



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE—Thursday, June 8, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LUTHER STRANGE, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Faithful Father, as our lawmakers face the challenges of this day, infuse their minds with a renewed sense of how much You have invested in them. Lead them to live for Your glory, embracing Your vision for our Nation and world. Lord, guide and inspire them with the great plans You want to accomplish through their work. May the knowledge that You are with them eviscerate fear, for You are our Lord and Savior.

Help us all to surrender to Your transforming power so that Your will may be accomplished on Earth, even as it is done in Heaven.

And, Lord, bless our wonderful pages as they prepare to leave Capitol Hill.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 8, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable LUTHER STRANGE, a

Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

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

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1628

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

### IRAN SANCTIONS BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, Senators voted on an overwhelming bipartisan basis—91 to 8—to advance critical legislation granting the administration more of the policy tools it needs to hold Iran accountable for its actions. We must now keep working toward final passage. The bill makes clear that Congress recognizes that Iran's aggressive behavior and efforts to expand its revolution across the broader Middle East must be stopped.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration's desire to draw down our conventional military presence from the Persian Gulf and Iraq created the self-

defeating imperative to avoid nation-state conflict at any cost, and they were reluctant to take any action that might upset the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—in other words, the so-called Iran deal. They kept this hands-off approach even when Iran supported terrorism and Shia militias and even as they harassed U.S. ships at sea—actions that were not part of the nuclear program or the Iran deal.

Advancing this bill makes the logical point that our Nation needs a comprehensive strategy to deal with all areas of Iran's aggression. It will give the current administration more of the tools it needs to take a stronger approach than the previous administration. It includes new mandatory ballistic missile sanctions, new terrorism sanctions, and a mechanism to ensure better enforcement of the arms embargo. These sanctions represent another key measure we can take now to keep American families safer and to support our allies over in that region.

I want to again note the broad bipartisan support this legislation has already received and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue working together so we can pass it.

### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. On another matter, Mr. President, just this week, Ohioans learned that a major insurer will exit their State's ObamaCare exchanges next year, leaving thousands in at least 18 counties without a single option—not one; not a single option—in the marketplace. The State's insurance department cites ObamaCare as the reason behind this troubling news, saying:

Before the Affordable Care Act (ACA) Ohio had a very competitive health insurance market. [But] new regulations from [the] ACA have driven some companies out of Ohio and made it harder for them to do business, both of which have driven up the cost of health insurance in Ohio.

Forcing insurance options out of the marketplace, making it harder for people to find coverage, driving up costs of health insurance—these are the results

of ObamaCare in Ohio and across the country, and the pain is all too real for thousands of Americans like those the President visited with just yesterday.

As he addressed a crowd in Cincinnati, the President shared the story of a small business owner from Louisville—my hometown—who, as the President said, is just one of the “many victims of the ObamaCare catastrophe” forced on the American people. Before ObamaCare, this Kentuckian’s employees had access to multiple options for high-quality, affordable healthcare. Now, under the failed healthcare law, these workers face premiums that are 150 percent higher, while having fewer choices. To make matters worse, health insurance under ObamaCare has become so unaffordable that he now has difficulty creating new jobs that would employ even more Kentuckians.

This Louisville man is not alone either. Just a couple of days ago, Dr. Tom Price, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, met with small business owners who have faced similar challenges because of ObamaCare, people like one Kentuckian from Richmond. Here is what this Kentuckian and founder of a CPA firm said of her experience with the failed healthcare law:

Of all the clients that we see, there’s not one good story about ObamaCare. And it’s mostly without exception, horror stories of what has happened to themselves and their own employees.

She, like so many others, knows that the so-called Affordable Care Act has really been anything but affordable for too many small business owners and their employees.

These Kentuckians’ stories provide just a glimpse into the disastrous impacts ObamaCare has had on Americans across the country. Although some may try to paint a different picture now, ObamaCare is responsible for the failures and the hurt it has created—not the American people, not those of us trying to help rescue families from this ill-advised law.

Since ObamaCare was fully enacted in 2013, premiums have increased by an average of 105 percent and millions of Americans have lost their plans. This year, people in just under three-quarters of counties nationally have only one or two choices on the ObamaCare exchanges, and the situation is likely to only get worse next year. That is why Senate Republicans believe we must act. That is why we are working to keep our commitment to the American people and finally provide relief from ObamaCare. This law has failed the American people, and the status quo is clearly unsustainable.

As Senate Republicans continue our conversations on a path forward, I hope our Democratic colleagues will finally put aside their last-ditch efforts to salvage this failing law that is hurting so

many people in the States they represent. It is time to face reality, no matter how inconvenient it may be, and help those who are counting on relief from ObamaCare.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

#### TESTIMONY OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning the Intelligence Committee is hearing testimony from former FBI Director James Comey. I hope and expect him to be as forthright and straightforward as he can. The Senate and, by extension, the American people deserve to know the truth about Mr. Comey’s interactions with the President.

Based on the opening statement Mr. Comey submitted to the committee, we know that he will confirm much of what we have already learned about the events of the past few months through the press. That is important in and of itself. Until now, we have read these reports with a healthy dose of skepticism, waiting for Mr. Comey to confirm or to refute their veracity. It appears the bulk of what we learned from the reports about Mr. Comey’s memos is true.

The President asked Mr. Comey to pledge “loyalty” to the President and asked him if he could “let go” of an investigation into one of the President’s close associates, former National Security Advisor General Flynn. That conversation took place in a meeting during which the President raised the prospect of Mr. Comey not continuing in the job.

The Senate appreciates this testimony. I am sure members of the Intelligence Committee will seek answers to many of the remaining and new questions the testimony raises.

There are so many questions that Mr. Comey’s testimony leaves hanging out there. Every single lead should be pursued. Let’s not lose sight of the very heart of this matter: a foreign adversary interfering with our democracy. There is an open counterintelligence investigation into whether members of the Trump campaign worked with that foreign adversary to help that campaign win the White House. This issue gets to the very foundation of our de-

mocracy: free and fair elections and the rule of law.

There is no process more sacred in democracy than the people exercising their voice at the ballot box. There is no principle more enshrined in our legal system than the principle that no one—no one—is above the law. Members of both parties should deeply care about getting the truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I hope that spirit will direct Senators in their questioning today.

#### RUSSIA AND IRAN SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Senators from both parties are negotiating the content of an amendment to the bill for tough, bipartisan Russia sanctions legislation.

On the Democratic side, we feel very strongly that we need a tough, effective package of Russia sanctions to move alongside Iran sanctions. I believe many of my Republican colleagues do, as well, so there is very likely an agreement to be reached.

President Putin has violated the sovereignty of Ukraine by annexing Crimea. He has committed human rights abuses, including the propping up of the brutal Assad regime in Syria, of stifling political dissent and the rights of his own people, and our intelligence community has concluded that Russia made a direct assault on our democracy by conducting a campaign to interfere in our elections.

That is why, principally, I proposed a vote on a bill put forward by my friend, the Republican Senator from South Carolina, Senator GRAHAM. This is a bill that includes as its cosponsors Senators MCCAIN and RUBIO on the Republican side and Senators CARDIN, BROWN, and MCCASKILL on the Democratic side. It is a strong bipartisan bill.

The bill would establish a process for Congress to review any Russia-related sanctions relief. The President and administration officials have demonstrated they are willing to consider lifting sanctions on Russia in exchange for vague, yet-to-be-articulated concessions, if any concessions at all. Congress ought to have the power to review any decision made by this administration before sanctions on Russia are lifted.

Senator MCCAIN has also introduced an amendment, along with Senator CARDIN, which would impose new sanctions on Russia. Given the revelations of Russian interference in our elections, new sanctions are warranted in addition to the existing sanctions. In addition to the Graham-Cardin bill, which should definitely be included, I hope Senator MCCAIN’s proposal is part of our consideration of Russia-related sanctions as well.

Chairman CORKER, Chairman CRAPO, Ranking Member BROWN, and Ranking

Member CARDIN are in ongoing discussions, as are the majority leader and I, about the content of the Russia sanctions and amendment. I am hopeful that we can resolve this issue and vote to advance both measures.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to work on their healthcare bill behind closed doors. They haven't made public a shred of bill text or even considered holding a committee hearing to debate the topic. Yesterday my friend the majority leader filed a motion to bring TrumpCare directly to the floor, skipping the committee process.

This is a party that screamed from the rafters "Read the bill, read the bill" when Democrats were putting together the Affordable Care Act. We spent over a year debating that bill. We tried with a bipartisan group of six to come up with a solution.

Republicans are putting together their bill in secret, with no Democratic input, and then will rush their bill to the floor without a single committee hearing, all in the span of 3 short weeks. This is a bill that will alter one-sixth of the American economy and affect tens of millions of American lives. For many, it will have life-and-death consequences.

The way Republicans are crafting this legislation is pulling the wool over the eyes of the American people on one of the most crucial issues affecting their lives. Why? There is only one explanation: They don't want the American people to see their bill. They don't want to go home to townhall meetings and let people give their opinions. Keep it under wraps, rush it through? There is only one good reason: They are not very proud of the product that they have put together.

The Republicans know that even if they make some changes to the bill that came over from the House—they may increase subsidies a bit or lower the amount of tax breaks they give to millionaires—they will still wind up with a bill that is far worse than the status quo: higher costs, less care. That is because they are working from a fundamentally flawed premise, which is to take support away from healthcare programs like Medicaid to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans. Senate Republicans can nibble around the edges, but they will not be able to excise the rotten core of their healthcare plan.

The House bill has the support of approximately 18 percent of Americans. A majority of Democrats, Independents, and Republicans don't like it. Don't you get the message, my Republican friends? We understand the ideologues are telling you that you must repeal. But now that people have actually

looked at repeal, they realize that is not the way to go.

The right approach is not to move backward, not to undo all the progress we have made in healthcare over the past 8 years and start from scratch. The American people don't want to go back to the days when an insurance company could discriminate against you because you have a preexisting condition or jack up your rates simply because you are older. That is not the kind of healthcare system the American people want. But that seems to be what our Republican colleagues, in the dark of night, are considering.

The right approach is to keep all the good things in the existing law and work in a bipartisan way to make more progress on lowering costs for consumers and improving the quality of care.

Again, I urge my Republican colleagues to drop their repeal efforts and, instead, work with Democrats on actually improving our healthcare system.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I heard President Trump talk about Democrats being obstructionists yesterday—out in Ohio, Kentucky—about a healthcare bill in which they are not asking for Democratic help or input. They are tied in a knot because their own party can't agree on the tax bill. They again are not asking for Democratic input. They are tied in a knot because their own party can't agree.

Now it looks as if they are doing the same thing on infrastructure. The President is in an "alter reality" world. He blames Democrats, but then his Republican colleagues, often at his instruction, are told not to work on the bill with Democrats. What is going on here?

What the President tweets and talks about at his rallies and what is actually happening are two different worlds—two different worlds. That is no good. It is no good for America, no good for the American people, and, frankly, no good for the President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Mrs. FISCHER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 1:30 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 99, the nomination of Scott Brown to be Ambassador to New Zealand; I further ask that there be 15 minutes of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation with no intervening action or debate; and that, if confirmed, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I think we all know that former FBI Director Comey just completed his public testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee. He testified about how President Trump asked him to pledge his loyalty to him personally and how the President asked the FBI to drop the investigation into former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn.

We know that last December, Michael Flynn had a discussion with the Russian Ambassador to the United States, Ambassador Kislyak, about dropping some of the economic sanctions that the United States has imposed on Russia. We know that Michael Flynn subsequently lied about that conversation.

We also know—and former FBI Director Comey discussed it today—that he

was fired by President Trump after he refused to pledge his loyalty to the President and did not drop the investigation into Michael Flynn.

All of that has led to the appointment of a special counsel, Bob Mueller, who has now taken over the executive branch portion of the investigation—an investigation which will likely go on for some time. It is essential for the good of the country that we get to the truth of what happened and get a full accounting and report.

As that investigation proceeds, there is one thing that should not wait, which is really what I want to talk about today. It is the need to take action against Russia for interfering in our democratic process and in our elections. There is no excuse for inaction on that front.

We know that starting in 2015, Russia launched an unprecedented and multifaceted campaign to undermine our elections—a view shared by our entire intelligence community. The Kremlin, according to former Director of National Intelligence Clapper, wanted to “undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process.” This was and remains the unanimous verdict of the intelligence community.

We know that as part of this effort, Russia hacked the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton campaign. We know that Russia’s military intelligence unit, the GRU, then released those emails to the public in increments which were timed to cause turmoil in the American electorate.

Russia paid more than 1,000 people—human trolls—to work out of a facility in Saint Petersburg, Russia. These trolls spent their waking hours creating anti-Clinton fake news reports and disseminating these stories in key states and districts. Russia also used thousands of botnets to echo and amplify these fake news stories.

Russia also targeted the election boards of nearly half the states in our country, successfully infiltrating at least four voter registration databases and gaining access to hundreds of thousands of voter records. They even attempted to infiltrate the Maryland State Board of Elections but were not successful.

My point here today is not to debate the extent to which those Russian actions impacted or did not impact our elections; my point is that there is unanimous agreement that they interfered in our democratic process and that tomorrow they could interfere in it for other purposes and other means. We know they have targeted Senators and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, and we can expect, especially if we do not take action, that these attacks will only grow in pace and sophistication as we head into future elections.

We also know that Russia’s attacks on democratic forms of government

reach well beyond our own borders. The intelligence community has warned us that Moscow will apply the lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against our allies and their election processes.

In the months following our election, we have seen Russia use a similar disruption strategy to try to undermine moderate candidates throughout Europe, including elections in France and the Netherlands. The Kremlin has also targeted German Chancellor Merkel’s Christian Democratic Party and German State computers.

The goal of these Russian attacks against our democracy and those of our allies is clear. In testimony before Congress this year, experts across the political spectrum have stated that Russia’s goal is straightforward—to undermine confidence in our democratic process, generate doubt about the legitimacy of our elections, and undermine the unity and resolve of the NATO alliance. They want to undermine confidence in democracy and the unity that has been demonstrated through NATO over many decades.

We have seen these unprecedented attacks on our democracy and on the democracies of our allies. The world is looking at us—and I am sure many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are hearing from officials from around the world, including our NATO allies—and is asking: Why is it that the United States has not taken any action to protect its democracy?

Why haven’t we responded to an attack that goes to the heart of our democratic system of government? Why aren’t we working closely and urgently with our allies to prevent these efforts to subvert our elections? Why, instead, are we hearing reports that President Trump is considering giving back the use of properties that the Russians used to spy on us, including one in my State of Maryland, on the Eastern Shore?

Following the overwhelming evidence of Russian interference in our elections, the Obama administration took some very limited measures to punish the Russians for those efforts, including denying them access to those properties. Those sanctions, of course, are on top of the already existing sanctions with respect to Russia’s actions in Ukraine. It is very important that we not talk about unwinding sanctions that have been put in place. That would only reward the Russians for the actions they have taken. Instead, we need to move on and pass legislation to send a clear message that we will sanction Russia for the actions it took to undermine our democratic process right here at home.

As our colleague Senator MCCAIN said yesterday on this floor, “The United States of America needs to send

a strong message to Vladimir Putin and any other aggressor that we will not tolerate attacks on our democracy.”

This is the time for all Americans to be patriots and not partisans. So, as the Senate soon considers a measure relating to sanctions on Iran, it is important that, at the same time, we enact sanctions against Russia for its violations of our democratic process.

I am a cosponsor of a number of bills that have been introduced to impose sanctions on Russia for that interference, and a number of those proposals are now being converted into amendments that will be offered. In addition to those Russian sanctions amendments that have been proposed, I have filed two additional amendments to ensure that we as a nation are thinking strategically about our long-term approach to combatting Russia’s cyber warfare, that we are shoring up our own cyber defenses in advance of our next elections, and that we are not rewarding Putin for these attacks by returning the diplomatic compounds that he used to spy on us.

My amendments would ensure that we have a concerted and unified strategy, developed with our NATO allies and European partners, to counter Russia’s cyber attacks, including its efforts to undermine our democratic elections. We do not currently have any kind of coordinated, developed strategy here in our own country or with our NATO and other allies.

My amendments would require the FBI to establish a high-level cyber security liaison for Presidential campaigns and major national political party committees to ensure that we do not have a repeat of the 2016 elections or at least that we are prepared to confront it. The liaison would share cyber threats as they arise and cyber security protocols with these organizations to stave off cyber attacks.

These amendments would also prevent the executive branch from returning the diplomatic compounds that Russia used to spy on us. They would prevent the return of those compounds until the Secretary of State certifies that Russia is no longer conducting cyber attacks against the United States that threaten our national security, our economy, or our financial stability.

It is outrageous that this administration is actually thinking of rolling back very modest sanctions that were put in place as a result of its attack on our democracy rather than joining us here in Congress on a bipartisan basis to make it clear that one cannot attack our democracy with impunity.

Mr. Comey’s testimony today and the work of the committees here and of Special Counsel Mueller are part of an ongoing effort to determine whether there was any collusion between the Russians and the Trump campaign.



That investigation will continue. People will investigate whether there are ongoing efforts to derail or disrupt or obstruct those investigations, and that will be a process which will play out over many months. But there is no reason to wait another moment before we take action on the question for which there is no dispute and no disagreement—the fact that the Russians interfered in our elections. Maybe yesterday they interfered because they had a preference for one candidate. Maybe the next time they will interfere because they have a preference for another candidate or another party. The point is that, on this issue, we need to show unity.

Our allies are asking us: How is it that you can sit on your hands and do nothing in response to what is an obvious attack on your democratic process? How can you even be considering relieving sanctions on Russia after its attack on your democracy?

I hope we will quickly take up legislation to impose sanctions on Russia, to send a strong signal to Russia and to our NATO allies and others around the world that we will not stand idly by when we have that kind of attack on our democratic process, that we will act, and we will act now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott P. Brown, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of Samoa to the Independent State of Samoa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 15 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brown nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Ex.]

#### YEAS—94

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

#### NAYS—4

Booker  
Gillibrand

Harris  
Schatz

#### NOT VOTING—2

Alexander

Menendez

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Under the previous order, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last year the Nation was shocked by undercover videos produced by investigative journalists with the Center for Medical Progress exposing Planned Parenthood's sale of fetal body parts and the callousness with which Planned Parenthood officials described their grisly work.

As we know, as Planned Parenthood and its allies in the mainstream media hoped, outrage fades with time, and attention turns—but not for long, for the abortion industry and its profiteers are never really beset by scandal. They are a scandal.

Just last month we got another reminder about the reality behind the talking points. Once again, it was the undercover journalists of the Center for Medical Progress doing the investigative journalism the mainstream media refuses to do. Once again, the video has been ignored by the pro-abortion media elite, whose principal interest is the story of the prosecution of the journalists for daring to speak this truth to their power.

The American people and their representatives in the U.S. Senate deserve to know what the new video shows. It shows the founder of Planned Parenthood's Consortium of Abortion Providers on a conference panel. She recounts a harrowing experience while performing an abortion: “An eyeball just fell down into my lap, and that is gross.” Her remarks were greeted with laughter from the audience.

It shows another Planned Parenthood doctor stating: “The fetus is a tough little object, so taking it apart in the womb is very difficult.”

This comment echoes a previous undercover video in which a Planned Parenthood doctor says that the bones of a 20-week old fetus were so strong that “I have to hit the gym for this.”

The video shows the director of abortion services for Planned Parenthood Gulf Coast saying that she sometimes uses forceps to “pull off a leg or two” to ensure an unborn child dies before being born—in other words, to avoid the moment when our Nation's laws might protect that child.

The video shows the medical director of Planned Parenthood in Michigan talking about surprising common ground between abortion doctors and pro-life activists.

We might actually both agree that there is violence in here. Let's just give them all the violence, it's a person, it's killing. Let's just give them all that.

That is not what they say in public. It certainly isn't what they tell their patients, the women who come into their clinics—just in private, at industry conferences, between networking opportunities and drinks at the open bar. Because they know—deep down, everyone knows the Center for Medical Progress videos shock, but they do not surprise. They don't teach us anything we don't already know. All they do is remind us of an inconvenient truth that demands our attention and our action.

It is certainly stirring the pro-abortion political machine into action. As expected, the Center for Medical Progress is once again the target of criminal and civil investigations designed to intimidate further questions about the abortion industry's methods and money. But the truth is out. It is there.

As we know, threats and intimidation are tactics of guilt and desperation of the losing side in every battle that has ever been fought. If Planned Parenthood were what they have publicly declared themselves to be, they would welcome transparency. We all know why they hide because we know what they hide.

The question, as always, is not what they will do, but what we will do. And the answer is always "as much as we can." We can start by enforcing existing abortion laws and by reforming others, for example, making the Mexico City policy permanent so taxpayer money is not used to promote abortions to disadvantaged people overseas or ending abortion after 20 weeks when unborn children begin to feel pain. We can confirm Federal judges who follow the Constitution rather than reverse engineer their preferred policy outcomes.

The truth about abortion is spreading because of advances in medical imaging, because of brave journalists, tireless activists, compassionate doctors, nurses, and other healthcare professionals. Statehouses are passing laws to protect American women and their children. The rising generation of young Americans is the most pro-life in decades because they know too.

Little by little, the truth is fighting free, like green shoots through the frost. One day soon, we will reaffirm our Nation's principles in their dignified fullness and avow, once again, that all men are created equal. All are entitled to life.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING SAM R. BRICE AND HOWARD A. "BUZZ" OTIS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, over the Memorial Day weekend, Alaska lost two really great men. These men were doers and they were builders in every sense of the word—both literally and figuratively. They were family people, and they were the best of friends to one another and to so many of us.

Today I wish to pay tribute to Sam R. Brice and Howard A. Otis—although, nobody called him Howard. We all knew him as "Buzz" Otis. I wish to take just a few moments this afternoon and tell Members of the Senate a little bit about these two very wonderful and great men.

You really couldn't find two more genuine Alaskans than Sam or Buzz. Yet neither was born in the State. They came to Alaska.

Sam grew up in Florida. He was educated at Columbia University in New York City. So he was a long way from New York City when he came to Fairbanks, AK. He served in the Marine Corps, and then he moved to Alaska to help his parents, Luther and helenka, establish a family construction business there in the Interior.

The story is pretty legendary about his mother helenka. His mother spelled her name always with a lower case "h". She didn't want the capital, and always made sure that you put the emphasis on the "len" in helenka. She was really the epitome of an independent, self-reliant, really strong Alaskan woman, and she wouldn't let anyone forget that. She was very outgoing, vivacious, and had a heart of gold. I think it all wore off on her children. We certainly saw that in Sam.

It was said that Sam Brice never met a stranger. He was known for remembering every good deed that others did for him—no matter how many years in the past it may have been, decades after the event. He always generously returned the favor and always remembered to just say: "Thank you for that"—"thank you for that."

Sam was one who just did good. He did good throughout the State. Those in rural Alaska have fond memories and affection for a man who helped build their communities and who was a leader. He was a leader of the Associated General Contractors, and in his later years was well known for roasting his fellow contractors at the AGC dinners. He had a great sense of humor, and that humor was really contagious.

The lines from Sam's obituary really say everything one needs to know about the man. They are:

In lieu of flowers, the family would wish all to remember Sam who lived by example, whether a handshake, a smile, or a contribution; he was always willing to lend a helping hand. Please remember all the different ways Sam has touched people's lives and consciously think how you can make the world a better place, as Sam demonstrated

throughout his life. We ask you honor Sam's memory by emulating his compassion to others and be a friend to man.

Sam's memorial services were this past Saturday. I was unable to attend. I know the church was packed to overflowing. But as I was in another part of the State that day, I couldn't help but think of those words from the obituary about how we can individually and collectively think about how we can make the world a better place by being compassionate to others, being a friend to others, and living that in our daily lives, as Sam did—truly, truly a great man.

His friend Buzz Otis was also a transplant to Alaska. He grew up in Michigan. He was educated at Michigan State and came to Alaska in 1975, thinking he was just going to explore the State for a few months, like so many who come to our State. They think they are just going to come, take a peek, and then leave, but as with many Alaskans, that didn't happen with Buzz. In 1976, he founded a landscaping business in Fairbanks called Great Northwest, and this was really his ticket to business success and to a lifetime commitment to Alaska.

I have so many good friends throughout the State who are givers and doers. I just think we Alaskans have a tendency to want to give back to our communities. We help our neighbors. Buzz Otis did that in spades. He was involved in a lot of different levels politically. He was a strong supporter of mine and other members of the Alaska delegation. He served on the Fairbanks North Star Borough Assembly and was elected as its presiding officer. He chaired the Fairbanks Economic Development Corporation and managed the North Pole Economic Development Corporation.

He was just involved in so many different aspects of his community. He was an outdoorsman and loved sports. He was a rugby player and had a rugby pitch. He loved the sport of dog mushing and encouraged young people to take it up. He was just always doing, always engaged.

He was blessed in life to have a great family and a wonderful, beautiful wife, Renee. That family standing together was a beautiful thing to watch in terms of the support they all gave one another, and it was truly so for Buzz, as a father and as a family man. I just can't think of anything better. Family really does come first.

That is ultimately what claimed the lives of these two wonderful men who had so much life left in them. Buzz's son was out on the river, and Sam and Buzz went out to check on him in Sam's plane. It wasn't out of the ordinary to do this. It was good weather, good visibility, and a pretty fair day for the Interior. It turns out that Buzz's son was OK, but the flight ended in tragedy. Sam's plane went down

near the Salcha River on the morning of Saturday, May 27.

If only this story had a happy ending. Instead, it had somewhat of an Alaskan ending. Sam and Buzz gave their lives doing what so many Alaskans do; that is, looking out for one another, looking out for their families.

But we know we don't remember people for how they lost their lives. We remember people for how they lived their lives. Sam and Buzz were truly "salt of the earth" Alaskans. They were honest, hardworking, caring, and adventurous. They hired local people, they treated them well, and they were always welcomed back by the communities they served so faithfully. They really dedicated their lives to the betterment of the last frontier, and they never forgot family. Family was always first.

Everyone says that you can't say enough about these people, and it is true. So I will conclude my remarks and just simply express the Senate's condolences to the Brice and Otis families: to Joan Brice, to Renee Otis, to their children, and to their families—great families—destined to carry on the legacies of Sam Brice and Buzz Otis.

#### 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALEUTIAN CAMPAIGN

We just recognized Memorial Day last week in our respective States. I was pleased to be with many Alaskans as we observed Memorial Day. We clearly revere those who serve in our military. In Alaska, we are home to more veterans per capita than any other State in the Union.

This year, I was privileged to host a most distinguished veteran at Alaska's official State veterans' memorial. This is located in a place called Byers Lake, which is midway on the Parks Highway between Fairbanks and Anchorage. It is extraordinarily picturesque. It is very tranquil. It is almost a spiritual place in many, many ways, as we look out to Denali in the background, being surrounded by the memorials for honoring those veterans who have served us.

But I was able to bring to that gathering a very distinguished veteran, our Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Zinke, a former Navy SEAL.

This following week, just on Sunday, I was able to do yet another Memorial Day. Our focus was not on those who gave their lives on foreign soil but in a battle for American soil. Our focus this past Sunday was on what is known as the "forgotten battle" of World War II. It was the bombing and subsequent occupation of the Aleutian Islands of Alaska by Japan. It was a yearlong campaign, and for those of us in Alaska, it is a campaign that we often speak about and we share the stories. There are veterans of that campaign who are still around today, sharing stories with us. They are living legends, if you will.

I recognize that for many, if you were to ask them whether the United States has ever been occupied—occupied in World War II—they wouldn't know. I think, unfortunately, the name the "forgotten battle" may be just exactly that. Most Americans don't recognize that the Aleutians were occupied by the Japanese, that Americans were killed in defending our homeland, and that some of the indigenous people were either transported to Japan as prisoners of war or evacuated to the southeastern coast of our State, a thousand miles away.

Making sure this "forgotten war" is not forgotten is a mission for me. It is an important part of our Nation's history. Again, that Aleutian Campaign was a yearlong campaign—fighting weather and terrain with equipment that was clearly not up to the challenge—to reclaim U.S. territory from a determined Japanese force.

A little bit of the history: On June 3, 1942, Japanese forces bombed Dutch Harbor and, over the succeeding days, occupied the islands of Attu and Kiska. These islands were occupied by Native people who had been there over a thousand years.

It was not until May of 1943 that Attu was retaken, and 549 U.S. and Allied troops were killed in combat. But there is evidence that the U.S. and Allied losses in the Battle of Attu were much higher as a result of exposure, disease, Japanese booby-traps, friendly fire, and frostbite. Let me just tell you, the elements out there in the Aleutians are particularly harsh. When you don't have the equipment, it makes it even more so.

The war in the Aleutians came at a great price for our Native people who had lived on those lands for thousands of years before the war. The homes were burned, churches were burned, and 881 of the Aleut residents of 9 separate villages were relocated to abandoned mining and fishing camps in Southeastern Alaska, where they were forced to live under some pretty tough conditions.

At the remembrance event that I attended in Alaska on Sunday, some of the evacuees were at the ceremony. They were there. They shared their stories about what it meant to literally be ripped from their village—without having any idea what was really going on—and then sent to an area that may have been a foreign country to them. On the Aleutian Islands, the environment is entirely different from that of a cannery in in Southeast Alaska. But what was extraordinary about these evacuees was, despite the very harsh, difficult, and, in many cases, horrible conditions, they never gave up. They didn't give up hope, and they certainly didn't give up their patriotism. Twenty-five men from the evacuated villages chose to join the fight. Three men joined the retake of Attu. All were

awarded the Bronze Star for their valor.

I think it is important to remember that the many lessons to be learned from the Aleutian Campaign. America once perceived itself as a nation oceans away from foreign threats. Today, I think it is unthinkable for us to think that any of our territory could be occupied by a foreign power. But we must never forget that during World War II, a portion of the United States was occupied, and it was occupied in those days, as today, because Alaska is a strategic location. These lessons cannot and should not be lost to history.

We all know the saying that those who forget history are condemned to repeat it. The Japanese incursion occurred less than a decade after GEN Billy Mitchell testified that Alaska is indeed the most strategic place in the world. The incursion taught our Nation a vital lesson—that the defense of America begins in Alaska. Fortunately, the lessons of the Aleutian Campaign and Alaska's strategic location are not lost on today's military planners.

Let me walk you through what we see in the State of Alaska right now, recognizing the proximity of Alaska to some of the hot spots around the world, whether it is North Korea, Russia, or China. Alaska is seeing a renaissance when it comes to our military presence. We see it at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, where Air Force F-22s and AWACS launch to acknowledge their Russian counterparts that are flying in the Air Defense Identification Zone. We see it at Eielson Air Force Base, which is preparing to receive two squadrons of F-35s beginning in 2020. We see it in the soldiers of the 4th Airborne Brigade Combat Team in Anchorage, who are now waiting deployment to Afghanistan. We see it in the soldiers of the 1st Stryker Brigade, who will soon begin their rotation of pre-deployment training at the National Training Center. We see it in the crews who are staffing ballistic missile radars in the State, looking very carefully at North Korea. We also see it in the patriotic construction workers who will begin building the new long-range missile discrimination radar at Clear Air Force Station this summer and on the missile fields of Fort Greely, ready to intercept an ICBM aimed at the North American continent from wherever. We see it in the Navy SEALs who train in Kodiak and in the coastguardsmen who protect our coastline from Metlakatla in the south, all the way north to the Arctic.

I think it is very clear that never again will the United States leave Alaska undefended, which brings me back to the characterization of the Aleutian Campaign as the forgotten battle. Seventy-five years ago, U.S. and Allied troops were called upon to repel an invader who occupied U.S. soil. We

in Alaska, particularly, will never forget that fact, but neither should America.

Ignoring the fact that war has been, in fact, waged on U.S. soil in this last century is a dangerous and a tragic thing. Let's resolve on this 75th anniversary of the start of the Aleutian Campaign that the forgotten battle is be forgotten no longer.

As I prepare to leave the floor, I would be remiss if I didn't add that at the remembrance event in Unalaska this weekend, it was not only an opportunity for many of the remaining evacuees to come together in Alaska—for some it was their former community; others were from the Pribilof, Kiska, and Attu. It was a coming together. It was a homecoming for some, but there was also an effort to bring together many of our veterans who had served in the Aleutian Campaign and whose only exposure to the Aleutians was when they came in to defend that territory. To have the exchange between those who had been forced from their homeland and those Americans, those veterans who had come to help—to have them united in a conversation for the first time ever was an exceptional American story.

Over the course of 3 days, the sharing of stories was a remarkable opportunity for us. I had a chance to speak with one of our World War II veterans who said: I always knew what our part of the fight was about, but I had no idea how what we were doing from the war effort had impacted these displaced people—the original people of the Aleutian Islands. To have that sharing, again, was a remarkable part of the story.

Then, to complete that picture, there were several individuals who were part of a Japanese film production company and were there to do the filming of this 75th remembrance because, as they said: This is an exceptional part of our history coming together too.

Recognizing, sharing that, and allowing the stories, again, to ensure that this is not forgotten was a very significant and, I think, healing opportunity for so many.

Madam President, I thank you for the opportunity to share this important part of our history, ensuring that the forgotten battle is not forgotten.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

DEPORTATION OF ANDRES MAGANA-ORTIZ

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, today the Secretary of Homeland Security has the opportunity to prevent an injustice and keep a family together. At 9 a.m. Hawaii time, Andres Magana-Ortiz was scheduled to report to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement office in Honolulu to be deported from his home of nearly 30 years.

Andres was brought to America when he was only 15 years old. In the years

since, he has raised three children who are U.S. citizens, is married to a U.S. citizen, has built a business, and has distinguished himself as a hard worker and a pillar of the South Kona community in Hawaii.

Andres' immigrant story is one familiar to so many American families. After working for more than a decade as a laborer on coffee farms across the Big Island, Andres saved enough money to buy his own farm. In the years since, Andres has taken on management of 15 other area coffee farms.

Suzanne Shriner, president of the Kona Coffee Farmers Association, put it best in her letter of support for him when she said:

Mr. Ortiz is a true example of the American Dream. Rising from a farm worker to a farm owner, he has created a successful business through hard work.

He has sent his children to college. And he has given back to his community, by working with other farms and farmers to control an invasive pest. His story is why we need to find a path to citizenship for these vital members of our farming community.

Andres has three children. Victoria, age 20, is a junior at the University of Hawaii. Paola, age 14, and Hector, age 12, are still in middle school. Their lives will be shattered without their father.

Andres remains on very good terms with his first wife, Veronica Ledesma Magana. In a letter she wrote to me, Veronica shared how much Andres cares for his children and how devastated they would be if he is forced to leave. She said:

Andres is a wonderful father to our children. They depend on him for so much and need him during these years that are so important to their development as human beings and citizens of the United States. Paola and Hector are children with special education needs.

This has been very hard for us as parents, but together we have worked to help her through school and life.

I am not able to support this family by myself.

Andres is an amazing role model to my children. He is a patient, loving, and supportive father to them in whatever they need. Victoria, Paola, and Hector love Andres very much and would go through extreme emotional hardship if he is deported.

She continues:

My oldest daughter will need to halt her college career to help me support Paola and Hector, especially because this deportation would bar him from returning to the [United States] for 10 years.

My children deserve a father to care for them, they deserve the educational opportunities he can offer them, and the love he shares with them every day.

I couldn't agree more.

In September 2014, Andres received a stay of removal in order to pursue various paths to achieving legal status. In fact, he has a pending application to receive such legal status.

Last November, he applied for an additional stay. Without warning or explanation, the government changed its

position in March 2017 and ordered that he be removed.

At that point, Andres filed for relief in Federal court. His case ultimately reached the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, where his request for an emergency stay was denied. Although the Ninth Circuit found it could not stay his removal, the chief judge of that court, Judge Reinhardt, issued a powerful, concurring opinion that clarifies the injustice in this case and made a powerful moral argument against President Trump's immigration policy.

Judge Reinhardt wrote:

It was fully within the government's power to once more grant his reasonable request. Instead, it has ordered him deported immediately. In doing so, the government forces us to participate in ripping apart a family. Three United States citizen children will now have to choose between their father and their country. If they leave their homeland with their father, the children would be forced to move to a nation with which they have no connection. All three children were born in the United States. None has ever lived in Mexico or learned Spanish. Moving with their father would uproot their lives, interrupt their education, and deprive them of the opportunities afforded by growing up in this country. If they remain in the United States, however, the children would not only lose a parent, but might also be deprived of their home, their opportunity for higher education, and their financial support.

Subjecting vulnerable children to a choice between expulsion to a foreign land or losing the care and support of their father is not how this nation should treat its citizens.

President Trump has claimed that his immigration policies would target the "bad hombres." The government's decision to remove Magana Ortiz shows that even the good hombres are not safe.

Mr. Ortiz is by all accounts a pillar of his community and a devoted father and husband.

The court went on to say:

It is difficult to see how the government's decision to expel him is consistent with the President's promise of an immigration system with "a lot of heart." I find no such compassion in the government's choice to deport Magana Ortiz.

We are unable to prevent Magana Ortiz's removal, yet it is contrary to the values of this Nation and its legal system. Indeed, the government's decision to remove Magana Ortiz diminishes not only our country but our courts, which are supposedly dedicated to the pursuit of justice.

Magana Ortiz and his family are in truth not the only victims. Among others are judges who, forced to participate in such inhumane acts, suffer a loss of dignity and humanity as well. I concur as a judge, but as a citizen I do not.

Judge Reinhardt made an important point, and I agree. The government has the power to prevent this family from being torn apart. Even now, Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly can issue an administrative stay to let Andres stay in this country while the government processes his application to receive legal status.

Earlier this week, I spoke to Secretary Kelly on the phone to discuss Andres' case and to urge him to issue a

stay that would allow him to stay in this country. Hawaii's congressional delegation has also written him a letter and provided a variety of other letters of support that Andres' friends, family, and neighbors have written on his behalf.

Secretary Kelly, I renew our call once more: Let Andres stay in our country. Let his children have a father present and active in their lives. It is not too late to keep this family together.

This entire ordeal speaks to the fear and anxiety spreading through immigrant communities across our country. Even the good hombres, as Judge Reinhardt called them, are at risk of being torn away from their families.

In an email, a spokesperson for ICE said: "While criminal aliens and those who pose a threat to public safety will continue to be a focus, DHS will NOT"—and the word "not" is in all caps—"exempt classes of removable aliens from potential enforcement." This is chilling. It means that 11 million people in our country will live in fear that they could be deported at a moment's notice.

We must pass comprehensive immigration reform that provides a pathway to citizenship and which prioritizes the unity of families. Andres' case is a tragedy, if not averted. There will be more cases like his in Hawaii and across the country. We must continue to fight on behalf of the good hombres and not stop until we succeed.

I would like to conclude by reading part of a letter I received from Gerald Personius, one of Andres' friends and a fellow coffee farmer from Captain Cook. He said:

Andres is a courageous, honest, caring, and dedicated person. So I ask you as a citizen of our beloved country to do the best you can to help this man continue to pursue his citizenship. He will not let America down.

We cannot let Mr. Ortiz down.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Democratic leader.

#### RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I would like to address the hearings that concluded just a few hours ago.

After hearing Mr. Comey's testimony today, America is stunned. The cloud hanging over this administration has just gotten a whole lot darker.

I commend both the chairman, Senator BURR, and the vice chairman, Senator WARNER, for the way they ran this hearing. The Senate and the American

people are better informed as a result of their work. Few committee hearings in the history of the Senate have produced the kind of eye-opening testimony we heard today. In its wake, I would like to make a few points.

First, for weeks, media reports indicated that the President had directly and indirectly pressured the FBI Director to end the FBI's investigation into General Flynn. Innuendos and intimations swirled around. But we now know much more of the truth. There is now no doubt that Mr. Comey understood the President's request that he let go of the investigation into General Flynn—in a meeting during which it was discussed whether Mr. Comey would keep his job as FBI Director—as a direct effort to prevent that investigation from going further that looks a lot like a quid pro quo.

During questioning from a Republican Senator, Mr. RISCH, Mr. Comey told us that he took the President's conversation with him about the FBI investigation into General Flynn as a directive to scuttle that investigation.

It is clear that President Trump's legal defense is to refute Mr. Comey's account. Well, the President threatened Mr. Comey with the release of tapes of their conversations. Presumably that includes the conversation in which President Trump asked Director Comey to "let go" of the Flynn investigation. It is awfully curious that no one from the President's team will either confirm or deny the existence of the tapes when the tapes are the only way to prove that Mr. Comey's testimony, which came under oath, is false or misleading. If President Trump disagrees with anything the Director has said today, he should play the tapes for all of America to hear or admit that there were no tapes.

Second, Director Comey's contrasting view of the Clinton email case and the Russia case is telling. Mr. Comey did not wish to see a special counsel in the Clinton case because he looked at the facts and determined there wasn't a case for one. With respect to the Russia probe, the Director examined the facts and felt there was enough potential evidence that a special counsel was warranted. Again, the contrast is telling.

Democrats and Republicans alike and the American people as well should be pleased that the investigation is in the hands of former Director Mueller.

Third, the hearing raised serious questions about Attorney General Sessions that he and the Justice Department must answer immediately. Senators WYDEN and HARRIS repeatedly asked Director Comey about Attorney General Sessions' involvement in the investigation before he recused himself. Director Comey didn't have direct knowledge of his involvement but made clear that he suspected that the Attorney General needed to recuse

himself weeks before he actually did so and that he could not share the reasons for that in an unclassified briefing.

So we need to know the answers to a number of questions regarding the Attorney General. The Senate Intelligence Committee investigation and Special Counsel Mueller ought to get to the bottom of this matter.

In conclusion, Mr. Comey's testimony has been very enlightening, but there is much work ahead for investigators in Congress and those under the direction of Mr. Mueller.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Monday, June 12, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of Executive Calendar No. 65. I further ask that there be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate, and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that following disposition of Executive Calendar No. 65, the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 722, with all postcloture time considered expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### TRIBUTE TO MARTY SHORVER

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, every week for some months now, I have been coming to the Senate floor and I have been using the opportunity to talk about someone in my State, the great State of Alaska, who has made a difference. We call that person the



Alaskan of the Week. These are individuals who are unsung in many ways and who are doing something for their community, for their State, and in many ways are inspiring everybody.

I am a little biased, but I believe I live in the most beautiful State in the country, probably the most beautiful place in the world, full of wonderful people and beautiful landscapes, and we certainly encourage everybody here in the Senate or those who are watching on TV to come to Alaska and experience it themselves, and they will have the trip of a lifetime, guaranteed. We are also blessed to live in a land that provides so much for our physical and spiritual needs. It is a very spiritual place.

Alaskans are hardy people; however, like anyplace in the country, people have tough times. Some people are more fortunate than others. But thankfully we have people all across our State—like we have people all across America—who give of themselves so that those in difficult situations can receive the care they need.

Today I want to take you to Kotzebue, AK, or what we often just refer to as Kotz. Kotz is about 550 miles northwest of Anchorage, 26 miles north of the Arctic Circle in Alaska's Northwest Arctic Borough. About 3,000 people live in Kotzebue. It is one of our bigger villages, and it is a hub for dozens of smaller villages that dot this enormous, beautiful region. Like most of Alaska, it is cold in the winter, and it is beautiful now under a never-setting Sun. The midnight Sun in Kotz is high in the sky. There are wonderful people there.

Like most places in Alaska, particularly in smaller villages in rural Alaska, community is everything. People take care of each other. People band together to help each other overcome challenges that can exist in the extreme environments we have in Alaska.

Let me tell my colleagues today about Marty Shoryer, who is one of the very generous residents of Kotzebue and who is our Alaskan of the Week. Born in Kotzebue, Marty is the general manager of Kotzebue Electric Association, where he has worked for more than 24 years. He has been married to his wife Lucy since 1977. They have six children and seven grandchildren. In his free time, he fishes—very common—plays hoops, and loves to cook for his family. He is also involved in the Boys and Girls Club and his Tribal government.

But here is why I want to talk about Marty and why he has been such an inspiration not only in Kotzebue but throughout the State. On Thanksgiving 2015, Marty got sick, and over the next several weeks, he had to go to the hospital repeatedly. While he was there, he noticed a group of people who would gather around the free coffee that was served at the hospital. He ap-

proached one of them, a woman named Jo-Ann, and asked a very simple question: "Why do you guys hang around here? What are you doing?"

She told him: "Well, we don't really have another place to go right now."

This disturbed Marty greatly. At that time of year in Kotzebue, it can get down to 20 and 30 below zero—a difficult place.

"You guys must be hungry," he said to Jo-Ann, and she said that they were. So the next day and the day after that—5 days a week—Marty and Lucy together used their own money and their own lunch hour during the workweek to make sandwiches—a simple act—30 to 40 sandwiches for that group at the hospital. Every day, every person who needs one gets a sandwich, sometimes turkey and cheese, sometimes caribou or sheefish spread. Marty is anxious for the salmon season to start so he can make salmon spread sandwiches. They also get a juice box and dessert. Simple but generous.

Recently, another generous Kotzebue resident, Sophie Foster, began making sandwiches as well, and before you know it, we have a whole community that is doing this, taking this simple example and getting involved. So now some people drop off cinnamon rolls or fruit. Others bring back bulk items when they travel to Anchorage. Dozens of people in Kotzebue, AK, are now helping in this effort because of Marty's simple act.

People like Marty and his wife Lucy make my State truly unique and a wonderful place. His generosity—doing something seemingly so simple: making a sandwich for someone who is hungry—has now had a big impact not only in Kotzebue but in Alaska. Marty didn't know the impact he would have when he began making sandwiches. "I was just trying to help a few people that day, make them happier."

Marty's actions have initiated a growing conversation in Kotzebue about how best to take care of people who need help. It has drawn attention to homelessness and hunger—very important issues not only in Alaska but throughout the country. Marty spurred this important conversation in Kotzebue and in our State through his simple actions, and that has inspired all of us.

Congratulations, Marty, for what you are doing, for your simple acts of inspiration, and for being our Alaskan of the Week.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

#### TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I come to the floor today to highlight the importance of travel and tourism in our economy and also to make the point that we are welcoming of people from other countries—and we are welcoming of people in our country, as

well—who want to be part, for a short time or a long time, of America. The travel and tourism business is an incredibly important part of the tourism economy.

Last month, I, along with my fellow cochairs of the Senate Travel and Tourism Caucus—Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR, Senator DEAN HELLER, and Senator BRIAN SCHATZ—led the Senate in the passage of a resolution recognizing the week of May 7 as National Travel and Tourism Week.

There are really good statistics—whether it is Missouri or West Virginia or the country at large—on this topic. One out of every nine jobs in the United States depends on travel and tourism. It accounts for over 15 million jobs nationwide. International travel to the United States is our single largest export industry. The single largest thing where people bring money into our country is tourism to the United States. It generates a trade surplus of roughly \$87 billion. As to that trade surplus with foreign travelers, foreign travelers stay longer, they spend more, and they like us better when they leave—virtually 100 percent of the time—than they did when they got here. Even if they thought they were going to like us a lot, they wind up liking us more. If they questioned whether they were going to like us at all, they almost always wind up on the very positive side of that question.

So it is not only a huge economic benefit of \$87 billion, but it is also a huge foreign policy benefit—a huge diplomatic benefit. It is just like when students come here and go to school. They have a connection to the United States that is almost always positive. It is so positive that many of them would like to stay, with that bachelor's degree or that engineering certificate and degree, because they have liked what they found when they were here. So \$87 billion is the surplus from just international travelers to the United States. But all told, travel and tourism generates nearly \$2.3 trillion in annual economic input for our country.

In Missouri, it has been estimated that the tourism industry, which is usually right behind agriculture in the list of our top industries, provides more than \$15 billion in annual economic impact and directly supports almost 300,000 Missouri jobs. When international tourists come here and spend their money at hotels, restaurants, and shops, they are not only supporting U.S. businesses, but they are contributing to local, State, and Federal tax revenue.

We have a great deal to offer when it comes to attracting these international visitors. We also have a lot of things we can do as a Congress to make a difference in how people travel and where they travel. We have a role to play in promoting the United States as a travel destination and in helping our

State and local tourism economies be a part of that travel.

The Visa Waiver Program is sometimes questioned by some of our colleagues who say anybody can get on a plane in any of these visa waiver countries, and we particularly hear that when something bad has just happened in 1 of those 38 countries—Great Britain, France, or Germany. We hear: Anybody could come here because they don't have to go to the U.S. Embassy and get a visa. Except that is not how it works. That is not how the Visa Waiver Program works at all now. It does enable citizens of the 38 countries that we include to travel here for tourism and business for 90 days or less without the need to obtain a specific visa. By the way, in return, Americans go to those 38 countries without having to go to the Embassy of that country and get a visa and have an interview that allows them to travel there. So that is both ways.

Most importantly from our perspective, as to people who are coming here, the program has a lot of security built into it. For all the travelers who come, the Visa Waiver Program is administered by the Department of Homeland Security. It works in consultation with the State Department. Visa waivers use a risk-based, multilayered approach to detect and prevent terrorists, criminals, and other bad actors from traveling here. If you have been in some country lately that we don't think you should have been in, if you have a history of travel back and forth to countries and we have had bad experiences with people who have been in those countries, not only do you not get a waiver but you are in for a much more extensive interview than if we were trying to interview everybody from all of those 38 visa waiver countries who wants to come to the United States.

The President announced about 4 months ago that we were going to have a more extensive visa process in countries that need a visa, but that also can be a more extensive visa process in countries that have visa waivers, if someone requires more vetting. If someone does not want to submit to additional vetting, then they don't have to come to the United States of America. Those kinds of questions are easily answered.

There are comprehensive vetting programs for individuals prior to the time they can get here—as well as when they get here—if they are in that visa waiver structure. So visa waiver works.

I think the visa program is working now with more extensive vetting than we have had in the past.

The program requires participants to have an electronic passport that has a chip in that passport that makes it virtually impossible to suggest that you are somebody or to try to pretend that you are somebody who you are not. The

passport is much more secure than it used to be—both our passports and passports from those countries.

In 2015, I worked with a bipartisan group of our colleagues to reform and improve this program and to secure that its robust security protocols would work as intended. We were also able to remove visa waiver eligibility for nationals of participating countries who have visited a country with a terrorism nexus, and for foreigners who participate who are originally from countries that may pose a terrorist threat. There are ways to screen that process that Americans should feel secure about. Frankly, it is a process that is getting better all the time. It is still not absolutely without risk. Travel has some risk. But thousands of people are bringing billions of dollars in tourism revenue to our economy, to see our country, and to pay our taxes. We ought to be sure we are minimizing the risk and maximizing the welcome for people we want to travel here.

I also worked with my colleagues twice now to offer a public-private partnership called Brand USA. The United States of America, just a few years ago, was one of the few countries in the world that made no real effort to encourage people in other countries to visit our country. In 2014, Senator KLOBUCHAR and I worked to reauthorize Brand USA through 2020. In a combination of visa waiver fees and private dollars, efforts have been successfully made to encourage people who want to be part of our economy—even for a short period of time, as a tourist. It is estimated that across all markets, each dollar of Brand USA marketing generated more than \$30 in visitor spending. Let me repeat: everywhere we spent a dollar of Brand USA—and that is a public-private dollar—more than \$30 came to the United States, it is estimated, because of that.

It is important for the Senate to support programs that work. Brand USA is one of those programs. The Visa Waiver Program and many others have significant, positive economic impacts on our country, on individual States, on local communities, and, by the way, on people whose business and travel necessarily take them to other countries.

Travel and tourism is one area where we have successfully worked together in a bipartisan manner. I hope we can continue that progress in this Congress. I will keep working with my colleagues to ensure that we have the right policies in place to keep Americans safe, while allowing our travel and tourism industries to continue growing and creating jobs.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, when I came onto the floor, you were not presiding; you were on the floor talking about the Visa Waiver Program. It is an agreement we have with almost 40 other nations that allows for the free flow of visitors from those countries to our country. It is viewed, in part, as a way to promote tourism and help grow that part of our economy and the economies of the other 38 or 39 nations with which we already have this agreement. Some people believe it is a gaping hole for fomenting terrorism and giving terrorists the ability to infiltrate our countries and do mischief here and other places around the world.

I applaud the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Missouri, for actually explaining how the system works. It is actually not just a way to enhance and promote tourism, which is important to all of our economies, it actually enhances our security if done well, done right, and done correctly. I say to the Presiding Officer, the former chairman of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security, I appreciate very much your making those comments today.

#### RESOLUTION CONDEMNING RECENT TERRORIST ATTACKS

I am going to do something today, Mr. President, that I have never done before. I have never come to the floor and actually read a resolution or a piece of legislation that we are going to be voting on later today. This is a resolution that came out of discussions yesterday as we were contemplating voting on additional sanctions with respect to Iran—sanctions not related to violations of the joint agreement on nuclear weapons. They appear to be in full compliance with what they professed to do, promised to do a year or two ago. There doesn't seem to be a question that they are doing what they promised to do, and that is good.

There is what we believe is an obvious violation of U.N. requirements that say the United Nations doesn't believe that Iran should be testing ballistic missile systems. Even though they have no nuclear weapons—we don't believe they are going to have them anytime soon; hopefully not, because that would help spark a nuclear arms race in that part of that world—we still have, along with the U.N., this prohibition against them developing and testing ballistic missiles. They have violated that a number of times, and a lot of other nations, including us, are concerned about that. We have before us this week and again next week legislation dealing with that.

My hope is that next week we will consider that legislation and have a chance to offer amendments to it. My

strong hope is that we will not only be talking about our desire to see Iran fully comply with the U.N. guidelines but that we will also couple with that legislation sanctions dealing with Russia. This is a country that continues to make mischief in this country and countries around the world.

Today, a lot of attention was riveted on the testimony by former FBI Director Jim Comey on whether there was an attempt by the Russians to influence our Presidential election last year. All 17 intelligence agencies in this country have decided unanimously that the question is not only did they attempt or want to influence the outcome of the Presidential election—they all say yes. The answer is yes. All those intelligence agencies say yes. The second thing they said is that they feel the Russians succeeded in what they wanted to accomplish because the person they wanted to see defeated—Secretary Clinton—lost, and the person they wanted to see win—Donald Trump—won and now serves as President of the United States.

The issue that is going on right now in the hearings before the Intelligence Committee involve whether there was collusion between the Trump organization and the Russians during or prior to the time of the election. Ultimately, we will find out the truth, and we will let the chips fall where they may.

I think we make a mistake in simply going forward and admonishing the Iranians for testing ballistic missile weapons while at the same time this effort by the Russians to really make a mockery of our election system and change the governance of this country is a far greater threat.

My hope is that when we come back and take up these issues next week, that we will not address only the one involving Iran but that we will address in a thoughtful way the actions the Russians have taken and not let them get away with this. That is the debate for next week.

In Iran, actually 2 or 3 weeks ago, they had elections. I have spoken about this before on the Senate floor. The elections they had were Presidential elections. Here in this country, we have Presidential elections every 4 years. As it turns out, in Iran they have them every 4 years as well. In this country, most people age 18 and older are eligible to vote. The percentage of people among the electorate who actually vote is not great. Actually, for the longest living democracy in the history of the world, it is sometimes a bit disappointing. But the percentage of people who turned out to vote in the Presidential election in Iran a few weeks ago approached 75 percent, which is a good deal higher, I believe, than what we have accomplished in recent years. They have a lot of young people in that country, and the average age of the 80 million people who work there is under

the age of 25. It turns out that the young people—not like the young people in Vietnam and a bunch of other countries—they like our country. They want a better relationship with our country, and the voting that occurred in Iran 2 or 3 weeks ago actually reflected that.

President Ruhani ran on a campaign that included better relations with, among others, the United States. And I think the election of a lot of mayors in places like Tehran, the capital of Iran, which has changed from a hardliner who didn't agree with President Ruhani's views on this matter—they were turned out of office. That is all a very encouraging development.

There are still people in that country who don't like us, and they wish us harm, wish us ill, and they support terrorism. This is a source of concern. But, particularly with the younger people there, it is a new day there, and I think that is encouraging. We shouldn't be blind to the mischief that some in their country would create, but we also shouldn't be blind to the encouraging things happening among the young people, especially reflected in the voting. We congratulate them on actually having an election where that many people voted.

In some other countries around the world where Muslim is the principal faith, they don't allow women to vote. They don't allow women to participate in the elections, and they don't allow them to get elected. In Iran, the elections in I think Tehran, in the city council alone—women do vote in Iran. They get to run for office. I think in the city council in Tehran alone, six women were elected to serve on the city council. So that is a positive.

We commend them for having elections, and it is their job to figure out whom they are going to elect. I am personally encouraged by the turnout and the participation, especially of women, the election of women, and the President and a lot of young leaders in that country who have different view of us and their willingness to work with us and other like-minded nations in the future.

On the heels of the election, roughly 2 weeks later, there were terrorist attacks in London, in Britain, I think in Australia in the last couple of weeks, and, in the last few days, in Iran. Their Parliament was attacked. You can imagine terrorists coming in and attacking those of us who work in this building, whether they happen to be the pages or Senators or staff. That is what happened in Tehran a couple of days ago at 10 o'clock in the morning, with folks breaking into Parliament and trying to kill folks. They also attacked a sacred site—I think a mausoleum—in another part of the country. Close to 15 people were killed, and many times that number were wounded, some very seriously.

On the heels of that attack and on the heels of the election, on the heels of the attack by ISIS—in both of the attacks on Iran, the attacks were masterminded apparently by ISIS. We don't know for sure given that ISIS tries to take credit for attacks they had nothing to do with or little to do with. But there are people in Great Britain who have lost loved ones, family members, friends. They are suffering, they are hurting, and they are mourning today, and the same is true of Iran.

Great Britain is one of our two or three closest allies in the world. They are like brothers and sisters to us, and we feel a special kinship and extend our condolences to those whose lives have been ended, whose lives have been shattered, and whose lives will be forever changed.

While we do that with our friends and allies in Britain who suffered from these attacks by ISIS, on the heels of a different kind of election in Iran—an encouraging election in Iran—and similar attacks by ISIS on Iran—some suggest it is because they have a willingness to actually have a better relationship with us, and maybe that is what drew the attacks by ISIS. In any event, we certainly express our condolences to the good people in Iran who lost their brothers, sisters, parents, aunts, uncles, and sons, and we remember them today.

The resolution has been drafted by Senator CORKER, the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, and by Senator CARDIN. It is a resolution that is not very long. I am going to read it. It is a resolution that dates to these attacks and mentions both countries I just mentioned—Great Britain, our ally, and Iran, with which we have had difficulty for the last 30, 40 years but which is now interested in a new day with us. To the extent that we can find a way to work together, especially in commerce, the Iranians want to buy aircraft from us. They want to buy Boeing aircraft. They don't want military aircraft. They have an airline which is just awful. It is decrepit, old, aged, and they want to buy \$10 to \$12 billion worth of Boeing aircrafts, passenger airlines. I would say let's sell to them. The idea is, if we would do that, we would not just put 5 or 10,000 people to work, we would provide job employment opportunities for even more people than that in this country. Why wouldn't we be interested in that? I hope we will allow that to go forward. It would be good for us and also it would be good for them, and maybe it would provide a foundation for working more closely together. I don't know if we would have the kind of relationship that we have with Britain, but as a veteran of the Vietnam war, I can state that when I go for a run some mornings—when I stay down here and go for a run early in the morning, I run down

to the Lincoln Memorial. I always run by the Vietnam Memorial. I take my fingers, and as I go along the wall, I let my fingers brush over the names of the people with whom I served, and there are 55,000 who died in that war. They were our friends, our colleagues, our family members, people we literally served with at that time, and they are gone. Yet somehow we have been able to let bygones be bygones and develop a close, august friendship with the Vietnamese. We are their strongest trading partner. They are buying a lot of aircraft from us these days, and we are now going to sell weaponry to them.

We are not going to do anything like that with Iran, certainly with respect to weaponry, but if we can get over finally our difficulties of war and hostilities and so forth with the Vietnamese, maybe we can someday, with a change in leadership with Iran, begin to look more toward a constructive relationship in the future.

The other thing I want to do is, I just want to take this resolution and actually read that which Senators CORKER and CARDIN and their staffs have worked on and thank them for their good work.

There will probably be a vote later this evening in wrapup, where there will be a unanimous consent request that this bipartisan resolution be approved. I think it is a good thing, it is the right thing, it is a fair thing. How would we want to be treated by other countries if ISIS attacks us and kills our people? We want them to be sympathetic and have some feeling for us and not be quiet about it. That is essentially what we want to do here.

The resolution goes something like this:

Condemning the recent terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom, the Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Australia, and Iran.

It offers "thoughts and prayers and sincere condolences to all of the victims, their families, and the people of their countries."

Whereas since May 22, 2017, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) has claimed responsibility for multiple terrorist attacks against civilians that have left more than 180 dead and many more wounded.

Whereas ISIS frequently claims attacks perpetrated by individual actors or other groups for propaganda purposes.

Whereas the people of the United Kingdom are grieving following two terrorist attacks claimed by ISIS in London on June 4 and Manchester on May 22 that targeted and killed innocent men, women, and children.

Whereas government forces in the Philippines are currently fighting ISIS militants in Mindanao, including ISIS-affiliated fighters from the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Chechnya, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen, who launched an assault in Marawi City on May 23 in an apparent effort to establish a caliphate in Southeast Asia.

Whereas ISIS has claimed responsibility for two explosions in Jakarta, Indonesia, killing three policemen.

Whereas ISIS targeted Coptic Christians in Egypt during an attack on a bus on May 26, killing 29 people.

Whereas 22 people were killed when ISIS detonated a car bomb at a Baghdad ice cream parlor, killing Iraqi families gathering with their children to break the Ramadan fast, and then detonated a second bomb killing elderly Iraqis collecting their pensions.

Whereas a terrorist attack claimed by ISIS killed one person in Melbourne, Australia, and wounded three police officers.

Whereas on June 7, in an attack claimed by ISIS, at least 12 people were killed when gunmen and suicide bombers targeted Iran's parliament and a shrine—

I believe it was a mausoleum or where one of their earlier leaders was entombed, enshrined—

in two coordinated attacks across Tehran.

Whereas these reprehensible attacks have no place in a peaceful world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns ISIS' horrific terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom, Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Australia, and Iran;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the victims of these attacks and their families;

(3) expresses solidarity with the people of the United Kingdom, the Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Australia, and Iran;

(4) recognizes the threat posed by ISIS and recommit to U.S. leadership in the Global Coalition working to defeat ISIS.

My father served in World War II. He was a chief petty officer. Most of my uncles served in World War II and/or Korea. One of my uncles I never met. My mom's youngest brother served in the U.S. Navy. He was stationed on a ship called the USS *Suwannee*. It was an aircraft carrier.

They were on duty in the Western Pacific in 1944, and their group of ships came under attack by Japanese kamikaze pilots, dive-bombing and crashing their aircraft into several ships, including the USS *Suwannee*, the ship on which my uncle Bob was stationed. He was 19 years old. I think he was on the ship and they were trying to launch aircraft to take on the kamikaze pilots before they could do much damage and several of the aircraft apparently crashed into the aircraft carrier on which my Uncle Bob was doing duty up on the deck of the aircraft carrier.

His body, along with the bodies of a number of people who were on the deck, were never recovered. They were killed, missing in action for an extended period of time, and their bodies were never recovered.

I told folks back in Delaware about my grandmother during one of the Memorial Day observances. I don't know if the Presiding Officer has this in Missouri, but in Delaware, during some of our observances, we have a place of honor where some of our Gold Star families sit. I told the Gold Star families at a bridge ceremony in Wilmington near the Delaware Memorial Bridge—I pointed out where the Gold Star families were sitting, and I said: My grandmother, if she were still alive, would be 110 today, and she would be sitting right over there with all the Gold Star families and mothers.

She never saw her son again after he went off to serve in the war. There was a lot of sorrow in that family for years and years and years. They had pictures for as long as I can remember. There was a picture of my Uncle Bob, age 19, posing, at the time, in his dress blue uniform.

I was a dead ringer for him. My sister and I, after we were born in West Virginia, grew up in Danville, VA. I went off to high school and then became a Navy midshipman and then went off to Southeast Asia. I would go home to visit my relatives in West Virginia, including my grandparents. I would go back to that house. I would go back to the picture and look at him because as I grew older, the resemblance was pretty remarkable. My grandmother, from the time I was a little boy until I grew up, would always call me Bobby. That was his name, not mine. I was Tommy, but she would call me Bobby. It was kind of eerie. She would never try to correct it. She would just call me Bobby.

Sometimes people would have nicknames for us as kids, and my grandfather always called me Joe. So we would go spend time, a week or two, with them in the summer, and my grandmother called me Bobby and my grandfather called me Joe. I wasn't sure who I was when I would go back to their home in Danville or Roanoke, VA, but I know my grandmother loved her son Bobby, and the folks who took his life were Japanese. They were Japanese.

In the Navy, I flew missions with Japanese forces during the Vietnam war and the Cold War when I was a naval flight officer. Japan is among our best friends today, one of our closest allies, despite the hundreds of thousands of lives which were lost in the attack on Pearl Harbor and the war that ensued.

Germany, at the other side of the world, was a bitter enemy during World War II and is among our closest allies and has been for years the bulwark in that part of the world.

I just mention them to say that the folks that might be our adversaries today—Vietnam, where I served, was a great adversary for a number of years, and today, as I said earlier, is one of our closest trading partners, and they are one of our partners. We had, I thought, a wonderful trade agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership should have been approved by us and never was. It was negotiated in the last administration. I think in history they will say that it was a huge mistake we made not to approve it after negotiating it over a period of several years with 11 other countries, including the Vietnamese.

The Vietnamese are amazingly close. They love Americans. God, they love Americans. They love us more than we love us, and you can feel it. Every time I go over there, I am reminded of that.

Things have a way of changing. Leadership changes, people change, the attitudes of people toward the rest of the world, including us, will change. The results of the Iranian election give me some encouragement. I hope they give the rest of us encouragement. I hope someday some of those young Iranian people who admire this country and love this country will have a chance to come here and visit.

Ironically, today is the last day we have a lot of young people here in this Chamber who are leaving us. We call them pages. Some are sitting down here. I walked up to them earlier today. We have doors—seven doors—and when we are having votes, people and Senators come in and out, and we have two pages stationed at every door. We have pages down here at the foot of the Presiding Officer on either side. What I tried to do was just go around to the pages and shake their hands, say goodbye, and thank them for their service during what has been really, as the Presiding Officer knows, a challenging time for all of us. I would say I had to have a chance to address these pages as well as the rest of our colleagues here, but I want to say to the pages, thanks a lot for your service, and we hope you have been inspired not by our shortcoming but by the potential you see here for us continuing to send this ship of state into the future.

A lot of people are concerned about the direction our country has taken. I would like to remind them, especially these pages, that 150 years ago we fought a civil war in this country. I grew up in Danville, VA, the last capital of the Confederacy. I think some people were still fighting the Civil War when I got there. I was 9 years old and my sister was 10. So 150 years ago, the Civil War was fought, where hundreds of thousands of people were killed, many more were crippled, wounded, and maimed.

After that, we saw our President assassinated. President Lincoln was assassinated. After that, our President who succeeded him, Andrew Johnson, was impeached, and somehow we got through all of that in the 19th century.

When we finally made it to the 20th century, what happened? World War I—we fought it, won it, and led our allies to victory. Then World War II, we fought it, won it, and led the allies to victory in World War II. The Cold War—won it, led our allies to victory in the Cold War. The Great Depression—we fought our way out of it and led the world to a much stronger economy.

When the 21st century dawned on January 1, 2001, here is where we were as a nation: the strongest economy on Earth, the most productive workforce on Earth, a nation of peace, four balanced budgets in a row. We hadn't balanced our budget since 1968, but the last 4 years of the Clinton administra-

tion we were 4 and 0 in terms of a balanced budget.

Since the century began, we were the world's mightiest Nation—the mightiest force for justice—and we were the most admired Nation on the planet. I would just keep in mind the words of Harry Truman: The only thing new in the world is the history we have forgotten and never learned. He was a guy from Missouri, as I recall, like our Presiding Officer.

We are going through a tough time now, and we will get through it. My hope is that our pages, who have provided a great service here in the recent months of their service, will someday come back as interns, maybe someday as staff members, maybe someday as Senators and Representatives and chiefs of staff, and will play other roles in guiding our country.

We thank all of you.

My hope is that, as time goes by, the tensions around the world, the hatred, the vitriol, and the murder and the mayhem will have dissipated. Countries just like Japan in World War II, like Germany in World War II, and like Vietnam in the Vietnam war were our bitter enemies at one time but are now our friends. Maybe we can turn the page with Iran, and they can turn the page with us. They will be better for it, and in the end, we will too.

Your generation, especially, will be better for that.

I thank Senator CORKER and, again, Senator CARDIN and their staffs. I thank our leadership—Senator MCCONNELL and Senator CHUCK SCHUMER—for making sure that this resolution was taken up and written. It worked out, and we will have a chance to vote on it. I just do not want somebody sometime later—this evening or tonight—when asking for unanimous consent to adopt a Senate resolution with a certain number on it, to ask: What was that all about? I want people to know that this is about something that is important, and I am grateful to all who had a hand in it.

Thank you very much.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### NOMINATION REFERRAL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that upon the reporting of the nomination of David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Transportation Security Administration, by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the nomination be referred to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs for a period not to exceed 30 calendar days, except that if the 30 days lapse while the Senate is in recess, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs shall have an additional 5 session days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination, after which the nomination, if still in committee, be discharged and placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

#### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

##### IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN359 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (8) beginning Fred Aziz, and ending Nathalie Scharf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

PN360 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (12) beginning David Gossack, and ending Pamela Ward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I would have cast my vote in

favor of Scott Brown to represent the United States as Ambassador to New Zealand and Samoa. New Zealand has been a treaty ally of the United States since the signing of the Australia-New Zealand-United States Treaty in 1951. As a crucial partner and ally, the United States and New Zealand share core values of democracy, human rights, and liberty, and I believe it is imperative for the United States to maintain strong allegiance to our longstanding friends throughout the world.●

#### REMEMBERING BARBARA MCCALLAHAN

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it is with very great sadness today that I honor the life of my longtime staff member and dear friend, Barbara Wise McCallahan. Barb passed away on May 26, 2017.

Barb has worked in my congressional and Senate offices for over 20 years, joining my team on my very first day in Congress in 1997. She was a volunteer on my campaign for the U.S. House and worked many subsequent campaigns. She staffed my Howell and Flint Township offices when I served in the U.S. House. Over the years, she represented me in Livingston, Washtenaw, Monroe, Wayne, and Oakland Counties as a regional manager in the Senate. For over 20 years, she has been an anchor for me in southeast Michigan.

Barb loved to tell the story of when she first walked into my campaign office to volunteer when I ran for the U.S. House of Representatives. Coming from the hometown of my opponent, she would laugh that my team suspected that she was a spy. This couldn't have been further from the truth. Barb has been fiercely loyal and steadfastly protective of me for over two decades.

I cannot think of anyone who has spent more time over the years driving in a car with me. We have survived blizzards, avoided countless speed traps, identified the fastest drive-through restaurants, and I have never seen anyone who could bypass construction better than Barb. The countless hours we spent together over the years deepened my appreciation for her resolve and determination and cemented a lasting friendship.

Barb was a fighter. She faced many challenges early in her life. She took that fighting spirit and tenacity and fought throughout her career for so many individuals, families, and communities she helped represent. She was committed, tough, proud, and resilient.

I watched Barb struggle with the debilitating effects of Parkinson's disease in recent months and, along with her family, friends, and coworkers, was deeply affected by her losses earlier this year. While we will all continue to mourn her death, we also celebrate her

life, her accomplishments, and her enduring spirit.

Barb is an example of the amazing and talented professionals who commit themselves to congressional service. She has served the State of Michigan and her country with distinction and honor.

No tribute to Barb can be done without including her family. I remember many community events and parades over the years with Barb and her young sons. Although a private person, Barb would light up when talking about her family; she was especially proud of her boys Patrick, Ian, and Brian and her grandson, Shane. On behalf of all of Team Stabenow, you will always be part of our family.

Please join me and countless others as we honor the life of my longtime staff member and dear friend, Barbara McCallahan.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO COLONEL DANIEL Q. GREENWOOD

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate a tremendous Marine officer, Col. Daniel Q. Greenwood, for his distinguished service as the commanding officer, 2d Marine Regiment, 2d Marine Division and commanding officer, Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force, SPMAGTF—Crisis Response—Africa. Colonel Greenwood's dynamic leadership and operational expertise brought about historic success for his unit and was instrumental to the accomplishment of priority U.S. national security objectives throughout Europe and Africa.

After taking command in April 2016, Colonel Greenwood aptly led a fine team of marines during their predeployment training, ensuring a cohesive and highly effective regiment that was able to singularly focus on mission requirements. His clear and concise guidance set the tone for the entire command, successfully focused the regimental headquarters, and enabled a positive command climate with open lines of communication and a constructive learning environment.

Upon deploying in October 2016, Colonel Greenwood's excellent leadership and operational prowess brought about continued organizational and operational achievements, to include his team's successful participation in multiple operations and 15 theater security cooperation engagements across the continent of Africa. Further, his vibrant personality and intuitive understanding of cultural complexities fostered alliances with key partner nations, building valuable partner capability and enduring relationships. One of the most significant accomplishments of the SPMAGTF was the assess-

ment of "high risk, high threat" U.S. embassies in West and North Africa. To prepare for crisis response actions, Colonel Greenwood personally interacted with multiple ambassadors and regional security officers to form essential relationships and facilitate necessary information sharing. His tireless efforts allowed current and future SPMAGTF rotations to develop feasible, supportable, and comprehensive contingency plans for these strategic posts.

I would also like to honor and thank the Greenwood family for their tremendous service and sacrifice during the past year. Colonel Greenwood's operational success was only possible because of the tireless support he received at home from his wife, Kim, and son, Charlie. We often forget the hardship and extra load our military spouses and children take on during work-ups and deployments, and I thank Kim and Charlie for sharing their husband and father with our Nation. Military service is a family commitment, and I thank the Greenwoods for their many years of public service.

Colonel Greenwood, congratulations on a successful command and deployment. I am so proud of your many accomplishments and wish you and your family the very best in your next assignment.●

##### TRIBUTE TO JAKE HEINECKE

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing Jake Heinecke, a law enforcement officer from Fergus County who retired from full-time service at the end of May. Deputy Heinecke spent two decades protecting and serving the people of Montana.

Deputy Heinecke was raised with a strong family background in law enforcement. His father was an instructor at the Montana Law Enforcement Academy, and the calling to law enforcement was clearly a natural fit for Jake. During the midnineties, Deputy Heinecke began his career as a reserve deputy in Beaverhead County, nestled in the southwestern corner of Montana. He quickly transitioned to full-time law enforcement after finishing college and served Beaverhead County for 15 more years. During the final chapters of his full-time law enforcement career, Deputy Heinecke served the people of Fergus County, located in the geographic center of the State. Troy Eades, the Fergus County sheriff, described Deputy Heinecke's performance in the department with concise clarity, "Great job. Great officer."

Despite retiring from full-time law enforcement, Jake plans to continue to play a role in the community by serving in the Central Montana Ambulance Service as a full-time EMT. Montanans appreciate the work of our law enforcement and emergency services professionals. When someone gives over two



decades of their professional life to protect and serve others, that accomplishment deserves our sincere gratitude. Thanks, Jake, for helping keep "The Last Best Place" safe for all of us to enjoy.●

#### FIVE MILLIONTH SOLDIER COMPLETES BASIC TRAINING AT FORT JACKSON

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate South Carolina's Fort Jackson, as the 5 millionth soldier has just completed the Basic Combat Training, BCT, Program.

Fort Jackson is located in Columbia, SC, and has a deep and proud history. For 100 years, Fort Jackson has helped the U.S. Army train and fulfill needs for disciplined and skilled soldiers in times of war and peace. As the U.S. Army's largest location for BCT, Fort Jackson is responsible for training half of the entire Army's BCT population. Fort Jackson also provides an array of services outside of BCT, including the U.S. Army's Drill Sergeant School and Soldier Support Institute.

Today I join the citizens of South Carolina in recognizing Fort Jackson, the soldiers, civilians, and retirees employed there, and the soldiers who have been trained there. I also extend my deepest gratitude to these soldiers' families, as they have also served and sacrificed for our country. With the completion of each mission, Fort Jackson continues to make the Palmetto State and the U.S. Army proud. I will always be thankful for Fort Jackson's dedication to protecting our great Nation.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DANIELLE RIPICH

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Danielle Ripich, who is retiring from over a decade of service not only to students but also to the State of Maine as president of the University of New England, UNE, this month.

Even though Danielle is not a native of Maine, she has, in every regard, embraced, cherished, and served the State just as any Mainer would. Under her tenure, UNE grew from 4,000 students to more than 10,000, increased its operating surplus by \$127 million, expanded its campuses in Biddeford and Portland while opening a campus in Tangier, Morocco—making UNE the only U.S. institution of higher education to own a study-abroad campus specifically designed for the needs of science students—and launched three new colleges within the university. Additionally, in the midst of a national crisis over student loans, Danielle presided over one of the lowest default rates nationally on student loans at only 2.5 percent, even with 95 percent of students at the university taking out loans.

A native of Ohio, Danielle began her impressive scholarly journey on her

home turf, receiving her Ph.D. in speech pathology from Kent State University and both her bachelor's and master's degrees in speech pathology from Cleveland State University. She then went on to serve in leadership roles at Case Western Reserve University and later became dean of the college of health professions, as well as a professor in the college of medicine's department of neurology at Medical University of South Carolina before joining UNE.

Danielle's accomplishments span beyond her work in higher education. As a result of her successful efforts in expanding both accessibility and opportunities at UNE for Maine's best and brightest, UNE's contribution to the Maine economy has topped more than \$1 billion per year, with an annual donation of more than \$21 million worth of health services to the community. The university is considered the leading supplier of healthcare professionals for the State of Maine. Danielle was named the 2016 Mainebiz Nonprofit Business Leader of the Year and is internationally recognized for her language research, particularly in the areas of child language and Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia. Adding to her already remarkable and diverse portfolio of accomplishments, she was named a congressional fellow by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Throughout her years of service to the State, our country, and the world at large in her roles including president of UNE, mentor to student, and trailblazer in child language and Alzheimer's disease research, Danielle has demonstrated remarkable citizenship and a commitment to higher education, medicine, and community progress that is rarely seen. The UNE that has evolved from Danielle's vision is bold, innovative, eager to disrupt the status quo, socially conscious and committed to imbuing its students with global awareness. I am glad to add my voice to all those who are recognizing Danielle's distinguished career, and I thank Danielle for her service and many contributions to our State.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES JACOBS

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Dr. James Jacobs on the occasion of his retirement as president of Macomb Community College. Dr. Jacobs has worked at Macomb Community College for nearly 50 years and was named president in 2008. He previously taught social science, political science, economics, and served as director for the Center for Workforce Development and Policy at the college. Under his leadership, Macomb Community College has grown to be one of the Nation's leading community colleges, providing an education to nearly 48,000 students a year. I appreciate the oppor-

tunity to recognize Dr. Jacobs' success as an education leader, as well as the contributions he has made to his community.

Dr. Jacobs has long been at the heart of Macomb Community College, an educational institution founded in 1954. The college has been growing ever since. With three campuses, the Lorenzo Cultural Center, and the Michigan Technical Education Center, Macomb Community College has grown into one of the leading community colleges in the Nation. It ranks in the top 2 percent for number of associate degrees awarded by community colleges and is the largest grantor of associate degrees in Michigan.

Under Dr. Jacobs, the education platform and course offerings have flourished. Today Macomb Community College offers precollegiate and graduate degrees, workforce training, and professional education. One such program that has prospered is the Macomb University Center. The University Center partners with other colleges and universities throughout the State of Michigan to offer students the opportunity to earn bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees in over 80 fields. Thanks to Dr. Jacobs, the university center has become a national model for educational partnerships.

Dr. Jacobs has grown Macomb Community College around a vision and mission that put the student at the forefront. With a focus on student success, efficiency and effectiveness, and community engagement, Macomb Community College has dedicated itself to provide learning opportunities and support services that enable students to achieve their educational goals.

Dr. Jacobs is also leader in Macomb and the region, both on and off campus. He is widely known for delivering the Macomb County Economic Forecast annually for the last 29 years. He also serves on numerous boards, including the Center for Automotive Research, Metropolitan Affairs Council, and the Detroit Institute of Arts.

I would like to congratulate Dr. Jacobs on his retirement as president of Macomb Community College and thank him for his decades of service to his community. It is certainly my hope that in retirement he will continue this type of work because we need his expertise and knowledge.●

#### REMEMBERING JOSEPH ELIJAH "BUCKSHOT" COLLETON

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today the Awendaw and McClellanville communities will pay tribute to a man known by many as Joseph Elijah "Buckshot" Colleton, who departed this life on June 3, 2016.

He was a gentle giant who loved children and cooking. Buckshot served in many capacities in the community, but he is most remembered for his loving

spirit towards children. He served the Head Start community for more than 35 years as their bus driver and often referred to Head Start students as all of his children.

When he was not with the children, he was cooking and feeding people at Buckshot's Restaurant in McClellanville. People from all around would visit for a taste of his shrimp and fish dishes and other southern cuisines.

Today we remember the life of Buckshot as loved ones, friends, and other guests come together to pay tribute to a great American and South Carolinian.●

#### GRANITE MOUNTAIN MINE DISASTER

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the victims and survivors of the Granite Mountain Mine disaster and commemorate the lasting legacy of the labor movement in Montana and across this nation.

One hundred years ago, Butte, MT, was home to a booming mining community, where hard-working men and women were working long hours to put food on the table and build a stronger State.

A great demand for copper during WWI and the Industrial Revolution led the 14,500 miners to work tirelessly, day and night. Long hours and high demands caused already insufficient safety standards to deteriorate even further.

On June 8, 1917, as men were being lowered into the mine to begin their shift, a lantern ignited an exposed cable, causing the mineshaft to fill with fire and toxic gasses.

One hundred and sixty-eight men tragically died in the blaze and the resulting carbon monoxide poisoning. The miners had minimal safety training, and the mine lacked even basic safety precautions, such as exit signs. Many of those who were saved spent upward of 50 hours in the mine before help arrived, barricaded from the fumes behind makeshift bulkheads.

The Granite Mountain disaster remains the worst hard rock mining disaster in U.S. history, but Butte miners managed to make progress out of this tragedy.

The Granite Mountain disaster led to a unification of the U.S. labor movement and an unprecedented push for labor laws that are still in effect today.

One hundred years later, we are thankful for our union brothers and sisters who fought and continue to fight for better pay, safer working conditions, civil rights, and a stronger economy for working Americans.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:10 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2213. An act to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

The message further announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker reappoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2213. An act to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

H.R. 1628. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1848. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Reopening of the commercial Sector in the Western, Northern, and Southern (Gillnet) Zones for King Mackerel in the Gulf of Mexico" (RIN0648-XF351) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1849. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 60 Feet Length Overall Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF190) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1850. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relative to Executive Order 13783; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1851. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Alternative Final Cover Request for Phase 2 of the City of Wolf Point, Montana, Landfill" (FRL No. 9962-18-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1852. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Revisions to the New Source Review State Implementation Plan; Air Permit Procedure Revisions" (FRL No. 9958-84-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1853. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana" (FRL No. 9963-15-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1854. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Stay of Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills and Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills" (RIN2060-AT62) (FRL No. 9963-19-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1855. A communication from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2017 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1856. A communication from the Executive Director, United States Access Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2016 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1857. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1858. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-up for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1859. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1860. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1861. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-1862. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-1863. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-1864. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-1865. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-1866. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Counsel, Office of Advocacy, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-1867. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Ad-

ministration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Counsel, Office of Advocacy, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-1868. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-40. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri applying to the United States Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the United States Constitution, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, the Founders of our Constitution empowered state legislators to be guardians of liberty against future abuses of power by the federal government; and

Whereas, the federal government has created a crushing national debt through improper and imprudent spending; and

Whereas, the federal government has invaded the legitimate roles of the states through the manipulative process of federal mandates, most of which are unfunded to a great extent; and

Whereas, the federal government has ceased to live under a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, it is the solemn duty of the states to protect the liberty of our people—particularly for the generations to come—to propose amendments to the United States Constitution through a convention of states under Article V to place clear restraints on these and related abuses of power: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, by the members of the Missouri Senate, Ninety-ninth General Assembly, First Regular Session, the House of Representatives concurring therein, Hereby apply to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the United States Constitution, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and members of Congress; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly adopts this application with the following understandings (as the term "understandings" is used within the context of "reservations, understandings, and declarations"):

(1) An application to Congress for an Article V convention confers no power on Congress other than to perform a ministerial function to "call" for a convention;

(2) This ministerial duty shall be performed by Congress only when Article V applications for substantially the same purpose are received from two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states;

(3) The power of Congress to "call" a convention solely consists of the authority to name a reasonable time and place for the initial meeting of the convention;

(4) Congress possesses no power whatsoever to name delegates to the convention, as this power remains exclusively within the authority of the legislatures of the several states;

(5) Congress possesses no power to set the number of delegates to be sent by any states;

(6) Congress possesses no power whatsoever to determine any rules for such convention;

(7) By definition, a Convention of States means that states vote on the basis of one state, one vote;

(8) A Convention of States convened pursuant to this application is limited to consideration of topics specified herein and no other;

(9) The General Assembly of Missouri may recall its delegates at any time for breach of their duties or violations of their instructions;

(10) Pursuant to the text of Article V, Congress may determine whether proposed amendments shall be ratified by the legislatures of the several states or by special state ratification conventions. The General Assembly of Missouri recommends that Congress specify its choice on ratification methodology contemporaneously with the call for the convention;

(11) Congress possesses no power whatsoever with regard to the Article V convention beyond the two powers acknowledged herein;

(12) Missouri places express reliance on prior legal and judicial determinations that Congress possesses no power under Article I relative to the Article V process, and that Congress must act only as expressly specified in Article V; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this application shall expire five (5) years after the passage of this resolution; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to prepare a properly inscribed copy of this resolution for the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each member of the Missouri Congressional delegation, and the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states requesting their cooperation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1141. A bill to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict (Rept. No. 115-93).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 117. A bill to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as "Alex Diekmann Peak" (Rept. No. 115-94).

S. 167. A bill to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas (Rept. No. 115-95).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 199. A bill to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir (Rept. No. 115-96).

S. 216. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets (Rept. No. 115-97).

S. 267. A bill to provide for the correction of a survey of certain land in the State of Alaska (Rept. No. 115-98).

S. 363. A bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-99).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 490. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam (Rept. No. 115-100).

S. 491. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Clark Canyon Dam (Rept. No. 115-101).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 703. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the Equus Beds Division of the Wichita Project (Rept. No. 115-102).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 710. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam (Rept. No. 115-103).

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 534. A bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 782. A bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Makan Delrahim, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Steven Andrew Engel, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1315. A bill to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to amend its regulations relating to qualified mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1316. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a one-year extension of the suicide prevention and resilience program for the National Guard and Reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1317. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a comprehensive and nationwide system to evaluate the quality of care provided to beneficiaries of Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program and to provide incentives for voluntary quality improvement; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1318. A bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1319. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a continuing medical education program for non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who treat veterans to increase knowledge and recognition of medical conditions common to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1320. A bill to reform apportionments to general aviation airports under the airport improvement program, to improve project delivery at certain airports, and to designate certain airports as disaster relief airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1321. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure that retirement investors receive advice in their best interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1322. A bill to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1323. A bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1324. A bill to prevent a person who has been convicted of a misdemeanor hate crime,

or received an enhanced sentence for a misdemeanor because of hate or bias in its commission, from obtaining a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. Kaine, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1325. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire, recruit, and train employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1326. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1327. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues are to be regulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1328. A bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1329. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to locate and recover certain assets of the United States Government; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1330. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a dependent to transfer entitlement to Post-9/11 Education Assistance in cases in which the dependent received the transfer of such entitlement to assistance from an individual who subsequently died, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1331. A bill to establish the Great Lakes Mass Marking Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1332. A bill to establish the Great Lakes Aquatic Connectivity and Infrastructure Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 188. A resolution condemning the recent terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom, the Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Australia, and Iran and offering thoughts and prayers and sincere condolences to all of the victims, their families, and the people of their countries; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 189. A resolution designating the week of June 5 through June 11, 2017, as "Hemp History Week"; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 112

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 112, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize per diem payments under comprehensive service programs for homeless veterans to furnish care to dependents of homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 242

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 242, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans to grant access to their records in the databases of the Veterans Benefits Administration to certain designated congressional employees, and for other purposes.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 425

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include in each contract into which the Secretary enters for necessary services authorities and mechanism for appropriate oversight, and for other purposes.

S. 563

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to amend the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 to require that certain buildings and personal property be covered by flood insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 593

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.

S. 655

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 655, a bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in logging operations from child labor laws.

S. 670

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 670, a bill to provide for the regulation of over-the-counter hearing aids.

S. 700

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 760

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 760, a bill to expand the Government's use and administration of data to facilitate transparency, effective governance, and innovation, and for other purposes.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 782, a bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

S. 804

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1038

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1038, a bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to submit to Congress a report on the utilization of small businesses with respect to certain Federal contracts.

S. 1151

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a non-refundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1202

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1202, a bill to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a high technology education pilot program, and for other purposes.

S. 1309

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1309, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit American Indian tribal councils to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Social Security to obtain social security coverage for services performed by tribal council members.

S. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 54, a resolution expressing the unwavering commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1327. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues are to be regulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor

of the Stop the Importation and Trafficking of Synthetic Analogues Act with my colleague Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY. This legislation addresses the significant challenges associated with prosecuting those who manufacture and traffic deadly synthetic drugs, including synthetic opioids, like clandestinely produced fentanyl, and synthetic cannabinoids and cathinones.

Synthetic drugs pose an increasing threat to our Nation. They hit our communities in cycles and cause devastation. For example, in Corpus Christi, TX, there were 31 EMS calls in 1 day related to synthetic drugs. In Syracuse, NY, 18 individuals were taken to the emergency room in a 24-hour period after taking synthetic marijuana, and in Cincinnati, OH, a shocking 174 overdoses occurred over 6 days. These overdoses were largely attributed to heroin laced with carfentanyl, a synthetic opioid that is 100,000 times stronger than morphine.

In 2012, Congress outlawed many synthetic drugs, but manufacturers did not stop producing them. Instead, they began producing controlled substance analogues which mimic the effects of controlled substances, such as opioids, marijuana, PCP, and LSD.

The new drug, even though it has an effect on the body that is similar to a controlled substance, may no longer be illegal under Federal law because it is not listed in one of the five schedules of the Controlled Substances Act. Consequently, these drugs are shipped to our country and marketed as legal alternatives to illegal drugs.

This makes enforcement efforts difficult.

Synthetic opioids, like fentanyl, are deadly. Since 2015, 130 deaths have been linked to the drug in the Bay area of California. Nationally, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that more than 15,000 deaths in 2015 involved synthetic opioids other than methadone, which includes fentanyl. That is equivalent to 42 deaths per day.

Like other synthetic drugs, illicit fentanyl and its analogues are clandestinely produced, and primarily enter the United States in one of three ways:

(1) Chinese chemists produce and ship it to the United States via international mail;

(2) Mexican drug traffickers produce it with precursor chemicals from China and smuggle it across the Southwest Border; or

(3) Chinese chemists produce and ship it to Canada, where it is smuggled across the northern border.

The point is, regardless of the type, synthetic drugs pose a deadly and quickly evolving public health threat.

It is clear that the current system for scheduling controlled substances and prosecuting controlled substance analogues is not able to keep up with the speed with which new synthetic drugs are produced or to prevent the deaths they cause.

That is why the Stop the Importation and Trafficking of Synthetic Drugs Act to provide the Department of Justice with new tools, using a multifaceted approach.

First, the bill immediately controls 13 fentanyl analogues that law enforcement has come into contact with. These substances have already caused 162 overdose deaths in the United States.

Second, while the existing Federal Analogue Enforcement Act allows prosecutors to charge those who manufacture, distribute, or dispense controlled substance analogues, the law contains definition of a controlled substance analogue that is vague and often misinterpreted. As a result, court cases using this law result in a drawn out and expensive battle of the experts.

Moreover, because controlled substance analogues are not listed as federally controlled substances, even if a prosecutor in one case successfully proves that a substance is a controlled substance analogue, this ruling is not applied across the board. A different person charged with manufacturing the exact same substance in another case is not automatically guilty of a crime. Instead, the prosecutor in the new case has to reprove that the substance in question is an analogue all over again.

Therefore, to ensure that prosecutors do not have to reprove that a substance is an analogue each and every time it appears, the bill establishes a new schedule A.

The legislation authorizes the Attorney General to add new synthetic drugs, including fentanyl and other analogues, to this new schedule, and make them illegal through an expedited, temporary scheduling process.

It also authorizes the Attorney General to permanently schedule these substances, either in schedule A or in another schedule, like schedule I. This provides the Attorney General with the maximum flexibility needed to better combat these dangerous drugs.

Those found guilty of manufacturing, distributing, or dispensing schedule A substances would be subject to existing schedule III penalties, or a maximum of 10 years imprisonment for a first offense.

The Department of Justice has told my staff that this approach will allow them to act quickly when new and dangerous substances threaten our communities.

Recognizing that the vast majority of synthetic drugs originate from outside of the United States, the legislation imposes criminal penalties for the illegal import and export of substances designated as schedule A. It also authorizes penalties for those who manufacture or distribute these substances while intending, knowing, or having reasonable cause to believe they will ultimately be imported into the United States.



Third, the bill maintains the ability of prosecutors to charge defendants using the Federal Analogue Enforcement Act, but clarifies the definition of a controlled substance analogue within the Act.

Specifically, the language clarifies that the chemical structure of the substance must be similar to that of schedule I or II controlled substance to be considered a controlled substance analogue. On top of this, the substance must also have a stimulant, depressant or hallucinogenic effect on the body that is similar to a schedule I or II controlled substance or the person manufacturing, distributing or dispensing the drug must represent or intend for the drug to have an effect that is similar to a schedule I or II controlled substance.

If prosecutors successfully prove a substance is a controlled substance analogue under the new definition, those who traffic the drug could face higher penalties than those assigned to schedule A, because the penalty would be associated with the drug it mimics.

Finally, those trafficking these substances do not market them as synthetic drugs. Instead, they mislabel the products, which are often sold at gas stations and convenience stores. To prevent this from happening, the bill requires all schedule A substances to be properly labeled and establishes civil penalties for failure to do so.

This provision will allow civil enforcement action to be taken to remove mislabeled products from the shelves of gas stations and convenience stores.

I want to close by sharing the story of one of my constituents, a young man named Connor Eckhardt. Unfortunately, a synthetic drug known as Spice claimed his life. Connor took one hit of the drug, which, according to the Drug Enforcement Administration, is a mixture of herbs and spices that is typically sprayed with a synthetic compound chemically similar to THC, the psychoactive ingredient in marijuana. His brain swelled, causing him to go into a coma, and he never woke up.

Sadly, Connor's story has become all too common. And this is unacceptable. That is why I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Stop the Importation and Trafficking of Synthetic Analogues Act. Law enforcement must have the ability to swiftly bring those who manufacture, distribute, and dispense these deadly drugs to justice.

I look forward to working with and obtaining feedback from my colleagues and other stakeholders on this bill, which provides new and necessary authorities to combat synthetic drugs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr.

WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1328. A bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Fair and Equal Housing Act of 2017, legislation to ensure equal housing opportunities for all Americans. This bill would protect Americans from housing discrimination based on gender identity and sexual orientation. No American should be turned away from a home they love because of who they love.

I am a former civil rights attorney. And during my practice, I focused on fair housing and I learned that a home is more than just a door, a roof, rooms, and walls. Your home is critical to your identity and central to the life of every American.

And a home becomes even more important when you are searching for a safe, stable place to live. But, say you run into problems as you're trying to rent that dream apartment and it is not because you are not a good tenant or a good neighbor. Instead, you learn that the apartment you wanted is suddenly no longer available because, after you met the landlord in person, they don't approve of your personal life or your appearance. Or you learn your rental application cannot be processed because you and your partner share the same sex.

Housing discrimination is real. And it is a reality for LGBT Americans because of incomplete protections in the Fair Housing Act (FHA), the landmark federal housing law. The FHA only prohibits housing discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial status, or disability. And if someone thinks this is not a real problem, more than 20 states and over 200 localities protect sexual orientation and gender identity in their own housing discrimination statutes.

This is about equality, plain and simple. I want to thank my fellow Virginian, Representative SCOTT TAYLOR, for his leadership on this issue. I also want to thank all the civil rights attorneys across the nation who fight for justice on this issue every day. This is the right thing to do.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 188—CONDEMNING THE RECENT TERRORIST ATTACKS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, THE PHILIPPINES, INDONESIA, EGYPT, IRAQ, AUSTRALIA, AND IRAN AND OFFERING THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS AND SINCERE CONDOLENCES TO ALL OF THE VICTIMS, THEIR FAMILIES, AND THE PEOPLE OF THEIR COUNTRIES

Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 188

Whereas since May 22, 2017, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) has claimed responsibility for multiple terrorist attacks against civilians that have left more than 180 dead and many more wounded.

Whereas ISIS frequently claims attacks perpetrated by individual actors or other groups for propaganda purposes.

Whereas the people of the United Kingdom are grieving following two terrorist attacks claimed by ISIS in London on June 4 and Manchester on May 22 that targeted and killed innocent men, women, and children.

Whereas government forces in the Philippines are currently fighting ISIS militants in Mindanao, including ISIS-affiliated fighters from the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Chechnya, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen, who launched an assault in Marawi City on May 23 in an apparent effort to establish a caliphate in Southeast Asia.

Whereas ISIS has claimed responsibility for two explosions in Jakarta, Indonesia, killing three policemen.

Whereas ISIS targeted Coptic Christians in Egypt during an attack on a bus on May 26, killing 29 people.

Whereas 22 people were killed when ISIS detonated a car bomb at a Baghdad ice cream parlor, killing Iraqi families gathering with their children to break the Ramadan fast, and then detonated a second bomb killing elderly Iraqis collecting their pensions.

Whereas a terrorist attack claimed by ISIS killed one person in Melbourne, Australia and wounded three police officers.

Whereas on June 7, in an attack claimed by ISIS, at least 12 people were killed when gunmen and suicide bombers targeted Iran's parliament and a shrine in two coordinated attacks across Tehran.

Whereas these reprehensible attacks have no place in a peaceful world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) condemns ISIS' horrific terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom, the Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Australia, and Iran;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the victims of these attacks and their families;

(3) expresses solidarity with the people of United Kingdom, the Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Australia, and Iran;

(4) recognizes the threat posed by ISIS and recommits to U.S. leadership in the Global Coalition working to defeat ISIS.

SENATE RESOLUTION 189—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JUNE 5 THROUGH JUNE 11, 2017, AS “HEMP HISTORY WEEK”

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 189

Whereas Hemp History Week will be held from June 5 through June 11, 2017;

Whereas the goals of Hemp History Week are to commemorate the historical relevance of industrial hemp in the United States and to promote the full growth potential of the industrial hemp industry;

Whereas industrial hemp is an agricultural commodity that has been used for centuries to produce many innovative industrial and consumer products, including soap, fabric, textiles, construction materials, clothing, paper, cosmetics, food, and beverages;

Whereas the global market for hemp is estimated to consist of more than 25,000 products;

Whereas the value of hemp imported into the United States for use in the production of other retail products is estimated at approximately \$76,000,000 annually;

Whereas the United States hemp industry estimates that the annual market value of hemp retail sales in the United States is more than \$570,000,000;

Whereas despite the legitimate uses of hemp, many agricultural producers of the United States are prohibited under current law from growing hemp;

Whereas because most hemp cannot be grown legally in the United States, raw hemp material and hemp products are imported for sale in the United States;

Whereas the United States is the largest consumer of hemp products in the world, but the United States is the only major industrialized country that restricts hemp farming; and

Whereas industrial hemp holds great potential to bolster the agricultural economy of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of June 5 through June 11, 2017, as “Hemp History Week”;

(2) recognizes the historical relevance of industrial hemp; and

(3) recognizes the growing economic potential of industrial hemp.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 223. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 224. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 225. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 226. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 227. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS)) proposed an

amendment to the resolution S. Res. 115, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division.

SA 228. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 115, supra.

SA 229. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 230. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 223. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 31, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

*(7) An assessment of Iran’s cyber capabilities, cyber force structure, and hostile cyber activities targeting the United States, United States interests, the interests of allies and partners of the United States, and interests of Iran’s regional neighbors, including an assessment of the acquisition, development, and deployment by Iran of cyber personnel and capabilities.*

SA 224. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, line 18, strike “AND NORTH AFRICA” and insert “NORTH AFRICA, AND SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA”.

On page 29, line 2, strike “and beyond” and insert “South and Central Asia, and beyond”.

SA 225. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 13. CONDITIONS FOR RETURN OF RUSSIAN DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES.**

Section 205 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 4305) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) Access to the Russian diplomatic facilities in Maryland and New York, which were closed by President Obama in December 2016, in accordance with subsection (b)(3), in response to efforts by the Government of Russia, or its surrogates, to interfere in the

2016 United States presidential campaign, shall be denied to all representatives of the Government of Russia until the Secretary of State, after consultation with Secretary of Treasury and the Attorney General, certifies to Congress that the Government of Russia is no longer conducting cyber-enabled activities that—

“(1) are reasonably likely to result in, or have materially contributed to, a significant threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economic health or financial stability of the United States; or

“(2) have the purpose or effect of—

“(A) harming, or otherwise significantly compromising the provision of services by, a computer or network of computers that support 1 or more entities in the United States in a critical infrastructure sector;

“(B) significantly compromising the provision of services by 1 or more entities in the United States in a critical infrastructure sector;

“(C) causing a significant disruption to the availability of a computer or network of computers in the United States;

“(D) causing a significant misappropriation of funds or economic resources, trade secrets, personal identifiers, or financial information in the United States for commercial or competitive advantage or private financial gain; or

“(E) tampering with, altering, or causing a misappropriation of information with the purpose or effect of interfering with or undermining United States election processes or institutions.”.

SA 226. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 13. STRENGTHENING ALLIED CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Strengthening Allied Cybersecurity Act of 2017”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In January 2017, the Director of National Intelligence (referred to in this Act as the “DNI”), in coordination with the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (referred to in this Act as the “FBI”), and the National Security Agency, judged with high confidence that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign aimed at the 2016 United States presidential election.

(2) The DNI report stated, “[The Department of Homeland Security] assesses that the types of systems Russian actors targeted or compromised were not involved in vote tallying.”.

(3) On January 10, 2017, the DNI stated, in testimony before the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, “We can say that we did not see evidence of the Russians altering vote tallies.”.

(4) On March 20, 2017, FBI Director James Comey stated, in testimony before the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, “We also, as a government, supplied information to all the states so they could equip themselves to make sure there was no successful effort to affect the vote and there was none, as we said earlier.”.

(5) The DNI, in coordination with the Central Intelligence Agency, the FBI, and the National Security Agency, judged that Russia's intelligence services conducted cyber operations against targets associated with the 2016 United States presidential election.

(6) The DNI assessed that the Russian Government's campaign aimed at the United States election featured—

(A) disclosures of data obtained through Russian cyber operations;

(B) intrusions into United States state and local election boards; and

(C) overt propaganda.

(7) Russia's use of public disclosures of Russian-collected data during the United States election was unprecedented.

(8) The DNI, in coordination with the Central Intelligence Agency, the FBI, and the National Security Agency, assessed that Russia will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the United States presidential election to influence future elections worldwide, including against United States allies and their election processes.

(9) In May 2016, Germany's domestic intelligence agency assessed that hackers linked to the Russian Government had targeted Chancellor Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Union party and German state computers.

(10) The head of Germany's foreign intelligence service, Bruno Kahl, later asserted that Germany had "evidence that cyber-attacks are taking place that have no other purpose than to elicit political uncertainty. The perpetrators are interested in delegitimizing the democratic process as such, regardless of who that ends of helping. We have indications that [the attacks] come from the Russian region." In November 2016, German Chancellor Merkel, said, "such cyber-attacks, or hybrid conflicts as they are known in Russian doctrine, are now part of daily life and we must learn to cope with them".

(11) On May 9, 2017, Admiral Michael Rogers, United States Cyber Command commander and Director of the National Security Agency, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that the United States surveilled Russian hackers attack French computer systems as the French election approached. In his testimony, Rogers said, "We had talked to our French counterparts prior to the public announcements of the events that were publicly attributed this past weekend, and gave them a heads up, 'Look we're watching the Russians, we're seeing them penetrate some of your infrastructure.'".

(12) In February 2017, the United Kingdom's Defence Secretary Fallon stated that—

(A) all North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries must support reform "to make NATO more agile, resilient, and better configured to operate in the contemporary environment including against hybrid and cyber-attacks"; and

(B) "NATO must defend itself as effectively in the cyber sphere as it does in the air, on land, and at sea."

(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The term "appropriate Federal agencies" means—

(A) the Department of Defense;

(B) the Department of Homeland Security;

(C) the Department of Justice;

(D) the Department of the Treasury;

(E) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and

(F) the Department of Commerce

(2) HYBRID WARFARE.—The term "hybrid warfare" means a military strategy that blends conventional warfare, irregular warfare, informational warfare, and cyber warfare.

(3) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "relevant congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(F) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(H) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(I) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(J) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(K) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(L) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(d) TRANS-ATLANTIC CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall develop, and submit to the relevant congressional committees, a trans-Atlantic cybersecurity strategy, with a classified annex, if necessary, that includes—

(A) a plan of action to guide United States cooperation with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies to respond to Russia's hybrid warfare against NATO allies;

(B) a plan of action to guide United States cooperation with European partners, including non-NATO nations, to counter Russia's cyber efforts to undermine democratic elections in the United States and Europe;

(C) an assessment of nonmilitary tools and tactics, including sanctions, indictments, or other actions that the United States can use, unilaterally or in cooperation with like-minded nations, to counter Russia's malicious cyber activity in the United States and Europe; and

(D) a review of resources required by the Department of State and appropriate Federal agencies to conduct activities to build cooperation with NATO allies and European partners on countering Russia's hybrid warfare and disinformation efforts.

(2) CIVIL LIBERTIES AND PRIVACY.—The Secretary of State shall ensure that the implementation of the strategy described in paragraph (1) is consistent with United States standards for civil liberties and privacy protections.

(e) FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY LIAISON TO UNITED STATES PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS AND MAJOR NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall appoint, at the rank of Executive Assistant Director, a cybersecurity liaison for presidential campaigns and major national political party committees, who, at the request of presidential campaigns and major national political party committees, shall—

(1) regularly share cybersecurity best practices and protocols with each presidential campaign, the Democratic National Committee, the Republican National Committee, the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, the National Republican Senatorial Committee, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and the National Republican Congressional Committee; and

(2) provide the timely sharing of cybersecurity threats to such campaigns and committees to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from such cybersecurity threats.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit an annual report to the relevant congressional committees on the implementation of the trans-Atlantic cybersecurity cooperation strategy developed under subsection (d).

**SA 227.** Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 115, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the Senate—

(1) commemorates "A Century of Service", the 100th anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division on June 8, 2017;

(2) commends the 1st Infantry Division for continuing to exemplify the motto of the 1st Infantry Division, "No Mission Too Difficult. No Sacrifice Too Great. Duty First!";

(3) honors the memory of the more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division who lost their lives in battle;

(4) expresses gratitude and support for all 1st Infantry Division soldiers, veterans, and their families, including 1st Infantry Division soldiers and their families of the past and future and those who are serving as of May 2017; and

(5) recognizes that the 1st Infantry Division holds an honored place in United States history.

**SA 228.** Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 115, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas June 8, 2017, is the 100th anniversary of the organization of the 1st Infantry Division;

Whereas the First Infantry Division was established in 1917 as the first permanent combined arms division in the Regular Army and has been on continuous active duty since 1917;

Whereas, from the heroic start of the 1st Infantry Division, the 1st Infantry Division has played an integral part in United States history by serving in—

(1) World War I;

(2) World War II;

(3) the Cold War;

(4) the Vietnam War;

(5) Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm;

(6) the Balkans peacekeeping missions;

(7) the War on Terror; and

(8) as of May 2017, multiple operations around the globe;

Whereas, immediately after its establishment, the 1st Division started to build a

prestigious reputation for its service in World War I;

Whereas, in May 1918, the victory of the 1st Division at the Battle of Cantigny, France, was the first United States victory of World War I, and despite suffering more than 1,000 casualties in that battle, the 1st Division seized the village from German forces, defended the village against repeated counterattacks, and bolstered the morale of the Allies;

Whereas, after the Battle of Cantigny, the 1st Division played a central role in other monumental battles of World War I, such as—

- (1) the Battle of Soissons;
- (2) the Battle of Saint-Mihiel; and
- (3) the Meuse-Argonne Offensive;

Whereas 5 soldiers of the 1st Division received the Congressional Medal of Honor during World War I;

Whereas the 1st Division—

- (1) remained on occupation duty in Germany to enforce the Armistice; and
- (2) in September 1919, was the last combat division to return home after World War I;

Whereas, following World War I, the 1st Division was 1 of only 3 United States Army divisions to remain on active duty, which is a strong testament to its accomplishments;

Whereas, in November 1939, the 1st Infantry Division was called to action again and, in August 1942, became 1 of the first United States divisions sent to the European theater during World War II;

Whereas, during World War II, the 1st Infantry Division fought bravely in Algeria, Tunisia, and Sicily in 1942 and 1943 before the courage and resolve of the 1st Infantry Division was tested on Omaha Beach in Normandy, France;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division, reinforced by units of the 29th Infantry Division, made the assault landing on Omaha Beach on D-Day, June 6, 1944, which began the liberation of Western Europe from Nazi control;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division continued its invaluable service throughout World War II, including in—

- (1) the liberation of France and Belgium;
- (2) the seizing of Aachen, the first city of Nazi Germany to fall to the Allies;
- (3) the Battle of the Huertgen Forest;
- (4) the Battle of the Bulge, in which the 1st Infantry Division held the critical northern shoulder at Butgenbach, Belgium;
- (5) the crossing of the Rhine River at Remagen;
- (6) the battles around the Ruhr Pocket in Germany; and
- (7) the offensive into Czechoslovakia, where the 1st Infantry Division liberated Nazi labor camps at Falkenau and Zwodau;

Whereas 17 members of the 1st Infantry Division received the Congressional Medal of Honor for their service during World War II;

Whereas, in recognition of exemplary service during World War II, the 1st Infantry Division was the recipient of—

- (1) 2 French Croix de Guerre with Palm, and Streamers embroidered with “Kasserine” and “Normandy”;
- (2) the World War II French Fourragere;
- (3) the Belgian Fourragere; and
- (4) the subordinate units of the 1st Infantry Division earned numerous Presidential Unit Citations;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division guarded the Nuremberg Trials and remained on occupation duty in Germany before returning home to Fort Riley, Kansas, in 1955;

Whereas, in 1965, the 1st Infantry Division was 1 of the first 2 divisions sent to the Vietnam War, and the 1st Infantry Division re-

mained in Vietnam for 5 years, during which the 1st Infantry Division—

- (1) protected the capital, Saigon, from attack by the North Vietnamese Army;

- (2) conducted hundreds of—

(A) offensive operations between Saigon and Cambodia against Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army units; and

(B) civil action and pacification operations to protect and assist the Vietnamese people; and

- (3) responded to the 1968 Tet Offensive by clearing Tan Son Nhut Air Force Base of enemy forces, securing Saigon and counterattacking vigorously;

Whereas 12 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division earned the Congressional Medal of Honor during the Vietnam War;

Whereas, in recognition of exemplary service during the Vietnam War—

- (1) the 1st Infantry Division was the recipient of—

(A) the United States Army Meritorious Unit Commendation;

(B) the Republic of Vietnam Cross of Gallantry with Palm for the period of 1965 to 1968; and

(C) the Republic of Vietnam civic Action Honor Medal, First Class; and

(2) the subordinate units of the 1st Infantry Division earned numerous Presidential unit citations and other Army awards;

Whereas, from 1970 to 1990 the 1st Infantry Division—

- (1) was a key component of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization deterrent strategy;

(2) maintained a forward-stationed brigade in Germany and deployed additional elements annually to Germany on major exercises that demonstrated United States resolve to friend and foe alike; and

(3) contributed directly to the peaceful end of the Cold War;

Whereas, in November 1990, the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Saudi Arabia and played a key role in the famous “left hook” attack of the US VII Corps through the deserts of western Iraq to destroy the Tawakalna Division of the vaunted Republican Guard of Saddam Hussein, among many other enemy forces;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Bosnia for 31 months between 1996 and 2000, to Macedonia for 4 months in 1999, and to Kosovo for 22 months between 1999 and 2003—

- (1) to enforce international peace agreements;

(2) to halt the worst ethnic violence in Europe since the Holocaust; and

(3) to bring peace and stability to the Balkans;

Whereas, in 2004, the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Iraq in Operation Iraqi Freedom as Task Force Danger and conducted sophisticated counterinsurgency operations that led to the first free and fair elections in Iraqi history in 2005;

Whereas, between 2005 and 2014, the brigade combat teams and other major headquarters and units of the 1st Infantry Division have deployed repeatedly to Iraq and Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn;

Whereas Specialist Ross A. McGinnis, a 1st Infantry Division soldier, is 1 of the very few people of the United States to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor in the War on Terror;

Whereas, in the defense of United States interests, the 1st Infantry Division deployed its units and soldiers to Africa in 2015 and Kuwait in 2016;

Whereas, since November 2016, the headquarters of the 1st Infantry Division has been in Iraq, where the 1st Infantry Division is—

- (1) engaged in the fight against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS); and

(2) providing the leadership structure for the Combined Joint Forces Land Component Command—Operation Inherent Resolve;

Whereas, as of May 2017—

(1) the Combat Aviation Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, is deployed to Afghanistan and is conducting combat aviation operations in support of the Afghan and international security forces battling the Taliban;

(2) the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, is deployed to South Korea, where it bolsters United States deterrence against North Korea; and

(3) the 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, is at Fort Riley, Kansas, where it is honing its combat-readiness in preparation for deployment; and

Whereas, since the establishment of the 1st Infantry Division in 1917—

(1) the 1st Infantry Division has been present all over the world, assisting in combat and noncombat missions for 100 years;

(2) more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have sacrificed their lives in combat; and

(3) 35 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have received the Medal of Honor: Now, therefore, be it

**SA 229.** Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 13. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY TO THE MEMBER NATIONS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The principle of collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is immortalized in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty in which members pledge that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all”.

(2) For almost 7 decades, the principle of collective defense has effectively served as a strategic deterrent for the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and provided stability throughout the world, strengthening the security of the United States and all 28 other member nations.

(3) Following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, the Alliance agreed to invoke Article 5 for the first time, affirming its commitment to collective defense.

(4) The recent attacks in the United Kingdom underscore the importance of an international alliance to combat hostile nation states and terrorist groups.

(5) Collective defense unites the 29 members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, each committing to protecting and supporting one another from external adversaries, which bolsters the North Atlantic Alliance.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to express the vital importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), as it continues to serve as a critical deterrent to potential hostile nations and terrorist organizations;

(2) to remember the first and only invocation of Article 5 by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in support of the United States after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001; and

(3) to affirm that the United States remains fully committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will honor its obligations enshrined in Article 5.

**SA 230.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 31, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 35, line 25.

At the end, add the following:

## **TITLE II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM OF IRAN**

### **SEC. 200. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act”.

### **SEC. 201. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) On April 2, 2015, President Barack Obama said, “Other American sanctions on Iran for its support of terrorism, its human rights abuses, its ballistic missile program, will continue to be fully enforced.”.

(2) On July 7, 2015, General Martin Dempsey, then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, “Under no circumstances should we relieve the pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities.”.

(3) On July 29, 2015, in his role as the top military officer in the United States and advisor to the President, General Dempsey confirmed that his military recommendation was that sanctions relating to the ballistic missile program of Iran not be lifted.

(4) The Government of Iran and Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps have been responsible for the repeated testing of illegal ballistic missiles capable of carrying a nuclear device, including observed tests in October and November 2015 and March 2016, violating United Nations Security Council resolutions.

(5) On October 14, 2015, Samantha Power, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, said, “One of the really important features in implementation of the recent Iran deal to dismantle Iran's nuclear program is going to have to be enforcement of the resolutions and the standards that remain on the books.”.

(6) On December 11, 2015, the United Nations Panel of Experts concluded that the missile launch on October 10, 2015, “was a violation by Iran of paragraph 9 of Security Council resolution 1929 (2010)”.

(7) On January 17, 2016, Adam Szubin, Acting Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, stated, “Iran's ballistic missile program poses a significant threat to regional and global security, and it will continue to be subject to international sanctions. We have consistently made clear that the United States will vigorously press sanctions against Iranian activities outside of

the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—including those related to Iran's support for terrorism, regional destabilization, human rights abuses, and ballistic missile program.”.

(8) On February 9, 2016, James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence, testified that, “We judge that Tehran would choose ballistic missiles as its preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons, if it builds them. Iran's ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering WMD, and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Iran's progress on space launch vehicles—along with its desire to deter the United States and its allies—provides Tehran with the means and motivation to develop longer-range missiles, including ICBMs.”.

(9) On March 9, 2016, Iran reportedly fired two Qadr ballistic missiles with a range of more than 1,000 miles and according to public reports, the missiles were marked with a statement in Hebrew reading, “Israel must be wiped off the arena of time.”.

(10) On March 11, 2016, Ambassador Power called the recent ballistic missile launches by Iran “provocative and destabilizing” and called on the international community to “degrade Iran's missile program”.

(11) On March 14, 2016, Ambassador Power said that the recent ballistic missile launches by Iran were “in defiance of provisions of UN Security Council Resolution 2231”.

(12) Iran has demonstrated the ability to launch multiple rockets from fortified underground facilities and mobile launch sites not previously known.

(13) The ongoing procurement by Iran of technologies needed to boost the range, accuracy, and payloads of its diverse ballistic missile arsenal represents a threat to deployed personnel of the United States and allies of the United States in Europe and the Middle East, including Israel.

(14) Ashton Carter, Secretary of Defense, testified in a hearing before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on July 7, 2015, that, “[T]he reason that we want to stop Iran from having an ICBM program is that the I in ICBM stands for intercontinental, which means having the capability to fly from Iran to the United States, and we don't want that. That's why we oppose ICBMs.”.

(15) Through recent ballistic missile launch tests the Government of Iran has shown blatant disregard for international laws and its intention to continue tests of that nature throughout the implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

(16) The banking sector of Iran has facilitated the financing of the ballistic missile programs in Iran and evidence has not been provided that entities in that sector have ceased facilitating the financing of those programs.

(17) Iran has been able to amass a large arsenal of ballistic missiles through its illicit smuggling networks and domestic manufacturing capabilities that have been supported and maintained by Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps and specific sectors of the economy of Iran.

(18) Penetration by Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps into the economy of Iran is well documented including investments in the construction, automotive, telecommunications, electronics, mining, metallurgy, and petrochemical sectors of the economy of Iran.

(19) Items procured through sectors of Iran specified in paragraph (18) have dual use applications that are currently being used to

create ballistic missiles in Iran and will continue to be a source of materials for the creation of future weapons.

(20) In order to curb future illicit activity by Iran, the Government of the United States and the international community must take action against persons that facilitate and profit from the illegal acquisition of ballistic missile parts and technology in support of the missile programs of Iran.

### **SEC. 202. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ballistic missile program of Iran represents a serious threat to allies of the United States in the Middle East and Europe, members of the Armed Forces deployed in the those regions, and ultimately the United States;

(2) the testing and production by Iran of ballistic missiles capable of carrying a nuclear device is a clear violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015), which was unanimously adopted by the international community;

(3) Iran is using its space launch program to develop the capabilities necessary to deploy an intercontinental ballistic missile that could threaten the United States, and the Director of National Intelligence has assessed that Iran would use ballistic missiles as its “preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons”; and

(4) the Government of the United States should impose tough primary and secondary sanctions against any sector of the economy of Iran or any Iranian person that directly or indirectly supports the ballistic missile program of Iran as well as any foreign person or financial institution that engages in transactions or trade that support that program.

### **SEC. 203. EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO EFFORTS BY IRAN TO ACQUIRE BALLISTIC MISSILE AND RELATED TECHNOLOGY.**

(a) CERTAIN PERSONS.—Section 1604(a) of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-484; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by inserting “, to acquire ballistic missile or related technology,” after “nuclear weapons”.

(b) FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—Section 1605(a) of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-484; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, to acquire ballistic missile or related technology,” after “nuclear weapons”.

### **SEC. 204. EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS THAT ACQUIRE OR DEVELOP BALLISTIC MISSILES.**

Section 5(b)(1)(B) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “would likely” and inserting “may”; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subclause (II) as subclause (III); and

(C) by inserting after subclause (I) the following:

“(II) acquire or develop ballistic missiles and the capability to launch ballistic missiles; or”.

### **SEC. 205. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM OF IRAN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8721 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“Subtitle C—Measures Relating to Ballistic Missile Program of Iran**

**“SEC. 231. DEFINITIONS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In this subtitle:

“(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ‘agricultural commodity’ has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

“(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the committees specified in section 14(2) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

“(B) the congressional defense committees, as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

“(3) CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ‘correspondent account’ and ‘payable-through account’ have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

“(4) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘foreign financial institution’ has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(i)).

“(5) GOOD.—The term ‘good’ has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

“(6) GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘Government’, with respect to a foreign country, includes any agencies or instrumentalities of that Government and any entities controlled by that Government.

“(7) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term ‘medical device’ has the meaning given the term ‘device’ in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

“(8) MEDICINE.—The term ‘medicine’ has the meaning given the term ‘drug’ in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

“(b) DETERMINATIONS OF SIGNIFICANCE.—For purposes of this subtitle, in determining if financial transactions or financial services are significant, the President may consider the totality of the facts and circumstances, including factors similar to the factors set forth in section 561.404 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

**“SEC. 232. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS THAT SUPPORT THE BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM OF IRAN.**

“(a) IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter, the President shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report identifying persons that have knowingly aided the Government of Iran in the development of the ballistic missile program of Iran.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) An identification of persons (disaggregated by Iranian and non-Iranian persons) that have knowingly aided the Government of Iran in the development of the ballistic missile program of Iran, including persons that have—

“(i) knowingly engaged in the direct or indirect provision of material support to such program;

“(ii) knowingly facilitated, supported, or engaged in activities to further the development of such program;

“(iii) knowingly transmitted information relating to ballistic missiles to the Government of Iran; or

“(iv) otherwise knowingly aided such program.

“(B) A description of the character and significance of the cooperation of each person identified under subparagraph (A) with the Government of Iran with respect to such program.

“(C) An assessment of the cooperation of the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea with the Government of Iran with respect to such program.

“(3) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

“(b) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after submitting a report required by subsection (a)(1), the President shall, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person specified in such report if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements under section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(c) EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any alien subject to blocking of property and interests in property under subsection (b).

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the head of state of Iran, or necessary staff of that head of state, if admission to the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States.

“(d) FACILITATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—The President shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the President determines knowingly, on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, conducts or facilitates a significant financial transaction for a person subject to blocking of property and interests in property under subsection (b).

**“SEC. 233. BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF PERSONS AFFILIATED WITH CERTAIN IRANIAN ENTITIES.**

“(a) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions

in all property and interests in property of any person described in paragraph (3) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements under section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(3) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person described in this paragraph is—

“(A) an entity that is owned, directly or indirectly, by a 25 percent or greater interest—

“(i) by the Aerospace Industries Organization, the Shahid Hemmat Industrial Group, the Shahid Bakeri Industrial Group, or any agent or affiliate of such organization or group; or

“(ii) collectively by a group of individuals that hold an interest in the Aerospace Industries Organization, the Shahid Hemmat Industrial Group, the Shahid Bakeri Industrial Group, or any agent or affiliate of such organization or group, even if none of those individuals hold a 25 percent or greater interest in the entity;

“(B) a person that controls, manages, or directs an entity described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) an individual who is on the board of directors of an entity described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) FACILITATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—The President shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the President determines knowingly, on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, conducts or facilitates a significant financial transaction for a person subject to blocking of property and interests in property under subsection (a).

“(c) IRAN MISSILE PROLIFERATION WATCH LIST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and publish in the Federal Register a list of—

“(A) each entity in which the Aerospace Industries Organization, the Shahid Hemmat Industrial Group, the Shahid Bakeri Industrial Group, or any agent or affiliate of such organization or group has an ownership interest of more than 0 percent and less than 25 percent;

“(B) each entity in which the Aerospace Industries Organization, the Shahid Hemmat Industrial Group, the Shahid Bakeri Industrial Group, or any agent or affiliate of such organization or group does not have an ownership interest but maintains a presence on the board of directors of the entity or otherwise influences the actions, policies, or personnel decisions of the entity; and

“(C) each person that controls, manages, or directs an entity described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(2) REFERENCE.—The list required by paragraph (1) may be referred to as the ‘Iran Missile Proliferation Watch List’.

“(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—



“(A) conduct a review of each list required by subsection (c)(1); and

“(B) not later than 60 days after each such list is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress under that subsection, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the review conducted under subparagraph (A) that includes a list of persons not included in that list that qualify for inclusion in that list, as determined by the Comptroller General.

“(2) CONSULTATIONS.—In preparing the report required by paragraph (1)(B), the Comptroller General shall consult with nongovernmental organizations.

**“SEC. 234. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PERSONS INVOLVED IN BALLISTIC MISSILE ACTIVITIES.**

“(a) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a certification that each person listed in an annex of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), or 1929 (2010) is not directly or indirectly facilitating, supporting, or involved with the development of or transfer to Iran of ballistic missiles or technology, parts, components, or technology information relating to ballistic missiles.

“(b) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the President is unable to make a certification under subsection (a) with respect to a person and the person is not currently subject to sanctions with respect to Iran under any other provision of law, the President shall, not later than 15 days after that certification would have been required under that subsection—

“(A) in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of that person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register a report describing the reason why the President was unable to make a certification with respect to that person.

“(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements under section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(c) EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any alien subject to blocking of property and interests in property under subsection (b).

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the head of state of Iran, or necessary staff of that head of state, if admission to the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States.

“(d) FACILITATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—The President shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United

States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the President determines knowingly, on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, conducts or facilitates a significant financial transaction for a person subject to blocking of property and interests in property under subsection (b).

**“SEC. 235. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN SECTORS OF IRAN THAT SUPPORT THE BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM OF IRAN.**

“(a) LIST OF SECTORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and publish in the Federal Register a list of the sectors of the economy of Iran that are directly or indirectly facilitating, supporting, or involved with the development of or transfer to Iran of ballistic missiles or technology, parts, components, or technology information relating to ballistic missiles.

“(2) CERTAIN SECTORS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a determination as to whether each of the automotive, chemical, computer science, construction, electronic, energy, metallurgy, mining, petrochemical, research (including universities and research institutions), and telecommunications sectors of Iran meet the criteria specified in paragraph (1).

“(B) INCLUSION IN INITIAL LIST.—If the President determines under subparagraph (A) that the sectors of the economy of Iran specified in such subparagraph meet the criteria specified in paragraph (1), that sector shall be included in the initial list submitted and published under that paragraph.

“(b) SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIED SECTORS OF IRAN.—

“(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person described in paragraph (4) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(B) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements under section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of this paragraph.

“(2) EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any alien that is a person described in paragraph (4).

“(B) COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the head of state of Iran, or necessary staff of that head of state, if admission to the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States.

“(3) FACILITATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—Except as provided in this section, the President shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the President determines knowingly, on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, conducts or facilitates a significant financial transaction for a person described in paragraph (4).

“(4) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this paragraph if the President determines that the person, on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act—

“(A) operates in a sector of the economy of Iran included in the most recent list published by the President under subsection (a);

“(B) knowingly provides significant financial, material, technological, or other support to, or goods or services in support of, any activity or transaction on behalf of or for the benefit of a person described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) is owned or controlled by a person described in subparagraph (A).

“(c) HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.—The President may not impose sanctions under this section with respect to any person for conducting or facilitating a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Iran or for the provision of humanitarian assistance to the people of Iran.

**“SEC. 236. IDENTIFICATION OF FOREIGN PERSONS THAT SUPPORT THE BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM OF IRAN IN CERTAIN SECTORS OF IRAN.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and publish in the Federal Register a list of all foreign persons that have, based on credible information, directly or indirectly facilitated, supported, or been involved with the development of ballistic missiles or technology, parts, components, or technology information related to ballistic missiles in the following sectors of the economy of Iran during the period specified in subsection (b):

“(1) Automotive.

“(2) Chemical.

“(3) Computer Science.

“(4) Construction.

“(5) Electronic.

“(6) Energy.

“(7) Metallurgy.

“(8) Mining.

“(9) Petrochemical.

“(10) Research (including universities and research institutions).

“(11) Telecommunications.

“(12) Any other sector of the economy of Iran identified under section 235(a).

“(b) PERIOD SPECIFIED.—The period specified in this subsection is—

“(1) with respect to the first list submitted under subsection (a), the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missile Sanctions Act and ending on the date that is 120 days after such date of enactment; and

“(2) with respect to each subsequent list submitted under such subsection, the one-year period preceding the submission of the list.

“(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each list submitted under subsection (a), not later than 120 days after the list is submitted under that subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress—

“(A) an assessment of the processes followed by the President in preparing the list; “(B) an assessment of the foreign persons included in the list; and

“(C) a list of persons not included in the list that qualify for inclusion in the list, as determined by the Comptroller General.

“(2) CONSULTATIONS.—In preparing the report required by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall consult with non-governmental organizations.

“(d) CREDIBLE INFORMATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘credible information’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 224 the following:

“Subtitle C—Measures Relating to Ballistic Missile Program of Iran

“Sec. 231. Definitions.

“Sec. 232. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons that support the ballistic missile program of Iran.

“Sec. 233. Blocking of property of persons affiliated with certain Iranian entities.

“Sec. 234. Imposition of sanctions with respect to certain persons involved in ballistic missile activities.

“Sec. 235. Imposition of sanctions with respect to certain sectors of Iran that support the ballistic missile program of Iran.

“Sec. 236. Identification of foreign persons that support the ballistic missile program of Iran in certain sectors of Iran.”

**SEC. 206. EXPANSION OF MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO BALLISTIC MISSILE CAPABILITIES OF IRAN.**

Section 104 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

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

“(ii) to acquire or develop ballistic missiles and capabilities and launch technology relating to ballistic missiles; or”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subclause (II) as subclause (III); and

(iii) by inserting after subclause (I) the following:

“(II) Iran’s development of ballistic missiles and capabilities and launch technology relating to ballistic missiles; or”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving those subparagraphs, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(B) by striking “WAIVER.—The” and inserting “WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of the Treasury may not waive under paragraph (1) the application of a prohibition or condition imposed with respect to an activity described in subparagraph (A)(ii) or (E)(ii)(II) of subsection (c)(2).”

**SEC. 207. DISCLOSURE TO THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF ACTIVITIES WITH CERTAIN SECTORS OF IRAN THAT SUPPORT THE BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM OF IRAN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13(r)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(r)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) knowingly engaged in any activity for which sanctions may be imposed under section 235 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012; or”

(b) INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 13(r)(5)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by striking “an Executive order specified in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(D)” and inserting “section 235 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, an Executive order specified in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(E)”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 13(r)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (D)(iii)” and inserting “subparagraph (E)(iii)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect with respect to reports required to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 208. REGULATIONS.**

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prescribe regulations to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 8, 2017 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Fostering Economic Growth: The Role of Financial Institutions in Local Communities”.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is author-

ized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Thursday, June 8, 2017 at 10 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 9:45 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The President’s Fiscal Year 2018 Budget.”

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 8, 2017 at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Beyond Iraq and Syria: ISIS’ Global Reach.”

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY**

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 8, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

**COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE**

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, June 8, 2017 from 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold an open hearing entitled “Open Hearing with Former CIA Director James Comey.”

**COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE**

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, June 8, 2017 from 1 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to my interns for the remainder of the month of June 2017. Those interns are Claire Faulkner, Fiona Kelty, Jackson Blackwell, Jaden Frazier, James Flemings, Kinani Halvorsen, Mary Crowley, Tasha Elizarde, Taylor Holman, Tristan Douville, Fatos Redzeqi, and Aimee Bushnell.

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

# CONDEMNING THE DEADLY ATTACK ON MAY 26, 2017, IN PORTLAND, OREGON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S.J. Res. 45, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) condemning the deadly attack on May 26, 2017, in Portland, Oregon, expressing deepest condolences to the families and friends of the victims, and supporting efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered read a third time and passed, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 45

Whereas, on May 26, 2017, 3 brave community members—Rick Best, Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche, and Micah David-Cole Fletcher—were stabbed as they protected 2 young women who were the targets of threatening anti-Muslim hate speech while riding on the Metropolitan Area Express Light Rail (commonly known as the “MAX”) in Portland, Oregon;

Whereas Rick Best and Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche lost their lives and Micah David-Cole Fletcher was gravely injured as a result of the attack;

Whereas acts of heroism and sacrifice for the safety and sake of others in the face of acts of domestic terrorism were demonstrated by the deceased and surviving victims;

Whereas Oregonians and people across the United States grieve for the families of all people affected by this needless tragedy; and

Whereas the people of the United States stand in solidarity against terrorism, white supremacy, hate, and intolerance: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—*

(1) condemns the deadly attack on May 26, 2017, in Portland, Oregon, in which 2 innocent people were killed and 1 other person was injured while standing up to hate and intolerance;

(2) offers deepest condolences to the families and friends of Rick Best and Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche;

(3) expresses hope for the swift and complete recovery of Micah David-Cole Fletcher;

(4) supports community efforts to heal from this terrible crime; and

(5) supports nationwide efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence.

## COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1ST INFANTRY DIVISION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 115.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 115) commemorating the 100th anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Moran amendment to the resolution be considered and agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the Moran amendment to the preamble be considered and agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 227) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the Senate—

(1) commemorates “A Century of Service”, the 100th anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division on June 8, 2017;

(2) commends the 1st Infantry Division for continuing to exemplify the motto of the 1st Infantry Division, “No Mission Too Difficult. No Sacrifice Too Great. Duty First!”;

(3) honors the memory of the more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division who lost their lives in battle;

(4) expresses gratitude and support for all 1st Infantry Division soldiers, veterans, and their families, including 1st Infantry Division soldiers and their families of the past and future and those who are serving as of May 2017; and

(5) recognizes that the 1st Infantry Division holds an honored place in United States history.

The resolution (S. Res. 115), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 228) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute)

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas June 8, 2017, is the 100th anniversary of the organization of the 1st Infantry Division;

Whereas the First Infantry Division was established in 1917 as the first permanent combined arms division in the Regular Army and has been on continuous active duty since 1917;

Whereas, from the heroic start of the 1st Infantry Division, the 1st Infantry Division

has played an integral part in United States history by serving in—

- (1) World War I;
- (2) World War II;
- (3) the Cold War;
- (4) the Vietnam War;
- (5) Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm;
- (6) the Balkans peacekeeping missions;
- (7) the War on Terror; and
- (8) as of May 2017, multiple operations around the globe;

Whereas, immediately after its establishment, the 1st Division started to build a prestigious reputation for its service in World War I;

Whereas, in May 1918, the victory of the 1st Division at the Battle of Cantigny, France, was the first United States victory of World War I, and despite suffering more than 1,000 casualties in that battle, the 1st Division seized the village from German forces, defended the village against repeated counterattacks, and bolstered the morale of the Allies;

Whereas, after the Battle of Cantigny, the 1st Division played a central role in other monumental battles of World War I, such as—

- (1) the Battle of Soissons;
- (2) the Battle of Saint-Mihiel; and
- (3) the Meuse-Argonne Offensive;

Whereas 5 soldiers of the 1st Division received the Congressional Medal of Honor during World War I;

Whereas the 1st Division—

- (1) remained on occupation duty in Germany to enforce the Armistice; and
- (2) in September 1919, was the last combat division to return home after World War I;

Whereas, following World War I, the 1st Division was 1 of only 3 United States Army divisions to remain on active duty, which is a strong testament to its accomplishments;

Whereas, in November 1939, the 1st Infantry Division was called to action again and, in August 1942, became 1 of the first United States divisions sent to the European theater during World War II;

Whereas, during World War II, the 1st Infantry Division fought bravely in Algeria, Tunisia, and Sicily in 1942 and 1943 before the courage and resolve of the 1st Infantry Division was tested on Omaha Beach in Normandy, France;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division, reinforced by units of the 29th Infantry Division, made the assault landing on Omaha Beach on D-Day, June 6, 1944, which began the liberation of Western Europe from Nazi control;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division continued its invaluable service throughout World War II, including in—

- (1) the liberation of France and Belgium;
- (2) the seizing of Aachen, the first city of Nazi Germany to fall to the Allies;
- (3) the Battle of the Huertgen Forest;
- (4) the Battle of the Bulge, in which the 1st Infantry Division held the critical northern shoulder at Butgenbach, Belgium;

(5) the crossing of the Rhine River at Remagen;

(6) the battles around the Ruhr Pocket in Germany; and

(7) the offensive into Czechoslovakia, where the 1st Infantry Division liberated Nazi labor camps at Falkenau and Zwodau;

Whereas 17 members of the 1st Infantry Division received the Congressional Medal of Honor for their service during World War II;

Whereas, in recognition of exemplary service during World War II, the 1st Infantry Division was the recipient of—

- (1) 2 French Croix de Guerre with Palm, and Streamers embroidered with “Kasserine” and “Normandy”;

(2) the World War II French Fourragere;

(3) the Belgian Fourragere; and

(4) the subordinate units of the 1st Infantry Division earned numerous Presidential Unit Citations;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division guarded the Nuremberg Trials and remained on occupation duty in Germany before returning home to Fort Riley, Kansas, in 1955;

Whereas, in 1965, the 1st Infantry Division was 1 of the first 2 divisions sent to the Vietnam War, and the 1st Infantry Division remained in Vietnam for 5 years, during which the 1st Infantry Division—

(1) protected the capital, Saigon, from attack by the North Vietnamese Army;

(2) conducted hundreds of—

(A) offensive operations between Saigon and Cambodia against Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army units; and

(B) civil action and pacification operations to protect and assist the Vietnamese people; and

(3) responded to the 1968 Tet Offensive by clearing Tan Son Nhut Air Force Base of enemy forces, securing Saigon and counter-attacking vigorously;

Whereas 12 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division earned the Congressional Medal of Honor during the Vietnam War;

Whereas, in recognition of exemplary service during the Vietnam War—

(1) the 1st Infantry Division was the recipient of—

(A) the United States Army Meritorious Unit Commendation;

(B) the Republic of Vietnam Cross of Gallantry with Palm for the period of 1965 to 1968; and

(C) the Republic of Vietnam civic Action Honor Medal, First Class; and

(2) the subordinate units of the 1st Infantry Division earned numerous Presidential unit citations and other Army awards;

Whereas, from 1970 to 1990 the 1st Infantry Division—

(1) was a key component of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization deterrent strategy;

(2) maintained a forward-stationed brigade in Germany and deployed additional elements annually to Germany on major exercises that demonstrated United States resolve to friend and foe alike; and

(3) contributed directly to the peaceful end of the Cold War;

Whereas, in November 1990, the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Saudi Arabia and played a key role in the famous “left hook” attack of the US VII Corps through the deserts of western Iraq to destroy the Tawakalna Division of the vaunted Republican Guard of Saddam Hussein, among many other enemy forces;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Bosnia for 31 months between 1996 and 2000, to Macedonia for 4 months in 1999, and to Kosovo for 22 months between 1999 and 2003—

(1) to enforce international peace agreements;

(2) to halt the worst ethnic violence in Europe since the Holocaust; and

(3) to bring peace and stability to the Balkans;

Whereas, in 2004, the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Iraq in Operation Iraqi Freedom as Task Force Danger and conducted sophisticated counterinsurgency operations that led to the first free and fair elections in Iraqi history in 2005;

Whereas, between 2005 and 2014, the brigade combat teams and other major headquarters and units of the 1st Infantry Division have

deployed repeatedly to Iraq and Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn;

Whereas Specialist Ross A. McGinnis, a 1st Infantry Division soldier, is 1 of the very few people of the United States to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor in the War on Terror;

Whereas, in the defense of United States interests, the 1st Infantry Division deployed its units and soldiers to Africa in 2015 and Kuwait in 2016;

Whereas, since November 2016, the headquarters of the 1st Infantry Division has been in Iraq, where the 1st Infantry Division is—

(1) engaged in the fight against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS); and

(2) providing the leadership structure for the Combined Joint Forces Land Component Command—Operation Inherent Resolve;

Whereas, as of May 2017—

(1) the Combat Aviation Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, is deployed to Afghanistan and is conducting combat aviation operations in support of the Afghan and international security forces battling the Taliban;

(2) the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, is deployed to South Korea, where it bolsters United States deterrence against North Korea; and

(3) the 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, is at Fort Riley, Kansas, where it is honing its combat-readiness in preparation for deployment; and

Whereas, since the establishment of the 1st Infantry Division in 1917—

(1) the 1st Infantry Division has been present all over the world, assisting in combat and noncombat missions for 100 years;

(2) more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have sacrificed their lives in combat; and

(3) 35 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have received the Medal of Honor: Now, therefore, be it

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 115

Whereas June 8, 2017, is the 100th anniversary of the organization of the 1st Infantry Division;

Whereas the First Infantry Division was established in 1917 as the first permanent combined arms division in the Regular Army and has been on continuous active duty since 1917;

Whereas from the heroic start of the 1st Infantry Division, the 1st Infantry Division has played an integral part in United States history by serving in—

(1) World War I;

(2) World War II;

(3) the Cold War;

(4) the Vietnam War;

(5) Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm;

(6) the Balkans peacekeeping missions;

(7) the War on Terror; and

(8) as of May 2017, multiple operations around the globe;

Whereas immediately after its establishment, the 1st Division started to build a prestigious reputation for its service in World War I;

Whereas in May 1918, the victory of the 1st Division at the Battle of Cantigny, France, was the first United States victory of World War I, and despite suffering more than 1,000 casualties in that battle, the 1st Division seized the village from German forces, de-

fended the village against repeated counter-attacks, and bolstered the morale of the Allies;

Whereas after the Battle of Cantigny, the 1st Division played a central role in other monumental battles of World War I, such as—

(1) the Battle of Soissons;

(2) the Battle of Saint-Mihiel; and

(3) the Meuse-Argonne Offensive;

Whereas 5 soldiers of the 1st Division received the Congressional Medal of Honor during World War I;

Whereas the 1st Division—

(1) remained on occupation duty in Germany to enforce the Armistice; and

(2) in September 1919, was the last combat division to return home after World War I;

Whereas following World War I, the 1st Division was 1 of only 3 United States Army divisions to remain on active duty, which is a strong testament to its accomplishments;

Whereas in November 1939, the 1st Infantry Division was called to action again and, in August 1942, became 1 of the first United States divisions sent to the European theater during World War II;

Whereas during World War II, the 1st Infantry Division fought bravely in Algeria, Tunisia, and Sicily in 1942 and 1943 before the courage and resolve of the 1st Infantry Division was tested on Omaha Beach in Normandy, France;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division, reinforced by units of the 29th Infantry Division, made the assault landing on Omaha Beach on D-Day, June 6, 1944, which began the liberation of Western Europe from Nazi control;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division continued its invaluable service throughout World War II, including in—

(1) the liberation of France and Belgium;

(2) the seizing of Aachen, the first city of Nazi Germany to fall to the Allies;

(3) the Battle of the Huertgen Forest;

(4) the Battle of the Bulge, in which the 1st Infantry Division held the critical northern shoulder at Butgenbach, Belgium;

(5) the crossing of the Rhine River at Remagen;

(6) the battles around the Ruhr Pocket in Germany; and

(7) the offensive into Czechoslovakia, where the 1st Infantry Division liberated Nazi labor camps at Falkenau and Zwodau;

Whereas 17 members of the 1st Infantry Division received the Congressional Medal of Honor for their service during World War II;

Whereas in recognition of exemplary service during World War II, the 1st Infantry Division was the recipient of—

(1) 2 French Croix de Guerre with Palm, and Streamers embroidered with “Kasserine” and “Normandy”;

(2) the World War II French Fourragere;

(3) the Belgian Fourragere; and

(4) the subordinate units of the 1st Infantry Division earned numerous Presidential Unit Citations;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division guarded the Nuremberg Trials and remained on occupation duty in Germany before returning home to Fort Riley, Kansas, in 1955;

Whereas in 1965, the 1st Infantry Division was 1 of the first 2 divisions sent to the Vietnam War, and the 1st Infantry Division remained in Vietnam for 5 years, during which the 1st Infantry Division—

(1) protected the capital, Saigon, from attack by the North Vietnamese Army;

(2) conducted hundreds of—

(A) offensive operations between Saigon and Cambodia against Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army units; and

(B) civil action and pacification operations to protect and assist the Vietnamese people; and

(3) responded to the 1968 Tet Offensive by clearing Tan Son Nhut Air Force Base of enemy forces, securing Saigon and counter-attacking vigorously;

Whereas 12 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division earned the Congressional Medal of Honor during the Vietnam War;

Whereas in recognition of exemplary service during the Vietnam War—

(1) the 1st Infantry Division was the recipient of—

(A) the United States Army Meritorious Unit Commendation;

(B) the Republic of Vietnam Cross of Gallantry with Palm for the period of 1965 to 1968; and

(C) the Republic of Vietnam civic Action Honor Medal, First Class; and

(2) the subordinate units of the 1st Infantry Division earned numerous Presidential unit citations and other Army awards;

Whereas from 1970 to 1990 the 1st Infantry Division—

(1) was a key component of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization deterrent strategy;

(2) maintained a forward-stationed brigade in Germany and deployed additional elements annually to Germany on major exercises that demonstrated United States resolve to friend and foe alike; and

(3) contributed directly to the peaceful end of the Cold War;

Whereas in November 1990, the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Saudi Arabia and played a key role in the famous “left hook” attack of the US VII Corps through the deserts of western Iraq to destroy the Tawakalna Division of the vaunted Republican Guard of Saddam Hussein, among many other enemy forces;

Whereas the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Bosnia for 31 months between 1996 and 2000, to Macedonia for 4 months in 1999, and to Kosovo for 22 months between 1999 and 2003—

(1) to enforce international peace agreements;

(2) to halt the worst ethnic violence in Europe since the Holocaust; and

(3) to bring peace and stability to the Balkans;

Whereas in 2004, the 1st Infantry Division deployed to Iraq in Operation Iraqi Freedom as Task Force Danger and conducted sophisticated counterinsurgency operations that led to the first free and fair elections in Iraqi history in 2005;

Whereas between 2005 and 2014, the brigade combat teams and other major headquarters and units of the 1st Infantry Division have deployed repeatedly to Iraq and Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn;

Whereas Specialist Ross A. McGinnis, a 1st Infantry Division soldier, is 1 of the very few people of the United States to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor in the War on Terror;

Whereas in the defense of United States interests, the 1st Infantry Division deployed its units and soldiers to Africa in 2015 and Kuwait in 2016;

Whereas since November 2016, the headquarters of the 1st Infantry Division has been in Iraq, where the 1st Infantry Division is—

(1) engaged in the fight against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS); and

(2) providing the leadership structure for the Combined Joint Forces Land Component Command-Operation Inherent Resolve;

Whereas as of May 2017—

(1) the Combat Aviation Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, is deployed to Afghanistan and is conducting combat aviation operations in support of the Afghan and international security forces battling the Taliban;

(2) the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, is deployed to South Korea, where it bolsters United States deterrence against North Korea; and

(3) the 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, is at Fort Riley, Kansas, where it is honing its combat-readiness in preparation for deployment; and

Whereas since the establishment of the 1st Infantry Division in 1917—

(1) the 1st Infantry Division has been present all over the world, assisting in combat and noncombat missions for 100 years;

(2) more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have sacrificed their lives in combat; and

(3) 35 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have received the Medal of Honor: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates “A Century of Service”, the 100th anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division on June 8, 2017;

(2) commends the 1st Infantry Division for continuing to exemplify the motto of the 1st Infantry Division, “No Mission Too Difficult. No Sacrifice Too Great. Duty First!”;

(3) honors the memory of the more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division who lost their lives in battle;

(4) expresses gratitude and support for all 1st Infantry Division soldiers, veterans, and their families, including 1st Infantry Division soldiers and their families of the past and future and those who are serving as of May 2017; and

(5) recognizes that the 1st Infantry Division holds an honored place in United States history.

#### CONDEMNING THE RECENT TERRORIST ATTACKS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, THE PHILIPPINES, INDONESIA, EGYPT, IRAQ, AUSTRALIA, AND IRAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 188, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 188) condemning the recent terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom, the Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, Australia, and Iran and offering thoughts and prayers and sincere condolences to all of the victims, their families, and the people of their countries.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 188) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 189, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 189) designating the week of June 5 through June 11, 2017, as “Hemp History Week.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 189) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### WILDLIFE INNOVATION AND LONGEVITY DRIVER ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 91, S. 826.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 826) to reauthorize the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program and certain wildlife conservation funds, to establish prize competitions relating to the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking, wildlife conservation, the management of invasive species, and the protection of endangered species, and for other purposes.

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE*.—This Act may be cited as the “Wildlife Innovation and Longevity Driver Act” or “WILD Act”.

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

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

*TITLE I—PARTNERS FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION*  
*Sec. 1001. Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program reauthorization.*

*TITLE II—FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION*

*Sec. 2001. Purpose.*

Sec. 2002. Amendments to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

#### TITLE III—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Sec. 3001. Reauthorization of multinational species conservation funds.

#### TITLE IV—PRIZE COMPETITIONS

Sec. 4001. Definitions.

Sec. 4002. Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking.

Sec. 4003. Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the promotion of wildlife conservation.

Sec. 4004. Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the management of invasive species.

Sec. 4005. Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the protection of endangered species.

Sec. 4006. Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for nonlethal management of human-wildlife conflicts.

Sec. 4007. Administration of prize competitions.

#### TITLE I—PARTNERS FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

##### SEC. 1001. PARTNERS FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 5 of the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Act (16 U.S.C. 3774) is amended by striking “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011” and inserting “\$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

#### TITLE II—FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION

##### SEC. 2001. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to protect water, oceans, coasts, and wildlife from invasive species.

##### SEC. 2002. AMENDMENTS TO THE FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE; AUTHORIZATION.**—The first section of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661) is amended by striking “For the purpose” and inserting the following:

###### “SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AUTHORIZATION.

“(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the ‘Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act’.

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—For the purpose”.

(b) **PROTECTION OF WATER, OCEANS, COASTS, AND WILDLIFE FROM INVASIVE SPECIES.**—The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SEC. 10. PROTECTION OF WATER, OCEANS, COASTS, AND WILDLIFE FROM INVASIVE SPECIES.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **CONTROL.**—The term ‘control’, with respect to an invasive species, means the eradication, suppression, or reduction of the population of the invasive species within the area in which the invasive species is present.

“(2) **ECOSYSTEM.**—The term ‘ecosystem’ means the complex of a community of organisms and the environment of the organisms.

“(3) **ELIGIBLE STATE.**—The term ‘eligible State’ means any of—

“(A) a State;

“(B) the District of Columbia;

“(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

“(D) Guam;

“(E) American Samoa;

“(F) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and

“(G) the United States Virgin Islands.

“(4) **INVASIVE SPECIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘invasive species’ means an alien species, the introduction of which causes, or is likely to cause, economic or environmental harm or harm to human health.

“(B) **ASSOCIATED DEFINITION.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘alien species’,

with respect to a particular ecosystem, means any species (including the seeds, eggs, spores, or other biological material of the species that are capable of propagating the species) that is not native to the affected ecosystem.

“(C) **INCLUSION.**—The terms ‘invasive species’ and ‘alien species’ include any terrestrial or aquatic species determined by the relevant tribal, regional, State, or local authority to meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable.

“(5) **MANAGE; MANAGEMENT.**—The terms ‘manage’ and ‘management’, with respect to an invasive species, mean the active implementation of any activity—

“(A) to reduce or stop the spread of the invasive species; and

“(B) to inhibit further infestations of the invasive species, the spread of the invasive species, or harm caused by the invasive species, including investigations regarding methods for early detection and rapid response, prevention, control, or management of the invasive species.

“(6) **PREVENT.**—The term ‘prevent’, with respect to an invasive species, means—

“(A) to hinder the introduction of the invasive species onto land or water; or

“(B) to impede the spread of the invasive species within land or water by inspecting, intercepting, or confiscating invasive species threats prior to the establishment of the invasive species onto land or water of an eligible State.

“(7) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term ‘Secretary concerned’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with respect to Federal land administered by the Corps of Engineers;

“(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Federal land administered by the Secretary of the Interior through—

“(i) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(ii) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

“(iii) the Bureau of Land Management;

“(iv) the Bureau of Reclamation; or

“(v) the National Park Service;

“(C) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to Federal land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service; and

“(D) the head or a representative of any other Federal agency the duties of whom require planning relating to, and the treatment of, invasive species for the purpose of protecting water and wildlife on land and coasts and in oceans and water.

“(8) **SPECIES.**—The term ‘species’ means a group of organisms, all of which—

“(A) have a high degree of genetic similarity;

“(B) are morphologically distinct;

“(C) generally—

“(i) interbreed at maturity only among themselves; and

“(ii) produce fertile offspring; and

“(D) show persistent differences from members of allied groups of organisms.

“(b) **CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT.**—Each Secretary concerned shall plan and carry out activities on land directly managed by the Secretary concerned to protect water and wildlife by controlling and managing invasive species—

“(1) to inhibit or reduce the populations of invasive species; and

“(2) to effectuate restoration or reclamation efforts.

“(c) **STRATEGIC PLAN.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Secretary concerned shall develop a strategic plan for the implementation of the invasive species program to achieve, to the maximum extent practicable, a substantive annual net reduction of invasive species populations or infested acreage on land or water managed by the Secretary concerned.

“(2) **COORDINATION.**—Each strategic plan under paragraph (1) shall be developed—

“(A) in coordination with affected—

“(i) eligible States;

“(ii) political subdivisions of eligible States; and

“(iii) federally recognized Indian tribes; and

“(B) in accordance with the priorities established by 1 or more Governors of the eligible States in which an ecosystem affected by an invasive species is located.

“(3) **FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.**—In developing a strategic plan under this subsection, the Secretary concerned shall take into consideration the economic and ecological costs of action or inaction, as applicable.

“(d) **COST-EFFECTIVE METHODS.**—In selecting a method to be used to control or manage an invasive species as part of a specific control or management project conducted as part of a strategic plan developed under subsection (c), the Secretary concerned shall prioritize the use of methods that—

“(1) effectively control and manage invasive species, as determined by the Secretary concerned, based on sound scientific data;

“(2) minimize environmental impacts; and

“(3) control and manage invasive species in the least costly manner.

“(e) **COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT.**—To achieve compliance with subsection (d), the Secretary concerned shall require a comparative economic assessment of invasive species control and management methods to be conducted.

“(f) **EXPEDITED ACTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretaries concerned shall use all tools and flexibilities available (as of the date of enactment of this section) to expedite the projects and activities described in paragraph (2).

“(2) **DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.**—A project or activity referred to in paragraph (1) is a project or activity—

“(A) to protect water or wildlife from an invasive species that, as determined by the Secretary concerned is, or will be, carried out on land or water that is—

“(i) directly managed by the Secretary concerned; and

“(ii) located in an area that is—

“(I) at high risk for the introduction, establishment, or spread of invasive species; and

“(II) determined by the Secretary concerned to require immediate action to address the risk identified in subclause (I); and

“(B) carried out in accordance with applicable agency procedures, including any applicable—

“(i) land or resource management plan; or

“(ii) land use plan.

“(g) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.**—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available to each Secretary concerned for a fiscal year for programs that address or include protection of land or water from an invasive species, the Secretary concerned shall use not less than 75 percent for on-the-ground control and management of invasive species, which may include—

“(1) the purchase of necessary products, equipment, or services to conduct that control and management;

“(2) the use of integrated pest management options, including options that use pesticides authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.);

“(3) the use of biological control agents that are proven to be effective to reduce invasive species populations;

“(4) the use of revegetation or cultural restoration methods designed to improve the diversity and richness of ecosystems;

“(5) the use of monitoring and detection activities for invasive species, including equipment, detection dogs, and mechanical devices;



“(6) the use of appropriate methods to remove invasive species from a vehicle or vessel capable of conveyance; or

“(7) the use of other effective mechanical or manual control methods.

“(h) INVESTIGATIONS, OUTREACH, AND PUBLIC AWARENESS.—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available to each Secretary concerned for a fiscal year for programs that address or include protection of land or water from an invasive species, the Secretary concerned may use not more than 15 percent for investigations, development activities, and outreach and public awareness efforts to address invasive species control and management needs.

“(i) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available to each Secretary concerned for a fiscal year for programs that address or include protection of land or water from an invasive species, not more than 10 percent may be used for administrative costs incurred to carry out those programs, including costs relating to oversight and management of the programs, recordkeeping, and implementation of the strategic plan developed under subsection (c).

“(j) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 60 days after the end of the second fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, each Secretary concerned shall submit to Congress a report—

“(1) describing the use by the Secretary concerned during the 2 preceding fiscal years of funds for programs that address or include invasive species management; and

“(2) specifying the percentage of funds expended for each of the purposes specified in subsections (g), (h), and (i).

“(k) RELATION TO OTHER AUTHORITY.—

“(1) OTHER INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL, PREVENTION, AND MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary concerned from pursuing or supporting, pursuant to any other provision of law, any activity regarding the control, prevention, or management of an invasive species, including investigations to improve the control, prevention, or management of the invasive species.

“(2) PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary concerned to suspend any water delivery or diversion, or otherwise to prevent the operation of a public water supply system, as a measure to control, manage, or prevent the introduction or spread of an invasive species.

“(l) USE OF PARTNERSHIPS.—Subject to the subsections (m) and (n), the Secretary concerned may enter into any contract or cooperative agreement with another Federal agency, an eligible State, a political subdivision of an eligible State, or a private individual or entity to assist with the control and management of an invasive species.

“(m) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of a contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (l), the Secretary concerned and the applicable Federal agency, eligible State, political subdivision of an eligible State, or private individual or entity shall enter into a memorandum of understanding that describes—

“(A) the nature of the partnership between the parties to the memorandum of understanding; and

“(B) the control and management activities to be conducted under the contract or cooperative agreement.

“(2) CONTENTS.—A memorandum of understanding under this subsection shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) A prioritized listing of each invasive species to be controlled or managed.

“(B) An assessment of the total acres of land or area of water infested by the invasive species.

“(C) An estimate of the expected total acres of land or area of water infested by the invasive species after control and management of the invasive species is attempted.

“(D) A description of each specific, integrated pest management option to be used, including a comparative economic assessment to determine the least-costly method.

“(E) Any map, boundary, or Global Positioning System coordinates needed to clearly identify the area in which each control or management activity is proposed to be conducted.

“(F) A written assurance that each partner will comply with section 15 of the Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 (7 U.S.C. 2814).

“(3) COORDINATION.—If a partner to a contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (l) is an eligible State, political subdivision of an eligible State, or private individual or entity, the memorandum of understanding under this subsection shall include a description of—

“(A) the means by which each applicable control or management effort will be coordinated; and

“(B) the expected outcomes of managing and controlling the invasive species.

“(4) PUBLIC OUTREACH AND AWARENESS EFFORTS.—If a contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (l) involves any outreach or public awareness effort, the memorandum of understanding under this subsection shall include a list of goals and objectives for each outreach or public awareness effort that have been determined to be efficient to inform national, regional, State, or local audiences regarding invasive species control and management.

“(n) INVESTIGATIONS.—The purpose of any invasive species-related investigation carried out under a contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (l) shall be—

“(1) to develop solutions and specific recommendations for control and management of invasive species; and

“(2) specifically to provide faster implementation of control and management methods.

“(o) COORDINATION WITH AFFECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—Each project and activity carried out pursuant to this section shall be coordinated with affected local governments in a manner that is consistent with section 202(c)(9) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712(c)(9)).”

### TITLE III—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

#### SEC. 3001. REAUTHORIZATION OF MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT.—Section 2306(a) of the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4245(a)) is amended by striking “2007 through 2012” and inserting “2018 through 2022”.

(b) REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT OF 1997.—Section 8(a) of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 4266(a)) is amended by striking “2007 through 2012” and inserting “2018 through 2022”.

(c) REAUTHORIZATION OF THE RHINOCEROS AND TIGER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1994.—Section 10(a) of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5306(a)) is amended by striking “2007 through 2012” and inserting “2018 through 2022”.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO THE GREAT APE CONSERVATION ACT OF 2000.—

(1) PANEL.—Section 4(i) of the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6303(i)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) CONVENTION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Wildlife Innovation and Longevity Driver Act, and every 5

years thereafter, the Secretary shall convene a panel of experts on great apes to identify the greatest needs and priorities for the conservation of great apes.”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) COMPOSITION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the panel referred to in paragraph (1) includes, to the maximum extent practicable, 1 or more representatives—

“(A) from each country that comprises the natural range of great apes; and

“(B) with expertise in great ape conservation.

“(3) CONSERVATION PLANS.—In identifying the conservation needs and priorities under paragraph (1), the panel referred to in that paragraph shall consider any relevant great ape conservation plan or strategy, including scientific research and findings relating to—

“(A) the conservation needs and priorities of great apes;

“(B) any regional or species-specific action plan or strategy;

“(C) any applicable strategy developed or initiated by the Secretary; and

“(D) any other applicable conservation plan or strategy.

“(4) FUNDS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary may use amounts available to the Secretary to pay for the costs of convening and facilitating any meeting of the panel referred to in paragraph (1).”

(2) MULTIYEAR GRANTS.—Section 4 of the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6303) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) MULTIYEAR GRANTS.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may award to a person who is otherwise eligible for a grant under this section a multiyear grant to carry out a project that the person demonstrates is an effective, long-term conservation strategy for great apes and the habitat of great apes.

“(2) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection precludes the Secretary from awarding a grant on an annual basis.”

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 5(b)(2) of the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6304(b)(2)) is amended by striking “\$100,000” and inserting “\$150,000”.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 6 of the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6305) is amended by striking “2006 through 2010” and inserting “2018 through 2022”.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO THE MARINE TURTLE CONSERVATION ACT OF 2004.—

(1) PURPOSE.—Section 2(b) of the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6601(b)) is amended by inserting “and territories of the United States” after “foreign countries”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6602) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “and territories of the United States” after “foreign countries”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ‘territory of the United States’ means—

“(A) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

“(B) Guam;

“(C) American Samoa;

“(D) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

“(E) the United States Virgin Islands; and

“(F) any other territory or possession of the United States.”

(3) MARINE TURTLE CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE.—Section 4 of the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6603) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by inserting “or a territory of the United States” after “foreign country”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “foreign countries” and inserting “a foreign country or a territory of the United States”.

(4) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 5(b)(2) of the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6604(b)(2)) is amended by striking “\$80,000” and inserting “\$150,000”.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 7 of the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6606) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

#### TITLE IV—PRIZE COMPETITIONS

##### SEC. 4001. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—The term “non-Federal funds” means funds provided by—

- (A) a State;
- (B) a territory of the United States;
- (C) 1 or more units of local or tribal government;
- (D) a private for-profit entity;
- (E) a nonprofit organization; or
- (F) a private individual.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(3) WILDLIFE.—The term “wildlife” has the meaning given the term in section 8 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 666b).

##### SEC. 4002. THEODORE ROOSEVELT GENIUS PRIZE FOR THE PREVENTION OF WILDLIFE POACHING AND TRAFFICKING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD.—The term “Board” means the Prevention of Wildlife Poaching and Trafficking Technology Advisory Board established by subsection (c)(1).

(2) PRIZE COMPETITION.—The term “prize competition” means the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking established under subsection (b).

(b) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish under section 24 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) a prize competition, to be known as the “Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize” for the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking—

(1) to encourage technological innovation with the potential to advance the mission of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking; and

(2) to award 1 or more prizes annually for a technological advancement that prevents wildlife poaching and trafficking.

(c) ADVISORY BOARD.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an advisory board, to be known as the “Prevention of Wildlife Poaching and Trafficking Technology Advisory Board”.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of not fewer than 9 members appointed by the Secretary, who shall provide expertise in—

- (A) wildlife trafficking and trade;
- (B) wildlife conservation and management;
- (C) biology;
- (D) technology development;
- (E) engineering;
- (F) economics;
- (G) business development and management; and

(H) any other discipline, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(3) DUTIES.—Subject to paragraph (4), with respect to the prize competition, the Board shall—

(A) select a topic;

(B) issue a problem statement; and

(C) advise the Secretary on any opportunity for technological innovation to prevent wildlife poaching and trafficking.

(4) CONSULTATION.—In selecting a topic and issuing a problem statement for the prize competition under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3), respectively, the Board shall consult widely with Federal and non-Federal stakeholders, including—

(A) 1 or more Federal agencies with jurisdiction over the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking;

(B) 1 or more State agencies with jurisdiction over the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking;

(C) 1 or more State, regional, or local wildlife organizations, the mission of which relates to the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking; and

(D) 1 or more wildlife conservation groups, technology companies, research institutions, institutions of higher education, industry associations, or individual stakeholders with an interest in the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking.

(5) REQUIREMENTS.—The Board shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(a).

(d) AGREEMENT WITH THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall offer to enter into an agreement under which the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation shall administer the prize competition.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(b).

(e) JUDGES.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary shall appoint not fewer than 3 judges who shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), select the 1 or more annual winners of the prize competition.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The judges appointed under paragraph (1) shall not select any annual winner of the prize competition if the Secretary makes a determination that, in any fiscal year, none of the technological advancements entered into the prize competition merits an award.

(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a cash prize is awarded under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the prize competition that includes—

(1) a statement by the Board that describes the activities carried out by the Board relating to the duties described in subsection (c)(3);

(2) if the Secretary has entered into an agreement under subsection (d)(1), a statement by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation that describes the activities carried out by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation relating to the duties described in section 4007(b); and

(3) a statement by 1 or more of the judges appointed under subsection (e) that explains the basis on which the winner of the cash prize was selected.

(g) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Board and all authority provided under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2022.

##### SEC. 4003. THEODORE ROOSEVELT GENIUS PRIZE FOR THE PROMOTION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD.—The term “Board” means the Promotion of Wildlife Conservation Technology Advisory Board established by subsection (c)(1).

(2) PRIZE COMPETITION.—The term “prize competition” means the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the promotion of wildlife conservation established under subsection (b).

(b) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish under section 24 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) a prize competition, to be known as the “Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize” for the promotion of wildlife conservation—

(1) to encourage technological innovation with the potential to advance the mission of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the promotion of wildlife conservation; and

(2) to award 1 or more prizes annually for a technological advancement that promotes wildlife conservation.

(c) ADVISORY BOARD.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an advisory board, to be known as the “Promotion of Wildlife Conservation Technology Advisory Board”.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of not fewer than 9 members appointed by the Secretary, who shall provide expertise in—

- (A) wildlife conservation and management;
- (B) biology;
- (C) technology development;
- (D) engineering;
- (E) economics;
- (F) business development and management; and

(G) any other discipline, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(3) DUTIES.—Subject to paragraph (4), with respect to the prize competition, the Board shall—

- (A) select a topic;
- (B) issue a problem statement; and
- (C) advise the Secretary on any opportunity for technological innovation to promote wildlife conservation.

(4) CONSULTATION.—In selecting a topic and issuing a problem statement for the prize competition under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3), respectively, the Board shall consult widely with Federal and non-Federal stakeholders, including—

(A) 1 or more Federal agencies with jurisdiction over the promotion of wildlife conservation;

(B) 1 or more State agencies with jurisdiction over the promotion of wildlife conservation;

(C) 1 or more State, regional, or local wildlife organizations, the mission of which relates to the promotion of wildlife conservation; and

(D) 1 or more wildlife conservation groups, technology companies, research institutions, institutions of higher education, industry associations, or individual stakeholders with an interest in the promotion of wildlife conservation.

(5) REQUIREMENTS.—The Board shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(a).

(d) AGREEMENT WITH THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall offer to enter into an agreement under which the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation shall administer the prize competition.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(b).

(e) JUDGES.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary shall appoint not fewer than 3 judges who shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), select the 1 or more annual winners of the prize competition.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The judges appointed under paragraph (1) shall not select any annual winner of the prize competition if the Secretary makes a determination that, in any fiscal year, none of the technological advancements entered into the prize competition merits an award.

(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a cash prize is

awarded under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the prize competition that includes—

(1) a statement by the Board that describes the activities carried out by the Board relating to the duties described in subsection (c)(3);

(2) if the Secretary has entered into an agreement under subsection (d)(1), a statement by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation that describes the activities carried out by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation relating to the duties described in section 4007(b); and

(3) a statement by 1 or more of the judges appointed under subsection (e) that explains the basis on which the winner of the cash prize was selected.

(g) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The Board and all authority provided under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2022.

**SEC. 4004. THEODORE ROOSEVELT GENIUS PRIZE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF INVASIVE SPECIES.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **BOARD.**—The term “Board” means the Management of Invasive Species Technology Advisory Board established by subsection (c)(1).

(2) **PRIZE COMPETITION.**—The term “prize competition” means the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the management of invasive species established under subsection (b).

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish under section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) a prize competition, to be known as the “Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize” for the management of invasive species—

(1) to encourage technological innovation with the potential to advance the mission of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the management of invasive species; and

(2) to award 1 or more prizes annually for a technological advancement that manages invasive species.

(c) **ADVISORY BOARD.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an advisory board, to be known as the “Management of Invasive Species Technology Advisory Board”.

(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The Board shall be composed of not fewer than 9 members appointed by the Secretary, who shall provide expertise in—

(A) invasive species;

(B) biology;

(C) technology development;

(D) engineering;

(E) economics;

(F) business development and management; and

(G) any other discipline, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(3) **DUTIES.**—Subject to paragraph (4), with respect to the prize competition, the Board shall—

(A) select a topic;

(B) issue a problem statement; and

(C) advise the Secretary on any opportunity for technological innovation to manage invasive species.

(4) **CONSULTATION.**—In selecting a topic and issuing a problem statement for the prize competition under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3), respectively, the Board shall consult widely with Federal and non-Federal stakeholders, including—

(A) 1 or more Federal agencies with jurisdiction over the management of invasive species;

(B) 1 or more State agencies with jurisdiction over the management of invasive species;

(C) 1 or more State, regional, or local wildlife organizations, the mission of which relates to the management of invasive species; and

(D) 1 or more wildlife conservation groups, technology companies, research institutions, institutions of higher education, industry associations, or individual stakeholders with an interest in the management of invasive species.

(5) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Board shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(a).

(d) **AGREEMENT WITH THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall offer to enter into an agreement under which the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation shall administer the prize competition.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(b).

(e) **JUDGES.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Secretary shall appoint not fewer than 3 judges who shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), select the 1 or more annual winners of the prize competition.

(2) **DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.**—The judges appointed under paragraph (1) shall not select any annual winner of the prize competition if the Secretary makes a determination that, in any fiscal year, none of the technological advancements entered into the prize competition merits an award.

(f) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a cash prize is awarded under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the prize competition that includes—

(1) a statement by the Board that describes the activities carried out by the Board relating to the duties described in subsection (c)(3);

(2) if the Secretary has entered into an agreement under subsection (d)(1), a statement by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation that describes the activities carried out by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation relating to the duties described in section 4007(b); and

(3) a statement by 1 or more of the judges appointed under subsection (e) that explains the basis on which the winner of the cash prize was selected.

(g) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The Board and all authority provided under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2022.

**SEC. 4005. THEODORE ROOSEVELT GENIUS PRIZE FOR THE PROTECTION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **BOARD.**—The term “Board” means the Protection of Endangered Species Technology Advisory Board established by subsection (c)(1).

(2) **PRIZE COMPETITION.**—The term “prize competition” means the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the protection of endangered species established under subsection (b).

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish under section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) a prize competition, to be known as the “Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize” for the protection of endangered species—

(1) to encourage technological innovation with the potential to advance the mission of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the protection of endangered species; and

(2) to award 1 or more prizes annually for a technological advancement that protects endangered species.

(c) **ADVISORY BOARD.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an advisory board, to be known as the “Protection

of Endangered Species Technology Advisory Board”.

(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The Board shall be composed of not fewer than 9 members appointed by the Secretary, who shall provide expertise in—

(A) endangered species;

(B) biology;

(C) technology development;

(D) engineering;

(E) economics;

(F) business development and management; and

(G) any other discipline, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(3) **DUTIES.**—Subject to paragraph (4), with respect to the prize competition, the Board shall—

(A) select a topic;

(B) issue a problem statement; and

(C) advise the Secretary on any opportunity for technological innovation to protect endangered species.

(4) **CONSULTATION.**—In selecting a topic and issuing a problem statement for the prize competition under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3), respectively, the Board shall consult widely with Federal and non-Federal stakeholders, including—

(A) 1 or more Federal agencies with jurisdiction over the protection of endangered species;

(B) 1 or more State agencies with jurisdiction over the protection of endangered species;

(C) 1 or more State, regional, or local wildlife organizations, the mission of which relates to the protection of endangered species; and

(D) 1 or more wildlife conservation groups, technology companies, research institutions, institutions of higher education, industry associations, or individual stakeholders with an interest in the protection of endangered species.

(5) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Board shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(a).

(d) **AGREEMENT WITH THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall offer to enter into an agreement under which the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation shall administer the prize competition.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(b).

(e) **JUDGES.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Secretary shall appoint not fewer than 3 judges who shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), select the 1 or more annual winners of the prize competition.

(2) **DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.**—The judges appointed under paragraph (1) shall not select any annual winner of the prize competition if the Secretary makes a determination that, in any fiscal year, none of the technological advancements entered into the prize competition merits an award.

(f) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a cash prize is awarded under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the prize competition that includes—

(1) a statement by the Board that describes the activities carried out by the Board relating to the duties described in subsection (c)(3);

(2) if the Secretary has entered into an agreement under subsection (d)(1), a statement by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation that describes the activities carried out by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation relating to the duties described in section 4007(b); and

(3) a statement by 1 or more of the judges appointed under subsection (e) that explains the basis on which the winner of the cash prize was selected.

(g) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The Board and all authority provided under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2022.

**SEC. 4006. THEODORE ROOSEVELT GENIUS PRIZE FOR NONLETHAL MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN-WILDLIFE CONFLICTS.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **BOARD.**—The term “Board” means the Nonlethal Management of Human-Wildlife Conflicts Technology Advisory Board established by subsection (c)(1).

(2) **PRIZE COMPETITION.**—The term “prize competition” means the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for the nonlethal management of human-wildlife conflicts established under subsection (b).

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish under section 24 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) a prize competition, to be known as the “Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize” for the nonlethal management of human-wildlife conflicts—

(1) to encourage technological innovation with the potential to advance the mission of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the nonlethal management of human-wildlife conflicts; and

(2) to award 1 or more prizes annually for a technological advancement that promotes the nonlethal management of human-wildlife conflicts.

(c) **ADVISORY BOARD.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an advisory board, to be known as the “Nonlethal Management of Human-Wildlife Conflicts Technology Advisory Board”.

(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The Board shall be composed of not fewer than 9 members appointed by the Secretary, who shall provide expertise in—

- (A) nonlethal wildlife management;
- (B) social aspects of human-wildlife conflict management;
- (C) biology;
- (D) technology development;
- (E) engineering;
- (F) economics;
- (G) business development and management;

and

(H) any other discipline, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(3) **DUTIES.**—Subject to paragraph (4), with respect to the prize competition, the Board shall—

- (A) select a topic;
- (B) issue a problem statement; and
- (C) advise the Secretary on any opportunity for technological innovation to promote the nonlethal management of human-wildlife conflicts.

(4) **CONSULTATION.**—In selecting a topic and issuing a problem statement for the prize competition under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3), respectively, the Board shall consult widely with Federal and non-Federal stakeholders, including—

(A) 1 or more Federal agencies with jurisdiction over the management of native wildlife species at risk due to conflict with human activities;

(B) 1 or more State agencies with jurisdiction over the management of native wildlife species at risk due to conflict with human activities;

(C) 1 or more State, regional, or local wildlife organizations, the mission of which relates to the management of native wildlife species at risk due to conflict with human activities; and

(D) 1 or more wildlife conservation groups, technology companies, research institutions, institutions of higher education, industry associations, or individual stakeholders with an interest in the management of native wildlife species at risk due to conflict with human activities.

(5) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Board shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(a).

(d) **AGREEMENT WITH THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall offer to enter into an agreement under which the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation shall administer the prize competition.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall comply with all requirements under section 4007(b).

(e) **JUDGES.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Secretary shall appoint not fewer than 3 judges who shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), select the 1 or more annual winners of the prize competition.

(2) **DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.**—The judges appointed under paragraph (1) shall not select any annual winner of the prize competition if the Secretary makes a determination that, in any fiscal year, none of the technological advancements entered into the prize competition merits an award.

(f) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a cash prize is awarded under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the prize competition that includes—

(1) a statement by the Board that describes the activities carried out by the Board relating to the duties described in subsection (c)(3);

(2) if the Secretary has entered into an agreement under subsection (d)(1), a statement by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation that describes the activities carried out by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation relating to the duties described in section 4007(b); and

(3) a statement by 1 or more of the judges appointed under subsection (e) that explains the basis on which the winner of the cash prize was selected.

(g) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The Board and all authority provided under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2022.

**SEC. 4007. ADMINISTRATION OF PRIZE COMPETITIONS.**

(a) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ADVISORY BOARDS.**—An advisory board established under section 4002(c)(1), 4003(c)(1), 4004(c)(1), 4005(c)(1), or 4006(c)(1) (referred to in this section as a “Board”) shall comply with the following requirements:

(1) **TERM; VACANCIES.**—

(A) **TERM.**—A member of the Board shall serve for a term of 5 years.

(B) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy on the Board—

(i) shall not affect the powers of the Board; and

(ii) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(2) **INITIAL MEETING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Board have been appointed, the Board shall hold the initial meeting of the Board.

(3) **MEETINGS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(B) **REMOTE PARTICIPATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Any member of the Board may participate in a meeting of the Board through the use of—

- (I) teleconferencing; or
- (II) any other remote business telecommunications method that allows each participating member to simultaneously hear each other participating member during the meeting.

(ii) **PRESENCE.**—A member of the Board who participates in a meeting remotely under clause (i) shall be considered to be present at the meeting.

(4) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold a meeting.

(5) **CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.**—The Board shall select a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson from among the members of the Board.

(6) **ADMINISTRATIVE COST REDUCTION.**—The Board shall, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize the administrative costs of the Board, including by encouraging the remote participation described in paragraph (3)(B)(i) to reduce travel costs.

(b) **AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.**—Any agreement entered into under section 4002(d)(1), 4003(d)(1), 4004(d)(1), 4005(d)(1), or 4006(c)(1) shall comply with the following requirements:

(1) **CONTENTS.**—An agreement shall provide the following:

(A) **DUTIES.**—The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation shall—

- (i) advertise the prize competition;
- (ii) solicit prize competition participants;
- (iii) administer funds relating to the prize competition;
- (iv) receive Federal funds—
- (I) to administer the prize competition; and
- (II) to award a cash prize;
- (v) carry out activities to generate contributions of non-Federal funds to offset, in whole or in part—

(I) the administrative costs of the prize competition; and

(II) the costs of a cash prize;

(vi) in consultation with, and subject to final approval by, the Secretary, develop criteria for the selection of prize competition winners;

(vii) provide advice and consultation to the Secretary on the selection of judges under sections 4002(e), 4003(e), 4004(e), 4005(e), 4006(e) based on criteria developed in consultation with, and subject to the final approval of, the Secretary;

(viii) announce 1 or more annual winners of the prize competition;

(ix) subject to subparagraph (B), award 1 cash prize annually; and

(x) protect against unauthorized use or disclosure by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation of any trade secret or confidential business information of a prize competition participant.

(B) **ADDITIONAL CASH PRIZES.**—The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation may award more than 1 cash prize annually if the initial cash prize referred to in subparagraph (A)(ix) and any additional cash prize are awarded using only non-Federal funds.

(C) **SOLICITATION OF FUNDS.**—The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation—

(i) may request and accept Federal funds and non-Federal funds for a cash prize;

(ii) may accept a contribution for a cash prize in exchange for the right to name the prize; and

(iii) shall not give special consideration to any Federal agency or non-Federal entity in exchange for a donation for a cash prize awarded under this section.

(c) **AWARD AMOUNTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount of the initial cash prize referred to in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ix) shall be \$100,000.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CASH PRIZES.**—On notification by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation that non-Federal funds are available for an additional cash prize, the Secretary shall determine the amount of the additional cash prize.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

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

The bill (S. 826), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

---

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 12,  
2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, June 12; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later

in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, postcloture.

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

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
JUNE 12, 2017, AT 4 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:43 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 12, 2017, at 4 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SCOTT P. BROWN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO NEW ZEALAND, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF SAMOA.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRED AZIZ AND ENDING WITH NATHALIE SCHARF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID GOSSACK AND ENDING WITH PAMELA WARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2017.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 8, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 8, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DUNCAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### IN MEMORY OF SERGEANT KYLE CLAYTON THOMAS

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to rise today in the memory of Mississippi Army National Guard Sergeant Kyle Clayton Thomas, who was killed on May 29, 2017, in a rollover incident at the National Training Center at Fort Irwin, California. Sergeant Thomas and three other soldiers were conducting combat maneuvers in an M1A2 SEPv2 Abrams Main Battle Tank.

Sergeant Thomas, an Amory native and a 2011 Amory High School graduate, was assigned to Alpha Company, 2nd Battalion 198th Armored, 155th Armored Brigade headquartered out of Tupelo, Mississippi.

He has been described as a compassionate person who loved life and spending time with his family. When his daughter, Devina Jayde Smith, was born, an incredible bond was formed between Sergeant Thomas and his daughter. Sergeant Thomas' father, Eddie Thomas, says the whole family is proud

of his son's commitment to his family and to the defense of this great Nation.

He divided his time between his job at NauticStar Boats manufacturing plant in Amory and service in the Mississippi Army National Guard.

His mother, Jo Ann Boussouar, says her son was always interested in the military. As a young boy, Sergeant Thomas would say that he wanted to be a tank driver.

The family says he excelled at soccer in high school, where he earned a scholarship to play at Itawamba Community College, but his patriotism led him down a different path, and he turned down the scholarship and joined the Mississippi Army National Guard. Ms. Boussouar says her son was able to fulfill his dream and to serve in the military. She is proud of her son's willingness to sacrifice his life for the safety of his family and of this Nation.

Prior to the incident, several colleagues and I went to Fort Irwin to discuss our defense readiness capabilities at the National Training Center, and we observed the tactical operations being carried out by the 155th Brigade Combat Team of the Mississippi Army National Guard, my brigade, the brigade that I deployed twice with. While I did not get to meet Sergeant Thomas while I was there, I did meet several other soldiers that were just like him and that were dedicated to serving and preserving the way of life we have in this great Nation.

Sergeant Thomas died on Memorial Day, the day our Nation has set aside to honor those servicemen and women who have fought and died to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. We cannot forget what this national holiday means to the families like Sergeant Thomas', who have experienced this loss. We can never forget those who gave all for the greatness of this Nation.

Dixie Thunder, Sergeant Thomas, Dixie Thunder.

### CONSEQUENCES OF IRRESPONSIBLE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I take to the floor of the House today in opposition to H.R. 10, the so-called Financial CHOICE Act, which is more appropriately called the "Wrongful" CHOICE Act.

Nearly a decade since the beginning of the financial crisis, my district is

still dealing with the consequences of irresponsible, underregulated financial institutions targeting toxic subprime loans to unsuspecting borrowers. In Prince George's County, one-quarter of all mortgages were subprime.

Nationally, Black homeowners were disproportionately affected by the foreclosure crisis, 80 percent more likely to lose their homes compared to other families with similar incomes and lifestyles. We later learned that several big banks had deliberately given people of color subprime mortgages. One such scandal-ridden bank, Wells Fargo, offered cash incentives for loan officers to peddle these, what they called ghetto loans to who they called mud people; in other words, Black customers, often single mothers.

For families in my district, it wasn't just about losing your home. An entire generation of wealth was wiped out. The financial foundation for future generations collapsed and may never be rebuilt. Families can't start a family, save for college, or set aside for their own retirement.

In the wake of the crisis, Democrats in Congress said, never again, and we took needed action to ensure that this sort of abusive behavior would never be repeated. We passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act and created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect American consumers from the types of practices that led to this crisis.

Now, even as the big banks, the creators of the financial crisis, are making record profits, the Financial CHOICE Act would once again give Wall Street permission to swindle working families and destroy the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This would be extremely harmful for hardworking Americans across the country.

Since its founding, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has been a powerful ally of the little guy. It has delivered nearly \$12 billion in relief to more than 29 million consumers harmed by predatory lenders, big banks, abusive debt collectors, and outright scammers.

Our Nation's veterans and military families have been some of the major beneficiaries of the agency's work. The agency worked with state attorneys general to secure debt relief for 17,000 servicemembers tricked into taking out high-cost loans. It ordered Navy Federal Credit Union to pay \$28.5 million for using illegal debt collection practices. It is suing Navient, the Nation's largest student loan company,



for illegal practices against millions of borrowers, including severely injured veterans.

The Bureau has also addressed the discriminatory practices that impact communities of color in the financial system head-on. The agency acted against Ally Bank, Honda, and Toyota for charging higher interest rates for African-American, Latino, and Asian borrowers regardless of their credit score. It strengthened protections for families who depend on prepaid debit cards for their wages and often fall into a spiral of debt from payday and auto title loans. The Bureau continues to target banks who are denying loans to qualified borrowers of color across the country.

Let's be clear: the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is truly living up to its name.

Mr. Speaker, nobody should want to return to a system that failed us and produced the financial crisis that damaged so many lives. Too many families and communities still carry the devastating scars of 2008, but that is exactly what the Financial CHOICE Act is trying to do. A rigged system is what led to the financial crisis, big banks got bailouts and sweetheart deals, and ordinary people suffered. That is why I am determined to oppose the Financial CHOICE Act, which seeks to roll back Wall Street reform and eliminate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Voting against this bill is the right thing to do for my district and it is the right thing for America.

#### IN HONOR OF DEPUTY DEVIN HODGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Anderson County Master Deputy Devin Hodges, who tragically passed away June 1 in the line of duty while participating in a training exercise on Lake Hartwell.

Deputy Hodges pursued his childhood dream and started his law enforcement career out of high school working as a dispatcher in Anderson County, then working for the Laurens County Sheriff's Office, the Abbeville County Sheriff's Office, and the Lander Police Department before returning to Anderson in January of this year.

As Anderson County Sheriff Chad McBride said, Devin had a big personality and a big heart, and it is a big loss. Devin was a man of character, a man of faith, who was known as a great father.

My thoughts and prayers are with Devin's wife, Krystal; his four children, Jeffrey, James, Katie, and Dianna; his brother, Christopher; his sister, Dominique; and his parents, Shari and

Ronnie; all of whom are constituents in my district, the Third District of South Carolina.

I know Devin is in a better place right now, joining his predeceased daughter, Isabella Faith, but the family he leaves behind will still acutely feel his loss, as we always do with the loss of a loved one.

I want to let the men and women in Anderson County law enforcement know that they continue to be in our prayers in this tragedy, as always with first responders, in our thoughts and our prayers.

So may God bless Devin's family, and may He continue to bless our country with stouthearted men and women like Devin, who are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice in order to protect us.

#### BAD ACTORS ON WALL STREET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, less than 10 years ago in 2008, bad actors on Wall Street brought the economy of our country to the brink of collapse. Because of their greed, recklessness, and deceit, millions of Americans lost their jobs, families were thrown out of their homes, and seniors saw their life savings evaporate before their very eyes.

Washington bailed out the big banks and they said they were too big to fail, but the American people never got a bailout. The American people were told: You are on your own. And in seven States, including my home State of Rhode Island, we are still working to recover jobs that were lost in this Great Recession. That is why it was so important 2 years later when Congress passed and President Obama signed into law the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010.

This law was a landmark victory for the American people, especially the American consumer. That is why it is so disturbing that Republicans now want to take us back to the days of too big to fail, a time when powerful Wall Street special interests exploited consumers and small investors, and our entire economy was put at risk.

The bill before us today, which I call the "Wrong" CHOICE Act, will turn Wall Street into the Wild West again and it will empower the big banks to do what they want at the expense of honest, hardworking families. This bill takes us back to an era when financial institutions could wipe out someone's retirement and foreclose on innocent homeowners completely unchecked. This bill repeals commonsense requirements that require financial advisers to act in the best interests of their clients. It will allow bad actors to push bad products on working people and seniors in exchange for paybacks.

This bill protects forced arbitration clauses and allows companies to require their customers to waive their right to a jury trial, and deny them their day in court when their rights are violated.

By the way, that includes servicemembers, brave men and women who have worn the uniform of the American Armed Forces. Unfortunately, servicemembers and veterans are often targeted for financial fraud and unscrupulous creditors because they are held to a higher standard of debt repayment. In addition, their frequent time away from home makes it harder for our servicemembers to identify scams.

The CFPB has already taken at least 12 major enforcement actions directly protecting servicemembers and their families. In 2016, the CFPB fined Navy Federal Credit Union \$28 million for illegal debt collection tactics. The CFPB took action against two for-profit colleges, ITT Technical Institute and Corinthian Colleges, both of which have been linked to predatory treatment of servicemembers and veterans. The now-defunct Corinthian was ordered to provide \$480 million in debt relief to defrauded students, including servicemembers.

In 2013, the CFPB ordered high-cost, small-dollar lender Cash America to pay up to \$14 million in restitution and a \$5 million penalty for violations of the Military Lending Act.

Just 2 months ago, CFPB sanctioned an auto lender that harassed and preyed on servicemembers. Security National Automotive Acceptance Company threatened that they would contact commanding officers about debts that our veterans incurred, and lied to our brave men and women in uniform about their obligations, and they have been held accountable because of the CFPB.

The CFPB was created to protect families and small businesses, and since 2010, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has returned nearly \$12 billion to 29 million consumers in all 50 States. More than 1 million consumers have used the CFPB's complaint database, and nearly all of them have received a timely resolution to their issues.

□ 1015

The CFPB held Wells Fargo accountable to the tune of \$100 million after they opened millions of fraudulent accounts for customers without telling them. Wells Fargo surreptitiously collected fees from these victims, and every dime was returned to consumers because the CFPB was on the job.

The sole purpose of CFPB's existence is to ensure that bank loans, mortgages, and credit cards are fair, affordable, understandable, and transparent. That is exactly what it is doing. Republicans want nothing more than to kill it.

No honest, hardworking American should be exploited when they are taking out a mortgage, trying to pay off their college debt, buying a car, or opening a bank account, but that is what is going to happen if Republicans get their way today. Passage of this bill will confirm what so many Americans believe: that Washington works for big business, the very rich, and powerful special interests, but not for them.

Let's remind ourselves that the American people sent us to Washington to work for them. They didn't send us here to fight for the big banks and credit card companies that already have too much power here in Washington.

Reject this bad bill. Vote for the American people. Protect consumers, and very strongly vote "no."

#### RESCUING AMERICA'S HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, when ObamaCare was imposed on the Nation, we were promised lower premiums, increased choices, and improved care, but exactly the opposite has happened.

Last year, premiums increased an average of 25 percent, and this year we are warned they will increase another 40 percent. Last year, only one provider remained in a third of American counties. This year, entire regions have no providers at all. In 2015, American life expectancies actually declined.

The Senate now has before it the American Health Care Act. It goes a long way toward replacing ObamaCare's compulsory one-size-fits-all bureaucratic mess with a consumer-friendly, patient-centered system.

The AHCA repeals the employer mandate that has trapped many Americans in part-time jobs. It repeals the individual mandate that forces Americans to buy plans they don't want, don't need, and can't afford. It changes the premium structure that forced young families to subsidize premiums for those in their peak earning years. It repeals nearly \$1 trillion of taxes on the American economy. It repeals the mandates that force an older couple to maintain pediatric coverage, and it maintains the safety net for those with preexisting conditions. It assures that these plans are within the financial reach of every family.

Well, despite the obvious failure of ObamaCare and the urgent need to rescue our healthcare system, opponents have gone into overdrive to frighten people and to distort the facts. The most lurid claim comes from the Congressional Budget Office: that 23 million Americans will lose their health insurance.

Now, we should first remember that this is the same office that predicted that ObamaCare exchanges would cover 26 million Americans by 2017. The actual number was 10 million. It predicted that ObamaCare would result in slight premium increases between 10 and 13 percent by 2016. The actual figure was 105 percent.

So how did the CBO come up with its latest claim? Well, much is based on assuming that people won't buy health insurance unless we force them. In reality, more people are already choosing not to purchase ObamaCare policies, and they are paying a steep tax penalty to boot. The CBO ignored provisions that allow people to tailor plans to best meet their own needs, which is a powerful market incentive for them to purchase plans.

Second, the CBO predicts that in future years Medicaid recipients will leave due to changes that restrain the growth in this program, yet it is precisely these changes that focus resources on services and not on waste and fraud.

Third, the CBO predicts that low-income, older Americans in the individual market will lose nearly \$13,000 of subsidies and be priced out of that market, yet it ignores the \$90 billion that were freed up in the final House version with the express understanding that the Senate would redirect these funds to replace these ObamaCare subsidies.

Fourth, the CBO predicts some people will choose less expensive plans without all the bells and whistles required under ObamaCare. Well, this, of course, is exactly what choice is all about: people making their own decisions based on their own needs and wants. Yet the CBO classifies them as uninsured.

The other major and false claim is that people with preexisting conditions will lose coverage, despite explicit language in the AHCA that nothing in this act shall be construed as permitting health insurers to limit access to health coverage for individuals with preexisting conditions.

There is one exception. If you are one of the 7 percent of patients in the individual market, and if you have a preexisting condition, and if you live in a State that has requested and received a waiver based on having an alternative program to assure your coverage, and if you have let your insurance lapse for more than 62 days in the past year, then, and only then, can you be charged a higher rate than the general population for your health plan, and then only for the first year.

This year, entire regions of the country will be unable to obtain policies on ObamaCare exchanges; premiums are spiraling out of reach for families that don't qualify for subsidies; and taxpayer costs are skyrocketing. The AHCA offers a way out of this night-

mare, restoring a healthy, competitive market, where patients will have the widest range of choices and the freedom to choose a plan that best meets their own needs, along with a supportive tax system to assure that these plans are within their financial reach.

If the Senate can come up with a better plan, let's see it. But one thing should be clear: inaction is not an option.

#### LOYALTY OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, amidst the breaking news alerts and tweets that have overwhelmed our Nation over the past several days, and as our Nation tunes in to a hearing taking place on the other side of the Capitol as I speak, lies a simple question: Did the President of the United States put his own personal and political interests above the interests of the American people?

Congress cannot allow itself to become desensitized to the gravity of those accusations or be deterred from an aggressive, expeditious, and fully independent investigation conducted in full view of the American public, because the real victims of this investigation's "cloud" are our constituents: Americans who wake up every morning praying that their monthly budget won't be compromised by the unexpected; who walk into their office hoping that today isn't the day that that layoff notice arrives; who tuck their son or daughter into bed at night knowing that, despite working two jobs, their kid won't be afforded the same luxuries as their friend down the street; who look to Washington for a hand and instead see us forced to wrestle with an almost unbelievable question: whether the leader of the free world compromised the security of his citizens and our democracy to a foreign adversary.

Mr. Speaker, there has been an awful lot of talk about loyalty in the past 24 hours. Let's be very, very clear. The American people should never have to be reassured of the loyalty of their Commander in Chief.

#### IN MEMORY OF GREGG ALLMAN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Gregg Allman, award-winning rock and roll singer and songwriter who passed away in Savannah, Georgia, on Sunday May 27, 2017, at the age of 69.

Mr. Allman will be remembered as the keyboardist and distinctly soulful

voice of the Allman Brothers, a three-time Grammy Award-winning Southern rock band whose popularity has spawned generations of dedicated followers throughout the world.

Born in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1947, Mr. Allman and his brother, Duane, were skilled guitarists and keyboardists by the time they graduated from high school. The brothers went on to perform with a number of small West Coast sound rock bands throughout the 1960s, moving between Los Angeles and Jacksonville, before establishing the Allman Brothers Band in 1969.

The band's most popular songs included "Midnight Rider," "Whipping Post," and "Ramblin' Man," which references Macon's Highway 41, where Mr. Allman was laid to rest. These songs will span the test of time and continue to live on, even as the music industry has drastically changed.

In 1973, Mr. Allman began a solo career and enjoyed a great deal of success as both a member of the Allman Brothers and a solo act. In 1995, Allman and the other members of the band were inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame.

I am proud that Mr. Allman chose to call Savannah home, and I am honored to have the opportunity to represent such an outstanding artist.

REMEMBERING FRANK CHAPPELL, JR.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the groundbreaking and altruistic life of Mr. Frank Chappell, who passed away on Saturday, May 27, 2017, at the age of 85.

Originally from Quitman, Georgia, Mr. Chappell always had a passion for serving others. He grew up as an integral member of his church and joined the Army directly after high school to serve his country and fight in the Korean war. In the Army, he gained the motivation he needed to continue his education, enrolling in Savannah State University upon his return home from Korea.

He moved to Savannah permanently after graduation and continued using his passion for service to make Savannah a better place to live. In 1957, he joined the Savannah police department.

Mr. Chappell was in the second group of African-American police officers the department had ever hired. However, at that time, these officers were still unable to drive in police cars or arrest potential criminals. Nevertheless, Mr. Chappell's personable nature created a connection with neighbors around Savannah that, before 1957, had felt underrepresented.

He retired from the police force after 35 years but, subsequently, embarked on another service position as a member of the city council for Thunderbolt, Georgia. During his term there, he was instrumental in building a new town hall and senior citizen building.

I am proud to thank Mr. Chappell, as well as his family, for all of his outstanding work in the Savannah community. He certainly will be missed.

AMERICAN PATRIOT AWARD WINNER JUDGE J. ALEXANDER ATWOOD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding career of Judge Alex Atwood, who received the American Patriot Award from the Glynn County Veterans Council on May 29, 2017. Each year, one individual that has exhibited leadership that positively impacts Glynn County receives this award.

Mr. Atwood is certainly worthy of this title. He started his career as a local law enforcement officer before he transitioned his knowledge of the law into a career as a special agent with the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, where he educated thousands on the role of public defenders.

In Glynn County, Judge Atwood is well known for his extraordinary legal career, serving as a magistrate judge for Glynn County and as a representative for Georgia's 179th District in the Georgia General Assembly. In this capacity, Judge Atwood has been a champion for Georgians. He introduced legislation that set parameters for illegal immigration, provides protections against human trafficking, and generates structured legal reform.

Judge Atwood has found the time to devote himself to a number of Glynn County organizations, working with each to make Glynn County a better place. Judge Atwood is a beaming example of leadership, and his career serves as an important lesson in fulfilling our civic duty as Americans.

#### THANKING HOWARD P. MARGULEAS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Howard Marguleas, a talented businessman, incredible father and friend, and blessing to those who knew him. He made a tremendous positive impact on so many lives, including my own. His list of achievements and contributions to our Nation is long.

Sadly, he passed away June 1, 2017. His spirit of service and leadership will live for generations to come.

As a business leader, he took the produce industry by storm as the principal founder of Sun World International. He brought many new products to American consumer markets, like the delicious new seedless watermelon, various new types of grapes, and the Hawaiian pineapple.

□ 1030

Sun World International became a powerhouse produce company under his watch, one of the largest in the Nation. His business leadership was well recognized.

He served on the California State Board of Food and Agriculture as a key adviser to Governor Pat Brown on issues important to the many farmers, ranchers, and consumers in California. He was named as one of the most influential produce leaders of the past 100 years by the industry publication, *The Packer*.

Mr. Marguleas was a genuinely good man. His incredible heart of gold was shown through his generosity as a philanthropist.

He championed healthcare access and education, issues near and dear to my own heart. He was vice chair at the University of California at Riverside, and served as a trustee at the Eisenhower Medical Center for more than 15 years.

He also helped found the Coachella Valley Boys and Girls Club, which has grown to five clubhouses serving thousands of children across the valley.

This is just a small part of the incredible work he did as a philanthropist and community leader throughout his life.

Mr. Marguleas was very special to me and my family in a very deeply personal way. He gave my father, Gilbert, the chance in life that transformed our entire family. He gave my dad, who didn't finish high school, a good job working at Sun World packing in Thermal and a ticket to the middle class.

He promoted my dad to eventually manage the plant. That allowed my family to move from our trailer and into our home in Coachella.

He used to give us Angels and Dodgers baseball tickets and giant Hershey chocolate bars for Christmas. For a kid who loves chocolate, those giant bars were like a gift from God Himself.

What really moves me is that he paid for a full year of my undergrad studies at UCLA, when my dad couldn't afford it. Imagine that. He helped a boy from a trailer park, son of farmworkers, achieve his dreams to be a doctor and serve the community. He did so without fanfare, headlines, or public recognition. He did it because he cared for my dad, my family, and me. Without him, I wouldn't be where I am today.

The amazing thing is that I am not the sole person touched and transformed by his kindness. There are so many more. His generosity and kindness are an inspiration.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Ardith, his four children, and nine grandchildren. I know that Howard's legacy will live on because his work touched so many across California and the Nation.

So on behalf of the people of California's 36th Congressional District; my wife, Monica; my girls, Sky and Sage; my mother, Blanca; my brother, Robbin; and my sister, Star, thank you, Mr. Marguleas. You will forever be in our hearts.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF PHILLIP D. LEDFORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Phillip D. Ledford, Navy veteran, dog lover, patriot, and husband to Helene, his wife of 41 years.

I was blessed to be Phil's next-door neighbor in Tucson for the last 20 years. Having lost my father at the age of 12, Phil became a father figure to me, and I loved him deeply.

Phil was born in Ohio and joined the Navy in 1963, at the age of 17, requiring his father to approve his enlistment. After 4 years serving as a boilerman and traveling the world, he transitioned to civilian life. After working in Ohio as a commercial refrigerator technician, Phil, Helene, and their beloved English Setter named Molley moved to Tucson.

Phil and his best friend and brother-in-law Mike would go on adventures in the desert and mountains, exploring old mines, gold prospecting, and hiking the beautiful landscapes of Arizona.

After Molley passed away, Phil and Helene couldn't imagine bringing another dog into their broken hearts for a while. Slowly, my Golden Retriever, Penelope, started to melt his heart, and soon they were spending their days together. Phil and Helene cared for Penelope when I was deployed to Afghanistan, then drove across the country to help me move when I got orders to Alabama. Phil came out to babysit Penelope and even drove her all the way back to Tucson to be at home for a while with Helene.

Phil volunteered to be a foster for the local Golden Retriever rescue organizations. He took this responsibility seriously, caring for many goldens coming out of difficult circumstances. One golden named Rudy had cancer, and Phil agreed to care for him until he passed. Rudy was deathly afraid of thunder, but Phil discovered that Rudy's fears were cured if he was riding in a car. So every time storms came, Phil would load Rudy up—even borrowing Mike's van so that Rudy could enter more easily—and drive him around so he wasn't afraid during the storm, even if the storm lasted all night—no complaints and no questions asked.

When I returned home to Tucson, we cut a hole in the wall between the two houses, and we had doggy doors, food bowls, toys, and treats in both places. Penelope happily lived in both of her homes again, roaming freely. What a life. What love.

Phil was with me when Penelope passed in 2014. Within a few weeks, Phil's best friend Mike went to be with the Lord after battling Agent Orange-caused cancer for years. It was a rough spring for Phil, losing his best guy friend and furry friend so quickly.

Despite our grief, we soon welcomed a rescue golden named Boomer into our lives and hearts. Boomer was a 10-month-old, energetic handful, and Phil got to work with his training, coaching, and love.

Phil was a patriot, who loved his country, God, and valued a hard day's work. He was a skilled tradesman, who was always eager to pull out his tools and try to fix literally anything that broke in the house or car.

Those of us who knew him best and loved him called him our favorite curmudgeon. He was stubborn and opinionated but would literally give you the shirt off his back or the last dollar in his wallet.

He used to scold me on my lack of discipline with the dogs. Boomer would get rambunctious with me and not listen but was perfectly well behaved with Phil. I realized, finally, that Boomer saw me as a litter mate and Phil as the pet parent.

In November 2015, Phil was diagnosed with head and neck cancer. The last year and a half, he navigated an extremely difficult journey. He channeled his stubbornness towards his fight against cancer and refused to give up or get down. His deep character traits of selflessness, faith, love, courage, and humility were tested and purified on this walk. He was a hero and example to all of us in the face of extreme pain, suffering, adversity, and eventually the end of his physical life.

In mid-April, the cancer came back with a vengeance and rapidly spread. The pain was unbearable at times, and it was so difficult for us to watch him suffer.

Two weeks ago yesterday, he took a turn for the worse. I flew home from D.C. to be with him. After a long night, Helene, Boomer, and I were by his side, praying he would be willing to let go and be received into God's holy embrace. He was unconscious for over 24 hours, but in that prayer, he scrunched his eyes closed twice, took his last breath, and went to be with the Lord, finally free of all the suffering and fully restored.

We could all learn a lot from Phil Ledford. He did not live a complicated life and found pure joy in simple and beautiful things: a walk with a beloved dog; exploring with his best friend Mike; watching football with his adored bride, Helene; tinkering with the furnace or his Jeep; a walk and casual dinner at our local favorite restaurant, Papa Locos; driving me to the airport or events with constituents; taking care of and protecting those whom he loved. He didn't seek glory, fame, or riches, but humanity, integrity, loyalty, and service.

Phil Ledford was a good man with a large heart and a selfless spirit. I truly could not have served in my calling in uniform and in Congress without his love and support. He directed us to not

have a memorial service or funeral, but he never said anything about a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives. It is the least I could do to honor his impact on my life and all those blessed to know him and love him, human and furry. We love you and miss you, Phil. As the song says: "Go rest high on that mountain. Son, your work on Earth is done."

### UNDERPAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express a simple principle: People who are working to bag groceries should not have to rely on government assistance, on nutrition assistance, to be able to buy groceries. Yet, across this country, there are thousands of workers who go and put in a full day's work yet can't afford the basic necessities of food and clothing.

And it is the taxpayers, all of us, that bear the responsibility for the underpayment by large corporations. A Berkeley study has said that this underpayment by large corporations, low wages, is costing the American taxpayers \$153 billion a year.

I am proud to introduce the Corporate Responsibility and Taxpayer Protection Act with nine other colleagues that would require companies to be responsible for the underpayment of their employees. The idea is simple: If people are putting in a hard day's work and a full week's work, they deserve wages that will allow them to be part of the middle class. Too often, what happens is corporations, even if they are paying a \$15 minimum wage, will adjust an employee's hours so that they don't get more take-home pay for the month.

What this bill will do is say that a corporation that isn't paying a fair wage, where employees are relying on government assistance, the corporation is responsible for that government assistance. It is not the taxpayers who should be paying for that; it is the corporations who should be held responsible for the underpayment of wages.

My hope is that none of the corporations will have to pay this tax. That they will do the right thing by working families in the middle class. That they will recognize that, in a time of record corporate profits, they can afford to pay a decent wage.

I am hopeful that this bill will receive bipartisan support, because it is the very premise of this country that if you work hard, if you play by the rules, you should be able to be part of the middle class.

### CIVILITY

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues and fellow citizens to elevate our political discourse in which we participate for the good of our country.

Some of what I see in America grieves me. The partisan divide grows more volatile, and decency shrinking in our political dialogue. Many on the left continue to say, Mr. Trump is "not my President." And in the past, some on the right have said, Mr. Obama is "not my President."

Now we have people who think it is comical to be photographed with the depiction of the President's bloodied head. I can only think of real-life intelligence photos I have viewed of innocent men and women shortly after their decapitation at the hands of a terrorist. Escalating America's political discussion to actions like what Ms. Griffin is guilty of undermines our Nation's discourse and weakens the unity of our citizens, and I don't know where it stops.

I fear we are pulling apart. The left and right should not hate each other. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., asserted: "Hate cannot drive out hate: only love can do that." We must be able to disagree, debate, and then strive together for America. When we pull apart, our Nation weakens and our citizens become more vulnerable. I fear that if we continue down this path, the political wedge will be so ugly it will not be so easily repaired.

□ 1045

It is this pulling apart that caused us not to pass a defense spending bill on time for almost a decade. Our military leaders have stated we are back to the hollow force of the 1970s due to this congressional malpractice. Our Navy is unable to fly half of their aircraft; the Army only has 3 of their 58 combat brigades fully ready to deploy; and our Air Force pilots fly less hours today than they did during the hollow force years.

In other words, the partisan rancor has undermined our Nation's defense, and our servicemen and -women are paying for this price in readiness. If North Korea, Russia, or another threat tries to take advantage of our weaknesses, our great warriors will pay for it with their blood.

I love our country and our representative democracy. We have had our times of extreme divide. At the beginning of our Nation's history, there were very aggressive debates between the followers of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, for example. We saw strife during Andrew Jackson's Presidency, when many of his opponents feared he was going to be America's Napoleon, and we survived those times.

But let us not forget the bitter acrimony leading up to the 1860s, when we saw physical assaults on the floor of Congress. That divide was only solved

after over 600,000 Americans died in the Civil War.

Let us debate the issues. I have already held five townhalls myself to engage in the essential debates to improve our country, and I will hold more. But when it comes to the vitriol and verbal assaults, let us all take a knee and reflect.

Are we taking our Nation to a potential precipice of a disaster if we keep turning up the volume of this partisan-ship?

Earlier this year, the congressional freshman class signed a civility pledge. I again pledge civility, but I also implore our Nation to include our media and entertainment to reflect on the tone and ugliness that we are seeing. Let us rein in the anger and disrespect. I implore our President, our Senate, all of us in the people's House, all of our citizens, let us raise the bar of our debate and treat each other with respect. Let us not cross the line between criticizing the issues to criticizing the person.

I have served in the military next to many great Americans for nearly 30 years, and we all swore to protect and defend every American with our lives, regardless of our party affiliations. In fact, I rarely knew if a person was a Republican or a Democrat during my time in the Air Force.

Let us not forget, too, that, during our history, 1.2 million Americans gave their lives in the defense of this country. They were Democrats, Republicans, Independents. Some had no party at all. Some were Federalists. Some were Whigs. They paid the ultimate price so we could have the privilege of a free and open debate that we enjoy today. They fought and died so our citizens could be the sovereigns of our Nation.

Let us turn away from the anger, outrage upon outrage, away from the character assassinations. Let us turn toward civil debate and contend for our ideas and values in a manner pursuant to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. When we lose an election, regardless of the party, let us do so gracefully, and respect the will of the voters and the Constitution. Let us agree when we agree, and respectfully disagree when we disagree. But to resist at all costs, on every issue, is damaging to our country.

Today, some are calling for impeachment of our President. With the facts that we have, it is wrong and it is putting politics over the well-being of our country, and we are better than this. Let us turn down the volume.

#### CONGRATULATING NORTH HALL HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL TEAM

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a joy today that I rise to con-

gratulate North Hall High School on winning the State baseball championship in Georgia in their class. This is especially happy for me because I am a Trojan. I graduated from North Hall High School in 1984.

It is amazing that it seems that long ago, but it is also looking back as one of the first sports championships in baseball that they have received, and it is a truly exciting time in our community. I have watched these young men grow up, many with my own son playing ball, and it is exciting to see that fulfillment.

At the start of the season, the team rallied around the promise of "Leave No Doubt." It reminded North Hall players and coaches to offer the best effort without exception and to prove wrong anyone who doubted their potential for success.

Persevering in the 2017 season was no small task. The team opened the first round of the State playoffs, in fact, with a 6-1 loss. Few people expected the Trojans to recover after that game, but they followed it with 10 straight wins.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that North Hall earned the title of State Champion.

This victory serves as a testament to the team's determination and a reminder to us all that dedication, even in the most unlikely circumstances, does pay off. Whenever we give up, we surrender our dreams.

To the young men that I have watched grow up, the young men in our community who now hold the title of State Champion, I say congratulations.

HONORING ARMY LIEUTENANT COLONEL TERRY BARRON

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of retired Army Lieutenant Colonel Terry Barron, Georgia's first female Blackhawk helicopter pilot. My neighbors in the city of Gainesville recently declared May 25 to be Terry Barron Day in honor of this outstanding servicemember.

Lieutenant Colonel Barron served in the Georgia National Guard for 30 years and, in 2011, was deployed to Iraq.

In addition to her military service, Lieutenant Colonel Barron served as a math professor and the former chair of Brenau University's math and science department. In this role, she equipped students with the knowledge and skills that allowed them to pursue careers in math and science.

As both a soldier and a professor, Lieutenant Colonel Barron has lived a life dedicated to serving and empowering others, making them more confident as they approach the challenges of each new day.

I would like to commend Lieutenant Colonel Barron for her service to northeast Georgia and on behalf of her country.

## PUTTING PEOPLE BACK IN POWER

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as I rise today, it is a good day on the floor of the House. It is a good day for those of us who have went before the voters on occasions and said that one of the issues that we have to take up in Washington, D.C., is removing the barriers to letting everyday people get up and be able to access the financial markets, to access their business opportunities, to follow their hopes, dreams, and ambitions. And on the floor of the House today, we will fulfill that.

We will take up and pass the Financial CHOICE Act, which repeals Dodd-Frank, which takes the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which many of us believe is unconstitutional—how could a body of Congress actually empower an agency that we have no control over, no accountability to us, they do as they want to do and, yet, control so much of our economy?

Today we take a step forward. We take a step forward to putting people back in power, to letting our community banks and our credit unions get back to doing what they do best, and that is treating their community and their people with respect, finding loans, opening up possibilities, having that next dream of someone who says, "I just want to take this opportunity," and being able to fund it.

You see, a lot has been said, and there are distractions everywhere, Mr. Speaker. We understand that many say nothing is getting done, but I look back and I say that the Republican majority is moving forward.

We have a new Supreme Court Justice. We have passed 14 CRAs, rolling back almost \$18 billion in compliance costs of regulations promulgated by the former administration.

We have begun the process of doing what we said we are doing by replacing a failed healthcare system in which we have just found out in Ohio, Nebraska, Iowa, Georgia, that premiums have skyrocketed, where markets are no longer viable, where insurance is not there, and even if it is there, there are many places where they can buy it but not use it. That is health insurance, not healthcare. In fact, that is nothing for those who need it.

You see, in Congress, we are moving forward. It is an agenda led by the administration, with the House and the Senate working together to say that we believe in the American people. We believe that the spirit of America is found in the individual hometowns, in the individual spirits that live there, not in a government that is controlled completely from Washington, D.C., where Washington says we know best. It is time we unleash the spirit again. Through this House, that process is starting today.

The Financial CHOICE Act is a fulfillment of a promise, and there are many more to come.

## DODD-FRANK HINDERS ECONOMIC GROWTH

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, we have been stuck in the slowest economic recovery in 70 years. With all the debate about the Financial CHOICE Act today, a simple question gets to the heart of the matter: Do we want to grow again?

I contend, Mr. Speaker, the answer is—the answer has to be a resounding yes. It has to be yes because there is a moral imperative at play. The Financial CHOICE Act is about ending a stagnant status quo that is crushing our economy and opportunity.

Multiple studies show that the Dodd-Frank Act has hindered economic growth. One study estimates that, because of the overregulation we have seen since the 2008 financial crisis, there are 650,000 fewer small businesses than there otherwise would be, which would have provided 6.5 million jobs. That is 6.5 million people not utilizing their God-given talents for the betterment of society. That is 6.5 million people not paying the Social Security, Medicare, and income taxes that we need to fund critical programs.

Some just want to raise taxes on the already-burdened taxpayers. I say, let us get new taxpayers into the game. Having more taxpayers helps us to pay for programs for veterans, education, medical research to find cures for diseases like Alzheimer's and cancer, taxpayers to help fund the national defense.

A couple of weeks ago, I visited a senior center in my district and had some very special conversations. Folks told me about the days when there were lots of jobs in factory towns in western Pennsylvania, and one World War II veteran showed me his Bronze Star.

These individuals are counting on us to allow an economy to grow that will create the taxpayers who can help pay for the critical programs that support them, that pay for their care.

We have a moral obligation, Mr. Speaker, to restore healthy growth to this economy. Today, let us pass the Financial CHOICE Act. Let us move from overregulation to right-sized regulation. Let us unclog the flow of capital to small businesses. Let us unclog consumers' access to credit. Let us lower the cost of financial services for everyday consumers. Let us bring an end to the anti-growth policies of the last 8 years and move into a much brighter, more prosperous future for everyone.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of grace and goodness, thank You for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing of strength and perseverance that each Member might best serve their constituents and our entire Nation.

May it be their purpose to see to the hopes of so many Americans, so as to authenticate the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our democratic Republic with the work they do.

Grant that the men and women of the people's House find the courage and wisdom to work together to forge solutions to the many needs of our Nation and ease the anxieties of so many.

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

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CRAWFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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



## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's Awareness Month. Alzheimer's is a progressive disease that leads to memory loss and other challenges in brain and physical function. Ultimately, it is fatal.

More than 5 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's, including over 220,000 residents of Illinois. Every 66 seconds, another American is diagnosed with this disease, and the rate of new cases are increasing. It has become our Nation's sixth leading cause of death.

Last year, Congress and the White House worked in a bipartisan manner to enact the 21st Century Cures Act. The legislation transforms our health research system to speed up the fight against Alzheimer's and other diseases, but that is just the start. Let's keep working together to end this devastating disease.

## DISMANTLING THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Financial Services Committee in strong opposition to the Financial CHOICE Act, or, more appropriately titled, the "Wrong" CHOICE Act.

The proponents of this bill claim it is about regulatory relief for our Nation's community banks, but it is not. This bill guts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an organization that was developed to protect consumers from unfair, deceptive, abusive practices.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today because the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has done amazing things. This bill would dismantle it, dismantle a Bureau that just in 6 years has recovered almost \$12 billion for over 29 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong choice. This bill returns the American economy to the deregulatory state that led us to the great financial crisis and the deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, because the fundamental question is, it does not provide choice or hope or opportunity for investors or for entrepreneurs.

## IN MEMORY OF STAFF SERGEANT ROBERT DALE VAN FOSSEN

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Staff Sergeant Robert Dale Van Fossen of the Army National Guard and celebrate his return home after more than half a century.

In November 1952, Staff Sergeant Van Fossen boarded an aircraft and took off from McChord Air Base in Tacoma, Washington, to Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska. In midflight, the plane disappeared in bad weather near Middleton Island in the Gulf of Alaska. Although some wreckage was found, no remains were recovered, and the Department of Defense notified the victims' families that they would have no remains to bury.

Van Fossen's parents held a memorial service for their son in Greenbrier at the Macedonia Baptist Church. Though all hope seemed lost, the Van Fossen family kept trying to solve the mystery.

For many years, they made efforts to learn about the crash. His sister Wilma Jean shared stories about it with her son Kevin Caid, and Kevin Caid began to seek as much information as he could regarding his late uncle.

In June 2012, on a training mission, a Black Hawk Army National Guard unit discovered the wreckage only 12 miles away from the original crash site of the C-124. After closer inspection of the spot, it was determined it was indeed the missing plane from 1952.

Finally, in March 2016, Staff Sergeant Robert Dale Van Fossen's remains were confirmed found in Alaska. Along with the news of his remains being found, the family was informed that he would be returning home.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that Staff Sergeant Robert Dale Van Fossen finally returned home last month and is now at last buried next to his sister Wilma Jean Caid at the Cleburne County Memorial Gardens.

## PARIS CLIMATE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with great disgust that I rise in condemnation of President Trump's withdrawal of the United States from the Paris climate accord.

Despite his promise to make America great again, the President's pullout from this agreement does exactly the opposite. It puts America behind 194 other countries that have placed truth and reality over ignorance.

Climate change is real and it is man-made. It is a threat that must be addressed, and it is extremely frustrating

that this administration has chosen to withdraw from the global fight against global warming. This pullout sends a message that the United States is no longer interested in leading the efforts to stop global warming, and it is a self-inflicted wound and undercuts trust in American leadership.

Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement will not save the coal industry, it won't make America great again, and it is another impulsive and destructive decision by this administration that hurts our future.

## HABITAT FOR HUMANITY AND DODD-FRANK

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

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, during my first term in Congress, I had the opportunity to join Habitat for Humanity on one of their builds back in Oakland County, Michigan. It was a lot of fun and time well spent.

Earlier this year, I met with Habitat and heard about their struggle to provide affordable homes under the regulations imposed by Dodd-Frank. Habitat for Humanity relies on the generosity of so many: not just volunteers who build the home or donate to their cause, but those who provide professional services free of charge.

Of course a home needs to be appraised before a loan is approved, and many times professional appraisers volunteer their services. Under Dodd-Frank, however, that is not allowed. Dodd-Frank mandates that appraisers receive customary and reasonable compensation for their services. This means Habitat can no longer accept donated services. In fact, Habitat told me that the complex Dodd-Frank rules have tripled the cost of loans.

That is why I introduced the HOME Act; and I urge my colleagues to support the act, as it is part of the CHOICE Act we are considering later today. Let's make sure Habitat can continue its important mission.

## PULLING OUT OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment that President Trump intends to pull the United States out of the historic Paris climate agreement. This agreement is a powerful symbol of America's strength and global leadership. It promised a bright future for our Nation and the world powered by clean energy.

America was poised to lead that clean energy revolution. Instead, the world is now making plans to move ahead without us. Jobs will be created

without us. New industries will be born and new innovative technologies manufactured without us. If we stick with this President's decision, America will be on the outside looking in.

I want to make one thing perfectly clear. I am still in, and so are more than 1,000 of America's most forward-thinking cities, States, universities, and businesses, including the cities of Albany, Schenectady, and Saratoga Springs, Union and Skidmore Colleges, and SUNY Albany. So are millions of our fellow Americans and communities in every single congressional district across our great Nation. Together, we will embrace the climate economy, even if our President does not.

President Trump's decision is a scar on America's image, but the American people will continue to demand leadership on reducing carbon pollution. Our children and our grandchildren are counting on us. Let's not fail them.

#### COMMUNITY BANKS AND DODD-FRANK

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of Dodd-Frank in 2010, a total of 357 financial institutions have been forced out of business. Four community banks in Alabama are on that list. That amounts to nearly \$7.5 billion less in Alabama's economy that could be lent to small businesses and farmers. In all, nearly 20 percent of Alabama's community banks have either closed or been forced to merge under Dodd-Frank.

Why is this happening? Because homegrown banks can't keep up with the crazy compliance costs that Dodd-Frank mandates. Here is an example:

One credit union in Alabama's Wiregrass region, their compliance department size has tripled. They estimate that these new costs have limited their growth by as much as \$60 million. That is not right. Hometown lenders in Alabama didn't cause the financial crisis of 2009, but now they and their customers are paying the price.

There is no question we need strong laws to govern our financial markets, but Dodd-Frank is not the answer. We now have a chance to fix this broken law, untangle this regulatory web, and unleash the capital investment that is so crucial to economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to support the CHOICE Act.

#### WITHDRAWING FROM THE PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the safety and future of the American people is in jeopardy.

Last week, the President made the irresponsible decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris climate accord. Military and national security leaders have asserted the need to address climate change as an imminent global threat. Removal from the Paris accord abdicates America's global leadership and increases the likelihood of climate disasters.

However, where our President has failed, State and local leaders are stepping up and leading. For example, last week, California's Governor, Jerry Brown, brokered an agreement with China on reducing emissions. On the campaign trail, the President had a lot to say about China taking American jobs, but when he had the chance to pave the way to create American job growth, he failed.

We must combat climate change and continue to deploy clean energy sources across the Nation that benefit our national security and create jobs.

#### NATIONAL HEMP HISTORY WEEK

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Hemp History Week.

Industrial hemp is a crop that can be used to produce more than 25,000 products, from textiles and fabrics to composites, auto parts, or even food. Hemp is such an industrial crop that, during World War II, the USDA produced a film encouraging farmers to grow hemp to support the war effort because textiles and fibers were in such short supply.

George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe all grew hemp. Today, however, industrial hemp is largely illegal for widespread production because the Controlled Substances Act does not make the distinction between hemp and marijuana.

Both are varieties of the cannabis plant, but that is where the similarities end. Unlike marijuana, hemp is high in fiber that makes it so useful and only has miniscule amounts of THC.

In 2004, Congress began to recognize the differences when it passed the 2014 farm bill, which included language to allow industrial hemp pilot programs. Today, more than 30 States have enacted laws to legalize industrial hemp for research or commercial purposes.

I was proud to lead the effort to create a hemp program in Kentucky that has been highly successful, with nearly 250 permitted growers and small businesses today. Now we need to take the next step in bringing hemp into the mainstream as a crop.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance legislation to make industrial hemp a legal crop for the farm-

ers of Kentucky and across the United States of America.

□ 1215

#### PROTECT AND EXPAND MONUMENT DESIGNATIONS

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 111th anniversary of the Antiquities Act. Over more than a century, Presidents of both parties have preserved and opened to the public over 157 monuments, like the Grand Canyon by President Theodore Roosevelt, or Zion in Utah by President William Howard Taft, or the Pacific National Monument in Hawaii by President George W. Bush. It is also connected to our economy and jobs, with 7 million jobs in the United States connected to outdoor recreation in our national monuments.

While this administration is reviewing certain monuments, we need to protect the ones that we already have, like Organ Mountains National Monument in New Mexico, or Bears Ears National Monument in Utah.

We also need to think about expanding national monuments where we have heritage that we want to preserve, like Castner Range, that preserves 10,000 years of human history and civilization in El Paso, Texas, where the United States and Mexico meet.

Mr. Speaker, let's work together to strengthen the Antiquities Act and not diminish its protections.

#### FREE SPEECH

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, people who are the loudest in proclaiming their tolerance are often the most intolerant people of all.

This has been proven in spades this year at the most liberal leftwing college campuses all over this country. Almost all colleges and universities now have programs or offices supposedly promoting diversity. However, this diversity apparently does not apply to conservatives.

Probably the least diverse groups in this Nation today are the faculties of our universities. And while almost everyone in higher education will say they are for freedom of speech, conservative students know they can express their views only at the risk of lower grades.

In addition, almost no leading conservatives are invited to be college commencements speakers. This year, we have even seen very hateful demonstrations and some violence at universities when conservative speakers

have been invited to speak at these supposed bastions of free speech. Some of the young student haters conducting their far-left demonstrations would have fit right in during the book-burning, anti-free speech days in Nazi Germany.

#### FOOD POLICY IS FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, for years, I have said: Food policy is foreign policy.

And I will say it again: Our food policy is our foreign policy.

Think about it. Food unites family and friends. Food is nutritional. Food is medicine. Food is the cement that sets a foundation for strong, healthy neighborhoods.

Just as Senator Dole and Senator McGovern worked together to rebuild SNAP, expand our School Lunch Program, and create WIC to fight hunger 40 years ago, we know food security is a bipartisan issue.

In Philadelphia, 20 percent of our population is food insecure, meaning 1 in 5 Philadelphians often don't know where their next meal will come from. To make our neighborhoods stronger block by block, we need to lay the framework for a strategy that gives our cities the resources to tackle this issue.

Believe me when I say that I know our country is facing trying times we have never seen before. From Comey to Russia, to the President's budget, and the Republican attack on healthcare, I know firsthand that the Nation has a lot to lose under this administration.

This is why we need to ensure that we have more tools in our toolbox. It is time to retool to fight hunger.

Food is the glue that keeps neighborhoods and nations united. Together, let's roll up our sleeves and work to retool the way we fight hunger in our cities, our Nation, and around the globe. Our food policy is our foreign policy.

#### HONORING AIR FORCE CAPTAIN JOE SMITH

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an American hero, Air Force Captain Joe Smith, as he makes his final flight home.

Though it has been nearly half a century since the 25-year-old fighter pilot was fatally shot down during the Vietnam war, he will finally be laid to rest in his hometown of Assumption, Illinois.

Thanks to the efforts of the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, a group

which searches the world for missing American veterans, the remains of Joe Smith were identified, along with his plane, by using DNA analysis. The effort made to bring him home all these years later is a true testament to the military's motto of no soldier left behind.

Those who knew Joe remember him as being a bright, polite young man, who was well educated, earning his master's degree in business at the University of Notre Dame and Washington University.

Though he did not have to, Joe went willingly into the service, where he began as a first lieutenant and quickly worked his way up to the promotion of being a captain.

With the help of the Assumption Historical Society, Joe's widow, Elaine Mills, a native of Decatur, has worked hard to keep his memory alive and honor his service to our Nation.

I hope to do the same by recognizing him today on this House floor. Joe is a true hero. This country and this House will long remember his valor.

#### MARSHALL PLAN

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, 70 years ago this week, Secretary of State George Marshall proposed an ambitious plan to rebuild Europe following the devastation of World War II.

Out of the Marshall Plan's transatlantic spirit of shared interests and economic cooperation, stronger military integration arose in the form of NATO. NATO, alongside the European Union, have formed the pillars of a safe, secure, and strong Europe while promoting the U.S. security and economic interests, our interests.

We must be firm in our commitment to article 5 of the NATO treaty. If America's commitment to the alliance is doubted, either by other NATO countries or adversaries of NATO, the peace secured by the United States and its allies will be threatened, make no mistake about it.

This is the longest peacetime period in Europe in over 1,000 years, which is really remarkable, and we should not take it for granted. It is our responsibility in Congress and in the White House to ensure that global order secured by NATO is strengthened, not damaged.

So it is important that we recognize this 70th anniversary of the Marshall Plan.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF MARY GOSEK

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a longtime central New York ovarian cancer advocate, Mary Gosek, who recently lost her own tremendous battle with the horrible disease.

Through her work as president of the Oswego Chapter of Hope for Heather, Mary devoted countless hours to educating women and men throughout our community on the symptoms and causes of ovarian cancer. Her great passion for finding a cure inspired many and gave hope to those who were suffering.

Mary's strength and determination was most visible in her efforts to raise awareness for ovarian cancer. Whether she was working together with her husband, Ed, to turn the Oswego State's ice hockey arena teal, organizing a teal takeover of the Oswego Speedway, or sharing her own experiences in Washington or Albany, Mary was committed to saving lives. Her spirit and tenacity in the fight against ovarian cancer will always be remembered. May it serve as an inspiration for others.

In Mary's memory, I will continue to advocate for increased funding for research into cures, treatment, and prevention so that we can someday know a day free of ovarian cancer. May her name forever be remembered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Rest peacefully, Mary.

#### HONORING STEVE HARDY

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the memory of Mayor Steve Hardy of Vacaville, California, a man who dedicated his life to service, first in the U.S. Navy for 5 years, then as a policeman, and later in the California State Senate, where I had the privilege of working with him when he was the staff director of the Governmental Organization Committee.

During his tenure as mayor, he led the city through a very difficult period—the Great Recession—revising the city's finances, bringing it back to vitality, and also continuing the role of Vacaville as one of the major cities in my district. It was a great pleasure working with him during those years.

His marriage of 46 years to his wife, Jerri, is a testament not only to his service to the community, but also to his family. He is survived by his children. I look forward to his memory and to the future of Vacaville.

#### DEBBIE'S KIDNAPPING STORY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans once thought that the horrors of human trafficking were a foreign problem. However, traffickers lurk all around us right here in America.

Debbie's mother thought nothing of letting her young daughter meet a friend in front of their yard one night to play. Her mother didn't realize her 15-year-old daughter, who was clad in her cartoon pajamas, was quickly abducted by two men in front of their house.

These deviants threw Debbie in the car, drugged her, and gang raped her. They threatened to shoot her if she ever tried to escape. For 60 days she was forced to have sex with countless men.

An anonymous tip led police to a hotel room where they found Debbie tied up and stashed under a bed. But many trafficking victims are never rescued. We cannot allow this scourge to continue to rage in America. Our children are not for sale, period.

And that is just the way it is.

#### REPEALING DODD-FRANK

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise because the majority is expected to vote today to repeal Dodd-Frank, the legislation that we passed after Wall Street predators in the mortgage meltdown crisis cost the American people 8.7 million jobs and \$19 trillion, including \$2.7 trillion in retirement savings. Ten million Americans lost their homes and entire communities were devastated.

But, amazingly, the majority wants to destroy the most important piece of financial safety legislation passed for the American people in 75 years. They call it the Financial CHOICE Act, but what kind of choice does it give you?

It destroys the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has saved 26 million people nearly \$12 billion from scams and rip-offs. It destroys the Volcker rule, which keeps banks from making speculative bets with your money.

The Financial CHOICE Act is the wrong choice for America and a very bad choice for Congress.

#### CREATING OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, today the House will take up and consider an important bill that will help create opportunity for all Americans: the Financial CHOICE Act.

The Financial CHOICE Act repeals the most harmful aspects of the Dodd-

Frank legislation that halted the flow of capital to our constituents, destroyed small community banks, frustrated small businesses, and generally made life harder for Americans. The Financial CHOICE Act provides relief to Main Street businesses that had nothing to do with the 2008 financial crisis, but were slammed with onerous and unnecessary regulations anyway.

Mr. Speaker, we need smart regulations that protect consumers and make our markets less risky. In many cases, Dodd-Frank did the opposite, and this has been a wet blanket on the economy, destroying jobs and opportunities for millions of Americans.

Importantly, Mr. Speaker, the bill also ends government bailouts for large banks considered too big to fail once and for all. It will cut our deficits by \$25 billion and finally subject the Federal Reserve to a proper audit.

Mr. Speaker, above all, our bill promotes economic growth so that all Americans can have the freedom and ability to get the job they want, create the small business they have always dreamed of, and secure their family's future.

#### PREPARING FOR DISASTER

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, with hurricane season underway, my constituents in Florida and all Americans living in coastal regions are susceptible to these devastating storms.

Disaster can strike at any time, often with little warning. It is never too early to prepare. Know your evacuation routes and have a supply kit ready. Also important, ensure your home is structurally sound to withstand intense winds and rain.

Taking steps now to reinforce a roof covering or protect an exterior window could mean the difference between saving money in the long run and dealing with major property damage.

That is why I am introducing the SHELTER Act, to provide tax credits to encourage people to stormproof their homes and properties. This legislation is about helping our communities be proactive when it comes to preparing for hurricane season.

Our local emergency managers in Pasco, Pinellas, and Hillsborough Counties do an incredible job of ensuring our communities are ready. But preparedness must also begin at home.

□ 1230

#### FRANCISCAN COMMUNITY DEPARTS CONWELL-EGAN

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, over the last 60 years, the Franciscan Friars shaped the lives of many students and families that have passed through the halls of Conwell-Egan Catholic High School in lower Bucks County. It is with a heavy heart that I rise today to announce the departure of the Franciscan community from Conwell-Egan.

If you went to Egan like me, then you knew Father Fidelis and Brother Larry. Their service and the service of more than 150 other Friars who have ministered there have brought profound grace and enrichment to the lives of so many young men and women throughout lower Bucks County.

The Franciscan Order at Conwell-Egan reinforced the school mission of building character through service, achieving academic excellence, and demonstrating a commitment to a life full of learning.

Myself, my family, and the entire lower Bucks County community are forever grateful for their continuous guidance and their continuous support. As we say good-bye to these exemplary individuals, true representatives of St. Francis, we wish them the best as they move on to their next mission.

#### REPEAL OF CONSUMER PROTECTIONS IS NOT WHAT AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the Financial CHOICE Act, which abandons the American people, as well as safety and soundness, in favor of Wall Street.

Six megabanks now control two-thirds of the financial sector in our country and reaped record profits of over \$170 billion in 2016. That is too much power in too few hands.

Current law has made progress in protecting consumers from predatory practices. Repeal of these consumer protections is not what the American people want.

This week, Congressman JONES and I propose to table the current legislation and replace it with our bipartisan bill, the Prudent Banking Act, which reinstates Glass-Steagall protections by separating prudent banking from risky Wall Street speculation that tanked our economy in 2008.

The Rules Committee refused to allow our bill a vote. Nevertheless, we remain resolute.

Glass-Steagall is something President Trump ran on, as did BERNIE SANDERS, and, in 2016, both the Republican and Democratic platforms enshrined policies to restore Glass-Steagall protections.

Americans should know there is a growing bipartisan consensus fighting to protect the progress we have made,

rein in Wall Street, and keep the wolves at bay and out of your pocket-book.

I will be voting "no" on this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF LESLIE SPAETH

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a beloved Warren County, Ohio, icon, Leslie Spaeth, who passed away recently at the age of 92.

Mr. Spaeth was a dedicated husband and father and grandfather and great-grandfather. What made him so special was his dedication, not only to his family, but also to his community and to his country.

Leslie Spaeth first served his Nation as a corporal during World War II.

Throughout his life, he continued to serve our community as a volunteer firefighter, as president of the Mason Council, as Warren County Auditor, as a member of the Warren County Board of Elections, and, finally, as the Warren County chairman of the Republican Party.

In his personal time, he bettered the lives of those around him, volunteering with the American Legion's Buckeye Boys State program and as an elder at his church.

Mr. Speaker, Leslie Spaeth was a patriot and a family man, and it has been my honor to represent him in Congress since Warren County came into my congressional district. I wish his family my sincere condolences as we say good-bye to one of our finest.

#### PROVIDING RELIEF TO AMERICA'S COMMUNITY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point: I am from the State of California, and that has long been the innovation capital for new ideas in America, for high-tech, and a place where a person with an idea and hard work and a little startup capital can grow a business.

We have had a major problem with respect to our community banks and our credit unions, the smaller ones, and that is they are going out of business at a very fast, rapid clip. A large percentage of them are struggling under this Dodd-Frank legislation that was passed in 2010.

Now, I think the legislation was well-intended, but to put all the regulatory burden and these costs on these smaller institutions has ended up with this one-size-fits-all regulation that makes it very, very difficult for them to give credit to entrepreneurs across our State.

I think that many of the provisions have been injurious, then, not only to the community banks, the credit unions, the smaller ones, but to the small businesses, to the borrowers, and to the savers that rely on these institutions.

We do need to make adjustment in this, and the Financial CHOICE Act will provide, I think, much-needed relief to the community financial institutions in a responsible and proactive way. I think that the premise is straightforward, which is a banking institution has to be strongly capitalized and well-managed to get the off-ramp from Dodd-Frank.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 8, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 8, 2017, at 9:04 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 184.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 375 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 10.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1237

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street

accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, at this time I proudly yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to start off by thanking Chairman HENSARLING and the entire Financial Services Committee for their leadership on this vital and important legislation. Job well done.

The Financial CHOICE Act answers a deep need at the very heart of our economy. We have heard about this need time and again from our constituents back home. I sure have.

Small businesses are struggling. They have been unable to hire, invest, or get the loans that they need to get off the ground. Families looking to keep their money safe are hit with fees that they cannot afford.

And why is this? Our community banks are in trouble. They are being crushed by the costly rules imposed on them by the Dodd-Frank Act. This law may have had good intentions, but its consequences have been dire for Main Street.

Let me put it this way: It is more than 1,000 pages long and has more rules and regulations than any other Obama-era law. The burdens created are real and deep.

These costs are unsustainable for small community banks who simply cannot afford to meet all the requirements and can't hire a team of lawyers to decipher the seemingly endless rules.

So what do they do? They hunker down. They are unable to loan out money. Or worse, they are shutting down.

The CHOICE Act reins in Dodd-Frank, and it delivers the regulatory relief these small banks so desperately need. This will change our communities because these banks are the lifeblood of our Main Streets.

Where I come from, representing towns small and medium, they are not big companies in big cities getting money from big banks. They are small- and medium-size businesses in small- and medium-size towns hoping the community banker will be able to give them the loan they need to hire some people, to take a risk, to start a small

business, to expand their small business. They know the needs of their communities, and they are able to identify the people who can fill those needs successfully.

There is a reason why they handle the vast majority of small-business loans in this country: because they are the ones who are the closest to the small businesses.

Here is the difference: The people big banks may overlook thinking it is some guy with a pipe dream, the community banker is able to recognize that as a father of four with the drive to make his dream of a bicycle shop into a reality or a woman seeking to rent out retail space to open her dream restaurant using her family recipes, or maybe it is a young farmer with a new idea to integrate the latest technology into the family farm. The big banks don't pay attention to that; only community banks do.

A couple of years later, with the help of these kinds of loans from these local banks, these so-called pipe dreams in these small towns and these rural counties become successful businesses. They become job creators. These are the ultimate success stories that our communities in America are built upon.

This is why the Financial CHOICE Act is so important. It helps community banks and the small businesses that absolutely depend on them, it helps them thrive. It protects consumers by increasing accountability and transparency over the wider financial sector, and it also repeals "too big to fail," the rules codified by Dodd-Frank that have left taxpayers on the hook for too long. Ultimately, the Financial CHOICE Act is a jobs bill, and it is one that will bring hope back to Main Street.

It is easy to talk about the economy and regulations as a series of numbers. It is easy to talk in vague terms about job creators and small-business owners. But what is far more important is identifying the problems that they actually face and actually doing something about those problems to help make a difference to improve their lives.

That is what this CHOICE Act is all about. It is why we were sent here: to look out for the people who work hard and who do the right thing.

Let's get this done for them. Let's get this done for the people who take the risks, who live and breathe their work, for the people who strive and struggle every day for their families. Let's pass the CHOICE Act today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 10 is being called the "Wrong" CHOICE Act by the American public because this bill is truly the wrong choice for all of us. Indeed, this is one of the worst bills I have seen in my time in Congress.

This bill is a vehicle for Donald Trump's agenda to deregulate and help out Wall Street. It destroys nearly all of the important policies we put in place in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to prevent another financial crisis and protect consumers. This bill would create vast harm and lead us right back to the bad old days.

We all remember the suffering that resulted from the Great Recession: \$13 trillion in household wealth was lost; 11 million people lost their homes; the unemployment rate hit 10 percent. The impact was enormous and felt by all. This bill would pave the way back to economic damage of the same scale—or worse.

The "Wrong" CHOICE Act guts the highly successful Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which works to make sure that hardworking Americans are not subjected to predatory practices in the financial marketplace.

Since its creation, the Consumer Bureau has returned nearly \$12 billion to more than 29 million consumers who have been ripped off by financial institutions. This bill would foolishly put a stop to the Consumer Bureau's good work and once again leave consumers vulnerable.

That is not all. Across the board, the "Wrong" CHOICE Act removes essential Dodd-Frank protections for consumers, investors, and our economy.

□ 1245

Despite what Republicans will tell you, banks large and small are doing just fine since the passage of Dodd-Frank. Last year, they posted record profits. Here is the bottom line: Donald Trump and Republicans want to open the door to another economic catastrophe like the Great Recession and return us to a financial system where reckless and predatory practices harm our families and communities. We cannot allow that to happen.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this catastrophically bad bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 7 years since the Dodd-Frank Act was passed, a monumental triumph of ideology over compassion and common sense. All of the promises of Dodd-Frank were broken. They promised us it would lift the economy, Mr. Chairman, but, instead, we are still stymied in the weakest, slowest recovery in the postwar era.

They promised us that it would end too big to fail, but, instead, it cynically codified too-big-to-fail banks in the law and backed it up with a taxpayer bailout fund.

It promised us, Mr. Chairman—they promised us that it would lead to a more stable economy, but, instead, the

big banks are bigger. The small banks are fewer. We are losing a community bank or credit union a day.

Our corporate bond market, a key component of financing of jobs, historic levels of volatility and illiquidity.

They promised us, Mr. Chairman, that it would help the consumer, but, instead, we see free checking cut in half at banks, bank fees are up. The ranks of the unbanked have increased.

For many creditworthy borrowers, they are paying \$500 more for an auto loan. Have you tried getting a mortgage recently? They are harder to come by and cost hundreds of dollars more to close.

Every promise of Dodd-Frank has been broken. And, Mr. Chairman, we hear about it every day. I heard from Julieann, a banker in Massachusetts, and she wrote, "'We have experienced a spike in loan declines to women,' for their investigation identified that women attempting to buy the family home to settle their divorce and stabilize their family were being declined at a high rate due to the Dodd-Frank Qualified Mortgage rules. . . ."

Dodd-Frank is hurting recently divorced women. I heard from Allen in New Hampshire who talked about his need for a new car, but he couldn't find a loan from a bank, and he said:

But for my local dealer's efforts on my behalf, there is no doubt I would not be driving my current car, and this was a desperate situation, for I am the sole income earner for my family. My wife is ill, and we have two young children in school. After my old vehicle broke down, I needed to find reliable, replacement transportation so that I could get to work and continue to provide for my family. Please ensure that financing car and truck dealerships are not stymied by Dodd-Frank's CFPB.

I heard from Maxine in Salt Lake City, who talked about her company. She said:

Last February, we were awarded a major catering contract for all food services in the new performing arts center. The new contract will require us to make a major investment in equipment in small wares. We will be able to hire 50 additional staff. Unfortunately, red tape got in the way, turned what should have been a golden opportunity into an unbelievable headache. Three banks informed us that our rating, according to new bank regulations imposed by Dodd-Frank, disqualified us from consideration.

Mr. Chairman, we have letter after letter, email after email, showing how Dodd-Frank is harming working families, harming small businesses, crushing community banks.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is a better, smarter way, and it is called the Financial CHOICE Act. It is going to create hope and opportunity for investors and consumers, and entrepreneurs, and it stands for economic growth for all, but bank bailouts for none.

Contrary to Dodd-Frank, and what every Democrat will come here today—



my friends on the other side of the aisle—and defend, we will end bank bailouts once and for all. We will replace bailout with bankruptcy. We will replace economic stagnation with a growing healthy economy. We will ensure that there will finally be pay increases, wage increases for working Americans who haven't seen a pay increase since Dodd-Frank became law.

We will replace Washington micro-management with market discipline. We will ensure that we replace taxpayer money with private money because for every bank who will have a 10 percent simple leverage ratio, which is analogous to having a private insurance policy against bailout, we will let them have that Dodd-Frank off-ramp, and that is so important.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are also going to hold Wall Street accountable with the toughest penalties that they have seen, and no more bailouts. Perhaps that is one of the reasons they oppose the Financial CHOICE Act and support the status quo of Dodd-Frank.

We will make sure that there is needed regulatory relief for our small banks and credit unions, because it is our small banks who loan to our small businesses, that create the job engine of America, and make sure that the American Dream is not a pipe dream; but, instead, it is a dream and a vision where we will only be limited by our imagination.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, the Speaker and Mr. HENSARLING would have you think this is all about community banks being hurt, but let me tell you what this is all about.

U.S. and foreign banks have paid more than \$160 billion in penalties to resolve cases brought against them by the Justice Department and Federal regulatory agencies for cases involving collusion, fraud against consumers, bribery, and other abuses.

There were 144 major cases of \$100 million or more against 26 large U.S. and foreign banks. Just look at this: Bank of America, \$56 billion; J.P.Morgan, \$28 billion; Citigroup, \$15 billion; Wells Fargo—and you know about Wells Fargo and what they did—\$11 billion; Goldman Sachs, \$9 billion; Morgan Stanley, \$5 billion. This is about rip-offs, so this bill will prevent us from being able to assess these kinds of penalties on those who are ripping off the American public.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), ranking member of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member. I rise today to oppose H.R. 10, a dangerous assault on American consumers that would gut the landmark Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act.

If the “Wrong” CHOICE Act is allowed to be inflicted on working families, the reckless financial speculators who sold out the American people on Wall Street would be given a free pass to perpetrate future financial abuses that will reap billions for them and rob average Americans of their financial security again.

The “Wrong” CHOICE Act would take us back to the pre-2008 era of unchecked reckless financial abuses that resulted in the worst recession since the Great Depression.

Let me remind Members of the crushing cost of that national economic emergency: over 8 million jobs lost, 10 percent unemployment, 7 million home foreclosures, and trillions of dollars of personal institutional wealth wiped out.

No proponent of this bill can look the American people in the face and tell them that this is better for consumers, because it is not.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I would first like to thank Chairman HENSARLING for introducing this important piece of legislation.

The CHOICE Act replaces the orderly liquidation authority under title II of Dodd-Frank with a new bankruptcy procedure developed by the Committee on the Judiciary in the Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act.

In 2008, our economy suffered one of the most significant financial crises in history. In the ensuing years, experts from the financial, regulatory, legal, and academic communities have examined how best to prevent another similar crisis from occurring and to eliminate the possibility of using taxpayer moneys to bail out failing firms.

The Judiciary Committee has advanced the review of this issue, with the aim of crafting a solution that will better equip our bankruptcy laws to resolve failing firms, while also encouraging greater private counterparty diligence in order to reduce the likelihood of another financial crisis.

The Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act is the culmination of a multiyear, bipartisan process that solicited and incorporated the views of a wide range of leading experts and relevant regulators. The CHOICE Act incorporates all of the provisions of the Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act, providing a balanced approach that increases transparency and predictability in the resolution of a financial firm.

Furthermore, it ensures that shareholders and creditors—not taxpayers—bear the losses related to the failure of a financial company.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the

gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), ranking member of the Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for yielding me time.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 10, the “Bad” CHOICE Act, which brings back the Wild West to our financial markets and hurts consumers.

It is a bad choice because this takes us back to a time when we were losing 800,000 jobs a month—not gaining 200,000 jobs a month. Colorado takes us back to when we had 10 percent unemployment—not 2.5 percent unemployment. It takes us back to a time when the stock market was 6,500—not 21,000.

It brings back no discipline. The markets were in chaos. People got hurt. This kind of return to bad legislation and bad regulation is not good for America, and we should all vote “no.”

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), a real leader on our committee and chairman of the Financial Institution and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to stand with Chairman HENSARLING today and offer my support for H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

This bill offers a responsible approach to financial regulation that will protect consumers and allow the American economy to flourish. The Financial CHOICE Act makes meaningful reforms that ensure transparency, restore a rule of law, and help consumers and small businesses gain access to the credit they need to move forward towards financial independence, be the entrepreneurs they are, and be able to realize their dreams.

Mr. Chairman, we lose one community bank or credit union a day, as the chairman just mentioned, every day. These are the institutions that lend to families and small businesses across America. These institutions are the backbone of each of our communities and something that must be done to reverse this dangerous trend of consolidation and closure.

There has been a considerable amount of discussion on both sides of the aisle on the need to help community financial institutions. The legislation we will consider today provides every Member of Congress the opportunity to cast a vote in favor of responsible regulatory relief for credit unions and community banks across the Nation.

The Financial CHOICE Act will increase access to credit for consumers by easing rules and regulations that never should have been applied to smaller financial institutions in the first place.

H.R. 10 also makes important reforms to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an unaccountable

agency that embodies the Washington-knows-best mentality that the Nation is so tired of seeing and, instead, creates a more responsible framework that actually protects consumers instead of special interests.

The Financial CHOICE Act offers a new model for financial opportunity and responsible regulation. It is time to take steps to remove the boot from the neck of our Nation's lenders and their customers.

Former Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan has said about the bill that it would have a tremendous stimulative effect on our economy. The Financial CHOICE Act is the right choice to help our communities grow their economies and our citizens realize their dreams.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his unwavering leadership and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the vice ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I understand the President of the United States himself has no real understanding of American history, but that is no excuse for this body for ignoring even the recent history of this country and returning us to the conditions, to the regulatory environment that not only preceded but contributed to cause the worst financial crisis that I have experienced in my lifetime, the Great Recession.

□ 1300

Millions of people lost their homes. Millions of people lost their job and lost everything they worked for because they were completely unprotected against institutions and organizations that were predators against them. This proposed legislation would take away those very protections and return us to a time when institutions and organizations can use unfair and deceptive practices, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under this legislation would be barred—would be barred—from going to bat for those people being taken advantage of.

This makes no sense. We ought to reject it, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of our Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, and I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on this important issue.

For the last 7 years, Dodd-Frank has blocked small businesses from getting the capital they need to grow and cre-

ate more jobs. As chairman of the Small Business Committee, it is no surprise that small businesses from all across the country tell me over and over again that this blocking of capital to them by Dodd-Frank is preventing them from creating more jobs which are needed in this country.

Whether to pay employees or to buy new equipment, we need to make it easier for small-business owners to gain access to capital. H.R. 10 is chock-full of real reforms, including the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups, or HALOS, Act to encourage and inspire entrepreneurs across the country.

The Nation's 29 million small businesses are working hard to achieve the American Dream. Let's not let our own government continue to stand in their way. Support this legislation. It is very important.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member, MAXINE WATERS.

Here they come again, Mr. Chairman. My colleagues seem to suffer from a case of policymaking amnesia. I was here in 2008 as our Nation stood on the edge of financial ruin. I will never forget those dark days.

Thanks to Wall Street making reckless bets and inadequate government oversight, millions of Americans lost their homes and jobs. Tell them about market discipline back in 2008. Main Street small businesses shed employees, and many shut their doors for good. Our economy nearly slid into another Depression.

Now, my Republican colleagues may have forgotten that sequence of events, but let me tell you something: The American people have not forgotten.

Dodd-Frank has improved accountability in the financial system. It has protected consumers and investors from predatory practices. It stabilizes our markets. And yet here we are talking about gutting this landmark law.

The American people are watching. Let's be clear. If you vote "yes," you are voting to restore the same conditions that fueled the crisis and collapse of 2008. It is a vote you will regret—and be remembered for. Vote "no."

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), who is a leader on our Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, the economic downturn in 2008 caused Michiganders and folks around the country to lose their jobs, families to lose their savings, and even some to lose their homes. Since that time, folks on the other side of the aisle have been attempting to convince the American people that the Dodd-Frank Act is "the

answer" to the financial crisis, despite the law failing to actually address the root cause of the downturn. In reality, Dodd-Frank has made it more difficult for hardworking taxpayers to secure a future for themselves and their children by denying them the economic recovery that they deserve.

Hardworking Americans rely on capital markets to save for everything from college to retirement. We as Congress must act to eliminate the burdensome and unnecessary red tape created under Dodd-Frank to ensure U.S. capital markets remain the most effective in the world so that all investors can receive the greatest return on their investments.

Since Dodd-Frank, our capital markets have become less stable, less efficient, and less liquid, which has made it more difficult for small businesses and American job creators around the country to access the necessary financial resources in order to expand and create jobs. In fact, Dodd-Frank has severed access to the capital markets for Main Street businesses and entrepreneurs who are the heartbeat of the American economy.

In order to succeed, small and growing companies need capital and credit—the lifeblood for growth, expansion, and job creation. Yet the government has continued to construct arbitrary walls that cut them off from essential financing as smaller companies are caught in a sea of red tape created by Washington bureaucrats.

Enough is enough. In order to increase economic opportunity, we must enact commonsense regulatory reform and restore accountability to Wall Street and to Washington. The House Financial Services Committee achieves this goal through the carefully crafted CHOICE Act, which we are debating here today.

The Financial CHOICE Act eliminates Dodd-Frank's one-size-fits-all regulatory structure which has strangled community financial institutions with overly burdensome regulations that were meant for the largest banks here in America.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, by enacting the CHOICE Act, community banks and credit unions can utilize their resources to help their individual customers and small businesses achieve financial independence. If we want small businesses to continue to be the engine of economic growth, we must remove the regulatory red tape that is preventing community lenders from supporting these small business job creators.

We hold Wall Street accountable. We hold the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau accountable, and we make

it more effective to do its job. No government agency should be unaccountable to the American taxpayer.

Dodd-Frank was a larger social agenda waiting for a crisis, and I understand that from my friends on the other side; but today, small businesses and hardworking Americans continue to pay the price.

The Financial CHOICE Act enacts pro-growth reforms, restores accountability, and provides opportunity. I encourage a “yes” vote.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a setback because it allows the American public to be subject to rip-offs. It allows you to be ripped off when you get your auto loan. Without your knowing it, it will allow you to pay a higher amount than you should be paying.

It allows you to, without your consent, have the money that you place in the bank be taken away from your account, moved over to another place, and used to gamble; if they win, they keep the profits—all done without your consent.

It allows, without your knowledge, the person that you are working with to invest your pension and to put his interests ahead of your interests.

This is a rip-off bill. We should not support it. The American consumers are placed at risk. This is the time to stand. We must say “no” to H.R. 10. It is, indeed, the wrong choice.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), who is a fighter on our committee. She is the chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to stand before you today to speak on H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act.

I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and all my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee for their hard work on this legislation, including holding 145 hearings on Dodd-Frank and the CHOICE Act.

For nearly 10 years following the financial crisis, our country witnessed one of the weakest recoveries of our lifetimes as Dodd-Frank held small businesses and families hostage and prevented our economy from growing. Now it is harder for families to qualify for a mortgage, obtain an auto loan, and access other forms of credit that they depend on every single day.

The only beneficiaries from Dodd-Frank have been Washington bureaucrats, who have grown more powerful; and big banks have only grown bigger at the expense of your personal free-

doms and your freedom to make your own financial decisions. Dodd-Frank has failed the American people.

Instead, the CHOICE Act, which stands for creating hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs, represents a better way from this Republican Congress that will provide Americans with the financial opportunities that they deserve. The CHOICE Act is about helping Main Street, not Wall Street, and will increase lending in our communities, open up our economy, end taxpayer-funded bank bailouts, and hold Wall Street and Washington accountable.

It will allow us to impose the toughest penalties on Wall Street executives who engage in fraud, deception, and self-dealing. Unlike before, executives who commit financial crimes will be held accountable, rather than innocent taxpayers and shareholders.

Americans deserve relief from the regulatory burden and lack of financial options that Dodd-Frank has created. Americans deserve the “Right” CHOICE Act.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), who is the ranking member of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the “Wrong” CHOICE Act. This is a bad bill, and I suspect that Republicans are pushing it through with only one hearing because they want to push it past the beleaguered public who lost trillions of dollars of wealth and home value during the last recession.

Republicans’ rubric about freedom and community banks is not fooling anyone. This legislation unleashes every bloodthirsty and greedy Wall Street superpredator back into the American people to feast on our misery like they did pre-Dodd-Frank. In contrast, you will actually hear the GOP blame predatory borrowers and say that they caused the crisis—like blaming hungry children for famines.

If this bill passes with the mere 10 percent capital requirements, the financial system will become brittle, prone to systemic crisis and taxpayer bailouts—a system that is less fair and rife with fraud.

Didn’t we learn our lesson in 2008? 2008 taught us that we cannot have sustainable economic growth absent good regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this bad bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is the chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, the Dodd-Frank Act is a failure, period. It is es-

timated to reduce economic output by nearly \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, and it contains more regulatory restrictions than all of the other regulations enacted by the previous administration combined, including ObamaCare.

The Financial CHOICE Act provides an off-ramp—much-needed relief—to Dodd-Frank’s growth-crushing regulations. Financial institutions like community banks and credit unions will have the choice to stay under the Dodd-Frank regulatory regime or opt for the relief that they are willing to obtain if they meet a 10 percent simple leverage ratio, a level that ensures that they can weather economic downturns without the help of taxpayer bailouts.

This legislation also reins in the primary culprit of the regulatory onslaught that has caused one in five community financial institutions in my State of Kentucky to close: the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This is done by giving Congress the power of the purse over the Bureau for the first time, making its Director removable by the President, requiring it to conduct cost-benefit analysis, and enhancing its mission to focus on consumer protection through competition and choice.

This legislation also delivers important regulatory relief to community financial institutions, incorporating the TAILOR Act, which requires Federal regulators to tailor their regulations based on the size of financial institutions instead of using the typical one-size-fits-all Washington model.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act ends stifling Dodd-Frank regulations that constrain lending for manufactured homes by including the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act. It also further reduces the chances of a mortgage crisis by giving financial firms an incentive to retain 100 percent of a mortgage’s risk and greater flexibility to lend by including my Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act.

Finally, this legislation places the steepest penalties in history on financial firms that actually break our laws.

So it ends too big to fail, it includes tough penalties—the toughest penalties in history—for financial fraud and other misdeeds, but it preserves consumer protections through competition, choice, and access to the credit Americans need to build our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on this issue.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have just got to stop some of this misrepresentation.

Exempt from CFPB’s supervision and enforcement, Wall Street reform—that is Dodd-Frank—recognizes community banks and credit unions have a small number of employees and a better consumer protection track record; thus,

they are carved out from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's supervision.

□ 1315

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's supervision and enforcement focuses on the largest banks that they won't talk about here today and non-banks that compete with small banks and credit unions.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, how soon do we forget?

The bill before us today is an affront to the American people. This bill is fatally flawed. It would set America up for more severe financial crises in the future. It is plain and simply the wrong choice.

Let me give you one example. Under the "Wrong" CHOICE Act, many banks would be free from regulatory oversight if they merely maintain a 10 percent leverage ratio.

Let's break that down for the American people. If this bill was law in 2008, one-third of the banks that eventually failed would be free from regulatory oversight altogether. To be clear, 125 banks that failed during the crisis would meet the bill's low requirement for regulatory relief, not according to me, but to an independent clearing-house analysis.

You don't have to be a financier to realize that this proposal is dangerous and an insult to American families who lost nearly everything. I am talking about those families in rural and urban America who saw their household net worth drop \$10 million, the largest loss of wealth in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), a gentleman on leave from the Financial Services Committee and one we proudly call our own.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I first want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and the entire Financial Services Committee for the work they have done on this bill. They have listened to Members and they have listened to constituents throughout this country. They studied the issue and they found the very best policy.

We all know we need economic growth, but we also know that growth means little if wages will not rise, if jobs do not return, and if more businesses close than open.

If a rising tide lifts all boats, we need to make sure every American is in the boat. Repealing Dodd-Frank with the Financial CHOICE Act lifts people back in so they can participate in America's economy. It will reestablish

the severed ties that link communities to the money they need to start businesses and hire employees.

Bringing back the community banks that Dodd-Frank destroyed means that more people, not just the wealthy, will have access to credit. But if we want everyone to be part of the American economy, we don't want people to face the same risks they did before. We want people to be treated fairly.

In 2008, people lost everything. Aided by misguided Washington policies, some played fast and loose and put almost everyone else at risk. So it is only natural that people looked around and asked: Why do we have a system where, when things go wrong, banks need to get bailouts, but the American people get nothing?

It is not a fair system. Dodd-Frank made it worse. It actually codified bailouts into law and made a taxpayer slush fund. On top of all that, we all know the regulations it created were just ridiculous.

Why is it that the rich and powerful get to game the complicated rules produced by their friends in the bureaucracy while everyone else faces a mountain of paperwork and regulations that no human being has a chance of understanding?

We all know that is not fair. All this ends up boxing out small-business owners and normal Americans who can't hire lawyers to sift through it all.

The Financial CHOICE Act levels the playing field. It makes both Wall Street and Washington accountable so that their bad decisions don't cost the taxpayers money. It makes things simple so that you don't need an Ivy League law degree to understand the rules that govern our lives.

America is a nation for the people. Everyone has a shot. Everyone should be treated the same. Everyone has a chance to succeed. The Financial CHOICE Act brings us a little closer to that America one more time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), one of our senior members of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I love this country. The heart and soul of our country is our financial system.

This bill is a dangerous bill to our economy. Let me tell you why. First of all, it takes away all of our consumer protections. I want to give you an example.

Before we had Dodd-Frank, a bank that is insured by the taxpayers could go in and use their customer's money. They could take their customer's money out to invest in risky bets, and then when the bets go south, it is the taxpayers that have to pick up the freight.

Secondly, let us use this example. Because of the impact and the complex-

ities of our financial system, so much of the cause and effect of the downturn were the big banks. What Dodd-Frank did was provide a test to be able to go in and simulate and confer with the bank to prevent it from going overboard.

Wake up, America. I have talked with our Senators and they have assured me that this bill is dead on arrival in the Senate.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), who is the chairman of the Terrorism and Illicit Finance Subcommittee.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, credit is one of the most powerful devices of our financial system. It was designed over time by modern societies. In some countries, credit is simply not available to those who need it the most: people at the bottom of the ladder.

In the United States, we have got a well-developed system where credit is available no matter how bad their credit rating might be. That is, it was available until the Dodd-Frank regulation created the CFPB.

In the Second District of New Mexico, 50 percent of the homes are mobile homes or manufactured housing. Dodd-Frank immediately began to show that they had no clue about how rural societies worked, and put into place regulations that choked off the access of most of our homeowners to manufactured housing.

That wasn't enough for the CFPB. They began then to set forward qualified mortgages, which then choked off traditional mortgages to many people in the Second District of New Mexico.

Many people in New Mexico will buy their first mobile home and they will live in that. Then, over their life, they will buy 8 or 10 more. Then they sell those one at a time, usually to people who can't get credit any other way. The CFPB simply shut that down. Now, seniors with less income, but people who need the loans the most, have one more source of credit dried up to them.

The rules that affect the rural mortgages and small businesses were so punitive that the economy in New Mexico has never come back. It is not just that the Financial CHOICE Act is the right choice in the rural areas, in our areas; it is the only choice.

I support H.R. 10, and I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the "Wrong" CHOICE Act. In addition to what else is wrong with the bill, there are two significant problems with it impacting the jurisdiction of the Education and

the Workforce Committee, where I serve as the ranking Democratic member.

First, the bill essentially eliminates the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The Bureau has played a crucial role in making sure student loan borrowers are treated fairly and receive the protections that they deserve. It has shut down fraudulent student loan debt relief scams, resolved countless consumer complaints, and secured hundreds of millions of dollars in loan forgiveness for borrowers tricked into taking out costly private loans.

The bill also repeals the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule, which simply ensures that financial advisers put their retirement clients' interests first.

Workers getting ready to retire often seek assistance in making what would be the biggest financial decision in their life. Let's be clear: many of these just set aside a few hundred dollars a month throughout their career, and now have hundreds of thousands of dollars to invest. They are counting on their financial adviser to do right by them and their families. This rule simply says that they have to do right for the families and the workers, not what may generate the highest fees.

Mr. Chairman, this bill undermines key policy priorities impacting student loans and retirement savings. We should stand up for students and retirees and reject this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, this debate oftentimes can become confusing because banking law is confusing.

We hear both sides take different positions on the Financial CHOICE Act and on Dodd-Frank, but I think the way you cut to the fat about whether Dodd-Frank was great law and does the Financial CHOICE Act actually make this law way better, I think we have to look at a couple simple factors.

Big banks brought us to the crisis in 2008. The question for my friends across the aisle and people watching this debate is: Because of Dodd-Frank, have big banks gotten smaller or have big banks gotten bigger?

The answer is: Big banks have gotten bigger.

If you go to rural Wisconsin, small community banks and credit unions that help grow businesses and help provide to capital to our families are going out of business. Big Wall Street banks don't set up shop in rural Wisconsin. So the little guy is getting hurt and the big guys are doing really well.

You have got to ask yourself: Who supports the Financial CHOICE Act?

You have the NFIB protecting small businesses, the Independent Community Bankers of America, the National Association of Federally-Insured Credit

Unions, and the Credit Union National Association. Credit unions and small banks support this bill.

Who doesn't support this bill?

Well, if you look to The Washington Post: HENSARLING, our chairman, faces opposition from big-bank CEOs that like Dodd-Frank. They hate the Financial CHOICE Act.

Another quote from The Wall Street Journal: "Big banks have an unexpected message for President-elect Trump: Don't trash the Dodd-Frank Act."

Big banks hate this bill, and little banks and little credit unions love it. If you want to know where people stand on this, go to your small community banker, go to your credit union, ask them about Dodd-Frank, and they will give you an earful. Then ask them: Do you like the Financial CHOICE Act? They will sit back and give you a small, slow clap.

Let's do what is right for the American people and the small banks and small credit unions. Let's join together, pass H.R. 10, and give a win to the little guy.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked: Who does not support this bill?

Let me tell him: advocates, experts, civil rights groups, labor groups, veterans groups, pension plans, and company shareholders.

We also received a petition urging a "no" vote from more than 220,000 concerned Americans.

Let me just say that AARP hates this bill. That is who opposes this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a senior member of the committee on Financial Services.

□ 1330

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains 12 measures that have wide Democratic support. Unfortunately, they have been held hostage and added to a bill that contains a pharmacy of poison pills.

The gentleman from New Mexico points out that we need to do something with manufactured housing. I support that bill. Liberate that bill. Don't put it in a bill that is going to die in the Senate.

The gentleman from Wisconsin talks about too big to fail. Please cosponsor the Sanders-Sherman bill to break up the too big to fail rather than this bill that lets them stay too big and takes away the regulation.

I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to support the Financial Accounting Foundation's efforts to have independently funded standards for government-issued debt. This bill takes that away.

I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to have different and lesser standards for community financial institutions like credit unions and local

banks. Instead, this highly partisan bill takes us down the wrong highway. It is a highway to a bill that will go nowhere in the Senate, and then we will resume our efforts to improve financial regulation in this country.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Chairman, I especially want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and the entire committee for all their hard work in getting us to this point to be able to pass H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, a very important bill to reform significant parts of Dodd-Frank that are failing. The Financial CHOICE Act is an important recognition of the many mistakes that policymakers made leading up to and responding to the financial crisis.

There is no doubt that the American people demanded changes from Washington when the financial crash led to higher unemployment, huge drops in home values, and lost hope and opportunities; but instead of reforms that would increase competition and decrease systemic risk, the Dodd-Frank Act grew government and piled new regulations on community banks and credit units and enshrined too big to fail into law.

Forty-two community banks and 106 Illinois credit unions have closed their doors since Dodd-Frank was signed in 2007. This is unacceptable.

I am grateful that regulatory relief legislation that I have championed is included in the Financial CHOICE Act, things like the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act and many other provisions that will provide great relief to our local financial institutions. That is what the Financial CHOICE Act is all about: giving opportunities back to local communities to make good financial decisions for their future.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, continuing to remind Mr. Duffy who opposes this bill, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America opposes this bill.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which I know does not surprise the chairman.

I have been here for some time. I was here in the 1990s. I was here in the 2000s. Frankly, we took the referee off the field in the 2000s, and we didn't put the referee as toughly on the field in the late 1990s as we should have. Brooksley Born warned us about that, and we kept our eyes shut, and keeping our eyes shut cost millions and millions of people their jobs, their homes, and their security.

Let us not return to the time of taking the referee off the field. This bill does that. It is a dangerous piece of legislation. The bill which my Republican colleagues have put forward

would put the American people at risk once again of having to bail out institutions if they lose money on risky investments.

Let me say to my Republican friends: I share their view that community banks should not be treated as too-big-to-fail banks. However, having said that, this bill takes the referee off the field one more time. It would effectively eliminate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that is now the American people's watchdog.

We have spent a lot of time this year in the last 5 months passing bills under the Congressional Review Act that have reduced consumer protections, civil rights protections, teacher protections, environmental protections. All we are doing is spending our time taking away protections for the American people and their futures.

Have we learned nothing, Mr. Chairman? Those who fail to learn from history, it is often said, are doomed to repeat it. Let us not doom our citizens to repeat it. Let us not fail to learn the lessons of 2008. Let us not doom ourselves to repeating the mistakes of the past.

The American people, average investors, and retirees, along with those who use our markets to save for college and purchase a home, deserve, and now have, commonsense protections.

Nobody is seeking to punish or limit what financial firms do well, and that is create and raise capital, but we must ensure that there are referees on the field to protect investors and taxpayers and citizens and, yes, our families and our children. This bill does the opposite. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say that perhaps the gentlewoman from California is unaware that the VFW has tweeted that it lauds Representative HENSARLING for a commitment to protect veterans, and then:

We are so happy that the Financial CHOICE Act has been endorsed by over 100 groups, including the Concerned Veterans for America, because of what we do to protect their freedoms.

At this point, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), a proud member of our committee.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Financial CHOICE Act, a bill that will provide the much-needed relief from the harmful, complex, and excessive regulatory environment created by the Dodd-Frank Act.

In the 7 years since the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act, our Nation has suffered from anemic economic growth, increasingly limited financial choices for consumers, and an unprecedented level of job-killing regulations. All the while, big banks have grown larger, and small banks and credit unions have suffered. In fact, community banks are closing at the rate of one per day.

Many of my constituents in small and rural towns in the Tampa Bay area rely heavily on their community banks for financial services. When those banks are forced to close their doors or raise their fees due to excessive regulation, my constituents lose access to essential services and opportunities.

Simply put, Dodd-Frank has failed.

The Financial CHOICE Act represents an alternative and effective approach to financial regulation, which will protect taxpayers and bank bailouts, empower investors, and hold government bureaucracies accountable.

This legislation makes it easier for hardworking Americans to save and invest for retirement, college, and their future. It will also increase access to and reduce the cost of credit for families that want to purchase a home or start a business.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of this bill and helping Washington get off the backs of hardworking taxpayers.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, you know, I was going to talk about leveraged buyouts, and I was going to talk about CDOs and CDO squared and Volcker rules and all those other things, but the truth is that is not what this is about. It is not about the details of the bill. It is about the concept. It is about Main Street versus Wall Street.

Now, I am not opposed to Wall Street, but if you make me make a choice, I am with Main Street. And I know that the radicals are against this bill, the radicals like the VFW, and I will just read what they said.

If enacted, the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017 would put those who have taken an oath to defend this country and our way of life in financial harm's way.

In light of this and on behalf of the nearly 1.7 million members of the VFW and its auxiliary, I call on you to oppose H.R. 10.

The other radical group that opposes this bill is the AARP, representing 38 million Americans; and the Communications Workers of America, with 700,000 members; and the Brotherhood of Teamsters, representing, I think, 900,000; and, of course, the California Teachers Association, which represents 900,000 people, who also invest \$202 billion in our country.

All that being said, I am shocked that I am sitting here thinking that the Dodd-Frank Act is some kind of a failure. Bottom line is we put an end to the Wild West of Wall Street and we are on to a nice, steady playing field. We should be able to adjust it, but we should not throw it out.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, apparently the gentleman forgot that

the big Wall Street banks also oppose this, according to the Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, and New York Times.

And I am now very happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I am here to support the Financial CHOICE Act, and for good reasons.

Under Dodd-Frank, North Carolina has lost 50 percent of our banks since 2010, while three community banks have consolidated just in the last month. Monthly banking fees have increased 111 percent.

As well, Dodd-Frank created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which even the liberal D.C. Court of Appeals calls unconstitutional and a threat to individual liberty.

Dodd-Frank has made the Wall Street banks even bigger and more powerful; and Dodd-Frank has contributed to the slowest, weakest economic recovery in 70 years, impeding access to capital and credit in the market for small business.

Maintaining the status quo is not acceptable.

The Financial CHOICE Act will impose the toughest penalties in history for fraud on Wall Street. It will end taxpayer bailouts for Wall Street and allow your community banks and credit unions to focus on serving you and your local business, which will help create jobs and grow the economy. The Financial CHOICE Act means opportunity for all Americans and bailouts for none.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, continuing to answer Mr. DUFFY about who opposes this bill, the Fleet Reserve Association, which includes the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have to say that this is the single worst piece of legislation that I have seen in my time here in Congress, and I have been here awhile. So I have to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for putting this amalgamation of terrible ideas together.

This bill basically destroys the work that we did to try to secure the banks after the financial crisis of 2008. It harms consumers, it lets off bad actors, it hamstring our financial regulators, and I believe it will lead to the next financial crisis.

This bill will destroy the only consumer protection agency in the United States Government by handing over the ability to defund the operation to the people who were committed to opposing its very creation.

It also repeals the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule that simply requires that financial advisers put the

interests of its clients first rather than its own.

And finally, it is important to emphasize that the Financial CHOICE Act rolls back the accountability and reporting standards for credit rating agencies, as Gretchen Morgenson discussed in a New York Times "Fair Game" column on May 7.

Mr. Chairman, to sum up, this is an awful bill. This is a real stinker. I hope that my colleagues here vote against it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, today is a good day. It is yet another day where we turn the page on the antigrowth policies of the last 8 years that have given us the slowest economic recovery in 70 years. I urge my colleagues to vote against the stagnant status quo with a vote for the Financial CHOICE Act.

With all the debate we are hearing, understand this: The heart of this bill is about right regulation, accountability, and growth, restoring healthy, robust growth that will create jobs, lift wages, and, through the creation of new taxpayers, will increase revenues to the Federal Treasury that will help pay for critical programs like Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, and national defense.

We have a moral obligation to restore healthy economic growth. The opponents of this bill, the status quo defenders, are seemingly okay with slow growth and fewer opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, take a stand for stronger growth. Take a stand for young people who want more job opportunities. Take a stand for young families who want a new home. Take a stand for seniors and veterans who rely on programs funded through a growing, healthy economy. Take a stand for a better way. Take a stand for a brighter future. Vote for H.R. 10. Vote for the Financial CHOICE Act.

□ 1345

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, during the financial crisis, 19 of the 20 largest financial institutions in the United States either required a bailout or a significant investment by the taxpayers. Clearly, reform was needed, and Dodd-Frank was that reform.

Since Dodd-Frank was put in place, consumer protections have improved materially, the banking system is safer and more sound, and our banks and our markets have far outpaced their inter-

national competitors. Dodd-Frank is working.

Is it a perfect piece of legislation? Of course not. Anytime Congress does something large and transforms an entire industry, we should sign up as a body for 10 years of fixes, which is what we have not done, and we have let the American people down.

Are we fixing Dodd-Frank today? No. We are pursuing a misguided and time-consuming and wasteful repeal effort.

I urge my colleagues to reject the CHOICE Act, and I urge my Republican colleagues to work with Democrats on bipartisan reforms to Dodd-Frank that build on its strength and solve and improve weaknesses in the legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Financial CHOICE Act. In response to the Great Recession, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank law. While well intentioned, various Dodd-Frank provisions and regulations are actually encouraging some of the behavior that led to the financial crisis.

The law permits Wall Street to receive bailouts and has constricted credit lending for consumers and small businesses. It has drastically hurt community banks throughout this country, and they had absolutely nothing to do with the financial crisis. Two thousand community banks have closed nationwide since Dodd-Frank, including 42 in New Jersey.

Dodd-Frank has institutionalized too big to fail for Wall Street, while telling community banks on Main Street that they are too small to succeed.

Congress agrees on the need for strong regulation of our financial system. The Financial CHOICE Act will bring balanced reform to our Nation's financial institutions.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding me time.

I stand here and I join my colleagues in opposition to the Financial CHOICE Act. It is the wrong act. And let me just say this to you: Certainly, it does not provide choice nor does it create hope and opportunity for investors and for consumers and for entrepreneurs.

I am from the great State of Ohio, and you may have a sign that says people are for it; I have letters from ProgressOhio; I have letters from Policy Matters Ohio; I also have a letter here from the National Consumer Law Center, Advancing Fairness In The Marketplace For All. Let me just tell you what they are saying. They are saying that it is breathtaking—the assault on hardworking Americans, the

assault on businesses that want to level the playing field to improve the economy.

Mr. Chair, this is ridiculous that we stand here. If it was such a good choice, we would have had more meetings on it. If it was such a good choice for hardworking Americans, then we would have worked with Republicans and Democrats to make it a fair choice, to make it a right choice. But I stand here today and tell you it is the wrong choice for consumers. It is the wrong choice because it eviscerates the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It is against the people, and it is not for hardworking Americans.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), a member of our committee and chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, despite the rhetoric and whatever its intentions, since Dodd-Frank's passage, big bank profits are shattering records, and home ownership is down, way down, to the lowest level seen in over 20 years. Car loans and small-business loans are much harder to get, too. Simply put, Dodd-Frank has been great for Federal regulators and even big banks but very bad for Hoosier consumers.

The Financial CHOICE Act changes that. It ends too big to fail and enables Hoosier financial institutions to escape the one-size-fits-all regulatory regime of Dodd-Frank. That will help hardworking Hoosiers get more affordable loans.

The Financial CHOICE Act also includes my bill, the RIGHTS at the CFPB Act, which ensures that anyone pursued by this Federal agency will have their rights protected and get their day in court.

I urge support of the Financial CHOICE Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, we have already debunked what we have been told by the opposition about the oversight, CFPB's supervision and enforcement. Of course, we have told you about that. Let's take a moment to tell you that community banks have showed strength in residential, commercial, industrial loans, and small-business lending. In fact, overall loan growth at community banks has been faster than at bigger banks. In the fourth quarter of 2016, lending was up 8.3 percent for community banks and 4.8 percent for larger banks.

Mr. Chair, with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding me time and for her leadership on this.

Nine years ago, I was there, in 2008, when our financial system collapsed, as a new Member of Congress, the sole scientist on the Financial Services Committee. And as we surveyed the wreckage of our economy, I wondered how we



ever could have gotten into a place like that with our financial system clogged with toxic assets based on trillions of dollars of mortgages that never had any realistic chance of being repaid by their homeowners.

We saw giant banks and trading firms leveraged beyond belief, huge financial corporations so complex that they had thousands of business units that even their CEOs were unaware of, and risk management software that was being ignored, if it existed at all.

How could we have gotten there? But when I look at the CHOICE Act that Republicans are about to ram through on a party-line vote, I understand perfectly how we got there. I see all the same forces of mindless deregulation and free market ideology, an overriding mania for tax cuts for the rich, while stripping financial protection for ordinary American families; the same refusal to learn the lessons of financial history and to replace them with alternative facts that fit their ideology.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand up for working families and protect our economy by opposing this bill today.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for offering the legislation under consideration today.

The Financial CHOICE Act takes the necessary steps in reforming the supervision of our financial system that the Dodd-Frank Act failed to do. Among other provisions, this legislation requires financial regulatory agencies to tailor regulatory actions to fit the risk profile and business model of supervised institutions. Not only will this ensure appropriately tailored compliance obligations for banks and credit unions of various risk profiles, but it saves valuable time and resources for bank examiners.

As it stands now, community banks are facing an ever-increasing regulatory burden that they can no longer shoulder. This has had a devastating impact on small banks, forcing consolidation or failure and stifling the creation of new banks in areas that need access to credit.

In December 2015, a report by the Dallas Fed highlighted this problem, noting that the regulatory environment tends to be one-size-fits-all and concluding that the regulatory oversight should match the risk level an institution poses to the financial system and the economy at large.

The CHOICE Act will stop the trend of increasing compliance costs and decreasing financial services.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) for his tireless efforts on this legislation and urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentlewoman from California has 21 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 15 minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, since it has been asked about who opposes this bill, I wanted to make sure that we include in our information to them the religious organizations. The Congregation of St. Joseph, the Seventh Generation Interfaith Coalition for Responsible Investment, the Dominican Sisters of Houston, the Sisters of Mercy, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, the Christian Brothers Investment Services, the National Association of Evangelicals, the American Baptist Home Mission Society, and the Mercy Investment Services all urge a "no" vote on this terrible bill.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a senior member now—he has been there for a while—of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, I am voting "no" on the "Wrong" CHOICE Act. All of us are. Just like healthcare, this legislation takes the approach that the best way to proceed is with the most extreme bill possible, a bill that attracts no Democrats and even makes moderate Republicans deeply uncomfortable.

One reason, the Dodd-Frank Act set up an office at CFPB to protect servicemembers. That office, initially led by Holly Petraeus, has done great work in educating and fighting for servicemember families. I have worked with Republicans for years to support and enhance it.

This bill makes that office optional. And it specifically strips the funding for its financial counseling project. That is appalling. It hurts my constituents, and, again, it makes my Republican friends deeply uncomfortable. It is one of scores of provisions that make clear this isn't a bill designed to help Americans. It is an ideological document. It hurts men and women in uniform. And oh, by the way, millions of others. It is a terrible approach.

Please vote "no" on the "Wrong" CHOICE Act.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), my friend and neighbor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chair, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has cost American small businesses, American entrepreneurs, and the American taxpayers millions of dollars in regulatory costs since the inception.

I actually own a business. I am a small-business owner, and I can tell you it is horrible legislation. And although this rouge and unaccountable

agency hides behind the false pretense that its actions protect consumers, there could be nothing further from the truth.

Take, for example, the ability to exempt small community financial institutions from any rule they impose. In fact, Dodd-Frank gives them explicit authority to do so. Yet because they lack congressional oversight, because they have a director who cannot be removed at will, they simply do absolutely nothing.

Mr. Chair, if my colleagues are looking for a reason to vote for this bill, they should look no further than the reforms that helped rein in the CFPB.

Specifically, I am happy to see the committee-incorporated provision I introduced last Congress which would apply the REINS Act to all financial agencies, including the CFPB.

Over the last 12 years, \$55 billion in regulatory costs have been levied by our financial agencies, and this must end, and it must end now.

Again, the Financial CHOICE Act is a win for American taxpayers. It is purely a win for Americans who are sick and tired of the heavy hand of Washington.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

In God we trust.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, the Members on the opposite side of the aisle have come here talking about what they are doing for small banks and how they are against the big banks. Let me tell you about a letter that was sent yesterday, June 7, from the American Bankers Association. They said: "We are pleased that this legislation contains provisions that ABA and our member banks have long supported."

Who are their members? JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, Bank of America. Wall Street loves this bad bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a senior progressive champion of the Financial Services Committee.

□ 1400

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Since Dodd-Frank's passage, the economy has created over 16 million jobs over 85 consecutive months. Business lending has increased 75 percent. Banks, large and small, are posting all-time record profits, community banks are outperforming larger banks, and credit unions are expanding their membership. And because of the work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 29 million people have seen \$12 billion back into their pocket and not into those of improper and illegal practicing financial services firms.

Do you want to know why we have the "Wrong" CHOICE Act before us today?

Because they want the money. Not the \$12 billion that went back to the 29 million veterans and farmers and students and citizens and people who need that kind of help for their families. They want that money going back to the big financial interests.

And that is the purpose of the “Wrong” CHOICE Act. It is between the many and the money, and the “Wrong” CHOICE Act stands firmly on the side of those who would line their pockets in the top 1 percent.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), a real workhorse of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the most honest, hardworking families in this country, in the great State of Maine. I also represent tens of thousands of small-business owners in our State that create thousands of jobs for our families.

In the State of Maine, Mr. Chairman, we know the difference between right and wrong, and it is wrong to force taxpayers to bail out huge Wall Street banks that take too much risk when it goes wrong. Now, the small community banks and credit unions that dot our landscape in Maine did not cause the most recent recession.

These reforms that we are passing today in the Financial CHOICE Act reduce unnecessary paperwork and costs that will help our small community banks and credit unions lend money to small businesses and our families so they can live better lives with more freedom and have better job opportunities.

Also, I am proud to say that the Financial CHOICE Act keeps in place very strong protections, Mr. Chairman, for consumers of financial services while at the same time imposing the toughest penalties ever for fraud and inside dealings for folks that participate in this industry.

It is no wonder, Mr. Chairman, that huge money center banks and Wall Street are not for the Financial CHOICE Act. But I am, and I encourage everybody to vote for this Financial CHOICE Act. It is a great bill for rural America.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), a new member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 10.

While this bill may contain some language that I would agree with and that is helpful to our community banks, as well as some of our credit unions, it would be very harmful to our seniors and the elderly.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act, as written, would be dead on arrival in the U.S. Senate and a monumental waste of time for this Chamber. As a public servant, we are called to serve the citizens of our great Nation, those who raised us; those who consistently told us, “it is more important to have the will than to have mere ability,” “hace mas el que quiere que el que puede;” those who forged a new path and a better way of life.

One of the best measures of a nation is how it cares for its elderly. As a country, we made a promise to our elderly, to protect them and ensure that they would have reliable access to resources, and the support they need to live a dignified life in their later years.

In my book, a promise made should be a promise kept.

Today, my colleagues in support of the “Wrong” CHOICE Act seek to renege on this promise and leave millions of elderly Americans vulnerable to financial exploitation schemes. One in every five Americans have been victims of financial abuse, accounting for a cost of over \$36 billion annually. We cannot abandon our elderly when their resources and, ultimately, their independence is threatened. We must stand with them and enable the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to continue to protect our elderly.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE), an incredibly talented member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support for the Financial CHOICE Act, and I urge a vote for it.

America’s workers, farmers, businesses, households, savers, and investors all deserve the flexibility and access to credit that the Financial CHOICE Act puts in place for our financial system.

As a former mayor, I know that families, cities, and counties need access to credit. Whether it is a city that wants to build a library or a community park, or a family that wants to buy a house, or the farmer that needs a new tractor to plow her field, we need a financial system that is strong, innovative, but, most of all, accessible.

Right now, under Dodd-Frank, that isn’t the case. For example, one of my constituents in Utah owns a catering business that is very successful, but the growth of her company has been stunted because she ran into red tape and delays after applying for a small business loan.

That is not how things should work. Community banks, which provide the majority of small bank loans, are closing at the rate of one per day. Middle- to low-income Americans are getting higher fees, less consumer service, and less access to credit than ever before.

Everyone deserves a chance to realize their version of the American Dream,

and the Financial CHOICE Act is a bold step toward achieving that dream.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), a new member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for her strong leadership in this fight against the “Wrong” CHOICE Act.

The bill before us is broken. I was Governor of Florida when the financial crisis and foreclosure crisis rolled through my State like a hurricane. Unrestrained greed on Wall Street caused a preventable disaster because at no point did anyone say: This is simply wrong.

I remember 2008 and 2009: the bailouts, the foreclosures, and the long, painful road to recovery. The financial crisis exposed a broken regulatory system, allowing Wall Street to gamble with Main Street’s future.

With this bill, Members are being asked to again trust the very people who brought us to this financial crisis. Don’t put them back in charge. Do not let them do it again. Please vote “no.”

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the Financial Services Committee whip.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership in guiding the Financial CHOICE Act through the Financial Services Committee and the House.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Arkansas State Bank Department, and an article by the Arkansas Bankers Association entitled “Disappearing Community Banks.”

ARKANSAS STATE  
BANK DEPARTMENT,  
May 1, 2017.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,  
Chairman, House Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,  
Ranking Member, House Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: I am writing in support of H.R. 10, the “Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.” As a state bank regulator, I have seen the huge burden Dodd-Frank Act of 2010 has placed on community banks. Since the financial crisis, several community banks in Arkansas have curtailed or discontinued lending activities—particularly, residential mortgages—which has been detrimental to the consumers they serve. In addition, the number of small community banks in our state and across the country has decreased, primarily through mergers with larger banks better equipped to handle Dodd-Frank’s onerous compliance regimen.

I believe the Financial CHOICE Act will address a number of issues which will improve the business climate for community banks. In particular, providing broad regulatory relief to banks with an average leverage capital ratio of at least 10 percent will enhance our community banks ability to serve the public. With fewer financial and employee resources allocated to compliance

issues, community banks will be able to increase lending to businesses and individuals, which will stimulate much-needed economic growth in their communities. Additionally, I strongly believe the leverage capital ratio is a better standard by which to assess a bank's health than risk-based measures.

Thank you for your work in advancing the Financial CHOICE Act. I greatly appreciate your efforts to help community banks.

Sincerely,

CANDACE A. FRANKS,  
*Commissioner.*

[From the Arkansas Banker Association]

DISAPPEARING COMMUNITY BANKS

(By Bill Holmes, President & CEO, Arkansas Bankers Association)

In 1994 I was working for the original Twin City Bank. We were in a bank wide campaign to break a billion dollars in assets. There were 260 banks headquartered in Arkansas. Today, there are 103. If we continue to lose community banks at the same pace our small businesses, home buyers and farmers will have only a third of the bank choices they enjoyed in 1994. This is a problem for our mostly rural state. And it is not just a local problem, it is happening across the country.

There are any number of reasons for this decline in community banks. For the last ten years, the reason I hear more than any other is the increasing cost of the federal regulatory burden. The costs of complying with regulations that should never have been intended for rural banks, the costs of training more and more staff for compliance issues, the cost of newly required software to feed a never ending appetite for data.

I will grant you that after the financial crisis some regulatory changes were necessary to improve financial stability. But ten years later we've ended up with too many regs that don't improve our banks, but do limit our bankers' discretion and look to drive credit decisions to a score sheet designed inside the beltway. Our community bankers have decades of history on their customers, and have always been a key to the economic growth in their communities. I don't think the intent of these regulations was to limit the growth, or limit the home buyers, in our state. But the fact is it does. And, it is time to fix this.

Chairman Hensarling's The Financial CHOICE Act was recently sent to the floor for a vote. It includes multiple changes that our banking industry endorses, and we feel we need these changes to help spur the economy. This legislation would ease some requirements on mortgages that banks hold in their own portfolios. This would let our bankers make many more loans to self-employed businessmen, or entrepreneurs with unstable incomes. The Act looks to tailor the regs and requirements based on the risks and business types of each bank. We need this to continue to give our customers more diversity and more choices of where and how to bank.

The U.S. economy is unique. We need a healthy and broad mix of banks to meet our customers' needs. From international corporations, to the startup food truck, our bankers are involved and are integral parts of our economy. If we cannot get sensible reform in Washington, Arkansas's banking sector will continue to shrink and become less diverse. Arkansans, and all Americans, will pay the price in terms of less lending and fewer opportunities for growth.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in this debate today, let's hear what a commissioner of banking from Arkansas says:

"I am writing in support of H.R. 10, the 'Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.' As a State bank regulator, I have seen the huge burden Dodd-Frank Act of 2010 has placed on community banks. Since the financial crisis, several community banks in Arkansas have curtailed or discontinued lending activities—particularly, residential mortgages—which has been detrimental to the consumers they serve."

That is a compelling endorsement of this bill from a regulator, Mr. Chairman, not from a Member of Congress.

And when you look at working families in Arkansas, recently I was told about an Army National Guard member from north Little Rock, in my district, who was informed that he would not receive a home to purchase a manufactured home that would have been twice as large and less expensive than the 60-year-old house he was renting for his family.

Or a hairstylist from Nevada County, who I received a letter from. She and her husband, a welder, were denied a loan to purchase a new home, despite having verifiable income.

That is why we need to repeal, replace, and pass the Financial CHOICE Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN), a new member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time and for her tireless work on behalf of working families in America.

Mr. Chairman, the Financial CHOICE Act is nothing more than a misguided attempt to return to the days where bad actors could put the entire financial system at risk.

There is bipartisan support to provide regulatory relief for community banks and credit unions. Just last week, I met with credit unions in my district, and they talked about the need for thoughtful, tailored regulation. Unfortunately, that kind of thoughtful reform is not what is before us today.

Instead, we have a bill before us that is a fundamental attack on working families in America. This bill will make it harder to go after bad actors in the financial markets by hamstringing regulators, and would completely gut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It would eliminate important programs that ensure that taxpayers will not be on the hook for future bailouts. And it makes our financial system a whole lot less secure.

The district that I represent was one of the hardest hit in the entire country during the financial crisis. My constituents sent me here to ensure that we don't repeat the mistakes of the past, which is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been named the Financial CHOICE Act, and I think it is a fitting name.

Each of us here today has a simple choice to make: Do we side with the working families of America? Or do we side with the big corporations and the special interests?

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), another hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Nearly 7 years ago, the American people were promised that the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act would end Washington bailouts, protect consumers, and lead to a more prosperous economy.

Instead, the big banks and the influence of the Federal Government have continued to get bigger while smaller, local community banks and credit unions are closing up shop and our country continues to struggle with anemic levels of economic growth.

This is why the Financial CHOICE Act is so important. This legislation gives us an opportunity to return the power to the "little guy or gal" who wants to create a better life for themselves and, by doing so, for all of us.

It takes steps to end the failure of excessive and redundant bureaucracy, and it will give our entrepreneurs the opportunity to access the startup capital they need to grow and thrive once again.

I am especially pleased that this bill includes provisions from my Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, and the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act. These three bills are important components of the Financial Services Committee's broader intent of improving opportunity and accountability for all. I appreciate the chairman's continued efforts to make this goal a reality.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for all of his work. I look forward to supporting the Financial CHOICE Act, and I hope all of us will do the same.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Chairman, do we have a role as Congress to protect American families?

In my home State of Florida, it is hard to go anywhere without meeting a family who was affected by the foreclosure crisis. Many not only lost their homes, but their life savings.

Through Dodd-Frank, Congress created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to go after the bad actors that made tough times worse for homeowners in Florida by giving the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau the

authority to go after mortgage companies for deceptive practices, threatening people who were behind on payments and putting them into debt collection when they were eligible for loan modification programs.

Dodd-Frank also allowed state attorneys general to file consumer protection lawsuits against bad actors on behalf of families in their States.

The Financial CHOICE Act would repeal these important consumer protections and return us to a time when families were being unfairly forced into foreclosure.

Mr. Chairman, we can't go back. This is America, where we take care of our own, don't we? If Congress doesn't protect American families, who will?

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and to reject this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a new and very knowledgeable member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, one of the consequences of the financial crisis is the government had to step in with taxpayer dollars and bail out the financial industry.

Once Dodd-Frank was enacted, however, we were told: Don't worry. There will never be another bailout. Rest assured, the orderly liquidation authority under title II will give the FDIC all the tools it needs to resolve a failed financial institution.

Indeed, title II does give the FDIC the ability to borrow from the Treasury all of the taxpayer dollars it needs to reorganize a failed financial institution. That kind of sounds like a bailout to me.

The Financial CHOICE Act truly ends the risk of taxpayer-funded bailout. Under the Financial CHOICE Act, a failed bank will go through bankruptcy. Bankruptcy is a tested, transparent process. Judges sitting in open court instead of unelected bureaucrats sitting behind closed doors will make consistent, predictable decisions based on decades of case law.

More importantly, bankruptcy puts the risk of failure on the bank's shareholders and creditors, not the taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support the Financial CHOICE Act, and truly put an end to the possibility of yet another taxpayer-funded bailout.

□ 1415

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have already done a good job of talking in great detail about why this bill is really a festival of bad choices, of wrong choices for America, but I want to focus on one issue in particular: executive pay.

This "Wrong" CHOICE Act actually takes away provisions that rein in irresponsible pay to executives, the very people who decide decisions that get us into this entire mess in the first place.

Number one, this bill eliminates a rule barring incentive-based executive pay that encourages "inappropriate risks." It puts the average American in danger of having to pay for another bank bailout. Giving out bonuses for putting our national financial stability at risk is flat wrong.

Number two, it eliminates a requirement for corporations to disclose how their CEO's pay compares to the average employee's salary. This bill eliminates transparency.

And number three, if you can believe it, this bill even abolishes a rule requiring companies to disclose whether executives and board directors are allowed to bet against their own stock. This bill takes us back to the days of Enron.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this irresponsible legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), a new member of our committee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, today we know that a major factor leading up to the worst economic crisis in our lifetime was the heavyhanded and meddlesome politics of the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, the previous administration responded to that crisis not by limiting the intrusion of the Federal bureaucracy, but by increasing it. They implemented Dodd-Frank under the guise of protecting the consumer, but, in reality, this bill empowered government, created new bureaucracies, made the big banks bigger, and virtually ended the creation of new community banks.

In the wake of the financial crisis, Georgia lost more banks than any other State in the Nation. Unemployment skyrocketed, and hundreds of businesses went under. But instead of creating opportunities for Georgians to pick themselves up and start again, Dodd-Frank continued to suppress our economic recovery, and today, nearly a decade after the end of the recession, there are still 47 counties in Georgia without a local community bank, and 3 counties without a single bank branch at all.

The Financial CHOICE Act will reverse these burdensome regulations and, once again, sow the seeds of prosperity on Main Street, not just Wall Street. The bill will end bailouts of big banks by taxpayers and unleash our economic potential by opening the economy to everyone.

I urge my colleagues to support the Financial CHOICE Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is all about obstructing effective law enforcement that challenges predatory payday lending, that protects military families from unjustified foreclosures, and addresses the burden of mounting student debt.

Republicans give Trump new power to fire the chief cop on the beat who protects consumers against wrongful financial practices. We have seen how well that worked with Trump and the FBI. Have you learned nothing about giving Trump more power?

Without the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Wells Fargo would never have been penalized for its multimillion-dollar fraud.

Republicans here want to shield Wall Street, granting it free rein to run over people across America and later reward it with even more tax breaks. They tolerate almost any wrongdoing, any crazy Trump tweet, so long as they can get more tax breaks and less consumer protection.

Enough is enough. It is time to say no to this sorry bill and offer protection to the people of America from financial wrongdoing.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on either side?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, to better balance the time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Senior citizens, beware of the Financial CHOICE Act. This bill repeals the best interest rule, which ensures that Americans that are saving for retirement get financial advice in their best interest.

Bad advice has real costs. Steven, a 69-year-old Vietnam veteran in Illinois, lost \$147,000 in retirement savings when he got advice that handsomely profited his so-called investment adviser but devastated him.

This bill guts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which prevents financial exploitation of senior citizens.

In December, the CFPB took an action against three crooked reverse mortgage companies that deliberately failed to tell seniors that they could lose their homes.

The Financial CHOICE Act is dangerous. It is dangerous for older Americans, it is dangerous for all Americans, and it is dangerous for our entire economy. It puts us all at risk. It is the wrong choice for America, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the

gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to the Financial CHOICE Act because it will gut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and roll back important protections for seniors, for students, and for hardworking families across the country.

The CFPB protects Americans from unscrupulous financial practices and deceitful debt collectors. Since its creation, it has assisted more than 29 million consumers, many of them seniors, with mortgages, credit cards, and debt collection.

Unfortunately, seniors are especially vulnerable to financial fraud and abuse. This bill would roll back the CFPB's ability to identify and stop unfair and abusive debt collection and telemarketing practices; and this harmful bill would also prevent the CFPB from cracking down on predatory payday lenders who take advantage of struggling families by issuing loans at exorbitant rates.

I worked as a consumer protection attorney, and I worked with too many families there who lost their homes, too many seniors who were harassed by debt collectors, too many people who were victims of predatory payday lending and got into the quicksand and were not able to get out. We cannot allow this shortsighted bill to stop the good work of the CFPB.

This bill is called the CHOICE Act, but it is the wrong choice, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the "Wrong" CHOICE Act. This bill has a hidden provision that strips away oversight for payday lenders.

Payday lenders are like loan sharks, charging upwards of 400 percent interest on loans. It is outrageous. They prey on vulnerable, low-income borrowers who are already struggling to get by.

That is how Yesenia from California got trapped in a cycle of debt. Her mother was diagnosed with breast cancer and lost her job, so Yesenia had to take out a loan just to buy food. The payday lender garnished her wages and charged sky-high interest rates and fees. She ended up paying back thousands more than she borrowed, all because she needed food for her and her mother.

Let's protect our workers and families. Let's not take away oversight of this abusive loan industry. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 10. It is the wrong choice.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a new member of our committee.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CHOICE Act, and I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his strong leadership.

Imposing regulations meant for large, transnational firms on community banks and credit unions may make sense to bureaucrats in Washington, but to hardworking families on Long Island, it means you can't buy that first home or you can't get that small-business loan.

Today we have the opportunity to remove the barriers to job creation and prosperity that have given us the weakest economic recovery in American history. The CHOICE Act will end taxpayer-funded bailouts, restore accountability, and jumpstart innovation and job creation.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, in 2008 our financial system cratered, bringing the broader world economy to its knees. Millions of Americans lost their homes; millions more lost their jobs by no fault of their own; and \$13 trillion in wealth and savings was lost.

We went to work fixing the glaring holes in our Nation's financial regulatory system. Among other things, we enacted tougher mortgage standards; we brought the derivatives market out of the shadows; we stopped the casino-like bets at our investment banks; and we created a consumer-focused protection bureau.

Unfortunately, what we couldn't do was eradicate greed; and, sadly, today greed is rearing its ugly head once again. The Republican-controlled Congress is about to pass H.R. 10, the "Wrong" CHOICE Act, a bill that would throw away the lessons of the 2008 financial crash and unleash the demons that nearly took down the world economy.

I urge the House to reject this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), another new member of our committee.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act. This critical piece of legislation rolls back onerous Obama-era regulations on the financial services industry that are strangling small businesses and hurting hardworking American taxpayers.

As I held roundtables across West Virginia, I heard from small-business owners and job creators that Obama-era regulations make it harder for

community banks to make loans to small businesses and first-time home buyers.

The Financial CHOICE Act will remove stifling Federal regulations from out-of-touch Washington bureaucrats and return financial decisionmaking to you, the individual consumers and to the small community banks.

I know that President Trump is committed to supporting the reforms in the Financial CHOICE Act, and I look forward to continuing to work with our President to grow our economy and bring much-needed relief to West Virginia consumers and small-business owners.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee for their leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my Republican colleagues, I have heard a lot of advocacy for the small banks. I am with you. Those folks did not cause the Depression, and we have got to give them relief.

But what this bill does is essentially use the good reputation of those small lending institutions in all our communities to create an opening for the bad actors that did cause this enormous recession, and it invites them to go back to their bad old days.

The business model of our small banks is to help our folks in small communities. The business model of some of the Wall Street banks is to play casino poker with taxpayer money, and that is what happened. We had institutions on Wall Street that were putting together packages of bad loans that they shorted for one investor, and then they sold them as AAA-rated, pension-worthy investments for pensions for our firefighters and teachers. That is absolutely outrageous, and we are allowing that to occur again.

We can help the small banks, and we should help the small banks, but we shouldn't give a free pass.

Now, there is one good thing in this bill. I am glad, very glad to see that the Durbin rule continues to exist. That was a crackdown. We finally got some relief for our retailers on the transaction fees on debit cards.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am now very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a huge fighter for freedom and a fighter against Federal price controls.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chairman, I draw a distinction between political costs and real costs. In no city in the country are the political costs treated as more real than Washington. But the truth is that for the other 99 percent of the country, the real costs are what count.

□ 1430

The real costs of the Durbin amendment have been amply documented. Community banks have seen interchange revenue fall 20 percent. The low-income consumer has seen his checking fees double. The small-ticket merchant has seen his interchange cost increase.

For those of us who campaigned on a platform of free markets and limited government, which is most of our party, I suggest that a principle that is followed only when it costs nothing is not much of a principle at all.

The principle that government shouldn't be setting prices, ended up having a political price of its own. And for some, that was the only reality of this debate. I only wish that I could say the same for the 1 million people the Durbin amendment has driven out of the banking system.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding to me and I associate myself with his remarks.

The Durbin amendment has not helped consumers and, in fact, has hurt them. It has hurt small banks and credit unions. The only entities that have benefited are the retailers, who, despite their promises to Congress, have not lowered cost, and some studies even show that they have increased cost.

Congress should not be in the business of price fixing. Price controls will never work and will always have negative consequences. I am committed to returning to free market principles that deliver real results for consumers.

Mr. HENSARLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank both gentlemen for their steadfast leadership on this issue. Basic economics tell us that when government fixes market prices, consumer welfare suffers. So it is not a surprise that researchers have found that the Durbin amendment resulted in a net loss of perhaps \$25 billion for consumers.

But in a larger sense, what we have is a legal dispute between two parties. This is an issue that belongs in the courts, not Congress, which is why we sought to repeal the Durbin amendment.

I remain hopeful that Congress will correct this mistake, and I will work towards that goal in the future.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the elements of the "Wrong" CHOICE Act that is particularly troublesome to me—and there are many—has to do with the "Wrong" CHOICE Act repealing section 953(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Now, people watching this debate, Mr. Chair, might find that to be just legislative talk, but it is substantively, really important. Section 953(b) was a hard-fought victory for investors, consumers, workers, and the general public. Mr. Chair, the law requires that publicly traded firms disclose the ratio between what they pay their CEO and what they pay their median worker.

I think this is important information. A CEO of an S&P 500 company makes, on average, about \$331 for every \$1 a typical rank-and-file worker makes. In some companies, this ratio can reach as high as \$1,000-to-\$1. Investors should be able to consider if a CEO provides hundreds of times more value to their employees before investing in a firm. Actually, exorbitant CEO pay, excessive CEO pay, can impact dividends. It can impact all kinds of decisions, lead to risk taking, and it is a good idea for investors and the general public to know that information.

So while executives are making critical decisions about the direction of their companies, quality employees ensure those decisions are being properly implemented.

This pay ratio information benefits investors by giving them valuable information for ascertaining whether or not a company's employees are being treated fairly and, therefore, able to retain employees; whether or not it is a stable company, and a company that values its people.

The ratio helps them to decide how to cast their say-on-pay advisory votes on executive compensation. And research shows that the higher the CEO-to-median-worker pay ratio, the more likely the CEO is to pursue the kind of risky investments that brought the global financial crisis to bear.

Institute for Policy Studies found that nearly 40 percent of the CEOs on their top 25 highest paid list over a 20-year period wound up being fired, sought a bailout, or were forced to pay fraud-related fines.

Moreover, a lower ratio of CEO-to-median-worker pay, implies more investment in human capital, and a longer-term outlook on the corporation.

According to the Center for Audit Quality's annual investor survey, 46 percent of investors say they consider CEO compensation in their decision-making.

The current culture of paying CEOs hundreds of times—and even thousands in some limited cases—more than typical employees hurts working families, is detrimental to employee morale, and goes against the research which shows us what is best practice.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), a new member of our committee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act. For 7 years now, Dodd-Frank has stalled our economic growth. While community banks and credit unions did not cause the recession, they have carried most of the burden following the crisis.

These smaller financial institutions are the lifeline of local businesses, farmers, entrepreneurs, and anyone striving for true financial independence. The Financial CHOICE Act will bring relief from onerous rules and regulations that have hamstrung the ability to loan and to borrow money.

Once businesses can access more capital, they will be able to grow, hire more employees, contribute more to their communities.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and this committee for working tirelessly to bring the American people the relief that they need.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his most diligent work on behalf of the American people, and also to our ranking member, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS. I just want to thank her for really educating this House and the public of the dangers to consumers of this horrible bill, of course, which I stand in opposition to.

It really is a wrong choice for American families. Shamefully, this bill gives Wall Street a handout while stealing from the pockets of everyday Americans. It would drag us back to the days where Wall Street and billionaires get richer, while struggling families are left out in the cold.

The bill significantly undermines both the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the rules it put in place to prevent predatory lending and subprime loans, particularly in communities of color. Families lost a generation of wealth prior to Dodd-Frank and have yet been able to recover.

But this bill also, I must say, puts Wall Street recklessness back in charge, and it will leave consumers out in the cold again. So it will take us back to where we were before, and we cannot go back.

That is why we are asking for a "no" vote. It destroys protections for seniors and jeopardizes their financial safety. So I hope that Members vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), another new member of the committee.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for this important bill. I rise today in support of H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act.

As a single parent and small-business owner, I know from my own experience



that the only way for hardworking Americans to achieve financial independence is by building an economy from Main Street up, not Wall Street down.

The CHOICE Act not only imposes the toughest penalties in history for financial fraud on Wall Street, it saves taxpayers \$30 billion. The CHOICE Act also eliminates taxpayer-funded bailouts while providing choices for consumers and a real opportunity for economic growth.

As an upstate New Yorker, our region suffers from economic challenges caused by excessive regulations, such as the Dodd-Frank Act, that have crushed small businesses. Yet small businesses create nearly 70 percent of the new jobs. This bill will increase access to capital for small businesses and startups—our job creators. It will increase job opportunities and positively benefit New York's 22nd District.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote to support our job creators and to vote for the Financial CHOICE Act.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, does it make sense that, after 8 years of a piece of regulation, Dodd-Frank, that has brought us increases in GDP, increases in jobs, and stability in financial markets, that we would now repeal that piece of legislation to go back to a time when we saw that deregulation strategy bring us the Great Recession?

It just doesn't make any sense to take the position that what we need is more wide open, Wild West, you are on your own kind of financial rules and laws in our country.

The fact is, before Dodd-Frank was passed, we had an abysmal consumer protection system. We really had seven or eight different agencies that were sort of responsible, but not really. Consumer protection was not a priority of the Federal Government. And as a result of it, we saw a proliferation of mortgages that got people who really couldn't handle that particular mortgage that they got, or the products were just fraudulent, get into a situation where they ended up going into foreclosure.

We saw the secondary market package up some of these bad mortgages. We saw rating agencies say that these were good equity products, and when these products started to fail, what we saw is that those big banks that trafficked in those equities get bailed out, and we saw citizens lose their homes.

The fact is, going back to those bad old days is just a bad idea—to bring us back to a time when we didn't have any consumer protection, when we didn't have any responsibility placed on the shoulders of management, when we didn't say that we were going to look after these rating agencies, and we didn't say that these systemically important large institutions were going to get a little bit more scrutiny.

Before the time that we did that, we saw ruin in the economy. Let me just remind the American people: we had many States with unemployment above 10 percent because of the deregulation, laissez-faire attitude that prevailed in the American financial services legal system.

Those bad old days nearly ruined so many families, and they are just now starting to recover. But under Dodd-Frank, we have seen month after month of private sector job growth. We have seen economic activity increase. Fast enough for me? No. I think we need much more.

But with over \$170 billion in record profits from 2016, I can tell you one thing: this claim on the other side that the banks and financial services sector is being crushed simply isn't a true statement. It is just not right.

Business lending is up 75 percent since Dodd-Frank. Data from the Federal Reserve shows aggregate bank lending has increased from about \$1.2 trillion, in 2010, to \$2 trillion in outstanding business loans. Vote "no" on the "Wrong" CHOICE Act.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have now had 7 years of history with Dodd-Frank, and what do we know? We know that the big banks are bigger. We know that the small banks are fewer. The gentleman cites some statistics about lending, but what he left out is, we are losing a community bank or credit union a day, and they are not dying of natural causes. They are dying of the dreaded Dodd-Frank disease.

Our small businesses continue to suffer. It takes small banks to lend to small businesses. The job engine of America and small bank business lending isn't recovering, and it can't recover, as long as Dodd-Frank is on the rolls of the Federal Register.

I got to tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is time. It is time for a better way. It is time to help our struggling families. That is really what this is all about. We have had 7 years of Dodd-Frank, and yet working Americans haven't received a pay increase. Their small businesses can't get loans. Struggling families have not seen their savings recover from the great financial panic which, oh, by the way, was brought about by government in the first place, with dumb regulation to put people into homes they couldn't afford to keep.

And let's also remember that Dodd-Frank is actually hurting the consumers it claims to help. Free checking was cut in half. Credit cards, there are fewer of them. They cost 200 to 300 basis points more. Have you tried to get a mortgage lately? They are harder to come by. They cost hundreds of more dollars to close.

Instead, what we have is, Washington elites now making the decision on whether or not we get to put a credit card in our wallet, whether we get to put a mortgage on our home.

No, Mr. Chairman, there is a better way. It is why we must enact the Financial CHOICE Act. There will be economic growth for all, bank bailouts for none, and we will, once again, have an America that is only limited by the size of its dreams.

Mr. Chair, I encourage all to support the Financial CHOICE Act.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, prior to 2010, banks lending to consumers operated with too little oversight and often exploited the lack of rules to turn a profit at any cost. We saw the dire consequences in the 2008 financial crisis. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was created to enforce laws and protect consumers in the marketplace. Their mission is to root out deceptive and abusive practices. And so far, the agency has returned \$11.8 billion to consumers from enforcement against abusive practices from banks, lenders, and financial companies.

I challenge any member of this body to go to one of their constituents and ask whether or not they would like a consumer watchdog to stand up for them against abuses from big banks, or if they'd like us to leave them to go it alone.

The CFPB has already returned \$11.8 billion to more than 29 million consumers. That is \$11.8 billion dollars that went back into the pockets of 29 million of our constituents. A vote for this legislation is a vote against those 29 million consumers who have been helped by the CFPB's actions.

In my home state of New Jersey, one resident held a mortgage with Citibank, who failed to report accurately the status of a closed account and incorrectly reported it as late. A complaint was submitted to the CFPB and when they intervened, the issue was resolved and the late mark removed.

Stories like these are not uncommon. Decisions like these can impact a consumer's credit for life and cause tremendous distress. Before the CFPB, consumers facing deceptive practices could go ignored by mega-banks and lending institutions. But when a government agency with enforcement powers gets involved, these banks pay attention. They can't ignore the CFPB.

When the cards are stacked against the everyday consumer, the need for the CFPB is a no-brainer.

The New York Times this morning reported that the President's pick to oversee the nation's largest banks, Joseph Otting, formerly ran OneWest, which has been criticized for "robo-signing" foreclosure documents in the wake of the financial crisis. If Mr. Otting didn't protect consumers when he ran a mortgage lender, why would he protect them as Comptroller of the Currency?

Especially in this Administration, we need an independent consumer watchdog that can act without the influence of politics on behalf of consumers. Some would choose to erode this bulwark of protection against the big



banks but it is needed now more than ever. Mr. Chair, this vote is a clear marker of who you stand with: I stand on the side of my constituents in urging a no vote.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chair, In 2008, Wall Street's criminal behavior drove the economy into the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression, creating the grossly unbalanced playing field that is our economy today. In response, Congress passed the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank) in 2010. While Dodd-Frank fell short on major banking reforms, I supported it because it was better than no reforms at all.

I am appalled that House Republicans pushed through the Financial CHOICE Act, which would gut major provisions of Dodd-Frank and allow Wall Street to return to the same reckless practices that occurred before the law was passed. The Financial CHOICE Act removes the watchdog from Wall Street, opening the door to destructive trading at the expense of pension funds, value investors, and average Americans.

Additionally, those on Wall Street who broke the law and used Americans' investments as a casino should be held accountable for their deceptive actions, including jail time. Yet, to this day, no Wall Street executive has seen jail time for the damage they did on our financial system. Instead, Wall Street executives are being rewarded with powerful jobs in the Trump administration.

It is outrageous that Republicans want to allow the banking sector to return to "business as usual" with dangerous financial products and high-speed speculation. We need stronger, not weaker, financial reforms, which is why I'm taking on reckless Wall Street trading with my 'Putting Main Street FIRST Act' legislation to discourage speculative trading by imposing a tax of a fraction of a percent on stock, bond, and derivative trades. Congress should be fighting for the interests of the American people, not Wall Street.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 10, the "Financial CHOICE Act of 2017".

I agree with Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS by calling this bill the "Wrong" CHOICE Act. H.R. 10 is a misguided anti-regulatory bill that will only diminish national efforts to protect and secure the financial stability of our nation.

H.R. 10 is ill-conceived, destroying key financial regulations and consumer protections put in place by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

H.R. 10 aims to deregulate a financial system that has failed to regulate itself in the past leading to the financial crash of 2008.

The nation still feels the reverberations of that crisis to this day.

We all remember the foreclosures, the neighborhoods and communities financially devastated, the jobs lost, and the retirements deferred.

Americans lost \$13 trillion in household wealth, 11 million Americans lost their homes, and the unemployment rate climbed to 10 percent.

This bill is inherently paradoxical because it claims to promote self-accountability on Wall Street, by taking away governmental regulations on financial institutions, but that is not the nature of the beast.

As evidenced by a very recent past, if given the opportunity, Wall Street runs rampant with greed and disregard for the citizens of our country.

After the 2008 financial crash, Congress enacted legislation to protect those that are most vulnerable and to help the country regain its rightful place in the economic system.

H.R. 10 attempts to halt the progress made to protect our economy and puts our entire nation's economy at risk of another crisis by launching an attack against the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), an institution designed to ensure a financial crash such as the 2008 crisis does not occur again.

CFPB is an effective government institution that has returned nearly \$12 billion to consumers cheated by banks and other financial institutions.

This bill strips the bureau's ability to stop unfair and abusive practices perpetuated by financial institutions by removing the bureau's political independence, threatening its funding and crippling its ability to ensure Americans' financial welfare.

Taking away CFPB's power is harmful to consumers and small investors, those whose life savings and futures depend on the protections that Congress provides.

People of color and low-income families remain especially vulnerable to the abuse perpetuated by financial institutions.

Houston, home to some of the most diverse population in the nation, would see direct consequences. H.R. 10 would risk the livelihood of many living in Houston.

The "Wrong" CHOICE Act abandons hard working people and aids Wall Street in the abuse of hard working Americans, jeopardizing the financial stability of the entire nation.

The "Wrong" CHOICE Act will drag us back to the days when lax lending, predatory practices and profiteers on Wall Street take advantage of vulnerable American families.

We must not return to the days when massive taxpayer bailouts were the norm.

We must not put our financial stability in jeopardy of another financial meltdown.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, in the 9 years since the 2008 financial crisis, there's a consensus that the crisis was caused by too much risk and lax regulation. Because of banks' overinvestment in risky financial products, our country was plunged into the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

Housing prices, where middle-class Americans for decades have focused their investment, fell by more than 30 percent and an estimated 5.5 million more American jobs were lost to slow growth during the crisis. My hometown of Houston, Texas, was further hit by the sudden fall of oil prices in 2014 and the attendant layoffs and slowdown in the local economy, making it hard for my constituents to save, provide for their families, and plan for the future.

Seven years after Dodd-Frank was enacted, our country is just now beginning to recover. Dodd-Frank was put in place to make sure that the conditions that led to the crisis cannot occur again. If the hardship suffered by the millions of Americans who saw the value of their home and their retirement funds disappear fails to convince my Republican col-

leagues of the need to make sure that banks cannot gamble with the money of middle-class Americans, it's difficult to imagine what would.

The CHOICE Act recreates the conditions that led to the 2008 crisis by allowing banks to again engage in risky investment behavior with their clients' money, and limiting oversight of banks by the federal government. If a key financial institution like the Lehmann Brothers, whose collapse contributed to the severity of the crisis in 2008, again collapses, the CHOICE Act then limits the ability of the government to intervene to guard against a total collapse of the financial system.

The assault that the CHOICE Act represents on the livelihood of middle and working class Americans isn't limited to this. Although consumer protection should be the most basic goal of all lawmakers, this bill subjugates consumer protection and welfare to the banking and finance industry in two additional ways. First, it will gut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the agency created by Dodd-Frank and tasked with protecting Americans from irresponsible or predatory behavior by financial institutions. The CHOICE Act thus nearly eradicates the ability of the U.S. government to monitor the safety of financial products for everyday Americans, thus leaving a massive void in consumers' daily lives, as financial product offerings continue to expand and grow more and more complex and sometimes difficult to understand.

The Wrong CHOICE Act will also nullify the much-needed fiduciary rule, allowing investment advisors to make decisions with the money of their clients that aren't in their clients' best interest. This is shameful, and will allow bad apple investment advisors to take advantage of often elderly clients who, understandably, assume that those investment advisors will help them save for their retirement rather than put their own fees first.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today to stand with our nation's retirees and working families and vote down this irresponsible bill.

□ 1445

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 115-163. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 10

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

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

*Sec. 2. Directed rulemaking repeals.*

**TITLE I—ENDING “TOO BIG TO FAIL” AND BANK BAILOUTS****Subtitle A—Repeal of the Orderly Liquidation Authority**

Sec. 111. Repeal of the orderly liquidation authority.

**Subtitle B—Financial Institution Bankruptcy**

Sec. 121. General provisions relating to covered financial corporations.

Sec. 122. Liquidation, reorganization, or recapitalization of a covered financial corporation.

Sec. 123. Amendments to title 28, United States Code.

**Subtitle C—Ending Government Guarantees**

Sec. 131. Repeal of obligation guarantee program.

Sec. 132. Repeal of systemic risk determination in resolutions.

Sec. 133. Restrictions on use of the Exchange Stabilization Fund.

**Subtitle D—Eliminating Financial Market Utility Designations**

Sec. 141. Repeal of title VIII.

**Subtitle E—Reform of the Financial Stability Act of 2010**

Sec. 151. Repeal and modification of provisions of the Financial Stability Act of 2010.

Sec. 152. Operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations.

**TITLE II—DEMANDING ACCOUNTABILITY FROM WALL STREET****Subtitle A—SEC Penalties Modernization**

Sec. 211. Enhancement of civil penalties for securities laws violations.

Sec. 212. Updated civil money penalties of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board.

Sec. 213. Updated civil money penalty for controlling persons in connection with insider trading.

Sec. 214. Update of certain other penalties.

Sec. 215. Monetary sanctions to be used for the relief of victims.

Sec. 216. GAO report on use of civil money penalty authority by Commission.

**Subtitle B—FIRREA Penalties Modernization**

Sec. 221. Increase of civil and criminal penalties originally established in the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989.

**TITLE III—DEMANDING ACCOUNTABILITY FROM FINANCIAL REGULATORS AND DEVOLVING POWER AWAY FROM WASHINGTON****Subtitle A—Cost-Benefit Analyses**

Sec. 311. Definitions.

Sec. 312. Required regulatory analysis.

Sec. 313. Rule of construction.

Sec. 314. Public availability of data and regulatory analysis.

Sec. 315. Five-year regulatory impact analysis.

Sec. 316. Retrospective review of existing rules.

Sec. 317. Judicial review.

Sec. 318. Chief Economists Council.

Sec. 319. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 320. Other regulatory entities.

Sec. 321. Avoidance of duplicative or unnecessary analyses.

**Subtitle B—Congressional Review of Federal Financial Agency Rulemaking**

Sec. 331. Congressional review.

Sec. 332. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.

Sec. 333. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.

Sec. 334. Definitions.

Sec. 335. Judicial review.

Sec. 336. Effective date of certain rules.

Sec. 337. Budgetary effects of rules subject to section 332 of the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

Sec. 338. Nonapplicability to monetary policy.

**Subtitle C—Judicial Review of Agency Actions**

Sec. 341. Scope of judicial review of agency actions.

**Subtitle D—Leadership of Financial Regulators**

Sec. 351. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Sec. 352. Federal Housing Finance Agency.

**Subtitle E—Congressional Oversight of Appropriations**

Sec. 361. Bringing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation into the appropriations process.

Sec. 362. Bringing the Federal Housing Finance Agency into the appropriations process.

Sec. 363. Bringing the National Credit Union Administration into the appropriations process.

Sec. 364. Bringing the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency into the appropriations process.

Sec. 365. Bringing the non-monetary policy related functions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System into the appropriations process.

**Subtitle F—International Processes**

Sec. 371. Requirements for international processes.

**Subtitle G—Unfunded Mandates Reform**

Sec. 381. Definitions.

Sec. 382. Application of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

**Subtitle H—Enforcement Coordination**

Sec. 391. Policies to minimize duplication of enforcement efforts.

**Subtitle I—Penalties for Unauthorized Disclosures**

Sec. 392. Criminal penalty for unauthorized disclosures.

**Subtitle J—Stop Settlement Slush Funds**

Sec. 393. Limitation on donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which certain departments or agencies are a party.

**TITLE IV—UNLEASHING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES, INNOVATORS, AND JOB CREATORS BY FACILITATING CAPITAL FORMATION****Subtitle A—Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification**

Sec. 401. Registration exemption for merger and acquisition brokers.

Sec. 402. Effective date.

**Subtitle B—Encouraging Employee Ownership**

Sec. 406. Increased threshold for disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans.

**Subtitle C—Small Company Disclosure Simplification**

Sec. 411. Exemption from XBRL requirements for emerging growth companies and other smaller companies.

Sec. 412. Analysis by the SEC.

Sec. 413. Report to Congress.

Sec. 414. Definitions.

**Subtitle D—Securities and Exchange Commission Overpayment Credit**

Sec. 416. Refunding or crediting overpayment of section 31 fees.

**Subtitle E—Fair Access to Investment Research**

Sec. 421. Safe harbor for investment fund research.

**Subtitle F—Accelerating Access to Capital**

Sec. 426. Expanded eligibility for use of Form S-3.

**Subtitle G—Enhancing the RAISE Act**

Sec. 431. Certain accredited investor transactions.

**Subtitle H—Small Business Credit Availability**

Sec. 436. Business development company ownership of securities of investment advisers and certain financial companies.

Sec. 437. Expanding access to capital for business development companies.

Sec. 438. Parity for business development companies regarding offering and proxy rules.

**Subtitle I—Fostering Innovation**

Sec. 441. Temporary exemption for low-revenue issuers.

**Subtitle J—Small Business Capital Formation Enhancement**

Sec. 446. Annual review of government-business forum on capital formation.

**Subtitle K—Helping Angels Lead Our Startups**

Sec. 451. Definition of angel investor group.

Sec. 452. Clarification of general solicitation.

**Subtitle L—Main Street Growth**

Sec. 456. Venture exchanges.

**Subtitle M—Micro Offering Safe Harbor**

Sec. 461. Exemptions for micro-offerings.

**Subtitle N—Private Placement Improvement**

Sec. 466. Revisions to SEC Regulation D.

**Subtitle O—Supporting America's Innovators**

Sec. 471. Investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds.

**Subtitle P—Fix Crowdfunding**

Sec. 476. Crowdfunding exemption.

Sec. 477. Exclusion of crowdfunding investors from shareholder cap.

Sec. 478. Preemption of State law.

Sec. 479. Treatment of funding portals.

**Subtitle Q—Corporate Governance Reform and Transparency**

Sec. 481. Definitions.

Sec. 482. Registration of proxy advisory firms.

Sec. 483. Commission annual report.

**Subtitle R—Senior Safe**

Sec. 491. Immunity.

Sec. 492. Training required.

Sec. 493. Relationship to State law.

**Subtitle S—National Securities Exchange Regulatory Parity**

Sec. 496. Application of exemption.

**Subtitle T—Private Company Flexibility and Growth**

Sec. 497. Shareholder threshold for registration.

**Subtitle U—Small Company Capital Formation Enhancements**

Sec. 498. JOBS Act-related exemption.

**Subtitle V—Encouraging Public Offerings**

Sec. 499. Expanding testing the waters and confidential submissions.

**TITLE V—REGULATORY RELIEF FOR MAIN STREET AND COMMUNITY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS****Subtitle A—Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing**

Sec. 501. Mortgage originator definition.

Sec. 502. High-Cost mortgage definition.

**Subtitle B—Mortgage Choice**

Sec. 506. Definition of points and fees.

**Subtitle C—Financial Institution Customer Protection**

Sec. 511. Requirements for deposit account termination requests and orders.

Sec. 512. Amendments to the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989.

*Subtitle D—Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access*

Sec. 516. Safe harbor for certain loans held on portfolio.

*Subtitle E—Application of the Expedited Funds Availability Act*

Sec. 521. Application of the Expedited Funds Availability Act.

*Subtitle F—Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement*

Sec. 526. Changes required to small bank holding company policy statement on assessment of financial and managerial factors.

*Subtitle G—Community Institution Mortgage Relief*

Sec. 531. Community financial institution mortgage relief.

*Subtitle H—Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform*

Sec. 536. Timeliness of examination reports.

*Subtitle I—National Credit Union Administration Budget Transparency*

Sec. 541. Budget transparency for the NCUA.

*Subtitle J—Taking Account of Institutions With Low Operation Risk*

Sec. 546. Regulations appropriate to business models.

*Subtitle K—Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility*

Sec. 551. Option for Federal savings associations to operate as a covered savings association.

*Subtitle L—SAFE Transitional Licensing*

Sec. 556. Eliminating barriers to jobs for loan originators.

*Subtitle M—Right to Lend*

Sec. 561. Small business loan data collection requirement.

*Subtitle N—Community Bank Reporting Relief*

Sec. 566. Short form call report.

*Subtitle O—Homeowner Information Privacy Protection*

Sec. 571. Study regarding privacy of information collected under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975.

*Subtitle P—Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment*

Sec. 576. Depository institutions subject to maintenance of records and disclosure requirements.

*Subtitle Q—Protecting Consumers' Access to Credit*

Sec. 581. Rate of interest after transfer of loan.

*Subtitle R—NCUA Overhead Transparency*

Sec. 586. Fund transparency.

*Subtitle S—Housing Opportunities Made Easier*

Sec. 591. Clarification of donated services to non-profits.

**TITLE VI—REGULATORY RELIEF FOR STRONGLY CAPITALIZED, WELL MANAGED BANKING ORGANIZATIONS**

Sec. 601. Capital election.

Sec. 602. Regulatory relief.

Sec. 603. Contingent capital study.

Sec. 604. Study on altering the current prompt corrective action rules.

Sec. 605. Definitions.

**TITLE VII—EMPOWERING AMERICANS TO ACHIEVE FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE**

*Subtitle A—Separation of Powers and Liberty Enhancements*

Sec. 711. Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.

Sec. 712. Bringing the Agency into the regular appropriations process.

Sec. 713. Consumer Law Enforcement Agency Inspector General Reform.

Sec. 714. Private parties authorized to compel the Agency to seek sanctions by filing civil actions; Adjudications deemed actions.

Sec. 715. Civil investigative demands to be appealed to courts.

Sec. 716. Agency dual mandate and economic analysis.

Sec. 717. No deference to Agency interpretation.

*Subtitle B—Administrative Enhancements*

Sec. 721. Advisory opinions.

Sec. 722. Reform of Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund.

Sec. 723. Agency pay fairness.

Sec. 724. Elimination of market monitoring functions.

Sec. 725. Reforms to mandatory functional units.

Sec. 726. Repeal of mandatory advisory board.

Sec. 727. Elimination of supervision authority.

Sec. 728. Transfer of old OTS building from OCC to GSA.

Sec. 729. Limitation on Agency authority.

*Subtitle C—Policy Enhancements*

Sec. 731. Consumer right to financial privacy.

Sec. 732. Repeal of Council authority to set aside Agency rules and requirement of safety and soundness considerations when issuing rules.

Sec. 733. Removal of authority to regulate small-dollar credit.

Sec. 734. Reforming indirect auto financing guidance.

Sec. 735. Removal of Agency UDAAP authority.

Sec. 736. Preservation of UDAP authority for Federal banking regulators.

Sec. 737. Repeal of authority to restrict arbitration.

**TITLE VIII—CAPITAL MARKETS IMPROVEMENTS**

*Subtitle A—SEC Reform, Restructuring, and Accountability*

Sec. 801. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 802. Report on unobligated appropriations.

Sec. 803. SEC Reserve Fund abolished.

Sec. 804. Fees to offset appropriations.

Sec. 805. Commission Federal construction funding prohibition.

Sec. 806. Implementation of recommendations.

Sec. 807. Office of Credit Ratings to report to the Division of Trading and Markets.

Sec. 808. Office of Municipal Securities to report to the Division of Trading and Markets.

Sec. 809. Independence of Commission Ombudsman.

Sec. 810. Investor Advisory Committee improvements.

Sec. 811. Duties of Investor Advocate.

Sec. 812. Elimination of exemption of Small Business Capital Formation Advisory Committee from Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Sec. 813. Internal risk controls.

Sec. 814. Applicability of notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act to guidance voted on by the Commission.

Sec. 815. Limitation on pilot programs.

Sec. 816. Procedure for obtaining certain intellectual property.

Sec. 817. Process for closing investigations.

Sec. 818. Enforcement Ombudsman.

Sec. 819. Adequate notice.

Sec. 820. Advisory committee on Commission's enforcement policies and practices.

Sec. 821. Process to permit recipient of Wells notification to appear before Commission staff in-person.

Sec. 822. Publication of enforcement manual.

Sec. 823. Private parties authorized to compel the Securities and Exchange Commission to seek sanctions by filing civil actions.

Sec. 824. Certain findings required to approve civil money penalties against issuers.

Sec. 825. Repeal of authority of the Commission to prohibit persons from serving as officers or directors.

Sec. 826. Subpoena duration and renewal.

Sec. 827. Elimination of automatic disqualifications.

Sec. 828. Denial of award to culpable whistleblowers.

Sec. 829. Clarification of authority to impose sanctions on persons associated with a broker or dealer.

Sec. 830. Complaint and burden of proof requirements for certain actions for breach of fiduciary duty.

Sec. 831. Congressional access to information held by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board.

Sec. 832. Abolishing Investor Advisory Group.

Sec. 833. Repeal of requirement for Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to use certain funds for merit scholarship program.

Sec. 834. Reallocation of fines for violations of rules of municipal securities rule-making board.

*Subtitle B—Eliminating Excessive Government Intrusion in the Capital Markets*

Sec. 841. Repeal of Department of Labor fiduciary rule and requirements prior to rulemaking relating to standards of conduct for brokers and dealers.

Sec. 842. Exemption from risk retention requirements for nonresidential mortgage.

Sec. 843. Frequency of shareholder approval of executive compensation.

Sec. 844. Shareholder Proposals.

Sec. 845. Prohibition on requiring a single ballot.

Sec. 846. Requirement for municipal advisor for issuers of municipal securities.

Sec. 847. Small issuer exemption from internal control evaluation.

Sec. 848. Streamlining of applications for an exemption from the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Sec. 849. Restriction on recovery of erroneously awarded compensation.

Sec. 850. Exemptive authority for certain provisions relating to registration of nationally recognized statistical rating organizations.

Sec. 851. Risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations.

Sec. 852. Transparency of credit rating methodologies.

Sec. 853. Repeal of certain attestation requirements relating to credit ratings.

Sec. 854. Look-back review by NRSRO.

Sec. 855. Approval of credit rating procedures and methodologies.

Sec. 856. Exception for providing certain material information relating to a credit rating.

Sec. 857. Repeals.

Sec. 858. Exemption of and reporting by private equity fund advisers.

Sec. 859. Records and reports of private funds.

Sec. 860. Definition of accredited investor.

Sec. 861. Repeal of certain provisions requiring a study and report to Congress.

Sec. 862. Repeal.

Subtitle C—Harmonization of Derivatives Rules  
 Sec. 871. Commissions review and harmonization of rules relating to the regulation of over-the-counter swaps markets.

Sec. 872. Treatment of transactions between affiliates.

**TITLE IX—REPEAL OF THE VOLCKER RULE AND OTHER PROVISIONS**

Sec. 901. Repeals.

**TITLE X—FED OVERSIGHT REFORM AND MODERNIZATION**

Sec. 1001. Requirements for policy rules of the Federal Open Market Committee.

Sec. 1002. Federal Open Market Committee blackout period.

Sec. 1003. Public transcripts of FOMC meetings.

Sec. 1004. Membership of Federal Open Market Committee.

Sec. 1005. Frequency of testimony of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to Congress.

Sec. 1006. Vice Chairman for Supervision report requirement.

Sec. 1007. Salaries, financial disclosures, and office staff of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Sec. 1008. Amendments to powers of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Sec. 1009. Interest rates on balances maintained at a Federal Reserve bank by depository institutions established by Federal Open Market Committee.

Sec. 1010. Audit reform and transparency for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Sec. 1011. Establishment of a Centennial Monetary Commission.

**TITLE XI—IMPROVING INSURANCE COORDINATION THROUGH AN INDEPENDENT ADVOCATE**

Sec. 1101. Repeal of the Federal Insurance Office; Creation of the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate.

Sec. 1102. Treatment of covered agreements.

**TITLE XII—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS**

Sec. 1201. Table of contents; Definitional corrections.

Sec. 1202. Antitrust savings clause corrections.

Sec. 1203. Title I corrections.

Sec. 1204. Title III corrections.

Sec. 1205. Title IV correction.

Sec. 1206. Title VI corrections.

Sec. 1207. Title VII corrections.

Sec. 1208. Title IX corrections.

Sec. 1209. Title X corrections.

Sec. 1210. Title XII correction.

Sec. 1211. Title XIV correction.

Sec. 1212. Technical corrections to other statutes.

**SEC. 2. DIRECTED RULEMAKING REPEALS.**

With respect to any directed rulemaking required by a provision of law repealed by this Act, to the extent any rule was issued or revised pursuant to such directed rulemaking, such rule or revision shall have no force or effect.

**TITLE I—ENDING “TOO BIG TO FAIL” AND BANK BAILOUTS**

**Subtitle A—Repeal of the Orderly Liquidation Authority**

**SEC. 111. REPEAL OF THE ORDERLY LIQUIDATION AUTHORITY.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is hereby repealed and any Federal law amended by such title shall, on and after the effective date of this Act, be effective as if title II

of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act had not been enacted.

**(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) *DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT.*—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended—

(A) in the table of contents for such Act, by striking all items relating to title II;

(B) in section 165(d)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “, the Council, and the Corporation” and inserting “and the Council”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “, the Council, and the Corporation” and inserting “and the Council”;

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking “and the Corporation”;

(iv) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking “and the Corporation jointly determine” and inserting “determines”;

(II) by striking “their” and inserting “its”;

(III) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and the Corporation”;

(IV) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and the Corporation”;

(v) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and the Corporation may jointly” and inserting “may”; and

(II) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by striking “and the Corporation” each place such term appears;

(bb) by striking “may jointly” and inserting “may”;

(cc) by striking “have jointly” and inserting “has”;

(vi) in paragraph (6), by striking “, a receiver appointed under title II,”; and

(vii) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

“(8) *RULES.*—Not later than 12 months after enactment of this paragraph, the Board of Governors shall issue final rules implementing this section.”; and

(C) in section 716(g), by striking “or a covered financial company under title II”.

(2) *FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.*—Section 10(b)(3) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(b)(3)) is amended by striking “, or of such nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or bank holding company described in section 165(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010, for the purpose of implementing its authority to provide for orderly liquidation of any such company under title II of that Act”.

(3) *FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.*—Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “, resolution under title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, or” and inserting “or is subject to resolution under”; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “, resolution under title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, or” and inserting “or resolution under”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (E).

**Subtitle B—Financial Institution Bankruptcy**  
**SEC. 121. GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO COVERED FINANCIAL CORPORATIONS.**

(a) *DEFINITION.*—Section 101 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following after paragraph (9):

“(9A) The term ‘covered financial corporation’ means any corporation incorporated or organized under any Federal or State law, other than a stockbroker, a commodity broker, or an entity of the kind specified in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 109(b), that is—

“(A) a bank holding company, as defined in section 2(a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; or

“(B) a corporation that exists for the primary purpose of owning, controlling and financing its subsidiaries, that has total consolidated assets of \$50,000,000,000 or greater, and for which, in its most recently completed fiscal year—

“(i) annual gross revenues derived by the corporation and all of its subsidiaries from activities that are financial in nature (as defined in section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956) and, if applicable, from the ownership or control of one or more insured depository institutions, represents 85 percent or more of the consolidated annual gross revenues of the corporation; or

“(ii) the consolidated assets of the corporation and all of its subsidiaries related to activities that are financial in nature (as defined in section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956) and, if applicable, related to the ownership or control of one or more insured depository institutions, represents 85 percent or more of the consolidated assets of the corporation.”.

(b) *APPLICABILITY OF CHAPTERS.*—Section 103 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(l) Subchapter V of chapter 11 of this title applies only in a case under chapter 11 concerning a covered financial corporation.”.

(c) *WHO MAY BE A DEBTOR.*—Section 109 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) a covered financial corporation.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “and” before “an uninsured State member bank”; and

(B) by striking “or” before “a corporation”; and

(C) by inserting “, or a covered financial corporation” after “Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991”.

(d) *CONVERSION TO CHAPTER 7.*—Section 1112 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Notwithstanding section 109(b), the court may convert a case under subchapter V to a case under chapter 7 if—

“(1) a transfer approved under section 1185 has been consummated;

“(2) the court has ordered the appointment of a special trustee under section 1186; and

“(3) the court finds, after notice and a hearing, that conversion is in the best interest of the creditors and the estate.”.

(e)(1) Section 726(a)(1) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “first,” the following: “in payment of any unpaid fees, costs, and expenses of a special trustee appointed under section 1186, and then”.

(2) Section 1129(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) In a case under subchapter V, all payable fees, costs, and expenses of the special trustee have been paid or the plan provides for the payment of all such fees, costs, and expenses on the effective date of the plan.

“(18) In a case under subchapter V, confirmation of the plan is not likely to cause serious adverse effects on financial stability in the United States.”.

(f) Section 322(b)(2) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking “The” and inserting “In cases under subchapter V, the United States trustee shall recommend to the court, and in all other cases, the”.

**SEC. 122. LIQUIDATION, REORGANIZATION, OR RECAPITALIZATION OF A COVERED FINANCIAL CORPORATION.**

Chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following

(and conforming the table of contents for such chapter accordingly):

**“SUBCHAPTER V—LIQUIDATION, REORGANIZATION, OR RECAPITALIZATION OF A COVERED FINANCIAL CORPORATION**

**“§ 1181. Inapplicability of other sections**

“Sections 303 and 321(c) do not apply in a case under this subchapter concerning a covered financial corporation. Section 365 does not apply to a transfer under section 1185, 1187, or 1188.

**“§ 1182. Definitions for this subchapter**

“In this subchapter, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) The term ‘Board’ means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

“(2) The term ‘bridge company’ means a newly formed corporation to which property of the estate may be transferred under section 1185(a) and the equity securities of which may be transferred to a special trustee under section 1186(a).

“(3) The term ‘capital structure debt’ means all unsecured debt of the debtor for borrowed money for which the debtor is the primary obligor, other than a qualified financial contract and other than debt secured by a lien on property of the estate that is to be transferred to a bridge company pursuant to an order of the court under section 1185(a).

“(4) The term ‘contractual right’ means a contractual right of a kind defined in section 555, 556, 559, 560, or 561.

“(5) The term ‘qualified financial contract’ means any contract of a kind defined in paragraph (25), (38A), (47), or (53B) of section 101, section 741(7), or paragraph (4), (5), (11), or (13) of section 761.

“(6) The term ‘special trustee’ means the trustee of a trust formed under section 1186(a)(1).

**“§ 1183. Commencement of a case concerning a covered financial corporation**

“(a) A case under this subchapter concerning a covered financial corporation may be commenced by the filing of a petition with the court by the debtor under section 301 only if the debtor or states to the best of its knowledge under penalty of perjury in the petition that it is a covered financial corporation.

“(b) The commencement of a case under subsection (a) constitutes an order for relief under this subchapter.

“(c) The members of the board of directors (or body performing similar functions) of a covered financial company shall have no liability to shareholders, creditors, or other parties in interest for a good faith filing of a petition to commence a case under this subchapter, or for any reasonable action taken in good faith in contemplation of such a petition or a transfer under section 1185 or section 1186, whether prior to or after commencement of the case.

“(d) Counsel to the debtor shall provide, to the greatest extent practicable without disclosing the identity of the potential debtor, sufficient confidential notice to the chief judge of the court of appeals for the circuit embracing the district in which such counsel intends to file a petition to commence a case under this subchapter regarding the potential commencement of such case. The chief judge of such court shall randomly assign to preside over such case a bankruptcy judge selected from among the bankruptcy judges designated by the Chief Justice of the United States under section 298 of title 28.

**“§ 1184. Regulators**

“The Board, the Securities Exchange Commission, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and

the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation may raise and may appear and be heard on any issue in any case or proceeding under this subchapter.

**“§ 1185. Special transfer of property of the estate**

“(a) On request of the trustee, and after notice and a hearing that shall occur not less than 24 hours after the order for relief, the court may order a transfer under this section of property of the estate, and the assignment of executory contracts, unexpired leases, and qualified financial contracts of the debtor, to a bridge company. Upon the entry of an order approving such transfer, any property transferred, and any executory contracts, unexpired leases, and qualified financial contracts assigned under such order shall no longer be property of the estate. Except as provided under this section, the provisions of section 363 shall apply to a transfer and assignment under this section.

“(b) Unless the court orders otherwise, notice of a request for an order under subsection (a) shall consist of electronic or telephonic notice of not less than 24 hours to—

“(1) the debtor;

“(2) the holders of the 20 largest secured claims against the debtor;

“(3) the holders of the 20 largest unsecured claims against the debtor;

“(4) counterparties to any debt, executory contract, unexpired lease, and qualified financial contract requested to be transferred under this section;

“(5) the Board;

“(6) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

“(7) the Secretary of the Treasury and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Treasury;

“(8) the Commodity Futures Trading Commission;

“(9) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

“(10) the United States trustee or bankruptcy administrator; and

“(11) each primary financial regulatory agency, as defined in section 2(12) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, with respect to any affiliate the equity securities of which are proposed to be transferred under this section.

“(c) The court may not order a transfer under this section unless the court determines, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that—

“(1) the transfer under this section is necessary to prevent serious adverse effects on financial stability in the United States;

“(2) the transfer does not provide for the assumption of any capital structure debt by the bridge company;

“(3) the transfer does not provide for the transfer to the bridge company of any property of the estate that is subject to a lien securing a debt, executory contract, unexpired lease or agreement (including a qualified financial contract) of the debtor unless—

“(A)(i) the bridge company assumes such debt, executory contract, unexpired lease or agreement (including a qualified financial contract), including any claims arising in respect thereof that would not be allowed secured claims under section 506(a)(1) and after giving effect to such transfer, such property remains subject to the lien securing such debt, executory contract, unexpired lease or agreement (including a qualified financial contract); and

“(ii) the court has determined that assumption of such debt, executory contract, unexpired lease or agreement (including a qualified financial contract) by the bridge company is in the best interests of the estate; or

“(B) such property is being transferred to the bridge company in accordance with the provisions of section 363;

“(4) the transfer does not provide for the assumption by the bridge company of any debt, executory contract, unexpired lease or agreement (including a qualified financial contract) of the debtor secured by a lien on property of the estate unless the transfer provides for such property to be transferred to the bridge company in accordance with paragraph (3)(A) of this subsection;

“(5) the transfer does not provide for the transfer of the equity of the debtor;

“(6) the trustee has demonstrated that the bridge company is not likely to fail to meet the obligations of any debt, executory contract, qualified financial contract, or unexpired lease assumed and assigned to the bridge company;

“(7) the transfer provides for the transfer to a special trustee all of the equity securities in the bridge company and appointment of a special trustee in accordance with section 1186;

“(8) after giving effect to the transfer, adequate provision has been made for the fees, costs, and expenses of the estate and special trustee; and

“(9) the bridge company will have governing documents, and initial directors and senior officers, that are in the best interest of creditors and the estate.

“(d) Immediately before a transfer under this section, the bridge company that is the recipient of the transfer shall—

“(1) not have any property, executory contracts, unexpired leases, qualified financial contracts, or debts, other than any property acquired or executory contracts, unexpired leases, or debts assumed when acting as a transferee of a transfer under this section; and

“(2) have equity securities that are property of the estate, which may be sold or distributed in accordance with this title.

**“§ 1186. Special trustee**

“(a)(1) An order approving a transfer under section 1185 shall require the trustee to transfer to a qualified and independent special trustee, who is appointed by the court, all of the equity securities in the bridge company that is the recipient of a transfer under section 1185 to hold in trust for the sole benefit of the estate, subject to satisfaction of the special trustee’s fees, costs, and expenses. The trust of which the special trustee is the trustee shall be a newly formed trust governed by a trust agreement approved by the court as in the best interests of the estate, and shall exist for the sole purpose of holding and administering, and shall be permitted to dispose of, the equity securities of the bridge company in accordance with the trust agreement.

“(2) In connection with the hearing to approve a transfer under section 1185, the trustee shall confirm to the court that the Board has been consulted regarding the identity of the proposed special trustee and advise the court of the results of such consultation.

“(b) The trust agreement governing the trust shall provide—

“(1) for the payment of the fees, costs, expenses, and indemnities of the special trustee from the assets of the debtor’s estate;

“(2) that the special trustee provide—

“(A) quarterly reporting to the estate, which shall be filed with the court; and

“(B) information about the bridge company reasonably requested by a party in interest to prepare a disclosure statement for a plan providing for distribution of any securities of the bridge company if such information is necessary to prepare such disclosure statement;

“(3) that for as long as the equity securities of the bridge company are held by the trust, the special trustee shall file a notice with the court in connection with—

“(A) any change in a director or senior officer of the bridge company;

“(B) any modification to the governing documents of the bridge company; and

“(C) any material corporate action of the bridge company, including—

“(i) recapitalization;

“(ii) a material borrowing;

“(iii) termination of an intercompany debt or guarantee;

“(iv) a transfer of a substantial portion of the assets of the bridge company; or

“(v) the issuance or sale of any securities of the bridge company;

“(4) that any sale of any equity securities of the bridge company shall not be consummated until the special trustee consults with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Board regarding such sale and discloses the results of such consultation with the court;

“(5) that, subject to reserves for payments permitted under paragraph (1) provided for in the trust agreement, the proceeds of the sale of any equity securities of the bridge company by the special trustee be held in trust for the benefit of or transferred to the estate;

“(6) the process and guidelines for the replacement of the special trustee; and

“(7) that the property held in trust by the special trustee is subject to distribution in accordance with subsection (c).

“(c)(1) The special trustee shall distribute the assets held in trust—

“(A) if the court confirms a plan in the case, in accordance with the plan on the effective date of the plan; or

“(B) if the case is converted to a case under chapter 7, as ordered by the court.

“(2) As soon as practicable after a final distribution under paragraph (1), the office of the special trustee shall terminate, except as may be necessary to wind up and conclude the business and financial affairs of the trust.

“(d) After a transfer to the special trustee under this section, the special trustee shall be subject only to applicable nonbankruptcy law, and the actions and conduct of the special trustee shall no longer be subject to approval by the court in the case under this subchapter.

**“§1187. Temporary and supplemental automatic stay; assumed debt**

“(a)(1) A petition filed under section 1183 operates as a stay, applicable to all entities, of the termination, acceleration, or modification of any debt, contract, lease, or agreement of the kind described in paragraph (2), or of any right or obligation under any such debt, contract, lease, or agreement, solely because of—

“(A) a default by the debtor under any such debt, contract, lease, or agreement; or

“(B) a provision in such debt, contract, lease, or agreement, or in applicable nonbankruptcy law, that is conditioned on—

“(i) the insolvency or financial condition of the debtor at any time before the closing of the case;

“(ii) the commencement of a case under this title concerning the debtor;

“(iii) the appointment of or taking possession by a trustee in a case under this title concerning the debtor or by a custodian before the commencement of the case; or

“(iv) a credit rating agency rating, or absence or withdrawal of a credit rating agency rating—

“(I) of the debtor at any time after the commencement of the case;

“(II) of an affiliate during the period from the commencement of the case until 48 hours after such order is entered;

“(III) of the bridge company while the trustee or the special trustee is a direct or indirect beneficial holder of more than 50 percent of the equity securities of—

“(aa) the bridge company; or

“(bb) the affiliate, if all of the direct or indirect interests in the affiliate that are property of the estate are transferred under section 1185; or

“(IV) of an affiliate while the trustee or the special trustee is a direct or indirect beneficial holder of more than 50 percent of the equity securities of—

“(aa) the bridge company; or

“(bb) the affiliate, if all of the direct or indirect interests in the affiliate that are property of the estate are transferred under section 1185.

“(2) A debt, contract, lease, or agreement described in this paragraph is—

“(A) any debt (other than capital structure debt), executory contract, or unexpired lease of the debtor (other than a qualified financial contract);

“(B) any agreement under which the debtor issued or is obligated for debt (other than capital structure debt);

“(C) any debt, executory contract, or unexpired lease of an affiliate (other than a qualified financial contract); or

“(D) any agreement under which an affiliate issued or is obligated for debt.

“(3) The stay under this subsection terminates—

“(A) for the benefit of the debtor, upon the earliest of—

“(i) 48 hours after the commencement of the case;

“(ii) assumption of the debt, contract, lease, or agreement by the bridge company under an order authorizing a transfer under section 1185;

“(iii) a final order of the court denying the request for a transfer under section 1185; or

“(iv) the time the case is dismissed; and

“(B) for the benefit of an affiliate, upon the earliest of—

“(i) the entry of an order authorizing a transfer under section 1185 in which the direct or indirect interests in the affiliate that are property of the estate are not transferred under section 1185;

“(ii) a final order by the court denying the request for a transfer under section 1185;

“(iii) 48 hours after the commencement of the case if the court has not ordered a transfer under section 1185; or

“(iv) the time the case is dismissed.

“(4) Subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of section 362 apply to a stay under this subsection.

“(b) A debt, executory contract (other than a qualified financial contract), or unexpired lease of the debtor, or an agreement under which the debtor has issued or is obligated for any debt, may be assumed by a bridge company in a transfer under section 1185 notwithstanding any provision in an agreement or in applicable nonbankruptcy law that—

“(1) prohibits, restricts, or conditions the assignment of the debt, contract, lease, or agreement; or

“(2) accelerates, terminates, or modifies, or permits a party other than the debtor to terminate or modify, the debt, contract, lease, or agreement on account of—

“(A) the assignment of the debt, contract, lease, or agreement; or

“(B) a change in control of any party to the debt, contract, lease, or agreement.

“(c)(1) A debt, contract, lease, or agreement of the kind described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2) may not be accelerated, terminated, or modified, and any right or obligation under such debt, contract, lease, or agreement may not be accelerated, terminated, or modified, as to the bridge company solely because of a provision in the debt, contract, lease, or agreement or in applicable nonbankruptcy law—

“(A) of the kind described in subsection (a)(1)(B) as applied to the debtor;

“(B) that prohibits, restricts, or conditions the assignment of the debt, contract, lease, or agreement; or

“(C) that accelerates, terminates, or modifies, or permits a party other than the debtor to ter-

minate or modify, the debt, contract, lease or agreement on account of—

“(i) the assignment of the debt, contract, lease, or agreement; or

“(ii) a change in control of any party to the debt, contract, lease, or agreement.

“(2) If there is a default by the debtor under a provision other than the kind described in paragraph (1) in a debt, contract, lease or agreement of the kind described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2), the bridge company may assume such debt, contract, lease, or agreement only if the bridge company—

“(A) shall cure the default;

“(B) compensates, or provides adequate assurance in connection with a transfer under section 1185 that the bridge company will promptly compensate, a party other than the debtor to the debt, contract, lease, or agreement, for any actual pecuniary loss to the party resulting from the default; and

“(C) provides adequate assurance in connection with a transfer under section 1185 of future performance under the debt, contract, lease, or agreement, as determined by the court under section 1185(c)(4).

**“§1188. Treatment of qualified financial contracts and affiliate contracts**

“(a) Notwithstanding sections 362(b)(6), 362(b)(7), 362(b)(17), 362(b)(27), 362(o), 555, 556, 559, 560, and 561, a petition filed under section 1183 operates as a stay, during the period specified in section 1187(a)(3)(A), applicable to all entities, of the exercise of a contractual right—

“(1) to cause the modification, liquidation, termination, or acceleration of a qualified financial contract of the debtor or an affiliate;

“(2) to offset or net out any termination value, payment amount, or other transfer obligation arising under or in connection with a qualified financial contract of the debtor or an affiliate; or

“(3) under any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement forming a part of or related to a qualified financial contract of the debtor or an affiliate.

“(b)(1) During the period specified in section 1187(a)(3)(A), the trustee or the affiliate shall perform all payment and delivery obligations under such qualified financial contract of the debtor or the affiliate, as the case may be, that become due after the commencement of the case. The stay provided under subsection (a) terminates as to a qualified financial contract of the debtor or an affiliate immediately upon the failure of the trustee or the affiliate, as the case may be, to perform any such obligation during such period.

“(2) Any failure by a counterparty to any qualified financial contract of the debtor or any affiliate to perform any payment or delivery obligation under such qualified financial contract, including during the pendency of the stay provided under subsection (a), shall constitute a breach of such qualified financial contract by the counterparty.

“(c) Subject to the court's approval, a qualified financial contract between an entity and the debtor may be assigned to or assumed by the bridge company in a transfer under, and in accordance with, section 1185 if and only if—

“(1) all qualified financial contracts between the entity and the debtor are assigned to and assumed by the bridge company in the transfer under section 1185;

“(2) all claims of the entity against the debtor in respect of any qualified financial contract between the entity and the debtor (other than any claim that, under the terms of the qualified financial contract, is subordinated to the claims of general unsecured creditors) are assigned to and assumed by the bridge company;

“(3) all claims of the debtor against the entity under any qualified financial contract between



the entity and the debtor are assigned to and assumed by the bridge company; and

“(4) all property securing or any other credit enhancement furnished by the debtor for any qualified financial contract described in paragraph (1) or any claim described in paragraph (2) or (3) under any qualified financial contract between the entity and the debtor is assigned to and assumed by the bridge company.

“(d) Notwithstanding any provision of a qualified financial contract or of applicable nonbankruptcy law, a qualified financial contract of the debtor that is assumed or assigned in a transfer under section 1185 may not be accelerated, terminated, or modified, after the entry of the order approving a transfer under section 1185, and any right or obligation under the qualified financial contract may not be accelerated, terminated, or modified, after the entry of the order approving a transfer under section 1185 solely because of a condition described in section 1187(c)(1), other than a condition of the kind specified in section 1187(b) that occurs after property of the estate no longer includes a direct beneficial interest or an indirect beneficial interest through the special trustee, in more than 50 percent of the equity securities of the bridge company.

“(e) Notwithstanding any provision of any agreement or in applicable nonbankruptcy law, an agreement of an affiliate (including an executory contract, an unexpired lease, qualified financial contract, or an agreement under which the affiliate issued or is obligated for debt) and any right or obligation under such agreement may not be accelerated, terminated, or modified, solely because of a condition described in section 1187(c)(1), other than a condition of the kind specified in section 1187(b) that occurs after the bridge company is no longer a direct or indirect beneficial holder of more than 50 percent of the equity securities of the affiliate, at any time after the commencement of the case if—

“(1) all direct or indirect interests in the affiliate that are property of the estate are transferred under section 1185 to the bridge company within the period specified in subsection (a);

“(2) the bridge company assumes—

“(A) any guarantee or other credit enhancement issued by the debtor relating to the agreement of the affiliate; and

“(B) any obligations in respect of rights of setoff, netting arrangement, or debt of the debtor that directly arises out of or directly relates to the guarantee or credit enhancement; and

“(3) any property of the estate that directly serves as collateral for the guarantee or credit enhancement is transferred to the bridge company.

#### “§ 1189. Licenses, permits, and registrations

“(a) Notwithstanding any otherwise applicable nonbankruptcy law, if a request is made under section 1185 for a transfer of property of the estate, any Federal, State, or local license, permit, or registration that the debtor or an affiliate had immediately before the commencement of the case and that is proposed to be transferred under section 1185 may not be accelerated, terminated, or modified at any time after the request solely on account of—

“(1) the insolvency or financial condition of the debtor at any time before the closing of the case;

“(2) the commencement of a case under this title concerning the debtor;

“(3) the appointment of or taking possession by a trustee in a case under this title concerning the debtor or by a custodian before the commencement of the case; or

“(4) a transfer under section 1185.

“(b) Notwithstanding any otherwise applicable nonbankruptcy law, any Federal, State, or local license, permit, or registration that the

debtor had immediately before the commencement of the case that is included in a transfer under section 1185 shall be valid and all rights and obligations thereunder shall vest in the bridge company.

#### “§ 1190. Exemption from securities laws

“For purposes of section 1145, a security of the bridge company shall be deemed to be a security of a successor to the debtor under a plan if the court approves the disclosure statement for the plan as providing adequate information (as defined in section 1125(a)) about the bridge company and the security.

#### “§ 1191. Inapplicability of certain avoiding powers

“A transfer made or an obligation incurred by the debtor to an affiliate prior to or after the commencement of the case, including any obligation released by the debtor or the estate to or for the benefit of an affiliate, in contemplation of or in connection with a transfer under section 1185 is not avoidable under section 544, 547, 548(a)(1)(B), or 549, or under any similar nonbankruptcy law.

#### “§ 1192. Consideration of financial stability

“The court may consider the effect that any decision in connection with this subchapter may have on financial stability in the United States.”.

#### SEC. 123. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 13.—Chapter 13 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “§ 298. Judge for a case under subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 11

“(a)(1) Notwithstanding section 295, the Chief Justice of the United States shall designate not fewer than 10 bankruptcy judges to be available to hear a case under subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 11. Bankruptcy judges may request to be considered by the Chief Justice of the United States for such designation.

“(2) Notwithstanding section 155, a case under subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 11 shall be heard under section 157 by a bankruptcy judge designated under paragraph (1), who shall be randomly assigned to hear such case by the chief judge of the court of appeals for the circuit embracing the district in which the case is pending. To the greatest extent practicable, the approvals required under section 155 should be obtained.

“(3) If the bankruptcy judge assigned to hear a case under paragraph (2) is not assigned to the district in which the case is pending, the bankruptcy judge shall be temporarily assigned to the district.

“(b) A case under subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 11, and all proceedings in the case, shall take place in the district in which the case is pending.

“(c) In this section, the term ‘covered financial corporation’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(9A) of title 11.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1334 OF TITLE 28.—Section 1334 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) This section does not grant jurisdiction to the district court after a transfer pursuant to an order under section 1185 of title 11 of any proceeding related to a special trustee appointed, or to a bridge company formed, in connection with a case under subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 11.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 13 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“298. Judge for a case under subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 11.”.

#### Subtitle C—Ending Government Guarantees

#### SEC. 131. REPEAL OF OBLIGATION GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following sections of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) are repealed:

(1) Section 1104.

(2) Section 1105.

(3) Section 1106.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents under section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the items relating to sections 1104, 1105, and 1106.

#### SEC. 132. REPEAL OF SYSTEMIC RISK DETERMINATION IN RESOLUTIONS.

Section 13(c)(4)(G) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(c)(4)(G)) is hereby repealed.

#### SEC. 133. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF THE EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5302 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) Amounts in the fund may not be used for the establishment of a guaranty program for any nongovernmental entity.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 131(b) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5236(b)) is amended by inserting “, or for the purposes of preventing the liquidation or insolvency of any entity” before the period.

#### Subtitle D—Eliminating Financial Market Utility Designations

#### SEC. 141. REPEAL OF TITLE VIII.

(a) REPEAL.—Title VIII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5461 et seq.) is repealed, and provisions of law amended by such title are restored and revived as if such title had never been enacted.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the items relating to title VIII.

#### Subtitle E—Reform of the Financial Stability Act of 2010

#### SEC. 151. REPEAL AND MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS OF THE FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010.

(a) REPEALS.—The following provisions of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such provisions are restored or revived as if such provisions had not been enacted:

(1) Subtitle B.

(2) Section 113.

(3) Section 114.

(4) Section 115.

(5) Section 116.

(6) Section 117.

(7) Section 119.

(8) Section 120.

(9) Section 121.

(10) Section 161.

(11) Section 162.

(12) Section 164.

(13) Section 166.

(14) Section 167.

(15) Section 168.

(16) Section 170.

(17) Section 172.

(18) Section 174.

(19) Section 175.

(b) ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS.—The Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5311 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(a), by striking paragraph (5);

(2) in section 111—

(A) in subsection (b)—  
 (i) in paragraph (1)—  
 (I) by striking “who shall each” and inserting “who shall, except as provided below, each”; and  
 (II) by striking subparagraphs (B) through (J) and inserting the following:  
 “(B) each member of the Board of Governors, who shall collectively have 1 vote on the Council;  
 “(C) the Comptroller of the Currency;  
 “(D) the Director of the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency;  
 “(E) each member of the Commission, who shall collectively have 1 vote on the Council;  
 “(F) each member of the Corporation, who shall collectively have 1 vote on the Council;  
 “(G) each member of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, who shall collectively have 1 vote on the Council;  
 “(H) the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency;  
 “(I) each member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, who shall collectively have 1 vote on the Council; and  
 “(J) the Independent Insurance Advocate.”;  
 (ii) in paragraph (2)—  
 (I) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B); and  
 (II) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively; and  
 (iii) by adding at the end the following:  
 “(4) VOTING BY MULTI-PERSON ENTITY.—  
 “(A) VOTING WITHIN THE ENTITY.—An entity described under subparagraph (B), (E), (F), (G), or (I) of paragraph (1) shall determine the entity’s Council vote by using the voting process normally applicable to votes by the entity’s members.  
 “(B) CASTING OF ENTITY VOTE.—The 1 collective Council vote of an entity described under subparagraph (A) shall be cast by the head of such agency or, in the event such head is unable to cast such vote, the next most senior member of the entity available.”;  
 (B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “The independent member of the Council shall serve for a term of 6 years, and each nonvoting member described in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of” and inserting “Each nonvoting members described under”;  
 (C) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:  
 “(3) STAFF ACCESS.—Any member of the Council may select to have one or more individuals on the member’s staff attend a meeting of the Council, including any meeting of representatives of the member agencies other than the members themselves.  
 “(4) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—All meetings of the Council, whether or not open to the public, shall be open to the attendance by members of the authorization and oversight committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.  
 “(5) MEMBER AGENCY MEETINGS.—Any meeting of representatives of the member agencies other than the members themselves shall be open to attendance by staff of the authorization and oversight committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.”;  
 (D) by striking subsection (g) (relating to the nonapplicability of FACA);  
 (E) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:  
 “(g) OPEN MEETING REQUIREMENT.—The Council shall be an agency for purposes of section 552b of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Government in the Sunshine Act’).  
 “(h) CONFIDENTIAL CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFINGS.—The Chairperson shall at regular times but not less than annually provide confidential briefings to the Committee on Financial Services

of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, which may in the discretion of the Chairman of the respective committee be attended by any combination of the committee’s members or staff.”; and  
 (F) by redesignating subsections (h) through (j) as subsections (i) through (k), respectively;  
 (3) in section 112—  
 (A) in subsection (a)(2)—  
 (i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the Federal Insurance Office and, if necessary to assess risks to the United States financial system, direct the Office of Financial Research to” and inserting “and, if necessary to assess risks to the United States financial system.”;  
 (ii) by striking subparagraphs (B), (H), (I), and (J);  
 (iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (K), (L), (M), and (N) as subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), and (J), respectively;  
 (iv) in subparagraph (J), as so redesignated—  
 (I) in clause (iii), by adding “and” at the end;  
 (II) by striking clauses (iv) and (v); and  
 (III) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (iv); and  
 (B) in subsection (d)—  
 (i) in paragraph (1), by striking “the Office of Financial Research, member agencies, and the Federal Insurance Office” and inserting “member agencies”;  
 (ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “the Office of Financial Research, any member agency, and the Federal Insurance Office,” and inserting “member agencies”;  
 (iii) in paragraph (3)—  
 (I) by striking “, acting through the Office of Financial Research,” each place it appears; and  
 (II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the Office of Financial Research or”; and  
 (iv) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking “, the Office of Financial Research.”;  
 (4) by amending section 118 to read as follows:  
**“SEC. 118. COUNCIL FUNDING.**  
 “There is authorized to be appropriated to the Council \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter to carry out the duties of the Council.”;  
 (5) in section 163—  
 (A) by striking subsection (a);  
 (B) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (a); and  
 (C) in subsection (a), as so redesignated—  
 (i) by striking “or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors” each place such term appears;  
 (ii) in paragraph (4), by striking “In addition” and inserting the following:  
 “(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition”; and  
 (iii) by adding at the end the following:  
 “(B) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFYING BANKING ORGANIZATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a proposed acquisition by a qualifying banking organization, as defined under section 605 of the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.”; and  
 (6) in section 165—  
 (A) by striking “nonbank financial companies supervised by the Board of Governors and” each place such term appears;  
 (B) by striking “nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors and” each place such term appears;  
 (C) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:  
 “(2) TAILORED APPLICATION.—In prescribing more stringent prudential standards under this section, the Board of Governors may differentiate among companies on an individual basis or by category, taking into consideration their capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including the financial activities of their subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate.”;

(D) in subsection (b)—  
 (i) in paragraph (1)(B)(iv), by striking “, on its own or pursuant to a recommendation made by the Council in accordance with section 115.”;  
 (ii) in paragraph (2)—  
 (I) by striking “foreign nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or”;  
 (II) by striking “shall—” and all that follows through “give due” and inserting “shall give due”;  
 (III) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and  
 (IV) by striking subparagraph (B);  
 (iii) in paragraph (3)—  
 (I) in subparagraph (A)—  
 (aa) by striking clause (i);  
 (bb) by redesignating clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively; and  
 (cc) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by adding “and” at the end;  
 (II) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C); and  
 (III) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (B); and  
 (iv) in paragraph (4), by striking “a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or”;  
 (E) in subsection (c)—  
 (i) in paragraph (1), by striking “under section 115(c)” and  
 (ii) in paragraph (2)—  
 (I) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:  
 “(A) any recommendations of the Council.”; and  
 (II) in subparagraph (D), by striking “nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or”;  
 (F) in subsection (d)—  
 (i) by striking “a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or” each place such term appears;  
 (ii) in paragraph (1), by striking “periodically” and inserting “not more often than every 2 years”;  
 (iii) in paragraph (3)—  
 (I) by striking “The Board” and inserting the following:  
 “(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board”;  
 (II) by striking “shall review” and inserting the following: “shall—  
 “(i) review”;  
 (III) by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and  
 (IV) by adding at the end the following:  
 “(ii) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the bank holding company submits the resolution plan, provide feedback to the bank holding company on such plan.  
 “(B) DISCLOSURE OF ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK.—The Board of Governors shall publicly disclose, including on the website of the Board of Governors, the assessment framework that is used to review information under this paragraph and shall provide the public with a notice and comment period before finalizing such assessment framework.”;  
 (iv) in paragraph (6), by striking “nonbank financial company supervised by the Board, any bank holding company,” and inserting “bank holding company”;  
 (G) in subsection (e)—  
 (i) in paragraph (1), by striking “a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or”;  
 (ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “the nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or” each place such term appears; and  
 (iii) in paragraph (4), by striking “a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or”;

(H) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “and any nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors”;

(I) in subsection (h)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1);

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; (iii) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (3)” each place such term appears and inserting “paragraph (2)”; and (iv) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or bank holding company described in subsection (a), as applicable” and inserting “a bank holding company described in subsection (a)”; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or a bank holding company described in subsection (a), as applicable” and inserting “a bank holding company described in subsection (a)”; and

(J) in subsection (i)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “, in coordination with the appropriate primary financial regulatory agencies and the Federal Insurance Office,”;

(II) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

“(i) shall—

“(I) issue regulations, after providing for public notice and comment, that provide for at least 3 different sets of conditions under which the evaluation required by this subsection shall be conducted, including baseline, adverse, and severely adverse, and methodologies, including models used to estimate losses on certain assets, and the Board of Governors shall not carry out any such evaluation until 60 days after such regulations are issued; and

“(II) provide copies of such regulations to the Comptroller General of the United States and the Panel of Economic Advisors of the Congressional Budget Office before publishing such regulations.”;

(bb) in clause (ii), by striking “and nonbank financial companies”;

(cc) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(dd) in clause (v), by striking the period and inserting the following: “, including any results of a resubmitted test”; and

(ee) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) shall, in establishing the severely adverse condition under clause (i), provide detailed consideration of the model’s effects on financial stability and the cost and availability of credit;

“(vii) shall, in developing the models and methodologies and providing them for notice and comment under this subparagraph, publish a process to test the models and methodologies for their potential to magnify systemic and institutional risks instead of facilitating increased resiliency;

“(viii) shall design and publish a process to test and document the sensitivity and uncertainty associated with the model system’s data quality, specifications, and assumptions; and

“(ix) shall communicate the range and sources of uncertainty surrounding the models and methodologies.”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) CCAR REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) PARAMETERS AND CONSEQUENCES APPLICABLE TO CCAR.—The requirements of subparagraph (B) shall apply to CCAR.

“(ii) TWO-YEAR LIMITATION.—The Board of Governors may not subject a company to CCAR more than once every two years.

“(iii) MID-CYCLE RESUBMISSION.—If a company receives a quantitative objection to, or oth-

erwise desires to amend the company’s capital plan, the company may file a new streamlined plan at any time after a capital planning exercise has been completed and before a subsequent capital planning exercise.

“(iv) LIMITATION ON QUALITATIVE CAPITAL PLANNING OBJECTIONS.—In carrying out CCAR, the Board of Governors may not object to a company’s capital plan on the basis of qualitative deficiencies in the company’s capital planning process.

“(v) COMPANY INQUIRIES.—The Board of Governors shall establish and publish procedures for responding to inquiries from companies subject to CCAR, including establishing the time frame in which such responses will be made, and make such procedures publicly available.

“(vi) CCAR DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph and subparagraph (E), the term ‘CCAR’ means the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review established by the Board of Governors.”; and

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)—

(aa) by striking “a bank holding company” and inserting “bank holding company”;

(bb) by striking “semiannual” and inserting “annual”;

(cc) by striking “All other financial companies” and inserting “All other bank holding companies”; and

(dd) by striking “and are regulated by a primary Federal financial regulatory agency”;

(II) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by striking “and to its primary financial regulatory agency”; and

(bb) by striking “primary financial regulatory agency” the second time it appears and inserting “Board of Governors”; and

(III) in subparagraph (C)—

(aa) by striking “Each Federal primary financial regulatory agency, in coordination with the Board of Governors and the Federal Insurance Office,” and inserting “The Board of Governors”; and

(bb) by striking “consistent and comparable”.

(K) in subsection (j)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “the factors described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 113 and any other” and inserting “any”;

(L) in subsection (k)(1), by striking “or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors”; and

(M) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) EXEMPTION FOR QUALIFYING BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.—This section shall not apply to a proposed acquisition by a qualifying banking organization, as defined under section 605 of the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.”.

(c) TREATMENT OF OTHER RESOLUTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an appropriate Federal banking agency that requires a banking organization to submit to the agency a resolution plan not described under section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act—

(A) the agency shall comply with the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4) of such section 165(d);

(B) the agency may not require the submission of such a resolution plan more often than every 2 years; and

(C) paragraphs (6) and (7) of such section 165(d) shall apply to such a resolution plan.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “appropriate Federal banking agency” and “banking organization” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 105.

(d) ACTIONS TO CREATE A BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—Section 3(b)(1) of the Bank Holding

Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Upon receiving” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving”;

(2) by striking “Notwithstanding any other provision” and inserting the following:

“(B) IMMEDIATE ACTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Board may not take any action pursuant to clause (i) on an application that would cause any company to become a bank holding company unless such application involves the company acquiring a bank that is critically undercapitalized (as such term is defined under section 38(b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act).”.

(e) CONCENTRATION LIMITS APPLIED ONLY TO BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 14 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1852) is amended—

(1) by striking “financial company” each place such term appears and inserting “banking organization”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

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

“(2) the term ‘banking organization’ means—

“(A) an insured depository institution;

“(B) a bank holding company;

“(C) a savings and loan holding company;

“(D) a company that controls an insured depository institution; and

“(E) a foreign bank or company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of this Act; and”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “financial companies” and inserting “banking organizations”.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3502(5) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Office of Financial Research.”.

(g) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents under section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle B of title I and 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 161, 162, 164, 166, 167, 168, 170, 172, 174, and 175.

## SEC. 152. OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not establish an operational risk capital requirement for banking organizations, unless such requirement—

(1) is based on the risks posed by a banking organization’s current activities and businesses;

(2) is appropriately sensitive to the risks posed by such current activities and businesses;

(3) is determined under a forward-looking assessment of potential losses that may arise out of a banking organization’s current activities and businesses, which is not solely based on a banking organization’s historical losses; and

(4) permits adjustments based on qualifying operational risk mitigants.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms “appropriate Federal banking agency” and “banking organization” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 605.

## TITLE II—DEMANDING ACCOUNTABILITY FROM WALL STREET

### Subtitle A—SEC Penalties Modernization

## SEC. 211. ENHANCEMENT OF CIVIL PENALTIES FOR SECURITIES LAWS VIOLATIONS.

(a) UPDATED CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.—

(1) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 8A(g)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h-1(g)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “\$7,500” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$375,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) THIRD TIER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall not exceed the amount specified in clause (ii) if—

“(I) the act or omission described in paragraph (1) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(II) such act or omission directly or indirectly resulted in—

“(aa) substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons; or

“(bb) substantial pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is the greatest of—

“(I) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(II) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission; or

“(III) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the act or omission.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 20(d)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77t(d)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) THIRD TIER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the amount of penalty for each such violation shall not exceed the amount specified in clause (ii) if—

“(I) the violation described in paragraph (1) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(II) such violation directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is the greatest of—

“(I) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(II) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to such defendant as a result of the violation; or

“(III) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the violation.”.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 21(d)(3)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u(d)(3)(B)) is amended—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(iii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(iii) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) THIRD TIER.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding clauses (i) and (ii), the amount of penalty for each such violation shall not exceed the amount specified in subclause (II) if—

“(aa) the violation described in subparagraph (A) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(bb) such violation directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons.

“(II) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in subclause (I) is the greatest of—

“(aa) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(bb) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to such defendant as a result of the violation; or

“(cc) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the violation.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 21B(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-2(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(iii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) THIRD TIER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall not exceed the amount specified in subparagraph (B) if—

“(i) the act or omission described in subsection (a) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(ii) such act or omission directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons or resulted in substantial pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission.

“(B) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is the greatest of—

“(i) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(ii) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission; or

“(iii) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the act or omission.”.

(3) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 9(d)(2) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-9(d)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) THIRD TIER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall not exceed the amount specified in clause (ii) if—

“(I) the act or omission described in paragraph (1) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(II) such act or omission directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons or resulted in substantial pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is the greatest of—

“(I) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(II) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission; or

“(III) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the act or omission.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 42(e)(2) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-41(e)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) THIRD TIER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the amount of penalty for each such violation shall not exceed the amount specified in clause (ii) if—

“(I) the violation described in paragraph (1) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(II) such violation directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is the greatest of—

“(I) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(II) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to such defendant as a result of the violation; or

“(III) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the violation.”.

(4) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 203(i)(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(i)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) THIRD TIER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall not exceed the amount specified in clause (ii) if—

“(I) the act or omission described in paragraph (1) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(II) such act or omission directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons or resulted in substantial pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is the greatest of—

“(I) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(II) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to the person who committed the act or omission; or

“(III) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the act or omission.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 209(e)(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-9(e)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) THIRD TIER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the amount of penalty for each such violation shall not exceed the amount specified in clause (ii) if—

“(I) the violation described in paragraph (1) involved fraud, deceit, manipulation, or deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement; and

“(II) such violation directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is the greatest of—

“(I) \$300,000 for a natural person or \$1,450,000 for any other person;

“(II) 3 times the gross amount of pecuniary gain to such defendant as a result of the violation; or

“(III) the amount of losses incurred by victims as a result of the violation.”.

(b) PENALTIES FOR RECIDIVISTS.—

(1) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 8A(g)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h-1(g)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), the maximum amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such subparagraphs if, within the 5-year period preceding such act or omission, the person who committed the act or omission was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that person.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 20(d)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77t(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), the maximum amount of penalty for each such violation shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such subparagraphs if, within the 5-year period preceding such violation, the defendant was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that defendant.”.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 21(d)(3)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u(d)(3)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), the maximum amount of penalty for each such violation shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such clauses if, within the 5-year period preceding such violation, the defendant was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that defendant.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 21B(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-2(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), the maximum amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such paragraphs if, within the 5-year period preceding such act or omission, the person who committed the act or omission was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that person.”.

(3) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 9(d)(2) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-9(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), the maximum amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such subparagraphs if, within the 5-year period preceding such act or omission, the person who committed the act or omission was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that person.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 42(e)(2) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-41(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), the maximum amount of penalty for each such violation shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such subparagraphs if, within the 5-year period preceding such violation, the defendant was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that defendant.”.

(4) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—

(A) MONEY PENALTIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—Section 203(i)(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(i)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), the maximum amount of penalty for each such act or omission shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such subparagraphs if, within the 5-year period preceding such act or omission, the person

who committed the act or omission was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that person.”.

(B) MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 209(e)(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-9(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FOURTH TIER.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), the maximum amount of penalty for each such violation shall be 3 times the otherwise applicable amount in such subparagraphs if, within the 5-year period preceding such violation, the defendant was criminally convicted for securities fraud or became subject to a judgment or order imposing monetary, equitable, or administrative relief in any Commission action alleging fraud by that defendant.”.

(c) VIOLATIONS OF INJUNCTIONS AND BARS.—

(1) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—Section 20(d) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77t(d)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting after “the rules or regulations thereunder,” the following: “a Federal court injunction or a bar obtained or entered by the Commission under this title,”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO A VIOLATION OF AN INJUNCTION OR CERTAIN ORDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each separate violation of an injunction or order described in subparagraph (B) shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through a continuing failure to comply with such injunction or order, each day of the failure to comply with the injunction or order shall be deemed a separate offense.

“(B) INJUNCTIONS AND ORDERS.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to any action to enforce—

“(i) a Federal court injunction obtained pursuant to this title;

“(ii) an order entered or obtained by the Commission pursuant to this title that bars, suspends, places limitations on the activities or functions of, or prohibits the activities of, a person; or

“(iii) a cease-and-desist order entered by the Commission pursuant to section 8A.”.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 21(d)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after “the rules or regulations thereunder,” the following: “a Federal court injunction or a bar obtained or entered by the Commission under this title,”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO A VIOLATION OF AN INJUNCTION OR CERTAIN ORDERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each separate violation of an injunction or order described in clause (ii) shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through a continuing failure to comply with such injunction or order, each day of the failure to comply with the injunction or order shall be deemed a separate offense.

“(ii) INJUNCTIONS AND ORDERS.—Clause (i) shall apply with respect to an action to enforce—

“(I) a Federal court injunction obtained pursuant to this title;

“(II) an order entered or obtained by the Commission pursuant to this title that bars, suspends, places limitations on the activities or functions of, or prohibits the activities of, a person; or

“(III) a cease-and-desist order entered by the Commission pursuant to section 21C.”.

(3) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—Section 42(e) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-41(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting after “the rules or regulations thereunder,” the following: “a Federal court injunction or a bar obtained or entered by the Commission under this title,”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO A VIOLATION OF AN INJUNCTION OR CERTAIN ORDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each separate violation of an injunction or order described in subparagraph (B) shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through a continuing failure to comply with such injunction or order, each day of the failure to comply with the injunction or order shall be deemed a separate offense.

“(B) INJUNCTIONS AND ORDERS.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to any action to enforce—

“(i) a Federal court injunction obtained pursuant to this title;

“(ii) an order entered or obtained by the Commission pursuant to this title that bars, suspends, places limitations on the activities or functions of, or prohibits the activities of, a person; or

“(iii) a cease-and-desist order entered by the Commission pursuant to section 9(f).”.

(4) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—Section 209(e) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-9(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting after “the rules or regulations thereunder,” the following: “a Federal court injunction or a bar obtained or entered by the Commission under this title,”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO A VIOLATION OF AN INJUNCTION OR CERTAIN ORDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each separate violation of an injunction or order described in subparagraph (B) shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through a continuing failure to comply with such injunction or order, each day of the failure to comply with the injunction or order shall be deemed a separate offense.

“(B) INJUNCTIONS AND ORDERS.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to any action to enforce—

“(i) a Federal court injunction obtained pursuant to this title;

“(ii) an order entered or obtained by the Commission pursuant to this title that bars, suspends, places limitations on the activities or functions of, or prohibits the activities of, a person; or

“(iii) a cease-and-desist order entered by the Commission pursuant to section 203(k).”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to conduct that occurs after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 212. UPDATED CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES OF PUBLIC COMPANY ACCOUNTING OVERSIGHT BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105(c)(4)(D) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7215(c)(4)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “\$100,000” and inserting “\$200,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$4,000,000”; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking “\$750,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$15,000,000” and inserting “\$22,000,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to conduct that occurs after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 213. UPDATED CIVIL MONEY PENALTY FOR CONTROLLING PERSONS IN CONNECTION WITH INSIDER TRADING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 21A(a)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-1(a)(3)) is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$2,500,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to conduct that occurs after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 214. UPDATE OF CERTAIN OTHER PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ff) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$7,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$4,000,000”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$50,000”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$100,000” and inserting “\$250,000”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$50,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to conduct that occurs after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 215. MONETARY SANCTIONS TO BE USED FOR THE RELIEF OF VICTIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 308(a) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7246(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) MONETARY SANCTIONS TO BE USED FOR THE RELIEF OF VICTIMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If, in any judicial or administrative action brought by the Commission under the securities laws, the Commission obtains a monetary sanction (as defined in section 21F(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) against any person for a violation of such laws, or such person agrees, in settlement of any such action, to such monetary sanction, the amount of such monetary sanction shall, on the motion or at the direction of the Commission, be added to and become part of a disgorgement fund or other fund established for the benefit of the victims of such violation.

“(2) DEFINITION OF VICTIM.—In this subsection, the term ‘victim’ has the meaning given the term ‘crime victim’ in section 3771(e) of title 18, United States Code.”.

(b) MONETARY SANCTION DEFINED.—Section 21F(a)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-6(a)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “ordered” and inserting “required”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply with respect to any monetary sanction ordered or required to be paid before or after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 216. GAO REPORT ON USE OF CIVIL MONEY PENALTY AUTHORITY BY COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on the use by the Commission of the authority to impose or obtain civil money penalties for violations of the securities laws during the period beginning on June 1, 2010, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MATTERS REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED.—The matters covered by the report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The types of violations for which civil money penalties were imposed or obtained.

(2) The types of persons on whom civil money penalties were imposed or from whom such penalties were obtained.

(3) The number and dollar amount of civil money penalties imposed or obtained, disaggregated as follows:

(A) Penalties imposed in administrative actions and penalties obtained in judicial actions.

(B) Penalties imposed on or obtained from issuers (individual and aggregate filers) and penalties imposed on or obtained from other persons.

(C) Penalties permitted to be retained for use by the Commission and penalties deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

(4) For penalties imposed on or obtained from issuers:

(A) Whether the violations involved resulted in direct economic benefit to the issuers.

(B) The impact of the penalties on the shareholders of the issuers.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “Commission”, “issuer”, and “securities laws” have the meanings given such terms in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

#### Subtitle B—FIRREA Penalties Modernization

#### SEC. 221. INCREASE OF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES ORIGINALLY ESTABLISHED IN THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REFORM, RECOVERY, AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1989.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO FIRREA.—Section 951(b) of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1833a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$1,000,000 per day or \$5,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000 per day or \$7,500,000”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE HOME OWNERS’ LOAN ACT.—The Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5(v)(6), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(2) in section 10—

(A) in subsection (r)(3), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(B) in subsection (i)(1)(B), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 7—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(B) in subsection (j)(16)(D), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(2) in section 10—

(A) in subsection (i)(2)(D), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(B) in subsection (j), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(3) in section 19(b), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.—The Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 202(a)(3), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(2) in section 205(d)(3), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(3) in section 206—

(A) in subsection (k)(2)(D), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(B) in subsection (l)(2)(D), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and



(B) in subsection (l), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO THE REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Title LXII of the Revised Statutes of the United States is amended—

(1) in section 5213(c), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(2) in section 5239(b)(4), by striking “\$1,000,000” each place such term appears and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(f) AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—The Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the 6th undesignated paragraph of section 9, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”;

(2) in section 19(l)(4), by striking “\$1,000,000” each place such term appears and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(3) in section 29(d), by striking “\$1,000,000” each place such term appears and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(g) AMENDMENTS TO THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1970.—Section 106(b)(2)(F)(iv) of the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1978(b)(2)(F)(iv)) is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” each place such term appears and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(h) AMENDMENTS TO THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956.—Section 8 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1847) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(i) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 215(a) of chapter 11, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”;

(2) in chapter 31—

(A) in section 656, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(B) in section 657, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”;

(3) in chapter 47—

(A) in section 1005, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”;

(B) in section 1006, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”;

(C) in section 1007, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(D) in section 1014, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(4) in chapter 63—

(A) in section 1341, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”;

(B) in section 1343, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(C) in section 1344, by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

### **TITLE III—DEMANDING ACCOUNTABILITY FROM FINANCIAL REGULATORS AND DEVOLVING POWER AWAY FROM WASHINGTON**

#### **Subtitle A—Cost-Benefit Analyses**

##### **SEC. 311. DEFINITIONS.**

As used in this subtitle—

(1) the term “agency” means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(2) the term “chief economist” means—

(A) with respect to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Director of the Division of Research and Statistics, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority;

(B) with respect to the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency, the Head of the Office of Economic Analysis, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority;

(C) with respect to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Chief Economist, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority;

(D) with respect to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Director of the Division of Insurance and Research, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority;

(E) with respect to the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Chief Economist, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority;

(F) with respect to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Director for Policy Analysis, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority;

(G) with respect to the National Credit Union Administration, the Chief Economist, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority; and

(H) with respect to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Director of the Division of Economic and Risk Analysis, or an employee of the agency with comparable authority;

(3) the term “Council” means the Chief Economists Council established under section 318; and

(4) the term “regulation”—

(A) means an agency statement of general applicability and future effect that is designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or to describe the procedure or practice requirements of an agency, including rules, orders of general applicability, interpretive releases, and other statements of general applicability that the agency intends to have the force and effect of law; and

(B) does not include—

(i) a regulation issued in accordance with the formal rulemaking provisions of section 556 or 557 of title 5, United States Code;

(ii) a regulation that is limited to agency organization, management, or personnel matters;

(iii) a regulation promulgated pursuant to statutory authority that expressly prohibits compliance with this provision;

(iv) a regulation that is certified by the agency to be an emergency action, if such certification is published in the Federal Register;

(v) a regulation that is promulgated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee under section 10A, 10B, 13, 13A, or 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, or any of subsections (a) through (f) of section 14 of that Act;

(vi) a regulation filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, or any national securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3(a)) for which the board or association has itself conducted the cost-benefit analysis and otherwise complied with the requirements of section 312; or

(vii) a regulation filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission by a national securities association registered under section 15A(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3(k)).

##### **SEC. 312. REQUIRED REGULATORY ANALYSIS.**

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICES OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING.—An agency may not issue a notice of proposed rulemaking unless the agency includes in the notice of proposed rulemaking an analysis that contains, at a minimum, with respect to each regulation that is being proposed—

(1) an identification of the need for the regulation and the regulatory objective, including identification of the nature and significance of

the market failure, regulatory failure, or other problem that necessitates the regulation;

(2) an explanation of why the private market or State, local, or tribal authorities cannot adequately address the identified market failure or other problem;

(3) an analysis of the adverse impacts to regulated entities, other market participants, economic activity, or agency effectiveness that are engendered by the regulation and the magnitude of such adverse impacts;

(4) a quantitative and qualitative assessment of all anticipated direct and indirect costs and benefits of the regulation (as compared to a benchmark that assumes the absence of the regulation), including—

(A) compliance costs;

(B) effects on economic activity, net job creation (excluding jobs related to ensuring compliance with the regulation), efficiency, competition, and capital formation;

(C) regulatory administrative costs; and

(D) costs imposed by the regulation on State, local, or tribal governments or other regulatory authorities;

(5) if quantified benefits do not outweigh quantitative costs, a justification for the regulation;

(6) an identification and assessment of all available alternatives to the regulation, including modification of an existing regulation or statute, together with—

(A) an explanation of why the regulation meets the objectives of the regulation more effectively than the alternatives, and if the agency is proposing multiple alternatives, an explanation of why a notice of proposed rulemaking, rather than an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking, is appropriate; and

(B) if the regulation is not a pilot program, an explanation of why a pilot program is not appropriate;

(7) if the regulation specifies the behavior or manner of compliance, an explanation of why the agency did not instead specify performance objectives;

(8) an assessment of how the burden imposed by the regulation will be distributed among market participants, including whether consumers, investors, small businesses, or independent financial firms and advisors will be disproportionately burdened;

(9) an assessment of the extent to which the regulation is inconsistent, incompatible, or duplicative with the existing regulations of the agency or those of other domestic and international regulatory authorities with overlapping jurisdiction;

(10) a description of any studies, surveys, or other data relied upon in preparing the analysis;

(11) an assessment of the degree to which the key assumptions underlying the analysis are subject to uncertainty; and

(12) an explanation of predicted changes in market structure and infrastructure and in behavior by market participants, including consumers and investors, assuming that they will pursue their economic interests.

##### **(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICES OF FINAL RULEMAKING.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an agency may not issue a notice of final rulemaking with respect to a regulation unless the agency—

(A) has issued a notice of proposed rulemaking for the relevant regulation;

(B) has conducted and includes in the notice of final rulemaking an analysis that contains, at a minimum, the elements required under subsection (a); and

(C) includes in the notice of final rulemaking regulatory impact metrics selected by the chief economist to be used in preparing the report required pursuant to section 315.



(2) **CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS.**—The agency shall incorporate in the elements described in paragraph (1)(B) the data and analyses provided to the agency by commenters during the comment period, or explain why the data or analyses are not being incorporated.

(3) **COMMENT PERIOD.**—An agency shall not publish a notice of final rulemaking with respect to a regulation, unless the agency—

(A) has allowed at least 90 days from the date of publication in the Federal Register of the notice of proposed rulemaking for the submission of public comments; or

(B) includes in the notice of final rulemaking an explanation of why the agency was not able to provide a 90-day comment period.

(4) **PROHIBITED RULES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An agency may not publish a notice of final rulemaking if the agency, in its analysis under paragraph (1)(B), determines that the quantified costs are greater than the quantified benefits under subsection (a)(5).

(B) **PUBLICATION OF ANALYSIS.**—If the agency is precluded by subparagraph (A) from publishing a notice of final rulemaking, the agency shall publish in the Federal Register and on the public website of the agency its analysis under paragraph (1)(B), and provide the analysis to each House of Congress.

(C) **CONGRESSIONAL WAIVER.**—If the agency is precluded by subparagraph (A) from publishing a notice of final rulemaking, Congress, by joint resolution pursuant to the procedures set forth for joint resolutions in section 802 of title 5, United States Code, may direct the agency to publish a notice of final rulemaking notwithstanding the prohibition contained in subparagraph (A). In applying section 802 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of this paragraph, section 802(e)(2) shall not apply and the terms—

(i) “joint resolution” or “joint resolution described in subsection (a)” means only a joint resolution introduced during the period beginning on the submission or publication date and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress directs, notwithstanding the prohibition contained in section 312(b)(4)(A) of the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017, the \_\_\_\_ to publish the notice of final rulemaking for the regulation or regulations that were the subject of the analysis submitted by the \_\_\_\_ to Congress on \_\_\_\_.” (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in.); and

(ii) “submission or publication date” means—

(I) the date on which the analysis under paragraph (1)(B) is submitted to Congress under paragraph (4)(B); or

(II) if the analysis is submitted to Congress less than 60 session days or 60 legislative days before the date on which the Congress adjourns a session of Congress, the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session.

#### SEC. 313. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Provided that an agency has first issued an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking in connection with a regulation, the agency is not required to comply with section 3506(c)(2) of title 44, United States Code, with respect to any information collection request—

(1) that identifies the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking in such request;

(2) that informs the person from whom the information is obtained or solicited that the provision of such information is voluntary;

(3) that is necessary to comply with section 312; and

(4) with respect to which the information collected will not be used for purposes other than compliance with this title.

#### SEC. 314. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND REGULATORY ANALYSIS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—At or before the commencement of the public comment period with respect to a regulation, the agency shall make available on its public website sufficient information about the data, methodologies, and assumptions underlying the analyses performed pursuant to section 312 so that the analytical results of the agency are capable of being substantially reproduced, subject to an acceptable degree of imprecision or error.

(b) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—The agency shall comply with subsection (a) in a manner that preserves the nonpublic nature of confidential information, including confidential trade secrets, confidential commercial or financial information, and confidential information about positions, transactions, or business practices.

#### SEC. 315. FIVE-YEAR REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a notice of final rulemaking, the chief economist of the agency shall issue a report that examines the economic impact of the subject regulation, including the direct and indirect costs and benefits of the regulation.

(b) **REGULATORY IMPACT METRICS.**—In preparing the report required by subsection (a), the chief economist shall employ the regulatory impact metrics included in the notice of final rulemaking pursuant to section 312(b)(1)(C).

(c) **REPRODUCIBILITY.**—The report shall include the data, methodologies, and assumptions underlying the evaluation so that the agency's analytical results are capable of being substantially reproduced, subject to an acceptable degree of imprecision or error.

(d) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—The agency shall comply with subsection (c) in a manner that preserves the nonpublic nature of confidential information, including confidential trade secrets, confidential commercial or financial information, and confidential information about positions, transactions, or business practices.

(e) **REPORT.**—The agency shall submit the report required by subsection (a) to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and post it on the public website of the agency. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall only submit its report to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

#### SEC. 316. RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW OF EXISTING RULES.

(a) **REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and every 5 years thereafter, each agency shall develop, submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and post on the public website of the agency a plan, consistent with law and its resources and regulatory priorities, under which the agency will modify, streamline, expand, or repeal existing regulations so as to make the regulatory program of the agency more effective or less burdensome in achieving the regulatory objectives. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall only submit its plan to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORT.**—Two years after the date of submission of each plan required under subsection (a), each agency shall develop, submit to the Committee on Banking,

Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and post on the public website of the agency a report of the steps that it has taken to implement the plan, steps that remain to be taken to implement the plan, and, if any parts of the plan will not be implemented, reasons for not implementing those parts of the plan. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall only submit its plan to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

#### SEC. 317. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period beginning on the date on which a notice of final rulemaking for a regulation is published in the Federal Register and ending 1 year later, a person that is adversely affected or aggrieved by the regulation is entitled to bring an action in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for judicial review of agency compliance with the requirements of section 312.

(b) **STAY.**—The court may stay the effective date of the regulation or any provision thereof.

(c) **RELIEF.**—If the court finds that an agency has not complied with the requirements of section 312, the court shall vacate the subject regulation, unless the agency shows by clear and convincing evidence that vacating the regulation would result in irreparable harm. Nothing in this section affects other limitations on judicial review or the power or duty of the court to dismiss any action or deny relief on any other appropriate legal or equitable ground.

#### SEC. 318. CHIEF ECONOMISTS COUNCIL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the Chief Economists Council.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Council shall consist of the chief economist of each agency. The members of the Council shall select the first chairperson of the Council. Thereafter the position of Chairperson shall rotate annually among the members of the Council.

(c) **MEETINGS.**—The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairperson, but not less frequently than quarterly.

(d) **REPORT.**—One year after the effective date of this Act and annually thereafter, the Council shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available on the Council's website, a report on—

(1) the benefits and costs of regulations adopted by the agencies during the past 12 months;

(2) the regulatory actions planned by the agencies for the upcoming 12 months;

(3) the cumulative effect of the existing regulations of the agencies on economic activity, innovation, international competitiveness of entities regulated by the agencies, and net job creation (excluding jobs related to ensuring compliance with the regulation);

(4) the training and qualifications of the persons who prepared the cost-benefit analyses of each agency during the past 12 months;

(5) the sufficiency of the resources available to the chief economists during the past 12 months for the conduct of the activities required by this subtitle; and

(6) recommendations for legislative or regulatory action to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of financial regulation in the United States.

#### SEC. 319. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 15(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 19(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “(2)” and all that follows through “light of—” and inserting the following:

“(1) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—Before promulgating a regulation under this chapter or issuing an order (except as provided in paragraph (2)), the Commission shall take into consideration—”;

(3) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated—  
(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “futures” and inserting “the relevant”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by adding “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(4) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

#### SEC. 320. OTHER REGULATORY ENTITIES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall provide to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available on the Commission’s website a report setting forth a plan for subjecting the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, and any national securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-4(a)), other than subsection (k) of such section 15A, to the requirements of this subtitle, other than direct representation on the Council.

#### SEC. 321. AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATIVE OR UNNECESSARY ANALYSES.

An agency may perform the analyses required by this subtitle in conjunction with, or as a part of, any other agenda or analysis required by any other provision of law, if such other analysis satisfies the provisions of this subtitle.

#### Subtitle B—Congressional Review of Federal Financial Agency Rulemaking

#### SEC. 331. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, an agency shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

- (i) a copy of the rule;
- (ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;
- (iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 334(2);
- (iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and
- (v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the agency shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

- (i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;
- (ii) the agency’s actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of title 5, United States Code;
- (iii) the agency’s actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 and subtitle G; and
- (iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency’s compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

(B) Agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General’s report under subparagraph (A).

(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 332 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 332, whichever is later.

(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 333 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this subtitle in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 332.

(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

- (A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;
- (B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;
- (C) necessary for national security; or
- (D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 332.

(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this subtitle, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

- (A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or
  - (B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,
- before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on

which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 332 and 333 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

(2)(A) In applying sections 332 and 333 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day, after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

#### SEC. 332. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR MAJOR RULES.

(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 331(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

- (A) bears no preamble;
- (B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): “Approving the rule submitted by \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_.”;
- (C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): “That Congress approves the rule submitted by \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_.”; and
- (D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 331(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to

postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 331(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

(h) This section and section 333 are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be

followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

#### **SEC. 333. CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR NONMAJOR RULES.**

(a) For purposes of this section, the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 331(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_, and such rule shall have no force or effect.” (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

(2) if the report under section 331(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 331(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

#### **SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.**

For purposes of this subtitle:

(1) The term “agency” has the meaning given such term under section 311.

(2) The term “major rule” means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(A) an annual cost on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

(3) The term “nonmajor rule” means any rule that is not a major rule.

(4) The term “rule” has the meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, except that such term does not include—

(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

(5) The term “submission date or publication date”, except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, means—

(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 331(a)(1)(A); and

(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 331(a)(1)(A); and

(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

#### **SEC. 335. JUDICIAL REVIEW.**

(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this subtitle shall be subject to judicial review.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal financial agency has completed the necessary requirements under this subtitle for a rule to take effect.

(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 332 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

#### SEC. 336. EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN RULES.

Notwithstanding section 331—

(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping, or

(2) any rule other than a major rule which the Federal financial agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the Federal financial agency promulgating the rule determines.

#### SEC. 337. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 332 OF THE FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 332 OF THE FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 332 of the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017 affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.”.

#### SEC. 338. NONAPPLICABILITY TO MONETARY POLICY.

Nothing in this subtitle shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

#### Subtitle C—Judicial Review of Agency Actions

##### SEC. 341. SCOPE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any judicial review of an agency action pursuant to chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent necessary to decision and when presented, the reviewing court shall determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an agency action and decide de novo all relevant questions of law, including the interpretation of constitutional and statutory provisions, and rules made by an agency. If the reviewing court determines that a statutory or regulatory provision relevant to its decision contains a gap or ambiguity, the court shall not interpret that gap or ambiguity as an implicit delegation to the agency of legislative rule making authority and shall not rely on such gap or ambiguity as a justification either for interpreting agency authority expansively or for deferring to the agency's interpretation on the question of law. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this section shall apply in any action for judicial review of agency action authorized under any provision of law. No law may exempt any such civil action from the application of this section except by specific reference to this section.

(b) AGENCY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “agency” has the meaning given such term under section 311.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect after the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### Subtitle D—Leadership of Financial Regulators

##### SEC. 351. FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION.

Section 2 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1812) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “5 members” and all that follows through “3 of whom” and inserting the following: “5 members, who”;

(2) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) VACANCY.—Any vacancy on the Board of Directors shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.”; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

##### SEC. 352. FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY.

Section 1312(b)(2) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4512) is amended by striking “for cause”.

#### Subtitle E—Congressional Oversight of Appropriations

##### SEC. 361. BRINGING THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) The” and inserting the following:

“(a) POWERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The”;

(2) by inserting “, subject to paragraph (2),” after “The Board of Directors of the Corporation”; and

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

“(2) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) OPERATING FUND.—There is established an Operating Fund, to which Congress shall provide annual appropriations to the Corporation, which shall be separate from the Deposit Insurance Fund.

“(B) RECOVERY OF COSTS OF ANNUAL APPROPRIATION.—The Corporation shall collect assessments and other fees, as provided under this Act, that are designed to recover the costs to the Government of the annual appropriation to the Corporation by Congress. Subject to subparagraph (E), the Corporation may only incur obligations, or allow and pay expenses, from the Operating Fund pursuant to an appropriations Act.

“(C) DEPOSITS.—Assessments and other fees described under subparagraph (B) for any fiscal year—

“(i) shall be deposited in the Operating Fund; and

“(ii) except as provided in subparagraph (E), shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

“(D) CREDITS.—Amounts deposited in the Operating Fund during a fiscal year shall be credited as offsetting the amount appropriated to the Operating Fund for such fiscal year.

“(E) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—This paragraph shall not apply to the Corporation's Insurance Business Line Programs and Receivership Management Business Line Programs, as in existence on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 7 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) DEPOSIT INSURANCE FUND EXEMPT FROM APPORTIONMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts received pursuant to any assessments or other fees that are deposited into the Deposit Insurance Fund shall not be

subject to apportionment for the purposes of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code, or under any other authority.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to expenses paid and fees collected on or after October 1, 2017.

##### SEC. 362. BRINGING THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1316 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4516) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) RECOVERY OF COSTS OF ANNUAL APPROPRIATION.—The Agency shall collect assessments and other fees that are designed to recover the costs to the Government of the annual appropriation to the Agency by Congress.

“(2) OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—Assessments and other fees described under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year—

“(A) shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations to the Agency; and

“(B) shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (f).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to expenses paid and assessments and other fees collected on or after October 1, 2017.

##### SEC. 363. BRINGING THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1755) is amended—

(1) by amending subsections (a) and (b) to read as follows:

“(a) PAYMENT BY FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS TO ADMINISTRATION.—Each insured credit union shall pay to the Administration an annual fee.

“(b) DETERMINATIONS OF ASSESSMENT PERIODS AND PAYMENT DATES.—The Board shall determine the periods for which the fee referred to under subsection (a) shall be assessed and the date for the payment of such fee or increments thereof.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “operating”;

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) RECOVERY OF COSTS OF ANNUAL APPROPRIATION.—The Administration shall collect fees other than those fees referred to under subsection (a) from each insured credit union, as provided under this Act, in an amount stated as a percentage of insured shares of each insured credit union (which percentage shall be the same for all insured credit unions). Such fees shall be designed to recover the costs to the Government of the annual appropriation to the Administration by Congress.

“(2) OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—Fees described under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year—

“(A) shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations to the Administration; and

“(B) shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR INSURANCE FUNCTIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund, including assessments and other fees that are deposited into, and amounts paid from, the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund.”; and

(4) by striking subsection (e).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 120(j), by striking paragraph (3);  
(2) by amending section 128 to read as follows:

**“SEC. 128. NATIONAL CREDIT UNION SHARE INSURANCE FUND EXEMPT FROM APPORTIONMENT.**

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts received pursuant to any assessments or other fees that are deposited into the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund or the Temporary Corporate Credit Union Stabilization Fund shall not be subject to apportionment for the purposes of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code, or under any other authority.”; and

(3) in section 203(a), by striking “and for such administrative and other expenses incurred in carrying out the purposes of this title”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to expenses paid and fees collected on or after October 1, 2017.

**SEC. 364. BRINGING THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5240A of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 16) is amended—

(1) by striking “Sec. 5240A. The Comptroller of the Currency may collect an assessment, fee, or other charge from any entity described in section 3(q)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(q)(1)), as the Comptroller determines is necessary or appropriate to carry out the responsibilities of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. In establishing the amount of an assessment, fee, or charge collected from an entity under this section,” and inserting the following:

**“SEC. 5240A. COLLECTION OF FEES; APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In establishing the amount of an assessment, fee, or charge collected from an entity under subsection (b),”;

(2) by striking “Funds derived” and all that follows through the end of the section; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT.**—

“(1) **RECOVERY OF COSTS OF ANNUAL APPROPRIATION.**—The Comptroller of the Currency shall impose and collect assessments, fees, or other charges that are designed to recover the costs to the Government of the annual appropriation to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency by Congress.

“(2) **OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.**—Assessments and other fees described under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year—

“(A) shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; and

“(B) shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5240 (12 U.S.C. 481 et seq.) of the Revised Statutes of the United States is amended by striking the fourth undesignated paragraph.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to expenses paid and fees collected on or after October 1, 2017.

**SEC. 365. BRINGING THE NON-MONETARY POLICY RELATED FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting after section 11B the following:

**“SEC. 11C. APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT FOR NON-MONETARY POLICY RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**

“(a) **APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT.**—

“(1) **RECOVERY OF COSTS OF ANNUAL APPROPRIATION.**—The Board of Governors of the Fed-

eral Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks shall collect assessments and other fees, as provided under this Act, that are designed to recover the costs to the Government of the annual appropriation to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System by Congress. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks may only incur obligations or allow and pay expenses with respect to non-monetary policy related administrative costs pursuant to an appropriations Act.

“(2) **OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.**—Assessments and other fees described under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year—

“(A) shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

“(B) shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

“(3) **LIMITATION.**—This subsection shall only apply to the non-monetary policy related administrative costs of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

“(1) **MONETARY POLICY.**—The term ‘monetary policy’ means a strategy for producing a generally acceptable exchange medium that supports the productive employment of economic resources by reliably serving as both a unit of account and store of value.

“(2) **NON-MONETARY POLICY RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The term ‘non-monetary policy related administrative costs’ means administrative costs not related to the conduct of monetary policy, and includes—

“(A) direct operating expenses for supervising and regulating entities supervised and regulated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, including conducting examinations, conducting stress tests, communicating with the entities regarding supervisory matters and laws, and regulations;

“(B) operating expenses for activities integral to carrying out supervisory and regulatory responsibilities, such as training staff in the supervisory function, research and analysis functions including library subscription services, and collecting and processing regulatory reports filed by supervised institutions; and

“(C) support, overhead, and pension expenses related to the items described under subparagraphs (A) and (B).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to expenses paid and fees collected on or after October 1, 2017.

**Subtitle F—International Processes**

**SEC. 371. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES.**

(a) **BOARD OF GOVERNORS REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248), as amended by section 1007(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(u) **INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES.**—

“(1) **NOTICE OF PROCESS; CONSULTATION.**—At least 30 calendar days before any member or employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Board of Governors shall—

“(A) issue a notice of the process, including the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process, to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Board of Governors; and

“(C) solicit public comment, and consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A), with respect to the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process.

“(2) **PUBLIC REPORTS ON PROCESS.**—After the end of any process described under paragraph (1), the Board of Governors shall issue a public report on the topics that were discussed during the process and any new or revised rulemakings or policy changes that the Board of Governors believes should be implemented as a result of the process and make the report available on the website of the Board of Governors.

“(3) **NOTICE OF AGREEMENTS; CONSULTATION.**—At least 90 calendar days before any member or employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Board of Governors shall—

“(A) issue a notice of agreement to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Board of Governors; and

“(C) consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A) with respect to the nature of the agreement and any anticipated effects such agreement will have on the economy.

“(4) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘process’ shall include any official proceeding or meeting on financial regulation of a recognized international organization with authority to set financial standards on a global or regional level, including the Financial Stability Board, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (or a similar organization), and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (or a similar organization).”.

(b) **FDIC REQUIREMENTS.**—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“SEC. 51. INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES.**

“(a) **NOTICE OF PROCESS; CONSULTATION.**—At least 30 calendar days before the Board of Directors participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Board of Directors shall—

“(1) issue a notice of the process, including the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process, to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(2) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Corporation; and

“(3) solicit public comment, and consult with the committees described under paragraph (1), with respect to the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process.

“(b) **PUBLIC REPORTS ON PROCESS.**—After the end of any process described under subsection (a), the Board of Directors shall issue a public report on the topics that were discussed at the process and any new or revised rulemakings or policy changes that the Board of Directors believes should be implemented as a result of the process and make the report available on the website of the Corporation.

“(c) **NOTICE OF AGREEMENTS; CONSULTATION.**—At least 90 calendar days before the Board of Directors participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Board of Directors shall—

“(1) issue a notice of agreement to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(2) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Corporation; and

“(3) consult with the committees described under paragraph (1) with respect to the nature of the agreement and any anticipated effects such agreement will have on the economy.”

“(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘process’ shall include any official proceeding or meeting on financial regulation of a recognized international organization with authority to set financial standards on a global or regional level, including the Financial Stability Board, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (or a similar organization), and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (or a similar organization).”

(c) TREASURY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 325 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES.—

“(1) NOTICE OF PROCESS; CONSULTATION.—At least 30 calendar days before the Secretary participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Secretary shall—

“(A) issue a notice of the process, including the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process, to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Department of the Treasury; and

“(C) solicit public comment, and consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A), with respect to the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process.

“(2) PUBLIC REPORTS ON PROCESS.—After the end of any process described under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall issue a public report on the topics that were discussed at the process and any new or revised rulemakings or policy changes that the Secretary believes should be implemented as a result of the process and make the report available on the website of the Department of the Treasury.

“(3) NOTICE OF AGREEMENTS; CONSULTATION.—At least 90 calendar days before the Secretary participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Secretary shall—

“(A) issue a notice of agreement to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Department of the Treasury; and

“(C) consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A) with respect to the nature of the agreement and any anticipated effects such agreement will have on the economy.

“(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘process’ shall include any official proceeding or meeting on financial regulation of a recognized international organization with authority to set financial standards on a global or regional level, including the Financial Stability Board, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (or a similar organization), and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (or a similar organization).”

(d) OCC REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter one of title LXII of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 21 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new section:

**“SEC. 5156B. INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES.**

“(a) NOTICE OF PROCESS; CONSULTATION.—At least 30 calendar days before the Comptroller of the Currency participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Comptroller of the Currency shall—

“(1) issue a notice of the process, including the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process,

to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(2) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; and

“(3) solicit public comment, and consult with the committees described under paragraph (1), with respect to the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process.

“(b) PUBLIC REPORTS ON PROCESS.—After the end of any process described under subsection (a), the Comptroller of the Currency shall issue a public report on the topics that were discussed at the process and any new or revised rulemakings or policy changes that the Comptroller of the Currency believes should be implemented as a result of the process.

“(c) NOTICE OF AGREEMENTS; CONSULTATION.—At least 90 calendar days before the Comptroller of the Currency participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Comptroller of the Currency shall—

“(1) issue a notice of agreement to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(2) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; and

“(3) consult with the committees described under paragraph (1) with respect to the nature of the agreement and any anticipated effects such agreement will have on the economy.

“(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘process’ shall include any official proceeding or meeting on financial regulation of a recognized international organization with authority to set financial standards on a global or regional level, including the Financial Stability Board, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (or a similar organization), and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (or a similar organization).”

(2) in the table of contents for such chapter, by adding at the end the following new item:

“5156B. International processes.”

(e) SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d), as amended by section 818(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES.—

“(1) NOTICE OF PROCESS; CONSULTATION.—At least 30 calendar days before the Commission participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Commission shall—

“(A) issue a notice of the process, including the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process, to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Commission; and

“(C) solicit public comment, and consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A), with respect to the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process.

“(2) PUBLIC REPORTS ON PROCESS.—After the end of any process described under paragraph (1), the Commission shall issue a public report on the topics that were discussed at the process and any new or revised rulemakings or policy changes that the Commission believes should be implemented as a result of the process and make the report available on the website of the Commission.

“(3) NOTICE OF AGREEMENTS; CONSULTATION.—At least 90 calendar days before the Commission participates in a process of setting financial

standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Commission shall—

“(A) issue a notice of agreement to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Commission; and

“(C) consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A) with respect to the nature of the agreement and any anticipated effects such agreement will have on the economy.

“(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘process’ shall include any official proceeding or meeting on financial regulation of a recognized international organization with authority to set financial standards on a global or regional level, including the Financial Stability Board, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (or a similar organization), and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (or a similar organization).”

(f) COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES.—

“(1) NOTICE OF PROCESS; CONSULTATION.—At least 30 calendar days before the Commission participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Commission shall—

“(A) issue a notice of the process, including the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process, to—

“(i) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Commission; and

“(C) solicit public comment, and consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A), with respect to the subject matter, scope, and goals of the process.

“(2) PUBLIC REPORTS ON PROCESS.—After the end of any process described under paragraph (1), the Commission shall issue a public report on the topics that were discussed during the process and any new or revised rulemakings or policy changes that the Commission believes should be implemented as a result of the process and make the report available on the website of the Commission.

“(3) NOTICE OF AGREEMENTS; CONSULTATION.—At least 90 calendar days before the Commission participates in a process of setting financial standards as a part of any foreign or multinational entity, the Commission shall—

“(A) issue a notice of agreement to—

“(i) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

“(B) make such notice available to the public, including on the website of the Commission; and

“(C) consult with the committees described under subparagraph (A) with respect to the nature of the agreement and any anticipated effects such agreement will have on the economy.

“(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘process’ shall include any official proceeding or meeting on financial regulation of a recognized international organization with authority to set financial standards on a global or regional level, including the Financial Stability Board, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (or a similar organization), and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (or a similar organization).”

**Subtitle G—Unfunded Mandates Reform**

**SEC. 381. DEFINITIONS.**

For purposes of this subtitle:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given such term under section 311.



(2) **DIRECT COSTS.**—The term “direct costs” has the meaning given such term under section 421(3) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658(3)), except that—

(A) in the case of a Federal intergovernmental mandate, the term means the aggregate estimated amounts that all State, local, and Tribal governments would incur or be required to spend or would be prohibited from raising in revenues in order to comply with the Federal intergovernmental mandate; and

(B) in the case of a Federal private sector mandate, the term means the aggregate estimated amounts that the private sector will be required to spend or could forgo in profits, including costs passed on to consumers or other entities taking into account, to the extent practicable, behavioral changes, in order to comply with the Federal private sector mandate.

(3) **OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—Except as provided under paragraphs (1) and (2), the definitions under section 421 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 shall apply to this subtitle.

#### **SEC. 382. APPLICATION OF THE UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) shall apply to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(b) **STATEMENTS TO ACCOMPANY SIGNIFICANT REGULATORY ACTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless otherwise expressly prohibited by law, before promulgating any general notice of proposed rulemaking or any final rule, or within six months after promulgating any final rule that was not preceded by a general notice of proposed rulemaking, if the proposed rulemaking or final rule includes a Federal mandate that may result in an annual effect on State, local, or Tribal governments, or to the private sector, in the aggregate of \$100,000,000 or more in any 1 year, the agency shall prepare a written statement containing the following:

(A) The text of the draft proposed rulemaking or final rule, together with the information required under subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 312, as applicable, including an explanation of the manner in which the proposed rulemaking or final rule is consistent with the statutory requirement and avoids undue interference with State, local, and Tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions.

(B) Estimates by the agency, if and to the extent that the agency determines that accurate estimates are reasonably feasible, of—

(i) the future compliance costs of the Federal mandate; and

(ii) any disproportionate budgetary effects of the Federal mandate upon any particular regions of the nation or particular State, local, or Tribal governments, urban or rural or other types of communities, or particular segments of the private sector.

(C)(i) A detailed description of the extent of the agency's prior consultation with the private sector and elected representatives (under subsection (c) and section 204 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1534) of the affected State, local, and tribal governments.

(ii) A detailed summary of the comments and concerns that were presented by the private sector and State, local, or Tribal governments either orally or in writing to the agency.

(iii) A detailed summary of the agency's evaluation of those comments and concerns.

(D) A detailed summary of how the agency complied with section 312, as applicable.

(2) **PREVENTION OF DUPLICATIVE REQUIREMENTS.**—If an agency is required to prepare a written statement under both paragraph (1) and section 202(a) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532(a)), the agency shall prepare only one written statement that consolidates and meets the requirements of such paragraph and such section.

(c) **STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECTOR INPUT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each agency shall, to the extent permitted in law, develop an effective process to permit impacted parties within the private sector (including small businesses) to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory proposals containing significant Federal mandates.

(2) **PREVENTION OF DUPLICATIVE PROCESSES.**—If an agency is required to develop a process under both paragraph (1) and section 204(a) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1534(a)), the agency shall develop only one process that consolidates and meets the requirements of such paragraph and such section.

(3) **GUIDELINES.**—For appropriate implementation of this subsection and of section 204 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, consistent with applicable laws and regulations, the following guidelines shall be followed:—

(A) Consultations shall take place as early as possible, before issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking, continue through the final rule stage, and be integrated explicitly into the rulemaking process.

(B) Agencies shall consult with a wide variety of State, local, and Tribal officials and impacted parties within the private sector (including small businesses). Geographic, political, and other factors that may differentiate varying points of view should be considered.

(C) Agencies should estimate benefits and costs to assist with these consultations. The scope of the consultation should reflect the cost and significance of the Federal mandate being considered.

(D) Agencies shall, to the extent practicable—

(i) seek out the views of State, local, and Tribal governments, and impacted parties within the private sector (including small businesses), on costs, benefits, and risks; and

(ii) solicit ideas about alternative methods of compliance and potential flexibilities, and input on whether the Federal regulation will harmonize with and not duplicate similar laws in other levels of government.

(E) Consultations shall address the cumulative impact of regulations on the affected entities.

(F) Agencies may accept electronic submissions of comments by relevant parties but may not use those comments as the sole method of satisfying the guidelines in this subsection.

(d) **OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall provide meaningful guidance and oversight so that each agency's regulations for which a written statement is required under subsection (b) and section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532) are consistent with the principles and requirements of this title, as well as other applicable laws, and do not conflict with the policies or actions of another Federal agency (as the term “agency” is defined under section 551 of title 5, United States Code). If the Administrator determines that an agency's regulations for which a written statement is required under subsection (b) and section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 do not comply with such principles and requirements, are not consistent with

other applicable laws, or conflict with the policies or actions of another Federal agency (as the term “agency” is defined under section 551 of title 5, United States Code), the Administrator shall identify areas of noncompliance, notify the agency, and request that the agency comply before the agency finalizes the regulation concerned.

(2) **ANNUAL STATEMENTS TO CONGRESS ON AGENCY COMPLIANCE.**—The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for inclusion in the annual report required by section 208 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1538) a written report detailing compliance by each agency with the requirements of this title that relate to regulations for which a written statement is required by subsection (b) and section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532), including activities undertaken at the request of the Administrator to improve compliance, during the preceding reporting period. The report shall also contain an appendix detailing compliance by each agency with subsection (c) and section 204 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

(e) **EXPANDED JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **AGENCY STATEMENTS ON SIGNIFICANT REGULATORY ACTIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Compliance or noncompliance by any agency with the provisions of subsection (b) and sections 202, 203(a)(1) and (2), and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 shall be subject to judicial review in accordance with this subsection.

(B) **LIMITED REVIEW OF AGENCY COMPLIANCE OR NONCOMPLIANCE.**—

(i) **SCOPE OF REVIEW UNDER TITLE 5.**—Agency compliance or noncompliance with the provisions of subsection (b) and sections 202, 203(a)(1) and (2), and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 shall be subject to judicial review under section 706(1) of title 5, United States Code, and as provided under clause (ii).

(ii) **COURT MAY COMPEL PREPARATION OF WRITTEN STATEMENT.**—If an agency fails to prepare the written statement (including the preparation of the estimates, analyses, statements, or descriptions) under subsection (b) and section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, prepare a written plan under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 203 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, or comply with section 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, a court may compel the agency to prepare such written statement, prepare such written plan, or comply with such section.

(C) **REVIEW OF AGENCY RULES.**—In any judicial review under any other Federal law of an agency rule for which compliance with this subtitle is required, the inadequacy or failure to prepare required material, or to comply with provisions of subsection (b) and sections 202, 203(a)(1) and (2), and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 may be used as a basis for staying, enjoining, invalidating or otherwise affecting such agency rule.

(D) **CERTAIN INFORMATION AS PART OF RECORD.**—Any information generated under subsection (b) and sections 202, 203(a)(1) and (2), and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 that is part of the rulemaking record for judicial review under the provisions of any other Federal law may be considered as part of the record for judicial review conducted under such other provisions of Federal law.

(E) **APPLICATION OF OTHER FEDERAL LAW.**—For any petition under subparagraph (B) the provisions of such other Federal law shall control all other matters, such as exhaustion of administrative remedies, the time for and manner of seeking review and venue, except that if such other Federal law does not provide a limitation

on the time for filing a petition for judicial review that is less than 180 days, such limitation shall be 180 days after a final rule is promulgated by the appropriate agency.

(F) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This paragraph shall apply to any agency rule for which a general notice of proposed rulemaking is promulgated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **JUDICIAL REVIEW AND RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Except as provided in paragraph (1)—

(A) any estimate, analysis, statement, description, or report prepared under this subtitle, any compliance or noncompliance with the provisions of this subtitle, and any determination concerning the applicability of the provisions of this subtitle shall not be subject to judicial review; and

(B) no provision of this subtitle shall be construed to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any person in any administrative or judicial action.

#### **Subtitle H—Enforcement Coordination**

#### **SEC. 391. POLICIES TO MINIMIZE DUPLICATION OF ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each agency (as defined under section 311) shall, not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, implement policies and procedures—

(1) to minimize duplication of efforts with other Federal or State authorities when bringing an administrative or judicial action against an individual or entity;

(2) to establish when joint investigations, administrative actions, or judicial actions or the coordination of law enforcement activities are necessary and appropriate and in the public interest; and

(3) to, in the course of a joint investigation, administrative action, or judicial action, establish a lead agency to avoid duplication of efforts and unnecessary burdens and to ensure consistent enforcement, as necessary and appropriate and in the public interest.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt State law or mandate coordination by a State authority.

#### **Subtitle I—Penalties for Unauthorized Disclosures**

#### **SEC. 392. CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES.**

Section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365), as amended by section 151(b)(6)(M), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) **CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any officer or employee of a Federal department or agency, who by virtue of such officer or employee’s employment or official position, has possession of, or access to, agency records which contain individually identifiable information submitted pursuant to the requirements of this section, the disclosure of which is prohibited by Federal statute, rule, or regulation, and who knowing that disclosure of the specific material is so prohibited, willfully discloses the material in any manner to any person or agency not entitled to receive it, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$5,000.

“(2) **OBTAINING RECORDS UNDER FALSE PRETENSES.**—Any person who knowingly and willfully requests or obtains information described under paragraph (1) from a Federal department or agency under false pretenses shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$5,000.

“(3) **TREATMENT OF DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection, a determination made under subsection (d) or (i) based on individually identifiable information submitted pursuant to the requirements of this section shall be

deemed individually identifiable information, the disclosure of which is prohibited by Federal statute.”.

#### **Subtitle J—Stop Settlement Slush Funds**

#### **SEC. 393. LIMITATION ON DONATIONS MADE PURSUANT TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS TO WHICH CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS OR AGENCIES ARE A PARTY.**

(a) **LIMITATION ON REQUIRED DONATIONS.**—No settlement to which a department or agency is a party may direct or provide for a payment to any person who is not a victim of the alleged wrongdoing.

(b) **PENALTY.**—Any Executive branch official or agent thereof who enters into or enforces a settlement in violation of subsection (a), shall be subject to the same penalties that would apply in the case of a violation of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsections (a) and (b) apply only in the case of a settlement agreement concluded on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—

(1) The term “department or agency”—

(A) has the meaning given the term “agency” under section 311; and

(B) means the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Justice, and the Rural Housing Service of the Department of Agriculture.

(2) The term “settlement agreement” means a settlement agreement resolving a civil action or potential civil action, a plea agreement, a deferred prosecution agreement, or a non-prosecution agreement.

(3) The term “payment” means a payment or loan.

(4) The term “payment to any person who is not a victim” means any payment other than a payment—

(A) to a person who is party to the lawsuit or settlement;

(B) that provides restitution for or otherwise directly remedies actual harm (including to the environment) directly and proximately caused by the party making the payment as a result of that party’s alleged wrongdoing;

(C) that constitutes payment for services rendered in connection with the case; or

(D) made pursuant to section 3663 of title 18, United States Code.

#### **TITLE IV—UNLEASHING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES, INNOVATORS, AND JOB CREATORS BY FACILITATING CAPITAL FORMATION**

#### **Subtitle A—Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification**

#### **SEC. 401. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.**

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) **REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

“(B) **EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.**—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

“(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

“(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(iii) Engages on behalf of any party in a transaction involving a public shell company.

“(C) **DISQUALIFICATIONS.**—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker is subject to—

“(i) suspension or revocation of registration under paragraph (4);

“(ii) a statutory disqualification described in section 3(a)(39);

“(iii) a disqualification under the rules adopted by the Commission under section 926 of the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 77d note); or

“(iv) a final order described in paragraph (4)(H).

“(D) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

“(E) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

“(i) **CONTROL.**—The term ‘control’ means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

“(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

“(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

“(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

“(ii) **ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.**—The term ‘eligible privately held company’ means a privately held company that meets both of the following conditions:

“(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

“(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than \$25,000,000.

“(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than \$250,000,000.

“(iii) **M&A BROKER.**—The term ‘M&A broker’ means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

“(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

“(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to

becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent fiscal year-end financial statements of the issuer of the securities as customarily prepared by the management of the issuer in the normal course of operations and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, reviewed, or compiled, any related statement by the independent accountant, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

“(iv) **PUBLIC SHELL COMPANY.**—The term ‘public shell company’ is a company that at the time of a transaction with an eligible privately held company—

“(I) has any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or that is required to file reports pursuant to subsection (d);

“(II) has no or nominal operations; and

“(III) has—

“(aa) no or nominal assets;

“(bb) assets consisting solely of cash and cash equivalents; or

“(cc) assets consisting of any amount of cash and cash equivalents and nominal other assets.

“(F) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

“(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

“(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

“(ii) **ROUNDING.**—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.”.

#### **SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

This subtitle and any amendment made by this subtitle shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### **Subtitle B—Encouraging Employee Ownership**

#### **SEC. 406. INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COMPENSATORY BENEFIT PLANS.**

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to increase from \$5,000,000 to \$20,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest \$1,000,000.

#### **Subtitle C—Small Company Disclosure Simplification**

#### **SEC. 411. EXEMPTION FROM XBRL REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES AND OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.**

(a) **EXEMPTION FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.**—Emerging growth companies are exempted from the requirements to use Extensible

Business Reporting Language (XBRL) for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such companies may elect to use XBRL for such reporting.

(b) **EXEMPTION FOR OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.**—Issuers with total annual gross revenues of less than \$250,000,000 are exempt from the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such issuers may elect to use XBRL for such reporting. An exemption under this subsection shall continue in effect until—

(1) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is two years after a determination by the Commission, by order after conducting the analysis required by section 3, that the benefits of such requirements to such issuers outweigh the costs, but no earlier than three years after enactment of this Act.

(c) **MODIFICATIONS TO REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise its regulations under parts 229, 230, 232, 239, 240, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to reflect the exemptions set forth in subsections (a) and (b).

#### **SEC. 412. ANALYSIS BY THE SEC.**

The Commission shall conduct an analysis of the costs and benefits to issuers described in section 411(b) of the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such analysis shall include an assessment of—

(1) how such costs and benefits may differ from the costs and benefits identified by the Commission in the order relating to interactive data to improve financial reporting (dated January 30, 2009; 74 Fed. Reg. 6776) because of the size of such issuers;

(2) the effects on efficiency, competition, capital formation, and financing and on analyst coverage of such issuers (including any such effects resulting from use of XBRL by investors);

(3) the costs to such issuers of—

(A) submitting data to the Commission in XBRL;

(B) posting data on the website of the issuer in XBRL;

(C) software necessary to prepare, submit, or post data in XBRL; and

(D) any additional consulting services or filing agent services;

(4) the benefits to the Commission in terms of improved ability to monitor securities markets, assess the potential outcomes of regulatory alternatives, and enhance investor participation in corporate governance and promote capital formation; and

(5) the effectiveness of standards in the United States for interactive filing data relative to the standards of international counterparts.

#### **SEC. 413. REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall provide the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report regarding—

(1) the progress in implementing XBRL reporting within the Commission;

(2) the use of XBRL data by Commission officials;

(3) the use of XBRL data by investors;

(4) the results of the analysis required by section 412; and

(5) any additional information the Commission considers relevant for increasing transparency, decreasing costs, and increasing efficiency of regulatory filings with the Commission.

#### **SEC. 414. DEFINITIONS.**

As used in this subtitle, the terms “Commission”, “emerging growth company”, “issuer”, and “securities laws” have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

#### **Subtitle D—Securities and Exchange Commission Overpayment Credit**

#### **SEC. 416. REFUNDING OR CREDITING OVERPAYMENT OF SECTION 31 FEES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) **OVERPAYMENT.**—If a national securities exchange or national securities association pays to the Commission an amount in excess of fees and assessments due under this section and informs the Commission of such amount paid in excess within 10 years of the date of the payment, the Commission shall offset future fees and assessments due by such exchange or association in an amount equal to such excess amount.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any fees and assessments paid before, on, or after the date of enactment of this section.

#### **Subtitle E—Fair Access to Investment Research**

#### **SEC. 421. SAFE HARBOR FOR INVESTMENT FUND RESEARCH.**

(a) **EXPANSION OF THE SAFE HARBOR.**—Not later than the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall propose, and not later than the end of the 120-day period beginning on such date, the Commission shall adopt, upon such terms, conditions, or requirements as the Commission may determine necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, and for the promotion of capital formation, revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that a covered investment fund research report that is published or distributed by a broker or dealer—

(1) shall be deemed, for purposes of sections 2(a)(10) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(10), 77e(c)), not to constitute an offer for sale or an offer to sell a security that is the subject of an offering pursuant to a registration statement that is effective, even if the broker or dealer is participating or will participate in the registered offering of the covered investment fund’s securities; and

(2) shall be deemed to satisfy the conditions of subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) of section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor provisions, for purposes of the Commission’s rules and regulations under the Federal securities laws and the rules of any self-regulatory organization.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFE HARBOR.**—In implementing the safe harbor pursuant to subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) not, in the case of a covered investment fund with a class of securities in substantially continuous distribution, condition the safe harbor on whether the broker’s or dealer’s publication or distribution of a covered investment fund research report constitutes such broker’s or dealer’s initiation or reinitiation of research coverage on such covered investment fund or its securities;

(2) not—

(A) require the covered investment fund to have been registered as an investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–1 et seq.) or subject to the reporting requirements of section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)) for any period exceeding the period of time referenced under paragraph (a)(1)(i)(A)(1) of section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(B) impose a minimum float provision exceeding that referenced in paragraph (a)(1)(i)(A)(1)(i) of section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations;

(3) provide that a self-regulatory organization may not maintain or enforce any rule that would—

(A) prohibit the ability of a member to publish or distribute a covered investment fund research report solely because the member is also participating in a registered offering or other distribution of any securities of such covered investment fund; or

(B) prohibit the ability of a member to participate in a registered offering or other distribution of securities of a covered investment fund solely because the member has published or distributed a covered investment fund research report about such covered investment fund or its securities; and

(4) provide that a covered investment fund research report shall not be subject to section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)) or the rules and regulations thereunder, except that such report may still be subject to such section and the rules and regulations thereunder to the extent that it is otherwise not subject to the content standards in the rules of any self-regulatory organization related to research reports, including those contained in the rules governing communications with the public regarding investment companies or substantially similar standards.

(c) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as in any way limiting—

(1) the applicability of the antifraud or antimanipulation provisions of the Federal securities laws and rules adopted thereunder to a covered investment fund research report, including section 17 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a), section 34(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-33), and sections 9 and 10 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78i, 78j); or

(2) the authority of any self-regulatory organization to examine or supervise a member's practices in connection with such member's publication or distribution of a covered investment fund research report for compliance with applicable provisions of the Federal securities laws or self-regulatory organization rules related to research reports, including those contained in the rules governing communications with the public.

(d) **INTERIM EFFECTIVENESS OF SAFE HARBOR.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From and after the 120-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, if the Commission has not adopted revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as required by subsection (a), and until such time as the Commission has done so, a broker or dealer distributing or publishing a covered investment fund research report after such date shall be able to rely on the provisions of section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, and the broker or dealer's publication of such report shall be deemed to satisfy the conditions of subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) of section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, if the covered investment fund that is the subject of such report satisfies the reporting history requirements (without regard to Form S-3 or Form F-3 eligibility) and minimum float provisions of such subsections for purposes of the Commission's rules and regulations under the Federal securities laws and the rules of any self-regulatory organization, as if revised and implemented in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

(2) **STATUS OF COVERED INVESTMENT FUND.**—After such period and until the Commission has adopted revisions to section 230.139 and FINRA has revised rule 2210, for purposes of subsection (c)(7)(O) of such rule, a covered investment fund

shall be deemed to be a security that is listed on a national securities exchange and that is not subject to section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)). Communications concerning only covered investment funds that fall within the scope of such section shall not be required to be filed with FINRA.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term “covered investment fund research report” means a research report published or distributed by a broker or dealer about a covered investment fund or any securities issued by the covered investment fund, but not including a research report to the extent that it is published or distributed by the covered investment fund or any affiliate of the covered investment fund.

(2) The term “covered investment fund” means—

(A) an investment company registered under, or that has filed an election to be treated as a business development company under, the Investment Company Act of 1940 and that has filed a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 for the public offering of a class of its securities, which registration statement has been declared effective by the Commission; and

(B) a trust or other person—

(i) issuing securities in an offering registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and which class of securities is listed for trading on a national securities exchange;

(ii) the assets of which consist primarily of commodities, currencies, or derivative instruments that reference commodities or currencies, or interests in the foregoing; and

(iii) that provides in its registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 that a class of its securities are purchased or redeemed, subject to conditions or limitations, for a ratable share of its assets.

(3) The term “FINRA” means the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority.

(4) The term “research report” has the meaning given that term under section 2(a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(3)), except that such term shall not include an oral communication.

(5) The term “self-regulatory organization” has the meaning given to that term under section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(26)).

#### **Subtitle F—Accelerating Access to Capital**

##### **SEC. 426. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY FOR USE OF FORM S-3.**

Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Form S-3—

(1) so as to permit securities to be registered pursuant to General Instruction I.B.1. of such form provided that either—

(A) the aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant is \$75,000,000 or more; or

(B) the registrant has at least one class of common equity securities listed and registered on a national securities exchange; and

(2) so as to remove the requirement of paragraph (c) from General Instruction I.B.6. of such form.

#### **Subtitle G—Enhancing the RAISE Act**

##### **SEC. 431. CERTAIN ACCREDITED INVESTOR TRANSACTIONS.**

Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d)(1) The transactions referred to in subsection (a)(7) are transactions where—

“(A) each purchaser is an accredited investor, as that term is defined in section 230.501(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor thereto); and

“(B) if any securities sold in reliance on subsection (a)(7) are offered by means of any general solicitation or general advertising, all such sales are made through a platform available only to accredited investors.

“(2) Securities sold in reliance on subsection (a)(7) shall be deemed to have been acquired in a transaction not involving any public offering.

“(3) The exemption provided by this subsection shall not be available for a transaction where the seller is—

“(A) an issuer, its subsidiaries or parent;

“(B) an underwriter acting on behalf of the issuer, its subsidiaries or parent, which receives compensation from the issuer with respect to such sale; or

“(C) a dealer.

“(4) A transaction meeting the requirements of this subsection shall be deemed not to be a distribution for purposes of section 2(a)(11).”; and

(2) by striking subsection (e).

#### **Subtitle H—Small Business Credit Availability**

##### **SEC. 436. BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMPANY OWNERSHIP OF SECURITIES OF INVESTMENT ADVISERS AND CERTAIN FINANCIAL COMPANIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 60 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-59) is amended—

(1) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting “(a) Notwithstanding”;

(2) by striking “except that the Commission shall not” and inserting the following: “except that—

“(1) section 12 shall not apply to the purchasing, otherwise acquiring, or holding by a business development company of any security issued by, or any other interest in the business of, any person who is an investment adviser registered under title II of this Act, who is an investment adviser to an investment company, or who is an eligible portfolio company; and

“(2) the Commission shall not”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) Nothing in this section shall prevent the Commission from issuing rules to address potential conflicts of interest between business development companies and investment advisers.”.

(b) **DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE PORTFOLIO COMPANY.**—Section 2(a)(46)(B) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(46)(B)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “(unless it is described in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), or (9) of such section)”.

(c) **INVESTMENT THRESHOLD.**—Section 55(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by inserting before the colon the following: “, provided that no more than 50 percent of its total assets are assets described in section 3(c)”.

##### **SEC. 437. EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 61(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-60(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively;

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the asset coverage requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 18(a)(1) (and any related rule promulgated under this Act) applicable to business development companies shall be 200 percent.

“(2) The asset coverage requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 18(a)(1) and of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 18(a)(2) (and any related rule promulgated under this Act) applicable to a business development company shall be 150 percent if—

“(A) within five business days of the approval of the adoption of the asset coverage requirements described in clause (ii), the business development company discloses such approval and

the date of its effectiveness in a Form 8-K filed with the Commission and in a notice on its website and discloses in its periodic filings made under section 13 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m)—

“(i) the aggregate value of the senior securities issued by such company and the asset coverage percentage as of the date of such company’s most recent financial statements; and

“(ii) that such company has adopted the asset coverage requirements of this subparagraph and the effective date of such requirements; and

“(B) with respect to a business development company that issues equity securities that are registered on a national securities exchange, the periodic filings of the company under section 13(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m) include disclosures reasonably designed to ensure that shareholders are informed of—

“(i) the amount of indebtedness and asset coverage ratio of the company, determined as of the date of the financial statements of the company dated on or most recently before the date of such filing; and

“(ii) the principal risk factors associated with such indebtedness, to the extent such risk is incurred by the company; and

“(C)(i) the application of this paragraph to the company is approved by the required majority (as defined in section 57(o)) of the directors of or general partners of such company who are not interested persons of the business development company, which application shall become effective on the date that is 1 year after the date of the approval, and, with respect to a business development company that issues equity securities that are not registered on a national securities exchange, the company extends, to each person who is a shareholder as of the date of the approval, an offer to repurchase the equity securities held by such person as of such approval date, with 25 percent of such securities to be repurchased in each of the four quarters following such approval date; or

“(ii) the company obtains, at a special or annual meeting of shareholders or partners at which a quorum is present, the approval of more than 50 percent of the votes cast of the application of this paragraph to the company, which application shall become effective on the date immediately after the date of the approval.”;

(3) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated), by inserting “or which is a stock” after “indebtedness”;

(4) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) (as redesignated)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “voting”; and

(B) by amending clause (iii) to read as follows:

“(iii) the exercise or conversion price at the date of issuance of such warrants, options, or rights is not less than—

“(I) the market value of the securities issuable upon the exercise of such warrants, options, or rights at the date of issuance of such warrants, options, or rights; or

“(II) if no such market value exists, the net asset value of the securities issuable upon the exercise of such warrants, options, or rights at the date of issuance of such warrants, options, or rights; and”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(6)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the following shall not apply to a business development company:

“(i) Subparagraphs (C) and (D) of section 18(a)(2).

“(ii) Subparagraph (E) of section 18(a)(2), to the extent such subparagraph requires any priority over any other class of stock as to distribution of assets upon liquidation.

“(iii) With respect to a senior security which is a stock, subsections (c) and (i) of section 18.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to preferred stock issued to a person who is not known by the company to be a qualified institutional buyer (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 57—

(A) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “section 61(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)(B)”;

and

(B) in subsection (n)(2), by striking “section 61(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)(B)”;

and

(2) in section 63(3), by striking “section 61(a)(3)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)”.

#### SEC. 438. PARITY FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES REGARDING OFFERING AND PROXY RULES.

(a) REVISION TO RULES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise any rules to the extent necessary to allow a business development company that has filed an election pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-53) to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers that are required to file reports under section 13 or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m; 78o(d)). Any action that the Commission takes pursuant to this subsection shall include the following:

(1) The Commission shall revise rule 405 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.405)—

(A) to remove the exclusion of a business development company from the definition of a well-known seasoned issuer provided by that rule; and

(B) to add registration statements filed on Form N-2 to the definition of automatic shelf registration statement provided by that rule.

(2) The Commission shall revise rules 168 and 169 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.168 and 230.169) to remove the exclusion of a business development company from an issuer that can use the exemptions provided by those rules.

(3) The Commission shall revise rules 163 and 163A under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.163 and 230.163A) to remove a business development company from the list of issuers that are ineligible to use the exemptions provided by those rules.

(4) The Commission shall revise rule 134 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.134) to remove the exclusion of a business development company from that rule.

(5) The Commission shall revise rules 138 and 139 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.138 and 230.139) to specifically include a business development company as an issuer to which those rules apply.

(6) The Commission shall revise rule 164 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.164) to remove a business development company from the list of issuers that are excluded from that rule.

(7) The Commission shall revise rule 433 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.433) to specifically include a business development company that is a well-known seasoned issuer as an issuer to which that rule applies.

(8) The Commission shall revise rule 415 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.415)—

(A) to state that the registration for securities provided by that rule includes securities registered by a business development company on Form N-2; and

(B) to provide an exception for a business development company from the requirement that a Form N-2 registrant must furnish the undertakings required by item 34.4 of Form N-2.

(9) The Commission shall revise rule 497 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.497) to include a process for a business development company to file a form of prospectus that is parallel to the process for filing a form of prospectus under rule 424(b).

(10) The Commission shall revise rules 172 and 173 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.172 and 230.173) to remove the exclusion of an offering of a business development company from those rules.

(11) The Commission shall revise rule 418 under the Securities Act of 1933 (17 C.F.R. 230.418) to provide that a business development company that would otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of General Instruction I.A of Form S-3 shall be exempt from paragraph (a)(3) of that rule.

(12) The Commission shall revise rule 14a-101 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (17 C.F.R. 240.14a-101) to provide that a business development company that would otherwise meet the requirements of General Instruction I.A of Form S-3 shall be deemed to meet the requirements of Form S-3 for purposes of Schedule 14A.

(13) The Commission shall revise rule 103 under Regulation FD (17 C.F.R. 243.103) to provide that paragraph (a) of that rule applies for purposes of Form N-2.

(b) REVISION TO FORM N-2.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise Form N-2—

(1) to include an item or instruction that is similar to item 12 on Form S-3 to provide that a business development company that would otherwise meet the requirements of Form S-3 shall incorporate by reference its reports and documents filed under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 into its registration statement filed on Form N-2; and

(2) to include an item or instruction that is similar to the instruction regarding automatic shelf offerings by well-known seasoned issuers on Form S-3 to provide that a business development company that is a well-known seasoned issuer may file automatic shelf offerings on Form N-2.

(c) TREATMENT IF REVISIONS NOT COMPLETED IN TIMELY MANNER.—If the Commission fails to complete the revisions required by subsections (a) and (b) by the time required by such subsections, a business development company shall be entitled to treat such revisions as having been completed in accordance with the actions required to be taken by the Commission by such subsections until such time as such revisions are completed by the Commission.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Any reference in this section to a rule or form means such rule or form or any successor rule or form.

#### Subtitle I—Fostering Innovation

#### SEC. 441. TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS.

Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7262) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS.—

“(1) LOW-REVENUE EXEMPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to an audit report prepared for an issuer that—

“(A) ceased to be an emerging growth company on the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the fifth anniversary of the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933; “(B) had average annual gross revenues of less than \$50,000,000 as of its most recently completed fiscal year; and

“(C) is not a large accelerated filer.

“(2) EXPIRATION OF TEMPORARY EXEMPTION.—An issuer ceases to be eligible for the exemption described under paragraph (1) at the earliest of—

“(A) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the tenth anniversary of the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933;

“(B) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer during which the average annual gross revenues of the issuer exceed \$50,000,000; or

“(C) the date on which the issuer becomes a large accelerated filer.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) AVERAGE ANNUAL GROSS REVENUES.—The term ‘average annual gross revenues’ means the total gross revenues of an issuer over its most recently completed three fiscal years divided by three.

“(B) EMERGING GROWTH COMPANY.—The term ‘emerging growth company’ has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

“(C) LARGE ACCELERATED FILER.—The term ‘large accelerated filer’ has the meaning given that term under section 240.12b-2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.”.

#### **Subtitle J—Small Business Capital Formation Enhancement**

#### **SEC. 446. ANNUAL REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS FORUM ON CAPITAL FORMATION.**

Section 503 of the Small Business Investment Incentive Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 80c-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The Commission shall—

“(1) review the findings and recommendations of the forum; and

“(2) each time the forum submits a finding or recommendation to the Commission, promptly issue a public statement—

“(A) assessing the finding or recommendation of the forum; and

“(B) disclosing the action, if any, the Commission intends to take with respect to the finding or recommendation.”.

#### **Subtitle K—Helping Angels Lead Our Startups**

#### **SEC. 451. DEFINITION OF ANGEL INVESTOR GROUP.**

As used in this subtitle, the term “angel investor group” means any group that—

(1) is composed of accredited investors interested in investing personal capital in early-stage companies;

(2) holds regular meetings and has defined processes and procedures for making investment decisions, either individually or among the membership of the group as a whole; and

(3) is neither associated nor affiliated with brokers, dealers, or investment advisers.

#### **SEC. 452. CLARIFICATION OF GENERAL SOLICITATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Regulation D of its rules (17 C.F.R. 230.500 et seq.) to require that in carrying out the prohibition against general solicitation or general advertising contained in section 230.502(c) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, the prohibition shall not apply to a presentation or other communication made by or on behalf of an issuer which is made at an event—

(1) sponsored by—

(A) the United States or any territory thereof, by the District of Columbia, by any State, by a political subdivision of any State or territory, or by any agency or public instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(B) a college, university, or other institution of higher education;

(C) a nonprofit organization;

(D) an angel investor group;

(E) a venture forum, venture capital association, or trade association; or

(F) any other group, person or entity as the Securities and Exchange Commission may determine by rule;

(2) where any advertising for the event does not reference any specific offering of securities by the issuer;

(3) the sponsor of which—

(A) does not make investment recommendations or provide investment advice to event attendees;

(B) does not engage in an active role in any investment negotiations between the issuer and investors attending the event;

(C) does not charge event attendees any fees other than administrative fees; and

(D) does not receive any compensation with respect to such event that would require registration of the sponsor as a broker or a dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or as an investment advisor under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; and

(4) where no specific information regarding an offering of securities by the issuer is communicated or distributed by or on behalf of the issuer, other than—

(A) that the issuer is in the process of offering securities or planning to offer securities;

(B) the type and amount of securities being offered;

(C) the amount of securities being offered that have already been subscribed for; and

(D) the intended use of proceeds of the offering.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) may only be construed as requiring the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend the requirements of Regulation D with respect to presentations and communications, and not with respect to purchases or sales.

#### **Subtitle L—Main Street Growth**

#### **SEC. 456. VENTURE EXCHANGES.**

(a) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) VENTURE EXCHANGE.—

“(1) REGISTRATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A national securities exchange may elect to be treated (or for a listing tier of such exchange to be treated) as a venture exchange by notifying the Commission of such election, either at the time the exchange applies to be registered as a national securities exchange or after registering as a national securities exchange.

“(B) DETERMINATION TIME PERIOD.—With respect to a securities exchange electing to be treated (or for a listing tier of such exchange to be treated) as a venture exchange—

“(i) at the time the exchange applies to be registered as a national securities exchange, such application and election shall be deemed to have been approved by the Commission unless the Commission denies such application before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the Commission received such application; and

“(ii) after registering as a national securities exchange, such election shall be deemed to have been approved by the Commission unless the Commission denies such approval before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the Commission received notification of such election.

“(2) POWERS AND RESTRICTIONS.—A venture exchange—

“(A) may only constitute, maintain, or provide a market place or facilities for bringing together purchasers and sellers of venture securities;

“(B) may determine the increment to be used for quoting and trading venture securities on the exchange;

“(C) shall disseminate last sale and quotation information on terms that are fair and reasonable and not unreasonably discriminatory;

“(D) may choose to carry out periodic auctions for the sale of a venture security instead of providing continuous trading of the venture security; and

“(E) may not extend unlisted trading privileges to any venture security.

“(3) EXEMPTIONS FROM CERTAIN NATIONAL SECURITY EXCHANGE REGULATIONS.—A venture exchange shall not be required to—

“(A) comply with any of sections 242.600 through 242.612 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(B) comply with any of sections 242.300 through 242.303 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(C) submit any data to a securities information processor; or

“(D) use decimal pricing.

“(4) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EXEMPTED SECURITIES.—A security that is exempt from registration pursuant to section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 shall be exempt from section 12(a) of this title with respect to the trading of such security on a venture exchange, if the issuer of such security is in compliance with all disclosure obligations of such section 3(b) and the regulations issued under such section.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) EARLY-STAGE, GROWTH COMPANY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘early-stage, growth company’ means an issuer—

“(I) that has not made an initial public offering of any securities of the issuer; and

“(II) with a market capitalization of \$1,000,000,000 (as such amount is indexed for inflation every 5 years by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, setting the threshold to the nearest \$1,000,000) or less.

“(ii) TREATMENT WHEN MARKET CAPITALIZATION EXCEEDS THRESHOLD.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an issuer that is an early-stage, growth company the securities of which are traded on a venture exchange, such issuer shall not cease to be an early-stage, growth company by reason of the market capitalization of such issuer exceeding the threshold specified in clause (i)(II) until the end of the period of 24 consecutive months during which the market capitalization of such issuer exceeds \$2,000,000,000 (as such amount is indexed for inflation every 5 years by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, setting the threshold to the nearest \$1,000,000).

“(II) EXEMPTIONS.—If an issuer would cease to be an early-stage, growth company under subclause (I), the venture exchange may, at the request of the issuer, exempt the issuer from the market capitalization requirements of this subparagraph for the 1-year period that begins on the day after the end of the 24-month period described in such subclause. The venture exchange may, at the request of the issuer, extend the exemption for 1 additional year.

“(B) VENTURE SECURITY.—The term ‘venture security’ means—

“(i) securities of an early-stage, growth company that are exempt from registration pursuant to section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933; and

“(ii) securities of an emerging growth company.”.

(b) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—Section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and



(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) a venture security, as defined under section 6(m)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.”.

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that the Securities and Exchange Commission should—

(1) when necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors, make use of the Commission’s general exemptive authority under section 36 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78mm) with respect to the provisions added by this section; and

(2) if the Commission determines appropriate, create an Office of Venture Exchanges within the Commission’s Division of Trading and Markets.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to impair or limit the construction of the antifraud provisions of the securities laws (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))) or the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under those provisions.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE FOR TIERS OF EXISTING NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGES.**—In the case of a securities exchange that is registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f) on the date of the enactment of this Act, any election for a listing tier of such exchange to be treated as a venture exchange under subsection (m) of such section shall not take effect before the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

#### **Subtitle M—Micro Offering Safe Harbor**

##### **SEC. 461. EXEMPTIONS FOR MICRO-OFFERINGS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(8) transactions meeting the requirements of subsection (e).”; and

(2) as amended by section 431(2), by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **CERTAIN MICRO-OFFERINGS.**—The transactions referred to in subsection (a)(8) are transactions involving the sale of securities by an issuer (including all entities controlled by or under common control with the issuer) that meet all of the following requirements:

“(1) **PRE-EXISTING RELATIONSHIP.**—Each purchaser has a substantive pre-existing relationship with an officer of the issuer, a director of the issuer, or a shareholder holding 10 percent or more of the shares of the issuer.

“(2) **35 OR FEWER PURCHASERS.**—There are no more than, or the issuer reasonably believes that there are no more than, 35 purchasers of securities from the issuer that are sold in reliance on the exemption provided under subsection (a)(8) during the 12-month period preceding such transaction.

“(3) **SMALL OFFERING AMOUNT.**—The aggregate amount of all securities sold by the issuer, including any amount sold in reliance on the exemption provided under subsection (a)(8), during the 12-month period preceding such transaction, does not exceed \$500,000.”.

(b) **EXEMPTION UNDER STATE REGULATIONS.**—Section 18(b)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) section 4(a)(8).”.

#### **Subtitle N—Private Placement Improvement**

##### **SEC. 466. REVISIONS TO SEC REGULATION D.**

Not later than 45 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Ex-

change Commission shall revise Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 501 et seq.) in accordance with the following:

(1) The Commission shall revise Form D filing requirements to require an issuer offering or selling securities in reliance on an exemption provided under Rule 506 of Regulation D to file with the Commission a single notice of sales containing the information required by Form D for each new offering of securities no earlier than 15 days after the date of the first sale of securities in the offering. The Commission shall not require such an issuer to file any notice of sales containing the information required by Form D except for the single notice described in the previous sentence.

(2) The Commission shall make the information contained in each Form D filing available to the securities commission (or any agency or office performing like functions) of each State and territory of the United States and the District of Columbia.

(3) The Commission shall not condition the availability of any exemption for an issuer under Rule 506 of Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 230.506) on the issuer’s or any other person’s filing with the Commission of a Form D or any similar report.

(4) The Commission shall not require issuers to submit written general solicitation materials to the Commission in connection with a Rule 506(c) offering, except when the Commission requests such materials pursuant to the Commission’s authority under section 8A or section 20 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h–1 or 77t) or section 9, 10(b), 21A, 21B, or 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78i, 78j(b), 78u–1, 78u–2, or 78u–3).

(5) The Commission shall not extend the requirements contained in Rule 156 to private funds.

(6) The Commission shall revise Rule 501(a) of Regulation D to provide that a person who is a “knowledgeable employee” of a private fund or the fund’s investment adviser, as defined in Rule 3c–5(a)(4) (17 C.F.R. 270.3c–5(a)(4)), shall be an accredited investor for purposes of a Rule 506 offering of a private fund with respect to which the person is a knowledgeable employee.

#### **Subtitle O—Supporting America’s Innovators**

##### **SEC. 471. INVESTOR LIMITATION FOR QUALIFYING VENTURE CAPITAL FUNDS.**

Section 3(c)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–3(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after “one hundred persons” the following: “(or, with respect to a qualifying venture capital fund, 500 persons)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) The term ‘qualifying venture capital fund’ means any venture capital fund (as defined pursuant to section 203(l)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3(l)(1))) with no more than \$50,000,000 in aggregate capital contributions and uncalled committed capital, as such dollar amount is annually adjusted by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.”.

#### **Subtitle P—Fix Crowdfunding**

##### **SEC. 476. CROWDFUNDING EXEMPTION.**

(a) **SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.**—Section 4(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d) is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6) transactions involving the offer or sale of securities by an issuer, provided that—

“(A) in the case of a transaction involving an intermediary between the issuer and the investor, such intermediary complies with the requirements under section 4A(a); and

“(B) in the case of a transaction not involving an intermediary between the issuer and the in-

vestor, the issuer complies with the requirements under section 4A(b).”.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS TO QUALIFY FOR CROWDFUNDING EXEMPTION.**—Section 4A of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d–1) is amended to read as follows:

#### **“SEC. 4A. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN SMALL TRANSACTIONS.**

“(a) **REQUIREMENTS ON INTERMEDIARIES.**—For purposes of section 4(a)(6), a person acting as an intermediary in a transaction involving the offer or sale of securities shall comply with the requirements of this subsection if the intermediary—

“(1) warns investors, including on the intermediary’s website used for the offer and sale of such securities, of the speculative nature generally applicable to investments in startups, emerging businesses, and small issuers, including risks in the secondary market related to illiquidity;

“(2) warns investors that they are subject to the restriction on sales requirement described under subsection (e);

“(3) takes reasonable measures to reduce the risk of fraud with respect to such transaction;

“(4) registers with the Commission and the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, including by providing the Commission with the intermediary’s physical address, website address, and the names of the intermediary and employees of the intermediary, and keep such information up-to-date;

“(5) provides the Commission with continuous investor-level access to the intermediary’s website;

“(6) requires each potential investor to answer questions demonstrating—

“(A) an understanding of the level of risk generally applicable to investments in startups, emerging businesses, and small issuers;

“(B) an understanding of the risk of illiquidity; and

“(C) such other areas as the Commission may determine appropriate by rule or regulation, including information relating to the owners’ and management’s experience, and any related party transactions and conflicts of interest;

“(7) carries out a background check on the issuer’s principals;

“(8) provides the Commission and potential investors with notice of the offering not less than 10 days prior to such offering, not later than the first day securities are offered to potential investors, including—

“(A) the issuer’s name, legal status, physical address, and website address;

“(B) the names of the issuer’s principals;

“(C) the stated purpose and intended use of the proceeds of the offering sought by the issuer; and

“(D) the target offering amount and the deadline to reach the target offering amount;

“(9) outsources cash-management functions to a qualified third party custodian, such as a broker or dealer registered under section 15(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, a trust company, or an insured depository institution;

“(10) makes available on the intermediary’s website a method of communication that permits the issuer and investors to communicate with one another; and

“(11) provides the Commission with a notice upon completion of the offering, which shall include the aggregate offering amount and the number of purchasers.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS ON ISSUERS IF NO INTERMEDIARY.**—For purposes of section 4(a)(6), an issuer who offers or sells securities without an intermediary shall comply with the requirements of this subsection if the issuer—

“(1) warns investors, including on the issuer’s website, of the speculative nature generally applicable to investments in startups, emerging

businesses, and small issuers, including risks in the secondary market related to illiquidity;

“(2) warns investors that they are subject to the restriction on sales requirement described under subsection (e);

“(3) takes reasonable measures to reduce the risk of fraud with respect to such transaction;

“(4) provides the Commission with the issuer’s physical address, website address, and the names of the principals and employees of the issuers, and keeps such information up-to-date;

“(5) provides the Commission with continuous investor-level access to the issuer’s website;

“(6) requires each potential investor to answer questions demonstrating—

“(A) an understanding of the level of risk generally applicable to investments in startups, emerging businesses, and small issuers;

“(B) an understanding of the risk of illiquidity; and

“(C) such other areas as the Commission may determine appropriate by rule or regulation;

“(7) provides the Commission with notice of the offering not less than 10 days prior to such offering, not later than the first day securities are offered to potential investors, including—

“(A) the stated purpose and intended use of the proceeds of the offering sought by the issuer; and

“(B) the target offering amount and the deadline to reach the target offering amount;

“(8) outsources cash-management functions to a qualified third party custodian, such as a broker or dealer registered under section 15(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, a trust company, or an insured depository institution;

“(9) makes available on the issuer’s website a method of communication that permits the issuer and investors to communicate with one another;

“(10) does not offer personalized investment advice;

“(11) provides the Commission with a notice upon completion of the offering, which shall include the aggregate offering amount and the number of purchasers; and

“(c) VERIFICATION OF INCOME.—For purposes of section 4(a)(6), an issuer or intermediary may rely on certifications as to annual income provided by the person to whom the securities are sold to verify the investor’s income.

“(d) INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO STATES.—The Commission shall make the notices described under subsections (a)(9), (a)(13), (b)(8), and (b)(13) and the information described under subsections (a)(4) and (b)(4) available to the States.

“(e) RESTRICTION ON SALES.—With respect to a transaction involving the issuance of securities described under section 4(a)(6), a purchaser may not transfer such securities during the 1-year period beginning on the date of purchase, unless such securities are sold to—

“(1) the issuer of such securities; or

“(2) an accredited investor.

“(f) CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) NO REGISTRATION AS BROKER.—With respect to a transaction described under section 4(a)(6) involving an intermediary, such intermediary shall not be required to register as a broker under section 15(a)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 solely by reason of participation in such transaction.

“(2) NO PRECLUSION OF OTHER CAPITAL RAISING.—Nothing in this section or section 4(a)(6) shall be construed as preventing an issuer from raising capital through methods not described under section 4(a)(6).”.

(c) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue or revise such rules as may be necessary to carry out section 4A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended by this Act. In issuing or revising such

rules, the Commission shall consider the costs and benefits of the action.

(d) DISQUALIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall by rule or regulation establish disqualification provisions under which an issuer shall not be eligible to utilize the exemption under section 4(a)(6) of the Securities Act of 1933 (as amended by this Act) based on the disciplinary history of the issuer or its predecessors, affiliates, officers, directors, or persons fulfilling similar roles. The Commission shall also establish disqualification provisions under which an intermediary shall not be eligible to act as an intermediary in connection with an offering utilizing the exemption under section 4(a)(6) of the Securities Act of 1933 based on the disciplinary history of the intermediary or its predecessors, affiliates, officers, directors, or persons fulfilling similar roles. Such provisions shall be substantially similar to the disqualification provisions contained in the regulations adopted in accordance with section 926 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 77d note).

#### SEC. 477. EXCLUSION OF CROWDFUNDING INVESTORS FROM SHAREHOLDER CAP.

Section 12(g)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l(g)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(5) For the purposes” and inserting:

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) EXCLUSION FOR PERSONS HOLDING CERTAIN SECURITIES.—For purposes of this subsection, securities held by persons who purchase such securities in transactions described under section 4(a)(6) of the Securities Act of 1933 shall not be deemed to be ‘held of record’.”.

#### SEC. 478. PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18(b)(4)(C) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)(C)) is amended by striking “section 4(6)” and inserting “section 4(a)(6)”.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF THE PRESERVATION OF STATE ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 305(a) of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, as amended by subsection (a), relate solely to State registration, documentation, and offering requirements, as described under section 18(a) of Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(a)), and shall have no impact or limitation on other State authority to take enforcement action with regard to an issuer, intermediary, or any other person or entity using the exemption from registration provided by section 4(a)(6) of such Act. Notwithstanding monetary penalties or sanctions, a State may not impose any filing or fee under such authority.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF STATE JURISDICTION OVER UNLAWFUL CONDUCT OF INTERMEDIARIES, ISSUERS, AND CUSTODIANS.—Section 18(c)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by striking “in connection with securities or securities transactions” and all that follows and inserting the following: “in connection with securities or securities transactions, with respect to—

“(A) fraud or deceit;

“(B) unlawful conduct by a broker or dealer; and

“(C) with respect to a transaction described under section 4(a)(6), unlawful conduct by an intermediary, issuer, or custodian.”.

#### SEC. 479. TREATMENT OF FUNDING PORTALS.

Section 5312(c) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(2) FUNDING PORTALS NOT INCLUDED IN DEFINITION.—The term ‘financial institution’ (as defined in subsection (a)) does not include a funding portal (as defined under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))).”.

### Subtitle Q—Corporate Governance Reform and Transparency

#### SEC. 481. DEFINITIONS.

(a) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(83) PROXY ADVISORY FIRM.—The term ‘proxy advisory firm’ means any person who is primarily engaged in the business of providing proxy voting research, analysis, or recommendations to clients, which conduct constitutes a solicitation within the meaning of section 14 and the Commission’s rules and regulations thereunder, except to the extent that the person is exempted by such rules and regulations from requirements otherwise applicable to persons engaged in a solicitation.

“(84) PERSON ASSOCIATED WITH A PROXY ADVISORY FIRM.—The term ‘person associated with’ a proxy advisory firm means any partner, officer, or director of a proxy advisory firm (or any person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions), any person directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control with a proxy advisory firm, or any employee of a proxy advisory firm, except that persons associated with a proxy advisory firm whose functions are clerical or ministerial shall not be included in the meaning of such term. The Commission may by rules and regulations classify, for purposes or any portion or portions of this Act, persons, including employees controlled by a proxy advisory firm.”.

(b) APPLICABLE DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subtitle—

(1) the term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission; and

(2) the term “proxy advisory firm” has the same meaning as in section 3(a)(83) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by this subtitle.

#### SEC. 482. REGISTRATION OF PROXY ADVISORY FIRMS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by inserting after section 15G the following new section:

#### “SEC. 15H. REGISTRATION OF PROXY ADVISORY FIRMS.

“(a) CONDUCT PROHIBITED.—It shall be unlawful for a proxy advisory firm to make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to provide proxy voting research, analysis, or recommendations to any client, unless such proxy advisory firm is registered under this section.

“(b) REGISTRATION PROCEDURES.—

“(1) APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A proxy advisory firm must file with the Commission an application for registration, in such form as the Commission shall require, by rule or regulation, and containing the information described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application for registration under this section shall contain information regarding—

“(i) a certification that the applicant has adequate financial and managerial resources to consistently provide proxy advice based on accurate information;

“(ii) the procedures and methodologies that the applicant uses in developing proxy voting recommendations, including whether and how the applicant considers the size of a company when making proxy voting recommendations;

“(iii) the organizational structure of the applicant;

“(iv) whether or not the applicant has in effect a code of ethics, and if not, the reasons therefor;

“(v) any potential or actual conflict of interest relating to the ownership structure of the applicant or the provision of proxy advisory services by the applicant, including whether the

proxy advisory firm engages in services ancillary to the provision of proxy advisory services such as consulting services for corporate issuers, and if so the revenues derived therefrom;

“(vi) the policies and procedures in place to manage conflicts of interest under subsection (f); and

“(vii) any other information and documents concerning the applicant and any person associated with such applicant as the Commission, by rule, may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

“(2) REVIEW OF APPLICATION.—

“(A) INITIAL DETERMINATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the application for registration is filed with the Commission under paragraph (1) (or within such longer period as to which the applicant consents) the Commission shall—

“(i) by order, grant registration; or

“(ii) institute proceedings to determine whether registration should be denied.

“(B) CONDUCT OF PROCEEDINGS.—

“(i) CONTENT.—Proceedings referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall—

“(I) include notice of the grounds for denial under consideration and an opportunity for hearing; and

“(II) be concluded not later than 120 days after the date on which the application for registration is filed with the Commission under paragraph (1).

“(ii) DETERMINATION.—At the conclusion of such proceedings, the Commission, by order, shall grant or deny such application for registration.

“(iii) EXTENSION AUTHORIZED.—The Commission may extend the time for conclusion of such proceedings for not longer than 90 days, if it finds good cause for such extension and publishes its reasons for so finding, or for such longer period as to which the applicant consents.

“(C) GROUNDS FOR DECISION.—The Commission shall grant registration under this subsection—

“(i) if the Commission finds that the requirements of this section are satisfied; and

“(ii) unless the Commission finds (in which case the Commission shall deny such registration) that—

“(I) the applicant has failed to certify to the Commission's satisfaction that it has adequate financial and managerial resources to consistently provide proxy advice based on accurate information and to materially comply with the procedures and methodologies disclosed under paragraph (1)(B) and with subsections (f) and (g); or

“(II) if the applicant were so registered, its registration would be subject to suspension or revocation under subsection (e).

“(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Subject to section 24, the Commission shall make the information and documents submitted to the Commission by a proxy advisory firm in its completed application for registration, or in any amendment submitted under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c), publicly available on the Commission's website, or through another comparable, readily accessible means.

“(c) UPDATE OF REGISTRATION.—

“(1) UPDATE.—Each registered proxy advisory firm shall promptly amend and update its application for registration under this section if any information or document provided therein becomes materially inaccurate, except that a registered proxy advisory firm is not required to amend the information required to be filed under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) by filing information under this paragraph, but shall amend such information in the annual submission of the organization under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

“(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 90 calendar days after the end of each calendar year, each registered proxy advisory firm shall file with the Commission an amendment to its registration, in such form as the Commission, by rule, may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors—

“(A) certifying that the information and documents in the application for registration of such registered proxy advisory firm continue to be accurate in all material respects; and

“(B) listing any material change that occurred to such information or documents during the previous calendar year.

“(d) CENSURE, DENIAL, OR SUSPENSION OF REGISTRATION; NOTICE AND HEARING.—The Commission, by order, shall censure, place limitations on the activities, functions, or operations of, suspend for a period not exceeding 12 months, or revoke the registration of any registered proxy advisory firm if the Commission finds, on the record after notice and opportunity for hearing, that such censure, placing of limitations, suspension, or revocation is necessary for the protection of investors and in the public interest and that such registered proxy advisory firm, or any person associated with such an organization, whether prior to or subsequent to becoming so associated—

“(1) has committed or omitted any act, or is subject to an order or finding, enumerated in subparagraph (A), (D), (E), (H), or (G) of section 15(b)(4), has been convicted of any offense specified in section 15(b)(4)(B), or is enjoined from any action, conduct, or practice specified in subparagraph (C) of section 15(b)(4), during the 10-year period preceding the date of commencement of the proceedings under this subsection, or at any time thereafter;

“(2) has been convicted during the 10-year period preceding the date on which an application for registration is filed with the Commission under this section, or at any time thereafter, of—

“(A) any crime that is punishable by imprisonment for one or more years, and that is not described in section 15(b)(4)(B); or

“(B) a substantially equivalent crime by a foreign court of competent jurisdiction;

“(3) is subject to any order of the Commission barring or suspending the right of the person to be associated with a registered proxy advisory firm;

“(4) fails to furnish the certifications required under subsections (b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and (c)(2);

“(5) has engaged in one or more prohibited acts enumerated in paragraph (1); or

“(6) fails to maintain adequate financial and managerial resources to consistently offer advisory services with integrity, including by failing to comply with subsections (f) or (g).

“(e) TERMINATION OF REGISTRATION.—

“(1) VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWAL.—A registered proxy advisory firm may, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may establish as necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors, which terms and conditions shall include at a minimum that the registered proxy advisory firm will no longer conduct such activities as to bring it within the definition of proxy advisory firm in section 3(a)(83) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, withdraw from registration by filing a written notice of withdrawal to the Commission.

“(2) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—In addition to any other authority of the Commission under this title, if the Commission finds that a registered proxy advisory firm is no longer in existence or has ceased to do business as a proxy advisory firm, the Commission, by order, shall cancel the registration under this section of such registered proxy advisory firm.

“(f) MANAGEMENT OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—

“(1) ORGANIZATION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Each registered proxy advisory firm shall establish, maintain, and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed, taking into consideration the nature of the business of such registered proxy advisory firm and associated persons, to address and manage any conflicts of interest that can arise from such business.

“(2) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—The Commission shall issue final rules to prohibit, or require the management and disclosure of, any conflicts of interest relating to the offering of proxy advisory services by a registered proxy advisory firm, including, without limitation, conflicts of interest relating to—

“(A) the manner in which a registered proxy advisory firm is compensated by the client, or any affiliate of the client, for providing proxy advisory services;

“(B) the provision of consulting, advisory, or other services by a registered proxy advisory firm, or any person associated with such registered proxy advisory firm, to the client;

“(C) business relationships, ownership interests, or any other financial or personal interests between a registered proxy advisory firm, or any person associated with such registered proxy advisory firm, and any client, or any affiliate of such client;

“(D) transparency around the formulation of proxy voting policies;

“(E) the execution of proxy votes if such votes are based upon recommendations made by the proxy advisory firm in which someone other than the issuer is a proponent;

“(F) issuing recommendations where proxy advisory firms provide advisory services to a company; and

“(G) any other potential conflict of interest, as the Commission deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

“(g) RELIABILITY OF PROXY ADVISORY FIRM SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each registered proxy advisory firm shall have staff sufficient to produce proxy voting recommendations that are based on accurate and current information. Each registered proxy advisory firm shall detail procedures sufficient to permit companies receiving proxy advisory firm recommendations access in a reasonable time to the draft recommendations, with an opportunity to provide meaningful comment thereon, including the opportunity to present details to the person responsible for developing the recommendation in person or telephonically. Each registered proxy advisory firm shall employ an ombudsman to receive complaints about the accuracy of voting information used in making recommendations from the subjects of the proxy advisory firm's voting recommendations, and shall resolve those complaints in a timely fashion and in any event prior to voting on the matter to which the recommendation relates.

“(2) DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘draft recommendations’—

“(A) means the overall conclusions of proxy voting recommendations prepared for the clients of a proxy advisory firm, including any public data cited therein, any company information or substantive analysis impacting the recommendation, and the specific voting recommendations on individual proxy ballot issues; and

“(B) does not include the entirety of the proxy advisory firm's final report to its clients.

“(h) DESIGNATION OF COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—Each registered proxy advisory firm shall designate an individual responsible for administering the policies and procedures that are required to be established pursuant to subsections (f) and (g), and for ensuring compliance with

the securities laws and the rules and regulations thereunder, including those promulgated by the Commission pursuant to this section.

“(i) PROHIBITED CONDUCT.—

“(1) PROHIBITED ACTS AND PRACTICES.—The Commission shall issue final rules to prohibit any act or practice relating to the offering of proxy advisory services by a registered proxy advisory firm that the Commission determines to be unfair or coercive, including any act or practice relating to—

“(A) conditioning a voting recommendation or other proxy advisory firm recommendation on the purchase by an issuer or an affiliate thereof of other services or products, of the registered proxy advisory firm or any person associated with such registered proxy advisory firm; and

“(B) modifying a voting recommendation or otherwise departing from its adopted systematic procedures and methodologies in the provision of proxy advisory services, based on whether an issuer, or affiliate thereof, subscribes or will subscribe to other services or product of the registered proxy advisory firm or any person associated with such organization.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1), or in any rules or regulations adopted thereunder, may be construed to modify, impair, or supersede the operation of any of the antitrust laws (as defined in the first section of the Clayton Act, except that such term includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, to the extent that such section 5 applies to unfair methods of competition).

“(j) STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION.—Each registered proxy advisory firm shall, on a confidential basis, file with the Commission, at intervals determined by the Commission, such financial statements, certified (if required by the rules or regulations of the Commission) by an independent public auditor, and information concerning its financial condition, as the Commission, by rule, may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

“(k) ANNUAL REPORT.—Each registered proxy advisory firm shall, at the beginning of each fiscal year of such firm, report to the Commission on the number of shareholder proposals its staff reviewed in the prior fiscal year, the number of recommendations made in the prior fiscal year, the number of staff who reviewed and made recommendations on such proposals in the prior fiscal year, and the number of recommendations made in the prior fiscal year where the proponent of such recommendation was a client of or received services from the proxy advisory firm.

“(l) TRANSPARENT POLICIES.—Each registered proxy advisory firm shall file with the Commission and make publicly available its methodology for the formulation of proxy voting policies and voting recommendations.

“(m) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) NO WAIVER OF RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, OR DEFENSES.—Registration under and compliance with this section does not constitute a waiver of, or otherwise diminish, any right, privilege, or defense that a registered proxy advisory firm may otherwise have under any provision of State or Federal law, including any rule, regulation, or order thereunder.

“(2) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as creating any private right of action, and no report filed by a registered proxy advisory firm in accordance with this section or section 17 shall create a private right of action under section 18 or any other provision of law.

“(n) REGULATIONS.—

“(1) NEW PROVISIONS.—Such rules and regulations as are required by this section or are otherwise necessary to carry out this section, including the application form required under subsection (a)—

“(A) shall be issued by the Commission, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section; and

“(B) shall become effective not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

“(2) REVIEW OF EXISTING REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall—

“(A) review its existing rules and regulations which affect the operations of proxy advisory firms;

“(B) amend or revise such rules and regulations in accordance with the purposes of this section, and issue such guidance, as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors; and

“(C) direct Commission staff to withdraw the Egan Jones Proxy Services (May 27, 2004) and Institutional Shareholder Services, Inc. (September 15, 2004) no-action letters.

“(o) APPLICABILITY.—This section, other than subsection (n), which shall apply on the date of enactment of this section, shall apply on the earlier of—

“(1) the date on which regulations are issued in final form under subsection (n)(1); or

“(2) 270 days after the date of enactment of this section.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 17(a)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78q(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “proxy advisory firm,” after “nationally recognized statistical rating organization.”.

**SEC. 483. COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT.**

The Commission shall make an annual report publicly available on the Commission's Internet website. Such report shall, with respect to the year to which the report relates—

(1) identify applicants for registration under section 15H of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by this subtitle;

(2) specify the number of and actions taken on such applications;

(3) specify the views of the Commission on the state of competition, transparency, policies and methodologies, and conflicts of interest among proxy advisory firms;

(4) include the determination of the Commission with regard to—

(A) the quality of proxy advisory services issued by proxy advisory firms;

(B) the financial markets;

(C) competition among proxy advisory firms;

(D) the incidence of undisclosed conflicts of interest by proxy advisory firms;

(E) the process for registering as a proxy advisory firm; and

(F) such other matters relevant to the implementation of this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle, as the Commission determines necessary to bring to the attention of the Congress;

(5) identify problems, if any, that have resulted from the implementation of this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle; and

(6) recommend solutions, including any legislative or regulatory solutions, to any problems identified under paragraphs (4) and (5).

**Subtitle R—Senior Safe**

**SEC. 491. IMMUNITY.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this subtitle—

(1) the term “Bank Secrecy Act Officer” means an individual responsible for ensuring compliance with the requirements mandated by subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code;

(2) the term “broker-dealer” means a broker or dealer, as those terms are defined, respectively, in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a));

(3) the term “covered agency” means—

(A) a State financial regulatory agency, including a State securities or law enforcement authority and a State insurance regulator;

(B) each of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies;

(C) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(D) a law enforcement agency;

(E) and State or local agency responsible for administering adult protective service laws; and

(F) a State attorney general.

(4) the term “covered financial institution” means—

(A) a credit union;

(B) a depository institution;

(C) an investment advisor;

(D) a broker-dealer;

(E) an insurance company;

(F) a State attorney general; and

(G) a transfer agent.

(5) the term “credit union” means a Federal credit union, State credit union, or State-chartered credit union, as those terms are defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

(6) the term “depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(7) the term “exploitation” means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual, including a caregiver or fiduciary, that—

(A) uses the resources of a senior citizen for monetary personal benefit, profit, or gain; or

(B) results in depriving a senior citizen of rightful access to or use of benefits, resources, belongings or assets;

(8) the term “Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies” has the meaning given the term in section 1003 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3302);

(9) the term “investment adviser” has the meaning given the term in section 202 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2);

(10) the term “insurance company” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a));

(11) the term “registered representative” means an individual who represents a broker-dealer in effecting or attempting to affect a purchase or sale of securities;

(12) the term “senior citizen” means an individual who is not less than 65 years of age;

(13) the term “State insurance regulator” has the meaning given such term in section 315 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6735);

(14) the term “State securities or law enforcement authority” has the meaning given the term in section 24(f)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78x(f)(4)); and

(15) the term “transfer agent” has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(b) IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.—

(1) IMMUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS.—An individual who has received the training described in section 492 shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for disclosing the possible exploitation of a senior citizen to a covered agency if the individual, at the time of the disclosure—

(A) served as a supervisor, compliance officer (including a Bank Secrecy Act Officer), or registered representative for a covered financial institution; and

(B) made the disclosure with reasonable care including reasonable efforts to avoid disclosure other than to a covered agency.

(2) IMMUNITY FOR COVERED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—A covered financial institution shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for a disclosure made by an individual described in paragraph (1) if—

(A) the individual was employed by, or, in the case of a registered representative, affiliated or

associated with, the covered financial institution at the time of the disclosure; and

(B) before the time of the disclosure, the covered financial institution provided the training described in section 492 to each individual described in section 492(a).

#### SEC. 492. TRAINING REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A covered financial institution may provide training described in subsection (b)(1) to each officer or employee of, or registered representative affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution who—

(1) is described in section 491(b)(1)(A);

(2) may come into contact with a senior citizen as a regular part of the duties of the officer, employee, or registered representative; or

(3) may review or approve the financial documents, records, or transactions of a senior citizen in connection with providing financial services to a senior citizen.

(b) TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The training described in this paragraph shall—

(A) instruct any individual attending the training on how to identify and report the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen;

(B) discuss the need to protect the privacy and respect the integrity of each individual customer of a covered financial institution; and

(C) be appropriate to the job responsibilities of the individual attending the training.

(2) TIMING.—The training required under subsection (a) shall be provided as soon as reasonably practicable but not later than 1 year after the date on which an officer, employee, or registered representative begins employment with or becomes affiliated or associated with the covered financial institution.

(3) BANK SECRECY ACT OFFICER.—An individual who is designated as a compliance officer under an anti-money laundering program established pursuant to section 5318(h) of title 31, United States Code, shall be deemed to have received the training described under this subsection.

#### SEC. 493. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preempt or limit any provision of State law, except only to the extent that section 491 provides a greater level of protection against liability to an individual described in section 491(b)(1) or to a covered financial institution described in section 491(b)(2) than is provided under State law.

#### Subtitle S—National Securities Exchange Regulatory Parity

#### SEC. 496. APPLICATION OF EXEMPTION.

Section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(1)), as amended by section 456(b), is further amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A);

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “that the Commission determines by rule (on its own initiative or on the basis of a petition) are substantially similar to the listing standards applicable to securities described in subparagraph (A)” and inserting “that have been approved by the Commission”;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or (B)”;

and

(4) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

#### Subtitle T—Private Company Flexibility and Growth

#### SEC. 497. SHAREHOLDER THRESHOLD FOR REGISTRATION.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 12(g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “shall—” and all that follows through “register such security” and inserting “shall, not later than 120 days after the last day

of its first fiscal year ended after the effective date of this subsection on which the issuer has total assets exceeding \$10,000,000 (or such greater amount of assets as the Commission may establish by rule) and a class of equity security (other than an exempted security) held of record by 2,000 or more persons (or such greater number of persons as the Commission may establish by rule), register such security”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “The dollar figure in this paragraph shall be indexed for inflation every 5 years by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounded to the nearest \$100,000.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “300 persons” and all that follows through “1,200 persons persons” and inserting “1,200 persons”;

and

(2) in section 15(d)(1), by striking “300 persons” and all that follows through “1,200 persons persons” and inserting “1,200 persons”.

#### Subtitle U—Small Company Capital Formation Enhancements

#### SEC. 498. JOBS ACT-RELATED EXEMPTION.

Section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000, adjusted for inflation by the Commission every 2 years to the nearest \$10,000 to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking “such amount as” and inserting: “such amount, in addition to the adjustment for inflation provided for under such paragraph (2)(A), as”; and

(B) by striking “such amount, it” and inserting “such amount, in addition to the adjustment for inflation provided for under such paragraph (2)(A), it”.

#### Subtitle V—Encouraging Public Offerings

#### SEC. 499. EXPANDING TESTING THE WATERS AND CONFIDENTIAL SUBMISSIONS.

The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5(d), by striking “an emerging growth company or any person authorized to act on behalf of an emerging growth company” and inserting “an issuer or any person authorized to act on behalf of an issuer”; and

(2) in section 6(e)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES” and inserting “DRAFT REGISTRATION STATEMENTS”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any issuer, prior to its initial public offering date, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than 15 days before the date on which the issuer conducts a road show, as such term is defined in section 230.433(h)(4) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.”.

#### TITLE V—REGULATORY RELIEF FOR MAIN STREET AND COMMUNITY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

#### Subtitle A—Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing

#### SEC. 501. MORTGAGE ORIGINATOR DEFINITION.

Section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (cc) and subsection (dd) as subsections (dd) and (ee), respectively; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(C) of subsection (dd), as so redesignated, by striking “an employee of a retailer of manufactured homes who is not described in clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) and who does not advise a consumer on loan terms (including rates, fees, and other costs)” and inserting “a retailer of manufactured or modular homes or its employees unless such retailer or its employees receive compensation or gain for engaging in activities described in subparagraph (A) that is in excess of any compensation or gain received in a comparable cash transaction”.

#### SEC. 502. HIGH-COST MORTGAGE DEFINITION.

Section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602), as amended by section 501, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (aa) (relating to disclosure of greater amount or percentage), as so designated by section 1100A of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, as subsection (bb);

(2) by redesignating subsection (bb) (relating to high cost mortgages), as so designated by section 1100A of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, as subsection (aa), and moving such subsection to immediately follow subsection (z); and

(3) in subsection (aa)(1)(A), as so redesignated—

(A) in clause (i)(I), by striking “(8.5 percentage points, if the dwelling is personal property and the transaction is for less than \$50,000)” and inserting “(10 percentage points if the dwelling is personal property or is a transaction that does not include the purchase of real property on which a dwelling is to be placed, and the transaction is for less than \$75,000 (as such amount is adjusted by the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index))”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking “or” at the end; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) in the case of a transaction for less than \$75,000 (as such amount is adjusted by the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index) in which the dwelling is personal property (or is a consumer credit transaction that does not include the purchase of real property on which a dwelling is to be placed) the greater of 5 percent of the total transaction amount or \$3,000 (as such amount is adjusted by the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index); or”.

#### Subtitle B—Mortgage Choice

#### SEC. 506. DEFINITION OF POINTS AND FEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 103 OF TILA.—Paragraph (4) of section 103(aa) of the Truth in Lending Act, as redesignated by section 502, is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A) and section 129C”;

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting “and insurance” after “taxes”;

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “, except as retained by a creditor or its affiliate as a result of their participation in an affiliated business arrangement (as defined in section 3(7) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602(7)),” after “compensation”; and

(C) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) the charge is—

“(I) a bona fide third-party charge not retained by the mortgage originator, creditor, or an affiliate of the creditor or mortgage originator; or

“(II) a charge set forth in section 106(e)(1);”;

and

(3) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking “accident,”; and  
(B) by striking “or any payments” and inserting “and any payments”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 129C OF TILA.—Section 129C of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)(C), by striking “103” and all that follows through “or mortgage originator” and inserting “103(aa)(4)”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(i), by striking “103” and all that follows through “or mortgage originator” and inserting “103(aa)(4)”.

#### **Subtitle C—Financial Institution Customer Protection**

#### **SEC. 511. REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.**

(a) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE MATERIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or group of customer accounts or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer or group of customers unless—

(A) the agency has a material reason for such request or order; and

(B) such reason is not based solely on reputation risk.

(2) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency believes a specific customer or group of customers is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity which—

(A) poses a threat to national security,

(B) is involved in terrorist financing,

(C) is an agency of the government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list,

(D) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country specified in subparagraph (C), or

(E) does business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer or group of customers has used due diligence to avoid doing business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), such belief shall satisfy the requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the agency shall—

(A) provide such request or order to the institution in writing; and

(B) accompany such request or order with a written justification for why such termination is needed, including any specific laws or regulations the agency believes are being violated by the customer or group of customers, if any.

(2) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification described under paragraph (1)(B) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution.

(c) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the customer or customers of the justification for the customer's account termination described under subsection (b).

(2) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or

a group of customer accounts based on a belief that the customer or customers pose a threat to national security, or are otherwise described under subsection (a)(2), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer or customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall issue an annual report to the Congress stating—

(1) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered a depository institution to terminate during the previous year; and

(2) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making such requests and orders and the frequency on which the agency relied on each such authority.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency” means—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution” means—

(A) a depository institution, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) an insured credit union.

#### **SEC. 512. AMENDMENTS TO THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REFORM, RECOVERY, AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1989.**

Section 951 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1833a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “affecting a federally insured financial institution” and inserting “against a federally insured financial institution or by a federally insured financial institution against an unaffiliated third person”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “SUBPOENAS” and inserting “INVESTIGATIONS”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (1)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) summon witnesses and require the production of any books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, or other records which the Attorney General deems relevant or material to the inquiry, if the Attorney General—

“(i) requests a court order from a court of competent jurisdiction for such actions and offers specific and articulable facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information or testimony sought is relevant and material for conducting an investigation under this section; or

“(ii) either personally or through delegation no lower than the Deputy Attorney General, issues and signs a subpoena for such actions and such subpoena is supported by specific and articulable facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information or testimony sought is relevant for conducting an investigation under this section.”.

#### **Subtitle D—Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access**

#### **SEC. 516. SAFE HARBOR FOR CERTAIN LOANS HELD ON PORTFOLIO.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 129C of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) SAFE HARBOR FOR CERTAIN LOANS HELD ON PORTFOLIO.—

“(1) SAFE HARBOR FOR CREDITORS THAT ARE DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A creditor that is a depository institution shall not be subject to suit for

failure to comply with subsection (a), (c)(1), or (f)(2) of this section or section 129H with respect to a residential mortgage loan, and the banking regulators shall treat such loan as a qualified mortgage, if—

“(i) the creditor has, since the origination of the loan, held the loan on the balance sheet of the creditor; and

“(ii) all prepayment penalties with respect to the loan comply with the limitations described under subsection (c)(3).

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—In the case of a depository institution that transfers a loan originated by that institution to another depository institution by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of the originating depository institution or the purchase of the originating depository institution, the depository institution transferring such loan shall be deemed to have complied with the requirement under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(2) SAFE HARBOR FOR MORTGAGE ORIGINATORS.—A mortgage originator shall not be subject to suit for a violation of section 129B(c)(3)(B) for steering a consumer to a residential mortgage loan if—

“(A) the creditor of such loan is a depository institution and has informed the mortgage originator that the creditor intends to hold the loan on the balance sheet of the creditor for the life of the loan; and

“(B) the mortgage originator informs the consumer that the creditor intends to hold the loan on the balance sheet of the creditor for the life of the loan.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) BANKING REGULATORS.—The term ‘banking regulators’ means the Federal banking agencies, the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency, and the National Credit Union Administration.

“(B) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘depository institution’ has the meaning given that term under section 19(b)(1) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 505(b)(1)).

“(C) FEDERAL BANKING AGENCIES.—The term ‘Federal banking agencies’ has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by this section may be construed as preventing a balloon loan from qualifying for the safe harbor provided under section 129C(j) of the Truth in Lending Act if the balloon loan otherwise meets all of the requirements under such subsection (j), regardless of whether the balloon loan meets the requirements described under clauses (i) through (iv) of section 129C(b)(2)(E) of such Act.

#### **Subtitle E—Application of the Expedited Funds Availability Act**

#### **SEC. 521. APPLICATION OF THE EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 602(20) (12 U.S.C. 4001(20)) by inserting “, located in the United States,” after “ATM”;

(2) in section 602(21) (12 U.S.C. 4001(21)) by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Puerto Rico,”;

(3) in section 602(23) (12 U.S.C. 4001(23)) by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Puerto Rico,”; and

(4) in section 603(d)(2)(A) (12 U.S.C. 4002(d)(2)(A)), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Puerto Rico,”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on January 1, 2017.



**Subtitle F—Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement**

**SEC. 526. CHANGES REQUIRED TO SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT ON ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL AND MANAGERIAL FACTORS.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall revise the Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement on Assessment of Financial and Managerial Factors (12 C.F.R. part 225—appendix C) to raise the consolidated asset threshold under such policy statement from \$1,000,000,000 (as adjusted by Public Law 113–250) to \$10,000,000,000.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Subparagraph (C) of section 171(b)(5) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5371(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that is subject to the application of the Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement on Assessment of Financial and Managerial Factors of the Board of Governors (12 C.F.R. part 225—appendix C).”.

**Subtitle G—Community Institution Mortgage Relief**

**SEC. 531. COMMUNITY FINANCIAL INSTITUTION MORTGAGE RELIEF.**

(a) *EXEMPTION FROM ESCROW REQUIREMENTS FOR LOANS HELD BY SMALLER CREDITORS.*—Section 129D of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639d) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(k) *SAFE HARBOR FOR LOANS HELD BY SMALLER CREDITORS.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—A creditor shall not be in violation of subsection (a) with respect to a loan if—

“(A) the creditor has consolidated assets of \$10,000,000,000 or less; and

“(B) the creditor holds the loan on the balance sheet of the creditor for the 3-year period beginning on the date of the origination of the loan.

“(2) *EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.*—In the case of a creditor that transfers a loan to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of the creditor, the purchase of the creditor, or a supervisory act or recommendation from a State or Federal regulator, the creditor shall be deemed to have complied with the requirement under paragraph (1)(B).”; and

(2) by striking the term “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(b) *MODIFICATION TO EXEMPTION FOR SMALL SERVICERS OF MORTGAGE LOANS.*—Section 6 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2605) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) *SMALL SERVICER EXEMPTION.*—The Consumer Law Enforcement Agency shall, by regulation, provide exemptions to, or adjustments for, the provisions of this section for a servicer that annually services 20,000 or fewer mortgage loans, in order to reduce regulatory burdens while appropriately balancing consumer protections.”.

**Subtitle H—Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform**

**SEC. 536. TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**SEC. 1012. TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS.**

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—

“(1) *FINAL EXAMINATION REPORT.*—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall

provide a final examination report to a financial institution not later than 60 days after the later of—

“(A) the exit interview for an examination of the institution; or

“(B) the provision of additional information by the institution relating to the examination.

“(2) *EXIT INTERVIEW.*—If a financial institution is not subject to a resident examiner program, the exit interview shall occur not later than the end of the 9-month period beginning on the commencement of the examination, except that such period may be extended by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency by providing written notice to the institution and the Independent Examination Review Director describing with particularity the reasons that a longer period is needed to complete the examination.

“(b) *EXAMINATION MATERIALS.*—Upon the request of a financial institution, the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall include with the final report an appendix listing all examination or other factual information relied upon by the agency in support of a material supervisory determination.

**“SEC. 1013. EXAMINATION STANDARDS.**

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In the examination of a financial institution—

“(1) a commercial loan shall not be placed in non-accrual status solely because the collateral for such loan has deteriorated in value;

“(2) a modified or restructured commercial loan shall be removed from non-accrual status if the borrower demonstrates the ability to perform on such loan over a maximum period of 6 months, except that with respect to loans on a quarterly, semiannual, or longer repayment schedule such period shall be a maximum of 3 consecutive repayment periods;

“(3) a new appraisal on a performing commercial loan shall not be required unless an advance of new funds is involved; and

“(4) in classifying a commercial loan in which there has been deterioration in collateral value, the amount to be classified shall be the portion of the deficiency relating to the decline in collateral value and repayment capacity of the borrower.

“(b) *WELL CAPITALIZED INSTITUTIONS.*—The Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies may not require a financial institution that is well capitalized to raise additional capital in lieu of an action prohibited under subsection (a).

“(c) *CONSISTENT LOAN CLASSIFICATIONS.*—The Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies shall develop and apply identical definitions and reporting requirements for non-accrual loans.

**“SEC. 1014. OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW.**

“(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established in the Council an Office of Independent Examination Review (the ‘Office’).

“(b) *HEAD OF OFFICE.*—There is established the position of the Independent Examination Review Director (the ‘Director’), as the head of the Office. The Director shall be appointed by the Council and shall be independent from any member agency of the Council.

“(c) *STAFFING.*—The Director is authorized to hire staff to support the activities of the Office.

“(d) *DUTIES.*—The Director shall—

“(1) receive and, at the Director’s discretion, investigate complaints from financial institutions, their representatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, concerning examinations, examination practices, or examination reports;

“(2) hold meetings, at least once every three months and in locations designed to encourage participation from all sections of the United States, with financial institutions, their rep-

resentatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, to discuss examination procedures, examination practices, or examination policies;

“(3) review examination procedures of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to ensure that the written examination policies of those agencies are being followed in practice and adhere to the standards for consistency established by the Council;

“(4) conduct a continuing and regular review of examination quality assurance for all examination types conducted by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies;

“(5) adjudicate any supervisory appeal initiated under section 1015; and

“(6) report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Council, on the reviews carried out pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4), including compliance with the requirements set forth in section 1012 regarding timeliness of examination reports, and the Council’s recommendations for improvements in examination procedures, practices, and policies.

“(e) *CONFIDENTIALITY.*—The Director shall keep confidential all meetings with, discussions with, and information provided by financial institutions.

**“SEC. 1015. RIGHT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MATERIAL SUPERVISORY DETERMINATIONS.**

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—A financial institution shall have the right to obtain an independent review of a material supervisory determination contained in a final report of examination.

“(b) *NOTICE.*—

“(1) *TIMING.*—A financial institution seeking review of a material supervisory determination under this section shall file a written notice with the Independent Examination Review Director (the ‘Director’) within 60 days after receiving the final report of examination that is the subject of such review.

“(2) *IDENTIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.*—The written notice shall identify the material supervisory determination that is the subject of the independent examination review, and a statement of the reasons why the institution believes that the determination is incorrect or should otherwise be modified.

“(3) *INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO INSTITUTION.*—Any information relied upon by the agency in the final report that is not in the possession of the financial institution may be requested by the financial institution and shall be delivered promptly by the agency to the financial institution.

“(c) *RIGHT TO HEARING.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director shall determine the merits of the appeal on the record or, at the financial institution’s election, shall refer the appeal to an Administrative Law Judge to conduct a confidential hearing pursuant to the procedures set forth under sections 556 and 557 of title 5, United States Code, which hearing shall take place not later than 60 days after the petition for review was received by the Director, and to issue a proposed decision to the Director based upon the record established at such hearing.

“(2) *STANDARD OF REVIEW.*—In rendering a determination or recommendation under this subsection, neither the Administrative Law Judge nor the Director shall defer to the opinions of the examiner or agency, but shall conduct a de novo review to independently determine the appropriateness of the agency’s decision based upon the relevant statutes, regulations, and other appropriate guidance, as well as evidence adduced at any hearing.

“(d) *FINAL DECISION.*—A decision by the Director on an independent review under this section shall—

“(1) be made not later than 60 days after the record has been closed; and

“(2) be deemed final agency action and shall bind the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review and the financial institution requesting the review.

“(e) **RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—A financial institution shall have the right to petition for review of final agency action under this section by filing a Petition for Review within 60 days of the Director's decision in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the Circuit in which the financial institution is located.

“(f) **REPORT.**—The Director shall report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on actions taken under this section, including the types of issues that the Director has reviewed and the results of those reviews. In no case shall such a report contain information about individual financial institutions or any confidential or privileged information shared by financial institutions.

“(g) **RETALIATION PROHIBITED.**—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency may not—

“(1) retaliate against a financial institution, including service providers, or any institution-affiliated party (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act), for exercising appellate rights under this section; or

“(2) delay or deny any agency action that would benefit a financial institution or any institution-affiliated party on the basis that an appeal under this section is pending under this section.

“(h) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed—

“(1) to affect the right of a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency to take enforcement or other supervisory actions related to a material supervisory determination under review under this section; or

“(2) to prohibit the review under this section of a material supervisory determination with respect to which there is an ongoing enforcement or other supervisory action.”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **RIEGLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994.**—Section 309 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4806) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting after “appropriate Federal banking agency” the following: “, the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “the appellant from retaliation by agency examiners” and inserting “the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by the agencies referred to in subsection (a)”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following flush-left text:

“For purposes of this subsection and subsection (e), retaliation includes delaying consideration of, or withholding approval of, any request, notice, or application that otherwise would have been approved, but for the exercise of the institution's or credit union's rights under this section.”;

(C) in subsection (e)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ensure that appropriate safeguards exist for protecting the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by any agency referred to in subsection (a) for exercising its rights under this subsection.”; and

(D) in subsection (f)(1)(A)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) any issue specifically listed in an exam report as a matter requiring attention by the institution's management or board of directors; and

“(v) any suspension or removal of an institution's status as eligible for expedited processing of applications, requests, notices, or filings on the grounds of a supervisory or compliance concern, regardless of whether that concern has been cited as a basis for another material supervisory determination or matter requiring attention in an examination report, provided that the conduct at issue did not involve violation of any criminal law; and”.

(2) **FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.**—Section 205(j) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1785(j)) is amended by inserting “the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency,” before “the Administration” each place such term appears.

(3) **FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT OF 1978.**—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 1003, by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) the term ‘Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies’—

“(A) means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the National Credit Union Administration; and

“(B) for purposes of sections 1012, 1013, 1014, and 1015, includes the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency;”;

(B) in section 1005, by striking “One-fifth” and inserting “One-fourth”.

#### **Subtitle I—National Credit Union Administration Budget Transparency**

#### **SEC. 541. BUDGET TRANSPARENCY FOR THE NCUA.**

Section 209(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1789) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) on an annual basis and prior to the submission of the detailed business-type budget required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) make publicly available and cause to be printed in the Federal Register a draft of such detailed business-type budget; and

“(B) hold a public hearing, with public notice provided of such hearing, wherein the public can submit comments on the draft of such detailed business-type budget;”;

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting “detailed” after “submit a”;

(B) by inserting “, and where such budget shall address any comments submitted by the public pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)” after “Control Act”.

#### **Subtitle J—Taking Account of Institutions With Low Operation Risk**

#### **SEC. 546. REGULATIONS APPROPRIATE TO BUSINESS MODELS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For any regulatory action occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall—

(1) take into consideration the risk profile and business models of each type of institution or class of institutions subject to the regulatory action;

(2) determine the necessity, appropriateness, and impact of applying such regulatory action

to such institutions or classes of institutions; and

(3) tailor such regulatory action in a manner that limits the regulatory compliance impact, cost, liability risk, and other burdens, as appropriate, for the risk profile and business model of the institution or class of institutions involved.

(b) **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out the requirements of subsection (a), each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall consider—

(1) the impact that such regulatory action, both by itself and in conjunction with the aggregate effect of other regulations, has on the ability of the applicable institution or class of institutions to serve evolving and diverse customer needs;

(2) the potential impact of examination manuals, regulatory actions taken with respect to third-party service providers, or other regulatory directives that may be in conflict or inconsistent with the tailoring of such regulatory action described in subsection (a)(3); and

(3) the underlying policy objectives of the regulatory action and statutory scheme involved.

(c) **NOTICE OF PROPOSED AND FINAL RULEMAKING.**—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall disclose in every notice of proposed rulemaking and in any final rulemaking for a regulatory action how the agency has applied subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **INDIVIDUAL AGENCY REPORTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on the specific actions taken to tailor the regulatory actions of the agency pursuant to the requirements of this Act.

(B) **APPEARANCE BEFORE THE COMMITTEES.**—The head of each Federal financial institution regulatory agency shall appear before the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate after each report is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) to testify on the contents of such report.

(2) **FIEC REPORTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 months after each report is submitted under paragraph (1), the Financial Institutions Examination Council shall report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on—

(i) the extent to which regulatory actions tailored pursuant to this Act result in different treatment of similarly situated institutions of diverse charter types; and

(ii) the reasons for such differential treatment.

(B) **APPEARANCE BEFORE THE COMMITTEES.**—The Chairman of the Financial Institutions Examination Council shall appear before the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate after each report is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) to testify on the contents of such report.

(e) **LIMITED LOOK-BACK APPLICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall conduct a review of all regulations adopted during the period beginning on the date that is seven years before the date of the introduction of this Act in the House of Representatives and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act, and apply the requirements of this Act to such regulations.

(2) **REVISION.**—If the application of the requirements of this Act to any such regulation requires such regulation to be revised, the applicable Federal financial institutions regulatory

agency shall revise such regulation within 3 years of the enactment of this Act.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) **FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REGULATORY AGENCIES.**—The term “Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies” means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.

(2) **REGULATORY ACTION.**—The term “regulatory action” means any proposed, interim, or final rule or regulation, guidance, or published interpretation.

#### **Subtitle K—Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility**

#### **SEC. 551. OPTION FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS TO OPERATE AS A COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATION.**

The Home Owners’ Loan Act is amended by inserting after section 5 (12 U.S.C. 1464) the following:

#### **“SEC. 5A. ELECTION TO OPERATE AS A COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATION.**

“(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘covered savings association’ means a Federal savings association that makes an election approved under subsection (b).

“(b) **ELECTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon issuance of the rules described in subsection (f), a Federal savings association may elect to operate as a covered savings association by submitting a notice to the Comptroller of such election.

“(2) **APPROVAL.**—A Federal savings association shall be deemed to be approved to operate as a covered savings association on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Comptroller receives the notice under paragraph (1), unless the Comptroller notifies the Federal savings association otherwise.

“(c) **RIGHTS AND DUTIES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as otherwise provided in this section, a covered savings association shall—

“(1) have the same rights and privileges as a national bank that has its main office situated in the same location as the home office of the covered savings association; and

“(2) be subject to the same duties, restrictions, penalties, liabilities, conditions, and limitations that would apply to such a national bank.

“(d) **TREATMENT OF COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.**—A covered savings association shall be treated as a Federal savings association for the purposes—

“(1) of governance of the covered savings association, including incorporation, bylaws, boards of directors, shareholders, and distribution of dividends;

“(2) of consolidation, merger, dissolution, conversion (including conversion to a stock bank or to another charter), conservatorship, and receivership; and

“(3) determined by regulation of the Comptroller.

“(e) **EXISTING BRANCHES.**—A covered savings association may continue to operate any branch or agency the covered savings association operated on the date on which an election under subsection (b) is approved.

“(f) **RULEMAKING.**—The Comptroller shall issue rules to carry out this section—

“(1) that establish streamlined standards and procedures that clearly identify required documentation or timelines for an election under subsection (b);

“(2) that require a Federal savings association that makes an election under subsection (b) to identify specific assets and subsidiaries—

“(A) that do not conform to the requirements for assets and subsidiaries of a national bank; and

“(B) that are held by the Federal savings association on the date on which the Federal savings association submits a notice of such election;

“(3) that establish—

“(A) a transition process for bringing such assets and subsidiaries into conformance with the requirements for a national bank; and

“(B) procedures for allowing the Federal savings association to provide a justification for grandfathering such assets and subsidiaries after electing to operate as a covered savings association;

“(4) that establish standards and procedures to allow a covered savings association to terminate an election under subsection (b) after an appropriate period of time or to make a subsequent election;

“(5) that clarify requirements for the treatment of covered savings associations, including the provisions of law that apply to covered savings associations; and

“(6) as the Comptroller deems necessary and in the interests of safety and soundness.”.

#### **Subtitle L—SAFE Transitional Licensing**

#### **SEC. 556. ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO JOBS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### **“SEC. 1518. EMPLOYMENT TRANSITION OF LOAN ORIGINATORS.**

“(a) **TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING FROM A DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION TO A NON-DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon employment by a State-licensed mortgage company, an individual who is a registered loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the individual—

“(A) has not had an application for a loan originator license denied, or had such a license revoked or suspended in any governmental jurisdiction;

“(B) has not been subject to or served with a cease and desist order in any governmental jurisdiction or as described in section 1514(c);

“(C) has not been convicted of a felony that would preclude licensure under the law of the application State;

“(D) has submitted an application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State; and

“(E) was registered in the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as a loan originator during the 12-month period preceding the date of submission of the information required under section 1505(a).

“(2) **PERIOD.**—The period described in paragraph (1) shall begin on the date that the individual submits the information required under section 1505(a) and shall end on the earliest of—

“(A) the date that the individual withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) the date that the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) the date that the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) the date that is 120 days after the date on which the individual submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(b) **TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR STATE-LICENSED LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING INTERSTATE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A State-licensed loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an applica-

tion State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the State-licensed loan originator—

“(A) meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (a)(1);

“(B) is employed by a State-licensed mortgage company in the application State; and

“(C) was licensed in a State that is not the application State during the 30-day period preceding the date of submission of the information required under section 1505(a) in connection with the application submitted to the application State.

“(2) **PERIOD.**—The period described in paragraph (1) shall begin on the date that the State-licensed loan originator submits the information required under section 1505(a) in connection with the application submitted to the application State and end on the earliest of—

“(A) the date that the State-licensed loan originator withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) the date that the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) the date that the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) the date that is 120 days after the date on which the State-licensed loan originator submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—

“(1) Any person employing an individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if such individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.

“(2) Any individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State pursuant to this section and who engages in residential mortgage loan origination activities shall be subject to the requirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if such individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.

“(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) **STATE-LICENSED MORTGAGE COMPANY.**—The term ‘State-licensed mortgage company’ means an entity licensed or registered under the law of any State to engage in residential mortgage loan origination and processing activities.

“(2) **APPLICATION STATE.**—The term ‘application State’ means a State in which a registered loan originator or a State-licensed loan originator seeks to be licensed.”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 4501 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1517 the following:

“Sec. 1518. Employment transition of loan originators.”.

(c) **AMENDMENT TO CIVIL LIABILITY OF THE CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY AND OTHER OFFICIALS.**—Section 1513 of the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5112) is amended by striking “are loan originators or are applying for licensing or registration as loan originators” and inserting “are applying for licensing or registration using the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry”.

#### **Subtitle M—Right to Lend**

#### **SEC. 561. SMALL BUSINESS LOAN DATA COLLECTION REQUIREMENT.**

(a) **REPEAL.**—Section 704B of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691c-2) is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 701(b) of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “; or” and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5).

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for title VII of the Consumer Credit Protection Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 704B.

#### **Subtitle N—Community Bank Reporting Relief**

##### **SEC. 566. SHORT FORM CALL REPORT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) **SHORT FORM REPORTING.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue regulations allowing for a reduced reporting requirement for covered depository institutions when making the first and third report of condition for a year, as required pursuant to paragraph (3).

“(B) **COVERED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION DEFINED.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘covered depository institution’ means an insured depository institution that—

“(i) is well capitalized (as defined under section 38(b)); and

“(ii) satisfies such other criteria as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate.”.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 365 days thereafter until the appropriate Federal banking agencies (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) have issued the regulations required under section 7(a)(12)(A) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, such agencies shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report describing the progress made in issuing such regulations.

#### **Subtitle O—Homeowner Information Privacy Protection**

##### **SEC. 571. STUDY REGARDING PRIVACY OF INFORMATION COLLECTED UNDER THE HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975.**

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine whether the data required to be published, made available, or disclosed under the final rule, in connection with other publicly available data sources, including data made publicly available under Regulation C (12 C.F.R. 1003) before the effective date of the final rule, could allow for or increase the probability of—

(1) exposure of the identity of mortgage applicants or mortgagors through reverse engineering;

(2) exposure of mortgage applicants or mortgagors to identity theft or the loss of sensitive personal financial information;

(3) the marketing or sale of unfair or deceptive financial products to mortgage applicants or mortgagors based on such data;

(4) personal financial loss or emotional distress resulting from the exposure of mortgage applicants or mortgagors to identity theft or the loss of sensitive personal financial information; and

(5) the potential legal liability facing the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency and market participants in the event the data required to be published, made available, or disclosed under the final rule leads or contributes to identity theft or the capture of sensitive personal financial information.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing,

and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General with respect to the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) any recommendations for legislative or regulatory actions that—

(A) would enhance the privacy of a consumer when accessing mortgage credit; and

(B) are consistent with consumer protections and safe and sound banking operations.

(c) **SUSPENSION OF DATA SHARING REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the final rule—

(1) depository institutions shall not be required to publish, disclose, or otherwise make available to the public, pursuant to the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (or regulations issued under such Act) any data that was not required to be published, disclosed, or otherwise made available pursuant to such Act (or regulations issued under such Act) on the day before the date of the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; and

(2) the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency and the Financial Institutions Examination Council shall not publish, disclose, or otherwise make available to the public any such information received from a depository institution pursuant to the final rule, except as required by law.

(d) **TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DATA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the effective date for new reporting requirements contained in the final rule shall be January 1, 2019.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) **DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term “depository institution” has the meaning given that term under section 303 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2802).

(2) **FINAL RULE.**—The term “final rule” means the final rule issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection titled “Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C)” (October 28, 2015; 80 Fed. Reg. 66128).

#### **Subtitle A—Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment**

##### **SEC. 576. DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS SUBJECT TO MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 304 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as paragraph (2) and adjusting the margin appropriately; and

(2) by inserting before such paragraph (2) the following:

“(i) **EXEMPTIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to a depository institution, the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply—

“(A) with respect to closed-end mortgage loans, if such depository institution originated less than 100 closed-end mortgage loans in each of the two preceding calendar years; and

“(B) with respect to open-end lines of credit, if such depository institution originated less than 200 open-end lines of credit in each of the two preceding calendar years.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Section 304(i)(2) of such Act, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by striking “section 303(2)(A)” and inserting “section 303(3)(A)”.

#### **Subtitle B—Protecting Consumers’ Access to Credit**

##### **SEC. 581. RATE OF INTEREST AFTER TRANSFER OF LOAN.**

(a) **AMENDMENT TO THE REVISED STATUTES.**—Section 5197 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 85) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “A

loan that is valid when made as to its maximum rate of interest in accordance with this section shall remain valid with respect to such rate regardless of whether the loan is subsequently sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to a third party, and may be enforced by such third party notwithstanding any State law to the contrary.”.

(b) **AMENDMENT TO THE HOME OWNERS’ LOAN ACT.**—Section 4(g)(1) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1463(g)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “A loan that is valid when made as to its maximum rate of interest in accordance with this subsection shall remain valid with respect to such rate regardless of whether the loan is subsequently sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to a third party, and may be enforced by such third party notwithstanding any State law to the contrary.”.

(c) **AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.**—Section 205(g)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1785(g)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “A loan that is valid when made as to its maximum rate of interest in accordance with this subsection shall remain valid with respect to such rate regardless of whether the loan is subsequently sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to a third party, and may be enforced by such third party notwithstanding any State law to the contrary.”.

(d) **AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.**—Section 27(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831d(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “A loan that is valid when made as to its maximum rate of interest in accordance with this section shall remain valid with respect to such rate regardless of whether the loan is subsequently sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to a third party, and may be enforced by such third party notwithstanding any State law to the contrary.”.

#### **Subtitle C—NCUA Overhead Transparency**

##### **SEC. 586. FUND TRANSPARENCY.**

Section 203 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1783) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **FUND TRANSPARENCY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall accompany each annual budget submitted pursuant to section 209(b) with a report containing—

“(A) a detailed analysis of how the expenses of the Administration are assigned between prudential activities and insurance-related activities and the extent to which those expenses are paid from the fees collected pursuant to section 105 or from the Fund; and

“(B) the Board’s supporting rationale for any proposed use of amounts in the Fund contained in such budget, including detailed breakdowns and supporting rationales for any such proposed use related to titles of this Act other than this title.

“(2) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.**—The Board shall make each report described under paragraph (1) available to the public and available on the Board’s website.”.

#### **Subtitle D—Housing Opportunities Made Easier**

##### **SEC. 591. CLARIFICATION OF DONATED SERVICES TO NON-PROFITS.**

Section 129E(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639e(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO APPRAISAL DONATIONS.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), if a fee appraiser voluntarily donates appraisal services to an organization described in section 170(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, such voluntary donation shall be deemed customary and reasonable.”.

**TITLE VI—REGULATORY RELIEF FOR STRONGLY CAPITALIZED, WELL MANAGED BANKING ORGANIZATIONS**

**SEC. 601. CAPITAL ELECTION.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—A banking organization may make an election under this section to be treated as a qualifying banking organization for purposes of the regulatory relief described under section 602.

(b) *REQUIREMENTS.*—A banking organization may qualify to be treated as a qualifying banking organization if—

(1) the banking organization has an average leverage ratio of at least 10 percent;

(2) with respect to a depository institution holding company, each insured depository institution subsidiary of the holding company simultaneously makes the election described under subsection (a); and

(3) with respect to an insured depository institution, any parent depository institution holding company of the institution simultaneously makes the election described under subsection (a).

(c) *ELECTION PROCESS.*—To make an election under this section, a banking organization shall submit an election to the appropriate Federal banking agency (and any applicable State bank supervisor that regulates the banking organization) containing—

(1) a notice of such election;

(2) the banking organization's average leverage ratio, as well as the organization's quarterly leverage ratio for each of the most recently completed four calendar quarters;

(3) if the banking organization is a depository institution holding company, the information described under paragraph (2) for each of the organization's insured depository institution subsidiaries; and

(4) if the banking organization is an insured depository institution, the information described under paragraph (2) for any parent depository institution holding company of the institution.

(d) *EFFECTIVE DATE OF ELECTION.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—An election made under this section shall take effect at the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date that the appropriate Federal banking agency receives the application described under subsection (c), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the banking organization has not met the requirements described under subsection (b).

(2) *NOTICE OF FAILURE TO MEET REQUIREMENTS.*—If the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that a banking organization submitting an election notice under subsection (c) does not meet the requirements described under subsection (b), the agency shall—

(A) notify the banking organization (and any applicable State bank supervisor that regulates the banking organization), in writing, of such determination as soon as possible after such determination is made, but in no case later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date that the appropriate Federal banking agency receives the election; and

(B) include in such notification the specific reasons for such determination and steps that the banking organization can take to meet such requirements.

(e) *TREATMENT OF CERTAIN NEW BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.*—In the case of a banking organization that is a newly-chartered insured depository institution or a banking organization that becomes a banking organization because it controls a newly-chartered insured depository institution, such banking organization may be treated as a qualifying banking organization immediately upon becoming a banking organization, if—

(1) an election to be treated as a qualifying banking organization was included in the appli-

cation filed with the appropriate Federal banking agency in connection with becoming a banking organization; and

(2) as of the date the banking organization becomes a banking organization, the banking organization's tangible equity divided by the banking organization's leverage exposure, expressed as a percentage, is at least 10 percent.

(f) *FAILURE TO MAINTAIN QUARTERLY LEVERAGE RATIO AND LOSS OF ELECTION.*—

(1) *EFFECT OF FAILURE TO MAINTAIN QUARTERLY LEVERAGE RATIO.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—If, with respect to the most recently completed calendar quarter, the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that a qualifying banking organization's quarterly leverage ratio is below 10 percent—

(i) the appropriate Federal banking agency shall notify the qualifying banking organization and any applicable State bank supervisor that regulates the banking organization of such determination;

(ii) the appropriate Federal banking agency may prohibit the banking organization from making a capital distribution; and

(iii) the banking organization shall, within 3 months of the first such determination, submit a capital restoration plan to the appropriate Federal banking agency.

(B) *LOSS OF ELECTION AFTER ONE-YEAR REMEDIATION PERIOD.*—If a banking organization described under subparagraph (A) does not, within the 1-year period beginning on the date of such determination, raise the organization's quarterly leverage ratio for a calendar quarter ending in such 1-year period to at least 10 percent, the banking organization's election under this section shall be terminated, and the appropriate Federal banking agency shall notify any applicable State bank supervisor that regulates the banking organization of such termination.

(C) *EFFECT OF SUBSIDIARY ON PARENT ORGANIZATION.*—With respect to a qualifying banking organization described under subparagraph (A) that is an insured depository institution, any parent depository institution holding company of the qualifying banking organization shall—

(i) if the appropriate Federal banking agency determines it appropriate, be prohibited from making a capital distribution (other than a capital contribution to such qualifying banking organization described under subparagraph (A)); and

(ii) if the qualifying banking organization has an election terminated under subparagraph (B), any such parent depository institution holding company shall also have its election under this section terminated.

(2) *IMMEDIATE LOSS OF ELECTION IF THE QUARTERLY LEVERAGE RATIO FALLS BELOW 6 PERCENT.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—If, with respect to the most recently completed calendar quarter, the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that a qualifying banking organization's quarterly leverage ratio is below 6 percent, the banking organization's election under this section shall be terminated, and the appropriate Federal banking agency shall notify any applicable State bank supervisor that regulates the banking organization of such termination.

(B) *EFFECT OF SUBSIDIARY ON PARENT ORGANIZATION.*—With respect to a qualifying banking organization described under subparagraph (A) that is an insured depository institution, any parent depository institution holding company of the qualifying banking organization shall also have its election under this section terminated.

(3) *ABILITY TO MAKE FUTURE ELECTIONS.*—If a banking organization has an election under this section terminated, the banking organization may not apply for another election under this section until the banking organization has

maintained a quarterly leverage ratio of at least 10 percent for 8 consecutive calendar quarters.

**SEC. 602. REGULATORY RELIEF.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—A qualifying banking organization shall be exempt from the following:

(1) Any Federal law, rule, or regulation addressing capital or liquidity requirements or standards.

(2) Any Federal law, rule, or regulation that permits an appropriate Federal banking agency to object to a capital distribution.

(3) Any consideration by an appropriate Federal banking agency of the following:

(A) Any risk the qualifying banking organization may pose to "the stability of the financial system of the United States", under section 5(c)(2) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

(B) The "extent to which a proposed acquisition, merger, or consolidation would result in greater or more concentrated risks to the stability of the United States banking or financial system", under section 3(c)(7) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, so long as the banking organization, after such proposed acquisition, merger, or consolidation, would maintain a quarterly leverage ratio of at least 10 percent.

(C) Whether the performance of an activity by the banking organization could possibly pose a "risk to the stability of the United States banking or financial system", under section 4(j)(2)(A) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

(D) Whether the acquisition of control of shares of a company engaged in an activity described in section 4(j)(1)(A) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 could possibly pose a "risk to the stability of the United States banking or financial system", under section 4(j)(2)(A) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, so long as the banking organization, after acquiring control of such company, would maintain a quarterly leverage ratio of at least 10 percent.

(E) Whether a merger would pose a "risk to the stability of the United States banking or financial system", under section 18(c)(5) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, so long as the banking organization, after such proposed merger, would maintain a quarterly leverage ratio of at least 10 percent.

(F) Any risk the qualifying banking organization may pose to "the stability of the financial system of the United States", under section 10(b)(4) of the Home Owners' Loan Act.

(4) Subsections (i)(8) and (k)(6)(B)(ii) of section 4 and section 14 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

(5) Section 18(c)(13) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(6) Section 163 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010.

(7) Section 10(e)(2)(E) of the Home Owners' Loan Act.

(8) Any Federal law, rule, or regulation implementing standards of the type provided for in subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010.

(9) Any Federal law, rule, or regulation providing limitations on mergers, consolidations, or acquisitions of assets or control, to the extent such limitations relate to capital or liquidity standards or concentrations of deposits or assets, so long as the banking organization, after such proposed merger, consolidation, or acquisition, would maintain a quarterly leverage ratio of at least 10 percent.

(b) *QUALIFYING BANKING ORGANIZATIONS TREATED AS WELL CAPITALIZED.*—A qualifying banking organization shall be deemed to be "well capitalized" for purposes of—

(1) section 216 of the Federal Credit Union Act; and

(2) sections 29, 38, 44, and 46 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(c) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN RISK-WEIGHTED ASSET REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFYING BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.**—

(1) **ACQUISITION SIZE CRITERIA TREATMENT.**—A qualifying banking organization shall be deemed to meet the criteria described under section 4(j)(4)(D) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, so long as after the proposed transaction the acquiring qualifying banking organization would maintain a quarterly leverage ratio of at least 10 percent.

(2) **USE OF LEVERAGE EXPOSURE.**—With respect to a qualifying banking organization, in determining whether a proposal qualifies with the criteria described under subparagraphs (A)(iii) and (B)(i) of section 4(j)(4) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall consider the leverage exposure of an insured depository institution instead of the total risk-weighted assets of such institution.

#### SEC. 603. CONTINGENT CAPITAL STUDY.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency shall each carry out a study, which shall include holding public hearings, on how to design a requirement that banking organizations issue contingent capital with a market-based conversion trigger.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, each agency described under subsection (a) shall submit a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made by the agency in carrying out the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) the agency's recommendations on how the Congress should design a requirement that banking organizations issue contingent capital with a market-based conversion trigger.

#### SEC. 604. STUDY ON ALTERING THE CURRENT PROMPT CORRECTIVE ACTION RULES.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to assess the benefits and feasibility of altering the current prompt corrective action rules and replacing the Basel-based capital ratios with the nonperforming asset coverage ratio or NACR as the trigger for specific required supervisory interventions. The Comptroller General shall ensure that such study includes the following:

(1) An assessment of the performance of an NACR forward-looking measure of a banking organization's solvency condition relative to the regulatory capital ratios currently used by prompt corrective action rules.

(2) An analysis of the performance of alternative definitions of nonperforming assets.

(3) An assessment of the impact of two alternative intervention thresholds:

(A) An initial (high) intervention threshold, below which appropriate Federal banking agency examiners are required to intervene and assess a banking organization's condition and prescribe remedial measures.

(B) A lower threshold, below which banking organizations must increase their capital, seek an acquirer, or face mandatory resolution within 90 days.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations on the most suitable definition of nonperforming assets, as well as the two numerical thresholds that trigger specific required supervisory interventions.

#### SEC. 605. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) **APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.**—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency” —

(A) has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

(B) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) **BANKING ORGANIZATION.**—The term “banking organization” means—

(A) an insured depository institution;

(B) an insured credit union;

(C) a depository institution holding company;

(D) a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act; and

(E) a U.S. intermediate holding company established by a foreign banking organization pursuant to section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) **FOREIGN EXCHANGE SWAP.**—The term “foreign exchange swap” has the meaning given that term under section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act.

(4) **INSURED CREDIT UNION.**—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given that term under section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act.

(5) **LEVERAGE EXPOSURE.**—The term “leverage exposure” —

(A) with respect to a banking organization other than an insured credit union or a traditional banking organization, has the meaning given the term “total leverage exposure” under section 3.10(c)(4)(ii), 217.10(c)(4), or 324.10(c)(4) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as applicable, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) with respect to a traditional banking organization other than an insured credit union, means total assets (minus any items deducted from common equity tier 1 capital) as calculated in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and as reported on the traditional banking organization's applicable regulatory filing with the banking organization's appropriate Federal banking agency; and

(C) with respect to a banking organization that is an insured credit union, has the meaning given the term “total assets” under section 702.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) **LEVERAGE RATIO DEFINITIONS.**—

(A) **AVERAGE LEVERAGE RATIO.**—With respect to a banking organization, the term “average leverage ratio” means the average of the banking organization's quarterly leverage ratios for each of the most recently completed four calendar quarters.

(B) **QUARTERLY LEVERAGE RATIO.**—With respect to a banking organization and a calendar quarter, the term “quarterly leverage ratio” means the organization's tangible equity divided by the organization's leverage exposure, expressed as a percentage, on the last day of such quarter.

(7) **NACR.**—The term “NACR” means—

(A) book equity less nonperforming assets plus loan loss reserves, divided by

(B) total banking organization assets.

(8) **NONPERFORMING ASSETS.**—The term “nonperforming assets” means—

(A) 20 percent of assets that are past due 30 to 89 days, plus

(B) 50 percent of assets that are past due 90 days or more, plus

(C) 100 percent of nonaccrual assets and other real estate owned.

(9) **QUALIFYING BANKING ORGANIZATION.**—The term “qualifying banking organization” means a banking organization that has made an election under section 601 and with respect to which such election is in effect.

(10) **SECURITY-BASED SWAP.**—The term “security-based swap” has the meaning given that

term under section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

(11) **SWAP.**—The term “swap” has the meaning given that term under section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act.

(12) **TANGIBLE EQUITY.**—The term “tangible equity” —

(A) with respect to a banking organization other than a credit union, means the sum of—

(i) common equity tier 1 capital;

(ii) additional tier 1 capital consisting of instruments issued on or before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(iii) with respect to a depository institution holding company that had less than \$15,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets as of December 31, 2009, or March 31, 2010, or a banking organization that was a mutual holding company as of May 19, 2010, trust preferred securities issued prior to May 19, 2010, to the extent such organization was permitted, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, to consider such securities as tier 1 capital under existing regulations of the appropriate Federal banking agency; and

(B) with respect to a banking organization that is a credit union, has the meaning given the term “net worth” under section 702.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(13) **TRADITIONAL BANKING ORGANIZATION.**—The term “traditional banking organization” means a banking organization that—

(A) has zero trading assets and zero trading liabilities;

(B) does not engage in swaps or security-based swaps, other than swaps or security-based swaps referencing interest rates or foreign exchange swaps; and

(C) has a total notional exposure of swaps and security-based swaps of not more than \$8,000,000,000.

(14) **OTHER BANKING TERMS.**—The terms “insured depository institution” and “depository institution holding company” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(15) **OTHER CAPITAL TERMS.**—With respect to a banking organization, the terms “additional tier 1 capital” and “common equity tier 1 capital” have the meaning given such terms, respectively, under section 3.20, 217.20, or 324.20 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as applicable, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

### TITLE VII—EMPOWERING AMERICANS TO ACHIEVE FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE

#### Subtitle A—Separation of Powers and Liberty Enhancements

##### SEC. 711. CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.

(a) **MAKING THE BUREAU AN INDEPENDENT CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1011—

(A) in the heading of such section, by striking “BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION” and inserting “CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY”;

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the heading of such subsection, by striking “BUREAU” and inserting “AGENCY”;

(ii) by striking “in the Federal Reserve System”;

(iii) by striking “independent bureau” and inserting “independent agency”; and

(iv) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency” (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Agency”);

(C) in subsection (b)(5), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) shall be appointed by the President; and”;



(D) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (3);

(E) in subsection (e), by striking “, including in cities in which the Federal reserve banks, or branches of such banks, are located,”; and

(F) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(2) in section 1012—

(A) in subsection (a)(10), by striking “examinations,”; and

(B) by striking subsection (c).

(b) **DEEMING OF NAME.**—Any reference in a law, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall be deemed a reference to the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT.**—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in the table of contents in section 1(b)—

(i) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(ii) in the table of contents relating to title X, in the items relating to subtitle B, subtitle C, and section 1027, by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(B) in section 2, by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) **AGENCY.**—The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency established under title X.”;

(C) in section 342 by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears in headings and text and inserting “Agency”;

(D) in section 1400(b)—

(i) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(ii) in the subsection heading, by striking “BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION” and inserting “CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY”;

(E) in section 1411(a)(1), by striking “Bureau” and inserting “Agency”; and

(F) in section 1447, by striking “Director of the Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Director of the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(2) **ALTERNATIVE MORTGAGE TRANSACTION PARITY ACT OF 1982.**—The Alternative Mortgage Transaction Parity Act of 1982 (12 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(B) in the subsection heading of subsection (d) of section 804 (12 U.S.C. 3803(d)), by striking “BUREAU” and inserting “AGENCY”.

(3) **ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT.**—The Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by amending the second paragraph (4) (defining the term “Bureau”) to read as follows: “(4) the term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”;

(B) in section 916(d)(1), by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(C) by striking “Bureau” each place that term appears in heading or text and inserting “Agency”.

(4) **EQUAL CREDIT OPPORTUNITY ACT.**—The Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 702 (15 U.S.C. 1691a), by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”; and

(B) by striking “Bureau” each place that term appears in heading or text and inserting “Agency”.

(5) **EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.**—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(B) in the heading of section 605(f)(1), by striking “BOARD AND BUREAU” and inserting “BOARD AND AGENCY”.

(6) **FAIR AND ACCURATE CREDIT TRANSACTIONS ACT OF 2003.**—The Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-159) is amended by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears in heading and text and inserting “Agency”.

(7) **FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.**—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by amending section 603(w) to read as follows:

“(w) **AGENCY.**—The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”; and

(B) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears, other than in sections 626 and 603(v), and inserting “Agency”.

(8) **FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT.**—The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by amending section 803(1) to read as follows:

“(1) The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”; and

(B) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears in heading or text and inserting “Agency”.

(9) **FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.**—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in the second paragraph (6) (with the heading “Referral to bureau of consumer financial protection”) of section 8(t) (12 U.S.C. 1818(t))—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION”; and inserting “CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY”; and

(ii) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(B) by amending clause (vi) of section 11(t)(2)(A) (12 U.S.C. 1821(t)(2)(A)(vi)) to read as follows:

“(vi) The Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”;

(C) in section 18(x) (12 U.S.C. 1828(x)), by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(D) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(E) in section 43(e) (12 U.S.C. 1831t(e)), by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(5) **AGENCY.**—The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”.

(10) **FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT OF 1978.**—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 1004(a)(4), by striking “Consumer Financial Protection Bureau” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(B) in section 1011, by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(11) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REFORM, RECOVERY, AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1989.**—The Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-73; 103 Stat. 183) is amended—

(A) in section 1112(b) (12 U.S.C. 3341), by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protec-

tion” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(B) in section 1124 (12 U.S.C. 3353), by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(C) in section 1125 (12 U.S.C. 3354), by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(D) in section 1206(a) (12 U.S.C. 1833b(a)), by striking “Federal Housing Finance Board” and all that follows through “Farm Credit Administration” and inserting “Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency, and the Farm Credit Administration”.

(12) **FINANCIAL LITERACY AND EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT.**—Section 513 of the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9702) is amended by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(13) **GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT.**—Title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(B) in section 505(a)(8) (15 U.S.C. 6805(a)(8)), by striking “Bureau” and inserting “Agency”.

(14) **HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975.**—The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(B) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(C) in section 303, by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) the term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”.

(15) **HOMEOWNERS PROTECTION ACT OF 1998.**—Section 10(a)(4) of the Homeowners Protection Act of 1998 (12 U.S.C. 4909(a)(4)) is amended by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(16) **HOME OWNERSHIP AND EQUITY PROTECTION ACT OF 1994.**—Section 158(a) of the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 1601 note) is amended by striking “Bureau” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(17) **INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT.**—The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (12 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(B) in section 1402, by amending paragraph (12) to read as follows:

“(12) ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”; and

(C) in section 1416, by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”.

(18) **REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES ACT OF 1974.**—The Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(B) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(C) in section 3, by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) the term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”.

(19) REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 5136C(b)(3)(B) of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 25b(b)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(20) RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT OF 1978.—The Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3401 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (B) of section 1101(7) (12 U.S.C. 3401(7)(B)) to read as follows:

“(B) the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency;” and

(B) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears in heading or text and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(21) S.A.F.E. MORTGAGE LICENSING ACT OF 2008.—The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 1507, by striking “Bureau, and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(B) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(C) by striking “Bureau” each place such appears, other than in sections 1505(a)(1), 1507(a)(2)(A), and 1511(b), and inserting “Agency”;

(D) in section 1503, by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) AGENCY.—The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”;

(E) in the heading of section 1508, by striking “**BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION**” and inserting “**CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY**”; and

(F) in the heading of section 1514, by striking “**BUREAU**” and inserting “**AGENCY**”.

(22) TELEMARKETING AND CONSUMER FRAUD AND ABUSE PREVENTION ACT.—The Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.) is amended by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” each place such term appears in heading or text and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(23) TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 552a(w)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “**BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION**” and inserting “**CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY**”; and

(ii) by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(B) in section 609(d)(2), by striking “Consumer Financial Protection Bureau of the Federal Reserve System” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”; and

(C) in section 3132(a)(1)(D), by inserting “the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency,” before “and the National Credit Union Administration”.

(24) TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(A) SECTION 987.—Section 987(h)(3)(E) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(B) NDAA FY 2015.—Section 557(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–29; 128 Stat. 3381; 10 U.S.C. 1144 note), is amended by striking “Consumer Financial Protection Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(25) TITLE 44, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 3502(5), by striking “the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,”; and

(B) in section 3513(c), by striking “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”.

(26) TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.—The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by amending section 103(b) (15 U.S.C. 1602(b)) to read as follows:

“(b) AGENCY.—The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”;

(B) by amending section 103(c) (15 U.S.C. 1602(c)) to read as follows:

“(c) BOARD.—The term ‘Board’ means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.”; and

(C) in section 128(f) (15 U.S.C. 1638(f)), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(D) in sections 129B (15 U.S.C. 1639b) and 129C (15 U.S.C. 1639c), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(E) in section 140A (15 U.S.C. 1651), by striking “in consultation with the Bureau” and inserting “in consultation with the Federal Trade Commission”;

(F) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears in heading or text and inserting “Agency”; and

(G) by striking “BUREAU” and inserting “AGENCY” in the paragraph headings for—

(i) section 122(d)(2) (15 U.S.C. 1632(d)(2));

(ii) section 127(c)(5) (15 U.S.C. 1637(c)(5));

(iii) section 127(r)(3) (15 U.S.C. 1637(r)(3)); and

(iv) section 127A(a)(14) (15 U.S.C. 1637a(a)(14)).

(27) TRUTH IN SAVINGS ACT.—The Truth in Savings Act (12 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by amending paragraph (4) of section 274 (12 U.S.C. 4313(4)) to read as follows:

“(4) AGENCY.—The term ‘Agency’ means the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”;

(B) by striking “National Credit Union Administration Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “National Credit Union Administration Board”; and

(C) by striking “Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”, except in section 233(b)(4)(B).

#### SEC. 712. BRINGING THE AGENCY INTO THE REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

Section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the heading of such subsection to read as follows: “BUDGET, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, AND AUDIT.”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) of paragraph (1), as so redesignated;

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Agency for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018 an amount equal to the aggregate amount of funds transferred by the Board of Governors to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection during fiscal year 2015.”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

#### SEC. 713. CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY INSPECTOR GENERAL REFORM.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8G—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “For purposes of implementing this section” and all that follows through the end of the subsection; and

(C) in subsection (g)(3), by striking “and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency;” after “the President of the Export-Import Bank;”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency,” after “the Export-Import Bank.”;

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE CONSUMER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 1011 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5491), as amended by section 311, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—There is established the position of the Inspector General of the Agency.”; and

(2) HEARINGS.—Section 1016 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR INSPECTOR GENERAL.—On a separate occasion from that described in subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Agency shall appear before each of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives at semi-annual hearings no less frequently than twice annually, at a date determined by the chairman of the respective committee, to testify regarding the reports required under subsection (b) and the reports required under section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).”.

(3) PARTICIPATION IN THE COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT.—Section 989E(a)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) The Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.”.

(4) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint an Inspector General for the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency in accordance with section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(c) TRANSITION PERIOD.—The Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall serve in that position until the confirmation of an Inspector General for the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency. At that time, the Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall become the Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

#### SEC. 714. PRIVATE PARTIES AUTHORIZED TO COMPEL THE AGENCY TO SEEK SANCTIONS BY FILING CIVIL ACTIONS; ADJUDICATIONS DEEMED ACTIONS.

Section 1053 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5563) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) PRIVATE PARTIES AUTHORIZED TO COMPEL THE AGENCY TO SEEK SANCTIONS BY FILING CIVIL ACTIONS.—

“(1) TERMINATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING.—In the case of any person who is a party to a proceeding brought by the Agency under this section, to which chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, applies, and against whom an order imposing a cease and desist order or a

penalty may be issued at the conclusion of the proceeding, that person may, not later than 20 days after receiving notice of such proceeding, and at that person's discretion, require the Agency to terminate the proceeding.

“(2) CIVIL ACTION AUTHORIZED.—If a person requires the Agency to terminate a proceeding pursuant to paragraph (1), the Agency may bring a civil action against that person for the same remedy that might be imposed.

“(g) ADJUDICATIONS DEEMED ACTIONS.—Any administrative adjudication commenced under this section shall be deemed an ‘action’ for purposes of section 1054(g).”

#### SEC. 715. CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMANDS TO BE APPEALED TO COURTS.

Section 1052 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5562) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “shall state” the following: “with specificity”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) MEETING REQUIREMENT.—The recipient of a civil investigative demand shall meet and confer with an Agency investigator within 30 calendar days after receipt of the demand to discuss and attempt to resolve all issues regarding compliance with the civil investigative demand, unless the Agency grants an extension requested by such recipient.”;

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the service of any civil investigative demand upon any person under subsection (c), or at any time before the return date specified in the demand, whichever period is shorter, or within such period exceeding 45 days after service or in excess of such return date as may be prescribed in writing, subsequent to service, by any Agency investigator named in the demand, such person may file, in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which such person resides, is found, or transacts business, a petition for an order modifying or setting aside the demand.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “at the Bureau”; and

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking “(1) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

#### SEC. 716. AGENCY DUAL MANDATE AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.

(a) PURPOSE.—Section 1021(a) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5511(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “In addition, the Director shall seek to implement and, where applicable, enforce Federal consumer financial law consistently for the purpose of strengthening participation in markets by covered persons, without Government interference or subsidies, to increase competition and enhance consumer choice.”.

(b) OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1013 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493), as amended by section 725, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall, not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, establish an Office of Economic Analysis.

“(2) DIRECT REPORTING.—The head of the Office of Economic Analysis shall report directly to the Director.

“(3) REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Office of Economic Analysis shall—

“(A) review all proposed rules and regulations, including regulatory guidance, of the Agency;

“(B) assess the impact of such rules and regulations, including regulatory guidance, on consumer choice, price, and access to credit products; and

“(C) publish a report on such reviews and assessments in the Federal Register.

“(4) MEASURING EXISTING RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Office of Economic Analysis shall—

“(A) review each rule and regulation issued by the Agency after 1, 2, 6, and 11 years of the date such rule became effective;

“(B) measure the rule or regulation's success in solving the problem that the rule or regulation was intended to solve when issued; and

“(C) publish a report on such review and measurement in the Federal Register.

“(5) COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT AND CIVIL ACTIONS.—The Office of Economic Analysis shall—

“(A) carry out a cost-benefit analysis of any proposed administrative enforcement action, civil lawsuit, or consent order of the Agency; and

“(B) assess the impact of such complaint, lawsuit, or order on consumer choice, price, and access to credit products.”.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT; RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1022(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) CONSIDERATION OF REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT BY THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—Before issuing any rule or regulation, the Director shall consider the review and assessment of such rule or regulation, including regulatory guidance, carried out by the Office of Economic Analysis.

“(6) IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS AND METRICS FOR JUDGING SUCCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall, in each proposed rulemaking of the Agency—

“(i) identify the problem that the particular rule or regulations is seeking to solve; and

“(ii) specify the metrics by which the Agency will measure the success of the rule or regulation in solving such problem.

“(B) REQUIRED METRICS.—The metrics specified under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall include a measurement of changes to consumer access to, and cost of, consumer financial products and services.”.

(3) CONSIDERATION OF COST-BENEFIT REVIEW RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in subtitle E of title X, by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 1059. CONSIDERATION OF COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT AND CIVIL ACTIONS.

“Before initiating any administrative enforcement action or civil lawsuit or entering into a consent order, the Director shall consider the cost-benefit analysis of such action, lawsuit, or order carried out by the Office of Economic Analysis.”; and

(B) in the table of contents under section 1(b), by inserting after the item relating to section 1058 the following:

“Sec. 1059. Consideration of cost-benefit analysis related to administrative enforcement and civil actions.”.

(c) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATIVE OR UNNECESSARY ANALYSES.—The Consumer Law Enforcement Agency may perform any of the analyses required by the amendments made by this section in conjunction with, or as part of, any other agenda or analysis required by any other provision of law, if such other agenda or analysis satisfies the provisions of this section.

#### SEC. 717. NO DEFERENCE TO AGENCY INTERPRETATION.

The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1022(b)(4)—

(A) by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(2) in section 1061(b)(5)(E)—

(A) by striking “affords to the—” and all that follows through “(i) Federal Trade Commission” and inserting “affords to the Federal Trade Commission”;

(B) by striking “; or” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (ii).

#### Subtitle B—Administrative Enhancements

#### SEC. 721. ADVISORY OPINIONS.

Section 1022(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)), as amended by section 716, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) ADVISORY OPINIONS.—

“(A) ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a procedure and, as necessary, promulgate rules to provide written opinions in response to inquiries concerning the conformance of specific conduct with Federal consumer financial law. In establishing the procedure, the Director shall consult with the prudential regulators and such other Federal departments and agencies as the Director determines appropriate, and obtain the views of all interested persons through a public notice and comment period.

“(ii) SCOPE OF REQUEST.—A request for an opinion under this paragraph must relate to specific proposed or prospective conduct by a covered person contemplating the proposed or prospective conduct.

“(iii) SUBMISSION.—A request for an opinion under this paragraph may be submitted to the Director either by or on behalf of a covered person.

“(iv) RIGHT TO WITHDRAW INQUIRY.—Any inquiry under this paragraph may be withdrawn at any time prior to the Director issuing an opinion in response to such inquiry, and any opinion based on an inquiry that has been withdrawn shall have no force or effect.

“(B) ISSUANCE OF OPINIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall, within 90 days of receiving the request for an opinion under this paragraph, either—

“(I) issue an opinion stating whether the described conduct would violate Federal consumer financial law;

“(II) if permissible under clause (iii), deny the request; or

“(III) explain why it is not feasible to issue an opinion.

“(ii) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), if the Director determines that the Agency requires additional time to issue an opinion, the Director may make a single extension of the deadline of 90 days or less.

“(iii) DENIAL OF REQUESTS.—The Director shall not issue an opinion, and shall so inform the requestor, if the request for an opinion—

“(I) asks a general question of interpretation;

“(II) asks about a hypothetical situation;

“(III) asks about the conduct of someone other than the covered person on whose behalf the request is made;

“(IV) asks about past conduct that the covered person on whose behalf the request is made does not plan to continue in the future; or

“(V) fails to provide necessary supporting information requested by the Agency within a reasonable time established by the Agency.

“(iv) AMENDMENT AND REVOCATION.—An advisory opinion issued under this paragraph may be amended or revoked at any time.

“(v) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—An opinion rendered pursuant to this paragraph shall be

placed in the Agency's public record 90 days after the requesting party has received the advice, subject to any limitations on public disclosure arising from statutory restrictions, Agency regulations, or the public interest. The Agency shall redact any personal, confidential, or identifying information about the covered person or any other persons mentioned in the advisory opinion, unless the covered person consents to such disclosure.

“(vi) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Agency shall, concurrent with the semi-annual report required under section 1016(b), submit information regarding the number of requests for an advisory opinion received, the subject of each request, the number of requests denied pursuant to clause (iii), and the time needed to respond to each request.

“(C) **RELIANCE ON OPINION.**—Any person may rely on an opinion issued by the Director pursuant to this paragraph that has not been amended or withdrawn. No liability under Federal consumer financial law shall attach to conduct consistent with an advisory opinion that had not been amended or withdrawn at the time the conduct was undertaken.

“(D) **ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Agency shall assist, to the maximum extent practicable, small businesses in preparing inquiries under this paragraph.

“(ii) **SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED.**—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘small business’ has the meaning given the term ‘small business concern’ under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

“(E) **INQUIRY FEE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall develop a system to charge a fee for each inquiry made under this paragraph in an amount sufficient, in the aggregate, to pay for the cost of carrying out this paragraph.

“(ii) **NOTICE AND COMMENT.**—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Director shall publish a description of the fee system described in clause (i) in the Federal Register and shall solicit comments from the public for a period of 60 days after publication.

“(iii) **FINALIZATION.**—The Director shall publish a final description of the fee system and implement such fee system not later than 30 days after the end of the public comment period described in clause (ii).”

## **SEC. 722. REFORM OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL CIVIL PENALTY FUND.**

(a) **SEGREGATED ACCOUNTS.**—Section 1017(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, as redesignated by section 712, is amended by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) **SEGREGATED ACCOUNTS IN CIVIL PENALTY FUND.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Agency shall establish and maintain a segregated account in the Civil Penalty Fund each time the Agency obtains a civil penalty against any person in any judicial or administrative action under Federal consumer financial laws.

“(B) **DEPOSITS IN SEGREGATED ACCOUNTS.**—The Agency shall deposit each civil penalty collected into the segregated account established for such penalty under subparagraph (A).”

(b) **PAYMENT TO VICTIMS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 1017(b) of such Act, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

“(3) **PAYMENT TO VICTIMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(i) **IDENTIFICATION OF CLASS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of deposit of amounts in a segregated account in the Civil Penalty Fund, the Agency shall identify the class of victims of the violation of Federal consumer financial laws

for which such amounts were collected and deposited under paragraph (2).

“(ii) **PAYMENTS.**—The Agency, within 2 years after the date on which such class of victims is identified, shall locate and make payments from such amounts to each victim.

“(B) **FUNDS DEPOSITED IN TREASURY.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Agency shall deposit into the general fund of the Treasury any amounts remaining in a segregated account in the Civil Penalty Fund at the end of the 2-year period for payments to victims under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) **IMPOSSIBLE OR IMPRACTICAL PAYMENTS.**—If the Agency determines before the end of the 2-year period for payments to victims under subparagraph (A) that such victims cannot be located or payments to such victims are otherwise not practicable, the Agency shall deposit into the general fund of the Treasury the amounts in the segregated account in the Civil Penalty Fund.”

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to civil penalties collected after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **AMOUNTS IN CONSUMER FINANCIAL CIVIL PENALTY FUND ON DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—With respect to amounts in the Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund on the date of enactment of this Act that were not allocated for consumer education and financial literacy programs on or before September 30, 2015, the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency shall separate such amounts into segregated accounts in accordance with, and for purposes of, section 1017(d) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, as amended by this section. The date of deposit of such amounts shall be deemed to be the date of enactment of this Act.

## **SEC. 723. AGENCY PAY FAIRNESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1013(a)(2) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) **COMPENSATION.**—The rates of basic pay for all employees of the Agency shall be set and adjusted by the Director in accordance with the General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to service by an employee of the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency following the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

## **SEC. 724. ELIMINATION OF MARKET MONITORING FUNCTIONS.**

The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1021(c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(2) in section 1022, by striking subsection (c); and

(3) in section 1026(b), by striking “, and to assess and detect risks to consumers and consumer financial markets”.

## **SEC. 725. REFORMS TO MANDATORY FUNCTIONAL UNITS.**

The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1013—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “shall establish” and inserting “may establish”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “shall establish” and inserting “may establish”;

(iii) paragraph (3)(D)—

(I) by striking “To facilitate preparation of the reports required under subparagraph (C), supervision and enforcement activities, and monitoring of the market for consumer financial products and services, the” and inserting “The”;

(II) by adding at the end the following: “Information collected under this paragraph may not be made publicly available, except as required by law.”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “shall establish” and inserting “may establish”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “There is established the” and inserting “At any time when the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity exists within the Agency, there shall be a”;

(C) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “shall establish” and inserting “may establish”;

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, if such Office exists within the Agency,” after “Community Affairs Office”; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “established by the Director” and inserting “, if established by the Director,”;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking “Not later than 24 months after the designated transfer date, and annually thereafter,” and inserting “Annually, at any time when the Office of Financial Education exists within the Agency,”;

(D) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “shall establish” and inserting “may establish”;

(E) by striking subsection (f);

(F) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(G) in subsection (f), as so redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “Before the end of the 180-day period beginning on the designated transfer date, the Director shall” and inserting “The Director may”;

(II) by striking “on protection from unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices and”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “The Office” and inserting “At any time when the Office of Financial Protection for Older Americans exists within the Agency, the Office”;

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)—

(aa) by striking clause (i);

(bb) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(cc) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking “to respond to consumer problems caused by unfair, deceptive, or abusive practices”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and alert the Commission and State regulators of certifications or designations that are identified as unfair, deceptive, or abusive”;

(III) in subparagraph (D)—

(aa) by striking clause (i); and

(bb) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) in section 1029(e), by inserting after “Affairs,” the following: “if established under this title,”;

(3) in section 1035—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “shall designate” and inserting “may designate”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “If the Secretary designates the Ombudsman under subsection (a), the Secretary”.

## **SEC. 726. REPEAL OF MANDATORY ADVISORY BOARD.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1014 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5494) is repealed.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the item relation to section 1014.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed as limiting the authority of the Director of the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency to establish advisory committees pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

**SEC. 727. ELIMINATION OF SUPERVISION AUTHORITY.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1002(15)(B)(ii)(I), by striking “examination or”;

(2) in section 1013(a)(1)(B), by striking “compliance examiners, compliance supervision analysts,”;

(3) in section 1016(c)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “supervisory and”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking “orders, and supervisory actions” and inserting “and orders”;

(4) in section 1024—

(A) in the heading, by striking “**SUPERVISION OF**” and inserting “**AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN**”;

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “as defined by rule in accordance with paragraph (2)” and inserting “as of the date of the enactment of the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (2);

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(iv) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking “1025(a) or”;

(C) by striking subsection (b);

(D) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(E) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(i) in the heading, by striking “**AND EXAMINATION AUTHORITY**”; and

(ii) by striking “, conduct examinations,” each place such term appears;

(F) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting “rulemaking and enforcement, but not supervisory,” before “authority of the Bureau”; and

(ii) by striking “conducting any examination or requiring any report from a service provider subject to this subsection” and inserting “carrying out any authority pursuant to this subsection with respect to a service provider”;

(5) by striking section 1025;

(6) in section 1026—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) **SCOPE OF COVERAGE.**—This section shall apply to any covered person that is an insured depository institution or an insured credit union.”;

(B) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “report of examination or related”;

(C) by striking subsection (c);

(D) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(E) in subsection (c), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **VERY LARGE INSTITUTIONS.**—

“(A) **PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), to the extent that the Agency and another Federal agency are authorized to enforce a Federal consumer financial law, the Agency shall have primary authority to enforce that Federal consumer financial law with respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, if such depository institution or credit union has total assets of more than \$10,000,000,000, and any affiliate thereof.

“(B) **REFERRAL.**—Any Federal agency, other than the Federal Trade Commission, that is authorized to enforce a Federal consumer financial law may recommend, in writing, to the Agency that the Agency initiate an enforcement proceeding with respect to a person described in subparagraph (A), as the Agency is authorized to do by that Federal consumer financial law.

“(C) **BACKUP ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.**—If the Agency does not, before the end of the 120-

day period beginning on the date on which the Agency receives a recommendation under subparagraph (B), initiate an enforcement proceeding, the other agency referred to in subparagraph (B) may initiate an enforcement proceeding.”; and

(F) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting after “subsection (a)” the following: “, or to any person described under subsection (c)(3)(A),”; and

(ii) by striking “section 1025” and inserting “this section”; and

(iii) by striking “When conducting any examination or requiring any report from a service provider subject to this subsection” and inserting “In carrying out any authority pursuant to this subsection with respect to a service provider”;

(7) in section 1027—

(A) by striking “supervisory,” each place such term appears;

(B) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “supervisory or”; and

(C) in subsection (p), by striking “section 1024(c)(1)” and inserting “section 1024(b)(1)”;

(8) in section 1034—

(A) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b);

(9) in section 1053—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking “sections 1024, 1025, and 1026” and inserting “sections 1024 and 1026”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(3)(B)(ii)(II), by striking “, by examination or otherwise,”;

(10) in section 1054(a), by striking “sections 1024, 1025, and 1026” and inserting “sections 1024 and 1026”;

(11) in section 1061—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period;

(ii) by striking “means—” and all that follows through “(A) all” and inserting “means all”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) **EXAMINATION.**—A transferor agency that is a prudential regulator shall have exclusive authority (relative to the Bureau) to require reports from and conduct examinations for compliance with Federal consumer financial laws with respect to a person described in section 1026(a).”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(12) in section 1063, by striking “sections 1024, 1025, and 1026” each place such term appears and inserting “sections 1024 and 1026”; and

(13) in section 1067, by striking subsection (e).

(b) **HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975.**—Section 305(d) of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2804(d)) is amended by striking “examine and”.

(c) **OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009.**—Section 626 of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (15 U.S.C. 1638 note) is repealed.

(d) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended—

(1) in the item relating to section 1024, by striking “**SUPERVISION OF**” and inserting “**AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN**”; and

(2) by striking the item relating to section 1025.

**SEC. 728. TRANSFER OF OLD OTS BUILDING FROM OCC TO GSA.**

Within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller of the Currency

shall transfer, at no cost, the parcel of real property in the District of Columbia located at 1700 G Street, Northwest, to the administrative jurisdiction, custody, and control of the Administrator of General Services.

**SEC. 729. LIMITATION ON AGENCY AUTHORITY.**

Section 1027 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5517) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(3)(A), by striking “may not exercise any rulemaking or enforcement authority” and inserting “may not exercise any rulemaking, enforcement, or other authority”;

(2) in subsection (i)(1), by striking “shall have no authority to exercise any power to enforce this title” and inserting “may not exercise any rulemaking, enforcement, or other authority”; and

(3) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “shall have no authority to exercise any power to enforce this title” and inserting “may not exercise any rulemaking, enforcement, or other authority”.

**Subtitle C—Policy Enhancements****SEC. 731. CONSUMER RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY.**

(a) **REQUIREMENT OF THE AGENCY TO OBTAIN PERMISSION BEFORE COLLECTING NONPUBLIC PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—Section 1022 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512), as amended by section 724(2), is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **CONSUMER PRIVACY.**—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Agency may not request, obtain, access, collect, use, retain, or disclose any nonpublic personal information about a consumer unless—

“(A) the Agency clearly and conspicuously discloses to the consumer, in writing or in an electronic form, what information will be requested, obtained, accessed, collected, used, retained, or disclosed; and

“(B) before such information is requested, obtained, accessed, collected, used, retained, or disclosed, the consumer informs the Agency that such information may be requested, obtained, accessed, collected, used, retained, or disclosed.

“(2) **APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENT TO CONTRACTORS OF THE AGENCY.**—Paragraph (1) shall apply to any person directed or engaged by the Agency to collect information to the extent such information is being collected on behalf of the Agency.

“(3) **DEFINITION OF NONPUBLIC PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘nonpublic personal information’ has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).”.

(b) **REMOVAL OF EXEMPTION FOR THE AGENCY FROM THE RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT.**—Section 1113 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3413) is amended by striking subsection (r).

**SEC. 732. REPEAL OF COUNCIL AUTHORITY TO SET ASIDE AGENCY RULES AND REQUIREMENT OF SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS CONSIDERATIONS WHEN ISSUING RULES.**

(a) **REPEAL OF AUTHORITY.**—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 1023 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5513) is hereby repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1022(b)(2)(C) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “, except that nothing in this clause shall be construed as altering or limiting the procedures under section 1023 that may apply to any rule prescribed by the Bureau”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents under section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 1023.

(b) **SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS CHECK.**—Section 1022(b)(2)(A) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by adding “and” at the end;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) the impact of such rule on the financial safety or soundness of an insured depository institution;”.

**SEC. 733. REMOVAL OF AUTHORITY TO REGULATE SMALL-DOLLAR CREDIT.**

The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1024(a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by adding “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; or” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(2) in section 1027, by adding at the end the following:

“(t) **NO AUTHORITY TO REGULATE SMALL-DOLLAR CREDIT.**—The Agency may not exercise any rulemaking, enforcement, or other authority with respect to payday loans, vehicle title loans, or other similar loans.”.

**SEC. 734. REFORMING INDIRECT AUTO FINANCING GUIDANCE.**

(a) **NULLIFICATION OF AUTO LENDING GUIDANCE.**—Bulletin 2013-02 of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (published March 21, 2013) shall have no force or effect.

(b) **GUIDANCE REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 1022(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)), as amended by section 721, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **GUIDANCE ON INDIRECT AUTO FINANCING.**—In proposing and issuing guidance primarily related to indirect auto financing, the Agency shall—

“(A) provide for a public notice and comment period before issuing the guidance in final form;

“(B) make available to the public, including on the website of the Agency, all studies, data, methodologies, analyses, and other information relied on by the Agency in preparing such guidance;

“(C) redact such information as necessary to maintain the nonpublic nature of confidential information, such as trade secrets and other confidential commercial or financial information, and personally identifiable information;

“(D) consult with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Justice; and

“(E) conduct a study on the costs and impacts of such guidance to consumers and women-owned, minority-owned, veteran-owned, and small businesses, including consumers and small businesses in rural areas.”.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to guidance issued by the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency that is not primarily related to indirect auto financing.

**SEC. 735. REMOVAL OF AGENCY UDAAP AUTHORITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1021(b)(2), by striking “from unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts and practices and”;

(2) by striking section 1031;

(3) in section 1036(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “provider” and all that follows through “to offer” and inserting “provider to offer”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “; or” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3); and

(4) in section 1061(b)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “(i) In general.—”; and

(ii) by striking clause (ii);

(B) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) (as amended by section 717(2)) as subparagraph (D); and

(5) in section 1076(b)(2), by striking “determine—” and all that follows through “(B) provide for” and inserting “determine, provide for”.

(b) **TELEMARKETING AND CONSUMER FRAUD AND ABUSE PREVENTION ACT.**—Section 3(c) of the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6102) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by striking “subsection (a)—” and all that follows through “(1) shall” and inserting “subsection (a) shall”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 1031.

**SEC. 736. PRESERVATION OF UDAP AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL BANKING REGULATORS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 18(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) **UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES BY DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce (including acts or practices which are unfair or deceptive to consumers) by depository institutions, each Federal banking regulator shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations defining with specificity such unfair or deceptive acts or practices, and containing requirements prescribed for the purpose of preventing such acts or practices.

“(2) **PROMULGATING SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR REGULATIONS.**—Whenever the Commission prescribes a rule under subsection (a)(1)(B), then within 60 days after such rule takes effect each Federal banking regulator shall promulgate substantially similar regulations prohibiting acts or practices of depository institutions which are substantially similar to those prohibited by rules of the Commission and which impose substantially similar requirements, unless—

“(A) the Federal banking regulator finds that such acts or practices of depository institutions are not unfair or deceptive; or

“(B) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System finds that implementation of similar regulations with respect to depository institutions would seriously conflict with essential monetary and payments systems policies of such Board, and publishes any such finding, and the reasons therefor, in the Federal Register.

“(3) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Compliance with regulations prescribed under this subsection shall be enforced—

“(i) under section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, with respect to a depository institution other than a Federal credit union; and

“(ii) under sections 120 and 206 of the Federal Credit Union Act, with respect to a Federal credit union.

“(B) **DEEMING OF VIOLATION.**—For the purpose of the exercise by a Federal banking regulator of the regulator’s powers under any Act referred to in subparagraph (A), a violation of any regulation prescribed under this subsection shall be deemed to be a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act.

“(C) **ENFORCEMENT THROUGH ANY EXISTING AUTHORITY.**—In addition to its powers under any provision of law specifically referred to in subparagraph (A), each Federal banking regulator may exercise, for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any regulation prescribed under this subsection, any other authority conferred on the regulator by law.

“(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue regulations under this subsection does not impair the authority of any other Federal banking regulator to make rules respecting the regulator’s own procedures in enforcing compliance with regulations prescribed under this subsection.

“(5) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Each Federal banking regulator exercising authority under this subsection shall transmit to the Congress each year a detailed report on its activities under this subsection during the preceding calendar year.

“(6) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this Act:

“(A) **BANK.**—The term ‘bank’ means—

“(i) national banks and Federal branches and Federal agencies of foreign banks;

“(ii) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organizations operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act; and

“(iii) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than banks referred to in clause (i) or (ii)) and insured State branches of foreign banks.

“(B) **DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘depository institution’ means a bank, a savings and loan institution, or a Federal credit union.

“(C) **FEDERAL BANKING REGULATOR.**—The term ‘Federal banking regulator’—

“(i) has the meaning given the term ‘appropriate Federal banking agency’ under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

“(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of a Federal credit union.

“(D) **FEDERAL CREDIT UNION.**—The term ‘Federal credit union’ has the same meaning as in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act.

“(E) **SAVINGS AND LOAN INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘savings and loan institution’ has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

“(F) **OTHER TERMS.**—The terms used in this paragraph that are not defined in this Act or otherwise defined in section 3(s) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act shall have the meaning given to them in section 1(b) of the International Banking Act of 1978.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 6(j)(6), by striking “section 18(f)(3) (15 U.S.C. 57a(f)(3))”, a Federal credit union described in section 18(f)(4) (15 U.S.C. 57a(f)(4))” and inserting “section 18(f), a Federal credit union described in section 18(f)”;

(2) in section 21(b)(6)(C), by striking “section 18(f)(3) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(f)(3))”, or a Federal credit union described in section 18(f)(4) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(f)(4))” and inserting “section 18(f), or a Federal credit union described in section 18(f)”;

(3) by striking “section 18(f)(2)” and inserting “section 18(f)”;

(4) by striking “section 18(f)(3)” each place such term appears and inserting “section 18(f)”;

(5) by striking “section 18(f)(4)” each place such term appears and inserting “section 18(f)”.



**SEC. 737. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT ARBITRATION.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 1028 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5518) is hereby repealed.

(b) *CLERICAL AMENDMENT.*—The table of contents under section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 1028.

**TITLE VIII—CAPITAL MARKETS IMPROVEMENTS****Subtitle A—SEC Reform, Restructuring, and Accountability****SEC. 801. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Section 35 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78kk) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

- “(1) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,605,000,000;
- “(2) for fiscal year 2018, \$1,655,000,000;
- “(3) for fiscal year 2019, \$1,705,000,000;
- “(4) for fiscal year 2020, \$1,755,000,000;
- “(5) for fiscal year 2021, \$1,805,000,000; and
- “(6) for fiscal year 2022, \$1,855,000,000.”

**SEC. 802. REPORT ON UNOBLIGATED APPROPRIATIONS.**

Section 23 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78w) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) *REPORT ON UNOBLIGATED APPROPRIATIONS.*—If, at the end of any fiscal year, there remain unobligated any funds that were appropriated to the Commission for such fiscal year, the Commission shall, not later than 30 days after the last day of such fiscal year, submit to the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and make available on the Commission’s website a report stating the amount of such unobligated funds. If there is any material change in the amount stated in the report, the Commission shall, not later than 7 days after determining the amount of the change, submit to such committees and make available on the Commission’s website a supplementary report stating the amount of and reason for the change.”

**SEC. 803. SEC RESERVE FUND ABOLISHED.**

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d) is amended by striking subsection (i).

**SEC. 804. FEES TO OFFSET APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) *SECTION 31 OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.*—Section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) *COLLECTION.*—The Commission shall, in accordance with this section, collect transaction fees and assessments.”;

(2) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “except as provided in paragraph (2),” before “shall”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) *GENERAL REVENUE.*—Any fees collected for a fiscal year pursuant to this section, sections 13(e) and 14(g) of this title, and section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 in excess of the amount provided in appropriation Acts for collection for such fiscal year pursuant to such sections shall be deposited and credited as general revenue of the Treasury.”;

(3) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking “the regular appropriation to the Commission by Congress for such fiscal year” each place it appears and inserting “the target offsetting collection amount for such fiscal year”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “subsection (l)(1)” and inserting “subsection (l)(2)”; and

(4) by striking subsection (l) and inserting the following:

“(l) *DEFINITIONS.*—For purposes of this section:

“(1) *TARGET OFFSETTING COLLECTION AMOUNT.*—The target offsetting collection amount for a fiscal year is—

“(A) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,400,000,000; and

“(B) for each succeeding fiscal year, the target offsetting collection amount for the prior fiscal year, adjusted by the rate of inflation.

“(2) *BASLINE ESTIMATE OF THE AGGREGATE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF SALES.*—The baseline estimate of the aggregate dollar amount of sales for any fiscal year is the baseline estimate of the aggregate dollar amount of sales of securities (other than bonds, debentures, other evidences of indebtedness, security futures products, and options on securities indexes (excluding a narrow-based security index)) to be transacted on each national securities exchange and by or through any member of each national securities association (otherwise than on a national securities exchange) during such fiscal year as determined by the Commission, after consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget, using the methodology required for making projections pursuant to section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.”

(b) *SECTION 6(b) OF THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.*—Section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “target fee collection amount” each place it appears and inserting “target offsetting collection amount”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “Subject to paragraphs (6)(B) and (7), an adjusted rate prescribed under paragraph (2) shall take effect on the later of—

“(A) the first day of the fiscal year to which such rate applies; or

“(B) five days after the date on which a regular appropriation to the Commission for such fiscal year is enacted.”;

(3) in paragraph (5), by inserting “of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934” after “sections 13(e) and 14(g)”; and

(4) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (8);

(5) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) *OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.*—Fees collected pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year—

“(A) except as provided in section 31(i)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations to the Commission; and

“(B) except as provided in paragraph (7), shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

“(7) *LAPSE OF APPROPRIATION.*—If on the first day of a fiscal year a regular appropriation to the Commission has not been enacted, the Commission shall continue to collect fees (as offsetting collections) under this subsection at the rate in effect during the preceding fiscal year, until 5 days after the date such a regular appropriation is enacted.”; and

(6) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (8) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting “TARGET OFFSETTING COLLECTION AMOUNT.”; and

(B) in the heading of the right column of the table, by striking “fee” and inserting “offsetting”.

(c) *SECTION 13(e) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.*—Section 13(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) *OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.*—Fees collected pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year—

“(A) except as provided in section 31(i)(2), shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations to the Commission; and

“(B) except as provided in paragraph (8), shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) *LAPSE OF APPROPRIATION.*—If on the first day of a fiscal year a regular appropriation to the Commission has not been enacted, the Commission shall continue to collect fees (as offsetting collections) under this subsection at the rate in effect during the preceding fiscal year, until 5 days after the date such a regular appropriation is enacted.”.

(d) *SECTION 14(g) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.*—Section 14(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) *OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.*—Fees collected pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year—

“(A) except as provided in section 31(i)(2), shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations to the Commission; and

“(B) except as provided in paragraph (8), shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) *LAPSE OF APPROPRIATION.*—If on the first day of a fiscal year a regular appropriation to the Commission has not been enacted, the Commission shall continue to collect fees (as offsetting collections) under this subsection at the rate in effect during the preceding fiscal year, until 5 days after the date such a regular appropriation is enacted.”.

(e) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section—

(1) shall apply beginning on October 1, 2017, except that for fiscal year 2018, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall publish—

(A) the rates established under section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by this section, not later than 30 days after the date on which an Act making a regular appropriation to the Commission for fiscal year 2018 is enacted; and

(B) the rate established under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended by this section, not later than August 31, 2017; and

(2) shall not apply with respect to fees for any fiscal year before fiscal year 2018.

**SEC. 805. COMMISSION FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION FUNDING PROHIBITION.**

The Securities and Exchange Commission may not obligate any funds for the purpose of Federal construction of a new headquarters facility of the Commission.

**SEC. 806. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**

Section 967 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) *IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.*—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall complete an implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the independent consultant

issued under subsection (b) on March 10, 2011. To the extent that implementation of certain recommendations requires legislation, the Commission shall submit a report to Congress containing a request for legislation granting the Commission such authority it needs to fully implement such recommendations.”.

**SEC. 807. OFFICE OF CREDIT RATINGS TO REPORT TO THE DIVISION OF TRADING AND MARKETS.**

Section 15E(p)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–7(p)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “within the Commission” and inserting “within the Division of Trading and Markets”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “report to the Chairman” and inserting “report to the head of the Division of Trading and Markets”.

**SEC. 808. OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES TO REPORT TO THE DIVISION OF TRADING AND MARKETS.**

Section 979 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 78o–4a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “, within the Division of Trading and Markets,” after “There shall be in the Commission”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “report to the Chairman” and inserting “report to the head of the Division of Trading and Markets”.

**SEC. 809. INDEPENDENCE OF COMMISSION OMBUDSMAN.**

Section 4(g)(8) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d(g)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the Investor Advocate shall appoint” and all that follows through “Investor Advocate” and inserting “the Chairman shall appoint an Ombudsman, who shall report to the Commission”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking “report to the Investor Advocate” and inserting “report to the Commission”; and

(B) by striking the last sentence.

**SEC. 810. INVESTOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE IMPROVEMENTS.**

Section 39 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78pp) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking “submit” and inserting “in consultation with the Small Business Capital Formation Advisory Committee established under section 40, submit”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and”; (ii) in subparagraph (D)(iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and (iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) a member of the Small Business Capital Formation Advisory Committee who shall be a nonvoting member.”;

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

“(2) TERM.—

“(A) LENGTH OF TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.—Each member of the Committee appointed under paragraph (1), other than the Investor Advocate, shall serve for a term of 4 years.

“(B) LIMITATION ON MULTIPLE TERMS.—A member of the Committee may not serve for more than one term, except for the Investor Advocate, a representative of State securities commissions, and the member of the Small Business Capital Formation Advisory Committee.”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “paragraph (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(3) in subsection (c), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) TERM.—

“(A) LENGTH OF TERM.—Each member elected under paragraph (1) shall serve for a term of 3 years in the capacity for which the member was elected under paragraph (1).

“(B) LIMITATION ON MULTIPLE TERMS.—A member elected under paragraph (1) may not serve for more than one term in the capacity for which the member was elected under paragraph (1).”; and

(4) by striking subsections (i) and (j).

**SEC. 811. DUTIES OF INVESTOR ADVOCATE.**

Section 4(g)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d(g)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking “and”;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) not take a position on any legislation pending before Congress other than a legislative change proposed by the Investor Advocate pursuant to subparagraph (E);

“(G) consult with the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation on proposed recommendations made under subparagraph (E); and

“(H) advise the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation on issues related to small business investors.”.

**SEC. 812. ELIMINATION OF EXEMPTION OF SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL FORMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**

Section 40 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (as added by Public Law 114–284) is amended by striking subsection (h).

**SEC. 813. INTERNAL RISK CONTROLS.**

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 4G, as added by this Act, the following:

**“SEC. 4H. INTERNAL RISK CONTROLS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of the following entities, in consultation with the Chief Economist, shall develop comprehensive internal risk control mechanisms to safeguard and govern the storage of all market data by such entity, all market data sharing agreements of such entity, and all academic research performed at such entity using market data:

“(1) The Commission.

“(2) Each national security association required to register under section 15A.

“(b) CONSOLIDATED AUDIT TRAIL.—The Commission may not approve a national market system plan pursuant to part 242.613 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), unless the operator of the consolidated audit trail created by such plan has developed, in consultation with the Chief Economist, comprehensive internal risk control mechanisms to safeguard and govern the storage of all market data by such operator, all market data sharing agreements of such operator, and all academic research performed at such operator using market data.”;

(2) in section 3(a), by redesignating the second paragraph (80) (relating to funding portals) as paragraph (81); and

(3) in section 3(a), by adding at the end the following:

“(82) CHIEF ECONOMIST.—The term ‘Chief Economist’ means the Director of the Division of Economic and Risk Analysis, or an employee of the Commission with comparable authority, as determined by the Commission.”.

**SEC. 814. APPLICABILITY OF NOTICE AND COMMENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT TO GUIDANCE VOTED ON BY THE COMMISSION.**

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4H, as added by this Act, the following:

**“SEC. 4I. APPLICABILITY OF NOTICE AND COMMENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT TO GUIDANCE VOTED ON BY THE COMMISSION.**

“The notice and comment requirements of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall also

apply with respect to any Commission statement or guidance, including interpretive rules, general statements of policy, or rules of Commission organization, procedure, or practice, that has the effect of implementing, interpreting, or prescribing law or policy and that is voted on by the Commission.”.

**SEC. 815. LIMITATION ON PILOT PROGRAMS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d), as amended by section 371(e), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) LIMITATION ON PILOT PROGRAMS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Any pilot program established by self-regulatory organizations, either individually or jointly, and filed with the Commission, including under section 11A or 19, shall terminate after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date that the Commission approved such program, unless the Commission issues a rule to permanently continue such program or approves such program on a permanent basis.

“(2) EXTENSION.—With respect to a particular pilot program described under paragraph (1), the Commission may extend the 5-year period described under such paragraph for an additional 3 years if the Commission determines such extension is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

“(3) LACK OF STATUTORY AUTHORITY.—If, with respect to a pilot program described under paragraph (1), the Commission determines that the pilot program should continue permanently, but the Commission lacks sufficient statutory authority to permanently continue the program, the Commission shall, not later than 1 year before such pilot program is scheduled to terminate pursuant to paragraph (1), notify the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate that the Commission believes the program should continue permanently but does not have sufficient statutory authority to continue the program.”.

(b) TREATMENT OF EXISTING PILOT PROGRAMS.—For purposes of section 4(k) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by subsection (a), the date on which the Commission approved a pilot program that was in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 816. PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.**

(a) PERSONS UNDER SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—Section 8 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The Commission is not authorized to compel under this title a person to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.”.

(b) PERSONS UNDER THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 23 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78w), as amended by section 802, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The Commission is not authorized to compel under this title a person to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.”.

(c) INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—Section 31 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–30) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The Commission is not

authorized to compel under this title an investment company to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.”.

(d) **INVESTMENT ADVISERS.**—Section 204 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-4) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.**—The Commission is not authorized to compel under this title an investment adviser to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.”; and

(2) in the second subsection (d), by striking “(d)” and inserting “(e)”.

**SEC. 817. PROCESS FOR CLOSING INVESTIGATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall establish a process for closing investigations (including preliminary or informal investigations) that is designed to ensure that the Commission, in a timely manner—

(1) makes a determination of whether or not to institute an administrative or judicial action in a matter or refer the matter to the Attorney General for potential criminal prosecution; and

(2) if the Commission determines not to institute such an action or refer the matter to the Attorney General, informs the persons who are the subject of the investigation that the investigation is closed.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the authority of the Commission to re-open an investigation if the Commission obtains new evidence after the investigation is closed, subject to any applicable statute of limitations.

**SEC. 818. ENFORCEMENT OMBUDSMAN.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d), as amended by section 803, is further amended by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) **ENFORCEMENT OMBUDSMAN.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Commission shall have an Enforcement Ombudsman, who shall be appointed by and report directly to the Commission.

“(2) **DUTIES.**—The Enforcement Ombudsman shall—

“(A) act as a liaison between the Commission and any person who is the subject of an investigation (including a preliminary or informal investigation) by the Commission or an administrative or judicial action brought by the Commission in resolving problems that such persons may have with the Commission or the conduct of Commission staff; and

“(B) establish safeguards to maintain the confidentiality of communications between the persons described in subparagraph (A) and the Enforcement Ombudsman.

“(3) **LIMITATION.**—In carrying out the duties of the Enforcement Ombudsman under paragraph (2), the Enforcement Ombudsman shall utilize personnel of the Commission to the extent practicable. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as replacing, altering, or diminishing the activities of any ombudsman or similar office of any other agency.

“(4) **REPORT.**—The Enforcement Ombudsman shall submit to the Commission and to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate an annual report that describes the activities and evaluates the effectiveness of the Enforcement Ombudsman during the preceding year.”.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT.**—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall appoint the initial Enforcement Ombudsman under subsection (i) of section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by subsection (a), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 819. ADEQUATE NOTICE.**

Section 21 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) **ADEQUATE NOTICE REQUIRED BEFORE BRINGING AN ENFORCEMENT ACTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No person shall be subject to an enforcement action by the Commission for an alleged violation of the securities laws or the rules and regulations issued thereunder if such person did not have adequate notice of such law, rule, or regulation.

“(2) **PUBLISHING OF INTERPRETATION DEEMED ADEQUATE NOTICE.**—With respect to an enforcement action, adequate notice of a securities law or a rule or regulation issued thereunder shall be deemed to have been provided to a person if the Commission approved a statement or guidance, in accordance with section 41, with respect to the conduct that is the subject of the enforcement action, prior to the time that the person engaged in the conduct that is the subject of the enforcement action.”.

**SEC. 820. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION'S ENFORCEMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman shall establish an advisory committee on the Commission's enforcement policies and practices (in this section referred to as the “Committee”).

(b) **DUTIES.**—

(1) **ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Committee shall conduct an analysis of the policies and practices of the Commission relating to the enforcement of the securities laws and make recommendations to the Commission regarding changes to such policies and practices.

(B) **SPECIFIC MATTERS INCLUDED.**—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Committee shall analyze and make recommendations to the Commission regarding matters including the following:

(i) How the Commission's enforcement objectives and strategies may be more effective.

(ii) The Commission's enforcement practices and procedures from the point of view of due process, the relationship of enforcement action to notice of legal requirements, the attribution of responsibility for violations, and the protection of reputation and rights of privacy.

(iii) The Commission's enforcement policies and practices in light of its statutory responsibility to protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation.

(iv) The appropriate blend of regulation, publicity, and formal enforcement action and on methods of furthering voluntary compliance.

(v) Criteria for the selection and disposition of enforcement actions, the adequacy of sanctions authorized by law, and the suitability and effectiveness of sanctions imposed by the Commission proceedings.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the Committee under subsection (a), the Committee shall submit to the Commission and the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the results of the analysis and the recommendations required by paragraph (1)(A).

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.**—The Committee shall be composed of not less than 3 and not greater than 7 members appointed by the Chairman.

(2) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Chairperson of the Committee shall be designated by the Chairman at the time of appointment of the members.

(d) **SUPPORT.**—The Commission shall provide the Committee with the administrative, professional, and technical support required by the Committee to carry out its responsibilities under this section.

(e) **TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE.**—The Committee established by subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that the report required by subsection (b)(2) is submitted.

(f) **CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMISSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the Committee submits the report required by subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall—

(1) consider the analysis and recommendations included in such report;

(2) adopt such recommendations, with any modifications, as the Commission considers appropriate; and

(3) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) lists each recommendation included in such report that the Commission does not adopt or adopts with material modifications; and

(B) for each recommendation listed under subparagraph (A), explains why the Commission does not consider it appropriate or does not have sufficient authority to adopt the recommendation or to adopt the recommendation without material modification.

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) **CHAIRMAN.**—The term “Chairman” means the Chairman of the Commission.

(3) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(4) **SECURITIES LAWS.**—The term “securities laws” has the meaning given such term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(h) **APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Committee is an advisory committee for purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

**SEC. 821. PROCESS TO PERMIT RECIPIENT OF WELLS NOTIFICATION TO APPEAR BEFORE COMMISSION STAFF IN-PERSON.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall establish a process under which, in any instance in which the Commission staff provides a written Wells notification to an individual informing the individual that the Commission staff has made a preliminary determination to recommend that the Commission bring an administrative or judicial action against the individual, the individual shall have the right to make an in-person presentation before the Commission staff concerning such recommendation and to be represented by counsel at such presentation, at the individual's own expense.

(b) **ATTENDANCE BY COMMISSIONERS.**—Such process shall provide that each Commissioner of the Commission, or a designee of the Commissioner, may attend any such presentation.

(c) **REPORT BY COMMISSION STAFF.**—Such process shall provide that, before any Commission vote on whether to bring the administrative or judicial action against the individual, the Commission staff shall provide to each Commissioner a written report on any such presentation, including any factual or legal arguments made by the individual and any supporting documents provided by the individual.

**SEC. 822. PUBLICATION OF ENFORCEMENT MANUAL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall approve, by vote of the Commission, and publish an updated manual that sets forth the policies and practices that the Commission will follow in the enforcement of the securities laws (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))). Such manual shall include policies and practices required by this Act, and by the amendments made by this Act, and shall be developed so as to ensure transparency in such enforcement and uniform application of such laws by the Commission.

(b) **ENFORCEMENT PLAN AND REPORT.**—Beginning on the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall transmit to Congress and publish on its Internet website an annual enforcement plan and report that shall—

(1) detail the priorities of the Commission with regard to enforcement and examination activities for the forthcoming year;

(2) report on the Commission's enforcement and examination activities for the previous year, including an assessment of how such activities comported with the priorities identified for that year pursuant to paragraph (1);

(3) contain an analysis of litigated decisions found not in favor of the Commission over the preceding year;

(4) contain a description of any emerging trends the Commission has focused on as part of its enforcement program, including whether and how the Commission has alerted or communicated with those who may be subject to the Commission's regulation of emerging trends;

(5) contain a description of legal theories or standards employed by the Commission in enforcement over the preceding year that had not previously been employed, and a summary justifying each such theory or standard; and

(6) provide an opportunity and mechanism for public comment.

**SEC. 823. PRIVATE PARTIES AUTHORIZED TO COMPEL THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION TO SEEK SANCTIONS BY FILING CIVIL ACTIONS.**

Title I of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 41. PRIVATE PARTIES AUTHORIZED TO COMPEL THE COMMISSION TO SEEK SANCTIONS BY FILING CIVIL ACTIONS.**

“(a) **TERMINATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING.**—In the case of any person who is a party to a proceeding brought by the Commission under a securities law, to which section 554 of title 5, United States Code, applies, and against whom an order imposing a cease and desist order and a penalty may be issued at the conclusion of the proceeding, that person may, not later than 20 days after receiving notice of such proceeding, and at that person's discretion, require the Commission to terminate the proceeding.

“(b) **CIVIL ACTION AUTHORIZED.**—If a person requires the Commission to terminate a proceeding pursuant to subsection (a), the Commission may bring a civil action against that person for the same remedy that might be imposed.

“(c) **STANDARD OF PROOF IN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a proceeding brought by the Commission under a securities law, to which section 554 of title 5, United States Code, applies, a legal or equitable remedy may be imposed on the person against whom the proceeding was brought only on a showing by the Commission of clear and convincing evidence

that the person has violated the relevant provision of law.”.

**SEC. 824. CERTAIN FINDINGS REQUIRED TO APPROVE CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES AGAINST ISSUERS.**

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4E the following:

**“SEC. 4F. CERTAIN FINDINGS REQUIRED TO APPROVE CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES AGAINST ISSUERS.**

“The Commission may not seek against or impose on an issuer a civil money penalty for violation of the securities laws unless the publicly available text of the order approving the seeking or imposition of such penalty contains findings, supported by an analysis by the Division of Economic and Risk Analysis and certified by the Chief Economist, of whether—

“(1) the alleged violation resulted in direct economic benefit to the issuer; and

“(2) the penalty will harm the shareholders of the issuer.”.

**SEC. 825. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION TO PROHIBIT PERSONS FROM SERVING AS OFFICERS OR DIRECTORS.**

(a) **UNDER SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.**—Subsection (f) of section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h–1) is repealed.

(b) **UNDER SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**—Subsection (f) of section 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u–3) is repealed.

**SEC. 826. SUBPOENA DURATION AND RENEWAL.**

Section 21(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “SUBPOENA.—” after the enumerator;

(2) by striking “For the purpose of” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purpose of”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **OMNIBUS ORDERS OF INVESTIGATION.**—

“(A) **DURATION AND RENEWAL.**—An omnibus order of investigation shall not be for an indefinite duration and may be renewed only by Commission action.

“(B) **DEFINITION.**—In subparagraph (A), the term ‘omnibus order of investigation’ means an order of the Commission authorizing 1 or more members of the Commission or its staff to issue subpoenas under paragraph (1) to multiple persons in relation to a particular subject matter area.”.

**SEC. 827. ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATIONS.**

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 4F the following:

**“SEC. 4G. ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATIONS.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a non-natural person may not be disqualified or otherwise made ineligible to use an exemption or registration provision, engage in an activity, or qualify for any similar treatment under a provision of the securities laws or the rules issued by the Commission under the securities laws by reason of having, or a person described in subsection (b) having, been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor or made the subject of any judicial or administrative order, judgment, or decree arising out of a governmental action (including an order, judgment, or decree agreed to in a settlement), or having, or a person described in subsection (b) having, been suspended or expelled from membership in, or suspended or barred from association with a member of, a registered national securities exchange or a registered national or affiliated securities association for any act or omission to act constituting conduct incon-

sistent with just and equitable principles of trade, unless the Commission, by order, on the record after notice and an opportunity for hearing, makes a determination that such non-natural person should be so disqualified or otherwise made ineligible for purposes of such provision.

“(b) **PERSON DESCRIBED.**—A person is described in this subsection if the person is—

“(1) a natural person who is a director, officer, employee, partner, member, or shareholder of the non-natural person referred to in subsection (a) or is otherwise associated or affiliated with such non-natural person in any way; or

“(2) a non-natural person who is associated or affiliated with the non-natural person referred to in subsection (a) in any way.

“(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any authority of the Commission, by order, on the record after notice and an opportunity for hearing, to prohibit a person from using an exemption or registration provision, engaging in an activity, or qualifying for any similar treatment under a provision of the securities laws, or the rules issued by the Commission under the securities laws, by reason of a circumstance referred to in subsection (a) or any similar circumstance.”.

**SEC. 828. DENIAL OF AWARD TO CULPABLE WHISTLEBLOWERS.**

Section 21F(c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u–6(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) to any whistleblower who is responsible for, or complicit in, the violation of the securities laws for which the whistleblower provided information to the Commission.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of paragraph (2)(E), a person is responsible for, or complicit in, a violation of the securities laws if, with the intent to promote or assist the violation, the person—

“(A) procures, induces, or causes another person to commit the offense;

“(B) aids or abets another person in committing the offense; or

“(C) having a duty to prevent the violation, fails to make an effort the person is required to make.”.

**SEC. 829. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE SANCTIONS ON PERSONS ASSOCIATED WITH A BROKER OR DEALER.**

Section 15(b)(6)(A)(i) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)(6)(A)(i)) is amended by striking “enumerated” and all that follows and inserting “enumerated in subparagraph (A), (D), (E), (G), or (H) of paragraph (4) of this subsection.”.

**SEC. 830. COMPLAINT AND BURDEN OF PROOF REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACTIONS FOR BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY.**

Section 36(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–35(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) In any such action brought by a security holder of a registered investment company on behalf of such company—

“(A) the complaint shall state with particularity all facts establishing a breach of fiduciary duty, and, if an allegation of any such facts is based on information and belief, the complaint shall state with particularity all facts on which that belief is formed; and

“(B) such security holder shall have the burden of proving a breach of fiduciary duty by clear and convincing evidence.”.

**SEC. 831. CONGRESSIONAL ACCESS TO INFORMATION HELD BY THE PUBLIC COMPANY ACCOUNTING OVERSIGHT BOARD.**

Section 105(b)(5) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7215(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraphs (B) and (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) AVAILABILITY TO THE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The Board shall make available to the Committees specified under section 101(h)—

“(i) such information as the Committees shall request; and

“(ii) with respect to any confidential or privileged information provided in response to a request under clause (i), including any information subject to section 104(g) and subparagraph (A), or any confidential or privileged information provided orally in response to such a request, such information shall maintain the protections provided in subparagraph (A), and shall retain its confidential and privileged status in the hands of the Board and the Committees.”.

**SEC. 832. ABOLISHING INVESTOR ADVISORY GROUP.**

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board shall abolish the Investor Advisory Group.

**SEC. 833. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC COMPANY ACCOUNTING OVERSIGHT BOARD TO USE CERTAIN FUNDS FOR MERIT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 109(c) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7219(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 109 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7219) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “USES OF FUNDS” and all that follows through “The budget” and inserting “USES OF FUNDS.—The budget”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “subsection (c)(1)” and inserting “subsection (c)”.

**SEC. 834. REALLOCATION OF FINES FOR VIOLATIONS OF RULES OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES RULEMAKING BOARD.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15B(c)(9) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 780-4(c)(9)) is amended to read as follows:

“(9) Fines collected for violations of the rules of the Board shall be deposited and credited as general revenue of the Treasury, except as otherwise provided in section 308 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 or section 21F of this title.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to fines collected after the date of enactment of this Act.

**Subtitle B—Eliminating Excessive Government Intrusion in the Capital Markets**

**SEC. 841. REPEAL OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FIDUCIARY RULE AND REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO RULEMAKING RELATING TO STANDARDS OF CONDUCT FOR BROKERS AND DEALERS.**

(a) REPEAL OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FIDUCIARY RULE.—The final rule of the Department of Labor titled “Definition of the Term ‘Fiduciary’: Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice” and related prohibited transaction exemptions published April 8, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 20946) shall have no force or effect.

(b) STAY ON RULES DEFINING CERTAIN FIDUCIARIES.—After the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall not prescribe any regulation under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) defining the circumstances under which an individual is considered a fiduciary until the date that is 60 days after the Securities and Exchange Commission issues a final rule relating

to standards of conduct for brokers and dealers pursuant to the second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 780(k)).

(c) REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO RULEMAKING RELATING TO STANDARDS OF CONDUCT FOR BROKERS AND DEALERS.—The second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 780(k)), as added by section 913(g)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall not promulgate a rule pursuant to paragraph (1) before providing a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and making such report available on the Commission’s website describing whether—

“(A) retail investors (and such other customers as the Commission may provide) are being harmed due to brokers or dealers operating under different standards of conduct than those that apply to investment advisors under section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-11);

“(B) alternative remedies will reduce any confusion or harm to retail investors due to brokers or dealers operating under different standards of conduct than those standards that apply to investment advisors under section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-11), including—

“(i) simplifying the titles used by brokers, dealers, and investment advisers; and

“(ii) enhancing disclosure surrounding the different standards of conduct currently applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisers;

“(C) the adoption of a uniform fiduciary standard of conduct for brokers, dealers, and investment advisors would adversely impact the commissions of brokers and dealers, the availability of proprietary products offered by brokers and dealers, and the ability of brokers and dealers to engage in principal transactions with customers; and

“(D) the adoption of a uniform fiduciary standard of conduct for brokers or dealers and investment advisors would adversely impact retail investor access to personalized and cost-effective investment advice, recommendations about securities, or the availability of such advice and recommendations.

“(4) ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—The Commission’s conclusions contained in the report described in paragraph (3) shall be supported by economic analysis.

“(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMULGATING A RULE.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register alongside the rule promulgated pursuant to paragraph (1) formal findings that such rule would reduce confusion or harm to retail customers (and such other customers as the Commission may by rule provide) due to different standards of conduct applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisors.

“(6) REQUIREMENTS UNDER INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—In proposing rules under paragraph (1) for brokers or dealers, the Commission shall consider the differences in the registration, supervision, and examination requirements applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisors.”.

**SEC. 842. EXEMPTION FROM RISK RETENTION REQUIREMENTS FOR NONRESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15G of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 780-11) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) the term ‘asset-backed security’ refers only to an asset-backed security that is comprised wholly of residential mortgages.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1); and

(B) by striking “(2) RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGES.—”;

(3) by striking subsection (h) and redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h); and

(4) in subsection (h) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “effective—” and all that follows through “(1) with respect to” and inserting “effective with respect to”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 941 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking subsection (c).

**SEC. 843. FREQUENCY OF SHAREHOLDER APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION.**

Section 14A(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n-1(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Not less frequently than once every 3 years” and inserting “Each year in which there has been a material change to the compensation of executives of an issuer from the previous year”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

**SEC. 844. SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS.**

(a) RESUBMISSION THRESHOLDS.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 240.14a-8(i)(12) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations to—

(1) in paragraph (i), adjust the 3 percent threshold to 6 percent;

(2) in paragraph (ii), adjust the 6 percent threshold to 15 percent; and

(3) in paragraph (iii), adjust the 10 percent threshold to 30 percent.

(b) HOLDING REQUIREMENT.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise the holding requirement for a shareholder to be eligible to submit a shareholder proposal to an issuer in section 240.14a-8(b)(1) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to—

(1) eliminate the option to satisfy the holding requirement by holding a certain dollar amount;

(2) require the shareholder to hold 1 percent of the issuer’s securities entitled to be voted on the proposal, or such greater percentage as determined by the Commission; and

(3) adjust the 1 year holding period to 3 years.

(c) SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS ISSUED BY PROXIES.—Section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS BY PROXIES NOT PERMITTED.—An issuer may not include in its proxy materials a shareholder proposal submitted by a person in such person’s capacity as a proxy, representative, agent, or person otherwise acting on behalf of a shareholder.”.

**SEC. 845. PROHIBITION ON REQUIRING A SINGLE BALLOT.**

Section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) PROHIBITION ON REQUIRING A SINGLE BALLOT.—The Commission may not require that a solicitation of a proxy, consent, or authorization to vote a security of an issuer in an election of members of the board of directors of the issuer be made using a single ballot or card that lists both individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) the issuer and individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) other proponents and permits the person granting the proxy, consent, or authorization to select from among individuals in both groups.”.

**SEC. 846. REQUIREMENT FOR MUNICIPAL ADVISOR FOR ISSUERS OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES.**

Section 15B(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-4(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) An issuer of municipal securities shall not be required to retain a municipal advisor prior to issuing any such securities.”.

**SEC. 847. SMALL ISSUER EXEMPTION FROM INTERNAL CONTROL EVALUATION.**

Section 404(c) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7262(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) EXEMPTION FOR SMALLER ISSUERS.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to any audit report prepared for an issuer that has total market capitalization of less than \$500,000,000, nor to any issuer that is a depository institution with assets of less than \$1,000,000,000.”.

**SEC. 848. STREAMLINING OF APPLICATIONS FOR AN EXEMPTION FROM THE INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.**

Section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-6(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c) The Commission” and inserting the following:

“(c) GENERAL EXEMPTIVE AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) APPLICATION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A person who wishes to receive an exemption from the Commission pursuant to paragraph (1) shall file an application with the Commission in such form and manner and containing such information as the Commission may require.

“(B) PUBLICATION; REJECTION OF INVALID APPLICATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the end of the 5-day period beginning on the date that the Commission receives an application under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall either—

“(I) publish the application, including by publication on the website of the Commission; or

“(II) if the Commission determines that the application does not comply with the proper form, manner, or information requirements described under subparagraph (A), reject such application and notify the applicant of the specific reasons the application was rejected.

“(ii) FAILURE TO PUBLISH APPLICATION.—If the Commission does not reject an application under clause (i)(II), but fails to publish the application by the end of the time period specified under clause (i), such application shall be deemed to have been published on the date that is the end of such time period.

“(3) DETERMINATION BY COMMISSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date that the Commission publishes an application pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), the Commission shall, by order—

“(i) approve the application;

“(ii) if the Commission determines that the application would have been approved had the applicant provided additional supporting documentation or made certain amendments to the application—

“(I) provide the applicant with the specific additional supporting documentation or amendments that the Commission believes are necessary for the applicant to provide in order for the application to be approved; and

“(II) request that the applicant withdraw the application and re-submit the application with such additional supporting documentation and amendments; or

“(iii) deny the application.

“(B) EXTENSION OF TIME PERIOD.—The Commission may extend the time period described under subparagraph (A) by not more than an additional 45 days, if—

“(i) the Commission determines that a longer period is appropriate and publishes the reasons for such determination; or

“(ii) the applicant consents to the longer period.

“(C) TIME PERIOD FOR WITHDRAWAL.—If the Commission makes a request under subparagraph (A)(ii) for an applicant to withdraw an application, such application shall be deemed to be denied if the applicant informs the Commission that the applicant will not withdraw the application or if the applicant does not withdraw the application before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the Commission makes such request.

“(4) PROCEEDINGS; NOTICE AND HEARING.—If an application is denied pursuant to paragraph (3), the Commission shall provide the applicant with—

“(A) a written explanation for why the application was not approved; and

“(B) an opportunity for hearing, if requested by the applicant not later than 20 days after the date of such denial, with such hearing to be commenced not later than 30 days after the date of such denial.

“(5) RESULT OF FAILURE TO INSTITUTE OR COMMENCE PROCEEDINGS.—An application shall be deemed to have been approved by the Commission, if—

“(A) the Commission fails to either approve, request the withdrawal of, or deny the application, as required under paragraph (3)(A), within the time period required under paragraph (3)(A), as such time period may have been extended pursuant to paragraph (3)(B); or

“(B) the applicant requests an opportunity for hearing, pursuant to paragraph (4)(B), but the Commission does not commence such hearing within the time period required under paragraph (4)(B).

“(6) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Commission shall issue rules to carry out this subsection.”.

**SEC. 849. RESTRICTION ON RECOVERY OF ERRO-NEOUSLY AWARDED COMPENSATION.**

Section 10D(b)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78j-4(b)(2)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: “, where such executive officer had control or authority over the financial reporting that resulted in the accounting restatement”.

**SEC. 850. EXEMPTIVE AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO REGISTRATION OF NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED STATISTICAL RATING ORGANIZATIONS.**

Section 15E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-7) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(u) COMMISSION EXEMPTIVE AUTHORITY.—The Commission, by rules and regulations upon its own motion, or by order upon application, may conditionally or unconditionally exempt any person from any provision or provisions of this title or of any rule or regulation thereunder, if and to the extent it determines that such rule, regulation, or requirement is creating a barrier to entry into the market for nationally recognized statistical rating organizations or impeding competition among such organizations, or that such an exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and is consistent with the protection of investors.”.

**SEC. 851. RISK-BASED EXAMINATIONS OF NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED STATISTICAL RATING ORGANIZATIONS.**

Section 15E(p)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-7(p)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “ANNUAL” and inserting “RISK-BASED”;

(B) by striking “an examination” and inserting “examinations”; and

(C) by striking “at least annually”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “, as appro-

priate,” after “Each examination under subparagraph (A) shall include”.

**SEC. 852. TRANSPARENCY OF CREDIT RATING METHODOLOGIES.**

Section 15E(s) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-7(s)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “rated by the nationally recognized statistical rating agency”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ix), by inserting before the period the following: “, except that the Commission may not require the inclusion of references to statutory or regulatory requirements or statutory provision headings or enumerators for any specific disclosure”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iv), by inserting before the period the following: “, except that the Commission may not require the inclusion of references to statutory or regulatory requirements or statutory provision headings or enumerators for any specific disclosure”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) NO MANDATE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF DISCLOSURES.—The Commission may not mandate the specific organization of the disclosures required under this paragraph.”.

**SEC. 853. REPEAL OF CERTAIN ATTESTATION REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CREDIT RATINGS.**

Section 15E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-7) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (iii); and

(2) in subsection (q)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (F).

**SEC. 854. LOOK-BACK REVIEW BY NRSRO.**

Section 15E(h)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-7(h)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Each nationally” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each nationally”;

(2) by striking “underwriter” and inserting “lead underwriter”;

(3) by striking “in any capacity”;

(4) by striking “during the 1-year period preceding the date an action was taken with respect to the credit rating”;

(5) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margin of such subclauses accordingly;

(6) in subclause (I), as so redesignated, by inserting before the semicolon the following: “during the 1-year period preceding the departure of the employee from the nationally recognized statistical rating organization”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) MAINTENANCE OF RATINGS ACTIONS.—In the case of maintenance of ratings actions, the requirement under clause (i) shall only apply to employees of a person subject to a credit rating of the nationally recognized statistical rating organization or an issuer of a security or money market instrument subject to a credit rating of the nationally recognized statistical rating organization.”.

**SEC. 855. APPROVAL OF CREDIT RATING PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGIES.**

Section 15E(r)(1)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-7(r)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “, or the Chief Credit Officer” after “performing a function similar to that of a board”.



**SEC. 856. EXCEPTION FOR PROVIDING CERTAIN MATERIAL INFORMATION RELATING TO A CREDIT RATING.**

Section 15E(h)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-7(h)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXCEPTION FOR PROVIDING CERTAIN MATERIAL INFORMATION.—Rules issued under this paragraph may not prohibit a person who participates in sales or marketing of a product or service of a nationally recognized statistical rating organization from providing material information, or information believed in good faith to be material, to the issuance or maintenance of a credit rating to a person who participates in determining or monitoring the credit rating, or developing or approving procedures or methodologies used for determining the credit rating, so long as the information provided is not intended to influence the determination of a credit rating, or the procedures or methodologies used to determine credit ratings.”.

**SEC. 857. REPEALS.**

(a) REPEALS.—The following provisions of title IX of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived as if such sections had not been enacted:

- (1) Section 912.
- (2) Section 914.
- (3) Section 917.
- (4) Section 918.
- (5) Section 919A.
- (6) Section 919B.
- (7) Section 919C.
- (8) Section 921.
- (9) Section 929T.
- (10) Section 929X.
- (11) Section 929Y.
- (12) Section 929Z.
- (13) Section 931.
- (14) Section 933.
- (15) Section 937.
- (16) Section 939B.
- (17) Section 939C.
- (18) Section 939D.
- (19) Section 939E.
- (20) Section 939F.
- (21) Section 939G.
- (22) Section 939H.
- (23) Section 946.
- (24) Subsection (b) of section 953.
- (25) Section 955.
- (26) Section 956.
- (27) Section 964.
- (28) Section 965.
- (29) Section 968.
- (30) Section 971.
- (31) Section 972.
- (32) Section 976.
- (33) Section 977.
- (34) Section 978.
- (35) Section 984.
- (36) Section 989.
- (37) Section 989A.
- (38) Section 989F.
- (39) Subsection (b) of section 989G.
- (40) Section 989I.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301) is amended—

- (1) in the table of contents in section 1(b), by striking the items relating to the sections described under paragraphs (1) through (23), (25) through (38), and (40) of subsection (a);
- (2) in section 953, by striking “(a) DISCLOSURE OF PAY VERSUS PERFORMANCE.”; and
- (3) in section 989G, by striking “(a) EXEMPTION.”.

**SEC. 858. EXEMPTION OF AND REPORTING BY PRIVATE EQUITY FUND ADVISERS.**

Section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) EXEMPTION OF AND REPORTING BY PRIVATE EQUITY FUND ADVISERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection, no investment adviser shall be subject to the registration or reporting requirements of this title with respect to the provision of investment advice relating to a private equity fund.

“(2) MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS AND ACCESS BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall issue final rules—

“(A) to require investment advisers described in paragraph (1) to maintain such records and provide to the Commission such annual or other reports as the Commission, taking into account fund size, governance, investment strategy, risk, and other factors, determines necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors; and

“(B) to define the term ‘private equity fund’ for purposes of this subsection.”.

**SEC. 859. RECORDS AND REPORTS OF PRIVATE FUNDS.**

The Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-1 et seq.) is amended—

- (1) in section 204(b)—
  - (A) in paragraph (1)—
    - (i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “investors,” and all that follows and inserting “investors.”;
    - (ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and
    - (iii) by striking “this title—” and all that follows through “to maintain” and inserting “this title to maintain”;
  - (B) in paragraph (3)(H)—
    - (i) by striking “, in consultation with the Council,”; and
    - (ii) by striking “or for the assessment of systemic risk”;
  - (C) in paragraph (4), by striking “, or for the assessment of systemic risk”;
  - (D) in paragraph (5), by striking “or for the assessment of systemic risk”;
  - (E) in paragraph (6)(A)(ii), by striking “, or for the assessment of systemic risk”;
  - (F) by striking paragraph (7) and redesignating paragraphs (8) through (11) as paragraphs (7) through (10), respectively; and
  - (G) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking “paragraph (8)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;
- (2) in section 211(e)—
  - (A) by striking “after consultation with the Council but”;
  - (B) by striking “subsection 204(b)” and inserting “section 204(b)”.

**SEC. 860. DEFINITION OF ACCREDITED INVESTOR.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a)(15) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(15)) is amended—

- (1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (G), respectively; and
- (2) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking “; or” at the end and inserting a semicolon, and inserting after such subparagraph the following:

“(B) any natural person whose individual net worth, or joint net worth with that person’s spouse, exceeds \$1,000,000 (which amount, along with the amounts set forth in subparagraph (C), shall be adjusted for inflation by the Commission every 5 years to the nearest \$10,000 to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) where, for purposes of calculating net worth under this subparagraph—

“(i) the person’s primary residence shall not be included as an asset;

“(ii) indebtedness that is secured by the person’s primary residence, up to the estimated fair market value of the primary residence at the time of the sale of securities, shall not be included as a liability (except that if the amount

of such indebtedness outstanding at the time of sale of securities exceeds the amount outstanding 60 days before such time, other than as a result of the acquisition of the primary residence, the amount of such excess shall be included as a liability); and

“(iii) indebtedness that is secured by the person’s primary residence in excess of the estimated fair market value of the primary residence at the time of the sale of securities shall be included as a liability;

“(C) any natural person who had an individual income in excess of \$200,000 in each of the 2 most recent years or joint income with that person’s spouse in excess of \$300,000 in each of those years and has a reasonable expectation of reaching the same income level in the current year;

“(D) any natural person who, by reason of their net worth or income, is an accredited investor under section 230.215 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this subparagraph);

“(E) any natural person who is currently licensed or registered as a broker or investment adviser by the Commission, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, or an equivalent self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934), or the securities division of a State or the equivalent State division responsible for licensing or registration of individuals in connection with securities activities;

“(F) any natural person the Commission determines, by regulation, to have demonstrable education or job experience to qualify such person as having professional knowledge of a subject related to a particular investment, and whose education or job experience is verified by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority or an equivalent self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934); or”.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 413 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203) is hereby repealed.

**SEC. 861. REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS REQUIRING A STUDY AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

The following provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act are repealed:

- (1) Section 412.
- (2) Section 415.
- (3) Section 416.
- (4) Section 417.

**SEC. 862. REPEAL.**

(a) REPEAL.—The following sections of title XV of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived as if such sections had not been enacted:

- (1) Section 1502.
- (2) Section 1503.
- (3) Section 1504.
- (4) Section 1505.
- (5) Section 1506.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the items relating to sections 1502, 1503, 1504, 1505, and 1506.

**Subtitle C—Harmonization of Derivatives Rules**

**SEC. 871. COMMISSIONS REVIEW AND HARMONIZATION OF RULES RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF OVER-THE-COUNTER SWAPS MARKETS.**

The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall review each rule, order, and interpretive guidance issued by either such Commission pursuant to title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street

Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8301 et seq.) and, where the Commissions find inconsistencies in any such rules, orders, or interpretive guidance, shall jointly issue new rules, orders, or interpretive guidance to resolve such inconsistencies.

#### SEC. 872. TREATMENT OF TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN AFFILIATES.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.—Section 1a(47) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(47)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) TREATMENT OF SWAP TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN AFFILIATES.—

“(i) EXEMPTION FROM SWAP RULES.—Except as provided under clause (ii), the Commission may not regulate a swap under this Act if all of the following apply to such swap:

“(I) AFFILIATION.—One counterparty, directly or indirectly, holds a majority ownership interest in the other counterparty, or a third party, directly or indirectly, holds a majority ownership interest in both counterparties.

“(II) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—The affiliated counterparty that holds the majority interest in the other counterparty or the third party that, directly or indirectly, holds the majority interests in both affiliated counterparties, reports its financial statements on a consolidated basis under generally accepted accounting principles or International Financial Reporting Standards, or other similar standards, and the financial statements include the financial results of the majority-owned affiliated counterparty or counterparties.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXEMPTED SWAPS.—With respect to a swap described under clause (i):

“(I) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—If at least one counterparty is a swap dealer or major swap participant, that counterparty shall report the swap pursuant to section 4r, within such time period as the Commission may by rule or regulation prescribe—

“(aa) to a swap data repository; or

“(bb) if there is no swap data repository that would accept the agreement, contract or transaction, to the Commission.

“(II) RISK MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT.—If at least one counterparty is a swap dealer or major swap participant, the swap shall be subject to a centralized risk management program pursuant to section 4s(j) that is reasonably designed to monitor and to manage the risks associated with the swap.

“(III) ANTI-EVASION REQUIREMENT.—The swap shall not be structured to evade the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in violation of any rule promulgated by the Commission pursuant to section 721(c) of such Act.”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 3(a)(68) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(68)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) TREATMENT OF SECURITY-BASED SWAP TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN AFFILIATES.—

“(i) EXEMPTION FROM SECURITY-BASED SWAP RULES.—Except as provided under clause (ii), the Commission may not regulate a security-based swap under this Act if all of the following apply to such security-based swap:

“(I) AFFILIATION.—One counterparty, directly or indirectly, holds a majority ownership interest in the other counterparty, or a third party, directly or indirectly, holds a majority ownership interest in both counterparties.

“(II) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—The affiliated counterparty that holds the majority interest in the other counterparty or the third party that, directly or indirectly, holds the majority interests in both affiliated counterparties, reports its financial statements on a consolidated basis under generally accepted accounting principles

or International Financial Reporting Standards, or other similar standards, and the financial statements include the financial results of the majority-owned affiliated counterparty or counterparties.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXEMPTED SECURITY-BASED SWAPS.—With respect to a security-based swap described under clause (i):

“(I) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—If at least one counterparty is a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, that counterparty shall report the security-based swap pursuant to section 13A, within such time period as the Commission may by rule or regulation prescribe—

“(aa) to a security-based swap data repository; or

“(bb) if there is no security-based swap data repository that would accept the agreement, contract or transaction, to the Commission.

“(II) RISK MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT.—If at least one counterparty is a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, the security-based swap shall be subject to a centralized risk management program pursuant to section 15F(j) that is reasonably designed to monitor and to manage the risks associated with the security-based swap.

“(III) ANTI-EVASION REQUIREMENT.—The security-based swap shall not be structured to evade the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in violation of any rule promulgated by the Commission pursuant to section 761(b)(3) of such Act.”.

#### TITLE IX—REPEAL OF THE VOLCKER RULE AND OTHER PROVISIONS

##### SEC. 901. REPEALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following sections of title VI of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived as if such sections had not been enacted:

(1) Section 603.

(2) Section 618.

(3) Section 619.

(4) Section 620.

(5) Section 621.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents under section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the items relating to sections 603, 618, 619, 620, and 621.

#### TITLE X—FED OVERSIGHT REFORM AND MODERNIZATION

##### SEC. 1001. REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICY RULES OF THE FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE.

The Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2B the following new section:

##### “SEC. 2C. DIRECTIVE POLICY RULES OF THE FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

“(2) DIRECTIVE POLICY RULE.—The term ‘Directive Policy Rule’ means a policy rule developed by the Federal Open Market Committee that meets the requirements of subsection (c) and that provides the basis for the Open Market Operations Directive.

“(3) GDP.—The term ‘GDP’ means the gross domestic product of the United States as computed and published by the Department of Commerce.

“(4) INTERMEDIATE POLICY INPUT.—The term ‘Intermediate Policy Input’—

“(A) may include any variable determined by the Federal Open Market Committee as a necessary input to guide open-market operations;

“(B) shall include an estimate of, and the method of calculation for, the current rate of inflation or current inflation expectations; and

“(C) shall include, specifying whether the variable or estimate is historical, current, or a forecast and the method of calculation, at least one of—

“(i) an estimate of real GDP, nominal GDP, or potential GDP;

“(ii) an estimate of the monetary aggregate compiled by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and Federal reserve banks; or

“(iii) an interactive variable or a net estimate composed of the estimates described in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(5) LEGISLATIVE DAY.—The term ‘legislative day’ means a day on which either House of Congress is in session.

“(6) OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS DIRECTIVE.—The term ‘Open Market Operations Directive’ means an order to achieve a specified Policy Instrument Target provided to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York by the Federal Open Market Committee pursuant to powers authorized under section 14 of this Act that guide open-market operations.

“(7) POLICY INSTRUMENT.—The term ‘Policy Instrument’ means—

“(A) the nominal Federal funds rate;

“(B) the nominal rate of interest paid on non-borrowed reserves; or

“(C) the discount window primary credit interest rate most recently published on the Federal Reserve Statistical Release on selected interest rates (daily or weekly), commonly referred to as the H.15 release.

“(8) POLICY INSTRUMENT TARGET.—The term ‘Policy Instrument Target’ means the target for the Policy Instrument specified in the Open Market Operations Directive.

“(9) REFERENCE POLICY RULE.—The term ‘Reference Policy Rule’ means a calculation of the nominal Federal funds rate as equal to the sum of the following:

“(A) The rate of inflation over the previous four quarters.

“(B) One-half of the percentage deviation of the real GDP from an estimate of potential GDP.

“(C) One-half of the difference between the rate of inflation over the previous four quarters and two percent.

“(D) Two percent.

“(b) SUBMITTING A DIRECTIVE POLICY RULE.—Not later than 48 hours after the end of a meeting of the Federal Open Market Committee, the Chairman of the Federal Open Market Committee shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the Comptroller General of the United States a Directive Policy Rule and a statement that identifies the members of the Federal Open Market Committee who voted in favor of the Directive Policy Rule.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR A DIRECTIVE POLICY RULE.—A Directive Policy Rule shall—

“(1) identify the Policy Instrument the Directive Policy Rule is designed to target;

“(2) describe the strategy or rule of the Federal Open Market Committee for the systematic quantitative adjustment of the Policy Instrument Target to respond to a change in the Intermediate Policy Inputs;

“(3) include a function that comprehensively models the interactive relationship between the Intermediate Policy Inputs;

“(4) include the coefficients of the Directive Policy Rule that generate the current Policy Instrument Target and a range of predicted future values for the Policy Instrument Target if changes occur in any Intermediate Policy Input;

“(5) describe the procedure for adjusting the supply of bank reserves to achieve the Policy Instrument Target;

“(6) include a statement as to whether the Directive Policy Rule substantially conforms to the Reference Policy Rule and, if applicable—

“(A) an explanation of the extent to which it departs from the Reference Policy Rule;

“(B) a detailed justification for that departure; and

“(C) a description of the circumstances under which the Directive Policy Rule may be amended in the future;

“(7) include a certification that the Directive Policy Rule is expected to support the economy in achieving stable prices and maximum natural employment over the long term;

“(8) include a calculation that describes with mathematical precision the expected annual inflation rate over a 5-year period; and

“(9) include a plan to use the most accurate data, subject to all historical revisions, for inputs into the Directive Policy Rule and the Reference Policy Rule.

“(d) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall compare the Directive Policy Rule submitted under subsection (b) with the rule that was most recently submitted to determine whether the Directive Policy Rule has materially changed. If the Directive Policy Rule has materially changed, the Comptroller General shall, not later than 7 days after each meeting of the Federal Open Market Committee, prepare and submit a compliance report to the appropriate congressional committees specifying whether the Directive Policy Rule submitted after that meeting and the Federal Open Market Committee are in compliance with this section.

“(e) CHANGING MARKET CONDITIONS.—

“(1) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require that the plans with respect to the systematic quantitative adjustment of the Policy Instrument Target described under subsection (c)(2) be implemented if the Federal Open Market Committee determines that such plans cannot or should not be achieved due to changing market conditions.

“(2) GAO APPROVAL OF UPDATE.—Upon determining that plans described in paragraph (1) cannot or should not be achieved, the Federal Open Market Committee shall submit an explanation for that determination and an updated version of the Directive Policy Rule to the Comptroller General of the United States and the appropriate congressional committees not later than 48 hours after making the determination. The Comptroller General shall, not later than 48 hours after receiving such updated version, prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a compliance report determining whether such updated version and the Federal Open Market Committee are in compliance with this section.

“(f) DIRECTIVE POLICY RULE AND FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE NOT IN COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Comptroller General of the United States determines that the Directive Policy Rule and the Federal Open Market Committee are not in compliance with this section in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (d), or that the updated version of the Directive Policy Rule and the Federal Open Market Committee are not in compliance with this section in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (e)(2), the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall, if requested by the chairman of either of the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 7 legislative days after such request, testify before such committee as to why the Directive Policy Rule, the updated version, or the Federal Open Market Committee is not in compliance.

“(2) GAO AUDIT.—Notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code,

upon submitting a report of noncompliance pursuant to subsection (d) or subsection (e)(2) and after the period of 7 legislative days described in paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall audit the conduct of monetary policy by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee upon request of the appropriate congressional committee. Such committee may specify the parameters of such audit.

“(g) CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS.—The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall, if requested by the chairman of either of the appropriate congressional committees and not later than 7 legislative days after such request, appear before such committee to explain any change to the Directive Policy Rule.”

#### SEC. 1002. FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE BLACKOUT PERIOD.

Section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 263) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) BLACKOUT PERIOD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During a blackout period, the only public communications that may be made by members and staff of the Committee with respect to macroeconomic or financial developments or about current or prospective monetary policy issues are the following:

“(A) The dissemination of published data, surveys, and reports that have been cleared for publication by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

“(B) Answers to technical questions specific to a data release.

“(C) Communications with respect to the prudential or supervisory functions of the Board of Governors.

“(2) BLACKOUT PERIOD DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, and with respect to a meeting of the Committee described under subsection (a), the term ‘blackout period’ means the time period that—

“(A) begins immediately after midnight on the day that is one week prior to the date on which such meeting takes place; and

“(B) ends at midnight on the day after the date on which such meeting takes place.

“(3) EXEMPTION FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from participating in or issuing public communications.”

#### SEC. 1003. PUBLIC TRANSCRIPTS OF FOMC MEETINGS.

Section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 263), as amended by section 1002, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PUBLIC TRANSCRIPTS OF MEETINGS.—The Committee shall—

“(1) record all meetings of the Committee; and

“(2) make the full transcript of such meetings available to the public.”

#### SEC. 1004. MEMBERSHIP OF FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE.

Section 12A(a) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 263(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “five” and inserting “six”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “One by the board of directors” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “One by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of New York and Boston; one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Philadelphia and Cleveland; one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Richmond and Atlanta; one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Chicago and St. Louis; one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve

Banks of Minneapolis and Kansas City; and one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Dallas and San Francisco.”; and

(3) by inserting after the second sentence the following: “In odd numbered calendar years, one representative shall be elected from each of the Federal Reserve Banks of Boston, Philadelphia, Richmond, Chicago, Minneapolis, and Dallas. In even-numbered calendar years, one representative shall be elected from each of the Federal Reserve Banks of New York, Cleveland, Atlanta, St. Louis, Kansas City, and San Francisco.”

#### SEC. 1005. FREQUENCY OF TESTIMONY OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2B of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 225b) is amended—

(1) by striking “semi-annual” each place it appears and inserting “quarterly”; and

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by inserting “and October 20” after “July 20” each place it appears; and

(B) by inserting “and May 20” after “February 20” each place it appears.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (12) of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 247b(12)) is amended by striking “semi-annual” and inserting “quarterly”.

#### SEC. 1006. VICE CHAIRMAN FOR SUPERVISION REPORT REQUIREMENT.

Paragraph (12) of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 247(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (11); and

(2) in such paragraph, by adding at the end the following: “In each such appearance, the Vice Chairman for Supervision shall provide written testimony that includes the status of all pending and anticipated rulemakings that are being made by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. If, at the time of any appearance described in this paragraph, the position of Vice Chairman for Supervision is vacant, the Vice Chairman for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (who has the responsibility to serve in the absence of the Chairman) shall appear instead and provide the required written testimony. If, at the time of any appearance described in this paragraph, both Vice Chairman positions are vacant, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall appear instead and provide the required written testimony.”

#### SEC. 1007. SALARIES, FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES, AND OFFICE STAFF OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (s) (relating to “Assessments, Fees, and Other Charges for Certain Companies”) as subsection (t); and

(2) by inserting before subsection (w), as added by section 371(a), the following new subsections:

“(u) ETHICS STANDARDS FOR MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND TRANSACTIONS.—The members and employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall be subject to the provisions under section 4401.102 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, to the same extent as such provisions apply to an employee of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

“(2) TREATMENT OF BROKERAGE ACCOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY OF ACCOUNT STATEMENTS.—The members and employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall—

“(A) disclose all brokerage accounts that the member or employee maintains, as well as any

accounts in which the member or employee controls trading or has a financial interest (including managed accounts, trust accounts, investment club accounts, and accounts of spouses or minor children who live with the member or employee); and

“(B) with respect to any securities account that the member or employee is required to disclose to the Board of Governors, authorize the brokers and dealers of such account to send duplicate account statements directly to Board of Governors.

“(3) PROHIBITIONS RELATED TO OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND ACTIVITIES.—The members and employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall be subject to the prohibitions related to outside employment and activities described under section 4401.103(c) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, to the same extent as such prohibitions apply to an employee of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

“(4) ADDITIONAL ETHICS STANDARDS.—The members and employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall be subject to—

“(A) the employee responsibilities and conduct regulations of the Office of Personnel Management under part 735 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(B) the canons of ethics contained in subpart C of part 200 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to the same extent as such subpart applies to the employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission; and

“(C) the regulations concerning the conduct of members and employees and former members and employees contained in subpart M of part 200 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to the same extent as such subpart applies to the employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

“(v) DISCLOSURE OF STAFF SALARIES AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION.—The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall make publicly available, on the website of the Board of Governors, a searchable database that contains the names of all members, officers, and employees of the Board of Governors who receive an annual salary in excess of the annual rate of basic pay for GS-15 of the General Schedule, and—

“(1) the yearly salary information for such individuals, along with any nonsalary compensation received by such individuals; and

“(2) any financial disclosures required to be made by such individuals.”.

(b) OFFICE STAFF FOR EACH MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.—Subsection (l) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Each member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may employ, at a minimum, 2 individuals, with such individuals selected by such member and the salaries of such individuals set by such member. A member may employ additional individuals as determined necessary by the Board of Governors.”.

#### SEC. 1008. AMENDMENTS TO POWERS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 343(3)), as amended by section 111(b)(3), is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting “that pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States” after “unusual and exigent circumstances”; and

(B) by inserting “and by the affirmative vote of not less than nine presidents of the Federal reserve banks” after “five members”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting at the end the following: “Federal reserve banks may not ac-

cept equity securities issued by the recipient of any loan or other financial assistance under this paragraph as collateral. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this sentence, the Board shall, by rule, establish—

“(I) a method for determining the sufficiency of the collateral required under this paragraph;

“(II) acceptable classes of collateral;

“(III) the amount of any discount on the value of the collateral that the Federal reserve banks will apply for purposes of calculating the sufficiency of collateral under this paragraph; and

“(IV) a method for obtaining independent appraisals of the value of collateral the Federal reserve banks receive.”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking the second sentence; and

(ii) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “A borrower shall not be eligible to borrow from any emergency lending program or facility unless the Board and all Federal banking regulators with jurisdiction over the borrower certify that, at the time the borrower initially borrows under the program or facility, the borrower is not insolvent.”;

(3) by inserting “financial institution” before “participant” each place such term appears;

(4) in subparagraph (D)(i), by inserting “financial institution” before “participants”; and

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

“(E) PENALTY RATE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the Board shall, with respect to a recipient of any loan or other financial assistance under this paragraph, establish by rule a minimum interest rate on the principal amount of any loan or other financial assistance.

“(ii) MINIMUM INTEREST RATE DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘minimum interest rate’ shall mean the sum of—

“(I) the average of the secondary discount rate of all Federal Reserve banks over the most recent 90-day period; and

“(II) the average of the difference between a distressed corporate bond yield index (as defined by rule of the Board) and a bond yield index of debt issued by the United States (as defined by rule of the Board) over the most recent 90-day period.

“(F) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION PARTICIPANT DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘financial institution participant’—

“(i) means a company that is predominantly engaged in financial activities (as defined in section 102(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5311(a))); and

“(ii) does not include an agency described in subparagraph (W) of section 5312(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code, or an entity controlled or sponsored by such an agency.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 11(r)(2)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(r)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii)(IV), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(iv) the available members secure the affirmative vote of not less than nine presidents of the Federal reserve banks.”.

#### SEC. 1009. INTEREST RATES ON BALANCES MAINTAINED AT A FEDERAL RESERVE BANK BY DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS ESTABLISHED BY FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE.

Subparagraph (A) of section 19(b)(12) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(12)(A)) is amended by inserting “established by the Federal Open Market Committee” after “rate or rates”.

#### SEC. 1010. AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the Comptroller General of the United States shall annually complete an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section 714 within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after each audit required pursuant to subsection (a) is completed, the Comptroller General—

(A) shall submit to Congress a report on such audit; and

(B) shall make such report available to the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests the report.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “or (f)” each place such term appears;

(B) in subsection (e), by striking “the third undesignated paragraph of section 13” and inserting “section 13(3)”; and

(C) by striking subsection (f).

(2) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—Subsection (s) (relating to “Federal Reserve Transparency and Release of Information”) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “has the same meaning as in section 714(f)(1)(A) of title 31, United States Code” and inserting “means a program or facility, including any special purpose vehicle or other entity established by or on behalf of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or a Federal reserve bank, authorized by the Board of Governors under section 13(3), that is not subject to audit under section 714(e) of title 31, United States Code”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking “or in section 714(f)(3)(C) of title 31, United States Code, the information described in paragraph (1) and information concerning the transactions described in section 714(f) of such title,” and inserting “the information described in paragraph (1)”; and

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking “and section 13(3)(C), section 714(f)(3)(C) of title 31, United States Code, and” and inserting “, section 13(3)(C), and”.

#### SEC. 1011. ESTABLISHMENT OF A CENTENNIAL MONETARY COMMISSION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Constitution endows Congress with the power “to coin money, regulate the value thereof”.

(2) Following the financial crisis known as the Panic of 1907, Congress established the National Monetary Commission to provide recommendations for the reform of the financial and monetary systems of the United States.

(3) Incorporating several of the recommendations of the National Monetary Commission, Congress created the Federal Reserve System in 1913. As currently organized, the Federal Reserve System consists of the Board of Governors in Washington, District of Columbia, and the Federal reserve banks organized into 12 districts around the United States. The stockholders of the 12 Federal reserve banks include national and certain State-chartered commercial banks, which operate on a fractional reserve basis.

(4) Originally, Congress gave the Federal Reserve System a monetary mandate to provide an elastic currency, within the context of a gold standard, in response to seasonal fluctuations in the demand for currency.

(5) Congress also gave the Federal Reserve System a financial stability mandate to serve as the lender of last resort to solvent but illiquid banks during a financial crisis.

(6) In 1977, Congress changed the monetary mandate of the Federal Reserve System to a dual mandate for maximum employment and stable prices.

(7) Empirical studies and historical evidence, both within the United States and in other countries, demonstrate that price stability is desirable because both inflation and deflation damage the economy.

(8) The economic challenge of recent years—most notably the bursting of the housing bubble, the financial crisis of 2008, and the ensuing anemic recovery—have occurred at great cost in terms of lost jobs and output.

(9) Policymakers are reexamining the structure and functioning of financial institutions and markets to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to place the financial system on a stronger, more sustainable path going forward.

(10) The Federal Reserve System has taken extraordinary actions in response to the recent economic challenges.

(11) The Federal Open Market Committee has engaged in multiple rounds of quantitative easing, providing unprecedented liquidity to financial markets, while committing to holding short-term interest rates low for a seemingly indefinite period, and pursuing a policy of credit allocation by purchasing Federal agency debt and mortgage-backed securities.

(12) In the wake of the recent extraordinary actions of the Federal Reserve System, Congress—consistent with its constitutional responsibilities and as it has done periodically throughout the history of the United States—has once again renewed its examination of monetary policy.

(13) Central in such examination has been a renewed look at what is the most proper mandate for the Federal Reserve System to conduct monetary policy in the 21st century.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF A CENTENNIAL MONETARY COMMISSION.**—There is established a commission to be known as the “Centennial Monetary Commission” (in this section referred to as the “Commission”).

(c) **STUDY AND REPORT ON MONETARY POLICY.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Commission shall—

(A) examine how United States monetary policy since the creation of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in 1913 has affected the performance of the United States economy in terms of output, employment, prices, and financial stability over time;

(B) evaluate various operational regimes under which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee may conduct monetary policy in terms achieving the maximum sustainable level of output and employment and price stability over the long term, including—

(i) discretion in determining monetary policy without an operational regime;

(ii) price level targeting;

(iii) inflation rate targeting;

(iv) nominal gross domestic product targeting (both level and growth rate);

(v) the use of monetary policy rules; and

(vi) the gold standard;

(C) evaluate the use of macro-prudential supervision and regulation as a tool of monetary policy in terms of achieving the maximum sustainable level of output and employment and price stability over the long term;

(D) evaluate the use of the lender-of-last-resort function of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as a tool of monetary policy in terms of achieving the maximum sustainable level of output and employment and price stability over the long term;

(E) recommend a course for United States monetary policy going forward, including—

(i) the legislative mandate;

(ii) the operational regime;

(iii) the securities used in open-market operations; and

(iv) transparency issues; and

(F) consider the effects of the GDP output and employment targets of the “dual mandate” (both from the creation of the dual mandate in 1977 until the present time and estimates of the future effect of the dual mandate ) on—

(i) United States economic activity;

(ii) actions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(iii) Federal debt.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commission shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report containing a statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission in carrying out the study under paragraph (1), together with the recommendations the Commission considers appropriate. In making such report, the Commission shall specifically report on the considerations required under paragraph (1)(F).

(d) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.**—

(A) **APPOINTED VOTING MEMBERS.**—The Commission shall contain 12 voting members as follows:

(i) Six members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with four members from the majority party and two members from the minority party.

(ii) Six members appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, with four members from the majority party and two members from the minority party.

(B) **CHAIRMAN.**—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate shall jointly designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman.

(C) **NON-VOTING MEMBERS.**—The Commission shall contain 2 non-voting members as follows:

(i) One member appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(ii) One member who is the president of a district Federal reserve bank appointed by the Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) **PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.**—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(3) **TIMING OF APPOINTMENT.**—All members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section.

(4) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) **MEETINGS.**—

(A) **INITIAL MEETING.**—The Commission shall hold its initial meeting and begin the operations of the Commission as soon as is practicable.

(B) **FURTHER MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chair or a majority of its members.

(6) **QUORUM.**—Seven voting members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(7) **MEMBER OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “Member of Congress” means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(e) **POWERS.**—

(1) **HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.**—The Commission or, on the authority of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, receive evidence, or administer oaths as the Commission or such subcommittee or member thereof considers appropriate.

(2) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—To the extent or in the amounts provided in advance in appropriation Acts, the Commission may contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this section, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5).

(3) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, any information, including suggestions, estimates, or statistics, for the purposes of this section.

(B) **REQUESTING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The head of such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the government shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish such information upon request made by—

(i) the Chair;

(ii) the Chair of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission; or

(iii) any member of the Commission designated by a majority of the commission to request such information.

(4) **ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(A) **GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis administrative support and other services for the performance of the functions of the Commission.

(B) **OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—In addition to the assistance prescribed in subparagraph (A), at the request of the Commission, departments and agencies of the United States shall provide such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as may be authorized by law.

(5) **POSTAL SERVICE.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(f) **COMMISSION PERSONNEL.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION OF STAFF.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to rules prescribed by the Commission, the Chair may appoint and fix the pay of the executive director and other personnel as the Chair considers appropriate.

(B) **APPLICABILITY OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.**—The staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of level V of the Executive Schedule.

(2) **CONSULTANTS.**—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under

section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate of pay for a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule.

(3) **STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such department or agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(g) **TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall terminate 6 months after the date on which the report is submitted under subsection (c)(2).

(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.**—The Commission may use the period between the submission of its report and its termination for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to the committee of Congress concerning its report.

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000, which shall remain available until the date on which the Commission terminates.

## **TITLE XI—IMPROVING INSURANCE CO-ORDINATION THROUGH AN INDEPENDENT ADVOCATE**

### **SEC. 1101. REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL INSURANCE OFFICE; CREATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT INSURANCE ADVOCATE.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Section 313 of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows (and conforming the table of contents for chapter 3 of such title accordingly):

#### **“§313. Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate**

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Department of the Treasury a bureau to be known as the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate (in this section referred to as the ‘Office’).

“(b) **INDEPENDENT INSURANCE ADVOCATE.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.**—The chief officer of the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate shall be known as the Independent Insurance Advocate. The Independent Insurance Advocate shall perform the duties of such office under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(2) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Independent Insurance Advocate shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons having insurance expertise.

“(3) **TERM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Independent Insurance Advocate shall serve a term of 6 years, unless sooner removed by the President upon reasons which shall be communicated to the Senate.

“(B) **SERVICE AFTER EXPIRATION.**—If a successor is not nominated and confirmed by the end of the term of service of the Independent Insurance Advocate, the person serving as Independent Insurance Advocate shall continue to serve until such time a successor is appointed and confirmed.

“(C) **VACANCY.**—An Independent Insurance Advocate who is appointed to serve the remainder of a predecessor’s uncompleted term shall be eligible thereafter to be appointed to a full 6 year term.

“(D) **ACTING OFFICIAL ON FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL.**—In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Independent Insurance Advocate, and pending the appointment and confirmation of a successor, or during the absence or disability of the Independent Insurance Advocate, the Independent Member shall appoint a federal official appointed by the President and

confirmed by the Senate from a member agency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, not otherwise serving on the Council, who shall serve as a member of the Council and act in the place of the Independent Insurance Advocate until such vacancy, absence, or disability concludes.

“(4) **EMPLOYMENT.**—The Independent Insurance Advocate shall be an employee of the Federal Government within the definition of employee under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

“(c) **INDEPENDENCE; OVERSIGHT.**—

“(1) **INDEPENDENCE.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may not delay or prevent the issuance of any rule or the promulgation of any regulation by the Independent Insurance Advocate, and may not intervene in any matter or proceeding before the Independent Insurance Advocate, unless otherwise specifically provided by law.

“(2) **OVERSIGHT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.**—The Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate shall be an office in the establishment of the Department of the Treasury for purposes of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

“(d) **RETENTION OF EXISTING STATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this section or section 314 shall be construed to establish or provide the Office or the Department of the Treasury with general supervisory or regulatory authority over the business of insurance.

“(e) **BUDGET.**—

“(1) **ANNUAL TRANSMITTAL.**—For each fiscal year, the Independent Insurance Advocate shall transmit a budget estimate and request to the Secretary of the Treasury, which shall specify the aggregate amount of funds requested for such fiscal year for the operations of the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate.

“(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—In transmitting the proposed budget to the President for approval, the Secretary of the Treasury shall include—

“(A) an aggregate request for the Independent Insurance Advocate; and

“(B) any comments of the Independent Insurance Advocate with respect to the proposal.

“(3) **PRESIDENT’S BUDGET.**—The President shall include in each budget of the United States Government submitted to the Congress—

“(A) a separate statement of the budget estimate prepared in accordance with paragraph (1);

“(B) the amount requested by the President for the Independent Insurance Advocate; and

“(C) any comments of the Independent Insurance Advocate with respect to the proposal if the Independent Insurance Advocate concludes that the budget submitted by the President would substantially inhibit the Independent Insurance Advocate from performing the duties of the office.

“(f) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the Independent Insurance Advocate such services, funds, facilities and other support services as the Independent Insurance Advocate may request and as the Secretary may approve.

“(g) **PERSONNEL.**—

“(1) **EMPLOYEES.**—The Independent Insurance Advocate may fix the number of, and appoint and direct, the employees of the Office, in accordance with the applicable provisions of title 5, United States Code. The Independent Insurance Advocate is authorized to employ attorneys, analysts, economists, and other employees as may be deemed necessary to assist the Independent Insurance Advocate to carry out the duties and functions of the Office. Unless otherwise provided expressly by law, any individual appointed under this paragraph shall be an employee as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, and subject to the provisions of such title and other laws generally ap-

plicable to the employees of the Executive Branch.

“(2) **COMPENSATION.**—Employees of the Office shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

“(3) **PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.**—The Independent Insurance Advocate may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for Level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

“(4) **DETAILS.**—Any employee of the Federal Government may be detailed to the Office with or without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege. An employee of the Federal Government detailed to the Office shall report to and be subject to oversight by the Independent Insurance Advocate during the assignment to the office, and may be compensated by the branch, department, or agency from which the employee was detailed.

“(5) **INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL.**—The Independent Insurance Advocate may enter into agreements under subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, with State and local governments, institutions of higher education, Indian tribal governments, and other eligible organizations for the assignment of intermittent, part-time, and full-time personnel, on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis.

“(h) **ETHICS.**—

“(1) **DESIGNATED ETHICS OFFICIAL.**—The Legal Counsel of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, or in the absence of a Legal Counsel of the Council, the designated ethics official of any Council member agency, as chosen by the Independent Insurance Advocate, shall be the ethics official for the Independent Insurance Advocate.

“(2) **RESTRICTION ON REPRESENTATION.**—In addition to any restriction under section 205(c) of title 18, United States Code, except as provided in subsections (d) through (i) of section 205 of such title, the Independent Insurance Advocate (except in the proper discharge of official duties) shall not, with or without compensation, represent anyone to or before any officer or employee of—

“(A) the Financial Stability Oversight Council on any matter; or

“(B) the Department of Justice with respect to litigation involving a matter described in subparagraph (A).

“(3) **COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES PROVIDED BY ANOTHER.**—For purposes of section 203 of title 18, United States Code, and if a special government employee—

“(A) the Independent Insurance Advocate shall not be subject to the restrictions of subsection (a)(1) of section 203, of title 18, United States Code, for sharing in compensation earned by another for representations on matters covered by such section; and

“(B) a person shall not be subject to the restrictions of subsection (a)(2) of such section for sharing such compensation with the Independent Insurance Advocate.

“(i) **ADVISORY, TECHNICAL, AND PROFESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The Independent Insurance Advocate may appoint such special advisory, technical, or professional committees as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Office and the members of such committees may be staff of the Office, or other persons, or both.

“(j) **MISSION AND FUNCTIONS.**—

“(1) **MISSION.**—In carrying out the functions under this subsection, the mission of the Office shall be to act as an independent advocate on



behalf of the interests of United States policyholders on prudential aspects of insurance matters of importance, and to provide perspective on protecting their interests, separate and apart from any other Federal agency or State insurance regulator.

“(2) OFFICE.—The Office shall have the authority—

“(A) to coordinate Federal efforts on prudential aspects of international insurance matters, including representing the United States, as appropriate, in the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (or a successor entity) and assisting the Secretary in negotiating covered agreements (as such term is defined in subsection (q)) in coordination with States (including State insurance commissioners) and the United States Trade Representative;

“(B) to consult with the States (including State insurance regulators) regarding insurance matters of national importance and prudential insurance matters of international importance;

“(C) to assist the Secretary in administering the Terrorism Insurance Program established in the Department of the Treasury under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

“(D) to observe all aspects of the insurance industry, including identifying issues or gaps in the regulation of insurers that could contribute to a systemic crisis in the insurance industry or the United States financial system; and

“(E) to make determinations and exercise the authority under subsection (m) with respect to covered agreements and State insurance measures.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP ON FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Independent Insurance Advocate shall serve, pursuant to section 111(b)(1)(J) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5321(b)(1)(J)), as a member on the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

“(B) AUTHORITY.—To assist the Financial Stability Oversight Council with its responsibilities to monitor international insurance developments, advise the Congress, and make recommendations, the Independent Insurance Advocate shall have the authority—

“(i) to regularly consult with international insurance supervisors and international financial stability counterparts;

“(ii) to consult with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the States with respect to representing the United States, as appropriate, in the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (including to become a non-voting member thereof), particularly on matters of systemic risk;

“(iii) to participate at the Financial Stability Board of The Group of Twenty and to join with other members from the United States including on matters related to insurance; and

“(iv) to participate with the United States delegation to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and observe and participate at the Insurance and Private Pensions Committee.

“(4) LIMITATIONS ON PARTICIPATION IN SUPERVISORY COLLEGES.—The Office may not engage in any activities that it is not specifically authorized to engage in under this section or any other provision of law, including participation in any supervisory college or other meetings or fora for cooperation and communication between the involved insurance supervisors established for the fundamental purpose of facilitating the effectiveness of supervision of entities which belong to an insurance group.

“(k) SCOPE.—The authority of the Office as specified and limited in this section shall extend to all lines of insurance except—

“(1) health insurance, as determined by the Secretary in coordination with the Secretary of

Health and Human Services based on section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-91);

“(2) long-term care insurance, except long-term care insurance that is included with life or annuity insurance components, as determined by the Secretary in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and in the case of long-term care insurance that is included with such components, the Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services in performing the functions of the Office; and

“(3) crop insurance, as established by the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

“(l) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—In carrying out the functions required under subsection (j), the Office may coordinate with any relevant Federal agency and any State insurance regulator (or other relevant Federal or State regulatory agency, if any, in the case of an affiliate of an insurer) and any publicly available sources for the provision to the Office of publicly available information. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each such relevant Federal agency and State insurance regulator or other Federal or State regulatory agency is authorized to provide to the Office such data or information.

“(m) PREEMPTION PURSUANT TO COVERED AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) STANDARDS.—A State insurance measure shall be preempted pursuant to this section or section 314 if, and only to the extent that the Independent Insurance Advocate determines, in accordance with this subsection, that the measure—

“(A) results in less favorable treatment of a non-United States insurer domiciled in a foreign jurisdiction that is subject to a covered agreement than a United States insurer domiciled, licensed, or otherwise admitted in that State; and

“(B) is inconsistent with a covered agreement.

“(2) DETERMINATION.—

“(A) NOTICE OF POTENTIAL INCONSISTENCY.—Before making any determination under paragraph (1), the Independent Insurance Advocate shall—

“(i) notify and consult with the appropriate State regarding any potential inconsistency or preemption;

“(ii) notify and consult with the United States Trade Representative regarding any potential inconsistency or preemption;

“(iii) cause to be published in the Federal Register notice of the issue regarding the potential inconsistency or preemption, including a description of each State insurance measure at issue and any applicable covered agreement;

“(iv) provide interested parties a reasonable opportunity to submit written comments to the Office; and

“(v) consider any comments received.

“(B) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—For purposes of this subsection, any determination of the Independent Insurance Advocate regarding State insurance measures, and any preemption under paragraph (1) as a result of such determination, shall be limited to the subject matter contained within the covered agreement involved and shall achieve a level of protection for insurance or reinsurance consumers that is substantially equivalent to the level of protection achieved under State insurance or reinsurance regulation.

“(C) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF INCONSISTENCY.—Upon making any determination under paragraph (1), the Director shall—

“(i) notify the appropriate State of the determination and the extent of the inconsistency;

“(ii) establish a reasonable period of time, which shall not be less than 30 days, before the determination shall become effective; and

“(iii) notify the Committees on Financial Services and Ways and Means of the House of

Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Finance of the Senate.

“(3) NOTICE OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Upon the conclusion of the period referred to in paragraph (2)(C)(ii), if the basis for such determination still exists, the determination shall become effective and the Independent Insurance Advocate shall—

“(A) cause to be published a notice in the Federal Register that the preemption has become effective, as well as the effective date; and

“(B) notify the appropriate State.

“(4) LIMITATION.—No State may enforce a State insurance measure to the extent that such measure has been preempted under this subsection.

“(5) APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT.—Determinations of inconsistency made pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be subject to the applicable provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (relating to administrative procedure), and chapter 7 of such title (relating to judicial review), except that in any action for judicial review of a determination of inconsistency, the court shall determine the matter de novo.

“(n) CONSULTATION.—The Independent Insurance Advocate shall consult with State insurance regulators, individually or collectively, to the extent the Independent Insurance Advocate determines appropriate, in carrying out the functions of the Office.

“(o) NOTICES AND REQUESTS FOR COMMENT.—

In addition to the other functions and duties specified in this section, the Independent Insurance Advocate may prescribe such notices and requests for comment in the Federal Register as are deemed necessary related to and governing the manner in which the duties and authorities of the Independent Insurance Advocate are carried out;

“(p) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this section shall—

“(1) preempt—

“(A) any State insurance measure that governs any insurer's rates, premiums, underwriting, or sales practices;

“(B) any State coverage requirements for insurance;

“(C) the application of the antitrust laws of any State to the business of insurance; or

“(D) any State insurance measure governing the capital or solvency of an insurer, except to the extent that such State insurance measure results in less favorable treatment of a non-United States insurer than a United States insurer; or

“(2) affect the preemption of any State insurance measure otherwise inconsistent with and preempted by Federal law.

“(q) RETENTION OF AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL REGULATORY AGENCIES.—Nothing in this section or section 314 shall be construed to limit the authority of any Federal financial regulatory agency, including the authority to develop and coordinate policy, negotiate, and enter into agreements with foreign governments, authorities, regulators, and multinational regulatory committees and to preempt State measures to affect uniformity with international regulatory agreements.

“(r) RETENTION OF AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Nothing in this section or section 314 shall be construed to affect the authority of the Office of the United States Trade Representative pursuant to section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) or any other provision of law, including authority over the development and coordination of United States international trade policy and the administration of the United States trade agreements program.

“(s) CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY.—The Independent Insurance Advocate shall appear before

the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs at semi-annual hearings and shall provide testimony, which shall include submitting written testimony in advance of such appearances to such committees and to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on the following matters:

“(1) OFFICE ACTIVITIES.—The efforts, activities, objectives, and plans of the Office.

“(2) SECTION 313(L) ACTIONS.—Any actions taken by the Office pursuant to subsection (l) (regarding preemption pursuant to covered agreements).

“(3) INSURANCE INDUSTRY.—The state of, and developments in, the insurance industry.

“(4) U.S. AND GLOBAL INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE MARKETS.—The breadth and scope of the global insurance and reinsurance markets and the critical role such markets plays in supporting insurance in the United States and the ongoing impacts of part II of the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act of 2010 on the ability of State regulators to access reinsurance information for regulated companies in their jurisdictions.

“(5) OTHER.—Any other matters as deemed relevant by the Independent Insurance Advocate or requested by such Committees.

“(t) REPORT UPON END OF TERM OF OFFICE.—Not later than two months prior to the expiration of the term of office, or discontinuation of service, of each individual serving as the Independent Insurance Advocate, the Independent Insurance Advocate shall submit a report to the Committees on Financial Services and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Finance of the Senate setting forth recommendations regarding the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the role, duties, and functions of the Independent Insurance Advocate.

“(u) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and section 314, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) AFFILIATE.—The term ‘affiliate’ means, with respect to an insurer, any person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the insurer.

“(2) COVERED AGREEMENT.—The term ‘covered agreement’ means a written bilateral or multi-lateral agreement regarding prudential measures with respect to the business of insurance or reinsurance that—

“(A) is entered into between the United States and one or more foreign governments, authorities, or regulatory entities; and

“(B) relates to the recognition of prudential measures with respect to the business of insurance or reinsurance that achieves a level of protection for insurance or reinsurance consumers that is substantially equivalent to the level of protection achieved under State insurance or reinsurance regulation.

“(3) INSURER.—The term ‘insurer’ means any person engaged in the business of insurance, including reinsurance.

“(4) FEDERAL FINANCIAL REGULATORY AGENCY.—The term ‘Federal financial regulatory agency’ means the Department of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Office of Thrift Supervision, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, or the National Credit Union Administration.

“(5) FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL.—The term ‘Financial Stability Oversight Council’ means the Financial Stability Oversight Council established under section 111(a) of

the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5321(a)).

“(6) MEMBER AGENCY.—The term ‘member agency’ has the meaning given such term in section 111(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5321(a)).

“(7) NON-UNITED STATES INSURER.—The term ‘non-United States insurer’ means an insurer that is organized under the laws of a jurisdiction other than a State, but does not include any United States branch of such an insurer.

“(8) OFFICE.—The term ‘Office’ means the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate established by this section.

“(9) STATE INSURANCE MEASURE.—The term ‘State insurance measure’ means any State law, regulation, administrative ruling, bulletin, guideline, or practice relating to or affecting prudential measures applicable to insurance or reinsurance.

“(10) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR.—The term ‘State insurance regulator’ means any State regulatory authority responsible for the supervision of insurers.

“(11) SUBSTANTIALLY EQUIVALENT TO THE LEVEL OF PROTECTION ACHIEVED.—The term ‘substantially equivalent to the level of protection achieved’ means the prudential measures of a foreign government, authority, or regulatory entity achieve a similar outcome in consumer protection as the outcome achieved under State insurance or reinsurance regulation.

“(12) UNITED STATES INSURER.—The term ‘United States insurer’ means—

“(A) an insurer that is organized under the laws of a State; or

“(B) a United States branch of a non-United States insurer.”.

(b) PAY AT LEVEL III OF EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Independent Insurance Advocate, Department of the Treasury.”.

(c) INDEPENDENCE.—Section 111 of Public Law 93–495 (12 U.S.C. 250) is amended—

(1) by inserting “the Independent Insurance Advocate of the Department of the Treasury,” after “Federal Housing Finance Agency,”; and

(2) by inserting “or official” before “submitting them”.

(d) TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEES.—All employees of the Department of Treasury who are performing staff functions for the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council under section 111(b)(2)(J) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5321(b)(2)(J)) on a full-time equivalent basis as of the date of enactment of this Act shall be eligible for transfer to the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate established pursuant to the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section for appointment as an employee and shall be transferred at the joint discretion of the Independent Insurance Advocate and the eligible employee. Any employee eligible for transfer that is not appointed within 360 days from the date of enactment of this Act shall be eligible for detail under section 313(f)(4) of title 31, United States Code.

(e) TEMPORARY SERVICE; TRANSITION.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the Independent Insurance Advocate is appointed and confirmed pursuant to section 313(b)(2) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by such amendment, the person serving, on such date of enactment, as the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council pursuant to section 111(b)(1)(J) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12

U.S.C. 5321(b)(1)(J)) shall act for all purposes as, and with the full powers of, the Independent Insurance Advocate.

(f) COMPARABILITY IN COMPENSATION SCHEDULES.—Subsection (a) of section 1206 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1833b(a)), as amended by section 711(c)(11)(D), is further amended by inserting “the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate of the Department of the Treasury,” before “and the Farm Credit Administration,”.

(g) SENIOR EXECUTIVES.—Subparagraph (D) of section 3132(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting “the Office of the Independent Insurance Advocate of the Department of the Treasury,” after “Finance Agency,”.

#### SEC. 1102. TREATMENT OF COVERED AGREEMENTS.

Subsection (c) of section 314 of title 31, United States Code is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) the Secretary of the Treasury and the United States Trade Representative have caused to be published in the Federal Register, and made available for public comment for a period of not fewer than 30 days and not greater than 90 days (which period may run concurrently with the 90-day period for the covered agreement referred to in paragraph (3)), the proposed text of the covered agreement;”.

#### TITLE XII—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

##### SEC. 1201. TABLE OF CONTENTS; DEFINITIONAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203; 124 Stat. 1376) is amended by striking the items relating to sections 407 through 414 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 407. Exemption of and reporting by venture capital fund advisers.

“Sec. 408. Exemption of and reporting by certain private fund advisers.

“Sec. 409. Family offices.

“Sec. 410. State and Federal responsibilities; asset threshold for Federal registration of investment advisers.

“Sec. 411. Custody of client assets.

“Sec. 414. Rule of construction relating to the Commodity Exchange Act.

“Sec. 418. Qualified client standard.

“Sec. 419. Transition period.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “section 3” and inserting “section 3(w)”;

(B) by striking “(12 U.S.C. 1813)” and inserting “(12 U.S.C. 1813(w))”;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking “1 et seq.” and inserting “1a”; and

(3) in paragraph (18)(A)—

(A) by striking “‘bank holding company,’”; and

(B) by inserting “‘includes,’” before “‘including,’”.

##### SEC. 1202. ANTITRUST SAVINGS CLAUSE CORRECTIONS.

Section 6 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5303) is amended, in the second sentence—

(1) by inserting “(15 U.S.C. 12(a))” after “Clayton Act”; and

(2) by striking “Act, to” and inserting “Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to”.

##### SEC. 1203. TITLE I CORRECTIONS.

Title I of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5311 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(a)(6) (12 U.S.C. 5311(a)(6)), by inserting “(12 U.S.C. 1843(k))” after “of 1956” each place that term appears;

(2) in section 111(c)(3) (12 U.S.C. 5321(c)(3)), by striking “that agency or department head” and inserting “the head of that member agency or department”;

(3) in section 112 (12 U.S.C. 5322)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by section 151)—

(I) by striking “to monitor” and inserting “monitor”; and

(II) by striking “to advise” and inserting “advise”;

(ii) in subparagraph (H) (as redesignated by section 151), by striking “may”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(5), by striking “subsection and subtitle B” each place such term appears and inserting “subtitle”; and

(4) in section 171(b)(4)(D) (12 U.S.C. 5371(b)(4)(D)), by adding a period at the end.

#### SEC. 1204. TITLE III CORRECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 327(b)(5) (12 U.S.C. 5437(b)(5)), by striking “in” and inserting “into”;

(2) in section 333(b)(2) (124 Stat. 1539), by inserting “the second place that term appears” before “and inserting”; and

(3) in section 369(5) (124 Stat. 1559)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i)—

(i) in subclause (III), by redesignating items (aa), (bb), and (cc) as subitems (AA), (BB), and (CC), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(ii) in subclause (IV), by redesignating items (aa) and (bb) as subitems (AA) and (BB), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(iii) in subclause (V), by redesignating items (aa), (bb), and (cc) as subitems (AA), (BB), and (CC), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly; and

(iv) by redesignating subclauses (III), (IV), and (V) as items (bb), (cc), and (dd), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) in clause (ii), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by striking clause (iv); and

(C) in subparagraph (G)(i), by inserting “each place such term appears” before “and inserting”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) SECTION 333.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) of this section shall take effect as though enacted as part of subtitle C of title III of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1538).

(2) SECTION 369.—The amendments made by subsection (a)(3) of this section shall take effect as though enacted as part of subtitle E of title III of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1546).

#### SEC. 1205. TITLE IV CORRECTION.

Section 414 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1578) is amended in the section heading by striking “COMMODITIES” and inserting “COMMODITY”.

#### SEC. 1206. TITLE VI CORRECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 610 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1596) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect as though enacted as part of section 610 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1611).

#### SEC. 1207. TITLE VII CORRECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 719(c)(1)(B) (15 U.S.C. 8307(c)(1)(B)), by adding a period at the end;

(2) in section 723(a)(1)(B) (124 Stat. 1675), by inserting “, as added by section 107 of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 (Appendix E of Public Law 106-554; 114 Stat. 2763A-382),” after “subsection (i)”;

(3) in section 724(a), by striking “adding at the end” and inserting “inserting after subsection (e)”;

(4) in section 734(b)(1) (124 Stat. 1718), by striking “is amended” and all that follows through “(B) in” and inserting “is amended in”;

(5) in section 741(b)(10) (124 Stat. 1732), by striking “1a(19)(A)(iv)(II)” each place it appears and inserting “1a(18)(A)(iv)(II)”;

(6) in section 749 (124 Stat. 1746)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “adding at the end” and inserting “inserting after subsection (f)”;

(B) in subsection (h)(1)(B), by inserting “the second place that term appears” before the semicolon.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (a) of this section shall take effect as though enacted as part of part II of subtitle A of title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1658).

#### SEC. 1208. TITLE IX CORRECTIONS.

Section 939(h)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1887) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “The” before “Commission”; and

(2) by striking “feasability” and inserting “feasibility”.

#### SEC. 1209. TITLE X CORRECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title X of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1002(12)(G) (12 U.S.C. 5481(12)(G)), by striking “Home Owners” and inserting “Homeowners”;

(2) in section 1013(a)(1)(C) (12 U.S.C. 5493(a)(1)(C)), by striking “section 11(1) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(1))” and inserting “subsection (l) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(l))”;

(3) in section 1017(a)(2) (as so redesignated by section 712) (12 U.S.C. 5497(a)(5))—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the last sentence by striking “716(c) of title 31, United States Code” and inserting “716 of title 31, United States Code”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)” and inserting “section 6101 of title 41, United States Code”;

(4) in section 1027(d)(1)(B) (12 U.S.C. 5517(d)(1)(B)), by inserting a comma after “(A)”;

(5) in section 1029(d) (12 U.S.C. 5519(d)), by striking the period after “Commission Act”;

(6) in section 1061(b)(7) (12 U.S.C. 5581(b)(7))—

(A) by striking “Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” each place that term appears and inserting “Department of Housing and Urban Development”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(12 U.S.C. 5102 et seq.)” and inserting “(12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.)”;

(7) in section 1063 (12 U.S.C. 5583)—

(A) in subsection (f)(1)(B), by striking “that”; and

(B) in subsection (g)(1)(A)—

(i) by striking “(12 U.S.C. 5102 et seq.)” and inserting “(12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.)”; and

(ii) by striking “seq.” and inserting “seq.”;

(8) in section 1064(i)(1)(A)(iii) (12 U.S.C. 5584(i)(1)(A)(iii)), by inserting a period before “If an”;

(9) in section 1073(c)(2) (12 U.S.C. 5601(c)(2))—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AND EDUCATION” after “FINANCIAL LITERACY”; and

(B) by striking “its duties” and inserting “their duties”;

(10) in section 1076(b)(1) (12 U.S.C. 5602(b)(1)), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, the Agency may, after notice and opportunity for comment, prescribe regulations”;

(11) in section 1077(b)(4)(F) (124 Stat. 2076), by striking “associates” and inserting “associate’s”;

(12) in section 1084(1) (124 Stat. 2081), by inserting a comma after “2009”;

(13) in section 1089 (124 Stat. 2092)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as subparagraph (C) and adjusting the margins accordingly; and

(14) in section 1098(6) (124 Stat. 2104), by inserting “the first place that term appears” before “and”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (11), (12), (13), (14), and (15) of subsection (a) shall take effect as though enacted as part of subtitle H of title X of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 2080).

#### SEC. 1210. TITLE XII CORRECTION.

Title XII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 2129) is amended, in section 1208(b) (12 U.S.C. 5626(b)), by inserting “, as defined in section 103(10) of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702(10)),” after “appropriated to the Fund”.

#### SEC. 1211. TITLE XIV CORRECTION.

Title XIV of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 2136) is amended, in section 1451(c) (12 U.S.C. 1701x-1(c)), by striking “pursuant”.

#### SEC. 1212. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO OTHER STATUTES.

(a) ALTERNATIVE MORTGAGE TRANSACTION PARITY ACT OF 1982.—The Alternative Mortgage Transaction Parity Act of 1982 (12 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 802(a)(3) (12 U.S.C. 3801(a)(3)), by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency”;

(2) in section 804 (12 U.S.C. 3803)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” each place such term appears and inserting “the Comptroller of the Currency”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking the comma after “Administration”.

(b) BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1970.—Section 106(b)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1972(1)) is amended, in the undesignated matter at the end, by striking “Federal Deposit Insurance Company” and inserting “Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation”.

(c) BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “Office of Thrift Supervision (20-4108-0-3-373).”.

(d) BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT.—Section 68(a)(1) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286tt(a)(1)) is amended by striking “Fund,” and inserting “Fund.”.

(e) CAN-SPAM ACT OF 2003.—Section 7(b)(1)(D) of the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 (15 U.S.C. 7706(b)(1)(D)) is amended by striking “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency or the Board of Directors of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as applicable”.

(f) CHILDREN’S ONLINE PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 1998.—Section 1306(b)(2) of the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6505(b)(2)) is amended by striking “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency or the Board of Directors of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as applicable”.

(g) COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1977.—The Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 803(1)(C) (12 U.S.C. 2902(1)(C)), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) in section 806 (12 U.S.C. 2905), by striking “companies,” and inserting “companies,”.

(h) CREDIT REPAIR ORGANIZATIONS ACT.—Section 403(4) of the Credit Repair Organizations Act (15 U.S.C. 1679a(4)) is amended by striking “103(e)” and inserting “103(f)”.

(i) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION MANAGEMENT INTERLOCKS ACT.—Section 205(9) of the Depository Institution Management Interlocks Act (12 U.S.C. 3204(9)) is amended by striking “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “appropriate Federal banking agency”.

(j) ECONOMIC GROWTH AND REGULATORY PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1996.—Section 2227(a)(1) of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 252(a)(1)) is amended by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision,”.

(k) ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT.—The Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 903 (15 U.S.C. 1693a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “103(i)” and inserting “103(j)”; and

(B) by redesignating the first paragraph designated as paragraph (4) (defining the term “Board”), as paragraph (3);

(2) in section 904(a) (15 U.S.C. 1693b(a))—

(A) by redesignating the second paragraph designated as paragraph (1) (relating to consultation with other agencies), the second paragraph designated as paragraph (2) (relating to the preparation of an analysis of economic impact), paragraph (3), and paragraph (4), as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking “In prescribing such regulations, the Board shall:” and inserting the following:

“(3) REGULATIONS.—In prescribing regulations under this subsection, the Agency and the Board shall—”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(C), as so redesignated, by striking “the Board shall”; and

(D) in paragraph (3)(D), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting “send promptly” before “any”; and

(ii) by striking “shall be sent promptly to Congress by the Board” and inserting “to Congress”;

(3) in section 909(c) (15 U.S.C. 1693g(c)), by striking “103(e)” and inserting “103(f)”;

(4) in section 918(a)(4) (15 U.S.C. 1693o(a)(4)), by striking “Act and” and inserting “Act; and”;

(5) by redesignating the section added by section 1073(4) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (relating to remittance transfers) (15 U.S.C. 1693o–1) as section 920 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act;

(6) by redesignating the section headed “Reasonable fees and rules for payment card transaction” (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2) as section 921 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act;

(7) by redesignating the section headed “Relation to State laws” (15 U.S.C. 1693g) as section 922 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act;

(8) by redesignating the section headed “Exemption for State regulation” (15 U.S.C. 1693r) as section 923 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act; and

(9) by redesignating the section headed “Effective date” (15 U.S.C. 1693 note) as section 924 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act.

(l) EMERGENCY ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 2008.—Section 101(b) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211(b)) is amended by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision,”.

(m) EQUAL CREDIT OPPORTUNITY ACT.—The Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 703 (15 U.S.C. 1691b)—

(A) in each of subsections (c) and (d), by striking “paragraph” each place that term appears and inserting “subsection”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by adding a period at the end;

(2) in section 704 (15 U.S.C. 1691c)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “Consumer Protection Financial Protection Act of 2010 with” and inserting “Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, compliance with”;

(ii) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “section 8” and inserting “Section 8”; and

(II) in subparagraph (C), by striking “banks;” and inserting “banks.”;

(iii) in each of paragraphs (6) and (7), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iv) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(B) in subsection (c), in the second sentence, by striking “subchapter” and inserting “title”; and

(3) in section 706(k) (15 U.S.C. 1691e(k)), by striking “, (2), or (3)” and inserting “or (2)”.

(n) EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 605(f)(2)(A) (12 U.S.C. 4004(f)(2)(A)), by striking “,” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) in section 610(a)(2) (12 U.S.C. 4009(a)(2)), by striking “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency and the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as appropriate,”.

(o) FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 603 (15 U.S.C. 1681a)—

(A) in subsection (d)(2)(D), by striking “(x)” and inserting “(y)”;

(B) in subsection (q)(5), by striking “103(i)” and inserting “103(j)”; and

(C) in subsection (v), by striking “Bureau” and inserting “Federal Trade Commission”;

(2) in section 604 (15 U.S.C. 1681b)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B)(i), by striking “section 615(a)(3)” and inserting “section 615(a)(4)”;

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B)(ii), by striking “clause (B)(i)(IV)” and inserting “clause (i)(IV)”;

(iii) in paragraph (4)(A)(ii), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and

(iv) by striking “section 609(c)(3)” each place that term appears and inserting “section 609(c)”; and

(B) in subsection (g)(5), by striking “PARAGRAPH (2).—” and all that follows through “The Bureau” and inserting “PARAGRAPH (2).—The Agency”;

(3) in section 605 (15 U.S.C. 1681c)—

(A) in subsection (f), by striking “who” and inserting “which”; and

(B) in subsection (h)(2)(A)—

(i) by striking “shall,” and inserting “shall,”; and

(ii) by striking “Commission,” and inserting “Commission,”;

(4) in paragraphs (1)(A), (1)(B)(i), (2)(A)(i), and (2)(B) of section 605A(h) (15 U.S.C. 1681c–1(h))—

(A) by striking “103(i)” each place that term appears and inserting “103(j)”; and

(B) by striking “open-end” each place that term appears and inserting “open end”;

(5) in section 607(e)(3)(A) (15 U.S.C. 1681e(e)(3)(A)), by striking “section 604(b)(4)(E)(i)” and inserting “section 604(b)(4)(D)(i)”;

(6) in section 609 (15 U.S.C. 1681g)—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(C)(i), by striking “section 604(b)(4)(E)(i)” and inserting “section 604(b)(4)(D)(i)”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “COMMISSION” and inserting “BUREAU”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(vi), by striking “603(w)” and inserting “603(x)”;

(C) in subsection (e)(2)(B)(ii)(II), by striking “an”; and

(D) by striking “The Commission” each place that term appears and inserting “The Bureau”;

(7) in section 610 (15 U.S.C. 1681h)—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “section” after “under”; and

(B) in subsection (e), by inserting a comma after “on the report”;

(8) in section 611 (15 U.S.C. 1681i), by striking “The Commission” each place that term appears and inserting “The Agency”;

(9) in section 612 (15 U.S.C. 1681j)—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) by striking “(w)” and inserting “(x)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “603(w)” each place that term appears and inserting “603(x)”;

(B) in subsection (g), by striking “television” and inserting “television”; and

(C) by striking “The Commission” each place that term appears and inserting “The Bureau”;

(10) in section 621 (15 U.S.C. 1681s)—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “, subsection (b)”;

(B) in subsection (e)(2), by inserting a period after “provisions of this title”; and

(C) in subsection (f)(2), by striking “The Commission” and inserting “The Agency” and

(11) in section 623(a)(5) (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2(a)(5)), by striking “OF ACCOUNTS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—A person” and inserting “OF ACCOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A person”.

(p) FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.—Section 206(g)(7)(D)(iv) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(g)(7)(D)(iv)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period.

(q) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(q)(2)(C) (12 U.S.C. 1813(q)(2)(C)), by adding “and” at the end;

(2) in section 7 (12 U.S.C. 1817)—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(D)” and inserting “(C)”; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) in subsection (e)(2)(C), by adding a period at the end;

(3) in section 8 (12 U.S.C. 1818)—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “(Act))” and inserting “(Act)”; and

(B) in subsection (t)(2)(C), by striking “depositors or” and inserting “depositors; or”;

(4) in section 11 (12 U.S.C. 1821)—

(A) in subsection (d)(2)(I)(ii), by striking “and section 21A(b)(4)”;

(B) in subsection (m), in each of paragraphs (16) and (18), by striking the comma after “Comptroller of the Currency” each place it appears; and

(5) in section 26(a) (12 U.S.C. 1831c(a)), by striking “Holding Company Act” each place that term appears and inserting “Holding Company Act of 1956”.

(r) **FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1974.**—Section 31(a)(5)(B) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2227(a)(5)(B)) is amended by striking “the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation” and all that follows through the period and inserting “or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the affordable housing program under section 40 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.”.

(s) **FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT.**—The Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 10(h)(1) (12 U.S.C. 1430(h)(1)), by striking “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency or the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as applicable”;

(2) in section 22(a) (12 U.S.C. 1442(a))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Comptroller of the Currency” and all that follows through “Supervision” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Chairperson of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration”;

(B) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2), by striking “Comptroller of the Currency” and all that follows through “Supervision” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration”.

(t) **FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.**—Paragraph (8)(B) of section 11(s) of the Federal Reserve Act (headed “Federal Reserve Transparency and Release of Information”) (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended by striking “this section” and inserting “this subsection”.

(u) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REFORM, RECOVERY, AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1989.**—The Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-73; 103 Stat. 183) is amended in section 1121(6) (12 U.S.C. 3350(6)), by striking “the Office of Thrift Supervision,”.

(v) **GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT.**—The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Public Law 106-102; 113 Stat. 1338) is amended—

(1) in section 132(a) (12 U.S.C. 1828b(a)), by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision,”;

(2) in section 206(a) (15 U.S.C. 78c note), by striking “Except as provided in subsection (e), for” and inserting “For”;

(3) in section 502(e)(5) (15 U.S.C. 6802(e)(5)), by striking “a Federal” and inserting “, a Federal”;

(4) in section 504(a)(2) (15 U.S.C. 6804(a)(2)), by striking “and, as appropriate, and with” and inserting “and, as appropriate, with”;

(5) in section 509(2) (15 U.S.C. 6809(2))—

(A) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(6) in section 522(b)(1)(A)(iv) (15 U.S.C. 6822(b)(1)(A)(iv)), by striking “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency and the Board of

Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as appropriate”.

(w) **HELPING FAMILIES SAVE THEIR HOMES ACT OF 2009.**—Section 104 of the Helping Families Save Their Homes Act of 2009 (12 U.S.C. 17152–25) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “and the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, shall jointly” and inserting “shall”;

(ii) by striking “Senate,” and inserting “Senate and”;

(iii) by striking “and the Office of Thrift Supervision”;

(iv) by striking “each such” and inserting “such”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “and the Office of Thrift Supervision”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking “and the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision,”;

(II) by striking “or the Director”;

(i) in the second sentence, by striking “and the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision”.

(x) **HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975.**—The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 304—

(A) in subsection (b)(5)(A), by striking “15 U.S.C. 1602(aa)(4)” and inserting “section 103(aa)(4) of the Truth in Lending Act”; and

(B) in subsection (j)(3) (12 U.S.C. 2803(j)(3)), by adding a period at the end; and

(2) in section 305(b)(1)(A) (12 U.S.C. 2804(b)(1)(A))—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “by” before “the appropriate Federal banking agency”;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “bank as,” and inserting “bank, as”.

(y) **HOME OWNERS’ LOAN ACT.**—The Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5 (12 U.S.C. 1464)—

(A) in subsection (d)(2)(E)(ii)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “Except as provided in section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the” and inserting “The”; and

(ii) by striking “, at the Director’s discretion,”;

(B) in subsection (i)(6), by striking “the Office of Thrift Supervision or”;

(C) in subsection (m), by striking “Director’s” each place that term appears and inserting “appropriate Federal banking agency’s”;

(D) in subsection (n)(9)(B), by striking “Director’s” and inserting “Comptroller’s”;

(E) in subsection (s)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “of such Act” and all that follows through “shall require” and inserting “of such Act, the appropriate Federal banking agency shall require”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “other methods” and all that follows through “determines” and inserting “other methods as the appropriate Federal banking agency determines”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking “DETERMINED” and all that follows through “may, consistent” and inserting “DETERMINED BY APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY CASE-BY-CASE. The appropriate Federal banking agency may, consistent”;

(II) by striking “capital-to-assets” and all that follows through “determines to be necessary” and inserting “capital-to-assets as the appropriate Federal banking agency determines to be necessary”;

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking “agency, may” and inserting “agency may”;

(II) by striking “the Comptroller” and inserting “the appropriate Federal banking agency”;

(2) in section 6(c) (12 U.S.C. 1465(c)), by striking “sections” and inserting “section”;

(3) in section 10 (12 U.S.C. 1467a)—

(A) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “time” and all that follows through “release” and inserting “time, upon the motion or application of the Board, release”;

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(H)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(I) by striking “1841(p)” and inserting “1841(p))”;

(II) by inserting “(12 U.S.C. 1843(k))” before “if—”;

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting “of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(l) and (m))” after “Company Act”;

(C) in subsection (e)(7)(B)(iii)—

(i) by striking “Board of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision”;

(ii) by inserting “, as defined in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301)” after “transfer date”;

(4) in section 13 (12 U.S.C. 1468b), by striking “the a” and inserting “a”.

(z) **HOUSING ACT OF 1948.**—Section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948 (12 U.S.C. 1701c(c)(3)) is amended by striking “Federal Home Loan Bank Agency” and inserting “Federal Housing Finance Agency”.

(aa) **HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968.**—Section 106(h)(5) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701x(h)(5)) is amended by striking “authorised” and inserting “authorized”.

(bb) **INTERNATIONAL BANKING ACT OF 1978.**—Section 15 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3109) is amended—

(1) in each of subsections (a) and (b)—

(A) by striking “, and Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” each place that term appears; and

(B) by inserting “and” before “Federal Deposit” each place that term appears;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “Comptroller, Corporation, or Director” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency, or Corporation”;

(3) in subsection (c)(4)—

(A) by inserting “and” before “the Federal Deposit”;

(B) by striking “, and the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision”.

(cc) **INTERNATIONAL LENDING SUPERVISION ACT OF 1983.**—Section 912 of the International Lending Supervision Act of 1983 (12 U.S.C. 3911) is amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows: “**EQUAL REPRESENTATION FOR FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION**”;

(2) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”;

(3) by striking subsection (b); and

(4) by striking “4” and inserting “3”.

(dd) **INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT.**—The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) is amended in each of section 1411(b) (15 U.S.C. 1710(b)) and subsections (b)(4) and (d) of section 1418a (15 U.S.C. 1717a), by striking “Secretary’s” each place that term appears and inserting “Director’s”.

(ee) **INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.**—Section 224 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-18c) is amended in the heading of the section by striking “**COMMODITIES**” and inserting “**COMMODITY**”.

(ff) **LEGAL CERTAINTY FOR BANK PRODUCTS ACT OF 2000.**—Section 403(b)(1) of the Legal Certainty for Bank Products Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C.

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking “agency, may” and inserting “agency may”;

(II) by striking “the Comptroller” and inserting “the appropriate Federal banking agency”;

(2) in section 6(c) (12 U.S.C. 1465(c)), by striking “sections” and inserting “section”;

(3) in section 10 (12 U.S.C. 1467a)—

(A) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “time” and all that follows through “release” and inserting “time, upon the motion or application of the Board, release”;

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(H)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(I) by striking “1841(p)” and inserting “1841(p))”;

(II) by inserting “(12 U.S.C. 1843(k))” before “if—”;

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting “of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(l) and (m))” after “Company Act”;

(C) in subsection (e)(7)(B)(iii)—

(i) by striking “Board of the Office of Thrift Supervision” and inserting “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision”;

(ii) by inserting “, as defined in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301)” after “transfer date”;

(4) in section 13 (12 U.S.C. 1468b), by striking “the a” and inserting “a”.

(z) **HOUSING ACT OF 1948.**—Section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948 (12 U.S.C. 1701c(c)(3)) is amended by striking “Federal Home Loan Bank Agency” and inserting “Federal Housing Finance Agency”.

(aa) **HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968.**—Section 106(h)(5) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701x(h)(5)) is amended by striking “authorised” and inserting “authorized”.

(bb) **INTERNATIONAL BANKING ACT OF 1978.**—Section 15 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3109) is amended—

(1) in each of subsections (a) and (b)—

(A) by striking “, and Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision” each place that term appears; and

(B) by inserting “and” before “Federal Deposit” each place that term appears;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “Comptroller, Corporation, or Director” and inserting “Comptroller of the Currency, or Corporation”;

(3) in subsection (c)(4)—

(A) by inserting “and” before “the Federal Deposit”;

(B) by striking “, and the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision”.

(cc) **INTERNATIONAL LENDING SUPERVISION ACT OF 1983.**—Section 912 of the International Lending Supervision Act of 1983 (12 U.S.C. 3911) is amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows: “**EQUAL REPRESENTATION FOR FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION**”;

(2) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”;

(3) by striking subsection (b); and

(4) by striking “4” and inserting “3”.

(dd) **INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT.**—The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) is amended in each of section 1411(b) (15 U.S.C. 1710(b)) and subsections (b)(4) and (d) of section 1418a (15 U.S.C. 1717a), by striking “Secretary’s” each place that term appears and inserting “Director’s”.

(ee) **INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.**—Section 224 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-18c) is amended in the heading of the section by striking “**COMMODITIES**” and inserting “**COMMODITY**”.

(ff) **LEGAL CERTAINTY FOR BANK PRODUCTS ACT OF 2000.**—Section 403(b)(1) of the Legal Certainty for Bank Products Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C.

27a(b)(1)) is amended by striking “that section” and inserting “section”.

(gg) PUBLIC LAW 93-495.—Section 111 of Public Law 93-495 (12 U.S.C. 250) is amended by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision,”.

(hh) REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 5136C(i) of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 25b(i)) is amended by striking “POWERS.” and all that follows through “In accordance” and inserting “POWERS.—In accordance”.

(ii) RIEGLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Section 117(e) of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4716(e)) is amended by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision,”.

(jj) S.A.F.E. MORTGAGE LICENSING ACT OF 2008.—Section 1514 of the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5113) is amended in each of subsections (b)(5) and (c)(4)(C), by striking “Secretary’s” each place that term appears and inserting “Director’s”.

(kk) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3D(d)(10)(A) (15 U.S.C. 78c-4(d)(10)(A)), by striking “taking” and inserting “take”;

(2) in section 3E(b)(1) (15 U.S.C. 78c-5(b)(1)), by striking “though” and inserting “thorough”;

(3) in section 4(g)(8)(A) (15 U.S.C. 78d(g)(8)(A)), by striking “(2)(A)(i)” and inserting “(2)(A)(ii)”;

(4) in section 15 (15 U.S.C. 78o)—

(A) in each of subparagraphs (B)(ii) and (C) of subsection (b)(4), by striking “dealer municipal advisor,” and inserting “dealer, municipal advisor,”;

(B) by redesignating subsection (j) (relating to the authority of the Commission) as subsection (p) and moving that subsection after subsection (o);

(C) as amended by section 841(d), by redesignating the second subsection (k) and second subsection (l) (relating to standard of conduct and other matters, respectively), as added by section 913(g)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 1828), as subsections (q) and (r), respectively and moving those subsections to the end; and

(D) in subsection (m), by inserting “the” before “same extent”;

(5) in section 15F(h) (15 U.S.C. 78o-10(h))—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “a” after “that acts as an advisor to”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “a” after “offers to enter into”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(A)(i)—

(i) by inserting “(A)” after “(18)”;

(ii) in subclause (VII), by striking “act of” and inserting “Act of”;

(6) in section 15G (15 U.S.C. 78o-11)—

(A) in subsection (e)(4)(A), by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”;

(B) in subsection (e)(4)(C)—

(i) by striking “129C(c)(2)” and inserting “129C(b)(2)(A)”;

(ii) by inserting “(15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(2)(A))” after “Lending Act”; and

(C) in subsection (e)(5), by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”;

(7) in section 17A (15 U.S.C. 78q-1), by redesignating subsection (g), as added by section 929W of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (relating to due diligence for the delivery of dividends, interest, and other valuable property rights) as subsection (n) and moving that subsection to the end.

(ll) TELEMARKETING AND CONSUMER FRAUD AND ABUSE PREVENTION ACT.—Section 3(b) of the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and

Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6102(b)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, provided, however, nothing in this section shall conflict with or supersede section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 46)”.

(mm) TITLE 5.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3132(a)(1)(D), as amended by section 711, by striking “the Office of Thrift Supervision,, the Resolution Trust Corporation,”; and

(2) in section 5314, by striking “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision.”.

(nn) TITLE 31.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking section 309; and

(B) in section 714(d)(3)(B) by striking “a audit” and inserting “an audit”.

(2) ANALYSIS.—The analysis for subchapter I of chapter 3 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 309.

(oo) TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.—The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 105 (15 U.S.C. 1604), by inserting subsection (h), as added by section 1472(c) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (124 Stat. 2187), before subsection (i), as added by section 1100A(7) of that Act (124 Stat. 2108);

(2) in section 106(f)(2)(B)(i) (15 U.S.C. 1605(f)(2)(B)(i)), by striking “103(w)” and inserting “103(x)”;

(3) in section 121(b) (15 U.S.C. 1631(b)), by striking “103(f)” and inserting “103(g)”;

(4) in section 122(d)(5) (15 U.S.C. 1632(d)(5)), by striking “section 603” and all that follows through “promulgate” and inserting “section 603, may promulgate”;

(5) in section 125(e)(1) (15 U.S.C. 1635(e)(1)), by striking “103(w)” and inserting “103(x)”;

(6) in section 129 (15 U.S.C. 1639)—

(A) in subsection (q), by striking “(l)(2)” and inserting “(p)(2)”;

(B) in subsection (u)(3), by striking “Board” each place that term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(7) in section 129C (15 U.S.C. 1639c)—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking the second period at the end; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(B)(ii)(I), by striking “a original” and inserting “an original”;

(8) in section 148(d) (15 U.S.C. 1665c(d)), by striking “Bureau” and inserting “Board”;

(9) in section 149 (15 U.S.C. 1665d)—

(A) by striking “the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision,” each place that term appears;

(B) by striking “National Credit Union Administration Bureau” each place that term appears and inserting “National Credit Union Administration Board”; and

(C) by striking “Bureau of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation” each place that term appears and inserting “Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation”; and

(10) in section 181(1) (15 U.S.C. 1667(1)), by striking “103(g)” and inserting “103(h)”.

(pp) TRUTH IN SAVINGS ACT.—The Truth in Savings Act (12 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.) is amended in each of sections 269(a)(4) (12 U.S.C. 4308(a)(4)), 270(a)(2) (12 U.S.C. 4309(a)(2)), and 274(6) (12 U.S.C. 4313(6)), by striking “Administration Bureau” each place that term appears and inserting “Administration Board”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-163. Each such amendment may be

offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-163.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, beginning on line 15, strike “meetings of the Council, whether or not open to the public,” and insert “public meetings of the Council”.

Page 48, after line 19, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraph accordingly):

“(5) TRANSCRIPTION REQUIREMENT FOR NON-PUBLIC MEETINGS.—The Council shall create and preserve transcripts for all non-public meetings of the Council.”.

Amend section 361 to read as follows:

**SEC. 361. BRINGING THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) The” and inserting the following:

“(a) POWERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The”;

(2) by inserting “, subject to paragraph (2),” after “The Board of Directors of the Corporation”; and

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

“(2) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided under paragraph (3), the Corporation may, only to the extent as provided in advance by appropriations Acts, cover the costs incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act, including with respect to the administrative costs of the Corporation and the costs of the examination and supervision of insured depository institutions.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to the Corporation’s Insurance Business Line Programs and Receivership Management Business Line Programs, as in existence on the date of enactment of this paragraph, and the proportion of the administrative costs of the Corporation related to such programs.”.

(b) EXAMINATION FEES.—Section 10(e)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(e)(1)) is amended by striking “to meet the expenses of the Corporation in carrying out such examinations” and inserting “and may be expended by the Board only to the extent as provided in advance by appropriations Acts to cover the costs incurred in carrying out such examinations”.

(c) OFFSET OF ADDITIONAL FEES.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall reduce the amount of insurance premiums charged by the Corporation under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act in an amount equal to any additional fees charged by the Corporation by reason of the amendments made by this section.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect



to expenses paid and fees collected on or after October 1, 2017.

Amend section 363 to read as follows:

**SEC. 363. BRINGING THE EXAMINATION AND SUPERVISION FUNCTIONS OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

(a) **OPERATING FEES.**—Section 105(d) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1755(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “All” and inserting “(1) All”;

(2) by striking “for the account of the Administration and may be expended by the Board to defray the expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act including the examination and supervision of Federal credit unions” and inserting “and may be expended by the Board only to the extent as provided in advance by appropriations Acts, to cover the costs incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act with respect to the costs of the examination and supervision of Federal credit unions and the proportion of the administrative costs of the Board related to the examination and supervision of Federal credit unions”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) The Board may only use amounts in the NCUA Operating Fund to the extent as provided in advance by appropriations Acts, including to pay for the costs incurred by the Board in carrying out the examination and supervision of Federal credit unions and the proportion of the administrative costs of the Board related to the examination and supervision of Federal credit unions.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the Board’s activities carried out pursuant to title II.”.

(b) **STAFF FUNDING.**—Section 120(j)(3) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1766(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “related to the examination and supervision of Federal credit unions under this Act and the proportion of the administrative costs of the Board related to the examination and supervision of Federal credit unions under this Act” before “shall be paid”; and

(2) by striking “insured credit unions under this Act” and inserting “Federal credit unions under this title, only to the extent as provided in advance by appropriations Acts”.

(c) **USE OF DEPOSIT FUNDS.**—Section 202(c)(1)(B)(iv) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(c)(1)(B)(iv)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The” and inserting “To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “This clause shall not apply to the Board’s activities carried out pursuant to this title.”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to expenses paid and fees collected on or after October 1, 2017.

Page 297, line 18, strike “Council” and insert “Secretary of the Treasury”.

Page 326, line 6, strike “A” and insert “P”.

Page 327, line 9, strike “B” and insert “Q”.

Page 329, line 3, strike “C” and insert “R”.

Page 330, line 5, strike “D” and insert “S”.

Page 370, beginning on line 24, strike “DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the” and insert “APPOINTMENT.—The”.

Page 527, line 2, strike “Independent Member” and insert “President”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is purely technical in nature that addresses a few discrete issues in the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Specifically, it clarifies the noninsurance-related functions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the National Credit Union Administration subject to congressional appropriations.

This amendment will not—not—affect the ability of the NCUA to determine the appropriate allocation of expenses between their insurance and other functions for purpose of their overall funding, but it will, for the first time, give Congress the power of the purse—our constitutional power of the purse—over many of the FDIC and NCUA’s operating expenses.

Additionally, the amendment revises the vesting of the appointment power for certain positions and clarifies congressional access to nonpublic meetings of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which was filed late, should be viewed as the first admission by the Republicans that H.R. 10 would be bad for our financial markets and our economy.

The amendment recognizes that it would be inappropriate for Members of Congress to attend nonpublic meetings of the council charged with reviewing sensitive financial information and discussing potential threats to our economy.

I agree with the sponsor that this was one of many harmful provisions in the “Wrong” CHOICE Act.

Here are a few more: the “Wrong” CHOICE Act eliminates the Office of Financial Research, which is tasked with studying emerging risks to our economy and informing the Financial Stability Oversight Council. The “Wrong” CHOICE Act stops the council from taking actions to prevent firms like AIG from threatening our economy. The “Wrong” CHOICE Act allows banks to choose the regulatory system that best suits their bottom line, even if doing so is bad for the economy and taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment also recognizes the dangers of subjecting our independent financial regulators to the partisan appropriations process, by restoring the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation’s and the National Credit Union Administration’s independent funding when it comes to their responsibilities for unwinding failed banks and credit unions.

I agree, this is important, but do you know what is also important and needing to be independent?

The authority to supervise those entities before they fail.

The bank and credit union regulators, including the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, have important yet sensitive responsibilities to make sure that financial institutions follow rules that are good for the economy, good for consumers, but which some institutions would rather ignore.

Subjecting these decisions to the appropriations process will result in fewer cops on the beat, weaker guardrails, and a greater likelihood of financial catastrophe.

We have seen this happen before. One of the reasons for the failure of the housing giants, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, was that they had a woefully underfunded regulator without independent funding.

Democrats fixed this when we created the independently funded Federal Housing Finance Agency in 2008. Since then, this agency has successfully made tough decisions to right both GSEs by putting them into conservatorship and cleaning up their businesses.

Ignoring this success and history, H.R. 10 would once again strip away the independent funding of the GSE’s regulator, as it would for all of the financial regulators.

I am pleased that this amendment has recognized the problems taking away independent funding for our regulators, but, unfortunately, it doesn’t go far enough. I oppose this amendment and I urge my colleagues to reject it and the entire “Wrong” CHOICE Act.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the work of the committee for doing the work of the American people.

Prior to coming to Congress, as a small-business owner and small-business leader, I was feeling the pain of the Dodd-Frank Act, wondering whether anyone in Washington, D.C., was listening. Now that I have had the opportunity to serve just this 1 year now in Congress, I have gone around the district. I have gone around and talked to businessowners, to farmers, and to community bankers who have been suffering under this law.

One of the things that hasn't been talked about is how the Dodd-Frank Act has harmed the SEC, how it has deprived people of due process. All but the wealthiest Americans are trapped in a system where the SEC has quasi-judicial hearings using administrative law judges. They have a 90 percent win rate because they have all the keys. They can block discretion, they can block discovery, and they can limit the facts and limit the debate.

So one of the good things that the Dodd-Frank reform—known as the CHOICE Act—accomplishes is ending this process so that people do have the right to due process in our courts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 10 and to end the abuses of the previous era.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, the late poet Maya Angelou had a saying: "When people show you who they really are, believe them."

So when the chief lobbyist for the American Bankers Association leads a pep rally before 1,500 bankers, we should pay attention. He probably means what he is saying.

In March, he told ABA members about all the opportunities for banking with a Republican Congress, he crowed: "I don't want a seat at the table. I want the table."

If we read this bill, we know what it looks like to give the financial services sector the whole table. We know they want the whole table.

H.R. 10 is clever at undermining financial regulators, emboldening Wall Street, and making it incredibly easy to delay regulators at every step of the rulemaking process.

It is important for the people of America to understand that when Republicans say they want to kill regulations, usually what they are talking about is safety regulations, regulations that make the water clean, the meat safe, and that financial product that you just bought not blow up in your face. They don't like regulations because regulations mean that the people who control some of these products can't just do whatever they want to do.

But for the people in the United States, you should know that financial regulators are going to keep money in your pocket, they are going to stop people with way more resources than you have from picking your pocket.

That is why we oppose this amendment. I think it is particularly important for people to realize that the rhetoric that we use denigrating regulation all the time is the same regulation that protects us, and that includes in the financial services sector.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I know that my friend and colleague from the other side of the aisle spoke about rhetoric. Unfortunately, that is pretty well all we have heard from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

I am absolutely fascinated, Mr. Chairman, how often Members on the other side of the aisle say: I care so much about community banks; I care so much about small business.

But, Mr. Chairman, do you know how many amendments that they filed on H.R. 10?

Let me count them. Zero. Zero amendments.

Where is their bill to help small banks? Where is their bill to help credit unions?

They don't have one, and they didn't offer any amendments, so that is all we hear.

We hear the rhetoric about Wall Street, Mr. Chairman, but it is fascinating to me—don't take my word for it, but according to The Washington Post, The New York Times, and The Wall Street Journal, three of the largest publications in our country, they all say the same thing: Large, Wall Street banks support Dodd-Frank, and they oppose the Financial CHOICE Act.

Now, why do they do that?

Maybe it is because my friends on the other side of the aisle are only all too happy to preserve Wall Street bailouts. They wrote it into the law. They codified it into the law; and then they took the rest of us and created this thing called the orderly liquidation authority, which is nothing more than a taxpayer-funded bailout system. Trillions of dollars can be taken from taxpayers to bail out large banks. And they defend it. No wonder the large banks, seemingly, are satisfied with the Dodd-Frank Act.

But who supports the Financial CHOICE Act?

The credit unions support it and the community banks support it because they are suffering and dying under the weight of the load of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Again, if we want to get this economy moving again, if we want to ensure that our hardworking constituents finally get the pay increase they deserve, that they finally get the future that they deserve, we must reject Dodd-Frank, and we must support not only this amendment, but the underlying Financial CHOICE Act.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-163.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title IV, insert the following:

#### **Subtitle X—Modernized Offering and Proxy Rules for Closed-End Funds**

#### **SEC. 499A. PARITY FOR CLOSED-END COMPANIES REGARDING OFFERING AND PROXY RULES.**

(a) REVISION TO RULES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise any rules to the extent necessary to allow any closed-end company, as defined in section 5(a)(2) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-5), that is registered as an investment company under such Act to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers that are required to file reports under section 13 or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m; 78o(d)). Any action that the Commission takes pursuant to this subsection shall include the following:

(1) The Commission shall revise section 230.405 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to—

(A) remove the exclusion of a registered closed-end company from the definition of a well-known seasoned issuer provided by that section; and

(B) add registration statements filed on Form N-2 to the definition of automatic shelf registration statement provided by that section.

(2) The Commission shall revise sections 230.168 and 230.169 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the exclusion of a registered closed-end company from the list of issuers that can use the exemptions provided by those sections.

(3) The Commission shall revise sections 230.163 and 230.163A of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove a registered closed-end company from the list of issuers that are ineligible to use the exemptions provided by those sections.

(4) The Commission shall revise section 230.134 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the exclusion of a registered closed-end company from that section.

(5) The Commission shall revise sections 230.138 and 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to specifically include any registered closed-end company as an issuer to which those sections apply.

(6) The Commission shall revise section 230.164 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove a registered closed-end company from the list of issuers that are excluded from that section.

(7) The Commission shall revise section 230.433, of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to specifically include any registered

closed-end company that is a well-known seasoned issuer as an issuer to which that section applies.

(8) The Commission shall revise section 230.415 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to—

(A) state that the registration for securities provided by that section includes securities registered by any registered closed-end company on Form N-2; and

(B) eliminate the requirement that a Form N-2 registrant must furnish the undertakings required by item 34.4 of Form N-2.

(9) The Commission shall revise section 230.497 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to include a process for any registered closed-end company to file a form of prospectus that is parallel to the process for filing a form of prospectus under section 230.424(b) of such title.

(10) The Commission shall revise sections 230.172 and 230.173 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the exclusion of an offering of any registered closed-end company from those sections.

(11) The Commission shall revise section 230.418 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that any registered closed-end company that would otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of General Instruction I.A of Form S-3 shall be exempt from paragraph (a)(3) of that section.

(12) The Commission shall revise section 240.14a-101 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that any registered closed-end company that would otherwise meet the requirements of General Instruction I.A of Form S-3 shall be deemed to meet the requirements of Form S-3 for purposes of Schedule 14A.

(13) The Commission shall revise section 243.103 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that paragraph (a) of that section applies for purposes of Form N-2.

(b) REVISIONS TO FORM N-2.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise Form N-2 to—

(1) include an item or instruction that is similar to item 12 on Form S-3 to provide that any registered closed-end company that would otherwise meet the requirements of Form S-3 shall incorporate by reference its reports and documents filed under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 into its registration statement filed on Form N-2; and

(2) include an item or instruction that is similar to the instruction regarding automatic shelf offerings by well-known seasoned issuers on Form S-3 to provide that any registered closed-end company that is a well-known seasoned issuer may file automatic shelf offerings on Form N-2.

(c) TREATMENT IF REVISIONS NOT COMPLETED IN A TIMELY MANNER.—If the Commission fails to complete the revisions required by subsections (a) and (b) by the time required by such subsections, any registered closed-end company shall be entitled to treat such revisions as having been completed in accordance with the actions required to be taken by the Commission by such subsections until such time as such revisions are completed by the Commission.

(d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) NO EFFECT ON RULE 482.—(1) Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to impair or limit in any way a registered closed-end company from using section 230.482 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to distribute sales material.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in this section to a section of title 17, Code of Federal

Regulations, or to any form or schedule means such rule, section, form, or schedule, or any successor to any such rule, section, form, or schedule.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman of the Financial Services Committee for his hard work, and the entire Financial Services Committee for all the effort they have undertaken in today's debate of the Financial CHOICE Act.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017. This amendment would allow for certain closed-end funds to be considered well-known seasoned issuers.

Ultimately, the proposed amendment is built upon the foundation of lowering costs and increasing access for investors by allowing companies that meet certain criteria to have the same equivalence as bigger companies that also have access to capital markets by making them available to those fast lanes that allow them to issue shares.

In 2005, the SEC put in place significant reforms that sought to modernize registration, communication, and offering processes for traditional operating companies. These reforms were designed to streamline the registration process, especially those for large reporting issuers or well-known seasoned issuers. Unfortunately, the SEC excluded registered closed-end funds from those reforms.

A closed-end fund is nothing more than a pooled investment fund with a fixed number of shares that is structured, listed, and traded just like a stock on the stock exchange. Closed-end funds are crucial to retirement savings and investment vehicles that many retail investors use. About 3 million mom-and-pop investors rely on closed-end funds to meet their investment needs. These funds serve as a long-term source of capital, which, in turn, promotes job creation—something we can all agree needs to happen more in this country.

Closed-end funds, though, are currently under attack by unfair onerous filing and offering regulations. This commonsense amendment would provide parity for these certain closed-end funds by streamlining their registration process, offering and communications processes that are currently available to other publicly traded companies. This unfair exclusion of closed-end funds has created an unlevel playing field.

Giving qualifying closed-end funds the ability to enjoy well-known sea-

soned issuer status would help those funds better evaluate and assess the market for their offerings and would enable them to more quickly access capital markets. Those closed-end funds, an important vehicle for retail investors, would allow them to get capital to more job creators.

There has been a steady decline in the number of closed-end funds and the number of new closed-end funds offerings because of this unlevel playing field. Since 2007, the number of closed-end funds has dropped by 20 percent.

□ 1500

In 2007, there were 42 new closed-end fund issuances; in 2016, there were only 8. That is an 81 percent decline.

What we can all agree on is that Americans need access to capital. They need access to the capital markets that will provide them the capital to thrive as they have created new products. Retail investors also need access to those investments in order to meet their particular needs.

These closed-end funds should not have been hamstrung in their ability to access the advantages afforded to operating companies. It is time we provide parity in this marketplace by leveling the playing field.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, the Hollingsworth amendment seeks to insert a totally new and unvetted set of exemptions from the security laws for closed-end funds. These are the type of pooled investment vehicles that typically issue a fixed number of shares that, unlike mutual funds, are not redeemable on a daily basis by the fund, making them harder for investors to sell.

The Financial Services Committee has had no hearings, no markups, no debate on these issues until now. Perhaps that is why the amendment has been mislabeled as only benefiting closed-end funds traded on an exchange with well-known seasoned issuer status.

In fact, the amendment is much broader, as it would allow even illiquid, nontraded funds to claim multiple exemptions. This effort would make it harder for the Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC, to police these products for investors.

This last-minute, partisan approach is not the way that Congress should proceed in making laws, but it is consistent with this bill. Although Democrats conducted 41 hearings to develop Dodd-Frank, Republicans planned only 1 hearing on this bill. It is not surprising, then, that the "Wrong"

CHOICE Act is a 600-page bill chock-full of bad partisan ideas and special interest wish lists that will harm our Nation's investors, consumers, and taxpayers.

For example, the bill would severely undermine the ability of the SEC, our Wall Street cop on the beat, to protect investors and hold bad actors accountable. Specifically, it would remove valuable law enforcement tools, burden the SEC with onerous cost-benefit analysis, and generate more and more endless litigation, tying the agency up.

Worse, the bill repeals the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule and effectively prevents the DOL or the SEC from ever moving forward to protect our Nation's investors and seniors from conflicted advice by unscrupulous financial advisers.

I will say, most financial advisers are not unscrupulous, but for the ones that are, there needs to be authority in the law to stop them. We need the fiduciary rule. The "Wrong" CHOICE Act takes it away.

But this should come as no surprise, since the Republicans in Congress have been relentless in their opposition to the DOL's commonsense requirement that financial advisers put their clients' interests ahead of their own when providing investment advice about retirement products.

Their extreme partisan efforts to kill the fiduciary rule ignore the facts that 9 in 10 Americans reportedly agree with the rule. An overwhelming majority—65 percent—of Americans who voted for President Trump appear to support the regulation.

Tellingly, just last week, after robust bipartisan debate, the Republican Governor of Nevada signed into law a bill requiring financial advisers to act in their clients' best interests.

The "Wrong" CHOICE Act continues this partisan slant by also rolling back bipartisan efforts from this and past Congresses to craft legislation that helps grow small business and protect investors.

Mr. Chair, we owe it to our constituents and the American people to work together to address real problems with real solutions that are thoroughly vetted. For that reason, I must oppose this bill and this amendment.

I will add, my colleague on other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, said: Where is our bill? That would be Dodd-Frank.

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

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the subcommittee chair.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I support this amendment offered by Congress-

man HOLLINGSWORTH, who is a great member of our committee.

But folks watching this, you have to understand what is going on. You just heard about how we are trying to roll back things, roll back bipartisan consensus. We have bipartisan consensus on this.

This very issue was in a bill that was proposed by current OMB Director Mick Mulvaney. In fact, when it came out of committee, there were 4 "no" votes against it. The ranking member herself voted for this very issue in a Business Development Corporation bill, a BDC bill, that had been sponsored the last Congress. In addition, the omnibus bill that had passed had this very provision in it as well.

So what you are seeing is hypocrisy, at best. Gamesmanship and politics really is probably what is going on.

This amendment builds upon a bipartisan provision in the CHOICE Act that directs the SEC to do something that had been an oversight. It is streamlining these securities-offering provisions.

I know it is complicated and very esoteric, but these well-known, seasoned issuers, or WKSIs as they are known, really have been a secure and safe way of investing for Joe and Janet retirement investor. That is what I like to the call them. It is my mom and dad and your mom and dad, us, and our brothers and sisters. It is retail investors. What this amendment does is conforms the filing and offering regulations for closed-end funds to those traditional operating companies.

With that, I offer my support and encourage support. Let's stop the hypocrisy and politics.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chair, I would just build on that to say that every WKSI goes through the SEC review and comment period.

What we are doing here is removing the duplicative SEC review and comment period, which only serves to delay capital getting out to businesses, which only serves to add cost to retail investors that use these pools.

So I support the amendment, and I support the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed business development funds. We have not talked about closed-end funds in committee. This amendment introduces a new idea which has not been debated. For that reason alone, we should vote it down.

We have got to have regular order around here. This is a complicated issue. All the avenues and all the different perspectives that need to be brought to bear should be done in committee, not right here.

Mr. Chairman, for those reasons alone, I would ask for a strong "no" vote on this particular amendment,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SMUCKER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 115-163.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title V the following new subtitle:

**Subtitle T—Protection of Consumer Information by Consumer Reporting Agencies**

**SEC. 596. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATED TO PROTECTION OF CONSUMER INFORMATION BY CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the Congress that consumer reporting agencies and subsidiaries of consumer reporting agencies should, when providing access to consumers to the information contained in the file of the consumer maintained by the consumer reporting agency, use strong multi-factor authentication procedures to verify the identity of consumers.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms "consumer", "consumer reporting agency", and "file" have the meanings given those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I start by thanking Chairman HENSARLING and the committee and the staff for all the hard work that they have done on this very important bill.

Mr. Chairman, protecting the personal information of Americans is critical to maintaining financial stability. Many of our families, friends, neighbors, and constituents have suffered from the threat of their personal information. While private industry works hard to implement strong protections for our online information, I believe that Congress has the responsibility to stay informed on the threats facing constituents in order to help protect those we represent from identity theft and IRS fraud.

As you are aware, over the past few years, consumer reporting agencies have experienced numerous breaches of

information. High-profile data breaches occurred in 2017, 2015, 2013, and 2011, among others.

A recent cyber attack on a CRA subsidiary allowed thieves to access taxpayer W-2s, giving them the ability to file fraudulent tax returns. Another attack exposed the Social Security numbers of an estimated 200 million Americans.

Protecting consumers and the constituents I serve in Pennsylvania's 16th District is my duty in Congress, and this includes cyber activity.

In 2015, the IRS paid out \$5.8 billion in fraudulent refunds to identity thieves. While it is important to clarify that that is not attributable fully to the hacks that I have already referenced, we should work to improve consumer protections and help stop the wasteful abuse of taxpayer dollars.

Our constituents rely on consumer reporting agencies to monitor their credit for theft or nefarious activities. My amendment simply encourages these agencies collecting our highly sensitive financial information to do everything they deem feasible to adequately protect our constituents from identity fraud that can wreak havoc on their financial stability and personal matters.

CRAs collect large amounts of personal, confidential data. The facts show these companies are under constant attack by cyber thieves. Therefore, this language merely encourages them to use the strongest protection for consumer data.

H.R. 10 takes critical steps to improving our consumer protections while improving our economic and regulatory environment. My amendment is about signaling our shared desire to protect our constituents and their data.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his work on this bill and for his support of this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that there might be some merit to this amendment, but I still claim time in opposition.

Because it wasn't brought up in committee, I think that there is a lot of hashing out of this particular amendment that could have happened and we might have been able to agree, but at this point in the process I have to claim time in opposition and I will explain why. I will say that, if we can work on it later, we will see what happens, but as now for now, we are urging a strong "no."

I think the amendment is well-intentioned because it purports to address

the growing problem of identity theft, something we all need to be concerned about. However, I am concerned that it may make it harder for some consumers who want to obtain their own reports, particularly those using the website [annualcreditreport.com](http://annualcreditreport.com), to access their free annual consumer reports from nationwide credit reporting agencies, or CRAs.

Also, the amendment purports to combat identity theft, but solely focuses on tougher authentication requirements for consumers who want to access their own files, not on all users who have access to consumer reports like landlords or employers. I think that is a weakness.

The website [annualcreditreport.com](http://annualcreditreport.com) and reports maintained by the big three require consumers to provide personally identifiable information and to successfully answer several questions about information on the consumer files before giving them access to reports online.

In a 2017 report, the Consumer Bureau noted that credit reporting complaints are consistently among the top three types of consumer complaints it handles. When consumers are denied online access, they have to mail copies of sensitive identifying documents in order to obtain their reports, which consumers note is time consuming as well as potentially not secure. This amendment could make that situation even worse.

I also find it a little confusing that the House is considering this amendment to a bill that will hamstring the only Federal agency, the Consumer Bureau, that has rulemaking, supervisory, and enforcement authority over most consumer reporting agencies and has actually addressed many credit reporting problems.

If Members support this amendment, then it simply does not make sense to me for the same Members to support H.R. 10, which will gut the Consumer Bureau's capacity to effectively address problems like identity theft.

Before Dodd-Frank, the Federal Trade Commission was the only Federal agency with enforcement authority over the CRAs, but there was no entity with supervising authority. Dodd-Frank closed that gap by giving the Consumer Bureau the supervisory power to monitor CRAs' operations.

Just this year, through the good work of the Consumer Bureau's examiners, the Consumer Bureau issued enforcement orders against all of the big three CRAs for misleading practices that harm consumers.

I urge colleagues to oppose the amendment and reject the "Wrong" CHOICE Act. I hope next time we can talk about this legislation before it gets to the floor. That would be better and more proper.

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, it is not my intent today to oppose the amendment; however, I do want to express my reservations over the amendment from the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think it is important that we set the record straight on a few points.

The credit reporting agencies are not required to adhere to any sort of thorough data security standard. Unlike many other industries, the financial services industry has had Federal security requirements in place for nearly 20 years.

□ 1515

The amendment sponsor's press release last week said credit reporting agencies do not have any Federal requirements for cybersecurity practices. That is news to the House Banking Services Committee, which has authored some of those requirements. So it simply isn't the case.

Credit reporting agencies are required to adhere to numerous data and consumer protection laws, including the Fair Credit Reporting Act and Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, along with several Federal rules and standards on data security.

I have some concerns that Congress should not be in the business of dictating specific security methodologies. The multifactor authentication procedures specified in the gentleman's amendment could be right sometimes, even many times, but circumstances, innovation, and the passage of time may indicate otherwise.

As chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, we want to spend some time on trying to look at this issue and hope that the gentleman works with our committee.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about an issue somewhat related that is critical in this debate and would go a long way toward improving our economy and the chances of consumers.

I have a bill, H.R. 435, the Credit Access and Inclusion Act. My amendment would help solve problems the Financial Services Committee has been discussing for more than a decade. This is not an amendment that I have submitted for disposition today, but I would like to bring to the attention of the body that this Credit Access and Inclusion Act was good legislation and should be taken up. It would address a problem of access to credit that the leader of this bill says he wants to solve.

My bill would allow utility, telecom, public and Section 8 housing residents to build a credit score without debt. It provides affirmative permission for

utility, telecom, and housing providers to report on-time payment information to credit reporting agencies.

I have introduced this bill in four consecutive Congresses. I introduced this bill with Mr. PITTENGER as a lead. It has the support of many members of the committee, including Representatives MALONEY, DUFFY, GREEN, STIVERS, MEEKS, LOVE, CAPUANO, and more, a truly bipartisan piece of legislation.

Why am I committed to passing the bill? Because 1 in 10 Americans do not have a credit score. These 26 million people are credit invisible, and they can have trouble getting an apartment and might pay more for insurance, and they will have a very hard time qualifying for a loan to buy a car or a home. Another 19 million are not scorable because there is too little information in their files. One in four African Americans and one in four Latinos are credit invisible and not scorable.

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time, and I thank him for his leadership.

Indeed, the whole issue of data security is so vital to our constituents, so many of them have been victimized by identity theft. So I appreciate his leadership on this issue, and I know that Chairman LUETKEMEYER in our committee will be leading on this issue. I support this underlying amendment.

I do have some outstanding questions on what type of multifactor authentication would be required. I want to ensure that we do not specify the technology, that this is a sense of Congress provision. But I look forward to working very closely with Congressman SMUCKER to refine the concept as it goes forward, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chair, I thank both chairmen.

This does not, obviously, replace any work that they are doing. This is a very, very important issue. This is a sense of Congress simply saying that we are very concerned about the security of the data of our constituents, and we are asking that to be looked at. But certainly there is a lot of work to be done, and I look forward to working with both the chairmen on this issue.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 115–163.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title V the following new subtitle:

**Subtitle T—Dividend Waiver Authority for Mutual Holding Companies**  
**SEC. 596. DIVIDEND WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR MUTUAL HOLDING COMPANIES.**

Section 10(o)(11) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(o)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (iii);

(2) by amending subparagraph (E) to read as follows:

“(E) VALUATION.—The appropriate Federal banking agency may not consider waived dividends in determining an appropriate exchange ratio in the event of a full conversion to stock form.”; and

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

“(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the appropriate Federal banking agency to require a vote of members of a mutual holding company to approve one or more dividend waivers or to place any additional restrictions on dividend waivers by mutual holding companies that are inconsistent with or exceed the requirements set forth in this paragraph.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the Financial CHOICE Act, to express my appreciation to Chairman HENSARLING and the committee for all their fine work, and to offer an amendment that will help small community banks, organized as mutual holding companies, attract investors and maintain longevity in communities across America and in upstate New York, which I represent.

Seven years since its enactment, it has become glaringly apparent that Dodd-Frank has worked to advantage big banks on Wall Street; but for many of my constituents, the most detrimental aspects of Dodd-Frank to upstate New York aren't necessarily what is going on on Wall Street but, rather, the damage it has inflicted upon small community banks and Main Street.

As has been highlighted here today, the U.S. is losing community banks at a rate of one per day. These disappearing institutions are neighborhood banks that are willing to make loans to families for mortgages or home equity, to small businesses to cover payroll and investment, investing in our communities, sponsoring our kids' baseball teams, and understanding the core principles of the communities that they serve.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is quite simple. It seeks to help all community banks that elect to raise capital through a mutual holding company, or an MHC, charter.

Dodd-Frank and the implementing Federal Reserve regulations came down hard on these mutual holding companies, putting onerous, expensive regulations on these mutual holding companies just for them to waive the receipts of dividends, a practice which was common pre-Dodd-Frank, and it worked very well.

In New York State, banks such as the Bank of Greene County, NorthEast Community Bank, Lake Shore Savings Bank, and many others throughout the Empire State and throughout the country have been burdened by Dodd-Frank's nonsensical dividend waiver rules. My amendment cuts the red tape, restores the dividend waiver process to what it was prior to Dodd-Frank, and frees up capital to be reinvested in our communities.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is another example of Republicans choosing to prioritize the interests of corporate insiders over consumers, which is what the “Wrong” CHOICE Act really symbolizes. We should not prevent regulators from addressing potential conflicts of interest but, instead, let all shareholders have their voice be heard.

While Democrats stand ready to work on targeted reforms to help responsible community banks and credit unions, we will reject any ideological legislation that puts our financial system and economy at risk of another crash and that gives a leg up to Wall Street and predatory lenders to rip off consumers all over again.

Republicans like to pretend that Wall Street reform destroyed our financial system and economy, but the alternative facts have no basis in reality. Thanks to Wall Street reform and other Democratic policies, our economy has made significant gains since the depths of the financial crisis.

Since Dodd-Frank became law, we have set a record, with 86 consecutive months of private sector job growth, during which the economy created more than 16 million private sector jobs. Let me assure you, much more work needs to be done, but this record is important and must be noted.

Financial institutions are thriving since the passage of Dodd-Frank. According to the FDIC, banks are posting record profits since the crisis. Profits for community banks increased more than 10 percent in the past year. In



2010, the banking industry set an all-time record with \$171 billion in profits. Business lending has increased 75 percent since Dodd-Frank became law. Credit union membership has expanded by more than 16 million members since 2010, an increase of 18 percent.

This has happened in part because we have a system that is fairer, because bad actors are held accountable. The highly successful Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was established and has returned nearly \$12 billion to 29 million consumers who were ripped off by unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices of bad actors. This tough consumer enforcement approach has put the entire financial industry on notice to follow the law and treat their consumers fairly or suffer the consequences.

So the economy is doing well, financial institutions are doing well, and consumers are finally being protected. The last thing we should do is go back to a failed, weak regulatory model that gave us bank bailouts and the Great Recession. But that is what the Republicans are offering the American people with this bill.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chair, I have listened to the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota, and I have to say I am reminded of what former Senator Moynihan said about we are all entitled to our own opinion, but not our own facts, and here are the facts.

The banks that are organized as mutual holding companies organize that way. They are owned by their depositors, and they have also been able to sell publicly traded stock, but they keep a majority position in the mutual holding company. Why? Because they want to maintain the community involvement. They want to maintain the community ownership and not have their bank taken over by a distanced series of investors. That is what is exactly happening with the Bank of Greene County, for instance, in my district.

The Bank of Greene County, as a mutual holding company, they own 55 percent of the bank. So it is owned by the depositors, the public shareholders, 45 percent; but because of Dodd-Frank and because of the change in the regulatory process that was eliminated in Dodd-Frank, every time the mutual holding company has dividends, annually, to waive, they must send a notice to every depositor. A depositor who might have \$5 in the account or \$50,000, they have to mail a notice to them. It costs them \$150,000 a year that is sim-

ply wasted, and that money can't be re-invested in our community.

Mr. Chair, I regret that the minority is misrepresenting what we are trying to do here. We are defending the interests of small community banks organized as mutual holding companies that want to keep their ownership of their bank local. In fact, the bank that I am talking about, they don't even securitize their mortgages. They underwrite and they keep all their mortgages locally in their portfolio.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank Mr. ELLISON and our ranking member, Congresswoman WATERS, for their great leadership on behalf of American consumers, American investors, and American taxpayers.

I rise in opposition to the amendment and to the bill.

Mr. Chair, today House Republicans are pushing a dangerous Wall Street first bill that would drag us right back to the days of the Great Recession. Eight years ago, unchecked recklessness on Wall Street ignited a financial meltdown that devastated families in every State in the Union: hundreds of thousands of people lost their jobs every month, and the unemployment rate soared to 10 percent; more than 11 million Americans lost their homes through foreclosure; \$13 trillion in wealth, including families' hard-earned retirement savings and college savings, was destroyed.

On the night of Thursday, September 18, 2008, the Treasury Secretary came to the Capitol for an emergency meeting with congressional leaders, Democrats and Republicans from the House and the Senate, to inform us of the financial meltdown. Secretary Paulson described the financial meltdown, which was horrific. When I asked the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke, what he thought of what he was telling us, Chairman Bernanke told us that, if we did not act immediately, we would not have an economy by Monday.

We would not have an economy by Monday.

Tens of millions of middle class families across America still bear the scars. You saw on the right the rise of the Tea Party, on the left, Occupy Wall Street.

The Democratic Congress vowed that Main Street taxpayers must never again pay the price for the recklessness of some on Wall Street. I don't paint everybody there with the same brush, but many on Wall Street, the predatory lenders and profiteers, had abused American families for far too long.

With Dodd-Frank, Democrats enacted the strongest Wall Street con-

sumer financial protections in history, critical reforms to protect hard-working Americans and to insist on accountability from Wall Street.

□ 1530

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that the law created has returned nearly \$12 billion worth of compensation to 29 million wronged Americans—many of them seniors, many of them servicemembers.

But with this bill, the Republicans will undo these safeguards, eviscerate the Consumer Bureau, and take our country back to the days of massive taxpayer bailouts. We cannot let that happen.

Our Republican colleagues have named this dreadful and dangerous legislation, this Wall Street-first legislation, the Financial CHOICE Act. The Financial CHOICE Act to prey on investors, to prey on consumers, to prey on taxpayers. That is the choice they want to give the financial institutions.

But let's look at the appalling choices it represents. Instead of protecting consumers, Republicans choose to help those who try to cheat consumers. Instead of protecting seniors, Republicans choose to help those who prey on retirement savings. Instead of protecting men and women in uniform, Republicans choose to help those who take advantage of our servicemembers' families while our heroes are defending our freedom on the battlefield. Instead of advancing an economy that works for everyone, Republicans choose to help the special interests get richer and to stick working people with a bill for a bailout when it goes wrong.

They have always been handmaidens of the special interests. We know that. But even for them, when we think we have seen it all, this really takes them to a new low.

So they call it the Financial CHOICE Act, but these are not the choices that the American people want. They are choices of the Republican Party that puts Wall Street first, that are handmaidens of special interests.

So while Director Comey testified in the Senate earlier today, on this side of the Capitol, House Republicans are feeding working families to the wolves on Wall Street.

As I said, I don't paint all on Wall Street with the same brush. The pervasive incentives baked into the Republican bill will enable the predatory to punish the honest.

Now, here we go. Think of it. We have a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 29 million Americans benefiting from \$12 billion in compensation. Oh, they don't like that. They want to do away with that.

The Volcker Rule, which would prevent the financial institutions from taking risk at taxpayers' expense, the classic Republican: privatize the gain, nationalize the risk. If we win, the private sector and these banks benefit. If we lose, the taxpayer pays the tab.

Something that had nothing to do with the Dodd-Frank bill, the fiduciary rule, which only simply said that financial advisers should have the interest of the investor they are advising at heart. This bill says no. We are doing away with the very compromised, I might say, fiduciary rule to protect investors.

So as I say, I don't paint all of Wall Street with the same brush. The American people want to know who stands with them. I know you want me not to talk about this because it is the truth about what you are doing to the American people, but as the minority leader, I have the right to speak on the floor. You had plenty of time to spread your malicious legislation to hurt the American people. I am using my time to speak the truth to them about what this bill does to their financial stability.

The American people want to know who stands with them and who stands with the special interests. My Republican colleagues, in the name of hardworking American families, I use my time on behalf of America's hardworking families, not on behalf of special interests.

I urge my colleagues to make the choice to reject this dastardly Wall Street-first bill and to vote in support of our men and women in uniform, our seniors who have built our country, in support of those hardworking Americans who are saving for their children's education, hoping to achieve the American Dream of homeownership, and do not want to be preyed upon by Republicans in Congress.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. May I inquire how much time is remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has the right to close.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, the last time this body listened to the minority leader and enacted Dodd-Frank, permanent Wall Street bailouts were enshrined into law. That is what the gentlewoman represents, but somehow we did not hear that in her speech. The last time we listened to the gentlewoman from California, what we see is that working Americans have not received a pay increase. Their paychecks are stagnant and their savings remain decimated the last time we listened to the gentlewoman from California, the minority leader. Since we listened to her, we have seen that free checking has been cut in half, bank fees have gone up, mortgages are more difficult to come by and they are more expensive to close. That is the last time we

listened to the gentlewoman from California, the minority leader.

Her counsel must be rejected, as should the Washington elitism that is represented by her philosophy must be rejected as well. It is why Dodd-Frank must be rejected and why the Financial CHOICE Act must be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment from the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I don't know if it was the last time, but one of the many times that we listened to NANCY PELOSI, we passed the Dodd-Frank Act, which protected consumers to the tune of 29 million of them to return \$11.5 billion to \$12 billion back to their families. I think that NANCY PELOSI has a pretty good record of helping out consumers. I think consumers of America would appreciate \$11.5 billion returned to their family budgets.

The last time we listened to NANCY PELOSI, we saw a Dodd-Frank which has stabilized markets, which gave us 85 consecutive months of private sector job growth.

But the last time we heard from these free-market, Ayn Randian conservatives, oh, boy, these guys ran the economy straight into the ditch with their deregulatory schemes and their hostility to any kind of regulation on Big Business.

We saw unemployment rates well north of 10 percent in many parts of this country; we saw home values plummet; and we saw mass foreclosures, all because of the failed Ayn Randian, free-market fundamentalist attitudes that we see so often on the other side of the aisle.

I will just note to my freshman friend that the minority leader can talk as long as she wants. You might want to check the rules on that one.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 115-163.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

**Subtitle T—Legitimate Financial Transactions Report**

**SEC. 596. TREASURY REPORT ON LEGITIMATE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.**

Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue a report to the Congress on—

(1) the Secretary's efforts to ensure that legitimate financial transactions move freely and globally; and

(2) how the Secretary coordinates on such efforts with Federal bank regulators, financial institutions, and money service businesses.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act.

Since Dodd-Frank was signed into law, we have seen more than 1,900 community financial institutions in the U.S. close.

Additionally, rules promulgated to combat money laundering in transnational organizations have had unintended consequences on legitimate businesses along the border.

In my home State of Arizona, banks and legitimate businesses along the U.S.-Mexico border have been particularly hard hit by ambiguous and onerous regulations. In the last decade, Arizona has lost 70 percent of its community banks.

These regulations, which were meant to minimize risk and combat money laundering, have actually contributed to high transaction costs and imposed substantial difficulties for legitimate companies engaged in cash-intensive types of businesses, like ranchers and farmers.

Many banking institutions have closed their doors, and others have dropped customers participating in cross-border commerce. As a result, individuals and local businesses, some of them family-owned who have been operating in the region for generations, have since lost access to banking services and the capital they rely on.

I strongly support Federal efforts to combat money laundering and illicit activities, and I understand how transnational criminal organizations can exploit vulnerabilities in the financial system for their own gain. However, limiting the availability of banking services and hampering cross-border transactions to legitimate businesses has negative impacts on communities in my district. Should this be the result of regulations handed down by Washington, the Treasury Department should examine ways to remove these unintended consequences.

As such, my amendment simply asks the Department of Treasury to review

existing regulations and submit a report to Congress regarding its efforts to work with Federal bank regulators, financial institutions, and money service businesses to ensure that legitimate financial transactions can move freely and globally.

It is critical that the new administration engage with small businesses and local stakeholders in the Southwest to ensure legitimate cross-border commerce can continue to be a major contributor to our economy. It is imperative we do everything we can to find a balance between economic needs of border communities while maintaining strong safeguards against illicit activities.

This amendment is supported by the Fresh Produce Association, the Electronic Transactions Association, and the Arizona Bankers Association.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, let me recognize that the problem that Representative MCSALLY is trying to address here is a legitimate problem that we think needs to be focused on.

I must oppose it because it is inadequate and simply not enough. It would be good if we could get together and try to come up with a bipartisan solution to this problem that she has, I think, identified as a legitimate issue.

But ensuring that legitimate financial transactions move freely and globally, particularly key remittance channels for vulnerable populations, is a subject of great importance and one on which I and my Democratic colleagues remain focused.

Many of us represent districts with significant immigrant populations from Central and South America, the Caribbean, Africa, all across the globe. We have heard just how critical it is for immigrants here in the United States to be able to send money that sustain their loved ones back home.

While I am pleased that there is a bipartisan recognition about the need to preserve critical remittance channels for legitimate transactions, I must say that I am deeply concerned by some of the rhetoric and proposals that we have seen from the Trump administration, which make me fear that access to remittances, particularly for vulnerable populations, may be in jeopardy.

Not only has the President been overtly anti-immigrant in his rhetoric during the 2016 campaign and since, he put out an alarming proposal about how he would force Mexico to pay for a wall on our Southern border. He proposed cutting off access to remittance transfers for anyone who couldn't document their immigration status until

Mexico agreed to pay an extortion payment of between \$5 billion and \$10 billion.

I also note that while it is essential that legitimate financial transactions move freely and globally, it is equally important that illegitimate and illicit transactions do not.

For this reason, I am concerned that the amendment before us falls short in that it fails to call the administration to disclose how it plans to curtail the flow of illicit funds, particularly funds which may be coming from key adversaries like the Russian Federation.

One doesn't have to look far to see that, despite record fines and numerous enforcement actions, global megabanks have continued to facilitate shady transactions even when such transactions are highly suspicious, have no economic rationale, and even likely involve money laundering and tax evasion.

One example of concern, Deutsche Bank, which operates in the U.S. and around the globe, was found by the Federal Reserve, New York State, and the United Kingdom to have facilitated a massive fraudulent trading scheme that allowed \$10 billion to flow out of Russia to unknown locales.

□ 1545

In order to better understand the scheme, I recently joined with a number of my colleagues in writing to the Treasury Secretary to ask for any and all records of suspicious activity related to Deutsche Bank's 2011 scheme in the Department's possession, including the names and identities of all parties who participated in, or benefited from, the scheme.

But, like much of the oversight Democrats are conducting on this administration, this request has apparently fallen on deaf ears.

So, again, I do appreciate the intent of the amendment—I even commend Representative MCSALLY for identifying this is an important issue—it should have gone further in demanding that this administration disclose how it will curtail well-known schemes being used to facilitate fraud. So I must urge a “no” vote, but I look forward to working with Representative MCSALLY on this important issue.

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague recognizing that this is a problem and saying he agrees with it, but then doesn't support the amendment because it is not enough. I don't understand that. I had hoped that he would support the amendment, and then we could continue to work together on other initiatives as well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 115-163.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 400, line 22, insert “(a) IN GENERAL. —” before “Within”.

Page 401, after line 2, insert the following: S0634

(b) GSA STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Administrator of General Services shall carry out a study to determine—

(A) the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency's office real estate leasing needs, in light of the changes to the Agency's structure made by this Act;

(B) whether the office space referenced in subsection (a) is the most cost-effective use of taxpayer money in meeting those needs, relative to alternative leasing options in the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area; and

(C) if there is a Government department or agency that has building needs that could be met by moving all or a portion of the employees of such department or agency to the property described under subsection (a).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall issue a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under paragraph (1).

(3) AUTHORITY TO SELL PROPERTY.—If, after carrying out the study required under paragraph (1), the Administrator of General Services determines that—

(A) the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency's office real estate leasing needs have changed in light of the changes to the Agency's structure made by this Act, and

(B) that there is no Government department or agency that has building needs that could be met by moving all or a portion of the employees of such department or agency to the property described under subsection (a),

the Administrator may sell such property to the highest bidder, so long as the revenue from the sale exceeds the combined cost of building such property and the cost of the most recently completed renovation of such property.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to explain my amendment to the Financial CHOICE Act.

Since the passage of Dodd-Frank, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has been unaccountable to Congress and harmed small businesses across this country. I am thankful for the work done by Chairman HENSARLING to rein in this out-of-control agency.

With the United States nearly \$20 trillion in debt, we must do everything possible to bring financial accountability to our Federal Government.

Spending at this rate will leave us not only financially bankrupt but morally bankrupt as well. It is immoral to spend money we don't have today and force our children to pay in the future.

Despite this, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau decided it was necessary to renovate their headquarters, estimated at more than \$200 million, over \$50 million more than the building is worth. Even in their initial designs, a lavish two-story waterfall and four-story glass staircase were more important than the financial prosperity of our children.

The Financial CHOICE Act makes changes to the CFPB, which will likely result in different real estate needs for the agency. My amendment is simple: it will require an assessment of whether the current CFPB building is a good use of taxpayer dollars. If not, it authorizes the General Services Administration to sell the building to the highest bidder, generating hundreds of millions of dollars by offloading a property that is unnecessary for the Federal Government to own.

Just a few months ago, my first grandchild, nicknamed Bear, was born. When he grows older, I want to tell him I did everything in my power to fight the out-of-control spending that plagues our generation. This amendment is part of that fight for Bear and all of our grandchildren.

This amendment requires our government to use taxpayer dollars efficiently, and it reinforces a culture of fiscal restraint and bureaucratic decisionmaking.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this commonsense and fiscally responsible amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, as if the CHOICE Act was not bad enough, this amendment piles on to the Republicans' misguided attacks on the highly successful Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

I don't understand why my Republican friends don't get—29 million people got \$11.5 billion of their money back because unscrupulous financial services firms unlawfully took their money. I would think we could get together on that. I would think we could agree that that is an important thing to work on. And now we are trying to mess with their building, for the sake of the children, no less.

The Bureau's inspector general conducted a thorough investigation of the Republican's made-up suggestion that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's building renovations were inappropriate.

The inspector general released an audit back in 2015, that stated:

We determined that construction costs appear reasonable based on comparisons to an independent cost estimate and the costs of two comparable building renovations identified by the U.S. General Services Administration. We also determined that potential renovation costs are below the amount previously budgeted and obligated for the renovation. . . . Current controls for approving, managing, and documenting renovation costs and project decisions are designed appropriately. . . .

May we put this issue to bed that there is some nefarious plot going on with the building? It wasn't legitimate when they first raised it. It is not legitimate now. And trying to bring a big deal up about their building, which is an issue that has been resolved, is not going to benefit the children of tomorrow. I think it will benefit the children for those 29 million families to get \$12 billion back. Now, that might help some kids. That might pay for some lunches, some school fees, and a whole bunch of other things to help families. But just messing with the CFPB over their building will not help anyone.

Even if the House Republicans are not willing to thank the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau for all it has done, I am.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has been a tough independent watchdog, has done a great job on behalf of American consumers, and has done a great job for American financial firms which do honest work. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, being a financial services firm that is actually selling a good product at a fair price and you have somebody down the street cutting corners, ripping off consumers, and you are losing your competitive advantage because you are honest. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau helps keep good financial firms good and not create this pervasive sentence to drag them in the wrong direction.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau maintains a transparent database that has collected over 1.1 million consumer complaints about financial institutions, and 97 percent of those have received a timely response.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has demystified financial transactions by requiring simple know-before-you-owe disclosures, and providing educational and comparison shopping tools so that consumers are empowered to make the right choice for them and their families.

Perhaps one of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's most notable accomplishments to date was its investigation of Wells Fargo's fraudulent account scandal. Let me tell you, Wells Fargo's fraudulent account scandal definitely hurt families and kids in those families, and the CFPB's good work helped those families.

Last September, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau fined Wells Fargo \$100 million for secretly opening up 2 million unauthorized accounts on

behalf of its consumers and ordered the bank to compensate customers it harmed. This marks the largest penalty the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has imposed to date. And that, Mr. Chairman, has helped families and children.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, to stop the petty stuff about the building. This has been reviewed by independent people. It is really just a waste of time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115-163 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH of Indiana.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. FASO of New York.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BUCK of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—232

|          |            |          |
|----------|------------|----------|
| Abraham  | Arrington  | Barr     |
| Aderholt | Babin      | Barton   |
| Allen    | Bacon      | Bergman  |
| Amash    | Banks (IN) | Biggs    |
| Amodei   | Barletta   | Blirakis |

Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith

Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Byrne  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce

Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—185

Adams  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas

Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny

DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard

Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack

Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halloran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarelli  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmuter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz

Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—13

Aguilar  
Clyburn  
Costa  
Cummings  
DeFazio

Dunn  
Engel  
Johnson, Sam  
LaMalfa

Maloney, Carolyn B.  
Marino  
Napolitano  
Reichert

## □ 1616

Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. BUTTERFIELD, RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR.

## HOLLINGSWORTH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 180, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

## AYES—231

Abraham  
Adenholdt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett

Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes

Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—180

Adams  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crist

Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer

Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin

Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suo zzi  
Swallow (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—19

Aguilar  
Bishop (UT)  
Clyburn  
Cole  
Costa  
Cummings  
DeFazio

Engel  
Green, Al  
Johnson, Sam  
Lamborn  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.

Marino  
Meadows  
Napolitano  
Polis  
Reichert  
Smith (NE)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1620

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, I was  
unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I  
would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 296.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably de-  
tained. Had I been present, I would have  
voted "yea" on rollcall No. 296.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 235, noes 184,  
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

## AYES—235

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Bartlett  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett

Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett

Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poli quinn  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—184

Adams  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Gottheimer

Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke

Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suo zzi  
Swallow (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—11

Aguilar  
Clyburn  
Costa  
Cummings  
DeFazio

Engel  
Johnson, Sam  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Marino

Napolitano  
Reichert

□ 1624

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.



## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—233

|               |                 |                   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Abraham       | Gibbs           | Olson             |
| Aderholt      | Gohmert         | Palazzo           |
| Allen         | Goodlatte       | Palmer            |
| Amash         | Gosar           | Paulsen           |
| Amodel        | Gowdy           | Pearce            |
| Arrington     | Granger         | Perry             |
| Babin         | Graves (GA)     | Pittenger         |
| Bacon         | Graves (LA)     | Poe (TX)          |
| Banks (IN)    | Graves (MO)     | Poliquin          |
| Barletta      | Griffith        | Posey             |
| Barr          | Grothman        | Ratcliffe         |
| Barton        | Guthrie         | Reed              |
| Bergman       | Harper          | Renacci           |
| Biggs         | Harris          | Rice (SC)         |
| Bilirakis     | Hartzler        | Roby              |
| Bishop (MI)   | Hensarling      | Roe (TN)          |
| Bishop (UT)   | Herrera Beutler | Rogers (AL)       |
| Black         | Hice, Jody B.   | Rogers (KY)       |
| Blackburn     | Higgins (LA)    | Rohrabacher       |
| Blum          | Hill            | Rokita            |
| Bost          | Holding         | Rooney, Francis   |
| Brady (TX)    | Hollingsworth   | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Brat          | Hudson          | Ros-Lehtinen      |
| Bridenstine   | Huizenga        | Roskam            |
| Brooks (AL)   | Hultgren        | Ross              |
| Brooks (IN)   | Hunter          | Rothfus           |
| Buchanan      | Hurd            | Rouzer            |
| Buck          | Issa            | Royce (CA)        |
| Bucshon       | Jenkins (KS)    | Russell           |
| Budd          | Jenkins (WV)    | Rutherford        |
| Burgess       | Johnson (LA)    | Sanford           |
| Byrne         | Johnson (OH)    | Scalise           |
| Calvert       | Jordan          | Schweikert        |
| Carter (GA)   | Joyce (OH)      | Scott, Austin     |
| Carter (TX)   | Katko           | Sensenbrenner     |
| Chabot        | Kelly (MS)      | Sessions          |
| Chaffetz      | Kelly (PA)      | Shimkus           |
| Cheney        | King (IA)       | Simpson           |
| Coffman       | King (NY)       | Smith (MO)        |
| Cole          | Kinzinger       | Smith (NE)        |
| Collins (GA)  | Knight          | Smith (NJ)        |
| Collins (NY)  | Kustoff (TN)    | Smith (TX)        |
| Comer         | Labrador        | Smucker           |
| Comstock      | LaHood          | Stefanik          |
| Conaway       | LaMalfa         | Stewart           |
| Cook          | Lamborn         | Stivers           |
| Costello (PA) | Lance           | Taylor            |
| Cramer        | Latta           | Tenney            |
| Crawford      | Lewis (MN)      | Thompson (PA)     |
| Cuellar       | LoBiondo        | Thornberry        |
| Culberson     | Long            | Tiberi            |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Loudermilk      | Tipton            |
| Davidson      | Love            | Trott             |
| Davis, Rodney | Lucas           | Turner            |
| Denham        | Luetkemeyer     | Upton             |
| Dent          | MacArthur       | Valadao           |
| DeSantis      | Marchant        | Wagner            |
| DesJarlais    | Marshall        | Walberg           |
| Diaz-Balart   | Massie          | Walden            |
| Donovan       | Mast            | Walker            |
| Duffy         | McCarthy        | Walorski          |
| Duncan (SC)   | McCauley        | Walters, Mimi     |
| Duncan (TN)   | McClintock      | Weber (TX)        |
| Dunn          | McHenry         | Webster (FL)      |
| Emmer         | McKinley        | Wenstrup          |
| Estes (KS)    | McMorris        | Westerman         |
| Farenthold    | Rodgers         | Williams          |
| Faso          | McSally         | Wilson (SC)       |
| Ferguson      | Meadows         | Wittman           |
| Fitzpatrick   | Meehan          | Womack            |
| Fleischmann   | Messer          | Woodall           |
| Flores        | Mitchell        | Yoder             |
| Fortenberry   | Moolenaar       | Yoho              |
| Fox           | Mooney (WV)     | Young (AK)        |
| Franks (AZ)   | Mullin          | Young (IA)        |
| Frelinghuysen | Murphy (PA)     | Zeldin            |
| Gaetz         | Newhouse        |                   |
| Gallagher     | Noem            |                   |
| Garrett       | Nunes           |                   |

## NOES—185

|                   |                   |                |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Adams             | Gottheimer        | O'Rourke       |
| Barragan          | Green, Al         | Pallone        |
| Bass              | Green, Gene       | Panetta        |
| Beatty            | Grijalva          | Pascarell      |
| Bera              | Gutierrez         | Payne          |
| Beyer             | Hanabusa          | Pelosi         |
| Bishop (GA)       | Hastings          | Perlmutter     |
| Blumenauer        | Heck              | Peters         |
| Blunt Rochester   | Higgins (NY)      | Peterson       |
| Bonamici          | Himes             | Pingree        |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Hoyer             | Pocan          |
| Brady (PA)        | Huffman           | Polis          |
| Brown (MD)        | Jackson Lee       | Price (NC)     |
| Brownley (CA)     | Jayapal           | Quigley        |
| Bustos            | Jeffries          | Raskin         |
| Butterfield       | Johnson (GA)      | Rice (NY)      |
| Capuano           | Johnson, E. B.    | Richmond       |
| Carbajal          | Jones             | Rosen          |
| Cardenas          | Kaptur            | Roybal-Allard  |
| Carlson (IN)      | Keating           | Ruiz           |
| Cartwright        | Kelly (IL)        | Ruppersberger  |
| Castor (FL)       | Kennedy           | Rush           |
| Castro (TX)       | Khanna            | Ryan (OH)      |
| Chu, Judy         | Kihuen            | Sanchez        |
| Cicilline         | Kildee            | Sarbanes       |
| Clark (MA)        | Kilmer            | Schakowsky     |
| Clarke (NY)       | Kind              | Schiff         |
| Clay              | Krishnamoorthi    | Schneider      |
| Cleaver           | Kuster (NH)       | Schrader       |
| Cohen             | Langevin          | Scott (VA)     |
| Connolly          | Larsen (WA)       | Scott, David   |
| Conyers           | Larson (CT)       | Serrano        |
| Cooper            | Lawrence          | Sewell (AL)    |
| Correa            | Lawson (FL)       | Shea-Porter    |
| Courtney          | Lee               | Sherman        |
| Crist             | Levin             | Sinema         |
| Crowley           | Lewis (GA)        | Sires          |
| Davis (CA)        | Lieu, Ted         | Slaughter      |
| Davis, Danny      | Lipinski          | Smith (WA)     |
| DeGette           | Loeb sack         | Soto           |
| Delaney           | Lofgren           | Speier         |
| DeLauro           | Lowenthal         | Suozi          |
| DelBene           | Lowey             | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Demings           | Lujan Grisham, M. | Takano         |
| DeSaulnier        | Lujan, Ben Ray    | Thompson (CA)  |
| Deutch            | Lynch             | Thompson (MS)  |
| Dingell           | Maloney, Sean     | Titus          |
| Doggett           | Matsui            | Tonko          |
| Doyle, Michael F. | McCollum          | Torres         |
| Ellison           | McEachin          | Tsongas        |
| Eshoo             | McGovern          | Vargas         |
| Espallat          | McNerney          | Veasey         |
| Esty (CT)         | Meeks             | Vela           |
| Evans             | Meng              | Velazquez      |
| Foster            | Moore             | Visclosky      |
| Frankel (FL)      | Moulton           | Walz           |
| Fudge             | Murphy (FL)       | Wasserman      |
| Gabbard           | Nadler            | Schultz        |
| Gallego           | Neal              | Waters, Maxine |
| Garamendi         | Nolan             | Watson Coleman |
| Gonzalez (TX)     | Norcross          | Welch          |
|                   | O'Halleran        | Wilson (FL)    |
|                   |                   | Yarmuth        |

NOT VOTING—12

|          |              |            |
|----------|--------------|------------|
| Aguilar  | Engel        | Napolitano |
| Clyburn  | Johnson, Sam | Reichert   |
| Costa    | Maloney,     | Shuster    |
| Cummings | Carolyn B.   |            |
| DeFazio  | Marino       |            |

□ 1628

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and op-

portunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 375, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 186, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—233

|             |               |                 |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham     | Calvert       | Estes (KS)      |
| Aderholt    | Carter (GA)   | Farenthold      |
| Allen       | Carter (TX)   | Faso            |
| Amash       | Chabot        | Ferguson        |
| Amodel      | Chaffetz      | Fitzpatrick     |
| Arrington   | Cheney        | Fleischmann     |
| Babin       | Coffman       | Flores          |
| Bacon       | Cole          | Fortenberry     |
| Banks (IN)  | Collins (GA)  | Fox             |
| Barletta    | Collins (NY)  | Franks (AZ)     |
| Barr        | Comer         | Frelinghuysen   |
| Barton      | Comstock      | Gaetz           |
| Bergman     | Conaway       | Gallagher       |
| Biggs       | Cook          | Garrett         |
| Bilirakis   | Costello (PA) | Gibbs           |
| Bishop (MI) | Cramer        | Gohmert         |
| Bishop (UT) | Crawford      | Goodlatte       |
| Black       | Culberson     | Gosar           |
| Blackburn   | Curbelo (FL)  | Gowdy           |
| Blum        | Davidson      | Granger         |
| Bost        | Davis, Rodney | Graves (GA)     |
| Brady (TX)  | Denham        | Graves (LA)     |
| Brat        | Dent          | Graves (MO)     |
| Bridenstine | DeSantis      | Griffith        |
| Brooks (AL) | DesJarlais    | Grothman        |
| Brooks (IN) | Diaz-Balart   | Guthrie         |
| Buchanan    | Donovan       | Harper          |
| Buck        | Duffy         | Harris          |
| Bucshon     | Duncan (SC)   | Hartzler        |
| Budd        | Duncan (TN)   | Hensarling      |
| Burgess     | Dunn          | Herrera Beutler |
| Byrne       | Emmer         | Hice, Jody B.   |

Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley

McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise

## NAYS—186

Adams  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings

DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Española  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi

Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader

## NOT VOTING—11

Aguilar  
Clyburn  
Costa  
Cummings  
DeFazio

Engel  
Johnson, Sam  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Marino

Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus

Napolitano  
Reichert

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1638

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 299, I missed the vote due to a personal illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am unavoidably detained in my Congressional District. Had I been present to vote on H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 295, No. 296, No. 297, No. 298, and No. 299 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Hensarling Amendment. I would have also voted "nay" on the Hollingsworth Amendment. I would have also voted "nay" on the Faso Amendment. I would have also voted "nay" on the Final Passage of H.R. 10—Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes taken on the House floor on June 8, 2017 as I had to return to California for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall Vote No. 295, "no" on rollcall Vote No. 296, "no" on rollcall Vote No. 297, "no" on rollcall vote No. 298, "no" on rollcall Vote No. 299.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on Thursday, June 8, 2017 because of a family obligation. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 295, on Agreeing to the Hensarling Amendment; "no" on rollcall No. 296, on Agreeing to the Hollingsworth Amendment; "no" on rollcall No. 297, on Agreeing to the Faso Amendment; "no" on rollcall No. 298, on Agreeing to the Buck Amendment; and "no"

on rollcall No. 299, on Passage of H.R. 10, the Financial Choice Act.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on June 8, 2017, on account of attending my son's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "Yea" for rollcall vote 295, "yea" for rollcall vote 296, "yea" for rollcall vote 297, "yea" for rollcall vote 298, and "yea" for rollcall vote 299.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017, TO MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2017

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, June 12, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

NUTRITION SUBCOMMITTEE  
EXAMINES SNAP TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, earlier this morning, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition hosted a hearing to examine SNAP technology and modernization.

SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, was formerly known as food stamps. The Agriculture Committee has conducted a thorough review of SNAP over the past 30 months.

This program is critically important to 42 million Americans who utilize it each month. It is the largest domestic hunger safety net program in the country, and it is imperative that it remains viable so we can continue to serve so many who are struggling. That is why, at today's hearing, we discussed technology and modernization of SNAP, including areas to enhance program integrity, streamline delivery of services, improve the customer experience, and ease administrative burdens.

In just 2004, EBT, or electronic benefit transfer, was completed. This is

the electronic system that allows a recipient to authorize transfer of their supplemental benefits to a retailer to pay for products. This was a tremendous step forward toward improving the program.

As chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I look forward to continuing to improve the efficiency of SNAP.

□ 1645

#### DARK DAYS OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, in the wake of the financial crisis, 7.8 million American consumers lost their homes through foreclosure. The failure to have a responsible regulatory environment also resulted in taxpayers paying \$7 trillion to bail out financial institutions through loans and, according to some reports, an additional \$22 trillion through the Federal Government's purchase of assets.

My home State of New Jersey was severely impacted by this crisis and still feeling the effects. So this is personal.

The Financial CHOICE Act is the wrong choice for Americans. This bill guts many of the commonsense protections that are outlined in Dodd-Frank and severely restricts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from doing its job.

The "Wrong" CHOICE Act gives Wall Street a hand while ignoring the needs of hardworking Americans. It will allow predatory lending practices to go unchecked and profiteers on Wall Street to skirt consequences.

Wall Street reform and other Democratic policies have given our country the strongest consumer protections in history.

I will continue to stand up for hardworking Americans and reject the "Wrong" CHOICE Act before Republicans pave the way back to the dark days of the financial crisis.

#### HONORING JOHN DEEDER ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of John Deeder, a valued member of the community in southwest Washington. John spent 48 years in education and announced his retirement earlier this year.

Throughout his life, John has been a coach, counselor, teacher, principal, superintendent, and more. More recently, he served as superintendent of the Evergreen Public Schools, the fifth largest in Washington State, for 11

years. His career in teaching exhibits how much he values educating students and setting them up to succeed. Those who have worked with John know that he has been dedicated to improving the learning experiences for kids in southwest Washington for just shy of 5 decades.

Under his innovative leadership, an incredible bioscience high school called the Henrietta Lacks Health and Bioscience High School was built. HeLa High School places an emphasis on workforce development in health sciences and biotechnology that is an investment in our future leaders. It took a decade to research, plan, and build this transformational school, but John remained committed to the vision of this school. Though John's formal career has ended, the legacy of his persistent leadership can be seen throughout HeLa High School and its students.

While John has extensive involvement in education, his community engagement also spans well beyond his career as superintendent. He has taken every opportunity to serve, and is a shining example of what makes this expansive and populated region feel like a tight-knit and caring community. He is an inspiration to all in southwest Washington, and I am confident he will continue working to improve education here and beyond.

I congratulate John on his retirement and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

#### RECOGNIZING THE CALVARY CHRISTIAN WARRIORS BOYS BASEBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Clearwater, Florida's Calvary Christian High School Warriors boys baseball team on their impressive State championship win. Coach Greg Olsen and the Warriors clinched an 11-1 victory against Pensacola Catholic High School to lead them to the Class 4A title, clinching the school's first State championship and capping off a perfect season of 30 wins and no losses.

Such an achievement takes more than skill and talent. It takes steely determination, unwavering focus, and perhaps, most importantly, the ability to work together. These skills are invaluable both on and off the field. What they have learned as teammates will enable their success not just as athletes, but as good citizens. Our entire community is proud of their outstanding sportsmanship and achievements.

On behalf of Pinellas County, congratulations Warriors.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF 1ST INFANTRY DIVISION

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the Army's 1st Infantry Division, or the "Big Red One."

From their heroic start, the 1st Infantry Division has played a vital role in our Nation's history, serving in almost every American war since 1917. Today, the Big Red One has over 5,000 soldiers deployed worldwide, with an additional 10,000 in my district at Fort Riley. They are preparing to deploy in support of ongoing operations.

Since 1917, more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have paid the ultimate sacrifice. We honor those who have worn the patch of the Big Red One and those that do so today. I cannot be more proud of our troops at Fort Riley. I am honored to represent them. I thank them all for their service.

#### CONGRATULATING THE WEST SIDE HIGH SCHOOL TRACK TEAMS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the girls and boys track teams at West Side High School in Newark, New Jersey, for winning gold in their respective 4x400 meter relay heats at the Penn Relays this year.

The oldest and largest track and field competition in the world, the Penn Relays is also one of the most prestigious, drawing nearly 20,000 athletes from across the globe. There is some really tough competition at the Penn Relays, but both West Side teams stood out.

The boys relay team, made up of James Bell, Jarrett Gentle, Jakai Coker, and Shaquan Williams, won their heat in an impressive 3 minutes 28 seconds, more than a second faster than the second place team.

The girls relay team, made up of Aminah Muhammad, Fatima Sannor, Tiyauna Evans, and Jahne Slocum, won their heat in an impressive 4 minutes and 7 seconds, more than 3 seconds faster than the second place finishers.

Madam Speaker, again, I congratulate the West Side High School track team and their coaches, Rickey Meekins and Eddie Greene, for bringing home the gold—a testament to their skill, dedication, and teamwork.

Go, Roughriders.

#### TROUP COUNTY DRUG TREATMENT COURT

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the work of the Troup County Drug Court in LaGrange, Georgia. I had the opportunity to speak at their commencement ceremony last week while I was back in the district.

This program holds offenders with substance abuse and mental health disorders accountable through strict supervision and treatment, and allows them to get their lives back on track.

As a dentist, I have had the opportunity to work with those suffering from substance abuse problems through my work with Hope Harbor, a Christian recovery center in my district. I have seen firsthand that, for every addiction, there is a real human being behind the statistic. These men and women have the potential to live long, productive lives serving their families and communities, and programs like this help them do just that.

The success rate of these programs speaks volumes about their value to the community and those that graduate from the program. Seventy-five percent of drug court graduates never reoffend. This is almost 2½ times higher than the 30 percent success rate of those who serve a prison sentence and receive no treatment.

I commend the hard work of the men and women of the Troup County Drug Court.

## TWO IMPORTANT ISSUES

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss two issues and to speak on their impact to the American people.

The first one is the Financial CHOICE Act, which we just debated. I oppose it for the very reason that we passed Dodd-Frank. We passed it to respond to the greatest recession in 80 years, which saw a financial crisis that caused working men and women to lose the greatest amount of wealth they have ever lost. Yet, our colleagues here believe that it is important to choose large corporate interests over working men and women.

At the same time, today we heard the testimony of Director Comey under oath. He gave a list of very troublesome acts and words offered by the President of the United States. Shortly thereafter, the President's lawyer, who was not under oath, came forward to deny, disparage, and suggest that Director Comey was not telling the truth.

That is clearly an indication that the Judiciary Committee should begin an inquiry. That is our jurisdictional duty: to begin an inquiry to discern who is telling the truth. The FBI is under our jurisdiction.

It is time for the House to hold hearings now. The truth must be known by the American people.

## REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF PAUL W. PAINTER, JR.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of the respected Savannah lawyer and gentleman, Paul W. Painter, Jr., who passed away on Saturday, May 27, 2017, at the age of 71.

Mr. Painter comes from a family that has worked tirelessly to serve our country both in the Armed Forces as well as our judiciary system. His father, Paul Painter, Sr., served during World War II, and then created a successful law practice.

Paul Painter, Jr., followed in his father's footsteps, graduating from Georgia Tech, and then serving in the Navy for 4 years. After that, Mr. Painter attended law school at the University of Georgia, beginning a career that would benefit and serve many Savannahians for years to come.

Mr. Painter started his own firm in Savannah, now known as the Ellis, Painter, Ratterree, & Adams Law Firm, with which he practiced for nearly 30 years. By the end of his law career, he was known as one of the best lawyers in the entire State of Georgia and was named to the list of Georgia's Top 10 lawyers in 2014.

The Paul W. Painter, Jr., Civility and Professional Award was also created in his honor to remember his fantastic work and to reward other outstanding lawyers in Georgia.

Mr. Painter was an honorable person who did everything possible to improve our judicial system, and he gained respect from lawyers all over. He will certainly be missed as an asset to our community and the entire legal field.

## OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

(Mr. TED LIEU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, as a former prosecutor, I rise to state the obvious: President Trump committed obstruction of justice.

We have direct evidence that the President asked the FBI Director for loyalty. He demanded it. He asked the FBI Director to drop an investigation into Michael Flynn.

The President fired the FBI Director. Then, on national TV, he said he did it because of the Russian probe. Then he told the Russians in the Oval Office that he did it to relieve great pressure because of the FBI investigation. That is classic obstruction of justice.

The Washington Post today has a quote from one of the prosecutors of

Watergate. He says: "I helped prosecute Watergate. Comey's statement is sufficient evidence for an obstruction of justice case."

I call on Special Counsel Mueller to investigate the President of the United States for violating the obstruction of justice statute, which is a felony.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

## PUTTING THE AMERICAN DREAM BACK INTO REACH

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, my generation has known two very profound events: war and recession.

To some folks, a decade seems like forever ago, but for most Virginians, most Americans, the events of the financial collapse 10 years ago still haunt their memories today. Financial devastation hit the poor and middle class in this country unlike anything we have witnessed in our lifetimes: businesses shuttered, retirement plans halted, families losing many homes.

In response, Congress passed Dodd-Frank, a bill with more regulations than all other bills passed during the Obama administration.

Dodd-Frank regulations have pushed many community banks out of business. We lose one of them or a credit union every single day. Small-business lending, the driver of jobs in this country, has declined; everyday banking services have been reduced; and homeownership is increasingly out of reach.

The Financial CHOICE Act provides more accountability over unelected bodies, unlocks small-business lending, allows community banks to survive, stops big-bank bailouts with our tax dollars, will increase homeownership, and it imposes the toughest penalties ever for financial fraud. This bill puts the American Dream into reach for millions of Americans.

□ 1700

## HECTOR BARAJAS-VARELA

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, veterans shouldn't have to come home in a body bag to be recognized as Americans.

Last weekend, I went, along with some of my colleagues, to Tijuana, Mexico, where we visited veterans who have served this country, who have picked up a weapon to go and fight in war to protect our freedoms. They survived, came home, and some of them were deported.

Do you know that if you go and you fight overseas and you are not a citizen and you die, you get automatic citizenship?

One of those people we saw this weekend is my constituent, Hector Barajas, from Compton. This is a photo of him. He was proudly still wearing his uniform. He was deported to Mexico after serving 5½ years in the U.S. Army, receiving two commendations.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 1405, which would allow noncitizen veterans who have been deported to come home and come back to the United States. I hope that he gets to come back, too.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL LISA L.A. EPPERSON

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

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Lisa L.A. Epperson on the occasion of her retirement from the United States Air Force, the best Air Force in the world.

Colonel Epperson has given a great deal to this Nation through her service. Her assignments include Wright-Patterson, Tyndall, Los Angeles, Hill, and Nellis Air Force Bases, and finally here at the Pentagon. Colonel Epperson has influenced mission systems from Defense Satellite Communications System and Minuteman III, an ICBM, to the F-15 and F-22. Most importantly, she impacted our warfighting operations in Operations Noble Eagle, Enduring Freedom, and Iraqi Freedom.

Throughout her distinguished career, Colonel Epperson represented our country with honor, and I am privileged to pay tribute to her. On behalf of Congress and the United States, I want to thank Colonel Epperson; her husband, David; and their children, Trevor and Cassidy, for their 20 years of service. I wish them Godspeed and continued happiness as they start this new chapter.

#### CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

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

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, tonight I am honored to lead a bipartisan Special Order on career and technical education. We have several Members joining us here this evening to highlight CTE programs in their districts and the upcoming reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

I would like to start the order by yielding to my colleague and colead, Congressman KRISHNAMOORTHY, who has been working hard with my Pennsylvania colleague, Congressman THOMPSON, on H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative SMUCKER for yielding. I really appreciate his leadership. I thank Congressman G.T. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania as well for his leadership. It is an honor to be here.

Madam Speaker, in recent years, global economic trends have led to an ever-growing skills gap. While unemployment has fallen to 4.4 percent in my home State of Illinois, there is still a widening gap between the jobs that are open and the skills workers need. This has become apparent as I have traveled throughout my district listening to community representatives, businesses, parents, students, and higher education officials discuss the local state of the economy.

I have been particularly concerned with the feedback I have received from businesses, who continue to report that there is a gap between the talent and skills they need in employees and what they can actually find. Shortages in skilled fields like machinists, technicians, operators, cybersecurity, and healthcare are impairing their ability to grow their businesses.

There is much Congress can do to improve the skills of our labor force, which is why I was proud to partner with my good friend and fellow member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Congressman G.T. THOMPSON, in introducing H.R. 2353.

Our bill reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins grant program through fiscal year 2023 and gives States and local governments the tools to better equip workers for higher paying middle class jobs in the 21st century.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act addresses one of the underlying causes of the skills gap: what is being taught in classes does not necessarily sync up with what is needed to get a job. H.R. 2353 requires a strong buy-in from local businesses in developing State plans.

With more local stakeholders involved in the process, it will better equip students with the technical skills they need to find success in local in-demand careers.

Finally, I believe it is important that we start to shift the culture sur-

rounding career and technical education. Every student, no matter his or her career goals, should participate in some form of career education. I believe that every student needs to graduate, not just with a diploma but with another piece of paper, namely an offer letter.

Some students will find success in a traditional 4-year college program; others, however, will learn the skills they need through a 2-year community college or on-the-job training.

I look forward to working with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to ensure its passage, and I look forward to sending this bill to the President later this year for signing.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Congressman KRISHNAMOORTHY for his leadership on this issue. The Congressman is a fellow member of the freshman class. I really appreciate the opportunity to work with him, particularly on this very important topic.

Madam Speaker, I yield to Congressman THOMPSON, the sponsor of H.R. 2353, who, for many years, has been leading the charge here in the House to strengthen career technical education.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania, Representative SMUCKER—he is doing a great job representing his congressional district and being a strong voice for Pennsylvania—for hosting this important Special Order tonight focused on career and technical education.

I appreciate my good friend, Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, who is with me and is leading the charge with the piece of legislation that I hope we will see on the House floor in the weeks to come.

As co-chair of the House Career and Technical Education Caucus, I often say that a high quality career in technical education can help restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity. Now, this statement is one I truly believe in.

For many Americans, those rungs have been displaced for different reasons, whether it is training that they have had, access to training, access to quality, effective training; whether it has been poverty; whether it has been unemployment, underemployment, all things that take away rungs on the ladder of opportunity, this career and technical education can truly restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity.

It is undeniable that career and technological education has helped many Americans obtain the knowledge and skills they need to break the cycle of poverty and achieve a lifetime of success.

The first step to increasing access to CTE programs, as we refer to them, across the United States is modernizing the Federal investment in these programs, and it has been more than a decade since Congress has updated the

Federal law governing CTE programs. This is problematic, due to the fact that so much about our society and our Nation's workforce has changed during this time. Since the last time the Perkins Act was reauthorized, we have new skill sets, new jobs, new industry, new opportunities, new technology.

So, for example, today, more than 1 million positions remain open in the trade, transportation, utility sectors, and an additional 315,000 manufacturing positions are currently unfilled. If we are to embark on a new era of American manufacturing and improved infrastructure, we need a qualified and well trained workforce to fill these positions. That is the number one asset of any business. It is not the location; it is not the compliance; it is not the marketing. It really is a qualified and trained workforce.

With all this in mind, I have worked with my colleagues in introducing the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act once again this Congress. Last Congress, this bill did pass unanimously out of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and was widely supported on the House floor by a vote of 405-5. Unfortunately, things bogged down in the Senate, with a lot of good legislation at the end of the last congressional cycle, and so here we are again, which is okay, because we have taken the opportunity to make this just a little bit better, too. We had some small refinements, but some improvements. We used our time effectively.

Now, this robust reauthorization of the Perkins Act will help ensure that Federal policies accurately reflect the challenges and realities facing today's students, workers, and employers. Additionally, the bill supports innovative learning opportunities and stronger engagements with employers. By promoting work-based learning at the Federal level, more employers will build relationships with students through hands-on experience. This type of learning is invaluable to students with a wide range of interests and learning styles.

I am proud to see this bill pass out of the committee unanimously once again last month. I am looking forward to its consideration on the House floor and in the Senate in the future.

Now, if we are serious about improving our Nation's workforce and providing greater opportunities for all Americans, we will work together to move this bill through the legislative process. After all, this new bill, as I have said before, does restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity.

The impact of increasing access and quality of career and technical education is far-reaching. Take, for example, maybe a 15-year-old girl who when in school was uninspired, her head is on her desk. She doesn't learn in the typ-

ical way that many of us do, where people talk at you and teach, but if you can put something in her hands, the tools of career and technical education, that could be a welder, a set of wrenches, it could be a paint brush, it could be a stethoscope, farm implements, she is inspired, and she does great, she excels.

I just heard about a young boy today, who is a young man now, but as a young boy was on the spectrum scale, he had some issues of autism. I was so inspired to hear this today. This young man went into career and technical education as a welder. And today, he is making a significant amount of money, more than what his teacher was making, right out of high school, as a welder because of what career and technical education did.

The young couple facing unemployment and underemployment who is at the kitchen table trying to decide how to make ends meet, and this is an opportunity to get back into the workforce. The middle-aged worker who has been working the line manufacturing who would like a promotion, do a little better by his family, bring more money home, it provides and serves that person. The family who is stuck in poverty maybe for generations, stuck in poverty so long, they don't even remember what was the incident that put them into poverty generations ago, but this is a way to break that cycle of poverty.

And certainly the successful business owner, who is doing all the right things, and she is invested in her business and has grown the business and has a great product and a great location and a great marketing plan, great compliance plan, because of regulation issues, but she is closing her business, because, Madam Speaker, she can't find qualified and trained workers to keep that business going, let alone grow it. These are all examples of folks who will benefit from this.

I really want to thank my colleagues for their enthusiastic support of career and technical education. On a day when I know there are other places where there are pressures to be this evening, you are right here on the House floor and leading the cause for career and technical education, and I am very thankful for that. Once again, thanks to Representative SMUCKER for his leadership and tonight's Special Order.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I would like to again thank the Congressman for his leadership on this very important issue. I very much enjoyed, in the 5 months I have been here, working with Congressman THOMPSON, a fellow member of the Pennsylvania delegation, but I have seen his passion for this issue. So, again, I look forward to continuing to work with you on this and really appreciate your leadership.

□ 1715

You mentioned the critical need of businesses to fill spots that are available today. We see the unemployment rate today. We know this is a problem today and will continue to be a problem.

My background is in construction. We owned a construction firm. We had about 150 employees. Our biggest problem always was finding qualified people to fill the spots that are available. At the same time, I saw the opportunities that were available to people who decided to take up a career in construction. It is not, as many people think, neither construction nor manufacturing nor many jobs that require technical trade skills today. Construction uses technology, and it is not a dirty job that people once thought it was. The manufacturing is the same way. At the same time, there are great-paying jobs, family-sustaining jobs available in these fields.

I think we need to do a better job of enlightening, essentially, the opportunities and talking about the opportunities that are available through career and technical education.

To your point again, Congressman, there is no better way to help people out of poverty than to connect them with a good-paying job and the self-worth that is achieved from finding a job. We know those jobs are available today. What career and technical education does is prepare people for great-paying jobs that are available.

Again, thank you so much for your leadership on this.

Now I would like to yield to another freshman colleague of mine on the Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. MITCHELL, who has an extensive background in higher education and brings that expertise to the committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank Mr. SMUCKER for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about education and workforce preparedness.

Prior to serving in Congress, I dedicated my 35-year career to workforce education, helping people develop skills necessary to get a job and start a career path.

There is something about the pride that comes when someone builds the skills necessary to start a career. Their whole world changes when they see what they can achieve and the difference that makes for their family.

I ran for Congress with the desire to make that opportunity possible for all Americans; to help all Americans succeed, as I and so many others in this Chamber have.

For some people, pursuing their desired career means a 4-year college degree. I have also seen that that is not the right path for many others. Yet, too often, those that wish to pursue careers in technical areas lack the skills to gain the employment and access the



skills training necessary to move forward.

This leads to a problem we have all heard of, the skills gap. People, young and mature, are unable to find jobs because they lack the necessary skills, and employers are unable to find qualified staff to fill their jobs.

We are seeing this repeatedly in my home State of Michigan. Several companies that have been awarded incentives to grow and expand through the Michigan Strategic Fund have had to dial back planned expansions due to hiring challenges. The Pure Michigan Talent Connect website lists nearly 100,000 open jobs and positions across a range of industries. Businesses simply cannot find qualified individuals to fill their open jobs. It threatens our Nation, and we must address it.

In efforts to assess the needs of our education system over the last 5 months, I have met with students, administrators, teachers, and employers throughout my congressional district. Every single employer I have met since I started office have told me the same thing, believe it or not. They need more employees with the skills necessary, the core technical skills necessary, to contribute in the workforce. Despite expensive and extensive recruitment efforts, they can't find them. It is creating a real problem. They are turning down work and turning down opportunity and growth across this Nation and in my district because they cannot find skilled employees.

Schools in my community recognize this problem, but too often their hands are tied, needing to ensure that students meet arbitrary standards and testing metrics. Here is the irony: rather than ensuring that they are prepared for employment in the community, we worry about test scores.

School leaders throughout my district have asked for one thing: more flexibility to offer choices to students and families to develop skills to meet the needs of employers and, frankly, the needs of the 21st century.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act would give additional flexibility to the community that education leaders are asking for. It will also allow States to better accommodate the local workforce needs. Schools, parents, employers, and teachers have made it clear: career and technical education can be improved by making it more relevant to students and employers, ensuring programs are accountable, involving all stakeholders, and granting more flexibility.

The bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act achieves those goals. I am proud to support it as one step to expand the educational opportunities in choice in this country.

Mr. SMUCKER. I thank Representative MITCHELL for his comments.

Again, I appreciate not only his passion for this issue, but the wealth of experience in this field that he brings to the table, and I look forward as well to continuing to work with him on this issue.

I now would like to yield to, once again, another freshman Member of the class who I very much enjoy working with, Mr. FERGUSON.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank Mr. SMUCKER for yielding to me.

I, too, would like to express my appreciation for Representative THOMPSON for taking the lead on this on our side of aisle. He did a great job. I also appreciate Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY from Illinois, who worked tirelessly to make this a real solid bill. So thanks to both of them. Thank you for taking time to lead these Special Orders tonight.

In my district and throughout Georgia, our school systems, technical colleges, and communities are creating innovative career tech opportunities to help transition students into a workforce through dual enrollment with the Technical College System of Georgia, work-based learning apprenticeships, and Career Academies like the THINC Academy in LaGrange, the Central Education Center in Newnan, and 12 for Life in Carrollton, Georgia.

These programs are helping our young people make the transition from high school directly into the workforce, and they are also helping adult learners transition into new careers.

I visited these centers and learned about these education programs, and they provide a meaningful transition for these students. They rely heavily on the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. This is a pivotal workforce development tool. It enables our education leaders to develop tailored programs that reflect the workforce needs, leveraging small dollars for very large outcomes.

Travelling throughout my district, the number one issue I hear from business and education leaders is workforce development. I have seen examples across the Third District of how community stakeholders are pulling together to do their part to develop career tech education and, in turn, create opportunities for young people to climb the ladder of success.

I am so impressed by the emerging partnerships that have naturally come about as these groups work to close the skills gap that we have in this country. They know the urgent need we have to educate students and develop these skills to fill the demands of a 21st century job.

This is a story of so many of our communities across the country and the reason why I support the effort to move forward and reauthorize the Perkins CTE. Reauthorizing Perkins CTE will upgrade the law and more accurately reflect the needs and work being

done by States and local communities, providing flexibility, streamlined application processes, promoting partnerships, accountability, and a limited Federal role.

It is time to make these reforms, and I proudly support H.R. 2353.

Mr. SMUCKER. I thank Mr. FERGUSON for his comments. As he mentioned, this is about family-sustaining jobs. Mr. FERGUSON has a lot of experience bringing jobs to his town of West Point in Georgia, where he was mayor, creating thousands of new jobs there through innovative policies. I look forward to continuing to work with him on this as well.

Now I yield to another colleague on the Education and Workforce Committee who has been a leading voice as well on CTE, Mr. WILSON.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank Congressman LLOYD SMUCKER for yielding to me. I appreciate his dedicated leadership to the people of Pennsylvania.

Students and businesses in South Carolina know firsthand the importance of an educated workforce to promote jobs. They also know that quality education doesn't have to come at the time and expense of a traditional 4-year college degree to achieve fulfilling jobs.

While visiting these schools and businesses across the Second District of South Carolina, I regularly learn how they have positively benefited from career and technical education programs that create jobs and lead to fulfilling lives.

With career and technical education, students can incorporate practical skills and training into their educational experience; skills that are valuable to the workforce to create jobs.

Businesses in South Carolina especially appreciate the opportunity to work with the technical colleges to work to close the skills gap and hire trained, experienced employees for highly technical jobs.

I have been grateful to have the opportunity to visit Midlands Technical College, Aiken Technical College, and Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College, along with the extraordinary programs at their area high schools.

I am grateful for the work of the Apprenticeship Carolina, readySC, and the South Carolina Technical College System for their role in connecting students with employers.

I also appreciate the countless businesses in South Carolina, like Boeing, Michelin, MTU, Fluor, and others that support the career and technical education programs and hire students from the programs or facilitate apprenticeship programs for meaningful jobs. In fact, these programs have been the basis for establishing the tire industry in South Carolina where, in the district I represent, Michelin is the largest single tire manufacturer in the world at that location.

Additionally, with Bridgestone, which is Japanese; Continental, which is German; Michelin, which is French; Giti, which is GT, which is Singapore; and soon a Chinese tire manufacturer, because of the training programs we have, South Carolina now is the leading manufacturer and exporter of tires of any State in the United States.

Additionally, with BMW, South Carolina is the leading exporter of cars of any State in the United States. In fact, last year, \$9.4 billion worth of BMWs were exported out of Charleston for worldwide distribution.

While South Carolina has been highly successful in promoting career and technical education programs, I hope all communities across the country can experience the success that we have achieved creating jobs.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will reduce regulations and allow State and local leaders to create career and technical education programs best for their communities.

As the House of Representatives will consider the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act soon, I urge all of my colleagues to support this job-creating legislation for meaningful and productive families.

Mr. SMUCKER. I thank Mr. WILSON for his comments.

I am happy to say that I am one of those who supports the economy in South Carolina by buying those Bridgestone and Firestone tires for my vehicles.

Mr. WILSON has been a strong advocate, obviously, for the people of his district, the people of his State, and has been a leader in regards to CTE. I look forward to working with him on this bill as well.

I think I will have one more speaker, who is on the way. As I wait for him, Mr. WILSON talked about some of the schools in his area that have been doing a great job in connecting people, training people, educating people for the kind of jobs that are available in our workforces.

Pennsylvania's 16th Congressional District is home to Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology, and it is an incredible story and similar to stories of many of the other institutions that are providing career and technical education.

There was a job fair recently at Thaddeus Stevens College, and for just a few hundred graduates, there were about 450 companies essentially competing for those individuals, competing to fill spots they had. So it goes without saying that the placement rate at many of these schools—I know certainly at Thaddeus Stevens College—is almost 100 percent placement rate. They have a problem, in fact, sometimes keeping people until graduation because students are offered jobs even

before they graduate, and they are hired away.

□ 1730

Some of the students coming out of Thaddeus Stevens College are earning, on average, \$45,000 annually. We have the Marcellus shale drilling in our area, welders, some of them are earning up to six figures, \$100,000 or more in the first or second year of employment. So, again, the kind of jobs that we are talking about here are great-paying, family-sustaining jobs.

My district is also home to Reading Area Community College and the Pennsylvania College of Health Sciences, both of which offer CTE programs. We have spoken with, as a part of leading up to this bill being introduced, their faculty, students, and staff about how some of these programs can be improved.

Harrisburg Area Community College has a campus in my district in Lancaster. They do something that I think we will be seeing more of and should be seeing more of: they run an innovative apprenticeship program. They brought together private businesses that work with the school to help prepare skilled workers to fill available jobs. It is a very innovative program. The program has been very, very successful.

Future initiatives there include expanding the program into our local high schools to ensure that graduates are college or career ready. It is an opportunity that I think we have across the country.

If you look at some other models, some of the European countries—for instance, I just had a long, extensive conversation with the Swiss Ambassador about the apprenticeship program in Switzerland.

Here, we often think of apprenticeship in what we may refer to as blue-collar workers, construction and manufacturing. In Switzerland, I was told that they have apprenticeship programs in up to 230 careers. So it is bankers and insurers. Many, many different companies are taking advantage of the apprenticeship program there.

It gets to the student debt problem that we hear so much about. Here, students are earning a degree. In an apprenticeship program, students are earning a degree while earning dollars, so it sort of does away with that, if you think about it. You are earning dollars as you are learning. So it is a great model that I hope to see more of here.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Representative SMUCKER for holding this Special Order.

Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, I rise to highlight the importance of career and technical education for

our Nation's workforce. I really appreciate all of the comments that the gentleman just mentioned, and I concur.

Madam Speaker, across Rhode Island, I continue to hear from employers struggling to find skilled workers to fill open jobs in fields such as manufacturing, IT, and other trades.

Hundreds of thousands of high-skilled, high-paying jobs are right now unfulfilled in our country, and this number is continuing to grow. Especially as we hear about bringing jobs back from overseas, manufacturing, just by way of example, has changed dramatically. These factories are no longer the old, dirty, noisy manufacturing factories of old that, say, our fathers or grandfathers were used to. They are now all high-tech. You see robots doing a lot of the manufacturing that require both programming and sophisticated knowledge how to run this advanced equipment.

So the jobs are coming back, but they are coming back in different ways, needing different skills. And right now we need to ensure that our workforce is equipped with the tools to meet the demands of the economy to close our Nation's skills gap. We can do this by better aligning education and industry.

Our students, Madam Speaker, should be learning the skills they need to succeed in growing economic sectors. This is one of the most important investments that we can make in our Nation's future.

The Governor of Rhode Island, Governor Raimondo, likes to say: We need to give our workers the skills that matter for jobs that pay.

In the Ocean State, the newly opened Westerly Education Center right now is working to promote CTE, providing a range of courses to help Rhode Islanders to meet the current and projected needs of the region's economy. The Westerly Education Center effectively brings together higher education, industry, and community partners to ensure students of all ages are prepared for workforce opportunities in Rhode Island. Classes range from industry-specific skills training to courses in critical thinking, management, and also soft skills.

CTE courses, Madam Speaker, are in demand. Approximately 12.5 million high school and college students are enrolled in CTE across the Nation. But Federal investment in this area has decreased, actually, since 2011, and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act hasn't been authorized since 2006. I am hoping that we are going to be able to see this act reauthorized very soon.

Perkins is the primary Federal investment in CTE, and the most important thing that we can do to support CTE across the country, to support students and businesses across the country, is to reauthorize this legislation.

It needs to be updated for our changing economy, and funding for CTE programs must be increased to support growing programs across the Nation.

Last Congress, I know that the House overwhelmingly passed the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education Act, and I call on my colleagues to do the same in this Congress as well. It was, in some ways, a rare moment of bipartisanship in the Congress and a great example of how we can work together. Hopefully, that will lead to other things as well.

H.R. 2353 recently passed unanimously by the Education and the Workforce Committee, and it is, again, the product of an inclusive and thoughtful process. I commend the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee and the ranking member and all of the members on both sides of the aisle for working so closely together—again, a very complicated piece of legislation that passed unanimously out of committee.

So, again, I thank my fellow CTE Caucus co-chair as well, Representative THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, for all of his great work on this bill. He is a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and he is the co-chair of the CTE Caucus. We work in lockstep on these matters. It has been a pleasure to work with him. I am grateful for his leadership, along with many other colleagues.

It makes many necessary updates to Perkins, with an emphasis on training students for the skills that they will need in high-growth economic sectors. The bill contains several important reforms, including increasing collaboration between education and industry, expanding student access to apprenticeships, supporting career counselors, and aligning State performance indicators with local labor markets, among other things.

Unfortunately, at a time when it is more crucial than ever to invest in CTE, the President's budget has proposed, though, a budget for fiscal year 2018 that cuts Perkins State grants by 15 percent. That is more than \$168 million across the country. In Rhode Island, that Perkins funding cut would mean a cut of more than \$800,000. If enacted, the President's budget would not only slash a crucial investment in our students, but it would deeply hurt businesses.

If we want businesses to come back to the country from overseas, if we want to relocate those jobs here, we need to make sure that we have the workforce that can actually do the jobs that would be available and that are, in fact, available right now.

This is the time to invest in workforce development, not undermine it. Demand for CTE is growing from students and industry, and our economy desperately needs it.

Madam Speaker, in closing, let me just say that I encourage my col-

leagues to prioritize CTE. It matters for your constituents, and it yields big returns for our States' economies and for our Nation's economy as a whole. Put simply, providing workers with the skills necessary to thrive in the economy is essential to our economic prosperity. It is the right thing to do, giving our workers the skills they need for jobs that pay.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative LANGEVIN. His points are very good. We appreciate his leadership as co-chair of the CTE Caucus and for the work that he has done in bringing this bill to the point where it is now.

He is right. It was passed unanimously out of the Education and the Workforce Committee. We thank the chair of the committee for making that a priority. We hope it passes the floor of the House—it did, of course, last session—and then we hope it becomes a priority for the Senate as well. It is important.

He has mentioned some of the schools, the institutions, in his district. I have talked about some in mine. I have heard from all of them. Not only have they given input into the bill itself and how we can improve the entire system across the country, but they have also talked about the importance of the grants that are provided to them through the Perkins Act. Reauthorization will be very beneficial in keeping those grants going, in providing the help that we can from the Federal level. So I thank him.

Madam Speaker, as I conclude with my remarks, I would first, again, like to thank all of my colleagues who have participated in this bipartisan Special Order. It is really, as we have seen, a bipartisan issue here.

I thank Congressman KRISHNAMOORTHY for helping to colead this and for cosponsoring the bill, along with Congressman THOMPSON.

In my own background, I was someone with a nontraditional education. I recognize the importance of providing our constituents with educational pathways that provide them the skills necessary to launch successful careers. In my experience, I know firsthand what it is like to work a full-time job while attending school, and I believe that it is important that we accommodate the needs of many different types of students that are ready to learn and willing to work.

So, again, I am excited and very happy to cosponsor and support the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This bill empowers State and local community leaders. It improves alignment with in-demand jobs, those jobs that we have been talking about. It increases transparency and accountability, and it ensures a limited Federal role, putting the decisionmaking where it should be.

Madam Speaker, I mentioned before, but, in closing, I thank my Pennsylvania colleague, Representative G.T. THOMPSON, for his leadership on this critically important legislation. The level of support for strengthening career and technical education among my colleagues in the House and on a bipartisan basis is absolutely outstanding, and I am very eager to continue finding new ways in which we can grow CTE and apprenticeship programs and expand access for Pennsylvania's working people to allow them to help achieve the American Dream.

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

#### PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to be here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. This is our Special Order hour. We have decided to devote our remarks this evening to the testimony of former FBI Director Comey, who testified in the U.S. Senate today.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, today, America watched former FBI Director Comey offer his testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. It was a dramatic and serious moment in the history of our country and in the unfolding of the crisis related to the investigation of Russia's involvement in the U.S. election and then the firing of General Flynn by President Trump.

□ 1745

This was the first time that Director Comey spoke publicly about his firing by President Trump and the investigation since he left the FBI, and his testimony confirmed much of what has been reported about the matter.

Now, what any reasonable-minded observer would have to conclude after watching the testimony today, after reading Mr. Comey's testimony, is that President Trump was trying mightily to use his office and his influence to get Director Comey to drop the investigation of General Flynn, his former National Security Advisor. Indeed, President Trump as much as said so when he said that he had fired Director Comey because he was unhappy about

the Russian investigation and, presumably, the Russian investigation into General Flynn.

Now, Madam Speaker, distinguished colleagues, look how far we have come over the last several months. The President of the United States hired a National Security Advisor after being warned not to by the former President of the United States, by then-President Obama. That National Security Advisor lasted a total of 24 days in office, when it was determined that he had lied to Vice President PENCE about his dealings with Russia. And then later we learned that he was a registered foreign agent, or he registered retroactively as a foreign agent, an agent for a foreign government. Now, think how dramatic this sequence of events is.

Imagine, if you will, if President Barack Obama had met with Attorney General Eric Holder and Vice President Joe Biden and FBI Director Comey in his office and then asked Vice President Biden and Attorney General Holder to leave his office, saying that he wanted to speak alone to the FBI Director, and then proceeded, essentially, to tell FBI Director Comey that he wanted him to drop the investigation into Hillary Clinton's emails, saying, you know, "Hillary Clinton's a good woman. She's a good person, and I hope you can just let the investigation into her emails go. Just let it go," and to demand repeatedly for absolute personal loyalty.

Now, as it happened, Director Comey refused to take a vow of absolute loyalty to the President. After all, he takes an oath of office to the Constitution of the United States and the people of the country, so he couldn't say that he would give absolute loyalty to the President of the United States. That is not consistent with our constitutional form of government.

But imagine that this had happened under the Obama administration. Obama had made a similar demand of FBI Director Comey who was investigating, after all, Hillary Clinton's emails, had dismissed the Vice President and the Attorney General to have a one-on-one conversation, and then said, "I really hope that you let this go," using the full trappings of his office and his influence to try to get the FBI Director to drop the investigation.

If that happened, I dare say that every Member of this body, every Member would have recognized that as an attempt to obstruct justice by the President of the United States, and lots of Members certainly would have been calling for impeachment of President Obama for interfering with an ongoing investigation by the FBI.

Well, what is happening now in Congress?

Well, lots of our colleagues are murmuring a defense of President Trump saying: Well, it doesn't look good and

maybe he shouldn't have done it, but he is new to government. Trump is new to Washington. He is not schooled in the ways of Washington, it is being said. He is actually a breath of fresh air that he doesn't know how Washington operates.

I think that that completely confuses the question. Dear colleagues, Madam Speaker, the law against obstruction of justice in the United States, which is a felony criminal offense, 18 U.S.C. 1503, applies against experienced government officials and inexperienced government officials. It applies to all citizens of the United States. It applies to people who have worked in Washington their whole life and people who have worked in Washington for several months. In fact, it applies to people across the country.

It is not a law that applies just in the District of Columbia. It applies in New York. It applies in Mar-a-Lago. It applies in California. It applies everywhere.

No American citizen can interfere with the due administration of justice, whether it is trying to persuade a juror to do a certain thing, whether it is trying to influence a judge in a particular case, or whether it is trying to get a prosecutor to drop an investigation into a particular person or into an entire subject matter.

No one has the right to interfere with the due administration of justice in America. That is both a criminal statutory principle in 18 U.S. Code. It is also a constitutional principle, which is well recognized because democracy, our constitutional democracy, depends upon the rule of law; and there is no rule of law if there is no evenhandedness and no impartiality in the administration of justice. No one has the right to interfere with justice.

Now what should be done about this?

Nobody quite knows what to do at this point. We do have a special counsel, Mr. Mueller, who has been appointed, and that is good, but what he is looking for is counterintelligence information, and he is looking for possible criminal activity.

But if we take a step back, what is all of this really about?

I was very pleased that former Director Comey talked about this in his testimony today. What this is about was a concerted, deliberate, comprehensive effort, orchestrated from the very top of the Russian Government, to interfere with the U.S. election. That is something now that former FBI Director Comey has spoken about publicly, and it is something that 18 of our intelligence agencies have reported to Congress and the American people in a public report with a high degree of certainty that there was an orchestrated campaign to undermine and subvert our campaign, starting at the highest levels of the Russian Government. That took place, okay?

So the criminal or counterintelligence investigation doesn't go to the question that has got to concern us in Congress, which is the threat to our democratic form of government. As FBI Director Comey restated today, 2016 could just be a dress rehearsal for what is coming at us in 2018 and 2020. The intelligence agencies said that they would try to do it again.

Russia is no match for the military might of the United States of America. Russia is no match for the economic might of the United States of America. Russia's autocratic, kleptocratic, dictatorial-style government is no match for the constitutional democracy that we have built up in the United States of America. But the Russians have figured out a way to use the internet to try to penetrate the democracies of the world on the cheap. It is not that expensive to have paid trolls to orchestrate fake news and propaganda and to try to distort the electoral process in the United States of America—or in the Netherlands, or in France, or in other countries around the world.

Now, we don't have all of the facts. That is why what we need is an independent, outside investigation by a commission that we set up outside of Congress—no Democratic Members of Congress, no Republican Members of Congress, no elected officials. What we will put on there are statesmen and stateswomen who are experienced in questions of democracy and foreign policy, who are trusted, and we will ask them to give us the kind of report that the 9/11 Commission gave to us but about what happened in the 2016 election and how do we prepare to stop it from happening again to us in the future.

Now, notice that you can support this, and I think you should support this, whether or not there was any collusion by anybody within the Trump administration. You can be completely convinced that there was collusion between particular members of the Trump administration or Trump campaign and Russia or you could be completely convinced that there was no collusion at all, that they knew nothing about those efforts. It doesn't make any difference. There was still a massive assault on American democracy, and we have got to respond to it.

That is why I think the pathway forward for us now is for both sides in Congress, both parties, to come together and to act in a patriotic way, not in a partisan way, to say let's create an objective, disinterested, outside commission to get to the bottom of what happened to us in this election. And we will let, for the time being, the Department of Justice and Special Counsel Mueller deal with the question of criminal culpability and criminal deeds, but that is of less importance, in truth, than the integrity of our political institution and the future of American democracy.

There is the question which remains unresolved and, at this point, still relatively untouched, about what is so special about Michael Flynn.

We have a President who is unafraid to offend anybody. He told our best allies in the world in NATO that NATO is obsolete. I think he has changed course on that, but he was very willing to basically wave off the importance of NATO.

He was willing to tell one of our biggest trade partners in the world, Mexico, that he was going to force them to build a wall on the border, force them to pay for it. And again, I think he seems to have backtracked from that. I don't know where he stands on that now.

He was willing to insult and affront the Government of Australia, which has been a great ally of America.

He had a TV show called "You're Fired," so he is not afraid of offending people, and we see him offend people all of the time and pick fights with people all of the time. He picked a fight with Meryl Streep. He is willing to tweet at anybody.

But suddenly, with Michael Flynn, this disgraced National Security Advisor whom he fired, President Trump goes to great lengths to try to interfere in an ongoing investigation which I think everybody can recognize is obstruction or attempted an obstruction of justice. He interferes with the FBI Director in a really astonishing and unprecedented way to try to get Flynn carved out of the investigation.

Why? What does Flynn know? What is the nature of their relationship such that the President goes to such extraordinary lengths to carve him out from the investigation?

That is something that we are going to need to get to the bottom of because democracies operate on the truth. Truth is built into our system. That is why we have judges and we have juries. That is why we have due process. That is why we have congressional oversight over the President of the United States. That is why all of us in public service swear an oath to the Constitution. The truth means something in a democracy, so we are going to have to get to the bottom of that.

But, in the meantime, Congress can act effectively and in a unified way. And I was encouraged by what both Republican and Democratic Senators on the Senate committee today were saying, which is that everybody agreed, or at least a lot of them agreed, that there had been this unacceptable assault on the electoral institution of our political democracy in 2016, and we have got to prevent it from happening again.

We need to have a bipartisan, or non-partisan, independent commission outside of Congress to study exactly what happened and to report back to us about what we need to do to build up

our defenses so our democracy is as strong as our economy and as our military. So our democratic institutions need to be fortified against subversion, against hacking, against cyber propaganda and fake news and so on.

Madam Speaker, I am going to call up and invite the very distinguished Congresswoman from Seattle, Washington, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, who has been a terrific leader for human rights and for democracy in the U.S. House of Representatives since her arrival in January.

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

□ 1800

#### FORMER FBI DIRECTOR COMEY'S TESTIMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative RASKIN for his leadership in the House. It has been a great honor to co-chair the CPC Special Order hour here every week on the floor.

Since I have just been elected the first vice chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I, unfortunately, won't be continuing to do that. But I am still going to be right here for these Special Order hours, because I do think that they are an important opportunity for Members to talk about issues all at once, and to kind of pick an issue, and then to focus on it.

Obviously, today, we are talking about the testimony from former FBI Director James Comey. This was highly anticipated testimony, and I would be willing to guess that a lot more people, perhaps, even watched the testimony than watched the inauguration. But I think we learned a great deal from former Director Comey. I appreciate that he was willing to come and testify, and he said some very important things.

In that testimony, Mr. Comey confirmed that President Trump sought to influence the FBI investigation into his campaign's ties to Russia, including that of Michael Flynn.

While the President had claimed that he did not ask former Director Comey to drop the investigation, Mr. Comey actually testified under oath that Trump's directive was clear, and that this was apparently so off-putting that he began to memorialize their meetings. Every single meeting he had with President Trump, he would have the meeting and then go back to the car and immediately take notes on the meeting, and that is troubling.

That was something that former Director Comey never did with previous

administrations. And one of the things that stuck out to me in his testimony is that he had actually asked—he felt so uncomfortable with the interactions that he was having with the President, because I think the American people need to understand, the FBI is built to be an independent organization.

The reason that the term of the FBI Director is 10 years is because it was a signal from Congress that even though the FBI Director does serve at the pleasure of the President—and Mr. Comey was clear about that in his testimony today—the President has the ability to hire and fire the FBI Director.

But the reason Congress signaled through legislation that the term of the FBI Director should be 10 years was because they wanted to send a signal that this body is incredibly important, and the independence of this body is incredibly important.

The fact that Mr. Comey, as FBI Director, felt so uncomfortable about these interactions with the President—nine interactions with the President. I think he had only two interactions with President Obama during his entire term, and yet, in just the first few months, he had nine interactions with President Trump. He actually asked Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein not to leave him alone with the President.

That is really a remarkable, scary thing that he would have to ask for that, and it certainly should have raised some red flags and should have triggered some action from the Attorney General, or the Deputy Attorney General. It did not. He never received an answer to that.

Mr. Comey also said that he expects the special counsel's investigation to look into the possibility that Trump's actions were an obstruction of justice. He said that this did fall within the investigation scope. So while he didn't directly say that Trump was directly under investigation, he did say that the President's behavior does fall within the investigation's scope.

That, frankly, does nothing to dispel any concerns that are out there amongst the American people, and many of us in Congress, that President Trump's campaign did not collude with Russia.

Apparently, he did not seem particularly concerned about whether or not Russia did interfere in the elections but was more interested in whether or not his circle of friends, Michael Flynn, was under threat.

Former Director Comey also confirmed that Michael Flynn is under criminal investigation, and he raised more questions about Attorney General Jeff Sessions. As I have spoken about on the floor before, Attorney General Sessions should not have been involved in the firing of James Comey in the first place.

He had recused himself from all things related to the investigation into the campaign's ties to Russia because of his involvement with the Trump campaign, and so that was good. We thought that was a very good move that he made to recuse himself, but then he immediately went and was directly involved in the decisionmaking around the person who was leading the investigation, in fact, involved in the decision to fire the person who was leading the investigation.

Mr. Comey also hinted that Jeff Sessions had more contact with the Russians than maybe we even knew about. He could not speak to that in a public setting. He said that is for a classified setting, but, obviously, that raises a lot more questions, and the American people certainly deserve the truth.

One of the biggest takeaways from the testimony was this: President Trump gave many changing reasons as to why former Director Comey was fired. And former Director Comey spoke to this today. He said, at first, it was because it was the handling—it was because of Comey's handling of the Clinton emails. Then it was that he had lost the support of the FBI agents, something that James Comey responded to, and said: "Those were lies, plain and simple."

Actually, Mr. Comey spent quite some time really acknowledging the work of the organization, the FBI organization, and the agents, and everything that he has done. I certainly got the impression that he felt very deeply upset by any indication that perhaps it was because his agents didn't want him to be there.

What Mr. Comey pointed to is that eventually the President, in his own words, admitted that he fired James Comey over the Russian investigation, and then, right after that, actually said to the Russians that the pressure has now been taken off now that Comey has been fired. Those are all incredibly disturbing.

And I am sad, Mr. Speaker, that the Republicans—some Republican colleagues, not all, but some—have tried to dismiss the President's actions as "mistakes made by a new President who is learning how to do his job." Speaker PAUL RYAN went so far as to say: "He is new at government. Therefore, I think he is learning as he goes."

This is just 1 day after the Speaker said that it is obviously—that was his word—not appropriate for the President to ask for Mr. Comey's loyalty. So which one is it, Mr. Speaker? It is unacceptable to excuse the President's actions simply because he is not a career professional, especially when we are talking about something of this magnitude—the magnitude of interference in our election process in the United States of America by a foreign government.

We do not have any information still about all of the ways in which a Presi-

dent of the United States, this President of the United States, may be indebted to some foreign government because of their actions with the election.

It has been repeatedly reported that the President does not sit for briefings, does not read the reports that are provided to him, does not stick to speeches on policies that are written for him, and, frankly, shows very little interest in participating in the administrative responsibilities that most Presidents go through in order to learn what is a very big job.

Yes, the job of the President of the United States is a very big job, and anybody who gets into that job, just as I do in this body as a new Member of Congress, we try to learn the rules. We go to the people who know the most. We ask them to give us briefings. We suck up as much information as we possibly can so that we understand both content and process.

But, unfortunately, this President has not done any of that, and he has made many unforced errors. Frankly, he has put our national security at risk by giving secrets away to Russia, insulting key allies who have now said that they won't share information with us because they don't trust that we are going to be able to keep it secret.

NATO and our allies in the European Union, where I just came back from, everybody around the world is unsure of what leadership, if any, to expect from the United States of America.

Angela Merkel said it the best when she said: We can't rely on anybody else anymore. And she said: We, as a European Union, have to just come together and rely on ourselves.

And while that is great for the European Union, I am glad that there is something that has happened here that has drawn the European Union together. It is an incredibly important entity for the world and has been doing remarkable work. But what I would hope, Mr. Speaker, is that countries around the world know that the United States is going to continue to take global leadership, is going to continue to demonstrate that global leadership, and, most of all, is going to be trusted to make relationships and respect the rules of those relationships.

The American people are aware that the President's background is not in politics. However, the White House is not "The Apprentice." Had a new employee in The Trump Organization made as many errors as have been made in this administration, he would have been fired a long time ago.

The American people deserve better. And not only do we demand that the President not intervene in any negative way in Director Mueller's investigation—and we are very pleased that Director Mueller has been appointed. I believe that was an incredibly important step that Assistant Attorney Gen-

eral Rod Rosenstein took to appoint somebody with the credibility that Mueller has—but we hope that this investigation will continue, because I think it is important for the American people to understand that this is not an independent investigator, or prosecutor. This is special counsel.

So that still means that anything that Director Mueller finds in his findings, his reports, they do get run up the chain of command at the Department of Justice. So if you watched yesterday's Senate Intelligence Committee hearings, you might have seen Senator KAMALA HARRIS discuss this and ask Rod Rosenstein if he could assure that there really would be independence, that neither Rosenstein nor Jeff Sessions would get involved in trying to change or influence, in any way, whatever Director Mueller comes up with.

She was not given that assurance yesterday, unfortunately, and so we still don't know. But we have to hope and believe that the President and this administration will preserve the independence of the special counsel and will take all of the findings and the recommendations as to what they are presented and not try to change them.

I really believe, Mr. Speaker, at this point, that while the special counsel is an important step forward, I join my colleague Mr. RASKIN and many others in this caucus, in our Democratic Caucus, in calling for a special commission, an independent commission, similar to the 9/11 Commission, filled with citizens—not with Members of Congress but with respected citizens—and people with expertise, as well as those citizens, to actually come together and think not only about the immediate impact of how we get to the bottom of what has happened, but, really, how do we prevent this going forward?

What we are talking about is the sanctity of our democracy; we are talking about whether our elections can be free of influence from other countries; we are talking about if an American citizen casts a vote here in the United States for the President of the United States, that that vote is not being influenced by a foreign government who has hacked our elections, or worked in collusion with a campaign for the President of the United States; and that ultimately, whoever we select, whether it is this President or any President in the future, that that President must be responsible to the American people.

That is what democracy is about. We don't want any President, now or in the future, to ever be in a situation where there is information that can be used against them, where they could be blackmailed, leveraged, or where they are actively colluding with any government outside of this country.

These are our elections. It is what makes this country great. It is why so many people from all around the world



look at America with tremendous gratitude, with tremendous respect, even awe for the way in which we have constructed our democracy. That is part of what goes on in this Chamber, and we need to know that the election of the President of this great country is always an election that the American people have faith in, and that democracy is preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I think what James Comey's testimony showed us today is, we got a lot of answers, but we didn't get enough answers. There is still more information that we need to find. There is more information that the Senate Intelligence Committee needs to find. There is more information that the President may have to provide, and there is more information that the American people are going to demand in order to ensure that we get to the bottom of where we are, that we get an independent commission established, and that we allow Director Mueller, in his investigation, to proceed without any interference.

That is the least that we have to be willing to do, and we have to be willing to put country above party as we try to ensure that we understand exactly what has happened. The American people deserve that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

□ 1815

#### FORMER FBI DIRECTOR COMEY'S SENATE TESTIMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to come before and stand before the Speaker and stand on this floor where so much great debate has occurred over the decades, even back to 150 years ago.

Now, I have been heard to say over the last few days a number of times that I thought the Comey testimony was ultimately the most overhyped event since Y2K, much ado about nothing, but one thing came through very, very, very clearly. I didn't watch the testimony. I was busy presiding over a hearing involving the Justice Department and grants to local communities and how that money is being spent, but I have gone back and been reviewing the testimony. The thing that strikes me most clearly is that our President, Donald J. Trump, is one of the most perceptive, intuitive leaders this country has ever had. He wasn't sure, apparently, if he could trust Comey.

Now, we have heard from a lot of other people in the administration, some still there, some not. This issue about the President's concern for loyalty with Comey indicates our President's gut instinct was right on. He

was dealing with an FBI Director who was such a political animal that he would listen to the Attorney General of the United States and instruct him to change his testimony to—I would submit, when you know it is an investigation that you are engaged in, looking at the emails and the potential criminality of Hillary Clinton, and your boss, the Attorney General, said: No, no, no—obviously it is an investigation—call it a matter.

Nobody calls the FBI investigations matters. So he has no problem changing his statement from the truth to political manipulation to cover for Hillary Clinton and to immediately do what his boss tells him to do: Lie about it. You know it is an investigation and I know it is an investigation, but we need you to lie about it. Just call it a matter.

I have dealt with some of the finest people I have known in my life that happened to work for the FBI at the time we were working together. I worked with them, and I have never, ever in any Federal court setting or Federal investigation setting heard any FBI agent in charge—field agent, leader in the FBI, the Justice Department—call an investigation a matter. But Mr. Comey is such a political animal that he was willing to salute not the flag, but Hillary Clinton and Loretta Lynch and change what he knew to be the truth so that his answer was more misleading.

So it is really interesting. Comey used the word, or said that Trump used the word, hoped that he would let it go.

Let's visit the Constitution briefly here. The Constitution does not mention an Attorney General. The Constitution does not mention the Federal Bureau of Investigation and does not mention a Federal Bureau of Investigation Director. It mentions Congress, it mentions the courts, and it mentions the executive branch, the President. It doesn't mention FBI Director, Attorney General. It is the President, under our Constitution, who is charged with seeing to the prosecution or the failure to prosecute as he believes is appropriate.

So, of course, somebody had to have been committing crimes in the Fast and Furious project, whatever you want to call it. I am not sure what it was. It sure appeared to be a criminal enterprise with people involved from DOJ conspiring to make sure that weapons got into the hands of criminals, which, in and of itself, was a crime.

We also know that by the Department of Justice's representatives getting involved during the Obama administration as part of this Fast and Furious effort, they called it, guns got into the hands of criminals, and Brian Terry was killed, a Federal agent doing his job. There is no indication that if the Department of Justice had not

forced those guns to be sold and to get into the hands of criminals that Brian Terry would not be dead.

If the Department of Justice had not forced this issue, forced guns into criminals' hands, we may very well have been hearing Brian Terry testify a number of times instead of pointing back toward his murder at the hands of criminals who our Department of Justice representatives under Eric Holder got guns to.

It might have been good to have a special counsel in the Fast and Furious investigation—or, as Loretta Lynch and Mr. Comey liked to use to deceive people, matter, Fast and Furious matter—because the truth is they didn't do much of an investigation.

We saw emails indicating that there was an effort to try to use getting those guns into the hands of criminals, drug cartels, as an excuse to take away law-abiding Americans' Second Amendment rights and continue to pursue that effort.

We also know that the IRS had people who were working to prevent conservatives from having an effect in the 2012 election the way they did in 2010. As the movement was growing, the Obama administration used the IRS as a political weapon to disarm those who would bring together funds and try to defeat President Obama in a second term. That certainly deserved a special counsel since all we seemed to get in our investigations from Congress' angle was a coverup.

It harkens us back to the Clinton administration when this tactic was discovered by people within the Clinton administration: Just cover things up. Just deny, obfuscate, and refuse to allow people to see the documentation. Destroy it after somebody dies. Get the records out of their office before anyone else has a chance to properly investigate what happened.

Somebody is alleged to have killed themselves at Fort Marcy Park. Then as I heard from my friend Dan Burton, they were questioning the person that supposedly found the body out there: Well, that is not where it was. That is not where the gun was. Everything appears to be changed.

Well, the Clinton administration discovered this wonderful tactic of obfuscating: just keep denying and denying the ability to get information and records, and if you do it long enough, you run out the clock and people don't get prosecuted.

We have seen that occur for 8 years. There were very, very serious matters in which somebody committed crimes. We didn't get a special investigator. We didn't get a proper investigation. We got a stonewall protecting those who must have done wrong. I am hoping the current Attorney General will dig and people that are responsible for crimes will be held to account.

But the fact is it is the President's obligation under the Constitution to

either pursue people or not pursue people. That is why, even though many of us were extremely upset that President Obama kept pardoning people who were convicted felons, and as much as it upset us that he, in a literal sense, not only obstructed justice, he destroyed it, unfortunately, the President has authority to demand people not be prosecuted.

So we heard new priorities around the country when President Obama took office. He didn't want his Justice Department spending a lot of time on enforcing drug laws. It turns out they hardly ever prosecuted. Compared to other administrations, they hardly ever prosecuted criminal gun violations—far fewer than past administrations—because what they wanted to do was allow the gun crimes to continue to ratchet out of control and then use that to demand more gun control when they weren't even using the laws that were in effect. Instead of enforcing the laws in effect, they continued to demand more gun control.

Just enforce what we had. Most all the crimes that were brought up during that period were crimes already without any other gun control laws needing to be passed and signed into law. Just enforce what we have.

But that wasn't happening. Nobody stood up and said President Obama should be prosecuted for obstruction of justice, because as distasteful as it was to me and so many others, the President has a right to set priorities as to what his prosecutors will pursue and what will be left alone.

So it is interesting on the Flynn matter. President Trump had every right to say: Look, I am giving a pardon, a pass, to this person and to that person. Let's move on. I hope you will find something else to do.

Trump didn't even do that. President Trump said he hoped, an aspiration, but there was no obstruction of justice.

How do we know that? Because we have found, through the testimony of former Director Comey, an incredibly innate ability to see everything through a political lens instead of a law-and-order lens. That is why he could have one Attorney General telling him, "Change what you are going to say so it deceives the public," and that is not a problem, we don't do a memo about that, but another President indicates: He is concerned about my loyalty and he brings it up, so I better do memos so that I can take him down later because he doesn't trust me.

□ 1830

Well, for good reason. The loyalty was to Loretta Lynch, the loyalty was to Hillary Clinton, the loyalty was to Barack Obama.

And Trump, what an incredible innate ability. He knew Comey was not a loyal, law-and-order man. He would twist the truth, as he was directed by

someone else, but he would also twist an untruth through, hurting the current President.

It appears President Donald J. Trump was exactly right in firing Comey. We didn't need to continue to have a politically astute diplomat wannabe running our FBI. We needed somebody that was law and order, no matter what.

Alan Dershowitz is a staunch Democrat, but through the years and with the things I disagreed with him on, I know he is a smart man. Here are some of the things he tweeted out:

"Comey says he understood word 'hope' to be a direction. If so, why didn't he tell the President that such a direction would be violation of DOJ rules?"

Well, here, again, the fact is, if Director-at-the-time Comey believed there was any effort to obstruct justice, then he was committing a crime, a felony, by not reporting it.

I was surprised that he went as far as he did today—because he did—by pushing as hard as he did on this idea that saying "hope" might have been a direction. The more he pushed that, the more he exposed himself to prosecution for a felony because he didn't report it.

But the truth is, even though he wrongly believed that there was something—a violation of law or obstruction—it wasn't. If he honestly believed that, he had to report it, and he didn't.

Oh, yeah, he did a memo. I wonder if we would have ever seen that memo if he had not been fired. I can guarantee if he had not been fired, from what we have now learned today, you can count on the fact that he, as Director of the FBI, would make memos any time it might help him harm President Donald Trump, but he would continue not to do memos when somebody, a Democrat, told him to mislead the public.

Alan Dershowitz said: If President commits independent crimes, for example, Nixon telling the staff to lie to the FBI, that is a crime.

You can't tell somebody to commit a crime, even if you are President.

Alan Dershowitz said: Paying dollars to silence witnesses is a crime.

You can't commit a crime or tell somebody to commit a crime even though you are President. That is obstruction. You should be prosecuted.

Mr. Dershowitz said: "Comey confirmed my view that, under the Constitution, the President would have the authority to order FBI Director to stop investigating Flynn."

He would. Just as Barack Obama says: I pardon you, I am taking away the justice that has been done in your case. I am obstructing justice.

In pardon after pardon, he obstructed justice. But when a President does it, as Obama did being President Obama, it was not a crime when he pardoned people.

Now, if you have a President that has somebody rich, whether that is their

name or just their monetary status, and they give you a bunch of their richness and you pardon them, then you may have sold part of your office, which could very well be a crime, and probably is.

But in the case of President Obama, there is no indication anybody paid him to pardon people. If nobody paid him, he just did it because he thought it was a good idea to have people involved with drugs out on the street again, or people at Guantanamo Bay back killing Americans. If he thinks that is a good idea, then he can legally obstruct justice, which President Obama legally did time and time again.

Alan Dershowitz also says, talking about Comey: "He confirmed that the President can order anyone to be investigated or not be investigated."

Dershowitz also said: "Comey stated the constitutional principle: President has authority to direct FBI to end a criminal investigation. Can also pardon anyone, ending investigation."

There is somebody on the internet that goes by the pseudonym "Ace of Spades." This guy has a wicked wit.

Ace of Spades sent out this tweet as if he is quoting Comey. These are Ace of Spades' words—an interpretation of the testimony today—he says, Comey: Loretta Lynch told me to lie and I didn't write that down, but I wrote down Trump's stuff because I was afraid he would lie.

Wow. It has got the networks all stirred up that former FBI Director Comey came in today and actually exposed the disloyalty to the President of the United States, to the Constitution, to the things he swore to uphold and protect.

Let's look at one other thing I hadn't heard anybody else mention. When you have an attorney as the FBI Director and he is talking to the President of the United States, there is a privilege involved there. Even the least modicum of loyalty and honor and integrity would cause someone who is taking an oath as an attorney, someone who has taken an oath as Director of the FBI, someone that knows their boss is the President and that all power is in the President for the executive branch and the FBI Director entirely gets his power from the President, it would be some smidgeon of honor to want to protect those private conversations.

As far as we know, they weren't classified, but it is something called privilege, it is something called loyalty, and it is something called honor.

The testimony we heard today was the former FBI Director saying: When it came to President Trump, I wasn't going to honor our privileged conversations. I wasn't going to honor the executive privilege. I wasn't going to honor the fact that my power as FBI Director and the authority to investigate someone or not investigate someone is derived entirely from the President of the

United States. I will honor a person that tells me to misrepresent the truth, but I am not going to honor someone who is concerned about fairness.

Even though the FBI Director knows better than most anyone else there is no evidence of collusion between the Russians and Donald Trump, there is no evidence of collusion with anybody in the Trump administration at this time, yet there was no sense of loyalty there.

Think of Shakespeare's words and the sarcasm of Marc Antony. Brutus says he is an honorable man. They are all honorable men. These are honorable people who told me to misrepresent the truth to the American people and to the press. These are people that love me because I leak things.

I was hoping for one question that I should have contacted one of my Senator friends and told them to ask, because I would like to know the truth. I know that my Democratic friends were so furious, just livid at Comey when, just days before the election, he announces he is reopening the investigation.

The rumor around here was that there were FBI agents who had been investigating and they knew that Hillary Clinton had violated the law all kinds of ways. Intent was not an issue. She had taken classified material into an unclassified computer and sent it to unclassified computers.

Comey said: Clean bill of health. Everything is good.

And they knew it wasn't good. So when they saw this was the rumor floating around, I would like to know the truth.

You know some FBI agents had to have found Anthony Weiner's computer and found tens of thousands of emails that we were told had been destroyed. Oh, we can't get those tens of thousands of emails. They are gone. And then they found them. Not only were they not in a classified area, not in a SCIF, not in a classified connection, laptop, not even in a government employee's laptop. They were on the laptop of someone who had shown the worst judgment in the world.

You want to talk about the potential for blackmailing—although, probably by this time, I don't know what you would have to come up with to blackmail him, because it is pretty well all out there. Nonetheless, all of these emails were found that were supposed to be gone. There is absolutely no question that some of them came to Hillary Clinton, were sent to an unclassified setting, and now, not only that, they are in the hands of Anthony Weiner, who has had his own criminal justice issues.

The rumor continued that we had such honorable FBI agents that they said, in essence: Mr. Director, clearly, this is criminal material and evidence.

If you don't announce you are reopening the investigation, we are going to resign, have a press conference, and show the world that you have been covering for Hillary Clinton the whole time.

Now, that was the rumor. If that were true, and, under those type circumstances, Director Comey then rushes out just days before the election and said, I am reopening the investigation because we found these emails, then that would make sense. He certainly would want FBI agents to completely destroy any election chances just days before the election of Hillary Clinton.

If Director Comey went out and said: I am reopening the investigation, even though Republicans were rejoicing and Democrats were livid, as I pointed out to someone back at the time in the media, I guess it could hurt Hillary Clinton.

But if Director Comey comes out a day or two before the election and says there is nothing here, clean bill of health, Hillary Clinton is great, no problems, when we knew he didn't have time, nobody had time to adequately review the tens of thousands of emails, you could run a few algorithms. Real law enforcement means looking at the evidence line by line—I have known people who did it; I have done it in a civil setting—until you find the smoking gun. But you have got to go through the monotony of reviewing each of those.

□ 1845

They had no time to do that, and yet former Director Comey came out, clean bill of health. It could not have been discerned in that amount of time like that. So it appeared pretty clearly the reason he said we are reopening the case was so he could say we closed it, to eliminate any chance of even a non-FBI person who comes forward and says, you know, there are classified emails that ended up on Anthony Weiner's computer that came from Hillary Clinton, to Huma, and to Weiner. There were crimes here, and the FBI Director is covering for him. That would likely have brought down Hillary Clinton much worse than the defeat she suffered.

So it is just interesting, but, Mr. Speaker, the irony with which former Director Comey's testimony drips this evening is that our President, Donald J. Trump, he has got good gut instincts. He had concerns that former Director Comey was disloyal, was manipulative, that he may be someone that the United States Government should not trust, and it turns out President Trump's gut instincts were exactly right.

He committed no crime. That has become clear. And so now we expect we will see the media and my friends on the other side of the aisle quit talking

about Russia—there is nothing there, there has been nothing there—unless we start looking at potential prosecution for taking millions and millions of dollars from owners of Uranium One, who gave those to the Clinton Foundation, which then again ended up benefiting the Clinton family, and Hillary Clinton then approves Russia getting around 25 percent of our uranium production, to the potential detriment and, possibly in future altercations, death of Americans at the hands of the uranium that Hillary Clinton profited from potentially mightily, even if it wasn't directly, and yet America suffered.

Look, it is time to talk about real crimes, investigate real crimes, investigate racketeer influence of corrupt organizations that would pay for people to commit violence at Trump events. Now we are talking.

America deserves better, and thank God we are going to have a new FBI Director. Former Director Comey did some good things while at the FBI, but, unfortunately, we saw the extent that politics tainted the Director today.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 12, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1547. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule; Delay of Effective Date [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0183; FRL-9963-34] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1548. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Erie County, PA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8481] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1549. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency

and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fans [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045] (RIN: 1904-AD28) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1550. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048] (RIN: 1904-AD37) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1551. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated-Purpose Pool Pumps [EERE-2015-BT-STD-0008] (RIN: 1904-AD52) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1552. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Tennessee's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Davidson, Rutherford, Sumner, Williamson, and Wilson Counties; and Minor Technical Corrections for Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standards in Other Areas [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0631; FRL-9963-54-OAR] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1553. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Nevada Air Plan Revisions, Clark County Department of Air Quality and Washoe County Health District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0653; FRL-9963-43-Region 9] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1554. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0318; FRL-9960-07-Region 9] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1555. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming; Negative Declarations [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0171; FRL-9963-21-Region 8] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1556. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Nevada, Lake Tahoe; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0399; FRL-9963-25-Region 9] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1557. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; CT; Approval of Single Source Orders; Correction [EPA-R01-OAR-2016-0648; A-1-FRL-9962-83-Region 1] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1558. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Main Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0196] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1559. A letter from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, St. Louis, MO [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0319] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1560. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Stuart, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0167] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1561. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tall Ships Charleston, Cooper River, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0121] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1562. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River 323.0-325.0, Huntsville, AL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0336] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1563. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Breakers to Bridge Paddle Festival, Lake Superior, Keweenaw Waterway, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0170] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1564. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, St. Louis, MO [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0312] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1565. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; United Illuminating Company Housatonic River Crossing Project; Housatonic River, Milford and Stratford, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0825] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1566. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Annually Recurring Events in Coast Guard Southeastern New England Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2016-1022] (RIN: 1625-AA08; AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1567. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Buffalo Carnival; Buffalo Outer Harbor, Buffalo, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0408] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1568. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Niagara River at Niagara Falls, New York [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0492] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1569. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, Temporary Anchorages and Safety Zones: Sail Boston 2017; Port of Boston, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0949] (RIN: 1625-AA08; AA01; AA87) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1570. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; East River, Brooklyn, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0434] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1571. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal State Unemployment Compensation Program; Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 Provision on Establishing Appropriate Occupations for Drug

Testing of Unemployment Compensation Applicants (RIN: 1205-AB63) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1572. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2017-38 (Rev. Proc. 2017-38) (RP-113603-17) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1573. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Credit for Renewable Electricity Production and Refined Coal Production, and Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor and Reference Prices for Calendar Year 2017 [Notice 2017-33] received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1574. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration; 2017 Section 45Q Inflation Adjustment Factor [Notice 2017-32] received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1575. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's final sequestration report for fiscal year 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 904(f)(1); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 254 (as amended by Public Law 112-25, Sec. 103); (125 Stat. 246) (H. Doc. No. 115—46); to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2823. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that retirement investors receive advice in their best interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. REED, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 2824. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 2825. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the

Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 2826. A bill to provide for an annual adjustment of the number of admissible refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr.

WALZ, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HECK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MENG, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BEYER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KIND, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend and expand the membership of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans to include veterans who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 2828. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 2829. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen enforcement of spousal court-ordered property distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 2830. A bill to authorize methane leak detection and mitigation research activities by the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 2831. A bill to improve the port and maritime security functions of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. BRAT, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2832. A bill to help individuals receiving assistance under means-tested welfare programs obtain self-sufficiency, to provide information on total spending on means-tested welfare programs, to provide an overall spending limit on means-tested welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 2833. A bill to require the President to assess the effects of the sale or export of major defense equipment to countries in the Middle East on the qualitative military edge of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 2834. A bill to improve the well-being of, and improve permanency outcomes for, children and families affected by heroin, opioids, and other substance abuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to waive the guarantee fee for loans of not more than \$150,000 provided to veterans and spouses of veterans under the Export Working Capital, International Trade, and Export Express programs; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for hurricane and tornado mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2837. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant family of members of the uniformed services temporary annual leave during the deployment of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2838. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure access to acupuncturist services through the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2839. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure access to qualified acupuncturist services for military members and military dependents, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure access to acupuncturist services through the Department of Veterans Affairs, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under the Medicare program; to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the appointment of qualified acupuncturists as officers in the commissioned Regular Corps and the Ready Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for

consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. LEE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOEBESACK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to ensure that each individual who provides identifying information to the State motor vehicle authority is automatically registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless the individual does not meet the eligibility requirements for registering to vote in such elections or declines to be registered to vote in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 2841. A bill to prevent a person who has been convicted of a misdemeanor hate crime, or received an enhanced sentence for a misdemeanor because of hate or bias in its commission, from obtaining a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2842. A bill to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 2843. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a comprehensive and nationwide system to evaluate the quality of care provided to beneficiaries of Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program and to provide incentives for voluntary quality improvement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2844. A bill to authorize 2 additional district judgeships for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESSTER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POLIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2845. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to support early college high schools and dual or concurrent enrollment programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2846. A bill to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FASO (for himself, Mr. REED, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2847. A bill to make improvements to the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and related provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow qualified entrepreneurs to temporarily defer Federal student loan payments after starting a new business; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 2849. A bill to provide emergency tax relief for persons affected by severe storms and flooding occurring in Louisiana; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 2850. A bill to establish the Military Resale Patron Benefits Advisory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 2851. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues are to be regulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to

be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2852. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require certain tax exempt organizations to certify that foreign funds will not be used to make any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make qualified biogas property and qualified manure resource recovery property eligible for the energy credit and to permit new clean renewable energy bonds to finance qualified biogas property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PALLONE):



H.R. 2854. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to permit an individual who is subject to a requirement to present identification as a condition of voting in an election for Federal office to meet such requirement by presenting a sworn written statement attesting to the individual's identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 2855. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to enhance Social Security benefits and maintain the commitment and the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 2856. A bill to provide for nonpreemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 2857. A bill to support foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 2858. A bill to establish a task force to review policies and measures to promote, and to develop best practices for, reduction of short-lived climate pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2859. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish demonstration projects for competency-based education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2860. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit American Indian tribal councils to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Social Security to obtain social security coverage for services performed by tribal council members; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2861. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide incentives for States to accept professional credentials related to

military training and skills that are obtained by members of the Armed Forces while serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 2862. A bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2863. A bill to provide for consistent and reliable authority and funding to meet conservation and deferred maintenance needs affecting lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H.R. 2864. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to allow certain issuers to be exempt from registration requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employer-provided job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 2866. A bill to review and improve licensing standards for placement in a relative foster family home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 2867. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a pilot program to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2868. A bill to protect National Flood Insurance Program policyholders from unreasonable premium rates and to require the Program to consider the unique characteristics of urban properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

56. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 126, designating May 2017 as "Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

57. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 78, endorsing Taiwan's participation as an observer in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, International Civil Aviation Organization, World Health Organization, and International Criminal Police Organization, and supporting the 24th anniversary of sister-state relations between the State of Hawaii and Taiwan Province of the Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution No. 35, supporting the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

59. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

60. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 2, to express support for the construction of a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and urge the President and Congress of the United States to fully fund the project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

61. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 25-34 (COR), expressing support for the passage of H.R. 809, the "Fighting For Orange-Stricken Territories In Eastern Regions (Foster) Act"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas introduced a bill (H.R. 2869) for the relief of Enrique Soriano and Areli Soriano; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 2824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 2827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 2828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress may enact laws necessary and proper to the execution of its enumerated powers. As this legislation solely amends the amount of time available for execution of previously granted authority, it is merely technical in nature and an appropriate exercise of Congress' authority to amend its previous actions through necessary and proper statutes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 2830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to interstate commerce)

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 2831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 2832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 2835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, under the "Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises".

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority to law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 2842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 9, which states "The Congress shall have Power . . . To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court."

Article III, Section 1 states that "The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the

United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 2847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEGOS:

H.R. 2848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

—Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, Congress has the authority to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1—All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 2856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of US Constitution

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 2864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) (1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives,

the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 2866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 2867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution ("The Congress shall have the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization . . .").

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 38: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 76: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 102: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 103: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 113: Mr. EVANS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 305: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 358: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 367: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 389: Mr. KIND and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 398: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 535: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 539: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 635: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 646: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 664: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 667: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 669: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 747: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. VELA, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 758: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 770: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 790: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 816: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 820: Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 830: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 848: Mr. COMER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 849: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. TORRES, Ms.

MC SALLY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 850: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 852: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 873: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 909: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 927: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 930: Mr. KEATING, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 931: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 959: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 964: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 996: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1017: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 1090: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1094: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1098: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 1120: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1143: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1164: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1225: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1231: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1239: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1243: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1247: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1267: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1311: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GALLEGOS, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1316: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 1318: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1322: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1358: Mr. DEFazio and Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 1368: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1415: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1422: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1441: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1444: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GALLEGOS, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1484: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1494: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1519: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1552: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1566: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1626: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1645: Mr. EMMER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1649: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1661: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1671: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1681: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1697: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1698: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1699: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1712: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1719: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1727: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1734: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.  
H.R. 1777: Mr. LAHOOD.  
H.R. 1802: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 1810: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio and Mr. COFFMAN.  
H.R. 1825: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. EMMER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1847: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.  
H.R. 1874: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MESSER.  
H.R. 1904: Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 1920: Mr. MEEHAN.  
H.R. 1953: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 1955: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 1988: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BERA, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2011: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H.R. 2062: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 2063: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2091: Mr. DESANTIS.  
H.R. 2147: Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
H.R. 2148: Mr. BARR.  
H.R. 2149: Mr. POSEY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTEMBERGER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. KING of Iowa.  
H.R. 2158: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 2207: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 2224: Mr. HUDSON.  
H.R. 2248: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 2260: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 2262: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 2307: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
H.R. 2309: Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BOST, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H.R. 2318: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2322: Mr. MAST.  
H.R. 2340: Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 2370: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
H.R. 2387: Mr. PALLONE.  
H.R. 2392: Mrs. TORRES and Mrs. BEATTY.  
H.R. 2414: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2421: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. HECK.  
H.R. 2422: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2428: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 2431: Mr. RATCLIFFE.  
H.R. 2432: Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
H.R. 2452: Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 2476: Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 2484: Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 2495: Mr. CRIST, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SHUSTER, and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 2505: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.  
H.R. 2514: Mrs. DEMINGS.  
H.R. 2519: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
H.R. 2523: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 2526: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.  
H.R. 2532: Mr. TAKANO and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
H.R. 2544: Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2550: Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 2583: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2587: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 2589: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 2591: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 2598: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H.R. 2603: Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 2640: Mr. RUSH, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 2645: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 2652: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 2659: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. ROSS.  
H.R. 2660: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
H.R. 2668: Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 2670: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.  
H.R. 2690: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H.R. 2703: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
H.R. 2713: Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 2715: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2723: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. PALMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.  
H.R. 2729: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. JAYAPAL.  
H.R. 2746: Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 2748: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2756: Ms. DELAULO.  
H.R. 2759: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2760: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2761: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2762: Mr. WALZ and Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 2765: Mr. MAST.  
H.R. 2777: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 2788: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H.R. 2790: Ms. TENNEY and Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 2796: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 2804: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2820: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. HULTGREN.  
H.R. 2822: Mr. DUNN.  
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. SCALISE.  
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. MITCHELL.  
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. HARRIS.  
H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H. Con. Res. 62: Mrs. NOEM.  
H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MENG.  
H. Res. 58: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. KING of New York.  
H. Res. 128: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. RASKIN.

H. Res. 188: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H. Res. 199: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.  
H. Res. 201: Mr. SCHNEIDER.  
H. Res. 256: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 274: Ms. DELBENE.  
H. Res. 307: Mr. MITCHELL.  
H. Res. 317: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. STEWART.  
H. Res. 318: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H. Res. 319: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H. Res. 370: Mr. KILMER, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

49. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Mayor and City Commission of Miami Beach, FL, relative to Resolution No. 2017-29870, supporting United States Senate Bill 928, and related House Bill 2119, creating the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act of 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

50. Also, a petition of the Council of the City of Warren, OH, relative to Resolution No. 4615/17, urging Ohio's Governor, General Assembly, and the Congressional Delegation to declare the opiate epidemic an emergency, prioritizing the need of Ohioans impacted by opioid addiction by dramatically increasing investments in prevention, treatment, recovery support, education, and interdiction efforts to end this epidemic; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

51. Also, a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, Texas, relative to urging Congress to enact legislation that would establish uniform nationwide infrastructure and procedures for the holding of a Convention to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution, pursuant to Article V; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

52. Also, a petition of the City Council of Walker, LA, relative to a Resolution, urging Congress to pass destination rate-based legislation that would give states the option to collect from remote online retailers the same tax that local brick-and-mortar merchants currently collect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

53. Also, a petition of the Town of Shutesbury, MA, relative to a Resolution, calling on the Massachusetts Legislature and the United States Congress to implement Carbon Fee and Dividend (or "Rebate"), placing a steadily rising fee on carbon-based fuels, and returning all fees collected, minus administrative costs, to households; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Ms. ESHOO on H.R. 305: Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING VICTORIA MOYER  
ARDEN

**HON. JARED HUFFMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Victoria (Vicki) Moyer Arden on her retirement as the Fine Arts Program Coordinator at Oak Grove Union School District in Sonoma County after over 16 years of exceptional service.

Born in Reading, Pennsylvania and raised in Madison, Connecticut, Ms. Arden received her Bachelor's degree from Towson State University and a Master's in Art Education from the University of New Mexico. In 2001, she and her family moved to Sebastopol where she has resided ever since.

During her tenure at Oak Grove Union School District, Ms. Arden developed a robust and comprehensive Fine Arts program that is a model for elementary and middle schools everywhere. She is well-regarded by her colleagues, students and their families for her passion for instilling a meaningful love of art in her students. She dedicated her entire professional career to supporting and promoting quality education for Sonoma students, where the fundamental subjects always included a well-rounded fine arts program. Her skills, talent and energy helped Oak Grove Elementary receive two prestigious California Distinguished School awards during her tenure there, among other distinctions.

Her philosophy that, "arts offer students a unique language to explore ideas, feelings, subject matter, and cultures" was realized by numerous students over the years, many of whom will be grateful for this influence for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing deep appreciation for Ms. Arden's extraordinary service to our public school children, and thank her for the indelible marks she has undoubtedly left on the thousands of students she has educated over the years, as well as her own two children, Paul and Gabe, and her husband John, and extend to her best wishes on her retirement.

MCKENNA GUBANICH

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud McKenna Gubanich for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

McKenna Gubanich is a student at Faith Christian Academy and received this award

because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by McKenna Gubanich is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to McKenna Gubanich for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO DOCTORS WILLIAM  
DESTLER AND REBECCA JOHN-  
SON OF THE ROCHESTER INSTI-  
TUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

**HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the service of two members of the Rochester, New York community, Rochester Institute of Technology President William Destler and his wife Doctor Rebecca Johnson, Associate of the University.

The Rochester area is home to an intelligent and curious community, thanks to residents who have dedicated their lives to the advancement of higher education. Doctors Destler and Johnson are no exception and thanks to their efforts, Rochester continues to be home to some of the finest institutes of higher learning that have produced notable alumni for generations.

Assuming the Presidency in 2007, Doctor Destler became responsible for a world-renowned university that includes nearly 19,000 students from all 50 states and more than 100 foreign nations. One hundred and twenty one thousand alumni around the world are proud to call RIT their alma mater and, at one point, Rochester as their home. RIT is also the third largest producer of undergraduate degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math among all private universities in the United States.

During his tenure as President, Doctor Destler recognized the symbiotic relationship between RIT and the city of Rochester, serving on multiple civic engagement boards including the Greater Rochester Chamber of Commerce and the Golisano Family Foundation. Leading his students by example, Doctor Destler is an international authority on high-power microwave sources and is best known for his pioneering work in the collective acceleration of heavy ions. Under his watch, female enrollment has increased 25 percent and international enrollment has increased an astounding

120 percent. Forty-one percent of the freshman class is deaf and hard of hearing, international and African, Asian, Latino, and Native American. These numbers alone are a testament to the strength through diversity of RIT.

Doctor Destler is one-half of an unparalleled team. He is joined by his wife, Doctor Rebecca Johnson, Associate of the University. In a time when bipartisan discussion is often contentious, Doctor Johnson has served on the committee for the Gray Matter series, which aims to promote civil discussion of divergent views on important topics. She is also the former president of the Board of Directors of the M.K. Gandhi Institute for Nonviolence and continues to serve on the board in leadership roles. Her passion also extends to civic engagement, best demonstrated through initiatives such as RIT's 2016 "Roar the Vote." Thanks to her efforts, RIT has made impressive strides toward energy sustainability through programs like the greenRITnetwork and FoodShare.

Over the course of their ten-year term, Doctors Destler and Johnson have truly come to embody the mantra of RIT, "The making of a living and the living of life." It is with sincere appreciation that we thank Doctors Destler and Johnson for their selfless dedication to higher education, RIT, and the proud city of Rochester. We wish them the best in their future endeavors and affirm that they will always be at home in our community.

HONORING SERGEANT JOE MOSS

**HON. JEB HENSARLING**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Sergeant Joe Moss for his courageous service to our country. Sergeant Moss grew up in Kerens, Texas where he was drafted by the United States Army.

Sergeant Moss grew up in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, which I have the privilege of representing. After he graduated from Malakoff High School, he began his service in the infantry for the Army during the Vietnam War. During his brave and valiant service to our country he was severely injured. As the squad leader, Sergeant Moss' platoon came in contact with a land mine while on a maneuver. Two of Sergeant Moss' fellow soldiers were killed and several, including himself, were injured. Sergeant Moss lost both of his legs in the explosion, something that would dramatically change his life; it didn't however, change who Sergeant Moss truly was.

There is no doubt that his selfless service to our country saved many lives while in Vietnam. He has helped countless veterans returning from battle by selflessly giving his time

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

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

and sharing his own experiences to mentor and support those who have fought for our country. While Sergeant Moss returned home in a wheelchair, he did not allow that to confine his tenacious spirit. Thirteen years after he returned, Sergeant Moss, along with a few friends who were also paraplegics, succeeded in climbing the rocky Guadalupe Peak—Texas' highest mountain which reaches 8,751 feet above sea level. The next day, President Ronald Reagan called to congratulate Sergeant Moss. Sergeant Moss is an inspiration and deserves to be honored. I know Sergeant Moss and his fellow soldiers did not all receive the return they truly deserved. So for Sergeant Moss and others, welcome home and thank you.

Humbly, I echo the words of President Ronald Reagan, "We will always remember. We will always be proud. We will always be prepared, so we will always be free." And humbly, I offer my sincere gratitude to Sergeant Joe Moss for his service and acts of bravery that allow us the freedoms we enjoy today.

#### OPPOSITION OF U.S. WITHDRAWAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

#### HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to President Trump's misguided decision to withdraw America from the Paris Climate Agreement. This agreement, which was negotiated and signed by President Obama, was a strong step in the right direction to combat climate change. The deal developed goals to reduce carbon pollution by increasing energy efficiency and investing in energy research and development.

Joining Syria and Nicaragua, the United States is now one of three countries not participating in this groundbreaking pact of 195 nations. With this decision, President Trump has chosen to relinquish America's position as a leader in global environmental policy and thus, forfeits the United States from technological advancements and solar jobs that would drive our global economic growth. To retreat from the world stage gives other countries, such as China and Russia, the opportunity to gain universal influence.

Moreover, President Trump's decision to break America's promise on energy commitment with no plan in place to reduce our carbon footprint jeopardizes our progress toward a more sustainable energy future. Because of the lack of leadership in the White House, citizens across our nation must rely on city and state officials to lead their communities in an effort to combat climate change.

More than 200 mayors from around the United States have joined the Mayors National Climate Action Agenda to adopt, honor, and uphold the commitments to the goals enshrined in the Paris Agreement as well as strengthen local efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I am proud to say that Birmingham Mayor William Bell has joined this initiative.

Our constituents deserve a responsible energy strategy that meets our obligation to pro-

tect the environment for future generations. This strategy should also include a proposed plan to eradicate environmental injustice, an issue that affects many Americans today, including citizens of my district.

For example, Perry County is a largely African American community in Alabama where coal ash from around the country is dumped. Time and time again, we see that communities of color, as well as the poor, are burdened with the negative health outcomes that stem from exposure to pollution and industrial waste.

America deserves a President that will work to establish an energy policy that will position the United States as an energy independent country that also leads the world toward a sustainable future.

#### HONORING DR. KARI MOE

#### HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2017

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the public service of Kari Moe, my Chief of Staff for over 10 years.

When I was first elected to Congress, many of my friends and colleagues said the one thing I had to do was hire a great Chief of Staff. Kari has been more than great—she has been irreplaceable.

Kari Moe met my personal hero and a mentor, Senator Paul Wellstone, when she was a freshman at Carleton College, where he was a professor. When the college's conservative administration moved not to renew Senator Wellstone's contract in 1975, Kari organized campus protests to grant him tenure. Kari and her fellow activists were victorious, and Wellstone was granted tenure.

That event marked the beginning of a long and successful career in organizing and leadership. Soon after graduating, she moved to Chicago to work for another personal hero, Harold Washington, the city's first black Mayor.

After Paul Wellstone won his Senate race in 1990, he called Kari to ask her to join his team in D.C. As Senator Wellstone's Chief, she helped achieve many progressive victories and helped develop staffers with her signature nurturing leadership style.

Kari has exceeded all expectations in her role as lead staffer for my office. She has, perhaps more than anyone, shaped my Congressional career. She helped us serve the 5th Congressional District, advance our policy agenda, and build the work of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. We have worked together every step of the way and I have appreciated her leadership. I will miss her and know she will continue to advance our agenda in her future work with young leaders.

She will be remembered in my office for her strength, empathy and leadership, always urging staff to act with purpose, and to remember that real change doesn't come from the top—it comes from empowering people at the grass roots.

I thank her for her service and will miss her in my office.

#### RECOGNIZING MIKE CHRISTOPHER ON HIS RETIREMENT AFTER 40 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

#### HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2017

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mike Christopher, a devoted public servant in Franklin County, Pennsylvania. Mike is retiring after 40 years of dedicated public service as supervisor of Washington Township.

Mike was born March 18, 1952 and graduated from Penn State University in 1975 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Environment Resource Management. He married his wife Andrea on May 15, 1976, and began working for Washington Township the next year as Supervisor. In 1993, Mike began serving as the Township Treasurer as well as Supervisor.

Mike is one of those outstanding individuals who is a true public servant, Mr. Speaker, and he didn't stop with working for his local community full time. He's served on numerous boards and committees in the Waynesboro area and Franklin County including the YMCA Board of Directors and Building Committee, as President of the Greater Waynesboro Chamber of Commerce, and as Secretary for the Waynesboro Area Drug Education Consortium. He is also the founder of the Franklin County Crime Solvers Board.

I am certainly not the first to recognize Mike for his outstanding service. In addition to much recognition throughout his career, just this year he was awarded the Chairman's Distinguished Service Award at the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors 95th Annual Conference in Hershey.

Mr. Speaker, Mike's willingness to serve his community and Pennsylvania sets him apart as an outstanding individual and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Mike on his retirement and wishing him nothing but continued success.

#### MICKAYLA CUNNINGHAM

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mickayla Cunningham for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Mickayla Cunningham is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Mickayla Cunningham is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.



I extend my deepest congratulations to Mickayla Cunningham for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

HONORING THE LIFE OF  
BALDOMERO VELA SR

**HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of prominent Rio Grande Valley businessman, Baldomero Vela Sr., who passed away on Friday, June 2, 2017.

Baldomero, or "Baldo," as he was known to friends and family, was born and raised in Hidalgo, Texas. After graduating from McAllen High School, he enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1944, serving in the 29th Infantry Division during World War II. He then attended the University of Texas at Austin, graduating in 1949 with a degree in pharmaceuticals.

Following graduation, Baldo was a pharmacist for 50 years in the Rio Grande Valley. In 1957, Baldo opened the Professional Pharmacy in McAllen, Texas. In the 1970s, he purchased Lee's Pharmacy, which is now owned and operated by two of his five children. In addition to his role as a pharmacist, Baldo was deeply involved in a number of community organizations, including the Hidalgo Lions Club, Knights of Columbus, McAllen Public Utilities Board and McAllen Housing Services.

Baldomero will be remembered as a kind and generous man, whose contributions to his community will not be easily forgotten. His generous spirit will live on in the Rio Grande Valley, leaving those he loved better for having known him.

Mr. Speaker, South Texas lost a strong community member this month. He embodied the values of diligence, selflessness, and service. He will be sorely missed.

---

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF STEPHANIE BARBER GETER AS SHE RECEIVES THE MEDGAR EVERS AWARD FROM THE BUFFALO BRANCH OF THE NAACP

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stephanie Barber Geter, recipient of The Medgar Evers Award at the NAACP—Buffalo Chapter's Medgar Evers Dinner. Ms. Geter has dedicated much of her life to serving others, especially the people of Western New York. She has left a lasting impact on our community by putting others before herself and combining her skills with compassion to improve the lives of others.

Ms. Geter served as Senior Vice President of Funds Distribution & Community Initiatives

at the United Way of Buffalo & Erie County. In this role, she distributed approximately \$25 million annually to agency providers and community partners which played a vital role in community development within Western New York. Ms. Geter's tireless work for the United Way of Buffalo & Erie County has improved the quality of life of countless members of our community, and presented so many individuals with opportunities they would not have had without her.

The extensive background in community service Ms. Geter possesses speaks volumes to her drive to make a positive impact on the world. She has experience working in the legislative service branch of government, neighborhood housing programs and youth job services. Ms. Geter has served diligently on numerous non-profit boards, community and government committees and oversight groups as well.

Currently, Ms. Geter works at Buffalo State College as Director of the Head Start Partnership. As Director, she is a mentor and teacher to Head Start teachers who go on to help children. In addition, Ms. Geter serves as the President of the Hamlin Park Taxpayers Association, Board Chair of Restoring Our Community Coalition, Board Chair of Elim Community Corporation, and is on the Board of the WNY Food Bank. As the Board Chair of Restoring Our Community Coalition, she has used her leadership to revitalize neighborhoods along Humboldt Parkway in Buffalo, NY. Ms. Geter has worked with Elim Community Corporation, a bible-based ministry that offers worship to many in our community. In her role on the Board of the WNY Food Bank, Ms. Geter organized and helped provide services vital to the people of Western New York. The impacts of her work can be seen in many different forms. While Ms. Geter has been involved in many different causes and organizations, one constant is her devotion to people in Western New York.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the time to recognize the remarkable work Ms. Stephanie Geter has done for the Western New York Community. Ms. Geter has truly dedicated her life to helping the people of Buffalo & Erie County. Stephanie's devotion to serving others is admirable and I would like to congratulate her on receiving the Medgar Evers Award.

---

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR  
ROBERT LEE SIMMONS II

**HON. MAC THORNBERRY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express appreciation for the work of Robert Lee Simmons II, Staff Director of the House Armed Services Committee. True confession—I don't like goodbyes, and I'm not very good at them. So I wrote down a few things I want to say and then will yield to others.

Bob Simmons has been a superb leader of the House Armed Services Committee staff for 12 years, across four chairmen. That longevity

and continued confidence in him as chairmen come and go, as Committee members come and go, as the challenges that our military and our country face come and too often stay, is pretty remarkable, especially in the business we are in.

I would say his greatest achievement is that he assembled, led, and inspired an outstanding group of people to give their best for our country through not only changing security challenges, but through changing political environments. And he has always operated in light of the unique responsibilities that the Constitution places on Congress as a separate, independent branch of government. Our system is messy, difficult, usually inefficient—as Churchill said, it "is the worst form of government except for all of the others that have ever been tried."

Over the years, Bob has spent the hours, incurred the headaches, the time in the car, the frustrations of dealing with knucklehead Members like me with the next great idea. And he has done all of that with patience and a cheerful disposition—usually. He has made this Committee, and helped make this Congress and this system of government, work. And our nation has benefited.

I believe that there is nothing more noble to which men and women can devote their lives than to the protection of their fellow citizens and the security of our nation. Bob Simmons has devoted his life to that cause, first in industry, then with us, now back to industry. But it has always been the same cause. And the guiding light has always been what's the right thing to do for our country, and for the men and women who serve it.

Everyone who serves in jobs like these does so at some sacrifice to family. And so I want to thank Donna and Rob for sharing Bob with us these 12 years and for understanding the missed anniversaries and birthdays. We were on quite a roll there for a while.

On behalf of the men and women who have been privileged enough to serve in this room at some point over the past 12 years, we are incredibly grateful for the opportunity to work with Bob, for what you have done for us, and for all you have done for that most noble cause.

---

HONORING CAPTAIN JERRY LYNN  
TATE

**HON. JEB HENSARLING**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Captain Jerry Lynn Tate for his courageous service to our country. While Captain Tate enjoys his retirement in Mabank, Texas, his exemplary military career leaves a far-reaching legacy of true, American exceptionalism.

Captain Tate joined the United States Army after graduating from the University of Oklahoma's Army ROTC. He was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in January of 1967.

Upon basic training and studies, Captain Tate was an instructor in the Armor School of Topographic Studies at Fort Knox. He went on

to earn his Army Aviator Wings and received 18 Air Medals for meritorious achievement while participating in flight support for combat ground forces throughout the Republic of Vietnam. As a pilot as well as an instructor in the Grumman OV-1 Mohawk, Captain Tate flew 945 hours and 315 missions in combat. He also received both the 1,000 and 2,000 hour plaque from Grumman Aerospace, commemorating his accident-free flying hours. There is no doubt that Captain Tate saved countless lives during his outstanding service to our country.

His acts of bravery were commemorated with many awards and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal. Upon his release from active duty as an instructor pilot and flight commander at Fort Rucker, Captain Tate went on to have a successful career as a pilot for Delta Air Lines for 33 years.

Humbly, I echo the words of President Ronald Reagan, "We will always remember. We will always be proud. We will always be prepared, so we will always be free." And humbly, I offer my sincere gratitude to Captain Jerry Lynn Tate for his service and acts of bravery that allow us the freedoms we enjoy today.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANDREA  
LUNA CERVANTES' RECEIPT OF  
THE 2017 HAMILTON SCHOLARS  
AWARD

**HON. PAUL A. GOSAR**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Ms. Andrea Luna Cervantes of Prescott, Arizona. Andrea is an accomplished and dedicated student who has devoted tremendous amounts of time and energy to her studies and to improving her community. I am excited to announce that Andrea is one of 35 national recipients of the 2017 Hamilton Scholars Award for outstanding academic accomplishments and community service. Her work ethic, academic aptitude and ability to connect with people of all ages renders her receipt of this award no surprise.

Currently, Andrea is a rising senior at Yuma High School, where she is well on her way to becoming a productive service leader. In reaching this point, she has overcome many hardships through determination and a supportive community. I fully expect she will continue to grow into a productive and engaged citizen—exactly the kind of leader our society is in need of.

Those who know Andrea recognize that she has the natural ability to reach out and connect with people of all backgrounds. Included amongst her work in the community is her service as the Vice President of Junior State of America (JSA)—an American non-partisan youth organization that helps high school students acquire leadership skills and the requisite skills to be effective debaters and civic participants. She also serves as the President of her chapter of the National Honor Society—an academic membership-based organization that fosters a commitment to academic excel-

lence. Andrea has competed at high levels of debate moderation and math competitions, and was a participant in the selective Yuma Youth Leadership Program.

Andrea is an ambitious, high-achieving young woman. She embodies the characteristics which, when cultivated, give rise to the best of our society's leaders. It is an honor of mine to recognize this Hamilton Scholar, and I expect only the best from Andrea's future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BRIAN BABIN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 7, I joined the Vice-President for an important event at Johnson Space Center in my congressional district. As a result, I missed the following recorded votes:

On roll call Number 288, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 374, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 289, agreeing to House Resolution 374, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 290, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 375, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 291, agreeing to House Resolution 375, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 292, the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 293, passage of an amendment to H.R. 2213, had I been present I would have voted "no."

On roll call Number 294, passage of H.R. 2213, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

I am pleased that my colleagues in the House voted to pass the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017 that will enable the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to fulfill its duty to protect the American people by waiving specific pre-employment requirements for certain qualified candidates to make the hiring process more expedient. The CBP is currently understaffed below its congressionally mandated level and this bill will help alleviate this staffing shortage.

DULLES HIGH SCIENCE TEAM  
GOES FAR IN NATIONAL COM-  
PETITION

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dulles High School of Sugar Land, TX, for placing in the top 16 at the 2017 National Science Bowl Competition hosted by the U.S. Department of Energy.

The National Science Bowl is a prestigious academic competition that brings together

thousands of middle and high school students from across the country. Students compete by solving technical problems and answering questions on a range of topics, such as biology, chemistry, earth and space science, physics and math. From January to March, regional elimination tournaments were held across the country. The top 111 teams from the regional competitions earned the opportunity to compete at the National Science Bowl. Dulles High School made it to the top 16, winning \$1000 for their school's science department. The team members included: Andrew Liu, Shree Mohan, Shreyas Balaji, Anish Patel, Abin Antony, Coach Judy Matney and Coach Chandra Mohan.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Dulles High School for earning a top 16 spot at the National Science Bowl. We're proud to have them represent TX-22 and look forward to seeing their future accomplishments.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISH-  
MENTS OF ANTHONY WILEY JR.  
AS HE RECEIVES THE YOUTH  
AWARD FROM THE BUFFALO  
BRANCH OF THE NAACP

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor the accomplishments of Mr. Anthony Wiley Jr., as he receives the Youth Award, which has been awarded to him by the Buffalo Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He is deserving of this award due to his involvement with his local Boy Scout Troop, and his volunteer work for churches throughout his community.

Anthony has been involved with community service as a member of his Boy Scout troop throughout his life, and has been promoted to an Assistant Scoutmaster of Troop 237. He attained this honor by earning his merit badges through service-oriented and camping experiences, and was further awarded the rank of Eagle Scout for his hard work and dedication.

Some of Anthony's achievements as a Boy Scout include performing his role as Crew Leader on an eighty-two mile journey at Philmont Scout Ranch in New Mexico, acting as a Patrol Leader and later as a Senior Patrol member, and becoming a member of the Arrow of the Arrow. His Eagle Scout Project involved supervising the building of a new supply cabinet for his church. Notably, he spent a total of 105 hours to complete this project, and was acknowledged and rewarded by the Eagle Scout board of review on December 22, 2015.

Anthony has shown dedication to the Scout Oath, exhibiting an exemplary sense of duty and admirable mental and moral aptitude. He is extensively involved with his community, as shown by his attendance at the Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church, where he plays the drums, volunteers regularly in the food pantry, and helps those who run the church in their

duties by tending to the sanctuary in the evenings.

He is a graduate of Tapestry Charter High School, where he was a member of the Thunder Hawks Varsity Basketball Team and of the school band.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor Mr. Anthony Wiley Jr. for his hard work and his dedication to his community. I wish him the best in his future endeavors and look forward to seeing how he will continue to serve others.

#### GOREVILLE HS GIRLS SOFTBALL

### HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the achievements of the Goreville Black Cats softball team, which earlier this month brought home the Illinois Class 1A State Championship.

The Black Cats put together a 26–8 season this year, swept through the regional and the sectional, and knocked off two of the state's top teams at the state finals in order to claim the title. The team beat Hardin-Calhoun 2–0 in extra innings in the championship game.

These student-athletes and their coaches have represented themselves, their school, and their community in a first-rate fashion. I join with the other Members of this House in congratulating them and wishing them all the best in their future academic and athletic endeavors.

Congratulations to: team members Katie Schuetz, Camille Green, Shayna Elms, Morgan Dunning, Alexandria King, Payton Sopczak, Adrianna Licka, Cheyenne Walker, Summar Albright (C), Kiara Miller, Breanna Stout, Camren Anderson (C), Macy Goins, Samantha Licka, Kelsey Ray; coaches and staff Steve Webb—Superintendent, Jeri Miller—Principal, Christina King—Assistant Principal, Todd Tripp—Athletic Director, Shanna Massey—Head Coach, Brooke Merrill—Assistant Coach, and Mandy Schuetz—Scorekeeper.

#### RECOGNIZING LOGAN LEE FOR HIS STATE TITLE AS THE 1A 220-POUND ILLINOIS STATE WRESTLING CHAMPION

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Logan Lee, a sophomore at Orion High School, for being named the Class 1A 220-pound Illinois State Champion in wrestling.

Logan Lee claimed a 12–9 victory at the Illinois State Wrestling Championship, and I would like to recognize Logan for his tremendous accomplishment. Logan's dedication and passion for his sport allowed him to overcome a difficult season, and a state bracket that in-

cluded the top seed in his path. As a former athlete, I understand the hard work and dedication that goes into being awarded such a title. Logan has dedicated himself to his sport, and shows us all the value of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent our community throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Logan Lee on his title, and I join the rest of our community in wishing him every success in the future.

#### HONORING FRANK B. MESIAH AS HE RECEIVES THE PRESIDENT'S AWARD FROM THE BUFFALO CHAPTER OF THE NAACP

### HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional service of civil rights and social justice pioneer Frank B. Mesiah as the former president of the Buffalo Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) as he is presented with the President's Award at the NAACP Annual Medgar Evers Dinner.

Frank Mesiah is from Buffalo's West Side and a graduate of Grover Cleveland High School, in the Buffalo Public School system he would later fight to integrate. He earned his Bachelor's and Master's degrees from Buffalo State College and worked as both a Buffalo police officer, Buffalo teacher, and at the New York State Department of Labor to support his wife and three daughters.

After serving our nation and earning an honorable discharge from the United States Army in the 1950's, Frank worked tirelessly to further the civil rights movement in the city of Buffalo. Under his leadership, the local NAACP chapter saw many successes in the public sector, notably in the city's police force and the public education system.

Frank diligently played the role of watchdog in the community by exposing racism and discrimination. Through the work of the NAACP, the Buffalo Public Schools were desegregated, thanks in no small part to Frank's efforts. He also fought for reforms in the Buffalo police force to ensure black and white officers were treated equally in the workplace. The NAACP also advanced black teachers and administrators in public schools.

In addition to striving for improvements for people of color in the city of Buffalo, Frank fought for the rights of women, senior citizens, and the gay and lesbian community. Buffalo is indebted to his remarkable determination and steadfast resolve. While much work remains to be done, Frank's work and the battles fought by the NAACP under his leadership have created a better place for us all.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to highlight the tremendous service of Frank Mesiah and the Buffalo Chapter of the NAACP. Our city is so grateful for his dedication to civil rights. I wish him the absolute best in all his future endeavors.

#### RECOGNIZING GREG J. FEERE UPON HIS RETIREMENT

### HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Greg J. Feere upon his retirement from the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council. Mr. Feere has been an extraordinary community leader at the Building Trades Council and throughout Contra Costa County.

During his tenure as Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Mr. Feere also served as a Commissioner for the Contra Costa County Fish & Wildlife and as a Trustee of Contra Costa College. Prior to his work with the Building Trades Council, Greg was the youngest Business Manager for Asbestos Workers Local 16 to be elected in 100 years of the Local's history.

During his 30 years of service as CEO of the Council, Greg was elected uncontested for his seven terms, which reflects his accomplished tenure. Some highlights of his achievements include designing the first Community Outreach Program in Northern California to create training and job opportunities for women, minorities and economically disadvantaged workers, doubling the Council's membership in two and a half years, at a time when other unions were losing members and development and promotion of the Best Employee Safety Team (B.E.S.T.) program used at Shell refinery, which set a national safety record of 4 million hours worked without a lost time accident; for which Shell refinery received the Business Roundtable National Safety Award.

Mr. Feere's rich legacy is filled with positive impacts on working families and the less fortunate for those living in Contra Costa County and beyond. I wish Greg all of the best in his retirement.

Congratulations to Greg on a remarkable legacy of service in Contra Costa.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF JAMES JACOBS FOR HIS OUTSTANDING CAREER WITH MACOMB COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. James Jacobs for his work on behalf of Macomb Community College. Mr. Jacobs has been a tireless advocate for the college and higher education during his presidency and career with MCC.

After graduating from Princeton with a degree in politics, Dr. Jacobs began his career with MCC as a professor in economics, where he specialized in occupational education and suburban economic development. After several decades of teaching, Dr. Jacobs moved into MCC's administration in 1994. During his time, he also worked with the Community College Research Center at Columbia University,

where he directed efforts on addressing issues facing community colleges throughout the country. In 2008, Dr. Jacobs was named President of MCC and served in this position until this year. During his tenure, Dr. Jacobs spearheaded a number of initiatives to grow and modernize the college, including expanding its training and vocational education programs to provide students in the community with in demand skillsets. These efforts have helped solidify MCC as a leader in workforce development and training.

Dr. Jacobs' decades of service with MCC has helped create a nationally renowned institution that effectively serves the needs of the Southeast Michigan community. Throughout his time as President, Dr. Jacobs has grown and expanded the college's workforce development and entrepreneurship offering, including the Innovation Fund Macomb Community College, which provides assistance to early-stage companies and entrepreneurs. His long-term planning has led to national recognition for MCC, including visits by President Obama and other state leaders. This legacy of excellence has helped drive economic development and provide a quality education to countless students, and Dr. Jacobs' leadership will be missed as he moves on from his current position.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. James Jacobs for his distinguished career with Macomb Community College. Dr. Jacobs' work with MCC has been critical to the development of southeast Michigan and the education of its workforce.

---

MONICA VALIENTE

---

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Monica Valiente for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Monica Valiente is a student at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Monica Valiente is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Monica Valiente for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF THE  
FALLEN SOLDIER ARMY SER-  
GEANT (SGT) CHRISTOPHER  
ROGER BELL

---

**HON. TRENT KELLY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen soldier Army Sergeant (SGT) Christopher Roger Bell who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on June 4, 2011, during Operation Enduring Freedom. SGT Bell was killed when an improvised explosive device hit his convoy in Laghman Province, Afghanistan. Also killed were Sergeant (SGT) Joshua David Powell, Sergeant (SGT) Devin Arielle Snyder, and Specialist (SPC) Robert Lee Voakes, Jr.

SGT Bell was assigned to the 164th Military Police Company, 793rd Military Police Battalion, 3rd Maneuver Enhancement Brigade of Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska.

SGT Bell, a Golden, Mississippi native, was 21 years old at the time of death. He joined the Army in July 2008 after graduating from Tremont High School in Tremont, Mississippi, and served at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, before being stationed in Alaska in January 2009.

"If he saw that someone needed help, he did not hesitate to step in and lend a hand," said Robert Worthington. "He always put others before himself. SGT Bell strived for perfection in every aspect of life, and knowing that perfection was out of reach, he still never stopped trying."

He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart and Good Conduct Medal, NATO Medal, and Combat Action Badge. He was also awarded the National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Combat and Special Skill Badge, Basic Marksmanship Qualification Badge, and Overseas Service Bar.

On June 17, 2011, SGT Bell was buried with full military honors at the Living Faith Tabernacle Cemetery in Columbus, Mississippi.

SGT Bell is survived by his wife, Samantha Lucas Bell; daughter, Lana Nicole Bell; his parents, Timothy and Barbara Bell; and brothers, Zachary and Timothy Bell. He is also survived by his maternal grandparents, James and Mary Wooten; his paternal grandmother, Judith Pitcher; his mother and father-in-law, Vera and Roger Lucas; and his brother-in-law, Roger Lucas.

SGT Bell's service and sacrifice will always be remembered.

HONORING NATIONAL CANCER  
SURVIVORS DAY AND THE  
SALISBURY VISITING NURSE AS-  
SOCIATION

---

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Cancer Survivors Day and to honor the cancer survivors and medical professionals gathered in Salisbury, Connecticut who are champions in the fight against cancer.

Cancer has touched all of our lives in some way, and there are more than 15 million survivors in our country. Whether we have seen family, friends, or neighbors fight the disease, they have shown us tremendous courage and fortitude. Their perseverance and commitment to a living fully after diagnosis is an inspiration to us all. Today's celebration in Salisbury makes a powerful statement about our community's commitment to those in need of support and our goal to improve the lives of those who have been diagnosed.

In Connecticut, we are lucky to have leaders in medical treatment and patient care. The Salisbury Visiting Nurse Association has been serving the people of northwestern Connecticut for over a century. These professionals both provide high quality care to patients and address their personal needs, often ensuring they can remain in the safety and comfort of their own home. It is dedicated health care professionals like these who support cancer patients and their families through treatment and to lead a fulfilling life. Each day, the nurses, social workers, and health care professionals of our community make a difference in the lives of our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, National Cancer Survivors Day is a global event that reminds us of the courage shown by cancer patients and of the everyday compassion that helps those who have been diagnosed. It is fitting and proper that we honor the survivors and care providers gathered in Salisbury, Connecticut today and celebrate their lives and work.

---

HONORING STEVE HARDY

---

**HON. JOHN GARAMENDI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Mayor Steve Hardy, a beloved member of the Vacaville community, who passed away this May.

Mr. Hardy was born in San Francisco, and served six years in the Navy from 1960 to 1966 as a radar operator on a destroyer. He then returned home and worked as a San Francisco police officer for five years before leaving that position to become a public policy specialist in Sacramento.

He served as the Staff Director for the California State Senate Committee on Governmental Organization for 19 years. From 1980 to 1985, Mr. Hardy was an advocate for the

California State Employees Association, the union of California's state workers.

Mr. Hardy served as Chairman of the Solano County Drug Abuse Advisory Council in 1978 and 1979, and as a member of the Vacaville Human Services Commission from 1977 through 1979.

He also served as a Vacaville Unified School Board Member from 1987 through 1991 where, among other positions, he served as its President. Mr. Hardy was elected to the Vacaville City Council in 2002, where he served two terms. In 2007 he was appointed director of the state Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control by then-Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, which led to his stepping down as a city council member. He was elected Mayor of Vacaville in 2010 and served one term.

Mayor Hardy was an excellent representative for the Vacaville community. He helped lead the city through the Great Recession, improve local surface transportation, and was always able to take a principled approach to the most critical challenges and decisions the Council faced.

Steve Hardy's loss leaves a major void in the community. Mr. Hardy's wife of 46 years, Jerri Hardy, passed away in March 2012. He is survived by a son, Stephen; and a daughter, Shannon. The Vacaville community mourns Steve's passing and remembers his selfless commitment to the community.

IN RECOGNITION OF SAINT  
PARIZE-LE-CHÂTEL, FRANCE

**HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the people of Saint Parize-le-Châtel, France as they commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the arrival of American troops during World War I.

During the Great War, Saint Parize-le-Châtel was the location of the Mars-sur-Allier Army Hospital which housed more than 40,000 wounded soldiers while it was in operation. Thus a deep and abiding relationship was established and continues to embody the close bond that the United States and France have maintained since the American Revolution.

This year, on the 100th Anniversary of the arrival of American troops to their town, the people of Saint Parize-le-Châtel are coming together to inaugurate a memorial that is dedicated to American servicemen and women who cared for their wounded comrades in arms at Mars-sur-Allier. The commitment of the Saint Parize-le-Châtel community to preserving and celebrating this history is a testament to the deeply held values of liberty, equality, and fraternity by both French and Americans alike. It is at times like this when we should all take a moment to remember and thank those who have risen, time and again, to defend these shared values throughout history.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Saint Parize-le-Châtel on this joyous occasion. I ask

that my colleagues join me in thanking Mayor André Garcia and the Council of Saint Parize-le-Châtel for their efforts in organizing this historic commemoration.

HONORING THE CAREER OF TIFFANY RENEE' LEWIS AS SHE RECEIVES THE DANIEL R. ACKER COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD FROM THE BUFFALO CHAPTER OF THE NAACP

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor the outstanding works of Ms. Tiffany Renee' Lewis, as she receives the distinguished Daniel R. Acker Community Service Award from the Buffalo Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Her contributions to the community of Buffalo are numerous, including her ownership of the Skin Deep Beauty Spa, her volunteer work for The American Cancer Society's "Look Good Feel Better" Program, her work as a realtor for Realty USA and as a marketing assistant for Watts Architecture and Engineering, and her development of the youth mentorship program, "Confident Girl," which she launched in 2016.

Through her volunteer work with The American Cancer Society's Look Good Feel Better Program, she has provided invaluable assistance to those who are suffering by helping cancer patients to look and feel their best. She is uniquely qualified for this service, as she received her Esthetics license from The Salon Professional Academy, receiving top honor for her hard work. She then further pursued her Certification in Clinical Oncology Esthetics through the Skin Therapy Institute, making her the first African American female to do so in the Western New York Region. Notably, she trained in Washington, D.C., with First Lady Michelle Obama's Personal Esthetician JoEllie Lee in June of 2014, earning a Certificate in Dealing with Multicultural Skin. Her dedication has allowed her to become a celebrity esthetician, speaker, educator and mentor who specializes in the health and wellness of the skin. In addition to her honorable work with cancer patients, she has also demonstrated her preeminence in her field through her work with celebrities, professional athletes and world renowned artistic directors. She also offers guidance by contributing to magazine and newspaper articles, as well as radio shows. She is now a highly-regarded expert in the field of Esthetics.

Ms. Lewis also holds a dual degree in Legal and Religious Studies, and has spent more than twelve years working within the community on various development programs. She combined her extensive experiences in community organizing and the beneficial social effects of Esthetics to create the "Confident Girl" Mentoring Program, which works to empower youth, teens and young adults in New York. The program serves over thirty young people in the Advantage After-School Program in Niagara Falls, New York, by helping them to

pursue self-discovery and wholesome developmental strategies. She works to promote feelings of self-confidence and self-worth in those who might otherwise feel marginalized. She teaches children and young adults about the importance of taking care of their minds, bodies and spirits. Simultaneously, she advocates for the youth members of her community, and continues to learn and develop ever-improving methods of Esthetic care and community development.

Formerly Ms. Lewis served as Vice-Chair for the Buffalo Promise Neighborhood Community Council, and has been a member of the National Notary Association, the Buffalo Niagara Association of Realtors, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the National Association of Realtors.

A native of Memphis, Tennessee, Ms. Lewis moved with her family to Buffalo, New York, at a young age. The Buffalo community is extremely grateful to her for her hard work and her contributions to the overall health of its members.

Ms. Lewis has been recognized for her accomplishments many times before, earning the Trailblazer Award by the program "Women Making History," the Women of Influence Award by Buffalo Business First, the New York State Award for Public Policy, the Volunteer of the Year Award for her community service with the developmentally disabled, a Volunteer Award by the Buffalo Promise Neighborhood, and many more.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor Ms. Tiffany Renee' Lewis for her inspirational dedication to the community. She has proven herself to be an extraordinarily intelligent and accomplished woman, and I wish her the best in her future endeavors.

CORBIN WINS KATY TOMPKIN  
HIGH'S FIRST STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mason Corbin of Katy, TX, for winning the state championship title in the Boys High Jump 6A division at the University Interscholastic League Track and Field State Meet.

Most people spend years training to win a state championship and then there is Mason. The Katy Tompkin High School junior tried out for track and field in February for the first time at the recommendation of a friend, even though he's been an avid basketball player since seventh grade. Mason won his first high jump meet in March by clearing 6-7 and went on to prove he can compete with the best by clearing 6-10 (and breaking a personal record) at the District 19-6A championships. He's currently ranked 15th in the nation and will compete at the New Balance Outdoor Nationals in the elite meet this June in North Carolina. We wish him good luck.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again

to Mason for winning the state championship. We're proud of his quick success and look forward to seeing him do well in his upcoming meets.

MIGUEL NUNEZ

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Miguel Nunez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Miguel Nunez is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Miguel Nunez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Miguel Nunez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

### HONOR FLIGHT OF OREGON

### HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize twenty-five World War II veterans from Oregon who visited their memorial on the National Mall on Friday, June 9, 2017 through Honor Flight of Oregon. Every time I have the chance to meet one of these heroes from the "Greatest Generation," I am reminded of the poignant words of General Dwight D. Eisenhower. In a message to Allied troops just before D-Day, he said, "The eyes of the world are upon you. The hopes and prayers of liberty loving people everywhere march with you."

He was right then, of course, Mr. Speaker. But over seventy years later, liberty loving people everywhere continue to owe—these heroes for their extraordinary service and their incredible stories of sacrifice and bravery on behalf of our country. That's why it is my privilege to enter their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

The veterans on this Honor Flight from Oregon are as follows: Robert Turkisher, Air Force; Curtis Lyon, Army Air Force; Benny Ashbaugh, Army; Lloyd Bert Baldwin, Army; Fred Feigner, Army; Albert Wellman, Army; Kenneth Williams, Army; Helen Bennett, Women's Army Corps; Frank White, Army and Navy; Jack Rickard, Marine Corps; Ray Rigutto, Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve; Duane Amundson, Navy; Theodore Bennett, Navy; Rudolph Fenk, Navy; Frank

Kline, Navy; Robert Martin, Navy; Thomas McAllisterr, Navy; Andrew Naylor, Navy; Julene Peterson, Navy; John Sefren, Navy; Samuel Sorrels, Navy; Quentin Smith, Navy; Dan Smith, Navy; Donald Warneke, Navy; Santo Regalbuto, Navy Reserve.

These twenty-five heroes join the over 150,000 veterans who have been honored through the Honor Flight Network of volunteers nationwide since 2005.

I also want to thank and recognize the guardians and group leaders on this flight, as well as the dedicated Board Members of Honor Flight of Oregon, who worked so hard to make this trip happen.

Mr. Speaker, at the height of the Civil War in 1863, President Abraham Lincoln wrote, "Honor to the Soldier, and Sailor everywhere, who bravely bears his country's cause." Each of us in this Chamber and in this Nation should be humbled by the courage of these brave veterans who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country.

### WELCOMING THE ROMANIAN PRESIDENT TO THE UNITED STATES

### HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to welcome Romanian President Klaus Iohannis to our Nation's Capital, and I look forward to personally meeting with him this evening. Two days ago, President Iohannis placed a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery, honoring the memory of our service members. Tomorrow, he is meeting with President Trump and other American officials. Romania is a stalwart U.S. partner and an important member of the NATO Alliance. It hosts the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System at Deveselu military base, which protects NATO members from ballistic missile threats originating from the Middle East.

Romania has also been a staunch American ally in global counterterrorism operations against ISIS and Al Qaeda, collaborating on intelligence-sharing initiatives to support U.S. and NATO operations. The Romanian armed forces have supported U.S. and NATO missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters for over a decade, contributing more than 30,000 total combat and support personnel. With over 600 troops currently serving in Afghanistan, Romania maintains the fourth largest NATO contingent protecting vital U.S. security interests and the safety of Afghan communities and international forces.

I join all my colleagues in welcoming a true friend, Romanian President Klaus Iohannis.

### COMMENDING COLONEL ANTHONY MITCHELL

### HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Colonel Anthony Mitchell for his efforts as Commander of the St. Louis District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Before his command ends in June of 2017, he will have overseen nearly \$200 million in civil works water resource planning, design, construction, and regulatory functions in the states of Illinois and Missouri.

Mitchell began his duties as the 51st Commander of the St. Louis District in 2014 and has since then worked to provide leadership and direction to more than 700 military and civilian personnel, functioning to provide water resource engineering solutions to the 300 miles of the Mississippi watershed above the Ohio River.

Aside from his accomplishments in engineering, Mitchell's military decorations are praiseworthy as well. Featuring two Bronze Star Medals; the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, four Meritorious Service Medals, two Army Commendation Medals, four Army Achievement Medals, the Parachutist Badge and the Army Engineer Association's Bronze de Fleury Medal. Additionally, in 2012 Mitchell was recognized as the Black Engineer of the Year Award Recipient for Professional Achievement in Government. These awards are truly a testament to Mitchell and the level of dedication he puts in to his work.

Colonel Mitchell's commitment to the St. Louis District has undoubtedly contributed to the Mississippi Valley Region's excellence and I congratulate him on his many achievements and thank him for his work.

NEVAEH JENSEN

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Nevaeh Jensen for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Nevaeh Jensen is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Nevaeh Jensen is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Nevaeh Jensen for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.



RECOGNIZING THE BROWARD  
EDUCATION FOUNDATION

**HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorees of the Broward Education Foundation for their efforts to make the Broward County Public School system one of the best in the state. These men and women have served Broward County with distinction through their efforts, and they have demonstrated a commitment to improving our public schools in South Florida.

The Broward Education Foundation helps to provide the students of Broward County with an exceptional education, enabling them to reach their greatest potential. The scholarships provided by the Foundation will enable 190 students this year alone to pursue their goals of higher education.

I express deep appreciation for the Broward Education Foundation's important work. Their dedication has truly changed lives by providing students the educational tools they need to achieve success. I thank them for their work and service.

HONORING BOB PESTONI

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bob Pestoni upon the occasion of celebrating 125 years of family winemaking in the Napa Valley.

A native of St. Helena, California, Mr. Pestoni graduated from St. Helena High School before attending Napa Valley College and then joining the U.S. Army. Mr. Pestoni is the descendant of the Pestino and Domingos winemaking families.

Mr. Pestoni's great-great-grandfather, Albino Pestoni, immigrated to Napa Valley from a small village in Switzerland near the Italian border in 1892. Ten years later, he, his wife Maria Madonna, and their four sons established Bonded Winery 935. One of those sons, Henry, formed a vineyard management crew and planted and managed vineyards throughout the upper Napa Valley. He learned how soil, sunlight, rootstock, and varietal selection could affect fruit quality, and, along with his wife Lena, he owned and operated Old Mill Winery from 1933 to 1958.

Mr. Pestoni and his brother Marvin used their foundation in sustainable farming to establish Upper Valley Disposal Service in 1963. Paying the same careful attention to the soil as their ancestors did, the brothers offered composting as a solution to our local wine community's discarded grape skin, pulp, seeds, and stems. Upper Valley Disposal and Recycling has been very successful, inspiring our community to refer to Mr. Pestoni as the "King of Compost."

After many years of growing winegrapes for other wine producers, Mr. Pestoni and his

wife, Sylvia, opened the doors of Rutherford Grove Winery in 1994. This year, in celebration of their family's 125th anniversary of Napa Valley Winemaking, the winery was renamed Pestoni Family Estate Winery.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Pestoni and his family before him have made single vineyard, handcrafted wines for 125 years. They are my friends. I am proud that this hardworking man and family do so much for our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

TRIAD HS GIRLS SOCCER

**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding sports team from southern Illinois. The Triad High School Women's Soccer team won the Illinois Class 2A state championship on June 3, defeating Wheaton Academy 5-4. After 100 minutes of scoreless play the Lady Nights began to make goals and fight off their competitors' shots resulting in their State Title.

The Lady Nights from Troy, Illinois, put together a 22-6 record en route to the championship, defeating rivals and earning one small victory at a time.

My congratulations go to: Madisyn Staufer, Jody Ellis, Kalie Gibbs, Madison Mell, Madeline Keller, Jordyn Besserman, Hailey Busche, Chelsea Riden, Meaghan Smith (C), Samantha Bassler (C), Ashley Newcombe, Sydney Thomas, Eryn Fanning, Chloe Scott, Erynn Little (C), Sydney Beach, Katie Rogers, Jordan Wilson, Sierra Schlemmer, Rebecca Byrd, Morgan Bohnenstiehl (C), Molly Suess, Mercedes King and coaches and staff Matt Bettlach—Varsity Head Coach, Jim Jackson—Varsity Assistant Coach, Heather Seger—Junior Varsity Coach, and Bailey Stack—Freshman Coach.

NICOLE DERWENT

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Nicole Derwent for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Nicole Derwent is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Nicole Derwent is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Nicole Derwent for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PEARLAND TEACHER AWARDED  
NATIONAL FELLOWSHIP

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Daniel Clason of Pearland, TX, for being awarded a Fellowship by the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation of Alexandria, VA.

A social studies teacher at KIPP Spirit College Prep, Daniel is one of 53 people nationwide to receive this fellowship. The James Madison Fellowship recognizes promising and distinguished teachers, while supporting further study of American history and government by those who want to teach related courses in secondary schools. The fellowship will fund up to \$24,000 of Daniel's master's degree, which is focused on the history and principles of the U.S. Constitution. This will allow Daniel to pursue a more in depth education, which he can pass on to his students.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Daniel for being awarded the James Madison Fellowship. Our students will greatly benefit from his hard work and will grow up to be defenders of the U.S. Constitution.

RECOGNIZING TYLER FLEETWOOD  
FOR HIS TITLE AS THE CLASS  
1A 120-POUND ILLINOIS STATE  
WRESTLING CHAMPION

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Tyler Fleetwood, for being named the Class 1A 120-pound Illinois State Champion in wrestling.

Tyler Fleetwood is now Fulton High School's first two-time state champion with an 11-5 victory over Aurora Christian in a 120-pound title match, and I would like to recognize Tyler for his tremendous accomplishment. Tyler's dedication and passion for wrestling secured him the state championship title yet again, and a state bracket that included the top seed in his path. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of commitment and hard work it takes to be awarded such a title. Tyler is an example of the importance and value of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud that there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent our community throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Tyler Fleetwood on his title, and I join the rest of our community in wishing him every success in the future.

HONORING KANASHA BLUE AS SHE RECEIVES THE RUFUS FRAZIER HUMAN SERVICES AWARD FROM THE BUFFALO CHAPTER OF THE NAACP

### HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to recognize Kanasha Blue's service to others. Ms. Blue's years of work in public service have earned her the Rufus Frazier Human Services Award at the NAACP—Buffalo Chapter's Medgar Evers award dinner.

A native of Montego Bay, Jamaica, Ms. Blue has made improving the lives of others a fundamental component of her life. She has resided in Buffalo, NY since 1997 and is a Veteran of Operation Enduring Freedom as well as a retired Staff Sergeant of the New York Army National Guard.

In addition to her commendable and brave service in our military, Ms. Blue is impressive in her willingness to go above and beyond what is asked of her. While deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Ms. Blue organized a drive for personal care items and clothing for local workers in need that helped close to 100 people meet their basic personal care needs. Recently, she supported deployed troops with a personal care item drive that resulted in hundreds of dollars in products being donated to the noble cause. These are just a few examples of Ms. Blue actively searching for opportunities to help others.

Ms. Blue volunteers with the Second Baptist Church Food Pantry, Lambda Pi Upsilon Sorority, Inc., and the Buffalo/Niagara Mentorship Program. She has used her leadership skills to bring about positive change in the lives of countless individuals. Her ability to lead and impact others led her to serve as President of Second Baptist Church Missionary/Deaconess Ministry, Third Vice Commander of the American Legion Jesse Clipper Post 430, Executive Committee member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and Co-Chair of the Young Adult Action Committee (YAAC).

Other accomplishments by Ms. Blue include her Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice from SUNY Buffalo State and a Master's Degree in Public Administration from Marist College. She enjoys spending time with her husband of two years, Robert Blue.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to take the time to recognize the great work Ms. Kanasha Blue has done for the Western New York community and people throughout the world. Her generosity and dedication are admirable and I wish her the best in all her future endeavors.

TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

### HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in my district. Specifically, this legislation will provide for a "commencement of construction" deadline extension for the Enloe Dam Hydroelectric Project that is being developed in Washington State by the Okanogan Public Utility District.

On July 9, 2013, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) granted the Okanogan Public Utility District an original license for the Enloe Dam Hydroelectric Project, which will be located at the existing Enloe Dam that is situated about 3.5 miles northwest of the City of Oroville in the State of Washington. The current Enloe Dam was constructed in 1920 on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land for power generation. However, operations ceased in 1958 when the extension of Bonneville Power Administration's high voltage transmission line into the Okanogan Valley provided a less expensive source of electricity. The proposed Enloe Dam Hydroelectric Project makes economic and environmental sense, as it will convert currently untapped energy in existing flow releases into clean, renewable energy.

The Enloe Dam Hydroelectric Project will have a footprint that is roughly half the size of the existing facility but will provide approximately three times the generating capacity of the decommissioned plant. Completion of the Project will provide Washingtonians and the Pacific Northwest region with a clean, renewable energy resource that generates an estimated 45,000 megawatt hours per year of carbon-free, renewable power. Additionally, the proposed project will create jobs and needed employment opportunities in a region with an unemployment rate that far exceeds the national average, underscoring the many positive benefits this project will have for the local community, state, and region.

The legislation will allow for development of this critical hydropower facility to move forward under a realistic regulatory timeline and in a manner consistent with prior congressional actions on similar projects. By passing this measure and extending the commencement of construction deadline for the Enloe Dam Hydroelectric Project, Congress can help spur hydropower development in Central Washington and ensure the Project's many benefits are realized. For these reasons I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation, which will have a positive and lasting impact on the region's energy supply and economic viability.

RECOGNIZING RABBI MICHAEL C. SIMON

### HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Rabbi Michael C. Simon to the Jewish community and the South Florida community at large.

For thirteen years, Temple Beth Kodesh in Boynton Beach, Florida has been blessed by Rabbi Simon's wisdom and leadership. Thirteen is a spiritually meaningful number in Judaism, repeated numerous times throughout the Torah, oral law, and liturgy. I would like to join the congregation in celebrating Rabbi Simon's milestone.

In addition to his leadership of the congregation, Rabbi Simon is the author of a book that focuses on Jewish life from a variety of different perspectives, and is an Adjunct Professor of Rabbinics at Gratz College and an Adjunct Professor of Jewish History at Florida Atlantic University.

I congratulate Rabbi Simon and his family for their exemplary service to the Jewish community in South Florida, and wish them many years of health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING GLAD TIDINGS CHURCH AND BISHOP JERRY WAYNE MACKLIN ON THEIR FIVE POINT CELEBRATION

### HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Glad Tidings Church of God in Christ on its "Five Point Celebration" and the congregation's continued service to our community.

Glad Tidings Church, celebrating its 39th anniversary, has been an anchor for the people of South Hayward, California since its establishment in 1978. Founder Bishop Jerry Wayne Macklin has worked tirelessly with local schools, government agencies, and nonprofit organizations to transform a neighborhood once overrun by drugs and crime into a community of faith and opportunity.

The efforts of Bishop Macklin and his congregation are to be honored at their upcoming "Five Point Celebration". The four-day event will celebrate the Church's 39th anniversary, the making of the final payment on the property's mortgage agreement, the groundbreaking of the Chester McGlockton Wellness and Family Life Center, the Inaugural Episcopal Elevation of Bishop Macklin as 2nd Assistant Presiding Bishop of Church of God and Christ, and last, but not least, the 65th birthday of Bishop Macklin.

Today, under Bishop Macklin's compassionate leadership, Glad Tidings Church has helped change perspectives on what a place of worship can offer its community. Bishop Macklin has sought to provide accessible

healthcare through its Health and Wellness Department, organized food drives for our vulnerable citizens, and secured affordable housing for those most in need.

These and countless other examples are what make Glad Tidings Church of God in Christ a pillar of our community and worthy of our recognition today. I want to thank Bishop Macklin and Glad Tidings devoted congregation for the positive impact their services have created in our community, and I offer my heartfelt congratulations during this time of celebration.

PATIENCE ADAMS

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Patience Adams for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Patience Adams is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Patience Adams is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Patience Adams for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING JOAN CLAYBROOK ON  
HER 80TH BIRTHDAY

**HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend, Joan Claybrook, on her 80th birthday on June 12th.

Joan has dedicated her life to improving the health and safety of all Americans. She served as president of Public Citizen from 1982 until 2009, where she led efforts to make our roads safer, protects our civil rights and liberties, and reform our campaign finance system. During the Carter Administration, she was appointed Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Joan is the recipient of numerous distinguished service awards for her tireless commitment to consumer advocacy.

Today, Joan continues to serve on the boards of Public Citizen; Georgetown University Law Center; Citizens for Tax Justice; Public Justice; Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety; and Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways. She frequently writes articles published in the nation's major newspapers and has appeared on all major networks and hundreds of local and syndicated radio programs.

I've had the privilege of knowing Joan for many years and I can't think of a more dedicated, more passionate public servant. I continue to be amazed by her energy and grit. I have no doubt that the lives of millions of Americans are better, and safer, because of Joan's work. I'm proud to call her a friend and I wish her the happiest of birthdays.

HONORING MR. JOHN MILLINGTON

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the life of my friend Mr. John Millington and to recognize his extraordinary contributions to our nation's understanding of global affairs, and his public service to the State of Connecticut and the Town of Washington, Connecticut. John passed away on December 16, 2016 at the age of 90, after a long life of dedicated service.

John was born in Gwynedd Valley, Pennsylvania and developed a love of nature early in his life. He began working in publishing and embarked on a diverse career connecting his interests in global affairs and journalism. John began his career with Time, Inc., and later moved to Bangkok, Thailand to manage the Bangkok World newspaper. With his experience working in international journalism and publishing, John joined the Council on Foreign Relations to support the organization's business development and membership growth.

In addition to his distinguished career in journalism and foreign affairs, John was a well-known and active member of his community in Washington. A lifelong advocate for conservation and environmental issues, John chaired Connecticut's Council on Environmental Quality during Governor Weicker's administration and was an instrumental champion of the campaign to protect the Shepaug River. Locally, he served as a board member of the Washington Community Housing Trust. The Town of Washington recognized John's tremendous contributions and passion for service in 2014 with the Stephen Reich award, the town's highest honor for citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, John Millington led a remarkable career and enthusiastically lent his talents to improve Washington, Connecticut, and our country. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor his life and memory here today. John Millington was a friend and a mentor, and I miss his wise counsel. My condolences go out to his wife, Edwina, and to his children and grandchildren. Those of us who knew John will cherish his memory, and his legacy will live on in our community.

RECOGNIZING THE YOUNG MEN'S  
AND YOUNG WOMEN'S HEBREW  
ASSOCIATION

**HON. ADRIANO ESPAILLAT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Young Men's & Young Women's Hebrew Association (YM&YWWA)—colloquially known as the "Y"—of Washington Heights and Inwood. On this agency's centennial anniversary, I want to highlight the indelible impact this institution has impressed upon our children and adults in our community of all backgrounds over several generations in New York's 13th district.

Since its founding in 1917 the mission of the "Y" has never wavered. The tradition of tikkun olam—literally "repairing the world"—has been exemplified by the "Y" in its acts of kindness and community service. Staff and lifelong volunteers have always looked to their neighbors to evaluate the most pressing needs and find out the best way to serve the needs of the community. Over the last century, Washington Heights & Inwood has seen multiple changes to its composition and outward face. Each year, a group of Jewish and Dominican students work together to study the history of the Dominican Republic's immigration policies prior to WWII, making the country one of a few safe harbors for Jews fortunate enough to escape Germany.

What binds these diverse populations to New York's 13th district is the "Y" embracing the mantle of the Mother of Exiles as Emma Lazarus wrote in The New Colossus. In its early years, the "Y" dealt with the aftermath of World War I and World War II resettling refugees from abroad here in our community. During the 1970s, the "Y" aided Jewish refugees from Russia with the same urgency and compassion afforded earlier in the century. This is emblematic of its mission to meet the needs of the time and people which has never wavered.

Over the last 100 years that has included providing access to social services; offering English classes and citizenship tutoring; assisting those with mental health concerns; launching the first day camp for neighborhood children; developing a thriving nursery school; opening a center for new parents; building a 100-unit independent living facility for older adults and the mobility impaired and providing services to support older adults to age in place.

Today, the "Y" has embraced the diverse and multicultural tableau of New York's 13th district. All staff are trained in cultural diversity and services all offered in English, Spanish, and Russian. The commitment of the "Y" remains steadfast by expanding its after school program, senior center services, and establishment of a new Camp Twelve Trails program. Over the last century, the "Y" has continued to innovate and serve the needs of New York's 13th district.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to celebrate and commemorate the centennial anniversary of the YM&YWWA of Washington Heights and Inwood. I sincerely hope that all Members of

Congress will have the benefit of such an institution to one day laud and commemorate 100 years of service as I do today.

REINA GUTIERREZ

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Reina Gutierrez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Reina Gutierrez is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Reina Gutierrez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Reina Gutierrez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

FORT BEND SOFTBALL TEAM  
WINS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend Christian Academy (FBCA) softball team of Sugar Land for winning the Texas Association of Private and Parochial Schools (TAPPS) State Championship.

The FBCA softball team beat Dallas Christian 6–2 in the Division II final, concluding an incredible 24–8 season. Their season included an undefeated District 7 championship, along with complete domination in their four playoff games, outscoring opponents 37–2. The FBCA softball team isn't a stranger to winning though. Over the past 11 years, the FBCA softball team has won six TAPPS State Championships, including last year's 2016 title. That's great.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the FBCA softball team for winning (again) the TAPPS State Championship. We are so proud of all their hard work and look forward to next year's state championship.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. LEE M. ZELDIN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening June 6 I was not present for votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 287, and YEA on Roll Call No. 286.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CON-  
GREGATIONAL CHURCH OF  
SOUTH DENNIS

**HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 200th Anniversary of the Congregational Church of South Dennis in Massachusetts.

Founded in 1817 by a collection of sea captains, the Congregational Church of South Dennis today remains widely renowned as the Sea Captains' Church. Prior to its foundation, since 1795, a house of worship was built at the very location upon which the current building stands. From 1795 to 1817 the people of South Dennis shared ministers with North Dennis and Harwich. In 1817, the church received its first full-time minister, Reverend John Sanford, and was formally organized into the Congregational Church of South Dennis. Construction of the current building used by the church was completed in 1837.

The Congregational Church is further recognized for its unique feature—the oldest working organ in the United States. Built in 1762 by Swiss organ builder John Snetzler in London, England, very little is known regarding its journey to the United States. Historians confirm that it was acquired by the Congregational Church of South Dennis on September 22, 1854 for \$600—where it has remained for over 160 years and delights and moves listeners through its chords and music every Sunday.

Today, the Congregational Church is made up of an intimate, dedicated community of loving, caring, and welcoming neighbors. Part of the United Church of Christ, the church is led by Rev. Dr. Paul R Adkins. To celebrate this momentous occasion, the Congregational Church has organized a concert and guided tours of the meetinghouse and cemetery, which will showcase the church's fascinating history and ties to seafaring.

Mr. Speaker, the 200th Anniversary of the Congregational Church of South Dennis is testament to the culture of acceptance and grace exhibited by this community. I ask that you join me in recognizing this historic anniversary.

HONORING TYLER HORTON AS HE  
RECEIVES THE YOUTH AWARD  
FROM THE BUFFALO BRANCH OF  
THE NAACP

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the accomplishments of this year's recipient of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Buffalo Branch Youth Award, Tyler Horton.

Tyler was born and raised in Buffalo, and has always been a contributor to his community. At an early age Tyler displayed signs of leadership by becoming the Vice President of the National Junior Honors Society while attending Westminster Community Charter School, where he achieved the title of Valedictorian. At the age of 12 he became a Boy Scout, and later, an Assistant Scoutmaster for Troop 237, where he earned many merit awards and badges.

The lessons Tyler learned in his Boy Scouts troops truly molded him into an outstanding citizen. In 2012 he was a Chaplain and Assistant Patrol Leader at the Philmont Scout Ranch in New Mexico, where he was able to share his Scout experience, serving as a mentor to other young men. In 2016 Tyler supervised and assisted renovations of the Macedonia Baptist Church's food pantry. Through his example of volunteerism and leadership, Tyler eventually became an Eagle Scout and a Member of the Order of the Arrow. Tyler now attends Bethesda World Harvest International Church and contributes to the youth group and Cinematography Team.

This year, Tyler is graduating from Health Science Charter School, where he is the Salutatorian, a member of the National Honors Society, a winner of the Jesse Ketchum Memorial Fund Bronze winner, and a Student Ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor this impressive young man as he is recognized by the NAACP. I wish him the best in all his future endeavors and look forward to seeing him continue to do good for others.

IN RECOGNITION OF JONATHAN  
ALLEN'S FIRST ROUND SELEC-  
TION BY THE WASHINGTON RED-  
SKINS IN THE 2017 NFL DRAFT

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate Mr. Jonathan Allen, who was recently drafted in the first round of the 2017 National Football League draft by his hometown team, the Washington Redskins.

Mr. Allen is from Leesburg, Virginia and played football at Stone Bridge High School in Ashburn, Virginia. Under the leadership of his coach and mentor, Mickey Thompson, the team finished with winning seasons each year he was there, and after graduating in 2013, Mr. Allen attended the University of Alabama as a five-star recruit, where he was named to the first team All-Southeastern Conference during his sophomore, junior, and senior years. Additionally in 2016, as a junior, he was instrumental in Alabama's National Championship, in which they defeated the Clemson Tigers.

Mr. Allen has also won a number of individual accolades, including being named the Washington Post All-Met Player twice in high school, being selected as the 2012 Virginia Gatorade Player of the Year, and lastly being

recognized as a 2013 U.S. Army All-American. At the University of Alabama Mr. Allen's football career blossomed. He was named the 2016 SEC Defensive Player of the Year and was also the recipient of the Bronko Nagurski Trophy and the Chuck Bednarik Award, which are given to the best defensive player in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

With Mr. Allen signing a four year contract with the Redskins, he is truly returning home. The team's practice facility is located in Ashburn, Virginia, and Mr. Allen is especially ready to give back to his community through the local mentorship of Coach Thompson's Bulldogs at Stone Bridge High School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Jonathan Allen on becoming a Washington Redskins player. I commend him for his impressive accomplishments, and I am proud to represent him and wish him all the best in his NFL career.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-  
EN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY  
SERGEANT FIRST CLASS (SFC)  
CLARENCE DOUGLAS McSWAIN

**HON. TRENT KELLY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Army Sergeant First Class (SFC) Clarence Douglas McSwain who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on June 8, 2006, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SFC McSwain died from injuries he sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near his military vehicle during combat operations in Baghdad.

SFC McSwain, of Meridian, was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Fort Campbell, Kentucky.

SFC McSwain was a proud soldier on his third tour in Iraq when he was killed. He met his 4-month-old son, Kenneth, only once. SFC McSwain's Sister, Ashley McSwain, said her brother put his family first. She said it was bad that the world had to lose him because he was one of the good guys.

SFC McSwain's father, Reverend Theodis McSwain, recently reflected on his son's service.

"I was very proud of him," Rev. McSwain said. "He wanted to serve his country."

SFC McSwain, a 1993 Meridian High School graduate, played high school football and graduated with honors. After high school, he attended the University of Southern Mississippi according to the Associated Press article.

"I was a medic that worked with him in his first two rotations and I just found out about his death," Troy Criddle said. "I am hurt by his passing. He was a great soldier and will always be a paratrooper."

"Clarence and I had the opportunity of spending a lot of time together in the 1st PLT Company C 2nd Battalion 237th," Staff Sergeant (SSG) Shannon Corbin said. "I believe that he was a shaping catalyst in me both professionally and personally."

SFC McSwain is survived by his father and mother; Theodis and Sandra Lee McSwain; wife, Kendrah; children; Jasmin, Krista and Kenneth McSwain; and siblings; David, Ashley, Kimberly, and Christopher McSwain.

SFC McSwain proudly served our nation to protect the freedoms we all enjoy.

IN RECOGNITION OF NANCY KATZ  
AND MARGO DICHTELMILLER  
FOR THEIR LIFETIME OF ADVOCACY FOR LGBT RIGHTS

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nancy Katz and Margo Dichtelmiller for being recognized by the American Civil Liberties Union's LGBT Project for their advocacy and efforts on behalf of LGBT rights. Ms. Katz and Dr. Dichtelmiller have played an important role in supporting the LGBT community through their engagement at the state and local level.

In a committed relationship for over 30 years, Ms. Katz and Dr. Dichtelmiller have been consistent champions for LGBT rights and have played a crucial role in achieving victories at the state and local level. Both have been strong supporters of Affirmations, the LGBT community center in Ferndale, Michigan, that offers services and support to individuals throughout southeast Michigan, having served as co-chairs for its capital campaign to raise funds for a new facility. Additionally, Ms. Katz and Dr. Dichtelmiller have worked with nonprofits and advocacy groups to improve protections for same-sex couples and ensure that they receive the benefits and protections that they deserve. They are well-known in the Michigan civil rights community for their commitment to justice and long record of leadership on these issues.

Ms. Katz and Dr. Dichtelmiller have been at the forefront of the battle for LGBT rights throughout their lives, and their work has helped pave the way for progress at the federal, state and local level in providing equal rights for all. The past decade has seen dramatic progress in strengthening LGBT rights and protections, as well as a transformation in attitudes among the wider public, and this progress would not have been possible without Ms. Katz and Dr. Dichtelmiller's tireless activism and support of local organizations committed to this cause. Their visionary efforts have helped break down barriers and improve the lives of LGBT Americans, and the significant accomplishments underscore the impact of their actions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Nancy Katz and Margo Dichtelmiller for their leadership in promoting LGBT rights. Their actions have set the stage for key victories for LGBT Americans.

REMA-ELENA THOMAS

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rema-Elena Thomas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Rema-Elena Thomas is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rema-Elena Thomas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rema-Elena Thomas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND  
SERVICE OF JOHN T. KNOX

**HON. MARK DeSAULNIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of a former Contra Costa Assemblyman, Mr. John Knox.

Mr. Knox spent 20 years in the Assembly, representing western Contra Costa County. Besides the state's environmental law, he sponsored laws creating the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, which was signed by Governor Reagan and thwarted plans to fill in parts of the bay; authorizing state regulation of health maintenance organizations, rewriting standards for sales of stock and other corporate securities in California, and establishing regional planning agencies.

Even after he retired from the Legislature and joined a law firm, he was often brought back to preside as the house parliamentarian. A section of Interstate 580 leading to the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge is named the John T. Knox Freeway because of his success in obtaining funding to rebuild a dangerous, undivided highway.

After his time in the Assembly, Mr. Knox was always willing to sit down and discuss issues, whether that be in classrooms or simply over lunch with colleagues and peers. He was always willing to lend his knowledge and experience to the betterment of the Contra Costa community.

John was an inspiration and a friend, and will be greatly missed by not only myself, but the entire Contra Costa community.

RECOGNIZING SHERIFF JIM  
PADILLA ON HIS RETIREMENT

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sheriff Jim Padilla, who retired as the Henry County Sheriff on May 28. Sheriff Padilla has honorably served Henry County over the past 41 years and he will be greatly missed.

Sheriff Padilla began a lifelong career in public service as a member of the Kewanee Police Department for 8 years, and later served 33 years with the Sheriff's Department. He has dedicated his career ensuring public safety and protecting the lives of all individuals within our community. Sheriff Padilla always exemplified what it meant to be a strong leader and worked tirelessly to pass the public safety sales tax, which provided the department with the resources it needed to better serve our community. I am proud to have such dedicated civil servants in our Illinois' 17th Congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, as the wife of a Sheriff, I know how hard law-enforcement officers work to keep our communities safe. I would like to again formally congratulate Sheriff Padilla on his well-earned retirement and thank him for all of his contributions and service to our community.

RICHLAND COUNTY MIDDLE  
SCHOOL

**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Richland County Middle School in Olney, Illinois, for their recognition by the National Association of Music Merchants.

It is a great honor to be seen as one of the Best Communities for Music Education in the United States. With help from director Eric Combs, the middle school's music program has shown commitment and support of the arts throughout the school and the community. The music program allows students to express themselves and grow as a person.

I applaud Mr. Combs and all of the participating students for their dedication to this program and for their hard work. I ask that we all congratulate Director Eric Combs and the students at Richland County Middle School for their Best Communities for Music Education Award.

SUGAR LAND, TX WINS BEST CITY

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sugar Land for being awarded the "best city" by the Texas Travel Counselors.

Tourism and travel professionals recognized Sugar Land with this prestigious award after action-packed visits to Sugar Land's historic locations. These visits included the Houston

Museum of Natural Science, the Fort Bend Children's Discovery Center, Constellation Field and a behind-the-scenes tour of the Smart Financial Centre. The Texas Travel Counselors agreed that my hometown of Sugar Land offers an impressive mixture of old and new.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Sugar Land for being awarded the "best city" by the Texas Travel Counselors. We're proud to have such an exemplary city represent TX-22.

ROSE MERRILL

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rose Merrill for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Rose Merrill is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rose Merrill is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rose Merrill for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 12, 2017

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 12, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK BERGMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

### AFTER RECESS

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

### PRAYER

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

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. Help us this day to draw closer to You so that with Your spirit, and aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day with grace and confidence.

Bless the Members of the people's House as they return from a long weekend back in their home districts.

With fascinating and rather dramatic political developments taking place around the world, may we Americans remain all the more committed to our constitutional form of government. May Your gifts of wisdom and insight pour forth on this assembly, so that

the wisdom of our Founders might be further enhanced by the work being done in this place.

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

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DEUTCH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, impacting more than 500,000 people in Florida, and 5 million Americans nationwide. It is also the only top 10 cause of death in America that cannot be prevented or cured.

Beyond the statistics, finding treatments and cures for Alzheimer's is a deeply personal mission to so many people, including myself.

In Florida, the Byrd Alzheimer's Institute at USF is one of the largest freestanding institutes dedicated to Alzheimer's research in the Nation. Their work brings us closer to cures and treatments every day.

We are also making great strides in the fight against Alzheimer's with the 21st Century Cures Act. This historic, nonpartisan legislation, which was signed into law late last year, creates a national data collection system for neurological diseases. Better data will pave the path forward to better treatments.

### PULSE NIGHTCLUB SHOOTING ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, "There will never be an end." That is how Emily Addison described the love and the loss she feels for her partner and the mother of her son, Deonka Drayton.

Deonka was one of 49 victims killed at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando 1 year ago today. She was one of hundreds who had gone to Pulse that night as a place of celebration, a place of joy, and a place of pride.

We mark 1 year since the worst mass shooting in our history, an act of terror against the LGBT community, and we mark this somber event today during Pride Month.

This day creates enormous tension for the LGBT community and its allies. Our hearts are broken for the victims and for their families.

We are angry, we are frustrated, yet we are still filled with pride. We are proud of the lives they lived, though they were cut far too short.

Today, I stand with the LGBT community. And together, we stand against hatred, we stand against terror, and we stand for love and for pride, pride that has no end.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 9, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 9, 2017, at 11:43 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 45.

That the Senate passed S. 826.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### RECESS

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

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

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1543

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 3 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

#### EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT NUMBERED 12737

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 446) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 446

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

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12737, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the Commission's procedures under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If the period required for commencement of construction of the project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license for the project effective as of the date of its expiration and the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of such expiration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 446.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 446 authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, upon request, to extend by 6 years the time period during which construction must commence on the Gathright Hydroelectric Project located in Alleghany County, Virginia. Additionally, FERC may reinstate the construction license if it is expired.

A similar bill was passed under suspension of the rules in the 114th Congress in a bipartisan way, and I would hope that we can do it today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 446, a bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project, introduced by Mr. GRIFFITH.

On March 13, 2012, FERC licensed the Gathright Hydroelectric Project to be located at the Army Corps of Engineers' Gathright Dam on the Jackson River in Alleghany County, Virginia. The licensee for the Gathright project was not able to commence construction by the already-extended deadline in March 2016.

The bill would, therefore, authorize FERC to extend for up to three consecutive 2-year periods the date by which the licensee is required to commence construction. Similar legislation passed the House of Representatives by voice vote twice during the last Congress.

I hope everybody will support passage of H.R. 446. I hope we can get this thing built.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 446, which would extend the construction commencement deadline for a hydroelectric project at the Gathright Dam in Alleghany County.

Extensive coordination between the hydroelectric project developer and the Army Corps and the current difficulties in obtaining a power purchase agreement have necessitated this construction's start-date extension.

This legislation has passed the House previously unanimously and was included in last Congress's House comprehensive energy bill. It is my hope that this legislation will once again re-

ceive overwhelming support in this Chamber. I appreciate the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 446.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT NUMBERED 12740

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 447) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 447

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

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12740, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the Commission's procedures under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If the period required for commencement of construction of the project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license for the project effective as of the date of its expiration and the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of such expiration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 447.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, upon request, to extend by 6 years the time period during which construction must commence on the Flannagan Dam and Reservoir Hydroelectric Project located in Dickenson County, Virginia. Additionally, FERC may reinstate the construction license if it is expired.

The bill, again, passed under suspension in the 114th Congress, and I would hope that we could do the same today in a bipartisan way.

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

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

I again rise in support of legislation by Mr. GRIFFITH, H.R. 447, which would extend the deadline for commencement of construction of the Flannagan Hydroelectric Project, to be located at the Army Corps of Engineers' John W. Flannagan Dam on the Russell Fork River in Dickenson County, Virginia.

The licensee for the Flannagan Hydroelectric Project did not commence construction by the already-extended deadline in January 2016. Legislation is now required for the project to move forward.

The bill would authorize FERC to extend for up to three consecutive years the date by which the licensee is required to commence construction.

During the last Congress, the full House of Representatives passed similar legislation by voice vote. I once again hope my colleagues will help me in supporting passage of H.R. 447. Let's get this one built, too.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 447, which would extend the construction commencement deadline for a hydroelectric project at the Flannagan Dam in Dickenson County.

Extensive coordination between the hydroelectric project developer and the Army Corps and the current difficulties in obtaining a power purchase agreement have necessitated this construction start-date extension.

This legislation passed the House last Congress unanimously and was included in the last Congress' House comprehensive energy bill. It is my hope that this legislation will once again receive overwhelming support in this Chamber. I appreciate the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 447.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STREAMLINING ENERGY EFFICIENCY FOR SCHOOLS ACT OF 2017

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 627) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 627

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Streamlining Energy Efficiency for Schools Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

Section 392 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6371a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.—

"(1) DEFINITION OF SCHOOL.—Notwithstanding section 391(6), for the purposes of this subsection, the term 'school' means—

"(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

"(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a)));

"(C) a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

"(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

"(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

"(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

"(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall establish a clearinghouse to disseminate information regarding available Federal programs and financing mechanisms that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, distributed generation, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

"(3) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

"(A) consult with appropriate Federal agencies to develop a list of Federal programs and financing mechanisms that are, or may be, used for the purposes described in paragraph (2); and

"(B) coordinate with appropriate Federal agencies to develop a collaborative education and outreach effort to streamline communications and promote available Federal programs and financing mechanisms described in subparagraph (A), which may include the development and maintenance of a single online resource that includes contact information for relevant technical assistance in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy that States, local education agencies, and schools may use to effectively access and use such Federal programs and financing mechanisms."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 627.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 627, is an important bill that would help the Nation's schools make use of existing Federal programs to actually reduce their energy use. There currently are a number of such programs that help schools undertake projects that improve energy efficiency. Unfortunately, school districts don't always have the know-how to navigate the complexities of the Federal system and take full advantage of these programs.

The bill creates a simple one-stop shop to get all the needed information and help school districts participate more fully in these programs. The bottom line is that the Nation's schools will, in fact, reduce their energy costs.

As it is, energy use in American K–12 schools totals \$6 billion every year, and reducing this figure can certainly save taxpayer dollars or free up funds that schools can use on things other than energy bills.

This bill, H.R. 627, has no cost since it merely sets up a system under which existing school energy efficiency programs can work better.

A similar bill was passed under suspension of the rules at the end of the last Congress, and I would hope that we can do it today, at the beginning of this Congress, so that the Senate can follow suit and get this to the President's desk.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my strong support for H.R. 627, Mr. CARTWRIGHT's Streamlining Energy Efficiency for Schools Act. This is a great bill that will provide a coordinated structure for our Nation's schools to help them better navigate available Federal programs and financing options.

Across the country, K-12 school districts spend literally billions of dollars on their energy bills each year while an estimated 14 million American children attend deteriorating public schools. By upgrading these systems, we can increase efficiency and focus school funding to achieve better educational outcomes.

This legislation passed the House previously with broad bipartisan support, and I urge everybody to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), the author of the bill.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership and Chairman UPTON for bringing this bill up under suspension today, and I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding me the time.

I thank the entire Energy and Commerce Committee, which, once again, voted unanimously in committee in favor of this bill—a bill that has passed the House twice under suspension in each of the past two Congresses. Both times it passed during the final days of the Congress, and the Senate did not have a chance to take the bill up. I am glad the House is considering it now in plenty of time for the Senate to consider it and act.

I would also thank Congressman PETER WELCH from Vermont for his leadership on the bill. It is no secret that he is one of the great champions in the House on the issue of energy efficiency, and it has been my pleasure to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, so many schools across the country are in need of upgrades and improvements to their facilities. In its most recent 2017 Infrastructure Report Card, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave the condition of our Nation's schools a grade of D-plus.

As school administrators undertake badly needed improvements, they have an opportunity to substantially improve their facilities' energy efficiency, producing benefits for both the environment and the economy. In reducing their energy bills, schools can put the savings to use on other educational priorities.

According to the EPA and the Department of Energy, K-12 school districts nationwide spend approximately \$8 billion on their energy bills every year—second only to personnel costs—exceeding the costs of textbooks and supplies. An estimated \$2 billion of that cost could be saved by improving

energy efficiency, an amount that could pay for, for example, 40 million textbooks.

Energy expenses are one of the few costs that can be reduced while at the same time improving classroom instruction. In fact, high-performance schools can lower a school district's operating costs by up to 30 percent.

There are numerous Federal initiatives already available to schools to help them become more energy efficient, but these programs are spread across the Federal Government, making it challenging, time consuming, and costly for schools to identify and take full advantage of these programs.

In addition, schools can use several different general purpose programs for energy efficiency projects if they know how to locate and apply for them.

Introduced in the Senate as S. 383 by Senator SUSAN COLLINS, this bipartisan Streamlining Energy Efficiency for Schools Act aims to provide a coordinating structure for busy school administrators to help them better navigate available Federal programs and financing options.

This legislation does not spend an additional dime and keeps its decision-making authority with the States, the school boards, and local officials.

This bill establishes a clearinghouse through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, which will disseminate information on Federal programs and financing mechanisms that may be used to develop energy efficiency, distributed generation, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

The bill also directs the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to coordinate with Federal agencies and develop an outreach effort to streamline communications and promote available Federal programs. Such outreach may include a single website where school officials can learn more about the relevant programs.

Overburdened school administrators should not have to spend hours and hours wading through the Federal bureaucracy as they look for ways to improve energy efficiency. This common-sense legislation will ensure that schools can more easily take advantage of existing energy efficiency programs.

It is a strategic and cost-saving investment to relieve the fiscal pressure felt by school districts across the country, supported by overburdened homeowners, while bringing us closer to energy security in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this great, bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr.

UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 627.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

#### EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT NUMBERED 12642

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 951) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 951

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

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12642, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the Commission's procedures under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If the period required for commencement of construction of the project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license effective as of the date of its expiration and the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of such expiration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 951, introduced by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the distinguished chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee, authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

FERC, to extend up to 6 years the time period during which construction must commence on the W. Kerr Scott Hydro-power Project located on the Yadkin River in Wilkes County, North Carolina. Additionally, FERC may reinstate the construction license if it is expired.

A similar bill was passed under suspension in the last Congress, and I hope that we can pass it again today, urging the Senate to take this legislation up.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us, sponsored by the gentlewoman from North Carolina, would authorize FERC to extend for 6 years the date by which the licensee for the W. Kerr Scott Hydropower Project is required to commence construction. This is necessary because the project's licensee was not able to commence construction by the already-extended deadline of July 17, 2016.

Similar legislation authored by Ms. FOXX passed the House during the 114th Congress by a vote of 406-3. I hope my colleagues will support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

I rise in support of H.R. 951, a bill I authored to extend the license authorizing the Wilkesboro Hydroelectric Company's construction of its hydropower project at W. Kerr Scott Dam.

The project has required exhaustive coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and there have been delays in the review process for the design plans. As the Wilkesboro Hydroelectric Company takes steps to comply with statutory mandates and requirements by Federal regulators, the shot clock for action on breaking ground dwindles. As has often happened with these projects, delays in the review process and coordination efforts precluded the start of construction.

I ask my colleagues to support a new authorization for this project, along with the other projects the House is considering today. Furthermore, I applaud Representative MCMORRIS RODGERS and the House Energy and Commerce Committee for working on comprehensive reform legislation to address the statutory framework and FERC processes pertaining to these projects.

I am a proud supporter of our Nation's renewable energy resources. Congress should optimize the use of our Nation's clean, renewable hydropower potential by bringing regulatory and permitting certainty to the process.

Given North Carolina's growth and demand for electricity, my State needs Congress to explore every opportunity

to meet our energy demands, provide for job growth, and sustain our environment. As chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I will work tirelessly with the other committees in the House and the Trump administration to achieve this.

I thank Chairman WALDEN, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, and former Chairman UPTON for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation, and I would like to think that we can pass it again this afternoon.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 951.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FEDERAL POWER ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1109) to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1109

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

#### SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF FACILITY MERGER AUTHORIZATION.

Section 203(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824b(a)(1)(B)) is amended by striking "such facilities or any part thereof" and inserting "such facilities, or any part thereof, of a value in excess of \$10,000,000".

#### SEC. 2. NOTIFICATION FOR CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

Section 203(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824b(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Commission shall promulgate a rule requiring any public utility that is seeking to merge or consolidate, directly or indirectly, its facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, or any part thereof, with those of any other person, to notify the Commission of such transaction not later than 30 days after the date on which the transaction is consummated if—

"(i) such facilities, or any part thereof, are of a value in excess of \$1,000,000; and

"(ii) such public utility is not required to secure an order of the Commission under paragraph (1)(B).

"(B) In establishing any notification requirement under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize the paperwork burden resulting from the collection of information."

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 1 shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1109, is, again, a bipartisan bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG). It was reported by unanimous consent from the Energy and Commerce Committee. It amends the Federal Power Act with respect to the prohibition regarding mergers or consolidations by a public utility.

Any merger or consolidation of a public utility whose value exceeds \$10 million must first be authorized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. In addition, FERC is required to promulgate a rule within 180 days that mandates any public utility seeking to merge or consolidate to notify FERC within 30 days of transaction consummation if the value of such merger or consolidation exceeds \$1 million but, in fact, is less than \$10 million.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1109, sponsored by Representatives WALBERG and DINGELL, which would add a \$10 million threshold to trigger FERC review of a merger or consolidation. This is a significant change to current law as established through the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Obviously, FERC should not have to rely on trade publications or on word of mouth to know that merger or consolidation activity involving regulated utilities is occurring. This bill, as reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee, includes language requiring FERC to undertake a rulemaking process for transactions above the \$1 million mark that fall below the new \$10 million threshold.

This addresses a problem, in that FERC lacked a standardized way to acquire the information necessary to know that these below-threshold transactions were occurring. Without that knowledge, it would be too easy for someone looking to evade the new \$10 million threshold to break their transaction into smaller pieces and, thereby, escape review.

I want to commend the gentleman and the gentlewoman from Michigan for their work to address this matter. I think this is sensible legislation that reduces the burden on industry and on the government, while ensuring the public good is fully protected.

I urge the passage of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the author of the legislation.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Michigan, the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee for this opportunity.

I also want to start off by thanking the Energy and Commerce Committee staff on both sides of the aisle for their time and work on this issue.

Additionally, I would like also to thank my colleague, DEBBIE DINGELL, for being an original cosponsor of H.R. 1109 and helping advance this bipartisan and, might I add, commonsense rule.

Based on current statute, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission takes the position that approval from the Commission is necessary for all mergers and acquisitions, no matter how small or insignificant the value of the facilities involved, even down to zero.

FERC's interpretation has led to trivial paperwork that bogs down the Commission and creates unnecessary red tape for American businesses, ultimately increasing utility bills for the consumer. H.R. 1109 will help reduce excessive paperwork burdens and bring down energy prices for American families.

This bipartisan solution unties FERC's hands and allows the Commission to ensure American consumers are getting the most affordable and reliable electricity possible in a commonsense sort of way. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1109.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1109.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# REINSTATING AND EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT 12715

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2122) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2122

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

## SECTION 1. REINSTATEMENT AND EXTENSION OF TIME FOR A FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING JENNINGS RANDOLPH DAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF TIME.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12715 (referred to in this section as the “project”), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (referred to in this section as the “Commission”) may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of, and the procedures of the Commission under, that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for not more than 3 consecutive 2-year periods that begin on the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) OBLIGATION OF LICENSEE.—Any obligation of the licensee for the project for the payment of annual charges under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)) shall commence on the expiration of the time period to commence construction of the project, as extended by the Commission under subsection (a).

(c) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the period required for the commencement of construction of the project has expired before the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license effective as of the date of the expiration of the license.

(2) EXTENSION.—If the Commission reinstates the license under paragraph (1), the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the expiration of the license.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 2122, was introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), and it authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, upon request, to extend by 6 years the time period during which construction must commence on the Jennings Randolph Hydroelectric Project, which is located on the North Branch of the Potomac River in Garrett County, Maryland, and Mineral County, West Virginia. Additionally, FERC may reinstate the construction license if it has expired.

A similar bill passed under suspension in the 114th Congress, so I hope that we can pass it again today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2122, a bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Jennings Randolph Dam, sponsored by my Energy and Commerce Committee colleague, Mr. MCKINLEY.

In March 2012, FERC licensed the construction of a hydroelectric facility at the Army Corps' Jennings Randolph Dam located on the Potomac River's North Branch in Maryland and West Virginia. The licensee for the Jennings Randolph Dam project was not able to commence construction by the already-extended deadline of April 2016. The bill would authorize FERC to extend for 6 years the date by which the licensee is required to commence construction.

FERC has no objections to this legislation, and similar legislation passed the House by a 418-2 vote during the 114th Congress. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 2122, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2122.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HYDROPOWER PERMIT EXTENSION ACT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2274) to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for extended periods relating to preliminary permits and commencement of construction, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.



The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2274

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

# SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "HYdropower Permit Extension Act" or the "HYPE Act".

## SEC. 2. EXTENSIONS OF PERIODS.

(a) PRELIMINARY PERMITS.—Section 5 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 798) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "three" and inserting "four"; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "Commission may extend the period of a preliminary permit once for not more than 2 additional years beyond the 3 years" and inserting the following: "Commission may—

"(1) extend the period of a preliminary permit once for not more than four additional years beyond the four years";

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) if the period of a preliminary permit is extended under paragraph (1), extend the period of such preliminary permit once for not more than four additional years beyond the extension period granted under paragraph (1), if the Commission determines that there are extraordinary circumstances that warrant such additional extension."

(b) TIME LIMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECT WORKS.—Section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) is amended in the second sentence by striking "once but not longer than two additional years" and inserting "for not more than eight additional years."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 2274, was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), and it was passed by unanimous consent by the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The bill, H.R. 2274, amends the Federal Power Act to allow the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, to extend periods relating to preliminary permits and commencement of construction of hydroelectric projects.

This bill is a commonsense bill, bipartisan, and I would hope that all Members would join me in supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2274, the HYdropower Permit Extension, or HYPE, Act.

I am pleased that the House is considering this legislation, which was recently introduced by my colleague, Mr. PETERS, of the committee, to provide the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with the authority to grant longer periods for preliminary and construction permits and associated extensions under sections 5 and 13 of the Federal Power Act.

Right now, as we have seen from the debating of these six bills today, this is something that can only be done by an act of Congress on a case-by-case basis.

□ 1615

As much as we have all enjoyed debating these extensions of time today, it is clear that it would be more efficient and it also would save more time in Congress if these extensions could be done directly by FERC. I commend Mr. PETERS. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), the author of the bill.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, hydropower is one of the few carbon-free energy sources that provides a steady baseload of electricity. Producing more electricity from hydropower helps us meet our clean energy goals and reduce harmful emissions that pollute our air and water.

This bill, the Hydropower Permit Extension Act, would cut red tape for hydropower construction permits and incentivize greater investment in this energy source.

The act gives already approved hydropower projects an extra year on their initial permit and allows FERC to grant a 4-year extension to projects that are delayed from breaking ground during their initial permit.

And as the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) said, right now this takes an act of Congress to extend construction permits for hydropower projects, even though they have gone through a rigorous environmental regulatory process.

Moving forward, the ultimate solution to unlocking hydropower is to streamline the regulatory process. It is my hope that we can continue to have bipartisan, productive conversations like these on how to get hydropower projects moving, how to get them approved more quickly, while still meeting high environmental standards.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member RUSH, for working with me and the committee to advance this bill through the committee and to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2274.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENDING A PROJECT INVOLVING THE CANNONVILLE DAM

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2292) to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonville Dam.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2292

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

## SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR A FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING CANNONVILLE DAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 13287, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (referred to in this section as the "Commission") may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the procedures of the Commission under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence construction of the project for up to 4 consecutive 2-year periods after the required date of the commencement of construction described in Article 301 of the license.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the required date of the commencement of construction described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license effective as of that date of expiration.

(2) EXTENSION.—If the Commission reinstates the license under paragraph (1), the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of that expiration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

This bill, H.R. 2292, was introduced by Mr. FASO from New York, and the bill authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, upon request, to extend by 8 years the time period during which construction must commence on the Cannonsville hydroelectric project—which is located on the west branch of the Delaware River in the Catskill Mountains of upstate New York.

The city of New York was granted a construction license for the Cannonsville hydroelectric project on May 13, 2014. Additionally, FERC may reinstate the construction license if it is expired. The bill was reported by unanimous consent from the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I support its passage on the floor today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2292, a bill to extend the deadline for commencement and construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Cannonsville Dam.

On May 13, 2014, FERC licensed construction of a hydroelectric facility at the Cannonsville Reservoir located on the west branch of the Delaware River in Delaware County, New York. The licensee for this project was not able to commence construction by the deadline of May 2016.

The additional reviews and repairs to the dam, which are necessary to begin construction of the hydroelectric project, will delay construction commencement beyond the expiration date of the original license and the 2-year extension which FERC is authorized to grant.

The bill would, therefore, authorize FERC to extend up to 8 years the date by which the licensee is required to commence construction.

Similar legislation passed the House during the 114th Congress by a vote of 417–2. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express support for my legislation, H.R. 2292, which would extend the construction period for the hydroelectric project at New York City's Cannonsville Dam in Delaware County, New York.

Once completed, the Cannonsville hydroelectric project will generate over 42,000 megawatt hours of electricity each year, enough to avoid the emission of 24,000 tons of greenhouse gases. But, unfortunately, the project is in jeopardy due to this time lag.

Current Federal Energy Regulation Commission regulations allow a licensee 2 years to begin construction of a hydroelectric project once the license has been issued. The FERC may extend the deadline for an additional 2 years, but this may only be done once.

If construction has not begun on the project by the expiration of the second extension, the Commission will terminate the license, risking all of the hard work and planning that had been put into the project development.

I introduced this legislation to further extend the deadline for construction at the Cannonsville site, because the second FERC-granted extension will expire shortly, and construction has not yet begun.

By allowing for additional time for commencement of construction, we can help protect downstream communities and ensure the safe development of a clean and renewable energy project on this New York City-owned facility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. UPTON, the chairman of the subcommittee, and Ms. DEGETTE, the ranking member of the subcommittee, and also thank the sponsors from New York State on this bipartisan legislation, including Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. COLLINS, and Mrs. MALONEY.

By bringing together the stakeholders from across the Empire State, we have ensured that a variety of constituent concerns have been met in the development of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2292 so that we can further protect public water supplies for New York City and help strengthen and modernize our Nation's energy infrastructure.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2292.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY HYDROPOWER EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2457) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2457

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “J. Bennett Johnston Waterway Hydropower Extension Act of 2017”.*

### SEC. 2. EXTENSION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbers 12756, 12757, and 12758, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the applicable project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the Commission's procedures under that section, extend the time period during which such licensee is required to commence the construction of its applicable project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of any extension issued by the Commission under that section for such project.

(b) *OBLIGATION FOR PAYMENT OF ANNUAL CHARGES.*—Any obligation of a licensee for a project described in subsection (a) for the payment of annual charges under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)) shall commence when the construction of the project commences.

(c) *REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE; EFFECTIVE DATE FOR EXTENSION.*—

(1) *REINSTATEMENT.*—If the time period required for commencement of construction of a project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license for such project, effective as of the date of the expiration of the license.

(2) *EFFECTIVE DATE FOR EXTENSION.*—If the Commission reinstates a license under paragraph (1) for a project, the first extension authorized under subsection (a) with respect to such project shall take effect on the effective date of such reinstatement under paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2457, as amended. This bill was introduced by Mr. JOHNSON from Louisiana and was reported by unanimous consent from the Energy and Commerce Committee. The bill, H.R. 2457, authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, to extend the time period during which a licensee is required to commence the construction of Commission project numbers 12756, 12757, and 12758 for up to three consecutive 2-year periods.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all Members to join me and support passage of this bill, as amended.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the last bill in our cohort of six extension bills that we are considering today, which I hope Mr. PETERS' bill will absolve us from having to do in the future.

This bill, the J. Bennett Johnston Waterway Hydropower Extension Act of 2017 was introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) on May 16, 2017. It would extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for up to three consecutive 2-year periods from the date of expiration of the original extension.

Additionally, the legislation defers the obligation on the licensee to pay any annual charges required under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act until the project actually commences construction.

Finally, the legislation allows for the prospective reinstatement of the license should that license expire prior to the legislation's date of enactment.

I just have to add a few words to what Mr. PETERS said earlier. Hydropower is so important. It is such an important renewable energy source in this country. We need to do everything we can on a bipartisan basis to make sure that we expedite these dams, that we really work together to get hydropower, even more important in our energy portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will favorably consider this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I echo the words from my good friend from Colorado. Hydro is an important renewable energy source, and it is one that supports all of the above. It is an increasing force across the country so that is why these bills are so important, and it also shows why they are so bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2457, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## ENERGY AND MANUFACTURING WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 338) to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 338

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

### SECTION 1. ENERGY AND MANUFACTURING WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy (in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall prioritize education and training for energy and manufacturing-related jobs in order to increase the number of skilled workers trained to work in energy and manufacturing-related fields when considering awards for existing grant programs, including by—

(1) encouraging State education agencies and local educational agencies to equip students with the skills, mentorships, training, and technical expertise necessary to fill the employment opportunities vital to managing and operating the Nation's energy and manufacturing industries, in collaboration with representatives from the energy and manufacturing industries (including the oil, gas, coal, nuclear, utility, pipeline, renewable, petrochemical, manufacturing, and electrical construction sectors) to identify the areas of highest need in each sector and the skills necessary for a high-quality workforce in the following sectors of energy and manufacturing:

(A) Energy efficiency industry, including work in energy efficiency, conservation, weatherization, or retrofitting, or as inspectors or auditors.

(B) Pipeline industry, including work in pipeline construction and maintenance or work as engineers or technical advisors.

(C) Utility industry, including work in the generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity and natural gas, such as utility technicians, operators, lineworkers, engineers, scientists, and information technology specialists.

(D) Nuclear industry, including work as scientists, engineers, technicians, mathematicians, or security personnel.

(E) Oil and gas industry, including work as scientists, engineers, technicians, mathematicians, petrochemical engineers, or geologists.

(F) Renewable industry, including work in the development, manufacturing, and production of renewable energy sources (such as solar, hydropower, wind, or geothermal energy).

(G) Coal industry, including work as coal miners, engineers, developers and manufacturers of state-of-the-art coal facilities, technology vendors, coal transportation

workers and operators, or mining equipment vendors.

(H) Manufacturing industry, including work as operations technicians, operations and design in additive manufacturing, 3-D printing, advanced composites, and advanced aluminum and other metal alloys, industrial energy efficiency management systems, including power electronics, and other innovative technologies.

(I) Chemical manufacturing industry, including work in construction (such as welders, pipefitters, and tool and die makers) or as instrument and electrical technicians, machinists, chemical process operators, chemical engineers, quality and safety professionals, and reliability engineers; and

(2) strengthening and more fully engaging Department of Energy programs and labs in carrying out the Department's workforce development initiatives including the Minorities in Energy Initiative.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Secretary or any other officer or employee of the Federal Government to incentivize, require, or coerce a State, school district, or school to adopt curricula aligned to the skills described in subsection (a).

(c) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize the education and training of underrepresented groups in energy and manufacturing-related jobs.

(d) CLEARINGHOUSE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish a clearinghouse to—

(1) maintain and update information and resources on training and workforce development programs for energy and manufacturing-related jobs, including job training and workforce development programs available to assist displaced and unemployed energy and manufacturing workers transitioning to new employment; and

(2) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, schools, community colleges, universities (including minority-serving institutions), workforce development programs, labor-management organizations, and industry organizations that would like to develop and implement energy and manufacturing-related training programs.

(e) COLLABORATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary—

(1) shall collaborate with States, local educational agencies, schools, community colleges, universities (including minority-serving institutions), workforce-training organizations, national laboratories, State energy offices, workforce investment boards, and the energy and manufacturing industries;

(2) shall encourage and foster collaboration, mentorships, and partnerships among organizations (including industry, States, local educational agencies, schools, community colleges, workforce-development organizations, and colleges and universities) that currently provide effective job training programs in the energy and manufacturing fields and entities (including States, local educational agencies, schools, community colleges, workforce development programs, and colleges and universities) that seek to establish these types of programs in order to share best practices; and

(3) shall collaborate with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census, States, and the energy and manufacturing industries to develop a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the energy and manufacturing workforce needs and opportunities by State and by region.

(f) **OUTREACH TO MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) give special consideration to increasing outreach to minority-serving institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities;

(2) make existing resources available through program cross-cutting to minority-serving institutions with the objective of increasing the number of skilled minorities and women trained to go into the energy and manufacturing sectors;

(3) encourage industry to improve the opportunities for students of minority-serving institutions to participate in industry internships and cooperative work/study programs; and

(4) partner with the Department of Energy laboratories to increase underrepresented groups' participation in internships, fellowships, traineeships, and employment at all Department of Energy laboratories.

(g) **OUTREACH TO DISLOCATED ENERGY AND MANUFACTURING WORKERS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) give special consideration to increasing outreach to employers and job trainers preparing dislocated energy and manufacturing workers for in-demand sectors or occupations;

(2) make existing resources available through program cross-cutting to institutions serving dislocated energy and manufacturing workers with the objective of training individuals to re-enter in-demand sectors or occupations;

(3) encourage the energy and manufacturing industries to improve opportunities for dislocated energy and manufacturing workers to participate in career pathways; and

(4) work closely with the energy and manufacturing industries to identify energy and manufacturing operations, such as coal-fired power plants and coal mines, scheduled for closure and to provide early intervention assistance to workers employed at such energy and manufacturing operations by—

(A) partnering with State and local workforce development boards;

(B) giving special consideration to employers and job trainers preparing such workers for in-demand sectors or occupations;

(C) making existing resources available through program cross-cutting to institutions serving such workers with the objective of training them to re-enter in-demand sectors or occupations; and

(D) encouraging the energy and manufacturing industries to improve opportunities for such workers to participate in career pathways.

(h) **ENROLLMENT IN WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall work with industry and community-based workforce organizations to help identify candidates, including from underrepresented communities such as minorities, women, and veterans, to enroll in workforce development programs for energy and manufacturing-related jobs.

(i) **PROHIBITION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the creation of a new workforce development program.

(j) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CAREER PATHWAYS; DISLOCATED WORKER; IN-DEMAND SECTORS OR OCCUPATIONS; LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD; STATE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD.**—The terms “career pathways”, “dislocated worker”, “in-demand sectors or occupations”, “local workforce development board”, and “State

workforce development board” have the meanings given the terms “career pathways”, “dislocated worker”, “in-demand sectors or occupations”, “local board”, and “State board”, respectively, in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).

(2) **MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTION.**—The term “minority-serving institution” means an institution of higher education with a designation of one of the following:

(A) Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5)).

(B) Tribal College or University (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).

(C) Alaska Native-serving institution or a Native Hawaiian-serving institution (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)).

(D) Predominantly Black Institution (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1059e(b)).

(E) Native American-serving nontribal institution (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1059f(b)).

(F) Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institution (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1059g(b)).

#### SEC. 2. REPORT.

Five years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a comprehensive report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on the outlook for energy and manufacturing sectors nationally. The report shall also include a comprehensive summary of energy and manufacturing job creation as a result of the enactment of this Act. The report shall include performance data regarding the number of program participants served, the percentage of participants in competitive integrated employment two quarters and four quarters after program completion, the median income of program participants two quarters and four quarters after program completion, and the percentage of program participants receiving industry-recognized credentials.

#### SEC. 3. USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that we are considering this legislation, H.R. 338, a bill to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, introduced by my friend and great colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

This bipartisan bill takes steps to help make training for energy manufacturing jobs available to women and minorities as well as veterans.

By way of background, the bill was unanimously approved by the House last Congress by a voice vote. It was also included in the energy bill conference negotiations. But, unfortunately, even though the bill received overwhelming support in both the House and the Senate, it didn't make it to the President's desk before time ran out.

The U.S. has undergone an energy renaissance, driven by newly discovered resources, technological innovation, and a skilled workforce. Millions and millions of new jobs had been created, and many more are opening up, but we have got to continue to invest in our workers in order to maintain global leadership and maximize the economic potential of our energy abundance.

This bill, H.R. 338, takes important steps in the right direction by requiring that the Department of Energy modernize and improve coordination among the numerous workforce development programs and activities that expand the Department's programs, offices, labs, and technology centers.

This bipartisan bill places an emphasis on maximizing the Department's existing resources and increasing the diversity of our energy and manufacturing workforce by increasing opportunities for women, minorities, and veterans.

It also improves reemployment opportunities for out-of-work and dislocated workers, which, for example, would provide welcome relief to workers discouraged by sharp downturns in the coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation before us today is a good government bill that is going to increase benefits for American workers. I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

□ 1630

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased we are considering this bill sponsored by my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. RUSH.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I must begin by commending Chairman WALDEN; Chairman UPTON; Ranking Member PALLONE; our friend and colleague from the great State of Colorado, Congresswoman DEGETTE; and the committee staff and all for working with my office to bring the 21st century workforce legislation to the House floor today.

I must also publicly acknowledge the leadership of my colleague Mr. HUDSON

of North Carolina and his staff, who played an instrumental and very important role in helping us to get to this point.

Mr. Speaker, the 21st century workforce bill represents hope and represents opportunity for many of our fellow citizens who feel as though they have been locked out of the American Dream. Mr. Speaker, this workforce bill also provides an example of how Congress should function and work on behalf of the American people.

This legislation enjoys the overwhelming support of Members of Congress who represent various constituencies from diverse regions of our Nation and who come with different and varying political persuasions. However, Mr. Speaker, we were able to put aside our political differences, our regional differences, and our cultural differences and focus our efforts on bringing forth a jobs bill that would benefit all communities and help lift up the American economy for all its people.

Mr. Speaker, this bill directs the Secretary of Energy to prioritize the training of underrepresented groups, including minorities, women, and veterans, as well as displaced and unemployed energy and manufacturing workers. This bill directs the Secretary of Energy to take into full recognition the hurt and the pain of the White middle class, of the White working class, the African-American, the Black working class, and the Brown working class in order to increase the number of skilled candidates trained to work in the related fields that were brought to bear by the energy renaissance in our Nation.

This bill will strengthen and more fully engage Department of Energy programs and national laboratories in order to carry out the Department's workforce development initiatives. This legislation will help to develop a skilled labor force trained to work in a wide array of sectors, including renewables, energy efficiency, oil and gas, coal, nuclear, utility, pipeline, and alternative fuels, as well as energy-intensive and advanced manufacturing industries.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the energy and manufacturing industries are two of the most critical and fastest growing sectors both domestically as well as internationally. The potential of these two industries can help bolster the American economy and are also vital to the growing number of people seeking middle class status—not just a change of lifestyle, but seeking more money. They are satisfied with their lifestyle; they just need more income.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we equip our citizens with the skills needed to meet this growing demand so that we can tap into these tremendous opportunities, and this bill, Mr. Speaker, will help us accomplish that goal.

Mr. Speaker, this 21st century workforce legislation addresses an issue

that is neither partisan nor bipartisan, but, rather, it is nonpartisan. It is a nonpartisan issue that benefits communities, benefits industry, and benefits the overall American economy.

This bill brings together government agencies, including the national labs, the energy and manufacturing industries, unions, schools, community colleges and universities, among others, and promotes cooperation and collaboration to ensure that we are tapping into a wealth of underutilized talent and are training and preparing workers for the energy and manufacturing jobs of the present and also of the future.

Mr. Speaker, one of the challenges that many of my constituents—and constituents all across the land—have brought to my attention pertains to individuals participating in training programs that, in many cases, don't even lead to finding a job.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, this bill will help industry, schools, and community-based workforce organizations to identify candidates for enrollment into training and apprenticeship programs. The objective will be to ensure that the skills learned are immediately transferable to good-paying jobs and good-paying careers within the energy and manufacturing sectors regionally, nationally, and, indeed, internationally.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important because it matches up the needs of industry with a willing and able workforce and, in the process, helps start new cycles of hope and opportunity for groups who have, in many cases, been overlooked and underserved: the White working class, the Black working class, and the Brown working class.

This legislation can help to open new pathways to jobs, careers, and entrepreneurial opportunities for women, minorities, our veterans, and all the different working classes that comprise the American workforce while also helping to move our overall economy forward.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when African-American and Latino unemployment rates are too high, when coal miners throughout the Rust Belt and beyond are finding themselves without work, when too many female heads of household cannot find adequate employment to take care of their families, and when veterans returning from defending our country still cannot find a job, it is a travesty—Mr. Speaker, a travesty—that eager employers still cannot locate the trained workers that they so desperately need.

This is common sense, Mr. Speaker, and this is a commonsense jobs bill that will help match up trained and qualified candidates with good-paying jobs and careers that will help lift up communities, strengthen the energy and manufacturing industries, and bolster the entire American economy as a whole.

With its focus not only on underserved communities such as minorities, women, and veterans, but also displaced and unemployed coal miners and other out-of-work energy workers, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when this legislation ultimately becomes law, it will go a long way in helping not only communities that look like the one I represent on the south side of Chicago, but look like communities all across the Nation, including communities in West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, and New Mexico—all across this country, every community and every district throughout this Nation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 338, a bipartisan jobs bill to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce.

By and large, we all share the same goals of creating more jobs and building a healthy economy; but, as we have seen too often in Washington, progress can get caught up in partisan gridlock. I am focused on cutting through the partisanship and the noise and finding commonsense solutions to the problems our country faces. H.R. 338 is a prime example of that.

Much like the bipartisan Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act that I was honored to help get signed into law several years ago, H.R. 338 strengthens job training programs—specifically in the energy and manufacturing industries—to invest in our workforce. This legislation will help connect individuals with job training programs while also making current programs more efficient, and it takes important steps to increase opportunities for women, veterans, and minorities.

As I have traveled across my district, I have seen firsthand just how effective local, high-skilled job training programs can be:

In Kannapolis, Rowan-Cabarrus Community College has partnered with A.L. Brown High School on a welding program that will open doors for so many students;

At both Stanly Community College and Sandhills Community College, the advanced manufacturing programs are the critical training grounds for high-skilled manufacturing workers;

At Fayetteville Tech, veterans get the support and the skills they need to find meaningful employment outside of the Armed Forces.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman WALDEN, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their support. I want to thank Ranking Member BOBBY RUSH for his leadership and for working with me in a bipartisan manner for a cause that is important to all of us, that is, to help people get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to continue to stay focused on America's priorities: jobs and the economy.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Colorado has an economy strongly based in the energy industry. Of course, my district, which is primarily an urban district, has many, many workers who could be working in this industry, so I want to commend both of these gentlemen for sponsoring this legislation.

It is a good bill. We need to get it across the finish line. Hopefully, because we are doing it early in this Congress, we can get that done. Please vote "yes."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say I have watched these two gentlemen, Mr. RUSH and Mr. HUDSON, work together, something that our committee does a lot on lots of different issues, from oversight to energy, to healthcare, to telecommunications.

Mr. RUSH has had an outstanding career. The gentleman's district is close to mine. He and I have been in each other's districts quite a bit over the last number of years. This bill is a legacy to Mr. RUSH. The gentleman has cared with real passion about energy jobs and making sure that we have the expertise and the technical training knowing that we want to compete with the rest of the world. I commend the gentleman again for working with Mr. HUDSON—a brilliant star on our side of the aisle—to get this bill done.

We look forward to the President's signing it into law, and we are looking forward to having the Senate move similar bipartisan legislation so we can get the job done. That is what it is all about.

So I want to thank the gentleman for his tireless commitment to getting this issue done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 338, to Promote a 21st Century Energy and Manufacturing Workforce Future Act.

For years, many of the industries I represent have complained of workforce shortages.

In East Houston and Harris County, if we were able to recruit every union electrician in the country, we would still have a shortage.

The same is probably true for pipefitters, welders, etc.

The economy in our part of the country is rapidly expanding thanks to the development of the Eagleford shale and the Permian Basin.

We must ensure that this economic prosperity is shared across all of our community.

In Texas, workforce diversity has to be a reality.

I am pleased that Representative RUSH has crafted this legislation and I am proud to be an original co-sponsor.

I am also proud to support workforce development opportunities for Hispanics, African-Americans, and women in the energy field.

The industry needs skilled workers and we need to create opportunity for everyone, including many of those I represent in and around the area.

The bill will encourage the Department of Energy to conduct outreach to these communities to ensure they have access to the knowledge, skills and abilities required to fill high paying jobs in the energy field.

Thanks to efforts by ExxonMobil and the Texas Gulf Coast Community College Consortium, we are already addressing the workforce needs of our industries but more needs to be done and this bill will help us achieve these goals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 338.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2292, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2457, by the yeas and nays.

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

#### EXTENDING A PROJECT INVOLVING THE CANNONSVILLE DAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2292) to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonville Dam, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—400

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



McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nunes  
O'Halloran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascarella  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pocan  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond

Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Speier

Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NAYS—1

Amash

## NOT VOTING—29

Bishop (UT)  
Blum  
Brooks (AL)  
Carter (TX)  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeSantis  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Engel  
Granger

Gutiérrez  
Harris  
Johnson, Sam  
Lawson (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
McEachin

Meng  
Napolitano  
Noem  
Pingree  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Renacci  
Rohrabacher  
Tiberi

## □ 1852

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY HYDROPOWER EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2457) to extend the deadline

for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

## YEAS—402

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barragán  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly

Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Demings  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Emmer  
Eshoo  
Español  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith

Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Hanabusa  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Long  
Loudermilk

Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nunes  
O'Halloran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascarella  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter

Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pocan  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter

Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NAYS—1

Amash

## NOT VOTING—27

Bishop (UT)  
Blum  
Brooks (AL)  
Carter (TX)  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeSantis  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Engel

Frelinghuysen  
Granger  
Gutiérrez  
Harris  
Johnson, Sam  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Meng

Napolitano  
Noem  
Pingree  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Renacci  
Rohrabacher  
Tiberi

## □ 1859

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 300 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 2292), and 301 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 2457), I did not cast my vote. Had I been

present, I would have voted "yea" on both of the votes.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2581, VERIFY FIRST ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1094, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017**

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-177) on the resolution (H. Res. 378) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2581) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit, and providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1094) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2372, VETERANS EQUAL TREATMENT ENSURES RELIEF AND ACCESS NOW ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2579, BROADER OPTIONS FOR AMERICANS ACT**

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-178) on the resolution (H. Res. 379) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2372) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2579) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**LGBT PRIDE MONTH**

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize June as LGBT Pride Month, a time in which we celebrate the progress our country has made toward equality and honor the contributions of LGBT Americans to the diverse fabric that is our Nation.

I would like to thank the many organizations in my congressional district, SAVE, Unity Coalition-Coalicion Unida, the National LGBTQ Task Force, just to name a few, and recog-

nize their invaluable work to promote acceptance and fight harassment, bullying, and discrimination wherever it takes place.

This month we also celebrate 2 years of marriage equality. The union of two people in marriage should not be based on gender, but on love, and those legally married couples deserve equal respect and treatment under the law.

Mr. Speaker, this month of celebration is also, sadly, a stark reminder that we have a lot more work to do to end LGBT violence. We also commemorate the 1-year anniversary of the Pulse Nightclub terrorist shooting. As we honor the memories of those we have lost, we must also make a commitment to stand together to disarm hate and demand the equality, dignity, and respect for all individuals at home and abroad.

**LGBT PRIDE MONTH**

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, after 18 years of a loving partnership, my friends, Tim and Mike, were finally allowed to do what billions of men and women have been doing for many centuries, enter a legal commitment called marriage.

Yesterday, I had the joy of celebrating LGBT Pride Month on the National Mall with Tim and Mike and hundreds of thousands of people of all genders and sexual orientations. We rejoiced our common humanity and the right for each person to be their true self. Miley Cyrus, the festival headliner, said it best: It was a party in the USA.

And, yes, our country has come a long way from the Stonewall riots of June 1969. The thing is, there is more work to be done.

Today, we remember the horrific Orlando Pulse Nightclub shooting 1 year ago. We must keep striving for a world where all people can live away from violence and free to love who they want to love without recrimination.

**LITTLE ROCK'S CHI ST. VINCENT INFIRMARY**

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Little Rock's CHI St. Vincent for being named to the 2017 list of 100 Great Hospitals in America by Becker's Hospital Review.

CHI St. Vincent Infirmary's history of excellence in patient care dates back to 1888, when it began as a 10-bed charity hospital and the first hospital in Little Rock.

Over the years, to meet increasing demand for patient care, in addition to

expansion for construction, the hospital has made four moves to larger facilities. In 1906, the hospital opened Arkansas' first nursing school, the St. Vincent's Infirmary School of Nursing.

I am proud to have come into this world at St. Vincent, as did our two children.

I would like to thank CHI St. Vincent for continuing its 129-year legacy of leadership in patient care centered on service and quality care in central Arkansas.

**AHCA TO REPEAL AFFORDABLE CARE ACT**

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, last month, House Republicans passed the AHCA, which would repeal the Affordable Care Act, and now Republican Senators are working on their own version.

So far, we know the plan they are developing will be a disaster for our economy and for countless Americans who will either pay more for their healthcare or struggle to afford coverage at all. The Senate plan would force working families to pay higher premiums, end Medicaid as we know it, and could make health insurance nearly unaffordable for people with pre-existing conditions and older Americans.

At this point, we don't know more details of the Senate plan because the Republican leadership is attempting to deny the American people a voice in their own healthcare system.

We need a healthcare reform that lowers cost, expands coverage, and strengthens our economy. We need legislation written in the light of day that can survive public debate. We do not need this.

**HONORING PENN STATE'S OLDEST ALUMNUS**

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, Penn State community lost a legend. Mr. Ray Walker passed away Friday at his home. He was 105 and Penn State's oldest living alumnus.

Ray told our local newspaper that he saw the university grow a lot over the years from "just a cow college" to becoming one of the largest universities in the Nation.

Penn State truly shaped Ray Walker's life. Back in 1931, he thought he wanted to be a doctor, but there was a requirement that he needed to take German. After failing twice, he re-evaluated his major and decided to pursue business.

Around that time, his father told him that he would have to leave Penn State because the family money was lost in the bank crash. But Ray went to work: He started selling potatoes and coal to fraternity houses, and by the time he graduated in 1935, he was sending money home to help his family.

He founded Bradford Coal and was the driving force in surface mining all over the world.

Penn State and I will miss Ray Walker. He was a friend. He was a distinguished alumnus and loved by all who knew him.

May he rest in peace.

#### PRESIDENT TRUMP'S MUSLIM BAN

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free are still welcome in America, no thanks to President Trump. Today, for the second time, President Trump lost a ruling on his Muslim ban in the Federal courts of appeal.

The purpose of the President's ban is clear. The then Presidential candidate Trump explicitly called for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States. Just last week, President Trump criticized his revised ban as politically correct and called for a much tougher version.

The President's executive order is a Muslim ban, plain and simple. Any argument to the contrary is undercut by the President's own tweets.

President Trump, by his own words and by his own actions, is abdicating America's moral leadership. The greatness of America is not built on isolation and discrimination. It is built on the rule of law and the ideals of equality and inclusion and on the rich history of immigration.

#### SUPPORT THE STAPLE ACT

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, brilliant minds from around the world come to the United States to pursue advanced degrees. Unfortunately, for many of these individuals, after we train them, after we educate them, we force them to return to their home countries due to our outdated immigration policy. And then guess what? They compete with us. They compete with the American economy, and this makes no sense.

That is why I am authoring the bipartisan Stopping Trained in America Ph.D.'s from Leaving the Economy Act, the STAPLE Act, along with my colleague Congressman QUIGLEY.

The STAPLE Act exempts individuals born outside the United States from the limits of employment-based green cards and H-1B visas that are awarded annually if that individual has earned a Ph.D. from an American institution in the STEM fields of science, technology, engineering, or math.

Mr. Speaker, by retaining the talent that has benefited from our education system, we can unleash even more economic and innovative opportunity here at home. Not only does the STAPLE Act help promote the American Dream for those from overseas, but it also brings the potential for new invention and ideas that benefit American families and jobs here at home.

#### REMEMBERING 49 AMERICANS GUNNED DOWN AT THE PULSE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2016, 49 Americans were gunned down at the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando. Tonight we remember the beautiful lives lost and all those who suffered injury in this horrific attack.

Sadly, LGBT Americans continue to be the target of horrific hatred and violence here and around the world. Don't let anyone tell you that we have full equality in this country. We don't. There is too much hatred in this country.

Anytime an LGBT American is mocked or treated as less than equal, it is an attack on the values that all of us share as Americans. These expressions of bigotry and intolerance only serve to exacerbate hatred and violence. We cannot let them go unanswered.

Over the last few days, so many have joined in showing their support for the LGBT community and remembering the victims in Orlando. We are strongest when we stand united toward a common purpose of equality for all Americans.

It is my sincere hope that we will build greater understanding toward one another and move closer toward ensuring that every American can live free from discrimination and violence of any kind and in a world where everyone is valued and treated with dignity and respect.

#### EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE TO HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENTERING THE MILITARY

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and to express my gratitude to the young men and women who are answering the call to serve in our military upon graduation from high school this year.

Throughout New York's 22nd Congressional District, countless men and women are serving our country. We are thankful to those who will now join them in the armed services. They have taken upon themselves a duty and a responsibility far greater than themselves.

General MacArthur famously said: "Duty, honor, country: those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, and what you will be."

We as a community and as a country are thankful for their dedication and service. We wish them tremendous success in their service to our great Nation.

I also wish to acknowledge specifically the Conklin Kiwanis Club's "First to Say Thank You" program that was held to honor the men and women of the Southern Tier who are joining the military service. From the 22nd District, there are 35 individuals who are being recognized, and their names will be permanently commemorated in the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I congratulate them and thank them.

□ 1915

#### RECOGNIZING BEATRICE AND FRED SORKIN

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to rise today to honor two remarkable constituents and their extraordinary achievement that should stand as a model for us all.

Last month, Beatrice and Fred Sorkin of Lincolnshire, Illinois, celebrated their 77th wedding anniversary—77 years of love, family, and commitment.

Bea and Fred met as teenagers in Brooklyn, New York. Fred was a sheet metal worker by trade and in 1950 started his own business that he ran for over 40 years. Bea worked in a bank. She began selling savings bonds and rose to become a bank teller and eventually assistant vice president.

Their family has been blessed with two children, Rae and Herbert; their spouses, Michael and Gloria; four grandchildren: Jeffrey, Andrew, Alyse, and Sharon; and, now, seven great-grandchildren.

According to the data collected by the Worldwide Marriage Encounter Organization, Bea and Fred are the longest married couple in all of Illinois. Bea and Fred Sorkin's enduring lifelong connection is an inspiring example for us all.

On behalf of Illinois' 10th District, it is my privilege to congratulate Bea and Fred on their 77th wedding anniversary. I wish them and their family

many more years of health and happiness together.

#### REPUBLICANS NEED TO PRODUCE A BUDGET SO WE CAN SERVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this House needs to get the job done for the American people and make sure that we operate by regular order. That means we want to pass bills here so that we can operate the Government of the United States, whether it is the Department of Defense, the Small Business Administration, or across the range of departments and agencies. But you can't do that well unless you have a budget.

Now, the Republicans control this House, the Republicans control the Senate, and the Republicans control the White House. They should be able to agree among themselves to pass a budget; and then when, as an appropriator, we pass our 12 appropriation bills, we are given a number and we mark up those 12 bills and we don't go over budget.

But guess what. The Republicans can't produce a budget.

Later this week, we are told the Military-Veterans Affairs appropriation bill will be marked up in committee and money will be put in that bill. The problem with that is, if we put the money in that bill, how do we know that we will be able to have money left over for the other 11 bills to fund seniors' Meals on Wheels or the infrastructure bill that people are talking about?

We have a real problem. The Republicans need to do the job and produce a budget so that we can serve the American people as they expect us to do.

#### TEXAS WOMEN VETERANS DAY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great jubilation and excitement to recognize and congratulate the Catholic Charities as they celebrate this day, June 12, being an historic day in Texas because it has been named as Texas Women Veterans Day.

The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Galveston-Houston wants to ensure that the Texas legislators who supported this are, in fact, congratulated. And we are grateful that it was signed into law.

Texas has the highest number of women veterans of any State in the country—last year, 183,597—and these heroes and heroes could soon have a special day when the State will annually recognize their sacrifices.

June 12 now has historic significance. On June 12, 1948, the Women's Armed

Services Integration Act was passed nationally, allowing women to serve as regular members of the military.

"We are delighted that this special population that has bravely served our Nation will be honored in this important way," says Cynthia N. Colbert, Catholic Charities president and CEO. "We serve women veterans through several programs, and we love having the opportunity to recognize those who have served and sacrificed for all of us."

So this is a great day. Thank you Texas and the legislators who sponsored it. I look forward to working with legislation to ensure we have a national day here in the United States.

But to the staff of Catholic Charities, those who travel to Austin and all of those who recognize that we must honor these veterans as the heroes and heroes of the Nation, congratulations. You have a day, June 12. Now, forever, we will honor you on this day.

God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to coanchor this CBC Special Order hour.

I would like to acknowledge the great work and the leadership of our chair, CEDRIC RICHMOND of Louisiana, and, of course, my coanchor, MARC VEASEY of Texas, as we lead the discussion for the next 60 minutes.

In these next 60 minutes, we have a chance to speak directly to the American people on issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, and the constituents that we represent.

In this hour, we would like to discuss racism and discrimination in America and, specifically, hate crimes and the radicalization and the domestic terrorism that they present to the American people.

The conclusion of Dylann Roof's trial a few months ago is the latest reminder that homegrown terrorism has become part of the fabric of life in America. This problem shows no signs of fading yet reveals a threat that is both rare and more complex than simple explanation suggests.

Solving the issue of domestic terrorism through hate crimes involves understanding the true nature of the problem—violent domestic extremism—so that effective steps can be taken to protect the Nation from it.

It is legitimate to ask whether homegrown terrorists are being radicalized. We talk about jihadi narratives and Islamic extremism, the Islamic State

group recruiting online; but there are other groups in this Nation which are radicalizing our youth, radicalizing young people to be a threat against other Americans. This is a subject and a discussion that has rarely been discussed and which we believe is very important.

Since 2001, almost 40 percent of the nearly 150 terrorism fatalities in the United States were related to domestic motivations, not jihadi narratives. It is my hope that in the discussion we will have this hour we are able to discuss in depth the effect that these hate crimes and this domestic violence has on the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter that was written June 7, 2017, by the Congressional Black Caucus to the Honorable Jeff Sessions, Attorney General; Andrew McCabe, Acting Director of the FBI; and John Kelly, Secretary of Homeland Security, in which we express our concern over the alarming number of hate crimes reported across the country, particularly in the wake of the election of President Donald J. Trump.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS,

Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. JEFF SESSIONS,  
*Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.*

ANDREW MCCABE,  
*Acting Director, Federal Bureau of Investigations, Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOHN KELLY,  
*Secretary of Homeland Security, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC.*

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS AND ACTING DIRECTOR MCCABE: I write today to express my concern over the alarming number of hate crimes reported across the country, particularly in the wake of the election of President Donald J. Trump. In addition to speaking out against this rising tide of hate, violence, and intolerance, it is critical that your agencies proactively investigate each and every incident of a potential hate crime and aggressively prosecute these cases to the fullest extent of the law.

During the presidential campaign, then-candidate Donald Trump employed starkly divisive rhetoric to connect with a segment of his base that relished in cultural grievance and hatred. His tone and the arguments that he made were incredibly offensive to minority communities, and his campaign rallies were forums for some of the ugliest public displays of race-based violence and animus in modern political times. Numerous Black Americans were assaulted at his rallies and scenes of deep racial resentment against Blacks, Hispanics, immigrants, and Muslims were frequently paraded and celebrated.

Since the election, it seems hate-filled individuals have been emboldened to terrorize minority communities. In just the first 34 days after the election, the Southern Poverty Law Center counted a total of 1,094 bias incidents around the nation. Disturbingly, the Center also calculated that 37 percent of these cases directly referenced either President-elect Trump, his campaign slogans, or his infamous remarks about sexual assault.

This data is just from the immediate aftermath of the election. The numbers have increased since then, with national news providing coverage. These are not isolated incidents, but rather a frightening trend forming before our eyes.

In fact, this is occurring in Congress' own back yard, like the horrific hate crime that took place just a few miles away at the University of Maryland when Richard Collins III, a promising young man, was stabbed to death on the eve of his graduation from Bowie State University by an admitted white supremacist. There have also been several reports of nooses hung throughout the District of Columbia, including in the African American Museum of History and Culture and on American University's campus. To add insult to injury, a Mississippi lawmaker recently called for Louisiana politicians to be "lynched" for supporting the removal of racist confederate monuments from New Orleans.

Surely there is no greater cause of a government than to protect the lives of its citizens, particularly those uniquely vulnerable to hate, intolerance, and violence. The federal hate crimes statutes were designed with that mission in mind and serve as a critically important tool in combatting the most insidious elements of our society. That is why I implore you to dedicate additional resources within your respective agencies to address the increasing frequency of these deplorable acts. You should and must investigate each and every potential hate crime and prosecute offenders to the fullest extent allowed under the law. You should also ensure that community leaders, including state and local law enforcement, understand the federal resources available to investigate and prosecute hate crimes.

Your leadership is required to not only bring justice to the victims of hate crimes, but also to send a clear message that these acts of domestic terrorism will never be tolerated in this country.

Sincerely,

CEDRIC RICHMOND,  
*Chair, Congressional Black Caucus.*

Ms. PLASKETT. In addition to speaking out against the rising tide of hate, violence, and intolerance in this country, it is critical that those agencies—the FBI, the Department of Justice, as well as Homeland Security—speak out and proactively investigate each and every incident of potential hate crime and aggressively prosecute these cases to the fullest extent of the law.

Since the election, it seems that hate-filled individuals have been emboldened to terrorize minority communities. In just the first 34 days after the election, the Southern Poverty Law Center counted a total of 1,094 bias incidents around the Nation. Disturbingly, the center also calculated that 37 percent of these cases directly referenced either President-elect Trump at the time, his campaign slogans, or infamous remarks about sexual assault. This data is just from the immediate aftermath of the election. The numbers have increased since then.

It is the responsibility of this Congress as well as those agencies to stem this flow of violence that is occurring in this Nation. We know that our

President would not tolerate these sorts of matters, and we are hopeful that he, the Justice Department, the FBI, and Homeland Security will do whatever is necessary to protect American lives from hate crimes that are occurring, domestic terrorism, and the radicalization of our young people to exert hate against other Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), my co-anchor, to speak on this issue. Then we will have an opportunity to hear from other members of the Congressional Black Caucus about this.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. PLASKETT for starting off this Special Order hour on racism and discrimination in the age of Trump.

I really think that this is important and timely that we talk about this because, as you mentioned, these incidents are on the rise and we need to start to discuss them. We need to have open and honest, frank discussions about them, to be quite forward, because, if we don't, then we are never going to be able to move past this or be able to have a better America in regards to racism, hate, and discrimination if we don't begin to have that open dialogue.

Not only does the country need to have an open dialogue, but I think that, as Members of Congress, we need to be the leaders in this area, and we should be the ones who are kicking off the dialogue and starting this.

Make no mistake about it, I know a lot of people will tell you that racism is dead, that discrimination is a thing of the past, that it was something that happened to people that are baby boomers and older and that the effects of discrimination are no longer with us, but we know that is not true.

We know that, again, as Ms. PLASKETT just mentioned a second ago, since 2016, there has been a disturbing number of incidents that have occurred, a disturbing number of things that have been said, things that have been tweeted, the rise of the alt-right, and so many other things that we should be concerned about.

The Southern Poverty Law Center supports this very claim. This organization has collected over 1,300 reported bias incidents between the day after the election and February 7.

Let me point out, because I know that, sadly, there are some people that will cast doubt towards the Southern Poverty Law Center, but the Southern Poverty Law Center has done a tremendous job over the last couple of decades or so of not only helping identify people that commit acts, but groups like the KKK, neo-Nazi groups, and others.

Quite frankly, I don't know why anyone would want to try to undermine or put down an organization that wants to put down groups like that, like the KKK, skinheads, and Nazis. It makes

no sense. I hate when I hear people say bad things about the Southern Poverty Law Center because of the time, money, and effort that they put into fighting groups like I just mentioned.

Let me be clear, because oftentimes when we talk about race, it turns into a very divisive topic, and we don't need for this to be a divisive topic. We need to sit down, come together, and talk because we need to create an opportunity here in America where we can change people's attitudes and make sure that our Nation's history is not repeated.

□ 1930

I also think that, as parents, we have to openly talk about race, bigotry, and hate with our children. One of the things that disturbs me as a parent and, quite frankly, just as a proud American is I will hear people say: Well, I don't say racist things in my house, so my kids would never hear that. If kids are saying racist things, then it must be because they are hearing it at home.

But I have to tell you, as a parent of an 11-year-old, I know that there are influences outside of my home. I know that there is a lot of peer pressure on kids. I know there are a lot of things on social media, and kids want to fit in. Kids want to be cool. So you can never utter one bad thing about a different nationality or race or someone of a different sexual orientation than yours in your house, and your kid could still end up being caught up in something bad like bigotry or racism just because of inappropriate influences at school.

That is why it is important, in my opinion, that, as parents, we talk about this with our children, as uncomfortable as it may make us, but we need to have the discussion. We need to know and our children need to know that it is important to us that we recognize other people's culture; that we recognize other people's faith and sexual orientation and religion so that, as they are forming and they are growing, they understand that this is a nation that is a great nation that is open to everybody, regardless of race, ethnic, or gender background.

I know that for some people, having to talk about racism, it can be very uncomfortable because it makes people guilty. A lot of times when it comes up or you are talking about this, you just—you hear people trying to come up with different examples to sort of assuage any sort of guilt that they may have. It makes them very uncomfortable.

But, again, we have to tackle this head-on. We have to come together to confront these issues of social injustice because it really is time that our Nation heals. It is time that our Nation heals and it is time that we break the chains of our plagued history.

I know that we have other Members here on the House floor that want to talk, and I have some things that I am going to mention a little bit later, just some of the unfortunate incidents that have happened with the President, with the Commander in Chief, the history that he has with racism that I would, quite frankly, like to see him address. Whether it is HUD discrimination, Central Park joggers, after they were exonerated by DNA, I think that his comments were: "Well, they still did something bad," so on and so on. Just some of the issues at the casino that he owned in New Jersey, we need to talk about those.

Quite frankly, he can be a leader—he can actually be a leader in discussing these incidents that happened under his control and under his command, whether it was at his private corporation or whether it was commenting on the Central Park joggers, about how it was a learning experience for him, how he is never going to let it happen again, and how he is never going to let those words utter out of his mouth.

But before I go into that, I am going to turn it back over to the Representative PLASKETT from the Virgin Islands. I, again, thank her very much for kicking this off.

Ms. PLASKETT. Congressman VEASEY, I think it is important, one of the things you talked about is what is going on in our homes and the fact that our children can be radicalized outside of the home. This is an opportunity for us as Americans to see the victimization even of those children who become a part of the alt-right, who become a part of neo-Nazi groups; that they are, in fact, being radicalized by these very disturbing groups, and that we, as leaders in America, have a responsibility.

That is why I am asking unanimous consent to have the letter that was written by Chairman CEDRIC RICHMOND put into the RECORD—the letter of June 7 that went to the FBI, to Homeland Security, as well as to the Justice Department to ask them to investigate and take proactive stances; not just to protect those individuals who are victimized when violence occurs, but to protect those young people and others who may be untowardly influenced by social media to become part of these groups.

I think that is a great point that you bring up, as well as our President becoming someone who can lead the charge against this. We see the rise of this activity during his campaign and after his election. Well, then our President needs to be the one to be Presidential and to stem this influence and this rise of hate crimes that are taking place.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am asking that our colleague, DONALD PAYNE, from the great State of New Jersey, who has done an amazing amount of

work in his own community in the area of Newark in trying to stem violence and criminal justice, the reform work that he is doing, to speak on this matter this evening. I thank him so much for the time that he is giving us. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Well, first, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, Congresswoman PLASKETT, and the gentleman from Texas, MARC VEASEY, for hosting tonight's Special Order hour on such an important topic: racism and discrimination.

Before I begin, I want to take a moment to mark the 1-year anniversary of the Pulse Nightclub shooting and to remember the 49 lives that were cut short in the deadliest mass shooting in our Nation's history.

As we grieve for the victims and their families, we must continue to stand in solidarity with the survivors and with the LGBTQ community against hate, intolerance, for love, in support of our Nation's values of equality and dignity for all.

The kind of intolerance, hate, and violence on display that day in Orlando has become an alarming trend in this country, a trend that has disturbingly been fueled by President Trump. According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, 37 percent of the 1,094 bias-related incidents in just the first month after the election referenced the President, his campaign slogans, or his remarks about sexual assault.

As he did throughout his campaign, President Trump continues to speak the language of racial and cultural grievance, pitting Americans against one another and perpetuating the viciousness he pretends to despise. The result is what you would expect: a spike in hate crimes and hate speech.

I have seen in my district in New Jersey where anti-Semitic graffiti was plastered on a pedestrian bridge. We have seen it at American University and just down the road at the National Museum of African American History and Culture, where nooses were found last month. Communities of color know this pain all too well.

Mr. Speaker, I am really fortunate to be able to discuss an issue of such importance to this Nation. This is one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

You know, I have been very fortunate in my life to have been born into a situation where a great American prior to me held this seat for 23 years in the 10th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey. His name was Donald Payne. He was my father and he afforded me a lifestyle, one of which I did not know of his suffering and pain growing up as a young African American in this country. But even in that situation, I have found myself—irrespective of being in that position, I found myself in situations that have been dangerous and uncomfortable.

As a young, 20-year-old—you know, when we are 20, we do things that we probably shouldn't be doing at times. I was on my lunchtime going downtown to pay a bill at a department store where I had my first credit card, and I was running late. So what I decided to do was make a U-turn on the main street, Broad Street, in Newark, New Jersey, which is the largest street in the town. And I made a U-turn to come in front of the store.

Naturally, you know, with my luck, a motorcycle police officer was coming down the street at the same time. So he pulled me over, as he should, and I was wrong. But I was using my cousin's car. So when he asked me for my license and registration, I could not find the papers that I needed and I was fumbling and nervous.

The officer leaned into the car and used the N-word and said: If you don't find those documents in a minute, I will throw you so far under the jail that they will never find you.

So this is very frightening for any citizen to go through. So I was able to get my license, and I handed it to him. Just before that, they would throw me so far under the jail that they would never find me again. Once I handed him my license and it said that I was DONALD PAYNE, Jr., whose father was a sitting councilman in the city of Newark, his whole attitude changed.

"Don't you know that you could get hurt, or you could hurt someone, or you have to be careful." A minute ago I was nothing. I would be so far under the jail, they would never find me. But now that I am connected to something or someone, all of a sudden we have become paternal.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of people in this country that aren't connected to someone, and these are the types of things that they go through. So I am just here to say that we must be vigilant. I believe in this country; I believe in its greatness. I believe in the words in the Pledge of Allegiance. I believe in the Constitution. We must make it work for all Americans.

Ms. PLASKETT. Thank you so much, Mr. PAYNE, for your words, your enlightenment, and for sharing that very personal piece of you and your own experience. There are so many African Americans and so many people of color in this country who have those exact same experiences.

Whether it is us, personally—I know I have mine exactly like that. You know, I have four sons, and each one of them have had that kind of experience here in this country.

With the rise of hate that is occurring, we have to be careful for every American and we need to be concerned that this country is no longer becoming a safe place for groups of individuals; that there are people that are rising up and attempting to terrorize other Americans. This should be of



concern to Congress. This should be of concern to our President.

I thank Mr. PAYNE again for that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE from Texas, who sits not only on the Budget Committee, but, very relevant to our discussion this evening, is one of the senior members of the Judiciary Committee, as well as Homeland Security Subcommittee, where so many of these issues form a confluence.

Thank you so much for being with us this evening, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE. We look forward to your remarks and to the enlightenment that you will be giving us here in this Chamber as well as the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Well, first of all, it is my honor and privilege to thank Congresswoman PLASKETT for her ongoing leadership in speaking to our colleagues and the American people. Let me take a moment of personal privilege to say to her that, over the weekend in Texas, I was with a number of individuals from the Virgin Islands, and it certainly was my first task to tell them of the excellent representation that they were getting by her leadership on so many issues.

But to you, I want to say that we were at the commissioning of the USS Gabrielle Giffords, and proudly so. The commander of that ship is from the Virgin Islands, so there was a contingent of individuals from all over the country for recognizing the commander and his wife. Let me say that I made sure that those sailors knew who was supporting them as well. It certainly was a great honor to former Congresswoman Giffords, and there wasn't a dry eye as we did that. So I just wanted to add that and thank you for your indulgence of that.

If I might, let me also acknowledge my colleague on the floor, Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS, and Floridians who are here, just to make note of the commemoration of the tragedy at the Pulse Nightclub.

□ 1945

This is the area in which the Congresswoman policed, if you will, and her spouse still there leads the community in law enforcement. I will honor to those who lost their lives, but to the recognition that terrorism and hateful acts are not to be accepted by any of us.

As a good friend of mine, a Muslim, said yesterday as we stood against hateful acts against Muslims around the world, and particularly around the United States, he said that the way that we deal with this danger is to love in recognition of the human dignity of all.

To the LGBTQ community, my deepest sympathy and recognition in this month that we honor and have Pride

Month that we recognize your deep involvement in this country and your right to human dignity. So I thank Congresswoman PLASKETT for allowing me to engage in that statement.

Let me say that I would hope that none of us would have wanted to be on the floor tonight to talk about the changing face of America since the election of the President of the United States but, in fact, to recognize that there has been a surge in discrimination throughout this Nation.

The roots of racial extremist violence against peaceful Black communities runs deep in American history: from this country's dark path of chattel slavery; to the southern lynch mobs that sought to permanently disenfranchise the Black vote; to the church bombing that killed four little Black girls in Birmingham; to the dismantling of an entire economic district in Tulsa; and to the senseless stabbing, just a few weeks ago, of a bright, young man by the name of Richard Collins III.

I am sad that the election of President Trump—and I am not sure whether this has been brought to his attention—I would like to bring it to his attention—has created a divisive atmosphere. Trump's political debut was centered on the racist birther movement, which questioned the citizenship of then-President Obama.

He was not in office then. And to some, it was a little humorous; some were shocked. Certainly, the Black community did not take it humorously. This was a Senator who had been duly elected by the citizens of Illinois. He had done nothing to bring in commentary on himself personally. He sought the Presidency of the United States. He offered to the American people all of the documentation that would be required, yet Donald Trump persisted for 5 years in insisting, through fake news, that he was not a citizen of the United States of America.

During his political campaign, he repeatedly refused to reject the endorsement of White supremacist groups. He failed to condemn supporters who shouted out racist slurs, and, on occasion, violently attacked protestors who happened to be an African-American woman, in particular.

In a nation completely comprised of immigrants, he has built a hateful movement around building a wall. And to my friends who are Hispanic, particularly Mexicans, he called them drug dealers and any number of names.

This country has prided itself on the value of immigration, of diversity, and, certainly, freed slaves who have come to make this country the great country that it is. Overall, his anti-immigrant incidents were the most reported, 315 incidents; followed by anti-Black, 221; anti-Muslim, 112; and anti-LGBT, 109.

So I just want to take a moment to add to my commentary, the things

that I think are grossly horrific; that we should realize that this is not a time for the CBC to be on the floor casting blame.

Let me also, as I acknowledge Congresswoman PLASKETT, thank our chairperson, Congressman CEDRIC RICHMOND, for his really unceasing leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and the work that he has done to make sure that we astutely have the information to be the conscience of Congress.

These are the pictures of hatred. This is the individual who killed the young man that—I don't want to show the wrong picture—but this is a picture of an individual who was engaged in the killing of two individuals, I believe in Portland, Oregon, because they were trying to defend someone of a different background.

We have a noose found hanging near a school in Washington, D.C. This is a picture of that. This has all happened since the election of President Trump.

We have an incident, June 9, 2017, The Washington Post says, "‘Shut up, Slave!’: A spilled Starbucks drink led to a racist tirade and sidewalk fight."

I don't know if people are under extreme tension, but this is all happening in 2017.

We have another one: A day without racism? Not for Trump's administration. The Department of Justice is dismantling, or lowering the Civil Rights Division, cutting the staffing that is there.

Hate crimes in the U.S. rising. These are the kinds of things. And tragically, here is a handsome, beautiful, young man who was taking his commission and getting ready to graduate, Richard Collins III, and he was killed.

Let me finish on these points about the criminal justice system that I think is very important.

Black Americans are more likely to have their cars searched.

Black Americans are more likely to be arrested for drug use.

Black Americans are more likely to be jailed while awaiting trial.

Black Americans are more likely to be offered a plea deal that includes prison time.

Black Americans are more likely to serve longer sentences than White Americans for the same offense.

Black Americans are more likely to be disenfranchised.

We also know that we have statistics, that I will offer into the RECORD, of Black American youth who are more likely to be included in the juvenile detention center, police stops, police searches, use of force during arrest, juvenile arrests, transgender arrests. Sixty percent of the transgender arrests are Black or Latino; arrests for marijuana.

Most Blacks are not likely to get pretrial release. More Blacks are likely to

be prosecuted. More Blacks are likely to get prison versus community service. Length of incarceration is longer than Whites.

State judge incarceration, there are 208,000 people in State prison for drug offenses; 32 percent are White, 68 percent are Black.

Federal drug convictions are higher among African Americans. Forty-seven percent were Hispanics, and we are higher than those.

Federal court sentencing, and, of course, incarceration of women African Americans are higher. Sentencing to life without parole, African Americans are higher, 65 percent.

Hiring people with criminal records, that makes it very difficult for us to work, and eliminating the right to vote.

So, Congresswoman, I will close by simply saying, where is the President on standing with the moral compass of asking the hatred to stop; to really empower a Department of Justice not to be led by an individual who has fought against voting rights, fought against the rights of those who are seeking to be rehabilitated in the criminal justice system; to join a bipartisan army of individuals against mass incarceration? Where is the President in standing against the hatred that has impacted the African-American community?

The words that he has said, where is the President in stopping this onslaught that is generating into violence in the streets?

Where is the moral compass of this administration? If it is not you, Mr. President, the Congressional Black Caucus will not take a back seat to you. We will fight and bring this country back to where it should be, and that is a country that believes in the equality of all Americans, and the African Americans who have died and bled in wars, and have been slaves, and, in essence, came through a reformation to be free. We will not take a back seat to all of this hatred.

I ask you, Mr. President, where are your answers?

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman VEASEY and Congresswoman PLASKETT for anchoring this important special order on "Racism and Discrimination in America."

For over 40 years the CBC has been at the forefront in the fight against the evils of racism, discrimination, marginalization, and the various manifestations of institutionalized racial bias.

In today's uncertain times, we must be more steadfast than ever to continue that fight.

No matter what your party identification is, I believe we can all agree that we must root out extremist violence everywhere, and especially within our borders.

And while we are all committed to eliminating ISIS and all its sympathizers, we must not underestimate the threat of domestic terrorism and domestic violence by racial extremists.

Throughout the history of this country, African-American communities have faced innumerable threats from those who don't comprehend that there is value within our nation's diversity.

The roots of racial extremist violence against peaceful Black communities runs deep in American history: From this country's dark past of chattel slavery, to the southern lynch mobs that sought to permanently disenfranchise the Black vote, to the church bombing that killed four little girls in Birmingham, to the dismantling of an entire economic district in Tulsa, to the senseless stabbing of a bright young man by the name of Richard Collins III just a few weeks ago.

As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, or the "Conscience of the Congress", I call on this body to do all it can to stem the rising tide of racial violence.

Although progress has been made, President Trump's divisive rhetoric, and the actions of his followers, have shown us that we still have much work to do before all of America can feel safe.

Consistent rhetoric of intolerance coming from Trump's campaign and now his administration has not only put a target on African-American communities, but also on Mexican-Americans, Muslim-Americans, women, and those within the immigrant population.

The election of Donald Trump has had a significant effect on the nation's race relations:

Trump's political debut was centered on the racist "birther movement", which questioned the citizenship of then President Obama for months.

During his political campaign, he repeatedly refused to reject the endorsement of white supremacist groups.

He failed to condemn supporters who shouted out racist slurs and on more than one occasion, violently attacked protesters.

In a nation completely comprised of immigrants, he has built a hateful movement around building a wall to keep them out.

This country has prided itself on being the melting pot of the world. The bastion of freedom of equality. Violence against any person based on their class, color, or creed is not only immoral, it's anti-American.

We must condemn, denounce, and seek to eliminate these acts of racial terror with the same fervor that we would when dealing with religious extremists.

I have to quote former Attorney General Eric Holder who stated, "Though this nation has proudly thought of itself as an ethnic melting pot, in things racial we have always been and continue to be, in too many ways, essentially a nation of cowards."

Regardless of who resides at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., this body, the people's chamber, has a responsibility to do all that it can to ensure the safety of all Americans. That is why I, along with my colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus, have sent out a letter to the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the acting director of the FBI urging them to allocate more time and resources to curbing the recent uptick in violence.

Incidents of Racialized Violence Since the Election:

The Southern Poverty Law Center has conducted a report on incidents of racialized violence following the Presidential election.

There were over 1000 violent attacks reported within a month of the election.

Overall, anti-immigrant incidents were the most reported at 315 incidents, followed by anti-black (221 incidents), anti-Muslim (112 incidents), and anti-LGBT (109 incidents).

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman for her leadership on issues related to the Judiciary Committee and to others.

At this time, I would like to invite the Congressman, not just from New York, but from, of course, what I believe is the best, most illustrious borough in New York City—Brooklyn, of course, which is where I was born and raised.

Thank you so much, Congressman JEFFRIES, for your leadership on the Judiciary Committee, your discussions about the issues that we are discussing here this evening, and I am waiting to hear what you are going to not only present to us here in this Chamber but to the American people on this issue.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for yielding, and for the phenomenal job that you have done, along with my classmate, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Representative MARC VEASEY.

As you know, I have great affection for the fact that you have a significant connection to Brooklyn. We say back home, there are two types of Americans: those who live in Brooklyn, and those who want to live in Brooklyn.

But, certainly, this is a significant issue, that the Congressional Black Caucus has gathered here today to discuss during this hour of power, the opportunity for members of the Congressional Black Caucus to speak directly to the American people on an issue of great significance.

Since January 20, we have seen a disturbing increase here in America in anti-immigrant, anti-Muslim, anti-Black, anti-LGBT, and anti-Semitic acts.

And the question is: Is this just a coincidence, or could it possibly have something to do with the election of the 45th President of the United States of America?

Now, in part, what we are seeing is connected to a historic backlash that has often occurred throughout this journey that we have been on here in America, that whenever we make significant progress, there is always a backlash amongst some in America who have got a problem with the fact that we have done things designed to be more consistent with our values of liberty and justice for all, equal protection under the law.

We know slavery was the original sin here in America. That was corrected in the aftermath of the North's victory during the Civil War. We had the reconstruction amendments: the 13th

Amendment, abolish slavery; 14th Amendment, equal protection under the law; 15th Amendment, the right to vote regardless of race. That was progress in America followed by the inevitable backlash.

The imposition of Jim Crow laws; a lynching epidemic; Black code, segregation, particularly through just the Deep South. Progress followed by backlash.

And then finally, in the 1960s, in an effort to create a more perfect union and address the unfinished business in America, you had the civil rights movement, anchored with the '64 Civil Rights Act, effectively ended Jim Crow; the '65 Voting Rights Act, giving African Americans in the Deep South, people of color throughout the country the right to vote, unimpeded from things like grandfather clauses, and poll taxes, and other types of shenanigans that people were practicing; the 1968 Fair Housing Act capped off the civil rights movement, followed by the inevitable backlash.

Richard Nixon ran a racist campaign, a southern strategy, designed to appeal to aggrieved Whites in parts of this country, particularly in the Deep South, ushered in an era of resistance to the progress that had been made, antibusing, antiaffirmative action.

And then, of course, we have got Barack Obama who was elected in what many of us viewed as an incredible step in the right direction. African Americans, having gone from the outhouse to the White House. Eight years of tremendous progress in moving this country forward, followed by the election of Donald Trump, a man who spent 5 years perpetrating the racist lie that Barack Obama was not born in the United States of America.

And many of us are wondering, why were so many people who worship at the altar of White supremacy drawn to Donald Trump's campaign? What was it about this individual that so many folks dripping in hatred flocked to his candidacy? That is not to say that everyone who voted for Donald Trump is a racist. We do know that every racist in America voted for Donald Trump. That is a problem.

And so, again, I just ask the question in closing: Is this all a big coincidence? We know part of it is the backlash that has often occurred whenever we have made progress in America. But this President has a responsibility to address the rise in hate crimes that have taken place on his watch, whether or not his election is directly connected to it.

Many of us have our own suspicions, but he is the Commander in Chief.

□ 2000

He has got to tell his Attorney General, who is straight out of central casting in terms of the good old boys: Your job as chief law enforcement offi-

cer in the land is to enforce the laws whether you like them or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands may continue.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that every single thing that has been said—and I would urge you to challenge anything as a fact. In fact, there are facts that have been left out in terms of my remarks about the 45th President of the United States. I have actually been kind of gentle as it relates to the person who is occupying 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue right now, but more to come. I would welcome the Speaker to dispute anything that has been said in the name of us trying to move this country forward consistent with the notions of equal protection under the law and liberty and justice for all.

Ms. PLASKETT. I thank Congressman JEFFRIES and I really appreciate his remarks. I know that this House has rules and is concerned about decorum in here. We at the Congressional Black Caucus are also very concerned about decorum. While we uphold the position of the President of the United States, many individuals—particularly constituents, the underserved within our communities—are fearful about us actually speaking out, specifically to the personage and to the person of President Donald Trump.

What we are trying to do in this Special Order is speak unrefutable facts; not about the personality, not subjective discussion about the President, not our feelings, and not our fears, but the actual facts of what has happened in this country and what is happening in this country because that is life for our children, that is the very essence of us continuing, and that is what democracy is about.

If we cannot critique the actions of our President, then that is very fearful to us as Americans and very fearful to this House, which is supposed to be a separate branch of government and which I recall maybe a year ago it speaking very vehemently against the person who was in the White House at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), who is my classmate. I thank Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN for her work, particularly in working with other Congressional Black Caucus women to found the Caucus for Black Women and Girls, which is very important right now because this is a forgotten group quite often here in the United States, and the gentlewoman is advocating and speaking out for those individuals.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman so much for her leadership and this Special Order hour and considering this subject matter that we are going to discuss.

I want to talk a little bit about something that has sort of been my observation and my experiences for a very long period of time and I think that are actually exacerbated by this Presidency that we currently have in this House. Let me, by way of association, just comment positively to the remarks of my colleague and the former speaker, HAKEEM JEFFRIES from New York.

I entitled my remarks "From the Cradle to the Grave."

From the cradle to the grave, Black people in America are required to be resilient, courteous, and persistent. The rules are always different.

From the cradle to the grave, Black people in America must be comfortable and confident in ourselves, but only so much so that we do not intimidate or aggravate.

From the cradle to the grave, Black people in America are told our plight, our struggle, and our sacrifice is a mere fantasy in post-racial America while we witness the reality of institutional racism, conscious discrimination, and our rich history erased or appropriated.

From cradle to grave, Black people in America experience this racism and discrimination walking home from the corner store eating a pack of Skittles, listening to music at a gas station, or simply sitting in our neighborhood park.

We experience this racism and discrimination showing up to school in our natural hairstyles, shopping in our favorite stores, or even just showing up to work—including the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Last Wednesday, it was reported that Black troops are far more likely than their White counterparts to face court-martial or other forms of military punishment.

National data shows us that Black girls are 5.5 times more likely to be suspended from school than White girls. That rate actually balloons in my State of New Jersey to 8.5 percent. More than 60 years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, school systems in the United States are still separate and unequal.

As of 2014, California had 31 open desegregation cases. In 2016, a Presidential candidate ran a campaign on divisive rhetoric that targeted our communities, our well-being, and our safe spaces. It only gets worse.

From the cradle to the grave, we are told to calm down, sit down, and be courteous and humble. From the cradle to the grave, the experiences, the challenges, the stories, our history, and even our very being are kept out of

boardrooms, classrooms, voting booths, department stores, history books, movie screens, television scripts, and the like.

But let me just tell you that, from the cradle to the grave, we are built to persevere, we are strengthened to overcome, we are born to lead, we are committed to uplift, and we are fully equipped to soar with weights on our shoulders even in these times and even under this Presidency. And guess what. We do.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for her inspiring words and motivation to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS). We always bring up the fact that Congressman DWIGHT EVANS is a freshman, but he isn't really a freshman. Everybody acknowledges his leadership in his work in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the State house that transcends him as a freshman. We call the gentleman a superfreshman in that respect because he comes with a great deal of experience and wisdom here to the House floor. I am very anxious to hear what the gentleman has to speak about related to hate crimes and the rise of domestic terrorism against people of color and against minorities here in this country.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for her leadership, along with my colleague from Texas, because both of them have demonstrated real clear leadership for the Congressional Black Caucus and the leadership of our chairman, CEDRIC RICHMOND. So I thank both of them publicly for what they have done and all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot to lose under the Trump administration. It has been very clear, as has been stated by all of my colleagues, from healthcare to food policy, to education, to affordable housing, the President and his party continue to look for ways to take away what we have come to know as fundamental programs behind building stronger neighborhoods.

Our Nation is facing challenging times and we simply cannot afford to carry on business as usual. From the nooses found at the Smithsonian National Museum of African American History and Culture to the racial slur spray-painted on LeBron James' house during the NBA finals and attacks against Jewish community centers and vandalism in Jewish cemeteries, our country and our globe are sadly seeing horrific increases in discrimination and racially biased incidents.

Dr. King always said: We have come over here in different boats, but we are now in the same boat.

I really mean just that. Think about it: an attack against one of us is an attack against all of us. We know we

have come a long way in our fight against racial intolerance and hate in our country, but our journey continues. It doesn't matter if you are Black, Jewish, Hispanic, or LGBT. We are stronger together when we celebrate both our similarities and our differences.

When we watch the news, it is incredibly upsetting to see what is still happening in 2017. A little over a week ago at the Smithsonian National Museum of African American History and Culture here in D.C., we found another noose on the Smithsonian grounds. The museum's founding director said: "It is a painful reminder of the challenges that African Americans continue to face."

We know that we are not only seeing violence and intolerance against the African-American community, but it is everywhere. This year at the Mount Carmel Cemetery, a Jewish cemetery just outside of my district in northeast Philadelphia, countless tombstones were toppled and vandalized. Days after this, the JCC in Wynnewood in my district received a bomb threat.

These are just a few of the truly cowardly acts of violence taking place in our neighborhoods, yet our Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, and the President claim to be tough on crime. They want to put more people in cities behind bars.

This weekend, Mr. Speaker, I was the keynote speaker at Gaudenzia, an addiction treatment and recovery center in my district. The graduates are some of the strongest individuals in our city, and their stories of perseverance and hard work are truly inspiring. I always say: Where you start is not where you end up.

Throughout my career, I have been dedicated to trying to find ways to build stronger neighborhoods block by block. To do this, we have to make good jobs, great schools, and access to healthcare a reality.

We know the tradition and reentry back into our neighborhoods isn't always easy. In Philadelphia, ShopRite supermarket is hiring to give good-paying jobs to those who formerly were incarcerated. The company estimates they have given over 500 jobs to formerly incarcerated individuals. This is the result in one city.

Sadly, we know that racism and bigotry are still a factor in our communities. We have to confront this head-on. As the Congressional Black Caucus collectively stands here today, we will not accept what is taking place. We are prepared to face these challenges, and we are asking others to join us because we recognize that we can move this country forward, but it will take all of us.

So what we are doing here today is raising the awareness because we must have this conversation in a public way. We must deal with this issue of racism,

noninclusion, and discrimination. No longer can we accept this.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you today: As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, we are prepared to do our part.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks and continued work to discuss middle communities, middle neighborhoods, and the importance of these communities and how they need to be protected.

Congressman VEASEY, we have had a discussion here this evening about so much of the rise in hate crimes and the rise of racial tensions. I know that this weekend Puerto Rico had its plebiscite in which they talked about becoming a State.

One of the things that I often talk to people about is the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, and Puerto Rico, all of us are territories now after 100 years.

It was never the intent of Congress for areas of the United States to be a territory for 100 years except for the fact that these are now people of color. These are communities of people of color. So based on the insular cases 100 years ago which said that the people living in the territories and offshore territories were people of alien races who couldn't understand Anglo-Saxon principles of law, that is why we were not able to have the full-fledged rights of American citizens.

□ 2015

Now we are seeing, even here on the mainland, individuals, people of color, who are being treated as second-class citizens and who are not afforded the full protection of this country.

When you have incidents like on May 20 with Richard Collins, on May 26 with Jeremy Joseph Christian, who began shouting racial slurs at two women on a Portland, Oregon, train, and as the two men stepped in to de-escalate the situation, those two great men were stabbed to death, and a third man was wounded, much needs to be done.

We have our moments of silence when there are mass shootings. We mourn for the families of Pulse nightclub and for what happened in those areas. But it is not enough for us to have Special Order hours, to have discussions, or even have moments of silence. Action must be taken by this administration.

Mr. VEASEY. Absolutely. We do need action taken by this administration, Representative PLASKETT.

I mentioned to you earlier that I wanted to talk about the President's history on racism and some of the things that came out in the campaign—not anything new but, nevertheless, very disturbing—and why we need for the President honestly to lead this discussion.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I know that there were other issues that the gentleman wanted to discuss with regard to some of these and examples that he wanted to give as well, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. Very briefly, we have the President's history on racism from the very beginning of his candidacy, of course, and the way he disparaged Mexicans and Mexican Americans in this country by calling people rapists and accusing people of bringing disease and crime into the United States, pretending that he didn't know who David Duke was. It is unbelievable, pretending to not know who David Duke was.

Ms. PLASKETT. I think he knows now.

Mr. VEASEY. Even condoning the beating of a Black Lives Matter protester, his history extends before that.

Of course, it was very well covered, very well chronicled during the campaign about the Justice Department suing his real estate company and his father's real estate company for not renting apartments to Black people, not renting apartments to African-American potential tenants. Of course, they ultimately settled that lawsuit because of the wrongdoing that happened there.

Ms. PLASKETT. That was in the 1970s, I believe.

Mr. VEASEY. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

In 1989, he encouraged and celebrated the wrongful imprisonment of the Central Park Five and took out full-page ads in New York area newspapers calling for the return of the death penalty in response to a very infamous case in which a woman was beaten and raped while jogging in Manhattan's Central Park.

Back then, before he was President, Donald Trump said: They should be forced to suffer, and when they kill, they should be executed for their crimes. I want these murderers and always will.

Of course, there was a lot of public outrage over that case. It was very well talked about. It was on all the talk shows and what have you.

Those men wrongfully spent time in prison because the DNA evidence exonerated them.

Ms. PLASKETT. Actually, they weren't men at the time. They were teenagers.

Mr. VEASEY. They were teenagers at the time.

Even after the DNA evidence exonerated them, he still said that maybe

they could be guilty of something. I thought that was a terrible thing to say.

Of course, the New Jersey Casino Control Commission fined Trump Plaza Hotel and Casino \$200,000 in 1992 because managers would remove African-American car dealers at the request of certain big-time gamblers that would come in.

In 1996, 20 African Americans in Indiana sued Trump for failing to honor a promise to hire mostly minority workers for a riverboat casino on Lake Michigan.

Let me tell you why, even despite this, the President has the ability to lead a discussion on race.

You might remember Shirley Sherrod. I don't know if that name rings a bell with you. She was an African-American agricultural worker who worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Georgia Department of Agriculture, and was given an example of how she overcame her own bias and her own racism.

Of course, her comments were misconstrued and the tapes were made to sound one way. She ultimately lost her job. She was offered her job back after it was proven this conservative newspaper had actually tried to disparage her so they could have some sort of a racism equivalent or something to try to make the readers feel better.

The reason why I bring that up is because here was a woman that was being honest about and trying to give an example about how she overcame bias and how she overcame prejudice. The President has an opportunity to talk about Central Park, to talk about racism in his apartments, to talk about the issues at the casino, to talk about the other areas in his life where he has fallen quite short when it comes to fairness and honesty and racism. So we need him to lead that discussion so we can begin to talk more and begin to heal our country.

Ms. PLASKETT. Part of leadership is expressing your shortcomings and using that as an opportunity to move forward and to move the Nation forward. So many people look to our President for his leadership and for his thoughts and his out-of-the-box thinking. This would be tremendous not only to the people who are being oppressed, but to others as well.

One of the things I wanted to leave us with was a quote and some work that the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law is working on, that has a mission to secure equal justice for all through the rule of law, targeting, in particular, the inequities confronting African Americans and other racial and ethnic minorities.

In December 2016, Kristen Clarke, who is the president, stated: "Hate crimes and hate-filled incidents stand as a dark cloud over our democracy. The recent spike in hate crimes is at-

tributable, in part, to racially charged rhetoric that characterized the 2016 election cycle and the rise of 'alt-right' white nationalist extremism. This is a moment that calls for Federal, State, and local officials to use every tool in their arsenal to fully investigate and prosecute these incidents when they occur."

And we from the Congressional Black Caucus say, as well, to eradicate this from our Nation.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the 2016 presidential election was an exceptionally bitter fight between Republicans and Democrats. The election highlighted many of the existing divides between many Americans and the underlying frustrations that we have been wrestling with as a people. Couple this with the resentful partisanship that we have experienced in Congress, and it is quite clear that there are deep rifts dividing our country. However, one of the biggest consequences of this partisan bickering and inability to compromise has been the increase in the frequency of hate crimes across America.

The latest figures from the Southern Poverty Law Center estimate that there have been nearly 1,372 bias incidents between the day after the election and February 7, when these statistics were last reported. SPLC is collecting self-reported data from across the country in an effort to monitor "bias incidents"—or acts of hostility that are motivated by racism or other prejudices—across the United States. While it is important to acknowledge the limitations of self-reported data, this trend is consistent with several other incidents reported nationwide that have challenged the notion that we are living in a post-racial society.

For example, several nooses were found throughout our nation's capital this month—one near an elementary school, another in the African American Museum of History and Culture, and on American University's campus. On June 2, a Muslim couple was allegedly harassed in Oregon and told to go back to their country. More prominently, two men in Portland were stabbed to death and another wounded when they tried to intervene on behalf of two women, one of whom was wearing a hijab, who were being verbally assaulted by a man yelling slurs.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the horrendous incidents being reported in the wake of this election and the hateful rhetoric that has come to define the political narrative. However, I am here to join my colleagues not only to denounce these actions and hateful words, but also to remind ourselves that we are better than this. We are better than this as a people and a nation, and we must all do our part to discourage this behavior and hold these violators accountable. Until we all take active roles within our society and democracy, we cannot reasonably expect our society to overcome these challenges and emerge a stronger society. I am proud to join my colleagues tonight in sending a clear message that these acts of hatred and violence will not be tolerated. Not today, not ever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### HONORING PULSE NIGHTCLUB VICTIMS IN ORLANDO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for 30 minutes.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as I stand here tonight before you, in my hometown of Orlando, thousands of people are gathered at Lake Eola Park like they were 1 year ago to mourn, honor, and pay tribute to the 49 lives we lost on January 12, 2016. We were with them earlier today. We would love to be with them tonight, as we were last year, but we are here doing the job we were elected to do.

I am joined tonight by my colleague—I am absolutely honored to serve with him—Representative DARREN SOTO. We stand here tonight on the floor of the House of Representatives together so the world will not forget the lives we lost in the Pulse nightclub shooting.

It was supposed to be like any other Saturday night for the men and women inside the Pulse nightclub. I can only imagine the excitement they shared that evening as they celebrated birthdays and friendships. Mr. Speaker, they were out for what my bishop likes to call late-night fellowship.

Then, at 2:20 a.m., when everyone was closing their tabs for the night and about to head home, it was then that an ISIS-inspired gunman, motivated by hate, walked into the club and opened fire. Within a matter of minutes, he was able to kill 49 people and wound so many others. The innocent men and women in the club didn't stand a chance against him that night.

We lost 49 lives. Their full potential will never be known, and we will always wonder, when we think about their lives, what could have been. Many others continue to recover from their visible and invisible wounds.

In the days and weeks following the Nation's deadliest mass shooting, we saw our community come together in beautiful ways. We mourned with those who lost their loved ones. We came out in droves to donate blood for the survivors who needed it. We showed support and gratitude for our law enforce-

ment officers, our first responders, and the nurses and doctors who acted with courage and bravery in the face of unimaginable tragedy.

We embraced and celebrated the diversity that makes Orlando "The City Beautiful." We showed the world that we are a city who defeats hate with love.

One year after the shooting, the wounds are still fresh and the scars are still not fully healed, but our community is resilient and united in the face of this tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Florida, (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida, Representative VAL DEMINGS. First of all, I thank her for her service in law enforcement and also for her husband, Jerry Demings' service in law enforcement and to remember the 1-year mark of the Pulse nightclub shooting.

□ 2030

I wrote a poem entitled: "Our Pulse Still Beats."

Inspiration from a brother lost too soon  
A place for his memory to play the tune  
Alas his pulse ceased

A safe place for a rainbow of people  
Full expression was presented throughout  
this steeple

They all danced to the pulsating sounds  
Then came a night of celebration  
For many friends from many nations  
On the move to impulsive grooves  
In the midst of the night a dark figure entered

Hate-filled heart and soul a splintered  
His guns pulsating death.

Horrors, and cries, as bullets fly  
Some they ran and some they died  
Their pulses ceased to be

Brave officers infiltrated the scene  
A melee ensued amidst the smoke and gleam  
And in the end terror was silenced, the repulsive vanquished

Medics and firefighters quickly came to the rescue

Seeking out those who cried out with fading hues

Come quick he is still breathing, wait she has a pulse

In makeshift ambulances staining ER floors in red

One by one saved from the dead

On the monitor, pulses finally steady beep, beep, beep

In the morn Orlando awakes in sadness  
But comes together as One above the madness

The pulse of the city is unspeakable grief and unbreakable love

From everywhere we came to the Center, the Bloodbank, the Lake, and the Streets

We gave our time, our pennies, our blood, our hugs, and our eats

Donors with a strong pulse are needed to replenish our stock

Makeshift monuments grew before our eyes  
We gathered at Dr. Phillips for those we lost and those still alive

As the bell rang 49 times, sorrow became the natural impulse, but so was unity

This emotion, this grief, this love was felt around the world

By mothers and fathers, boys and girls  
A community pulsating with sadness and defiant hope

Our happy little tourist town known for magic

Became the site of history's most violent shooting, tragic

But our community's pulse still beats  
One year later one community stronger

Our pulse still beats  
For those who survived

Our pulse still beats  
And for those we lost

Our love still remains  
For the 49 angels our love still remains

Though pain will ever be in our hearts  
Our love still remains.

Mrs. DEMINGS. I want to thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for that very beautiful and inspiring poem that really captures not only the tragedy that occurred in Orlando at the Pulse Nightclub that night, but the heroic acts, how our community came together, and really provides the hope that our community needs in moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, no one can tell the story better than the family members who lost their loved ones that night, the survivors who were within the club that night. At this time, we would like to share some of the letters from family members and survivors.

The first letter that I would like to share comes from a mother who, if you were watching at all during the early hours of this tragic incident, this particular mother was going around asking anyone who she could about her son, trying to find him, trying to get word of him. I would like to share a mother's story from Christine Leinonen.

"My son was one of the 49 people killed at Pulse Nightclub on June 12 of 2016. Those were 49 humans who collectively could have lived another 2,500 years. That is longer than we have had civilization. They were moms, dads, siblings, kids, straight, gay, Latino, Asian, Caucasian. They were your constituents. They deserved better than to die in a flurry of bullets.

"My son Chris was a happy, quirky, goofy young man and had been from baby on. He was every mother's dream to hit the kid lottery. He was an only child, and I never married. I couldn't have loved him more.

"He became a licensed mental health therapist. He loved his work and his personal life.

"Chris had many friends. Chris and his boyfriend, Juan, were one of at least three couples to die together that night: another Juan and two Luises. Chris was one of two Christophers to die that night and at least six Christophers who died or survived. The magnitude of the killing is that there were so many names repeated.

"My son was a loving and giving person. He was someone who was going to be my right-hand man as I became old and incapacitated. Now I have no one.

"Chris lived his life with love and kindness. He was a walking, talking United Nations, inclusive of all; not by



design, but because he cared about character, not race, gender, sexuality, or ethnicity. He lived a life of inclusion. You would have loved him if you knew him, whether he was your child or friend or cousin or coworker. The world has a little less joy without him in it.

"Hugs and kisses, Christopher's mom."

And at this time, I would like to yield to my colleague from Florida (Mr. SOTO), who will continue to share.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman DEMINGS for sharing Chris' story.

A coworker of mine, Ramses Tinoco, who survived the Pulse Nightclub shooting, sent me this letter entitled "Everlasting Unity."

"My name is Ramses Tinoco, and I am a Pulse Nightclub shooting survivor. I thank God for giving me the opportunity to continue with my life so that I can spread empowerment, compassion, love, and unity.

"I want to express my feelings and point of view. Realistically, as a community and nation, we all suffered a tragic attack of terror on this one-year remembrance of June 12, 2016. Today, this is known as the biggest mass shooting in American history. Here at the doorsteps of Pulse Nightclub, let's take in consistent consideration of the ones who ultimately suffered the most: the victims, families of the deceased, the injured survivors, the other survivors who were there and escaped by God's grace, and the community who stood by, grieved in the aftermath.

"As a community, we have been given an opportunity to rebuild ourselves as stronger individuals and help those that are falling behind in depression, anguish, lament, and grief. As a community, we must show that constantly we are not alone, we are united more than ever, and, above all, that we are better than yesterday.

"This attack was a terrible and unfortunate tragedy to live through. It was an ultimate reminder that there is still a lot of discrimination and hate in this world. However, we must engage, learn from it, and utilize it to confront and prevent future fear in our community and ultimately the rest of the world. We can't be stronger if we fuel hate and negativity. We can't be stronger by pointing fingers and censoring others based on their race, financial status, sexual orientation, and religious beliefs.

"Our world is facing some hard times. Everyone is becoming a victim. How can we stop this and end the fear? We must stand up and speak out for our rights, for our peace and protection, and for the safety of our country. Above all, we need to engage solidarity and equality for the love of humanity. We can begin to make this world a better place, right here, right now. It starts with you going out and doing

something nice for someone. We need to live in a world free of fear. That time begins now.

"Ramses Tinoco" of Orlando, Florida.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SOTO for his remarks.

I would like to continue to share letters from the survivors of Pulse. The next letter that I will share comes from Brandon Wolf.

"It is hard to believe it has been a year. That Saturday night was like any other: loud music, skinny jeans, cheap drinks. Alongside my best friends, Drew Leinonen and Juan Guerrero, I was as free as ever. Standing outside on the patio, in his typical way, Drew tossed his arm around my shoulders and spoke his last words to me: 'You know what we never say enough? That we love each other.'"

Those were the last words that Drew spoke that evening.

"... I learned a lesson from Orlando's recovery: that equality and unity aren't trophies, and the journey we are on isn't over. We can't take our eyes off the prize or forget what lies ahead.

"We have to disarm hate. Silence it. Snuff it out. Replace it with the same message Drew had for me: love.

"Brandon Wolf."

At this time, I yield to my colleague from Florida (Mr. SOTO) to share another letter regarding this tragic incident.

Mr. SOTO. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for sharing Brandon's story.

Next we have a story from a friend.

"My name is Jim McDermott, and I am a good friend of Chris Brodman who was the first survivor of the Pulse massacre to pass away of a rare brain aneurysm on September 11 of last year. Chris came to Orlando and made it his home in the fall of 2007. His outgoing, natural interest in other people and their stories made him quite popular in our community—and we are still grieving his loss to this day. It is hard to imagine that his constant, wonderful smile is not around anymore to brighten our days.

"He was and is the best friend one could ever have.

"Chris was celebrating at Pulse a few days late because he had to work on the actual day of his birthday itself. He was lingering with friends, enjoying the festive atmosphere of the club that was one of his favorites, when the attack began. In what I find to be an example of his character, Chris pushed his friends to safety over the back fence first before escaping himself. Not one person who knows him finds this to be a surprise, as Chris was always our protector, our confidante, and our hero.

"As we come upon the one-year mark of the assault on Pulse, we wanted to remind the world of his heroism and

his day-to-day loving example of how a great person can affect your life for the better. Chris loved people that were utterly themselves and unique. He prized authenticity and loyalty wherever he went. He had high standards, and he lived by them, and it made us want to live up to them as well.

"I know in my heart that he would want us to bridge the divides that separate us. He believed strongly in forgiveness and kindness. He was open to new ideas and new ways of thinking if it would lead people to a better life. My favorite recent picture of him was after the shooting where he proudly held up a sign at the LGBT Center downtown saying: 'Love always wins.'

"In his memory, let us strive to remember not just the victims of this tragedy but the survivors as well. Let us ensure that they are getting the counseling and medical care that they continue to need. We should strive to maintain the loving bubble of hope that has surrounded our city, because of this event, despite all of the strife and division elsewhere in this country. We need to tell, preserve, and remember their stories, for they are worth hearing."

□ 2045

"They have important lessons to teach all of us. Orlando is known as being the premier destination in the world for families of all kinds—a rainbow of diversity that is infused in every aspect of our city beautiful. So today let us protect the loving vision Orlando has become around the world in the face of this tragedy. Let us stay Orlando Strong. And in so doing, we remain the beautiful haven that drew Chris to us.

"And let us never forget the red-haired boy from Shirley, New York, who taught us about unconditional love and friendship from the day he arrived.

"We love you forever, Chris.

"Sincerely,

"Jim McDermott."

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to share a survivor's letter by the name of Joshua McGill.

"My name is Joshua McGill, and I was there the night of the Pulse shooting a year ago.

"Although nothing will ever take away that tragic night for me and the fellow LGBTQ community, not only for Orlando, but for all people around the world that were affected by this form of hate towards our community, I must say that we have not let hate win thus far, and continue to spread love and prayers for one another and for the other families and victims that were either there that night, or affected in some way.

"It has been a true honor in seeing how close everyone has come together. It shows our strength as a whole and the love that we can all provide for one another in a time of need.

"The continuance of all of this gives me hope for my future in the community and in the world. May God bless you and everyone out there.

"I've become a stronger person since then, and if my strength can help others, I want to.

"Thank you for hearing my words.

"Joshua McGill."

Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), my colleague.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida, Congresswoman DEMINGS, my colleague, for reading the letter of Joshua. How inspiring it really was.

Next we have a statement from our dear friend, Eric Rollings, who is one of our supervisors of the Orange County Soil and Water Board, and who also is one of our only openly gay elected officials.

"As an openly gay elected official and Orlando resident for 27 years, I know the city and Orange County very well. We are a loving, caring community that supports the rights and pursuit of happiness for all of our residents. One year ago this very day, we were devastated to feel the loss of so many lives from every part of all of Orlando. Yes, Pulse by name was a gay nightclub, but it was attended by everyone and all walks of life felt safe dancing and having a good time for more than a decade.

"As the night became dawn and the horror of the extent of what happened became painfully available by every media outlet, I didn't need to listen to news reports because I live right across the street from Pulse. The sound of the blades from the helicopters above my house cut through June air, day after day, looking for a better camera angle. Out of so much pain came so much love.

"Immediately Orlando went into action. The outpouring of love from everywhere in the world is still so incredible. The help came from faith-based organizations, the small stores, corporate America. Most of all, it came out of love and our neighbors. I hope this never happens to your community or any community, but it most likely will. Let me offer some advice.

"Love thy neighbor, know your neighbor, and take care of your neighbor. Do not wait until another tragedy. Talk to your children about violence. Let's help the persons that suffer from mental illnesses.

"There is a significance and real difference between a city that is tolerant, a city accepting, and a city that embraces the LGBTQ and all its communities and individuals within those communities. I am proud to live in a city and a county that embraces! We are Orlando Strong and we are Orlando United."

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share this last survival letter

for tonight. It is from Eric Borrero. It says:

"Dear Congress,

"It is to me how fast one year has gone by. The horrifying emotions and feeling of that night have not fled. Instead, they lay dormant in the recesses of my mind, bubbling up like lava in a moment's notice from unforeseen triggers.

"It is like living on a roller coaster: having great moments over the past year, making things feel absolutely normal; and extreme lows, feeling as if I will never come out of the darkness.

"Even through the disturbing images of the past, I am optimistic about the future I have ahead of me. I can fully grasp that life will never go back to the normal that I once knew, but this experience has helped me focus on what is needed in the world. That is love and inclusion for all people.

"Over the past year, I have had the most amazing support system of friends and family, who have been there for me as I have cried and battled the demons that lay with me when I sleep.

"These feelings have not changed since that night, but I remain positive and stand with my LGBTQ and Latinx brothers and sisters for a better future for everyone.

"Regards,

"Eric Borrero."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share that, today, Representative SOTO, Representative STEPHANIE MURPHY, and I introduced a resolution to recognize and mark one year since the Pulse tragedy. We were joined by 143 Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, who are standing to show the community of Orlando that we stand with them in support; that Congress will not forget the victims, the survivors, the first responders, and the communities that are shattered by the hands of domestic terrorists; and that we will do everything we can to prevent future mass shootings, and take care of the people who are left standing in the wake of these tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, our community declared June 12, 2017, Orlando United Day, a day of love and kindness. All across our community, people are coming together to honor the victims by volunteering and attending vigils and memorials.

We are a community that will never forget. We won't forget those 49 innocent men and women who were sons, daughters, mothers, husbands, wives, students, teachers, entrepreneurs, and dreamers, who had a lot of life left to live. We are a community that will continue to honor these men and women, not through our words, but through our actions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank God for Representative SOTO, for his service to our community. I am honored to serve with him in the United States Congress. I

appreciate the work that he has done for the last several years throughout our community. I was honored to share this Special Order with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of the names of those who perished in the Pulse Nightclub shooting.

[From www.cityoforlando.net, June 12, 2017]

#### VICTIM'S NAMES

Stanley Almodovar III, 23 years old; Amanda L. Alvear, 25 years old; Oscar A. Aracena Montero, 26 years old; Rodolfo Ayala Ayala, 33 years old; Antonio Davon Brown, 29 years old; Darryl Roman Burt II, 29 years old; Angel Candelario-Padro, 28 years old; Juan Chavez Martinez, 25 years old; Luis Daniel Conde, 39 years old; Cory James Connell, 21 years old.

Tevin Eugene Crosby, 25 years old; Deonka Deidra Drayton, 32 years old; Simón Adrian Carrillo Fernández, 31 years old; Leroy Valentin Fernandez, 25 years old; Mercedes Marisol Flores, 26 years old; Peter Ommy Gonzalez Cruz, 22 years old; Juan Ramon Guerrero, 22 years old; Paul Terrell Henry, 41 years old; Frank Hernandez, 27 years old; Miguel Angel Honorato, 30 years old.

Javier Jorge Reyes, 40 years old; Jason Benjamin Josaphat, 19 years old; Eddie Jamoldroy Justice, 30 years old; Anthony Luis Laureano Disla, 25 years old; Christopher Andrew Leinonen, 32 years old; Alejandro Barrios Martinez, 21 years old; Brenda Marquez McCool, 49 years old; Gilberto R. Silva Menendez, 25 years old; Kimberly Jean Morris, 37 years old; Akrya Monet Murray, 18 years old.

Luis Omar Ocasio Capo, 20 years old; Geraldo A. Ortiz Jimenez, 25 years old; Eric Ivan Ortiz-Rivera, 36 years old; Joel Rayon Paniagua, 32 years old; Jean Carlos Mendez Perez, 35 years old; Enrique L. Rios, Jr., 25 years old; Jean Carlos Nieves Rodriguez, 27 years old; Xavier Emmanuel Serrano-Rosado, 35 years old; Christopher Joseph Sanfeliz, 24 years old; Yilmay Rodriguez Solivan, 24 years old.

Edward Sotomayor Jr., 34 years old; Shane Evan Tomlinson, 33 years old; Martin Benitez Torres, 33 years old; Martin Benitez Torres, 33 years old; Jonathan A. Camuy Vega, 24 years old; Juan Pablo Rivera Velázquez, 37 years old; Luis Sergio Vielma, 22 years old; Franky Jimmy Delesus Velázquez, 50 years old; Luis Daniel Wilson-Leon, 37 years old; Jerald Arthur Wright, 31 years old.

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

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues' tribute to the victims of that terrible tragic murder spree by a radical Islamist who said he was doing it for the Islamic State. The attorney general herself indicated that we have a tape of him saying he is doing it for the Islamic State.

There is nothing that justifies such an outrageous murder of even one innocent victim, much less the dozens that

were mowed down by what could normally, in the old days, be said to have been a crazed killer. But he wasn't so much crazed as he was driven by a radical Islamic agenda, the same radical Islamic agenda that caused 30 million, mostly Muslim, Egyptians to rise up. Coming near the anniversary of that event in Egypt, the greatest peaceful uprising in the history of the world, the Egyptians said: We don't want a Muslim brother, we don't want a radical Islamist controlling our country.

It was rather tragic that the shooter—and I don't want to give him any more notoriety than necessary, so I won't mention his name—was not a lone wolf, as is so often supposed and we were led to believe repeatedly during the Obama administration. But as Reporter Patrick Poole indicates, he was yet another known wolf. The FBI knew he was and the local law enforcement knew who he was, which brings me to a point I wanted to discuss tonight.

Robert Mueller is the special prosecutor who now needs to resign. He was the FBI Director that had the FBI training materials purged so FBI agents could not know what they were looking for in a radical Islamist. He changed the training. He purged it to please the Council on American-Islamic Relations.

As one intelligence officer said: We blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemy.

That is what FBI Director Robert Mueller did.

When challenged in a hearing where I was questioning him over the pitiful investigation of the Tsarnaev older brother after Russia had notified us twice in the United States of his radicalization, after the second time, finally, ho-hum, Mueller's FBI not being adequately trained to recognize what a radical Islamist believes, how they act, what they do, what they are studying, what they are memorizing, what they wear, what their personal appearance is, they are not trained to recognize, they didn't know what they were looking for.

□ 2100

They didn't know what they were looking for. They go out. The best we can find out, they talked to Tsarnaev, and he said, "No, I'm not a terrorist," basically.

So, not knowing what else to do, since Mueller had destroyed the proper training to recognize radical Islamists, they went and talked to his mother who assured them, "No, he's a good boy; he's not a terrorist," and the result was people murdered and maimed at the Boston Marathon.

The result of the FBI going after those who would try to teach others what real radical Islam was, the results of dumbing down the FBI and their ability to spot people who wanted to

kill others in the name of Allah: people killed at Boston, people killed in Orlando. And it wasn't any more the fault of guns in Orlando than it was the fault of a white truck in London.

It is the people who use those weapons to kill; otherwise, it is a matter of defense, the great equalizer. The truck is a great means of conveyance.

But Robert Mueller has created problems for this country, and there are a lot of people that are buried now. Perhaps they would, perhaps they would not be deceased if Robert Mueller had done his job and had been as concerned about finding radical Islamists in America as he was—as he told me, they didn't go to the Boston mosque where Tsarnaev surely gave evidence of being radicalized. That is not his words. I said: You didn't even go to the mosque to find out, to talk, to investigate.

The best he could do is come back and say: We did go to that mosque as part of our outreach program, part of the lovely sit down, chat, have some tea, whatever—I don't know what they had, water, whatever it was—make merry, chat. While Tsarnaev was plotting to murder many people, as many as he could at the Boston Marathon, Bob Mueller and his FBI are making merry at the Boston mosque that he did not even know who started it. I asked him that. He didn't know.

I said: Did you even know that al-Hamoudi started that mosque? No, he didn't know that. Al-Hamoudi is doing 23 years—23 years—in Federal prison for supporting terrorism. And as I understand, I had heard that that was more to the credit not of Mueller's folks, but of help from England. How ironic is that?

But I see that I have a friend here. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

HONORING THE LIFE OF COACH SPIKE DYKES

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I love everything about west Texas. I love the beautiful sunsets and the starry nights. I love that our farmers and ranchers feed and clothe the American people. I love that we produce more fossil and renewable energy than any other region in the United States.

People from all over the country rely on west Texas to make America great, but the greatest contribution from our region is our people. The people of west Texas have a distinct friendliness, a can-do spirit, a humble demeanor, a unique sense of humor; and on April 10, 2017, we lost one of our very own who embodied these attributes like no one else.

Former head football coach at Texas Tech and favorite son of west Texas, Spike Dykes carved his legacy into the bedrock of our region and into the hearts of hundreds of student athletes and thousands of fans across this country.

A small town kid from Ballinger, Texas, who achieved his wildest dreams

of becoming a Division I head football coach, Coach Dykes went on to lead the Red Raiders to seven straight bowl seasons and was later inducted into the Texas Sports Hall of Fame.

I had the honor of calling Spike Dykes "Coach" for a short time when I walked on the Texas Tech football team, and later I had the honor of calling him my friend.

We are all saddened by his passing, and our prayers are with his children and my friends, Rick, BeBe, Sonny, and their families.

Thank you, Coach, for your colorful wit and country wisdom. Thank you for leaving a legacy of love for people and all things west Texas. Thank you for teaching us that in life, like the game of football, it is not whether you win or lose; it is who you are; it is how you play the game.

God doesn't make them any better than you, Coach. God bless.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Texas, a great, noble tribute.

I wish that it were I who was standing here to say glowing things about people that have been running the FBI; but President Trump as a candidate said he wanted to come drain the swamp, and the more we dig, the more it appears to be a swirling cesspool up here.

We had a man who had been running the FBI who came before the Senate, a Senate committee and testified that he did a memo after talking to President Trump, that he had never felt the need to do a memo after talking to President Obama or President Bush or to take notes like he did; but he was afraid that Trump might lie sometime in the future, and so he felt it important to do a memo, to write some notes. That is what he said.

Rather incredibly, he didn't find a need to do a memo after Attorney General Loretta Lynch, according to him, told him what really has to be a lie. She knew that Hillary Clinton was being investigated for a crime. It was a criminal case, a criminal investigation. She directed FBI Director Comey not to use "investigation," use "matter." Well, it was an investigation, and to say anything other than that was a lie.

But how ironic that he was afraid Trump might lie in the future; whereas, he had an Attorney General that made him feel a little uneasy, but he didn't write any notes. So what about his credibility?

Well, he said he took those notes as a recollection refreshed. And those of us that have tried cases, been judges, you know, we know that past recollection recorded can be an exception to the hearsay rule. But if he signed an FBI employment agreement, which people are supposed to sign, it should have included these words: "All information acquired by me in connection with my official duties with the FBI and all official material to which I

have access remain the property of the United States of America. I will surrender upon demand by the FBI, or upon my separation from the FBI, all materials containing FBI information in my possession."

That means that if an FBI agent, Director, FBI employee makes notes, makes a memorandum to refresh his recollection later, it is not a personal piece of property any more than what Sandy Berger stuffed in his socks was personal property to him. It doesn't matter that he prepared it. It was done while being paid by the FBI, on FBI time, regarding FBI matters. As FBI Director, he was talking to the President.

How ironic, also, we have no memos after President Obama made the basic statement that he didn't think Hillary should be prosecuted. We haven't heard any outcry from the great Director Comey about how wrong that was. What an obstruction of justice by President Obama. We didn't hear any of that.

I mean, that is about as direct as you can get when the President was talking on television and told the world, and the fact that you may say it out front to the world doesn't make it any less intimidating or directional than if you look somebody in the face one on one and tell them. It is not a defense to say it on television, and yet he wasn't concerned by that.

So we start looking a little deeper since it appears he wasn't being honest about being his personal property, and you would like to think that he had a good legal education, but Alan Dershowitz has made clear that the FBI—there is nothing wrong if the President tells him we are not prosecuting this individual for this crime. I am pardoning him here and now. He has the power.

All power that Director Comey has is derived from his boss, the President. So why would he go back and do a memo and consult or, I believe the more proper word is "collude" with others at the Justice Department about what the President said?

Because, make no mistake, if any of those individuals at the Justice Department who were colluding with James Comey after he met with the President, if they thought there was an obstruction of justice and they didn't report it as they did not, then they committed a crime. So why would they not report it?

It appears there can only be one answer. Surely they did not intend to commit a crime by misprision of a felony if they really believed it were obstruction. So it appears, since they clearly did not think that there was obstruction of justice in the President's use of the word "hope," then they must have surely applauded James Comey's writing of a memo, writing of notes so that he could pull it

out later and use it to go after the President. There can be no other reason that he did what he did.

He either committed a crime by not reporting obstruction as soon as he possibly could, or he was colluding with his colleagues to bring down the President of the United States. So, the more we find as we dig, the more of a cesspool it appears to be here in Washington.

Mollie Hemingway has done an extraordinary job today from The Federalist. She goes through, she has an article: "James Comey Has a Long History of Questionable Obstruction Cases."

I wish I had remembered these, and I feel a bit guilty that I didn't realize at the time these things were going on, the miscarriage of justice that was occurring at the hands of James Comey and Bob Mueller.

She brings up Frank Quattrone, "a banker who Comey pursued relentlessly on banking-related charges without fruition. But while he couldn't find any wrongdoing or criminal conduct, he went after him for supposed 'obstruction of justice' because of a single ambiguous email. Sound familiar?"

"Before he was indicted"—talking about Quattrone, before Quattrone was indicted—"Comey made false statements about Quattrone and his intent. The first trial ended in a hung jury, but the second one got a conviction."

"That conviction was overturned in 2006. Quattrone was so scarred by the harassment"—by Comey—"he began funding projects designed to help innocent people who are victims of prosecutorial overreach or other problems."

□ 2115

"He said his motivation for supporting such projects was that at the very moment he was found guilty in the second trial, he realized there must be innocent people in prisons who lacked the financial resources to fight for justice. He also started the Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice at the University of Pennsylvania Law School."

"Quattrone has noted, with interest, the disparities in how he was treated by Comey for a single ambiguous email compared to his handling of Hillary Clinton's email server scandal," with thousands, tens of thousands of email.

How about Martha Stewart? "You might remember Martha Stewart being sent to jail. You might not remember that James Comey was the man who put her there, and not because he was able to charge her for anything he began investigating her for. The original investigation was into whether Stewart had engaged in insider trading. They didn't even try to get her on that charge. Gene Healy wrote about it in 2004, warning about Federal prosecutorial overreach."

By Comey, of course. He said, "Comey didn't charge Stewart with in-

sider trading. Instead, he claimed that Stewart's public protestations of innocence were designed to prop up the stock price of her own company . . . and thus constituted securities fraud. Stewart was also charged with making false statements to Federal officials investigating the insider trading charge—a charge they never pursued. In essence, Stewart was prosecuted for 'having misled people by denying having committed a crime with which she was not charged,' as Cato Institute Senior Fellow Alan Reynolds put it.

"The pursuit was described as 'vindictive' in The New York Times and 'petty and vindictive' in The Daily Beast."

"But she still served a 5-month prison sentence."

Stephen Hatfill, and this is one that really gets me to my core. I did not remember the outcome, and I feel guilty, but I was handling felony cases back in Texas at the time.

"The FBI absolutely bungled its investigation into the Anthrax attacker who struck after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Carl Cannon goes through this story well, and it's worth reading for how it involves both Comey and his dear 'friend' and current special counsel Robert Mueller. The FBI tried—in the media—its case against Hatfill. Their actual case ended up being thrown out by the courts:

"Comey and Mueller badly bungled the biggest case they ever handled. They botched the investigation of the 2001 anthrax letter attacks that took five lives and infected 17 other people, shut down the U.S. Capitol and Washington's mail system, solidified the Bush administration's antipathy for Iraq, and eventually, when the facts finally came out, made the FBI look feckless, incompetent, and easily manipulated by outside political pressure."

"More from Cannon, recounting how messed up the attempt to convict Steven Hatfill for a crime he didn't commit was:

"In truth, Hatfill was an implausible suspect from the outset. He was a virologist who never handled anthrax, which is a bacterium. Ivins, by contrast, shared ownership of anthrax patents, was diagnosed as having paranoid personality disorder, and had a habit of stalking and threatening people with anonymous letters—including the woman who provided the long-ignored tip to the FBI. So what evidence did the FBI have against Hatfill? There was none, so the agency did a Hail Mary, importing two bloodhounds from California whose handlers claimed could sniff the scent of the killer on the anthrax-tainted letters. These dogs were shown to Hatfill, who promptly petted them. When the dogs responded favorably, their handlers told the FBI that they had 'alerted' on Hatfill and that he must be the killer."

"When Bush administration officials were worried about the quality of the

case Mueller and Comey had, the two men assured them. 'Comey was "absolutely certain" that it was Hatfill,' Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said.

"Such certitude seems to be Comey's default position in his professional life," Cannon wrote. He shouldn't have been certain in this case. After the six years the FBI spent destroying his life, they settled a \$4.6 million lawsuit he filed and officially exonerated him."

Good work, James Comey and Bob Mueller. You ruined the life of a man with no evidence at all, but told the Bush administration, oh, we are absolutely certain this is the guy.

What about Scooter Libby, and Judith Miller? I didn't remember this: "After pressuring John Ashcroft—I am reading through the article—"After pressuring John Ashcroft to recuse himself from the responsibility on the grounds of potential conflicts of interest, Comey gave Patrick Fitzgerald, his close personal friend and godfather to one of his children, the role of special counsel into the investigation of the leak of Valerie Plame's identity as a CIA employee. Some conflicts of interest are more important to Comey than others, apparently.

"Fitzgerald immediately discovered that Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage was the leaker. Of course, the FBI and Department of Justice had known that all along, so Comey's push for a special counsel is . . . intriguing."

There was no reason for a special counsel. The FBI knew it. The Department of Justice knew it. They pushed for one anyway. Comey was at the middle of it.

Mueller, you know, his close friend, of course, but Fitzgerald was the godfather of one of his children, for heaven's sake.

"The 3-year investigation was a cloud over the Bush administration"—which didn't seem to bother Comey at all, oh, of course not—"and resulted in nothing but the jailing of a journalist"—who was protecting a source, even though they didn't need it. Wow, how mean-spirited—" . . . and a dubious prosecution of Scooter Libby for, wait for it, obstruction of justice. Comey was unconcerned about the jailing of journalists and never threatened to resign over this infringement on First Amendment freedoms."

And it talks about Hillary Clinton in this article, but I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, this is a scary time in America.

You have this article from John Hinderaker, June 10, Power Line, quoting Senator WARNER:

"And so, in all of your experience"—he is talking to Director Comey—"this was the only President that you felt like, in every meeting, you needed to document, because at some point, using your words, he might put out a

non-truthful representation of that meeting?"

Comey says: "That's right, Senator."

He goes on: ". . . I had a one-on-one meeting with President Bush about a very important and difficult national security matter.

"I didn't write a memo documenting that conversation either—sent a quick email to my staff to let them know there was something going on, but I didn't feel, with President Bush, the need to document it in that way, again, because of—the combination of those factors just wasn't present with either President Bush or Obama."

This article goes on to point out that is simply not true. That was a lie.

And whoever remembered that a book named "Angler" was written by Barton Gellman, with Comey as his big chief source, went so far as to be able to quote the conversation after working with Comey, and in the footnotes from the "Angler," it says: "Quotations from the Bush-Comey conversations are taken verbatim from unclassified notes describing Comey's report of the meeting shortly afterward."

But Comey's email that he says he just let them know that there was something going on, here is what he said in his email, because it was printed in "Angler."

"The President just took me into his private office for a 15-minute, one-on-one talk. Told him he was being misled and poorly served. We had a very full and frank exchange. Don't know that either of us can see a way out. He promised he would shut down 5/6 if Congress didn't fix FISA. Told him Mueller was about to resign. He just pulled Bob into his office."

Yeah, he didn't just say something was going on. He told him what happened. He memorialized that visit with a note, and then in the book, it is word-for-word, according to Mr. Comey, what was said, and it makes him to be out all American, clean, honest, upstanding, fine law enforcement officer, when it turns out he was anything but that.

"The real pattern," as it says here at the end of the article is that, "Comey is a snake in the grass who creates tendentious, self-serving memos that can later be used to cover his own rear end or to discredit presidents, but only if they are Republicans."

Gellman's phrasing was clumsy in the article, but this is serious stuff that it turns out, oh, four members of Mueller's team have donated to Democrats. Well, isn't that cozy? Comey closely coordinated with Mueller on Trump testimony. We heard from the FBI Director that he actually did collude with other members at the Justice Department.

It is so clear. There are people at the Justice Department out to get President Trump, out to get Attorney General Sessions. They are out to get

every one of them, and just the way they did, the man they said there was no question was the culprit in killing people with anthrax, that was a lie.

And they don't care who gets hurt. It is time to dismiss the special prosecutor; see if we really need one because now we know that Comey manipulated the system exactly the way he manipulated it when he told John Ashcroft he should recuse himself so he could appoint Patrick Fitzgerald, give him the appointment, that is.

Enough is enough of Comey, of Mueller. It is time to drain the swamp, and they will go down the drain when we do.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of his flight being canceled.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through June 16.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution condemning the deadly attack on May 26, 2017, in Portland, Oregon, expressing deepest condolences to the families and friends of the victims, and supporting efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 13, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1576. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Recordkeeping (RIN: 3038-AE36) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1577. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Whistleblower Awards Process (RIN: 3038-AE50) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1578. A letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Pistachios Grown in California, Arizona, and New Mexico; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No.: AMS-SC16-0076; SC16-983-2 FIR] received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1579. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Jon M. Davis, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1580. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Larry D. Wyche, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1581. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1582. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1583. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1584. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burundi that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1585. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Performance Report for FY 2016; to the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1586. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress covering the 6-month period ending March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1587. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's 56th Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-up, covering the six-month period ending March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1588. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Public Law 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1589. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's semiannual report to Congress from the Treasury Inspector General and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration for the period of October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1590. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1591. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Management Directorate, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1592. A letter from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy and designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1593. A letter from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1594. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a change in previously submitted reported information and designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1595. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting nine (9) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1596. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, U.S. Customs and

Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1597. A letter from the Vice Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's Annual Performance Report for FY 2016 and Annual Performance Plan for FY 2017-2018, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1598. A letter from the Executive Director, United States Access Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1599. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons and Revisions to Entries on the Entity List [Docket No.: 170303229-7229-01] (RIN: 0694-AH36) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1600. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Vermilion Snapper [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XF424) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1601. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF418) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1602. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; 2016-2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for King Mackerel in Western Zone of the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 101206604-1758-02] (RIN: 0648-XF414) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1603. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Amendments to the Reef Fish, Spiny Lobster, and Corals and Reef Associated Plants and Invertebrates Fishery Management Plans of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands [Docket No.: 160810719-7353-02] (RIN: 0648-BG29) received



June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1604. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2017 and 2018 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XE904) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1605. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Amendment 26 [Docket No.: 160426363-7275-02] (RIN: 0648-BG03) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1606. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish Longline Component [Docket No.: 120404257-3325-02] (RIN: 0648-XF382) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1607. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Skate Complex; Adjustment to the Skate Wing and Skate Bait Inseason Possession Limits [Docket No.: 160301164-6694-02] (RIN: 0648-XF146) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1608. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF346) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1609. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF325) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1610. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Adminis-

tration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF248) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1611. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 60 Feet Length Overall Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF190) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1612. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF339) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1613. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF310) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1614. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2017 Recreational Fishing Seasons for Red Snapper in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 140818679-5356-02] (RIN: 0648-XF369) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1615. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2017 Sector Quota Transfer Adjustment [Docket No.: 151130999-6594-02] (RIN: 0648-XF247) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1616. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2017 Recreational Accountability Measures and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XF166) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1617. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Possession and Trip Limit Implementation for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 150105004-5355-01] (RIN: 0648-XF377) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1618. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Western Gulf of Mexico Sub-Region; Closure [Docket No.: 160620545-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF211) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1619. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Reopening of the Commercial Sector in the Western, Northern, and Southern (Gillnet) Zones for King Mackerel in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 160426363-7275-02] (RIN: 0648-XF351) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1620. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7161-02] (RIN: 0648-XF368) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1621. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 160808696-7010-02] (RIN: 0648-BG76) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1622. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's General and Legislative Annual Report and Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(b); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 1(e); (108 Stat. 918); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1623. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report titled "Child Welfare Outcomes 2010-2014: Report to Congress", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 679b(a)(5); Public Law 105-89, Sec. 203(a); (111 Stat. 2127); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1624. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security and Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Departments' final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Materials from Peru [CBP Dec. 17-03] (RIN: 1515-AE29) received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1625. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report titled "Medicare National Coverage Determinations (NCD) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ff(f)(7); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1869(f)(7) (as amended by Public Law 106-554, Sec. 1(a)(6)); (114 Stat. 2763A-546); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1626. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on contributions received to carry out training and equipping of Iraqi forces, pursuant to Public Law 113-291, Sec. 1236(k)(1); (128 Stat. 3561); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

1627. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report titled "Annual Report to Congress on the Open Payments Program April 2017", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1320a-7h(d); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1128G (as added by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 6002); (124 Stat. 693); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1873. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands; with an amendment (Rept. 115-165, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1654. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1109. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act (Rept. 115-167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 338. A bill to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce (Rept. 115-168, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 446. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project (Rept. 115-169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 447. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project (Rept. 115-170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 627. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 951. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project (Rept. 115-172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2274. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for extended periods relating to preliminary permits and commencement of construction, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2292. A bill to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam (Rept. 115-174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2122. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam (Rept. 115-175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2457. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects; with an amendment (Rept. 115-176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 378. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2581) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit, and providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1094) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-177). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 379. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2372) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2579) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage (Rept. 115-178). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1873

referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 2870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax benefits for investments in gigabit opportunity zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2871. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHSHON:

H.R. 2872. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to promote hydropower development at existing nonpowered dams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2873. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2874. A bill to achieve reforms to improve the financial stability of the National Flood Insurance Program, to enhance the development of more accurate estimates of flood risk through new technology and better maps, to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risks, and to provide for alternative methods to insure against flood peril, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2875. A bill to make administrative reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program to increase fairness and accuracy and protect the taxpayer from program fraud and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2876. A bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2877. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to prohibit any subsidy for flood insurance coverage for any property owned or operated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2878. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 2879. A bill to reform apportionments to general aviation airports under the airport improvement program, to improve project delivery at certain airports, and to designate certain airports as disaster relief airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2880. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to promote closed-loop pumped storage hydropower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 2881. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified registered nurse anesthetists in such hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 2882. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to ocean acidification; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2883. A bill to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2884. A bill to amend section 2201 of title 44, United States Code, to require the

preservation of Presidential social media accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 2885. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 2886. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen the provisions relating to child labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. TROTT):

H.R. 2887. A bill to regulate certain State impositions on interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 2888. A bill to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DEMINGS (for herself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of

Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HECK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H. Res. 380. A resolution commemorating one year since the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida, on June 12, 2016; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2870.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 17.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2871.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2872.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2873.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2874.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2875.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This proposal is introduced pursuant to Article I.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution gives Congress the broad authority to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To regulate Commerce . . . among the several states; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 9:

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 2883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the

United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause to "regulate commerce . . . among the several States," Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 2888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice and Claims or the United States, or any particular State.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 110: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 173: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 184: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 305: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 350: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 351: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 355: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 358: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 367: Mr. WALDEN and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 371: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 377: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 463: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 539: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 553: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 564: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 592: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 627: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 671: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 681: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 714: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 721: Mr. DENT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 741: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 747: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 750: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 807: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SHEA-POR-TER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 820: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BASS, Mr. PERRY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 828: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 830: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 846: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 849: Mr. FASO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 873: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 916: Ms. ROSEN and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 927: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 959: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 960: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1017: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1034: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1038: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1046: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COMER, and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 1057: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1059: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1090: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VALADAO, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1094: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1097: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1098: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 1111: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1136: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1148: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1150: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1154: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1158: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1164: Mr. BOST, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1168: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1196: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1200: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1223: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1225: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1243: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1247: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1265: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1270: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1272: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1276: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1279: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1291: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1299: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1316: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1317: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1318: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1334: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1361: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KIND, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1393: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1405: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1422: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1434: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1441: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1445: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1456: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SMUCKER.

- H.R. 1472: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 1478: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 1501: Mr. O'HALLERAN.  
H.R. 1515: Mrs. LOWEY.  
H.R. 1587: Ms. GABBARD.  
H.R. 1606: Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 1614: Ms. PINGREE and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 1626: Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 1635: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 1639: Mr. HIMES.  
H.R. 1661: Mr. KILMER and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 1673: Mr. ESPAILLAT.  
H.R. 1676: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 1697: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. BERGMAN.  
H.R. 1698: Mr. HECK and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1731: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
H.R. 1817: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1838: Mr. GAETZ.  
H.R. 1841: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1865: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
H.R. 1884: Mr. BACON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H.R. 1902: Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 1933: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.  
H.R. 1953: Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 1955: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 1988: Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 1991: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 2023: Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 2029: Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 2046: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2047: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2048: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2055: Mr. BUDD.  
H.R. 2091: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2147: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 2150: Mr. COOK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BOST, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. HUNTER.  
H.R. 2152: Mr. MEADOWS.  
H.R. 2174: Mr. BUDD and Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 2193: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BARTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 2205: Mr. MARSHALL.  
H.R. 2276: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 2310: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 2327: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 2339: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.  
H.R. 2340: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. DUNN.  
H.R. 2358: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 2428: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 2450: Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 2451: Mr. SOTO and Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 2452: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. HECK.  
H.R. 2472: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 2476: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H.R. 2480: Mr. CLAY, Ms. BASS, and Mr. CHABOT.  
H.R. 2499: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 2505: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 2514: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 2519: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. CRAMER.  
H.R. 2532: Mr. OLSON and Mr. HARPER.  
H.R. 2587: Mr. TONKO and Mrs. BEATTY.  
H.R. 2608: Mr. KNIGHT.  
H.R. 2616: Mr. PANETTA.  
H.R. 2640: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2652: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 2659: Mr. VELA and Ms. ROSEN.  
H.R. 2678: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. COFFMAN.  
H.R. 2690: Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 2701: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2707: Mr. GALLEGO.  
H.R. 2723: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 2747: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COOK, and Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 2756: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 2774: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 2775: Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 2776: Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 2777: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2798: Mr. LANCE and Mr. PALLONE.  
H.R. 2819: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 2823: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 2827: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. JAYAPAL.  
H.R. 2831: Ms. MCSALLY.  
H.R. 2840: Mr. POLIS, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KIHUEN.  
H.R. 2841: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 2845: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 2855: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.  
H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BACON, and Mr. BARR.  
H. Con. Res. 49: Mrs. LOWEY.  
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. BARLETTA.  
H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. POE of Texas.  
H. Res. 28: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H. Res. 69: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H. Res. 129: Mr. COLE.  
H. Res. 188: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H. Res. 259: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. VALADAO.  
H. Res. 279: Mr. DEUTCH.  
H. Res. 282: Ms. ROSEN.  
H. Res. 307: Mr. FERGUSON.  
H. Res. 310: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. HECK.  
H. Res. 317: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. CHABOT.  
H. Res. 359: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BOST, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H. Res. 368: Mr. SOTO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

**SENATE—Monday, June 12, 2017**

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, great is Your faithfulness. We find strength in difficult times because our thoughts about Your mercy and providential care sustain us.

Lord, guide our lawmakers to make You their sure foundation. From this foundation, may they gain strength for today and bright hope for tomorrow. Help them to base their hope on Your exceedingly great and precious promises, as You do for them more than they can ask or imagine. May they have such an inner sense of Your presence that they will desire to commune with You throughout this day.

And, Lord, bless our incoming summer page class. May these young people increase intellectually, physically, socially, and spiritually.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

**SANCTIONS LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, last week, the Senate voted on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis to advance the Iran sanctions bill currently before us, and we will take another vote today to proceed to that bill. I want to thank the chairs and ranking members of the Foreign Relations and Banking Committees—Chairman CORKER, Chairman CRAPO—for their efforts to craft additional, much-needed sanctions on Russia as well. I would encourage Members of both parties to keep working together so we can pass the critical Iran sanctions legislation very soon.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, 7 years ago, Senate Democrats and the

Obama administration forced ObamaCare on the American people, but ObamaCare never actually lived up to what Democrats had promised. From rising costs to shrinking choices and collapsing markets, the problems associated with ObamaCare grew across the country as the years passed, leaving the American people to literally pick up the pieces.

ObamaCare's years-long legacy of failure will only get worse unless we act. Consider the latest examples of how it is threatening to hurt more Americans. In Washington State, people in two counties just learned they could have zero insurance options under ObamaCare plans next year. Thousands of Ohioans across 18 counties just found out they could also be left with absolutely zero choices under ObamaCare. Iowans could be left without a single major insurance option to choose from statewide as well. And in Nebraska, nearly 100,000 residents learned they could be left with just one insurance option on the ObamaCare exchanges next year or potentially none at all.

At the rate things are going, Americans living in nearly half of all counties could be left with just one or even zero insurance options under ObamaCare next year. Think about that. Millions of people in nearly half of all the counties across America are at risk of having no options or a single option of insurance plans because of ObamaCare.

Worse still, as choices continue to drop, premiums keep rising, often by double digits, meaning those lucky enough to have a choice under ObamaCare may not even be able to afford the plan they select. It is a fact underlined by reports released just this afternoon by the Centers for Medicare and Medicare Services, or CMS. These reports show that hundreds of thousands of Americans who selected an ObamaCare plan ended up canceling their coverage after just a few weeks, and the most common reason they cited for doing so was because it was too expensive. Is it any wonder? As another groundbreaking report revealed last month, premiums have on average doubled—and in some cases even tripled—in the vast majority of States on the Federal exchange since ObamaCare's full enactment in 2013.

You would think the Democrats would want to work with us now to clean up the years-long mess they created. Instead, they are defending the status quo or trying to shift the blame for the failures of their own law—a law Democrats designed, a law Democrats

forced on our country, a law Democrats defended year after year as it hurt Americans over and over. There is just no serious way to try to spin these years of ObamaCare failures at this late date.

It is also clear that the status quo is simply unsustainable and demands action. That is why Republican Senators have been working hard on solutions that could help rescue American families who have been hurt by this law's failures. Members will keep working this week because bringing relief from ObamaCare may not be easy, but it is necessary. We are going to keep working hard to get this done.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

**ANNIVERSARY OF THE PULSE NIGHTCLUB MASS SHOOTING IN ORLANDO**

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before I begin, I would like to take a moment to remember the victims of the shooting at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando that occurred 1 year ago today. It was the deadliest shooting by a single gunman in our Nation's history. Forty-nine Americans died that night, and 53 more were injured. They were children, parents, sisters, brothers, and friends. They went out that night to celebrate with their friends and instead came face to face with a soul twisted by an inexplicable hate.

The best way I can see to honor their memory is to honor them with action. We should redouble our efforts to make this country safer from the scourge of terrorism and gun violence to ensure that our schools and our churches, our theaters and our nightclubs are safe places where all Americans can be who they truly are. Let that be our mission as we remember the 49 victims of the Orlando attack and keep their families in our prayers.

**SANCTIONS LEGISLATION**

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on Russia sanctions, soon we will move to



a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the Iran sanctions legislation. The two leaders, Chairmen CORKER and CRAPO, the two ranking members, BROWN and CARDIN, continue to negotiate a package of strong Russia sanctions that can be offered as an amendment to the bill. I am hopeful we can come to an agreement soon, one that at the very least includes legislation put forward by Senators GRAHAM and CARDIN that would establish a process for Congress to review any Russia-related sanctions relief. Senator MCCAIN, along with Senator CARDIN, has also submitted an amendment for tough, new sanctions, which I very much support. Democrats feel strongly that Russia sanctions should move alongside Iran sanctions, and we are prepared to do what we can to make sure we get a vote on a good amendment and hopefully a bipartisan one.

#### SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as we continue to grapple with last week's testimony from former Director Comey, it seems the new strategy by some on the right is now to question the credibility of Special Counsel Mueller. Already, former Speaker Gingrich and others have said negative things about Mueller just weeks after praising his selection. They know that Mr. Mueller is the man now responsible for following up on Mr. Comey's testimony so the hard right is trying to discredit him in advance. They know they can't debate the facts or the issues or defend the actions of the White House on the merits, so what do they do? They attack the referee and try to besmirch the reputation of someone like Mr. Mueller.

Mr. Mueller is a man of integrity. That is agreed to by just about everybody. He has devoted his entire career to his country. He came out of private life to do a job on behalf of his country and be right down the middle. Even Attorney General Jeff Sessions has praised Mr. Mueller for his service and credibility, saying his "integrity is undoubted," as is his "experience and love of country." Those are Jeff Sessions' words. Now the political right has pulled out their partisan knives to try and defame his reputation.

It is a shameful, shameful ploy. The right must be afraid of what Mr. Mueller is going to find. I would ask Speaker Gingrich a question. Is he afraid of what Mr. Mueller is going to find out? Is that why he is attacking his reputation? The baseless attacks on former Director Mueller ring hollow. Former Director Mueller has been hailed as a paragon of public service by people of all political stripes. This country comes to a low point when that kind of attack is issued.

Despite what Speaker Gingrich may try to imply, we should have every con-

fidence that he will investigate the matters at hand with integrity and thoroughness.

I can tell you one thing, the little bit I know about him, Speaker Gingrich's attack and attacks like that will not do a thing to deter Director Mueller from finding out the truth.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Madam President, a word on healthcare.

The Republicans continue to work on their healthcare bill behind closed doors, and now it seems they are looking for a vote on a final bill before the July 4th recess.

To all of America, this should be a red alert. This is not a drill. This is a red alert. In a very short time, maybe only 2 weeks, the Republican majority may try to jam through a healthcare bill that no one in America has seen—no committee hearings, no public debate. According to some reports, the Republicans will not publicly release the text until the very last moment.

What Senate Republicans are doing on healthcare is one of the most outrageous examples of legislative malpractice in decades.

Senator MCCONNELL, who believes in regular order, ought to think long and hard before he does this because it will not go down as a fine moment in history for him, for his party, or for the Senate. This is the party that chanted "Read the bill, read the bill," when ObamaCare was being debated, and now they will not even show the bill.

Democrats spent over a year on the Affordable Care Act, the ObamaCare bill, with multiple committee hearings. We actually accepted dozens of Republican amendments. Show us the bill. Senators GRASSLEY, HATCH, and others had amendments that were added to the bill. Show us the bill so we have the same opportunity.

Why would the majority so starkly depart from the normal legislative procedure? Why would they seek to pass in the dark of night a bill that affects one-sixth of the economy, millions of people's lives?

Leader MCCONNELL used to stress the importance of regular order in the Senate. Why is he proceeding with the Republican healthcare bill in the most irregular way? I know why. It is because Republicans don't want the American people to see the bill. They are so ashamed of their healthcare plan, they want to pass it in the dead of night, with no hearings, no amendments—rushing it through.

It is not a bill they are proud of. If they were proud of the bill, they would say: Let's debate it. They are ashamed of the bill. They know they have the hard right on their backs saying: You have to do something. But at least have the decency, the honor, a little bit of courage to put the bill out there

and let us debate it and let us amend it.

The Republicans don't want the American people to know their bill will likely gut Medicaid to finance a massive tax break for the wealthiest of Americans, hurt the healthcare of average Americans, middle-class Americans, elderly Americans, those who abuse opioids, so they can have a big tax break for people whose income is above \$200,000 a year.

The Republicans don't want the American people to know their bill will make older and sicker Americans pay more for less coverage. Someone 63 or 64 could see their premiums go up three, four, five times, while millionaires and billionaires get a break on their taxes. If it were my bill, I would be ashamed of it too. Thank God it is not.

Republicans don't want the American people to know their bill will cause their costs to go up, their care to go down, while leaving millions of Americans without health insurance. Why are Republicans working so hard in secret for a bill they are clearly not proud of? Because the ideologues on the hard right are pushing them to just repeal and give a tax break to the rich.

It is because they repeated the political slogan "repeal and replace" to their base for 7 years without coming up with a workable healthcare plan when the day came that they were actually in charge.

Now we have this Frankenstein bill from the House, assembled from spare parts intended to buy off different Republican constituencies, and the Republican majority in the Senate, which we thought at one point would show more honor and more courage, seems to be taking the same approach. They are working on modifying the bill so it can get 50 votes in their caucus, no matter what the impact is on the country. Most of the devastating consequences of the House bill will remain.

Mark my words, my Republican friends, the Republican Party will regret the day it passes a bill that looks anything like what is now being considered. Every independent analysis has shown that TrumpCare will devastate sicker, older Americans, folks in rural areas, the working poor, younger couples and middle-aged couples who have a parent in a nursing home. It will raise costs on middle-class families, and those struggling to get there will be left with a healthcare system that works only for the healthiest and wealthiest among us, and the Republicans will own every last shred of the responsibility. They will own it completely because there has not been a scrap of bipartisan input on the bill, not a single Democratic amendment, not a single hearing, and no one even knows exactly what the bill looks like.

A senior GOP aide said in the paper today that they weren't releasing the

bill text because “we are not stupid.” I challenge that claim. Keeping a bill this bad holed up in secret and then forcing it down the throats of the American people is much more stupid than simply showing the bill, allowing it to be vetted and amended, and allowing it to be improved. It is much more stupid.

The Republicans are going down a dark path, down a dangerous road that will have devastating consequences for their party and of course for the American people. Believe me, this is not what Democrats want.

We Democrats are actually willing to take on some of the responsibility. We are willing to work with our Republican colleagues to make improvements to our healthcare system and to fix problems with the existing law. That involves some political risk. We are willing to take on that risk to try and help more Americans afford healthcare.

The Republicans are doing just the opposite by hiding their bill under lock and key. They are trying to avoid the risk of public backlash on a bill that, at least the polling shows, has the support of a mere sliver of the American people—18 percent. It will backfire. It will do potentially irrevocable damage to their party and more importantly to our country.

The Republicans ought to turn back before it is too late. They will rue the day they rushed this bill, in the dark of night, that does so much damage to the American people.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, before he leaves the floor, I want to say

to my friend, the Democratic leader, among his other attributes, he now claims omniscience. He knows everything—even about things that haven't even been written yet, and I, for one, appreciate as a Republican his concern about the Republican Party.

I would challenge his memory because I was here in 2010, when 60 Democrats in the Senate jammed through ObamaCare, a bill that we frankly need to save the American people from as it begins to melt down.

As the distinguished Presiding Officer from Iowa knows, there is not a single carrier in Iowa that is willing to sell ObamaCare insurance on the exchanges because they are simply bleeding money.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will my good friend and gym mate from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. SCHUMER. Is omniscience a comment of all-knowing, and if I don't know what the bill is all about, then I couldn't be omniscient; isn't that true?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I would say to my friend from New York that he is omniscient if he claims to know the content of a bill that has not yet been voted on or agreed upon by Republicans in the Senate. I would just put that in the same category as his other advice to folks on this side of the aisle and again challenge his memory to how we got here in the first place.

I was here on Christmas Eve when we voted. I ended up voting against, but Democrats voted to jam ObamaCare through this body and on a strictly party-line vote. The fact is, ObamaCare is failing millions of people because if they have access to coverage at all, many of them have seen their premiums go up an average of 105 percent since 2013. That is the average in the 30-plus States that carry ObamaCare insurance on the healthcare exchanges—a 105-percent increase. Many of them have also seen their deductibles get so big that they cannot even really use the insurance they have because basically they are effectively self-insured.

So I take with a grain of salt the comments from my friend from New York that somehow we are doing something that is so horrible when we are trying to rescue the American people and clean up the mess our Democratic friends created when they jammed ObamaCare through on a party-line vote. If they were serious about it, what they would do is accept our invitation to work with us to improve healthcare for all Americans. It would be much better if we could do this on a bipartisan basis. It would certainly be more durable and be sustained for much longer than things done strictly on party-line votes. Yet, in the absence of any real help from our Democratic friends, who just seem to be standing

idly by and not lifting a finger to help the people being hurt by ObamaCare today, we are going to have to do the best we can with the hand we have been dealt on behalf of the people whom we represent.

Madam President, on another matter, as a global leader of state-sponsored terrorism, Iran continues to threaten the very existence of the nation of Israel and destabilize the Middle East by creating a breeding ground for violence and hatred.

For the past several years, the United States and our allies have attempted to contain Iran, often to no avail. For one, President Obama's lopsided nuclear deal left a zero imprint on Iran's terrorist activities. So last week the senior Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, introduced legislation to apply impactful and powerful sanctions on the nation of Iran. This bill will give the President the ability to block any trade that could benefit Iran's ballistic missile programs or support its military build-up.

I plan to introduce a bipartisan amendment to this bill that would target Mahan Air. This is Iran's largest commercial airline that doubles as the preferred mode of transportation for terrorists and their weapons. That is right. It is a civilian airline, but it is actually used to facilitate terrorism and to transport weapons. Mahan Air not only supports the efforts of the Quds Force, which is a special unit of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, but it supports Hezbollah as well. This terrorist airline is a conduit for personnel, weapons, and a violent ideology throughout the region.

Unfortunately, despite its proven transgressions, Mahan Air continues to expand international operations by adding more international airports to its flight patterns, including several in Europe. This is an obvious threat to the safety and security of the people where these planes are allowed to land. Not only are the goods they transport a cause for concern, but their very presence is a security risk to Americans who fly in and out of airports at which a Mahan aircraft may land.

Through all of this, of course, Iran continues to support their terrorist activities, indeed carrying on under the guise of commercial civilian aircraft flights.

My amendment would require the Department of Homeland Security to compile and make public a list of airports at which Mahan Air has recently landed and then require the Department of Homeland Security to assess what security measures should be added.

We have a duty to protect American citizens, and I am thankful that Chairman CORKER will bring this legislation to the floor. The fight against terrorism is multifaceted, and it is not

easy, but we can start by targeting state sponsors of terrorism like Iran with economic sanctions while we strengthen our military and continue the great tradition of American leadership around the world.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Finally, Madam President, let me return to where I began—to the issue of ObamaCare.

There is a lot of work to be done here at home as well. I know it is easy for us to get mired in the “how,” but it is also important for us to remember why we are repealing ObamaCare and why we are replacing it with something far better for American families.

I want to continue to highlight one of the many stories I am hearing from my constituents. I wonder whether the Senator from New York is hearing some of these same stories from his constituents.

This gentleman is a small business owner in the Fort Worth area who told me that since ObamaCare was implemented, this small business owner has been forced to change his insurance every year. Can you imagine going through that headache and hassle when President Obama said: If you like your health coverage, you can keep it. He was also the one who said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. He also promised that premiums would go down an average of \$2,500 for a family of four—none of which has proved to be true. In this particular gentleman's case, as is the case for many Americans, his rates have gone through the roof, rising from roughly \$350 a month to \$800 a month. Despite the higher cost, he now receives less coverage because his out-of-pocket maximum has risen from \$3,500 to \$14,000. That is simply outrageous. Throughout the entire process, he has been fighting a losing battle.

As is the case with many States, including Iowa, provider after provider has pulled out of my State as well, as they are unable to afford ObamaCare at all.

This small business owner is not only forced to literally find new insurance every year, but he has to change providers each year and has fewer options available. Along the way—this is the other promise President Obama made that has been broken—this gentleman has lost access to his doctor of 20 years. He refers to the hope he had when President Obama looked into the camera and said: Now listen to me. You can keep your insurance, and you can keep your doctor, and you will pay less. That is what President Obama said when he was selling ObamaCare. Instead, this gentleman, this small business owner from Fort Worth, did not get to keep his insurance. He lost his doctor of 20 years, and he now pays nearly three times more for less coverage and higher deductibles.

He closed his letter to me with a question. He asked: Can I count on you?

I look around the Chamber, and I ask all of us: Can the American people count on us?

I know they can because it is our responsibility to provide something far better than what they have had under ObamaCare. They can count on us if we work together to find solutions that actually provide the high-quality healthcare American families deserve at prices they can afford. In many instances, this means getting government out of the way and allowing the marketplace to lower costs and increase quality, which is what markets do much better than government regulation.

Right now, every Senator on this side of the aisle is discussing with our colleagues how best to accomplish that, and we are also discussing this with the people whom we represent—the physicians, the healthcare providers, and others—to try to determine the best way forward. I hope our Democratic colleagues will join us rather than give us lectures from the Senate floor about the way we are conducting our business, particularly when their hands are unclean, to say the least, when it comes to the way they jammed ObamaCare down the throats of the American people to such bad effect. I would encourage them, rather than to just obstruct, to actually work with us in a bipartisan fashion. We would come up with a better product, a more durable product, if our Democratic friends would work with us rather than just sit on their hands or actively obstruct our efforts to get the job done.

I urge our colleagues from both sides to work together to find a solution that repeals what is broken in ObamaCare and replace it with patient-centered, accessible, and affordable healthcare. I hope that eventually others will come around to join us if for no other reason than their constituents are hurting from the status quo.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE PULSE NIGHTCLUB MASS SHOOTING IN ORLANDO

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise to recognize the first anniversary of a horrific tragedy that shook this Nation. One year ago, in the early morning hours of June 12, 2016, we all witnessed an unthinkable act of hatred and terror at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, FL. It was Pride Month and Latin night, and dozens of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people, along with friends and family, were gathered simply to have fun in what should have been a place of acceptance, affirmation, and safety. In a matter of moments, what should have been a celebration turned into one of the worst mass shootings in American history—a

targeted act of terror and hate, an attack on the freedoms we all hold dear. These 49 innocent people lost their lives in this attack, and 53 others were wounded. Many, many others bear the emotional scars.

This was not only a deadly act of domestic terrorism; it was a hate crime—a crime that targeted victims because of who they were and was designed not just to harm its victims but to terrorize everyone in the community.

Last year, I came to the floor to read the names and tell the stories of the victims of this massacre in Orlando, because we cannot and we must not forget these men and women. Their stories need a voice. Today, I rise again to remember the victims.

As I did 1 year ago, I come to the floor to ask my colleagues to find the courage to stand up, speak out, and act to confront the rising tide of hate crimes and discrimination in America. We must never forget the victims of this hate crime, and we must honor them with action.

While the Pulse shooting was an unimaginable horror, it is, sadly, far from the only act of violence that has been perpetrated out of hatred. Even before June 12 of last year, we had seen an alarming increase in reports of hate crimes against LGBTQ people but also against racial and religious minorities and immigrants. In the aftermath of a divisive election, we saw hundreds of documented instances of discrimination, harassment, and even violence against members of minority communities as well as increased hostility within our Nation's schools. In this year alone, at least 11 transgender people have been murdered, most of them women of color.

The fact is that many members of racial, ethnic, disability, and religious minority communities, as well as LGBT people, live in very real fear for their safety. They are scared, and it is incumbent upon President Trump as our Nation's leader to demonstrate to them and to all Americans that discrimination and violence against any individual because of who he is, whom he loves, and how he worships will not be tolerated in this country.

When I stood here last year, I called for a greater investment in the Federal Government's effort to both try to prevent hate crimes and fully investigate and prosecute them whenever they happen. After President Trump took office, I was joined by a number of my Senate colleagues in urging him and the Attorney General to support robust funding for the Department of Justice's programs that combat bias-motivated crimes. I believe a documented increase in hate crimes demands an increase in the resources that are committed to fighting this problem. Yet the budget put forward by President Trump and Attorney General Sessions seeks no increases. In fact, it proposes

cutting more than 100 staff from the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

This administration has failed to step up and speak out against this disturbing trend across our country or to commit the resources necessary to fight it.

Instead of showing the moral leadership our Nation needs in the face of increasing hatred and division, President Trump and his administration have taken steps to roll back our Nation's progress in many areas, including progress for the LGBT community.

Rather than issue a proclamation recognizing Pride Month and committing to address the many challenges still facing LGBT Americans, President Trump recently issued an Executive order that could open the door to discrimination with Federal taxpayer dollars.

Rather than stand up for transgender students facing bullying, harassment, and discrimination, this administration rescinded guidance to schools about the rights of those vulnerable young people under Federal law.

Rather than building on the steps taken to better understand the needs of LGBT people by simply counting us, the Trump administration has walked back efforts to ask about LGBT Americans in Federal surveys at the Department of Health and Human Services and the Census Bureau.

Simply put, President Trump has not lived up to his vow to be a President for all Americans.

But where I come from, in Wisconsin, our State motto consists of one word: "Forward." I believe that no matter who is in the Oval Office, our country must move in only one direction—forward.

Remember, while Pride Month is, of course, about celebration—of who we are and of how far we have come—it is just as much about bravely standing up and speaking out so that others will not feel compelled to live in silence.

To the survivors of the Pulse shooting and the families and friends of those who were murdered and who feel the wounds of this tragedy most deeply, we hear your voices and we are inspired by your strength.

As a community, we have never been deterred by tragedy and will not be now. One of the early leaders in our fight for equality was Harvey Milk, and he was also struck down by violent hatred. Harvey Milk famously said: "Hope will never be silent."

So today I rise to remind us of the power of hope in the face of tragedy. We must continue to work to pass on to the next generation a country that is more equal, not less. We must remain strong in fighting any rollback of progress, large or small.

There is more work to be done to ensure that all Americans are protected from hatred and discrimination, and

the work toward full equality for LGBTQ people and their families remains far from complete.

For myself and those who stand united this Pride Month, we are guided by our uniquely American values. It is about freedom—the freedom to realize our founding belief that all Americans are created equal under the law. It is about fairness—whether gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender Americans deserve to be treated just like their family members, their friends, their neighbors, their fellow workers. It is about opportunity—about whether every American gets to dream the same dreams, chase the same ambitions, and have the same shot at success.

This is the promise of America, and we must fight to make sure we keep it. I yield the floor.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session for consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth P. Rapuano, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Florida.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE PULSE NIGHTCLUB MASS SHOOTING IN ORLANDO

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I will not be addressing the matter before us because I have just come from Orlando, where so many are feeling such deep, deep sorrow today. It has been 1 year since the tragic attack on the Pulse nightclub in Orlando.

The horror of that early morning still remains fresh for so many, especially those hundreds and hundreds of people who gathered at the Pulse nightclub this morning on the occasion of 1 year since the tragedy. There was quite a ceremony to remember the 49 innocent souls we lost. It was a massacre of huge proportions by a terrorist.

What terrorists want to do is to divide people. They want to terrorize them. They inject fear. Interestingly, the terrorist, whose name was Omar Mateen—although he changed the lives of so many, he took the lives of 49 people. He changed a lot of other lives of those who were wounded, and, of course, the families of the 49 victims are still suffering.

Interestingly, a terrorist wants to divide and inject fear, but this has had the opposite effect in Orlando. It has unified people. It has unified the com-

munity as I have never seen before. It has unified our State; indeed, it has unified our Nation. So quite the opposite effect has happened from what the terrorist intended—other than the slaughter of 49 innocent lives. Sadly, these are the 49, and they are all being honored today. It was a very moving ceremony.

One of the causes that came out of the unification of Orlando is that—instead of creating a number of victims' funds—they put it all into one fund. Tens of millions of dollars have now gone into that fund, and it is helping to finance some of the victims who survived and their medical expenses, some of the families and the loved ones of those who were lost.

Interestingly, being there, suddenly those moments came rushing back. I heard about it early on a Sunday morning when the news broke about the massacre the night before, which had occurred in the early morning hours. As I raced from my home to downtown Orlando on South Orange Avenue, I was able to get on the telephone the No. 3 at the FBI, and he gave me authorization to tell what they originally were anticipating had happened. Once I got to the scene, I was able to share that. Of course, they had a representative of the FBI on the scene. They had set up a command post. Mayor Buddy Dyer had taken charge. It was quite a scene.

The tales of heroism are nonstop. The Orlando Police Department SWAT team, which went inside—before they could get the SWAT team there, members of the Police Department and the Sheriff's Department were there. One block away was a fire station that became a triage point. First responders got there and were trying to save people's lives. It was because of the massive number of casualties—49—that while the gunman Mateen was holed up in one of the bathrooms with hostages, some whom he had already shot had bled to death. While he was in the bathroom, police and paramedics were going in and pulling people out in those dark hours of the early morning. Of course, they were using whatever vehicle—if there was a pickup truck, they would put the victims on the truck. Fortunately, Orlando Regional Medical Center is only about six to eight blocks away, and, of course, it is a trauma center hospital.

About a week later, I went to see the trauma surgeons. A resident who had been getting his residency there as a trauma surgeon was so moved by that experience that he put on his Facebook page what he was feeling and showed a picture of his bloody shoes that he didn't even recognize because he was so busy. It was not until the next day that he looked at those shoes. He put a picture of that on his Facebook page, and he wrote: To be a trauma surgeon and have waves of people coming in, I didn't know if they were Black or

White; I didn't know if they were gay or straight. All I knew was I was doing everything I could to save lives.

In some cases, they would make an initial prep; then they would get the victim, who was still living, up to the operating room where other surgeons were taking over. In some cases, they did not have time. They had to do the operation right there in the trauma center. Fortunately, the one trauma center in all of Central Florida is right there at Orlando Regional Medical Center.

So a terrorist, perhaps aided and abetted by his wife—this is an open question, and that determination has not been made. A terrorist tried to divide us as a nation, just as they had before on 9/11 and at San Bernardino and in so many other cases where they had been foiled. There are others whom you can't label as terrorists, but they are in their own ways—all the killings that have occurred at schools. If you lump all of that together, they try to divide us. Yet Orlando came together, united. They have a catch phrase for it. It is called Orlando Strong.

America is a nation of compassion, generosity, kindness, and respect. Those are precisely the qualities we saw from the people of Orlando when they came together a year ago, and this Senator saw that again in vivid detail this morning.

We are forever grateful for the bravery and heroism of the police, the first responders, the sheriff's department, the FBI, the families, and victims helping other victims. We are forever grateful for the trauma surgeons and the operating room nurses and doctors, as they saved lives. We are forever grateful for the hospital and how it completely accommodated all of this mass confusion and how it forgave all of the medical expenses for those who had been victims, both the living and the dead. We are forever grateful for those who rushed to the scene that night in the face of uncertainty, in the pitch darkness of that nightclub, not knowing where the shooter was. We are forever grateful for the skills of the negotiators as they tried to talk the shooter down. Ultimately, when he came out with the automatic weapons blazing, they had to take him down.

To all of those heroes, we say thank you. To all of those heroes who are also the families of these victims, we say thank you. To the victims' families and loved ones, we want to say that even though you lost those loved ones, they did not die in vain. Out of evil, what we have seen is good.

Thanks to all of Orlando, not only for what you did that night, but thank you for what you do every day. A year later, I can report to the Senate that we are Orlando Strong.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, a year ago today, Americans—myself included—awoke to the shocking news that 49 of our fellow Americans had been killed overnight in one of the deadliest mass shootings, mass attacks in our Nation's history.

I recall that day. It was a Sunday morning. I was home, and we were getting ready to go to church, as we do. The news was on. We don't usually turn on the TV. That day, the text messages were coming in, and it spoke about this horrifying incident that occurred overnight. The news reports were still sketchy.

For whatever reason—be it because of our work here or a bad gut feeling—I remember telling my family that I was going to get in my truck and drive the 3 hours to Orlando to be there because I felt there was something beyond the scale and scope of it, a little bit different about this horrifying attack. As I drove north on the Florida turnpike, the updates on the radio kept coming in. The scale of it was unbelievable. The numbers kept climbing, and there was still not a lot of detail about what was behind it.

After I arrived on the scene and was able to interact with some of our Federal authorities and State authorities who were there, the picture still wasn't abundantly clear, but the one thing that began to emerge was, this was the act of a single individual inspired by an ideology of hate and supported in the pursuit of that ideology by people who before that and since then have been responsible for attacks all over the world.

I think the part that was perhaps most troubling for a lot of people is—especially for me, I found myself at that time, 45 years of age, at the halfway point between the age of the people who would have been there and the age of someone whose child might have been there, and the randomness of it—the notion that a lot of young people went out that night to have a good time with their friends. It was Latin night. This was a well-known nightclub in the LGBT community in Central Florida. I don't think that when you get up at night and get dressed and go out that you think one of the risks involved is you are going to end up interacting with a jihadist terrorist. That is what happened that night.

The other part that was so startling is, so often for so many of us, these bad things happen somewhere else. They happen in France. They happen in London. They happened on 9/11 in New York City. This happened in Florida, just down the street from a place that

I had been a year earlier—a small business, furniture store whose owners I had gotten to know as I was writing a book about small businesses and the like. The familiarity of it, how close it was to home, and the idea that the war on terror had not just come to America that day but it had come to Central Florida. Ultimately, we learned it had come to impact people whom we knew through others and whose stories sounded quite familiar.

We now know it was the worst attack on U.S. soil since September 11 of 2001. In this time when we are having so many debates about whom we are going to allow into our country and what criteria we are going to use and from what places they can come, it is important to stop and remember that the individual—whose name I will not even say because I think one of the hopes he had is that he would go down in history as a famous person, but this individual lived in our country for a long time. He lived among us since the day he was born. He was not someone who had come on an airplane or had recently arrived from another culture, another society. He was an American, born and raised in the United States. If my memory doesn't fail me, I believe he was born in Queens, NY.

What strikes me is, he benefited from everything this country offers: freedom, liberty. He knew people. He lived among fellow Americans his whole life. He went to work every morning alongside them. He had all of the blessings and the opportunities and everything this country provides. Yet even that was not enough to somehow inspire him not just to take on this evil ideology but to act on it.

Obviously, the attack was personal for the 49 families with stories of their own and of course the countless others who were injured. I know it was personal to the LGBT community and Central Florida. As I said, Pulse was a well-known cornerstone of the community, particularly for younger people.

As I said earlier, this was deeply personal for Floridians and for the people of Central Florida. I will get to that in a moment because I am extraordinarily proud of that community. I think it was personal for all Americans.

When I arrived, I saw these people, largely still—I don't know what time it was, but the attacks weren't even 12 hours old. I saw family members of people they loved or loved ones who were outside in desperate mode. You know that look on your face where, "I want to know what happened. I don't know if the person I love is inside there. I haven't heard from them."

One of the most chilling things I heard from law enforcement was that the cell phones were still buzzing as people were calling their loved ones. It brought home that this wasn't just 49 as a number. It is so easy to see that scroll across the television set. It is

even easy to say it now, 49. They were 49 human beings, 49 human beings with families who loved them, parents who loved them, siblings who loved them. I saw that firsthand when I got there. I saw the look of people behind the yellow rope who had no idea if someone whom they deeply loved and cared for lay dead on the other side of that tape.

I remember not long after, crowds began to form and people started showing up with signs that said things like: "We're with you." "We love you." This was early. I am talking about 12 to 13 hours after the attack happened.

I commend the law enforcement—Federal, State, local—who came together and responded. I saw people coming off duty, people who were not on duty that day, putting on the uniform and showing up to see how they could help. We saw the long lines of everyday citizens bringing food and water to support their efforts. Later that day, we saw long lines of Floridians lined up to donate blood.

There is no doubt that this was a community that was heartbroken, but it was also a community that was unbroken; that I believe woke up stronger and more united than it was when I went to sleep the night before.

I think, ultimately, the man who committed this attack and the people who inspired him to do so would have been horrified by what they saw. I think they would have been horrified to see First Baptist Church in Orlando—a pillar of the Christian evangelical community—opening its doors to the LGBT community and welcoming them and their families and holding services there. I think they would have been horrified by that. I think they would have been horrified by people putting aside, if but for a moment, their voter registration cards, their preferences in the upcoming elections, their backgrounds, the way their last names are pronounced or whom they love. They put all this aside and said: These are 49 Americans—and their families—who just died at the hands of an evil terrorist. We are committed to doing everything we can to provide support for them. I think these terrorists would have been horrified to see what has happened since that time.

In so many ways, Central Florida grew up—and I mean that in a positive way—so much in the last year, in terms of coming together, in the sense of community, and obviously it is sometimes in tragedy that we see that happen. I think it served as an extraordinary inspiration to communities all around the country who hope to achieve the same level of unity without the tragedy.

While the attack may have succeeded in sowing death and heartbreak, it failed in sowing doubt about our way of life. In the year that has followed, we have seen hundreds of thousands of Americans come together in Orlando to

celebrate the lives of the victims and to begin that healing process.

In the weeks and months after the attack, memorials were established throughout downtown Orlando, marking the loss of 49 of our brothers and sisters. We saw ceremonies held in every part of the State, from Pensacola to Miami, FL.

One thing that really stands out in particular is, one of the memorials was a set of 49 white crosses that rested aside the Orlando Regional Medical Center, the trauma center where a number of the victims were taken that morning. Those crosses are now at the Orange County Regional History Center. Each one of these crosses is about 3 to 4 feet high and has the name of one of the 49 victims. People from all across the Nation visited this memorial, including, at the time, President Obama and Vice President Biden. They came to pay their respects and to leave a token of their mourning in the honor of those taken that night—cards and pictures, teddy bears and flowers were set around each cross, and people wrote notes and well-wishes on the crosses to honor the memory of each of the 49.

When the crosses were taken by a police motorcade to the history center, one mother—I have chosen not to list her name because it is not for me to do, but she was there to assist that Tuesday with moving that cross that represented her daughter. She and her husband, I think, by now know this, but we share a mutual friend in the Orlando area, and I have learned firsthand from him just how hard the loss of their daughter was for them.

In the end, before I am a Senator or anything else I do, I am a husband and a father, and I have a child whose name is the same as their daughter. I, for the life of me, cannot begin to fathom what they have gone through in the past year, along with 48 other families.

As they moved her cross with her name on it, they saw a note on it that had been written by someone in the community. They don't know who it was. The note was very simple, but it was very powerful. The note said: "I never knew you but I love you."

It strikes me that line, "I never knew you but I love you," for those of us in the Christian faith, reminds us of what Christ said is one of our greatest Commandments, to love your neighbor as yourself.

For the past year, we have felt the deep pain. We have also seen in Orlando that it is united. "One Orlando." At a time when we can always find something to divide us, a community came together to honor the memory of those who were lost. Each of them was a son or a daughter, a brother, a sister, a mother, a father, a husband, a wife, or a partner. In the end, they were a part of our families and our communities. Each of them, like all of us, had immense promise and hope. Each in their

own way were a part of what makes this country a great nation, and they were lost that terrible night 1 year ago, but they were loved.

A year later, we remember them and those they left behind. I hope we will honor them by finding a way as a nation to remember that despite our differences on a vast number of issues, we are still one nation under God, the greatest Nation on Earth, the most extraordinary people who have ever lived, a nation that is not simply a people bound together by a common blood or common heritage, a common ethnicity. America is more than a country. It is an idea, the idea that every single human being has a God-given right to live life as they so choose and to fulfill their potential. I hope we will continue to work here and everywhere we can to live up to that powerful idea that changed the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rapuano nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 142 Ex.]

YEAS—95

|            |              |            |
|------------|--------------|------------|
| Alexander  | Cochran      | Feinstein  |
| Baldwin    | Collins      | Fischer    |
| Barrasso   | Coons        | Flake      |
| Bennet     | Corker       | Franken    |
| Blumenthal | Cornyn       | Gardner    |
| Blunt      | Cortez Masto | Gillibrand |
| Booker     | Cotton       | Graham     |
| Boozman    | Crapo        | Grassley   |
| Brown      | Cruz         | Harris     |
| Cantwell   | Daines       | Hassan     |
| Capito     | Donnelly     | Hatch      |
| Cardin     | Duckworth    | Heinrich   |
| Carper     | Durbin       | Heitkamp   |
| Casey      | Enzi         | Heller     |
| Cassidy    | Ernst        | Hirono     |



|           |           |            |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Hoeven    | Merkley   | Shaheen    |
| Inhofe    | Moran     | Shelby     |
| Isakson   | Murkowski | Strange    |
| Johnson   | Murphy    | Sullivan   |
| Kaine     | Murray    | Tester     |
| Kennedy   | Nelson    | Thune      |
| King      | Paul      | Tillis     |
| Klobuchar | Peters    | Toomey     |
| Lankford  | Portman   | Udall      |
| Leahy     | Reed      | Van Hollen |
| Lee       | Roberts   | Warner     |
| Manchin   | Rounds    | Warren     |
| Markey    | Rubio     | Whitehouse |
| McCain    | Sasse     | Wicker     |
| McCaskill | Schatz    | Wyden      |
| McConnell | Schumer   | Young      |
| Menendez  | Scott     |            |

## NAYS—1

Sanders

## NOT VOTING—4

|        |          |
|--------|----------|
| Burr   | Risch    |
| Perdue | Stabenow |

The nomination was confirmed.

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

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

# COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

## ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on the motion to proceed to S. 722, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only, with Senator WICKER recognized for 12 minutes, to be followed by Senator MERKLEY for 12 minutes; and that following those remarks, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

# COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 722) to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign

Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Regional strategy for countering conventional and asymmetric Iranian threats in the Middle East and North Africa.

Sec. 4. Imposition of additional sanctions in response to Iran's ballistic missile program.

Sec. 5. Imposition of terrorism-related sanctions with respect to the IRGC.

Sec. 6. Imposition of additional sanctions with respect to persons responsible for human rights abuses.

Sec. 7. Enforcement of arms embargos.

Sec. 8. Review of applicability of sanctions relating to Iran's support for terrorism and its ballistic missile program.

Sec. 9. Report on coordination of sanctions between the United States and the European Union.

Sec. 10. Report on United States citizens detained by Iran.

Sec. 11. Exceptions for national security and humanitarian assistance; rule of construction.

Sec. 12. Presidential waiver authority.

## SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The term "act of international terrorism" has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term "foreign person" means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term "Iranian person" means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of Iran; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of Iran or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran.

(5) IRGC.—The term "IRGC" means Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

(6) KNOWINGLY.—The term "knowingly" has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(7) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term "United States person" means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

# SEC. 3. REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR COUNTERING CONVENTIONAL AND ASYMMETRIC IRANIAN THREATS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intel-

ligence shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for deterring conventional and asymmetric Iranian activities and threats that directly threaten the United States and key allies in the Middle East, North Africa, and beyond.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include at a minimum the following:

(1) A summary of the near- and long-term United States objectives, plans, and means for countering Iran's destabilizing activities, including identification of countries that share the objective of countering Iran's destabilizing activities.

(2) A summary of the capabilities and contributions of individual countries to shared efforts to counter Iran's destabilizing activities, and a summary of additional actions or contributions that each country could take to further contribute.

(3) An assessment of Iran's conventional force capabilities and an assessment of Iran's plans to upgrade its conventional force capabilities, including its acquisition, development, and deployment of ballistic and cruise missile capabilities, unmanned aerial vehicles, and maritime offensive and anti-access or area denial capabilities.

(4) An assessment of Iran's chemical and biological weapons capabilities and an assessment of Iranian plans to upgrade its chemical or biological weapons capabilities.

(5) An assessment of Iran's asymmetric activities in the region, including—

(A) the size, capabilities, and activities of the IRGC, including the Quds Force;

(B) the size, capabilities, and activities of Iran's cyber operations;

(C) the types and amount of support, including funding, lethal and nonlethal contributions, and training, provided to Hezbollah, Hamas, special groups in Iraq, the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Houthi fighters in Yemen, and other violent groups across the Middle East; and

(D) the scope and objectives of Iran's information operations and use of propaganda.

(6) A summary of United States actions, unilaterally and in cooperation with foreign governments, to counter destabilizing Iranian activities, including—

(A) interdiction of Iranian lethal arms bound for groups designated as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) Iran's interference in international commercial shipping lanes;

(C) attempts by Iran to undermine or subvert internationally recognized governments in the Middle East region; and

(D) Iran's support for the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, including—

(i) financial assistance, military equipment and personnel, and other support provided to that regime; and

(ii) support and direction to other armed actors that are not Syrian or Iranian and are acting on behalf of that regime.

(c) FORM OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

# SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS IN RESPONSE TO IRAN'S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State should continue to implement Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters).

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to any person that the

President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(2) is a successor entity to a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(4) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that would otherwise be imposed pursuant to paragraph (3);

(5) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4); or

(6) knowingly provides or attempts to provide financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4) or (5).

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.

(d) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (c)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(e) **REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO IRAN'S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing each person that—

(A) has, during the period specified in paragraph (2), conducted any activity that has materially contributed to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(B) is a successor entity to a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(D) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that could be imposed as a result of a relationship described in subparagraph (C);

(E) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

(F) is known or believed to have provided, or attempted to provide, during the period specified in paragraph (2), financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, any material contribution to a

program described in subparagraph (A) carried out by a person described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E).

(2) **PERIOD SPECIFIED.**—The period specified in this paragraph is—

(A) in the case of the first report submitted under paragraph (1), the period beginning January 1, 2016, and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(B) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

## **SEC. 5. IMPOSITION OF TERRORISM-RELATED SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IRGC.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The IRGC is subject to sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), Executive Order 13553 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of certain persons with respect to serious human rights abuses by the Government of Iran), and Executive Order 13606 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking the property and suspending entry into the United States of certain persons with respect to grave human rights abuses by the Governments of Iran and Syria via information technology).

(2) The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—Quds Force (in this section referred to as the “IRGC-QF”) is the primary arm of the Government of Iran for executing its policy of supporting terrorist and insurgent groups. The IRGC-QF provides material, logistical assistance, training, and financial support to militants and terrorist operatives throughout the Middle East and South Asia and was designated for the imposition of sanctions by the Secretary of Treasury pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism) in October 2007 for its support of terrorism.

(3) The IRGC, not just the IRGC-QF, is responsible for implementing Iran's international program of destabilizing activities, support for acts of international terrorism, and ballistic missile program.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to the IRGC and foreign persons that are officials, agents, or affiliates of the IRGC.

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions applicable with respect to a foreign person pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

## **SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of each person the Secretary determines, based on credible evidence, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) is responsible for extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed against individuals in Iran who seek—

(A) to expose illegal activity carried out by officials of the Government of Iran; or

(B) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote internationally recognized human rights and freedoms, such as the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections; or

(2) acts as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign person in a matter relating to an activity described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person on the list required by subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

## **SEC. 7. ENFORCEMENT OF ARMS EMBARGOS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (d), the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the supply, sale, or transfer directly or indirectly to or from Iran, or for the use in or benefit of Iran, of any battle tanks, armored combat vehicles, large caliber artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, missiles or missile systems, as defined for the purpose of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, or related materiel, including spare parts; or

(2) knowingly provides to Iran any technical training, financial resources or services, advice, other services or assistance related to the supply, sale, transfer, manufacture, maintenance, or use of arms and related materiel described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.

(c) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) **EXCEPTION.**—The President is not required to impose sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person for engaging in an activity described in that subsection if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) permitting the activity is in the national security interest of the United States;

(2) Iran no longer presents a significant threat to the national security of the United States and to the allies of the United States; and

(3) the Government of Iran has ceased providing operational or financial support for acts of international terrorism and no longer satisfies the requirements for designation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(e) **STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “state sponsor of terrorism” means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

(1) section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)(1)(A)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(2) section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a));

(3) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

(4) any other provision of law.

**SEC. 8. REVIEW OF APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO IRAN'S SUPPORT FOR TERRORISM AND ITS BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall conduct a review of all persons on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury for activities relating to Iran—

(1) to assess the conduct of such persons as that conduct relates to—

(A) any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program; or

(B) support by the Government of Iran for acts of international terrorism; and

(2) to determine the applicability of sanctions with respect to such persons under—

(A) Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters); or

(B) Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS.**—If the President determines under subsection (a) that sanctions under an Executive Order specified in paragraph (2) of that subsection are applicable with respect to a person, the President shall—

(1) impose sanctions with respect to that person pursuant to that Executive Order; or

(2) exercise the waiver authority provided under section 12.

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON COORDINATION OF SANCTIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN UNION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of each instance, during the period specified in subsection (b)—

(A) in which the United States has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the European Union has not imposed corresponding sanctions; and

(B) in which the European Union has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons

to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the United States has not imposed corresponding sanctions.

(2) An explanation for the reason for each discrepancy between sanctions imposed by the European Union and sanctions imposed by the United States described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) **PERIOD SPECIFIED.**—The period specified in this subsection is—

(1) in the case of the first report submitted under subsection (a), the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(2) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 10. REPORT ON UNITED STATES CITIZENS DETAINED BY IRAN.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United States citizens, including United States citizens who are also citizens of other countries, detained by Iran or groups supported by Iran that includes—

(1) information regarding any officials of the Government of Iran involved in any way in the detentions; and

(2) a summary of efforts the United States Government has taken to secure the swift release of those United States citizens.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 11. EXCEPTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under sections 4, 5, 6, and 7:

(1) Any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations of the United States.

(3) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Iran or for the provision of humanitarian assistance to the people of Iran, including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.

(b) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—A requirement or the authority to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 shall not include the authority to impose prohibitions with respect to the importation of goods.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this Act.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.**—The term “agricultural commodity” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) **GOOD.**—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) **MEDICAL DEVICE.**—The term “medical device” has the meaning given the term “device” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) **MEDICINE.**—The term “medicine” has the meaning given the term “drug” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

**SEC. 12. PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.**

(a) **CASE-BY-CASE WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis and for a period of not more than 180 days, a requirement under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a person, and may waive the continued imposition of such sanctions, not less than 30 days after the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to waive such sanctions.

(2) **RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.**—The President may, on a case-by-case basis, renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for an additional period of not more than 180 days if, not later than 15 days before that waiver expires, the President makes the determination and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report described in paragraph (1).

(3) **SUCCESSIVE RENEWAL.**—The renewal authority provided under paragraph (2) may be exercised for additional successive periods of not more than 180 days if the President follows the procedures set forth in paragraph (2), and submits the report described in paragraph (1), for each such renewal.

(b) **CONTENTS OF WAIVER REPORTS.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) in connection with a waiver of sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 with respect to a person, or the renewal of such a waiver, shall include—

(1) a specific and detailed rationale for the determination that the waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States;

(2) a description of the activity that resulted in the person being subject to sanctions;

(3) an explanation of any efforts made by the United States, as applicable, to secure the cooperation of the government with primary jurisdiction over the person or the location where the activity described in paragraph (2) occurred in terminating or, as appropriate, penalizing the activity; and

(4) an assessment of the significance of the activity described in paragraph (2) in contributing to the ability of Iran to threaten the interests of the United States or allies of the United States, develop systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, support acts of international terrorism, or violate the human rights of any person in Iran.

(c) **EFFECT OF REPORT ON WAIVER.**—If the President submits a report under subsection (a) in connection with a waiver of sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 with respect to a person, or the renewal of such a waiver, the President shall not be required to impose or maintain sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as applicable, with respect to the person described in the

report during the 30-day period referred to in subsection (a).

# MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

## BUILDING AND SUSTAINING A LARGER NAVY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, I rise this afternoon to direct the attention of this body to an important national security issue: building and sustaining a larger Navy.

President Trump wants a 350-ship Navy, which aligns with the Navy's requirement for 355 ships. Right now we have only 275 ships in the battle fleet. Increasing the size of the Navy by 80 ships, even as older ships retire each year, is a test of national will. It will not happen overnight. However, Congress has the responsibility to lay a firm foundation this year to prepare for a deliberate and responsible buildup in the future. A healthy shipbuilding industrial base is necessary to succeed.

Today, I will offer some general comments about the state of shipbuilding. Then I will focus on the submarine industrial base, in particular, because of its unique challenges. Finally, I will make suggestions on how Congress can support the industrial base in general and the submarine yards specifically.

Last month, my subcommittee convened two hearings on this matter. The first was with naval officials. This took place in a classified setting because of their expertise and because of sensitive information. The other hearing was with the country's two top shipbuilders—Huntington Ingalls and General Dynamics—as well as the Shipbuilders Council of America, which is the trade association for suppliers. We discussed the industrial base as it exists today and the challenges associated with building up the fleet.

Based on my subcommittee's work, here are four general impressions of the state of shipbuilding.

No. 1, the yards are turning out most classes of ships on time and on budget. Ingalls Shipbuilding just delivered the newest big-deck amphibious ship—the LHA—13 weeks early. Electric Boat and Newport News continue to deliver Virginia-class attack submarines, or SSNs. Construction time for attack submarines has declined by 1½ years—from 84 months to 66 months. There are a few notable exceptions, but, by and large, industry is delivering for the warfighter and for the taxpayer.

No. 2, most yards have excess capacity to ramp up shipbuilding. This is very good news for national security. The Navy's accelerated fleet plan concluded that the industrial base can build an additional 29 ships—above projections—over the next 7 years. The

glaring exceptions are the submarine yards, which will struggle to meet planned demand as the new Columbia-class ballistic missile submarine production starts. In terms of capacity, our submarine yards have a ways to go.

No. 3, two decades of low-rate shipbuilding have significantly reduced the supplier base. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that ships cost more today than they did during the Reagan buildup, even when adjusting for inflation. Twenty years ago, about 17,000 suppliers served the submarine business. Now only about 3,000 first-tier suppliers are left. Let me repeat this. We used to have 17,000 suppliers. Now we have 3,000. These 3,000 suppliers include large corporations, such as Northrop Grumman and L3, which have tens of thousands of employees. These 3,000 suppliers also include mom-and-pop small businesses with just a few employees. Whether they deal with large corporations or small businesses, the shipyards increasingly buy from sole-source suppliers. In fact, Newport News spends about 65 percent of its budget in buying pieces and parts from single and sole-source suppliers. General Dynamics faces a very similar situation. I have little doubt that this dramatic erosion in the supplier base explains why ships cost more today.

No. 4, in terms of my general observations, Congress has a critical role to play in supporting a buildup through advance procurement funding, through multiyear procurement authority, and through block buys. These tools can stimulate the supplier base, stabilize the workforce, and achieve significant savings through producing economies of scale. In addition, incremental funding authority is a tool that Congress can authorize to smooth out peaks and valleys in appropriations. This makes it easier to buy more ships in 1 year without busting the budget.

To sum it up, most yards are performing well and have the capacity to ramp up. The submarine yards are doing exceptional work but will struggle because of capacity. All shipbuilders face a diminished supplier base, which undermines competition, and Congress can help improve the supplier situation and stabilize the skilled workforce through using acquisition authorities.

That is a snapshot of the overall shipbuilding industrial base. Now let's turn to submarines specifically. Let's begin with the Navy's requirements.

In 2016, the Navy set a new requirement. The total requirement for ships is 355. That includes an increase of 47 ships from the previous level. For the Navy's submarine fleet, the new plan calls for 66 attack submarines and 12 ballistic missile submarines. We currently have 52 attack submarines—a number that will eventually decline to 41 over the next decade unless we do something about it. I propose we do

something about it. We currently have 14 ballistic missile submarines as part of our nuclear deterrent. Beginning in 2021, 12 of these will be replaced by the new Columbia-class ballistic missile submarines.

To reiterate, we need 355 ships. That includes 66 attack submarines and 12 ballistic missile submarines. How does the President's budget request match up? The fiscal year 2018 request includes nine ships and prioritizes readiness more so than modernization. Congress needs to work with the President to reach his goal and to reach the requirement of 350 to 355 ships. I look forward to working with the administration on these budget numbers in order to make them work and to help the President achieve his goal.

Now let's talk about submarines. The budget request fully funds R&D for Columbia-class SSBNs to keep the program on track. The budget also funds the procurement of two Virginia-class submarines. We have followed this policy for years.

The Navy will struggle to ramp up submarine production because of the industrial base for submarines and how it will be stretched to capacity. The CBO tells us that reaching 355 ships in 15 years is not possible because we lack submarine production capacity. Electric Boat and Newport News are investing billions to recapitalize facilities, workforce, and suppliers, but that recapitalization effort is aimed at meeting current projected demand.

Arresting the decline in attack submarines, while maintaining the schedule for the Columbia-class SSBN, will take a significant recapitalization effort. We have done it before, and we can do it again. From the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, industry steadily delivered three attack submarines per year and added a fourth SSBN on time and on budget. There is no reason we cannot do this again. We must take decisive action now to make this a reality. There are four ways in which Congress can help.

No. 1, repeal the defense budget caps. Sufficient and stable funding is the starting point for expanding submarine and shipbuilding capacity. The Budget Control Act-mandated budget caps have damaged military readiness and choked off modernization. While intended as a way to incentivize us to reform mandatory programs, the BCA defense caps have proved to be a self-inflicted wound. We cannot solve our spending and debt problem on the backs of our warfighters and industrial base, much less on the backs of the security of Americans. Congress needs to end the defense budget caps immediately.

No. 2, we need to accelerate and fully fund advance procurement. This will help stimulate and encourage new entrants into the supplier base. We need more competition. We need more suppliers. Driving down the cost per ship

will free up resources to buy more ships.

No. 3, we need to incentivize capital investment. Congress should work with industry to identify responsible and cost-effective ways to incentivize investments in facilities and capital equipment.

No. 4, we need to target some appropriations to fund process improvements. I mentioned earlier that Newport News and Electric Boat have shaved a year and a half off Virginia production through more efficient manufacturing. We need more of this sort of thing.

Shipbuilding is a team effort, and these are four ways in which Congress can help to constructively participate in this national project.

The requirement for a bigger Navy is clear. The Navy needs our help to fulfill its mission. Numbers matter when it comes to projecting naval power in this day and age. The President and the Navy agree that we must build a bigger Navy.

To summarize, the shipbuilding industrial base is up to the task. Submarine production will be the most challenging part of this. There is limited capacity for submarine yards, and we need to do something about that, but Congress can take a number of steps now. We must start to build a foundation this year. I am committed—and I hope the entire Congress is committed—to setting this firm foundation, and I certainly intend to use my chairmanship on Seapower for this goal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### CLIMATE DISRUPTION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, climate disruption is a significant concern for the health of our planet. It is affecting everything from our agriculture to our economy, to our forests, to our world's glaciers, to our ice sheets, and, certainly, to the distribution of the world's insects and the diseases they carry.

President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement has attracted additional attention to the role that America should play in taking on this major challenge. How significant are the impacts of climate disruption to our forests and our farming and our fishing? What are the business opportunities of transforming an economy from that based on fossil fuels to that based on clean and renewable energy? What are other nations doing? How fast do we need to move to save the planet?

There will be many scholarly speeches on these topics here on the floor—many who will have been informed by the experiences that Senators will have had in their home States, both in the evolution of wind and solar energy and

the changes that they are seeing in their forests and their farming and their fishing. I hope to draw attention and, hopefully, insights as to these issues in a more lighthearted fashion by presenting periodic episodes of a Senate Climate Disruption Quiz. Today, I am presenting episode No. 1 of this Disruption Quiz series. Let's get started.

Question No. 1: Which famous CEO resigned from three Presidential councils after President Trump announced that the United States would withdraw from the Paris Agreement? Was it Bob Iger of Disney? Was it Elon Musk of Tesla and SpaceX? Was it Travis Kalanick, the CEO of Uber? Consider which of these individuals made this decision.

The right answer is Elon Musk. Congratulations if that is what you guessed.

Bob Iger of Disney resigned from a Presidential council, but he resigned only from one, not three. He resigned from the Presidential Strategic and Policy Forum, and he has been quite significant in putting forward other environmental issues, such as the zero waste of Disney's theme parks.

He said when he resigned:

Protecting our planet and driving economic growth are critical to our future, and they aren't mutually exclusive.

He continued:

I deeply disagree with the decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

Travis Kalanick, the controversial and besieged Uber CEO, also resigned from the same council, that being the Presidential Strategic and Policy Forum, but he did so in response to the President's Muslim ban, not to the announcement that the United States would withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

That takes us to Elon Musk, who resigned from three councils—the President's Strategic and Policy Forum, Manufacturing Initiative, and Executive Council on Infrastructure.

He tweeted:

Am departing Presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or for the world.

So that is the first question. Now get ready to see if you can answer the second question correctly.

Question No. 2: As of today, which two countries are not party to the Paris Agreement? Is it Syria and Nicaragua? Is it Iran and North Korea, two members of the axis of evil? Is it Togo and Indonesia, or is it India and Cambodia? I am sure you have heard climate news about all of these countries, but you may not know which ones are the only two countries in the world that are not members of the Paris Agreement.

By the way, the United States is not on this list because even though we have announced we are withdrawing, that takes some time, and we are actually still a member.

The correct answer is Syria and Nicaragua.

Nicaragua hasn't signed on because they don't believe the Paris Agreement goes far enough in its fight against climate disruption. Today, more than half of Nicaragua's electricity comes from renewable resources—wind, solar, wave, and geothermal. The Government of Nicaragua predicts that within a few years, the percentage of electricity from renewables will rise to 80 percent. Because of the abundance of these resources, a 2013 World Bank report labeled Nicaragua “a renewable energy paradise.”

The reason Syria didn't participate or sign on to the Paris Agreement is because it is in the midst of a horrific 6-year-long civil war that has claimed the lives of 300,000 men, women, and children and driven millions out of the country.

Now we will turn to question No. 3. Thanks in part to warmer temperatures and milder winters, cases of which tick-borne illness have more than doubled since 1991? Is the answer Colorado tick fever or tularemia or Lyme disease or Heartland virus?

By the way, all of these are real diseases. Well, Colorado tick fever is a viral infection that is mostly found in the mountain areas of the Western United States and Canada and is transmitted by the bite of an infected Rocky Mountain wood tick. Tularemia, which is also known as rabbit fever or deer fly fever or O'Hara's fever, is certainly a scary-sounding disease. Lyme disease is mostly transmitted by deer tick bites and is predominantly found in the Northeast and upper Midwest, the Mid-Atlantic regions of the country. And then there is the Heartland virus, which is transmitted by the lone star tick.

Well, the correct answer is—drum roll—C, Lyme disease.

Since 1991, the number of cases of Lyme disease in the United States has doubled. Approximately 30,000 people are diagnosed with the disease each year, but because it is very difficult to diagnosis, the Centers for Disease Control thinks the real number of cases is about 10 times that, or 300,000 people per year here in the United States. The main reason for the increase we have seen in Lyme disease is warmer temperatures and milder winters. Cold winters kill ticks; warm winters don't. That is what it boils down to.

On to question No. 4. Who was recently quoted as saying that “the fuel of choice right now, certainly for us, is wind”? Was it Bono, the lead singer of U2 and founder of the One Campaign, known for its activist work in Africa? Was it Gwyneth Paltrow, the award-winning actress? Was it Ben Fowke, the CEO of Xcel Energy, which owns and operates 13 coal plants around the country? Was it Pope Francis, who

gave our President a copy of his encyclical when the President visited with him just a few weeks ago?

Well, it turns out the answer is C, the CEO of Xcel Energy. That is a little bit surprising given that they operate more than a dozen coal plants, but it is also a company that generates one-fifth of its electricity from wind.

In January, the company shut down a large natural gas plant in Colorado for 2 days, and wind, on average, provided the power for half of its customer demand. Wind is Xcel's fuel of choice because once the turbines are built, the cost of the fuel to operate the turbines is zero. The fuel, plainly speaking, is free. And that is what led him to this comment saying that it is a preferred choice. Anytime you can get free fuel, it beats gearing up your coal plant or your natural gas plant.

Now we will turn to question No. 5, our final question. The Power Minister of which country recently announced that they intend to sell only electric cars by the year 2030? Is the answer India, which is home to 1.3 billion citizens, the world's third largest oil importer and a country with 300 million individuals who don't yet have access to electricity? Is it Germany, a manufacturing powerhouse, which has had a large feed-in tariff—a subsidy, if you will—to encourage distributed solar, solar panels on the tops of commercial buildings and homes? Is it China, where the use of cars has absolutely exploded. And the pollution in Beijing is among the worst pollution in the world, driven largely by the combustion of fossil fuels. Is it Canada, which has a new Prime Minister, Prime Minister Trudeau, who has prioritized tackling climate disruption?

If you guessed Germany, you are almost right but not quite. Germany's Bundesrat, the country's upper legislative chamber, passed a nonbinding resolution last October calling for a phaseout of gasoline-powered vehicles by 2030. But that is not quite the question that was asked. The question is, Which country's Power Minister said they would only sell electric cars by the year 2030? And the answer to that is India.

Speaking at this year's annual conference of the Confederation of Indian Industry, Power Minister Piyush Goyal said:

We are going to introduce electric vehicles in a very big way. We are going to make electric vehicles self-sufficient. The idea is that by 2030, not a single petrol or diesel car should be sold in the country.

India, by the way, is already on track to be the world's third largest solar market, with the country's solar capacity expected to reach 18.7 gigawatts by the year's end. The country is also adding 50 percent more solar and wind generation than currently installed here in the United States. They are replacing 770 million street and house-

hold lights with energy-saving and long-lasting LEDs, and they are bringing access to electricity to thousands of poor rural villages through the provision of solar. And they are doing all this faster than anyone could have anticipated.

So that is the full five questions for this week's Senate Climate Disruption Quiz. Climate disruption is the seminal challenge of our generation. We need to start taking strong, decisive action now to avoid reaching the point where the damage we are doing to our planet becomes irreversible.

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:40 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 10:13 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CORKER).

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be closed.

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

#### COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—Continued

##### AMENDMENT NO. 232

(Purpose: To impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation and to combat terrorism and illicit financing.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 232.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for Mr. CRAPO, proposes an amendment numbered 232.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 232 to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, Mike Crapo, Luther Strange, Cory Gardner, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, James M. Inhofe, John Thune, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Lisa Murkowski, Bob Corker.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

##### AMENDMENT NO. 233 TO AMENDMENT NO. 232

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 233 to amendment No. 232.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following:

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

##### JOINT REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Elizabeth Erin Walsh, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, sent to the Senate by the President, be referred jointly to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

##### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Tuesday, June 13, Senator PAUL or his designee be recognized to make a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 42; that debate on the motion be equally divided between the proponents and opponents until 12:30 p.m.; that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings, and at 2:15 p.m. there be 10 minutes of debate remaining on the motion to discharge the resolution,



equally divided between Senator PAUL or his designee and the opponents; and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the motion to discharge.

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

### REMEMBERING PAMELA TODD MAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to remember Pamela Todd May, a dedicated attorney, a compassionate servant, and a respected community member. With her passing on May 14 of this year, Kentucky has lost an extraordinary woman.

Pam employed her talents to serve others. As the legal counsel for Pikeville Medical Center, PMC, for over 30 years, she strived to improve the quality of life for many in her community. Through her service as a trustee for the University of Kentucky, Pam guided an institution to prepare thousands of students for a lifetime of success. Her career also included service as an assistant Pike County attorney.

To her loyal staff and colleagues, Pam will be remembered not only for her skills, but also for her warmth. Although her family and community have lost an incredible woman, I hope their memories of her love will help to ease their grief. Elaine and I join with so many in eastern Kentucky and around the Commonwealth in expressing our heartfelt condolences to her husband, Walter, her children, Andrea and Philip, and all of her family and friends.

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

## VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, due to a memorial service in Michigan, I was unable to attend today's rollcall vote on the nomination of Kenneth P. Rapuano to be Assistant Secretary of Defense. Had I been able to attend, I would have supported his nomination. •

### WILDLIFE INNOVATION AND LONGEVITY DRIVER ACT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wanted to express my support for the Wildlife Innovation and Longevity Driver Act, also known as the WILD Act. I commend my Senate colleagues for passing this legislation last week.

I firmly believe that we have a moral duty to be good stewards of our planet, and that includes working together to conserve species and their habitat in the United States and around the world. We face many pressing wildlife management challenges; yet we have

heard in the Environment and Public Works Committee that State and Federal agencies do not have adequate resources to face these troubling challenges. That is what makes innovation and collaboration so important, and the WILD Act inspires both.

The WILD Act incentivizes innovators by establishing cash-prize competitions for new technologies that prevent poaching, promote conservation, manage invasive species, protect endangered species, and use nonlethal methods to control wildlife. It directs Federal agencies to manage invasive species on public lands and reauthorizes effective government conservation programs, including those that protect some of our most loved species—elephants, great apes, tigers, rhinos, and marine turtles.

The WILD Act also reauthorizes the Department of Interior's Partnership for Fish and Wildlife Program, which leverages Federal funding by working with hard-working private landowners to restore and improve fish and wildlife habitats on their land.

Wildlife conservation is not a partisan issue, which is why I was so pleased to join with Chairman BARRASSO and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of this legislation.

The WILD Act has also been endorsed by a diverse group of stakeholders, including the World Wildlife Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited, and the Family Farm Alliance. I want to thank these organizations for their commitment to this issue and their interest in helping our challenged fisheries and threatened ecosystems, as well as internationally treasured rhinos and elephants.

I urge the House to pass the WILD Act and the President to sign it into law.

Thank you.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### REMEMBERING WILLIAM G. SESLER

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of William G. Sesler, Esq., 89, who passed away peacefully on May 22, 2017. Bill's exceptional service to our country in the U.S. Air Force, his dedication as a public servant in Pennsylvania, and his unwavering commitment to underserved communities throughout his career are worthy of recognition. His contributions to the Commonwealth will never be forgotten.

I ask that the obituary from Gregory P. Sesler from May 26 be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

Thank you to the hospital care takers, physicians, pastors, friends, relatives, church community and family.

I was on my way home from the hospital last week after having just left my father and after the decision had been made by the family to put him on palliative care. It was hard, my mother was awesome. A wave of sadness swept over me as I began to think of all of the things I would soon not be able to with him again in this world. But then I thought of all the things we had been able to do together and what a blessed life he had lived.

Maybe we wouldn't climb Mount Washington together again, but we did it once. No longer would we sail the Chesapeake, go ice-boating, travel on the German autobahn, see the Reformation Wall in Geneva, go to Africa to Ngorongoro crater, or go transatlantic on the QE II, but we had had a chance to do them all before. We had travelled thousands of miles and done dozens of business deals together, eaten lunch together at the Maenerchor Club hundreds of times. No he wouldn't drive my Jaguar way too fast again, or sail our Catalina sailboat or visit Civil War Battle Fields or see the wild horses of the Outerbanks, or see the Northern Lights in Alberta or the great cathedrals of Europe, or return to Kenyon College for another reunion or read his letters to the Editor. But we had been able to do all of those things together.

We got the chance to shoot pheasants in South Dakota, geese in North Dakota, go to Mexico with his grandchildren, see the cliffs of Western Ireland, listen to Pavarotti at the Warner, smoke cigars on the back porch, banter about an article in the New York times, argue about business decisions, drink too much wine on a fishing trip in Canada, and enjoy over 50 Christmas parties together.

Although I will never again have to endure his criticism or crave his praise or chase a bear out of our campsite within the Smokey Mountains, I have been able to do all of those things with him.

Although he won't be bursting into my office on December 23rd and having me accompany him to buy an apartment's worth of furniture for a refugee family, or feeling the pride of seeing my aged parents volunteer in the homeless shelter, I did get to do that with him once.

There may be no more deer hunting or trout fishing trips to Potter County or camping on the Outer Banks, or horseback riding in the Allegheny Forests, or watching World War II documentaries or going to James Bond movies on my birthday, but not everybody gets the chance to create this wealth of memories and for that chance I have been very blessed.

But while Dad loved to travel and do and experience life in a very full way, and to share those experiences with his children and grandchildren generously, it was his transfer of character, drive, and confidence to us that was his greatest gift. He also instilled in us an innate curiosity of the world. We both thank him and curse him for our restless discursive minds. My mother once said that one of the reasons she married my dad 59 years ago was because she knew her life would never be boring. She was right.

My dad was a non-politically correct liberal. He cared for people and believed in government as an agent of good, but he wasn't shy about criticizing the slothful or undisciplined. He wasn't afraid to refer to sloppy or vague thinking as BS. He admired the great planners who got things done. General George Marshall was one of those. He was not an admirer of Donald Trump. After William had been in the ICU for four days and

we were able to wean him from the ventilator, he asked for his New York Times. His first comment when opening the paper was "He fired Comey? What the hell!"

I had a special relationship with my dad. After returning to Erie from law school in 1984 we worked together for 33 years. Logged thousands of miles together, built 15 office buildings together, had many triumphs and losses, made money and lost money. We had fights, we had love, and I wouldn't trade any of it. Thanks Dad. Thanks for helping with my kid's college tuition, thanks for helping me buy a house, thanks for teaching me about the law and making me a better lawyer. Thank you for making me a more careful thinker, thank you for being my business partner, for being the family patriarch and also a great dad.

He was a man who was confident, direct, capable, and precise, who valued careful thinking, reasoning and planning, he could be a tough dad and a demanding boss, and even though he was often a critic you didn't want to hear, you often knew in the back of your mind that the criticism was justified.

You were also a patriarch who greatly loved and cared for your family and were so generous to all of us, monetarily, intellectually, spiritually, and emotionally—you gave us so much. You made our lives and the lives of many people who we will never know so much better with this love, your public service and the resolve to get things done.

And so, we thank the Lord this day for the life of this man, my dad, and ask God to hold him in the palm of his hand, to keep him safe, to care for him, to love him and to welcome him into eternal life.●

#### TRIBUTE TO HOOSIER STUDENTS

● Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in my home State of Indiana, we take great pride when our children display exemplary academic work and interest in our Nation's history. We are very proud of four Hoosier middle school students from Warsaw, IN, who are using their research skills to tell the story of a heroic veteran for their National History Day project entitled "Taking a Stand at Pearl Harbor."

I am pleased to recognize these four fine young men, Keller Bailey and Jason Benyousky of Washington STEM Academy, Geoffrey Hochstetler, who is educated at home, and Ryun Hoffert of Eisenhower Elementary; who worked together to research, write, and perform a series of skits around the theme, "Making a Stand in History." These boys chose to design their project around the events of December 7, 1941, the day the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. As part of their detailed research, the students read a book by a veteran and Pearl Harbor survivor Donald Stratton. This book inspired one of the scenes of their presentation, which depicts the heroic actions of Boatswain's Mate 2nd Class Joe George's rescue of six men from the sinking USS *Arizona*. Ryun Hoffert went the literal extra mile and traveled to Pearl Harbor for the 75th anniversary of the attack to meet with local experts and see the memorials erected in honor of our fallen heroes.

After this exhaustive research effort, these dedicated students each wrote scenes for their presentation.

According to their project sponsor, Richard Rooker, each student brought his unique gifts to the team: "Keller displayed indefatigable energy. Jason contributed his outstanding acting ability. Geoffrey lent the team his calm and steady demeanor, and Ryun brought his insatiable curiosity about history to the project."

In February, their presentation won first place in the district competition. They continued to revise, refine, and practice their presentation, and their perseverance paid off on May 6, when they placed first in the junior division in the Indiana State competition. This week, they will compete at the national competition at the University of Maryland.

I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to Keller, Jason, Geoffrey, and Ryun for their hard work, patriotism, and success in the Indiana State competition for National History Day. I would also like to recognize the supportive parents, teachers, and advisers who helped the students along the way, especially Mr. Rooker. On behalf of all Hoosiers, we are proud of your creativity and determination; your entire State is cheering for you.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10. An act to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes.

#### PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator HATCH, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Con-

gress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Andrew K. Maloney, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Anne Elizabeth Wall.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 905. A bill to require a report on, and to authorize technical assistance for, accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

\*Brock Long, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1333. A bill to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1334. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1335. A bill to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 1336. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1337. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to make certain strategic energy infrastructure projects eligible for certain loan guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr.

TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1338. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1339. A bill to provide authority for access to certain business records collected under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 prior to November 29, 2015, to make the authority for roving surveillance, the authority to treat individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 permanent, and to modify the certification requirements for access to telephone toll and transactional records by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

S. 1340. A bill to provide for an expedited permitting process for critical energy infrastructure projects relating to the establishment of a regional energy hub in Appalachia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1341. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat obligations financing professional sports stadiums as private activity bonds if such obligations meet the private business use test; to the Committee on Finance.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 190. A resolution honoring the memory of the victims of the terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub one year ago; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5,

United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 37

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 45

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 45, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally re-enter the United States after being removed and for other purposes.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 445

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 448

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 448, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psy-

chologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 636

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 636, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, *supra*.

S. 738

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 738, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide funds to States and Indian tribes for the purpose of promoting economic revitalization, diversification, and development in economically distressed communities through the reclamation and restoration of land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining carried out before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana

(Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

S. 899

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 899, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1197

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1197, a bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility

for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease.

S. 1243

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1243, a bill to require sexual assault prevention and response training for all individuals enlisted in the Armed Forces under a delayed entry program.

S. 1284

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1284, a bill to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1328, a bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 162

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 162, a resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promoting religious freedom, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 229

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 229 intended to be proposed to S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1338. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

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

S. 1338

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Dust Off Crews of the Vietnam War Congressional Gold Medal Act".

### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) a United States Army Dust Off crewman (pilot, crew chief, and medic) is a helicopter crew member who served honorably in the Vietnam War aboard a helicopter air ambulance under the radio call sign "Dust Off";

(2) Dust Off crews performed aeromedical evacuation for United States, Vietnamese, and allied forces inside South Vietnam from May 1962 through March 1973.

(3) nearing the end of World War II, the United States Army began using helicopters for medical evacuation and years later, during the Korean War, these helicopter air ambulances were responsible for transporting 17,700 United States casualties;

(4) during the Vietnam War, with the use of helicopter air ambulances, United States Army Dust Off crews pioneered the concept of dedicated and rapid medical evacuation and rescued almost 900,000 United States, South Vietnamese, and other allied sick and wounded, as well as wounded enemy forces;

(5) helicopters proved to be a revolutionary tool to assist those injured on the battlefield;

(6) highly skilled and intrepid, Dust Off crews were able to operate the helicopters and land them on almost any terrain in nearly any weather to pick up wounded, after which the Dust Off crews could provide care to these patients while transporting them to ready medical facilities;

(7) the vital work of the Dust Off crews required consistent combat exposure and often proved to be the difference between life and death for wounded personnel;

(8) the revolutionary concept of a dedicated combat life-saving system was cultivated and refined by United States Army Dust Off crews during 11 years of intense conflict in and above the jungles of South Vietnam;

(9) innovative and resourceful Dust Off crews in Vietnam were responsible for taking the new concept of helicopter medical evacuation, born just a few years earlier, and revolutionizing it to meet and surpass the previously unattainable goal of delivering a battlefield casualty to an operating table within the vaunted "golden hour";

(10) some Dust Off units in Vietnam operated so efficiently that they were able to deliver a patient to a waiting medical facility on an average of 33 minutes from the receipt of the mission, which saved the lives of countless personnel in Vietnam, and this legacy continues for modern-day Dust Off crews;

(11) the inherent danger of being a member of a Dust Off crew in Vietnam meant that there was a 1 in 3 chance of being wounded or killed;

(12) many battles during the Vietnam War raged at night, and members of the Dust Off crews often found themselves searching for a landing zone in complete darkness, in bad weather, over mountainous terrain, and all while being the target of intense enemy fire as they attempted to rescue the wounded, which caused Dust Off crews to suffer a rate of aircraft loss that was more than 3 times that of all other types of combat helicopter missions in Vietnam;

(13) the 54th Medical Detachment typified the constant heroism displayed by Dust Off crews in Vietnam, over the span of a 10-month tour, with only 3 flyable helicopters and 40 soldiers in the unit, evacuating 21,435 patients in 8,644 missions while being airborne for 4,832 hours;

(14) collectively, the members of the 54th Medical Detachment earned 78 awards for valor, including 1 Medal of Honor, 1 Distinguished Service Cross, 14 Silver Star Medals, 26 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 2 Bronze Star Medals for valor, 4 Air Medals for valor, 4 Soldier's Medals, and 26 Purple Heart Medals;

(15) the 54th Medical Detachment displayed heroism on a daily basis and set the standard for all Dust Off crews in Vietnam;

(16) 5 members of the 54th Medical Detachment are in the Dust Off Hall of Fame, 3 are in the Army Aviation Hall of Fame, and 1 is the only United States Army aviator in the National Aviation Hall of Fame;

(17) Dust Off crew members are among the most highly decorated soldiers in American military history;

(18) in early 1964, Major Charles L. Kelly was the Commanding Officer of the 57th Medical Detachment (Helicopter Ambulance), Provisional, in Soc Trang, South Vietnam;

(19) Major Kelly helped to forge the Dust Off call-sign into history as one of the most welcomed phrases to be heard over the radio by wounded soldiers in perilous and dire situations;

(20) in 1964, Major Kelly was killed in action as he gallantly maneuvered his aircraft to save a wounded American soldier and several Vietnamese soldiers and boldly replied, after being warned to stay away from the landing zone due to the ferocity of enemy fire, "When I have your wounded.";

(21) General William Westmoreland, Commander, Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (1964–1968), singled out Major Kelly as an example of "the greatness of the human spirit" and highlighted his famous reply as an inspiration to all in combat;

(22) General Creighton Abrams, Westmoreland's successor (1968–1972), and former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, highlighted the heroism of Dust Off crews, "A special word about the Dust Offs . . . Courage above and beyond the call of duty was sort of routine to them. It was a daily thing, part of the way they lived. That's the great part, and it meant so much to every last man who served there. Whether he ever got hurt or not, he knew Dust Off was there.";

(23) Dust Off crews possessed unique skills and traits that made them highly successful

in aeromedical evacuation in Vietnam, including indomitable courage, extraordinary aviation skill and sound judgment under fire, high-level medical expertise, and an unequalled dedication to the preservation of human life;

(24) members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Vietnam had their confidence and battlefield prowess reinforced knowing that there were heroic Dust Off crews just a few minutes from the fight, which was instrumental to their well-being, willingness to fight, and morale;

(25) military families in the United States knew that their loved ones would receive the quickest and best possible care in the event of a war-time injury, thanks to the Dust Off crews;

(26) the willingness of Dust Off crews to also risk their lives to save helpless civilians left an immeasurably positive impression on the people of Vietnam and exemplified the finest American ideals of compassion and humanity; and

(27) Dust Off crews from the Vietnam War hailed from every State in the United States and represented numerous ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds.

#### SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design in honor of the Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service, which saved countless lives and contributed directly to the defense of our country.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense.

(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Dust Off Crews of the Vietnam War, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it will be available for display as appropriate and available for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should also make the gold medal awarded pursuant to this Act available for display elsewhere, particularly at appropriate locations associated with the Vietnam War, and that preference should be given to locations affiliated with the Smithsonian Institution.

#### SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 3 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

#### SEC. 5. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medal struck pursuant to this Act is a national medal for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1341. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-re-

lated agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

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

S. 1341

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as "Children Don't Belong on Tobacco Farms Act".

#### SEC. 2. TOBACCO-RELATED AGRICULTURE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN.

Section 3(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking "in any occupation, or (2)" and inserting "in any occupation, (2)"; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon the following: "or (3) any employee under the age of eighteen years has direct contact with tobacco plants or dried tobacco leaves"; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking "other than manufacturing and mining" and inserting "other than manufacturing, mining, and tobacco-related agriculture as described in paragraph (3) of the first sentence of this subsection,".

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 190—HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE PULSE ORLANDO NIGHTCLUB ONE YEAR AGO

Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 190

Whereas, in the early hours of Sunday, June 12, 2016, a 29-year-old man from Ft. Pierce, Florida, killed 49 and wounded 53 innocent people in a horrific terrorist attack on Pulse Orlando, a lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender nightclub, during Latin night;

Whereas the gunman, who was investigated in 2013–2014 by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (in this preamble referred to as the "FBI") for possible connections to terrorism, pledged his allegiance to the leader of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (in this preamble referred to as "ISIL");

Whereas then-President Obama called the attack an act of both terror and hate as well as an attack on all of the people of the United States and the fundamental values of equality and dignity;

Whereas the attack is the deadliest mass shooting in the modern history of the United

States and the worst terrorist attack on United States soil since September 11, 2001;

Whereas the law enforcement professionals of the city of Orlando and Orange County, Florida, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the FBI, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and other emergency and health care professionals responded to the attack bravely and admirably and in a coordinated manner, saving many lives;

Whereas following the attack hundreds of people stood in long lines to donate blood for those injured in the attack, and the people of Orlando, the State of Florida, and the United States expressed overwhelming support for the victims, their families, and their loved ones regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, or sexual orientation;

Whereas local organizations and caregivers came together with the Federal, State, and local government to support the victims and help the community heal;

Whereas the community of Orlando and communities across the State of Florida and the United States, in the spirit of unity and respect, continue to support the victims, their families, their loved ones, and all those affected by the attack, as well as the brave men and women of Federal, State, and local law enforcement and other emergency and health care professionals for their dedicated service to their communities;

Whereas Monday, June 12, 2017, marks one year since the attack; and

Whereas the threat of terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies persists, including the threat posed by homegrown terrorists inspired by foreign terrorist organizations like ISIL: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the victims killed in the horrific terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub on June 12, 2016, and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies for their families, loved ones, and friends;

(2) honors the survivors of the attack and pledges continued support for their recovery;

(3) recognizes the unity, compassion, and resilience of the Orlando community after the attack;

(4) applauds the dedication and bravery of Federal, State, and local law enforcement and counterterrorism officials for their efforts to respond to the attack, prevent future attacks, and secure communities;

(5) stands together with all people of the United States, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, or sexual orientation, in the face of terror and hate; and

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the United States and its allies to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other terrorist groups at home and abroad and to address the threat posed by homegrown terrorism.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 231. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 232. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and

Mr. CARDIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 722, *supra*.

SA 233. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, *supra*.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 231. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

#### SEC. 11. REPORT ON AIRPORTS USED BY MAHAN AIR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2020, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) a list of all airports at which aircraft owned or controlled by Mahan Air have landed during the 2 years preceding the submission of the report; and

(2) for each such airport—

(A) an assessment of whether aircraft owned or controlled by Mahan Air continue to conduct operations at that airport;

(B) an assessment of whether any of the landings of aircraft owned or controlled by Mahan Air were necessitated by an emergency situation;

(C) a determination regarding whether additional security measures should be imposed on flights to the United States that originate from that airport; and

(D) an explanation of the rationale for that determination.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) PUBLICATION OF LIST.—The list required by subsection (a)(1) shall be publicly and prominently posted on the website of the Department of Homeland Security on the date on which the report required by subsection (a) is submitted to Congress.

SA 232. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 33, line 7, strike “subsection (a)” and insert “subsection (b)”.

On page 33, line 15, strike “subsection (a)” and insert “subsection (b)”.

On page 47, line 18, strike “The President” and insert “Except as provided in subsection (b), the President”.

On page 47, line 22, insert “(other than subsection (b))” after “this Act”.

At the end, add the following:

#### TITLE II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND COMBATING TERRORISM AND ILLICIT FINANCING

##### SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

##### Subtitle A—Sanctions and Other Measures With Respect to the Russian Federation

##### SEC. 211. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On March 6, 2014, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on those determined to be undermining democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine or threatening the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine. President Obama subsequently issued Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) and Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) to expand sanctions on certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine.

(2) On December 18, 2014, the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 was enacted (Public Law 113-272; 22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.), which includes provisions directing the President to impose sanctions on foreign persons that the President determines to be entities owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or nationals of the Russian Federation that manufacture, sell, transfer, or otherwise provide certain defense articles into Syria.

(3) On April 1, 2015, President Obama issued Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on persons determined to be engaged in malicious cyber-hacking.

(4) On July 26, 2016, President Obama approved a Presidential Policy Directive on United States Cyber Incident Coordination, which states, “certain cyber incidents that have significant impacts on an entity, our national security, or the broader economy require a unique approach to response efforts”.

(5) On December 29, 2016, President Obama issued an annex to Executive Order 13694, which authorized sanctions on the following entities and individuals:

(A) The Main Intelligence Directorate (also known as Glavnoe Razvedyvatel'noe Upravlenie or the GRU) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(B) The Federal Security Service (also known as Federalnaya Sluzhba Bezopasnosti or the FSB) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(C) The Special Technology Center (also known as STLC, Ltd. Special Technology Center St. Petersburg) in St. Petersburg, Russian Federation.

(D) Zorsecurity (also known as Esage Lab) in Moscow, Russian Federation.



(E) The autonomous noncommercial organization known as the Professional Association of Designers of Data Processing Systems (also known as ANO PO KSI) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(F) Igor Valentinovich Korobov.

(G) Sergey Aleksandrovich Gizunov.

(H) Igor Olegovich Kostyukov.

(I) Vladimir Stepanovich Alexseyev.

(6) On January 6, 2017, an assessment of the United States intelligence community entitled, "Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections" stated, "Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the United States presidential election." The assessment warns that "Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes".

#### SEC. 212. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the President—

(1) should engage to the fullest extent possible with partner governments with regard to closing loopholes, including the allowance of extended prepayment for the delivery of goods and commodities and other loopholes, in multilateral and unilateral restrictive measures against the Russian Federation, with the aim of maximizing alignment of those measures; and

(2) should increase efforts to vigorously enforce compliance with sanctions in place as of the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to the Russian Federation in response to the crisis in eastern Ukraine, cyber intrusions and attacks, and human rights violators in the Russian Federation.

#### PART I—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

##### SEC. 215. SHORT TITLE.

The part may be cited as the "Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017".

##### SEC. 216. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIONS RELATING TO SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before taking any action described in paragraph (2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes the proposed action and the reasons for that action.

(2) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An action described in this paragraph is—

(i) an action to terminate the application of any sanctions described in subparagraph (B);

(ii) with respect to sanctions described in subparagraph (B) imposed by the President with respect to a person, an action to waive the application of those sanctions with respect to that person; or

(iii) a licensing action that significantly alters United States' foreign policy with regard to the Russia Federation.

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subparagraph are—

(i) sanctions provided for under—

(I) this title or any provision of law amended by this title, including the Executive Orders codified under section 222;

(II) the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.); or

(III) the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.); and

(ii) the prohibition on access to the properties of the Government of the Russian Federation located in Maryland and New York that the President ordered vacated on December 29, 2016.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF ACTION.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) shall include a description of whether the action—

(A) is not intended to significantly alter United States' foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; or

(B) is intended to significantly alter United States' foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(4) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome shall include a description of—

(i) the anticipated reciprocal diplomatic outcome;

(ii) the anticipated effect of the action on the national security interests of the United States; and

(iii) the policy objectives for which the sanctions affected by the action were initially imposed.

(B) REQUESTS FROM BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEES.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives may request the submission to the Committee of the matter described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is not intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is not intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report; and

(B) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a)(1) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under paragraph (1) of a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not take that action unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that action is enacted in accordance with subsection (c).

(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action for a period of 12 calendar days after the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), and the President vetoes the joint resolution, the President may not take that action for a period of 10 calendar days after the date of the President's veto.

(6) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) is enacted in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection:

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term "joint resolution of approval" means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: "A joint resolution approving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation."; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: "Congress approves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on relating to \_\_\_\_\_", with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(2) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term "joint resolution of disapproval" means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: "A joint resolution disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation."; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: "Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on relating to \_\_\_\_\_", with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

(i) referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs if the joint resolution relates to a report under Section 216 A3 that is described as an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States' foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; and

(ii) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations if the joint resolution relates to a report under Section 216 A3 that is described as an action that is intended to significantly alter United States' foreign policy with respect to the Russian Federation.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of

such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of that House, that House receives an identical joint resolution from the other House, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the joint resolution from the other House—

(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(B) TREATMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of the other House shall be entitled to expedited procedures in that House under this subsection.

(C) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

(D) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

(7) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of

that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees and leadership" means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

## PART II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

### SEC. 221. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) GOOD.—The term "good" has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term "international financial institution" has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 2622(c)).

(4) KNOWINGLY.—The term "knowingly", with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) PERSON.—The term "person" means an individual or entity.

(6) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term "United States person" means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

### SEC. 222. CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) CODIFICATION.—United States sanctions provided for in Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine), Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), and Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including with respect to all persons sanctioned under such

Executive Orders, shall remain in effect except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) **TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions described in subsection (a) that are imposed on a person in connection with activity conducted by the person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions described in subsection (a) in the future.

(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive Order 13694 or 13757 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) **APPLICATION OF NEW UKRAINE-RELATED SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive Order 13660, 13661, 13662, or 13685 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

#### **SEC. 223. MODIFICATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13662.**

(a) **DETERMINATION THAT CERTAIN ENTITIES ARE SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may determine that a person meets one or more of the criteria in section 1(a) of Executive Order 13662 if that person is a state-owned entity operating in the railway, shipping, or metals and mining sector of the economy of the Russian Federation.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 1 WITH RESPECT TO THE FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 14 days maturity or new equity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(c) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 2 WITH RESPECT TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 2 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 30 days maturity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(d) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 4.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 4, dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the provision, exportation, or reexportation, directly or indirectly, by United States persons or persons within the United States, of goods, services (except for financial services), or technology in support of exploration or production for deepwater, Arctic offshore, or shale projects—

(1) that have the potential to produce oil;

(2) in which a Russian energy firm is involved; and

(3) that involve any person determined to be subject to the directive or the property or interests in property of such a person.

#### **SEC. 224. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ACTIVITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(1) impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(A) knowingly engages in significant activities undermining cybersecurity against any person, including a democratic institution, or government on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person described in subparagraph (A);

(2) impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services (except financial services) in support of, an activity described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(3) impose 3 or more of the sanctions described in section 4(c) of the of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(c)) with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly provides financial services in support of an activity described in paragraph (1)(A).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTA-**

**TION.**—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) **SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “significant activities undermining cybersecurity” includes—

(1) significant efforts—

(A) to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy an information and communications technology system or network; or

(B) to exfiltrate, degrade, corrupt, destroy, or release information from such a system or network without authorization for purposes of—

(i) conducting influence operations; or

(ii) causing a significant misappropriation of funds, economic resources, trade secrets, personal identifications, or financial information for commercial or competitive advantage or private financial gain;

(2) significant destructive malware attacks; and

(3) significant denial of service activities.

#### **SEC. 225. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO SPECIAL RUSSIAN CRUDE OIL PROJECTS.**

Section 4(b)(1) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(b)(1)) is amended by striking “on and after the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may impose” and inserting “on and after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017, the President shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so,”.

#### **SEC. 226. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**

Section 5 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so,”; and

(B) by striking “on or after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so,”; and

(B) by striking “on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date

that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 227. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908(a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—  
 (A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “is authorized and encouraged to” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—  
 (i) by striking “President determines is” and inserting “President determines is, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017,”; and

(ii) by inserting “or elsewhere” after “in the Russian Federation”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “The President” and inserting “except as provided in subsection (d), the President”; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.”.

**SEC. 228. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSERS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 10. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS THAT EVADE SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) materially violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any license, order, regulation, or prohibition contained in or issued pursuant to any covered Executive order; or

“(2) facilitates significant deceptive or structured transactions for or on behalf of—

“(A) any person subject to sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to the Russian Federation; or

“(B) any child, spouse, parent, or sibling of an individual described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b).

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(d) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act;

“(2) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine; and

“(3) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraphs (E) or (F) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

“(e) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice that—

“(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ‘covered Executive order’ means any of the following:

“(A) Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(B) Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(C) Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(D) Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

“(E) Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(F) Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ‘foreign person’ has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017).

“(3) STRUCTURED.—The term ‘structured’, with respect to a transaction, has the meaning given the term ‘structure’ in paragraph (xx) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

**“SEC. 11. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person, based on credible information, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation;

“(2) materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to, a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

“(3) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion

from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

“(c) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made efforts to reduce serious human rights abuses in territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by that Government.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b)(1).

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b)(1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(e) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice—

“(A) that—

“(i) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future; or

“(B) that the President determines that insufficient basis exists for the determination by the President under subsection (a) with respect to the person.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Section 2(2) of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,” before “the Committee on Foreign Relations”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “the Committee on Financial Services” before “the Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

#### SEC. 229. NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS UNDER UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014.

(a) SANCTIONS RELATING TO DEFENSE AND ENERGY SECTORS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—Section 4 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) NOTIFICATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign person under subsection (a) or (b).

“(2) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN PRODUCERS, TRANSFERORS, OR BROKERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a)(2) with respect to a foreign person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(A) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(B) a notice that—

“(i) the foreign person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the foreign person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a)(2) in the future.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (B)(ii) of subsection (a)(3), by striking “subsection (h)” and inserting “subsection (i)”.

(b) SANCTIONS ON RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—Section 5 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign financial institution under subsection (a) or (b).”; and

(3) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “section 4(h)” and inserting “section 4(i)”.

#### SEC. 230. STANDARDS FOR TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING THE PEACE, SECURITY, STABILITY, SOVEREIGNTY, OR TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF UKRAINE.—Section 8 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8907) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”.

(b) SANCTIONS RELATING TO CORRUPTION.—Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”.

#### SEC. 231. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS ENGAGING IN TRANSACTIONS WITH THE INTELLIGENCE OR DEFENSE SECTORS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to a person the President determines knowingly, on or after such date of enactment, engages in a significant transaction with a person that is part of, or operates for or on behalf of, the defense or intelligence sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation, including the Main Intelligence Agency of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation or the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation.

(b) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

#### SEC. 232. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PIPELINES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment described in subsection (b) or sells, leases, or provides to the Russian Federation, for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, goods, services, technology, information, or support described in subsection (c)—

(1) any of which has a fair market value of \$1,000,000 or more; or

(2) that, during a 12-month period, have an aggregate fair market value of \$5,000,000 or more.

(b) INVESTMENT DESCRIBED.—An investment described in this subsection is an investment that directly and significantly contributes to the enhancement of the ability of the Russian Federation to construct energy export pipelines.

(c) GOODS, SERVICES, TECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION, OR SUPPORT DESCRIBED.—Goods, services, technology, information, or support

described in this subsection are goods, services, technology, information, or support that could directly and significantly facilitate the maintenance or expansion of the construction, modernization, or repair of energy pipelines by the Russian Federation.

**SEC. 233. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO INVESTMENT IN OR FACILITATION OF PRIVATIZATION OF STATE-OWNED ASSETS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 if the President determines that a person, with actual knowledge, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment of \$10,000,000 or more (or any combination of investments of not less than \$1,000,000 each, which in the aggregate equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period), or facilitates such an investment, if the investment directly and significantly contributes to the ability of the Russian Federation to privatize state-owned assets in a manner that unjustly benefits—

(1) officials of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) close associates or family members of those officials.

(b) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

**SEC. 234. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF ARMS AND RELATED MATERIEL TO SYRIA.**

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose on a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that such foreign person has, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly exported, transferred, or otherwise provided to Syria significant financial, material, or technological support that contributes materially to the ability of the Government of Syria to—

(A) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies;

(B) acquire or develop ballistic or cruise missile capabilities;

(C) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

(D) acquire significant defense articles, defense services, or defense information (as such terms are defined under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.)); or

(E) acquire items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

(2) APPLICABILITY TO OTHER FOREIGN PERSONS.—The sanctions described in subsection (b) shall also be imposed on any foreign person that—

(A) is a successor entity to a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or has acted for or on behalf of, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed on a foreign person described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES.—If the foreign person is an individual, the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, the foreign person.

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to the foreign person regardless of when issued.

(ii) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under clause (i) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the foreign person.

(c) WAIVER.—Subject to section 216, the President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FINANCIAL, MATERIAL, OR TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT.—The term “financial, material, or technological support” has the meaning given such term in section 542.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” has the meaning given such term in section 594.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(3) SYRIA.—The term “Syria” has the meaning given such term in section 542.316 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

**SEC. 235. SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**

(a) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed with respect to a person under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a) are the following:

(1) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ASSISTANCE FOR EXPORTS TO SANCTIONED PERSONS.—The President may direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States not to give approval to the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in the extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the sanctioned person.

(2) EXPORT SANCTION.—The President may order the United States Government not to issue any specific license and not to grant any other specific permission or authority to export any goods or technology to the sanctioned person under—

(A) the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency

Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(B) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.);

(C) the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); or

(D) any other statute that requires the prior review and approval of the United States Government as a condition for the export or reexport of goods or services.

(3) LOANS FROM UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President may prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to the sanctioned person totaling more than \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period unless the person is engaged in activities to relieve human suffering and the loans or credits are provided for such activities.

(4) LOANS FROM INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President may direct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any loan from the international financial institution that would benefit the sanctioned person.

(5) PROHIBITIONS ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The following prohibitions may be imposed against the sanctioned person if that person is a financial institution:

(A) PROHIBITION ON DESIGNATION AS PRIMARY DEALER.—Neither the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System nor the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may designate, or permit the continuation of any prior designation of, the financial institution as a primary dealer in United States Government debt instruments.

(B) PROHIBITION ON SERVICE AS A REPOSITORY OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS.—The financial institution may not serve as agent of the United States Government or serve as repository for United States Government funds.

The imposition of either sanction under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as 1 sanction for purposes of subsection (b), and the imposition of both such sanctions shall be treated as 2 sanctions for purposes of subsection (b).

(6) PROCUREMENT SANCTION.—The United States Government may not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from the sanctioned person.

(7) FOREIGN EXCHANGE.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the sanctioned person has any interest.

(8) BANKING TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the sanctioned person.

(9) PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any person from—

(A) acquiring, holding, withholding, using, transferring, withdrawing, transporting, importing, or exporting any property that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and with respect to which the sanctioned person has any interest;

(B) dealing in or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to such property; or



(C) conducting any transaction involving such property.

(10) **BAN ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations or guidelines as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of the sanctioned person.

(11) **EXCLUSION OF CORPORATE OFFICERS.**—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, the sanctioned person.

(12) **SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—The President may impose on the principal executive officer or officers of the sanctioned person, or on persons performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions under this subsection.

(b) **SANCTIONED PERSON DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “sanctioned person” means a person subject to sanctions under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a).

**SEC. 236. EXCEPTIONS, WAIVER, AND TERMINATION.**

(a) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The provisions of this part and amendments made by this part shall not apply with respect to the following:

(1) Activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or under other international agreements.

(b) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—No requirement to impose sanctions under this part or an amendment made by this part shall include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(c) **WAIVER OF SANCTIONS THAT ARE IMPOSED.**—Subject to section 216, if the President imposes sanctions with respect to a person under this part or the amendments made by this part, the President may waive the application of those sanctions if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under section 224, 231, 232, 233, or 234 with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

(2) a notice that—

(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under this part in the future.

**SEC. 237. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this part or the amendments made by this part shall be construed—

(1) to supersede the limitations or exceptions on the use of rocket engines for national security purposes under section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note), as amended by section 1607 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 1100) and section 1602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2582); or

(2) to prohibit a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Defense from acquiring components referred to in such section 1608.

**PART III—REPORTS**

**SEC. 241. REPORT ON OLIGARCHS AND PARASTATAL ENTITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the following:

(1) Senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, including the following:

(A) An identification of the most significant senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, as determined by their closeness to the Russian regime and their net worth.

(B) An assessment of the relationship between individuals identified under subparagraph (A) and President Vladimir Putin or other members of the Russian ruling elite.

(C) An identification of any indices of corruption with respect to those individuals.

(D) The estimated net worth and known sources of income of those individuals and their family members (including spouses, children, parents, and siblings), including assets, investments, other business interests, and relevant beneficial ownership information.

(E) An identification of the non-Russian business affiliations of those individuals.

(2) Russian parastatal entities, including an assessment of the following:

(A) The emergence of Russian parastatal entities and their role in the economy of the Russian Federation.

(B) The leadership structures and beneficial ownership of those entities.

(C) The scope of the non-Russian business affiliations of those entities.

(3) The exposure of key economic sectors of the United States to Russian politically exposed persons and parastatal entities, including, at a minimum, the banking, securities, insurance, and real estate sectors.

(4) The likely effects of imposing debt and equity restrictions on Russian parastatal entities, as well as the anticipated effects of adding Russian parastatal entities to the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(5) The potential impacts of imposing secondary sanctions with respect to Russian oligarchs, Russian state-owned enterprises, and Russian parastatal entities, including impacts on the entities themselves and on the economy of the Russian Federation, as well as on the economies of the United States and allies of the United States.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.**—The term “senior foreign political figure” has the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

**SEC. 242. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF EXPANDING SANCTIONS TO INCLUDE SOVEREIGN DEBT AND DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing in detail the potential effects of expanding sanctions under Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), or any successor directive, to include sovereign debt and the full range of derivative products.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 243. REPORT ON ILLICIT FINANCE RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the end of each one-year period thereafter until 2021, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing interagency efforts in the United States to combat illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain a summary of efforts by the United States to do the following:

(1) Identify, investigate, map, and disrupt illicit financial flows linked to the Russian Federation if such flows affect the United States financial system or those of major allies of the United States.

(2) Conduct outreach to the private sector, including information sharing efforts to strengthen compliance efforts by entities, including financial institutions, to prevent illicit financial flows described in paragraph (1).

(3) Engage and coordinate with allied international partners on illicit finance, especially in Europe, to coordinate efforts to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for illicit financial flows described in

paragraph (1), including examples of that engagement and coordination.

(4) Identify foreign sanctions evaders and loopholes within the sanctions regimes of foreign partners of the United States.

(5) Expand the number of real estate geographic targeting orders or other regulatory actions, as appropriate, to degrade illicit financial activity relating to the Russian Federation in relation to the financial system of the United States.

(6) Provide support to counter those involved in illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation across all appropriate law enforcement, intelligence, regulatory, and financial authorities of the Federal Government, including by imposing sanctions with respect to or prosecuting those involved.

(7) In the case of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice, investigate or otherwise develop major cases, including a description of those cases.

(c) BRIEFING.—After submitting a report under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide briefings to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to that report.

(d) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall coordinate with the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of State in preparing each report under this section.

(e) FORM.—Each report submitted under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) ILLICIT FINANCE.—The term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President.

#### **Subtitle B—Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia**

#### **SEC. 251. FINDINGS.**

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the Russian Federation has sought to exert influence throughout Europe and Eurasia, including in the former states of the Soviet Union, by providing resources to political parties, think tanks, and civil society groups that sow distrust in democratic institutions and actors, promote xenophobic and illiberal views, and otherwise undermine European unity. The Government of the Russian Federation has also engaged in well-documented corruption practices as a means toward undermining and buying influence in European and Eurasian countries.

(2) The Government of the Russian Federation has largely eliminated a once-vibrant Russian-language independent media sector and severely curtails free and independent media within the borders of the Russian Federation. Russian-language media organizations that are funded and controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation and disseminate information within and outside of the Russian Federation routinely traffic in anti-Western disinformation, while few

independent, fact-based media sources provide objective reporting for Russian-speaking audiences inside or outside of the Russian Federation.

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to violate its commitments under the Memorandum on Security Assurances in connection with Ukraine’s Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Budapest December 5, 1994, and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe Final Act, concluded at Helsinki August 1, 1975 (commonly referred to as the “Helsinki Final Act”), which laid the ground-work for the establishment of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, of which the Russian Federation is a member, by its illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014, its illegal occupation of South Ossetia and Abkhazia in Georgia in 2008, and its ongoing destabilizing activities in eastern Ukraine.

(4) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to ignore the terms of the August 2008 ceasefire agreement relating to Georgia, which requires the withdrawal of Russian Federation troops, free access by humanitarian groups to the regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and monitoring of the conflict areas by the European Union Monitoring Mission.

(5) The Government of the Russian Federation is failing to comply with the terms of the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, as well as the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014.

(6) The Government of the Russian Federation is—

(A) in violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly known as the “INF Treaty”); and

(B) failing to meet its obligations under the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002 (commonly known as the “Open Skies Treaty”).

#### **SEC. 252. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation bears responsibility for the continuing violence in Eastern Ukraine, including the death on April 24, 2017, of Joseph Stone, a citizen of the United States working as a monitor for the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

(2) the President should call on the Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) to withdraw all of its forces from the territories of Georgia, Ukraine, and Moldova;

(B) to return control of the borders of those territories to their respective governments; and

(C) to cease all efforts to undermine the popularly elected governments of those countries;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation has applied, and continues to apply, to the countries and peoples of Georgia and Ukraine, traditional uses of force, intelligence operations, and influence campaigns, which represent clear and present threats to the countries of Europe and Eurasia;

(4) in response, the countries of Europe and Eurasia should redouble efforts to build resilience within their institutions, political systems, and civil societies;

(5) the United States supports the institutions that the Government of the Russian Federation seeks to undermine, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union;

(6) a strong North Atlantic Treaty Organization is critical to maintaining peace and security in Europe and Eurasia;

(7) the United States should continue to work with the European Union as a partner against aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation, coordinating aid programs, development assistance, and other counter-Russian efforts;

(8) the United States should encourage the establishment of a commission for media freedom within the Council of Europe, modeled on the Venice Commission regarding rule of law issues, that would be chartered to provide governments with expert recommendations on maintaining legal and regulatory regimes supportive of free and independent media and an informed citizenry able to distinguish between fact-based reporting, opinion, and disinformation;

(9) in addition to working to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, the United States should work with the individual countries of Europe and Eurasia—

(A) to identify vulnerabilities to aggression, disinformation, corruption, and so-called hybrid warfare by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(B) to establish strategic and technical plans for addressing those vulnerabilities;

(C) to ensure that the financial systems of those countries are not being used to shield illicit financial activity by officials of the Government of the Russian Federation or individuals in President Vladimir Putin’s inner circle who have been enriched through corruption;

(D) to investigate and prosecute cases of corruption by Russian actors; and

(E) to work toward full compliance with the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (commonly referred to as the “Anti-Bribery Convention”) of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development; and

(10) the President of the United States should use the authority of the President to impose sanctions under—

(A) the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112–208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note); and

(B) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

#### **SEC. 253. STATEMENT OF POLICY.**

The United States, consistent with the principle of *ex injuria jus non oritur*, supports the policy known as the “Stimson Doctrine” and thus does not recognize territorial changes effected by force, including the illegal invasions and occupations of Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Crimea, Eastern Ukraine, and Transnistria.

#### **SEC. 254. COORDINATING AID AND ASSISTANCE ACROSS EUROPE AND EURASIA.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Countering Russian Influence Fund \$250,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund shall be used to effectively implement, prioritized in the following order and subject to the availability of funds, the following goals:

(1) To assist in protecting critical infrastructure and electoral mechanisms from cyberattacks in the following countries:

(A) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union that the Secretary of State determines—

(i) are vulnerable to influence by the Russian Federation; and

(ii) lack the economic capability to effectively respond to aggression by the Russian Federation without the support of the United States.

(B) Countries that are participating in the enlargement process of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union, including Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Macedonia, Moldova, Kosovo, Serbia, and Ukraine.

(2) To combat corruption, improve the rule of law, and otherwise strengthen independent judiciaries and prosecutors general offices in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(3) To respond to the humanitarian crises and instability caused or aggravated by the invasions and occupations of Georgia and Ukraine by the Russian Federation.

(4) To improve participatory legislative processes and legal education, political transparency and competition, and compliance with international obligations in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(5) To build the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations countering the influence and propaganda of the Russian Federation to combat corruption, prioritize access to truthful information, and operate freely in all regions in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(6) To assist the Secretary of State in executing the functions specified in section 1287(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) for the purposes of recognizing, understanding, exposing, and countering propaganda and disinformation efforts by foreign governments, in coordination with the relevant regional Assistant Secretary or Assistant Secretaries of the Department of State.

(C) REVISION OF ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH AMOUNTS MAY BE USED.—The Secretary of State may modify the goals described in subsection (b) if, not later than 15 days before revising such a goal, the Secretary notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the revision.

(D) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia (authorized pursuant to section 601 of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5461) and section 102 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5812)), and in consultation with the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, the Director of the Global Engagement Center of the Department of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, coordinate and carry out activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) METHOD.—Activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) shall be carried out through—

(A) initiatives of the United States Government;

(B) Federal grant programs such as the Information Access Fund; or

(C) nongovernmental or international organizations, such as the Organization for Se-

curity and Co-operation in Europe, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Black Sea Trust, the Balkan Trust for Democracy, the Prague Civil Society Centre, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, the European Endowment for Democracy, and related organizations.

(3) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the programs and activities carried out to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) during the preceding fiscal year.

(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall include, with respect to each program or activity described in that subparagraph—

(i) the amount of funding for the program or activity;

(ii) the goal described in subsection (b) to which the program or activity relates; and

(iii) an assessment of whether or not the goal was met.

(C) COORDINATION WITH GLOBAL PARTNERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to maximize cost efficiency, eliminate duplication, and speed the achievement of the goals described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall ensure coordination with—

(A) the European Union and its institutions;

(B) the governments of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union; and

(C) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) REPORT BY SECRETARY OF STATE.—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) the amount of funding provided to each country referred to in subsection (b) by—

(i) the European Union or its institutions;

(ii) the government of each country that is a member of the European Union or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(iii) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b); and

(B) an assessment of whether the funding described in subparagraph (A) is commensurate with funding provided by the United States for those goals.

(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to or limit United States foreign assistance not provided using amounts available in the Countering Russian Influence Fund.

(G) ENSURING ADEQUATE STAFFING FOR GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES.—In order to ensure that the United States Government is properly focused on combating corruption, improving rule of law, and building the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations in countries described in subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of State shall establish a pilot program for Foreign Service officer positions focused on governance and anticorruption activities in such countries.

## SEC. 255. REPORT ON MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS CONTROLLED AND FUNDED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a description of media organizations that are controlled and funded by the Government of the Russian Federation, and any affiliated entities, whether operating within or outside the Russian Federation, including broadcast and satellite-based television, radio, Internet, and print media organizations.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

## SEC. 256. REPORT ON RUSSIAN FEDERATION INFLUENCE ON ELECTIONS IN EUROPE AND EURASIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on funds provided by, or funds the use of which was directed by, the Government of the Russian Federation or any Russian person with the intention of influencing the outcome of any election or campaign in any country in Europe or Eurasia during the preceding year, including through direct support to any political party, candidate, lobbying campaign, nongovernmental organization, or civic organization.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) RUSSIAN PERSON DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Russian person” means—

(1) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(2) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

## SEC. 257. UKRAINIAN ENERGY SECURITY.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereign and territorial integrity;

(2) to condemn and oppose all of the destabilizing efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine in violation of its obligations and international commitments;

(3) to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Government of the Russian Federation or the separation of any portion of Ukrainian territory through the use of military force;

(4) to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus;

(5) to assist in promoting reform in regulatory oversight and operations in Ukraine's energy sector, including the establishment and empowerment of an independent regulatory organization;

(6) to encourage and support fair competition, market liberalization, and reliability in Ukraine's energy sector;

(7) to help Ukraine and United States allies and partners in Europe reduce their dependence on Russian energy resources, especially natural gas, which the Government of the Russian Federation uses as a weapon to coerce, intimidate, and influence other countries;

(8) to work with European Union member states and European Union institutions to promote energy security through developing diversified and liberalized energy markets that provide diversified sources, suppliers, and routes;

(9) to continue to oppose the NordStream 2 pipeline given its detrimental impacts on the European Union's energy security, gas market development in Central and Eastern Europe, and energy reforms in Ukraine; and

(10) that the United States Government should prioritize the export of United States energy resources in order to create American jobs, help United States allies and partners, and strengthen United States foreign policy.

(b) **PLAN TO PROMOTE ENERGY SECURITY IN UKRAINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Energy, shall work with the Government of Ukraine to develop a plan to increase energy security in Ukraine, increase the amount of energy produced in Ukraine, and reduce Ukraine's reliance on energy imports from the Russian Federation.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall include strategies for market liberalization, effective regulation and oversight, supply diversification, energy reliability, and energy efficiency, such as through supporting—

(A) the promotion of advanced technology and modern operating practices in Ukraine's oil and gas sector;

(B) modern geophysical and meteorological survey work as needed followed by international tenders to help attract qualified investment into exploration and development of areas with untapped resources in Ukraine;

(C) a broadening of Ukraine's electric power transmission interconnection with Europe;

(D) the strengthening of Ukraine's capability to maintain electric power grid stability and reliability;

(E) independent regulatory oversight and operations of Ukraine's gas market and electricity sector;

(F) the implementation of primary gas law including pricing, tariff structure, and legal regulatory implementation;

(G) privatization of government owned energy companies through credible legal frameworks and a transparent process compliant with international best practices;

(H) procurement and transport of emergency fuel supplies, including reverse pipeline flows from Europe;

(I) provision of technical assistance for crisis planning, crisis response, and public outreach;

(J) repair of infrastructure to enable the transport of fuel supplies;

(K) repair of power generating or power transmission equipment or facilities; and

(L) improved building energy efficiency and other measures designed to reduce energy demand in Ukraine.

(3) **REPORTS.**—

(A) **IMPLEMENTATION OF UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014 PROVISIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the status of implementing the provisions required under section 7(c) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926(c)), including detailing the plans required under that section, the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth

under that section, and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies developed pursuant to that section.

(B) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the plan developed under paragraph (1), the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth in paragraph (2), and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies.

(C) **BRIEFINGS.**—The Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall brief the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days after the submission of each report under subparagraph (B). In addition, the Department of State shall make relevant officials available upon request to brief the appropriate congressional committees on all available information that relates directly or indirectly to Ukraine or energy security in Eastern Europe.

(D) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) **SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF COUNTRIES IN EUROPE AND EURASIA TO DECREASE THEIR DEPENDENCE ON RUSSIAN SOURCES OF ENERGY.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) The Government of the Russian Federation uses its strong position in the energy sector as leverage to manipulate the internal politics and foreign relations of the countries of Europe and Eurasia.

(B) This influence is based not only on the Russian Federation's oil and natural gas resources, but also on its state-owned nuclear power and electricity companies.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the United States should assist the efforts of the countries of Europe and Eurasia to enhance their energy security through diversification of energy supplies in order to lessen dependencies on Russian Federation energy resources and state-owned entities; and

(B) the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should play key roles in supporting critical energy projects that contribute to that goal.

(3) **USE OF COUNTERING RUSSIAN INFLUENCE FUND TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund pursuant to section 254 shall be used to provide technical advice to countries described in subsection (b)(1) of such section designed to enhance energy security and lessen dependence on energy from Russian Federation sources.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State a total of \$30,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 to carry out the strategies set forth in subsection (b)(2) and other activities under this section related to the promotion of energy security in Ukraine.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibilities required and authorities provided under section 7 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926).

## SEC. 258. TERMINATION.

The provisions of this subtitle shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

## SEC. 259. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

Except as otherwise provided, in this subtitle, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

## Subtitle C—Combating Terrorism and Illicit Financing

## PART I—NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORIST AND OTHER ILLICIT FINANCING

## SEC. 261. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President, acting through the Secretary, shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the appropriate Federal banking agencies and Federal functional regulators, develop a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance.

(b) **TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive national strategy developed in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) **UPDATES.**—Not later than January 31, 2020, and January 31, 2022, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees updated versions of the national strategy submitted under paragraph (1).

(c) **SEPARATE PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL.**—Any part of the national strategy that involves information that is properly classified under criteria established by the President shall be submitted to Congress separately in a classified annex and, if requested by the chairman or ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees, as a briefing at an appropriate level of security.

## SEC. 262. CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

The strategy described in section 261 shall contain the following:

(1) **EVALUATION OF EXISTING EFFORTS.**—An assessment of the effectiveness of and ways in which the United States is currently addressing the highest levels of risk of various forms of illicit finance, including those identified in the documents entitled “2015 National Money Laundering Risk Assessment” and “2015 National Terrorist Financing Risk Assessment”, published by the Department of the Treasury and a description of how the strategy is integrated into, and supports, the broader counter terrorism strategy of the United States.

(2) **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES.**—A comprehensive, research-based, long-range, quantifiable discussion of goals, objectives, and priorities for disrupting and preventing

illicit finance activities within and transiting the financial system of the United States that outlines priorities to reduce the incidence, dollar value, and effects of illicit finance.

(3) **THREATS.**—An identification of the most significant illicit finance threats to the financial system of the United States.

(4) **REVIEWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES.**—Reviews of enforcement efforts, relevant regulations and relevant provisions of law and, if appropriate, discussions of proposed changes determined to be appropriate to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective efforts at all levels of government, and with international partners of the United States, in the fight against illicit finance.

(5) **DETECTION AND PROSECUTION INITIATIVES.**—A description of efforts to improve, as necessary, detection and prosecution of illicit finance, including efforts to ensure that—

(A) subject to legal restrictions, all appropriate data collected by the Federal Government that is relevant to the efforts described in this section be available in a timely fashion to—

(i) all appropriate Federal departments and agencies; and

(ii) as appropriate and consistent with section 314 of the International Money Laundering Abatement and Financial Anti-Terrorism Act of 2001 (31 U.S.C. 5311 note), to financial institutions to assist the financial institutions in efforts to comply with laws aimed at curbing illicit finance; and

(B) appropriate efforts are undertaken to ensure that Federal departments and agencies charged with reducing and preventing illicit finance make thorough use of publicly available data in furtherance of this effort.

(6) **THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE FINANCIAL SECTOR IN PREVENTION OF ILLICIT FINANCE.**—A discussion of ways to enhance partnerships between the private financial sector and Federal departments and agencies with regard to the prevention and detection of illicit finance, including—

(A) efforts to facilitate compliance with laws aimed at stopping such illicit finance while maintaining the effectiveness of such efforts; and

(B) providing guidance to strengthen internal controls and to adopt on an industry-wide basis more effective policies.

(7) **ENHANCEMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION.**—A discussion of ways to combat illicit finance by enhancing—

(A) cooperative efforts between and among Federal, State, and local officials, including State regulators, State and local prosecutors, and other law enforcement officials; and

(B) cooperative efforts with and between governments of countries and with and between multinational institutions with expertise in fighting illicit finance, including the Financial Action Task Force and the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units.

(8) **TREND ANALYSIS OF EMERGING ILLICIT FINANCE THREATS.**—A discussion of and data regarding trends in illicit finance, including evolving forms of value transfer such as so-called cryptocurrencies, other methods that are computer, telecommunications, or Internet-based, cyber crime, or any other threats that the Secretary may choose to identify.

(9) **BUDGET PRIORITIES.**—A multiyear budget plan that identifies sufficient resources needed to successfully execute the full range of missions called for in this section.

(10) **TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENTS.**—An analysis of current and developing ways to lever-

age technology to improve the effectiveness of efforts to stop the financing of terrorism and other forms of illicit finance, including better integration of open-source data.

## **PART II—ENHANCING ANTITERRORISM TOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

### **SEC. 271. IMPROVING ANTITERROR FINANCE MONITORING OF FUNDS TRANSFERS.**

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To improve the ability of the Department of the Treasury to better track cross-border fund transfers and identify potential financing of terrorist or other forms of illicit finance, the Secretary shall carry out a study to assess—

(A) the potential efficacy of requiring banking regulators to establish a pilot program to provide technical assistance to depository institutions and credit unions that wish to provide account services to money services businesses serving individuals in Somalia;

(B) whether such a pilot program could be a model for improving the ability of United States persons to make legitimate funds transfers through transparent and easily monitored channels while preserving strict compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act (Public Law 91-508; 84 Stat. 1114) and related controls aimed at stopping money laundering and the financing of terrorism; and

(C) consistent with current legal requirements regarding confidential supervisory information, the potential impact of allowing money services businesses to share certain State examination information with depository institutions and credit unions, or whether another appropriate mechanism could be identified to allow a similar exchange of information to give the depository institutions and credit unions a better understanding of whether an individual money services business is adequately meeting its anti-money laundering and counter-terror financing obligations to combat money laundering, the financing of terror, or related illicit finance.

(2) **PUBLIC INPUT.**—The Secretary should solicit and consider public input as appropriate in developing the study required under subsection (a).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

### **SEC. 272. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION REGARDING TERRORIST FINANCING INTELLIGENCE.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, should intensify work with foreign partners to help the foreign partners develop intelligence analytic capacities, in a financial intelligence unit, finance ministry, or other appropriate agency, that are—

(1) commensurate to the threats faced by the foreign partner; and

(2) designed to better integrate intelligence efforts with the anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing regimes of the foreign partner.

### **SEC. 273. EXAMINING THE COUNTER-TERROR FINANCING ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY IN EMBASSIES.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(1) a list of the United States embassies in which a full-time Department of the Treasury financial attaché is stationed and a description of how the interests of the Department of the Treasury relating to terrorist financing and money laundering are addressed (via regional attachés or otherwise) at United States embassies where no such attachés are present;

(2) a list of the United States embassies at which the Department of the Treasury has assigned a technical assistance advisor from the Office of Technical Assistance of the Department of the Treasury;

(3) an overview of how Department of the Treasury financial attachés and technical assistance advisors assist in efforts to counter illicit finance, to include money laundering, terrorist financing, and proliferation financing; and

(4) an overview of patterns, trends, or other issues identified by the Department of the Treasury and whether resources are sufficient to address these issues.

### **SEC. 274. INCLUSION OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 101(c)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(c)(1)) is amended by inserting “the Secretary of the Treasury,” before “and such other officers”.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) may not be construed to authorize the National Security Council to have a professional staff level that exceeds the limitation set forth under section 101(e)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(e)(3)).

### **SEC. 275. INCLUSION OF ALL FUNDS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5326 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by striking “coin and currency”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “subtitle and” and inserting “subtitle or to”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “United States coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in such order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in such order)”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “coins or currency (or monetary instruments)” and inserting “funds”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order)”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 5326 by striking “coin and currency”.

## **PART III—DEFINITIONS**

### **SEC. 281. DEFINITIONS.**

In this subtitle—

(1) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term “appropriate Federal banking agencies” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

(3) the term “Bank Secrecy Act” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91–508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code;

(4) the term “Federal functional regulator” has the meaning given that term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809);

(5) the term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President;

(6) the term “money services business” has the meaning given the term under section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations;

(7) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(8) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each territory or possession of the United States.

#### Subtitle D—Rule of Construction

##### SEC. 291. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title (other than sections 216 and 236(b)) shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

**SA 233.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have two requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Sen-

ate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

#### COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, June 12, 2017, at 5:30 p.m., for a business meeting.

#### COMMITTEE IN INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Monday, June 12, 2017 from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Hart Senate Office Building to hold a closed briefing.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE PULSE ORLANDO NIGHTCLUB ONE YEAR AGO

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 190, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 190) honoring the memory of the victims of the terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub one year ago.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 190) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, in consultation with the chairperson of the Committee on Indian Affairs, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114–244, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children: Don Atqasq Gray of Alaska.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 13; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, Senator PAUL or his designee be recognized, as under the previous order.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:18 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 13, 2017, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

DAWN DEBERRY STUMP, OF TEXAS, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2022, VICE TIMOTHY G. MASSAD, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID G. EHRHART, OF TEXAS, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE GORDON O. TANNER.

##### THE JUDICIARY

CLARIA HORN BOOM, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF KENTUCKY, VICE JENNIFER B. COFFMAN, RETIRED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BETH ANN WILLIAMS, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE CHRISTOPHER H. SCHROEDER.

##### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be admiral*

VICE ADM. JAMES G. FOGGO III

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 12, 2017:

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

KENNETH P. RAPUANO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DAVID JOHNSON

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2017

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate David Johnson of Lawrence, Kansas, for his commitment, leadership, and service to the State of Kansas and people struggling with mental illnesses everywhere.

As his tenure as CEO of the Bert-Nash Community Mental Health Center nears its end, and we reflect on his sixteen years serving as CEO, we celebrate the work he has done to positively impact the Lawrence community, Douglas County, the State of Kansas, and beyond.

David demonstrated national leadership as the CEO of a community mental health center by continuing to serve the ever-growing community of Lawrence, while facing the challenge of decreased funding. David has championed initiatives for mental health care such as the Mental Health First Aid grant program and was the person who first brought that program's need and impact to my attention. David has been such an effective national voice for this program that he was invited as a Congressional witness in 2014 to share with Members of Congress the need for the Mental Health First Aid Act of 2013.

As one of the original fourteen people trained as Mental Health First Aid instructors in the country, David undoubtedly encouraged and inspired more people to get that training so they could help their family, friends and neighbors in their time of need.

David is willing to boldly lead on the issue of mental health care and advocate for the millions of Americans hiding in the shadows struggling with mental illness.

When it comes to our home State of Kansas, David has made his imprint through undertaking statewide efforts that help create new opportunities for people with mental illness and their families. These initiatives allow more people to discover and receive the care they need while their families are educated on ways to help their loved ones.

I extend my deepest appreciation to David Johnson for his service and commitment to the State of Kansas and while I am sad to hear of his retirement, I wish him and his family all the best in the years ahead.

HONORING LGBTQ LEADERS IN  
THE TWIN CITIES

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2017

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the transgender, queer, lesbian, bisex-

ual, and gay members of my community as we begin celebrating Pride. Every year, Twin Cities Pride recognizes individuals and organizations who have devoted their lives to equality. This year, the Grand Marshal is Jana Shortal, and the Community Champions of Pride are Clare Housing and the Avenues for Homeless Youth GLBT Host Homes Program.

Jana Shortal is a journalist, public figure, and co-anchor of KARE 11's Breaking the News, one of the Twin Cities' most popular evening news programs. Jana has garnered a lot of attention across our city—accolades for her coverage of a mom dying of cancer, criticism in the Star Tribune for wearing skinny jeans, and national awards for telling stories about race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity. Throughout her career, Jana has been guided by an overarching goal: telling the story. Like she's said herself, "The average person's completely-not-average story motivates me." Often times we get lost in statistics or politics and forget to talk about how it's actually impacting people's lives. Jana's drive to humanize the news is more important now than ever—we can't let elected officials control the narrative just because they dislike the facts. I thank Jana for her service to our community, for her realness on screen, and for her devotion to telling the story.

Clare Housing and Avenues for Homeless Youth provide something that can mean the difference between life and death for LGBTQ folks: a place to live. For 30 years, Clare Housing has provided housing for hundreds of people with HIV or AIDS. They manage multiple apartment buildings for people who are independent, as well as nearly a dozen family homes where people can eat regular meals and have a caseworker assist them with doctor's visits and medicine. We have made tremendous progress on HIV treatment, and it is unacceptable that a lack of access to housing or healthcare means it can still be a death sentence. Thanks to Clare Housing's leadership, HIV positive individuals can get the housing stability they need to keep their bodies healthy.

Avenues for Homeless Youth's GLBT Host Home Program is a national model for community and volunteer-driven efforts to end LGBTQ youth homelessness. Nearly 40 percent of homeless youth identify as LGBTQ, and many of them were pushed out of their homes due to their gender or sexuality. This program provides not only a roof over their head, but an environment where their identities are validated and supported. Over their 15 year history, the GLBT Host Home Program has helped hundreds of kids grow into happy and healthy adults. No one should be forced into a life of economic struggles simply because their parents are closed minded. The Host Home Program is a tremendous example of what "It takes a village" looks like in practice.

If the last five months have taught us anything, it's that we still have so much work to

do. We can't sit back and watch our federal government walk back protections for trans kids, or school districts lead the charge to belittle and exclude them. We can't accept the talk that we have to wait because there are more important or less divisive issues. LGBTQ equality is deeply connected to economic inequality, racism, sexism, and every other -ism we're fighting against. We must fight for both social and economic equality, because if we don't fight for both, we won't get either. My deepest thanks to these leaders in our community who are showing how we advance equality on all fronts.

RECOGNIZING OSCAR AMEZCUA

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2017

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mariachi Legend Oscar Amezcua who, from his humble beginnings in Jalisco, Mexico, immigrated to San Diego in 1945 and quickly became an icon in Hispanic culture. Oscar's skills earned him a spot on the renowned Mariachi Vargas de Tecalitlán, which was just the start of his distinguished career. Oscar would go on to establish his own group, Mariachi Guadalajara, all while raising his three sons Carlos, Oscar, Alex, and his daughter Lucia with his wonderful wife Gloria.

Oscar Amezcua has dedicated his life to creating and providing us with music that has made significant contributions to San Diego's music and culture and is credited by many with bringing Mariachi music to San Diego. Recently, at the age of 87, Oscar celebrated this past Cinco de Mayo celebration by performing at a special concert in San Diego's famous Balboa Park and was recognized by San Diego Mayor Kevin Falconer, who declared May 5, 2017, as "Oscar Amezcua Day—The Father of San Diego Mariachi Music."

I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in recognizing Oscar's contributions to San Diego's music and Hispanic culture and I look forward to his continued involvement for years to come.

AMANDA ALVARADO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Amanda Alvarado for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Amanda Alvarado is a student at Molholm Elementary School and received this award

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

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

because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Amanda Alvarado is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Amanda Alvarado for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### RECOGNIZING JORDAN COFFMAN

##### HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jordan Coffman, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Jordan is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Jordan has served in a variety of leadership roles from Co-President of the National Honor Society to Senator-at-Large of the Student Government Association at her school. In addition to her service roles, Jordan has excelled in athletics, receiving the Hoehne Female Athlete award and placing first in several Track and Field races.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Jordan and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Jordan.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Jordan Coffman as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.

#### RECOGNIZING A LETTER TO THE EDITOR: HEY, WHITE HOUSE: LEAVE D.C. ALONE

##### HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share an excellent Letter to the Editor, urging the Trump administration to respect the political autonomy of American citizens living in Washington, D.C., written by David Jonas Bardin to the Washington Post.

In "Hey, White House: Leave D.C. Alone," David writes:

"The May 28 editorial 'More meddling' said that the White House has joined Congress "in trying to block the District's Death with Dignity law." President Trump's proposed budget

would unconstitutionally forbid implementation of that law in the 2018 fiscal year, which starts Oct. 1. The Constitution established federal legislative power over a future federal district as well as future federal installations outside the District of Columbia, such as Fort Bragg, N.C., to safeguard legitimate federal government interests there. The Bill of Rights immediately limited those powers in order to block tyranny.

"Even before statehood and even without D.C. voting rights in Congress, it is high time to recognize that Americans living in the District count as 'the people' under the 10th Amendment, which says: 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.' Power to allow, forbid or regulate physician-assisted suicide was never delegated to the federal government.

"Mr. Trump should heed President William Henry Harrison's wise words: 'The people of the District of Columbia are not the subjects of the people of the States, but free American citizens.'"

#### IN RECOGNITION OF DR. ARTHUR SMITH

##### HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Arthur Smith of Chester County, Pennsylvania for his 48 years of service to our community. Dr. Smith will be retiring at the end of this year after an astounding 48 years of service to the Ridley, Delaware County School District.

Dr. Smith has for decades been a fixture in Ridley's schools, serving in both teaching and administrative capacities. It's not uncommon today for Ridley Middle School's "Parents Night" to be packed with parents of current students who themselves had taken classes taught by Dr. Smith years or decades ago.

Dr. Smith brought to his teaching an unmatched commitment to his students and an unwavering desire to see them succeed. But his day as an educator didn't end with the final bell each afternoon. He then drove to West Chester University, where for years he's taught evening classes. His typical days began before 5 a.m. and ended after he got home at 10:30 that night.

Forty-eight years, 9,227 middle school students, 6,700 college students and countless hours spent helping each of them succeed—that's Dr. Smith's legacy. On behalf of our entire community, I thank him for his service and wish him the best in his retirement.

#### ADALYN LUKOWICZ

##### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Adalyn

Lukowicz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Adalyn Lukowicz is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Adalyn Lukowicz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Adalyn Lukowicz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### RECOGNIZING VICTORIA BERNABEI

##### HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Victoria Bernabei, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Victoria is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Victoria served as Honor Guard Commander as well as Cadet Captain of the Civil Air Patrol for which she received the Earhart Award. She has also received various Academic All-State honors. Additionally, she volunteers as a soccer coach in her community, demonstrating exemplary leadership skills and a heart for service.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Victoria and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Victoria.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Victoria Bernabei as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF AUBURN HILLS CITY CLERK TERRI KOWAL

##### HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate City Clerk Terri Kowal of Auburn Hills, Michigan, as she receives the prestigious Quill Award from the International Institute of Municipal Clerks.

Recognized for her outstanding contributions in her profession, Clerk Kowal was selected as one of only two recipients for this unparalleled recognition, an incredible honor

considering the thousands of municipal clerks across the United States and Canada. With this achievement, Kowal is proclaimed an international champion of her craft.

Having dedicated her life to helping the City of Auburn Hills and her community, Kowal has built her career on serving others. Understanding the responsibility and ethics required to be a municipal clerk, she did not waver in taking on this important task and great responsibility in service of her fellow citizens.

Receiving this award is not only a great honor for Clerk Kowal and a testament to her hard work, but invokes a great sense of pride for the city of Auburn Hills, Oakland County, and the great State of Michigan. Clerk Kowal should be seen as an example of the ideal public servant—one who puts the needs of the community before her own.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my most sincere congratulations to Terri Kowal as she receives this extraordinary honor and is celebrated as a pillar of the City of Auburn Hills.

---

HONORING DR. GERARD OAKLEY,  
JR. OF HUNTINGTON, WV

---

**HON. EVAN H. JENKINS**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Gerard J. Oakley, Jr. of Huntington, West Virginia. Dr. Oakley served his country as a medical officer in the United States Air Force during Operation Desert Storm, retiring after 20 years of service with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

After serving in the armed forces, Dr. Oakley made his home in Huntington with his wife, Tanyia, and their four sons to continue his practice as a gynecologic oncologist. Dr. Oakley has spent the last 20 years providing quality cancer care for patients in his community, both through his private practice and with the Mountains of Hope Cancer Coalition.

Dr. Oakley has been recognized as a leader among his peers on numerous occasions, from service as the leader of gynecologic oncology at Marshall University to chief of staff at Cabell Huntington Hospital. Dr. Oakley was instrumental in the founding of the Edwards Comprehensive Cancer Center in Huntington and has been serving as its medical director.

Dr. Oakley helped the Edwards Comprehensive Cancer Center obtain its certification as an Academic Comprehensive Cancer Program and brought new technologies in radiation oncology and robot assisted surgery to the cancer center, allowing patients to have cutting-edge cancer care close to home.

I thank Dr. Oakley for his leadership, his service, and all he has done for the people of the great state of West Virginia in the fight against cancer.

ALEX FLORES

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alex Flores for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Alex Flores is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alex Flores is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alex Flores for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

RECOGNIZING ALEXANDER  
HAMILTON

---

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alexander Hamilton, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Alexander is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Alexander has earned a variety of awards for his academic and athletic achievements, including the Ironman Award for football and the Silver Cross Award for academics. He also served as captain of his school's football team, where he was selected for the Academic All State First Team. Additionally, he works as a volunteer for the Special Olympics, demonstrating compassion and a true heart for service.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Alexander and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Alexander.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Alexander Hamilton as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

HONORING THE GETTYSBURG COLLEGE WOMEN'S LACROSSE TEAM

**HON. SCOTT PERRY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly honor the Gettysburg College Women's Lacrosse Team on earning the NCAA Division III Women's Lacrosse Championship. The Gettysburg College Bullets earned a 6–5 victory over top-ranked The College of New Jersey to earn its second National Championship.

With a record of 21–3, Gettysburg College tied the program record for most victories in a season, and eclipsed the program and conference record for goals against average at 4.79. The Bullets also defeated two number one teams this season for the first time in program history. Their accomplishments have earned the respect of their peers as the Bullets earned the top spot in the final Intercollegiate Women's Lacrosse Coaches Association Division III Coaches' Poll.

I extend my heartfelt congratulations to Head Coach Carol Cantele and the school officials, family and friends that supported these young women on their incredible and impressive journey.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I commend and congratulate the Gettysburg College Women's Lacrosse Team on earning the NCAA Division III Women's Lacrosse Championship. Their work ethic and commitment to excellence serve as the standard for all to follow.

---

HONORING GREG J. FEERE

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Greg J. Feere upon his retirement after thirty years as Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council. Mr. Feere has been a tireless advocate for over 35,000 local skilled trades workers.

Mr. Feere graduated from Clayton Valley High School in 1966. He earned an Associate of Arts degree at Diablo Valley College and a Bachelor of Arts in Public Administration from Chico State University.

Before becoming CEO of the Council, Mr. Feere worked for ten years in Alaska as a hunting, fishing and photography guide on Kodiak Island and the Arctic Brooks Range. He also worked on the Trans Alaskan Pipeline in Palmer and Point Barrow. Mr. Feere joined the Heat and Frost Insulators Union Local 16 in San Francisco, where they recognized his leadership abilities after just five years by naming him the youngest business manager in their history.

The men and women of the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council elected Mr. Feere to be their CEO nine times. He has fought to protect their interests, create safe working conditions and promote their careers through training and professional development. Mr. Feere has served two terms as

the Northern California Vice President of the California State Building Trades, where he worked to represent nearly 500,000 Californians. Mr. Feere's father used to tell him that "there has to be somebody who looks out for the little guy." Greg has become that somebody and has been able to look out for many members of our community.

In addition to his excellent work with the Council, Mr. Feere has served as a commissioner for Contra Costa County Fish and Wildlife and a trustee of Contra Costa College.

Mr. Speaker, Greg Feere has led a long career serving the people of our community. He has played a major role in fighting for well-paying middle class jobs. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement.

ALIYA MOORE

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aliya Moore for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Aliya Moore is a student at Peck Elementary and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aliya Moore is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aliya Moore for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIAD HS GIRLS SOCCER

### HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding sports team from southern Illinois. The Triad High School Women's Soccer team won the Illinois Class 2A state championship on June 3, defeating Wheaton Academy 5-4. After 100 minutes of scoreless play, the Lady Knights began to make goals and fight off their competitors' shots, resulting in their State Title.

The Lady Knights, from Troy, Illinois, put together a 22-6 record en route to the championship, defeating rivals and earning one small victory at a time.

My congratulations go to: Madisyn Stauffer, Jody Ellis, Kalie Gibbs, Madison Mell, Madeline Keller, Jordyn Besserman, Hailey Busche, Chelsea Riden, Meaghan Smith (C),

Samantha Bassler (C), Ashley Newcombe, Sydney Thomas, Eryn Fanning, Chloe Scott, Erynn Little (C), Sydney Beach, Katie Rogers, Jordan Wilson, Sierra Schlemmer, Rebecca Byrd, Morgan Bohnenstiehl (C), Molly Suess, Mercedes King and coaches and staff Matt Bettlach—Varsity Head Coach, Jim Jackson—Varsity Assistant Coach, Heather Seger—Junior Varsity Coach, and Bailey Stack—Freshman Coach.

### RECOGNIZING PHILIP DALKE

### HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Philip Dalke, a Naval Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional District. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Philip is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Philip demonstrated excellent leadership and service as captain of both the Varsity Volleyball and Basketball teams at his school. He received multiple awards recognizing his athletic talents, including the League Defensive Player of the Year and Male Athlete of the Year awards. He was also inducted into his school's chapter of the National Honor Society and was an active member of Student Government, showing a passion for education and heart for public service.

Our Nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Philip and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Philip.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Philip Dalke as an appointee to the Naval Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our Nation.

### ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT (H.R. 2213)

### HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act (H.R. 2213).

The current polygraph requirement was mandated as part of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to identify agents who could be corruptible or working with drug traffickers. This bill weakens critical polygraph requirements for U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agents.

Given CBP's scope of work with organized crime, drug cartels, and corruption, waiving the polygraph requirements would potentially expose the agency to corrupt law enforcement who would use their positions for personal gain.

It is Congress' duty to ensure that CBP is using the most stringent practices when hiring agents. Other federal agencies such as FBI, DEA, ATF, and Secret Service do not exempt polygraph requirements, why should CBP be the exception?

I voted yes on the Lujan Grisham amendment to the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act. This amendment would have ensured that safety measures were in place to safeguard national security, and protect the integrity of the CBP and its officers.

After the failure of this amendment, it became clear that I cannot support this bill.

AMANDA PETERS

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Amanda Peters for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Amanda Peters is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Amanda Peters is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Amanda Peters for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

### HONORING BRADLEY H. PETERSEN

### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleague, Representative JARED HUFFMAN, to honor Mr. Bradley H. Petersen, who is being awarded the Viticulture Award of Excellence by the Sonoma County Winegrape Commission.

Mr. Petersen is a third-generation farmer in the Dry Creek area of Sonoma County, California. He grew up watching his parents harvest wine grapes, and showed an early interest in mechanics. He earned his undergraduate degree from Cal Poly Technical University in Agricultural Mechanics and Engineering, gaining skills that would serve him well throughout his career. Mr. Petersen has been the vineyard manager for Silver Oak Cellars and Twomey Cellars for the past eighteen years.

In addition to his prominence in the agricultural community, Mr. Petersen has demonstrated the same leadership and devotion to our entire region. He is the past President of

the Geyserville Kiwanis Club, and he worked as a volunteer firefighter for Geyserville for fifteen years, achieving the rank of Battalion Chief. Mr. Petersen also served two years as Chairman and eight years as a commissioner on the Sonoma County Winegrape Commission Board.

Working alongside his Jack Russell sidekick, Sparky, Mr. Petersen is dedicated to sustainable farming. His colleagues praise his leadership, noting his integrity, honesty, and respect for all around him.

The Sonoma County Winegrape Commission is awarding Mr. Petersen the Viticulture Award of Excellence based on the innovative techniques he practices and his proven leadership. His work in both viticulture and our community has been invaluable to the people of Sonoma County.

Mr. Speaker, Brad Petersen is a hard worker and an expert viticulturist. He has demonstrated a passion for sustainable farming and a commitment to our community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

#### ST. MARY'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. LEE M. ZELDIN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to St. Mary's Episcopal Church as the congregation celebrates its 150th Anniversary. The church's endurance throughout time matches the ceaseless devotion of its patrons, and is an achievement that must be appropriately recognized and praised.

Constructed shortly after the Civil War, St. Mary's Episcopal Church in Ronkonkoma, New York has stood as a testament to its patrons' religious fervor and tenacity. For a short time following the conclusion of the Civil War, Episcopalians in the area worshipped in a school house until the congregation eagerly decided in June of 1867 to build a church. The church was completed six short months later, and its first service was held on Christmas Eve of 1867. The property for the church, and a sizeable portion of the funds used to construct it, were donated by Welsh Colonel John Henry Puleston, a knight and distinguished Member of Parliament.

Unfortunately, the parish fell on hard times around 1880, when the number of communicants dropped significantly due to a dearth of year-round Protestants in the area. While there were talks about shuttering the church, Reverend Rodney M. Edwards believed the religiosity and love expressed by his parishioners was so resolute that he could not imagine deserting them. Accordingly, the church's ardor attracted more communicants, and the parish began to once again thrive a decade later. Then, in 1920, benefactors joined together to revive and repair the Church in the image of its founders' intentions.

The current St. Mary's Episcopal Church, which was admitted into union with the diocese in 1972, was built with the essence of its predecessor, but with more space to house a

growing number of patrons. Today, the rector of the parish is the experienced Reverend Beth O'Callaghan, who leads a congregation of over 200 communicants. This year, the parish remarkably celebrates its 150th anniversary, an apt representation of St. Mary's Episcopal Church's unyielding zeal and devotion.

Mr. Speaker, St. Mary's Episcopal Church's 150th Anniversary is an achievement that serves as a testament to the devotion of the congregation. Their religious zeal cannot be underscored or admired enough, and it is my distinct honor and privilege to represent the church in the First Congressional District of New York.

#### RECOGNIZING ALEXANDER MUELLER

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alexander Mueller, a Merchant Marine Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Alexander is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Alexander has already begun his service to our nation through his participation in the United States Naval Sea Cadet Corps. He demonstrated his commitment to public service as an active member of his high school's Student Council and Student Government, and was awarded Academic All State First Team in recognition of his outstanding athletic and academic achievements.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Alexander and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Alexander.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Alexander Mueller as an appointee to the Merchant Marine Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

#### ABIGAIL PORTER

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Abigail Porter for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Abigail Porter is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Abigail Porter is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels

strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Abigail Porter for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF T. DWAYNE MCCAY, PH.D.

**HON. BILL POSEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. Dwayne McCay who currently serves as the President of Florida Institute of Technology. Dr. McCay is a renowned engineer and research scientist who was recently named Fellow of the National Academy of Inventors class of 2016—a highly prestigious professional distinction.

Dwayne McCay grew up in the cotton fields of northeast Arkansas with a passion for literature. In the late 1950's and early 1960's, as the world witnessed space exploration for the first time with the launch of Sputnik, Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin, and Astronaut Alan Shepard, Dwayne found himself looking toward the stars like so many youth at that time, including myself. He and his young friends founded a rocket society in 1961—WOMC (Wike, Oldham, McCay and Crowell)—and they had three successful launches of their homemade rockets with McCay acting as the propellant engineer.

Dwayne went on to achieve a Ph.D. in engineering and mathematics from Auburn University. He pursued a career as a research engineer with ARO, Inc., then as a senior research physical scientist with the Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory. He went on to become a senior engineer at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, being elevated to branch chief, and later division chief.

Prior to serving as President of F.I.T., Dr. McCay served as Provost and Chief Academic Officer at the Florida Institute of Technology and became Florida Tech's Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer (COO) in January 2011. Dr. McCay was previously at The University of Tennessee Space Institute, where he served as Alumni Distinguished Service Professor of Engineering Science and Program Chair of Engineering Science and Mechanics, and was chosen in a national search in 1993 as the chief executive officer for the campus.

He and his wife, Dr. Mary Helen McCay, also an accomplished inventor and engineer, hold 15 joint U.S. patents in the area of metallurgical engineering. Together they have authored approximately 200 technical publications and, in 1998, achieved the national honor from the U.S. Department of Energy's American Museum of Science and Energy for their technological achievements.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Dwayne McCay, as well as Dr. Mary Helen McCay and the dedicated faculty at

F.I.T., for their contributions to science and engineering, and for their commitment to inspiring young minds and future scientists of our nation.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF BAY  
BEACH AMUSEMENT PARK

**HON. MIKE GALLAGHER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 125th Anniversary of Bay Beach Amusement Park. Bay Beach is an amusement park owned and operated by the City of Green Bay. Bay Beach is the ninth oldest amusement park in the United States. It offers affordable entertainment to visitors across the state of Wisconsin and plays a big role in the city's tourism industry.

Bay Beach was initially established by Mitchell Nejedly. Mr. Nejedly purchased the land and began developing the land for a private beach resort. In 1920, the park's owners donated the entire park and its building to the City of Green Bay with the intent that the land was used for park, playground, and entertainment purposes.

The City of Green Bay expanded and developed Bay Beach in a family-focused destination with an emphasis on affordability for all. Today, it offers 22 distinct attractions, including the Zippin Pippin roller coaster.

On June 10, 2017, Bay Beach will celebrate its 125th Birthday. This park is an asset to the community with a unique history and role in the city for five generations.

RECOGNIZING NOLAN  
LAUFENBERG

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nolan Laufenberg, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional District. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Nolan is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Nolan and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Nolan.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Nolan Laufenberg as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

ALEYNA RENEAU

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aleyna Reneau for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Aleyna Reneau is a student at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aleyna Reneau is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aleyna Reneau for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 7th and June 8th, 2017, I missed the following votes due to a medical procedure. Had I been present, I would have voted:

On Roll Call Number 292, To Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I would have voted No.

On Roll Call Number 293, On Agreeing to the Michelle Lujan Grisham Amendment to H.R. 2213, I would have voted Aye.

On Roll Call Number 294, On Final Passage of H.R. 2213, I would have voted No.

On Roll Call Number 295, On Agreeing to the Hensarling Amendment to H.R. 10, I would have voted No.

On Roll Call Number 296, On Agreeing to the Hollingsworth Amendment to H.R. 10, I would have voted No.

On Roll Call Number 297, On Agreeing to the Faso Amendment to H.R. 10, I would have voted No.

On Roll Call Number 298, On Agreeing to the Buck Amendment to H.R. 10, I would have voted No.

On Roll Call Number 299, On Final Passage of H.R. 10, I would have voted No.

ACKNOWLEDGING REPRESENTATIVE  
CHARLES SARGENT FOR  
HIS SERVICE

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, public service is not just a career path, it is a way of

life. Many aspire to this role but very few fulfill this profession devoutly. These diligent leaders seek and strive to empower their constituency. They understand the pulse and the needs of their community and give the people their voice. Today, I would like to acknowledge Representative Charles Sargent for his service to our community, state, and nation.

Service is not a foreign term to Representative Sargent. He faithfully served in the United States Navy. His time in the military and as a business leader created the foundation of his life's work as a strong conservative leader in the Tennessee State House. His leadership in business and the insurance industry served as an asset which made him an outstanding and excellent leader as the chairman of the House Finance, Ways and Means Committee. Representative Sargent is also generous with his time, energy, and resources. He dedicates himself to multiple charities throughout our state. True leadership is not as it appears but as it performs. His admirable service in making the tough decisions today will make a brighter future for millions of Tennesseans tomorrow. His insight will continue to impact our state and we look forward to his leadership in the future.

RECOGNIZING SHAINA SMIDT

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shaina Smidt, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Shaina is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Shaina served as the Captain of her school's Varsity Basketball team for most of her high school years, and also worked as a student basketball coach, demonstrating a real gift of leadership and heart for service. Additionally, Shaina received a variety of academic awards and was a member of her high school's chapter of the National Honor Society, showing her commitment to and passion for education.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Shaina and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Shaina.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Shaina Smidt as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.



ANAIIS RIVERA

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anais Rivera for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Anais Rivera is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Anais Rivera is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Anais Rivera for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

**NORTHEAST DISTRICT ELKS LODGES**
**HON. MIKE GALLAGHER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Northeast District Elks Lodges in Wisconsin's 8th Congressional district for their strong support of patriotism in their communities. In 1907, the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks designated Flag Day as June 14th. The Elks have paired their traditions and culture with that of our Country and made the American Flag a symbol of self-dedication to God, to Country, and to Fellowmen.

I would like to call attention to their dedication and passion to this nation and the flag that represents it. This year, members of Green Bay Elks Lodge 259 will be celebrating Flag Day for the 108th consecutive year. Members of Appleton Elks Lodge 337 are celebrating their chapter founding the oldest Flag Day parade since 1950.

Citizens from Oconto, Kaukauna, and Marinette are also given the chance to celebrate this important day. Oconto Elks Lodge 887, Kaukauna Elks Lodge 962, and Marinette Elks Lodge 1313 give Americans this opportunity.

Flag Day is a day honoring the symbolism the flag provides to all American citizens. It is my honor to report this type of patriotism displayed by constituents in northeastern Wisconsin.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SIERRA CLUB OF MICHIGAN FOR 50 YEARS OF SAFEGUARDING THE ENVIRONMENT

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sierra Club of Michigan on the organization's 50th Anniversary. The Sierra Club has played a pivotal role in helping protect Michigan's environmental heritage.

Originally founded in 1967 as an all-volunteer organization, the Sierra Club of Michigan is today comprised of 10 different branches that further its mission of grassroots activism in defense of the state's environment. Through its advocacy and efforts, the Sierra Club has secured important protections and environmental safeguards that protect some of Michigan's most well-known landmarks and natural spaces, including the Pictured Rocks and the Sleeping Bear Dunes. Additionally, the organization has been instrumental in spurring Congress to ban drilling for oil under the Great Lakes and promoting environmentally sound resource management of the state's forests and fisheries. The Sierra Club has also played a key role in passing legislation to mandate the use of renewable energy and establish strong energy efficiency standards for the State of Michigan. These policy solutions have had a positive impact on the public health of Michigan's residents and the environment.

Careful stewardship of the environment is critical to the future of Michigan, and the Sierra Club of Michigan's efforts over the past 50 years have helped institute safeguards that protect health and safety for future generations. As the home of the Great Lakes and a wide variety of wildlife, Michigan's environmental legacy is fundamental to its economy and the well-being of its citizens, and it is critical that we continue to protect this important part of our state's identity. Sierra Club of Michigan's actions have been key to raising awareness and driving action to prevent harm to public health and the state's nature resources, and it is my hope that the organization continues its great work in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Sierra Club of Michigan on the 50th Anniversary of its founding. The group and its members have helped safeguard Michigan's environment and wildlife for future generations.

---

**IN RECOGNITION OF TEAM MATHIAS**
**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my constituents, Roy and Chris Giordano, and Team Mathias, an extraordinary non-profit organization located in Loudoun County, Virginia, for their work to increase

awareness about pediatric cancer and also to support families whose loved ones are struggling with the disease. Team Mathias is named after Mathias Giordano, whose determination to make a difference in the lives of other pediatric cancer patients resulted in the establishment of the organization, even as he struggled with bone cancer himself. Thirteen year old Mathias Giordano was a radiant light in this world whose optimism and valor gave assurance to young patients and their families that they are not alone in fighting the tragic disease of pediatric cancer that yearly afflicts over 10,000 children and remains the leading cause of death from disease among children in our nation.

Team Mathias, led by Roy and Chris Giordano and in collaboration with enthusiastic and diligent volunteers, annually hosts the Team Mathias Golf Tournament, and the Annual Team Mathias 5k Trail and Family Run that is taking place this year at the Evergreen Sportsplex in Leesburg. The proceeds from these events are used to increase awareness of all childhood cancers, raise funds for research, and make a donation to Special Love, a local non-profit that provides cancer families a community of support, made up of patients and families. In fulfillment of his own wishes, Team Mathias sends wonderful care packages to pediatric patients and their siblings, just as Mathias had specified.

Since my time in the Virginia General Assembly, advocating for those with pediatric cancer and working to find cures have been priorities of mine, and I take great pride in the number of family and community based organizations in Virginia's 10th District, like Team Mathias, that go above and beyond to spread awareness for those suffering from these illnesses. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and thanking Roy and Chris Giordano and their team of volunteers, for the incredibly compassionate work of supporting families with loved ones who are fighting pediatric cancer. I also ask my colleagues that we remember Mathias, who faced his battle with cancer with fearless courage, grace, and dignity.

---

**AIDE (IDALY) SABINAS**
**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aide (Idaly) Sabinas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Idaly Sabinas is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Idaly Sabinas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Idaly Sabinas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge

Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### RECOGNIZING SPENCER ROHLWING

##### HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Spencer Rohlwing, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Spencer is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Spencer has demonstrated outstanding academic achievement, graduating Maxima Cum Laude and receiving a variety of awards during high school, including Highest Honors and the Gold Cross Award, both of which are given only to students who attain a GPA of 4.0 or higher. Additionally, Spencer was captain of both the Varsity Soccer team and the Varsity Track and Field team, showing his excellence in leadership and service.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Spencer and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Spencer.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Spencer Rohlwing as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

#### RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF SOUTHWEST AIRLINES' FIRST AFRICAN-AMERICAN CHIEF PILOT LOUIS "LOU" FREEMAN

##### HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Southwest Airlines' first African-American Chief Pilot Lou Freeman. On June 8, 2017, after 37 years of service, Captain Freeman announced his retirement. Captain Freeman will forever be remembered as the first African-American chief pilot for any airline.

Captain Freeman served our amazing country in the Air Force for six years, and will forever be the model of a modern Chief Pilot. His desire to be perfect was personified by his unwavering commitment to the skies and his passengers. His most famous trip might have been when he flew Rosa Parks' remains to her funeral, but the one that meant the most was his last which was full of family and friends.

Today, Captain Freeman is set to celebrate his 65th birthday, and he deserves to be hon-

ored for his dedication to our country. Since joining Southwest in 1980, Captain Freeman has been an example for so many Americans. In life, there are many successes and failures, but to strive for perfection and to do so every day is what separated Captain Freeman from his contemporaries.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Captain Freeman on such a groundbreaking as well as barrier breaking career. More so, I wish Captain Freeman and his wife the best during retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the retirement of one of America's first and finest, one of Dallas' own, is worthy of placing these sentiments in the permanent record of the United States Congress.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Nos. 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, and 299 I was absent due to personal illness. Had I been present, I would have voted yes. On roll call No. 293 I was also absent due to personal illness. Had I been present, I would have voted no.

#### RECOGNIZING SCOTT JOHNSON

##### HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scott Johnson, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Scott is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Scott has proven himself to be an outstanding athlete, earning a variety of awards for his many achievements, including the Navy Outstanding Titan Award as well as the Underclassmen Athlete of the Year Award. He also served as captain of his school's Cross Country and Track and Field teams. Additionally, Scott was elected Vice President and President of his class during his freshman and senior years of high school, respectively, demonstrating his commitment to leadership and passion for public service.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Scott and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Scott.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Scott Johnson as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

ANGELA SIERRA

##### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angela Sierra for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Angela Sierra is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angela Sierra is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angela Sierra for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### HONORING JIM VOLZ

##### HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Jim Volz, a public servant widely admired and respected, who retired on June 9, 2017, after 32 years of public service for the people of the State of Vermont.

Jim served as Chair of the Vermont Public Service Board, a challenging and demanding role, guiding Vermont through a period of dramatic change in the State's energy policy. His reputation as thorough and fair, considerate and wise, was essential to the progress Vermont made during challenging times.

As evidence of the high esteem Jim enjoys, he was first appointed by a Republican governor and then reappointed by a Democratic governor. Jim was seen by all as nonpartisan and scrupulously fair, with an incisive mind, even temperament, and gracious disposition.

Before being appointed Chair of the Public Service Board, Jim served 20 years at the Vermont Department of Public Service—sixteen of those as Director of Public Advocacy. That totals 32 consequential years in the regulatory arena.

Vermont's good fortune began in 1981 when Jim came to Vermont to clerk for Justice Franklin Billings on the Vermont Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the grateful State of Vermont, I say thank you to Jim Volz for his career of dedicated service to the people of Vermont.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE PARIS ACT

**HON. EARL BLUMENAUER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the president announced that he would withdraw from the non-binding Paris Agreement, undermining the credibility of the United States and displaying a complete disregard for the effects of climate change. This is unacceptable.

Climate change is real. We are already experiencing rising sea levels and harsher storms at an accelerated pace, and without action, they are only going to get worse. Poll after poll show that the majority of American people support staying in the Paris Agreement, and the scientific community has reached a clear consensus that climate change is largely caused by human activity. In the face of these facts, the president continues to undermine environmental protections and reject the science of climate change.

The American people should not be responsible for bailing out leaders who ignore science to gain political points, while subjecting the United States—and the rest of the world—to the catastrophic effects of climate change. That's why today I am introducing the Prohibiting Aid for Recipients Ignoring Science Act, or the PARIS Act, to ensure that any president has a stake in the catastrophic consequences of ignoring climate science.

The PARIS Act would prevent properties owned by the president's family from receiving federally subsidized flood insurance from the National Flood Insurance Program. The president should not be able to shift costs to taxpayers as he does business in flood-prone areas while withdrawing from efforts to mitigate the impacts of climate change.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to give the president a stake in this fight and to take serious action on addressing climate change. The fate of our children, our grandchildren, and the planet depends on it.

## RECOGNIZING GIANNI ORLANDO

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gianni Orlando, an Air Force Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Gianni is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Gianni has demonstrated excellent leadership and athleticism serving as captain of his school's lacrosse team, and helping lead both the football and lacrosse teams to victory in the Colorado State Championships. Additionally, he was inducted into his school's chapter of the National Honor Society and earned

summa cum laude as a junior, showing his dedication to and passion for education.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Gianni and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Gianni.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Gianni Orlando as an appointee to the Air Force Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

## HONORING THE TYLER JUNIOR COLLEGE APACHES, 2017 NJCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S TENNIS CHAMPIONS

**HON. LOUIE GOHMERT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with enormous pride that I recognize and congratulate the Tyler Junior College Apaches Women's Tennis Team on winning the 2017 NJCAA Division I Women's Tennis Championship.

This is the 18th national championship in the women's tennis program's outstanding history and the 55th national title for Tyler Junior College.

The TJC Apaches won their 2017 championship in a hard-fought victory against ASA Miami (FL), winning with 46 points to ASA Miami's 44, at the Reffkin Tennis Center in Tucson, Arizona. The Apache's victory capped off an undefeated 21-0 regular season.

Aside from winning the overall tournament, several team members excelled individually as well. Three TJC freshmen, Jasmine Asghar, Kalani Soli, and Yuna Ito each earned a singles title. Ms. Soli and Montana Moore also brought home a doubles championship, winning 6-2; 6-2 in straight sets.

Congratulations should also be extended to team members Mekeila Erspamer, Oceane Garibal, Elena Tenderso, and Michelle Walker for their significant roles in bringing the entire team to victory.

This recognition of their accomplishment is extended to all of the athletic staff including Head Coach John-Paul Connell, Assistant Coaches Kimm Ketelson and Brent Krivokapich. We must also extend accolades to TJC President Dr. L. Michael Metke, Assistant VP/Athletics and Student Life Dr. Tim Drain, Assistant Athletic Director Kelsi Weeks, Associate Athletic Director Chuck Smith, and Administrative Assistant Sherry Harwood.

The faculty, staff, and friends of Tyler Junior College and the entire community of Tyler have devoted countless hours to support and encourage these outstanding young athletes in the pursuit of their dreams.

It is my most esteemed honor to acknowledge everyone involved with this endeavor. May God continue to bless these students, their families and friends, and all those individuals who call Tyler, Texas their home.

Congratulations to the 2017 NJCAA Division I Women's Tennis Champions, the Tyler Junior College Apaches, as their championship legacy is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD that will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

## CELEBRATING BARRY COOPER ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

**HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2017*

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Barry Cooper, who has dedicated 41 years to federal service. His work in the Federal Aviation Administration has ensured safer, more efficient travel for all Americans; and he is worthy of every recognition he has received.

Barry is retiring as the Regional Administrator of the Great Lakes Region in Region and Property Operations in Des Plaines, Illinois. He began his career in federal service in 1976, working for 12 years as a civil engineer. Barry then became an Associate Program Manager in 1988 of Airway Facilities, now Technical Operations. He continued to move up in the FAA; and with each position he took on, the word "manager" was a recurrence in his title. This is indicative of Barry's incredible leadership skills, showing a clear trust from his peers to grant Barry greater responsibility.

Barry spearheaded the establishment of the Chicago Area Modernization Program Office in 2003. Nearly 15 years later, the office is still active. He created a team of people, each with diverse goals, and united them to build a coalition with the City of Chicago as operator of O'Hare International Airport. Through this office, Barry facilitated a process in which the City of Chicago, through a reimbursement process, paid salaries for the extra employees needed to meet a shortened deadline for the Environmental Impact Statement.

It has been a pleasure to work with Barry for the last 10 plus years. My office and I have worked closely with the FAA on many issues regarding O'Hare Airport, mainly as it relates to the O'Hare Modernization Program. Barry was our "go to" expert with any questions we had and he was always responsive and easy to reach. Even if he was travelling, he would call me or my staff back as soon as he landed. Over the years, my office has requested several meetings or briefings on different matters and it was very easy to set up a meeting with Barry or his staff.

Barry also had a way of taking complex technical matters and making them easy to understand. I recall attending the FAA workshops at William Howard Taft High School in 2015 regarding the 2015 Re-Evaluation of the O'Hare Modernization Environmental Impact Statement. Barry walked around the auditorium with me explaining the different poster boards displayed around the room. Barry's knowledge was so vast and he was always so kind, with that infectious smile on his face. I will miss working with him.

Please join me in recognizing all the contributions Barry Cooper has made over the last 41 years. I extend my best wishes to Barry as he enters this new stage in life and makes many more wonderful memories with his wife, children, and grandchildren.

CELEBRATING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF FORMER NHTSA ADMINISTRATOR AND CONSUMER ADVOCATE JOAN B. CLAYBROOK

### HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2017

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 80th birthday of an outstanding consumer advocate and dear friend, Joan B. Claybrook.

Joan has championed consumer safety both inside and outside of government. She started her public service as an analyst at the Social Security Administration. In 1966, Congress created the National Traffic Safety Bureau—now the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Joan joined the new agency early on, helping to set the foundation for auto safety policy in this country. She left NHTSA to work at U.S. Public Interest Research Group and Public Citizen before returning in 1977 to serve as NHTSA Administrator under President Jimmy Carter.

Joan's post-government career is equally distinguished. For 27 years, she served as President of Public Citizen, a leading advocacy organization for health, safety, accountability, and fairness. As ranking member of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over auto safety, I have worked with Joan many times over the years on issues from requiring rear backup cameras to stopping the sale of cars under recall. She testifies frequently before my subcommittee, and I always value her insight.

Even after she retired as President of Public Citizen, Joan remains a strong advocate for consumers. She continues to serve on the Public Citizen board and as Co-Chair of Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety. When a pressing auto safety issue arises, I know it is only a matter of time before I hear from Joan.

People owe their lives to Joan Claybrook's public service and advocacy. That is why her extraordinary work has been recognized by prominent institutions, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, Consumer Federation of America, and Georgetown Law Center. As Joan celebrates her 80th birthday, I want to celebrate her enormous contribution to consumer safety. Every American goes through the day a little safer because of Joan.

### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily

Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 13, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the Romanian anti-corruption process, focusing on successes and excesses.

SVC-212-210

9:45 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, and Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SD-226

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine paving the way for self-driving vehicles.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine S. 517, to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid vapor pressure limitations under such Act.

SD-406

Committee on Finance

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, and David Malpass, of New York, to be an Under Secretary, Andrew K. Maloney, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, and Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be General Counsel, all of the Department of the Treasury.

SD-215

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine ideology and terror, focusing on understanding the tools, tactics, and techniques of violent extremism.

SD-342

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense.

SD-192

11 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the Capitol Police.

SD-124

2 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine S. 440, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, S. 677, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, S. 685, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the States of Montana and North Dakota, S. 930, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, S. 1012, to provide for drought preparedness measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 1029, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to exempt certain small hydroelectric power projects that are applying for relicensing under the Federal Power Act from the licensing requirements of that Act, and S. 1030, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit to Congress a report on certain hydropower projects.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

SD-138

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation

To hold hearings to examine southeast Europe, focusing on strengthening democracy and countering malign foreign influence.

SD-419

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for veterans' programs and fiscal year 2019 advance appropriations requests.

SR-418

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine military caregivers, focusing on families serving for the long run.

SD-106

3 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine tax reform, focusing on removing barriers to small business growth.

SR-428A

JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine agricultural research, focusing on perspectives on

past and future successes for the 2018 Farm Bill.

SR-328A

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine agency approaches to reorganization, focusing on the Office of Management and Budget's memorandum on the Federal workforce.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine fostering economic growth, focusing on midsized, regional, and large institution perspective.

SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Forest Service.

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of David C. Nye, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho, Scott L. Palk, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Vishal J. Amin, of Michigan, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General, and Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Mark Andrew Green, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

SD-419

11 a.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 75, to provide for the reconsideration of claims for disability compensation for veterans who were the subjects of experiments by the Department of Defense during World War II that were conducted to assess the effects of mustard gas or lewisite on people, S. 111, to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process to determine whether individuals claiming certain service in the Philippines during World War II are eligible for certain benefits despite not being on the Missouri List, S. 410, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the transfer of unused Post-9/11 Educational Assistance benefits to additional dependents upon the death of the originally designated dependent, S. 473, the amend title 38, United States Code, to make qualification requirements for entitlement to Post-9/11 Education Assistance more equitable, to improve support of veterans receiving such educational assistance, S. 758, to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry's review and publication of illness and conditions relating to veterans stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and their family members, S. 798, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to apply to individuals pursuing programs of education while on active duty, to recipients of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, and to programs of education pursued on half-time basis or less, S. 844, to amend title 38, United States Code, to consider certain time spent by members of reserve components of the Armed Forces while receiving medical care from the Secretary of Defense as active duty for purposes of eligibility for Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, S. 882, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the entitlement to educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs for members of the Armed Forces awarded the Purple Heart, S. 1192, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for pro-rated charges to entitlement to educational assistance under Department of Veterans Affairs Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for cer-

tain licensure and certification tests and national tests, S. 1209, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, S. 1218, to promote Federal employment for veterans, S. 1277, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a high technology education pilot program, and an original bill to authorize a dependent to transfer Post-9/11 Educational Assistance in cases in which the dependent received entitlement from an individual who subsequently died.

SR-418

1:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

JUNE 20

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Interior.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine collaborative initiatives, focusing on restoring watersheds and large landscapes across boundaries through state and Federal partnerships.

SD-366

JUNE 22

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy.

SD-366

JUNE 27

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor.

SD-138

## SENATE—Tuesday, June 13, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, Sovereign of this planet, give us the wisdom to surrender to Your will.

Lord, guide our lawmakers to trust You with all of their challenges and opportunities, as they strive to please You in their thoughts, words, and actions. Provide them with the discernment they need to tackle the problems of these critical times. When they feel overwhelmed, sustain them as they give You their burdens. As they seek to be totally dependent on You for their guidance and strength, free them from the chains of anxiety and fear. May Your sovereign might abound in their lives.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

### SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Republican Senate took another step to advance key sanctions legislation to hold Iran accountable. The Iranians are pursuing a regional strategy intent on empowering Shia militias, Hezbollah, their Houthi proxies, and other groups. After years of the Obama administration's willingness to ignore Iran's malign activities and failure to address Iran's provocations, we finally have an administration that shares our desire to take a stronger approach to keep the American people safe.

This legislation will enhance our ability to hold Iran accountable, which is of great importance given Iran's continued testing of ballistic missiles, its harassment of U.S. vessels at sea, and its support of terrorism across the region.

At a time when we face many challenges both at home and abroad, we must do everything we can to enable our country to counter threats where they exist and protect the American people. That is why we will keep working to pass this Iran sanctions legislation and, with it, additional sanctions on Russia.

I again want to commend Senator CORKER and the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee and Senator CRAPO and the ranking member on the Banking Committee, who worked to craft this bipartisan agreement.

This is a signal. Russia's attempt to influence our elections last year was the result of 8 years of a failed foreign policy. The Obama administration's efforts to draw down our conventional capabilities and commitments made it clear to aggressive states such as China, Russia, and Iran that America would watch passively as they increased their respective spheres of influence. This bipartisan amendment should represent the first step in crafting a policy response to cyber attacks against our country.

Now, two things must follow from this small step. First, our Department of Defense and intelligence community must develop a warfighting doctrine and strategy that recognizes cyber attacks, active measures, and support of proxies as asymmetric, unconventional attacks on the United States. Our response needs to be tied to the escalatory ladder and an overwhelming response. No nation-state should be able to attack our sovereignty without suffering an unacceptable response. Sanctions represent only one facet of our foreign policy tools.

Second, Senators coming together to impose additional sanctions against Iran and Russia should work toward providing the Defense Department with the force structure and combat readiness necessary to restore deterrents against these aggressor states. Again, sanctions are only one foreign policy tool.

We must also restore both our foreign presence and our full-spectrum warfighting capability as well. Doing so will send a message to those nations that wish us harm, and it will reassure our allies.

### RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Last, Mr. President, as it concerns our allies, later today the junior Senator from Kentucky will move to discharge a resolution of disapproval against American

arms sales to Saudi Arabia. It is important to note that our Sunni Arab allies are engaged in two important struggles. The first is against ISIL and the extremist ideology it espouses and the attacks it pursues. The second is against Iran's efforts to expand its sphere of influence and revolution across the broader Middle East. In Yemen, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are fighting against the Iranian proxy Houthi forces. As we know, some have raised the issue of the Saudi conduct of that war, but blocking this arms sale will diminish Saudi capability to target with precision.

The complete arms sales package to Saudi Arabia includes munitions, professional military education, training, air and missile defense systems, and air force modernization. Part of the training provided to Saudi Arabia will be on subjects such as avoiding civilian casualties.

More important, as the counter-ISIL coalition continues to make gains in Mosul and Raqqa, Iranian-supported militias in Iraq are posturing to create a land bridge through Iraq and into Syria. This land bridge could ultimately extend to Lebanon and improve Iran's support for Hezbollah. So now is not the time to undermine one of our critical allies in the Arab world by disapproving part of an arms sales package that will improve Saudi capabilities.

### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, on another matter, the House of Representatives will vote later today on the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017, which would give the Department of Veterans Affairs more of the tools it needs to hold bad actors accountable. Last week, the Senate passed this bipartisan legislation on a voice vote, and once the House weighs in, the bill will go to the President's desk for his signature.

Throughout our country, VA facilities have been plagued by widespread dysfunction. Our veterans deserve the timely and effective care they were promised, and I am committed to continue working with colleagues in Congress and in the administration to make sure they get it. This sensible approach has been a top priority of this Congress, and I am proud that we came together to continue addressing the problems in our VA system.



Representing Kentucky veterans is one of the greatest privileges I have had as a Senator. Through their selfless service, America's veterans have earned our admiration and our gratitude. This legislation is just one example of how Congress and the administration are working to keep our commitments to our Nation's veterans.

I would like to thank Senator RUBIO and Chairman ISAKSON for their work on this measure on behalf of our Nation's veterans. I look forward to the House voting later today to send this bill to the President.

#### THE ECONOMY AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, on one final matter, after 8 years of sluggish economic growth under the Obama administration, I was pleased to see some positive numbers out of last month's jobs report. Now, following so many years of failed leftwing policies that held Americans back, a new administration and a pro-growth Congress have been working together to move our economy and job creation in a positive direction. We have already undertaken what has been described as the most ambitious regulatory roll-back since Reagan, and we are working hard in a number of other areas as well.

In fact, this month the administration is redoubling those efforts on the economy, kicking off with an emphasis on workforce development. These initiatives are a top priority for many States like mine, who are proud to have a Governor who has been a staunch advocate for expanding apprenticeship programs and preparing a workforce that can fill current employment gaps while also attracting new businesses and job opportunities to our State.

I have also been proud to play a role in supporting these efforts, and I have worked to secure Federal funds for workforce development programs in Kentucky. Specifically, I have been proud to help secure funding for training and employment services for laid-off coal miners in an effort to help them find new job opportunities.

Efforts like these are critical in preparing American workers for success in today's global economy, but we know there is more we can do to help. One way the Republican Senate is working to do that is through tax reform. It has been more than 30 years since we last passed comprehensive tax reform legislation, and since then, the international economy has only grown more competitive. That is why it is imperative that we do what we can to modernize our tax structure, as we also better prepare America's workforce for the many challenges and the global competition that face us in today's economy.

Over the past three decades, our tax system has grown increasingly con-

voluted and punitive, making it harder for individuals and businesses to succeed. In fact, according to the National Taxpayer Advocate's annual report to Congress, "if tax compliance were an industry, it would be one of the largest in the United States." It is not hard to see why, considering that our Internal Revenue Code is made up of about 4 million words, which, to give some context, is nearly seven times longer than Leo Tolstoy's notoriously lengthy "War and Peace."

It goes on to say that "a simpler, more transparent tax code will substantially reduce the estimated six billion hours and \$195 billion that taxpayers spend on income tax return preparation; reduce the disparity in tax liabilities between sophisticated or well advised taxpayers and other taxpayers; enable taxpayers to understand how their tax liabilities are computed and prepare their own returns; improve taxpayer morale and tax compliance . . . and enable the IRS to administer the tax system more effectively and better meet taxpayer needs."

In short, as that report observed, when it comes to our Tax Code, there is no doubt simpler is better.

So how do we get a simpler Tax Code? With tax reform. But that is just one of the numerous benefits that would come from a revised tax system.

For instance, instead of inadvertently incentivizing companies to go overseas, as our current Tax Code does, a revised system would encourage businesses to keep jobs right here in the United States. Instead of restricting businesses' ability to expand, create jobs, and increase wages, as our current Tax Code does, a revised system would open up more opportunities for workers. Instead of deterring the type of growth that boosts the economy and puts more people back to work, as our current Tax Code does, a revised system would actually promote American investment.

These are just the types of solutions middle-class families need right now, and they are the types of policies that the Republican Senate will continue to pursue as we work to reform our tax system. Fortunately, we now have an administration that is actually interested in making our Tax Code simpler for families and American businesses alike, without demanding \$1 trillion in tax hikes for more government spending.

Respective committees in the House and Senate have been working for some time to move our tax reform efforts forward, and the Speaker and I recently had a productive meeting with the President about this very issue. I appreciate the good work my colleagues are doing on this matter, especially the Finance Committee chairman, Senator HATCH, who has long been an advocate for simplifying our Tax Code. He has been working closely

with committee members and Chairman BRADY to advance the tax reform our economy simply demands.

This is not an easy process. There are difficult issues that must be navigated, particularly with respect to business reform, but I am confident we can arrive at solutions that will be good for American workers and the businesses that employ them. We have made progress already, and we will keep moving forward as Members offer their input for consideration.

I hope our friends across the aisle will come together in support of these bipartisan objectives as well, but either way, we have to keep working on this issue because we know the benefits tax reform can have for the American people who, after 8 long years of sluggish economic growth under the Obama administration, deserve a lot more.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### RUSSIA SANCTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night Senators reached a bipartisan agreement on a package of Russia sanctions for the Senate to vote on as an amendment to the pending Iran sanctions.

It was the result of several days of negotiations and hard work. The Republican leader and I spent a lot of time on this, and I thank him for that, as did Senators CRAPO, BROWN, CARDIN, CORKER, SHAHEEN, DURBIN, and MENENDEZ. I thank each of them for their efforts and their expertise in getting this done.

In particular, I thank Senator CARDIN, ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who is one of the most trusted voices in our caucus on this issue. He did an excellent job of forging a bipartisan consensus on this committee with little regard for the credit he would receive. I also want to thank Senator BROWN, our ranking member on Banking, who has been steadfast in making sure we would get a good, effective sanctions bill done. We wouldn't have done this also without Senators SHAHEEN, DURBIN, MENENDEZ, and their staffs. I thank all of them.

The final result of these negotiations is a good result for our country. By codifying the existing sanctions and requiring congressional review of any decision to weaken or lift them, we are ensuring that the United States continues to punish President Putin for his reckless and destabilizing actions. I believe it is particularly significant that a bipartisan coalition is seeking to reestablish Congress as a final arbiter of sanctions relief, no matter what the administration does, particularly,

considering that this administration has been too eager to put sanctions relief on the table. These additional sanctions will also send a powerful and bipartisan statement to Russia and any other country that might try to interfere in our elections that they will be punished, and Congress will stand firm in making sure they are punished, Democrats and Republicans.

Again, I thank my Republican and Democratic colleagues for putting party aside, for doing what is best for the country. I hope this agreement quickly passes both the House and Senate, and we hope the President will sign this legislation as well, even though it cedes the power to Congress.

#### SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am frankly disturbed by the new strategy on the hard right to discredit Special Counsel Mueller and sully his reputation. Their strategy is clear. They know or suspect that facts might not be good for the President so they are trying to vilify the man who is in charge of finding them, but they have chosen the wrong man. Anyone who engages in these baseless attacks about Mr. Mueller's character is only heaping dishonor upon themselves.

Mr. Mueller is known for his service to America and for his integrity. He is a straight arrow. He is a Republican. Only a few weeks ago, these same hard-right commentators and pundits were praising Mr. Mueller. They were lauding his qualities. Even Attorney General Jeff Sessions has unequivocally praised Mr. Mueller in the past for his service and credibility. Sessions said, Mueller's "integrity is undoubted . . . his experience and love of country is undoubted."

To these hard-right commentators who are attacking this honorable man who is trying to do a job for our country and see that the rule of law is obeyed, read what Attorney General Sessions has said.

Now, because Director Comey's testimony has made President Trump's actions less and less defensible, these hard-right commentators have turned tail. They have started an ad hominem, nasty assault on a career public servant and a very fine man.

A close associate of the President, Mr. Christopher Ruddy, has even insinuated that the President might fire Special Counsel Mueller. I can't think of a worse move for the President at this time. I would have him look back in history and see what happened to a President who tried to do the same thing.

I have one question. What are these people who are attacking Mueller afraid of? Are they afraid of what Mr. Mueller is going to find? Is the White House afraid of what Mr. Mueller is going to uncover?

It seems pretty obvious that if they were not worried, they would let Mueller proceed because they would be confident he would find nothing. I find no other legitimate reason why the critics would flip so quickly to attack a man of integrity unless they were worried about what he might find. Again, if the White House truly has nothing to hide, they ought to encourage Special Counsel Mueller to investigate. They should let him do his job.

When people say "where there is smoke, there is fire," they are pointing to actions like this, and it makes the American people distrustful of the White House and their allies.

I know these attacks probably don't bother Mr. Mueller. He has a very strong spine, and he will go after the facts regardless of the noise around him, but they are bothersome, they are wrong, and they are nasty.

One of the most important things in our democracy is a bedrock faith in the rule of law; that no person is above the rule of law. The President's allies are going to attack every single law enforcement agent involved in the Russia investigation. If the White House ever joins in those attacks, it will greatly erode the American people's faith in the rule of law and do significant damage to our democracy at a time when it seems somewhat more fragile than it has in the past. This is not a game. This is not fun.

This is a very serious investigation that is headed by one of the most trusted men in Washington. It is about foreign interference in our elections, something that eats at—that corrodes the very roots of our democracy, the very wellspring of our being, and pride as a nation. I would urge that these attacks on Mr. Mueller be ceased and that my friends on the other side join me in defending his reputation. They have gone a little too far.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally on healthcare, there are only 11 calendar days of Senate business left before the July 4th recess, and yet Republicans are looking to vote on a final healthcare bill before the deadline, and not a soul outside the Republican caucus has seen the bill. I am not sure that every Member of the Republican caucus inside has seen it.

To everyone in America, this should be a red alert. This should be a red alert for doctors, hospital administrators, and patient groups, groups that represent older Americans, groups that fight for children's healthcare, groups that fight for better treatment for substance abuse and mental health. This should be a red alert for working families across this country whose lives depend on affordable healthcare and yet have no earthly idea what their representatives in Congress might pass in just 2 short weeks.

They might never know. The Republicans have not scheduled a single committee hearing—not one—not a single committee hearing on a bill that would reorganize one-sixth of the American economy, touch the lives of millions of Americans—a life-and-death issue for some—not a single committee hearing or public debate on a bill that would potentially change drastically the way Medicaid is funded, the way women are treated in our healthcare system, the way we treat older Americans and those with preexisting conditions.

Why on Earth haven't we had a single committee hearing on a bill of this magnitude? Why on Earth is this bill being hidden from public view?

There is only one reason. The Republican majority is afraid of the American people learning what is in their healthcare bill. They don't want the American people to know how much they cut and destroy Medicaid or how fat of a tax break they give to the wealthiest few because they know the backlash would be severe. In short, by their actions, it seems our Republican colleagues are ashamed of this bill, and they know their chances of passing the Republican healthcare bill would plummet if they release a bill that looks anything like the House healthcare bill, which only a tiny sliver of Americans support—17 percent in the last poll. The majority of Republicans and the majority of Trump voters are opposed to TrumpCare.

So our Republican colleagues have made a calculation, which is ultimately self-defeating, to keep their healthcare bill hidden from view under lock and key until the last possible moment. Maybe this is the only strategy to pass a bill as unpopular as this bill is going to be. Maybe it will shield their bill from criticism in the short term, but make no mistake, there will be a reckoning if this bill is passed.

Passing a bill of this scale, with so many consequences for the American people, without telling them what is in it, without telling them how they would fare, the political retribution will be swift. It will be a catastrophe for the Republican Party. I am afraid, worse, this bill will be a catastrophe for the American people.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Kentucky or his designee will be recognized.

The Senator from Kentucky.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—  
S.J. RES. 42

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee from further consideration of S.J. Res. 42, relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion to discharge.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, today is an extraordinary day. Today is an auspicious day, for we will be discussing issues of war and peace.

Believe it or not, we rarely discuss such important issues. We have been at war for 15 years. There have been a handful of debates—most of them indirect, most of them forced only under duress, and most of them would have been avoided if the leadership of both parties could avoid them, but today they cannot avoid this debate because this is what is called a privileged motion.

Today we will discuss the involvement of the United States in the Middle East, and we will also discuss whether we should engage in a new war in Yemen. Today we will discuss an arms sale to Saudi Arabia that threatens the lives of millions of Yemenis, but we will discuss something even more important than an arms sale, we will discuss whether we should be actively involved. Should the United States be actively involved with refueling the Saudi planes, with picking targets, with having advisers on the ground? Should we be at war in Yemen?

If you remember your Constitution, it says no President has that authority—only to repel imminent attack—but no President alone has the unilateral authority to take us to war. Yet here we are on the verge of war.

What will war mean for Yemen? Seventeen million folks in Yemen live on the brink of starvation. I think to myself, is there ever anything important that can happen in Washington? Is there anything I can do to save some of the millions of children who are dying in Yemen? This is it. This is this debate today.

It isn't about an arms sale, it is about children like Ali, who died. Why are they dying? Because the Soviets have blockaded the ports. Ninety percent of Yemen's food comes in from the ocean and they can get no food and they are starving and dying of cholera because of war. We think of famine being related to the weather. Sometimes it is, but more often than not famine is related to man, is manmade, and the most common cause is war.

How bad is it in Yemen? Seventeen million people live on the edge of star-

vation. Some, like Ali, have already died. What are people saying about it? They say that the humanitarian crisis in Yemen may be worse than Syria.

Let me repeat that because nobody in America is listening to this. Everybody is paying attention to some silly show trials and silly stuff going on in committees. Nobody is talking about this at all. They say it is worse than Syria. Millions of people have fled Syria. Hundreds of thousands have died, and people are now predicting Yemen may be worse.

One refugee group said this: The impending famine in Yemen may reach Biblical proportions. Think about that. It is astounding what is going on there, and it is being done without your permission but with your weapons.

Today I will force a vote with the help of Senator MURPHY, who has been a prime mover in this, to tell you the truth, and has done a great job in bringing people together, but we will force this vote for these children in Yemen because we have a chance today to stop the carnage. We have a chance to tell Saudi Arabia we have had enough.

The question is, Should we give money or arms to Saudi Arabia at all? What has Saudi Arabia done over the last 30 years? They have been the No. 1 exporter of jihadist philosophy, the No. 1 exporter of let's hate America, let's hate the Judeo-Christian ethic, let's hate the Judeo-Christian tradition. It is coming from Saudi Arabia. They teach it in the schools in our country. They teach it in the schools in Indonesia. They corrupt the religion of Islam throughout the world, and we are going to give them weapons? I think it is a huge, huge mistake.

If you say: Well, I doubt that. There is no way they are that bad. Don't they share intelligence with us? Don't they help us in the war on terror?

Yes, every time they help us, they hurt us twofold worse. I will give you an example directly from Hillary Clinton. When she is writing honestly and not talking to the public, she sends an email to John Podesta. This is one that was leaked through WikiLeaks. Writing to John Podesta, Hillary Clinton said: We must put pressure on Saudi Arabia and Qatar because they are supplying logistical and financial support to ISIL.

ISIS is the group we are fighting in the Middle East again, and Saudi Arabia was supplying them. This is according to Hillary Clinton, not indirectly but directly.

Who in their right mind would give money, arms, or share our technology with a country that has been supporting ISIS? Who would do that? Who would think that is a good idea? Yet they will come here and say that it is about Iran, and we have to combat Iran everywhere.

Guess what. This may make the situation with Iran worse. What do you

think Iran thinks when Saudi Arabia gets weapons? They think to themselves, well, if the Saudis are getting more, we need more.

What do you think Israel thinks? If the Saudis get more, we need more.

Have you ever heard of an arms race? That is what this is. We are fueling an arms race in the Middle East. Every side wants more. You say: Well, we have to do this. We have to combat Iran.

Do you know how much the Gulf sheikhdoms, Saudi Arabia, and all their allies—the ones who are bombing the hell out of Yemen—do you know how their military spending compares to that of Iran? It is 8 to 1. All of the money is in the Gulf h. All of the power, all of the weapons are in the Gulf sheikhdoms. They have more weapons and spend more on weapons—8 to 1—than Iran.

We are going to vote on Iran sanctions this week, and they say that they don't want ballistic missiles Iran. Well, I don't either. The best way to do that is to put pressure on Saudi Arabia.

How would you put pressure on Saudi Arabia? Maybe we wouldn't sell them arms. Maybe we would withhold the sale of arms until they come to the table and we get a ballistic agreement with Iran. It is a naive and foolish notion to think that Iran is going to give up on their ballistic weapons. They are never giving up on their ballistic weapons unless Saudi Arabia did the same thing.

People don't talk about this, but Saudi Arabia has ballistic missiles. They have Chinese missiles. They are called the Dongfeng-21 N-3. They have dozens of these. Do you know where they are pointed? Tehran and Tel Aviv.

Saudi Arabia is no friend of Israel. Do they cooperate with Israel some? Yes, but their missiles are pointed at Tel Aviv, Israel. Saudi Arabia's other missiles are pointed at Tehran. Are these missiles nuclear capable? Yes. They are not thought to be nuclear tipped, meaning they haven't been armed with nuclear missiles, but everyone who is in the arms community acknowledges that these missiles could carry a nuclear payload if they were altered. They have the ability to do it.

Should we send arms to Saudi Arabia? Here is another quote from Bob Graham, and this is a paraphrase. He says that there is an abundance of evidence that the Saudis were complicit in 9/11.

Have we forgotten that 15 out of the 19 hijackers were from Saudi Arabia? Have we forgotten the missing 28 pages that they kept from the American public for over a decade? When you read those missing 28 pages, which have now been released, they tend to implicate Saudi Arabia. They tend to indicate that the attackers, particularly in San Diego, were befriended by a government agent for Saudi Arabia.

There is an abundance of information that implicates Saudi Arabia in 9/11. In fact, less than a year ago, this very Congress voted unanimously or virtually unanimously to let American citizens—the victims of 9/11, their families—sue Saudi Arabia. This is an extraordinary thing. We almost never let people sue governments, particularly foreign governments, but we voted nearly unanimously. Why? Because people still have sympathy for the 9/11 victims and their families and because people obviously believe there is some information that may implicate Saudi Arabia.

You say: Oh, no, they have changed. Well, how much could they have changed? It was only a year or two ago Hillary Clinton was writing that email saying that the Saudis are giving financial and logistical support to ISIL. Who in their right mind would sell arms to Saudi Arabia under those circumstances?

If it doesn't persuade you that the Saudis are supporting ISIL and terrorism and may have been part of 9/11, perhaps we should look not only at the humanitarian disaster in Yemen—what they are doing to the public and that their goal basically is famine, to bring them to submission—but perhaps we should also look at Saudi Arabia as a country. Perhaps we should look at the human rights record of Saudi Arabia.

I will give you a couple of instances of what it is like to live in Saudi Arabia. There was a young girl who was 19 years old. They haven't named her because her story is so traumatic. She was 19 years old. They call her the Girl of Qatif. She was 19 years old, and she was raped by 7 men.

The men were punished, a couple of years in prison. You know what happened? They arrested the victim because, you see, in Saudi Arabia it is your fault if you are raped. In Saudi Arabia, rape victims are arrested, put in prison, and publicly whipped. She was given 6 months in prison and 200 lashes. That was her sentence.

Ultimately, it did not come to the fore. Do you know why? Partly because the United States stood up and said it was wrong and partly because, perhaps behind the scenes, we said: Maybe we are not going to sell you weapons if you behave like a bunch of barbarians.

I will tell you another story about Ali al Nimr, a Shiite. The Middle East is somewhat divided between Sunni and Shia. He is a Shiite. They are about 10 percent of the public in Saudi Arabia. They are the minority. They are treated like dirt. His uncle was a sheikh. And by all accounts, he was one who called for peaceful elections, who wasn't an advocate of violence. He never was known or seen to have a weapon but was executed by the Saudis for leading protests. He was executed for standing up in front of people and saying: We should have elections. We

should not have this authoritarian government that lords it over us and does not allow us even to practice our religion in public.

Ali's uncle was beheaded. Ali was 17 at the time. It was the beginning of the Arab Spring, and Ali got excited and motivated. If you see the pictures of him, it is heartbreaking. You see pictures of him in western clothing. He liked poetry. He liked music. He was, by all means, the kind of person that we wish would come to leadership in Saudi Arabia.

At 17, he went to a rally and he chose to be part of the Arab Spring to say: We don't want authoritarianism. We don't want despots. We don't want Kings and all of their lording over us. We want elections.

For that, he was arrested and put on death row. Death row in Saudi Arabia, being Saudi Arabia, includes beheading and crucifixion. That will be his sentence—beheading and crucifixion.

This is the regime that you are being asked to send weapons to. People say: Oh, they are buying them.

The technology is ours. It is American technology that was developed for the defense of this country, and the companies would never have the technology had we not paid them to have it. The American taxpayer has a right to that technology, and while for almost every other good in the marketplace the government has no right to tell you how who to sell it to, arms are different because they are all developed by the U.S. taxpayer.

I do believe there should be rules about who gets our arms. I don't think we should sell them to Saudi Arabia if they might wind up in the hands of ISIS. I don't think we should sell them to Saudi Arabia if they punish people for protests, if they punish people for speaking out by beheading them and crucifying them.

I am not for selling them a rifle, much less precision-guided missiles. Some will say: Oh if we give them more accurate missiles, they will kill civilians. That presumes they are not targeting civilians.

Do you think it was a mistake? Do you think they accidentally bombed a funeral procession? Do you think their intelligence was so bad they didn't know it was a funeral procession? They killed 125 people at a funeral. They wounded 500. We wonder about why we have so much terrorism. Yes, maybe some hate us inherently, but some of it is blowback to policy.

Do you think the people who died or the people who survived or the relatives of those who died in that funeral procession will ever forget it? They will remember it 100 years from now.

The problem we face is that terrorism goes on and on as long as we keep supporting despots who treat their people like crap, who sentence them to beheading and crucifixion, who

are starving their neighboring country, which is one of the poorest nations on the planet Earth.

We are not getting better. We are not getting any closer to peace by supporting the Saudis. It is a huge mistake. The Girl of Qatif, a rape victim, was sentenced to prison and 70 lashes. Ali al Nimr, still on death row, was sentenced to beheading and crucifixion. Raif Badawi, who is he? I don't know much about him, but he is an outspoken blogger. He is somebody who writes his opinion and may have opinions that may not be orthodox. For that, the Saudis arrested him, and he is in jail for 10 years, and he is sentenced to a thousand lashes.

I don't think you can survive a thousand lashes, so the Saudis—in their great humanity—are dividing his treatment into 10 doses. He has already had 100 publicly applied. He has 900 more to go.

Shouldn't we think a little bit about supplying arms to this country? If the human rights aspect of this is not enough, I think we should probably think about the region. There is a problem in the Middle East. There is conflict. Some of it goes very deep.

Those who live in the Middle East member the Battle of Karbala in 680 A.D., when a grandson of Muhammad and Khalifa came together and had a battle. They still remember, and they are still unhappy about a battle from 680 A.D.; they have long memories.

I am reminded of what one Afghan told a reporter or a soldier recently. He said: You have all the watches, but we have all the time. They live there and have for centuries and will be there when we are gone. They have to fix their own problems. We can occasionally say that we are going to help some people destroy an evil empire or an evil group like ISIS, yes, but the people fighting—the people on the ground—need to be the people who live there. It cannot be foreigners, and it cannot be people whom they consider to be pagans or it is never going to work. Yet we are foolish if we do not look at the repercussions of what it means to sell arms to Saudi Arabia.

How will Iran react?

I was in a committee hearing the other day, and one of the Senators said: We do not care how Iran reacts. We do not care what it thinks.

By golly, we ought to if we are going to put sanctions on them. Doesn't that mean we care enough that we are trying to modulate and change their behavior? The whole idea of sanctions means that we do care about what Iran thinks. It does not mean we agree with it, it does not mean we condone it, and it does not mean we say Iran is right. But, certainly, we do care about what it thinks. What do you think Iran thinks about supplying arms to Saudi Arabia? It thinks: We need more.

Saudi arms alone are the third biggest in the world now. It is the United

States, which is as big as the next 10 combined. Then, it is China. Then, it is Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia has these other gulf sheikhdoms, despots. They are all allies of ours. There are about five or six of them, and, altogether, they have eight times more weapons than Iran. So we are complaining—I think, justifiably so—because we worry about the mischief of Iran in the Middle East. We are complaining about that, and we want them to change their behavior.

What do you think is the prime reason they create weapons and are creating the ballistic missiles?

Some of it is because they fear our invasion, like in Iraq, but I think a great deal of why Iran develops weapons is its fear of Saudi Arabia. In fact, when you look back at Iraq and the whole weapons of mass destruction that never existed, one of the interesting stories is that—it may be a theory, but I think it has some evidence—Saddam Hussein pretended, valiantly, that he had weapons of mass destruction not to deter us but to deter Iran. Here is Saddam Hussein, sending all of these smoke signals up that he has weapons of mass destruction because he wants to keep Iran at bay.

We think everything is about us, and we never acknowledge that maybe some of it is about the regional politics. When we give weapons or sell weapons to Saudi Arabia, there will be, for every action, a reaction. There will be significantly more pressure for Iran to come forward and have more weapons.

What does it do to our ally Israel?

There have been at least a few reports that say Israel believes that, every time we give a dollar to Saudi Arabia, they need to respond with a dollar and a half. There was a quote from one of their government ministers on this, which reads that he worries about their qualitative edge.

I have a quote here from a colleague of mine—a friend of mine—who is a rabbi and a friend of the Constitution.

Rabbi Nate Segal writes:

While I understand the President's intentions, we must proceed with great caution due to the challenges and the history of the region. At this time, I don't see the benefits of the arms deal for the United States or Israel.

This is coming from someone who believes, with every fiber of his being, that Israel should be defended. He is worried that, by giving weapons to Saudi Arabia, it detracts from the qualitative edge that Israel currently has.

Imagine what would happen if the Government of Saudi Arabia were overthrown. They have billions and billions of dollars of weapons. Many of these weapons are the most sophisticated weapons we have. Is there a chance that they could be overthrown? I don't know. They behead their citizens and

crucify them. Do you think anybody who lives in Saudi Arabia might have some pent-up anger for the regime?

William Wilberforce once said of slavery: "In having heard all this, you can choose to look the other way, but you can never say that you didn't know."

I love that statement because so many people at the time of slavery looked away. They just said: It is something we do. It is part of our time. It is part of our age.

So many people knew the horror of slavery. So many people knew the horror of what was happening to a people, and they looked away.

I think, in having heard of the impending famine in Yemen, in having seen Ali, and in having heard of the impending famine, you can choose to look away. Many in this body will, today, choose to look away.

They will say: Do you know what? Saudi Arabia gives us some benefit sometime, and we hate Iran more. So let's just give some more weapons to Saudi Arabia.

They will be looking away from the human rights tragedy that is central to Saudi Arabia's whole being. They will be looking away from the fact that Saudi Arabia was supporting ISIS in the Syrian civil war. They will be looking away from the fact that the Saudi blockade is starving Yemeni children.

Do you know what? I choose not to look away. Today I stand up for the thousands of civilians who are being killed in Yemen. Today I stand up for the millions of voiceless children in Yemen who will be killed by the Saudi blockade. Today I stand up for saying that we, the United States, should no longer be fueling the arms race in the Middle East. It has come to no good. The wars and the rage and the anger are thousands of years old. We will never get to the bottom of it. We should defend ourselves at all costs. We should be very careful as to whom is admitted into the country, and we should not get involved in every civil war in every misbegotten part of the planet.

It is my hope and my prayer that enough Americans will wake up and say that we are tired of war, that we are tired of funding every war on the globe, and that we are tired of sacrificing our young in every civil war.

Today this will be a bipartisan vote. There will be a large contingent from the other side of the aisle and a small contingent from this side. This is important. This is a rare day in Senate history, when we actually have the chance to stop an evil, but we will stop this evil by sending a loud message to the President and a loud message to Saudi Arabia that we are not going to blindly support the arms race.

We are not going to be blind to your human rights transgressions, and we are not going to blindly give you weap-

ons in the face of beheading your citizens and crucifying them.

Today I take a stand for those who do not have a voice, and I hope the Senate will think long and hard and will vote against this arms sale to Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I support the position from the Senator from Kentucky. I believe that what he has said about the situation between the United States and Saudi Arabia is timely and needs to be heard. People across the United States and around the world should be aware of the fact that we are witnessing four famines across this world. One of them is in Yemen, and three others are on the continent of Africa. This is a famine that is created not by drought, not by national defense, but by human disaster—by a war that has been created and is one that has been pushed largely by the Saudis at the expense of the people—the innocent people—who live in the country of Yemen.

What the Senator from Kentucky is basically calling on all of us to do is to ask: What role is the United States playing in Saudi Arabia's aggressive activities? Should we be more vigilant in our knowing that what we are selling them is being used in ways that are inconsistent with the values of the United States of America? We know the record of the Saudi monarchy when it comes to human rights, and the Senator from Kentucky has spoken to that quite eloquently. We know what they have done to their own people, to the people who live in their country, and to those who seek to have the basic freedoms that we take for granted in America.

We also know that, when it comes to the Saudi activity of promoting their version—the most extreme version—of Islam, they have been guilty of promulgating Wahhabism, which has led to extreme forms of the Muslim faith in some places in the world. Those are realities.

We know the reality of 9/11. When we traced the origins of those who came and killed 3,000 innocent Americans, too many roads led back to Riyadh; too many roads led back to Saudi Arabia. So why can't we be more open and honest in our relationship with this country?

The Senator from Kentucky has told us this morning that the amendment that will be offered shortly by him and by Senator MURPHY is one that calls on the Senate to take an honest look at Saudi Arabia today and its relationship with the United States.

May I add one other element on a personal basis?

It is so rare on the floor of the Senate to see what we have just seen this morning—a proposal for an amendment to be debated and an amendment to be

voted on on the floor of the Senate. I can count on one hand how many times that has happened this year in the Senate. What used to be the most deliberative body in America—the great debating society and so forth—has turned into a place of rubberstamps and unanimous consents. I am glad—win or lose in our effort here on this amendment—that the Senator is bringing this important issue to the floor. I thank him for making it a bipartisan effort in the process.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, what I have come to the floor to speak to is another issue that really calls on the Senate and asks the basic question: Why are we here?

I think we know that we were elected to make America a better nation and to help families across this Nation realize the great opportunity and goodness of this Nation.

One of the issues that most people worry about the most in their daily lives is healthcare. They should. Many times, I have said on the floor that, if you have ever been in a position in your life as a father of a seriously sick child and have had no health insurance when that has happened, you will never forget that as long as you live. I know. I have been there. I went through a period of time with my wife, in raising our daughter, when she needed the best medical care in America, and we did not have any health insurance. It was frightening to think what would happen to our little girl because we did not have the protection of health insurance and the quality care that everybody wants for themselves and for the people they love.

At this moment in time, we are in a debate about the future of healthcare in America—the future of health insurance in America. I cannot think of a more serious topic. People say: Well, it is one-sixth of the American economy—our healthcare system. That is critically important. Even more so, this is such a personal matter for every individual.

The Affordable Care Act, which was passed 6 or 7 years ago, I was proud to vote for. We couldn't get any support from the other side of the aisle—not one single vote, not one Republican vote in support of it. Our goal, of course, with the Affordable Care Act was to reduce the number of Americans who were uninsured when it came to health insurance. We achieved a major part of our goal. The rate of uninsured in health insurance in America was cut in half by the Affordable Care Act. We expanded opportunities for health insurance through the Medicaid Program, as well as through private insurance exchanges, which were moved in the right direction.

We also said something else in that we wanted to build into the health insurance system of America protections

for families. We wanted to make sure that you could not be discriminated against in buying health insurance simply because someone in your family had been sick. Think of how many of us—one out of three, I might add—have preexisting conditions or of someone in our family who has a preexisting condition. It happens—a child surviving cancer, a child with diabetes, somebody in the family who has a heart condition. Those are the realities of life for families across America.

Before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the health insurance companies could say not only no to you but, really, no when it came to coverage, or they could charge you premiums that were way beyond what people could afford to pay. We eliminated that in the Affordable Care Act—eliminated it. You cannot discriminate against an American on the basis of his having a preexisting medical condition.

The insurance companies went wild in defining what a preexisting condition was that might raise your premiums or to deny you coverage. Having had acne in your adolescence was a preexisting condition. The fact that you were a woman who might give birth to a child was a preexisting condition. The list went on and on. We eliminated that and said that you cannot discriminate against Americans because of those things.

We have people on the other side who have said that we have to get rid of that protection. If we do, what will happen to all of these people?

On Saturday, I went to a march in Chicago, in Lincoln Park. It was the Children's Heart Foundation and the congenital heart defect alliance. Of course, it speaks for itself. The No. 1 birth defect among children in America is a heart defect, and 1 out of 100 babies born has a heart problem. These are kids with preexisting conditions. You should have seen the families show up in big, big numbers, supporting little kids—some of them just babies. They were proudly wearing T-shirts, standing up, and saying that we are going to fight for this little boy or little girl. They were trying to promote medical research to save their lives.

It is something that really touched me as I looked at 600 people on that hot Saturday afternoon, marching in Lincoln Park in Chicago. I said to them: When it gets down to the basics in life, the most important thing in your life is your baby. The next most important thing is your family, whom you have standing behind that baby. Then there is the doctor—that doctor whom you are counting on to do everything in his power or her power to make sure your baby survives. But you need to bring into this conversation another group—politicians, Senators, and Congressmen—because we are making decisions right here in Washington that will decide whether the families who marched

in Lincoln Park in Chicago on Saturday and families like them all across America will have access to affordable health insurance, real health insurance that will cover them. That is what the debate is about.

It was just a few weeks ago that the House of Representatives passed a measure to repeal the Affordable Care Act and to replace it. At the end of the day, not a single Democrat voted for the measure. It passed by two votes—two votes—in the House of Representatives.

When they came back and analyzed what the Republicans had voted for in the House of Representatives when it came to healthcare, here is what they found: Their proposal to eliminate the Affordable Care Act—the one that passed the House of Representatives several weeks ago—according to the Congressional Budget Office—a non-partisan, expert group—according to the CBO, 23 million Americans will lose their health insurance under the plan that passed the House of Representatives. In my State of Illinois, with 12.5 million people in our population, 1 million people would lose their health insurance.

I will just tell my colleagues, I don't see how any Member of Congress can stand before us and say: I have a great solution for healthcare in America. We are going to take health insurance away from 23 million people. But that is what the vote did. And their vote, sadly, eliminated the protection against discrimination because of preexisting conditions.

So what has been the reaction to the House repeal bill that was passed? I can tell my colleagues that in my State there is not a single group, not one medical advocacy group, who supports what the House of Representatives did.

I am from downstate Illinois, outside the city of Chicago. I have a congressional district down there in smalltown America, great people. If you went into that part of Illinois and said to them "I am going to vote for a measure that is going to put in jeopardy the future of your local hospital," the people would literally rise up to resist it.

The Illinois Hospital Association tells us that the Affordable Care Act repeal passed by the House of Representatives endangers hospital services all across our State but especially in small towns and in rural America. They estimate that we are going to lose 60,000 jobs at these hospitals in our State. I can tell you what those hospital jobs are in smalltown America, in rural America. They are the best jobs in the community. These are medical experts, doctors and nurses and supervisors and administrators who keep these hospitals operating, and they are paid well to do it, and they should be. Those are the jobs at risk of being eliminated by the vote in the House of Representatives.



One million people in our State could lose health insurance, and our hospitals are threatened with closure. That is why the Illinois Hospital Association opposes what the Republicans did in the House of Representatives, and that is why the Illinois State Medical Society—our doctors—and the Chicago Medical Society have come out against what happened in the House of Representatives. That is why the nurses have opposed what was passed in the House of Representatives as well. Not a single medical advocacy group supports what happened in the House of Representatives. Not one in my State. Can't find one of them.

So now we remember from basic civics that after it passes the House, it is our turn in the Senate. What are we going to do with healthcare reform? Well, I wish I could tell you. We are told we are going to vote on it. Maybe as soon as 2 weeks from now, we will come to the floor and vote on changing the healthcare system of the United States of America.

What is the proposal of the Republicans in the Senate when it comes to the future of our healthcare system in America? I don't know, and the reason I don't know is it is being done in secret. There have been no committee hearings, no opportunity to offer amendments. In fact, we haven't even seen the measure we are going to be asked to vote on in 2 weeks.

The Congressional Budget Office, which is supposed to analyze it, hasn't published any analysis of the Republican plan. Yet they are moving forward at a breakneck pace to have us vote on it, up or down, before we leave for the Fourth of July recess. It is a frightening prospect.

They will do it under what is known as reconciliation. I won't bore people with Senate procedure, but what it basically means is they can move it through with a simple majority vote in the U.S. Senate. Amendments will be considered on what they call a vote-arama basis. And if it sounds like some kind of a game, it is almost a game. You offer an amendment and you get perhaps 1 minute to explain your amendment on changing healthcare in America, and the other side gets 1 minute to explain their opposition, and off you go to a vote and then another one and another one. Your head is spinning, trying to figure out what in the world each of these amendments and each of these votes is going to mean. Those are the measures to be taken by the Senate when it comes to healthcare.

This is exactly the opposite of what happened when the Affordable Care Act was passed. We adopted 160 Republican amendments to the Affordable Care Act. None of them voted for final passage, but 160 amendments were offered by Republicans to change it, and they were adopted. It was a bipartisan process on the amendments.

How many amendments will we be able to offer to the Republican Senate proposal that is going to come before us in 2 weeks? The answer is that we don't know because we have never seen the Republican proposal. It has been done in secret. Thirteen Republican Senators were chosen by the majority leader to sit in private and come up with this bill. There was no open committee hearing, no open discussion. Some Republicans were invited in, and some were not. We don't know what the ultimate product will look like, but I can tell you this: Whatever the Republican Senators come up with, it is going to have a dramatic impact on each and every single American, every one of us in our communities back home.

I know this idea of repealing the Affordable Care Act in 2 weeks is a solemn political promise that many Republicans made, but they also made a promise to the people they represent to do what they can to help these families through their difficult times. That is why we need to make sure the product that is passed by the Republicans in the Senate is one that serves the needs of people across the United States of America.

If this product coming from the Republicans is like the House measure that takes away health insurance for 23 million Americans, then I can understand why the Republicans want to do this in secret. I can understand why they don't want us to see it until the very last minute and then vote on it and get out of town as fast as they can, because it is an embarrassment to think that the U.S. Senate and the House, for that matter, would vote to take away health insurance from 23 million Americans. That is a dereliction of duty, and from where I am sitting, it is just flat immoral to take away health insurance from that many people.

What if we end up with a product like the House of Representatives' that jeopardizes rural hospitals and hospitals in the inner cities, that closes down these community healthcare clinics, reduces access. Well, I will tell you what will happen. People without health insurance will still show up at the hospital sick, in the emergency room, and they will still be treated, but they won't be able to pay for it. Who will pay for their care? We will pay for their care. Everyone else with health insurance will pay more because people who are uninsured will receive free medical care. That is the reality. And, of course, if you don't have a regular doctor or a regular medical home, as they call it these days, what started off as a minor problem could turn into a major problem, even life-threatening. That is why the Affordable Care Act builds into it community healthcare clinics and opportunities to create a medical home.

When I met with the Chicago Medical Society at a convention they had in Chicago this last week, I was surprised by a few things. First, I was surprised to learn that out of the 5,000 physicians in the Chicago Medical Society, they received responses back from over 1,000 who said they thought the measure that passed the House of Representatives—the Republican repeal bill—was the worst news they had heard when it came to the future of healthcare. They preferred the Affordable Care Act. But they went on to say something that may surprise people. These doctors—over 1,000 of them responding to the survey—said they thought it was time for us to talk about very significant changes to our healthcare system in America. They are tired of fighting the private insurance companies. What they suggested is that we look at a plan like Medicare for all.

Right now, Medicare serves 50 million or 60 million Americans. People can't wait to turn 65 and finally qualify for Medicare, with no exclusions for preexisting conditions, and they know that Medicare is going to give them quality care, and it is not going to bankrupt them as individuals.

These doctors in the Chicago area have said it is now time for America to seriously look at Medicare for all, and I agree with them. I think it is time to look at it because the private health insurance system, even as we have tried to save it, salvage it, remake it through the Affordable Care Act, has real shortcomings.

I hope those on the other side who are considering changes in our healthcare system will actually listen to doctors, listen to hospital administrators, and listen to the families they represent. Why they are doing this in secrecy, why they are refusing to give us a chance for committee hearings and amendments I can't tell you, other than the obvious: Clearly, what they have come up with is something they don't believe the American people will accept, so they need to push it through without disclosure at the last minute and get out of town in the hopes that people won't blame them.

Well, when it comes to healthcare, people don't forget. I won't forget, and the people of Illinois won't forget the votes that were cast in the House of Representatives which threaten to take away health insurance from 1 million people in my State.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for his comments. Certainly we hear those same things in town meetings in Vermont.

#### RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, on another matter, this afternoon, Attorney General Sessions will return to the Senate for the

first time since his confirmation hearing. It has been more than 3 months since the press revealed that the Attorney General gave false testimony in response to questions from both myself and from Senator FRANKEN about his contact with Russian officials; yet the Attorney General has made no effort to come back before the Judiciary Committee to explain these actions—actions that some could construe as perjury.

There are now countless new and troubling questions swirling around the Attorney General. In fact, he was scheduled to appear before the Appropriations Committee this morning—a committee that would have to vote on his request for a budget—but, for the second time in as many months, he abruptly canceled. Neither I nor Senator FRANKEN sit on the Intelligence Committee, so we are not going to have the opportunity to follow up with the Attorney General in person. I am not going to be able to ask him why he hid his contacts with the Russian Ambassador, including a reported third meeting at the Mayflower Hotel, nor will I be able to ask about the timing of his recusal or his involvement with the Russia investigation both before his recusal and after. I will not be able to ask whether the President ever suggested he intervene in the Russia investigation in any way. And especially I will not be able to ask how the Attorney General can justify violating his recusal from the Russia investigation by working to fire its lead investigator.

The American people deserve answers to each of these questions—not only answers, they deserve truthful answers. That is why I shared my questions for Attorney General Sessions on these topics. But I also shared them with members of the Intelligence Committee.

So, at least, on the plus side, Attorney General Sessions will finally face some serious questions, but I am still concerned he is not going to be the most forthcoming witness. We saw last week that Trump administration officials have invented a brand new claim of privilege to insulate themselves from congressional oversight—and to protect themselves from giving answers that would be embarrassing or damaging to the President.

I asked the Congressional Research Service to provide me with a list of valid reasons to refuse to answer a question from a Senator. There is executive privilege, of course, but it has to be invoked by the President, and it is not absolute. Of course, there are also constitutional privileges, such as the Fifth Amendment right to not incriminate oneself. Even in my days as prosecutor, I strongly protected the rights of people, no matter what crime they were charged with, to take the Fifth Amendment if they wanted to, but there is no “I would rather not answer”

privilege. That is not in the Fifth Amendment. That is not an executive privilege. Unless it necessarily involves disclosing classified information, the answer “I would rather discuss this behind closed doors” is not a valid response either. That is really not a valid response. That is just trying to get out of answering questions.

The Attorney General’s spokesperson said yesterday that Attorney General Sessions “believes it is important for the American people to hear the truth directly from him and [he] looks forward to answering the committee’s questions.” Yet it was also reported yesterday he plans to invoke executive privilege in response to some inquiries. If true, the Attorney General is speaking out of both sides of his mouth.

I hope the Attorney General is not going to allow President Trump to follow the precedent of Richard Nixon and go down the path of invoking executive privilege to stop an inquiry into illegal or unethical conduct. These questions need to be answered. The American people deserve the truth. They deserve an Attorney General who is held accountable for his leadership of the Justice Department, not one who is embroiled in controversy and hides from the congressional committee of oversight jurisdiction of his Department.

We must not lose sight of the fact that our democracy was attacked. It was attacked by a country that has no respect for us. If we do not take this seriously, we will be attacked again. We must know exactly how that happened so we can protect our democratic institutions and protect our country. This goes way beyond the Republican or the Democratic parties. That includes knowing whether members of the Trump campaign enabled Russian interference.

Russia is not a friend. Just as they have tried to interfere with elections in some of the NATO countries in other parts of the world, we know they have tried to interfere with ours. The American people also deserve to know whether the President or his administration have attempted to interfere in the Russia investigation, knowing it was improper. Any such attempt would amount to obstruction of justice.

Attorney General Sessions needs to answer critical questions today. He needs to answer for his leadership of the Justice Department in both the Senate Appropriations and the Judiciary Committees. He can keep ducking the questions, but sooner or later, the Attorney General must answer for his actions.

We deserve to know whether he is acting in the public interest—which is what an Attorney General should do—or in Donald Trump’s personal interest. If he cannot decide between those interests, if he cannot distinguish between the public’s interests and Donald Trump’s interests, well, he is not fit to serve as Attorney General.

I pointed out, when Deputy Rosenstein came before the Appropriations Committee this morning, all the things the administration were cutting out of the budget—money for victims of crime, money to go after the opioid epidemic in this country, large cuts in the FBI. I could go on and on. However, there is one place they did put in money for more lawyers. They put in money for lawyers to work taking private property of people in Texas and Arizona and elsewhere to build this wall of the President’s. So we will take out money for victims of crime or for fighting the opioid epidemic, but we will sure learn how to get money to hire private lawyers to go after people’s private property along the Rio Grande to build a wall which will not really accomplish anything, other than to fulfill part of a campaign promise—a campaign promise to build a \$40 billion wall. The other part, of course, was to have Mexico pay for it. The check is in the mail—very, very, very slow mail.

I see—speaking of Attorneys General and people from Texas—my friend, the former attorney general of Texas, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas on the floor so I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Republican whip.

**MR. CORNYN.** Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Vermont for his kind words. We do agree, occasionally, about a few things. We are, in some ways I think, the odd couple when it comes to things like open government and freedom of information. We agree on those things, somebody, I would say, from the left end of the political spectrum and somebody like me from the right end of the political spectrum, which I find particularly gratifying, but there are a lot of other things we have different views on. That is not unusual or to be unexpected, but I enjoy working with him when we can find those areas of common ground to work on.

#### IRAN SANCTIONS BILL

**MR. PRESIDENT,** last night, the Senate voted to move forward with tough, new sanctions to hold Iran accountable for its continued support of terrorism. The unanimous vote we had is a strong message to the world that the United States will not tolerate Iran’s complicity on terror and a clear indicator of just how important this legislation is.

Just last month, Secretary of State Tillerson noted that “Iran remains a leading state sponsor of terror.” I would amend that slightly and say it is “the” leading state sponsor of terror.

The Secretary said he would be undertaking a review of the success or failure of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—what we know as the lopsided nuclear deal President Obama inked with Iran—because, unfortunately, as we have seen, the Obama administration’s deal, relative to Iran’s

nuclear aspirations, did zero—zero—to stop Iran's investment in terrorism around the world. As a matter of fact, it generated quite a bit of new cash which Iran could use to pay for acts of terrorism around the world. So the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal, all but cemented the status of the state sponsor of terrorism as a future nuclear power.

I remember being in the House Chamber when Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel talked about this paving the way to Iran achieving a nuclear weapon, albeit some 10 years hence, which may seem like a long time to us, but if you are the nation of Israel, 10 years is right around the corner if you are living in that neighborhood and going to be in its crosshairs.

Part of the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal, released billions of dollars to the Iranian regime and empowered our adversary—our avowed enemy—to engage in even more terrorist activities abroad. Instead of weakening Iran, it actually bolstered Tehran's hostile capabilities. On top of that, President Obama pushed aside our strongest ally in the region—I mentioned Israel—in order to lay a gift at the feet of one of greatest antagonists of the United States, with little or no benefit to our Nation. That is why it is no surprise Iran continues to violate international restrictions against ballistic missile testing and illicit arms transfers, flying in the face of any promises that were made in the agreement.

Last year, then-Director of National Intelligence James Clapper testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, confirming what we had all feared: "Iran's ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering [weapons of mass destruction], and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East."

Under President Obama's nuclear deal, their conventional inventory and capability are essentially free to grow, and grow they have.

So what kind of deal was the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal? It was a lopsided deal. More importantly, it was a dangerous deal as well.

Of course, Iran's reach goes far beyond their own border. They support the Assad regime in Syria and the Houthi rebellion in Yemen, two groups which have continually encouraged violence against Americans and even murder of their own citizens.

Last month, on his way to Saudi Arabia, Secretary of Defense James Mattis confirmed that Iranian-supplied missiles were being fired by the Houthis into Saudi Arabia. So not only is Iran breaking the nuclear deal but also U.N. Security Council resolutions as well.

In Syria, Iran continues to prop up and shield the Butcher of Damascus, Bashar al-Assad, even after he has brutally used chemical weapons against his own people. Some 400,000 Syrians,

at last count, have lost their lives in the Syrian civil war, supported by Iran, supported by Russia, propping up this butcher who is head of the regime.

So last night's show of bipartisan support is more than just a message of unity against terrorism; it is a sign the Senate will fight to stop Iran from tightening its grip on power. The legislation we will pass this week introduces new sanctions and embargoes on Iran.

First, it imposes new restrictions on persons who transact with and support Iran's ballistic missile programs, giving our President authority to impose sanctions on their weapons providers.

The legislation also makes clear that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps bears responsibility for destabilizing activities and terrorism in the region by extending new sanctions to them as well.

This bill also addresses Iran's human rights abuses by directing the Secretary of State to submit a list of people who are guilty of human rights violations so we can take further action against them.

Lastly, it reaffirms the arms embargo by allowing the President to block the property of any person or entity involved in the supply, sale, or transfer of prohibited arms and related materiel to and from Iran.

I also submitted yesterday an amendment to this Iranian sanctions legislation that targets Mahan Air, which is Iran's largest commercial airline. As a transporter of terrorists and weapons, Mahan Air is nothing more than a commercial coverup for terrorist activities, and, with routes in and out of Europe, it is essential for us to stop their continued expansion and to understand how their activities bear on the safety of American lives.

I am thankful for Chairman CORKER's leadership on the Iran and now Russia sanctions bill, and the expediency in which we are moving forward. While we can't, in this bill, undo all of the harm caused by the foreign policy of the Obama administration, we can work to correct course, and I am glad we are doing so in a bipartisan way. Last night's vote was a sign of unity, and I am looking forward to getting this legislation through the Senate and onto the President's desk.

Mr. President, I wish to take a moment and talk about the Saudi arms sale, which we will be voting on this afternoon at about 2:30 or in that timeframe. We know Saudi Arabia remains under threat from the violent ambitions of Iran, which I just got through speaking about, but that is not just a threat to us, it is a threat in the region, particularly to Sunni allies like Saudi Arabia.

A stronger Saudi Arabia will provide a powerful deterrent to Iranian aggression. This particular sale of weapons, announced by the President when he

was in Saudi Arabia a couple weeks ago, will help provide greater regional stability to pushing back the advancing tide of Iranian-backed terrorism. It will help against Iranian-backed Houthis' weak government control, which allows terrorism to flourish in the region.

Al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula has been described by U.S. officials as the most active and dangerous affiliate of al-Qaida today, with several thousands of adherents and fighters inside of Yemen supported by the Iranian regime. AQAP, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, has continued to take advantage of the political and security vacuum. This arms sale will also bolster the kingdom's ability to provide for its own security and continue contributing to counterterrorism operations across the region, thereby reducing the burden on the United States and our own military forces by equipping them to do their own security and not depend on us.

The sale will also help deter regional threats and enhance the kingdom's ability to protect its borders, contribute to coalition counterterrorism operations, and target bad actors more precisely.

Finally, it will improve the kingdom's defensive military capabilities. Since 2015, Saudi Arabia has intercepted more than 40 missiles fired at the kingdom by Iranian-backed Houthi militias. Nine of these missiles have struck Saudi territory itself.

I look forward to voting in the 2:30 timeframe this afternoon against the resolution of disapproval filed by our colleague. I think it is important for us to help our allies defend themselves, to fill a power vacuum left that would otherwise be filled by U.S. forces and military effort.

I think it sends a strong message to Iran and their affiliates in the Middle East that we will not stand quietly or stand silently in the face of the continued growth of their terrorist activities and support for terrorist activities around the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to express my support for S.J. Res. 42 and my opposition to the transfer of specific defense articles to the Government of Saudi Arabia. I have arrived at this decision after extensive research and careful deliberation. I would like to state very clearly for the record why I have come to this decision. I have decided to support S.J. Res. 42 and oppose the transfer of specific defense articles to Saudi

Arabia primarily because of the Saudi Government's refusal to take specific steps that I repeatedly requested to alleviate the horrible humanitarian suffering in Yemen.

Before I further explain that decision, I would like to explain what is not informing my decision. I am not reflexively opposed to arms sales in general or to Saudi Arabia specifically. On the contrary, after a series of questions are satisfactorily addressed, I believe arm sales to key partners and allies can enable them to more effectively defend our common interests and oppose common threats. After all, the United States cannot and should not employ U.S. military forces in every instance. When the United States and our partners confront common threats, we should encourage and empower regional allies and regional partners to play prominent roles wherever possible. When our partners are defending our common interests, we want them to be as well-equipped and well-trained and effective as possible.

I recognize that despite our differences, the Saudi Government is an important regional security partner for the United States of America. However, when we work through our allies and partners, we shouldn't set aside our national security interests, and we certainly shouldn't set aside our support for universal humanitarian principles. That principle certainly applies to the Saudis and to the situation in Yemen.

My decision today is based neither on an opposition to arms sales in general nor an opposition to arms sales to the Saudis in particular. Instead, my decision today is based primarily on the persistent and misguided refusal of the Saudi Government to take specific steps that I have requested to alleviate some of the humanitarian suffering in Yemen.

My decision should come as a surprise to no one. As I have said on the Senate floor before, the United Nations calls the situation in Yemen the largest humanitarian crisis in the world. According to the U.N.—which, incidentally, our intelligence resources rely on for much of their information—Yemen has almost 19 million people. Two-thirds of the population is in need of humanitarian or protection assistance, including approximately 10 million who require immediate assistance to save or sustain their lives—two-thirds of their population. If that is not a recipe for instability in a dangerous region of the world, I don't know what is. So 17 million people are food-insecure, while 7 million people don't know where their next meal is coming from, and they are at risk of famine.

In addition, according to the U.N. as of yesterday, the World Health Organization reports a cumulative total of over 124,000 suspected cases of cholera and over 900 associated deaths. Cholera

is impacting the most vulnerable. In fact, children under the age of 15 account for 28 percent of all deaths.

The situation is growing far worse. An NGO with personnel on the ground in Yemen tells my office that the large majority of these cholera cases have taken place since late April. Perhaps the most heartbreaking statistic is that a child under the age of 5 dies of preventable causes every 10 minutes in Yemen.

Throughout this process, rather than just mourning this terrible situation, I have tried to identify tangible steps that can save lives, that can lead to a political settlement in Yemen, and that can enhance both regional and national security interests of the United States. In the case of Yemen, it became clear quickly that there were specific steps the Saudis could take to help alleviate the horrible humanitarian situation in Yemen.

Based on that realization back in April—April 27, I led a nine-member, bipartisan letter to the incoming Saudi Ambassador, noting the important security partnership between the United States and the Government of Saudi Arabia and Saudi Arabia's role as a regional leader. I asked Riyadh to take some specific steps related to Yemen that would prevent thousands or even millions of additional people from dying there. Among several requests, I asked the Saudis to permit the delivery of U.S.-funded cranes to the Port of Hodeidah that would dramatically improve the ability to offload humanitarian supplies there. That is important because the Port of Hodeidah processes roughly 70 to 80 percent of all of the food and other critical imports that come into the country of Yemen. This is the port that supplies people who are in the most desperate need of food and medical attention.

I also asked Riyadh to address unnecessary additional delays that the Saudi-led coalition was causing for humanitarian and commercial supplies going into that port. Not receiving a satisfactory response, I subsequently raised these issues directly with the Saudi Foreign Minister when he met with me and other Senators here on Capitol Hill. Still not receiving a satisfactory answer, we have continued to raise these requests repeatedly with the Saudi Embassy. As recently as yesterday, the Saudis have refused to be responsive on the cranes. Further, in the face of clear evidence from the United Nations to the contrary, the Saudis have even denied a role in causing delays of humanitarian and commercial shipments into Yemen. So for almost 2 months, the Saudis have failed to take my requests seriously.

For those who are new to this issue, perhaps this discussion of cranes and delays at ports seems a bit wonkish—maybe in the weeds. Yet in a humanitarian situation as dire as Yemen—

with a child under 5 dying of preventable diseases every 10 minutes—every shipment of food or fuel, every day of delay can have life-and-death implications. The Saudis know this, yet they have been unresponsive to my requests.

There is no doubt that the Iranians and the Houthis are up to no good in Yemen. There is no doubt that Saudi Arabia has the right to defend its borders, and there is also no doubt that this situation in Yemen is complex. But it is a false choice to suggest that we have to choose between opposing Iran and helping the millions of suffering people in Yemen. I believe we have a moral responsibility and a national security imperative to do all we can to help the people in Yemen who are starving, who need medicine, who are dying.

The longer this war in Yemen continues, the more we will drive the Houthis into the arms of the Iranians. The more leverage the Iranians and the Russians will gain in Yemen, the more terrorist groups like al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula will thrive.

Perhaps the Saudi Government isn't concerned about my vote. Perhaps they think this issue will just blow over, that attention will wane, that Senators will lose interest. I recognize I am just one Senator with just one vote, but I would caution the Saudi Government against such a view. I am not going to be losing interest in this issue anytime soon.

To the Saudis I say this: When I make a request and your government is unresponsive—at least as far as I am concerned—there will be consequences for that decision. My vote demonstrates that fact.

To my colleagues, I respectfully say that America's support should never be unconditional. It is in our interests and it is consistent with the humanitarian values that we profess to demand that the Saudis take some of these steps to alleviate humanitarian suffering in Yemen. For this reason, I am going to vote in support of S.J. Res. 42 today, and I urge my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Murphy-Paul-Franken resolution of disapproval and to outline my concerns about the unfettered sale of arms to Saudi Arabia. The Saudi-led war in Yemen has created a humanitarian disaster in one of the region's poorest countries. Many thousands of civilians have been killed, many more made homeless, and millions are at risk of starvation, according to the United Nations refugee agency. The chaos in Yemen has also been strategically disastrous for the United States, providing fertile ground for extremist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS

and creating new opportunities for Iranian intervention.

In addition to being morally indefensible and strategically shortsighted, the Trump administration's unconditional support for the Saudi coalition, including billions of dollars in arms sales, risks dragging the United States into yet another war in the Middle East.

These are the reasons I strongly support the resolution of disapproval offered by my colleagues and their effort to block some of these arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

I also think it is long past time that we begin to take a very hard look at our relationship with Saudi Arabia. This is a country that is run by a hereditary monarchy in which women are treated as third-class citizens.

I would like to mention for a moment the case of Loujain Alhathloul, a Saudi Arabian human rights activist who was arrested at King Fahd International Airport on June 4. She has been an advocate for women's rights in Saudi Arabia.

In 2014, she was arrested for defying the country's ban—are you ready for this—on women drivers and imprisoned for 73 days.

In 2015, she ran as a candidate in a local council election—the third in the nation's modern history and the first in which women were allowed to both vote and run—even though her name was never added to the ballot.

More recently, Alhathloul criticized a Saudi Government-sponsored women's empowerment summit, which was attended by Ivanka Trump, for its lack of inclusiveness.

While she has now been released from jail—and I am very glad to hear that—this is no way to treat a peaceful dissident. The human rights organization Amnesty International reported that during her detention, Alhathloul was not allowed access to an attorney, nor was allowed to speak to her family.

Finally and perhaps more significantly, it is important that here on the floor of the Senate, we begin to discuss the decades-long effort by Saudi Arabia to export an ultra-reactionary form of Islam throughout the world.

A recent piece in the *Boston Globe* by Stephen Kinzer, a journalist who has covered the Middle East for many years—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Boston Globe*, June 11, 2017]

SAUDI ARABIA IS DESTABILIZING THE WORLD

(By Stephen Kinzer)

Just a few months ago, the governor of Indonesia's largest city, Jakarta, seemed headed for easy reelection despite the fact that he is a Christian in a mostly Muslim country. Suddenly everything went violently wrong. Using the pretext of an offhand re-

mark the governor made about the Koran, masses of enraged Muslims took to the streets to denounce him. In short order he lost the election, was arrested, charged with blasphemy, and sentenced to two years in prison.

This episode is especially alarming because Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country, has long been one of its most tolerant. Indonesian Islam, like most belief systems on that vast archipelago, is syncretic, gentle, and open-minded. The stunning fall of Jakarta's governor reflects the opposite: intolerance, sectarian hatred, and contempt for democracy. Fundamentalism is surging in Indonesia. This did not happen naturally.

Saudi Arabia has been working for decades to pull Indonesia away from moderate Islam and toward the austere Wahhabi form that is state religion in Saudi Arabia. The Saudis' campaign has been patient, multi-faceted, and lavishly financed. It mirrors others they have waged in Muslim countries across Asia and Africa.

Successive American presidents have assured us that Saudi Arabia is our friend and wishes us well. Yet we know that Osama bin Laden and most of his 9/11 hijackers were Saudis, and that, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton wrote in a diplomatic cable eight years ago, "Donors in Saudi Arabia constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide."

Recent events in Indonesia shine a light on a Saudi project that is even more pernicious than financing terrorists. Saudi Arabia has used its wealth, much of which comes from the United States, to turn entire nations into hotbeds of radical Islam. By refusing to protest or even officially acknowledge this far-reaching project, we finance our own assassins—and global terror.

The center of Saudi Arabia's campaign to convert Indonesians to Wahhabi Islam is a tuition-free university in Jakarta known by the acronym LIPIA. All instruction is in Arabic, given mainly by preachers from Saudi Arabia and nearby countries. Genders are kept apart; strict dress codes are enforced; and music, television, and "loud laughter" are forbidden. Students learn an ultra-conservative form of Islam that favors hand amputation for thieves, stoning for adulterers, and death for gays and blasphemers.

Many of the students come from the more than 100 boarding schools Saudi Arabia supports in Indonesia, or have attended one of the 150 mosques that Saudis have built there. The most promising are given scholarships to study in Saudi Arabia, from which they return fully prepared to wreak social, political, and religious havoc in their homeland. Some promote terror groups like Hamas in Indonesia and the Islamic Defenders Front, which did not exist before the Saudis arrived.

Eager to press his advantage, King Salman of Saudi Arabia made a nine-day trip to Indonesia in March, accompanied by an entourage of 1,500. The Saudis agreed to allow more than 200,000 Indonesians to make the hajj pilgrimage to Mecca each year—more than come from any other country—and sought permission to open new branches of their LIPIA university. Some Indonesians are pushing back against the Saudi assault on their traditional values, but it is difficult to deny permission for new religious schools when the state is not able to provide decent secular alternatives. In Indonesia, as in other countries where the Saudis are actively promoting Wahhabism—including

Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Bosnia—the weakness and corruption of central governments create pools of rootless unemployed who are easily seduced by the promises of free food and a place in God's army.

The surging fundamentalism that is transforming Indonesia teaches several lessons. First is one that we should already have learned, about the nature of the Saudi government. It is an absolute monarchy supported by one of the world's most reactionary religious sects. It gives clerics large sums to promote their anti-Western, anti-Christian, anti-Semitic brand of religious militancy abroad. In exchange, the clerics refrain from criticizing the Saudi monarchy or its thousands of high-living princes. Saudis with close ties to the ruling family give crucial support to groups like Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and ISIS. This fact should be at the front of our minds whenever we consider our policy toward the Middle East—including when we decide whether to side with the Saudis in their new dispute with neighboring Qatar.

Saudi Arabia's success in reshaping Indonesia shows the importance of the global battle over ideas. Many in Washington consider spending for cultural and other "soft power" projects to be wasteful. The Saudis feel differently. They pour money and resources into promoting their world view. We should do the same.

The third lesson that today's Indonesia teaches is about the vulnerability of democracy. In 1998 Indonesia's repressive military dictatorship gave way to a new system, based on free elections, that promised civil and political rights for all. Radical preachers who would previously have been imprisoned for whipping up religious hatred found themselves free spread their poison. Democracy enables them to forge giant mobs that demand death for apostates. Their political parties campaign in democratic elections for the right to come to power and crush democracy. This is a sobering reality for those who believe that one political system is best for all countries under all circumstances.

The Saudi campaign to radicalize global Islam also shows that earth-shaking events often happen slowly and quietly. The press, focused intently on reporting today's news, often misses deeper and more important stories. Historians of journalism sometimes point to the northward "great migration" of African-Americans after World War II as an epochal story that few journalists noticed because it was a slow process rather than one-day news event.

The same is true of Saudi Arabia's long campaign to pull the world's 1.8 billion Muslims back to the 7th century. We barely notice it, but every day, from Mumbai to Manchester, we feel its effects.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this article by Mr. Kinzer used the example—this is just one example—of Indonesia to demonstrate the incredibly negative impact Saudi financing has had in many places around the world.

I will quote from his article:

Saudi Arabia has been working for decades to pull Indonesia away from moderate Islam and toward the austere Wahhabi form that is state religion in Saudi Arabia. The Saudis' campaign has been patient, multi-faceted, and lavishly financed. It mirrors others they have waged in Muslim countries across Asia and Africa.

Successive American presidents have assured us that Saudi Arabia is our friend and wishes us well. Yet we know that Osama bin

Laden and most of his 9/11 hijackers were Saudis, and that, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton wrote in a diplomatic cable eight years ago, "Donors in Saudi Arabia constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide."

Recent events in Indonesia shine a light on a Saudi project that is even more pernicious than financing terrorists. Saudi Arabia has used its wealth, much of which comes from the United States, to turn entire nations into hotbeds of radical Islam. By refusing to protest or even officially acknowledge this far-reaching project, we finance our own assassins—and global terror.

That is the end of a quote from that excellent article from the *Boston Globe*.

We all understand that there are times when we must work with problematic governments in order to advance our security goals, but for far too long, we have been giving a pass to a government in Saudi Arabia that supports ideas and policies that are fundamentally at odds with American values and that have led to extremely negative consequences for American security.

I think the time has come for the Congress to take a very hard look at this relationship and assess whether it is actually serving the interests and values of the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I take the floor to strenuously argue against the proposition being pushed by Senators PAUL, MURPHY, and others to deny arms sales of about \$500 million to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The package they are trying to exclude from the \$110 billion arms deal is precision-guided munitions that would be used by the F-15s, a package of Joint Direct Attack Munitions, Paveway laser-guided bombs for Saudi Tornado and Typhoon aircraft. The bottom line is, the package we are talking about are precision weapons the Saudi Air Force and military could use in operations against Iran's proxy in Yemen and other threats that continue to plague us.

The flaws of the Saudi Government are real. They are known to me. My friends on the other side, particularly Senator PAUL, constantly put Saudi Arabia and Iran on the same footing. I think that is a very unwise analysis.

To suggest that Saudi Arabia is as bad as Iran is just missing the point, big time. The Iranian bureaucracy is the most destabilizing force in the Mideast. They have aggressively pursued

military action through proxies and have been directly involved in military actions in Syria. Iran's efforts to dominate Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and now Yemen have to be pushed back.

Here is what Secretary Mattis said about this proposal when I asked him the question: How would Iran view passage of this proposal limiting precision-guided weapons to the Saudis by Congress? He stated: "I believe Iran would be appreciative of us not selling these weapons to Saudi Arabia."

That is pretty direct. Iran would be really happy.

On September 21, 2016, 71 U.S. Senators supported a tank sale to Saudi Arabia. The vote was 71 to 27. In other words, 71 U.S. Senators rejected RAND PAUL's proposal to stop the sale of tanks. I would argue that a tank is not nearly as much of a precision weapon as the weapons we are talking about here to be given to the Saudi Air Force. If we are worried about collateral damage in Yemen, I understand the concern. Precision weapons would help that cause, not hurt it.

We have to understand whom we are dealing with in Yemen. We are dealing with Iran. Saudi Arabia has a border with Yemen. The Iranians are backing a force called the Houthis to bring down a pro-Western government in Yemen. From a Saudi perspective, everywhere you look you see Iran encroaching throughout the Mideast.

The bureaucracy in Iran is the biggest threat to the world order, and that is saying a lot, given the way the world is. I say that with confidence because what Iran is doing is trying to destabilize the Mideast in an unprecedented fashion. Our Arab allies are tired of it, and now is the time to stand with them—with their imperfections—against Iran and their hostilities.

This \$500 million chunk of the \$110 billion weapons sale is absolutely essential to the Saudi Air Force to get these weapons, not only to minimize casualties but to win the fight against the aggressive nature of Iran in Yemen and other places.

I don't know where we are going with Iran, but the President has said the current nuclear deal is absolutely a terrible deal. He is right. This deal locks in a march toward a nuclear weapon by the Iranians if they don't cheat. They don't have to cheat. In 10 or 15 years, the agreement allows them to enrich and reprocess without limitation, so this deal has to be replaced.

I hope we don't go to war with anyone, but if we go to war, I want allies that are capable to help us in the fight. We complain about our Arab allies not doing enough. When they want to do more, we say no to them. Guess what. No wonder people believe America is an unreliable partner. We say one thing and do another.

To my Democratic colleagues: You were OK with voting to help President

Obama increase the capability of the Saudi Army at a time when it was in our national security interest. What has changed between September 21 and today? What geopolitical situation has changed that all of a sudden Iran is no longer the threat they were in September of last year and Saudi Arabia is less reliable? Nothing, other than the election of Donald Trump. I have been a critic of Donald Trump—President Trump—when I thought it was necessary for the good of the country, but all I can say is, this wholesale defection by Democrats really is disturbing. It is undermining, I think, our national security interests when it comes to containing Iran. It is sending the worst possible signal we could be sending to our Arab allies at a time when we need them the most. I don't question people's motives; I question their judgment.

Here is my problem. I had no problem helping President Obama because I believe Saudi is the bulwark against Iranian expansion. Our allies in Saudi Arabia are imperfect, but they do share intelligence with us, they are in the fight, and we need to help them because it is in our interest to help them. You had absolutely no problem helping them when it was President Obama's idea. Everything Trump you seem to be against. That is absolutely disappointing, and quite frankly despicable.

To my Republican colleagues: RAND PAUL has been consistent. I respect his consistency. I just completely disagree with him. If you think containing Iran and keeping them from toppling Yemen, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon is not in our national interest, you are making a huge mistake. The last thing we want is the Iranian Ayatollah to march through the Mideast and start spreading his form of radical Shi'ism in the backyards of all of our Arab allies.

So I cannot urge this body more to reject this ill-conceived idea. It is \$500 million out of a \$110 billion package. It is the kind of weapons that will matter on the battlefield. It will lessen civilian casualties, which is a noble goal, and will also give capabilities to the Saudis to more effectively contain Iran that is marching through Yemen, through their proxies, the Houthis.

General Mattis—Secretary Mattis has it right. Iran would be appreciative of our not selling those weapons to Saudi Arabia.

We are going to sanction Iran this week, I hope, for what they have done outside of the nuclear agreement. Since the nuclear agreement was passed, they have humiliated our sailors. They captured them on the high seas and humiliated them. I don't remember Saudi Arabia doing that. They are test-firing missiles in the violation of a U.N. resolution that could destroy Israel and one day reach us and our allies throughout the Mideast and Europe. They are spreading their form of



radical Shi'ism all through the world, all through the Mideast. The money they received from the Iranian nuclear deal is not going to build roads, bridges, and hospitals, it is increasing the lethality of the IRG and other Iranian combatant units.

What we are trying to do and what President Trump is trying to do is give our allies the ability to contain the threat which is in our interest. Sanctioning Iran and denying Saudi Arabia the weapons they need to defend themselves and others against Iran is pretty inconsistent.

There is a military necessity for these weapons. It will change the equation on the battlefield. It is in our interest that Iran lose this effort to take over Yemen and destabilize the Mideast at large. You have to remember that these are the same people—the Iranians—who built lethal IEDs and injected them into Iraq—IEDs that killed many, many American soldiers. This is the same regime that took over our Embassy years ago, humiliated our sailors, and chants “death to America and Israel” on a regular basis. Yet here we are, sitting as a legislative body, contemplating our not helping an ally who is willing to fight the threat that is posed by Iran in the Mideast. All I can say is that on September 21, 2016, almost every Democrat saw this as a good move to help Saudi Arabia.

Now almost all of you are voting against an arms package that is more necessary today than it was in 2016. The only change is that we have a new President whom you hate.

I was not a big fan of President Obama's, but when I thought it was right, I stood with him. President Trump is right to increase the capability of the Saudi military to deal with the Iranian aggression. There is no bigger threat to the Middle East and America, I believe, than this Iranian regime in the hands of an ayatollah who is really a religious Nazi.

So I hope you will vote for what is best for America, which is to empower our allies to contain threats that we commonly enjoy. We enjoy the experience of being in the crosshairs of the Ayatollah. They want to destroy the royal family in Saudi Arabia. They want to destroy Israel, and they want to destroy us. So the idea that we are not going to help an ally that is willing to fight is just inconceivable, and the idea that we are going to vote no for an arms package because Trump is President—and all of you over there voted yes before—is disappointing.

To my Republican colleagues, if you really think Iran is a threat, do not vote with Senator PAUL because you are sending the wrong signal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, while my friend's remarks on the motives of

Democrats are fresh in people's minds, let me address this directly. There is a new President today, but there is a different policy, and that is what this resolution is about. Let me be very clear about what we are talking about today.

Senator GRAHAM would have you believe that we are about to vote on the entirety of the \$110 billion in arms sales that was proposed—that was unveiled—by President Trump during his visit to Saudi Arabia. That is not the case. We are voting today on \$500 million of that \$110 billion sale. You can still be friends with Saudi Arabia and sell it \$109.5 billion worth of arms rather than \$110 billion worth of arms. The specific set of arms that we are talking about—precision-guided munitions that are going to be used to perpetuate the Saudi bombing campaign in Yemen—was the specific set of weapons that the Obama administration refused to transfer to the Saudis at the end of 2016. We did not take a vote on this in 2016. We took a vote on a different arms sale.

It is not simply that there is a new President and that Democrats are objecting to the arms sale that President Trump is moving forward with. It is that we have a new policy. This specific set of munitions that President Trump is asking us to consent to is one that President Obama would not sell. The policy is different, not just the personnel. Let's talk about why the policy is different.

What is happening today in Yemen is a humanitarian catastrophe of epic proportions. There are four famines that exist in the world today. One of them is in Yemen, and only one of those four is caused, in part, by the United States. The United States supports the Saudi-led bombing campaign that has had the effect of causing a humanitarian nightmare to play out in that country such that 8 million people right now in Yemen are in starvation or are on the brink of starvation. Last week, we received word that 100,000 people in Yemen now have cholera. Cholera? All of this is directly a result of the civil war.

The reason that the Obama administration decided not to transfer the precision-guided munitions to the Saudis is that the Saudis were using the weapons we were giving them in order to deliberately target humanitarian infrastructure and civilian infrastructure inside Yemen. The Saudis have made it pretty clear that time is on their side, that they can wait out the Yemeni population and drive it to the negotiating table. They suggest that this humanitarian catastrophe, ultimately, accrues to their benefit because it eventually will push the Houthis into supporting a better deal than they would have otherwise for the Saudis.

Let me give you some direct evidence of how this bombing campaign is leading to the humanitarian crisis.

This cholera outbreak, which has been covered in the news, began, in part, because the Saudi airstrikes were targeting water treatment facilities inside Sanaa. This is independent reporting from relief agencies that operate on the ground inside Yemen that tell us that the Saudi bombing campaign that has targeted civilian infrastructure—in this case, water treatment facilities—has led to the cholera outbreak.

It continues. The bombing campaign that is leading to this catastrophe continues. The reason the Obama administration would not sell them this specific set of arms is that it did not have confidence that the arms would be used to hit purely military targets.

What we are asking for is to hold off on selling these precision-guided munitions until we get some clear promise—some clear assurance—from the Saudis that they are going to use these munitions only for military purposes and that they are going to start taking steps—real steps, tangible steps—to address the humanitarian crisis.

Senator YOUNG has been very articulate on the things that the Saudis are doing to stop—to halt—to slow the flow of relief supplies into Yemen today. There are some proactive things the Saudis could do, which they are not, that could save millions of lives inside Yemen today.

More broadly, I think this is an important moment for U.S. policy in the Middle East. The Saudis are our friends. They are an important, stabilizing presence in the Middle East. They have helped to broker a kind of detente between Sunni nations and Israel, our sacred ally. They cooperate with us on counterterrorism measures. They share intelligence with us. Clearly, we have an important economic relationship, but they are an imperfect partner.

This body should have a debate as to whether it is in the national security interests of the United States to get drawn more deeply into the set of proxy wars that is playing out in the region between the Sunnis and the Shia. That proxy battle plays out in Yemen; it plays out in Syria; and it plays out in other ways in places like Lebanon. Just because you have a friend does not mean that you have to back every single one of your friend's fights. If my friend asks me to hand him a rock to throw at the neighborhood kids, I am not going to do it, but if he wants me to help him stand up to the neighborhood bully, then maybe I will be there for him. Even with your friends you decide what fights you join them in and what fights you don't.

In Yemen, it is not just I who is making the argument that the civil war is accruing to the detriment of U.S. national security interests; it is a broad swath of foreign policy experts and Middle East experts in this city and across this country and across the

globe. Why? It is that this civil war is radicalizing the Yemeni people against the United States. They do not perceive this bombing campaign that is killing thousands of civilians as a Saudi bombing campaign. They perceive it as a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign.

Just get your intelligence briefing, and look at the difference in the amount of space that AQAP controls today versus what it controlled before the civil war began. AQAP, which is the arm of al-Qaida that has the most capability to hit the United States, has grown exponentially in terms of the territory it controls. ISIS has grown as well. These extremist groups take advantage of the civil war, and if our priority in the region is really about defeating these organizations, then this civil war is not helping in that effort. Civilians are dying; extremist groups are growing; and the Yemeni population is being radicalized against us.

To exacerbate matters, the Trump administration has walked away from the political process. Secretary Kerry was actively involved in trying to bring the Houthis and the Saudi-backed government together. He got close to an agreement, but it fell apart. This administration has not restarted that process. For those who want to throw more arms into this contest, I think it is hard to believe that, ultimately, it will lead to any cease-fire or any peaceful transition to a new government if the United States is totally absent from the negotiating table as we are today.

This is not about objecting to the entirety of the sale, and this is not about delivering a broader message to the Saudis. This is about saying that this specific conflict in Yemen is not going well and is hurting the United States. Until we get some real assurances from the Saudis that they are going to pay attention to the "no strike" list, until we get some commitments from the Saudis that they are going to let relief supplies flow into Yemen to address the famine and address the cholera outbreak, then let's press pause on this small slice of this arms sale.

I am proud to join with Senator PAUL and others, and I hope that my colleagues will see fit to support it when we vote in about an hour and a half.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before we recess for the caucus lunches, I wish to comment on the upcoming vote on a resolution of disapproval regarding a portion of President Trump's recent

arms sales to Saudi Arabia. I have announced that I am in favor of the resolution of disapproval for several reasons.

First, the human rights and humanitarian concerns have been well documented with respect to Yemen. Yemen's story in the Middle East is a tragic one. Yemen's previous President ruled the country for decades with an iron fist and fleeced the country of its resources for his personal gain. He also allowed terrorist groups to enjoy safe haven in Yemen in the days after 9/11.

Today, Yemen remains a country in dire straits. It is on the verge of a famine, and there have been over 100,000 cases of cholera.

To make matters worse, the current conflict in Yemen, which includes the Saudi military, has worsened the humanitarian situation. Selling the kingdom precision weapons in this deal could further exacerbate the crisis.

Second, and of equal concern to me, is an area that hasn't been talked about much in this debate; that is, that the Saudi Government continues to aid and abet terrorism via its support and funding of schools that spread extremist Wahhabi propaganda. Saudi Arabia's support for these Wahhabi madrassas goes back decades. It is responsible for much of the radicalization of Muslim youth in the Middle East and North Africa.

In the past several months, we have witnessed lone-wolf attacks in London and in Tehran and elsewhere around the globe. Though the nature of terrorism has changed, many of the sources are the same. The propagation of Wahhabism, an extreme ideology, continues to fuel radicalism and terrorism around the globe. So if we want to get serious about cracking down on terrorism, the United States should focus—one of the focuses should be—on countering the spread of Wahhabism.

The White House has not clearly articulated how the United States will put pressure on Saudi Arabia to end their support of Wahhabi schools, even as it claims that President Trump's recent visit to Riyadh was focused on curtailing terrorism. Furthermore, the administration has not sufficiently assured Congress that these weapons will not fall into the wrong hands.

Look at Pakistan. It has become a radical place—it wasn't 15 years ago—in good part because of Saudi funding—Saudi individuals who are a good part of the government, some who are friends with the government—of these madrassas, which taught radicalism to the Pakistani people.

Look at Indonesia, one of the largest countries in the world. It had usually practiced a form of Islam that was mild and tolerant. The Wahhabi schools are now flourishing in Indonesia, and it is becoming a radical place of danger to us.

We have to send a message to Saudi Arabia.

They do some good things. I support their putting pressure, for instance, on the Palestinian Authority to finally make peace with Israel. But they do a lot of bad things. It seems there has almost been a rotten deal between the Saudi monarchy and the Wahhabi clerics to work together. It has to end.

My vote for this resolution of disapproval hopefully can send a message to the Saudis that their behavior in regard to Wahhabism must change. It is hurting the world and eventually will hurt them.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STRANGE).

#### MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 42—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate remaining on the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 42, equally divided between Senator PAUL or his designee and the opponents of the motion.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the resolution before us.

It has obviously been tried before, and I think there is no doubt that if it were to pass, this could pose a very dangerous threat to our relationship with Saudi Arabia at a time when the Iranians have now achieved a peninsula all the way across from Tehran all the way to Baghdad, and there is no doubt that the Iranians have continued their aggressive behavior.

If we vote down this arms sale to Saudi Arabia, it would have a devastating effect on our standing in the Middle East and a long-term impact on our ability to counter what is clearly Iranian aggressive behavior. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to join with Senator MCCAIN very quickly.

At 71 to 27, on September 21 of last year, we voted to approve tank sales to Saudi Arabia because they need more weapons and equipment to counter the Iranian aggression in Yemen and other places.

Most of the people who are now going to vote against precision-guided weapons that will reduce civilian casualties voted for tank sales. This \$500 million carved out of this package gives Saudi

Arabia a qualitative edge on the battlefield against Iranian proxies who could care less about civilian casualties. It is the most upside-down thinking I have ever seen, and many of you over there actually approved this because it was worked on before President Trump became President. So it is really disheartening to see you support President Obama's tank sales but that you are not going to support President Trump's selling weapons, which gives us an advantage over Iran in Saudi Arabia and actually reduces civilian casualties.

Secretary Mattis said it the best: Iran would appreciate killing this deal and taking these weapons off the table. I urge everybody in here, if you are serious about standing up to Iran, stand with Saudi Arabia, as imperfect as they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the question is, Should we sell arms to Saudi Arabia—a country that many suspect was involved in 9/11; a country that many suspect gave weapons to ISIS, the people we are fighting in the Middle East; a country that imprisons the victims of rape because it is apparently or presumably the fault of the woman who is raped in Saudi Arabia?

One woman, the girl of Qatif, was given a sentence of 70 lashes and 6 months in jail. They increased her penalty to 200 lashes, and finally, only when we protested, was it reversed.

They sentenced a poet to 1,000 lashes. Sometimes you don't survive 1,000 lashes. So they gave him 100 at a time. He is going to be imprisoned for 10 years.

They are not the kind of persons we should be sending your weapons to. These weapons were funded and supported by the American taxpayer, and we should not be willy-nilly giving them to people who imprison their people for protesting.

Currently, a young man, 17 years old, named Ali al-Nimr is on death row. But it is not enough just to kill him for protesting for free speech and free press. They will behead him and crucify him.

This barbaric nation should not be getting our weapons. We should not sell them weapons.

Currently, there is a blockade of Yemen, and 17 million people risk starvation. We should not be supporting this effort.

There is probably no greater purveyor of hatred for Christianity and Judaism than Saudi Arabia. We should not be giving them weapons. They have madrassas across the world teaching hatred of us, preaching hatred of the West, hatred of Christianity, hatred of Judaism, and these people want to give them weapons. I don't get it. It makes no sense.

Some will argue that it is a jobs program. Well, isn't that swell. We are

going to give money to people who behead you and crucify you to create jobs. That should never be the way we make a decision about arms sales in our country.

A famous Republican and general, General Dwight Eisenhower, said he worried that someday we would make decisions not based on our defense but based on the military industrial complex.

I am embarrassed that people are out here talking about making us some money and making a buck, while 17 million people live on a starvation diet and are threatened with famine. I am embarrassed that people would bring up trying to feather the nest of corporations in order to sell these weapons. This should be made, pure and simple, on our national defense.

Saudi Arabia is not a reliable ally. Saudi Arabia should not get these weapons. For every supposed good thing they do, they do five things that are bad for America. They are the biggest purveyor of hatred of Christianity and Judaism.

I request a "no" vote, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I respect my friend from Kentucky. We work together on the Foreign Relations Committee. I could not disagree more on this issue, and I will give a brief outline.

The Houthis are an Iran-backed entity that overthrew a Western-backed government in Yemen. Last year on the floor, with a vote of 71 votes, this body voted to support the selling of tanks to Saudi Arabia.

Foreign policy partisanship generally stops at the shores. I know Senator PAUL has been very consistent on this, but I am afraid this vote is somewhat about some Members wanting to get a piece of President Trump's hide on an issue that is far more important than something like that. I am fearful that this is what is happening today on the floor.

A lot of people don't realize that Saudi Arabia already has the bombs. What we would be selling to them is the precision-guided weaponry systems that allow these bombs to be smart bombs and not dumb bombs.

Most people have been concerned about Saudi Arabia when they have been involved in pushing back the Houthis, who, by the way, are firing weapons into their country from the southern border. It would be no different than if Mexico were doing that to ours. I know that is not going to happen. But, obviously, we would be firing back. So what is happening here is that they bought the bombs from Italy, and what they want to buy from us is these precision systems that allow them to not kill civilians. It is to protect civilians.

Think about this. Here in the Senate we want to protect civilians in Saudi Arabia, and in our wisdom we are looking at blocking the sale of the very mechanisms that would allow that to happen—in some cases, I am afraid, just to make a point against the Trump administration.

Actually, their policies here have been very sound. The meeting they had in Saudi Arabia was very beneficial. Saudi Arabia has flaws, but they have been an ally. This would show us as stepping away from an ally in a way that is cutting our nose off to spite our face by not allowing them to have the precision mechanisms to keep them from killing civilians.

We have taken Senators down in the SCIF. There is absolutely no evidence that Saudi Arabia tried to kill civilians—none. As a matter of fact, there is evidence to the contrary. So, please, let's be rational. I know there are disagreements over some foreign policy issues. This should not be one of them. I urge defeat of this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Saudi Arabia bombed a funeral procession. There was no mistake here. There was no cloud cover. There was no growth or coppice of trees and they accidentally bombed a funeral procession. They bombed them and killed 125 civilians in a funeral. They wounded 500. This was no mistake. This was no error. This was them, pointedly dropping bombs on civilians.

They put protestors in jail. They have a 17-year-old—he is now 20—who has been in jail for 3 years. He will be beheaded and then crucified. We should not be giving these people weapons. They supported ISIS. They are on the wrong side of the war. They are the greatest purveyor of hatred for Christianity and Judaism. They do not deserve your weapons. They are going to give your weapons. They belong to the American people. They are going to give them to people who behead and crucify protesters.

You can't take a Bible into Saudi Arabia. You can't visit their major cities.

We can't make them be like us, but we don't have to encourage their behavior by giving them weapons that may well fall into the hands of people who are our enemies.

I urge a "no" vote. I think we should not be selling arms to Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Leg.]

**YEAS—47**

|              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Baldwin      | Harris    | Paul       |
| Bennet       | Hassan    | Peters     |
| Blumenthal   | Heinrich  | Reed       |
| Booker       | Heitkamp  | Sanders    |
| Brown        | Heller    | Schatz     |
| Cantwell     | Hirono    | Schumer    |
| Cardin       | Kaine     | Shaheen    |
| Carper       | King      | Stabenow   |
| Casey        | Klobuchar | Tester     |
| Coons        | Leahy     | Udall      |
| Cortez Masto | Lee       | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth    | Markey    | Warren     |
| Durbin       | Menendez  | Whitehouse |
| Feinstein    | Merkley   | Wyden      |
| Franken      | Murphy    | Young      |
| Gillibrand   | Murray    |            |

**NAYS—53**

|           |           |          |
|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Alexander | Fischer   | Nelson   |
| Barrasso  | Flake     | Perdue   |
| Blunt     | Gardner   | Portman  |
| Boozman   | Graham    | Risch    |
| Burr      | Grassley  | Roberts  |
| Capito    | Hatch     | Rounds   |
| Cassidy   | Hoehen    | Rubio    |
| Cochran   | Inhofe    | Sasse    |
| Collins   | Isakson   | Scott    |
| Corker    | Johnson   | Shelby   |
| Cornyn    | Kennedy   | Strange  |
| Cotton    | Lankford  | Sullivan |
| Crapo     | Manchin   | Thune    |
| Cruz      | McCain    | Tillis   |
| Daines    | McCaskill | Toomey   |
| Donnelly  | McConnell | Warner   |
| Enzi      | Moran     | Wicker   |
| Ernst     | Murkowski |          |

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

**ORDER OF PROCEDURE**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the McConnell second-degree amendment No. 233 be withdrawn; that the pending cloture motion with respect to amendment No. 232 be withdrawn; that the amendment be modified with the technical changes at the desk; and that at 2 p.m., Wednesday, June 14, the Senate vote on adoption of the McConnell for Crapo amendment No. 232, as modified, with no intervening action or debate and no second-degree amendments in order to amendment No. 232 prior to the vote; finally, that following leader remarks on Wednesday, June 14, the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will not object, but I reserve the right to object.

First, I want to thank the majority leader, as well as Senators CORKER, CARDIN, CRAPO, and BROWN. This is another example of how we can work together on issues we agree on. I am very proud of this bill. I think it will do a lot of good in both directions—in the Iran direction and particularly in the Russia direction. The lack of trust of Mr. Putin on both sides of the aisle here is paramount. Now this says that

these sanctions will stay in place unless Congress disapproves them and adds some new sanctions—both good things. I hope the House will pass the bill without change and send it to the President's desk.

With that, I withdraw any objection and again thank the majority leader for the cooperation we have had.

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

The amendment (No. 232), as modified, is as follows:

On page 33, line 7, strike “subsection (a)” and insert “subsection (b)”.

On page 33, line 15, strike “subsection (a)” and insert “subsection (b)”.

On page 47, line 18, strike “The President” and insert “Except as provided in subsection (b), the President”.

On page 47, line 22, insert “(other than subsection (b))” after “this Act”.

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND COMBATING TERRORISM AND ILLICIT FINANCING**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

**Subtitle A—Sanctions and Other Measures With Respect to the Russian Federation**

**SEC. 211. FINDINGS.**

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On March 6, 2014, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on those determined to be undermining democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine or threatening the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine. President Obama subsequently issued Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) and Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) to expand sanctions on certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine.

(2) On December 18, 2014, the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 was enacted (Public Law 113–272; 22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.), which includes provisions directing the President to impose sanctions on foreign persons that the President determines to be entities owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or nationals of the Russian Federation that manufacture, sell, transfer, or otherwise provide certain defense articles into Syria.

(3) On April 1, 2015, President Obama issued Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on persons determined to be engaged in malicious cyber-hacking.

(4) On July 26, 2016, President Obama approved a Presidential Policy Directive on United States Cyber Incident Coordination,

which states, “certain cyber incidents that have significant impacts on an entity, our national security, or the broader economy require a unique approach to response efforts”.

(5) On December 29, 2016, President Obama issued an annex to Executive Order 13694, which authorized sanctions on the following entities and individuals:

(A) The Main Intelligence Directorate (also known as Glavnoe Razvedyvatel'noe Upravlenie or the GRU) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(B) The Federal Security Service (also known as Federalnaya Sluzhba Bezopasnosti or the FSB) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(C) The Special Technology Center (also known as STLC, Ltd. Special Technology Center St. Petersburg) in St. Petersburg, Russian Federation.

(D) Zorsecurity (also known as Esage Lab) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(E) The autonomous noncommercial organization known as the Professional Association of Designers of Data Processing Systems (also known as ANO PO KSI) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(F) Igor Valentinovich Korobov.

(G) Sergey Aleksandrovich Gizunov.

(H) Igor Olegovich Kostyukov.

(I) Vladimir Stepanovich Alexseyev.

(6) On January 6, 2017, an assessment of the United States intelligence community entitled, “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections” stated, “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the United States presidential election.” The assessment warns that “Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes”.

**SEC. 212. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that the President—

(1) should engage to the fullest extent possible with partner governments with regard to closing loopholes, including the allowance of extended prepayment for the delivery of goods and commodities and other loopholes, in multilateral and unilateral restrictive measures against the Russian Federation, with the aim of maximizing alignment of those measures; and

(2) should increase efforts to vigorously enforce compliance with sanctions in place as of the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to the Russian Federation in response to the crisis in eastern Ukraine, cyber intrusions and attacks, and human rights violators in the Russian Federation.

**PART I—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

**SEC. 215. SHORT TITLE.**

The part may be cited as the “Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 216. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIONS RELATING TO SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before taking any action described in paragraph (2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes the proposed action and the reasons for that action.

(2) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An action described in this paragraph is—

(i) an action to terminate the application of any sanctions described in subparagraph (B);

(ii) with respect to sanctions described in subparagraph (B) imposed by the President with respect to a person, an action to waive the application of those sanctions with respect to that person; or

(iii) a licensing action that significantly alters United States' foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subparagraph are—

(i) sanctions provided for under—

(I) this title or any provision of law amended by this title, including the Executive Orders codified under section 222;

(II) the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.); or

(III) the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.); and

(ii) the prohibition on access to the properties of the Government of the Russian Federation located in Maryland and New York that the President ordered vacated on December 29, 2016.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF ACTION.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) shall include a description of whether the action—

(A) is not intended to significantly alter United States' foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; or

(B) is intended to significantly alter United States' foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(4) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome shall include a description of—

(i) the anticipated reciprocal diplomatic outcome;

(ii) the anticipated effect of the action on the national security interests of the United States; and

(iii) the policy objectives for which the sanctions affected by the action were initially imposed.

(B) REQUESTS FROM BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEES.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives may request the submission to the Committee of the matter described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is not intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is not intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report; and

(B) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is intended to achieve a reciprocal diplomatic outcome, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House

of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a)(1) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under paragraph (1) of a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not take that action unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that action is enacted in accordance with subsection (c).

(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action for a period of 12 calendar days after the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), and the President vetoes the joint resolution, the President may not take that action for a period of 10 calendar days after the date of the President's veto.

(6) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) is enacted in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection:

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of approval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution approving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.”; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress approves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_,” with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(2) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of disapproval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution disapproving the President's pro-

posal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.”; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_,” with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

(i) referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs if the joint resolution relates to a report under section 216A3 that is described as an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, and

(ii) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations if the joint resolution relates to a

report under section 216A3 that is described as an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to the Russian Federation.

(B) **REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.**—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) **PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.**—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(D) **RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.**—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(E) **CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.**—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(6) **RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(A) **COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.**—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of that House, that House receives an identical joint resolution from the other House, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the joint resolution from the other House—

(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(B) **TREATMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.**—If one House fails to introduce a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of the other House shall be entitled to expedited procedures in that House under this subsection.

(C) **TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.**—If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

(D) **APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.**—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

(7) **RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.**—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

## **PART II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

### **SEC. 221. DEFINITIONS.**

In this part:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **GOOD.**—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) **INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “international financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)).

(4) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(6) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

### **SEC. 222. CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **CODIFICATION.**—United States sanctions provided for in Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of

certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine), Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), and Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including with respect to all persons sanctioned under such Executive Orders, shall remain in effect except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) **TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions described in subsection (a) that are imposed on a person in connection with activity conducted by the person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions described in subsection (a) in the future.

(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive Order 13694 or 13757 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) **APPLICATION OF NEW UKRAINE-RELATED SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive Order 13660, 13661, 13662, or 13685 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

### **SEC. 223. MODIFICATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13662.**

(a) **DETERMINATION THAT CERTAIN ENTITIES ARE SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS.**—The Secretary



of the Treasury may determine that a person meets one or more of the criteria in section 1(a) of Executive Order 13662 if that person is a state-owned entity operating in the railway, shipping, or metals and mining sector of the economy of the Russian Federation.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 1 WITH RESPECT TO THE FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 14 days maturity or new equity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(c) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 2 WITH RESPECT TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 2 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 30 days maturity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(d) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 4.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 4, dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the provision, exportation, or reexportation, directly or indirectly, by United States persons or persons within the United States, of goods, services (except for financial services), or technology in support of exploration or production for deepwater, Arctic offshore, or shale projects—

(1) that have the potential to produce oil;

(2) in which a Russian energy firm is involved; and

(3) that involve any person determined to be subject to the directive or the property or interests in property of such a person.

**SEC. 224. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ACTIVITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(1) impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(A) knowingly engages in significant activities undermining cybersecurity against any person, including a democratic institution, or government on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person described in subparagraph (A);

(2) impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services (except financial services) in support of, an activity described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(3) impose 3 or more of the sanctions described in section 4(c) of the of the Ukraine

Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(c)) with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly provides financial services in support of an activity described in paragraph (1)(A).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.**—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) **SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “significant activities undermining cybersecurity” includes—

(1) significant efforts—

(A) to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy an information and communications technology system or network; or

(B) to exfiltrate, degrade, corrupt, destroy, or release information from such a system or network without authorization for purposes of—

(i) conducting influence operations; or

(ii) causing a significant misappropriation of funds, economic resources, trade secrets, personal identifications, or financial information for commercial or competitive advantage or private financial gain;

(2) significant destructive malware attacks; and

(3) significant denial of service activities.

**SEC. 225. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO SPECIAL RUSSIAN CRUDE OIL PROJECTS.**

Section 4(b)(1) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(b)(1)) is amended by striking “on and after the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may impose” and inserting “on and after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017, the President shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so.”

**SEC. 226. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**

Section 5 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so.”; and

(B) by striking “on or after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so.”; and

(B) by striking “on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 227. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908(a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “is authorized and encouraged to” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “President determines is” and inserting “President determines is, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017.”; and

(ii) by inserting “or elsewhere” after “in the Russian Federation”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “The President” and inserting “except as provided in subsection (d), the President”; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.”.

**SEC. 228. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSERS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 10. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS THAT EVADE SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) materially violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any license, order, regulation, or prohibition contained in or issued pursuant to any covered Executive order; or

“(2) facilitates significant deceptive or structured transactions for or on behalf of—

“(A) any person subject to sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to the Russian Federation; or

“(B) any child, spouse, parent, or sibling of an individual described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b).

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(d) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act;

“(2) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine; and

“(3) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraphs (E)

or (F) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

“(e) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice that—

“(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ‘covered Executive order’ means any of the following:

“(A) Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(B) Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(C) Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(D) Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

“(E) Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(F) Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ‘foreign person’ has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017).

“(3) STRUCTURED.—The term ‘structured’, with respect to a transaction, has the meaning given the term ‘structure’ in paragraph (xx) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

**“SEC. 11. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person, based on credible information, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation; or

“(2) materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to, a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

“(3) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

“(c) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made efforts to reduce serious human rights abuses in territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by that Government.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b)(1).

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b)(1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(e) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice—

“(A) that—

“(i) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future; or

“(B) that the President determines that insufficient basis exists for the determination by the President under subsection (a) with respect to the person.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Section 2(2) of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,” before “the Committee on Foreign Relations”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “the Committee on Financial Services” before “the Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

**SEC. 229. NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS UNDER UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014.**

(a) SANCTIONS RELATING TO DEFENSE AND ENERGY SECTORS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—Section 4 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) NOTIFICATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign person under subsection (a) or (b).

“(2) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN PRODUCERS, TRANSFERORS, OR BROKERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a)(2) with respect to a foreign person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(A) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(B) a notice that—

“(i) the foreign person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the foreign person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a)(2) in the future.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (B)(ii) of subsection (a)(3), by striking “subsection (h)” and inserting “subsection (i)”.

(b) SANCTIONS ON RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—Section 5 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign financial institution under subsection (a) or (b).”; and

(3) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “section 4(h)” and inserting “section 4(i)”.

**SEC. 230. STANDARDS FOR TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING THE PEACE, SECURITY, STABILITY, SOVEREIGNTY, OR TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF UKRAINE.—Section 8 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8907) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”.

(b) SANCTIONS RELATING TO CORRUPTION.—Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”.

**SEC. 231. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS ENGAGING IN TRANSACTIONS WITH THE INTELLIGENCE OR DEFENSE SECTORS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to a person the President determines knowingly, on or after such date of enactment, engages in a significant transaction with a person that is part of, or operates for or on behalf of, the defense or intelligence sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation, including the Main Intelligence Agency of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation or the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation.

(b) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

**SEC. 232. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PIPELINES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in

section 235 with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment described in subsection (b) or sells, leases, or provides to the Russian Federation, for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, goods, services, technology, information, or support described in subsection (c)—

(1) any of which has a fair market value of \$1,000,000 or more; or

(2) that, during a 12-month period, have an aggregate fair market value of \$5,000,000 or more.

(b) INVESTMENT DESCRIBED.—An investment described in this subsection is an investment that directly and significantly contributes to the enhancement of the ability of the Russian Federation to construct energy export pipelines.

(c) GOODS, SERVICES, TECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION, OR SUPPORT DESCRIBED.—Goods, services, technology, information, or support described in this subsection are goods, services, technology, information, or support that could directly and significantly facilitate the maintenance or expansion of the construction, modernization, or repair of energy pipelines by the Russian Federation.

**SEC. 233. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO INVESTMENT IN OR FACILITATION OF PRIVATIZATION OF STATE-OWNED ASSETS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 if the President determines that a person, with actual knowledge, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment of \$10,000,000 or more (or any combination of investments of not less than \$1,000,000 each, which in the aggregate equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period), or facilitates such an investment, if the investment directly and significantly contributes to the ability of the Russian Federation to privatize state-owned assets in a manner that unjustly benefits—

(1) officials of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) close associates or family members of those officials.

(b) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

**SEC. 234. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF ARMS AND RELATED MATERIEL TO SYRIA.**

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose on a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that such foreign person has, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly exported, transferred, or otherwise provided to Syria significant financial,

material, or technological support that contributes materially to the ability of the Government of Syria to—

(A) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies;

(B) acquire or develop ballistic or cruise missile capabilities;

(C) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

(D) acquire significant defense articles, defense services, or defense information (as such terms are defined under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.)); or

(E) acquire items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

(2) **APPLICABILITY TO OTHER FOREIGN PERSONS.**—The sanctions described in subsection (b) shall also be imposed on any foreign person that—

(A) is a successor entity to a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or has acted for or on behalf of, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions to be imposed on a foreign person described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall exercise all powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES.**—If the foreign person is an individual, the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, the foreign person.

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to the foreign person regardless of when issued.

(ii) **EFFECT OF REVOCATION.**—A revocation under clause (i) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the foreign person.

(c) **WAIVER.**—Subject to section 216, the President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FINANCIAL, MATERIAL, OR TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT.**—The term “financial, material, or technological support” has the meaning given such term in section 542.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(2) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” has the meaning given such term in section 594.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(3) **SYRIA.**—The term “Syria” has the meaning given such term in section 542.316 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

#### SEC. 235. SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.

(a) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions to be imposed with respect to a person under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a) are the following:

(1) **EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ASSISTANCE FOR EXPORTS TO SANCTIONED PERSONS.**—The President may direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States not to give approval to the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in the extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the sanctioned person.

(2) **EXPORT SANCTION.**—The President may order the United States Government not to issue any specific license and not to grant any other specific permission or authority to export any goods or technology to the sanctioned person under—

(A) the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(B) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.);

(C) the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); or

(D) any other statute that requires the prior review and approval of the United States Government as a condition for the export or reexport of goods or services.

(3) **LOANS FROM UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The President may prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to the sanctioned person totaling more than \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period unless the person is engaged in activities to relieve human suffering and the loans or credits are provided for such activities.

(4) **LOANS FROM INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The President may direct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any loan from the international financial institution that would benefit the sanctioned person.

(5) **PROHIBITIONS ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The following prohibitions may be imposed against the sanctioned person if that person is a financial institution:

(A) **PROHIBITION ON DESIGNATION AS PRIMARY DEALER.**—Neither the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System nor the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may designate, or permit the continuation of any prior designation of, the financial institution as a primary dealer in United States Government debt instruments.

(B) **PROHIBITION ON SERVICE AS A REPOSITORY OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS.**—The financial institution may not serve as agent of the United States Government or serve as repository for United States Government funds.

The imposition of either sanction under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as 1 sanction for purposes of subsection (b), and the imposition of both such sanctions shall be treated as 2 sanctions for purposes of subsection (b).

(6) **PROCUREMENT SANCTION.**—The United States Government may not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from the sanctioned person.

(7) **FOREIGN EXCHANGE.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the sanctioned person has any interest.

(8) **BANKING TRANSACTIONS.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the sanctioned person.

(9) **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any person from—

(A) acquiring, holding, withholding, using, transferring, withdrawing, transporting, importing, or exporting any property that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and with respect to which the sanctioned person has any interest;

(B) dealing in or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to such property; or

(C) conducting any transaction involving such property.

(10) **BAN ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations or guidelines as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of the sanctioned person.

(11) **EXCLUSION OF CORPORATE OFFICERS.**—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, the sanctioned person.

(12) **SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—The President may impose on the principal executive officer or officers of the sanctioned person, or on persons performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions under this subsection.

(b) **SANCTIONED PERSON DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “sanctioned person” means a person subject to sanctions under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a).

#### SEC. 236. EXCEPTIONS, WAIVER, AND TERMINATION.

(a) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The provisions of this part and amendments made by this part shall not apply with respect to the following:

(1) Activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or under other international agreements.

(b) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—No requirement to impose sanctions under this part or an amendment made by this part shall include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(c) **WAIVER OF SANCTIONS THAT ARE IMPOSED.**—Subject to section 216, if the President imposes sanctions with respect to a person under this part or the amendments made by this part, the President may waive the application of those sanctions if the President determines that such a waiver is in the

national security interest of the United States.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under section 224, 231, 232, 233, or 234 with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

(2) a notice that—

(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under this part in the future.

#### **SEC. 237. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this part or the amendments made by this part shall be construed—

(1) to supersede the limitations or exceptions on the use of rocket engines for national security purposes under section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note), as amended by section 1607 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1100) and section 1602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2582); or

(2) to prohibit a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Defense from acquiring components referred to in such section 1608.

### **PART III—REPORTS**

#### **SEC. 241. REPORT ON OLIGARCHS AND PARASTATAL ENTITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the following:

(1) Senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, including the following:

(A) An identification of the most significant senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, as determined by their closeness to the Russian regime and their net worth.

(B) An assessment of the relationship between individuals identified under subparagraph (A) and President Vladimir Putin or other members of the Russian ruling elite.

(C) An identification of any indices of corruption with respect to those individuals.

(D) The estimated net worth and known sources of income of those individuals and their family members (including spouses, children, parents, and siblings), including assets, investments, other business interests, and relevant beneficial ownership information.

(E) An identification of the non-Russian business affiliations of those individuals.

(2) Russian parastatal entities, including an assessment of the following:

(A) The emergence of Russian parastatal entities and their role in the economy of the Russian Federation.

(B) The leadership structures and beneficial ownership of those entities.

(C) The scope of the non-Russian business affiliations of those entities.

(3) The exposure of key economic sectors of the United States to Russian politically ex-

posed persons and parastatal entities, including, at a minimum, the banking, securities, insurance, and real estate sectors.

(4) The likely effects of imposing debt and equity restrictions on Russian parastatal entities, as well as the anticipated effects of adding Russian parastatal entities to the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(5) The potential impacts of imposing secondary sanctions with respect to Russian oligarchs, Russian state-owned enterprises, and Russian parastatal entities, including impacts on the entities themselves and on the economy of the Russian Federation, as well as on the economies of the United States and allies of the United States.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.**—The term “senior foreign political figure” has the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

#### **SEC. 242. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF EXPANDING SANCTIONS TO INCLUDE SOVEREIGN DEBT AND DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing in detail the potential effects of expanding sanctions under Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), or any successor directive, to include sovereign debt and the full range of derivative products.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

#### **SEC. 243. REPORT ON ILLICIT FINANCE RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the end of each one-year period thereafter until 2021, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describ-

ing interagency efforts in the United States to combat illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain a summary of efforts by the United States to do the following:

(1) Identify, investigate, map, and disrupt illicit financial flows linked to the Russian Federation if such flows affect the United States financial system or those of major allies of the United States.

(2) Conduct outreach to the private sector, including information sharing efforts to strengthen compliance efforts by entities, including financial institutions, to prevent illicit financial flows described in paragraph (1).

(3) Engage and coordinate with allied international partners on illicit finance, especially in Europe, to coordinate efforts to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for illicit financial flows described in paragraph (1), including examples of that engagement and coordination.

(4) Identify foreign sanctions evaders and loopholes within the sanctions regimes of foreign partners of the United States.

(5) Expand the number of real estate geographic targeting orders or other regulatory actions, as appropriate, to degrade illicit financial activity relating to the Russian Federation in relation to the financial system of the United States.

(6) Provide support to counter those involved in illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation across all appropriate law enforcement, intelligence, regulatory, and financial authorities of the Federal Government, including by imposing sanctions with respect to or prosecuting those involved.

(7) In the case of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice, investigate or otherwise develop major cases, including a description of those cases.

(c) **BRIEFING.**—After submitting a report under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide briefings to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to that report.

(d) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall coordinate with the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of State in preparing each report under this section.

(e) **FORM.**—Each report submitted under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **ILLICIT FINANCE.**—The term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President.

#### **Subtitle B—Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia**

#### **SEC. 251. FINDINGS.**

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the Russian Federation has sought to exert influence throughout Europe and Eurasia, including in the

former states of the Soviet Union, by providing resources to political parties, think tanks, and civil society groups that sow distrust in democratic institutions and actors, promote xenophobic and illiberal views, and otherwise undermine European unity. The Government of the Russian Federation has also engaged in well-documented corruption practices as a means toward undermining and buying influence in European and Eurasian countries.

(2) The Government of the Russian Federation has largely eliminated a once-vibrant Russian-language independent media sector and severely curtails free and independent media within the borders of the Russian Federation. Russian-language media organizations that are funded and controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation and disseminate information within and outside of the Russian Federation routinely traffic in anti-Western disinformation, while few independent, fact-based media sources provide objective reporting for Russian-speaking audiences inside or outside of the Russian Federation.

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to violate its commitments under the Memorandum on Security Assurances in connection with Ukraine's Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Budapest December 5, 1994, and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe Final Act, concluded at Helsinki August 1, 1975 (commonly referred to as the "Helsinki Final Act"), which laid the ground-work for the establishment of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, of which the Russian Federation is a member, by its illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014, its illegal occupation of South Ossetia and Abkhazia in Georgia in 2008, and its ongoing destabilizing activities in eastern Ukraine.

(4) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to ignore the terms of the August 2008 ceasefire agreement relating to Georgia, which requires the withdrawal of Russian Federation troops, free access by humanitarian groups to the regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and monitoring of the conflict areas by the European Union Monitoring Mission.

(5) The Government of the Russian Federation is failing to comply with the terms of the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, as well as the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014.

(6) The Government of the Russian Federation is—

(A) in violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly known as the "INF Treaty"); and

(B) failing to meet its obligations under the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002 (commonly known as the "Open Skies Treaty").

#### SEC. 252. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation bears responsibility for the continuing violence in Eastern Ukraine, including the death on April 24, 2017, of Joseph Stone, a citizen of the United States working as a

monitor for the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

(2) the President should call on the Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) to withdraw all of its forces from the territories of Georgia, Ukraine, and Moldova;

(B) to return control of the borders of those territories to their respective governments; and

(C) to cease all efforts to undermine the popularly elected governments of those countries;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation has applied, and continues to apply, to the countries and peoples of Georgia and Ukraine, traditional uses of force, intelligence operations, and influence campaigns, which represent clear and present threats to the countries of Europe and Eurasia;

(4) in response, the countries of Europe and Eurasia should redouble efforts to build resilience within their institutions, political systems, and civil societies;

(5) the United States supports the institutions that the Government of the Russian Federation seeks to undermine, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union;

(6) a strong North Atlantic Treaty Organization is critical to maintaining peace and security in Europe and Eurasia;

(7) the United States should continue to work with the European Union as a partner against aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation, coordinating aid programs, development assistance, and other counter-Russian efforts;

(8) the United States should encourage the establishment of a commission for media freedom within the Council of Europe, modeled on the Venice Commission regarding rule of law issues, that would be chartered to provide governments with expert recommendations on maintaining legal and regulatory regimes supportive of free and independent media and an informed citizenry able to distinguish between fact-based reporting, opinion, and disinformation;

(9) in addition to working to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, the United States should work with the individual countries of Europe and Eurasia—

(A) to identify vulnerabilities to aggression, disinformation, corruption, and so-called hybrid warfare by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(B) to establish strategic and technical plans for addressing those vulnerabilities;

(C) to ensure that the financial systems of those countries are not being used to shield illicit financial activity by officials of the Government of the Russian Federation or individuals in President Vladimir Putin's inner circle who have been enriched through corruption;

(D) to investigate and prosecute cases of corruption by Russian actors; and

(E) to work toward full compliance with the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (commonly referred to as the "Anti-Bribery Convention") of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development; and

(10) the President of the United States should use the authority of the President to impose sanctions under—

(A) the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112-208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note); and

(B) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

#### SEC. 253. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The United States, consistent with the principle of *ex injuria jus non oritur*, supports the policy known as the "Stimson Doctrine" and thus does not recognize territorial changes effected by force, including the illegal invasions and occupations of Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Crimea, Eastern Ukraine, and Transnistria.

#### SEC. 254. COORDINATING AID AND ASSISTANCE ACROSS EUROPE AND EURASIA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Countering Russian Influence Fund \$250,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund shall be used to effectively implement, prioritized in the following order and subject to the availability of funds, the following goals:

(1) To assist in protecting critical infrastructure and electoral mechanisms from cyberattacks in the following countries:

(A) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union that the Secretary of State determines—

(i) are vulnerable to influence by the Russian Federation; and

(ii) lack the economic capability to effectively respond to aggression by the Russian Federation without the support of the United States.

(B) Countries that are participating in the enlargement process of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union, including Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Macedonia, Moldova, Kosovo, Serbia, and Ukraine.

(2) To combat corruption, improve the rule of law, and otherwise strengthen independent judiciaries and prosecutors general offices in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(3) To respond to the humanitarian crises and instability caused or aggravated by the invasions and occupations of Georgia and Ukraine by the Russian Federation.

(4) To improve participatory legislative processes and legal education, political transparency and competition, and compliance with international obligations in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(5) To build the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations countering the influence and propaganda of the Russian Federation to combat corruption, prioritize access to truthful information, and operate freely in all regions in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(6) To assist the Secretary of State in executing the functions specified in section 1287(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) for the purposes of recognizing, understanding, exposing, and countering propaganda and disinformation efforts by foreign governments, in coordination with the relevant regional Assistant Secretary or Assistant Secretaries of the Department of State.

(c) REVISION OF ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH AMOUNTS MAY BE USED.—The Secretary of State may modify the goals described in subsection (b) if, not later than 15 days before revising such a goal, the Secretary notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the revision.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia (authorized pursuant to section 601 of the Support for East European Democracy



(SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5461) and section 102 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5812)), and in consultation with the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, the Director of the Global Engagement Center of the Department of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, coordinate and carry out activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) **METHOD.**—Activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) shall be carried out through—

(A) initiatives of the United States Government;

(B) Federal grant programs such as the Information Access Fund; or

(C) nongovernmental or international organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Black Sea Trust, the Balkan Trust for Democracy, the Prague Civil Society Centre, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, the European Endowment for Democracy, and related organizations.

(3) **REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the programs and activities carried out to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) during the preceding fiscal year.

(B) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall include, with respect to each program or activity described in that subparagraph—

(i) the amount of funding for the program or activity;

(ii) the goal described in subsection (b) to which the program or activity relates; and

(iii) an assessment of whether or not the goal was met.

(e) **COORDINATION WITH GLOBAL PARTNERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to maximize cost efficiency, eliminate duplication, and speed the achievement of the goals described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall ensure coordination with—

(A) the European Union and its institutions;

(B) the governments of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union; and

(C) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) **REPORT BY SECRETARY OF STATE.**—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) the amount of funding provided to each country referred to in subsection (b) by—

(i) the European Union or its institutions;

(ii) the government of each country that is a member of the European Union or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(iii) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b); and

(B) an assessment of whether the funding described in subparagraph (A) is commensu-

rate with funding provided by the United States for those goals.

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to or limit United States foreign assistance not provided using amounts available in the Countering Russian Influence Fund.

(g) **ENSURING ADEQUATE STAFFING FOR GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES.**—In order to ensure that the United States Government is properly focused on combating corruption, improving rule of law, and building the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations in countries described in subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of State shall establish a pilot program for Foreign Service officer positions focused on governance and anticorruption activities in such countries.

#### **SEC. 255. REPORT ON MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS CONTROLLED AND FUNDED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a description of media organizations that are controlled and funded by the Government of the Russian Federation, and any affiliated entities, whether operating within or outside the Russian Federation, including broadcast and satellite-based television, radio, Internet, and print media organizations.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

#### **SEC. 256. REPORT ON RUSSIAN FEDERATION INFLUENCE ON ELECTIONS IN EUROPE AND EURASIA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on funds provided by, or funds the use of which was directed by, the Government of the Russian Federation or any Russian person with the intention of influencing the outcome of any election or campaign in any country in Europe or Eurasia during the preceding year, including through direct support to any political party, candidate, lobbying campaign, nongovernmental organization, or civic organization.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) **RUSSIAN PERSON DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Russian person” means—

(1) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(2) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

#### **SEC. 257. UKRAINIAN ENERGY SECURITY.**

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereign and territorial integrity;

(2) to condemn and oppose all of the destabilizing efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine in violation of its obligations and international commitments;

(3) to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Government of the Russian Federation or the separation of any portion of Ukrainian territory through the use of military force;

(4) to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus;

(5) to assist in promoting reform in regulatory oversight and operations in Ukraine's energy sector, including the establishment and empowerment of an independent regulatory organization;

(6) to encourage and support fair competition, market liberalization, and reliability in Ukraine's energy sector;

(7) to help Ukraine and United States allies and partners in Europe reduce their dependence on Russian energy resources, especially natural gas, which the Government of the Russian Federation uses as a weapon to coerce, intimidate, and influence other countries;

(8) to work with European Union member states and European Union institutions to promote energy security through developing diversified and liberalized energy markets that provide diversified sources, suppliers, and routes;

(9) to continue to oppose the NordStream 2 pipeline given its detrimental impacts on the European Union's energy security, gas market development in Central and Eastern Europe, and energy reforms in Ukraine; and

(10) that the United States Government should prioritize the export of United States energy resources in order to create American jobs, help United States allies and partners, and strengthen United States foreign policy.

(b) **PLAN TO PROMOTE ENERGY SECURITY IN UKRAINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Energy, shall work with the Government of Ukraine to develop a plan to increase energy security in Ukraine, increase the amount of energy produced in Ukraine, and reduce Ukraine's reliance on energy imports from the Russian Federation.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall include strategies for market liberalization, effective regulation and oversight, supply diversification, energy reliability, and energy efficiency, such as through supporting—

(A) the promotion of advanced technology and modern operating practices in Ukraine's oil and gas sector;

(B) modern geophysical and meteorological survey work as needed followed by international tenders to help attract qualified investment into exploration and development of areas with untapped resources in Ukraine;

(C) a broadening of Ukraine's electric power transmission interconnection with Europe;

(D) the strengthening of Ukraine's capability to maintain electric power grid stability and reliability;

(E) independent regulatory oversight and operations of Ukraine's gas market and electricity sector;

(F) the implementation of primary gas law including pricing, tariff structure, and legal regulatory implementation;

(G) privatization of government owned energy companies through credible legal frameworks and a transparent process compliant with international best practices;

(H) procurement and transport of emergency fuel supplies, including reverse pipeline flows from Europe;

(I) provision of technical assistance for crisis planning, crisis response, and public outreach;

(J) repair of infrastructure to enable the transport of fuel supplies;

(K) repair of power generating or power transmission equipment or facilities; and

(L) improved building energy efficiency and other measures designed to reduce energy demand in Ukraine.

(3) REPORTS.—

(A) IMPLEMENTATION OF UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014 PROVISIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the status of implementing the provisions required under section 7(c) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926(c)), including detailing the plans required under that section, the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth under that section, and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies developed pursuant to that section.

(B) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the plan developed under paragraph (1), the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth in paragraph (2), and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies.

(C) BRIEFINGS.—The Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall brief the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days after the submission of each report under subparagraph (B). In addition, the Department of State shall make relevant officials available upon request to brief the appropriate congressional committees on all available information that relates directly or indirectly to Ukraine or energy security in Eastern Europe.

(D) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF COUNTRIES IN EUROPE AND EURASIA TO DECREASE THEIR DEPENDENCE ON RUSSIAN SOURCES OF ENERGY.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) The Government of the Russian Federation uses its strong position in the energy sector as leverage to manipulate the internal politics and foreign relations of the countries of Europe and Eurasia.

(B) This influence is based not only on the Russian Federation’s oil and natural gas resources, but also on its state-owned nuclear power and electricity companies.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the United States should assist the efforts of the countries of Europe and Eurasia to enhance their energy security through diversification of energy supplies in order to lessen dependencies on Russian Federation energy resources and state-owned entities; and

(B) the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should play key roles in supporting critical energy projects that contribute to that goal.

(3) USE OF COUNTERING RUSSIAN INFLUENCE FUND TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund pursuant to section 254 shall be used to provide technical advice to countries described in subsection (b)(1) of such section designed to enhance energy security and lessen dependence on energy from Russian Federation sources.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State a total of \$30,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 to carry out the strategies set forth in subsection (b)(2) and other activities under this section related to the promotion of energy security in Ukraine.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibilities required and authorities provided under section 7 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926).

**SEC. 258. TERMINATION.**

The provisions of this subtitle shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 259. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**

Except as otherwise provided, in this subtitle, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

**Subtitle C—Combating Terrorist and Illicit Financing**

**PART I—NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORIST AND OTHER ILLICIT FINANCING**

**SEC. 261. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary, shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the appropriate Federal banking agencies and Federal functional regulators, develop a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance.

(b) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive national strategy developed in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than January 31, 2020, and January 31, 2022, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees updated versions of the national strategy submitted under paragraph (1).

(c) SEPARATE PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL.—Any part of the national strategy that involves information that is properly classified under criteria established by the President shall be submitted to Congress separately in a classified annex and, if requested by the chairman or ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees, as a briefing at an appropriate level of security.

**SEC. 262. CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.**

The strategy described in section 261 shall contain the following:

(1) EVALUATION OF EXISTING EFFORTS.—An assessment of the effectiveness of and ways in which the United States is currently addressing the highest levels of risk of various forms of illicit finance, including those identified in the documents entitled “2015 National Money Laundering Risk Assessment” and “2015 National Terrorist Financing Risk Assessment”, published by the Department of the Treasury and a description of how the strategy is integrated into, and supports, the broader counter terrorism strategy of the United States.

(2) GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES.—A comprehensive, research-based, long-range, quantifiable discussion of goals, objectives, and priorities for disrupting and preventing illicit finance activities within and transiting the financial system of the United States that outlines priorities to reduce the incidence, dollar value, and effects of illicit finance.

(3) THREATS.—An identification of the most significant illicit finance threats to the financial system of the United States.

(4) REVIEWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES.—Reviews of enforcement efforts, relevant regulations and relevant provisions of law and, if appropriate, discussions of proposed changes determined to be appropriate to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective efforts at all levels of government, and with international partners of the United States, in the fight against illicit finance.

(5) DETECTION AND PROSECUTION INITIATIVES.—A description of efforts to improve, as necessary, detection and prosecution of illicit finance, including efforts to ensure that—

(A) subject to legal restrictions, all appropriate data collected by the Federal Government that is relevant to the efforts described in this section be available in a timely fashion to—

(i) all appropriate Federal departments and agencies; and

(ii) as appropriate and consistent with section 314 of the International Money Laundering Abatement and Financial Anti-Terrorism Act of 2001 (31 U.S.C. 5311 note), to financial institutions to assist the financial institutions in efforts to comply with laws aimed at curbing illicit finance; and

(B) appropriate efforts are undertaken to ensure that Federal departments and agencies charged with reducing and preventing illicit finance make thorough use of publicly available data in furtherance of this effort.

(6) THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE FINANCIAL SECTOR IN PREVENTION OF ILLICIT FINANCE.—A discussion of ways to enhance partnerships between the private financial sector and Federal departments and agencies with regard to the prevention and detection of illicit finance, including—

(A) efforts to facilitate compliance with laws aimed at stopping such illicit finance while maintaining the effectiveness of such efforts; and

(B) providing guidance to strengthen internal controls and to adopt on an industry-wide basis more effective policies.

(7) ENHANCEMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION.—A discussion of ways to combat illicit finance by enhancing—

(A) cooperative efforts between and among Federal, State, and local officials, including State regulators, State and local prosecutors, and other law enforcement officials; and

(B) cooperative efforts with and between governments of countries and with and between multinational institutions with expertise in fighting illicit finance, including the

Financial Action Task Force and the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units.

(8) **TREND ANALYSIS OF EMERGING ILLICIT FINANCE THREATS.**—A discussion of and data regarding trends in illicit finance, including evolving forms of value transfer such as so-called cryptocurrencies, other methods that are computer, telecommunications, or Internet-based, cyber crime, or any other threats that the Secretary may choose to identify.

(9) **BUDGET PRIORITIES.**—A multiyear budget plan that identifies sufficient resources needed to successfully execute the full range of missions called for in this section.

(10) **TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENTS.**—An analysis of current and developing ways to leverage technology to improve the effectiveness of efforts to stop the financing of terrorism and other forms of illicit finance, including better integration of open-source data.

## **PART II—ENHANCING ANTITERRORISM TOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

### **SEC. 271. IMPROVING ANTITERROR FINANCE MONITORING OF FUNDS TRANSFERS.**

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To improve the ability of the Department of the Treasury to better track cross-border fund transfers and identify potential financing of terrorist or other forms of illicit finance, the Secretary shall carry out a study to assess—

(A) the potential efficacy of requiring banking regulators to establish a pilot program to provide technical assistance to depository institutions and credit unions that wish to provide account services to money services businesses serving individuals in Somalia;

(B) whether such a pilot program could be a model for improving the ability of United States persons to make legitimate funds transfers through transparent and easily monitored channels while preserving strict compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act (Public Law 91-508; 84 Stat. 1114) and related controls aimed at stopping money laundering and the financing of terrorism; and

(C) consistent with current legal requirements regarding confidential supervisory information, the potential impact of allowing money services businesses to share certain State examination information with depository institutions and credit unions, or whether another appropriate mechanism could be identified to allow a similar exchange of information to give the depository institutions and credit unions a better understanding of whether an individual money services business is adequately meeting its anti-money laundering and counter-terror financing obligations to combat money laundering, the financing of terror, or related illicit finance.

(2) **PUBLIC INPUT.**—The Secretary should solicit and consider public input as appropriate in developing the study required under subsection (a).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

### **SEC. 272. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION REGARDING TERRORIST FINANCING INTELLIGENCE.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, should intensify work with foreign partners to help the foreign partners develop intelligence analytic capacities, in a financial intelligence unit, finance ministry, or other appropriate agency, that are—

(1) commensurate to the threats faced by the foreign partner; and

(2) designed to better integrate intelligence efforts with the anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing regimes of the foreign partner.

### **SEC. 273. EXAMINING THE COUNTER-TERROR FINANCING ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY IN EMBASSIES.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(1) a list of the United States embassies in which a full-time Department of the Treasury financial attaché is stationed and a description of how the interests of the Department of the Treasury relating to terrorist financing and money laundering are addressed (via regional attachés or otherwise) at United States embassies where no such attachés are present;

(2) a list of the United States embassies at which the Department of the Treasury has assigned a technical assistance advisor from the Office of Technical Assistance of the Department of the Treasury;

(3) an overview of how Department of the Treasury financial attachés and technical assistance advisors assist in efforts to counter illicit finance, to include money laundering, terrorist financing, and proliferation financing; and

(4) an overview of patterns, trends, or other issues identified by the Department of the Treasury and whether resources are sufficient to address these issues.

### **SEC. 274. INCLUSION OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 101(c)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(c)(1)) is amended by inserting “the Secretary of the Treasury,” before “and such other officers”.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) may not be construed to authorize the National Security Council to have a professional staff level that exceeds the limitation set forth under section 101(e)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(e)(3)).

### **SEC. 275. INCLUSION OF ALL FUNDS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5326 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by striking “coin and currency”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “subtitle and” and inserting “subtitle or to”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “United States coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in such order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in such order),”; and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “coins or currency (or monetary instruments)” and inserting “funds”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order)”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 5326 by striking “coin and currency”.

## **PART III—DEFINITIONS**

### **SEC. 281. DEFINITIONS.**

In this subtitle—

(1) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term “appropriate Federal banking agencies” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

(3) the term “Bank Secrecy Act” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91-508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code;

(4) the term “Federal functional regulator” has the meaning given that term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809);

(5) the term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President;

(6) the term “money services business” has the meaning given the term under section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations;

(7) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(8) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each territory or possession of the United States.

### **Subtitle D—Rule of Construction**

#### **SEC. 291. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title (other than sections 216 and 236(b)) shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I just want to say to my colleague, the Democratic leader, that I think this is a good example of the Senate at its best. We all know this has been a period of rather partisan sparring back and forth on a variety of different things, but both sides were able to put that aside and deal with two important issues in a very significant way. I think it is good for the Senate and

good for the country, and I thank the Democratic leader for his comments.

#### COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. 722.

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

The clerk will report the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 722) to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 232, to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation and to combat terrorism and illicit financing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

#### U.S. TRAVEL TO CUBA

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, rumor has it that on Friday the President will announce a change in U.S. policy toward Cuba. There are lots of different rumors about what that might entail. I thought I would talk for just a couple of minutes about the consequences of such action, what has been accomplished in Cuba, what our goals are, and what I think our goals should be.

We have had a long policy of isolation with regard to Cuba. For more than 50 years, we tried to isolate the island and hoped the government would change somehow. It didn't. For more than 50 years, we have prohibited Americans from freely traveling to Cuba. We have had periods that the restrictions have gone down a bit and then up again, but by and large Americans have been prohibited, unless they fall into certain classes, to travel to Cuba. Then, when they are in Cuba, their travel around the island, the activities they undertake, are specifically prescribed by the U.S. Government.

I always thought that certainly there is a place for economic sanctions. Sometimes they can help nudge countries or push countries toward a desired outcome—but a travel ban? You only impose a travel ban under extreme circumstances, such as when national security reasons dictate, and there hasn't, for a long time, been national security reasons for a travel ban. I have always thought that as an American citizen that if somebody is going to limit my travel, it ought to be a Communist, somebody from another country that wouldn't let me in, not my own government to tell me where I can and cannot travel. I think most Americans feel that way.

I think we ought to first consider whom these sanctions are on. The sanctions we have had for so many years

have not really been on Cubans; they have been on Americans. Gratefully, the previous administration lessened these restrictions or lessened the impact around them. Around 2008 or 2009, the last administration said that Cuban Americans should be able to travel freely at least. Prior to that, we had instances where Cuban Americans would have to decide, if their parents, for example, were still in Cuba and were aging, maybe their mother was infirm—they had to decide if my mother passes away, do I attend her funeral or if my father passes away within 3 years—see, it used to be that Cuban Americans were limited to travel to the island just once every 3 years. They had to decide whether to attend their mother's funeral or their father's funeral. What a terrible thing for our government to tell American citizens, that they have to choose whether to attend their father's funeral or their mother's funeral. What kind of a country is that? Why would we do that? Yet we did for a number of years.

Gratefully, the last administration lifted restrictions on Cuban-American travel and at the same time lifted considerable restrictions on remittances, allowing money to flow more freely to relatives and others on the island. That coincided with the time the Cuban Government realized they couldn't employ every Cuban, not even at \$20 a month, so they said: Go ahead and find another line of work in the private sector, run a bed and breakfast, have a private restaurant, have an auto repair facility or a beauty shop. Hundreds of thousands of Cubans have done so over the past 5 years, largely with seed capital provided by travel from Americans, particularly Cuban-American travel and remittances.

So there was a situation where virtually no Cuban was employed in the private sector 5 years ago, but today as much as 25 percent of the Cuban workforce is now in the private sector. They have obviously more economic freedom. The average waiter in a Cuban private restaurant brings in \$40 to \$50 a day, while the average Cuban working for the Cuban Government brings in \$20 to \$30 a month. So there is significantly more economic freedom for those in the private sector in Cuba but also significantly more personal freedom as well. That is a good thing. That stands with the policy and goal we always had to increase freedom for the Cuban people.

Now we hear that the administration may want to turn back some of that progress and say that Americans shouldn't be able to travel as freely or as frequently to Cuba. Some of the rumors say they will limit travel to once a year. We don't know if that will be for Cuban Americans or all Americans. By the way, it seems rather strange to have a policy that is ethnically based, where we say: You are a Cuban Amer-

ican, you can travel, but if you are another type of American, you can't. That just seems pretty un-American. We can't get back into a situation where a Cuban American, living in the United States, will have to choose whether they can attend their mother or their father's funeral. I hope we don't get back into that time.

Another thing we ought to consider is that when Americans travel more freely, as they have been able to do under what is called a general license for individual travelers—that was one of the changes that was made in just the past couple of years—then individual American travelers tend to go to Cuba and stay in a bed and breakfast run by a private Cuban citizen, travel in private taxi cabs, frequent a private restaurant. My own family has done that.

If we go back to the time when American travelers have to travel under a specific license or as a group, then those travelers will be pushed toward the Cuban hotels which are owned by the Cuban Government or military. Therefore, you have aided the Cuban Government more than the Cuban people. Under no system will you be able to cut off money completely from the Cuban Government or the private sector. There is leakage everywhere. That is how economies work. Why in the world do we have a policy where we directly benefit the Cuban Government by pushing American travelers to the hotels they own rather than the private homes owned by private Cuban citizens? It seems to me these policies, if they are going to come forward—and it seems that they might be—just go against the policies and the goals we have.

Another thing we need to consider is that in the old times, when we had more restrictive policies on travel on Americans, those had to be enforced somehow. That falls upon the Office of Foreign Assets Control at Treasury.

OFAC, you may have heard recently, is the office we charge to enforce our sanctions on Iran. We are putting new sanctions on Iran. They will be charged with enforcing those. They will be charged with enforcing sanctions on Russia and new sanctions on Russia as well. Sanctions on North Korea, again, falls to OFAC. Yet we are telling OFAC that now they are going to have to spend a considerable amount of time and resources and manpower tracking down people going to Cuba to see if they stick to their designated, approved itinerary, whatever that might be, whatever we think they ought to be doing there, rather than what they want to be doing there. That just seems foolish to me and a waste of money, time and resources, and wrong-headed priorities with regard to other priorities that we have on sanctions.

We had situations in previous years that would simply be laughable if they

weren't true, but I think the administration ought to consider that when we have a restrictive policy on travel, we are going to have situations that are just flat embarrassing to us. If that sounds crazy, it doesn't sound crazy to Joan Slote of San Diego, who traveled to Cuba in the year 2000 at the age of 72 with a Canadian company that organized cycling tours. She was fined \$7,500 in the United States because she hadn't preapproved the itinerary and didn't follow the guidelines. She went through a Canadian company to do that. The subsequent fees totaled nearly \$10,000. I think it was settled for something less, but why in the world are we sanctioning and fining a 72-year-old woman who went on a biking tour in Cuba.

Consider the case of Cevin Allen in the State of Washington. He spent part of his childhood in Cuba, where his parents were missionaries. They built an Assembly of God Church in a town in southeastern Cuba. His parents died in 1987 in a house fire. Ten years later, Allen traveled to Cuba to scatter the ashes of his parents at the church they had built. He also brought a family Bible to give to the church's pastor. Cevin returned to the United States via Nassau, Bahamas, where he told U.S. agents he had just been to Cuba. He told them the reasons for his travel. His initial fine was \$7,500.

Do we really want to be fining people who are scattering the ashes of their parents? These aren't isolated incidents. This went on for a while.

A woman from Indiana was fined for distributing Bibles in Cuba because her itinerary didn't include a trip to the beach. She went to the beach, I am told, to participate or to watch a baptism that was happening at that time. Why in the world would we try to limit that kind of travel? Yet that is what we would be doing if we go back to restricting travel.

Maybe these rumors are overblown. Maybe we will not be imposing new restrictions on travel, but if we are, I hope the administration will consider these things.

There is another rumor out there that we know that if we diminish American travel, therefore diminishing the amount of money that goes to these Cuban entrepreneurs who are running bed and breakfasts and private restaurants, then we can make up for it somehow by having some of our government agencies teach entrepreneurship classes. Anybody who has been in Cuba understands that Cubans who have survived on \$20 a month for decades are more entrepreneurial than we will ever be. They don't need lessons in entrepreneurship, they need customers, and by denying Americans the freedom to travel to Cuba, we will be denying them customers, and they will be worse off. Their political freedom will be diminished. Their economic freedom will

be diminished. Their personal freedom will be diminished. That is not what we want.

Obviously, we want the Cuban Government to change. It has been disappointing, the rate of change. Why would we take it out on the Cuban people? Don't they have it tough enough with a Communist government that wants to control and keep that control as long as they can? Why don't we continue to help the Cuban people as they have been helped over the past couple of years? We also want to consider the cooperation we have with the Cuban Government with regard to issues such as drug interdiction, environmental cooperation, immigration enforcement. In the past couple of years, we had a lot of Cubans rafting to South Florida because of the wet foot, dry foot policy. We have had tens of thousands of Cubans crossing the Mexican border to make it to Arizona or Texas or California or New Mexico to claim or to be paroled into our system and ultimately perhaps to get citizenship. Because of agreements we have had and the diplomatic cooperation we have had over the past couple of years, and specifically over the past couple of months, we have been able to reach an agreement where we don't have that kind of migration and those kinds of issues. So there are tangible benefits to the diplomatic cooperation we have had. I am told we are not going to touch that; that we are not going to roll back. We have diplomatic relations and that is a good thing.

We don't want to go back to the time where instead of an embassy, we had a special interests section in Cuba and the Cubans had one here. I hope the President of the United States and his Cabinet will consider these things as they make decisions on what to do on Cuba. There are changes to policy we can make, but I would argue they would be more in terms of further liberalizing travel. We have a bill that has been filed in the Senate with 55 cosponsors. It is a bipartisan bill to completely lift the travel ban and get rid of it completely. If such a measure is brought to the floor, I am confident there will be between 65 and 70 votes—maybe more—for such a bill. Instead, we seem to be going in the other direction or the administration is talking about going in the other direction. I hope they will reconsider.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, Russia remains a hostile, recalcitrant power

that deploys its military, its cyber espionage activities, and its economic tactics to harm the United States of America—to drive a wedge between us and our allies.

President Obama began to impose tough sanctions for Russia's cyber attacks, its cyber intrusion, its illegal annexation of Crimea, and its continuing aggression in Ukraine and Syria. Congress joined in that effort by enacting two measures to tighten and broaden those sanctions. Lifting and relaxing those sanctions now would only reward Russia's attempts to undermine our democracy.

The administration continues to exercise a policy of strategic ambiguity when it comes to Russia, and the President, putting it mildly, has sent mixed signals. Just last month, Gary Cohn, the President's senior economic adviser, seemed to suggest that the United States could relax sanctions on Russia, and, as press reports confirmed 2 weeks ago, in its early days, the Trump administration considered removing all measures against Russia, according to former administration officials. Think of that.

We all hear the discussion—maybe collusion, maybe not—about the Russians' friendship with the administration, whether the Trump family or the Trump businesses or the Trump White House has had some kind of relationships—almost everybody here thinks—with the oilmen, with the oligarchs, with the Kremlin, maybe even Putin himself. And to think that soon after taking office, before the public and the rest of us began to start learning more about Trump's ties with Russia, the administration considered the removal of any kind of measures punishing Russia.

This amendment, written by Senators CRAPO, CORKER, CARDIN, me, and our offices and our staffs, sends an unambiguous message that the United States will not accept Russia's continued aggression, will adopt tough measures to both punish its past actions and deter future aggression against our country and our allies.

Over the last week, the chairs and ranking members of key Senate committees conducted intense negotiations over a package of tough and meaningful reforms and expansions to our current Russia sanctions regime. We have had good, positive, productive, bipartisan conversations. Last night we reached agreement on this broad package of new measures that substantially expands sanctions on Russia in response to its malicious cyber attacks, efforts to undermine democracy, and continuing aggression in Syria and in eastern Ukraine. This package assures Congress and the people we represent that we have more of a say in this critical national security debate.

The amendment would do a number of things. It would codify and strengthen six existing Obama administration

Executive orders on Russia and Ukraine and on Russian cyber activities and the sanctions flowing from them.

It would provide for strict congressional review of any effort by the President to relax and suspend and terminate or waive Russian sanctions patterned after the Iran Review Act.

It would require mandatory imposition of sanctions on malicious cyber activity against the United States, on corrupt Russian actors around the world, on foreign sanctions evaders violating the Russia, Ukraine, and cyber-related sanctions controls, on those involved in serious human rights abuses in territories forcibly controlled by Russia, and on special Russian crude oil projects around the world.

It would authorize broad new sanctions on key sectors of Russia's economy, including mining, metals, shipping, and railways, as well as new investments in energy pipelines.

It would crack down on anyone investing in corrupt privatization efforts in Russia—something we have seen a lot of over 20 years.

It would broaden the Treasury Department's authority to impose geographic targeting orders, allowing investigators to obtain ATM and wire transfer records so Treasury can better target illicit activity of Russian oligarchs in the United States.

It would require Treasury to provide Congress with a study on the tangled web of senior government officials from Russia and their family members and any current U.S. economic exposures to Russian oligarchs and their investments, and that includes real estate.

It would require the administration to assess and report to Congress on extending secondary sanctions to additional Russian oligarchs and state-owned and related enterprises.

Since 2014, Congress has worked together—Republicans and Democrats—to craft increasingly tougher sanctions to hold Russia accountable for a long line of misdeeds. It is a long line indeed, from Russia's violations of international law and of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, to its role in the brutal repression in the war in Syria, to the cyber attacks that we are learning more and more about on Americans.

The Ukrainian community in my State—vibrant, successful, progressive—and around the world knows firsthand the dangers of unchecked Russian aggression. We should strengthen—not weaken, not relax, not peel back—Russian sanctions.

I urge my colleagues here and in the House to support this amendment, and I will urge the President to sign it into law. We must continue to vigorously enforce and strengthen sanctions against Russia to send a message to its leaders and the world that the United

States of America will not tolerate efforts to undermine democracy around the world.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. President, our democracy is founded on checks and balances—and not just among the branches of government. Our Founders enshrined the freedom of the press in the Bill of Rights for a reason. We can't have a functioning democracy without freedom of the press. That is why last week the Newseum marked its annual Day Without News to remind Americans what our country would be—what we would be like, what we would look like, how we would act—without a free press.

Journalists' entire job is to ask tough questions and to challenge powerful interests. While in church, we comfort the afflicted, journalists afflict the comfortable. Reporters put their safety and far too often their lives on the line, whether it is covering floods and hurricanes at home or traversing the globe to bring us the stories of our troops. We depend on reporters in Ohio and around the world to both bring us the stories that impact our day-to-day lives and to tell the stories that simply otherwise might not be told.

Supporting a vibrant, independent, proactive press corps has rarely been more important in our country. Yet, too often we see reporters restricted, vilified, attacked, and even physically threatened, all for doing the jobs for which they were hired.

Today brought news in this body that some people in this building—some Members of the Senate—are trying to bar reporters from asking Senators questions. This is outrageous. If Senators can't handle tough questions from reporters about their plans to take healthcare away from millions of Americans, maybe they should change the bill, not restrict the reporters.

We remember that Oval Office meeting with Russian officials. We have seen the pictures of the President of the United States with the Russian Foreign Minister, with the Russian Ambassador. We have seen those pictures, but what we need to remember about those pictures—those photos that ran on front pages around this country and all over the world—those photos weren't taken by American journalists. The President of the United States threw them out of the Oval Office. Those pictures were taken by the Russian state media.

The Russian state media was allowed to be in the room with the President of the United States in the Oval Office—hallowed ground in our democracy—while the American press was thrown out. The Russian state media, the old Soviet news agency, TASS, the remnants of the old Soviet propaganda machine, was allowed in, while the American press was barred. When you hide from the press, you hide from the American people.

On November 16, a group representing more than a dozen journalist organizations sent a letter to the President-elect. They wrote: "This isn't about access for the press itself, it's about access for Americans in diverse communities around the country."

Having a strong, independent White House and congressional press corps isn't just important for those reporters' stories. Think about the signal it sends to mayors and city council members and State legislators. If the Members of Congress—the President, by throwing press out of the Oval Office and bringing in the old Soviet news agency TASS, or the Senate, by throwing reporters out of the Senate—if they don't have to be accountable, why should a mayor, why should a city council person, why should a Governor think they should be accountable?

It is not just Washington reporters who are vital to democracy. It is reporters in Ohio telling us the stories, bringing us the faces of the opioid epidemic that devastates families and communities. It is Ohio's editorial pages highlighting how important the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is to our drinking water and our State's economy. It has enabled Senator PORTMAN and me and bipartisan Senators all over the Great Lakes, from New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota—Senators from both parties fighting back and stopping the cuts that would have destroyed so much of the progress in cleaning up the Great Lakes. It is journalists in every corner of my State highlighting the devastation that the proposed budget would have on our schools and our housing and rural communities. It is emphasizing again that 200,000 Ohioans right now are getting opioid treatment because they have insurance from the Affordable Care Act. It is reminding politicians in Ohio of both parties that those people need insurance. That is what a free press does.

Parenthetically, I would add, my wife is a journalist. She is a Pulitzer Prize winner. She is a columnist. She is soon to be a novelist. She clearly has outspoken views about this, as I do. She is a member of the press. I am a Member of this body. We both believe in a free press. We both believe in a free democracy.

We answer to journalists in this body because they are the eyes and ears of the people we serve. If you can't understand—if none of us are strong enough and articulate enough and gutsy enough to stand before reporters who ask tough questions about your positions, then maybe you ought to rethink your positions.

We need diligent, courageous reporters to dig up their stories. We need independent editors to put them on



front pages. We need media organizations willing to hold the powerful accountable.

The American people have a right to know what is going on in their own government, from the White House down to the city council office.

The behavior today of the Rules Committee—the Rules Committee decision to ban reporters—television reporters specifically—from this body is just reprehensible. Thomas Jefferson said, “Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.” That is as true today as it was more than 200 years ago at the time of our country’s founding.

To all of the reporters out there, thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am glad to be down here with our ranking member, Senator BEN CARDIN from Maryland. I want to thank him and his staff for working until 10:20 last night to complete negotiations on a Russia amendment. I want to thank Senator CRAPO and his staff and Senator BROWN and his staff for the work they did on the sanctions component, where over the last 5 months they have worked with our counterparts around the world to make sure that what we did in this piece of legislation was something that was workable. Truly, I think it has been a great effort by four different offices. I am glad that cloture has been filed on that amendment, and I understand we are going to vote on it tomorrow at 2 o’clock.

I will be very brief. Senator CARDIN and I are here on the floor together, and I know he wants to make some comments about this. Let me just give a brief summary, if I could.

The amendment enhances Congress’s role in determining sanctions policy on Russia. It provides for the President to use a national security waiver or sanctions termination after giving Congress 30 days to review the proposed action.

I think everyone here knows I am a strong proponent of congressional review. We began that under President Obama. To me, it gets us in a place where we are playing an appropriate role in foreign policy.

The amendment codifies existing sanctions on Russia for their activities in Ukraine and cyber space.

The amendment strengthens and expands existing conduct-based sanctions by requiring the imposition of sanctions on actors undermining cyber security, supplying arms to Syria, human rights abusers, and those involved in corrupt privatization of government-owned assets.

It mandates sanctions on Russian deep-water, Arctic, and shale projects worldwide and yet allows for waivers to be made based on national security interests of the United States.

This amendment prioritizes U.S. foreign assistance to allies in their fight against Russian aggression. This is something I know Senator CARDIN worked hard on, and I appreciate his efforts.

It authorizes \$250 million to establish the Countering Russian Influence Fund to implement programs in EU and NATO member countries—Senator PORTMAN played a role in this as well, and I appreciate his efforts—as well as candidate nations, to combat Russian interference, with a priority given to programs that develop cyber security, address public corruption, respond to humanitarian crises, counter disinformation, and support democratic institutions.

It requires the State Department and other Federal agencies to collaborate and develop a plan to reduce Ukraine’s dependence on Russian energy imports, which we know Russia has used to extort Ukraine.

I think it is a very good piece of legislation. I appreciate the contributions of many Members here. I know Senator MCCAIN, Senator GRAHAM, Senator RUBIO, and so many people here have been involved in wanting to produce legislation that pushes back in this way. We have tried to utilize the best of many bills that have been put forth.

Again, I cannot thank the ranking member and his staff enough for the way they have worked with us to get us to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I just want to follow up briefly with Chairman CORKER. The two of us became friends in 2007, when we were both elected to the U.S. Senate the same year and were part of the same class. But I think the two of us really became close friends a little over 2 years ago, when we were confronted with how Congress should deal with the nuclear agreement being negotiated by President Obama with Iran and our European friends, along with Russia and China.

As the two of us worked around the clock to try to develop an appropriate review process so that Congress could play a constructive role—we recognize that we are the legislative branch, and we have oversight functions, but there is an appropriate role for us with regard to Executive actions—we came out with something that no one expected could be done; that is, nearly unanimous support in this body for a review statute in regard to the Iran negotiations.

Chairman CORKER has taken this same template and has now used that to apply to Russia in the removal of sanctions on Russia. It started with a bill that was put together by Senator GRAHAM and me. It has been modified through the negotiations we have had, as Senator CORKER has commented,

with Senator BROWN and Senator CRAPO. But it does, in effect, provide that there will be notice to Congress before the administration can give any sanction relief to Russia, so there can be transparency and a discussion and a debate. Then there is a process by which Congress, if we feel strongly and can get the necessary support, can disapprove of sanction relief.

I think that is the proper way for us to deal with one of the most important bilateral relationships in the world—between the United States and Russia—and it is appropriate that it is going to be an amendment to the Iran sanctions bill because the review process came out of the Iran agreement.

The review process would be triggered if there is action taken by the President to give relief, but the legislation also includes additional sanctions, as the chairman pointed out, with Russia. It does this in a way that codifies the President’s Executive orders so that there is now congressional support for Executive orders. It expands those sanctions in the area of cyber, as the chairman pointed out, and for energy projects, financial institutions facilitating transactions, Russian arms and related materiel to Syria, the corrupt privatization of government-owned assets.

I particularly thank the chairman for the way he was able to recognize that, in Russia, what we don’t want to see us contribute to is corruption, and we concentrate on the corruption issue, not the business issue. It is the area of corruption that becomes the important thing.

We tighten up a lot of the different sanctions. Then we set up a process where there needs to be certified progress made; otherwise, these are mandatory sanctions the President must impose.

As the chairman pointed out, negotiations included aspects of legislation that was first introduced by Senator MCCAIN and me on sanctions, by Senator GRAHAM and me on review of sanction relief, by Senators CRAPO and BROWN on proposed legislation dealing with sanctions, and Chairman CORKER had significant drafting issues that he brought to the table in our negotiations. So it was a free discussion, and the end result is—I said this before but I want to underscore this—the Banking Committee brought some very helpful suggestions to make sure the financial sanctions worked. It is one thing that we want to make sure there are penalties, but we have to make sure they work right, and I compliment the work of the Banking Committee in making sure that we use the right standards and that this will meet international muster. It is absolutely essential that this template be one in which our European allies can follow our leadership. If we didn’t do that, we could have been isolated, which would not have had the

same impact as I think these sanctions will have in working with our European allies.

The chairman mentioned several of our colleagues on the committee. I need to mention Senator SHAHEEN and Senator MENENDEZ, who played very, very important roles in our caucus. Senator DURBIN and Senator SCHUMER also played roles in this, and I acknowledge their contributions.

Included in this bill is the democracy initiative, which deals with providing more unified support with our allies in Europe in fighting Russia's propaganda and attacks on our democratic institutions. Senator PORTMAN made major contributions to that, as the chairman has also acknowledged, and then, brought to us mainly through the Banking bill, we have a strategy to trace terrorism and financing in terrorism, which I think is very important to be included in the amendment.

We will have a chance to vote on this amendment at 2 o'clock tomorrow. I encourage my colleagues to adopt this. Senator CORKER and I expect to be back on the floor tomorrow as we manage the underlying bill, at which time I will want to comment on the importance of our passing the Iran sanctions bill, which is vitally important because of Iranian activities taking place today.

For all of those reasons, I encourage my colleagues to please read the amendment that has been filed in a bipartisan effort to deal with this challenge that Russia has provided through their activities in attacking our democratic institutions, in their continued aggression in Ukraine, and their human rights violations in Syria.

I might add that Senator MENENDEZ's provisions on human rights sanctions are included in this amendment. It really does, I think, capture the essence of the broad consensus of the U.S. Senate and is worthy of our support.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his comments. Again, I wish to reiterate that the Banking staff, Senator CRAPO and his staff, and Senator BROWN and his staff did an outstanding job of focusing on sanctions that would work in the appropriate way, as was just laid out, and really brought out the best of the two committees to come up with the legislation that we have.

I hope we will have a very strong vote tomorrow. I think this very much supports U.S. foreign policy. I look forward to that taking place tomorrow at 2 o'clock.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN, for their fine work on the Countering Iran's Destabilizing

Activities Act, of course, and then this Russia amendment that so many of us have been pushing for so long. I especially thank Senator CARDIN for his leadership on that, as well as Senator BROWN and Senator CRAPO—and the work that Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER did, as well as a lot of members of the Foreign Relations Committee, who care a lot about this.

As I look at this, I look first at the Iranian part of the underlying bill. We have had many disagreements in the last few years on the Iranian nuclear agreement, but it is now critical. This is the time for those who opposed the agreement and those who supported it to come together to ensure that all of the parties to the agreement are upholding their obligations.

When the United States and our allies agreed to the Iranian nuclear agreement, we made it clear that we will continue to hold Iran accountable for its nefarious activities outside of the four corners of the agreement. We must hold Iran accountable for missile tests, for financing terrorism, and human rights violations. That is our job, and that is why I was an early cosponsor of the legislation before the Senate today.

The Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017 imposes mandatory sanctions on those involved with Iran's ballistic missile program, as well as those who fund terrorist organizations and commit human rights violations. Iran's ballistic missile program is a threat to regional and global security, and United Nations Security Council resolution 2231 makes it illegal for Iran to develop ballistic missiles that could carry a nuclear weapon. Any person or business involved in helping Iran obtain illegal weapons should be banned from doing business with the United States, have their assets immediately frozen, and their travel restricted.

Minimizing the threat Iran poses also means holding it accountable for funding terrorist groups that threaten Israel and seek to destabilize the region. We should be doing everything in our power to better track terrorist financing so we can stop the flow of money that funds suicide bombers and illicit weapons.

Our mission here is clear: We must protect our own citizens and our allies by enacting strong legislation to ensure that Iran does not cheat on its international commitment. Iran must know that if it violates the rules, it will be held accountable.

Democrats and Republicans have come together to get this done, and it is my hope that we can pass the legislation this week, including the amendment imposing strong sanctions against Russia, which is essential to protecting our democracy from foreign interference.

Seventeen United States intelligence agencies have confirmed that Russia

tried to interfere in the 2016 election. That is not all. We know Russia is using covert cyber attacks, espionage, and harmful propaganda to try to undermine our democracy. They launched cyber attacks against local election systems, a U.S. voting systems software company, and the emails of more than 100 local election officials. Russian-backed criminals hacked into Yahoo and stole data from 500 million accounts. They repeatedly harassed American diplomats in Moscow.

The former Director of Intelligence, James Clapper, recently testified that Russia will continue to interfere in our political system. This is what he said:

I believe [Russia is] now emboldened to continue such activities in the future both here and around the world and to do so even more intensely. If there has ever been a clarion call for vigilance and action against a threat to the very foundation of our democratic political system, this episode is it.

Vigilance—that is what we need right now. That is why I joined a bipartisan group of my colleagues to introduce the Countering Russian Hostilities Act, legislation that would impose strong sanctions against Russia. These sanctions would address Russia's cyber attacks, its human rights violations, and its illegal annexation of land in Ukraine and Georgia.

I am also the cosponsor of the Russia Sanctions Review Act, bipartisan legislation that would require congressional review if sanctions against Russia are rolled back.

The Russia sanctions amendment offered today contains essential portions of both of these pieces of legislation.

After those 17 intelligence agencies confirmed that Russia interfered in our elections, President Obama enacted important sanctions against officials in the Russian Government and hackers conducting malicious cyber activity on behalf of the Russian Government. The amendment before us today would codify those sanctions. The amendment also strengthens sanctions against Russia's energy sector, corrupt Russian officials, and those who supply weapons to the Assad regime.

The day the Obama administration was imposing these additional sanctions on Russia, I was actually with Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM in Eastern Europe. The goal of our trip was to reinforce support for NATO and our allies in the face of increased Russian aggression. On the trip, we went to the Baltics, Ukraine, and Georgia, countries on the frontlines of these fights. They know Russia's playbook well.

In our meetings with Presidents and Prime Ministers of these countries, it was increasingly evident that if we don't stop Russia now, cyber attacks against governments, political parties, newspapers, and companies will only get worse. We heard about websites being shut down and internet access limited when one government—the

Government of Estonia—simply had the audacity to move a bronze statue from a public square to a cemetery. It was of a Russian fighter. The Russian Government didn't like it, so they cut down their internet access.

Also, there were members of the Ukrainian Parliament who were invited to Lithuania. What happened to the Lithuanians in the Parliament? They were hacked into. Ukraine itself was targeted by Russian hackers more than 6,500 times over a 2-month period.

Most recently, Russia tried to undermine elections in France.

For years, our allies have been subjected to Russian aggression and invasion. But they are undeterred, unwilling to give up on that which they fought so hard for—independence, freedom, democracy.

So this is not just about defending our own democracy, as we look at these Russia sanctions that are before us today, as we look at the investigation that is ongoing and looking into the interference into our election. It is about defending a democratic way of life and democracies across the world. It is not just about the simple word "election" or the simple word "democracy." It is not just about one candidate or one political party. As Senator RUBIO has noted, the next time it will be the other party.

No, this is about our Constitution. It is about our own independence from foreign powers. It is about freedom and the rights guaranteed to us in our own Constitution. If that is undermined, if foreign governments are allowed to come in and handpick who their candidate is based on either propaganda or cyber attacks, then we lose our constitutional rights because we the people are no longer determining who our representatives are. Other countries are.

The world continues to look to America for our steadfast leadership. The United States—a beacon for freedom and democracy—must continue to stand up against Russian aggression, not just in word but in deed. That is why it is so important that the Senate is coming together today to pass strong sanctions against the Russian Government. We want the Russian people to be able to have a democracy. We want them to be able to have a democracy that doesn't do things like bring down planes in Ukraine, that doesn't do things like try to influence other countries' elections. That is why these sanctions are so important.

We know that the Russian Government today is actively working to undermine our democracy and hurt American businesses. This is part of the cyber war. We know that this unprecedented interference has been orchestrated by the Kremlin so that Americans actually lose faith in our own political system. Over time, Russia has grown more determined in its effort to

weaken democracies in its expanded sphere of influence. Now, more than ever, Americans are looking to the Senate for leadership. We must stand strong and united so that Russia and other nations know that attacks against our democracy must not go unchecked. The amendment before us on the sanctions is an important step in doing just that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

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

#### U.S.-MEXICO SUGAR AGREEMENT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to express my considerable disappointment with the U.S.-Mexico sugar agreement that was announced just last week. This deal was concluded recently. The fact is that this is a bad deal for the United States. I am completely mystified as to why our Commerce Department would agree to it. It is a bad deal for U.S. consumers, and we are all consumers. It is a bad deal for American workers.

It completely fails to address the high price of sugar that we have in America today. In fact, it makes the problem worse. It increases the price that we all have to pay for sugar. It reduces choices for consumers, and it absolutely threatens jobs in the many food-producing industries that we have across our country. What it does is that it continues the protectionist policies that favor a handful of big sugar producers and refiners.

These are large, agribusiness companies, generally, already subsidized by domestic agricultural policies that force American consumers to pay artificially inflated prices for their products. It also limits imports, and the fact is that the agreement should be doing just the opposite. It should be giving us a free market in sugar so that American consumers can shop for the best deal available in the world, and that is exactly what it does not do.

Unfortunately, what they did at the Commerce Department is they failed to prioritize the concerns of ordinary American consumers, ordinary American workers. The fact is that the United States is a significant net importer of sugar. We are a huge country, and we don't produce as much sugar as we consume. So we import the difference. Mexico happens to be the No. 1 source of imported sugar. We get about 35 percent of our imported sugar from Mexico. The NAFTA trade agreement provided for free trade in sugar. It took a long time to get there, but it contemplated an arrangement where Mexico could sell to American consumers—

like my wife, when she goes shopping at the store, and all of our families—without duties, without tariffs, without taxes, without obstacles.

But that didn't work out so well for some of the sugar producers. So they went to court, and they accused Mexico of dumping sugar.

In order to avoid tariffs, the Mexican Government agreed to what they call the suspension agreement. It is an agreement that basically sets a minimum price.

So that is what we do. That is our sugar policy. The government dictates it, essentially, in conjunction with foreign governments. It is the American Government that has all the leverage here. We set prices. We fix prices. We don't have a free market. We establish, by central government fiat, what the price will be.

We also establish import quotas. We decide how much of foreign sugar an American will be permitted to buy, reminiscent of "Moscow on the Mississippi." This is not how you have a free market that allows consumers to have the choices and the benefits from lower competition.

I was concerned about where this negotiation was heading. So Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Democratic Senator from New Hampshire, and I sent a letter to Commerce Secretary Ross to urge him to consider the impact on consumers—which is all of us, I will reiterate—in negotiating this deal. There was a similar letter from House Members. Unfortunately, it apparently did not persuade our Commerce Department. In fact, this new agreement—as I think I mentioned—leaves us with a policy that is worse than it was before. This new so-called suspension agreement increases the already-inflated price of sugar—2 percent higher for raw sugar and 8 percent higher for refined sugar if it is imported from Mexico.

How does it help the 320 million Americans? How does it help ordinary Americans to be forced to pay more for the sugar that we all have to buy? It is a staple in our food. The answer is that it doesn't help. It hurts the single mom who is going to the grocery store to buy cereal for her kids when she has to pay approximately twice the price of the global price for sugar. Where does that money go? It goes straight out of her pocket and straight into the pockets of this handful of wealthy sugar producers in America. So it is absolutely bad policy for American consumers.

Make no mistake about it. Higher prices for Mexican sugar mean higher prices for American consumers—all of us. The Coalition for Sugar Reform estimates that the new agreement—just the new agreement—will cost U.S. consumers an additional billion dollars a year. That goes straight to the growers, the producers. As I said, U.S. sugar prices are already almost double the

world prices, generally, because of the ridiculous agricultural policy we have with respect to sugar. The American Enterprise Institute reports that they believe that the current policy already costs U.S. consumers \$3 billion a year. So you have the \$3 billion a year from this flawed policy we used to have. Now we just added another billion dollars a year in costs to our consumers by virtue of this suspension agreement. What the Commerce Department should be doing in these contexts is described as to reduce and eliminate this mandatory price fixing, eliminate these barriers to trade, and put U.S. consumers as the first priority.

I will point out that it is not only Americans as consumers who are harmed by this, but it is also Americans as workers. There are industries that use sugar as a component in their food products. My State of Pennsylvania, in particular, has a lot of these companies—200 confectioners. We have the most in any State. Our sugar-using industries employ nearly 40,000 workers across our Commonwealth. We have 600,000 workers across the country in the various food and beverage industries that make products that we all consume that use sugar. Guess what. Higher sugar prices jeopardize those well-paying food manufacturing jobs. About 120,000 such jobs have been lost over the last 2 decades because what happens is that American food producers just can't compete. American food producers are forced to buy artificially expensive sugar. Their foreign competitors don't have to do that. Their foreign competitors can buy sugar on the world market at about half the price. So guess what? An American candy maker or cereal maker or other food maker is at a huge competitive disadvantage. We have been losing them, in part, because we force them to pay these artificially high prices.

Our own Commerce Department—the very same Commerce Department that negotiated this deal—did a study. This is their work, not mine. They estimate that when you artificially prop up the price of sugar, you might save some jobs in the sugar-growing industry, but for every job you save there, you lose three jobs in the food processing and manufacturing industry—in the sugar consumption industry. What a terrible trade. What a terrible arrangement.

I am very disappointed to learn about this. The Commerce Department clearly failed to negotiate an agreement that would put consumers first and consumers' pocketbooks first. Instead, we have increased prices above the already artificially high levels. We have restrictions on sugar trade, and, apparently, we have decided to pursue protectionist policies that advance the interests of a small handful of wealthy growers at the expense of several hundred million American consumers. This

strikes me as crony capitalism, and it is a huge mistake.

I hope that this is not a sign of what is to come in trade negotiations. We are told that the administration is going to be reevaluating and renegotiating various agreements, including NAFTA and others. As they are being reconsidered, I hope we will not go down this protectionist road of favoring a handful of the privileged few at the expense of the many, as we apparently did in this agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, however loud, persistent, and powerful the climate denial operation has been, we have to remember that it has always been built on lies. It is a huge fortress of lies stacked upon lies—lies about the science, lies about the scientists, lies about doubt, lies about costs, lies through phony front groups, and lies about where the money comes from and who is pulling the strings.

This fortress of lies protects a subsidy to the fossil fuel industry that the International Monetary Fund puts at \$700 billion per year. For big, big money, you can do big, big lies, and they do. These have been the biggest lies of our generation. But to paraphrase the great reggae singer Jimmy Cliff: "The bigger you lie, the harder you fall." To paraphrase the "Game of Thrones," "The fall is coming." In the last few weeks, there has been news that has shaken this fortress of lies and moves us toward that fall. Shareholders are rising up.

For as long as there have been shareholder resolutions to fossil fuel companies about climate change, there has been resolute opposition from management to every vote. Hundreds of shareholder resolutions went down to defeat until now.

Occidental Petroleum shareholders last month won the first victory against management, and a week later mighty ExxonMobil was defeated by its shareholders. This new reporting that shareholders have demanded will help clear away the lies. The fall is coming.

There are even lies within the lies. To fend off this latest shareholder resolution to try to make the company look less irresponsible, ExxonMobil's CEO repeated the company's claim that it knows climate change is real and supports a carbon fee—but it doesn't.

As everyone in this building knows, ExxonMobil maintains a massive lobbying apparatus in Washington, and that massive apparatus is and always has been resolutely opposed to any

such thing as a carbon fee or any serious climate action whatsoever, for that matter, unless maybe ExxonMobil doesn't know what its own vast lobbying apparatus is doing. Maybe ExxonMobil spends that enormous amount of money to exert its influence in Washington to stop any climate action, and the CEO is unaware of that going on. I doubt that. You be the judge of whether that is credible.

It is not just shareholders rising up; attorneys general are starting to win. The attorney general of New York has just filed pleadings in State court in New York asserting that ExxonMobil's climate reporting has been a "sham"—to use the word from his filing; that, in the oldest of accounting tricks, ExxonMobil kept two sets of books assessing carbon pollution risk. After fierce opposition by ExxonMobil lawyers using every trick in the book to delay and snarl the New York attorney general, it looks now as if ExxonMobil may have lied to its investors and its shareholders. If ExxonMobil has lied to its shareholders, that is a violation of law, and that fall comes hard indeed.

Secretary of State Tillerson evidently knew of and approved the two sets of carbon pollution books when he was CEO of ExxonMobil. We will see where this goes, but of all the people around Trump who might be indicted, now we might add the Secretary of State.

The Attorney General of Massachusetts is also pursuing ExxonMobil against equally fierce tactics by ExxonMobil lawyers. To try to get away from the Massachusetts attorney general, the lawyers even went so far as to claim—get this—that ExxonMobil was not doing business in Massachusetts; that it didn't have the minimum contacts with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts necessary for the State even to assert jurisdiction. Well, the judge virtually laughed that argument out of court, but it shows how desperate ExxonMobil must be feeling as it tries to wriggle away from having to answer questions under oath.

Nothing turns a big lie into a hard fall better than having to put that right hand up and give truthful testimony and face cross-examination under penalty of perjury.

Will the Securities and Exchange Commission take a look at this sham reporting, too, or has the Federal government, under Trump, degenerated into such a fossil fuel banana republic that no Federal agency will do its job against that industry or might it even chime in on the side of industry Pruitt-style?

Do you remember the question of whether the fossil fuel climate denial operation merits investigation under Federal civil racketeering laws? The tobacco industry was sued under Federal civil racketeering laws by the U.S. Department of Justice so there is a

model. You may remember that the question as to the fossil fuel climate denial operation was referred by Attorney General Lynch to the FBI—or so she testified.

One wonders, did the FBI ever take an honest look? What was the outcome? Was there ever a report? Are they still looking at it?

Remember that the Department of Justice won its civil racketeering case against the tobacco industry, they won it at trial, and they won again on appeal. The woman who won that case for the Department of Justice, the lead trial attorney for the Department, has said publicly that this climate denial operation also merits investigation as fraud. That would seem to be a knowledgeable opinion from the woman who won the last case, an opinion perhaps worth heeding, but did anything happen? Will anything happen?

Forget too big to fail or too big to jail. Is the power of the fossil fuel industry now so great that it is too big even to investigate, even by the Department of Justice? Does it now take State attorneys general to do the job because the Federal government is so owned now by the fossil fuel industry?

Think about it. What if the FBI reported to the Attorney General that there was a meritorious fraud case arising out of all the lies propping up climate denial? Who believes Attorney General Sessions would allow that case to go forward against his party's biggest backer?

Well, the bigger the lie, ultimately, the harder the fall. One way or the other, this fact remains constant and true. There always will come a day of reckoning. With these shareholder victories and with these attorneys general victories, that day of reckoning is closing in—the day when they have to put that right hand up and testify truthfully and under oath, not just send out spin through front groups and operatives but testify truthfully under penalty of perjury.

It is long overdue for truth to have its day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin Countering Russian Aggression and Cyber Attacks Act of 2017. This bill, filed as an amendment, was filed as amendment No. 232 to the Iran sanctions bill late last night.

Yesterday, the Senate Banking and Foreign Relations Committees concluded their work on a groundbreaking piece of legislation regarding Russia sanctions. I say groundbreaking because the legislation not only ratchets up pressure against the Russian Federation for its illegal invasion and annexation of Crimea, continuing escalation of violence in eastern Ukraine,

and its cyber activities against businesses and citizens of the United States, but it also, importantly, provides Congress with a strong oversight process over almost any termination or suspension of these sanctions.

Senators CORKER, BROWN, CARDIN, and their staffs spent many hours to ensure that we put together a thoughtful and measured product, and I thank them for their work.

Senator BROWN and I have worked together for months to try to craft a responsible Russia sanctions package, and Senator CORKER has been a tireless champion of this measure as has Senator CARDIN. I also would be remiss if I did not recognize the work of Senators MCCAIN, BROWN, SHAHEEN, and the many others who have worked to develop much of what has ended up in this legislation. All of us appreciate the leadership of Majority Leader MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER, who worked with us as we came to our final agreement.

The need for this legislation was underlined by the fact that many Americans have deep concerns about Russia's behavior over the past few years. Since coming to power, Russian President Putin has become increasingly belligerent, nationalistic, and autocratic.

Currently, the United States has imposed sanctions on Russia for Russia's invasion and annexation of Crimea and its role in supporting the separatist movements in eastern Ukraine, Russia's increasing cyber attacks and cyber espionage against the United States, Russia's support for the Assad regime in Syria, and Russia's complicity for corruption.

Although this is not an exhaustive list, it demonstrates the lengths to which Russia will go to seize power and influence in the international arena.

Unfortunately, Putin's desire to increase Russia's political influence is not driven by a desire to raise the standard of living for Russians. Instead, it is driven by a craving to enrich and empower himself and his cronies.

Over the course of the past 3 months, the Senate Banking Committee has held hearings assessing the impacts of the current sanctions regime against Russia. We examined the existing Russian sanctions architecture in terms of its effectiveness and its economic impact. The Russians have largely learned to live within the economic confines of the existing sanctions regime.

In Putin's calculation, the cost of the sanctions do not outweigh the benefits of occupying Crimea and contributing to unrest in Ukraine, to continuing to support the Assad regime's assault on civilians in Syria, and conducting cyber attacks on people, companies, and institutions around the globe.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle feel the United States needs to be

much stronger in its response. Americans want to see the United States stand firm in the defense of our long-held values, which include respect for territorial integrity, human rights, and liberty.

At this point, the only way to change Putin's cost-benefit analysis is to increase the pressure which we apply directly through sanctions.

The Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin amendment is an effective way to increase the pressure on Russia for its irresponsible conduct. Our legislation signals to the world the unflagging commitment of the United States to the sanctity of territorial integrity, human rights, and good governance. Our amendment also demonstrates our resolve in responding to cyber attacks against U.S. citizens and entities and against our allies.

In summary, the Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin amendment does four things: It escalates and expands the current sanctions regime against Russia; it creates new sanctions against Russia; it engages Congress at a higher level than before by providing a mechanism for Congress to vote before lifting any sanctions on Russia; and it increases the Treasury Department's ability to track illicit finance, including illicit flows linked to Russia.

We escalate and expand the current sanctions regime against Russia by codifying and modifying six current Executive orders. Four of these orders relate to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, and two relate to Russia's malicious cyber activity.

We expand the sanctions under the Ukraine-related Executive orders to reach Russian deep-water, Arctic, and shale projects worldwide. We also permit the President to apply these sanctions to Russian railway, shipping, and metals and mining sectors.

The amendment also creates several new sanctions against Russia. There are new sanctions for those who are engaged in significant activities undermining cyber security. These sanctions also apply to those providing material support for such malicious cyber actors.

We also impose mandatory sanctions on entities engaged in special Russian energy projects and on foreign financial institutions facilitating transactions in response to Russia's continued aggression in Ukraine.

The amendment includes tough sanctions on Russian Government officials, their relatives, and close associates responsible for significant corruption in Russia or elsewhere.

It sanctions people who help others evade sanctions and people responsible for human rights violations in any territory controlled by Russia.

Additionally, it sanctions those who work for or on behalf of the Russian defense and intelligence sectors, those who invest or support the construction

of Russian energy export pipelines, and corrupt government officials who enrich themselves after making deals to privatize state-owned assets.

Finally, it sanctions those who help the Assad regime acquire chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons technology, ballistic or cruise missile capabilities, or destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons.

The Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin amendment will result in some very powerful new sanctions on Russia. Part of our agreement includes congressional review language to ensure Congress exerts proper oversight on the use of these powerful sanctions. We require the President to notify Congress when imposing certain types of sanctions, and we will have the opportunity to review any attempts to lift sanctions with regard to Russia. We intend to use this review model on all sanctions regimes moving forward, and I intend to work to apply it to sanctions on Iran.

Amendment No. 232 is more than just the sanctions and congressional review; this legislation also includes important counterterrorism financing provisions adopted by the House and Senate during the 114th Congress. It requires the creation of a national strategy for combatting the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance. This strategy ensures that the United States pursues a coordinated and effective fight against illicit finance at all levels of the Russian Government.

Our measure requires the strategy to enhance public-private partnerships to prevent and detect illicit finance. The measure also requires the Treasury Department to report on its efforts to identify illicit finance flows linked to Russia affecting the U.S. financial system or the financial system of our allies. We must engage all of our allies, particularly our trading partners, to work with us so that we achieve our objectives without collateral damage, which is so often the case. It is important that our trading partners be with us on this issue rather than being the victims of the actions we take.

This is a strong bipartisan measure that in important respects represents the next step forward. Of course, this will not be the last step if Russia does not begin to demonstrate verifiable steps toward reducing its course of aggression on multiple fronts. Make no mistake—the sanctions currently in place and those submitted in our amendment last night are Putin's fault and not a result of Putin's confused notions of Russian power and pride.

Even though unilateral actions are not the best option, America must lead on this issue and encourage others to follow since the most successful sanctions result from a united front of United States and European Union cooperation.

Since the unlawful annexation of Crimea, the years of destabilizing eastern Ukraine through relentless war, the global spread of cyber intrusions, and Putin's indefensible support of Assad's leadership of Syria, particularly in light of its recent chemical attack, fewer are left in Europe to defend Putin's policies. The times call for clarity of purpose and a correct amount of pressure. We have that in this amendment.

Again, thank you to Senators CORKER, BROWN, and CARDIN for your hard work and support and to each of the other Senators from both sides of the aisle who have worked to help develop and pursue the policies adopted in this legislation. Thank you to Leader McConnell and Senator Schumer for all of your help and support.

I look forward to passing this measure in short order, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today, I speak in favor of the Iran sanctions bill. I am an original cosponsor of the bill, so it should come as no surprise that I support it. My only concern is that we did not pass it sooner.

As I stand here today, I cannot help but feel that this moment highlights the folly of the last 8 years of President Obama's foreign policy. For 8 years, President Obama did everything he could to curry favor with the Ayatollahs in Tehran. He ignored popular protests, known as the Green Movement, and the thousands of Iranians who cried out for something more than sham elections. He lectured our Gulf Arab allies on the need to "share" the Middle East with their sworn enemy in some kind of cold peace. He insisted on putting daylight between us and our friend Israel. He dallied and dithered as the regime helped its client Bashar al-Assad help tear apart his own country in a brutal civil war. Most infamously, he traded away billions of dollars in sanctions relief for a flimsy, one-sided nuclear deal—a deal that did not prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon so much as ultimately guarantee it in just a few years.

What do we have to show for all of this? What did we get for looking the other way for 8 years? Not a more reasonable Iran, not a more open, tolerant, democratic Iran, not a friendlier Iran, but an emboldened Iran—one that continues to launch ballistic missiles

in willful defiance of United Nations Security Council resolutions. For everything we have done to mollify the ayatollahs and their sensitivities, they have gone out of their way to inflame ours. What did President Obama do? Nothing but appease them.

But we should not lay these failures solely on the last President's doorstep, because he represents a mindset that is too widely shared. It is one that sees Iran's obvious imperial aggression in the Middle East and yet still considers America the aggressor. It is one that tries to compartmentalize and haggle with a regime whose leaders shout "death to Israel" and "death to America" virtually every Friday. It is one that refuses to call a spade a spade and say to the Ayatollahs that enough is enough.

But today we are changing course—and not a moment too soon. This legislation will finally hold the regime and Tehran accountable for their brazen attempts to bully their neighbors and assert supremacy throughout the Middle East. It will put heavy sanctions on anyone who is involved in helping Iran develop ballistic missiles, circumvent our arms embargo, or spread terrorism throughout the world.

I know there are those who consider this kind of a move to be provocative, but I would say that it is the Iranian regime's aggression that has been provocative. All of these sanctioned activities are things that the regime and Tehran should not be doing in the first place. I do not think it is provocative to hold our enemies to the same standards as our friends. I do not think it is unreasonable to do what we can to protect our friends and ourselves from Iranian-supported terrorism and from a regime that is responsible for killing hundreds of American troops in the Middle East. Instead, I think it is long overdue.

Today, I am glad to see the Senate finally prepared to rectify these grave mistakes.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### REAUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the bipartisan legislation that will reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program. I wish to speak a little bit about flood insurance first before I talk about our much needed legislation.

As most people know—but unfortunately some folks don't know or maybe they forget—if you have homeowners



insurance on your home and you have a flood, you are not covered. Homeowners insurance does not cover flooding. In order to be covered for flooding, you have to have a separate policy, and about the only place you can go to get flood insurance is from the Federal program—the National Flood Insurance Program. Now, that is a bit of an overstatement. It is possible to buy flood insurance from a private insurer—and certainly we want to encourage private insurers to participate more in the flood insurance market—but today, for the most part, if you want to carry flood insurance, you have to get it through the Federal program, and that is called the National Flood Insurance Program. It is administered by FEMA.

It is hard to overstate the importance of flood insurance to the American people. It is even harder to overstate the importance of flood insurance to the people of Louisiana. The gross domestic product in my State is about \$220 billion to \$230 billion a year. If you add up all the goods and services that we as Louisianans produce every year, it comes out to between \$220 billion and \$230 billion. Without flood insurance, you can cut that figure in half. We would have to, in effect, turn out the lights.

There are 450,000 flood insurance policies in my State. Many of those people have to have flood insurance; it is a condition of their mortgage. So the Flood insurance program and, more specifically, the National Flood Insurance Program, is extraordinarily important to America, but it is even more extraordinarily important to the people of Louisiana.

We are introducing a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program. The current program expires in September. If we don't reauthorize it, most Americans who have flood insurance at the present time will no longer be able to access it. It is critical that the U.S. Congress act and act immediately.

The bill we are introducing—and I will explain in a moment whom I mean by “we”—is bipartisan legislation.

Now, there are a lot of issues that divide Congress today, and reasonable people are entitled to disagree over some of these very difficult issues, but there are also issues we can come together on, and I respectfully suggest that flood insurance is one of them.

We have put together a bipartisan coalition, including Senator BOB MENENDEZ from New Jersey, who happens to be a Democrat; and Senator CORY BOOKER from New Jersey, who happens to be a Democrat; Senator THAD COCHRAN, chairman of our Appropriations Committee in the Senate, from Mississippi, who is a Republican; Senator MARCO RUBIO from Florida, who is a Republican; Senator BILL NELSON from Florida, who is a Democrat; Senator

VAN HOLLEN from Maryland, who happens to be a Democrat; and more Senators are coming on board.

We are introducing a bill called the SAFE National Flood Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. SAFE, of course, is an acronym. It refers to sustainable, affordable, fair, and efficient—SAFE—the SAFE National Flood Insurance Program Reauthorization Act.

Let me briefly tell my colleagues what it does. I will start with cost. It doesn't do a bit of good to offer someone insurance if they can't afford it, and too many times that has been the case with flood insurance. Right now, under the current program, the National Flood Insurance Program is allowed to raise a homeowner's flood insurance premium by 18 percent—not 10 percent, not 12 percent but by a staggering 18 percent—and to do that every year. If you are insuring a second home—let's suppose you have a vacation home—or if you are a businesswoman or a businessman and insuring a commercial establishment, the national program can raise your premiums every year by 25 percent. Nobody can pay those kinds of increases.

No. 1, our bill would cap the amount the Flood Insurance Program can raise someone's premium at 10 percent annually. I wish we could tap it at zero percent annually, but 10 percent is certainly a lot better for our people than 18 percent and 25 percent, respectively. If FEMA properly implements some other provisions of our act, which I will talk about in a moment, there will not be any increases.

No. 2, our bill, the SAFE National Flood Insurance Program Reauthorization Act, would extend the National Flood Insurance Program by 6 years. I wish we could extend it longer. I wish we could do 10 years or 15 years or 20 years, but it is necessary for us, as the Presiding Officer knows, to get unified, bipartisan support on this legislation, and we think 6 years—a 6-year authorization is probably the best we can do to pass this bill.

No. 3, our bill will save about \$750 million a year. Let me say that again. Our bill will save about \$750 million each and every year to be used in the Flood Insurance Program. Here is how our legislation would do it.

First, as we know, the Flood Insurance Program has a deficit. We have had a large number of natural disasters, including floods, over the past several years in our country, unfortunately. We had Hurricane Sandy. We had Hurricane Katrina. In my State in Louisiana, last year we had two horrible floods, both in the northern part of my State and in the southern part of my State. In a couple of instances, we had 23 inches of rain in 2 days. I don't care if you live on Mount Everest, if you get 23 inches of rain in 2 days, you are going to flood. Those floods were very expensive.

Those catastrophes and many others caused the National Flood Insurance Program to operate at a deficit. The deficit is \$25 billion. Another way of stating that is, the program owes \$25 billion in debt, but we owe it to ourselves. We don't owe it to a bank, we don't owe it to a foreign country, we don't owe it to any private entity; we owe it to ourselves, and we have been paying interest to ourselves out of the premiums—the cashflow, if you will—of the Flood Insurance Program every year. That 10 percent—10 cents out of every dollar that comes into the National Flood Insurance Program—is devoted to just paying the interest on this debt that we owe ourselves.

Our bill would suspend those interest payments for 6 years. That will free up about \$400 million a year.

We are also saving money by asking those who work with us in implementing the National Flood Insurance Program to sharpen their pencils. Let me explain what I mean by that. FEMA is in charge of the National Flood Insurance Program, but FEMA doesn't run the program. It doesn't run the insurance company that administers the policies. FEMA hires private insurers in the private sector to actually run the program. We call that the “write your own” program.

For the most part, those private insurers that administer the program do a good job, but they don't have any risk. They have zero risk, none, nada. The risk is on the National Flood Insurance Program—the Federal government—and therefore the American taxpayer. We just hire the private insurers to administer the program—to collect the premiums, to sell the policies, to adjust the claims. So they have no risk. Yet we are paying them 31 cents out of every dollar that the program would take in.

Our bill respectfully suggests that is too much money. While we appreciate the cooperation we get and the good work we get from the private insurers who help us administer this program, we are going to ask them—actually, we are going to tell them—to reduce their compensation from 31 cents out of every dollar. That is going to save about \$350 million a year. So we just saved about \$750 million a year for the National Flood Insurance Program.

What are we going to do with the money? First, mitigation. With flooding—and it is inevitable that we are going to have floods. I don't know why bad things happen to good people, but they do. You can pay a little bit up front or you can pay a whole lot later, and this is what I mean by that.

If we spend the money on mitigation to protect against the flooding that we know will inevitably happen, we will save money for the American taxpayer in the long run, and we will use a portion of that \$750 million in savings to

mitigate against flood risk. By mitigation, I mean offering low- or no-interest loans to homeowners to elevate their homes so they will not flood—building levees, building flood walls. Our bill does not say specifically what mitigation measures should be taken, and it does not say which mitigation projects will be built, but it does say that mitigation is the answer, not the complete answer but part of the answer. We haven't done enough of it. Now we are going to have the resources to do it.

The second way we are going to use that money is to try to do a better job with maps. We set rates in the National Flood Insurance Program based on the likelihood that someone will be flooded. We determine that likelihood by using maps drawn by experts using computer models. We are not using the most up-to-date, state-of-the-art technology to draw those maps, but if our bill passes, we will, including but not limited to a new technology called LIDAR. I confess, I don't understand the technology, but it is called LIDAR, Light Detection and Ranging technology. It can be used to draw more accurate flood maps to more accurately assess someone's propensity to flood.

Why is that important? You might be in a high-risk flood zone right now and paying a large premium. With state-of-the-art technology, you may be put into a lower risk flood zone and pay less. I am not guaranteeing that result, but it is certainly possible. In any event, we need to as accurately as possible assess the risk, and the only way to do that is through proper mapping.

Our bill would also include a provision that will allow Congress to provide better and greater oversight of FEMA in administering the program. Let me say specifically what it will do.

The very able Administrator at FEMA who handles the Flood Insurance Program testified before the Banking Committee a few months ago that if one of these private insurance companies that administers the Flood Insurance Program for us has lawyers or consultants who are not doing their jobs, FEMA doesn't have the authority to fire them. This bill will give FEMA the authority to fire those consultants, and here is why this is important: Most of the lawyers, engineers, and other consultants private insurance companies hire to help them administer the program on behalf of the National Flood Insurance Program do a pretty good job, but some of them do not. There have been recorded instances both in New Jersey and in Louisiana where certain people, engineers and lawyers, have seen it as their mission to do anything they possibly can to keep a homeowner who has paid his or her hard-earned money to buy insurance from getting the money they deserve if they flood, and that is just wrong.

If you are trying to defraud the National Flood Insurance Program, we need to fight you like a tiger. But if you have paid your premiums and, unfortunately, you have flooded, you are entitled to get your money. You should not be required to fight some engineer or some lawyer who is throwing up obstacle after obstacle after obstacle. Our bill says that if there are consultants who do that and the private insurance companies don't want to fire them, then, by God, FEMA will, and we are going to hold FEMA accountable.

A couple more points I will mention: This bill will also extend coverage limits. Right now, the most flood insurance a homeowner can buy is \$250,000. While that is a lot of money, that doesn't cover some homes, given the rate of inflation in America today, and our bill would expand coverage limits to \$500,000 for homes and \$1.5 million for commercial establishments.

I have talked to some of my colleagues in the Senate and in the House, and some of them, whom I am happy for, represent States that haven't had any major floods, and I hope they never do. But if we have learned anything in the last few years in terms of flooding, we have learned that just when men and women think they can control everything in this world and can control their destiny, they can't control God and Mother Nature. Flooding can happen at any time.

Let me say it again. You can live in a mountain State. You can live on top of a mountain. But if you get 23 inches of rain in 2 days, you are going to flood, and that is why you need flood insurance. That is why this bill is not just important to coastal States like Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, New Jersey, and Maryland; it is important to all Americans.

This is a bipartisan bill. Have I mentioned that? I think I did. This is a bipartisan bill. It is supported by many Democrats. It is supported by many Republicans. It is a bill that is not only important for our economy, but it is important for the peace of mind of the American people. I hope we will not let politics get in the way of doing what we know to be right.

Once again, the bill is called the SAFE—which stands for Sustainable, Affordable, Fair, and Efficient—National Flood Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. I hope this body will come together as one and support this much needed legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

HONORING LIEUTENANT PATRICK WEATHERFORD

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay respect to a law enforcement officer in my home State of Arkansas who lost his life in the line of duty yesterday, Monday, June 12, 2017.

Lieutenant Patrick Weatherford of the Newport Police Department joined other officers in responding to the call of a vehicle break-in when he was shot. Sadly, Lieutenant Weatherford passed away later that evening.

Lieutenant Weatherford served on the Newport police force for 15 years and recently graduated from the FBI Academy. He was also a graduate of ASU-Newport and the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Lieutenant Weatherford was recognized as the 2016 Jackson County Officer of the Year by Arkansas attorney general Leslie Rutledge.

His colleagues had great respect and admiration for him, and he was known as an officer who performed his duties with professionalism and skill.

This is the second Arkansas law enforcement officer we have lost in 2017. Any occasion when someone who is sworn to protect and serve their community does not return home to the loved ones waiting for them is incredibly sad and heartbreaking. Arkansans value the men and women who volunteer to help ensure and enhance public safety knowing the risks involved.

We are devastated by the loss of another law enforcement officer in our State, and we thank all of those who sacrifice so much to protect us.

I want to encourage my colleagues to pass the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act to allow Governors to order the American flag to fly at half-staff in recognition of the sacrifice of first responders like Lieutenant Weatherford who make the ultimate sacrifice.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Lieutenant Weatherford's family and friends, as well as the community he served, which will no doubt miss him dearly. I pray they will all find comfort during such a difficult time as this.

I also stand with all Arkansans in expressing our gratitude for Lieutenant Weatherford's service and commit to honoring the sacrifice he and others have made to protect us.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the committee substitute amendment.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, Rob Portman, Jeff Flake, Dan Sullivan, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Ron Johnson.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the underlying bill, S. 722.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Jeff Flake, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, Steve Daines, Dan Sullivan, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, John Thune, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso, Ron Johnson, Rob Portman.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture motions be waived.

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO CAROLYN LERNER  
AND MARK COHEN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the service of Special Counsel Carolyn Lerner. Ms. Lerner's term as the leader of the U.S.

Office of Special Counsel, OSC, has expired. By many accounts, she has been the most successful leader of that office in the agency's 40 year history.

This office has a critical mission, one that is more important now than ever. It protects government whistleblowers and helps to eliminate government waste, fraud, and abuse. It is also responsible for the enforcement of the Hatch Act, which keeps the Federal workplace free from improper partisan politics.

Special Counsel Lerner was confirmed unanimously by the Senate in June 2011. During her tenure, she restored the integrity of the Office of Special Counsel after a difficult period. Moreover, she reestablished the OSC as a safe and effective office to defend government whistleblowers.

Moreover, I would also like to recognize the exemplary service of her principal deputy, Mark Cohen, who is leaving government service as well. The OSC played a critical role in protecting hundreds of whistleblowers at the Department of Veterans Affairs. They worked with these courageous employees to improve care for veterans at hospitals across the country, including efforts to improve conditions for veterans in the Baltimore VA.

Under Ms. Lerner and Mr. Cohen's leadership, the OSC worked with Homeland Security whistleblowers to end an improper overtime program, saving the taxpayers \$100 million a year according to the Congressional Budget Office.

These and many, many other victories for whistleblowers and taxpayers set a new standard in terms of effectiveness for this important office.

As my colleague and friend from Maryland, Congressman CUMMINGS, stated in a recent Washington Post article, "Ms. Lerner turned the Office of Special Counsel 'into a model agency and set the bar as the head of that office.'" I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

As Senator GRASSLEY, a longtime champion of government whistleblowers, stated in the same article, "Her leadership should be a road map for future leaders of this office."

Given the office's important good government role, the OSC enjoyed broad, bipartisan support under Lerner and Cohen's leadership. I concur with my colleagues and encourage the next leaders of that office to follow their lead as I pay tribute to their government service.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 2017]  
SPECIAL COUNSEL LERNER LEAVES OFFICE AS TRUMP REJECTS HIGHLY PRAISED WHISTLEBLOWER ADVOCATE

(By Joe Davidson)

The defining moment for the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) after Carolyn Lerner be-

came head of the agency was a gruesome one about body parts and a dismembered Marine.

It's not the usual fare for the office on M Street NW that deals with Hatch Act violations and prohibited personnel practices. But protecting whistleblowers is where OSC makes its reputation—as in the 2011 case involving the Defense Department's Port Mortuary in Dover, Del.

Soon this little but powerful office will have a new special counsel. Rejecting the advice of Republicans and Democrats to keep Lerner, President Trump has nominated Henry Kerner to take her place. He is a former Republican congressional staffer and currently assistant vice president at the Cause of Action Institute, a small-government advocacy organization.

Lerner, who leaves office on June 14, had been on the job only a few months when she revealed reports by federal employees of grisly transgressions at the morgue operated by the Air Force. Body parts were lost in two cases, and in another, the office reported that the mangled body of a Marine "was dismembered with a saw in order to make the body fit inside a military uniform, without the consent or notification of the family."

With a staff that wouldn't begin to fill one Pentagon hallway, Lerner humbled and embarrassed the Defense Department, the government's largest agency. Lawmakers were appalled. The Air Force secretary at the time expressed his sincere "regret" for "lapses in our standards at Dover," a non-apologetic understatement.

The action of the Office of Special Counsel—no relation to a special prosecutor or to Robert S. Mueller III, the special counsel investigating Russian meddling in the 2016 presidential election—secured mortuary reforms and protected the employees who were targets of Air Force retaliation.

"I think that we have sent the federal community a message that whistleblowers should be valued," Lerner said Monday in her office overlooking St. Matthew's Cathedral. "Whistleblowers now feel comfortable coming forward, and that is helping our government."

The Port Mortuary case "really helped the federal community understand that OSC was robust enforcer of whistleblower laws," she added.

Considering the widespread retaliation against federal whistleblowers, her assessment of their comfort might be optimistic, but there is no doubt that the Office of Special Counsel is a more robust agency than the moribund place they found before she got there.

It moved "from last-resort option to first choice for getting relief for whistleblowers," said Tom Devine, legal director of the Government Accountability Project, a whistleblower advocacy organization.

Relief for individual whistleblowers also can mean systemic improvements for federal agencies and taxpayers. The Department of Veterans Affairs is the obvious example. Congress approved VA improvements following a 2014 scandal over the coverup of long patient wait times, which was revealed by whistleblowers. Whistleblower disclosures also led to a new overtime pay system for Border Patrol agents. Lerner's office was instrumental in both.

Devine's strong praise for OSC is not unqualified. "The bad news is they operate at a molasses pace" in some instances, he said. He added that he would like Lerner to be more aggressive about taking legal action against federal agencies that violate whistleblower rights.

Despite the slow pace, agency statistics show impressive gains. There were “276 favorable actions for whistleblowers and other victims of PPPs [prohibited personnel practices] this past year, more than double the annual average,” the office said in its budget justification to Congress. “In the last two years, OSC has achieved five times the number of favorable actions in whistleblower retaliation complaints than in any prior two-year period in agency history. . . . In FY 2016, for the second straight year, OSC received upwards of 6,000 new matters, a 25 percent increase over the prior two-year period.”

The increased caseload leads to bigger backlogs, but it also demonstrates that employees are more willing to trust the office with sensitive cases.

Ironical criticism comes from James J. Wilson, the agency’s chief human capital officer. He filed a whistleblower retaliation complaint against Lerner with the Merit Systems Protection Board after failing to find success before the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. Regarding his complaints to the council, Wilson, who previously filed grievances against former employers at two other agencies, signed an affidavit saying, “I received final decisions closing these four matters with no further action being taken.”

Whatever the criticism of Lerner, it is outweighed by praise from whistleblowers and Members of Congress.

“She’s fearless,” Robert MacLean, an air marshal whistleblower, told me earlier this year. His was the first federal whistleblower case heard by the Supreme Court and MacLean credits his victory largely to work done by OSC.

Unusual in this era of hyper-polarization, she is lauded by both sides of the aisle.

“Leading the Office of Special Counsel requires a deep appreciation for the patriotic work that whistleblowers do to shine a light on fraud or misconduct in government. Carolyn Lerner has been a steadfast advocate for government whistleblowers, and I am grateful for her service at OSC,” said Sen. Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa), chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. “Her leadership should be a road map for future leaders of this office.”

The Senate Whistleblower Protection Caucus, founded by Grassley and Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.), had urged the Trump administration to retain Lerner.

“I am disappointed the president chose not to take Sen. Grassley’s and my recommendation to renominate Carolyn Lerner, who is an experienced leader with bipartisan support,” said Wyden.

It’s also bicameral. Before Trump’s decision, Rep. Rod Blum (Iowa), Republican chairman of the House Whistleblower Protection Caucus, led a bipartisan House letter saying Lerner deserved another term. Among those who signed was Rep. Elijah Cummings (Md.), the ranking Democrat on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Lerner turned the Office of Special Counsel “into a model agency and set the bar as the head of that office,” Cummings said by email Monday. “She served with independence and tenacity to hold agency officials accountable when they retaliated against whistleblowers.”

#### TRIBUTE TO BETSY HUMPHREYS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate who supports

efforts to build support for biomedical research and improved public health, I would like to pay tribute to a great public servant and the first woman and first librarian to lead the National Library of Medicine, NLM, the world’s largest biomedical library and a part of the National Institutes of Health. Ms. Humphreys recently announced that she will retire at the end of June after 44 years of extraordinary leadership and distinguished public service.

On May 9, the board of regents of the National Library of Medicine approved and presented the following resolution to congratulate, commend, and thank Betsy Humphreys for her 44 years of service to the NLM. I would like to share that resolution with my colleagues and join the NLM board of regents in paying tribute to Betsy Humphreys, a public servant who has had a profound and lasting impact on the NLM, the United States, and the global community.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

Ms. Betsy L. Humphreys has served NLM, the United States, and the global community with distinction since 1973, culminating in her appointment as the NLM Deputy Director in 2005, a post she continues to occupy today, and serving as NLM Acting Director from April 1, 2015 to August 14, 2016—the first woman and first librarian to lead the Library.

In a career that could be called one long highlight reel, she directed the groundbreaking Unified Medical Language System project, which produces knowledge sources to support advanced processing, retrieval, and integration of information from disparate electronic information sources, and which is used around the world. In the process, she developed unique knowledge and experience with the content and format of many biomedical terminologies, health vocabularies, and clinical classifications that would serve her well in all endeavors to follow.

She was a key contributor to interagency efforts to advance standardization of electronic health data, which resulted in the development, promotion, and implementation of mechanisms for designating US standards for health data exchange. She was also a major contributor to the Federal regulation setting the standards for use in electronic interchange of administrative health data.

Taking a broader view, she led US government efforts to remove major barriers to the use of standard clinical terminologies in electronic health records (EHRs). Before there was an Office of the National Coordinator (ONC) for Health Information Technology within HHS, she negotiated the world’s first nationwide license for a clinical terminology, SNOMED CT, with usage terms favorable to the US. This became a model for other countries and was adopted by the International Health Terminology Standards Development Organisation (IHTSDO) when it was formed to put ownership of SNOMED CT in an international entity. She was IHTSDO’s founding Chair and has served with distinction as its US member.

With the establishment of the ONC, she led NLM’s substantial and ongoing collaboration with that body to develop, support, and disseminate for free US use the key clinical terminologies required for certification of EHR products and use of EHRs by Medicare and Medicaid providers and hospitals. She also directed the development and dissemination of many tools, including mappings, subsets, browsers, etc., and innovative systems, including the NLM Value Set Authority Center and NIH Common Data Element Repository, to support the use of standards in health care, quality measurement, and in research.

She directed the legislatively mandated expansion of ClinicalTrials.gov to encompass registration of additional trials and submission of summary results information. This multi-year, multi-faceted process involved numerous partners and stakeholders, showcasing her ability to grasp and solve complex problems and her considerable skill at consensus building. ClinicalTrials.gov is the largest and most heavily used international clinical trials registry.

She worked tirelessly and creatively to expand and enhance access to research publications, data, and high quality health information for scientists, health professionals, system and product developers, information professionals, and the general public. This often involved building and maintaining strong partnerships across the Federal government to adapt and rebrand strategies to changes in Administrations and priorities and to capitalize on emerging opportunities.

She oversaw the expansion of PubMed Central to include direct deposits of articles from many publishers, manuscript submissions from investigators of publications resulting from NIH-funded research and research funded by other Federal agencies and private funders, including the Gates Foundation, and digitized articles from back issues of biomedical journals, through a partnership with the Wellcome Trust.

She led a collaboration with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to make drug information and device registrations submitted to the FDA by product manufacturers available to the public via NLM’s heavily used DailyMed system. In addition, she guided the creation of the AccessGUDID database, which provides public access to registration data for medical devices.

Under her enthusiastic direction, NLM became an early implementer of application programming interfaces and download sites for its many heavily used data and information resources, flinging open the gates and allowing their use by other computer systems and by innovative product developers.

As NLM Acting Director, even in the face of hiring restrictions, she enhanced the quality and efficiency of NLM’s high-volume operations, ensured reliable 24/7 availability of electronic information services that are essential to research, health care, and public health worldwide, and advanced major initiatives, including the re-competition of NLM’s Informatics Research Training Grants and the re-competition and migration from contracts to cooperative agreement grants of the Regional Medical Libraries in the National Network of Libraries of Medicine.

Throughout her career, in an exemplary fashion, she demonstrated creativity, adaptability, and resilience in partnering with stakeholders inside and outside of NLM. She leads by fostering employee development, diversity, teamwork, and making optimal use of human, financial, and information resources.

Throughout NLM, she is respected and indeed beloved for her kindness, her resourcefulness, and her can-do spirit. Truly a treasure as a human being and as a public servant, she demonstrated a career-long commitment to interagency collaboration and harnessing government resources for the public good.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

#### REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13405 OF JUNE 16, 2006, WITH RESPECT TO BELARUS—PM 9

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with that provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine democratic processes or institutions of Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2017.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine democratic processes or institutions of Belarus, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 2017.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate: ;

H.R. 338. An act to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce.

H.R. 446. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 447. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 627. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes.

H.R. 951. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 1109. An act to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act.

H.R. 2122. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam.

H.R. 2274. An act to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for extended periods relating to preliminary permits and commencement of construction, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2292. An act to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam.

H.R. 2457. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

At 5:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1094. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 10. An act to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 338. An act to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 627. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1109. An act to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2457. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 446. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 447. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 951. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 2122. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam.

H.R. 2274. An act to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for extended periods relating to preliminary permits and commencement of construction, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2292. An act to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1869. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Triclopyr; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL No. 9961-29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1870. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule; Delay of Effective Date" (FRL No. 9963-34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1871. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of twelve (12) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1872. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015, with respect to Burundi; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1873. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1874. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1875. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 103rd Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1876. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated-Purpose Pool Pumps" ((RIN1904-AD52) (Docket No. EERE-2015-BT-STD-0008)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1877. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated-Purpose Pool Pumps" ((RIN1904-AD52) (Docket No. EERE-2015-BT-STD-0008)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1878. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fans" ((RIN1904-AD28) (Docket No. EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1879. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps" ((RIN1904-AD37) (Docket No. EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1880. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products" ((RIN1904-AD51) (Docket No. EERE-2011-BT-STD-0043)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1881. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fans" ((RIN1904-AD28) (Docket No. EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1882. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Prod-

ucts" ((RIN1904-AD51) (Docket No. EERE-2011-BT-STD-0043)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1883. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps" ((RIN1904-AD37) (Docket No. EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048)) received in the Office of the President of Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1884. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California; Coachella Valley; Attainment Plan for 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards" (FRL No. 9962-54-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1885. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the General Definitions for Texas Air Quality Rules" (FRL No. 9962-23-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1886. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles with Mobile Source Incentive Programs" (FRL No. 9962-47-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1887. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; CT; Approval of Single Source Orders; Correction" (FRL No. 9962-83-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1888. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Nevada, Lake Tahoe; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9963-25-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1889. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming; Negative Declarations" (FRL No. 9963-21-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1890. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9960-07-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1891. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Nevada Air Plan Revisions, Clark County Department of Air Quality and Washoe County Health District" (FRL No. 9963-43-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1892. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Tennessee's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Davidson, Rutherford, Sumner, Williamson, and Wilson Counties; and Minor Technical Corrections for Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standards in Other Areas" (FRL No. 9963-54-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1893. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous" (Rev. Proc. 2017-38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1894. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Child Welfare Outcomes 2010-2014: Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1895. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1896. A communication from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1897. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1898. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.



EC-1899. A communication from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Presidential Records" (RIN3095-AB87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1900. A communication from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Homeland Security Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2016-2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1901. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of Homeland Security and Department of Labor Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Annual Adjustments for the H-2B Temporary Non-agricultural Worker Program" (RIN1235-AA16 and RIN1615-AC10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1902. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Acetyl Fentanyl Into Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-413) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1903. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report relative to Article III judgeship recommendations and corresponding draft legislation for the 115th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1904. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF204) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1905. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF449) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1906. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF458) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1907. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fish-

eries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Increase for the Small Vessel Category of the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XF313) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1908. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XF413) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1909. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2017 and 2018 Commercial Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-BG41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1910. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; 2017 and 2018 Sector Operations Plans and 2017 Allocation of Northeast Multispecies Annual Catch Entitlements" (RIN0648-XF138) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1911. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northern Red Hake Accountability Measure" (RIN0648-BG63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1912. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Review of the Commission's Part 95 Personal Radio Services Rules; Petition for Rulemaking of Garmin International, Incorporated; Petitions for Rulemaking of Omnitronics, Limited Liability Company" ((WT Docket No. 10-119; RM No. 10762; RM No. 10844) (FCC 17-57)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-41. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Florida opposing United

Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and requesting its repeal or fundamental alteration; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION No. 574

Whereas, the United States has long supported a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security, and

Whereas, since 1993, the United States has facilitated direct, bilateral negotiations between both parties toward achieving a two-state solution and ending all outstanding claims, and

Whereas, it is the long-standing policy of the United States that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only come through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties, and

Whereas, it was the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto United Nations Security Council resolutions dictating additional binding parameters on the peace process, and

Whereas, it was also the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto one-sided or anti-Israel United Nations Security Council resolutions, and

Whereas, the United States has stood in the minority internationally over successive administrations in defending Israel in international forums, including vetoing one-sided resolutions in 1995, 1997, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2011 before the United Nations Security Council, and

Whereas, the United States recently signed a new memorandum of understanding with the Israeli government regarding security assistance, consistent with long-standing support for Israel among successive administrations and Congresses and representing an important United States commitment toward Israel's qualitative military edge, and

Whereas, on November 29, 2016, the United States House of Representatives unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 165, expressing and reaffirming long-standing United States policy in support of a direct, bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and in opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions that impose a solution to the conflict, and

Whereas, on December 23, 2016, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations disregarded House Concurrent Resolution 165 and departed from long-standing United States policy by abstaining and permitting United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be adopted under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter, and

Whereas, the United States' abstention on United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contradicts the Oslo Accords and its associated process that is predicated on resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict between the parties through direct, bilateral negotiations, and

Whereas, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 claims that "the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace," and

Whereas, by referring to the "4 June 1967 lines" as the basis for negotiations, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively states that the Jewish Quarter of

the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are "occupied territory," thereby equating these sites with outposts in the West Bank which the Israeli government has deemed illegal, and

Whereas, passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively legitimizes efforts by the Palestinian Authority to impose its own solution through international organizations and unjustified boycotts or divestment campaigns against Israel by calling "upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967," and will require the United States and Israel to take effective action to counteract the resolution's potential harmful impacts, and

Whereas, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 did not directly call upon Palestinian leadership to fulfill their obligations toward negotiations or mention that part of the eventual Palestinian state is currently controlled by Hamas, a designated terrorist organization, and

Whereas, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 sought to impose or unduly influence solutions to final-status issues and is biased against Israel: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida,*

That the Florida Senate finds that:

(1) The passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermined the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final-status issues or are one-sided and anti-Israel, reversing decades of bipartisan agreement

(2) The passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermines the prospect of Israelis and Palestinians resuming productive, direct, bilateral negotiations.

(3) The passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contributes to the politically motivated acts of boycotting, divesting from, and sanctioning Israel and represents a concerted effort to extract concessions from Israel outside of direct, bilateral negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians, which must be actively rejected.

(4) Any future measures taken by any organization, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose an agreement or parameters for an agreement will set back the peace process, harm the security of Israel, contradict the enduring bipartisan consensus on strengthening the United States-Israel relationship, and weaken support for such organizations.

(5) A durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians is only possible with direct, bilateral negotiations between the parties resulting in a Jewish, democratic state living next to a demilitarized Palestinian state in peace and security.

(6) The United States government should work to facilitate serious, direct, unconditional negotiations between the parties toward a sustainable peace agreement.

(7) The United States government should oppose and veto future one-sided, anti-Israel United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final-status issues; and be it further

*Resolved,* that the Florida Senate opposes and requests the repeal of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 or the fundamental alteration of the resolution so that it:

(1) Is no longer one-sided and anti-Israel.

(2) Authorizes all final-status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved

through direct, bilateral negotiations between the parties involved; and be it further

*Resolved,* that copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and the Israeli Embassy in Washington, D.C., for transmission to the proper authorities of the State of Israel as a tangible token of the sentiments expressed herein.

POM-42. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Florida condemning the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement and the increasing incidence of acts of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 1184

Whereas, Floridians have, as a matter of public policy, long opposed bigotry, oppression, discrimination, and

Whereas, Florida and Israel have enjoyed a long history of friendship and are great allies, each supporting the best interests of the other, and

Whereas, the State of Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, is the greatest friend and ally of the United States in the region, and

Whereas, the elected representatives of the state recognize the importance of expressing Florida's unwavering support for the Jewish people and the State of Israel's right to exist and right to self-defense, and

Whereas, the incidence of acts of anti-Semitism is increasing throughout the world, including in the United States and in Florida, and is reflected in official hate crime statistics, and

Whereas, the international Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement is one of the main vehicles for spreading anti-Semitic perspectives and advocating the elimination of the Jewish State, and

Whereas, the level of activities promoting BDS against Israel has increased in this state, in communities and on college campuses, and contributes to the promotion of anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist propaganda, and

Whereas, the increase in BDS campaign activities on college campuses nationwide has resulted in an increase in confrontations with, intimidation of, and discrimination against Jewish students, and

Whereas, leaders of the BDS movement express that their goal is to eliminate Israel as the national home of the Jewish people, and

Whereas, the BDS campaign's call for academic and cultural boycotts has been condemned by many of our nation's largest academic associations, more than 250 university presidents, and many other leading scholars as a violation of the bedrock principle of academic freedom: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida,*

That the Florida Senate condemns the international Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement against the State of Israel and calls upon the governmental institutions of this state to denounce hatred and discrimination whenever they appear; and be it further

*Resolved,* that the Florida Senate urges the President of the United States to order withdrawal of the United States Customs and Border Protection statement dated January 23, 2016, entitled "West Bank Country of Origin Marking Requirements," so that goods made in the West Bank can continue to be properly labeled "Made in Israel;" and be it further

*Resolved,* that copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, and the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Embassy of Israel in Washington, D.C., for transmission to the proper authorities of the State of Israel as a tangible token of the sentiments expressed herein.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 55. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York (Rept. No. 115-104).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 214. A bill to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project (Rept. No. 115-105).

S. 566. A bill to withdraw certain land in Okanogan County, Washington, to protect the land, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-106).

S. 714. A bill to amend Public Law 103-434 to authorize Phase III of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project for the purpose of improving water management in the Yakima River basin, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-107).

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1344. A bill to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1345. A bill to enhance interstate commerce by creating a national hiring standard for motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1346. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the non-consensual distribution of private sexual images and to prohibit harassment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1347. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent catastrophic

out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs for seniors and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1348. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to publicly justify unnecessary price increases; to the Committee on Finance.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 122

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for non-preemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 251

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 251, a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board in order to ensure that it cannot be used to undermine the Medicare entitlement for beneficiaries.

S. 567

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to allow Federal savings associations to elect to operate as national banks, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, *supra*.

S. 769

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

(Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to align physician supervision requirements under the Medicare program for radiology services performed by advanced level radiographers with State requirements.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 954

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 954, a bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

S. 960

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 960, a bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to protect open, machine-readable databases.

S. 967

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 967, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program, and for other purposes.

S. 1020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of personal service income earned in pass-thru entities.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1099, a bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend advanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1151

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a non-refundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1186

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1186, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to designate certain entities as centers of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education, and for other purposes.

S. 1194

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1194, a bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food and vitamins for digestive and inherited metabolic disorders under Federal health programs and private health insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1221

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1221, a bill to counter the influence of the Russian Federation in Europe and Eurasia, and for other purposes.

S. 1303

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1303, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1307

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1337

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1337, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to make certain strategic energy infrastructure projects eligible for certain loan guarantees, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 16

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

S.J. RES. 42

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 42, a joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles.

AMENDMENT NO. 232

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 232 proposed to S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1344. A bill to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today Senator BLUNT and I are reintroducing the Family Self-Sufficiency Act, and we are pleased to be joined in this effort in this Congress by our colleagues, Senators SCOTT and MENENDEZ.

The Family Self-Sufficient, FSS, Program is an existing Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, employment and savings incentive initiative for families that use section 8 vouchers or live in public housing. FSS provides participants access to the resources and training that enable them to pursue higher paying employment opportunities and meet financial goals, while putting FSS families in a better position to save by establishing an interest-bearing escrow account for them. Upon graduation from the FSS program, the family can use these savings to pay for job-related expenses, such as additional workforce training or the purchase or maintenance of a car needed for commuting purposes. In short, FSS is all about giving our constituents the incentives and the tools to move up the economic ladder.

Our bipartisan legislation enhances the FSS Program by streamlining the administration of this program, broadening the supportive services that can be provided, and extending the reach of the FSS Program to tenants who live in privately owned properties with project-based assistance. In short, we make the FSS Program easier to administer and more effective.

First, to streamline the FSS Program, our bill would permanently combine two separate but similar FSS Programs into one. Under the existing authorization, HUD is supposed to operate one FSS Program for those families served by the Housing Choice Voucher Program and another for those families served by the Public Housing Program. This is the case even though the purpose of each FSS Program—to increase economic independence and self-sufficiency—is identical. Unfortunately, without a permanent change in the authorization, public housing agencies, PHAs, may at some point in the future have to operate essentially two programs to achieve the same goal. With our bill, PHAs would be relieved of this unnecessary burden permanently.

Second, our legislation broadens the scope of the supportive services that

may be offered to include attainment of a high school equivalency certificate, education in pursuit of a postsecondary degree or certification, and financial literacy, such as training in financial management, financial coaching, and asset building. Providing families in need with affordable rental housing is critical, but combining this resource with the support and services to help families get ahead increases the effectiveness of this Federal investment. Our legislation makes it easier for FSS participants to obtain the training necessary to secure employment and the education to make prudent financial decisions to protect and grow their earnings.

Lastly, our bill permanently extends the FSS Program to families who live in privately owned properties subsidized with project-based rental assistance. It shouldn't matter what kind of housing assistance a family gets. Families seeking to achieve self-sufficiency shouldn't be held back by this sort of technicality.

I thank Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Compass Working Capital, Housing Partnership Network, Preservation of Affordable Housing, National Housing Conference, Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future, National NeighborWorks Association, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Public Housing Authority Directors Association, Public Housing Association of Rhode Island, and Rhode Island Housing for their support. I also thank Senator BLUNT, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator SCOTT for their partnership and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, which will help give those receiving housing assistance a greater chance to build their skills and achieve economic independence.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 234. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 234. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON IRAN AND NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR AND BALLISTIC MISSILE COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Iran developed a close working relationship with North Korea on many ballistic missile programs, dating back to an acquisition of Scud missiles from North Korea in the mid-1980s.

(2) By the mid-1980s North Korea reverse-engineered Scud B missiles originally received from Egypt, and developed the 500-kilometer range Scud C missile in 1991, and sold both the Scud B and Scud C, as well as missile production technology, to Iran.

(3) In 1992, then-Director of the Central Intelligence Robert Gates, in testimony to Congress, identified Iran as a recipient of North Korean Scud missiles.

(4) In 1993, then-Director of Central Intelligence James Woolsey provided more detail, stating that North Korea had sold Iran extended range Scud C missiles and agreed to sell other forms of missile technology.

(5) Annual threat assessments from the intelligence community during the 1990s showed that North Korea's ongoing export of ballistic missiles provided a qualitative increase in capabilities to countries such as Iran.

(6) The same threat assessments noted that Iran was using North Korean ballistic missile goods and services to achieve its goal of self-sufficiency in the production of medium-range ballistic missiles.

(7) The intelligence community assessed in the 1990s that Iran's acquisition of missile systems or key missile-related components could improve Iran's ability to produce an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

(8) Throughout the 2000s, the intelligence community continued to assess that North Korean cooperation with Iran's ballistic missile program was ongoing and significant.

(9) In 2007 a failed missile test in Syria caused the death of Syrian, Iranian, and North Korean experts.

(10) North Korea built the nuclear reactor in Syria that was bombed in 2007. Syria failed to report the construction of the reactor to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which was Syria's obligation under its safeguards agreement with the agency.

(11) Official sources confirm that Iran and North Korea have engaged in various forms of clandestine nuclear cooperation.

(12) North Korea and Iran obtained designs and materials related to uranium enrichment from a clandestine procurement network run by Abdul Qadeer Khan.

(13) In the early 2000s, North Korea exported, with the assistance of Abdul Qadeer Khan, uranium hexafluoride (UF<sub>6</sub>) gas to Libya, which was intended to be used in Libya's clandestine nuclear weapons program.

(14) On January 6, 2016, North Korea conducted its fourth nuclear weapons test.

(15) On September 9, 2016, North Korea conducted its fifth nuclear weapons test.

(16) Iranian officials reportedly traveled to North Korea to witness its three previous nuclear tests in 2006, 2009, and 2013.

(17) Before North Korea's 2013 test, a senior American official was quoted as saying "it's very possible that North Koreans are testing for two countries".

(18) In September 2012, Iran and North Korea signed an agreement for technological and scientific cooperation.

(19) In an April 2015 interview with CNN, then-Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter said that North Korea and Iran "could be" cooperating to develop a nuclear weapon.

(20) On March 11, 2017, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats provided written testimony to Congress that stated that

Pyongyang's "export of ballistic missiles and associated materials to several countries, including Iran and Syria, and its assistance to Syria's construction of a nuclear reactor . . . illustrate its willingness to proliferate dangerous technologies".

(21) A 2016 Congressional Research Service report confirmed that "ballistic missile technology cooperation between the two [Iran and North Korea] is significant and meaningful".

(22) Admiral Bill Gortney, Commander of United States Northern Command, testified to Congress on April 14, 2016, that "Iran's continuing pursuit of long-range missile capabilities and ballistic missile and space launch programs, in defiance of United Nations Security Council resolutions, remains a serious concern".

(23) Iran has engaged in nuclear technology cooperation with North Korea.

(24) It has been suspected for over a decade that Iran and North Korea are working together on nuclear weapons development.

(25) Since the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-277) repealed requirements for the intelligence community to provide unclassified annual report to Congress on the "Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions", the number of unclassified reports to Congress on nuclear-weapons issues decreased considerably.

(26) North Korea's cooperation with Iran on nuclear weapon development is widely suspected, but has yet to be detailed by the President to Congress.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ballistic missile programs of Iran and North Korea represent a serious threat to allies of the United States in the Middle East, Europe, and Asia, members of the Armed Forces deployed in those regions, and ultimately the United States;

(2) further cooperation between Iran and North Korea on nuclear weapons or ballistic missile technology is not in the security interests of the United States or our allies;

(3) the testing and production by Iran of ballistic missiles capable of carrying a nuclear device is a clear violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015), which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council and supported by the international community; and

(4) Iran is using its space launch program to develop the capabilities necessary to deploy an intercontinental ballistic missile that could threaten the United States, and the Director of National Intelligence has assessed that Iran would use ballistic missiles as its "preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons".

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of other relevant agencies, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on nuclear and ballistic missile cooperation between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea, including the identity of Iranian and North Korean persons that have knowingly engaged in or directed the provision of material support or the exchange of information between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea on their respective nuclear programs.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5 (a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Hearing on the Nominations of Kristine Svinicki (Reappointment), Annie Caputo and David Wright to be Members of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Nominations of Susan Bodine to be Assistant Administrator of the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency."

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017 at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Review of the FY 2018 State Department Budget Request."

##### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "The Cost of Prescription Drugs: How the Drug Delivery System Affects What Patients Pay" on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a legislative hearing.

## COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

## COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017 from 2:30 p.m.–4:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold an open hearing entitled “Open Hearing with Attorney General Jeff Sessions.”

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in open session, to receive testimony on Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA

The Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017 at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled “State-Sponsored Cyberspace Threats: Recent Incidents and U.S. Policy Response.”

## PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to the following members of my staff: Chris Burdick and Victoria King.

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

POLICE OFFICER SCOTT BASHIUM  
POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 92, S. 831.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 831) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the “Police Officer Scott Bashium Post Office Building.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 831) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 831

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

SECTION 1. POLICE OFFICER SCOTT BASHIUM  
POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the “Police Officer Scott Bashium Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Police Officer Scott Bashium Post Office Building”.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE  
14, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:45 a.m. on Wednesday, June 14; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 722 as under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:45 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:18 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10:45 a.m.



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 13, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COMER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 13, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES COMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### AMERICAN SOLDIERS KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, sadly, I come to the floor to remind the Members of the House, as well as the American people, that three Americans were killed last week in Afghanistan: Corporal Dillon Baldrige, Sergeant William Bays, Sergeant Eric Houck. They were killed by the Afghans they were training.

Afghanistan is the biggest waste of life and money I have ever seen in my life. I have beside me two little girls who, at the time, lived in my district: Eden Baldrige and Stephanie Baldrige. Their daddy, Kevin, was sent from Camp Lejeune, which is in my district, along with Colonel Benjamin Palmer, who serves at Cherry Point, which is also in my district. They were sent to Afghanistan 3 years ago to train Afghanists how to be policemen.

Well, the tragedy of this story is that Corporal Baldrige emailed his wife,

Amy, and said: "Amy, I don't trust them. I don't trust any of them." And the very next day, he was shot, along with Colonel Palmer, and killed.

Yet we in the Congress have never had a debate since 2001 on the future of America's involvement in Afghanistan. That is why JOHN GARAMENDI and some on my side and his side—he is a Democrat—have put in a bill, H.R. 1668. All we are asking is that we have a debate. You can be for the bill that Mr. GARAMENDI and I have put in or you can be against it, but give us a chance to have a debate.

In 16 years, we have spent over \$850 billion, over 2,000 Americans have been killed and 20,000 severely wounded, yet it seems like the leadership in Congress does not understand that we have a constitutional responsibility, and that responsibility is to debate, especially when we are asking our young men and women to go overseas and give their life for this country.

Yet again, we have not had a debate since 2001. There are 300 members of Congress sitting on the floor today from both parties who were not here in 2001 and who have never been part of a debate on Afghanistan. I don't know what else we can do. We have written the Speaker of the House individually, myself included, and as a group, Republican and Democrat, asking the Speaker to permit a new AUMF to get to the floor of the House to have that kind of debate on Afghanistan.

Again, it is almost like it doesn't exist, but it does exist when we bring bills to the floor to continue to spend billions of dollars over there. And John Sopko, the inspector general for Afghan reconstruction, has testified that waste, fraud, and abuse is worse in Afghanistan today than it was 16 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to say to the families of the three servicemen who I read their names—I will one more time—Corporal Dillon Baldrige, Sergeant William Bays, Sergeant Erick Houck: God be with you. We in the House of Representatives, both parties, send to you our sincere condolences.

I thank the good Lord that they were willing to give their life for this country. It is just a matter of why in the world do we continue to be in a country known as the empire of graveyards, since so many countries have been there and failed? And that is all we are doing, is failing, too, by wasting life and money.

### THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HAS OVERSIGHT OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes. Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, the saga continues, and there seems to be no end in sight for the Trump administration's growing legal and ethical problems. Every day another shoe drops, or at least another foot is inserted into the administration's mouth.

The testimony of James Comey before the Senate Intelligence Committee last week showed us that this is no longer just a matter of foreign intelligence and the Russian meddling in American elections. While that is very important and we need to address the foreign intelligence and security aspects of that matter, the very important question of how we keep Russia from hacking our elections in the future, what is clear is that the investigations into the Trump administration are now matters for the Judiciary Committee.

The gentlewoman from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, and I were on CNN this weekend, and we made the point that the Judiciary Committee has the oversight responsibility for the Justice Department, therefore, it is time for the committee to do its job.

That was the theme of my speech here last week, and nothing has happened. It is also the reason I wrote to Judiciary Chairman BOB GOODLATTE last week to request that he take action, hold hearings, begin preparations for the hearings that will come—and they will come—because the silence of the Judiciary Committee has been deafening so far.

As soon as President Trump said on Friday he was willing to testify under oath 100 percent, I wrote Judiciary Chairman GOODLATTE to say the committee should schedule a hearing and take the President at his word.

Now, I don't think the chairman will invite the President, a man he campaigned for, because the role of the House Judiciary Committee right now is to protect the President at all costs, shielding the President from tough questions instead of representing the people's interest.

In doing so, Judiciary Republicans and House Republicans in general are getting deeper and deeper into bed with this President. You see, they have a whole agenda, and they are counting on this President to help them cut

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

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

taxes for people with trust funds while cutting healthcare, education, child care, civil rights and voting rights for people who work for a living.

Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee ought to be in the middle of congressional examinations of the Trump administration, and so far they have been on the sidelines.

Is it no longer the practice of the House of Representatives to hold oversight hearings? Is it no longer the practice of this body to hold the executive branch and the White House accountable?

I have never seen an administration more in need of congressional oversight than this one, yet the Congress does not dare do anything that might cause the President to call someone out in one of his dawn Twitter rants.

We know that the administration has a policy now—this administration—of not cooperating with congressional oversight, instructing agencies not to comply with inquiries from members of Congress unless they are a committee chairman, all of whom happen to be Republican.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but the President and his administration are accountable to over 320 million Americans, all 435 Members of this body and 100 Senators as well, regardless of their party affiliation.

At least one senior senator called this policy opposing congressional oversight nonsense. To his credit, the Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, Mr. GRASSLEY of Iowa, is not impacted by the Trump administration policy because he is a chairman, but he spoke out forcefully against the Presidential obstruction. See, my friends, that is how you do it, the way Mr. GRASSLEY did it. Follow his example.

And then there is our old friend, the former Speaker and an adviser to the President, Mr. Gingrich, who is now advising the President to terminate Mr. Mueller, the former FBI Director investigating the President and his subordinates, including the family members of the President. Mr. Gingrich said Mueller was a superb choice with an impeccable reputation for fairness just a couple of weeks ago, but now he says there is no way Mueller can be fair. He wants the President to fire Mueller and he wants a political fight against the very idea of special prosecutors.

Now, Mr. Gingrich has been joined in this chorus by a Trump confidante and golf buddy, the president of Newsmax, who says the President is contemplating firing Mueller.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to see the President on a fast track to impeachment, then he should take this advice and fire Mueller. If you want to see this President in the express lane to impeachment, no ifs, ands, or buts, then go for it. We dare you.

Even the Judiciary Committee, which has shown no interest in doing

anything other than rubber stamping this administration's agenda, would be forced to take action.

#### VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment and recognize an important piece of legislation that is scheduled for a vote on the House floor today, the Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act.

This bipartisan legislation will reform the VA by allowing the Secretary to fire underperforming employees, ensure appropriate protections for whistleblowers, and authorize the Secretary to directly appoint folks to critically important positions that need filled quickly. This legislation has already passed the Senate, and I look forward to its passage in the House, and to send it to the President for his signature this week.

Those that serve our Nation are honored heroes. Unfortunately, the VA bureaucracy hasn't always provided the care, respect, and honor they deserve. I look forward to this vote and to bringing our valued veterans one step closer to the care they deserve.

#### KINSLEY, KANSAS, SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I was honored to join the Kinsley, Kansas, Summer Food Service Program at the Kinsley-Offerte Junior-Senior High School. It always makes my day when I walk into a room filled with children I delivered in the past decade and their moms.

Like those programs in communities in my district and around the country, these folks serve free breakfast and lunch, and the program is sponsored by the school district. It is great to see this local partnership, this community coalition coming together to help their children.

We live in the most prosperous country in the world, where we have annually produced a tremendous abundance of food, yet it continues to amaze me that we have the level of hunger that we do, especially among our own children.

Good nutrition is too important for the development of these young minds not to ensure, through the communities and programs like these, that they are well fed. Whether you are in the largest ag-producing district in the country, like mine in Kansas, or a city on the coast, we have no excuses.

I thank programs like these for their role in raising a healthy generation.

#### NATIONAL TEACHERS HALL OF FAME

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2½ centuries, 119 of our Nation's

educators have tragically lost their lives while serving both their students and their communities, a terrible sacrifice they didn't expect when they followed their calling to help our young people.

The National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia State University, in my district, built a memorial honoring those who have lost their lives while pursuing their educational calling. Founded in 2014, the memorial was built to honor those who had taught students, ranging from kindergarten to 12th grade, and has now been expanded to honor fallen educators at all academic levels.

While the National Teachers Hall of Fame is regionally recognized, our country still lacks a national memorial for those that have lost their lives while serving our students. By recognizing this memorial, we don't have to spend a dime of Federal funding, but we have a place to remember these men and women.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2711, that will do just that. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

#### COVFEFE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the President tweeted the word "covfepe." We still don't know what it means, why the President tweeted it, or if it was simply an innocent typo, something we are all guilty of making. But what is more important than the creation of a random, now infamous, word in a tweet is that the President deleted the post less than 12 hours later. This is just 1 of 18 tweets the President has deleted since his inauguration, and, each time, the question is raised whether or not he can legally do that, because when the President deletes a tweet, it is equivalent to him destroying a record.

That is why I have introduced the COVFEFE Act, Communications Over Various Feeds Electronically for Engagement. It is a silly name, but a serious issue. By expanding the Presidential Records Act to include social media, it would ensure that all tweets posted by the President from his personal account are archived and preserved and would finally answer the question on whether or not the President can delete tweets.

Although the bill's name is a little tongue-in-cheek, the focus of the legislation is more important now than ever. If the President is going to take to social media to make sudden public policy proclamations, we must ensure that these statements are documented and preserved for future reference. As Sean Spicer has said, each @realDonaldTrump tweet should be taken as an official White House statement.

□ 1015

Tweets are powerful, and the President must be held accountable for every post, from commenting on NATO, to the Paris Agreement, to his Muslim travel ban, and his response to the devastating terror attack in London. And on Monday, we learned that the appellate court cited the President's tweet in ruling against the travel ban.

The President's frequent unfiltered use of his personal Twitter account as a means of official communication is unprecedented, and we must respond accordingly. Sometimes it takes a creative acronym to drive attention to a much larger issue.

This is the second bill I have introduced this Congress to address the lack of transparency in the administration. Back in March, I introduced the aptly named "Mar-a-Lago Act" to require the White House visitor logs, or visitor logs from any other location where the President conducts official business, to be made public to the American people.

Unlike the Obama administration, the current administration stated they are unwilling to do so. For these reasons, it is critical that we push commonsense policy that promotes government accountability and transparency, because in order to maintain public trust in government, elected officials must answer for what they do and say. That includes 140-character tweets and records of who has the President's ear at the White House, Trump Tower, or his southern Florida home. If regaining the public's trust is the first step, then taking action to maintain that trust for the long term is the next.

Standalone transparency legislation is absolutely necessary, but it is not enough. We must stop treating transparency and accountability as peripheral issues and proactively incorporate them into everything we do.

Going forward, I will continue to promote efforts to increase public access to the Federal Government and ensure that all elected officials are being held accountable for their words and their actions.

#### THE PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's most important mandate is to revive America's struggling economy. This simply cannot be done under the terms of the Paris climate accord.

According to The Heritage Foundation, adhering to that agreement would have destroyed 400,000 American jobs and forfeit \$2.5 trillion in lost productivity by 2035. That is about \$20,000 in lower annual earnings for a family of four.

There is a reason we suffered the slowest economic growth of the post-war era under Barack Obama: bad deals and bad policies like this.

President Obama bound America to the Paris accord by executive fiat. He committed billions of dollars of taxes paid by American families to an international slush fund for developing countries, and then he set his agencies loose to suppress American industry, regardless of the costs imposed on working Americans.

And for what exactly? The EPA's own modeling predicts that if the accord were fully implemented by 2030, it would reduce global temperature increases by 17/100ths of 1 degree by 2100.

Its advocates have recently dismissed this inconvenient truth by explaining: Well, it would at least send a powerful signal.

Well, we can already see the cost to average families of sending this powerful signal. European energy prices are more than twice as high as the United States, and their economies lag far behind even the anemic growth under Obama.

California has adopted many of these policies and now bears one of the highest energy costs in the country, along with the highest poverty rate. Without the high-tech wealth of the bay area, California's economy would trail well behind the national growth rate.

Paris apologists promise a new era of green energy jobs. Well, as long as consumers are coerced into buying overpriced green products and struggling families are forced to fork over billions of dollars through higher utility bills and taxes, well, of course, politically connected green energy companies will do very well, but at enormous expense to the overall economy.

Those 374,000 solar jobs we hear about generate just 1 percent of our electricity. The 187,000 coal, oil, and gas jobs remaining in this country generate 65 percent of our electricity.

The wide historical fluctuations in both carbon dioxide and global temperature suggest that natural influences vastly outweigh human causes. Paleoclimatologists tell us that atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels were five times higher during the Jurassic Period, and global temperatures were 13 degrees higher during the Pleistocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum. That is long before humans or SUVs.

In 2016, President Obama came to Yosemite Valley to warn that the last of Yosemite's surrounding glaciers would soon disappear. Ironically, if he stood on the same spot 20,000 years earlier, he would have been buried under about 2,000 feet of glacial ice.

The first IPCC report in 1990, sounding the alarm over global warming, gives us some practical experience with its climate modeling. Actual global temperatures are now well below the lowest of the forecasts that the IPCC

made 27 years ago. And 20 years before that, the scientific consensus warned that pollution was about to trigger another Ice Age.

The fact is the current state of science is a long way from understanding the intricate natural forces and interrelationships in global climatology, let alone being able to accurately predict temperature changes over hundreds of years within fractions of a degree. That is perhaps why many prominent and respected climatologists continue to challenge and debate the question, despite claims that 97 percent of the scientists agree and despite calls to silence them as heretics.

As the fable of "The Emperor's New Clothes" illustrates, nothing is more menacing to a flawed consensus than a single dissenter. Thanks to our politically incorrect President, the United States has just stepped forward from the crowd and pointed out the obvious.

The Paris accord points the way to a future of skyrocketing energy prices, lower productivity and wages, a massive wealth transfer from America to nations like China and India, and a permanently declining quality of life for our children.

Fortunately, President Trump has a different vision, a future in which families can enjoy the prosperity that abundant energy provides and the quality of life that comes from that prosperity. We can't get there from Paris.

But whichever course we take, one thing is certain, the Earth will continue to warm and cool as it has for billions of years.

#### FREE NABEEL RAJAB

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the immediate and unconditional release of Nabeel Rajab, the prominent Bahraini human rights defender who remains in custody in Bahrain after being arrested a year ago. He is currently being detained in a hospital.

Nabeel is a leading human rights activist known across the region and beyond for this peaceful views. His work is internationally recognized, and he has won several major human rights awards.

Nabeel has been unjustly imprisoned several times since 2011, when he participated in protests against the Government of Bahrain and joined calls for democratic reform.

In April 2015, he was arrested following tweets criticizing the Saudi-led coalition airstrikes in Yemen and the treatment of detainees in Bahrain's Juw Prison. He was released after 3 months, but prosecutors ordered his re-arrest in June of 2016. He is being held on numerous charges and is on trial in

two separate cases for his human rights work. If convicted on all charges, he would face up to 18 years in jail.

So what kinds of charges are we talking about? He is accused of insulting national institutions, spreading tentatious rumors, and offending a foreign country. In other words, he is accused of exercising his right to freedom of speech.

Last December, a court ordered Nabeel's release on bail, but he was immediately rearrested for making "false or malicious" statements in TV interviews where he criticized Bahrain's refusal to allow journalists and human rights groups access to their country.

I have experienced that, by the way. In August of 2014, I was denied permission to visit Bahrain with Brian Dooley, who works with Human Rights First.

Since his arrest last year, Nabeel has undergone two operations, suffered heart palpitations, required emergency medical care, and developed other medical conditions. After the first operation, he was returned to prison with an open wound and had to be rushed back to the hospital 3 days later to treat the resulting infection.

His trials have been postponed more than a dozen times since his arrest last year, most recently yesterday. Nabeel has spent most of the last 10 months in solitary confinement after The New York Times published an op-ed by him last September. In that piece, Nabeel urged the Obama administration to use its leverage to resolve the conflict in Yemen instead of fanning the flames by supplying arms to the Saudi coalition.

A second New York Times piece by Nabeel appeared just last month on May 17, where he urged the Trump administration to review its relations with authoritarian regimes like Bahrain.

I include in the RECORD these two articles so this House can see for itself the kinds of opinions that the Bahraini Government considers so dangerous.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 2016]

LETTER FROM A BAHRAIN JAIL

(By Nabeel Rajab)

RIFFA, BAHRAIN.—I write this from a Bahraini jail cell where I have been detained, largely in isolation, since the beginning of summer. This is not new to me: I have been here before, from 2012 to 2014, in 2015, and now again, all because of my work as a human rights defender.

Nor am I alone: There are some 4,000 political prisoners in Bahrain, which has the highest prison population per capita in the Middle East. This is a country that has subjected its people to imprisonment, torture and even death for daring to desire democracy. My close colleague Abdulhadi al-Khawaja was tortured and sentenced to life in prison in 2011 for his human rights work.

No one has been properly held to account for systematic abuses that have affected thousands. In 2015, I was arrested on new charges of "insulting a statutory body" and "spreading rumors during a time of war" for

posts on Twitter. The police held me from April to July last year. I was released only after the king of Bahrain issued a pardon in an earlier case, also related to views I had expressed.

Despite the pardon, the 2015 charges and a travel ban remained in place, and I was threatened with further action. The head of the cybercrimes unit at the Criminal Investigation Directorate in Bahrain summoned me and my family to a meeting, where—in front of my children—he warned me that if I didn't stop my advocacy work, I would face up to 15 years in prison.

That threat became reality when I was arrested in June. The warrant came from the same cybercrimes unit chief who threatened me last year, and I now face prosecution for my work exposing human rights abuses. The authorities even added a third charge of "insulting a neighboring country," meaning Saudi Arabia. They have also laid a new charge against me of spreading "false news," in relation to interviews I've given to the news media. It's quite the rap sheet.

My supposed "insult" to Saudi Arabia relates to tweets I posted calling for an end to the war in Yemen, a war escalated by the Saudi-led coalition to which Bahrain belongs and for which the United States provides support. The United States has authorized multibillion-dollar arms sales to the Saudis since the war began last year.

From the beginning, I was against the war. The civilian death toll was immediate and catastrophic, and I spoke out against the unfolding humanitarian crisis, calling for peace. Now, I am paying the price.

I met Secretary of State John Kerry on his visit to Bahrain earlier this year and was glad to talk with him about our difficult situation. Mr. Kerry criticized the boycott of the 2014 election by opposition parties, although the opposition's demand was simply for a constitutional monarchy in place of Bahrain's autocratic system. Since that election, the leader of the largest opposition group, the Wefaq National Islamic Society, was sentenced to nine years for "promoting violence," and the society was suspended and its assets frozen.

I would like to ask Mr. Kerry now: Is this the kind of ally America wants? The kind that punishes its people for thinking, that prevents its citizens from exercising their basic rights?

The government has gone after me not only for my comments on Yemen, but also for my domestic activism. One of my charges, "insulting a statutory body," concerns my work shedding light on the torture of hundreds of prisoners in Jaw Prison in March 2015. The State Department has highlighted the same problem, but last year lifted the arms embargo it had placed on Bahrain since the repressions that followed the 2011 Arab Spring protests, citing "meaningful progress on human rights reforms." Really?

After I met Mr. Kerry, I was interrogated at the Interior Ministry by the chief of the cybercrimes unit, the one who later ordered my arrest. He wanted to know everything about my conversation with the secretary of state. That official interrogated me again in April after I signed an open letter, with 25 other activists, calling on President Obama to discuss human rights and the plight of activists in the Middle East when he visited Saudi Arabia earlier this year.

The Bahraini government tried to pressure me into publicly disavowing the letter. I refused.

Recent American statements on Bahrain's human rights problems have been strong,

and that is good. But unless the United States is willing to use its leverage, fine words have little effect. America's actions, on the other hand, have emboldened the government to detain me and other rights advocates: Its unconditional support for Saudi Arabia and its lifting of the arms ban on Bahrain have direct consequences for the activists struggling for dignity in these countries.

Instead of fanning the flames in Yemen by supplying arms to the Saudi coalition, Mr. Obama's administration should use its leverage to resolve the conflict. Working to secure the release of people who call for peace, and are trying to build democracy in the region, would serve that aim.

Update: After this Op-Ed essay was published, Nabeel Rajab was charged with publishing "false news and statements and malicious rumors that undermine the prestige of the kingdom."

Nabeel Rajab is the president of the Bahrain Center for Human Rights and an advisory committee member for Human Rights Watch's Middle East and North Africa Division.

[From the New York Times, May 17, 2017]

DON'T PROFIT FROM ABUSES BY BAHRAIN

(By Nabeel Rajab)

Yemen has entered its third year of war, and war crimes are being committed at an escalating rate. For Yemen's children, facing a man-made famine, this conflict between Houthi rebels and a coalition led by Saudi Arabia has begun a new phase of horrors.

Despite that, President Trump is planning to make Saudi Arabia the destination of his first state visit this week. Meanwhile, his administration already decided to lift all human rights restrictions on arms sales to my country, Bahrain, which is a partner in the Saudi-led coalition fighting in Yemen. This reckless pursuit of profit without any strings attached—including a lucrative deal for 19 F-16 fighter jets worth \$2.8 billion—will aid and abet the destruction of Yemen, intensifying the country's humanitarian disaster.

It fills me with shame that my country, Bahrain, is bombing Yemen, with United States support. And while the Saudi-led coalition continues its air assault on Yemen, Bahrain is also trying to crush civil society back home. This other, domestic campaign is aimed at people who, like me, cannot abide injustice and are willing to speak out.

Even so, we look to our friends in United States for strength and a united vision for a better future. Americans expect to have a government that is accountable, and that respects and protects its people's rights. That is our great ambition, also, in the Gulf.

We know we risk much in calling for this. Some of my fellow activists have been tortured, sentenced to life imprisonment, even killed. But I believe that respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms is the way to attain peace, stability and prosperity in any nation; I have devoted my life to that ideal.

Criticizing war crimes and torture on Twitter, speaking to journalists about our dire situation in Bahrain and the Gulf, and writing this newspaper: For these actions, I now face a total of 18 years' imprisonment. I've already spent more than 10 months in jail, mostly in solitary confinement. One of the charges against me derives from my taking a stand against the war in Yemen—not only because it causes misery and tragic loss of life, but also because it fosters violence and terrorism across the region.

Does the Trump administration know that former Bahraini soldiers have left the country to join the Islamic State? Does Washington know that Bahrain allows no Shiite citizens in its military even though Shiites are a majority of the population? Does the White House know that the Bahraini Army is a sectarian force that publishes books endorsing the murder of Shiites who do not "repent"?

When I criticized the fostering of extremism in the Bahraini Army, I was tossed into prison for six months. Bahrain's king, Hamad bin Isaal-Khalifa, has just approved a constitutional amendment allowing military courts to try civilians on unspecified charges of "terrorism." It is a law so vague and sweeping that my act of criticism could now result in a military prosecution.

This same Bahraini military, newly empowered, will soon be awarded its new American-made jets to fly over Yemen.

Bahraini citizens recognize that the United States is a superpower, but that status should not depend solely on its military capacity. American power should also be built on respect for justice, equality and human rights—the core principles upon which the United States was founded. It is these values that should dictate American foreign policy, not the profit margin of Lockheed Martin, maker of those F-16s destined for Bahrain.

The Trump administration must review its relations with authoritarian regimes like Bahrain's. These problematic alliances cost the United States far more in the long term than any gain it makes from arms deals. Human rights and justice should be a consistent priority in American foreign policy, not applied in one case, ignored in another.

All our destinies are tied together. What will happen to Bahrain if everyone who supports peace, democracy and the rule of law is in jail? To whom will Bahrain's disenfranchised youth turn to for support and guidance? These are the questions the Trump administration must ask itself before it sends my jailers another batch of fighter jets.

I am realistic about what to expect. After all, President Trump recently played host in Washington to Saudi Arabia's deputy crown prince and Egypt's president for life without bringing up human rights. But I have faith in the American people and civil society, as well as the lawmakers who continue to challenge these shortsighted, morally unsound policies.

Meanwhile, my trial date kept being moved. First, it was set for April 16. But this was the day of Bahrain's Formula One Grand Prix, the biggest sports event in the country, so that was embarrassing for the government. Then, my trial was rescheduled for May 3. But that happened to be World Press Freedom Day, so the authorities pushed the date back again, to this week.

My detention has entered its 11th month. My health has declined. I'm recovering from a painful surgical procedure, yet the authorities have made every part of my detention as difficult as possible. My lawyers have been obstructed from providing me the best possible defense. But what I have endured is a small fraction of what the people of Yemen have suffered, largely because of the military intervention of Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and their allies.

For my part, I will not stand idly by. I urge Americans not to do so, either. They must all call for an end to the Trump administration's unconditional support for my country's misdeeds at home and abroad.

Nabeel Rajab is the president of the Bahrain Center for Human Rights and an advisory

sory committee member for Human Rights Watch's Middle East and North Africa Division.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Under Obama, the State Department repeatedly called on Bahrain to release Nabeel and drop the charges against him. It also tied the sale of F-16s to Bahrain to improvements in human rights.

In contrast, the new administration has lifted the hold on the F-16 sales and failed to call for Nabeel's release. When President Trump met with the King of Bahrain on May 21, he told him: We are going to have a very, very long-term relationship. I look forward to it very much—many of the same things common.

It was Trump's quote.

I am not sure what the President had in mind, but let's review what has happened in Bahrain this year. On January 5, the government restored arrest and investigation powers to its national security agency notorious for torturing detainees in 2011. This reverses one of the few security sector reforms outlined in the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry that the government carried out.

On January 15, Bahrain carried out its first execution since 2010, killing three men who were allegedly tortured into making false confessions.

On February 21, Bahrain's constitution was amended to allow military courts to try civilians.

On May 31, the government dissolved the secular opposition political party Wa'ad, and it was the last major opposition party still operating in the country after the al-Wefaq party was dissolved last summer.

On June 4, the government ordered al-Wasat, the country's only independent newspaper, to be suspended indefinitely.

Mr. Speaker, Bahrain is headed down an increasingly authoritarian path. It is closing off all avenues for peaceful dissent.

But the President of the United States does not get it. Could that have to do with the income he earned when the Bahraini Government held its National Day celebration at Trump International Hotel last December?

What I know is that appearances matter, and Bahrain is an increasingly volatile dangerous place for our military personnel. We should not enable the Bahraini Government's repression. I call for the immediate and unconditional release of Nabeel Rajab and others jailed for their peaceful political views, and I urge the Trump administration to join me. I thank my colleagues for listening.

APPLAUDING THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL YOUNG FARMERS COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, I met with members of the National Young Farmers Coalition. This nonprofit was founded just 8 years ago by three farmers in upstate New York. They gathered around a farmhouse table to talk about the challenges facing them and their peers: difficulty securing loans, access to affordable farmland, and student loan debt.

They decided that they and other young farmers needed to step up and fight for the future of farming as a united front. Across the country, other young farmers were also coming to the same realization, and the coalition was born.

It works in conjunction with farmers, consumers, organizations, and government to tackle the many challenges that young, independent, and sustainable farmers face in their first years of operating a farm business.

Young farmers include all people who are kicking off a career in agriculture. Typically, in their first 10 years of growing, this includes anyone from a first-year farm apprentice to someone pursuing a midlife career change to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, rural America is struggling. But rural areas offer unique contributions to our Nation, often in the form of agriculture, raw materials, and naturally occurring commodities.

As more and more young people pursue fast-paced careers in cities and urban centers, the size and composition of populations in rural America is rapidly changing. American agriculture, in particular, is facing a crisis of attrition.

Two-thirds of our farmland is on the cusp of transition as farmers grow older and retire, and there are fewer young farmers positioned to manage this resource.

□ 1030

Farmers over the age of 65 outnumber farmers under the age of 35 by a margin of 6 to 1. The number of farmers under the age of 35 grew by only 1 percent from 2007 to 2012. In order to fix this problem, we must help incentivize more young people to pursue careers in agriculture.

That is why, together with Representatives JOE COURTNEY of Connecticut and JOHN FASO of New York, I introduced the Young Farmers Success Act, which aims to accomplish this by adding farmers to the existing Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program.

After making 10 years of income-based student loan payments, a young farmer would see the balance of his or her student loans forgiven, just as other public servants who utilize this program currently do. It is my hope that the enactment of this legislation will lead to the continued enhancement of our Nation's farms.

Agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, and as such, many of the rural communities in the State depend on agriculture in some form. Unfortunately, USDA released its first farm income forecast for 2017 and predicted that net farm income is expected to decline for the fourth consecutive year.

Declining farm income coupled with low commodity prices over the past few years have adversely impacted farmers and rural communities across the Nation. I have met with farmers in and outside my district who are facing tough decisions about the future of their farms.

As vice chair of the Agriculture Committee and chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I know our Nation needs a robust agriculture sector so that we can continue to provide our Nation and nations across the world with nutritious food and fiber. In order to do so, we need to find ways to cultivate the next generation of farmers. Now, I believe that the Young Farmers Success Act does just that by taking away one of the barriers that can deter young and beginner farmers from entering into agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers feed this Nation. Farmers are stewards of the land and cornerstones of our rural communities. They provide the country with a safe and affordable food supply. But we need to do more to cultivate the future generation of farmers. They face tough odds by the very nature of the business, and this legislation will provide incentives for those who would like to pursue a future in the agriculture industry, which aids our national security and the long-term sustainability of our country.

Investing in our Nation's ability to put food on the table for our neighbors is not a partisan issue. I encourage every Member of this House to cosponsor this important legislation.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ST. CLOUD AREA ADAPTED SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the St. Cloud Area adapted softball team for winning the State championship earlier this month.

Coach Mike Bakken led the team to victory with the help of Tyrell Franck-Ross, Dayton Wienjes, and Jordan Williams, who all played exceptionally well. While the individual accomplishments were important, it was a team effort, with all 16 players giving it their all and leaving everything they had on the field.

The tournament was intense, with St. Cloud coming from behind to win the first game. St. Cloud scored five

runs in the top of the seventh to beat Chaska 17-14.

We are proud of all the players from around the State for their effort in the tournament, and we are especially proud of our St. Cloud Area team for their success and their hard work over this past season.

#### YOUNG LEADERS IN STEM

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two high school students from my district for being chosen to represent the great State of Minnesota in two prestigious science, technology, engineering, and math, more commonly called STEM-based, programs.

Alex Nutt, of Princeton High School, has been selected to participate in the Congress of Future Medical Leaders; and Michael Dehmer, of Buffalo High School, has been selected to participate in the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders.

These programs were specifically designed to inspire high school students who are at the top of their class and hope to pursue a science-based career. Once they have successfully completed their congress, Alex and Michael will continue to receive mentoring to help them successfully pursue their chosen careers.

The career paths that Alex Nutt and Michael Dehmer have chosen to pursue are not easy, but they are incredibly important to our country. In order for our Nation to remain both competitive and successful, it is vital that today's students take an active interest in STEM fields. That is why I am proud to honor both Alex and Michael and to thank the National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists and the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists for working to ensure that the future of our Nation is bright.

#### MINNESOTA'S FUTURE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate all the recent high school graduates in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District on completing a major milestone in their young lives.

This milestone represents the beginning of the rest of your lives. And while we celebrate your achievement, we are also excited for your future, and there is so much to be excited about.

Many of you will go on to further your careers in education, travel and see the world. Some of you might go to medical school, and one of you might actually cure a disease. Some of you might run for public office, and one of you might even become the President of the United States.

You will be active in your communities. You will build families and be incredible assets to the great State of Minnesota. Your possibilities are limitless, and I hope you will always think big and never give up on your dreams.

We wish you the best of luck as you take the next step in your journey, and

we look forward to watching you succeed and thrive.

I also want to thank your parents and the teachers of these wonderful scholars for guiding them along and helping them achieve this great goal. An education is the key that opens all of life's doors, and we thank you for handing these students the key.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MARK J. SIZER

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Stearns County Human Services Administrator Mark Sizer for his dedicated service to our community. After 40 years of public service and 23 years dedicated to Stearns County, Mark is heading into retirement.

Since he was appointed to the human services administrator position in 2011, Mark has dedicated himself to the many programs and employees in his department and to the cities of Stearns County. Under Mark's leadership, Stearns County has offered some of the best services and programs in Minnesota.

Stearns County is one of the largest and most densely populated counties in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, and we are fortunate to have had such a dedicated public servant and strong leadership at the helm of this incredibly important department.

Thank you for your service, Mark. I wish you a happy and relaxing retirement with those you love. You certainly deserve it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF EDWARD PLATH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the motto of the United States Coast Guard is *Semper Paratus*—"Always Ready"—and throughout its history, the members of our Coast Guard have stood ready to protect our homeland from all threats. I rise today to recognize the important work of our Coast Guard as well as its members throughout history, including those like Edward Plath.

Edward, like so many Americans of his day, answered the call to service at the onset of World War II. Despite being turned down by the Army over medical concerns, he soon joined the Coast Guard and served honorably in New Jersey, protecting the region's coastline and its vital ports from the ever-present danger of Nazi attack.

But for Edward, the Coast Guard during the war meant more than just duty to country. It was on a blind date with a fellow sailor that he met the woman he said he would marry. A year later, they married, and for over six decades



Edward and his wife lived as a loving couple and raised three daughters, including my constituent, Elizabeth Donaldson.

Mr. Plath passed away in 2010, just a couple months after his wife. But on May 17 of this year, he was buried at sea with full military honors off the coast where he served in New Jersey.

I am grateful for Mr. Plath's service to our Nation, and I am proud our team in Bucks County could assist his daughter in honoring his final wish.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to Edward Plath and to all those who serve and continue to serve, and we must always be ready to support them in any way we can, consistent with the motto of the U.S. Coast Guard.

#### DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important when we have an opportunity to discuss issues in a more deliberative manner to rise to the floor to remind Americans, who every day get up and work and provide the engine to this economy, of the destructive behavior that is about to begin in the United States Congress.

The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, took 3 years-plus to engage with every health professional, Americans across the Nation, tens upon tens upon tens of hearings, and individual engagement with people who were sick and families who had lost loved ones because of lack of insurance.

I remember hearing from parents whose children had died because they had no insurance, one mother of a young professional lawyer who had, unfortunately, steered toward drugs but had gotten himself rehabilitated but had developed hepatitis. Because he had no insurance, he wound up dying in the emergency room. There were endless stories like that.

But the Affordable Care Act came in and provided dollars for preexisting conditions. It set a table of essentials that no health insurance could deny you the right to be covered, whether you were pregnant, whether or not you had a preexisting condition. They couldn't deny you hospital coverage.

I don't know if Americans are realizing or our colleagues know that in days past, before the Affordable Care Act, you could be sold an insurance boondoggle that, when you got to the emergency room or the hospital and had to be admitted, they would say you have no coverage. That is the life-saving aspect of the Affordable Care Act.

I don't want anyone to be disabused of the fact that, after the House passed this heinous, terrible, dangerous, dev-

astating bill, it would go away. The Senate now is going to pick up the same TrumpCare bill that will provide higher costs with less coverage; that will include 23 million people losing their coverage; and as well, that will gut the priorities and the protections for preexisting conditions. If you have asthma, if you are pregnant, you won't be covered. And then, of course, there is a crushing age tax where those who are 50 and older may be paying \$12,000 or more for their coverage in healthcare; and as well, it steals from Medicare and jeopardizes the Medicare trust fund.

Let it be very clear: that is the same pathway of the Senate bill, which is then going to come back to the House. The Republicans continue to undermine the very needs of the American people.

Now, let me explain why insurance companies are closing in various States like Ohio.

It is not ObamaCare. It is the Republicans refuse to come together with Democrats and fix it. It is the devastating, destructive executive order from the administration that refuses to pay subsidies. The subsidies allowed working and middle class Americans to have insurance. And the insurance industry, the health insurance industry said, it is too unstable a market—not because of Americans, not because of people who are buying insurance, but because, directly from the White House, they have undermined it by stopping the payment of subsidies between the White House and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

What kind of mercy is that? Where is the kindness and the love and the honoring of the pact we make with the American people that we will stand as their protectors? Where is the basis for how we fought so hard under President Obama and finally got what had not been secured in a century: health insurance for Americans?

Yet we also face a devastating, unstable government. The firing of Director Comey, the testimony under oath that says, by Director Comey, that he felt directed to end the Flynn investigation. I know that doesn't put food on the plates of Americans or their children, but it is the integrity of government.

Where are the investigations in this House? Where are the fact-finding investigations in this House?

The rumor that is now proliferating that a distinguished professional like Mr. Mueller, a former Director of the FBI who served Republican and Democratic Presidents, there is a rumor that the special counsel will be fired.

We are always told in our neck of the woods in Texas that where there is smoke, there is fire. Mr. President, are you going to begin Watergate all over again? The Saturday Night Massacre?

This House needs to begin its investigation now, and this is a need to

begin to move on directing the Judiciary Committee to begin an investigation of the facts. It warrants it because we have to clear the air before we can sit down at the table and do the work that needs to be done.

In the midst of all of this, a destructive bill is being prepared in the Senate that is going to kill the healthcare of all Americans. It is time for all of us to wake up and take our government back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1045

#### PASS VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to send to the President's desk legislation bringing unprecedented accountability to the VA and badly needed protections for whistleblowers who expose wrongdoing.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who has worked with whistleblowers to shed light on negligence, abuse, and even criminal activity within the Central Alabama VA, I can tell you that this reform legislation is long overdue. When it comes to the VA scandal that erupted a few years ago, most Americans probably remember Phoenix, Arizona, and the horrendous activity that happened there. Phoenix became the epitome of a nationwide VA accountability problem, and rightly so.

However, in many ways, the Central Alabama VA could also be considered a poster child for the need of reform of the Department of Veterans Affairs from top to bottom. It might not have garnered as many headlines as Phoenix, but the nature and extent of the abuse inside the Central Alabama VA was every bit as bad, if not worse.

My staff and I worked with courageous whistleblowers and dedicated journalists to pull back the curtain there. Here are just a handful of examples of what we found:

More than 900 X-ray cancer screenings, some showing malignancies, were lost and unread for years. When alerted to the problem, top administrators tried to cover it up.

A VA pulmonologist manipulated more than 1,200 patient records, but even after being caught twice, was still given a satisfactory review.

Perhaps the most disturbing is a Central Alabama VA employee took a recovering veteran to a crack house and bought him drugs and provided him prostitutes in order to extort his VA payments. And even when caught, this employee was not fired, not until 1½ years later, when we exposed it in the newspaper.

The crack incident stands out in my mind for many reasons. First, it still haunts me to my core just how callous and uncaring a person could be to do such a thing to a veteran patient. Second, it illustrates just how complacent the bureaucracy had become to let that behavior slide. And third, it is chilling to think that we would never have even known about it if not for a brave VA employee who walked into my Montgomery office and handed us a copy of the police report.

Thankfully, under the 2014 reform law, the director of the Central Alabama VA was fired in the wake of these exposures. That law took an important step toward speeding up the termination process for top officials. But did you know that he remains the only senior official fired as a result of the VA scandal?

Mr. Speaker, we all know that law did not go far enough. For one thing, it did not extend the strict accountability standards to rank-and-file employees. Senior managers aren't the only ones responsible for the failures at the VA. There has been a culture of complacency up and down the chain of command for a very long time, and the complicated process for disciplining or removing problem employees only makes it worse.

That law also didn't go far enough to protect whistleblowers. There is no question in my mind that without the courage of those who came forward to tell the truth, very little would have changed at the Central Alabama VA, if anything at all, yet those whistleblowers were the very targets of retaliation from supervisors and other officials.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to take that next step on behalf of our veterans and those who are working to serve them. S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, grants the VA Secretary the power to fire, demote, or suspend any VA employee no matter their rank. The bill also increases protections for whistleblowers who put themselves at risk to improve the lives and care for veterans.

Let me say that most VA employees care a great deal about veterans and work very hard to provide the best service. It is not fair for the hard-working employees of the VA that a few bad actors get to evade punishment. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Dr. David Shulkin, has said he wants greater authority to remove bad employees as he sees fit. It is time for Congress to give him that authority and to let him know what we expect and that we expect him to use it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing by our veterans, to pass this legislation today and send it to the President's desk.

#### CANARY IN THE OBAMACARE COAL MINE

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare has created a healthcare crisis for the people in my district. Not long ago, I received this letter from one of my constituents in Knoxville: "I just read where Humana Insurance Company will not offer health insurance in any of the exchanges in 2018. This puts my wife in a predicament, as there will be no health insurance companies offering health insurance in 2018 in Knoxville at this time. We need help with this mounting issue, as I am sure there are a lot more of us in the same boat. When we first signed up for ACA insurance 3 years ago, her monthly premium was \$245. The second year it was \$660. This year it is \$963 a month. This is absolutely ridiculous for a person on a limited income."

Many thousands in Tennessee and across the Nation have very similar stories. My constituent was right. It is ridiculous. Now, even this expensive insurance will disappear, and there are a lot of people in the same boat as my constituent and his wife.

Because there has been so much publicity about how the Republicans now control both Congress and the White House, it seems a great many people do not realize that we are still totally and completely under ObamaCare. A bill was passed in the House, but a different version is being discussed in the Senate. So Republicans have not yet done anything to change ObamaCare. So if someone is still having trouble getting health insurance or is still paying too much for their insurance, it is still because of ObamaCare.

Just today, in the nonpartisan Capitol Hill newspaper, *The Hill*, is this headline, "Insurer exits bolster GOP case for ObamaCare repeal." Insurance companies are still pulling out right and left all over the country because of ObamaCare. ObamaCare is still imploding all over the country.

ObamaCare's allegedly compassionate regulations were supposed to guarantee access to healthcare for the sick. Instead, they have made access worse. Current propaganda seems to be persuading some people that ObamaCare is really protecting the people it claims to be, but Harvard and others are finding otherwise in their studies. They are finding that the ObamaCare regulations literally penalize insurers who offer quality coverage for the sick. This motivates insurers to offer only unattractive plans to people with expensive medical conditions.

The insurance company who offers the best plans ends up with the most—and the sickest—enrollees, and so the highest costs. Sadly, this is causing a race to the bottom. The ObamaCare

regulations are causing everyone, including people with preexisting conditions, to have low-quality coverage or no insurance options at all.

ObamaCare's harmful government regulations have driven every insurer out of the marketplace exchange in 16 counties in the Knoxville region. For 43,000 Tennesseans—unless Blue Cross Blue Shield can come back into the area, which they are considering—there will be no exchange plans available after December.

But it is not just in Knoxville. Millions of Americans have only one insurer left in the exchange, if any. ObamaCare's regulations are driving out more and more insurers every day, leaving Americans with less choice and ultimately no choice.

Throwing more taxpayer money at this problem won't solve it. This will continue to happen all across this country as long as we have ObamaCare's harmful regulations on the books.

Knoxville, Tennessee, is the canary in the ObamaCare coal mine. Mr. Speaker, President Trump says he wants to repeal ObamaCare. He should send his healthcare people to Knoxville, talk and listen to our people, share my constituents' stories, show the American people that ObamaCare's regulations are the cause of our Nation's crisis and are limiting access to healthcare.

If President Trump goes before the Nation on national television and explains in understandable detail what is going on with ObamaCare now and how he is trying to fix it, the American people will rally once again to repeal ObamaCare's harmful government regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this Wall Street Journal article written by Michael Cannon, director of health policy studies at the Cato Institute.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 28, 2017]

#### HOW OBAMACARE PUNISHES THE SICK

(By Michael Cannon)

Republicans are nervous about repealing ObamaCare's supposed ban on discrimination against patients with pre-existing conditions. But a new study by Harvard and the University of Texas-Austin finds those rules penalize high-quality coverage for the sick, reward insurers who slash coverage for the sick, and leave patients unable to obtain adequate insurance.

The researchers estimate a patient with multiple sclerosis, for example, might file \$61,000 in claims. ObamaCare's rules let MS patients buy coverage for far less, forcing insurers to take a loss on every MS patient. That creates "an incentive to avoid enrolling people who are in worse health" by making policies "unattractive to people with expensive health conditions," the Kaiser Family Foundation explains.

To mitigate that perverse incentive, ObamaCare lobs all manner of taxpayer subsidies at insurers. Yet the researchers find insurers still receive just \$47,000 in revenue per MS patient—a \$14,000 loss per patient.

Predictably, that triggers a race to the bottom. Each year, whichever insurer offers the best MS coverage attracts the most MS patients and racks up the most losses. Insurers that offer high-quality coverage either leave the market, as many have, or slash their coverage. Let's call those losses what they are: penalties for offering high-quality coverage.

The result is lower-quality coverage—for MS, rheumatoid arthritis, infertility and other expensive conditions. The researchers find these patients face higher cost-sharing (even for inexpensive drugs), more prior-authorization requirements, more mandatory substitutions, and often no coverage for the drugs they need, so that consumers "cannot be adequately insured."

The study also corroborates reports that these rules are subjecting patients to higher deductibles and cost-sharing across the board, narrow networks that exclude leading cancer centers, inaccurate provider directories, and opaque cost-sharing. A coalition of 150 patient groups complains this government-fostered race to the bottom "completely undermines the goal of the ACA."

It doesn't have to be like this. Employer plans offer drug coverage more comprehensive and sustainable than ObamaCare. The pre-2014 individual market made comprehensive coverage even more secure: High-cost patients were less likely to lose coverage than similar enrollees in employer plans. The individual market created innovative products like "pre-existing conditions insurance" that—for one-fifth the cost of health insurance—gave the uninsured the right to enroll in coverage at healthy-person premiums if they developed expensive conditions.

If anything, Republicans should fear not repealing ObamaCare's pre-existing-conditions rules. The Congressional Budget Office predicts a partial repeal would wipe out the individual market and cause nine million to lose coverage unnecessarily. And contrary to conventional wisdom, the consequences of those rules are wildly unpopular. In a new Cato Institute/YouGov poll, 63% of respondents initially supported ObamaCare's pre-existing-condition rules. That dropped to 31%—with 60% opposition—when they were told of the impact on quality.

Republicans can't keep their promise to repeal ObamaCare and improve access for the sick without repealing the ACA's penalties on high-quality coverage.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend M. Davies Kirkland, Dulin United Methodist Church, Falls

Church, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Gracious and loving God, we offer thanks for this day that You have given us, a day full of new beginnings, opportunities, and potential for our country.

We ask Your blessings upon these Representatives, their staffs, and all here who work through government to serve people of varied traditions, faiths, and races.

Give them guidance and strength as they debate, deliberate, and make difficult decisions on laws which will govern our country.

Give them patience and civility to listen compassionately, to show respect for each other, and to work together for the common good.

And, O God, give them hope. For though the path may seem perilous and the hurdles high, may hope sustain these public servants that they might accomplish the more perfect union that our forebears dreamed of: a more perfect union of justice, freedom, and liberty for all.

I pray this in Your Almighty name.  
Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### WELCOMING REVEREND M. DAVIES KIRKLAND

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pastor Dave Kirkland, who led us in the opening prayer. Pastor Kirkland is appointed as the pastor of Dulin United Methodist Church in Falls Church, Virginia, where he has been the pastor for the last 17 years.

Previously, he was appointed to Del Ray United Methodist Church in Alexandria, Virginia, for 6 years and associate pastor at Asbury United Methodist Church in Harrisonburg, Virginia, for 4 years.

Dave's passion in ministry is related to the great Commandment: to love God with all your heart, soul, and mind, and to love your neighbor as yourself.

This is articulated in preaching, raising money, and good deeds performed by the congregation through reaching out to the lost and the least.

A highlight of this ministry of hope at Dulin: over 60 homeless persons each Sunday morning are served a breakfast, attend a worship service, and are given toiletries and assistance cards to purchase items at Giant Food.

Dulin is engaged in several local ministries, such as Homeless Shelter, Homestretch, Rebuilding Together, and Meals on Wheels; and he also supports a child rescue center in Sierra Leone.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to welcome Pastor Dave today to the House of Representatives, and I personally thank him for offering the opening prayer.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### FORT JACKSON CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the Fort Jackson Centennial, a celebration of 100 years of military service and opportunity at that extraordinary post.

As the largest initial entry training facility for the Army, Fort Jackson has been a leader in training in military readiness. Indeed, Fort Jackson recently achieved a remarkable milestone, having trained an estimated five million soldiers.

I know firsthand of the dedication and capability of Fort Jackson. As a member of the Army Reserve and the South Carolina Army National Guard and a graduate of the Adjutant General School, I trained at Fort Jackson. Additionally, three of my four sons have served in the South Carolina National Guard, receiving world class training at Fort Jackson.

I have also seen how Fort Jackson supports the Midlands community, promoting civilian and military jobs, providing strong leaders and volunteers for our community, drawing millions of visitors. This is why the Midlands has worked hard to become the most military-friendly community in America.

Congratulations to General Pete Johnson for a strong command at Fort Jackson. I look forward to continued success for American families. Victory starts here.

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

#### COST-SHARING REDUCTION PAYMENTS

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, Secretary Price refused to say whether the administration would fulfill its obligation to make cost-sharing reduction payments. This is the latest in a string of actions to sabotage the individual health insurance markets and ultimately leave people paying more for their insurance premiums.

President Trump and the Republican majority have said that the Affordable Care Act is collapsing as a justification of taking away insurance from 23 million Americans, but the truth is they are taking active measures to drive uncertainty and undermine the law.

Insurers have little time left to finalize their rate filings for 2018, and without certainty as to whether or not cost-sharing subsidies will be paid, they will significantly raise their rates or exit the marketplaces altogether.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cut out the games and make the cost-sharing reduction payments, and to stop actively trying to undermine Americans' access to affordable, quality health insurance.

Even my friend from Texas (Mr. BRADY), chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, called for the funding of insurer payments in order to help stabilize the insurance market and help lower premiums for Americans who rely on these subsidies.

There is simply no excuse for delay.

#### NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June is National Dairy Month, and, personally, I can't think of a better way to start the summer.

From calcium to potassium, dairy products, like milk, contain nine essential nutrients which may help to

better manage your weight, reduce your risk for high blood pressure, osteoporosis, and certain cancers.

Whether it is a protein to help build and repair the muscle tissue of active bodies or vitamin A to help maintain healthy skin, dairy products are a natural nutrient powerhouse. Those are just a few of the reasons that we should celebrate dairy not just in June, but all year long.

National Dairy Month started out as National Milk Month in 1937 as a way to promote drinking milk. It was initially created to stabilize the dairy demand when production was at a surplus, but has now developed into an annual tradition that celebrates the contributions the dairy industry has made to the world.

Proudly, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the largest milk-producing States in the Nation, certainly the largest agriculture commodity in Pennsylvania. As vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I wish everyone a happy National Dairy Month.

#### RED SQUARE PROTEST BY YOUNG RUSSIANS

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, thousands of Russians took to the streets of Moscow's Red Square to protest President Putin's party of crooks and thieves. The protesters chanted that they want to make Russia free and that they want to live in a modern democratic state. They want democracy.

Today, in America, here in the Nation's Capitol, another Trump official is testifying before Congress on Russia's interference with U.S. elections for the fourth time in as many weeks. There is no doubt that Russia interfered. This we know. Did Russia interfere in coordination with Trump officials? With whom and to what extent? This is what the American people deserve to know.

Today, in America, the talk is how Putin tried to dishonor American democracy to do one thing, to keep his people from wanting it, the very democracy that is uniquely America's.

And yesterday, in Moscow, was about what Putin couldn't do. He couldn't keep young Russia from taking to the streets of his capital city denouncing him as a crook and a coward and demanding American democracy.

#### NEW AMERICANS CAUCUS' CALL TO VOTE

(Mrs. TORRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a Member of Con-

gress but as an immigrant and a proud American, and I and my fellow members of the New Americans Caucus took the step to not just become naturalized citizens and exercise our right to vote but also to get involved in our communities and eventually run for office.

This is why, today, I want to encourage all of those who can to do the same, become a citizen and get involved. Your vote is your voice. It allows you to use that voice to better your community and to speak up for those who still can't.

Citizenship is a security. Citizenship is power. These days, too much is at stake, so don't wait until it is too late.

#### CONGRATULATING COMMANDER KEITH WOODLEY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, with this being Caribbean-American Heritage Month, I wanted to highlight and congratulate a native Virgin Islander who is now the new commander of the USS *Gabrielle Giffords*, which was commissioned this past weekend in Texas.

The USS *Gabrielle Giffords*, the 16th ship to be named for a woman and only the 13th ship to be named for a living person since 1850, is, in fact, commanded by Keith Woodley, a native of St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands, a graduate of Florida A&M and the Florida Institute of Technology.

At the commissioning of the ship, Commander Woodley stated: "This is not just a new ship. This is a new class of ship. . . . They have risen to that challenge and performed exceptionally well in getting this ship ready for service."

I would be remiss in not also acknowledging, during Caribbean-American Heritage month, Alton Adam, born in 1889, who was also from St. Thomas and the U.S. Navy's first bandmaster. His music was performed by numerous bands and continues to be performed.

I also, of course, want to wish my parents a happy 58th wedding anniversary today. We love you. God bless you.

#### TAKE ACTION ON A COMPREHENSIVE INFRASTRUCTURE BILL

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue impacting communities throughout Arizona's First Congressional District and the country. We must take action on a comprehensive infrastructure bill. Our crumbling roads and bridges pose a greater threat to safety with every car, truck, and school bus that crosses them.

Our pilots land on runways long overdue for repairs, and rural and travel communities, without access to modern technology, lose their competitive advantage in business and education.

In Arizona, flood control projects in Winslow, essential broadband access in Tuba City, and transportation infrastructure in rural Gila County are all in need of attention.

This is something that impacts every State, every district in this country, and I believe we can find broad bipartisan support on this issue in Congress.

Ensuring that our communities have adequate resources to repair their roads, invest in technology, and protect their residents is of paramount importance. I call on my colleagues to continue working on this.

We cannot push this issue aside any longer. We must come together and pass a bipartisan infrastructure bill that invests in our rural communities.

□ 1215

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE TERRIFIED OF TRUMPCARE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are speaking up, and they are absolutely terrified of the Republican healthcare plan, TrumpCare. According to a FOX News poll, two-thirds of Americans disapprove of TrumpCare. That's a FOX News poll.

Why? Because it will take away healthcare from 23 million Americans. For those who still have the good fortune of being able to get insurance, they will pay more for worse care. If you are age 50 to 65, fasten your seatbelts; you are about to pay five times what others will pay for health insurance and for prescription drugs.

Of course, in the Senate, they are crafting their version of TrumpCare in secret, behind closed doors. Nobody knows what is in it. Why? Because they know the American people will reject it.

We know we have got issues we have to deal with in healthcare. No law is perfect, and the ACA is one of those. But my goodness, you cannot do this behind closed doors. We have to do this in public. People need to understand what Congress is doing. We have got to get it right, and we have to do it in the open.

#### SALUTING THE PHILADELPHIA ORCHESTRA ON ITS HISTORIC ASIAN TOUR

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

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the Philadelphia Orchestra on a historical tour through Asia.

I have had the privilege of working to support them over the years during my time in the Pennsylvania Legislature and now here in Congress. I can't think of a better cultural ambassador for our country, the Commonwealth, and our great city than the finely tuned Philadelphia Orchestra.

The historical tour started in Shanghai, China, where they serenaded the visitors of the new Shanghai Disney Resort. They continued on to Beijing and Mongolia.

Philadelphia's magnificent orchestra marked a historical first when they became the first Western orchestra to play at the people-to-people exchange. The President of Mongolia and I met last year in the city of Philadelphia.

The orchestra then continued on to Seoul and to Hong Kong. In Seoul, the orchestra participated in a master class with the Heart to Heart Orchestra and Korea United College Orchestra. In Hong Kong, the Philadelphia Orchestra concluded with a coaching session for the Hong Kong Youth Orchestra and a well-earned reception.

I would like to give special recognition to the Philadelphia Orchestra's director, the chairman, as well as the woman who brought it all together, Allison Vulgamore.

I am proud to represent a city that boasts some of the most iconic music heard around the world. I welcome back our well-traveled Philadelphia Orchestra and look forward to the next symphony.

#### VA ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight Congress' making more important strides on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

The last few years, we have all heard stories about employees at the VA who failed in their duty to serve and protect our Nation's heroes. It is true that most VA employees are hardworking and dedicated, but as we have come to find out, there are bad actors who must be held accountable. Our veterans deserve nothing less.

Strangely, as the VA has tried to discipline these bad actors, the existing bureaucracy and red tape has stymied the Secretary's ability to do so. That is why the House today will pass the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, to create a more efficient and effective system to remove, demote, or suspend any VA employee for poor performance or misconduct.

Our bill still ensures due process and actually expands protections for whistleblowers, but, importantly, it will let the VA Secretary do his job and clean up the Department and protect our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, protecting those veterans isn't a political issue; it is a cause we must all champion. I encourage a bipartisan vote on today's bill.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 13, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 13, 2017, at 11:23 a.m.:

Appointment:  
Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff  
Commission on Native Children.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### RESIGNATION AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I, Jason Chaffetz, am submitting my resignation as the Chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform effective immediately. It has been the privilege of a lifetime to serve in this position, and I look forward to continuing to serve as a member of this historic committee for the remainder of my time in office.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,  
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.  
There was no objection.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 381

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Rutherford.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Gowdy, Chair.

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, ranked as follows on the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Chaffetz, after Mr. Jordan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2581, VERIFY FIRST ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1094, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017**

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 378 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 378**

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2581) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 1094) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides for debate on the final negotiated bill between the House and the Senate. This process began last Congress and resulted in the House passing H.R. 1259 in March of this year.

The Senate introduced and passed the version of the bill we have before us today by voice vote. It mirrors the reforms contained in Chairman ROE's bill that the House has already passed by a bipartisan vote.

Mr. Speaker, we often talk about veterans in this country: We thank them for their sacrifice; we applaud them at sporting events; we tell ourselves that we must take care of them, must repay them for the service to our Nation. But in the past few years, we have discovered that America's care for our veterans has been wholly inadequate. The Department of Veterans Affairs has failed them.

Shameful misconduct at the VA has been rampant, and it has hurt our veterans:

In 2014, we learned that the Phoenix VA concealed extremely long wait lines for patients and that up to 40 vets may have died while waiting for care at the facility;

Just last year, we discovered that a VA Hospital in Colorado Springs also falsified wait time records. The majority of patients at that hospital faced wait times over 30 days, and 28 patients had an average wait time of 76 days. One veteran is even thought to have committed suicide because he wasn't referred for mental healthcare, even though he had been deemed at risk for suicide.

That is why Congress needs to act. S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017, allows the Secretary of the VA to hold all employees at the agency accountable for their conduct.

We desperately need this legislation, not because all the employees at the VA have problems. Quite the opposite. Most VA employees show up to work every day because they are passionate about serving our Nation's veterans. But there are bad apples, people who put our veterans in danger. These people must be held accountable, and, frankly, many of them must be fired.

This bill empowers the Secretary to reprimand, suspend, or remove VA employees who have engaged in misconduct. It also permits the Secretary to recoup bonuses if an employee performed poorly or conducted themselves inappropriately and to recoup relocation expenses for fraud, waste, or malfeasance.

The bill also bolsters protection for whistleblowers, creating an office within the VA devoted to protecting those who expose wrongdoing. Supervisors will be taught how to protect whistleblowers and will be held accountable for how well they do.

And the bill requires reporting to Congress on the performance of senior executives at the VA and on the outcomes of disciplinary actions at the agency.

You may be wondering why Congress has taken such an in-depth interest in an executive branch agency, and I will tell you why. It is our job.

The legislative branch was designed to oversee the executive branch. We appropriate the funds used to pay the salaries of everyone working at the VA. These funds come from the taxpayer. For the sake of the taxpayer, we must ensure that the VA is serving its purpose.

But this bill also empowers the Secretary of the VA, allowing him or her to take immediate action to protect veterans. We can't wait for long appeals processes when a bad employee on the front lines of a VA hospital is harming our veterans.

This legislation should not be controversial. Both Democrats and Republicans want the best for our veterans. This legislation, the legislation we are discussing today, gives the VA Secretary and Congress more tools to hold employees accountable because if we are holding employees accountable, then we are protecting our veterans from abuse.

This bill is one small way to say thank you to those men and women who have served our country. We can never adequately repay them, but we can do our best to provide them with sufficient medical care.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding me the necessary and customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to debate the rule for consideration of two separate pieces of legislation: S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act; and H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act.

I begin with S. 1094, legislation aimed at bringing enhanced accountability at the Department of Veterans Affairs and improving the care we provide to our Nation's veterans. Among other things, this bill codifies in law the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection at the VA and streamlines the process to demote, remove, or suspend VA employees if evidence proves they engaged in misconduct or poor performance.



Mr. Speaker, last night at the Rules Committee, we had the opportunity to hear from the chairman and ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee about this legislation, Dr. ROE and Mr. WALZ. They discussed the bipartisan nature in which they have worked on this issue, along with the bipartisan work done in the Senate, to craft legislation that they hope can achieve strong bipartisan support in this body.

It is because of this display of bipartisanship and cooperation and a semblance of regular order that I am dismayed that I must now address the process and substance by which we are considering the second bill encompassed in this rule, H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act.

□ 1230

Let me connect the dots for you on how we got to this point, and bear with me. The Republican majority's path to take healthcare from 23 million Americans has been as convoluted as it has been chaotic.

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you and my colleagues should remember, first, the Republican mantra was repeal. Then it was repeal and replace. Then it was repeal and delay, followed by access to coverage, and then, patient centered.

Finally, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle settled on a three-bucket strategy. The first bucket of this strategy was the Republicans' American Health Care Act. The majority brought their first iteration of this bill to the floor after working on it for 17 days, and, with no hearings, only to have it go down in flames in the most public and spectacular fashion.

So they went back to the drawing board—not to improve the bill, or improve healthcare for the American people, mind you, but to garner enough Republican votes for a bill that ultimately had 17 percent approval ratings. And they added a manager's amendment to get support, then they added another manager's amendment, then another, and another.

Then with a bill patched together with the wants and wishes of powerful healthcare lobbyists and tax breaks for the superwealthy, with no CBO score, and with no way for the American people, let alone their own Members, to actually know what was in the bill, the majority pushed the bill through the House of Representatives.

What did my Republican friends do after passing this inexplicably bad bill? They got on a couple of buses from here at the Capitol and went to a rose garden ceremony hosted by President Donald John Trump to celebrate upending one-sixth of the American economy and taking away healthcare from 23 million people.

That was certainly the Republicans' most recent mission-accomplished mo-

ment, and it must have been some celebration because it will be another 2 weeks before the majority would actually get around to sending their healthcare bill to the Senate, due to the fact that they were not sure if it complied with the Senate rules or, more specifically, the Byrd rule in the U.S. Senate.

Then there is the second bucket of this plan, which involves the Trump administration rolling back regulations. Should the work associated with the second bucket proceed as it has with the other two, then I am sure it, too, will be a disaster, benefitting the wealthy at the expense of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the Republicans' third bucket. According to Senator TED CRUZ, this bucket is "a sucker's bucket." Indeed, some like Senator TOM COTTON have referred to all of this bucket talk as simply a bunch of political spin. Whatever it is, it is an empty bucket.

The most recent bill the Republican majority has decided to dump in this sucker's bucket is H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act. Under current law, premium assistance tax credits are available for eligible individuals and families to subsidize the cost of health insurance. Individuals are not eligible for these credits unless they are U.S. citizens or are living in the country legally.

Currently, applicants have 90 days to provide documentation or otherwise address any issues with citizenship and immigration status, and are presumed eligible to enroll in marketplace coverage. If an individual is unable to provide the necessary documentation, coverage and financial assistance are terminated.

This provision ensures that individuals are not left in a position of having to wait potentially months to be verified before they can afford coverage, and it provides the proper guardrails to terminate assistance if an individual is deemed ineligible. There is no evidence to support the majority's claim that this process is not working.

H.R. 2581 would repeal this 90-day verification period, setting up an unnecessary barrier for eligible individuals to receive the credits they need to afford lifesaving healthcare. Republicans themselves acknowledge that the verification process could take months, but, nevertheless, they are bringing forth today's bill knowing full well that it will make it harder for vulnerable people to access healthcare when they need it most.

It would disproportionately hurt low-income Americans, especially naturalized Americans from immigrant families since they can have a harder time producing documentation needed to verify their citizenship. But don't just take my word for it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by dozens and dozens of

national, State, and local civil rights and advocacy groups strongly opposing this legislation, such groups as the NAACP, the Children's Defense Fund, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, the American Friends Service Committee, the Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Institute of the Sisters of Mercy, and I could go on, and on, and on, but in the interest of time, I thank the Speaker for allowing it to be made a part of the RECORD.

JUNE 12, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As national, state, and local organizations concerned about immigrant rights or access to affordable health care, we are writing to strongly urge you to VOTE NO on H.R. 2581, the "Verify First" Act. This bill is an attack on people's ability to see a doctor and on immigrants and people of color. It is not the "common sense" taxpayer protection bill that its supporters would have you believe.

H.R. 2581 is a dangerous bill that puts up roadblocks for both citizens and immigrants to obtain timely, affordable health insurance. It would strip away provisions that provide for a person to obtain subsidies for enrollment in an Affordable Care Act (or the contemplated American Health Care Act) plan while they work with Department of Health and Human Services to verify their U.S. citizenship or immigration status. The people most impacted are U.S. citizens who were born abroad or naturalized. The bill also affects many immigrants, especially those newly arrived or certain victims of domestic violence and trafficking survivors.

The fact is that when individuals are not able to immediately verify their citizenship or immigration status on an Affordable Care Act Marketplace, it begins an often months long, strenuous process of sending in documents that must be physically inspected. Health care assisters routinely say these clients are the hardest cases they work on because the process for verifying citizenship and immigration status is a time-consuming exercise in dealing with inefficient government processes.

Rather than protect American taxpayers, H.R. 2581 would strip from American taxpayers important protections that are needed to overcome deficiencies in federal government databases. Immigrants who are not lawfully present are categorically barred from enrollment in health insurance on the Affordable Care Act marketplaces, and for the subsidies that make that insurance affordable. Moreover, safeguards protecting taxpayers are already built into the ACA; individuals whose citizenship or immigration status cannot be verified already are required to pay back all of their subsidies when they file their taxes and "reconcile" their premium tax credits.

Supporters of this bill cite a sloppy Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee report that arrived at a made-up number of supposed "fraud." It's just not true. The committee assumed that every person who lost coverage for failure to verify their citizenship and immigration status was undocumented. In the experience of our organizations and organizations we work with, this is false. These reports describe the first year of the marketplaces, and it is well documented that system outages and understaffing, among other technical problems,

contributed to the federal Marketplace's failure to verify consumers' status promptly. The Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General reported in 2014 that a cause of the delay in verification was the agency's lack of prioritization of this issue.

Despite huge gains since then, problems still persist. The Social Security database holding many citizens' information may not reflect common changes, such as when a person marries and changes their last name, or when someone naturalizes and gains U.S. citizenship. People lose their coverage because they receive notices in languages they cannot read. Immigrants are required to submit documents multiple times, or wait while the Department of Homeland Security finds paper files, a result of deficiencies in their databases affecting groups like asylum applicants and some survivors of domestic violence. These are among the many issues consumers face.

Congress has already deprived undocumented immigrants from the ability to buy coverage, even at full price, so they can see a doctor when they are sick, but this bill would go a step further to delay or put out of reach affordable health insurance for many citizens and lawfully present immigrants. Our organizations firmly believe that this would be detrimental to the people we represent and to all of our communities as a whole. We have seen that when health insurance is unaffordable, people are effectively prevented from obtaining access to the care they need to be healthy.

This bill is not just an attack on our health care system, it is also an attack on immigrants and people of color, which our organizations stand firmly against. In his statements when introducing this bill, Rep. Lou Barletta focused the bill as part of his effort to "stop illegal immigration." Rep. Barletta has a long history of anti-immigrant rhetoric, from trying to prevent immigrants from leasing a residence to stating that they should be denied life-saving services in hospital emergency rooms. This bill is simply a vehicle for scapegoating immigrants and people of color and will keep eligible people from accessing health care.

We the undersigned organizations urge you to vote NO on H.R. 2581 and the continued assault on immigrants and the health of our communities.

Sincerely,

#### NATIONAL

Advocates for Youth; African American Ministers in Action; American Federation of Teachers (AFT); American Friends Service Committee; American Intercession; American Society on Aging; Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum; Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC; Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; Asian Pacific Partners for Empowerment, Advocacy & Leadership (APPEAL); Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations (AAPCHO); Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Breast Cancer Action; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for Medicare Advocacy, Inc.; Child Welfare League of America; Children's Advocacy Institute; Children's Defense Fund; Church World Service (CWS).

Coalition on Human Needs; Columbian Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, US Provinces; Conscious Talk Radio; Detention Watch Network; Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund; Dominican Sisters; Dominicans of Sinsinawa; Family Equality Council; Farmworker Justice;

First Focus Campaign for Children; Food Research & Action Center; Franciscan Sisters of the Poor IJPC; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Generations Inc.; GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBT Equality; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Indivisible; Institute of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas; Interfaith Worker Justice.

Irish Apostolate USA; Jobs With Justice; Justice in Aging; Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Commission, Priests of the Sacred Heart, US Province; Lambda Legal; Leadership Team of the Felician Sisters of North America; League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC); Medical Mission Sisters; Mi Familia Vota; MomsRising; NAACP; NAPAFAASA; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum; National Association of County and City Health Officials; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA); National Council of Churches.

National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Health Law Program; National Hispanic Medical Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Network of Abortion Funds; National Organization for Women; National Women's Health Network; Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; NMAC; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; Peace and Justice Office of the Congregation of Notre Dame; Physicians for Reproductive Health; PICO National.

Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Poor People's Economic Human Rights Campaign; Prevention Institute; Project Inform; Racine Dominicans; Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need; Refugee Ministries; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Service Employees International Union; Sisters of Charity; Sisters of Charity of Nazareth; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas—Institute Justice Team; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; United Sikhs; United We Dream; Ursuline Sisters of Tildonk, U.S. Province; We Belong Together; API Wellness.

#### STATE AND LOCAL

Academy of Medical & Public Health Services; Advocates for Children and Youth; AgeOptions; Almost Home, Inc.; Anti-Hunger & Nutrition Coalition; Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families; Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Los Angeles; Asian Community Alliance—Cincinnati OH; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Services In Action, Inc.; Baltimore Jewish Council; California Health Professional Student Alliance; California Immigrant Policy Center; California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (CLRJ); California OneCare; California Pan-Ethnic Health Network; California Partnership; California Physicians Alliance; CASA.

Center for Southeast Asians; Chicago Hispanic Health Coalition; Child Care Resources of Rockland; Children Now; Children's Defense Fund—CA; Chinatown Service Center; Chinese-American Planning Council; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Collaborative Center for Justice; Colorado Center on Law and Policy; Colo-

rado Center on Law and Policy; Columbia Legal Services; Community Health Councils; D.C. Hunger Solutions; DuPage Federation on Human Services Reform; Empower Missouri; Ensuring Opportunity Campaign to End Poverty in Contra Costa; Erie Benedictines for Peace; Esperanza Health Centers; EverThrive Illinois; Farmworker Association of Florida.

Florida Immigrant Coalition (FLIC); Give for a Smile; Greater Kansas City Coalition to End Homelessness; Having Our Say Coalition; Health Access California; Health Care for All—WA; Health Law Advocates; Healthy House Within A MATCH Coalition; Hmong Ohio of Tomorrow; Hunger Action Los Angeles; IHM Sisters, Immaculata, PA; IL Hunger Coalition; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Indivisible Mountain Home, Idaho; Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity; IRIS—Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services; Islamic Civic Engagement Project; Jewish Family & Children's Service; Kansas Applesseed; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Korean Community Services of Metropolitan NY; La Fe Policy Research and Education Center.

La Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program; Legal Council for Health Justice; Legal Services of Southern Piedmont; Maine Consumers for Affordable Health Care; Make the Road New York; Maryland CASH Campaign; Maryland Hunger Solutions; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA); Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Maternal and Child Health Access; Maternity Care Coalition; National Association of Social Workers, CT Chapter; National Tongan American Society; Nationalities Service Center; NC Child; New Mexico Center on Law and Poverty; New York Immigration Coalition; New York Legal Assistance Group; NICOS Chinese Health Coalition; NJ State Industrial Union Council; NOELA Community Health Center; Northern NJ Chapter, National Organization for Women.

Northwest Health Law Advocates; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project; Office of the Health Care Advocate at Vermont Legal Aid; OneAmerica; Pacific Islander Health Partnership; Pitkin County Human Services; Public Justice Center; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Rainbow Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; RESULTS—Santa Fe (NM); Salaam Cleveland; Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN); Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Houston; Sisters of St. Dominic of Blauvelt, NY; Sisters of the Most Precious Blood; Social Justice Committee St. Patrick Church; South Asian Network; Southwest Women's Law Center; St. Francis St Vincent de Paul Society; Tennessee Justice Center; Thai Health And Information Service.

The Children's Partnership; The Latino Health Insurance Program, Inc.; Turning Points; United Way Bay Area; URI Feinstein Center for a Hunger Free America; Vermont Affordable Housing Coalition; Virginia Poverty Law Center; Voices for Vermont's Children; Voz Hispana Cambia Comunitario; Washington Community Action Network; Washington Healthcare Access Alliance; Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO; West Chester Food Cupboard; West Side Campaign Against Hunger; Westlake Chinese Culture Association; Wisconsin Council of Churches; Wisconsin Faith Voices for Justice; Women's Action Movement Washtenaw County, MI; Worksite Wellness LA; Xaverian Brothers; Young Women United.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, "This bill," that letter says, "is an attack on

people's ability to see a doctor and on immigrants and people of color."

"H.R. 2581 is a dangerous bill that puts up roadblocks for both citizens and immigrants to obtain timely, affordable health insurance."

If this is what we are in store for with the Republican's third bucket, then it is even worse than a sucker's bucket. It is callous, and it is cruel, and someone described the Vice Presidency once many years ago as a warm bucket of spit.

As my colleague, Congressman RICHARD NEAL, said last night at the Rules Committee, bad process leads to bad product. I agree with Mr. NEAL, and this bill is a perfect example of his salient insight. The provisions in this legislation are contingent upon enactment of the American Health Care Act.

If the American Health Care Act is enacted, this bill would not go into effect. That means we are now considering legislation amending a bill that we have already sent to the Senate, and that the Senate has made clear it has no intention of taking up.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado as well.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act. I helped introduce this legislation with my good friend and colleague, Mr. BARLETTA from Pennsylvania, to ensure illegal immigrants are not able to use healthcare tax credits to purchase health insurance.

Under ObamaCare, the Federal Government paid these tax credits up front on a temporary basis to people before verifying their immigration status. This created a pay-and-chase system where the Federal Government would seek repayment only after it found it had paid out benefits to an illegal immigrant.

This bill puts an end to this taxpayer abuse by requiring the Social Security Administration, or the Department of Homeland Security, to verify the immigration status of every tax credit applicant before the Treasury Department issues a credit.

Texans and hardworking taxpayers around the country already struggle to pay for their healthcare. Their hard-earned dollars should not be used to foot the bill for those who broke the law to come here. My constituents in Texas and American taxpayers deserve better.

I want to thank Congressman BARLETTA for his dedication and continued leadership on this issue, and, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise only to express my real disappointment in the way that this bill has been brought to the floor. Had the majority not insisted on a closed rule, preventing the House from voting on any and all amendments to repair and improve S. 1094, I would have offered an amendment to ensure that it applies in a way that respects the due process rights of Federal workers, and that it would apply only to collective bargaining agreements ratified on or after enactment.

I support the goal of improving accountability at the VA, but I want to make sure it is not done in a way that prejudices and undermines the collective bargaining rights and the due process rights of the workforce.

There are real problems at the VA now, we know. There are 45- to 49,000 vacancies there. There is bureaucratic dysfunction in a lot of places, and all that this bill would do is to change the evidentiary standard of proof from the preponderance of the evidence to substantial evidence in leveling sanctions and discipline against employees.

That is a tiny detail. It is an irrelevant distraction from the massive problems that actually are facing the VA today. So we should be filling these vacancies. We should be improving the function of the VA, but we should not use this or that problem as an excuse to undermine the due process rights of the workforce. That sets a terrible example for the Federal workforce, generally, and it does nothing to repair the underlying problems and inadequacies that are taking place at the VA.

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

In response to my friend from Florida's statement about the second piece of legislation that we are dealing with in this rule, I believe it is our responsibility to the American taxpayer, and we are fulfilling that responsibility. We are expected to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars. This bill ensures that the government only disburses premium tax credits under the Affordable Care Act, or under the American Health Care Act, to those individuals who are eligible for those tax credits.

Under the ACA, an individual who is not lawfully present in the United States is ineligible from receiving a premium credit. Unfortunately, the ACA also allows the government to hand out the tax credit first and verify later.

This pay-and-chase scheme means taxpayer money is flowing out the door to people who don't meet the requirements for premium tax credits, and much of these funds may not be recouped. In fact, under the ACA, over half a million people who were ineligible for coverage and tax credits received credits.

H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to ensure that any department disbursing payments have first verified the recipient's legal presence with information like Social Security numbers. By requiring this verification, we can confirm that, under both the ACA and AHCA, those who receive credits deserve credits.

With that confirmation, we will ensure that these laws are used as they were intended; that the wishes of the American taxpayer are followed. I urge Members to support this important legislation.

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

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Donald Trump issued an executive order placing a hiring freeze on Federal civilian employees across the executive branch. This executive order, like many of the executive orders this President has issued, failed to take into account the effects it could have on our most vulnerable communities.

Veterans make up one-third of all Federal workers. I am very pleased that one is in my office. She is probably smiling because sometimes Charity probably doesn't think I even know that she is in the office. But she is there and does incredible work.

The Department of Veterans Affairs—a severely understaffed agency serving those veterans—cannot afford a hiring freeze.

This week, Republicans are bringing to the floor bills they claim would improve veterans' lives. If the President and my Republican colleagues are truly committed to our veterans, then they should ensure that reckless hiring freezes do not harm them in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative SCHRADER's bill, H.R. 696, which would prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of my amendment, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, what we have here today is a rule with one bill that really was worked on in a bipartisan manner—sort of like regular order like we were promised by the Speaker at the outset of this session of Congress—and another bill, which is just more of the same from this majority: creating problems where none existed before.

The fact remains that the Republicans' healthcare bill and overall bucket strategy is a disaster for the American people, and no amount of Rose Garden backslapping is going to change that fact.

Under the Republican plan, 23 million Americans will be kicked off of their health insurance and \$800 billion will be cut from Medicaid. Footnote right there, we hear that the Senate is taking up something. We don't know where and who is doing the taking up, but what I read today is that they are considering a glide path of some kind to cut Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, cutting Medicaid hurts poor people. Whether you glide it or run it over them, either way you look at it, it hurts them, and we need to pay attention to that, particularly if we are doing it to provide for those of us that are better off in our society.

Seventy-five billion dollars will be cut from Medicare, insurance premiums would increase for people ages 60 to 64 by more than \$3,000 a year, and protections for those with preexisting conditions will be eliminated.

I read about a 63-year-old lady who said that all of her conditions are pre-existing and she can't afford insurance. H.R. 2581 only adds to this pain by setting up an unnecessary barrier for eligible individuals to get access to healthcare.

But not to worry, under the Republican plan, the 400 highest income families would ultimately get tax cuts averaging around \$7 million a year, and that information comes from the Ways and Means Committee's fact sheet.

Mr. Speaker, I and others here very frequently have pointed out that what the Republicans want to do is to cut benefits for poor people—the most vulnerable in our society—and to provide for the better-off tax cuts—those people in our society who least need them.

It occurs to me that if we were to have an opportunity to ask the 400 wealthiest families in this country whether or not they really need a tax cut, my belief, based on the four billionaires that I have known personally—two are deceased now—but in my conversations with all of them, their position was that they didn't need a cut. To the man, each one of them said that, if they were to receive tax cuts, they would prefer that they go to education, particularly education for kindergartners and prekindergartners.

If my Republican colleagues can move past throwing red meat to their base—a group of people, mind you, who are most certainly disadvantaged—one day they are going to wake up and recognize that much of what we are doing here, even though they support it, many of the persons who are doing it, they, too, are caught up in this downward spiral that is involving healthcare in this country, the game that we are playing.

If we are willing to work in a serious manner to address the issues in our healthcare system, then I know that Democrats are ready to work with Republicans. But whatever is going on in the other body, I assure you, no Democrats in the other body are involved in.

Last night I asked the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee whether or not he knew what this bill looked like, and his answer was that he did not.

I also said what I repeat here, that people are hurting in this country. Whether it is ObamaCare that the Republicans, I believe, are going to find that it is going to be hard to fix, or whether it is the Affordable Care Act that is in some phantom hole over in the other body, somehow or another, my friends on the other side are going to be held accountable for all of what is necessary to be done. The only way that is sensible—and I believe that every American is imploring us to undertake—is to sit down together.

I cannot believe that the 435 people plus 6 here in the House of Representatives and the 100 United States Senators do not have the ability to do all of the things that are necessary in order for Americans to receive adequate healthcare and to lead with protecting the most vulnerable in our society.

It is ridiculous to talk about cutting Medicaid when more than 60 percent of the people on Medicaid are seniors that are in nursing homes.

What are we going to say to those families? How are we going to address them when it comes to the reality that they are confronted with while we are up here jaw jacking back and forth about whether or not it is ObamaCare or whether or not it is the Affordable Care Act that we can't seem to find.

Somewhere along the lines, we need to sit down and work together. Failure to do so is to our own peril and to the peril of the citizens of this great country of ours.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here discussing two important bills. One of them fulfills the congressional duty to steward taxpayer dollars well. We shouldn't be handing out tax credits to people without first checking their eligibility for their tax credits. This is common sense.

H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, will require verification of legal presence in this country before someone can receive a tax credit. It is only fair to the American people that we pass this legislation.

The other bill in this rule, S. 1094, protects our veterans from harm. We all have a commitment to repaying the men and women who have served this Nation in the military. These brave in-

dividuals have put much on the line and sacrificed so much time and opportunity. They deserve the best healthcare.

This legislation holds the VA accountable. We need to empower the VA Secretary to quickly fire employees who put our veterans in danger. We also need the VA to report to Congress so that the legislative branch can fulfill its oversight duties.

I thank the sponsors of these important bills—Senator RUBIO for S. 1094 and Representative BARLETTA for H.R. 2581.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the resolution, and I urge a “yes” vote on the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 378 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 696) to prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting the Department of Veterans Affairs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 696.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the

control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 189, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

#### YEAS—229

|               |                 |                   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Abraham       | Gibbs           | Olson             |
| Aderholt      | Gohmert         | Palazzo           |
| Allen         | Goodlatte       | Palmer            |
| Amash         | Gosar           | Paulsen           |
| Amodei        | Gowdy           | Pearce            |
| Arrington     | Graves (GA)     | Perry             |
| Babin         | Graves (LA)     | Pittenger         |
| Bacon         | Graves (MO)     | Poe (TX)          |
| Banks (IN)    | Grothman        | Poliquin          |
| Barletta      | Guthrie         | Posey             |
| Barr          | Harper          | Ratcliffe         |
| Barton        | Harris          | Reed              |
| Bergman       | Hartzler        | Reichert          |
| Biggs         | Hensarling      | Renacci           |
| Bilirakis     | Herrera Beutler | Rice (SC)         |
| Bishop (MI)   | Hice, Jody B.   | Roby              |
| Bishop (UT)   | Hill            | Roe (TN)          |
| Black         | Holding         | Rogers (AL)       |
| Blackburn     | Hollingsworth   | Rogers (KY)       |
| Blum          | Hudson          | Rohrabacher       |
| Bost          | Huizenga        | Rokita            |
| Brady (TX)    | Hultgren        | Rooney, Francis   |
| Brat          | Hunter          | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Bridenstine   | Hurd            | Ros-Lehtinen      |
| Brooks (IN)   | Issa            | Roskam            |
| Buchanan      | Jenkins (KS)    | Ross              |
| Buck          | Jenkins (WV)    | Rothfus           |
| Bucshon       | Johnson (LA)    | Rouzer            |
| Budd          | Johnson (OH)    | Royce (CA)        |
| Burgess       | Jordan          | Russell           |
| Byrne         | Joyce (OH)      | Rutherford        |
| Calvert       | Katko           | Sanford           |
| Carter (GA)   | Kelly (MS)      | Scalise           |
| Carter (TX)   | Kelly (PA)      | Schweikert        |
| Chabot        | King (IA)       | Scott, Austin     |
| Chaffetz      | King (NY)       | Sensenbrenner     |
| Cheney        | Kinzinger       | Sessions          |
| Coffman       | Knight          | Shimkus           |
| Cole          | Kustofoff (TN)  | Shuster           |
| Collins (GA)  | Labrador        | Simpson           |
| Collins (NY)  | LaHood          | Smith (MO)        |
| Comer         | LaMalfa         | Smith (NE)        |
| Comstock      | Lamborn         | Smith (NJ)        |
| Conaway       | Lance           | Smith (TX)        |
| Cook          | Latta           | Smucker           |
| Costello (PA) | Lewis (MN)      | Stefanik          |
| Cramer        | LoBiondo        | Stewart           |
| Crawford      | Long            | Stivers           |
| Culberson     | Loudermilk      | Tenney            |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Love            | Thompson (PA)     |
| Davidson      | Lucas           | Thornberry        |
| Davis, Rodney | Luetkemeyer     | Tiberi            |
| Denham        | MacArthur       | Tipton            |
| Dent          | Marchant        | Trott             |
| DeSantis      | Marino          | Turner            |
| DesJarlais    | Marshall        | Upton             |
| Diaz-Balart   | Massie          | Valadao           |
| Donovan       | Mast            | Wagner            |
| Duffy         | McCarthy        | Walberg           |
| Duncan (SC)   | McCaul          | Walden            |
| Duncan (TN)   | McClintock      | Walker            |
| Dunn          | McHenry         | Walorski          |
| Emmer         | McKinley        | Walters, Mimi     |
| Estes (KS)    | McMorris        | Webster (FL)      |
| Farenthold    | Rodgers         | Wenstrup          |
| Faso          | McSally         | Westerman         |
| Ferguson      | Meadows         | Williams          |
| Fitzpatrick   | Meehan          | Wilson (SC)       |
| Fleischmann   | Messer          | Wittman           |
| Flores        | Mitchell        | Womack            |
| Fortenberry   | Moolenaar       | Woodall           |
| Fox           | Mooney (WV)     | Yoder             |
| Franks (AZ)   | Mullin          | Yoho              |
| Frelinghuysen | Murphy (PA)     | Young (AK)        |
| Gaetz         | Newhouse        | Young (IA)        |
| Gallagher     | Noem            | Zeldin            |
| Garrett       | Nunes           |                   |

#### NAYS—189

|                 |               |             |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|
| Adams           | Brady (PA)    | Cicilline   |
| Aguilar         | Brown (MD)    | Clark (MA)  |
| Barragán        | Brownley (CA) | Clarke (NY) |
| Bass            | Bustos        | Clay        |
| Beatty          | Butterfield   | Cleaver     |
| Bera            | Capuano       | Clyburn     |
| Beyer           | Carbajal      | Cohen       |
| Bishop (GA)     | Cárdenas      | Connolly    |
| Blumenauer      | Carson (IN)   | Conyers     |
| Blunt Rochester | Cartwright    | Cooper      |
| Bonamici        | Castor (FL)   | Correa      |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Castro (TX)   | Costa       |
| F.              | Chu, Judy     | Courtney    |

|                   |                          |                |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Crist             | Khanna                   | Price (NC)     |
| Crowley           | Kihuen                   | Quigley        |
| Cuellar           | Kildee                   | Raskin         |
| Davis (CA)        | Kilmer                   | Rice (NY)      |
| Davis, Danny      | Kind                     | Richmond       |
| DeFazio           | Krishnamoorthi           | Rosen          |
| DeGette           | Kuster (NH)              | Roybal-Allard  |
| Delaney           | Langevin                 | Ruiz           |
| DeLauro           | Larsen (WA)              | Ruppersberger  |
| DelBene           | Larson (CT)              | Rush           |
| Demings           | Lawrence                 | Ryan (OH)      |
| DeSaulnier        | Lawson (FL)              | Sánchez        |
| Deutch            | Lee                      | Sarbanes       |
| Dingell           | Levin                    | Schakowsky     |
| Doggett           | Lewis (GA)               | Schiff         |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Lieu, Ted                | Schneider      |
| Ellison           | Lipinski                 | Schrader       |
| Engel             | Loebsock                 | Scott (VA)     |
| Eshoo             | Lofgren                  | Scott, David   |
| Espallat          | Lowey                    | Serrano        |
| Esty (CT)         | Lujan Grisham, M.        | Sewell (AL)    |
| Evans             | Lujan, Ben Ray           | Shea-Porter    |
| Foster            | Lynch                    | Sherman        |
| Frankel (FL)      | Maloney                  | Sinema         |
| Fudge             | Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean | Slaughter      |
| Gabbard           | Matsui                   | Smith (WA)     |
| Gallego           | McColum                  | Soto           |
| Garamendi         | McEachin                 | Speier         |
| Gonzalez (TX)     | McNerney                 | Suozi          |
| Gottheimer        | Meeks                    | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Green, Al         | Meng                     | Takano         |
| Green, Gene       | Moore                    | Thompson (CA)  |
| Grijalva          | Moulton                  | Thompson (MS)  |
| Gutiérrez         | Murphy (FL)              | Titus          |
| Hanabusa          | Nadler                   | Tonko          |
| Hastings          | Neal                     | Torres         |
| Heck              | Nolan                    | Tsongas        |
| Higgins (NY)      | Norcross                 | Vargas         |
| Himes             | O'Halleran               | Veasey         |
| Hoyer             | O'Rourke                 | Vela           |
| Huffman           | Pallone                  | Velázquez      |
| Jackson Lee       | Panetta                  | Visclosky      |
| Jayapal           | Pascrell                 | Walz           |
| Jeffries          | Payne                    | Wasserman      |
| Johnson (GA)      | Perlmutter               | Schultz        |
| Johnson, E. B.    | Peters                   | Waters, Maxine |
| Jones             | Peterson                 | Watson Coleman |
| Kaptur            | Pingree                  | Welch          |
| Keating           | Pocan                    | Wilson (FL)    |
| Kelly (IL)        | Polis                    | Yarmuth        |
| Kennedy           |                          |                |

#### NOT VOTING—12

|             |              |            |
|-------------|--------------|------------|
| Brooks (AL) | Higgins (LA) | Napolitano |
| Cummings    | Johnson, Sam | Pelosi     |
| Granger     | Lowenthal    | Taylor     |
| Griffith    | McGovern     | Weber (TX) |

□ 1321

Mses. JAYAPAL and WILSON of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

#### AYES—229

|           |            |             |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Abraham   | Babin      | Bergman     |
| Aderholt  | Bacon      | Biggs       |
| Allen     | Banks (IN) | Bilirakis   |
| Amash     | Barletta   | Bishop (MI) |
| Amodei    | Barr       | Bishop (UT) |
| Arrington | Barton     | Black       |

Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris

Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry

Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—190

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)

Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny

DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Español  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard

Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren

Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halloran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Perlmuter  
Kuster (NH)  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz

Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—11

Brooks (AL)  
Cummings  
Granger  
Griffith

Higgins (LA)  
Huizenga  
Johnson, Sam  
Napolitano

Pelosi  
Taylor  
Weber (TX)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1327

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 303.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding a missed vote due to a meeting with constituents on the House steps. Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 303, H. Res. 378, The Rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2581—Verify First Act and S. 1094—Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, I would have voted “yea.”

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 302 and No. 303 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2581 and S. 1094. I would have also voted “nay” on H. Res. 378—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2581—Verify First Act and S. 1094—Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to report my absence on the vote of the H. Res. 378, the combined rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2581 and S. 1094, as well as the vote on the previous question. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 302 (Previous Question on H. Res. 378), and “yea” on rollcall No. 303 (Adoption of H. Res. 378).

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 166, answered “present” 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

## YEAS—238

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Beatty  
Bergman  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cole  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Cook  
Cooper  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
DeLauro

DelBene  
Demings  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Engel  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Goodlatte  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Green, Al  
Guthrie  
Hanabusa  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Hollingsworth  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)

Kustoff (TN)  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lipinski  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McHenry  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pascarell  
Pearce  
Perlmuter  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Posey  
Quigley  
Reichert  
Richmond  
Roby



Roe (TN) Sessions  
 Rogers (AL) Shea-Porter  
 Rogers (KY) Sherman  
 Rooney, Francis Shimkus  
 Rooney, Thomas Shuster  
 J. Simpson  
 Roskam Smith (NE)  
 Ross Smith (NJ)  
 Rothfus Smith (TX)  
 Ruppersberger Smith (WA)  
 Rush Smucker  
 Russell Speier  
 Rutherford Stefanik  
 Ryan (OH) Stewart  
 Scalise Suozzi  
 Schneider Takano  
 Schweikert Tenney  
 Scott (VA) Thornberry  
 Scott, David Titus  
 Sensenbrenner Torres  
 Serrano Trott

## NAYS—166

Aguilar Gosar  
 Amash Graves (GA)  
 Barragán Graves (LA)  
 Barton Graves (MO)  
 Bass Green, Gene  
 Beyer Grothman  
 Biggs Gutiérrez  
 Blum Hastings  
 Bost Herrera Beutler  
 Boyle, Brendan Hice, Jody B.  
 F. Holding  
 Brady (PA) Hoyer  
 Brownley (CA) Hudson  
 Buck Hurd  
 Burgess Jackson Lee  
 Capuano Jayapal  
 Carbajal Jenkins (KS)  
 Cárdenas Jenkins (WV)  
 Carter (GA) Johnson (OH)  
 Castor (FL) Jones  
 Clark (MA) Jordan  
 Clarke (NY) Joyce (OH)  
 Coffman Keating  
 Cohen Kennedy  
 Collins (GA) Khanna  
 Comer Kihuen  
 Conaway Kilmer  
 Connolly Kind  
 Conyers Kinzinger  
 Correa Knight  
 Costa LaHood  
 Costello (PA) Lance  
 Courtney Langevin  
 Crist Latta  
 Crowley Lawrence  
 Curbelo (FL) Lawson (FL)  
 Davis, Rodney Lee  
 DeFazio Levin  
 Delaney Lewis (GA)  
 DeSantis Lieu, Ted  
 Doyle, Michael LoBiondo  
 F. Loebach  
 Ellison Lofgren  
 Espallat Lowenthal  
 Evans Lowey  
 Farenthold Lynch  
 Faso MacArthur  
 Fitzpatrick Maloney  
 Flores Carolyn B.  
 Foxx Maloney, Sean  
 Franks (AZ) Matsui  
 Fudge McGovern  
 Gaetz McKinley  
 Gallagher McKally  
 Gallego Moore  
 Gibbs Murphy (PA)  
 Gonzalez (TX) Neal

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

## NOT VOTING—24

Bera Grijalva  
 Brooks (AL) Issa  
 Cummings Johnson, Sam  
 Eshoo Kelly (IL)  
 Frankel (FL) Labrador  
 Gohmert Napolitano  
 Granger Pelosi  
 Griffith Raskin

Tsongas  
 Velázquez  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)  
 Welch  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin

□ 1334

Messrs. RENACCI and CURBELO of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 304.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the initial vote series due to my attendance at the funeral of Kyle Milliken. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 302, “yea” on rollcall No. 303, and “yea” on rollcall No. 304.

## VERIFY FIRST ACT

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 378, I call up the bill (H.R. 2581) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Pursuant to House Resolution 378, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

## H.R. 2581

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

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Verify First Act”.*

## SEC. 2. VERIFICATION OF STATUS IN UNITED STATES AS CONDITION OF RECEIVING ADVANCE PAYMENT OF HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.

(a) APPLICATION TO CURRENT HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—Section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect for months beginning before January 1, 2020, is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) VERIFICATION OF STATUS IN UNITED STATES FOR ADVANCE PAYMENT.—No advance payment of the credit allowed under this section with respect to any premium under subsection (b)(2)(A) with respect to any individual shall be made under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act unless the Secretary has received confirmation from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that the Commissioner of Social Security or the Secretary of Homeland Security has verified under section 1411(c)(2) of such Act the individual’s status as a citizen or national of the United States or an alien lawfully present in the United States using a process that includes the appropriate use of information related to citizenship or immigration status, such as social security account numbers (but not individual taxpayer identification numbers).”.

(b) APPLICATION TO NEW HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—Section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by the American Health Care Act of 2017 and in effect for months beginning after December 31, 2019, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) VERIFICATION OF STATUS IN UNITED STATES FOR ADVANCE PAYMENT.—No advance payment of the credit allowed under this section with respect to any amount under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1) with respect to any individual shall be made under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act unless the Secretary has received confirmation from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that the Commissioner of Social Security or the Secretary of Homeland Security has verified under section 1411(c)(2) of such Act the individual’s status as a citizen or national of the United States or a qualified alien (within the meaning of section 431 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1641)) using a process that includes the appropriate use of information related to citizenship or immigration status, such as social security account numbers (but not individual taxpayer identification numbers).”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT ON CONTINUOUS HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVISION.—Section 2710A(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 133 of the American Health Care Act of 2017, is amended by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

“In the case of an individual who applies for advance payment of a credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and for whom a determination of eligibility for such advance payment is delayed by reason of the requirement for verification of the individual’s status in the United States under section 1411(c)(2) of such Act, the period of days beginning with the date of application for advance payment and ending with the date of such verification shall not be taken into account in applying subparagraph (B). The Secretary shall establish a procedure by which information relating to this period is provided to the individual.”.

(d) DELAY PERMITTED IN COVERAGE DATE IN CASE OF DELAY IN VERIFICATION OF STATUS FOR INDIVIDUALS APPLYING FOR ADVANCE PAYMENT OF CREDIT.—Section 1411(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18081(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “applicant’s eligibility” the following: “(other than eligibility for advance payment of a credit under section 1412)”; and

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

“(5) DELAY PERMITTED IN COVERAGE DATE IN CASE OF DELAY IN VERIFICATION OF STATUS FOR INDIVIDUALS APPLYING FOR ADVANCE PAYMENT OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual whose eligibility for advance payments is delayed by reason of the requirement for verification under subsection (c)(2), if, for coverage to be effective as of the date requested in the individual’s application for enrollment, the individual would (but for this paragraph) be required to pay 2 or more months of retroactive premiums, the individual shall be provided the option to elect to postpone the effective date of coverage to the date that is not more than 1 month later than the date requested in the individual’s application for enrollment.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) APPLICATION TO CURRENT HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) is contingent upon the enactment of the American Health Care Act of 2017 and shall apply (if at all) to months beginning after December 31, 2017.

(2) *APPLICATION TO NEW HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.*—The amendment made by subsection (b) is contingent upon the enactment of the American Health Care Act of 2017 and shall apply (if at all) to months beginning after December 31, 2019, in taxable years ending after such date.

(3) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT ON CONTINUOUS HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVISION.*—The amendment made by subsection (c) is contingent upon the enactment of the American Health Care Act of 2017 and shall take effect (if at all) as if included in such Act.

(4) *FLEXIBILITY IN COVERAGE DATE IN CASE OF DELAY IN VERIFICATION OF STATUS.*—The amendment made by subsection (d) is contingent upon the enactment of the American Health Care Act of 2017 and shall apply (if at all) to applications for advance payments for months beginning after December 31, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) each will control 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Last month House Republicans took a significant step to return patient-centered healthcare to the American people. We passed the American Health Care Act. The American Health Care Act begins our step-by-step process to repeal ObamaCare and replace this collapsing law with a 21st century healthcare system that truly works for American families, job creators, our States, and our taxpayers.

Now, as work on the American Health Care Act moves forward in the Senate, we are moving forward on a parallel track to deliver more solutions for the American people. One of those is the Verify First Act, sponsored by Congressman LOU BARLETTA of Pennsylvania.

This legislation takes important action to protect taxpayer dollars from waste, fraud, and abuse. It prevents the American Health Care Act's monthly tax credits and ObamaCare's current subsidies from being dispensed until the legal status of an eligible recipient can be verified.

Under ObamaCare, people who are in the United States illegally are prohibited from receiving taxpayer-funded subsidies to help purchase health insurance; but like so many aspects of ObamaCare, there is a major defect. ObamaCare starts by assuming a person is a legal resident and sends the money right away even if the verification process is still incomplete.

As we have seen with so many Federal programs, it is all but impossible to get fraudulently claimed money back after it is already out the door. This flaw of ObamaCare is no different. It has resulted in taxpayer-funded subsidies being spent on people who are not in the United States legally and, therefore, not eligible to receive them.

My constituents in Texas and yours around the country work too hard to see their tax dollars wasted by Washington's carelessness. The best solution to protect taxpayer dollars from waste, fraud, and abuse is to stop it before it occurs, and that is what the Verify First Act by Mr. BARLETTA will do.

This bill strengthens existing verification tools by making a commonsense change. Rather than sending the money first and confirming legal status later, it verifies legal status up front. So if you want to receive financial support for health insurance, this bill simply requires that you first provide a Social Security number or another form of acceptable information to validate citizenship or immigration status.

This commonsense change will apply to ObamaCare beginning with next year's open enrollment period, and after ObamaCare is repealed, it will apply to the tax credits offered in the American Health Care Act when they take effect. This helps ensure that taxpayer-funded assistance for the purchase of health insurance is only distributed to people who are eligible, not to those who are in our country illegally.

I want to thank Congressman BARLETTA for his leadership on this important legislation. The Verify First Act is a much-needed solution to safeguard taxpayer dollars from waste, fraud, and abuse both now and in the future, and that is crucial as we continue our efforts to repeal and replace the failing ObamaCare law. It is vital to improving America's health system for the long term.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of the Verify First Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can't believe we are here today attempting to pass such a blatantly discriminatory bill. Under the guise of fighting fraud, Republicans are attempting to pass a bill that will put additional barriers to care for all Americans—all this in exchange for one Member's vote for TrumpCare, which guts healthcare for 23 million Americans, and the Republicans barely passed that bill out of the House.

This bill fails to recognize the diversity of American families; instead, it forces a single approach for all those who need financial help to get the care that they need.

I don't know if everyone on the other side of the aisle knows this, but there

are already measures in place to prevent advanced premium tax credits from going to ineligible people. There is already a mechanism in place for Treasury to reconcile tax credits, and any undocumented individual found to have received a subsidy must repay them in full.

The other side will also try to make the argument that this measure will help fight fraud in the healthcare system, that there is somehow overwhelming amounts of evidence that immigrants are the main perpetrators of fraud. Beneficiaries struggling to access care are not the perpetrators of fraud. These are good people trying to do right by their families and by their country.

Of course, my colleagues over there are going to cite a Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs report, written by a Republican majority, that found, "a half a million illegal immigrants received \$750 million in healthcare subsidies."

Well, I have that report right here in my hand, and nowhere does it say that 500,000 undocumented immigrants received millions of dollars in healthcare subsidies, as Mr. BARLETTA's press release claims. What the report says is 500,000 individuals, and not 500,000 undocumented individuals or any other term that Republicans like to use to disparage immigrants.

□ 1345

There is no evidence to suggest that immigrants without authorization to be here would take the risk of signing on to a government website to fraudulently get healthcare coverage.

So what are the unintended consequences of this bill?

I hate to break it to my colleagues, but the people most impacted are U.S. citizens who were born abroad or naturalized, not undocumented individuals.

This bill is yet another example that the Republican majority will do anything to demonize even the smallest subsection of immigrants in order to gut healthcare for Americans and get their billionaire buddies a big, fat tax break. Whether that means sowing fear in communities by raiding homes in order to hunt people down or denying access to care for legal immigrants who are entitled to care, no excuse is too ridiculous for Republicans to attack the immigrant community.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by 226 organizations in opposition to H.R. 2581.

JUNE 12, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As national, state, and local organizations concerned about immigrant rights or access to affordable health care, we are writing to strongly urge you to VOTE NO on HR 2581, the "Verify First" Act. This bill is an attack on people's ability to see a doctor and on immigrants and people of color. It is not the "common sense" taxpayer protection bill that its supporters would have you believe.

HR 2581 is a dangerous bill that puts up roadblocks for both citizens and immigrants to obtain timely, affordable health insurance. It would strip away provisions that provide for a person to obtain subsidies for enrollment in an Affordable Care Act (or the contemplated American Health Care Act) plan while they work with Department of Health and Human Services to verify their U.S. citizenship or immigration status. The people most impacted are U.S. citizens who were born abroad or naturalized. The bill also affects many immigrants, especially those newly arrived or certain victims of domestic violence and trafficking survivors.

The fact is that when individuals are not able to immediately verify their citizenship or immigration status on an Affordable Care Act Marketplace, it begins an often months long, strenuous process of sending in documents that must be physically inspected. Health care assisters routinely say these clients are the hardest cases they work on because the process for verifying citizenship and immigration status is a time-consuming exercise in dealing with inefficient government processes.

Rather than protect American taxpayers, HR 2581 would strip from American taxpayers important protections that are needed to overcome deficiencies in federal government databases. Immigrants who are not lawfully present are categorically barred from enrollment in health insurance on the Affordable Care Act marketplaces, and for the subsidies that make that insurance affordable. Moreover, safeguards protecting taxpayers are already built into the ACA; individuals whose citizenship or immigration status cannot be verified already are required to pay back all of their subsidies when they file their taxes and "reconcile" their premium tax credits.

Supporters of this bill cite a sloppy Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee report that arrived at a made-up number of supposed "fraud." It's just not true. The committee assumed that every person who lost coverage for failure to verify their citizenship and immigration status was undocumented. In the experience of our organizations and organizations we work with, this is false. These reports describe the first year of the marketplaces, and it is well documented that system outages and understaffing, among other technical problems, contributed to the federal Marketplace's failure to verify consumers' status promptly. The Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General reported in 2014 that a cause of the delay in verification was the agency's lack of prioritization of this issue.

Despite huge gains since then, problems still persist. The Social Security database holding many citizens' information may not reflect common changes, such as when a person marries and changes their last name, or when someone naturalizes and gains U.S. citizenship. People lose their coverage because they receive notices in languages they cannot read. Immigrants are required to submit documents multiple times, or wait while the Department of Homeland Security finds paper files, a result of deficiencies in their databases affecting groups like asylum applicants and some survivors of domestic violence. These are among the many issues consumers face.

Congress has already deprived undocumented immigrants from the ability to buy coverage, even at full price, so they can see a doctor when they are sick, but this bill would go a step further to delay or put out of reach affordable health insurance for

many citizens and lawfully present immigrants. Our organizations firmly believe that this would be detrimental to the people we represent and to all of our communities as a whole. We have seen that when health insurance is unaffordable, people are effectively prevented from obtaining access to the care they need to be healthy.

This bill is not just an attack on our health care system, it is also an attack on immigrants and people of color, which our organizations stand firmly against. In his statements when introducing this bill, Rep. Lou Barletta focused the bill as part of his effort to "stop illegal immigration." Rep. Barletta has a long history of anti-immigrant rhetoric, from trying to prevent immigrants from leasing a residence to stating that they should be denied life-saving services in hospital emergency rooms. This bill is simply a vehicle for scapegoating immigrants and people of color and will keep eligible people from accessing health care.

We the undersigned organizations urge you to vote NO on HR 2581 and the continued assault on immigrants and the health of our communities.

Sincerely,

#### NATIONAL

Advocates for Youth; African American Ministers In Action; American Federation of Teachers (AFT); American Friends Service Committee; American Intercession; American Society on Aging; Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum; Asian Americans Advancing Justice/AAJC; Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; Asian Pacific Partners for Empowerment, Advocacy & Leadership (APPEAL); Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations (AAPCHO); Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Breast Cancer Action; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for Medicare Advocacy, Inc.; Child Welfare League of America; Children's Advocacy Institute; Children's Defense Fund; Church World Service (CWS);

Coalition on Human Needs; Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, US Provinces; Conscious Talk Radio; Detention Watch Network; Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund; Dominican Sisters; Dominicans of Sinsinawa; Family Equality Council; Farmworker Justice; First Focus Campaign for Children; Food Research & Action Center; Franciscan Sisters of the Poor IJPC; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Generations Inc.; GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBT Equality; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Indivisible; Institute of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas; Interfaith Worker Justice;

Irish Apostolate USA; Jobs With Justice; Justice in Aging; Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Commission, Priests of the Sacred Heart, US Province; Lambda Legal; Leadership Team of the Felician Sisters of North America; League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC); Medical Mission Sisters; Mi Familia Vota; MomsRising; NAACP; NAPAFA; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum; National Association of County and City Health Officials; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA); National Council of Churches;

National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Education Association; National Em-

ployment Law Project; National Health Law Program; National Hispanic Medical Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Network of Abortion Funds; National Organization for Women; National Women's Health Network; Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; NMAC; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; Peace and Justice Office of the Congregation of Notre Dame; Physicians for Reproductive Health; PICO National;

Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Poor People's Economic Human Rights Campaign; Prevention Institute; Project Inform; Racine Dominicans; Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need; Refuge Ministries; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Service Employees International Union; Sisters of Charity; Sisters of Charity of Nazareth; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas—Institute Justice Team; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; United Sikhs; United We Dream; Ursuline Sisters of Tildonk, U.S. Province; We Belong Together; API Wellness;

#### STATE AND LOCAL

Academy of Medical & Public Health Services; Advocates for Children and Youth; AgeOptions; Almost Home, Inc.; Anti-Hunger & Nutrition Coalition; Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families; Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Los Angeles; Asian Community Alliance—Cincinnati OH; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Services In Action, Inc.; Baltimore Jewish Council; California Health Professional Student Alliance; California Immigrant Policy Center; California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (CLRJ); California OneCare; California Pan-Ethnic Health Network; California Partnership; California Physicians Alliance; CASA;

Center for Southeast Asians; Chicago Hispanic Health Coalition; Child Care Resources of Rockland; Children Now; Children's Defense Fund-CA; Chinatown Service Center; Chinese-American Planning Council; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Collaborative Center for Justice; Colorado Center on Law and Policy; Colorado Center on Law and Policy; Columbia Legal Services; Community Health Councils; D.C. Hunger Solutions; DuPage Federation on Human Services Reform; Empower Missouri; Ensuring Opportunity Campaign to End Poverty in Contra Costa; Erie Benedictines for Peace; Esperanza Health Centers; EverThrive Illinois; Farmworker Association of Florida;

Florida Immigrant Coalition (FLIC); Give for a Smile; Greater Kansas City Coalition to End Homelessness; Having Our Say Coalition; Health Access California; Health Care for All-WA; Health Law Advocates; Healthy House Within A MATCH Coalition; Hmong Ohio of Tomorrow; Hunger Action Los Angeles; IHM Sisters, Immaculata, PA; IL Hunger Coalition; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Indivisible Mountain Home, Idaho; Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity; IRIS—Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services; Islamic Civic Engagement Project; Jewish Family & Children's Service; Kansas Appleseed; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Korean Community Services of Metropolitan NY; La Fe Policy Research and Education Center;

La Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program; Legal Council for Health Justice; Legal

Services of Southern Piedmont; Maine Consumers for Affordable Health Care; Make the Road New York; Maryland CASH Campaign; Maryland Hunger Solutions; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA); Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Maternal and Child Health Access; Maternity Care Coalition; National Association of Social Workers, CT Chapter; National Tongan American Society; Nationalities Service Center; NC Child; New Mexico Center on Law and Poverty; New York Immigration Coalition; New York Legal Assistance Group; NICOS Chinese Health Coalition; NJ State Industrial Union Council; NOELA Community Health Center; Northern NJ Chapter, National Organization for Women;

Northwest Health Law Advocates; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project; Office of the Health Care Advocate at Vermont Legal Aid; OneAmerica; Pacific Islander Health Partnership; Pitkin County Human Services; Public Justice Center; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Rainbow Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; RESULTS-Santa Fe (NM); Salaam Cleveland; Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN); Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Houston; Sisters of St. Dominic of Blauvelt, NY; Sisters of the Most Precious Blood; Social Justice Committee St. Patrick Church; South Asian Network; Southwest Women's Law Center; St. Francis St Vincent de Paul Society; Tennessee Justice Center; Thai Health And Information Service;

The Children's Partnership; The Latino Health Insurance Program, Inc.; Turning Points; United Way Bay Area; URI Feinstein Center for a Hunger Free America; Vermont Affordable Housing Coalition; Virginia Poverty Law Center; Voices for Vermont's Children; Voz Hispana Cambio Comunitario; Washington Community Action Network; Washington Healthcare Access Alliance; Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO; West Chester Food Cupboard; West Side Campaign Against Hunger; Westlake Chinese Culture Association; Wisconsin Council of Churches; Wisconsin Faith Voices for Justice; Women's Action Movement Washtenaw County MI; Worksite Wellness LA; Xaverian Brothers; Young Women United;

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), the author of the Verify First Act, and as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, I am proud to advance this bill.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and working with me on this important issue. I also thank leadership for recognizing this issue and working with me to fix the problem.

I am proud to rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act.

My bill is intended to stop fraud in the distribution of healthcare tax credits and protect taxpayer dollars. It is simple: the American people expect that we are verifying that someone qualifies for taxpayer money before that money goes out the door.

This is about the Federal Government being good stewards of the money our constituents send to Washington. Every Federal dollar that goes to

someone committing fraud is a dollar that is not going to a person who truly needs and deserves assistance.

No one should be allowed to commit fraud at the taxpayers' expense. No business would give a refund without first verifying a receipt.

Yet this is exactly what is happening under our current healthcare system. The law claims that taxpayer money will only go to people who qualify for it. Yet no one is being held responsible for making sure that that happens. My bill does that.

Under current law, the Federal Government pays tax credits to individuals without first verifying that they qualify to receive them. If individuals cannot verify their legal status, the IRS is then forced to chase after the money.

This pay-and-chase model of distributing tax credits has greatly increased costs to the taxpayers. A 2016 Senate report revealed that, under ObamaCare, \$750 million in taxpayer-funded healthcare subsidies went to people who did not qualify for those benefits.

We could fix this problem and save time and money so that IRS agents are helping people, instead of trying to recover improper payments by verifying legal status first.

My bill simply requires the IRS to work with the relevant Federal agencies to verify that an individual is a citizen, national, or lawfully present in the United States before tax credits go out the door. This can be done by verifying an applicant's Social Security number or other immigration documents. Again, the American people expect that we are already doing this.

Under my bill, everyone who applies for the advance premium tax credit will be verified for legal status. Most people won't even know that this is happening because the verification check is so quick.

My bill also includes protections that ensure that individuals who are legally entitled to these tax credits are not penalized if there is a delay in verifying their documents. I first raised this issue last year with the previous administration. I am raising it again this year because there is no evidence that anything has been done to address it.

Nobody wanted to take responsibility for mismanaging \$750 million of taxpayer money. Everyone pointed fingers at other people. My bill holds people accountable.

While I received assurances from the current administration that it would implement and follow a process to verify legal status, my bill would require it in law. This issue is too important to be left to the changing positions of unelected Federal bureaucrats. The American people deserve to know that their representatives are doing everything in their power to protect taxpayer money.

The Verify First Act provides that certainty and upholds the integrity of

the health insurance premium tax credit by putting an end to fraud and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the cosponsors of my bill for their support. They include DIANE BLACK, MO BROOKS, JEFF DUNCAN, JIMMY DUNCAN, MIKE KELLY, DOUG LAMBORN, MIKE MCCAUL, DAVID MCKINLEY, KRISTI NOEM, JIM RENACCI, MIKE ROGERS, LAMAR SMITH, JASON SMITH, G.T. THOMPSON, and JOE WILSON.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from NumbersUSA and FAIR, two groups that have been working with me to protect the interests of the American worker and legal immigrants.

NUMBERSUSA,  
Arlington, VA, May 23, 2017.

Hon. LOU BARLETTA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARLETTA: NumbersUSA, on behalf of our more than 8 million activists, applauds you for introducing the Verify First Act to ensure that health care tax credits are not paid to illegal aliens or other disqualified aliens. As you know, NumbersUSA opposed the ineffective verification provisions in the Affordable Care Act because we knew they would result in taxpayer-funded subsidies being sent to illegal aliens. Our concerns, unfortunately, were confirmed by the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, which reported that more than \$700 million in Obamacare subsidies had been paid to ineligible aliens by 2015. Like you, we recognized that these same ineffective verification procedures in the American Health Care Act (AHCA) would result in the payment of health care tax credits to illegal or otherwise ineligible aliens.

The Verify First Act will require the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to actually verify the citizenship or immigration status of every applicant for a credit under the AHCA before the Treasury Department issues the credit. Both SSA and DHS have established, proven methods of verifying status in a timely and efficient manner, including the E-Verify system, which relies on data from these two agencies to verify work authorization, and the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) system, which uses DHS data to establish welfare eligibility.

Hard-working Americans and legal residents already are struggling to pay for their own health care. There is simply no excuse for the Federal government to force them to subsidize health care for illegal aliens through taxpayer-funded credits.

For this reason, NumbersUSA is delighted to support your Verify First Act and we look forward to working with you to make sure it is enacted into law. We also applaud House Republican Leadership and the House Ways and Means Committee for working with you to close this expensive loophole in our health care system.

Sincerely,

ANNE MANETAS,  
Vice President, NumbersUSA.

FEDERATION FOR AMERICAN  
IMMIGRATION REFORM,  
Washington, DC, May 24, 2017.

Hon. LOU BARLETTA,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARLETTA: On behalf of the Federation for American Immigration Reform's (FAIR) nearly 1.5 million members and supporters nationwide, I am writing to thank you for introducing the Verify First Act. This important piece of legislation would deny health care tax credits to illegal aliens and ensure that Americans' hard-earned tax dollars only go to those with a valid Social Security number (SSN).

As you know, federal law explicitly prevents illegal aliens from receiving tax credits. Despite this, a recent report by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee found that nearly 500,000 illegal aliens received approximately \$750 million in taxpayer-funded health care subsidies as of June 2015. Under Obamacare, the federal government pays health care tax credits on a "temporary basis" to individuals who are unable to verify their citizenship. If an individual is ultimately unable to verify their immigration status, the funding is suspended and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) attempts to recoup overpayments from the individuals who were wrongly covered. This challenging practice—known as "pay and chase"—is costing taxpayers millions.

As a complement to the recently passed American Health Care Act, your legislation ensures that the IRS has verified that an individual is a citizen, national, or lawfully present in the United States before the advance health insurance premium tax credit is disbursed. This will be done by checking an applicant's SSN or other immigration documents. Additionally, your legislation prohibits the use of the Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN), which are issued without verification of legal status.

For the aforementioned reasons, FAIR applauds you for introducing the Verify First Act. When this important piece of legislation is considered on the House floor, FAIR will include the vote in our voting report.

Sincerely,

DAN STEIN,  
President.

Mr. BARLETTA. Additionally, this legislation is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste and Americans for Tax Reform.

Finally, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy noting that the President would sign this bill into law.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2581—VERIFY FIRST ACT—REP. BARLETTA,  
R-PA AND 14 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act. Under Obamacare, millions of dollars in advance payments of the premium tax credit may have been paid on behalf of individuals who were likely ineligible beneficiaries, including illegal immigrants. By eliminating the practice of providing advance payments while an applicant's immigration status is being verified, this bill stems the flow of payments to ineligible individuals under Obamacare and strengthens the ability of the Administration to ensure premium tax credits will be appropriately provided to eligible individuals under the American Health Care Act of 2017 (AHCA). By protecting the integrity of Federal funds, this bill furthers the President's vision of a

more efficient Federal Government that respects taxpayer dollars.

H.R. 2581 would prohibit advance payments of premium tax credits to individuals under current law and the AHCA, unless the Secretary of the Treasury receives confirmation that the individual is a citizen or a national of the United States, or is lawfully present in the United States. H.R. 2581 would also strengthen the AHCA, as passed by the House of Representatives on May 4, 2017, which the Administration continues to support strongly.

If H.R. 2581 were presented to the President in its current form, his advisors would recommend that he sign the bill into law.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage of my bill.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the majority that the IRS would be able to do their job if they didn't spend the last 8 years demonizing the IRS and cutting their budget year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this act jeopardizes American families' ability to afford health insurance.

The so-called Verify First Act would require a new verification process of an individual's Social Security number before he or she can receive any tax credit for health coverage, either under the ACA or under the disastrous House-passed TrumpCare bill.

This bill does nothing to address the reality that more than 23 million Americans would lose health insurance under the Republican healthcare legislation; nor does it address the harm caused by cutting \$800 billion from Medicaid by eliminating the expansion for moderate-income workers and by imposing per capita caps on program spending; and it does nothing to address higher premiums for older workers and discrimination against Americans with preexisting conditions that will occur under the TrumpCare bill that this legislation is amending.

Instead, this bill takes that one step further by making it harder for children, including newborns and survivors of domestic violence and sex trafficking, to obtain a tax credit for purchasing their own health coverage. Under the legislation, Social Security numbers would be required before receiving a tax credit, and it prohibits the use of an individual taxpayer identification number, which those without a Social Security number use to file their tax returns.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been said, there are already protections built into the law to ensure that tax credits are issued to qualifying individuals. Under current law, eligibility for tax credits is verified when an individual applies to enroll in coverage. The eligibility is then subject to a secondary verification process that identifies ineligible individuals and terminates their coverage. This system

strikes a balance between rigorously verifying eligibility, while also ensuring that eligible individuals are not subject to financial hardship because of red tape.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would make it more difficult for American families to access affordable healthcare. I oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a chart that I am going to put up here in a minute, but there is something that I think we all need to realize: Our positions here not only are as representatives but also stewards of taxpayer money.

Now, a lot of people sometimes become confused as to whose money it is that we are talking about, and what we are talking about is hardworking American taxpayers.

The definition of a steward is pretty simple: It is someone who manages another's property or financial affairs; one who administers anything as the agent of another or others.

The oath we take makes us responsible for every single penny that we spend or allocate because it came out of the pocket of a hardworking American taxpayer.

So it just seems to me that Mr. BARLETTA's idea makes sense: this idea that somehow actually making sure that people qualify for a subsidy is somehow being mean-hearted and not being actually a steward of these dollars.

I just wanted to point this out. This is H.R. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. It was the final vote on March 21, 2010. And I would just tell some of my colleagues: Take a look because some of your names are very prominent there—and you can see it. The piece that we are talking about is the piece that was included in the Affordable Care Act. This isn't something that we dreamed up overnight; this is something that was actually part of the Affordable Care Act.

And now we are saying: My goodness, we are allowing these subsidies to be out there. And then what we are saying is: Well, we are going to presume that whoever it is who applied for these subsidies actually is entitled to them.

Now, that only works in Washington, D.C. In the private sector, you usually have to verify before you do anything, as opposed to saying: Well, do you know what, somebody said that they were entitled to this, so we ought to just go ahead and pass this on.

I have got to tell you: It is a lot easier when it doesn't come out of your pocket. But, when it comes out of hardworking American taxpayers' pockets, I think it is incumbent upon us, as elected representatives, to say that

there is something that doesn't make sense here.

When over half a million people receive over \$750 million in subsidies, somebody, somewhere, should be saying: How did this happen?

I think it is interesting that neither HHS or the IRS has any method in place to actually go out and recoup these dollars that were wrongfully awarded. This just doesn't make sense. Mr. BARLETTA is doing something that is common sense.

And I know that when the act was passed, the most famous quote of all is: We have to pass it to find out what is in it.

Well, we did pass it. I wasn't here. I was in the private sector. But these are all of the folks who passed it. This is actually your policy. This is LOU BARLETTA's policy. This isn't a Republican policy. This is a policy that was part of the Affordable Care Act.

Why in the world would we ever, as taxpayers, expect people to verify this type of activity?

We should just say: Listen, they seem like pretty good folks, and they are going to eventually get back to us.

We have no way of recouping this money.

Now, we can rail about people not having hearts; we can rail about people who don't like immigrants; and we can rail about taking this out on hardworking families and making it difficult for them to get by.

I would just say this: We are trying to protect taxpayer money. We are trying to protect something that is so basic. We are trying to protect something that is actually part of the law that was passed as part of the Affordable Care Act. This isn't a foreign idea. This just makes sense.

So I would just ask my friends: Listen, please go to H.R. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and go to section 1411—this is your language, by the way. As I said, I wasn't here at the time. I did read it, and I am still scratching my head to say: Do you know what, this is probably a good policy; you should probably read it before you pass it.

But it says exactly what it is that you expect people receiving these subsidies to go through.

It is amazing me today that, all of a sudden, this is Potomac amnesia: I don't remember that part of the law.

So, look, there could be nothing more sensible—commonsensical—than making sure that before we issue subsidies, that are funded by hardworking American taxpayers, that we actually verify who it is that is getting them; rather than going ahead and putting it out there and then saying: Do you know what, maybe they don't qualify.

Well, how do you get the money back?

This pay-and-chase idea, to me, would never work in the private sector

because we actually have to be responsible for what we do.

Now, I don't want you to get all wrapped around the axle and think that somehow we are coming after people in a way that doesn't make sense.

Here is what I want you to think about: I want you to think about the people who actually pay the tab, the people who actually pick up the check, the people who actually pay taxes, the people to who we are the most responsible.

And to somehow come up with an idea that it is mean-hearted to verify who is getting these subsidies, to me, is tomfoolery. If you want to do something, and you want to make it hard for people to understand what we are doing, do this: I would love to go back home and tell people what you folks just don't understand. You sent the money to us, we decided how we are going to spend it, we decided that we can give it to anybody we want, and, by the way, if they don't qualify, that shouldn't bother you.

Now, let's just do something that makes sense.

□ 1400

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Well, you know what? I really don't need a full minute to talk about something that is common sense, but I have been here now a little bit over 6 years, and it is hard for me to believe that this act was passed back on March 21, 2010, and the language we are talking about today is the actual language that was in the bill that we had to pass before we could find out what was in it.

Maybe at that time somebody should have read this, and it was a good idea to actually verify these things. That would have saved a whole lot of time, a whole lot of money, and a whole lot of irresponsible spending.

Again, whether you want to agree with the study or not agree with the study, when half a million people receive over \$750 million in hardworking American taxpayer money, and then we are told: Geez, I can't believe you are that mean that you want to go back and recoup money from people who didn't deserve it—no. What we are saying is let's verify first. Let's make sure of every single penny that goes out of this House—the people's House, by the way—and let's do what is the responsible thing to do as stewards of every single taxpayer penny.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleagues that under the ACA, there is also a verification process for subsidies. But I would just raise the issue that for newborn children, most of whom don't have a Social Security number when they are new-

born—and this includes children of our military members serving overseas—if they have a severe health problem, then delaying verification, which can be up to 6 weeks for them, can mean the difference between life and death. And I am talking about a situation such as that experienced by Jimmy Kimmel, if you take the time to see his response to what happened with his newborn.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), also a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this so-called American Health Care bill is a real Titanic of a sorry piece of legislation: It would sink 23 million Americans losing their health coverage; millions more who have a preexisting condition would face great barriers; it would undermine Medicare; it would provide price-gouging, Big Pharma manufacturers with a huge tax windfall, all as part of almost a trillion dollars in a tax cut—which is what their bill is really all about, not healthcare—those benefits going to a few corporations and the superrich among us.

Most every healthcare professional group in the country along with the AARP and the vast majority of Americans reject this bill. We would have even more people rejecting if it hadn't been hidden, if even one administration official had had the courage to come and be held accountable for this bill in a public hearing. But, apparently, we will not have that anywhere in this Congress before this huge bill is approved.

The American people are locked on board this sinking ship. Our insurance markets are already taking on water from Trump sabotage, and disaster looms in front of us.

This is not a Verify First bill that we take up today; it is a patch on this sinking Titanic ship.

It is not a Verify First; it is a "Vilify First" our immigrants, and it is really just the next chapter in Trump's anti-immigrant crusade, which he tweets about on a regular basis.

Our Republican colleagues celebrate this Immigrant Heritage Month, June. They celebrate the fourth anniversary of 68 Members of the United States Senate, in a bipartisan way, approving comprehensive immigration reform. They do it with this "Vilify First Act."

And while I want to protect taxpayers and think we have a responsibility to ferret out and prevent every dime of fraud that might be out there, I also feel a responsibility to struggling families that I represent who already have so many barriers in the way of getting medical coverage to their children.

Not everyone is as fortunate as Jimmy Kimmel, although he had the misfortune of a child born with serious



medical needs, he at least had the ability to do something about it. And folks need to be able to access promptly and immediately, sometimes, a family doctor.

We should fight fraud wherever it occurs. I do wish we had the same level of enthusiasm about protecting taxpayers from Medicaid fraud by big pharmaceutical manufacturers, for offshore tax dodging that denies us billions of dollars, as they voice for taking on the poor. We don't have that, but we do need to analyze carefully what the Government Accountability Office that provides the basis for this legislation really said.

They found a need to address \$750 million. Under the program, they did not find one dollar, one red cent that an immigrant had taken improperly from this program. They did not document any immigrant fraud. There may be some out there, but you can't rely on this study to find it.

We were asked: Well, why do you think this has anything to do with immigrants? Well, I can tell you why. Because the sponsor of the amendment, who is here on the floor, when he introduced this piece of legislation, said he was after what he called illegal immigrants; and he said that he would not vote for TrumpCare, that sorry Titanic of a bill, he would not vote for it unless this provision was adopted.

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I personally represent San Antonio, San Marcus, Lockhart, and Austin families that already face barriers to getting their children medical coverage, and adding an additional requirement just means they are that much less likely, in the event of an emergency, to be able to get coverage. We need to prevent fraud. This is not the way to do it.

What we need is comprehensive immigration reform to deal with these immigration issues just like the Senate approved 4 years ago—make improvements on it; debate it; consider it—sink this sorry piece of legislation, try to raise up the antifraud provisions and the comprehensive immigration reform that we so desperately need, and to grow this economy.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act. This legislation is part of our continued focus on improving the Nation's healthcare system beyond the passage of the American Health Care Act. The bill ensures those who receive help to purchase health insurance are truly eligible. What is wrong with that?

Under the Obama administration, an estimated \$750 million in tax credits

have been awarded to over 500,000 individuals who were later determined to be ineligible. For the sake of hard-working Americans everywhere, we need to be better stewards of taxpayer dollars. That means verify first.

Why not? The Verify First Act protects taxpayer dollars from waste, fraud, and abuse under ObamaCare and, in the future, under the American Health Care Act. This bill is good for taxpayers and good for America's healthcare future. It is as simple as that.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a colleague from the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided bill. This bill will prevent people who have a legitimate right to healthcare from accessing it and will harm them, and it is for reasons that are completely unjustified.

Currently, taxpayers must provide a Social Security number or tax I.D. number in order to qualify for a premium tax credit for healthcare. While the taxpayer's citizenship and immigration status are verified, they are given a 90-day grace period in which to prove their legal status.

This grace period was put into place to ensure that people do not lose critical healthcare coverage and continue to have it while their paperwork is cleared. This bill would remove this safeguard and make it more difficult for numerous people to obtain health insurance. That could be a matter of life or death.

This bill would certainly create barriers for immigrants who are here legally. It would also create barriers for U.S. citizens who have complications with their Social Security numbers. This includes people who recently change their name after marriage, have an error in their records, were born abroad, or were victims of human trafficking. It would also affect newborns, who do not get their Social Security number right away.

Republicans claim that reports released by the GAO and the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee were proof of immigrants defrauding the government, but neither of these reports back up this claim.

First of all, the GAO report was actually a test to identify vulnerabilities for fraud in the system. They did not find instances of immigrants committing fraud for healthcare subsidies. The Senate report found that 500,000 individuals did not complete their verification process and were, thus, deemed ineligible for subsidies.

The author of today's bill takes this information and leaps to the conclusion that all those who did not complete the process were undocumented

immigrants and were attempting to commit fraud, but there is nothing in either report to substantiate this. In fact, the ACA requires undocumented immigrants or anybody who does receive subsidies in error to pay back every cent on their tax return at the end of the year.

This bill seeks to address a problem that does not exist. Instead, it would harm people by denying or delaying health insurance subsidies to people who need them. This is wrong. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, which was introduced by my colleague, good friend, and fellow Pennsylvanian LOU BARLETTA. This is a simple piece of legislation that ensures no American taxpayer dollars are used to fund healthcare for those who are here undocumented.

Congress, the American people, and my constituents were told that, under ObamaCare, illegal immigrants would not be eligible for tax credits. Instead, the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee issued a report detailing that, as of June 2015, over half a million people without legal status have received up to \$750 million in taxpayer-funded subsidies. No record can be found if any of this was ever recovered.

It is time that we ensure our taxpayers that their dollars are only going to those with legal status. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to share the Chamber with my fellow Northwesterner.

We have gone through this in the Ways and Means Committee with one of the least productive hearings I can remember, and that says a lot in my 10 years on the committee. We do it good natured, but, frankly, it is beside the point. And my friends from the Ways and Means Committee have documented the fact that this is a solution in search of a problem.

The real outrage ought to be what is happening now behind closed doors to take a flawed bill that came from the House, was actually made worse in order to get the votes for it, and passed through on a narrow party-line vote—actually, a number of Republicans voted against it—lodged in the Senate, no public hearings. In fact, we are told that they are not enabling people to actually get ahold of the documents to know what is going on.

You know, it is stunning to me to have heard some of my Republican friends complain about the process of the Affordable Care Act. I was in the middle of that. We took a year. Three committees in the House had multiple hearings, work sessions. There were actually some Republican amendments adopted out in the open. CBO scored the bill so people knew. Now we are on the verge of, we are told, having that sneak through the Senate without the glare of publicity, without an open public process, which will deny healthcare to millions of people—millions of people—and shred much of the good work that has been done through the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1415

We have been told and we acknowledge there are little things that we could do to fine-tune it, but in 7 years of Republican crow and crow, we have never had an opportunity to do that. Instead, this administration and my Republican friends consistently made it worse, destabilized, sent conflicting signals to the healthcare industry, to the insurance companies. And you don't have to take my word for it. News accounts quote people in the industry about what the Republicans have done to destabilize it and try to make it fail.

There was a reason that virtually everybody in the healthcare space was opposed to the Republican approach. It is not thoughtful. It is not fair. It is not effective. It is not necessary. But today we are looking at some provisions that will make it a little more burdensome.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there may be some people that will be swept up who had gotten care that they didn't, but there will be people who will be swept up who were entitled to care who could not jump through the hurdles or, at a minimum, had their care delayed. We haven't properly analyzed that. But as I say, it is beside the point.

There are tremendous opportunities for us to work together on a bipartisan agenda that we have in the Ways and Means Committee, of things that we could move forward and agree upon to make healthcare better, that doesn't depend on shredding the guarantees of the ACA; that doesn't depend on gutting Medicaid, which more Americans rely upon for their healthcare than any other program in the country. We wouldn't have to mess with that.

Instead, we are having a sideshow. I don't know that it goes anywhere, but it certainly isn't the issue that Americans could focus on, should focus on,

that is going to imperil their healthcare for tens of millions of Americans if the Republicans have their way.

That is exactly why we are debating this today, to deflect attention, occupy time, and prevent doing the job that we should have done right here, and allow the Senate to be able to continue this unfortunate process.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), a colleague of mine on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, introduced by my good friend and colleague, Congressman LOU BARLETTA. This legislation seeks to remedy one of the many oversights of the ACA that it failed to address—an oversight at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Under the current system, the Treasury disburses credits to individuals before their application has been verified. In the real world, where I come from, that just doesn't happen. If the IRS then finds out that this individual is not eligible, they have to try to get the money back. It is almost impossible to recover that money.

This legislation closes a loophole simply by requiring an individual be verified as lawfully present before the Treasury releases the money. It is important to understand that the issue at hand is about poor stewardship of hard-earned tax dollars. That is what the American people sent us down here for. The sole intent of this credit was for the credits to be used lawfully, and this legislation helps ensure just that.

At a time when our national debt is \$19 trillion and counting, it makes no sense for the Federal Government to continue to write these checks. My constituents in Ohio depend on me to ensure responsible stewardship of their hard-earned tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to commit to the same responsibility and support the Verify First Act.

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

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are calling this bill and the two other healthcare bills on the floor this week “fixes” for TrumpCare. But what exactly is it that you are fixing?

This bill does nothing to address the more than 23 million individuals who will lose their coverage or the \$800 billion cut to Medicaid under TrumpCare. Nothing in this bill will do anything to fix the waiver allowing insurers to discriminate against individuals with pre-existing conditions by jacking up their rates, and nothing in this bill will do anything to roll back the massive tax cut that they are handing out to the top 400 households in America.

Instead of addressing the real issues with our healthcare system, you bring

a racist bill to the floor that you use to buy a vote, literally, for your TrumpCare bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House are very clear about imputing the character of lawmakers, and I would warn the gentleman, she is treading on the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman attempting to raise a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I am considering.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has the time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I will monitor the remainder of the remarks.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was addressing a racist piece of legislation that was used to buy a vote for the TrumpCare bill. But the problem is that this bill doesn't do anything that it says it does. It is based on a blatantly partisan Senate report that doesn't even say what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that it says.

It is baffling how many of my Republican colleagues believe that this report that they keep citing actually said anything about undocumented immigrants. Did you “read” this report in the same way that you “read” the AHCA and all of its amendments?

If you actually read the report, you would know that it does not state that these individuals were undocumented immigrants, but only that they did not complete the verification process. The hurdles might have been too big, it might have taken too much time or too much effort, and they dropped out of the verification process without completing it.

The report also doesn't say that hundreds of thousands of undocumented immigrants enrolled and received premium credits. The report states that “as of September 30, 2015, CMS awarded approximately \$750 million in advance premium tax credits to individuals enrolled through healthcare.gov who CMS later determined to be ineligible. . . .”

It is funny that the daughter of Mexican American immigrants is able to read and understand the distinctions made in this report better than some of my native-born colleagues can.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by begging my Republican colleagues to prove to me that this bill isn't about shutting out immigrants from access to care: legal immigrants or children of those born overseas to our military or newborn children or victims of domestic violence or victims of human trafficking.

Prove to me that you care about the health and wellbeing of all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin or their economic circumstances.

I am actually in agreement with you that ineligible individuals should not

see a single penny of the subsidies provided by both the ACA and the AHCA, but there are protections already in place where only citizens and people lawfully present in the United States can enroll in marketplace coverage and get subsidies to help them pay their premiums and cost-sharing charges.

This bill doesn't fix anything. It just seeks to further demonize immigrants as criminals and people with my last name out of the healthcare system.

Instead of wasting our time on a bill that is in search of a problem to solve, a problem that doesn't even exist, let's work together to make sure that other Americans are not caught up in the unintended consequences of this bill and aren't denied coverage when they are actually eligible for those subsidies and that coverage.

Let's actually work on a better way for the American people.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's make sure we fact-check some things here. Nothing in this bill changes the eligibility of the Affordable Care Act and who is eligible for it. In fact, the Republican healthcare bill that passed the House, according to the American Action Network, there will be roughly 5.3 million more Americans that will be eligible for help for their healthcare under the Republican plan than under the Affordable Care Act.

Let's fact-check a couple of other issues. We are told that this has all come about because the IRS has not funded properly, but I would remind our Democrat colleagues that the majority of our Democrat colleagues supported the spending levels, which President Obama signed into law regarding the Internal Revenue Service.

Secondly, they have raised the issue that there are no Social Security numbers available. But in truth, nearly 96 percent of children born in America receive their Social Security numbers within 2 weeks. There is an expedited process going forward to achieve the others as well.

We are told, listening today: there is no fraud in ObamaCare; there is no need to worry about; there is no need for this bill by Mr. BARLETTA.

But I remind our colleagues that twice the Government Accountability Office looked at eligibility within the Affordable Care Act. In 2014, they used fake identities to see if they could obtain ObamaCare coverage on the exchange, and in 11 out of 12 applications—some with no data at all—the GAO was granted subsidies for people who don't even exist.

So you say: Well, that is 2014. Certainly, things got better.

Well, last year, they ran it again in the special enrollment period, and in this test, the GAO was able to obtain

coverage for imaginary people in 9 out of 12 cases.

We are told today that our taxpayer dollars aren't being wasted. Well, the American public knows better, and they know this because we have worked for 7 years to oppose what we knew would be a failing law. We held more than 200 congressional hearings. We had 65-plus hours of open debate on the American Health Care Act, and 37 bills passed the House that were ultimately, in one form or another, included in the Republican bill.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Speaker: Our Democrat friends are in denial. ObamaCare is collapsing. Prices have more than doubled. They haven't gone down. They have more than doubled for most Americans; in some States more than tripled, and those rates aren't going down. They are skyrocketing. People aren't getting more choices of healthcare plans. They are disappearing.

Texas has seen nine insurers abandon our State—I think more than any other State—and it is getting fewer and fewer. It is occurring across the country.

You are not able to see more local doctors and go to more local hospitals; just the opposite. It is fewer, and that is hurting everyone in America. ObamaCare is a sinking ship, and it is taking some very good Americans down with it.

The question is: Do we begin to give people a lifeline to truly affordable care?

With this bill, Mr. BARLETTA insists in a commonsense way that your tax dollars go to those we are trying to help: those who can't get healthcare at work; those who don't get it through government programs like Medicare or the VA; those small-business people; those folks coming out of college; those entrepreneurs who are at home starting a new business or raising their families; even those early retirees. Those are the people we are trying to help, and every dollar counts.

Mr. BARLETTA's bill, which I am proud as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to bring to you, makes a commonsense requirement: that you be verified to get those subsidies before you receive them; to make sure those precious dollars actually go to the Americans we are trying to help.

I strongly support the Verify First Act. If you stand for stopping waste, and fraud, and abuse in protection of your tax dollars, I would urge your support for this bill.

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, which will put important safeguards in place to ensure that federal tax dollars are not fraudulently used to pay for illegal immigrants to enroll in Obamacare.

Right now, the federal government provides Obamacare premium tax credits to individuals before fully making sure that these individuals rightfully qualify for these benefits.

For example, the federal government has wrongfully issued hundreds of millions of dollars in tax credits to individuals without first verifying their immigration status. After the money goes out the door, the Internal Revenue Service must attempt to track down these individuals to recoup the money.

Last year the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs reported that more than \$750 million in taxpayer dollars went to 500,000 people who did not meet the qualifications for those benefits.

H.R. 2581 addresses this issue by requiring that the Social Security Administration, the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health and Human Services to certify that an individual is a citizen, national, or legal immigrant before they receive a health care tax credit.

Given that our nation is nearly \$20 trillion in debt, we cannot afford to hand out hundreds of millions of dollars in Obamacare tax credits to individuals who do not qualify.

This bill is a common-sense measure that puts the interests of hardworking taxpayers first and ensures that health care dollars will be directed only at those who are eligible.

I hope that the Senate will soon take up and pass this commonsense bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 378, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

□ 1430

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Sánchez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2581 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 4, line 5, insert after the first period the following: "The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of a delay in verification of such status of an individual who has not attained the age of 1."

Page 5, line 4, insert after the first period the following: "The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of a delay in verification of such status of an individual who has not attained the age of 1."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill.

If adopted, the Verify First Act will proceed to final passage as amended.

The Democratic motion to recommit simply amends the Verify First Act to ensure that our most vulnerable—newborns and infants—do not experience a delay in health coverage.

We know that the citizenship of newborns can't be verified electronically because they don't have Social Security numbers yet when they are born. In order to verify their child's status, parents have to send a copy of their child's birth certificate, which can take anywhere from 1 to 6 weeks to obtain, depending on the State, and that is the best-case scenario if the parents throw a perfect game in documenting and planning for the arrival of their newborn. Just like any perfect game, a little luck is involved in that.

That luck includes having the Social Security Administration process your child's Social Security number as soon as they receive it, that the Administration doesn't make a mistake in the spelling of your child's name, and that you have the financial resources and education to know exactly what steps you need to take to ensure that your newborn has coverage the moment they come out of your womb.

When most people are anticipating the birth of a child, that is not what they are thinking about. The birth of a child is one of life's most precious moments. The joy you feel when you hold your child for the first time should be the only feeling going through your mind. Filling the paperwork out to ensure that your child is covered shouldn't even be something that you should have to worry about.

But the Verify First Act, as currently drafted, would give you another thing to worry about and add an unnecessary barrier for newborns to receive the care they need. God forbid if your child needs extra care after they are born but doesn't have coverage because your plan is waiting to verify your child's status.

A child's life should not hang in the balance because of paperwork and red tape. For all the claims that Republicans are the pro-life party, they sure know how to make life difficult for a newborn as soon as they are out of the womb. They claim to protect the lives of the unborn and crusade against life-saving institutions such as Planned Parenthood. But where are their morals and love of life after the child is born? It somehow magically disappears, and they will throw every obstacle up to ensure that newborns don't receive the care that they need and that they are entitled to.

Whether it is through the unintended consequences of a poorly drafted bill such as this one, or gutting the program that covers half the births in the U.S., Republicans will do everything to gut access to care or place obstacles in struggling people's paths. That's right,

by cutting over \$800 billion out of Medicaid, Republicans are endangering the health and welfare of all newborn children.

Earlier I asked my Republican colleagues to prove to me that they care about the health and well-being of all Americans regardless of the color of their skin or their economic circumstances. Well, I am asking them now to prove to me that they care about the well-being of newborn children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democratic motion to recommit, and let us write a bill that will actually help all U.S. citizens get the coverage that they need and are entitled to.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this isn't about verifying for infants. Ninety-six percent of children receive their Social Security numbers within 2 weeks after they are born in a hospital, and many of them have parents who are eligible for these credits as well, so it is immediate care. Even without all that, they can achieve and receive healthcare immediately as they process the premium support.

In the American Health Care Act that passed the House, there are more than \$1 billion set aside to help further the verification process to make sure that we are providing timely credits—but for those who are eligible. In truth, our friends across the aisle want to detract from the challenge today, which is that ObamaCare is a sinking ship.

Today's bill is about the taxpayers. Congress has to do all in its power to ensure the money taken from hard-working taxpayers is actually used for programs that improve their lives in this country and are not frittered away on fraud and abuse.

That is why this bill is so critical. It doesn't change eligibility. It simply says that we are not going to pay first and chase later, which always is a losing approach for taxpayers. Not a dollar of taxpayer money should go out the door until citizenship or legal status is verified, period.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Democrats' motion to recommit and stand on behalf of taxpayers who want those dollars to go to Americans we are truly trying to help for the first time get truly affordable healthcare.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1094.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 378, I call up the bill (S. 1094) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 378, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

### S. 1094

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

#### TITLE I—OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION

Sec. 101. Establishment of Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection.

Sec. 102. Protection of whistleblowers in Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 103. Report on methods used to investigate employees of Department of Veterans Affairs.

#### TITLE II—ACCOUNTABILITY OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES, SUPERVISORS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES

Sec. 201. Improved authorities of Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve accountability of senior executives.

Sec. 202. Improved authorities of Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve accountability of employees.

Sec. 203. Reduction of benefits for Department of Veterans Affairs employees convicted of certain crimes.

Sec. 204. Authority to recoup bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department of Veterans Affairs.

- Sec. 205. Authority to recoup relocation expenses paid to or on behalf of employees of Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 206. Time period for response to notice of adverse actions against supervisory employees who commit prohibited personnel actions.
- Sec. 207. Direct hiring authority for medical center directors and VISN directors.
- Sec. 208. Time periods for review of adverse actions with respect to certain employees.
- Sec. 209. Improvement of training for supervisors.
- Sec. 210. Assessment and report on effect on senior executives at Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 211. Measurement of Department of Veterans Affairs disciplinary process outcomes and effectiveness.

#### **TITLE I—OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION**

##### **SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### **“§323. Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department an office to be known as the ‘Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection’ (in this section referred to as the ‘Office’).

“(b) HEAD OF OFFICE.—(1) The head of the Office shall be responsible for the functions of the Office and shall be appointed by the President pursuant to section 308(a) of this title.

“(2) The head of the Office shall be known as the ‘Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection’.

“(3) The Assistant Secretary shall report directly to the Secretary on all matters relating to the Office.

“(4) Notwithstanding section 308(b) of this title, the Secretary may only assign to the Assistant Secretary responsibilities relating to the functions of the Office set forth in subsection (c).

“(c) FUNCTIONS.—(1) The functions of the Office are as follows:

“(A) Advising the Secretary on all matters of the Department relating to accountability, including accountability of employees of the Department, retaliation against whistleblowers, and such matters as the Secretary considers similar and affect public trust in the Department.

“(B) Issuing reports and providing recommendations related to the duties described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) Receiving whistleblower disclosures.

“(D) Referring whistleblower disclosures received under subparagraph (C) for investigation to the Office of the Medical Inspector, the Office of Inspector General, or other investigative entity, as appropriate, if the Assistant Secretary has reason to believe the whistleblower disclosure is evidence of a violation of a provision of law, mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

“(E) Receiving and referring disclosures from the Special Counsel for investigation to the Medical Inspector of the Department, the Inspector General of the Department, or such other person with investigatory author-

ity, as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate.

“(F) Recording, tracking, reviewing, and confirming implementation of recommendations from audits and investigations carried out by the Inspector General of the Department, the Medical Inspector of the Department, the Special Counsel, and the Comptroller General of the United States, including the imposition of disciplinary actions and other corrective actions contained in such recommendations.

“(G) Analyzing data from the Office and the Office of Inspector General telephone hotlines, other whistleblower disclosures, disaggregated by facility and area of health care if appropriate, and relevant audits and investigations to identify trends and issue reports to the Secretary based on analysis conducted under this subparagraph.

“(H) Receiving, reviewing, and investigating allegations of misconduct, retaliation, or poor performance involving—

“(i) an individual in a senior executive position (as defined in section 713(d) of this title) in the Department;

“(ii) an individual employed in a confidential, policy-making, policy-determining, or policy-advocating position in the Department; or

“(iii) a supervisory employee, if the allegation involves retaliation against an employee for making a whistleblower disclosure.

“(I) Making such recommendations to the Secretary for disciplinary action as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate after substantiating any allegation of misconduct or poor performance pursuant to an investigation carried out as described in subparagraph (F) or (H).

“(2) In carrying out the functions of the Office, the Assistant Secretary shall ensure that the Office maintains a toll-free telephone number and Internet website to receive anonymous whistleblower disclosures.

“(3) In any case in which the Assistant Secretary receives a whistleblower disclosure from an employee of the Department under paragraph (1)(C), the Assistant Secretary may not disclose the identity of the employee without the consent of the employee, except in accordance with the provisions of section 552a of title 5, or as required by any other applicable provision of Federal law.

“(d) STAFF AND RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Assistant Secretary has such staff, resources, and access to information as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Office.

“(e) RELATION TO OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL.—The Office shall not be established as an element of the Office of the General Counsel and the Assistant Secretary may not report to the General Counsel.

“(f) REPORTS.—(1)(A) Not later than June 30 of each calendar year, beginning with June 30, 2017, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the activities of the Office during the calendar year in which the report is submitted.

“(B) Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report, the following:

“(i) A full and substantive analysis of the activities of the Office, including such statistical information as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate.

“(ii) Identification of any issues reported to the Secretary under subsection (c)(1)(G),

including such data as the Assistant Secretary considers relevant to such issues and any trends the Assistant Secretary may have identified with respect to such issues.

“(iii) Identification of such concerns as the Assistant Secretary may have regarding the size, staffing, and resources of the Office and such recommendations as the Assistant Secretary may have for legislative or administrative action to address such concerns.

“(iv) Such recommendations as the Assistant Secretary may have for legislative or administrative action to improve—

“(I) the process by which concerns are reported to the Office; and

“(II) the protection of whistleblowers within the Department.

“(v) Such other matters as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate regarding the functions of the Office or other matters relating to the Office.

“(2) If the Secretary receives a recommendation for disciplinary action under subsection (c)(1)(I) and does not take or initiate the recommended disciplinary action before the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Secretary received the recommendation, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a detailed justification for not taking or initiating such disciplinary action.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘supervisory employee’ means an employee of the Department who is a supervisor as defined in section 7103(a) of title 5.

“(2) The term ‘whistleblower’ means one who makes a whistleblower disclosure.

“(3) The term ‘whistleblower disclosure’ means any disclosure of information by an employee of the Department or individual applying to become an employee of the Department which the employee or individual reasonably believes evidences—

“(A) a violation of a law, rule, or regulation; or

“(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 308(b) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) The functions set forth in section 323(c) of this title.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“323. Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection.”.

##### **SEC. 102. PROTECTION OF WHISTLEBLOWERS IN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking sections 731, 732, 734, 735, and 736;

(2) by redesignating section 733 as section 731; and

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

##### **“§732. Protection of whistleblowers as criteria in evaluation of supervisors**

“(a) DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF CRITERIA REQUIRED.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, shall develop criteria that—

“(1) the Secretary shall use as a critical element in any evaluation of the performance of a supervisory employee; and

“(2) promotes the protection of whistleblowers.

“(b) **PRINCIPLES FOR PROTECTION OF WHISTLEBLOWERS.**—The criteria required by subsection (a) shall include principles for the protection of whistleblowers, such as the degree to which supervisory employees respond constructively when employees of the Department report concerns, take responsible action to resolve such concerns, and foster an environment in which employees of the Department feel comfortable reporting concerns to supervisory employees or to the appropriate authorities.

“(c) **SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEE AND WHISTLEBLOWER DEFINED.**—In this section, the terms ‘supervisory employee’ and ‘whistleblower’ have the meanings given such terms in section 323 of this title.

**“§ 733. Training regarding whistleblower disclosures**

“(a) **TRAINING.**—Not less frequently than once every two years, the Secretary, in coordination with the Whistleblower Protection Ombudsman designated under section 3(d)(1)(C) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), shall provide to each employee of the Department training regarding whistleblower disclosures, including—

“(1) an explanation of each method established by law in which an employee may file a whistleblower disclosure;

“(2) the right of the employee to petition Congress regarding a whistleblower disclosure in accordance with section 7211 of title 5;

“(3) an explanation that the employee may not be prosecuted or reprised against for disclosing information to Congress, the Inspector General, or another investigatory agency in instances where such disclosure is permitted by law, including under sections 5701, 5705, and 7732 of this title, under section 552a of title 5 (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act), under chapter 93 of title 18, and pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191);

“(4) an explanation of the language that is required to be included in all nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements pursuant to section 115(a)(1) of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (5 U.S.C. 2302 note); and

“(5) the right of contractors to be protected from reprisal for the disclosure of certain information under section 4705 or 4712 of title 41.

“(b) **MANNER TRAINING IS PROVIDED.**—The Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that training provided under subsection (a) is provided in person.

“(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not less frequently than once every two years, the Secretary shall provide training on merit system protection in a manner that the Special Counsel certifies as being satisfactory.

“(d) **PUBLICATION.**—The Secretary shall publish on the Internet website of the Department, and display prominently at each facility of the Department, the rights of an employee to make a whistleblower disclosure, including the information described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a).

“(e) **WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘whistleblower disclosure’ has the meaning given such term in section 323 of this title.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended—

(1) by striking the items relating to sections 731 through 736; and

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

“731. Adverse actions against supervisory employees who commit prohibited personnel actions relating to whistleblower complaints.

“732. Protection of whistleblowers as criteria in evaluation of supervisors.

“733. Training regarding whistleblower disclosures.”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 731 of such title, as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) making a whistleblower disclosure to the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, the Inspector General of the Department, the Special Counsel, or Congress;”; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (F) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking “complaint in accordance with section 732 or with” and inserting “disclosure made to the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection,”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “through (F)” and inserting “through (E)”; and

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

“(d) **WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘whistleblower disclosure’ has the meaning given such term in section 323(g) of this title.”.

**SEC. 103. REPORT ON METHODS USED TO INVESTIGATE EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 540 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on methods used to investigate employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs and whether such methods are used to retaliate against whistleblowers.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the use of administrative investigation boards, peer review, searches of medical records, and other methods for investigating employees of the Department.

(2) A determination of whether and to what degree the methods described in paragraph (1) are being used to retaliate against whistleblowers.

(3) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action to implement safeguards to prevent the retaliation described in paragraph (2).

(c) **WHISTLEBLOWER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “whistleblower” has the meaning given such term in section 323 of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 101.

**TITLE II—ACCOUNTABILITY OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES, SUPERVISORS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES**

**SEC. 201. IMPROVED AUTHORITIES OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO IMPROVE ACCOUNTABILITY OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 713 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

**“§ 713. Senior executives: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct**

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—(1) The Secretary may, as provided in this section, reprimand or suspend, involuntarily reassign, demote, or remove a covered individual from a senior executive position at the Department if the Secretary determines that the misconduct or performance of the covered individual warrants such action.

“(2) If the Secretary so removes such an individual, the Secretary may remove the individual from the civil service (as defined in section 2101 of title 5).

“(b) **RIGHTS AND PROCEDURES.**—(1) A covered individual who is the subject of an action under subsection (a) is entitled to—

“(A) advance notice of the action and a file containing all evidence in support of the proposed action;

“(B) be represented by an attorney or other representative of the covered individual’s choice; and

“(C) grieve the action in accordance with an internal grievance process that the Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, shall establish for purposes of this subsection.

“(2)(A) The aggregate period for notice, response, and decision on an action under subsection (a) may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The period for the response of a covered individual to a notice under paragraph (1)(A) of an action under subsection (a) shall be 7 business days.

“(C) A decision under this paragraph on an action under subsection (a) shall be issued not later than 15 business days after notice of the action is provided to the covered individual under paragraph (1)(A). The decision shall be in writing, and shall include the specific reasons therefor.

“(3) The Secretary shall ensure that the grievance process established under paragraph (1)(C) takes fewer than 21 days.

“(4) A decision under paragraph (2) that is not grieved, and a grievance decision under paragraph (3), shall be final and conclusive.

“(5) A covered individual adversely affected by a decision under paragraph (2) that is not grieved, or by a grievance decision under paragraph (3), may obtain judicial review of such decision.

“(6) In any case in which judicial review is sought under paragraph (5), the court shall review the record and may set aside any Department action found to be—

“(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with a provision of law;

“(B) obtained without procedures required by a provision of law having been followed; or

“(C) unsupported by substantial evidence.

“(c) **RELATION TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.**—Section 3592(b)(1) of title 5 and the procedures under section 7543(b) of such title do not apply to an action under subsection (a).

“(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered individual’ means—

“(A) a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a)(4) of title 5); or

“(B) any individual who occupies an administrative or executive position and who was appointed under section 7306(a), section 7401(1), or section 7401(4) of this title.

“(2) The term ‘misconduct’ includes neglect of duty, malfeasance, or failure to accept a directed reassignment or to accompany a position in a transfer of function.

“(3) The term ‘senior executive position’ means—



“(A) with respect to a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a) of title 5), a Senior Executive Service position (as such term is defined in such section); and

“(B) with respect to a covered individual appointed under section 7306(a) or section 7401(1) of this title, an administrative or executive position.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7461(c)(1) of such title is amended by inserting “employees in senior executive positions (as defined in section 713(d) of this title) and” before “interns”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 713 and inserting the following new item:

“713. Senior executives: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct.”

**SEC. 202. IMPROVED AUTHORITIES OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO IMPROVE ACCOUNTABILITY OF EMPLOYEES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 713 the following new section:

**“§ 714. Employees: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary may remove, demote, or suspend a covered individual who is an employee of the Department if the Secretary determines the performance or misconduct of the covered individual warrants such removal, demotion, or suspension.

“(2) If the Secretary so removes, demotes, or suspends such a covered individual, the Secretary may—

“(A) remove the covered individual from the civil service (as defined in section 2101 of title 5);

“(B) demote the covered individual by means of a reduction in grade for which the covered individual is qualified, that the Secretary determines is appropriate, and that reduces the annual rate of pay of the covered individual; or

“(C) suspend the covered individual.

“(b) PAY OF CERTAIN DEMOTED INDIVIDUALS.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any covered individual subject to a demotion under subsection (a)(2) shall, beginning on the date of such demotion, receive the annual rate of pay applicable to such grade.

“(2)(A) A covered individual so demoted may not be placed on administrative leave during the period during which an appeal (if any) under this section is ongoing, and may only receive pay if the covered individual reports for duty or is approved to use accrued unused annual, sick, family medical, military, or court leave.

“(B) If a covered individual so demoted does not report for duty or receive approval to use accrued unused leave, such covered individual shall not receive pay or other benefits pursuant to subsection (d)(5).

“(c) PROCEDURE.—(1)(A) The aggregate period for notice, response, and final decision in a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The period for the response of a covered individual to a notice of a proposed removal, demotion, or suspension under this section shall be 7 business days.

“(C) Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 7513 of title 5 shall apply with respect to a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section.

“(D) The procedures in this subsection shall supersede any collective bargaining

agreement to the extent that such agreement is inconsistent with such procedures.

“(2) The Secretary shall issue a final decision with respect to a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice, including a file containing all the evidence in support of the proposed action, to the covered individual of the removal, demotion, or suspension. The decision shall be in writing and shall include the specific reasons therefor.

“(3) The procedures under chapter 43 of title 5 shall not apply to a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section.

“(4)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B) and subsection (d), any removal or demotion under this section, and any suspension of more than 14 days under this section, may be appealed to the Merit Systems Protection Board, which shall refer such appeal to an administrative judge pursuant to section 7701(b)(1) of title 5.

“(B) An appeal under subparagraph (A) of a removal, demotion, or suspension may only be made if such appeal is made not later than 10 business days after the date of such removal, demotion, or suspension.

“(d) EXPEDITED REVIEW.—(1) Upon receipt of an appeal under subsection (c)(4)(A), the administrative judge shall expedite any such appeal under section 7701(b)(1) of title 5 and, in any such case, shall issue a final and complete decision not later than 180 days after the date of the appeal.

“(2)(A) Notwithstanding section 7701(c)(1)(B) of title 5, the administrative judge shall uphold the decision of the Secretary to remove, demote, or suspend an employee under subsection (a) if the decision is supported by substantial evidence.

“(B) Notwithstanding title 5 or any other provision of law, if the decision of the Secretary is supported by substantial evidence, the administrative judge shall not mitigate the penalty prescribed by the Secretary.

“(3)(A) The decision of the administrative judge under paragraph (1) may be appealed to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

“(B) Notwithstanding section 7701(c)(1)(B) of title 5, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall uphold the decision of the Secretary to remove, demote, or suspend an employee under subsection (a) if the decision is supported by substantial evidence.

“(C) Notwithstanding title 5 or any other provision of law, if the decision of the Secretary is supported by substantial evidence, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall not mitigate the penalty prescribed by the Secretary.

“(4) In any case in which the administrative judge cannot issue a decision in accordance with the 180-day requirement under paragraph (1), the Merit Systems Protection Board shall, not later than 14 business days after the expiration of the 180-day period, submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that explains the reasons why a decision was not issued in accordance with such requirement.

“(5)(A) A decision of the Merit Systems Protection Board under paragraph (3) may be appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit pursuant to section 7703 of title 5 or to any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(B) of such section.

“(B) Any decision by such Court shall be in compliance with section 7462(f)(2) of this title.

“(6) The Merit Systems Protection Board may not stay any removal or demotion

under this section, except as provided in section 1214(b) of title 5.

“(7) During the period beginning on the date on which a covered individual appeals a removal from the civil service under subsection (c) and ending on the date that the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issues a final decision on such appeal, such covered individual may not receive any pay, awards, bonuses, incentives, allowances, differentials, student loan repayments, special payments, or benefits related to the employment of the individual by the Department.

“(8) To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall provide to the Merit Systems Protection Board such information and assistance as may be necessary to ensure an appeal under this subsection is expedited.

“(9) If an employee prevails on appeal under this section, the employee shall be entitled to backpay (as provided in section 5596 of title 5).

“(10) If an employee who is subject to a collective bargaining agreement chooses to grieve an action taken under this section through a grievance procedure provided under the collective bargaining agreement, the timelines and procedures set forth in subsection (c) and this subsection shall apply.

“(e) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—(1) In the case of a covered individual seeking corrective action (or on behalf of whom corrective action is sought) from the Office of Special Counsel based on an alleged prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b) of title 5, the Secretary may not remove, demote, or suspend such covered individual under subsection (a) without the approval of the Special Counsel under section 1214(f) of title 5.

“(2) In the case of a covered individual who has made a whistleblower disclosure to the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, the Secretary may not remove, demote, or suspend such covered individual under subsection (a) until—

“(A) in the case in which the Assistant Secretary determines to refer the whistleblower disclosure under section 323(c)(1)(D) of this title to an office or other investigative entity, a final decision with respect to the whistleblower disclosure has been made by such office or other investigative entity; or

“(B) in the case in which the Assistant Secretary determines not to refer the whistleblower disclosure under such section, the Assistant Secretary makes such determination.

“(f) TERMINATION OF INVESTIGATIONS BY OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Special Counsel (established by section 1211 of title 5) may terminate an investigation of a prohibited personnel practice alleged by an employee or former employee of the Department after the Special Counsel provides to the employee or former employee a written statement of the reasons for the termination of the investigation.

“(2) Such statement may not be admissible as evidence in any judicial or administrative proceeding without the consent of such employee or former employee.

“(g) VACANCIES.—In the case of a covered individual who is removed or demoted under subsection (a), to the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary shall fill the vacancy arising as a result of such removal or demotion.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered individual’ means an individual occupying a position at the Department, but does not include—

“(A) an individual occupying a senior executive position (as defined in section 713(d) of this title);

“(B) an individual appointed pursuant to sections 7306, 7401(1), 7401(4), or 7405 of this title;

“(C) an individual who has not completed a probationary or trial period; or

“(D) a political appointee.

“(2) The term ‘suspend’ means the placing of an employee, for disciplinary reasons, in a temporary status without duties and pay for a period in excess of 14 days.

“(3) The term ‘grade’ has the meaning given such term in section 7511(a) of title 5.

“(4) The term ‘misconduct’ includes neglect of duty, malfeasance, or failure to accept a directed reassignment or to occupy a position in a transfer of function.

“(5) The term ‘political appointee’ means an individual who is—

“(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5 (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5; or

“(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulation.

“(6) The term ‘whistleblower disclosure’ has the meaning given such term in section 323(g) of this title.”

(b) CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CLERICAL.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 713 the following new item:

“714. Employees: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct.”

(2) CONFORMING.—Section 4303(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) any removal or demotion under section 714 of title 38.”

**SEC. 203. REDUCTION OF BENEFITS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES.**

(a) REDUCTION OF BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§ 719. Reduction of benefits of employees convicted of certain crimes**

“(a) REDUCTION OF ANNUITY FOR REMOVED EMPLOYEE.—(1) The Secretary shall order that the covered service of an employee of the Department removed from a position for performance or misconduct under section 713, 714, or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law shall not be taken into account for purposes of calculating an annuity with respect to such individual under chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the individual is convicted of a felony (and the conviction is final) that influenced the individual’s performance while employed in the position; and

“(B) before such order is made, the individual is afforded—

“(i) notice of the proposed order; and

“(ii) an opportunity to respond to the proposed order by not later than ten business days following receipt of such notice; and

“(C) the Secretary issues the order—

“(i) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under subparagraph (B)(ii), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(ii) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under subparagraph (B)(i).

“(2) Any individual with respect to whom an annuity is reduced under this subsection may appeal the reduction to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to such regulations as the Director may prescribe for purposes of this subsection.

“(b) REDUCTION OF ANNUITY FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEE.—(1) The Secretary may order that the covered service of an individual who the Secretary proposes to remove for performance or misconduct under section 713, 714, or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law but who leaves employment at the Department prior to the issuance of a final decision with respect to such action shall not be taken into account for purposes of calculating an annuity with respect to such individual under chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that individual is convicted of a felony (and the conviction is final) that influenced the individual’s performance while employed in the position; and

“(B) before such order is made, the individual is afforded—

“(i) notice of the proposed order;

“(ii) opportunity to respond to the proposed order by not later than ten business days following receipt of such notice; and

“(C) the Secretary issues the order—

“(i) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under subparagraph (B)(ii), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(ii) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under subparagraph (B)(i).

“(2) Upon the issuance of an order by the Secretary under paragraph (1), the individual shall have an opportunity to appeal the order to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before the date that is seven business days after the date of such issuance.

“(3) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall make a final decision with respect to an appeal under paragraph (2) within 30 business days of receiving the appeal.

“(c) ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 37 business days after the Secretary issues a final order under subsection (a) or (b) with respect to an individual, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall recalculate the annuity of the individual.

“(d) LUMP-SUM ANNUITY CREDIT.—Any individual with respect to whom an annuity is reduced under subsection (a) or (b) shall be entitled to be paid so much of such individual’s lump-sum credit as is attributable to the period of covered service.

“(e) SPOUSE OR CHILDREN EXCEPTION.—(1) The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Manage-

ment, shall prescribe regulations that may provide for the payment to the spouse or children of any individual referred to in subsection (a) or (b) of any amounts which (but for this subsection) would otherwise have been nonpayable by reason of such subsections.

“(2) Regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall be consistent with the requirements of section 8332(o)(5) and 8411(1)(5) of title 5, as the case may be.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered service’ means, with respect to an individual subject to a removal for performance or misconduct under section 719 or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law, the period of service beginning on the date that the Secretary determines under such applicable provision that the individual engaged in activity that gave rise to such action and ending on the date that the individual is removed from or leaves a position of employment at the Department prior to the issuance of a final decision with respect to such action.

“(2) The term ‘lump-sum credit’ has the meaning given such term in section 8331(8) or section 8401(19) of title 5, as the case may be.

“(3) The term ‘service’ has the meaning given such term in section 8331(12) or section 8401(26) of title 5, as the case may be.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 717 the following new item:

“719. Reduction of benefits of employees convicted of certain crimes.”

(b) APPLICATION.—Section 719 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall apply to any action of removal of an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 719 or 7461 of such title or any other provision of law, commencing on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 204. AUTHORITY TO RECOUP BONUSES OR AWARDS PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 203, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§ 721. Recoupment of bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may issue an order directing an employee of the Department to repay the amount, or a portion of the amount, of any award or bonus paid to the employee under title 5, including under chapters 45 or 53 of such title, or this title if—

“(1) the Secretary determines that the individual engaged in misconduct or poor performance prior to payment of the award or bonus, and that such award or bonus would not have been paid, in whole or in part, had the misconduct or poor performance been known prior to payment; and

“(2) before such repayment, the employee is afforded—

“(A) notice of the proposed order; and

“(B) an opportunity to respond to the proposed order by not later than 10 business days after the receipt of such notice; and

“(3) the Secretary issues the order—

“(A) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under paragraph (2)(B), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(B) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not

later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under paragraph (2)(A).

“(b) APPEAL OF ORDER OF SECRETARY.—(1) Upon the issuance of an order by the Secretary under subsection (a) with respect to an individual, the individual shall have an opportunity to appeal the order to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before the date that is seven business days after the date of such issuance.

“(2) The Director shall make a final decision with respect to an appeal under paragraph (1) within 30 business days after receiving such appeal.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter, as amended by section 203(a)(2), is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 719 the following new item:

“721. Recoupment of bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 721 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an award or bonus paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed to modify the certification issued by the Office of Personnel Management and the Office of Management and Budget regarding the performance appraisal system of the Senior Executive Service of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

**SEC. 205. AUTHORITY TO RECOUP RELOCATION EXPENSES PAID TO OR ON BEHALF OF EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 204, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§ 723. Recoupment of relocation expenses paid on behalf of employees of Department**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may issue an order directing an employee of the Department to repay the amount, or a portion of the amount, paid to or on behalf of the employee under title 5 for relocation expenses, including any expenses under section 5724 or 5724a of such title, or this title if—

“(1) the Secretary determines that relocation expenses were paid following an act of fraud or malfeasance that influenced the authorization of the relocation expenses;

“(2) before such repayment, the employee is afforded—

“(A) notice of the proposed order; and

“(B) an opportunity to respond to the proposed order not later than ten business days following the receipt of such notice; and

“(3) the Secretary issues the order—

“(A) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under paragraph (2)(B), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(B) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under paragraph (2)(A).

“(b) APPEAL OF ORDER OF SECRETARY.—(1) Upon the issuance of an order by the Secretary under subsection (a) with respect to an individual, the individual shall have an opportunity to appeal the order to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before the date that is seven business days after the date of such issuance.

“(2) The Director shall make a final decision with respect to an appeal under paragraph (1) within 30 days after receiving such appeal.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 721, as added by section 204(b), the following new item:

“723. Recoupment of relocation expenses paid on behalf of employees of Department.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 723 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an amount paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to or on behalf of an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs for relocation expenses on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 206. TIME PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF ADVERSE ACTIONS AGAINST SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES WHO COMMIT PROHIBITED PERSONNEL ACTIONS.**

Section 731(a)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, as redesignated by section 102(a)(2), is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “14 days” and inserting “10 days”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “14-day period” and inserting “10-day period”.

**SEC. 207. DIRECT HIRING AUTHORITY FOR MEDICAL CENTER DIRECTORS AND VISN DIRECTORS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7401 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Directors of medical centers and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks with demonstrated ability in the medical profession, in health care administration, or in health care fiscal management.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 7404(a)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” before “The annual”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), as designated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “and 7401(4)” after “7306”; and

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

“(B) Section 5377 of title 5 shall apply to a position under section 7401(4) of this title as if such position were included in the definition of ‘position’ in section 5377(a) of title 5.”.

**SEC. 208. TIME PERIODS FOR REVIEW OF ADVERSE ACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.**

(a) PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, PODIATRISTS, CHIROPRACTORS, OPTOMETRISTS, REGISTERED NURSES, PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS, AND EXPANDED-FUNCTION DENTAL AUXILIARIES.—Paragraph (2) of section 7461(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) In any case other than a case described in paragraph (1) that involves or includes a question of professional conduct or competence in which a major adverse action was not taken, such an appeal shall be made through Department grievance procedures under section 7463 of this title.”.

(b) MAJOR ADVERSE ACTIONS INVOLVING PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OR COMPETENCE.—Section 7462(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, within the aggregate time period specified in paragraph (5)(A),” after “is entitled”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “At least 30 days advance written notice” and inserting “Advance written notice”; and

(ii) by striking “and a statement” and inserting “a statement”; and

(iii) by inserting “and a file containing all the evidence in support of each charge,” after “with respect to each charge,”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “A reasonable time, but not less than seven days” and inserting “The opportunity, within the time period provided for in paragraph (4)(A)”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) After considering the employee’s answer, if any, and within the time period provided for in paragraph (5)(B), the deciding official shall render a decision on the charges. The decision shall be in writing and shall include the specific reasons therefor.”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph (A):

“(A) The period for the response of an employee under paragraph (1)(B) to advance written notice under paragraph (1)(A) shall be seven business days.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “30 days” and inserting “seven business days”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(5)(A) The aggregate period for the resolution of charges against an employee under this subsection may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The deciding official shall render a decision under paragraph (3) on charges under this subsection not later than 15 business days after the Under Secretary provides notice on the charges for purposes of paragraph (1)(A).

“(6) The procedures in this subsection shall supersede any collective bargaining agreement to the extent that such agreement is inconsistent with such procedures.”.

(c) OTHER ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7463(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the same notice and opportunity to answer with respect to those charges as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 7462(b)(1) of this title” and inserting “notice and an opportunity to answer with respect to those charges in accordance with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 7462(b)(1) of this title, but within the time periods specified in paragraph (3)”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, within the aggregate time period specified in paragraph (3)(A),” after “is entitled”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “an advance written notice” and inserting “written notice”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “a reasonable time” and inserting “time to answer”; and

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

“(3)(A) The aggregate period for the resolution of charges against an employee under paragraph (1) or (2) may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The period for the response of an employee under paragraph (1) or (2)(B) to written notice of charges under paragraph (1) or (2)(A), as applicable, shall be seven business days.

“(C) The deciding official shall render a decision on charges under paragraph (1) or (2) not later than 15 business days after notice is

provided on the charges for purposes of paragraph (1) or (2)(A), as applicable.”.

**SEC. 209. IMPROVEMENT OF TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide to each employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who is employed as a supervisor periodic training on the following:

(1) The rights of whistleblowers and how to address a report by an employee of a hostile work environment, reprisal, or harassment.

(2) How to effectively motivate, manage, and reward the employees who report to the supervisor.

(3) How to effectively manage employees who are performing at an unacceptable level and access assistance from the human resources office of the Department and the Office of the General Counsel of the Department with respect to those employees.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **SUPERVISOR.**—The term “supervisor” has the meaning given such term in section 7103(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **WHISTLEBLOWER.**—The term “whistleblower” has the meaning given such term in section 323(g) of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 101.

**SEC. 210. ASSESSMENT AND REPORT ON EFFECT ON SENIOR EXECUTIVES AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) measure and assess the effect of the enactment of this title on the morale, engagement, hiring, promotion, retention, discipline, and productivity of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the measurement and assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required by subsection (a)(1) shall include the following:

(1) With respect to engagement, trends in morale of individuals in senior executive positions and individuals aspiring to senior executive positions.

(2) With respect to promotions—

(A) whether the Department is experiencing an increase or decrease in the number of employees participating in leadership development and candidate development programs with the intention of becoming candidates for senior executive positions; and

(B) trends in applications to senior executive positions within the Department.

(3) With respect to retention—

(A) trends in retirement rates of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department;

(B) trends in quit rates of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department;

(C) rates of transfer of—

(i) individuals from other Federal agencies into senior executive positions at the Department; and

(ii) individuals from senior executive positions at the Department to other Federal agencies; and

(D) trends in total loss rates by job function.

(4) With respect to disciplinary processes—

(A) regarding individuals in senior executive positions at the Department who are the subject of disciplinary action—

(i) the length of the disciplinary process in days for such individuals both before the

date of the enactment of this Act and under the provisions of this Act described in subsection (a)(1); and

(ii) the extent to which appeals by such individuals are upheld under such provisions as compared to before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) the components or offices of the Department which experience the greatest number of proposed adverse actions against individuals in senior executive positions and components and offices which experience the least relative to the size of the components or offices’ total number of senior executive positions;

(C) the tenure of individuals in senior executive positions who are the subject of disciplinary action;

(D) whether the individuals in senior executive positions who are the subject of disciplinary action have previously been disciplined; and

(E) the number of instances of disciplinary action taken by the Secretary against individuals in senior executive positions at the Department as compared to governmentwide discipline against individuals in Senior Executive Service positions (as defined in section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code) as a percentage of the total number of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department and Senior Executive Service positions (as so defined).

(5) With respect to hiring—

(A) the degree to which the skills of newly hired individuals in senior executive positions at the Department are appropriate with respect to the needs of the Department;

(B) the types of senior executive positions at the Department most commonly filled under the authorities in the provisions described in subsection (a)(1);

(C) the number of senior executive positions at the Department filled by hires outside of the Department compared to hires from within the Department;

(D) the length of time to fill a senior executive position at the Department and for a new hire to begin working in a new senior executive position;

(E) the mission-critical deficiencies filled by newly hired individuals in senior executive positions and the connection between mission-critical deficiencies filled under the provisions described in subsection (a) and annual performance of the Department;

(F) the satisfaction of applicants for senior executive positions at the Department with the hiring process, including the clarity of job announcements, reasons for withdrawal of applications, communication regarding status of applications, and timeliness of hiring decision; and

(G) the satisfaction of newly hired individuals in senior executive positions at the Department with the hiring process and the process of joining and becoming oriented with the Department.

(c) **SENIOR EXECUTIVE POSITION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “senior executive position” has the meaning given such term in section 713 of title 38, United States Code.

**SEC. 211. MEASUREMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DISCIPLINARY PROCESS OUTCOMES AND EFFECTIVENESS.**

(a) **MEASURING AND COLLECTING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall measure and collect information on the outcomes of disciplinary actions carried out by the Department of Veterans Affairs during the three-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act and the effectiveness of such actions.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—In measuring and collecting pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall measure and collect information regarding the following:

(A) The average time from the initiation of an adverse action against an employee at the Department to the final resolution of that action.

(B) The number of distinct steps and levels of review within the Department involved in the disciplinary process and the average length of time required to complete these steps.

(C) The rate of use of alternate disciplinary procedures compared to traditional disciplinary procedures and the frequency with which employees who are subject to alternative disciplinary procedures commit additional offenses.

(D) The number of appeals from adverse actions filed against employees of the Department, the number of appeals upheld, and the reasons for which the appeals were upheld.

(E) The use of paid administrative leave during the disciplinary process and the length of such leave.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the disciplinary procedures and actions of the Department.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The information collected under subsection (a).

(B) The findings of the Secretary with respect to the measurement and collection carried out under subsection (a).

(C) An analysis of the disciplinary procedures and actions of the Department.

(D) Suggestions for improving the disciplinary procedures and actions of the Department.

(E) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day. You and many Members of this body are well aware that bringing real accountability to the Department of Veterans Affairs has been a goal of mine and many of my colleagues for many years. That is why I am proud to rise today to support S. 1094, which passed the United States Senate last week via voice vote.

This bill is heavily modeled off of my bill, H.R. 1259, which passed out of the

House with bipartisan support earlier this Congress, and I am proud to have worked with Senators ISAKSON, TESTER, and RUBIO to craft this vital piece of legislation.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017 would provide the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs with yet another tool to instill accountability at VA by giving him the authority to expeditiously remove, demote, or suspend any VA employee for poor performance or misconduct while still preserving an employee's rights to due process.

This bill would create an expedited procedure for all VA employees to respond and appeal to proposed removals, demotions, and suspensions for performance or misconduct, or in the case of title 38 employees, which are our healthcare providers, for a question involving direct patient care or clinical competence.

The prenotification and response process would have to be completed within 15 business days, and the employee would be entitled to an expedited appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board where the first step at the administrative judge level would be limited to 180 days.

Additionally, either party would be able to appeal the administrative judge's decision to the full MSPB and would be provided the opportunity for limited judicial review.

This bill would also provide improved protections for whistleblowers by creating a new office and an Assistant Secretary position specifically for accountability and whistleblowers. It would allow the Secretary to reduce an employee's Federal pension if they are convicted of a felony that influenced their job at VA. It would provide the Secretary with the authority to recoup a bonus provided to an employee who engaged in misconduct or malfeasance prior to receiving the bonus, and would allow the Secretary to recoup any relocation expenses that were authorized for a VA employee only through the employee's ill-gotten means, such as fraud, waste, or malfeasance.

Lastly, it would also provide the Secretary with the direct hiring authority he has been asking for so that he can hire medical center directors and VISN directors in a more expedited manner and fill the leadership vacancies across VA.

Mr. Speaker, as I have always said, I agree with all of my colleagues that the vast majority of VA employees—many of whom I know personally and call friends—are hardworking public servants who are dedicated to providing quality healthcare and benefits for veterans.

But for far too long, the failures of bad actors have tarnished the good name of all VA employees. Unfortunately, despite the tireless efforts of

our courageous whistleblowers, the extensive reporting on a lack of accountability by the media and the outrage of the American public, we still see far too many instances of VA employees not living up to the standards America expects. Most importantly, they are not living up to the standards that the men and women who have served this great Nation deserve.

This isn't a political issue. This is a veterans' issue. I can't imagine how any Member of this body can defend not standing for veterans to vote for this bipartisan legislation. The lack of accountability isn't specific to any one area of the Department. It is systemic. In the last few years, the committee discovered an instance of a VA nurse scrubbing in drunk for a veteran's surgery—I found that unbelievable—and a care support specialist in the agency's drug and addiction program taking a recovering addict to a crack house to buy him drugs and a prostitute, a VA medical center clerk participating in an armed robbery, and a practitioner watching pornography at work while they were supposedly treating a patient.

What is more, it has been proven that some senior managers have retaliated against whistleblowers, costing VA and, in turn, taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in restitution.

All of these acts in and of themselves are egregious, but they are just the tip of the iceberg. They have one thing in common: none of these employees were held accountable in a reasonable timeframe, if at all.

There are many factors that contribute to this failure, but an antiquated civil service system and a complicated grievance process have left VA unwilling—and sometimes just unable—to jump through the many hoops to do what is right. This is not an issue unique to VA. Too often it is nearly impossible to remove a poorly performing government employee.

Officials on both sides of the aisle have expressed their concern about the current process to remove or discipline subpar employees. Just last year, Mr. Speaker, VA's then-Deputy Secretary Sloan Gibson sat before our committee and admitted that it was too difficult to fire a substandard VA employee.

Further, the Government Accountability Office studied the government's ability to hold low-performing employees accountable and found that it took 6 months to a year on average, and sometimes significantly longer, to fire a poorly performing government employee—6 months to a year.

I have heard concerns that the bill will hurt the Department's ability to recruit and retain good employees. I don't buy this argument as every employee I speak to tells me the exact opposite.

Good employees want to work in an environment where they know every-

one can be held accountable for their actions. I believe the current status quo hurts the morale of the employees who are doing the right thing each and every day.

This is the same for employees of the Department who are veterans. I know that some have said that this would hurt veterans who are employed at the VA since they make up a large percentage of our VA employees. But as a veteran myself and as my fellow veterans here today would agree, we don't serve, whether in uniform or civilian clothes, because we prioritize our individual protection. The mission always comes first, and at VA, the mission is our veterans.

□ 1445

Veterans want to work alongside colleagues they know are working hard for the men and women who they served alongside.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to acknowledge some individuals who have made this bill become a reality.

First and foremost, I want to thank the 18 veterans groups representing millions of veterans and their families who are supporting this bill and real accountability at the VA. Many of them are in the gallery today, and I can't thank them enough for all they have done and all they continue to do for our Nation's heroes.

Many of these groups took a courageous stand in support of VA accountability, even when it wasn't a politically popular idea. And I especially want to thank Concerned Veterans for America, The American Legion, and Paralyzed Veterans of America for being some of our earliest and staunchest supporters.

I also want to thank someone who, this Congress, has been with us from day one, and that is the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, Dr. David Shulkin. We have worked with Secretary Shulkin and his team to draft the bill that is before us today, and I am thankful for his and President Trump's support.

President Trump and Secretary Shulkin have endorsed this legislation, not because they want to punish or make it harder to recruit employees, but because they see this change is needed if the Secretary is going to meet the President's goal of truly reforming the VA.

I also want to thank the bipartisan group of Senators who we worked with in crafting this bill, including Senator ISAKSON; Senator TESTER; and the primary sponsor, Senator RUBIO. Senator RUBIO and his staff have been with me every step of the way, and I am thankful for his and his staff's efforts over the years.

I also want to thank a good friend of mine, Ranking Member WALZ, and his staff for their support and leadership. They have been fantastic. I also want

to thank Speaker RYAN and Majority Leader MCCARTHY and their staffs for helping us bring this bill to the floor.

Lastly, I would like to single out former Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman Jeff Miller, a good friend, great leader of this committee, and my chairman for 6 years. His leadership got the ball rolling on this issue, which led to House-passed legislation twice last Congress and kept the spotlight on accountability issues at VA through his dogged oversight.

Finally, I would like to thank my staff, and especially the professional and communications staff of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for their years of hard work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, today, we have a bipartisan, bicameral bill that makes meaningful change to VA's civil service system, while maintaining due process rights.

Today, we have the opportunity to make real and lasting changes to a broken system.

Today, we can stand together with veterans against the status quo that has failed them for far too long. They deserve better.

I hope all of you will join me, and the 18 veterans organizations that support this legislation, to do what is right and send this bill to the President's desk.

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

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

I would like to associate myself with the chairman's remarks, especially the thanks of all the people involved in this. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is the third time we have come to this body this Congress, as the chairman and the ranking member of the VA Committee, as fellow veterans, as friends and American citizens, on issues of utmost importance to our veterans. We do have a constituency. We do have a special interest group that we look out for: America's veterans.

Those 18 groups, plus millions of Americans across this country, their collective voices through their organizations, through the Disabled American Veterans, through The American Legion, articulate every Congress in front of us what their top priorities are. This year, they came in front of us and said the three things that Congress needs to get done, needs to get right, and needs to get moving as soon as possible in this 2-year period that we have is: appeals reform, choice extension of care in the community, and an accountability bill.

Well, I am proud to say this is the third of those three. The other two have moved here in a bipartisan manner.

In the climate that we are in, and the uncertainty that the American public is feeling—quite honestly, probably the frustration they feel with this body—I think it is important to note that none

of those things were easy lifts, none of them were locked in, and many of them contained things that were pretty ideologically polarizing.

Chairman ROE, through his leadership and with the professional staff, was able to navigate to get to that point that the top priority and focus was care for veterans—making sure that care is delivered in a timely manner; making sure those delivering the care are the best possible; and, as the chairman said, if they are doing their job, they are afforded their constitutional rights and appeals. If they are not, I agree with the chairman, they should be removed as quickly as possible. They should certainly not be rewarded for that. That strengthens the VA. That strengthens those good employees.

Again, keep this in mind: This is the second largest agency in the Federal Government. It has a \$190 billion budget. It has 350,000-plus employees. It is an issue that unites us and that Americans are passionate about.

So we stand before you today with an issue that is unified, as Americans, as accountability. Certainly, the examples that Chairman ROE mentioned, no one is going to defend those. I am pleased because I think the chairman clearly understands that every time one of those issues goes unaddressed in a timely manner, it hurts the morale of the entire agency and erodes trust in the system by Americans.

Those veterans who use the VA system know they are getting quality care. On any given day, tens of thousands of appointments and procedures are being carried out in the most professional manner. All of that is undermined if a bad employee is allowed to not live up to those standards.

So I am pleased to say that I am in full support of this piece of legislation. The way this was done is the way we are taught in school how it is supposed to work. We debate, we send something there, we don't agree, then we let the Senate do that. We all work together to get something. We bring back that little, I am just a bill sitting on Capitol Hill. Now it is back over here. It is not perfect in everyone's mind, but it is certainly perfect in terms of how legislation is done and reaching those goals. Everyone compromised.

I think the chairman needs to be singled out on this. I thank him for commenting about Chairman Miller. We had Mike Michaud on our side work on that, too. Others have been here and done it, but we needed someone to get it over the line.

The three pieces I mentioned—appeals, choice, and accountability—are certainly things that were on everybody's mind. All three are going to pass through this House.

Just a couple of notes on this. This does maintain due process protections for employees, and I support that. I

hope we can come together and pass the compromise piece.

The bill promotes accountability by giving the VA the tools it needs to hold bad employees accountable, while maintaining those constitutional-mandated workplace rights.

At this point, I would say that Secretary Shulkin has earned the trust of, certainly, this committee, certainly of the veterans service organizations, and I would say, if you don't know, the American people. He has asked for some of these things. I take that very seriously. If he says this will add to accountability, if he says this will make his job better in delivering care for veterans, that weighs heavily.

He asked us for these things. He asked and was part of making that. We should be grateful that he is willing to work with Congress.

It also requires VA to evaluate supervisors based on their protection of whistleblowers. This commonsense provision aligns the incentives for supervisors to protect whistleblowers when they shed light on dangerous situations and problematic employees at the agency.

I want to be clear: we don't support collective bargaining rights just because it is a union issue that we think should be there, those of us who ideologically believe workplace protections allow for a larger voice and protect good employees who are pointing out bad behavior from being arbitrarily fired without a collective will to fight back.

One person in a manager's office with no support or no legal right is a very dangerous situation. One employee being backed by workplace guarantees and their union collectively bargained rights helps make us stronger.

The bill requires the VA to improve its training regarding whistleblower disclosures. This is a really key piece. We want to ensure there are no excuses for employees at the VA to not know how to handle protected disclosures. Proper training will be a key to ensure all employees and not just supervisors understand the importance.

No matter what this bill does, it would be hard to support if it didn't do the things the chairman said. It does protect those constitutional rights. It maintains all existing due process protections in current law by ensuring there is notice and an opportunity to respond before an employee is fired.

The bill even improves the appeals process by requiring the VA to provide an employee with the complete evidence file when they are fired, thereby empowering them to appeal sooner. If someone is wrongfully accused of wrongdoing, now they are going to see and have the entire file. We are just asking that they do it sooner.

If someone commits one of the acts that the chairman talked about, it is indefensible for it to take 6 months or



a year to have it adjudicated. We certainly want them to have a fair due process, but, again, if we are waiting to get that done, that is holding a position for someone else that could be serving veterans. It also keeps an employee under the cloud of not getting it done and moving on. If they are innocent, we want to move it on as quickly as possible. We do not jeopardize or change any of their appeal process to come back.

Now is the time to bring real, long-lasting constitutional accountability measures to the Department of Veterans Affairs. I would hope we could come together to pass this. Again, the entire goal of all of the people involved with this was to improve the care for this Nation's veterans, ensuring people's rights to be heard, and a fair due process if they are accused of something, but with the intention that if you are not serving our veterans in the manner that you should, then there are other places you should work. This ensures that those tools are there.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I want to thank Chairman ROE and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs for their work on this legislation and their focus on reforming the VA. I know they and the Secretary are all committed to making sure our veterans get the best—and only the best—no excuses.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has an honorable task to care for and heal our veterans. We made a promise in this country that, if you serve, your fellow citizens will take care of you. That is through the employees of the VA that we as a nation fulfill the promise. It is for this reason that we cannot accept the failures and backlogs in our veterans' programs.

We all know that there are thousands of great employees at the VA who consider their duty to care for the veterans as much bigger than just a job. But the few bad apples are spoiling the whole barrel.

We know how this works. You can have an office or a team committed to doing the best job possible. But when one isn't pulling their weight; when somebody is breaking the rules and getting away with it; when bad people get transferred or promoted, instead of fired; that totally destroys the whole organization. It undermines morale, makes the team ineffective, and allows for failures to continue or get worse. Failures at the VA have life-or-death consequences.

This has happened for years—years, where a person who was jailed got

leave to serve time and then returned to the VA; years, where an employee showed up drunk to work and participated in a surgery; years, where a psychiatrist watched deeply inappropriate videos with a veteran in the room; and after years of all this and none of them getting fired, the good employees become dispirited, the culture of the VA will decline, and too many of our veterans receive low-quality care, if they can get care at all.

Mr. Speaker, the VA is steeped in a culture of ambivalence, coupled with a lack of accountability, and our veterans suffer as a result. Fixing the culture at the VA requires us to acknowledge the great work of the many, without leaving them tainted with the incompetence and scandal of the few. It requires removing the bad apples.

So I am glad that we are finally sending this bill to the President's desk. The House passed a similar bill in 2015, but the Senate did not act. We passed another in the new Congress earlier this year.

Now that our Senate counterparts have voted, we will take our final step today to send this legislation to the President's desk. Once President Trump signs this into law, I predict we will begin to see the culture change at the VA and our veterans will get the care we promised them and they deserve.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), my good friend and the vice ranking member of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time. And I want to thank Ranking Member WALZ and Chairman ROE for their work on the issue of accountability and their tireless commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

Throughout the debate over accountability at the Department of Veterans Affairs, I have advocated for legislation that holds VA employees accountable, without violating their constitutional right to due process.

□ 1500

This legislation strikes that balance far better than previous accountability proposals. This compromise respects current grievance procedures, maintains existing due process protections, and improves the appeals process by requiring managers to present employees with all of the evidence before they move on a disciplinary action.

Today we are voting to strengthen whistleblower protections. This bill codifies the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, and it mandates that its Director is a Senate-confirmed position instead of a polit-

ical appointee. It also offers training on how to handle whistleblowers correctly, which will encourage employees to come forward if they witness misconduct.

Do I have concerns about this bill? Absolutely, I do. This is not the accountability legislation that I would have written. We must always remember that a third of VA employees are veterans themselves, and they deserve the workplace protections afforded to them in the Constitution as well as the respect of this Congress. But my concerns pale in comparison to the serious and numerous institutional issues raised by accountability bills previously advanced in the House.

Passing this bill today will accomplish several important objectives:

We will fulfill the repeated requests from veteran service organizations and the VA itself for a stronger accountability system.

We will support the VA's continuing effort to create a culture of excellence.

We will provide veterans greater confidence that the VA is prepared to meet their needs.

Finally, by passing this bill, we can shift our focus from who is fired from the VA to who is hired at the VA.

As I stand here today, there are nearly 50,000 vacant jobs at the VA. This is a significant and urgent challenge. Ultimately, the success of the Department of Veterans Affairs will depend on recruiting, training, and retaining the highest quality talent available.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee to streamlining the hiring process and ensuring that the VA has the staff and expertise it needs to provide veterans the care and support they have earned.

I applaud the Senate for forging this compromise, and I again want to recognize Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ for their important work.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California (Mr. TAKANO) for his support.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), my good friend and vice chair of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act.

As a grateful nation, we must implement meaningful VA reform. Every day veterans contact my office seeking assistance in dealing with the agency. Like many of my colleagues here, I have full-time staff specifically dedicated to helping veterans with VA casework. I hear from veterans every day who are waiting for care, waiting for an answer, or simply waiting to finally be heard and recognized.

These are true American heroes, Mr. Speaker. We must do all we can to help

them. The VA should be rolling out the red carpet for our veterans and treating them like the heroes they are.

The VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act is good, commonsense legislation. If a VA employee is involved in misconduct, they should be demoted, suspended, or fired—certainly not promoted or given a bonus. If a VA employee sees misconduct and wants to report it, they should not fear repercussions.

Of course, the vast majority of VA employees are hardworking and dedicated professionals. At the end of the day, this bill is about holding the bad actors accountable and protecting the whistleblowers and refocusing the VA on its mission to serve our Nation's heroes. With the passage of the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, we are turning the page to a fresh start for the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman ROE for doing such an outstanding job and also the ranking member for working in a bipartisan fashion. I appreciate it so very much. This is the way Congress should operate.

God bless our veterans.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to hold bad actors accountable and make the VA a stronger system for our Nation's veterans.

Since the unacceptable wait time scandal came to light in 2014, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has worked diligently to fix the long-term problems at the VA and to ensure we are serving our veterans as well as they have served us.

From top to bottom, the number one priority for almost every VA employee is serving our veterans. But when an employee does not live up to this mission, engages in misconduct, or puts veterans at risk, we must ensure that the VA is able to hold them accountable.

It is critically important that we acknowledge that the vast majority of the 350,000 VA employees, a third of whom are veterans themselves, are hardworking individuals who have dedicated themselves to serving our country and our Nation's veterans. By being able to hold accountable the few bad actors in the VA, we not only serve our veterans, but we make the job of the rest of the workforce easier to perform.

Because we need a world-class, 21st century VA, this bill also provides the Secretary with direct hiring authority for senior management so that we can bring on the talent we need to properly serve our veterans.

This is an important example of what we can get done when we work in a bi-

partisan manner. I want to thank Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ, both the chairman and ranking member of the Senate for working with our VSOs and the VA to find a compromise on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I support this compromise. I ask my colleagues to vote "yes." This is a very good bill.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), an Army and Marine veteran deployed to Iraq.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I rise today in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs and Whistleblower Protection Act, which the House of Representatives will consider today.

Time and time again, I have called to reform the VA, an organization that has been mired in a culture of corruption and bureaucratic incompetence. The VA has consistently failed to meet our Nation's obligations to veterans, the men and women who have sacrificed so much in the protection of our freedoms.

This act also provides the necessary protections for those who do the right thing and come forward to report wrongdoing. This legislation makes it possible to fire the bad VA employees who have failed our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, along with those in the Senate, for their hard work and support of this legislation. I look forward to getting it to the President's desk for his signature and to finally bringing accountability to the VA.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), a friend of all of our veterans and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, for everything our veterans have given in service to the country, they have earned their benefits and access to timely, quality healthcare at the VA. That is the promise that was made to them when they volunteered to serve. That is the promise that we in Congress are obligated to keep.

Honoring this promise is not just a matter of resources; it also depends on changing the actual culture at the VA. From the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the doctors and nurses, to the administrators who deal with the flood of appointments that come in, it has to be about serving the veteran, not about serving the bureaucracy.

For as long as I have been in Congress, improving VA accountability has been a bipartisan goal. I am glad to see us working across the aisle once again on this legislation that builds on the progress we made in 2014.

This bill strengthens whistleblower protections, which encourages employees to call out careless or criminal behavior that we have unfortunately seen too often at VAs around the country. It

gives the Secretary greater authority to remove or discipline poorly performing and negligent employees, and it provides a reasonable and efficient appeals process for VA employees that is the subject of compromise.

The bill won't solve all the problems at the VA, but by holding bad actors accountable and protecting the hardworking employees who care for our veterans, this bipartisan legislation will improve on the service that our veterans receive.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work done by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the administration, and the veterans service organizations to craft this important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." Let's send this bill to the President's desk and help veterans in my district in San Diego and across the country get the care that they have earned.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), my good friend and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the Floor on this important issue.

Gentlemen, it was our first Commander in Chief, George Washington, who said something to the effect that we can never expect our young men and women to step forward and fight for our country unless those who have already returned from the battlefield are taken care of.

This is a solemn oath that we all have to honor. It is critically important. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, in the State of Maine, we have about 125,000 veterans, and we love our veterans. We understand what it is like to fight for our freedom and to stand up for our way of life.

In the State of Maine, we have Togus Medical Center, which is the first veterans hospital in the country, about 150 years old. We understand this. They have great employees, and many of them are veterans themselves.

However, a couple of years ago our country was shocked to learn that there were and are some bad actors in this whole process. A few years ago, we learned that some of the folks at the veterans facility in Phoenix, Arizona, were cooking the scheduling books in order to get paid more money through a bonus program when, in fact, they did not and had not scheduled mental health appointments for some of our veterans who were at risk, and, as a result, a number of those veterans died. This is absolutely unacceptable.

There is nobody who has fought for this country on the front lines who comes home, who needs help, that should be denied help; and it certainly shouldn't be those who are supposed to take care of them who are cooking the books for their own benefit.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am asking every Republican and Democrat here in

this Chamber to support the Senate's bill, 1094. This is a good bill that holds the VA employees accountable for improper behavior. And, yes, sir, it does give, Mr. Speaker, management at the VA the opportunity to replace, fire, or otherwise, those who are supposed to care for our veterans who have chosen not to do so. Please support S. 1094.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Minnesota has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am certainly willing to yield some of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee if there are other speakers who would like to speak on this if the gentleman's time runs short. If I could save myself 3 minutes for my closing, I would certainly be willing to do that. I am not certain what the parliamentary procedure is to do so.

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

□ 1515

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), a veteran and a member of the committee, to speak on this issue.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017. This important legislation will streamline the arduous process to remove, demote, or suspend any VA employee for poor performance, negligence, or misconduct.

We all know the list of scandals: veterans dying on wait lists, intoxicated surgical staff, armed robbery, grossly mismanaged construction projects. Yet the civil service rules allow bad VA employees to stay on the public payroll.

Our veterans deserve better.

Today we take a bold step toward reversing that failure. This legislation will allow Secretary Shulkin to immediately remove bad employees as he works to restructure and improve veterans' care. It also ensures that whistleblowers are protected from retaliation. The bottom line is that it implements real accountability at the VA, accountability to the men and women who have bravely served this country.

The Veterans Affairs Accountability Act is an important first step in addressing poor performance and misconduct at the VA, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

I thank the chair and the ranking member very much for their work on this.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), chairman of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my highest privilege to serve with Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ on the VA Committee, and I am grateful for the honor to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity.

I want to thank Chairman ROE for his leadership on an issue that I believe gets at the root cause of many of the problems, maybe most of the problems that plague the Department of Veterans Affairs: the lack of accountability. Where you don't have a culture of accountability in an organization, you have mediocrity; and mediocrity and excellence in service do not and cannot coexist.

We are talking about serving our veterans, the men and women who are willing to sacrifice everything for our freedom and security. These folks gave their best to our country, and they deserve the very best from our country.

Having almost half a million delinquent disability claims is not our very best; having veterans wait in line for months to see a physician, not our best; having hundreds of billions of dollars in improper payments is not our best; waiting 6 months to a year to terminate somebody for misconduct and poor performance is definitely not our best.

People all over this country, hard-working Americans, get up every day; they work hard; they perform; they deliver results; and if they don't, they lose their job. If they are small-business owners, they go out of business. We ought to have no less expectation for our Federal Government and its employees, especially those who serve our veterans.

The VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act gives the Secretary the tools he needs to hold his employees accountable for serving our veterans and to change the culture from one that accepts mediocrity to one that expects excellence.

I applaud Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ for helping our country take a big step towards delivering on our promises to our veterans.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), a member of our committee and, for many years, who was in the process of protecting us in law enforcement.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

As we have all seen from various reports and news stories, increased ac-

countability at the VA is long, long overdue. For far too long, the leadership in the Department of Veterans Affairs has been unable to make firing decisions that would be common sense in any other setting.

The VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act gives the Secretary the authority to fire the bad actors and creates a removal process that is more in line with the private sector. It also gives the Secretary the ability to punish poor performers by recouping bonuses and relocation expenses. We must ensure that employees who fail to do their jobs are not rewarded but are, instead, held accountable.

Another part of this legislation is the enhanced protection for whistleblowers. These are employees who are doing the right thing and advocating for our veterans. They should not be faced with retribution by their leadership.

One of the most important jobs of this Congress is working to improve the lives of our Nation's veterans. When our fellow Americans bravely put on the uniform and serve, we must ensure that that sacrifice does not go unnoticed.

In my time serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have seen how Congress and the leadership of the VA, in partnership with veterans service organizations, are working to create the culture of service and accountability that our veterans truly deserve.

As Secretary Shulkin has often said, the VA needs changing, and I believe this bill is a huge step in that direction.

I would like to thank Chairman ROE for his leadership, and Senator RUBIO. This issue is crucial to the 150,000 veteran men and women of northeast Florida, and I thank them for their leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee chair and a lieutenant general in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act.

Anyone who has been responsible for the success of a business or organization knows that the most important part of the equation is the people. It is no different with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Our veterans have given their all, and they deserve our all; but, unfortunately, vulnerabilities in the VA's administrative processes have led to incompetence, neglect, and even unchecked illegal activity on the part of a small number of VA employees.

Unfortunately, lack of oversight and accountability in the hiring and retention process mean that the VA is still failing our veterans. Even in the few instances where the VA has tried to discipline employees for wrongdoing or neglect, it has been foiled by a complex and lengthy administrative process that rarely yields results.

S. 1094 addresses the VA's administrative shortcomings by providing the Secretary with the authority to remove, demote, or suspend any employee for poor performance or misconduct while, at the same time, enhancing protections for whistleblowers.

As a leader of marines and a Vietnam veteran, I know what our servicemen and -women across generations and conflicts have sacrificed for our freedoms and our country. They don't just deserve quality care; they have earned it.

We made a commitment to defend our veterans just as they have defended our way of life, and that starts with reforms that restore efficiency and accountability at Veterans Affairs.

I would like to thank Chairman ROE and the committee for all their hard work. I strongly urge my colleagues to support.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), a new member of our committee, who is doing a great job.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, since the day I was elected to Congress, I pledged to do everything in my power to help veterans receive the care and attention they deserve. S. 1094 will ensure that persons hired to care for the health and the well-being of our veterans do so according to VA regulations, and those who fail in their duties are held accountable. Moreover, this bill protects whistleblowers from retaliation when they alarm us of VA misconduct.

Currently, Puerto Rico has one VA regional benefit office, one VA hospital, and a few outpatient clinics. These facilities provide all the VA services to the island's veterans. This bill will help ensure places with limited VA facilities, like Puerto Rico, will be efficiently administered and make certain that the VA's employees adhere to the standards of excellence that our men and women in uniform expect.

I thank Senator RUBIO for sponsoring this bill, but I need to thank Chairman ROE for guiding this important legislation on the House floor the same way he did with H.R. 1529.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), my good friend who I have served with for 6 years on

the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans deserve high-quality healthcare. They have earned it. That is why I rise today to urge support of S. 1094, the Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. This is landmark, bipartisan legislation to reform the VA and improve care for our veterans after years of poor performance and scandal.

My grandfather is a World War II veteran who regularly attends the VA in Indianapolis, so I know firsthand that the vast majority of employees at the VA are honest and hardworking public servants. Lack of accountability at the agency, though, has allowed a few bad actors to damage the VA and harm our vets, from manipulating wait lists to letting calls to the suicide hotline go unanswered, to theft and wrongful prescribing of opioids.

Our veterans deserve better.

The Veterans Accountability Act will hold bureaucrats accountable for wrongdoing, make it easier to dismiss bad employees, and strengthen protections for whistleblowers. These are commonsense reforms and long overdue.

Because our military men and women, our Hoosier heroes, fought to protect us, the least we can do is fight for them and ensure that they get high-quality care.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a combat-wounded veteran, Bronze Star winner, Purple Heart winner, Defense Meritorious Service and Army Commendation Medal winner.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding me time, and the ranking member, both of the gentlemen, for their leadership, and also our Senator from Florida, Senator RUBIO, for his leadership on this bill.

This is a great bill, and that is why I couldn't be more happy than to rise and speak about this bill. For a long time, our veterans have deserved better, and this bill is exactly that: It is better.

Veterans across the board—Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Coast Guard—they have common experiences and common healthcare challenges as a result of certainly combat, but also as a result of just simply the austere life of being in the military. Whether it is a daily life of jumping out of planes or roping out of helicopters or kicking in doors or jumping off the back end of trucks, you live an austere life.

Oftentimes, I hear people say a year in the military can be like a dog-year.

It is tough on you, and that is why the VA is so critical. It is so critical that the VA maintain an expertise in providing for our unique healthcare needs.

I get my healthcare from the VA. I know many VA employees who are hardworking and certainly unyielding in their dedication, but I have also encountered many who are not, plain and simple, many who lack the hunger or who lack the appropriate mentality or the decorum to care for our men and women who are willing to give their last breath in defense of our country. This is the reality.

Every single veteran needs to be treated like the most important patient ever to be seen every single time they walk into the VA. Anything less is a failure.

In the past several years, this bureaucracy of rules, it has obstructed the VA's ability to go out there and fire employees who have been charged with armed robbery, who have been accused of being drunk while performing surgeries, and this simply cannot stand.

There should never be somebody allowed to service our veterans who would receive a dishonorable discharge in the military for what their actions are. They shouldn't be allowed the honor of serving people who served this country in World War II or Korea or Vietnam or Panama, Kosovo, Bosnia, Somalia, the Gulf war, Iraq, Afghanistan. Folks shouldn't be given that honor lightly.

It is exactly why this bill, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act is so important. The bill establishes whistleblower protections so that we can ensure veterans get the best possible care and make sure that no veteran is ever dishonored twice by the same person.

I want to thank you again for yielding me time. I want to thank you on behalf of every single veteran across this country for this great bill.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MAST for those kind words and words spoken for every American veteran.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

□ 1530

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and Senator RUBIO for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, scandal after scandal has caused heightened distrust between veterans and the VA. For far too long, veterans nationwide have been disrespected by those who are supposed to be advocates for them, sometimes with deadly consequences.

Be it in regional offices—like the one in Philadelphia, which my office has

worked closely with—or medical centers, from Phoenix to Florida, we have seen the devastating impact of the current culture of mismanagement and distrust, and its impact on backlogged claims and lack of care for those who devoted their lives to serve our country.

The legislation before the House today institutes the needed reforms throughout the Department of Veterans Affairs by granting the authority, and the expectation, that the Secretary remove, demote, or suspend any VA employee for poor performance or misconduct.

Rebuilding this trust between Veterans Affairs and those who had served us must be a priority. The Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act is crucial to reforming this trust, and I am proud to support it. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same. We must serve our veterans as well as they have served us.

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

Mr. Speaker, you heard it from a wide range of folks here on the floor. This is the way Congress is supposed to work and this is what is expected of us. This is what my constituents in southern Minnesota expect, and this is what the gentleman from Tennessee's or the gentleman from Florida's constituents expect: look at a problem, assess it, come up with some different solutions, and debate those out.

I want to be clear, as I said earlier, these are tough issues. There was debate—heated debate. We may even have raised our voices a few times doing this, but that is the way the world's greatest democracy is supposed to function.

Again, three of the most pressing issues, three of the top priorities of this Nation's veterans, all addressed in the first 6 six months of this Congress, all addressed to the satisfaction of a wide, bipartisan VSO community that is grateful for it.

I think, in trying to find these challenges and understanding them, people are trying to get at the heart of this. I do think there are great frustrations, and I have said, totally indefensible of the examples given.

But when we had this debate before, there were some examples of bad managers inadvertently firing people who were pointing out things that the manager was doing; and the due process considerations got that person their job back, and we got rid of the manager.

I think that when we first started debating this, I made the case that this could be a right-to-work bill in disguise. This bill is not that. This bill, as the chairman said, was not the intention. The intention was accountability. The intention of the bill was to streamline the process while protecting those due process rights.

I am grateful that the chairman, as always, kept his word. He followed through and he negotiated that.

The thing that I would say before closing here, Mr. Speaker, is that I agree with the majority leader. I think the combination of many things that we are doing possesses the potential to see real reforms moving in the right direction. Something that I think hasn't been mentioned here—that the Secretary did with consultation with the chairman, myself, and others—was that he took the action of streamlining the medical record procedure between the DOD, and the VA added to that.

There is transformational, generational-type change happening at the VA, but none of this will matter. And the majority leader said he expects to see that. We must ensure that it happens. We must ensure the accountability, we must monitor, we must ask that it is happening, and we must come back at this again. If there is a glitch that was unintended, let's come back at it again in this same manner of reaching an outcome.

This is a positive day, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that those folks paying attention to this and watching—certainly the veterans, but everyone—know that Congress can work together; Congress can take on pressing issues; Congress can come up with bipartisan solutions; and Congress can agree that the thing that defines us most is not Republican or Democrat—it is U.S. citizen, it is veteran, and it is care for them.

Today I am proud to get this through here. Let's send it on to the President, and let's all celebrate the Administration signing this into law and moving forward.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today is a proud day, I think, for this Nation. The United States of America does more for its veterans than all other nations in the world combined; and I don't think that, on some days, that is even enough for these heroes that have served us and many of whom have spoken this afternoon.

I want to express my appreciation to the minority and the majority staff, and to Sergeant Major WALZ for walking hand in hand. As he said, this was not an easy process. There were a lot of difficult issues that we both dealt with.

I also want to thank our friends on the Senate side who also went through the same process and brought a bill to the floor that we can all, I think, enthusiastically support.

The Secretary said when he was first chosen—and I might add, 100-0, Secretary Shulkin was a bipartisan agreement in the Senate. I think he is a leader to transform the VA. He asked for accountability. He said: I cannot do

my job as Secretary if I don't have this piece of legislation.

So he was very supportive, along with President Trump, so we gave him that.

We also protected due process rights for the employees who work for the VA—a very important issue.

Whistleblower protections. We could not do our job, Mr. Speaker, if we did not have these whistleblowers. There are 350,000 employees, 154 medical centers, and over 800 outpatient clinics. There is no way that we could monitor that without their help. So their protections are there.

Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage both sides of the aisle to support S. 1094, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support increased accountability and whistleblower protection at the Department of Veterans Affairs. And I recognize that S. 1094 represents a compromise approach that was crafted specifically to address severe, long-standing problems at VA hospitals.

But a number of S. 1094's provisions concern me. As Vice Ranking Member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, these concerns would be amplified if these provisions were applied to other contexts or across the federal government in future legislation.

A partial list of problematic provisions includes:

The bill requires a lower standard of evidence that would allow removal, demotion, and other disciplinary actions even if the majority of evidence is exculpatory.

The bill supersedes existing collective bargaining agreements.

The bill provides for the clawback and forfeiture of bonuses and pensions under a standard that is broad and susceptible to abuse.

The bill denies senior executives of the right to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board, which they have under current law.

The bill imposes unreasonable timelines on the ability of employees to respond to allegations that may lead to discipline and eliminates the ability of the Merit System Protection Board to mitigate penalties that may have been overly harsh and raise due process concerns.

The bill prohibits the use of administrative leave for employees challenging demotions. This provision could also force employees to use their accrued sick or annual leave while on appeal, which Courts have considered a taking in violation of the Constitution.

While S. 1094 is a bipartisan compromise aimed at dealing with a specific and troubled department, a number of its provisions are problematic and would not serve as an example for future civil service-related legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 378, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 2581;

Passage of H.R. 2581, if ordered; and

Passage of S. 1094.

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

#### VERIFY FIRST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2581) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 231, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

#### YEAS—193

|                 |              |                |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Cicilline    | Dingell        |
| Aguilar         | Clark (MA)   | Doggett        |
| Barragán        | Clarke (NY)  | Doyle, Michael |
| Bass            | Clay         | F.             |
| Beatty          | Cleaver      | Duncan (TN)    |
| Bera            | Clyburn      | Ellison        |
| Beyer           | Cohen        | Engel          |
| Bishop (GA)     | Connolly     | Eshoo          |
| Blumenauer      | Conyers      | Españalat      |
| Blunt Rochester | Cooper       | Esty (CT)      |
| Bonamici        | Correa       | Evans          |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Costa        | Poster         |
| F.              | Courtney     | Frankel (FL)   |
| Brady (PA)      | Crist        | Fudge          |
| Brown (MD)      | Crowley      | Gabbard        |
| Brownley (CA)   | Cuellar      | Galleo         |
| Bustos          | Davis (CA)   | Garamendi      |
| Butterfield     | Davis, Danny | Gonzalez (TX)  |
| Capuano         | DeFazio      | Gottheimer     |
| Carbajal        | DeGette      | Green, Al      |
| Cárdenas        | Delaney      | Green, Gene    |
| Carson (IN)     | DeLauro      | Grijalva       |
| Cartwright      | DelBene      | Gutiérrez      |
| Castor (FL)     | Demings      | Hanabusa       |
| Castro (TX)     | DeSaulnier   | Hastings       |
| Chu, Judy       | Deutch       | Heck           |

|                |               |                |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Higgins (NY)   | Maloney, Sean | Schakowsky     |
| Himes          | Matsui        | Schiff         |
| Hoyer          | McCollum      | Schneider      |
| Huffman        | McEachin      | Schrader       |
| Jackson Lee    | McGovern      | Scott (VA)     |
| Jayapal        | McNerney      | Scott, David   |
| Jeffries       | Meeks         | Serrano        |
| Johnson (GA)   | Meng          | Sewell (AL)    |
| Johnson, E. B. | Moore         | Shea-Porter    |
| Jones          | Moulton       | Sherman        |
| Kaptur         | Murphy (FL)   | Sinema         |
| Keating        | Nadler        | Sires          |
| Kelly (IL)     | Neal          | Slaughter      |
| Kennedy        | Nolan         | Smith (WA)     |
| Khanna         | Norcross      | Soto           |
| Kihuen         | O'Halloran    | Speier         |
| Kildee         | O'Rourke      | Suozi          |
| Kilmer         | Pallone       | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Kind           | Panetta       | Takano         |
| Krishnamoorthi | Pascarell     | Thompson (CA)  |
| Kuster (NH)    | Payne         | Thompson (MS)  |
| Langevin       | Pelosi        | Titus          |
| Larsen (WA)    | Perlmutter    | Tonko          |
| Larson (CT)    | Peters        | Torres         |
| Lawrence       | Peterson      | Tsongas        |
| Lawson (FL)    | Pingree       | Vargas         |
| Lee            | Pocan         | Veasey         |
| Levin          | Polis         | Vela           |
| Lewis (GA)     | Price (NC)    | Velázquez      |
| Lieu, Ted      | Quigley       | Visclosky      |
| Lipinski       | Raskin        | Walz           |
| Loeb           | Rice (NY)     | Wasserman      |
| Lofgren        | Richmond      | Schultz        |
| Lowenthal      | Rosen         | Waters, Maxine |
| Lowe           | Roybal-Allard | Watson Coleman |
| Lujan Grisham, | Ruiz          | Welch          |
| M.             | Ruppersberger | Wilson (FL)    |
| Luján, Ben Ray | Rush          | Yarmuth        |
| Lynch          | Ryan (OH)     |                |
| Maloney,       | Sánchez       |                |
| Carolyn B.     | Sarbanes      |                |

#### NAYS—231

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Abraham       | Davis, Rodney   | Jenkins (WV) |
| Aderholt      | Denham          | Johnson (LA) |
| Allen         | Dent            | Johnson (OH) |
| Amash         | DeSantis        | Jordan       |
| Amodei        | DesJarlais      | Joyce (OH)   |
| Arrington     | Diaz-Balart     | Katko        |
| Babin         | Donovan         | Kelly (MS)   |
| Bacon         | Duffy           | Kelly (PA)   |
| Banks (IN)    | Duncan (SC)     | King (IA)    |
| Barletta      | Dunn            | King (NY)    |
| Barr          | Emmer           | Kinzing      |
| Barton        | Estes (KS)      | Knight       |
| Bergman       | Farenthold      | Kustoff (TN) |
| Biggs         | Faso            | Labrador     |
| Bilirakis     | Ferguson        | LaHood       |
| Bishop (MI)   | Fitzpatrick     | LaMalfa      |
| Bishop (UT)   | Fleischmann     | Lamborn      |
| Black         | Flores          | Lance        |
| Blackburn     | Fortenberry     | Latta        |
| Blum          | Fox             | Lewis (MN)   |
| Bost          | Franks (AZ)     | LoBiondo     |
| Brady (TX)    | Frelinghuysen   | Long         |
| Brat          | Gaetz           | Loudermilk   |
| Bridenstine   | Gallagher       | Love         |
| Brooks (AL)   | Garrett         | Lucas        |
| Brooks (IN)   | Gibbs           | Luetkemeyer  |
| Buchanan      | Gohmert         | MacArthur    |
| Buck          | Goodlatte       | Marchant     |
| Bucshon       | Gosar           | Marino       |
| Budd          | Gowdy           | Marshall     |
| Burgess       | Graves (GA)     | Massie       |
| Byrne         | Graves (LA)     | Mast         |
| Calvert       | Graves (MO)     | McCarthy     |
| Carter (GA)   | Grothman        | McCaul       |
| Carter (TX)   | Guthrie         | McClintock   |
| Chabot        | Harper          | McHenry      |
| Chaffetz      | Harris          | McKinley     |
| Cheney        | Hartzler        | McMorris     |
| Coffman       | Hensarling      | Rodgers      |
| Cole          | Herrera Beutler | McSally      |
| Collins (GA)  | Hice, Jody B.   | Meadows      |
| Collins (NY)  | Higgins (LA)    | Meehan       |
| Comer         | Hill            | Messer       |
| Comstock      | Holding         | Mitchell     |
| Conaway       | Hollingsworth   | Moolenaar    |
| Cook          | Hudson          | Mooney (WV)  |
| Costello (PA) | Huizenga        | Mullin       |
| Cramer        | Hultgren        | Murphy (PA)  |
| Crawford      | Hunter          | Newhouse     |
| Culberson     | Hurd            | Noem         |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Issa            | Nunes        |
| Davidson      | Jenkins (KS)    | Olson        |

|                 |               |               |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Palazzo         | Rothfus       | Tiberi        |
| Palmer          | Rouzer        | Tipton        |
| Paulsen         | Royce (CA)    | Trott         |
| Pearce          | Russell       | Turner        |
| Perry           | Rutherford    | Upton         |
| Pittenger       | Sanford       | Valadao       |
| Poe (TX)        | Scalise       | Wagner        |
| Poliquin        | Schweikert    | Walberg       |
| Posey           | Scott, Austin | Walden        |
| Ratcliffe       | Sensenbrenner | Walker        |
| Reed            | Sessions      | Walorski      |
| Reichert        | Shimkus       | Walters, Mimi |
| Renacci         | Shuster       | Webster (FL)  |
| Rice (SC)       | Simpson       | Wenstrup      |
| Roby            | Smith (MO)    | Westerman     |
| Roe (TN)        | Smith (NE)    | Williams      |
| Rogers (AL)     | Smith (NJ)    | Wilson (SC)   |
| Rogers (KY)     | Smith (TX)    | Wittman       |
| Rohrabacher     | Smucker       | Womack        |
| Rokita          | Stefanik      | Woodall       |
| Rooney, Francis | Stewart       | Yoder         |
| Rooney, Thomas  | Stivers       | Yoho          |
| J.              | Taylor        | Young (AK)    |
| Ros-Lehtinen    | Tenney        | Young (IA)    |
| Roskam          | Thompson (PA) | Zeldin        |
| Ross            | Thornberry    |               |

#### NOT VOTING—6

|          |              |            |
|----------|--------------|------------|
| Cummings | Griffith     | Napolitano |
| Granger  | Johnson, Sam | Weber (TX) |

□ 1603

Messrs. VALADAO, GOHMERT, RUSSELL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. WITTMAN, WALKER, BROOKS of Alabama, GROTHMAN, YOUNG of Alaska, and WENSTRUP changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, KELLY of Illinois, and FRANKEL of Florida changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayeas 238, noes 184, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

#### AYES—238

|             |              |               |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abraham     | Brady (TX)   | Comer         |
| Aderholt    | Brat         | Comstock      |
| Allen       | Bridenstine  | Conaway       |
| Amash       | Brooks (AL)  | Cook          |
| Amodei      | Brooks (IN)  | Costello (PA) |
| Arrington   | Buchanan     | Cramer        |
| Babin       | Buck         | Crawford      |
| Bacon       | Bucshon      | Cuellar       |
| Banks (IN)  | Budd         | Culberson     |
| Barletta    | Burgess      | Curbelo (FL)  |
| Barr        | Byrne        | Davidson      |
| Barton      | Calvert      | Davis, Rodney |
| Bergman     | Carter (GA)  | DeFazio       |
| Biggs       | Carter (TX)  | Denham        |
| Bilirakis   | Chabot       | Dent          |
| Bishop (MI) | Chaffetz     | DeSantis      |
| Bishop (UT) | Cheney       | DesJarlais    |
| Black       | Coffman      | Donovan       |
| Blackburn   | Cole         | Duffy         |
| Blum        | Collins (GA) | Duncan (SC)   |
| Bost        | Collins (NY) | Duncan (TN)   |



Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foss  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador

LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher

Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone

Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano

Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Viscosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—8

Cummings  
Granger  
Griffith  
Johnson, Sam  
Lewis (MN)  
Napolitano  
Sherman  
Weber (TX)

□ 1610

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 306.

#### NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to the House of Representatives and the American people.

Whereas, President Nixon explained that "People have got to know whether or not their President is a crook" when he invited the Joint Committee on Taxation to audit his returns after the Internal Revenue Service gave him an unwarranted tax discount;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed his tax return information to the public;

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, Joint Committee on Taxation, and the Committee on Finance have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas, pursuant to Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution,

often referred to as the Origination Clause, the House of Representatives has the sole authority to initiate legislation that raises revenue for the national government, and the Committee on Ways and Means is considering a comprehensive reform of the Tax Code;

Whereas, according to media reports analyzing President Trump's leaked 2005 tax return, we know that had his own tax plan been in place, he would have paid an estimated mere 3.48 percent rate instead of a 24 percent rate, saving him \$31.3 million;

Whereas, according to The New York Times, the President used a legally dubious tax maneuver in 1995 that could have allowed him to avoid paying any Federal taxes for 18 years;

Whereas, President Trump holds "interests as the sole or principal owner in approximately 500 separate entities," according to his attorneys, and the President's tax plan proposes to cut the tax rate on such "pass-through" entities from 39.6 percent to 15 percent;

Whereas, one analysis estimated that President Trump would personally save \$6.7 million from two tax breaks included in the Republicans' first tax cut, which they misleadingly call the American Health Care Act;

Whereas, without the President's tax returns, the American people cannot determine how much he will personally benefit from proposed changes to the Tax Code;

Whereas, an ABCNews/Washington Post poll found that 74 percent of Americans would like President Trump to disclose his tax returns and the most-signed petition on the White House website calls for the release of the President's tax return information to verify compliance with the Emoluments Clause, with more than 1,097,000 signatures as of date of this resolution;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election better understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation, Russian businesses, and Russian individuals;

Whereas, after breaking his pledge to make his tax returns available, President Trump instead presented a one-page letter from a law firm giving him a clean bill of health on any business dealings with Russians, but failed to note that the very same law firm boasted of the "prestigious honor" of being named "Russia Law Firm of the Year" for 2016;

Whereas, former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, before he was fired by President Trump, publicly confirmed that the Bureau has been investigating potential ties between President Trump's campaign and Russia since July and that the Russian President Vladimir Putin favored a Trump electoral victory;

Whereas, President Trump's son-in-law and senior advisor, Jared Kushner,

## NOES—184

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly

Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)

Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin

met during the Presidential transition at the behest of the Russian Ambassador with Sergey N. Gorkov, a graduate of a school run by the successor to the KGB and who was appointed by Vladimir Putin to head a Russian state-owned bank that is on the U.S. sanctions list;

Whereas, Mr. Kushner proposed establishing a secret back channel of communications directly to Vladimir Putin, even considering the use of Russian embassy facilities to do so;

Whereas, Attorney General Jeff Sessions falsely stated during his Senate confirmation hearing that he “did not have communications with the Russians,” when in fact he met at least twice during the campaign with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak;

Whereas, former Director Comey testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that President Trump had asked him in the Oval Office about “letting Flynn go,” referring to the investigation into former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn’s business ties to Russia;

Whereas, President Trump stated on May 11, 2017, that he had decided that he was going to fire Comey because of “this Russia thing”;

Whereas, former Director Comey, on June 8, 2017, testified that Special Counsel Robert Mueller could investigate whether President Trump’s actions with regard to Director Comey and the Flynn investigation constituted obstruction of justice;

Whereas, in 2013, President Trump said, “Well, I’ve done a lot of business with the Russians. They’re smart and they’re tough,” and President Trump’s son, Donald Trump, Jr., told a news outlet in 2008 that “Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets”;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses;

Whereas, the Director of the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics said that the President’s plan to transfer his business holdings to a trust managed by family members is “meaningless” and “does not meet the standards that . . . every President in the past four decades has met”;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the Constitution for the express purpose of preventing Federal officials from accepting any “present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state”;

Whereas, the Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C., has hired a “director of diplomatic sales” to generate high-priced business among foreign leaders and diplomatic delegations;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means used the authority under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means has now voted three times along party lines to continue to cover-up President Trump’s tax returns;

Whereas, the House of Representatives has now refused nine times to act on President Trump’s tax returns;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, Government contracts, or otherwise;

Whereas, the House of Representatives undermines its dignity and the integrity of its proceedings by continuing the cover-up of President Trump’s tax returns:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved, that the House of Representatives shall, one, immediately request the tax return and return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as well as the tax return and return information with respect to the President’s businesses of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e, specifically each corporation and each partnership within the meaning of subchapter K of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 where he is listed as an officer, director, or equivalent, or exercises working control; and

Two, postpone consideration of tax reform legislation until the elected Representatives of the American people in this House have obtained President Trump’s tax returns and return information to ascertain how any changes to the Tax Code might financially benefit the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

# DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (S. 1094) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 55, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

YEAS—368

|                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham         | Coffman        | Gabbard         |
| Adams           | Cole           | Gaetz           |
| Aderholt        | Collins (GA)   | Gallagher       |
| Aguilar         | Collins (NY)   | Gallego         |
| Allen           | Comer          | Garamendi       |
| Amash           | Comstock       | Garrett         |
| Amodel          | Conaway        | Gibbs           |
| Arrington       | Connolly       | Gohmert         |
| Babin           | Conyers        | Gonzalez (TX)   |
| Bacon           | Cook           | Goodlatte       |
| Banks (IN)      | Cooper         | Gosar           |
| Barletta        | Correa         | Gottheimer      |
| Barr            | Costa          | Gowdy           |
| Barton          | Costello (PA)  | Graves (GA)     |
| Beatty          | Courtney       | Graves (LA)     |
| Bera            | Cramer         | Graves (MO)     |
| Bergman         | Crawford       | Green, Gene     |
| Biggs           | Crist          | Grothman        |
| Bilirakis       | Cuellar        | Guthrie         |
| Bishop (GA)     | Culberson      | Harper          |
| Bishop (MI)     | Curbelo (FL)   | Harris          |
| Bishop (UT)     | Davidson       | Hartzler        |
| Black           | Davis (CA)     | Heck            |
| Blum            | Davis, Danny   | Hensarling      |
| Blumenauer      | Davis, Rodney  | Herrera Beutler |
| Blunt Rochester | DeFazio        | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Bonamici        | DeGette        | Higgins (LA)    |
| Bost            | Delaney        | Higgins (NY)    |
| Boyle, Brendan  | DeLauro        | Hill            |
| F.              | DelBene        | Himes           |
| Brady (PA)      | Demings        | Holding         |
| Brady (TX)      | Denham         | Hollingsworth   |
| Brat            | Dent           | Hudson          |
| Bridenstine     | DeSantis       | Huffman         |
| Brooks (AL)     | DesJarlais     | Huizenga        |
| Brooks (IN)     | Deutch         | Hultgren        |
| Brownley (CA)   | Diaz-Balart    | Hunter          |
| Buchanan        | Dingell        | Hurd            |
| Buck            | Doggett        | Issa            |
| Bucshon         | Donovan        | Jenkins (KS)    |
| Budd            | Doyle, Michael | Jenkins (WV)    |
| Burgess         | F.             | Johnson (LA)    |
| Bustos          | Duffy          | Johnson (OH)    |
| Butterfield     | Duncan (SC)    | Jones           |
| Byrne           | Duncan (TN)    | Jordan          |
| Calvert         | Dunn           | Joyce (OH)      |
| Capuano         | Emmer          | Kaptur          |
| Carbajal        | Eshoo          | Katko           |
| Cárdenas        | Estes (KS)     | Keating         |
| Carter (GA)     | Esty (CT)      | Kelly (MS)      |
| Carter (TX)     | Farenthold     | Kelly (PA)      |
| Cartwright      | Faso           | Kennedy         |
| Castor (FL)     | Ferguson       | Khanna          |
| Castro (TX)     | Fitzpatrick    | Kihuen          |
| Chabot          | Fleischmann    | Kildee          |
| Chaffetz        | Flores         | Kilmer          |
| Cheney          | Fortenberry    | Kind            |
| Chu, Judy       | Foster         | King (IA)       |
| Ciulline        | Foxo           | King (NY)       |
| Clark (MA)      | Frankel (FL)   | Kinzinger       |
| Clay            | Franks (AZ)    | Knight          |
| Cleaver         | Frelinghuysen  | Krishnamoorthi  |

Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)

Neal  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Rohy  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David

Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Veasey  
Vela  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NAYS—55

Barragán  
Bass  
Beyer  
Brown (MD)  
Carson (IN)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Crowley  
DeSaulnier  
Ellison  
Engel  
Español  
Evans  
Fudge  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa

## NOT VOTING—7

Blackburn  
Cummins  
Granger

Griffith  
Johnson, Sam  
Napolitano

Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Sánchez  
Schakowsky  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Smith (WA)  
Suozi  
Thompson (MS)  
Vargas  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Wilson (FL)  
Young (AK)

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to record my last vote due to ineffective card. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 307.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 305, No. 306, and No. 307 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2581. I would have voted "nay" on the Passage of H.R. 2581—Verify First Act. I would have also voted "nay" on the Passage of S. 1094—Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

## RECOGNIZING OPHELIA GAINES

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable career of Mrs. Ophelia Gaines, who will retire as executive director of Concerted Services on June 30, 2017.

Mrs. Gaines' career with Concerted Services, a nonprofit action group that focuses on fighting poverty throughout 28 counties in southeast Georgia, has spanned nearly 44 years.

Mrs. Gaines began her work with the company in 1973, traveling door to door in low-income communities, educating families on how to enroll in programs like Head Start, Energy Assistance, and Senior Nutrition.

Mrs. Gaines' altruistic career continued with her decision to teach social work classes at both Georgia Southern University and Savannah State University, enabling young people to carry on her work throughout southeast Georgia.

I am proud to rise today to recognize Mrs. Gaines, and thank her for all of her outstanding contributions to our local communities and to the lives of our fellow Georgians.

## WARRIORS CHAMPIONSHIP WIN

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, last night the world watched my home team, the Golden State Warriors, end a historic season by bringing home their second national championship in 3 years.

The Warriors, led by unanimous Finals MVP Kevin Durant and leg-

endary players Steph Curry, Draymond Green, and Klay Thompson, showed the power of teamwork both on and off the court.

The team is an example for young people, showing that if you can work together and trust one another, you can accomplish anything.

Mr. Speaker, these finals against the talented Cleveland Cavaliers were a thrill to watch. We saw basketball at its best—incredible talent and a real passion from both sides. Thank you to the Warriors team for making our dreams of another championship a reality.

This remarkable team has made history as one of the best ever, winning a record 15 straight games in the playoffs and clinching a 16-to-1 postseason record.

Thank you to Coaches Steve Kerr and Mike Brown, the entire Warriors staff, and all of the talented players on their well-deserved victory.

Throughout this journey, Warriors fans have stayed loyal and faithful, and they deserve this victory as well.

My dear late mother, Mildred Massey, was the Warriors' biggest fan, and I know she is smiling from above. I can't wait to celebrate with all the Warriors fans and players back in Oakland. Go Warriors, go Oakland, go Dub Nation.

## CREATING ACCOUNTABILITY AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the passage of the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability Act. This important legislation will create a culture of accountability at the VA and begin the process of restoring the VA's sole mission of providing high-quality care for our Nation's veterans.

For far too long, the VA has been plagued with scandal. From years' long wait lists to out-of-control bonuses, the VA needs real reform.

In their selfless service to our great Nation, our veterans have sacrificed so much to protect us. They shouldn't be plagued with difficulty accessing the care that they need and deserve.

As the mother of an Active-Duty U.S. Marine, I am sympathetic to the needs of our veterans. It is among my top priorities to make sure that we advocate for a better, more accountable VA. On behalf of the veterans of the 22nd District of New York, I am pleased to see this legislation pass with bipartisan support.

Today, we are correcting a wrong that has hurt too many of our Nation's heroes. I look forward to seeing the President sign this measure into law and have full confidence in VA Secretary Shulkin's ability to implement

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

the important reforms contained in this critical piece of legislation.

#### RECOGNIZING SAN PEDRO HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Pedro High School girls softball team who late last month reclaimed their crown as L.A. City Section Division I champions.

On the night of Friday, May 19, the Pirates won their first city title in 8 years and 17th overall. Star pitcher Cindy Robles persevered through illness to throw a four-hitter with three strikeouts, illustrating her toughness after coming down with a 102-degree fever earlier in the day.

Her teammates were behind her every step of the way, always making the key play at the necessary moment. By rallying together and continually picking each other up, the Pirates girls softball team represents the true spirit of California's 44th Congressional District.

No matter what adversity we might face individually, our community always finds a way to rally together in pursuit of our common goals. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to these strong young women and all they represent.

#### EXPORT AMERICAN LIQUIFIED NATURAL GAS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, Cheniere Energy, headquartered in Houston, Texas, delivered its first liquified natural gas shipment out of the Sabine Pass terminal to northern Europe, to the Netherlands, and to Poland. This follows shipments to southern Europe from earlier this year.

Put simply, this is a tremendous game changer. Exporting LNG is not just an economic issue, it is a geopolitical security issue. These shipments help thwart Russian aggression and weaken Russia's stranglehold over Europe, and it is about time.

Under Secretary Perry's leadership, the Energy Department is finally approving licenses for LNG terminals to ship LNG overseas.

Our natural gas is cheaper and more abundant in supply than anywhere in the world. Harnessing our domestic energy resources and exporting some of it to our friends and to our allies around the world makes sense for our economy and for our national security.

We should apply the Blue Bell ice cream philosophy to our domestic energy resources. It is: Use what we can and sell the rest.

And that is just the way it is.

#### STUDENT LOAN DEBT BURDEN

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans are more burdened by student loan debt than ever. The statistics are truly stunning. They owe over \$1.4 trillion in student loan debt spread out among 44 million borrowers. That is about \$600 billion more, or double the total United States credit card debt.

And the problem is only getting worse. The average class of 2016 graduate has more than \$37,172 in student loan debt, which is up 6 percent from the previous year. Yet President Trump just proposed gutting the best lifelines and safeguards that these borrowers have.

The Trump budget cuts the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, which makes public interest and non-profit work attainable for students, despite their debt loads; it consolidates income-based repayment programs that are critical to managing repayment; and it completely scraps subsidized interest on some student loans.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot profess to stand for the middle class, for American workers, and for American values while pulling the rug out from under 44 million borrowers bearing the weight of what is the greatest systemic threat to our economic stability.

#### AMERICANS' RIGHT TO LIVE IN FAITH

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, during his confirmation hearing to become President Trump's Deputy Director for the Office of Management and Budget, Russ Vought faced inappropriate and unconstitutional lines of questioning from two of the Budget Committee's Democratic Senators directly relating to his Christian faith.

A Senator took direct issue with an article Mr. Vought wrote last year describing a core tenet of the Christian faith that salvation comes through faith in Jesus Christ. After attempting to twist that belief into a claim that Mr. Vought is hateful and discriminatory toward non-Christians, Senator SANDERS said: "This nominee is really not someone who this country is supposed to be about. I will vote 'no.'"

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vought's qualifications are excellent. To take the view of Senator SANDERS that is clearly tied to a disagreement over a religious tenet is discriminatory in and of itself.

Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution states "no religious test shall ever be

required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. Vought's Christian faith should not have been the subject of this harsh questioning, and no excuse should ever justify a public official putting someone's faith on trial. We should not ignore this episode but, rather, stand in defense of Mr. Vought's right to live his faith as we defend the religious freedom of all Americans.

#### AVON GROVE RED DEVILS WIN STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Avon Grove Red Devils men's lacrosse team on their State championship victory.

The Red Devils finished the season with a 23-2 record, beating Philadelphia area powerhouse Conestoga in the PIAA Class 3A title game with a thrilling 5-4 victory.

Sophomore Zach Augustine was one of the heroes, scoring the game-winning goal in double overtime, a moment that he described as "unbelievable."

This redeeming victory for them comes 3 years after a heartbreaking loss for the Red Devils in the 2014 State title game. Senior midfielder Doug Jones, a freshman on that 2014 team, said: "I remember as a freshman saying to myself that I wanted to get back here. We knew we had one goal: to win this. It means the absolute world to us."

I applaud the commitment displayed by these young men, both to each other and to their community. Congratulations to the Avon Grove Red Devils team, the coaches, their families, and the faculty, staff, and students that made this championship so special.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-47)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the

Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with that provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine democratic processes or institutions of Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2017.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine democratic processes or institutions of Belarus, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 2017.

#### THE PEOPLE'S NIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, many times as our Members in the House travel throughout our districts, we are often asked: What is being done in the House? What is being accomplished?

Well, this afternoon we are going to take a few minutes and allow you to hear directly from the Members, something that we like to call the People's Night. This is the people's House, so from time to time we like to bypass any of the outlets and talk directly to the American people.

Now, a lot of people might not know specifically what has been going on in the House. Well, I think these visuals may aid in specifically talking about some of the things that we are accomplishing.

For example, if you will see the chart, this chart lists the House-passed bills to date. It also includes the last four Presidents. As you can see, the House of the 115th Congress has passed 158 pieces of legislation; 158 bills we have sent to the Senate or to the President.

The House isn't the only one that has been busy. Our President has been busy. In fact, if you will notice this chart behind, you will notice that we are also at a record pace if you look at the last four, five Presidents. Of these bills, the President has signed 37 bills into law, compared with the next most, which was George Herbert Walker Bush many years ago, with 35.

That is what the House is working on; it is what we are working with the Senate, we are working with the President.

But this afternoon I want you to hear directly from some of the Members themselves who have been very instrumental not only in what we have accomplished, but also some of the things that we are looking forward to accomplishing over the next few months.

The first person I would like to introduce to you is our chairman of the Financial Services Committee, JEB HENSARLING. Representative HENSARLING is from Texas' Fifth District and has been instrumental in doing something that we have been promising and trying to accomplish for many years.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield to Chairman JEB HENSARLING, my good friend.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and let me thank him for his leadership of the Republican Study Committee and what that committee means to the conservative movement and what it means to the cause of freedom and opportunity for so many working men and women.

I especially want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his work on the American Health Care Act and what that means to so many of our constituents to truly be able, after this rise of premiums where people are paying more to get less in healthcare, to really bring us to a moment where we can have patient-centered healthcare. I just want to thank him for that.

These are actually hopeful times for the American people. Regrettably, as we know, working America hasn't received a pay increase in almost a decade. Their savings have remained decimated since the financial crisis. So to get this economy moving again, our President knows, this Congress knows that, number one, we do have to return to patient-centered healthcare, not for what that means just to our families, but what it means to our economy.

We have to have fundamental tax reform as well, and I know that our House Ways and Means Committee is working on that assiduously, but we also have to have fundamental reform of our regulations. There is no regulation that has imposed more burden on our economy than the Dodd-Frank Act. In fact, it is more burdensome to our economy than all Obama-era regulations combined. It is simply that bad.

When they passed this bill in the wake of the financial crisis, they told us that it would lift the economy. But instead of lifting the economy, we are mired in the slowest, weakest recovery in the postwar era.

They told us that it would end bank bailouts, but cynically, it codified them into law and backed it up with a taxpayer bailout fund.

They told us and they promised us it would make the economy more stable,

but instead, the big banks have gotten bigger and the small banks have gotten fewer.

They told us and promised us it would help the consumer, but instead of helping the consumer, free checking at banks has been cut in half. Bank fees have increased. Has anybody within earshot tried to get a mortgage recently? They are harder to come by. They cost hundreds of more dollars to close. There are fewer credit card offerings.

What has happened here is, under Dodd-Frank, those who are seeking credit are now paying more and receiving less. This is hurting not only our families, but it has hurt our economy. Small business lending hasn't recovered, entrepreneurship is at a generational low.

So that is why it was so important that on Thursday of last week this body, this House, took action and passed the Financial CHOICE Act. The Financial CHOICE Act represents, for all of America, economic opportunity for all, bank bailouts for none.

It replaces the era of bank bailouts with bankruptcy for these large financial institutions. It replaces Washington micromanagement with market discipline. That is how we help to grow this economy. It will create more credit for more people.

There is a whole part of this legislation that is totally devoted to our small banks and credit unions because it is our small community financial institutions that help finance our small businesses. It is our small businesses which are the job engine of America. That is what has been choked off by this heavy hand of Obama regulation.

So I was proud to play a very small role in the House to bring the Financial CHOICE Act to the House so that we can indeed, as the acronym suggests, create hope and opportunity for investors, for consumers, for entrepreneurs. We want the animal spirits in the American economy to move again. We want that budding optimism that tomorrow can be a better day, that you can be your own boss, that you can start your own small business. We want that opportunity to flourish yet again in America. That is what we managed to do with the Financial CHOICE Act.

I am very happy that we have now sent it over to the Senate. We look forward to having the Senate act upon this. The American people can't wait to get this economy moving again.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for highlighting this for the American people, and I want to thank him again for his leadership of the Republican Study Committee. Without this august group, the Congress' largest caucus, the caucus of conservatives, this would not have happened, and I want to thank him for that.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Chairman HENSARLING. Most people would not describe your role as a small part in making sure that people have more opportunities in our financial industry.

Not that we are showing Texas any partiality this evening, but our second Representative is a former Federal prosecutor from the great State of Texas, and many would consider one of the top conservatives in all of the United States Congress, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), my friend, is here to talk about the CFPB, among some other issues. So without further ado, I yield to Mr. RATCLIFFE.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I would like to thank my colleague and friend from North Carolina, the gentleman, Congressman WALKER, for yielding to me and for hosting this Special Order tonight, which is fittingly titled, "The People's Night." After all, there is a reason that the United States House of Representatives is often called the people's House. It is because our job is to fight for the priorities of the people that we are privileged to represent here.

Over the past 6 months, Republicans have been fighting for the people, fighting to fundamentally change Washington and to return power to the American people where it really belongs.

We have been doing this against a strong headwind of obstructionists, sometimes from colleagues across the aisle, sometimes from certain in the media more interested in a liberal agenda than in accurate reporting, and sometimes from embedded bureaucrats and special interests within the government industrial complex who really don't want to see the Washington swamp drained. But in spite of that, we are succeeding.

□ 1700

And while many of these conservative winds have gone unreported and, therefore, flown under the radar, the truth is that we are indeed steering the ship in the right direction, we are steadily undoing the damage done by out-of-touch policies by the Obama administration.

Case in point is a fact that has not garnered a lot of headlines, but should have, something that Congressman WALKER pointed out earlier: the fact that in the first 100 days of this 115th Congress, we have passed more bills—158 to be exact—than were passed during the first 100 days of any and all of the four prior administrations: the Obama, Bush, Clinton, and H.W. Bush administrations. And as proof of our productivity, we have signed more of those bills into law than in any of the other administrations' first 100 days as well.

But it is not just the quantity of the bills that we are turning into laws. It is about the quality and the substance.

We are passing legislation that is making government smaller. We are passing legislation that is making government less costly. We are passing legislation that is making the government finally more accountable to the people. We are dismantling the enormous bureaucratic overgrowth and underbrush that spun out of control under former President Obama.

As a former prosecutor, I believe you have got to win your case with verifiable facts and evidence, so let me give you some. In the last 20 years, prior Congresses have successfully used the Congressional Review Act one time. Just once in the prior 20 years has Congress used the CRA to undo midnight regulations passed at the 12th hour in the dead of night as administrations were walking out the door. But in the first 4 months of this Congress, Republicans have united to use the CRA 14 times to overturn 14 of President Obama's most harmful midnight regulations, and in so doing, we have saved the American people, the United States taxpayers, billions of dollars in the process.

Now we are in the process of finally saving America from arguably the most disastrous piece of legislation in our Nation's history: ObamaCare.

If anyone needs any further evidence of its implosion into a death spiral, just yesterday CMS announced that 2 million Americans dropped off of the ObamaCare exchanges in just the first 3 months of this year.

The ObamaCare house is on fire, and rather than waiting for it to burn to the ground with American families still inside, Republicans in the peoples' House have acted now. Republicans won't let Americans suffer in the face of such inevitable continuing adversity when it comes to our healthcare. So as ObamaCare continues to dissolve in front of our eyes, we have already taken action by sending an ObamaCare repeal bill over to the Senate.

All of this work makes me incredibly optimistic about the results that we are continuing to deliver on the people's behalf, just as we did again last week when we passed a House bill that tackles a key issue that I have been sounding the alarm about since my first day in Congress: ending the reckless overreach of ELIZABETH WARREN's Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

I was so grateful for the opportunity to support the House's passage of my fellow Texan, JEB HENSARLING's, Financial CHOICE Act last week, which puts an end to the days of the Obama-era CFPB as we know it, because the Financial CHOICE Act legislation converts the CFPB into the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency, which is tasked with promoting competition rather than stifling it, tasked with enhancing consumer choice rather than eliminating it, all the while ensuring con-

gressional oversight that has been missing for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, every Federal agency needs to have someone grading its paper, and the Financial CHOICE Act will allow the CFPB's paper to be graded for the very first time.

I am incredibly excited about the economic opportunities that our Nation is going to continue to be afforded as we continue here to wipe away President Obama's sweeping government mandates and regulations so we can get our country back on track and back working for all Americans.

There is a lot more to be done to ensure that America's brightest days truly are ahead of us, but with so many committed conservatives as we have here tonight, I am optimistic that we are going to continue to deliver results for the people here in what finally, once again, can be appropriately referred to as the peoples' House.

Mr. WALKER. I thank Representative RATCLIFFE for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, once again, if people are watching at home or are gathering here today, I want to remind them that, many times—Members of Congress, when you go back home, you hear a lot of times: Do your job; get things done.

And as I reflect your attention again to our chart here this evening, we can talk a little bit about what we have passed in the House: 158, the most in several different administrations.

However, even though we are going to talk tonight a little about what we have done and what we look forward to, we are not stopping with 158, we are not stopping with the 37 that have been signed into law. We are looking forward to doing some new things.

I think one of the best people to talk about something that we are excited about is certainly somebody that I call a friend, a fellow member, a colleague from North Carolina, someone who allows me to tag along into NASCAR country from time to time, a real friend of the people, someone who I have learned that will tell you the truth no matter what you ask. It is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding. I thank the chairman also for organizing, once again, an opportunity for us to speak directly to the American people, and for his tremendous leadership on the values that we conservatives hold very dear.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about a piece of legislation tonight that we plan to bring to the floor of the House this fall. The right to defend yourself doesn't end when you cross State lines, which is where my Concealed Reciprocity Act of 2017, also known as H.R. 38, comes into play. We currently have 196 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle.



My bill simply provides law-abiding citizens the right to carry concealed and travel freely between States without worrying about conflicted concealed carry State codes or onerous civil suits.

As it stands, the patchwork of agreements is confusing for even the most cautious concealed-carry permit holder, and it has caused law-abiding citizens, like Shaneen Allen, a single mother from New Jersey, to unwittingly break the law and suffer arrest and detention.

Now, the Constitution's very clear. If you look at Article IV, section 1, it says: "Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and Judicial Proceedings of every other State. . . ."

That is why a driver's license is recognized in other States. That is why a marriage license is recognized in other States. That is why divorce proceedings are recognized in other States; in the same way the concealed-carry permit or the right to carry concealed should be recognized.

In the Senate, Senator JOHN CORNYN introduced companion legislation. Senator CORNYN has long been a champion for our Second Amendment rights, and I am pleased to work with him as he continues his strong leadership on national concealed carry reciprocity.

I have already received a tremendous amount of support from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who recognize our constitutional right to keep and bear arms. However, the left continues to spread misinformation and employ fear tactics about this bill, erroneously saying it will increase crime and arm criminals.

First of all, under this law, an individual who travels to a different State has to follow the laws of that State. In the same way with a driver's license, when you drive into another State, they recognize that you are a legal driver, but you have got to follow their laws.

Second, every single person who wants to buy a firearm still has to go through the Federal background check. My bill does nothing to change that.

Further, statistics have shown that violent crime has decreased as gun ownership and concealed-carry permits have increased. Since 1991, 25 States have adopted right-to-carry laws. The number of people with carry permits has risen to over 12 million people, and the Nation's violent crime rate has decreased 51 percent.

Also, if a criminal with malice intent wants to get a gun, I can guarantee you that he or she isn't worried about following the laws that are on the books. Unfortunately, we can't change that, but we can ensure that law-abiding citizens can legally carry concealed firearms to defend themselves.

As a shock to no one, big city liberal Michael Bloomberg has promised to

spend \$25 million to stop this legislation. He could spend all the money he wants, but our gun rights are not for sale.

With a groundswell of support from Americans across the country and a pro-Second Amendment President, we will make national concealed carry reciprocity a reality this Congress. More and more States are recognizing the rights of law-abiding citizens to carry a concealed handgun without permission from government, including two this year, bringing that total to 12.

In my home State of North Carolina, lawmakers in the House voted in favor of House bill 746 to make a concealed-carry permit no longer necessary in locations where it is currently permissible to openly carry a handgun. It is a commonsense bill. I am proud of the leadership of the folks in Raleigh. It just demonstrates that all across this country, the American people are recognizing that our right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

So I would just offer this very simple piece of legislation, following the Constitution that says a law-abiding citizen trying to do the right thing is not going to be criminalized because they have crossed an invisible line in the ground.

I am pleased to be here today to talk about it, and I am thankful for having this opportunity and support.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HUDSON for his passion about that.

Speaking of passion, in the 2½ years that I have served in the United States Congress, there are Members who work on different projects, different concerns, different issues. I will tell you someone who I have really grown to love and appreciate, someone who has lived it out on the battlefield as he has worked to literally put veterans back together as a surgeon on the battlefield, someone who understands and has worked well into the life arena, and that is Dr. BRAD WENSTRUP, a fellow steering committee member on the Republican Steering Committee.

Without further ado, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. WENSTRUP, to please share what is on his heart today.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk about this.

You know, as a physician, we take an oath. We say: Do no harm.

And today in America and here in Washington, D.C., we are debating physician-assisted suicide, where we are authorizing physicians to take someone's life—to assist in taking someone's life. To me, this undermines the very thing that healthcare is all about.

Who is most affected in this situation?

Our most vulnerable citizens: the disabled and the poor.

As a doctor, I can tell you, what has always been in my heart is this is about care and about comfort, and those are our priorities.

Physician-assisted suicide does not provide comfort. It merely ends life.

In Washington, D.C., a doctor can decide that you may be going to die within 6 months if you have a terminal disease—a terminal disease if you are untreated. Many terminal diseases would be terminal if they are not treated. With that, the doctor can write a prescription. There is no tracking of that prescription once it is given and there is no witness of the patient taking this prescription. They can simply go home to die alone.

In one State where there is physician-assisted suicide, they have had an increase in suicides outside of physician-assisted suicides. I think that what we are saying to too many people is: You are not needed.

Again, this undermines what I think we are all about and what healthcare should be all about.

I think of the movie, "It's a Wonderful Life," which so many people watch every Christmastime. Mr. Potter says to George Bailey: "George, you are worth more dead than alive."

Is that really who we want to be?

As a resident in Chicago in the 1980s, one of our responsibilities was to do physical exams on everyone admitted to the hospital regardless of what they were admitted for. I can remember a doctor coming up to me and saying: We just admitted our first AIDS patient, but you don't have to go see him.

And this is a time when people didn't know what was going on, what was causing this, how it was being spread. And I thought that was wrong and I went in anyway to examine this patient. I had to go in like it was a lunar landing because there was so much uncertainty about what was causing death to so many people. This patient was very sick. I learned so much from this one patient because there were so many things wrong, but it didn't compare to what I learned when I finished that exam and he looked at me and said: You just examined me more than anyone.

□ 1715

I have never forgotten, throughout my entire medical career, the value of human life and what it must feel like to be discarded. He died the next day. I still know his name. And he taught me a valuable lesson on his very last day of life: Healthcare is about cures, it is about caring, it is about compassion, and society should be about the same thing, and the ideal that every person has value until their very last breath.

I am pleased to say that the President's budget addresses this issue, and we will, too, here in the House because you and your loved ones matter.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative WENSTRUP. I appreciate his passionate plea.

Speaking of life, one of the most outstanding voices that I have gotten a chance to meet, someone who, without compromise, unashamedly talks about the value and the worth of an unborn child is Representative TRENT FRANKS from Arizona. He is here today to talk about a future bill, hopefully one that we can add to this total of 37 in the not too distant future.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), someone who is a warrior in Congress.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WALKER for this opportunity.

It is so appropriate on People's Night to talk about the very littlest people in America, isn't it?

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is a unique nation that is premised on that bedrock foundation that we are all created equal, and that each of us is endowed by our Creator with the unalienable right to live.

That is why it is so important for Members of Congress to remind ourselves from time to time that protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are really all here. It is our sworn oath before God and the people of this Nation.

Yet today, a great shadow looms over America. More than 18,000 late-term abortions, very late-term abortions, are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia—this, in the land of the free and the home of the brave. It is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other major civilized nation on Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies at this stage, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them. Yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

But thankfully, Mr. Speaker, the winds of change have finally begun to blow, and the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act has already once passed in this body, and it will again, Mr. Speaker; and these little babies now have a new and very powerful friend and protector in President Donald J. Trump.

No matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deception what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it will remain a deeply sincere effort, beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and

their pain-capable unborn babies from this torturous atrocity of late-term abortion on demand. Ultimately, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

So the question that now remains is whether the Republican leader in the Senate will find the courage to prevent pro-abortion Democrats from once again using the Senate filibuster to prevent this bill from even coming to the floor in the Senate for debate.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for all Americans to open our eyes and our souls and recognize the humanity of these helpless little babies and the inhumanity of what is being done to them. Protecting these little children of God and their mothers is not a Republican issue; it is not a Democratic issue; it is a decisive test of our own humanity and who we are as a human family.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative FRANKS as he continues to stand year after year in fighting and standing up for the unborn child.

Many times you get to meet some wonderful people here in the United States Congress. And someone asked me the other day: Who is a strong Member? Who is someone who is willing to stand up?

I guess they might have thought I would have said the Speaker or the majority leader, as well they do in their own right. When I think of somebody willing to engage, it is the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK). She is not just known in the Sixth District; she is known throughout all of Tennessee as far as being willing to stand up for those who cannot stand up and protect themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my colleague and friend, the chair of the RSC, for hosting this Special Order tonight to highlight some of the recent victories that this Republican-controlled Congress has secured to ensure that every American enjoys freedom and opportunity for which our Nation was founded.

I rise today to thank my colleagues in the House and the Senate for passing my resolution of disapproval, H.J. Res. 43, which used the authority of the Congressional Review Act to overturn the Obama administration's eleventh hour rule forcing States like mine, Tennessee, to fund abortion providers.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to thank Vice President MIKE PENCE, who cast that tie-breaking vote in the Senate. Tennesseans appreciate his courageous leadership.

Now, abortion is not healthcare, and vulnerable women seeking true comprehensive care deserve better than abortion-centric facilities like Planned Parenthood.

For over 45 years, States like Tennessee had the authority to direct their

family planning funds to the healthcare providers that best suited their needs. Yes, they had that decision to decide what is best for their unique communities. Sadly, in a parting gift to the abortion industry, President Obama stole this freedom and flexibility and forced his own political agenda on States across the country like my very own State of Tennessee.

While I am unapologetically pro-life, this bill is simply about states' rights.

Mr. Speaker, when President Trump signed this bill, he put the American people, not the bureaucrats here in Washington, back in the driver's seat of empowering States like Tennessee to steer their title X dollars away from abortion-centric facilities like Planned Parenthood and to give the right back to the State to make that decision about which facilities provide the most comprehensive care for women in their State.

It was an honor to work with Senator ERNST and the pro-life community to help this life-affirming legislation reach the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again thank President Trump for his leadership on this matter.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman BLACK.

When we talk about what is getting done, I want to remind our audience this evening, Mr. Speaker, that our President, even without a full Cabinet, has been busy taking time to make sure that what the House and the Senate are sending him is being signed into law.

As you can see on my chart this evening, 37, that is the most. You have to go back. In fact, the last four Presidents haven't equalled that total. And 158 bills from the House have been passed.

One of the things that has been promised by this administration and by Members of Congress is to make sure that we are doing everything we can to take care of a very important segment of our population, and that is our veterans.

It wasn't long after I arrived 2½ years ago that I had a chance to meet someone. Now, as a former pastor, you can always tell the character and integrity of someone when they have gone through a hardship.

I met Dr. PHIL ROE after he had lost a loved one in his life. He could have gone home, but he had a mission to complete, and that is to stand up for those veterans who needed standing up. A former physician himself, he was willing to come back and continue to fight. What a privilege it is to serve with the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Dr. PHIL ROE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WALKER for yielding.

I would like to associate my remarks with Mr. HUDSON, Dr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FRANKS, and my good friend DIANE BLACK.

I am a concealed carry permit holder—full disclosure—and what Mr. FRANKS said: I am an OB/GYN doctor by training. I have delivered 5,000 babies in my lifetime, and every single one of them I view as valuable. I have watched these young people that I have delivered grow up and become very productive citizens not only in my community, but around the country.

Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, I was a young soldier in southeast Asia. When we came home from the military, we were advised not to wear our uniforms when we traveled because of basically what was going on in the country: the opposition to the Vietnam war. That left a very deep, indelible mark on me, and I thought that is no way we should be treating our men and women who protected us and gave us the freedoms that we have and live by to this day.

When I got the privilege of being elected—when I retired from my medical practice in northeast Tennessee and ran for Congress and was fortunate enough to win—I was asked to be on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which I have served on for the past 8 years.

We know that 3 years ago there was a scandal in Phoenix, Arizona. Then we realized it was not just Phoenix, Arizona. It was all across the country where veterans were not being served, and, actually, veterans were dying while they were waiting for care at a VA. That is as wrong as it gets.

So, what we elected to do in our committee, when we discovered this, was to try to get some legislation up that actually did something about this. And one of the things that touched me—I watched late into the evening, like many of you all probably around the country and in this gallery watched—was the election results. It was around 3 or 3:30 in the morning when then President-elect Trump gave his election speech.

Very shortly into it, not a minute or two into that speech, he mentioned our veterans. And it really, really encouraged me because I think he is an administration that is very sincere in improving care.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is not money. When I came here in 2009, you, the taxpayers, were spending about \$97 billion on VA care, on benefits, and on cemeteries. Today, that number is going to be \$186 billion. We have gone from 260,000 employees in the VA to over 360,000 employees. There is enough money and personnel to take care of the problems.

When the President was sworn in and he selected his Secretary of the VA, Dr. David Shulkin—I believe is now the man for the job—he was approved 100-0 by the Senate. Dr. Shulkin said: The

first thing I need is accountability legislation that allows me to terminate bad employees.

At the VA, the vast majority—and many of them are personal friends of mine that I have worked with in healthcare—are good people taking the very best care they can of veterans. But there are some bad apples there, and they cannot be terminated. It almost could not happen, Mr. Speaker.

So what this legislation does is it protects the whistleblowers who call these people out. It provides due process rights for employees so that they don't have those trampled on, but it allows the Secretary to terminate these bad apples and, hopefully, improve the morale of the entire VA. This is only phase one.

We also have passed out of this body and over to the Senate—I want to thank our Senate colleagues, Senator ISAKSON; Senator RUBIO, who is a lead sponsor in the Senate; and Senator TESTER, the minority leader. I also want to thank the minority leader on our side of the aisle, Sergeant Major Walz, who worked hand in hand. This was a bipartisan bill, which is how legislation should be passed. We passed it in the House and it went to the Senate. They reformed the bill. It came back, and we now await the President's signature.

We are also doing repeals reform. We passed that out of here. We have, now, 470,000 backlog claims of veterans waiting for their appeals. Hopefully, we are going to address this problem.

The Secretary, we have just extended the Choice Program for veterans who want to choose care outside of the VA, and also a new electronic health system. So we have a lot of work to do.

It is a true privilege to do what I get to do, which is to help the 21 million men and women who have served this country, who allow us to be free.

I thank the gentleman for the privilege to be down here tonight to share this with the American people.

□ 1730

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROE and appreciate his continued service. It is a privilege to certainly work with him in the House.

One of our newest Members who came in the 115th class, a gentleman by the name of JIM BANKS—in fact, he is the only new Member serving on the Republican Steering Committee. Some would describe him as a quick study, I guess, but he is here this evening to specifically talk about continued VA accountability and the Department of Defense readiness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership of the Republican Study Committee. It is one of the great honors that I have in this Congress to serve

with him and others to advocate for conservative principles to move our country forward.

With a new Republican administration, many of the innovative ideas coming from this House now have a chance to become law and achieve real results for the American people. The contrast between this administration and the last one is most clear when it comes to prioritizing readiness for our Department of Defense and caring for our veterans.

As those veterans in Congress know firsthand, shortchanging readiness on the front end will have long-term implications in the years that follow.

We have the moral imperative to ensure that our young men and women who go into harm's way are never in a fair fight. We have an obligation to ensure that our forces are the best-trained, best-equipped, and best-led fighting force in the world. This obligation starts with prioritizing a stable and predictable budget and appropriations process.

Our leaders in the Department of Defense must be able to forecast and anticipate training needs, and that means ending the trend of continuing resolutions that offer neither good fiscal discipline nor the ability to plan that our military leaders desperately need.

Consider that two-thirds of our Army are not ready to deploy. Our Navy is smaller than it has been in 99 years, and our Air Force is the smallest ever and losing pilots at an alarming rate. These are not the marks of a ready force, and the work to rebuild must begin right now.

However, it is important to look at prioritizing the needs of our servicemembers holistically. Just as we would not send them into harm's way without the training they need, we have an obligation to care for the injuries they sustained when they return home. Our veterans deserve and have earned the highest quality of care and to have that care delivered in a timely and efficient manner.

Unfortunately, too often the VA does not have the power to remove substandard employees who are failing our veterans. The overwhelming majority of VA employees are hardworking and dedicated to their jobs, and it is simply not fair to these employees that the VA cannot hold substandard employees accountable.

But with a Republican President in the White House, our veterans will finally see real accountability in the VA with passage of the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. With passage of this bill, there will be a new and expedited process to remove employees who are failing to properly serve our veterans, while maintaining the due process rights of VA workers, as well as their right to appeal.

It would also implement stronger protections for whistleblowers, ensuring that no employee is intimidated into silence.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a chance to make sure our Armed Forces have the means to protect our country and ensure all veterans receive the quality of care they deserve.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BANKS, and I appreciate this is such an important issue that he is battling.

Once again, this evening, Mr. Speaker, we are reminding that tonight is the People's Night here in the people's House. We are focusing in on the work of the Members of Congress.

As you can see in our chart this evening, 158 bills have been passed through Congress. So many times we continue to hear: What is Congress working on?

Well, not only have we passed these 158, we are still working on passing things in the future.

One of the great Members from South Carolina, Mr. JEFF DUNCAN, is someone who has a genuine heart and passion for others, but also has a wonderful heart for the outdoors, as he is currently chairman of the Sportsmen's Caucus.

Without further ado, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I want to talk to America today about the Hearing Protection Act. Consequences of firearms exposure: Noise-induced hearing loss is a major health problem for hunters and recreational shooters.

Now, I started hunting at an early age with my father; and in the field and hunting activities, I learned a lot about life, a lot about myself. Most importantly, I got time to spend with my father, who has now passed away.

But we enjoyed the outdoors generally in the shooting sports, whether that was over a brace of bird dogs, quail hunting, shooting doves, hunting ducks, or deer hunting. And I can tell you, with my own experience, that firing multiple firearms—shotguns, rifles, handguns—risks your hearing health.

Men and women in our United States military experience hearing loss or tinnitus. That is a large expenditure for the VA. Tinnitus accounts for around 1.45 million disability-related instances for veterans. The most prevalent disability compensations are based on that.

So what can we do about it?

Well, there is an apparatus, a firearm accessory, that you can add to a firearm to muffle or suppress that sound. It is commonly called a suppressor or a silencer, but it does anything but silence a weapon.

America, you need to realize that Hollywood has glorified suppressors for

firearms. You can see it in your mind—James Bond taking out his concealed weapon that he couldn't conceal with a suppressor on it because the suppressor adds another 8 inches to the length of the barrel—screwing the suppressor on to commit a crime.

Hollywood has made you believe that that suppressor silences that weapon when, in actuality, a suppressor on any sort of firearm drops the decibels about 30 decibels. Most firearms would be louder than a jackhammer, and no one would say that a jackhammer is silent.

So we have got a bill that would allow suppressors to be sold, like they are sold in Europe, but with a little more American restrictions. In Europe, as restrictive as their gun laws are, you can go to the hardware store and buy a suppressor across the counter, just like you could buy a scope, a sling, or a magazine for a deer rifle. It is gentlemanly to hunt or shoot in Europe with a suppressed weapon to keep the sound down, but it doesn't silence it, as we mentioned before.

Depending on the caliber of ammunition, a typical hunting rifle is 160 to 180 decibels—suppressed would be about 125 to 145 decibels.

The bill we have would allow you to go in and purchase a suppressor from your Federal firearm license-holder, do a background check, just like you have to go through to purchase the firearm itself—background check, and purchase a suppressor to help the hunting and the hearing health of the hunters and the shooting sports enthusiasts across the country.

I hope we can get this bill passed to help the hearing health of so many people in America and dispel all the rumors. I thank the gentleman for letting us speak to the American people tonight.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DUNCAN.

Many times in Congress you hear sometimes maybe big words or crazy words, words like "appropriations" or "appropriators." We have one of those appropriators with us tonight, a strong conservative from the State of Georgia, my friend, Representative TOM GRAVES, who is going to talk a little bit about his proposal and an idea that I believe helps us continue adding to this number of 158.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I could not be more excited to be here tonight and to experience what we are experiencing here.

You know, when this President was elected, he made a promise: He was going to drain the swamp, he was going to shake things up, and he was going to make government work again.

I have got to highlight real quickly though, before I talk about appropriations, what really has happened. Here in the last—in this under 5 months,

600,000 new jobs have been created. Unemployment is at the lowest it has been in nearly a decade, at 4.3 percent. He has put a plan forth to help rescue Americans from a healthcare plan that has been failing.

The largest increase in defense spending in nearly 10 years has already been passed and signed into law and is part of your display there.

He has presented a budget to this Congress that balances in 10 years, rebuilds our military, reforms our Tax Code, and empowers the taxpayers, while not empowering government.

And he has also put the American people and the American workers and American businesses first by pulling us out of that Paris accord. He has been shaking things up and draining the swamp.

So what is next? For us, it is, we have got to reform this appropriations process.

Let me read you some statistics here. The current process that we operate under to fund the greatest Nation on the globe has only worked four times in the last 40 years. The last time we passed all 12 appropriations bills that were enacted by the start of the new fiscal year was in 1996 is the last time.

And, in fact, a more stunning statistic: Since 2009, not one appropriations bill has passed this House, passed the Senate, and been signed into law by the President before its time was due. That is zero for 96.

So I have just got a simple idea, a simple concept. Let's just change what is not working. Let's change the process. Let's design a process that actually works for the American people and funds the government in a very responsible, fiscally responsible way that begins streamlining government; that is eliminating agencies; that is empowering the American people; and, ultimately, showing a responsible House of Representatives and a Republican vision forward.

And it is real simple. Let's run it through the committee. Let's do 12 bills, all through their different subcommittees. Let's combine them in full committee, and let's bring them to the House floor for everybody to have an opportunity to vote on, to amend, to engage in the debate.

I believe, if we do this, we are going to save time. We are going to have more time for tax reform. We are going to have more time for infrastructure investment. We are going to have more time for finishing out the healthcare bill. But it is going to be transparent. Everyone can see it. It is going to be effective. We are going to get it done.

At the end of the day, we are going to be able to rebuild our military to where we know it needs to be. We are going to be able to secure our border. We are going to protect the innocent unborn. We are going to reform Wall Street. We are going to invest in roads

and infrastructure. We are going to streamline or eliminate a lot of agencies, and we are going to do all that while cutting spending. But that is only if we are willing to make government work again.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GRAVES.

It doesn't take you long, around the Halls of Congress, to see someone who has a genuine heart for service, someone who can quickly give up his chair, or someone who sees someone that is without. Sometimes I think that is a person who has served in faith many years, and sometimes I just think that is part of the natural tendency of a person who certainly has a heart, not only for God but to serve others.

I can think of nobody who better fits that description than our chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, here to talk a little bit about his passion and his vision for tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative WALKER. And first let me thank him for not just hosting this evening, People's Night, but his leadership of the Republican Study Committee and how he is leading our efforts to truly move this country back in the right direction.

As a friend, and from someone who admires him so much, I thank him for his leadership. It has already made a huge difference in issues like repealing ObamaCare.

So how many of you are pleased with the way you are taxed in America? Not many Americans are because the code we have got, it is so complex and so costly, it is just unfair.

So House Republicans are working with this President and the Senate to deliver the first pro-growth tax reform in a generation. We know this is a once-in-a-generation opportunity, and the goals we set out from the House is, first, we want a Tax Code not designed merely to wring money from you. We have that Tax Code. We want a Tax Code built for growth, designed to grow jobs, your wages, and the U.S. economy.

In doing that, we want to leapfrog America from nearly dead last among our global competitors back into the lead pack as the best place on this Earth for that next new job, that next new investment.

What we propose is a Tax Code with three big reforms: The lowest rates for our local businesses in modern history, and redesigned so our local companies can compete and win anywhere in the world, especially here at home.

Secondly, we are proposing for families and individuals a code so fair and simple that 9 out of 10 Americans will be able to file using a simple postcard system, and it works.

And the final reform is because we propose a much fairer and simpler Tax

Code; we propose a fairer and simpler tax collector.

□ 1745

So we proposed to bust up the IRS and redesign it into a 21st century agency focused on you, the taxpayer. These are the reforms included in the House Republican blueprint. We are excited to work with President Trump and the Senate to deliver on pro-growth tax reform, bold, that leapfrogs America back to the front and returns jobs back to the United States—manufacturing, research and headquarters jobs.

It is a tough challenge. We will need your input. I encourage you to come to the Ways and Means Committee website, learn more, speak out, be part of changing and reforming this horrible Tax Code.

Mr. WALKER, thank you again for your leadership of this Special Order and our efforts.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY for his comments. It is an honor to have him with us this evening.

We have talked a little bit about veterans tonight. Former veteran, chaplain, and pastor, Representative COLLINS, we would love for you to talk about something that is part of that 158 pieces of legislation that has been passed, what we called the REINS Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WALKER for yielding, and I appreciate him offering this. It is providing a different take that we are not getting in the meeting anywhere.

Go back real quickly: a few months ago, the first week of the session, the House comes in and does what it promised. It says it is going to take on regulatory reform. It is going to take on the burdens, and one of the first bills out of the chute was the REINS Act.

The REINS Act is very simple. It has a \$100 million impact on the economy. It comes back to the people's House, into the Senate for approval. Instead of bureaucrats in cubicles down the street thinking they know what is best for our districts and for our country, it is back to the people that were elected.

You see, when it was first brought up, they said: Well, this is going to put a burden on our bureaucrats, our government workers. They are doing all these things.

Well, if they want to run for Congress, then pay the fee and run for Congress.

The REINS Act puts it back where it is supposed to be. This is an accomplishment that I am proud of. The Senate just recently passed their version. This is something that President Trump has said he would sign. This is about moving forward on the promises we have.

Congressman WALKER does a great job highlighting where we have been

and where we are going. This is a promise kept. If anybody wants to know what the American agenda looks like, look to the Republican majority, look to the past 5 months. And all I can say is that the promises are being kept, and there is more to come.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative COLLINS for his comments.

As we continue to talk about some of the things that have been accomplished and also things that we are looking forward to, it is a wonderful opportunity to introduce my friend, Representative JODY HICE from the great State of Georgia, a fellow former pastor who still enjoys those opportunities, I am sure, when you have a few. But tonight I want him to talk about the Free Speech Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is an honor to be here with you.

I think by this time most people are familiar, at least they have heard about the Johnson amendment. It came about in 1954, when Lyndon Johnson barely won a race for Senate because many people thought he was soft on communism. So one of the first things he did when he got here was, behind closed doors, without any vetting, without any debate, had inserted into the IRS Code a statement that basically says that nonprofits cannot address political issues, or they could potentially lose their tax-exempt status.

That now, for 60 years-plus, has become a target for pastors, for churches, for nonprofits using tax-exempt status as leverage to prevent them from speaking, addressing political issues. It is political correctness at its worst.

When our government becomes the gatekeeper of free speech, then we actually have no free speech at all. And in this process, they also are influencing what religious institutions can and cannot be.

Our Founders believed that our country should not establish a State church. They also believe that government should not dictate the religious practices of its citizens, or abridge the free speech of Houses of worship. That is what is taking place.

As a result of this, my good friend, Whip STEVE SCALISE, and I introduced H.R. 781, the Free Speech Fairness Act, which creates a carve-out for 501(c)(3) organizations to address political discourse as long as it is within the normal course of business with de minimis associated expenses. I am pleased that the President has also been extremely vocal on this issue, but we really need this codified because the unfairness must stop.

I know our time is running short, but I urge our colleagues to support this, and I deeply appreciate the gentleman

providing me the opportunity to speak on this Johnson amendment.

Mr. WALKER. I thank Representative HICE and I appreciate his courage in being willing to stand and speak out.

My great friend, Representative GARY PALMER, from the home of the University, Crimson Tide Alabama football, great to have you here tonight talking about a very important issue, the Agency Accountability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who will close us out this evening.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WALKER for arranging this Special Order.

Looking ahead, H.R. 850, the Agency Accountability Act, would be a game changer for government run amuck. In 2015, Federal agencies collected over \$530 billion—that is billion dollars—in fees, fines, and other revenue independent of the appropriations process.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution grants Congress the power of the purse. This assigns to Congress the role of final arbiter of the use of public funds. Allowing agencies to have slush funds outside of the normal appropriations process is a recipe for bad acting.

For instance, during the Obama administration, the Department of Justice would send money collected through fees and settlements to political activist groups aligned with the administration policies; many times in contradiction to Congress' will. Nearly 15 percent of the Department of Justice's entire budget is from alternative funding sources, not Congress. However, DOJ isn't a lone wolf.

The Department of Labor has raised over \$1.3 billion from fines and fees and the Environmental Protection Agency collected over \$600 million, just to name a few.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PALMER and all the Members for coming out this evening and listening to our presentation on the passage of 158 bills.

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

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1215, PROTECTING ACCESS TO CARE ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. WALKER) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-179) on the resolution (H. Res. 382) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) to finish his statement.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and allowing me to complete my remarks on this Special Order organized by Congressman WALKER.

As I was saying, if you recall the 2014 debate over funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the Obama administration made it clear that they would contravene the will of Congress with regard to President Obama's amnesty order and would fund his amnesty program using fines and fees.

The Department of Homeland Security had over \$400 million that the Department could spend outside of what Congress appropriated. It is unacceptable for agencies to ignore the will of Congress by funding programs outside of the typical appropriations process.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau gets all of its funding outside of Congress through transfers from the Federal Reserve and from fines imposed on financial institutions. The CFPB does not get one dime appropriated from Congress, meaning they are not subject to congressional oversight. When it comes to the CFPB, Congress has no power of the purse to ensure that that agency is accountable to Congress.

One of the top priorities in the Republican Better Way agenda is our commitment to reclaim our Article I authority. The Agency Accountability Act would direct all fines, fees, and settlements to the Treasury, making them subject to the normal appropriations process. This would end the unconstitutional slush funds that allow programs to operate independently and outside the purview of Congress. Most importantly, it would allow for Congress to fully account for how much money the government actually collects and where that money is coming from. The House should take up the Agency Accountability Act and pass it.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my friend for pointing out the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

One thing about that group, when I was a judge, or assistant DA, if you needed somebody's banking records, then you would have to get sworn evidence—normally in affidavit form—and take it to a judge, and there had to be sufficient detail in the affidavit to establish—again, under oath—that a crime had probably been committed and that the person whose banking

records we were seeking had probably committed the crime.

If that could be done, then the judge would sign the warrant. Like my years as a judge handling felony cases, there were some warrants I turned down. There is just not enough particularity here. There is not probable cause that this person committed the crime, or I don't see probable cause that a crime was committed. But, normally, law enforcement was good about making sure that probable cause was there, and the DA office would help them.

But the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has come in and it has basically begun to challenge the Internal Revenue Service for acting in the most unconstitutional ways. It may be a toss up now which one uses more unconstitutional authority than the other.

For the CFPB to gather people's financial records when there is no evidence that they committed a crime, no evidence that any crime had been committed—they just gather evidence, purportedly, to make sure nobody is taking advantage of people—well, that is not the way our Constitution works. It is supposed to be that if a bank or a lender takes advantage of an individual, then the individual can complain; then their banking records can be obtained.

But for a governmental entity to just gather people's financial records, it is not just Orwellian; it is outrageous, and it needs to stop. And as my colleague, Mr. PALMER, was pointing out, they have gotten—it was set up back when the Democrats had the majority, and they intentionally set up this governmental entity that would basically be beyond control by the Congress. They intentionally set up a group that could make a living hell for individuals or for banks, for others, because it is the government and it is gathering people's records.

And then along comes—you had ObamaCare get passed. Well, in order to help people, just like the CFPB—and for my liberal friends, that is sarcasm—well, you are going to get everybody's healthcare records, that way the government can help people better because they will have all of their records.

Well, some people, some liberal left-leaning folks would say: Well, we call that helping people. We gather all of their medical records and we gather all of their financial records so we can help them. But those who are Libertarian, Conservative, we don't consider that helping; we consider that abusive, and we don't need it.

□ 1800

One of the great honors and developments since I have been in Congress has been the development of a friendship with just an absolutely great patriotic American. He is a friend of



mine, and he has come twice to sit in my seat in the gallery, most recently to hear President Trump deliver a State of the Union Address.

Here is a story by Sean Hannity. It is entitled, "Pull the plug on the Mueller-Comey witch hunt."

It says: "Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation is turning into a witch hunt and it needs to be shut down immediately.

"Ex-FBI Director James Comey, who admitted sparking the probe by leaking information to The New York Times, is nothing more than a calculating, cunning partisan political hack at home in the D.C. swamp. During last week's hearing, Comey admitted that he intentionally gave a memo to his friend hoping it would lead to appointment of a special counsel.

"I asked a friend of mine to share the content of the memo with a reporter,' Comey told lawmakers. 'Didn't do it myself for a variety of reasons, but I asked him to because I thought that might prompt the appointment of a special counsel. And so I asked a close friend of mine to do it.'

"What Comey is admitting to under oath cannot be overlooked here or understated. His end goal was the appointment of the special counsel, which just so happens to turn out to be his longtime friend, Robert Mueller.

"By leaking information, Comey could be putting himself again in serious legal trouble. If those memos were classified—and several legal experts are arguing they are—Comey may have broken the law. Comey created those memos on government computers in a government truck, making it property of the U.S. Government, not James Comey. In addition to that, there are nondisclosure agreements that the FBI rules that exist that Comey also could have violated.

"Leaks aside, Comey's relationship with Mueller is a massive conflict of interest. It is why it is time to now shut down this political witch hunt that is really aimed at stopping the President, delegitimizing him and hopefully, in the minds of some, making sure he gets thrown out of office. It is that serious.

"We have a guy, Comey, who is beyond disgruntled and angry after being fired by the President and now one of Comey's closest friends is leading the investigation as the special counsel. I don't care if you are left, right, Republican, Democrat, does that sound fair, honest, objective to you? Of course not.

"Conflict of interest rules disqualify Mueller from being special counsel in a case involving his pal. And if that is not bad enough, four members of Mueller's team have donated to Democrats.

"Not to mention, why did James Comey wait until his hearing last week to actually mention the fact that Loretta Lynch, the then-Attorney Gen-

eral, tried to interfere with an FBI investigation? He testified that she instructed him to soft-pedal his investigation by calling it a 'matter.' This on top of her infamous meeting on the tarmac with Bill Clinton.

"The real collusion that Mueller is never going to probe is not with President Trump and the Russians, it appears to be between the Clinton campaign, the Obama administration, Loretta Lynch and James Comey."

And I would add Mueller himself.

"Let's pull the plug on this witch hunt and go after the real lawbreakers."

So that is from FOX News.

Mr. Speaker, it is extraordinary what has come out. I already knew before all of this started that Robert Mueller—a great patriot who served this country in the Vietnam war, Bronze Star for courage and bravery—but he got into government, and he apparently wanted nothing but yes-men. He wanted yes-men and -women. He didn't want people who had been around for a while that could point out when he had a suggestion that was going to lead to trouble. He would rather have the trouble than have anybody point out such things. So he created a policy he called the 5-year, up-or-out program.

We have FBI offices all over the country and local law enforcement that I have worked with so many times through so many years. And, as people know, you will have bad apples in every crowd, but I would submit that when you are talking about law enforcement, the percentage of bad apples is dramatically lower than you find in the general population at large. We are greatly blessed in that respect. But with all of the massive number of employees with the Department of Justice, Mueller has this 5-year, up-or-out policy.

So if you were in a supervisory position of any kind for 5 years anywhere in the country, then at the end of the 5 years, you had to uproot your wife and your children—your family—and you had to move to Washington and be a minion among minions in the office here at the Department of Justice; or, if you weren't willing to uproot your family in the communities where they had gained so much credibility and were considered such an important part of law enforcement in the area, then you had to get out of the FBI. It is not that you weren't absolutely priceless and invaluable to law enforcement, it is that Bob Mueller did not want your experience where you might ever question him.

So as an article—I believe it was in The Wall Street Journal—years ago pointed out, under his leadership, the FBI lost thousands upon thousands of years of experience. So we keep having people get killed around the country, and people wonder: How did the FBI not pick this up? How did the FBI not recognize this?

Well, I recall when I got out of law school and I was an assistant DA, I would see criminal defense attorneys. I would think in my head—I would know in my head—I knew a whole lot more law than they did. Heck, I had won moot court; won a trip to London, England; at Baylor Law School, I won an award for best brief award—for that I had a partner. I won an award for a Law Review article on torts that I did. Gee, I was coming up against lawyers who hadn't won awards in law school like I had. So I am going: gee, this ought to be pretty easy. They are not near as smart as I am when it comes to the law.

What I learned rather quickly in courtroom work is that knowledge of the law is extremely helpful, but experience is even more helpful: getting a feel and an understanding of human nature, learning to pick up different signs from people, what they think about different things, when they are holding something back; when you are cross-examining somebody, when to know to keep going or when to know to stop. There are a lot of things you pick up over questioning thousands of people.

Somebody right out of law school that knows every bit of the law is going to have a hard time competing with somebody that has a tremendous amount of experience in the courtroom with human nature.

That is true of law enforcement. I have known law enforcement that just had an incredible knack for just knowing when people were lying. It is amazing to see some of our great law enforcement at work, as I have through my career.

But FBI Director Robert Mueller didn't want them around. After you have been in a supervisory position for 5 years or more, you either come to Washington and take up your little cubicle or get out. Again, Robert Mueller did incalculable damage to the FBI, to its experience, to its ability to root out and find criminals. That experience that he ran off from the FBI was absolutely incalculable. It is just priceless.

He also spent millions on a software program. Many tried to tell him: Wait, you have got us inputting stuff in a system that is not going to work. It doesn't fit our needs.

I don't know if he had some relative there he got it from, why he was so sold on this terrible program. People tried to tell him, but those are the people he wanted out. He didn't want anybody questioning his brilliant intellect.

As a result, they wasted a massive number of hours by FBI employees and wasted the millions that were spent on the program trying to make the program work. Later they had to scrap it. Why? Because he was talked into a bad program, and he wouldn't listen to anybody that tried to tell him about the problems.

We also know that one of the reasons we continue to have people who were

on the radar of the FBI—even questioned by the FBI—continue to get away with murder, literally, or be able to commit murder in America and commit terrorism involving murder, is because Robert Mueller tried to make radical Islamists who hate America and who want to overthrow our way of life feel better. So he brought in people to purge our training material in the FBI so that we wouldn't offend radical Islamists who want to kill us.

Michele Bachmann and I reviewed much of the material that was purged. Lynn Westmoreland viewed some of it and he had to go, but it involved hours going through.

Unfortunately—and obviously it was intentional—but the FBI, under Mueller, classified the purged materials so I couldn't have a blowup poster here to show something very important that FBI agents would need in order to understand radical Islam. So they classified that so I can't bring it down here and show people. Once again, the damage that FBI Director Robert Mueller did to the FBI was basically incalculable. I mentioned before, one of our intelligence guys said: We were blinded of our ability to see our enemy.

We have Robert Mueller to thank, or CAIR, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, that is always there to rush in and have a press conference after violence and say: We don't support this kind of violence.

Though, clearly, when the evidence is reviewed, the Council on American-Islamic Relations—individuals involved in CAIR—ultimately wants to see sharia law as the law of the land. There are principals that should have been prosecuted as supporting terrorism.

□ 1815

There were scores of people that were listed as co-conspirators in supporting terrorism. Instead of pursuing those after the Holy Land Foundation trial convicted the principals involved—I think it was over 100 counts of supporting terrorism—instead of being alerted and being more on his guard, FBI Director Mueller bent over backwards more and more to accommodate those who want to see Sharia law take over America and be the law of the land, scrapping our Constitution.

At one time it was considered treason to want to scrap the Constitution and replace it with anything, but in Bob Mueller's America, people that wouldn't mind seeing the Constitution go away and be replaced by Sharia law, you want to develop an outreach program for those people.

So instead of going to the Boston mosque, where the Tsarnaevs surely had to have indicated and shown signs of being radicalized, Robert Mueller and his FBI went to the mosque as part of an outreach program to make merry and play patty cake with people who could have established, if they were

honest, that the Tsarnaev brothers had indeed been radicalized, the information from Russia was correct.

Yet because, under Bob Mueller's leadership, the training materials were purged, FBI agents didn't know what they were looking for. They didn't know what scriptures in the Koran were referred to, were quoted by people who had been radicalized.

They had no idea what to look for in speaking to Kim Jensen, who prepared over 700 pages of training materials so people in the FBI could learn radical Islam. His training materials were banned. They were supposed to have been destroyed, but after it became clear that the FBI could not recognize radical Islamists, that Mueller had done so much damage in regard to training FBI agents, it was finally decided that we kind of need to get somebody back in here and get some materials back in here so maybe we don't keep getting people killed in the country after we are alerted to somebody who has been radicalized as an Islamic terrorist and we let them go because we don't know they are radicalized because FBI Director Robert Mueller prevented our FBI from being trained to recognize radical Islam.

I know there are some people who—not because they are aware of his virtues, but have heard other people say he is a great guy—just extoll his virtue, not realizing the kind of damage that has been done.

As I mentioned last night, Mr. Speaker, you look at the damage that James Comey and Robert Mueller—really tight friends—have done to the country to an extent I didn't even realize until we started looking at the article by Mollie Hemmingway in *The Federalist*, which is rather breathtaking, and I had no idea until I read that.

According to the article, Comey talked a very fine man, John Ashcroft, into recusing himself so he would not appoint a special prosecutor to find out who leaked the fact that Valerie Plame was a CIA agent. He commits to Ashcroft: Recuse yourself and I will find somebody good.

Mr. Comey likes to talk about conflicts of interest, unless they apply to himself.

So Ashcroft recuses himself, and Mr. Comey, who convinced him to do so, looks high and low: Who could we possibly find to investigate and prosecute whoever it was that leaked information about Valerie Plame? Oh, how about my very dear friend, Patrick Fitzgerald, who happens also to be the Godfather of my child?

So he likes to talk about conflict of interest and chummy relationships, unless they are his chummy relationships, in which case he just puts them in places which appear to be clear conflicts of interest. Which is no surprise that he was supportive and even manipulative in creating what appeared to

be a need for a special prosecutor, which actually there was not a need for a special prosecutor at all. He just leaked information. There was a good chance he probably violated the law. He certainly should have violated his FBI employment agreement.

Memos that he prepares as part of his job regarding meetings he had as part of his job, those should belong to the FBI under an employment agreement. I am sure that he has seen Presidents for whom he has worked take their own memos and take them back and use them to write books. Perhaps that is what he is thinking: I will take my memos that I personally prepared and I will be like a President and I will save my memos and use them to write a book.

Of course, it turns out, with regard to this one memo that he wrote about his conversation with President Trump, he consulted with other members of the Justice Department, who all need to be fired, and colluded with them to figure out what should be done.

There is no question these people are smart, or they wouldn't be where they were. They knew that if there was an obstruction of justice in which Trump had engaged, then they would have to report it. Failing to report it would be a crime. They didn't. So we know there was no crime. What we know is they were conspiring and colluding to hurt the President of the United States.

So we don't need a special prosecutor. We certainly don't need Mueller. He has done enough damage. It is time to let the special prosecutor go that Comey needlessly created.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of family matters.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1628. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Sweet Onions Grown in the

Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No.: AMS-SC-16-0116; SC17-956-1 IR] received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1629. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Almonds Grown in California; Change in Quality Control Requirements [Docket No.: AMS-SC-16-0047; SC16-981-3 FIR] received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1630. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No.: AMS-SC-16-0088; SC16-966-1 FR] received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1631. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — National Organic Program (NOP); Organic Livestock and Poultry Practices [Docket No.: AMS-NOP-15-0012; NOP-15-06 FR] (RIN: 0581-AD44) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1632. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triclopyr; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0036; FRL-9961-29] received June 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1633. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of an increase in the Program Acquisition Unit Cost for the Chemical Demilitarization — Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(d)(3); Public Law 97-252, Sec. 1107(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 110-417, Sec. 811(c)); (122 Stat. 4522); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1634. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report titled, "Acceptance of Contributions For Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608(e); Public Law 101-403, Sec. 202(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 112-81, Sec. 1064(7)); (125 Stat. 1587); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1635. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (New Haven County, CT, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8479] received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1636. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final order — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Acetyl Fentanyl

Into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-413] received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1637. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California; Coachella Valley; Attainment Plan for 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0244; FRL-9962-54-Region 9] received June 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1638. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles with Mobile Source Incentive Programs [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0497; FRL-9962-47-Region 6] received June 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1639. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the General Definitions for Texas Air Quality Rules [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0464; FRL-9962-23-Region 6] received June 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1640. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of the Commission's Part 95 Personal Radio Services Rules [WT Docket No.: 10-119; Petition for Rulemaking of Garmin International, Inc. (RM-10762); Petition for Rulemaking of Omnitronics, L.L.C. (RM-10844) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1641. A letter from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation For National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's Semiannual Report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 30, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1642. A letter from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance Report for FY 2016-2018, and the Department's Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1643. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to the Congress from the Office of Inspector General, for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1644. A letter from the Director, General Counsel and Legal Policy Division, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Technical Updating Amendments to Executive Branch Financial Disclosure and Standards of Ethical Conduct

Regulations (RIN: 3209-AA00 and 3209-AA04) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1645. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Semiannual Report to the Congress by Office of Inspector General and the Corporation's Management Response for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1646. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress, covering the period of October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1647. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Lease Continuation Through Operations [17XE1700DX EX1SF0000.DAQ000 EEEEE50000] (RIN: 1014-AA35) received June 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1648. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; Commercial Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XF290) received June 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1649. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Final Amendment 5b [Docket No.: 130417378-7331-02] (RIN: 0648-BD22) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1650. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF253) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1651. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XF218) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1652. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF200) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1653. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's reapportionment of tribal Pacific whiting allocation — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2016 Tribal Fishery Allocations for Pacific Whiting; Reapportionment Between Tribal and Non-Tribal Sectors [Docket No.: 160126053-6398-02] (RIN: 0648-XF230) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1654. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Re-allocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF262) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1655. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of Homeland Security and Department of Labor Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Annual Adjustments for the H-2B Temporary Non-agricultural Worker Program [CIS No.: 2585-16] (RIN: 1615-AC10) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1656. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Merchandise Produced by Convict, Forced, or Indentured Labor; Conforming Amendment and Technical Corrections [CBP Dec. No. 17-04] (RIN: 1515-AE22) received June 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1657. A letter from the Board Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2018 Proposed Budget and Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Oversight and Government Reform.

1658. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination to suspend the limitation on the obligation of State Department Appropriations contained in Secs. 3(b) and 7(b) of this Act for six months, pursuant to Public Law 104-45, Sec. 7(a)(1); (109 Stat. 400); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1659. A letter from the Labor Member, and Management Member, Railroad Retirement

Board, transmitting the Board's report on the actuarial status of the railroad retirement system, including any recommendations for financing changes, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231u(a)(1); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 22(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-90, Sec. 108(a)); (115 Stat. 890); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

1660. A letter from the Labor Member, and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2017 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; Public Law 100-647, Sec. 7105; (102 Stat. 3772); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 382. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system (Rept. 115-179). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 2889. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to limit the orphan drug exclusion under the drug discount program under section 340B of such title; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2890. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to permit captive insurance companies that were members of a Federal Home Loan Bank prior to September 12, 2014, to continue to be eligible to be members of such a Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 2891. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of children of Vietnam veterans born with spina bifida for benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2892. A bill to amend chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, to ensure that new vehicles enable fuel competition so as to reduce the strategic importance of oil to the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 2893. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to bolster fairness and transparency in consideration of interstate natural gas pipelines, to provide for greater public input opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2894. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for education and outreach with respect to the prevention and treatment of tick-borne illnesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of

New York (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2895. A bill to provide a requirement to improve data collection efforts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2896. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a midyear cost-of-living increase to account for an insufficient increase for 2017, to apply the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to future Social Security COLAs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2897. A bill to authorize the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the Director of the National Park Service to enter into cooperative management agreements for the operation, maintenance, and management of units of the National Park System in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 2898. A bill to amend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to modify the appointment and composition of resource advisory committees; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 2899. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. Res. 381. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. KILMER,

Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of

California, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H. Res. 383. A resolution to express support for recognition of June 2017 as National Orca Protection Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws, which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 2891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The commerce clause, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution and clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 2898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 112: Mr. CRIST and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 169: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 233: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 242: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 373: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 392: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 422: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. YODER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 468: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 489: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 535: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 553: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 564: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 586: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 631: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 632: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 638: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 664: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 721: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 747: Mr. OLSON and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 750: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 769: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 828: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 830: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 837: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 849: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BACON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 852: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 878: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 978: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1022: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1046: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1057: Mr. VELA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1058: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1062: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 1098: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1148: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1164: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1171: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1225: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1267: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1291: Mr. SOTO and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1298: Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1307: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1316: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1361: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1393: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1406: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1415: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1421: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1422: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1438: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1441: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1444: Mr. COLE and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1447: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1456: Mr. YOHO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1475: Mr. SUOZZI and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1494: Mr. VELA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1515: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1529: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1542: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1552: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1558: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1566: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1626: Mr. BOST and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1635: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1655: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1661: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1697: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BACON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1698: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 1711: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1739: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1777: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1811: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1821: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1825: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1828: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1832: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1838: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1864: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1865: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1874: Mr. KATKO and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1911: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1928: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1951: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1955: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2002: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2059: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2069: Mr. COLE and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2077: Mr. BACON and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 2106: Mr. REICHERT, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2119: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2141: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 2148: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 2150: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2158: Mr. RUSH and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2215: Mr. BEYER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2224: Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 2232: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2240: Ms. SINEMA and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2248: Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILMER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO.

- H.R. 2306: Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 2308: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. POE of Texas.  
H.R. 2317: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 2318: Mr. HECK.  
H.R. 2352: Mr. WALKER.  
H.R. 2358: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 2371: Mr. GALLEGO.  
H.R. 2383: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 2396: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. LUETKE-MEYER.  
H.R. 2401: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BOST.  
H.R. 2408: Mr. MAST and Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 2426: Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 2434: Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 2435: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 2476: Mr. MOULTON.  
H.R. 2480: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 2482: Mr. BACON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 2506: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 2595: Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 2616: Mr. JONES and Mr. O'HALLERAN.  
H.R. 2620: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. ROKITA.  
H.R. 2641: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
H.R. 2651: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 2652: Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 2662: Mr. CRAMER.  
H.R. 2670: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 2704: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 2723: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 2742: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RENACCI.  
H.R. 2745: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 2790: Ms. MENG, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.  
H.R. 2801: Mr. SERRANO, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 2825: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. GALLAGHER.  
H.R. 2826: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
H.R. 2827: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 2834: Ms. BASS.  
H.R. 2836: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
H.R. 2847: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2855: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
H.R. 2857: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2859: Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 2866: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BASS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2867: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2881: Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 2884: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SOTO, Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CLAY.  
H.R. 2887: Mr. ROHRBACHER.  
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. BACON.  
H.J. Res. 104: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H. Con. Res. 13: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.  
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CROWLEY.  
H. Res. 15: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H. Res. 30: Mr. KIND.  
H. Res. 136: Mrs. LOWEY.  
H. Res. 218: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H. Res. 257: Mr. MEEKS.  
H. Res. 285: Mr. PALLONE.  
H. Res. 313: Mr. MAST.  
H. Res. 316: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. GOSAR.  
H. Res. 317: Mr. COLE.  
H. Res. 332: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H. Res. 351: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. MENG.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during Roll Call votes No. 300, and No. 301 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on H.R. 2292—To extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam. I would have also voted Yea on H.R. 2457—J. Bennett Johnston Waterway Hydropower Extension Act of 2017.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAMES  
DONALD GRAY III**HON. PATRICK MEEHAN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a long-time member of my team here in my Washington, D.C. office. Today marks Jim Gray's last day with our office, after years of service that began when he was just an intern in my first term. Jim returned to my office as a staff assistant even before he had graduated from the University of Maryland, and balanced the demands of life on Capitol Hill against the completion of his academic course of study. Jim has always brought to my team a commitment to service and a relentless desire to get the job done.

Jim rose through the ranks to become one of my most trusted policy advisors, handling a broad policy portfolio including trade, defense and foreign affairs. He'll soon be departing Washington for sunny South Carolina, and I wish him the best. I know his parents, James Donald Gray Jr. and Teresa, and his sister Lindsay, are proud of him.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANDREA  
LUNA CERVANTES' RECEIPT OF  
THE 2017 HAMILTON SCHOLARS  
AWARD**HON. PAUL A. GOSAR**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Ms. Andrea Luna Cervantes of Yuma, Arizona. Andrea is an accomplished and dedicated student who has devoted tremendous amounts of time and energy to her studies and to improving her community. I am excited to announce that Andrea is one of 35

national recipients of the 2017 Hamilton Scholars Award for outstanding academic accomplishments and community service. Her work ethic, academic aptitude and ability to connect with people of all ages renders her receipt of this award no surprise.

Currently, Andrea is a rising senior at Yuma High School, where she is well on her way to becoming a productive service leader. In reaching this point, she has overcome many hardships through determination and a supportive community. I fully expect she will continue to grow into a productive and engaged citizen—exactly the kind of leader our society is in need of.

Those who know Andrea recognize that she has the natural ability to reach out and connect with people of all backgrounds. Included amongst her work in the community is her service as the Vice President of Junior State of America (JSA)—an American non-partisan youth organization that helps high school students acquire leadership skills and the requisite skills to be effective debaters and civic participants. She also serves as the President of her chapter of the National Honor Society—an academic membership-based organization that fosters a commitment to academic excellence. Andrea has competed at high levels of debate moderation and math competitions, and was a participant in the selective Yuma Youth Leadership program.

Andrea is an ambitious, high-achieving young woman. She embodies the characteristics which, when cultivated, give rise to the best of our society's leaders. It is an honor of mine to recognize this Hamilton Scholar, and I expect only the best from Andrea's future endeavors.

U.S. WWII MIA RECOVERY  
OPERATIONS IN INDIA**HON. GEORGE HOLDING**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the ongoing and long-standing efforts to recover the remains of American service members who served during World War II in northeast India.

These service members remain missing in action to this day and they deserve a proper burial.

During World War II, the United States flew hundreds of supply missions on a route that included flight paths directly over the Himalayas through enemy territory from India to China.

Given these treacherous routes and hazardous flying conditions, the United States took heavy casualties.

To this day Mr. Speaker, U.S. airmen remain unrecovered and unburied.

Efforts to locate and document these crash sites have been intermittently undertaken by both private citizens and the U.S. Department of Defense.

Over the years, in addition to these documentation efforts, the Governments of the United States and India have worked together to recover our service members.

However Mr. Speaker, the tempo of recovery operations could be categorized as slow at best for a variety of reasons, leaving the families of the deceased without closure.

Part of the problem involves the challenging conditions in which these crash sites are located—some have been located on the Himalayan mountainsides at altitudes approaching 10,000 feet.

Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, the single largest impediment to these recovery operations came when the Government of India placed a de facto moratorium on operations in Arunachal Pradesh for the vast majority of 2010 until 2015.

It should be noted during this time, that Leon Panetta, who at the time was Secretary of Defense, visited India and was able to secure permission for the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command to recover remains and bring them back to the United States. The spirit of this agreement lives on today.

In early 2016, then-Secretary of Defense Ash Carter participated in a repatriation ceremony in New Delhi which highlighted a recovery operation undertaken by the Joint POW/MIA Account Command at the end of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the United States and India today enjoy ever-increasing defense and security ties that underscore our strategic partnership.

As co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans, I urge the Governments of the United States and India to increase their collaboration and accelerate the recovery of these remains. The families of those lost during World War II deserve closure. We need to bring our airmen home.

## RECOGNIZING RICHARD J. SLOMA

**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colonel Richard J. Sloma, a Syracuse native and second-generation Polish-American, who has dedicated much of his adult life to serving this great country and our community. Colonel Sloma enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve upon graduating high school and later went on to obtain his bachelor's degree from SUNY Oswego and his master's degree from the University at Albany. Colonel

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

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

Sloma is currently a member of the Polish Legion of American Veterans—Post 14, the Syracuse Polish Home, the Polish American Historical Association, and serves as an Archivist for the New York State Archives in Albany.

This year, Colonel Sloma will be honored at the 2017 Syracuse Polish Festival as the “2017 Pole of the Year.” He will be recognized for his dedicated service to our country.

Colonel Sloma served on U.S. Army active duty assignments in New York State, North Dakota, and Italy. Colonel Sloma then joined the New York Army National Guard and was deployed to Afghanistan with the 27th Infantry Brigade from Syracuse in 2008. There, Colonel Sloma served as the Director of Intelligence for the Task Force Phoenix in Kandahar. Colonel Sloma later retired in 2013 with the rank of Colonel as the New York State Counterdrug Task Force Commander. Colonel Sloma had over 20 years of active duty experience and 31 years of total military experience, earning the Legion of Merit award, Bronze Star, Joint Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Commendation Medal, three Meritorious Medals, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, and the Airborne Badge.

I am honored to recognize Colonel Richard J. Sloma for his service to our great nation and upon being named “2017 Pole of the Year” by the Syracuse Polish Scholarship Fund, Inc.

#### COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM H. HECHT

#### HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and public service of William H. Hecht.

Born in Tifton, Georgia, Bill received a Master's of Divinity from Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri, and an M.A. in philosophy from Washington University. After serving as a Lutheran pastor at Faith Lutheran Church in Mt. Vernon, Illinois, he became a campus pastor at the University of Oklahoma.

Bill had a long history in both Missouri state politics and on the national stage in Washington, D.C. In 1967, he became the executive director of the Missouri State Republican Party. Two years later, he served as Vice President of the American Security Council, and in 1971 he became Executive Assistant to the Chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security. After serving as an advisor and spokesman for the Reagan for President Campaign, Bill founded the respected government relations firm Hecht, Spencer and Associates in 1981.

Bill was well known for his political camaraderie and engaging conversation. He was a regular at the Capitol Hill Club, where he was respected by lawmakers for his sharp wit and political advice. Bill also took great pride in mentoring some of the brightest young minds in Washington, dedicating his time to getting to know countless young people and their families. Bill was always direct, and even in the digital media age he exemplified the value

of authentic relationships and person-to-person communication.

Outside of politics, Bill was deeply dedicated to his family and friends. He was a devoted husband, proud father, and loving grandfather. Bill touched the lives of many and will be deeply missed by all who knew him.

#### LAWRENCE ZHAO

#### HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lawrence Zhao, who is a 7th grade student at Next Generation School in Champaign, Illinois. Lawrence will be competing in the 2017 National You Be the Chemist Challenge. The You Be the Chemist Challenge is an interactive academic contest that invites students from all around the United States in Grades 5 to 8 to explore chemistry concepts and their real-world applications.

Lawrence has advanced through many rigorous levels of competition over the past school year to qualify for the national competition, which is held Monday, June 19th, in Washington D.C. The competition starts out at a local level, where students participate individually, with first the distribution of a quiz that relates to chemistry and those who pass it are eligible to participate in the local contest. The local contest consists of a quiz-bowl style format containing several rounds of multiple choice questions.

Lawrence won the local challenge and had the opportunity to compete in a similar style state-wide competition. Having received the highest score at the state challenge, he advanced to the national challenge. I applaud Lawrence Zhao for his exemplary performance thus far, and I wish him the best of luck in not only the challenge, but all his future endeavors.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal conflict, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 300, and YEA on Roll Call No. 301.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Monday, June 12, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 300 and 301.

#### HONORING THE WOMEN'S ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CENTER

#### HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Women's Enterprise Development Center (WEDC) based in Westchester County, New York, which is celebrating its 20th Anniversary on June 15th.

Since its establishment in White Plains, NY, in 1997, the Women's Enterprise Development Center has helped hundreds of aspiring entrepreneurs start and grow their own businesses by providing them with training, advisory services, and access to capital. The more than 1600 graduates of WEDC's 60-hour Entrepreneurship Program have achieved business success in many fields ranging from accounting to moving organic food products to construction and landscaping to senior services. WEDC's clients include women who lack access to traditional business and financial resources. In 2015 alone, WEDC provided 1,666 motivated clients with the tools they needed to succeed.

The accomplishments of WEDC have not gone unnoticed, and over the years it has gained support from the federal, state and local governments as well as major corporations such as IBM, M&T Bank, MasterCard, Morgan Stanley Wealth Management, Verizon, and Wells Fargo. WEDC was recently designated as the New York Empire State Development Entrepreneurial Assistance Program (EAP) Center for the Mid-Hudson Valley, and its work has been recognized by the County governments of Westchester and Rockland as well as the U.S. Small Business Administration, which named it a Women's Business Center in 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have worked for the last two decades with Anne Janiak, a founder and the CEO of WEDC, and her team to support entrepreneurial women in New York's Hudson Valley. I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding their 20 years of service to the Lower Hudson Valley and congratulate them as they celebrate this important anniversary.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 300 and No. 301. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall No. 300, and yea on rollcall No. 301.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL  
PARK SERVICE IMPROVEMENT  
ACT

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the District of Columbia National Park Service Improvement Act, a bill that would clarify that D.C. has the authority to enter into cooperative management agreements (CMAs) with the National Park Service (NPS) to maintain and invest in NPS properties in the city. NPS is the steward for many of our country's most beautiful natural wonders, but they are uniquely responsible for most of the small, urban parks here in the District. Given NPS's limited budget and resources, we should be encouraging local jurisdictions to work collaboratively with NPS to make sure that our national parks are being cared for. States have already explored these opportunities, but my bill would remove any doubt that the District has the same authority as the states to enter into CMAs with NPS.

The city already has plans to enter into a CMA with NPS to take over operational jurisdiction of Franklin Park, an NPS park in downtown D.C. that has seen better days. The city plans to work with the Downtown Business Improvement District to transform the park to its former glory by ensuring regular maintenance and providing amenities such as food, gardens, and other services. As the city's downtown core has grown to include more housing, businesses, and workers, the need for green space has also grown. The city's plans for Franklin Park are a model for what can be done when local jurisdictions get creative about protecting and improving our nation's parks.

My bill is uncontroversial and simply clarifies that the District can provide financial support to NPS in order to maintain their property. This is a win for the city, the federal government, and all those who live in or visit the District and enjoy our NPS parks. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING PAUL FLETCHER

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Paul Fletcher, a Naval Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional District. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Paul is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Paul has demonstrated excellent leadership and service, acting as the Founder and President of several school clubs, in addition to serving as captain of his school's Wrestling Team. His exceptional athletic ability has been

proven by his performance in wrestling and shooting sports. Paul was also a member of his high school's chapter of the National Honor Society in which he served as the chapter's Secretary.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Paul and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Paul.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Paul Fletcher as an appointee to the Naval Academy for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

CONGRATULATING JACIE KERSH  
FOR BEING NAMED THE WINNER  
OF DISTRICT 206'S GREAT  
GALESBURG SHAKE

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jacie Kersh, a Galesburg High School senior, for being named the winner of District 205's Great Galesburg Shake.

The Great Galesburg Shake is an opportunity for young adults to demonstrate their manners and conversational skills in a professional environment. Thanks to this program, Jacie was able to learn important life skills such as engagement, confidence, a firm handshake, manners and conversational skills that will allow her to grow, succeed and become a leader in our community. I would like to recognize Jacie for standing out among the 120 students who participated, and for her tremendous composure which will serve her well in her bright future. I am proud to see such accomplished young individuals representing our community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Jacie Kersh on her incredible accomplishment, and I join the rest of our community in wishing her every success in the future.

THE MEMBERS OF CONNECTICUT'S  
HOUSE DELEGATION HONOR  
RUDY BROWN ON THE OCCASION  
OF HIS RETIREMENT

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mrs. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today and join my Connecticut colleagues, JOHN LARSON, JOE COURTNEY, JIM HIMES, and ELIZABETH ESTY, in extending our deepest thanks and sincere appreciation to Rudy Brown, who, after a thirty-one year career with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, will be retiring later this year. As the government liaison for EPA's Region 1 office, each of us has had the opportunity to work with Rudy on a variety of projects over the years and owe him a great debt of gratitude for all of his good work.

In our roles as Members of Congress, we and our staffs deal with a number of federal agencies while working on behalf of our constituents and yet it is rare to find someone like Rudy. His dedication and commitment to his work and helping to fulfill the mission of the EPA are second to none. He has met every challenge with a willingness to roll-up his sleeves and see what could be done, and always with a smile.

In a career that has spanned over three decades, and with responsibilities to the six New-England States that make up EPA's Region 1, Rudy has spent countless hours ensuring that Congressional members and their staffs had the information and background they needed to address issues of concern to their residents. From large Superfund projects and issues concerning the Long Island Sound, to cornfields redevelopment and grant announcements, we and our staffs have always known that we could count on Rudy's guidance and have never doubted that he would provide us with the best possible information, even if it was not necessarily what we were hoping to hear—that is an invaluable resource when it comes to constituent service.

As he comes up on his retirement, we stand together to say thank you to Rudy Brown—thank you for your thirty-one years of federal service, thank you for your unwavering commitment, and thank you for making the time to ensure that we have been able to serve our constituents in the best possible way. We have no doubt that his wife and daughters are looking forward to spending more time with him and wish him all the best for many more years of health and happiness as he enjoys this next chapter of his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. ZOE LOFGREN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2017, I missed two votes due to a dental emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 300—Yea, and rollcall No. 301—yea.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND DR.  
LOUIS E. SANDERS

**HON. NITA M. LOWEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Reverend Dr. Louis E. Sanders, who is retiring this month from his position as Pastor of the St. Charles A.M.E. Zion Church in Sparkill, Rockland County, NY, in my District.

Throughout his life, Reverend Sanders has been deeply involved in the church and the philosophical questions surrounding religion. As a young student in North Carolina, he was active in the Mt. Hebron A.M.E. Zion Church before earning a BS degree in Social Science from North Carolina A&T, and MA and MS degrees from the City University of New York.

He also received a Master of Divinity degree from Union Theological Seminary and a Doctorate of Humane Letters from St. Thomas Aquinas College in Sparkill, NY.

For the past 49 years, Reverend Sanders has served the people of New York's Lower Hudson Valley. In 1968, he was hired by the Tuckahoe Board of Education in Eastchester, New York, where he taught Social Studies for 30 years. He began his church ministry in 1970 and preached at Greater Centennial A.M.E. Zion Church in Mount Vernon, NY. He would go on to serve various roles at churches throughout the Hudson Valley before being appointed Pastor of the St. Charles A.M.E. Zion Church in 1981.

As Pastor, Reverend Sanders has increased church membership tenfold and extended its impact far into the community. He began a program to aid homeless children from Harlem in developing positive life attitudes, an SAT tutorial program for minority students, and an HIV/AIDS awareness program that provided on-site testing and educational programs. He has been a major proponent of civil rights and hosted discussions on apartheid in South Africa and human rights in the former Soviet Union. As a result of these efforts, he was inducted into the Rockland County Civil and Human Rights Hall of Fame in 2009, one of many well-deserved awards he has received.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Sanders has improved the lives of countless people in his community and across the Lower Hudson Valley. I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding his years of inspired leadership and dedicated service to the residents of Rockland County, the Lower Hudson Valley, and New York State.

IN MEMORY OF MR. FERMON  
LEWIS RACHELS

**HON. JODY B. HICE**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Fermon Lewis Rachels, a World War II veteran and outstanding civil servant from my district who passed away in February of this year.

A member of the Greatest Generation, Mr. Rachels was born July 14, 1927 in Wrightsville, Georgia. He courageously put his life on the line during World War II, serving as a technician, fourth grade in the United States Army and was one of the last 12,000 WWII veterans alive in Georgia. After leaving the Army, he served as a Trade Craftsman Supervisor at the Georgia Department of Transportation, and at the time of his retirement, at age 84, he was the oldest active employee in Department of Transportation history. He was an active member of Brown Memorial Baptist Church and of the American Legion Post Number 44. Mr. Rachels was selected as Johnson County's Man of the Year in 1985.

Mr. Rachels is survived by his loving wife of 68 years, Hazel Carroll Rachels, his son, Charles Lewis Rachels, his daughter, Sharon Rachels, four grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

On behalf of the 10th District of Georgia and the United States of America, I want to extend my deepest gratitude and appreciation to Mr. Rachels and his family for his outstanding service to our nation and our community.

RECOGNIZING JEANETTE  
STEERMAN

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeanette Steerman, a Naval Academy Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional District. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Jeanette is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Jeanette has demonstrated excellent leadership and a heart for public service as Class President, National Honor Society President, and 4-H President at her high school. She was also an active member and award winner of her high school's FFA chapter, in which she held several leadership positions. Additionally, Jeanette qualified as an Honor Roll student for eight consecutive years and was given a variety of awards recognizing her outstanding academic achievements, including the Young Einstein Award.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Jeanette and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Jeanette.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Jeanette Steerman as an appointee to the Naval Academy for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.

PASSING OF CARDINAL LUBOMYR  
HUSAR

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, with deepest regret and gratitude for his precious and sacrificial life, I wish to include in the RECORD a tribute to the earthly life of Cardinal Lubomyr Husar, a worldwide pillar of holiness, unity, and righteousness. Remembered for his unwavering commitment to defeat tyranny in Ukraine and beyond, we honor his legacy as an indomitable defender of global harmony and respect for life.

Cardinal Husar's tireless dedication to his faith helped revive the spirit of an aching people. In an era fraught with division and tensions, he fought to preserve Greek Orthodoxy in Ukraine, using its teachings to restore the identity and morale of the nation, and to inspire millions beyond.

As he worked to bridge the fissures of a divided world, Cardinal Husar courageously

sought to remedy the upheaval of the last century. Cardinal Husar welcomed John Paul II back to a former Soviet republic for the first time in a thousand years and helped strengthen global interfaith cooperation. I was privileged to be present at that magnificent and grand occasion during which a mass was offered in open fields outside Kyiv, hundreds of chalices gleamed in the sun as the eastern and western Catholic traditions opened the event to people of all traditions.

The Catholic Church in Poland was the vault of national memory and identity during the 123 years the nation was temporarily erased from the European map. Similarly, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church led the archival documentation of Ukraine's national identity and aspiration during the decades Stalin tried to starve Ukraine into defeat. Stalin's efforts to erase the Ukrainian language, history and culture, failed because of the Church's preservation.

Cardinal Husar championed and supported the establishment of the Ukrainian Catholic University's development in Lviv. Astoundingly, it is the only Catholic institution of higher learning in the former Soviet space, a credit to Cardinal Husar's leadership. Even today, it remains one of the pillars of higher education in Ukraine, uncorrupted by the grim Soviet legacy.

An enlightened figure, his temperance and compassion instilled significant progress in the greater reconciliation efforts underway.

A national symbol, Cardinal Husar guided his homeland through an era of great uncertainty, as it struggled to shed the horrors of the past and regained independence with the historic opportunity to build forward toward an open and more democratic society, and vital crossroads between East and West. Driven by his own internal moral compass, his teachings helped to usher in a new era of freedom and unity. He exuded eternal hope for his newly emancipated people. For the Cardinal, freedom itself was more than liberty; ultimately, it provided him "the opportunity to do good."

The last time I had the privilege of speaking with Cardinal Husar, his vision was failing him. But he was completely lucid and urged me to always maintain hope for the future. When he exited the meeting, he proceeded up the stairwell of his residence with a lit candle in hand. That flame continues to burn bright in his memory.

Cardinal Husar's teachings have preserved a spirited and theological legacy instructing future generations for years to come. May his teachings continue to inspire and involve our work every day towards a unified global community. Against all darkness, I am confident the light of Lubomyr Husar will continue to shine and endure. May his soul guide and protect his beloved homeland.

# HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF CANADA'S CONFEDERATION

## HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 150th Anniversary of Canada's Confederation.

As one of our closest allies and largest trading partners, our country shares a historic bond with the people of Canada. This connection is deeply felt by North Country residents, who hold strong economic and cultural ties with our neighbors across the border.

In celebrating Canada's foundation, it is only fitting that we also celebrate the nation's first capital city; Kingston, Ontario. Located directly across the Saint Lawrence River from New York's 21st district, the city holds an essential place in Canadian history; serving as the birthplace of Canada's first Prime Minister, John Alexander Macdonald.

Congratulations to the people of Canada as they celebrate this remarkable milestone. I am confident that our unique and enduring friendship will continue for many years to come.

# CELEBRATING THE BROWARD COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH COURT'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

## HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Broward County Mental Health Court on celebrating its 20th Anniversary on June 23, 2017.

This year's Anniversary will honor the Broward County Public Defender, Mr. Howard Finkelstein; the Honorable Dale Ross; the Broward Sheriff's Office; the Broward Behavioral Health Coalition; the United Way of Broward County; Henderson Behavioral Health; the Broward County Crime Commission; the Mental Health Association of Southeast Florida; and the National Alliance on Mental Illness Broward County. All of these outstanding individuals and organizations deserve this honor as they have devoted countless hours and years to helping those with mental illness navigate an often unforgiving criminal justice system.

As we celebrate this august occasion, I would be remiss if I did not single out the efforts of Judge Ginger Lerner-Wren. Judge Lerner-Wren was tasked with presiding over and administering our country's first Mental Health Court in 1997, shortly after taking the bench. Since that time, she has been a leader in the field of Therapeutic Jurisprudence and the justice that emanates therefrom. Judge Lerner-Wren, and all those who work for the Mental Health Court, as well as those dedicated to the cause of Therapeutic Jurisprudence really have one simple goal in mind—ensuring dignity for those suffering from mental illness, who find themselves navigating our criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud all those associated with Broward County's Mental Health Court over the past 20 years. Their work has made an important difference in the lives of those dealing with mental health issues, to their families, and our community. I wish the Court many more years of continued success, and look forward to championing their important work in Congress.

# TRUMP CUTTING THE EPA WATERSENSE PROGRAM MAKES NO SENSE AT ALL

## HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues a column written by Mary Ann Dickinson on the importance of the WaterSense program, which for ten years has saved consumers money and helped to conserve limited water resources.

TRUMP CUTTING THE EPA WATERSENSE PROGRAM MAKES NO SENSE AT ALL

(By Mary Ann Dickinson)

President Trump promised clean water for all Americans while preserving our natural resources. Yet his recently announced 2018 budget seeks to eliminate or drastically curtail programs that do just that.

It is especially perplexing to see EPA's small but mighty WaterSense program on the chopping block. WaterSense, like its larger predecessor EnergyStar, is a voluntary water product-labeling program that partners with business and communities to enhance the market for water-efficient fixtures and appliances. In this way, WaterSense encourages consumers to purchase products that save water and energy.

In just ten years since its launch, the WaterSense program has already made valuable contributions to building water security for American communities. It has saved more than 1.5 trillion gallons of water, enough to serve all of California's residents for a year. Those savings help protect the nation's water future—ensuring that more water is available for future generations, emergencies and our waterways. Less water used also means less energy used to heat, pump and treat water—thereby eliminating 78 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions from our atmosphere.

The blue and green WaterSense logo helps customers easily choose new toilets, showerheads, faucets and irrigation controllers that have been independently certified to perform as well as or better than standard models—while using at least 20 percent less water.

That choice is good for American families that already spend an average of \$1,100 per year on water. In fact, it has already saved consumers \$32.6 billion in water and energy bills. With water rates rising each year, WaterSense can help families better manage their household expenses.

But WaterSense isn't just delivering more reliable and affordable water to consumers; it's actually driving innovation and supporting economic growth—goals at the core of Trump's platform.

Large American plumbing and irrigation manufacturers have seen their businesses grow by adding WaterSense-labeled products

to their portfolios, while start-ups and smaller shops are getting their products to market more quickly, thanks to the clearly defined performance standards and certification process in the WaterSense program. This has resulted in a competitive edge for companies manufacturing American-made WaterSense products. In addition, as water becomes more scarce and expensive, WaterSense can help all businesses reduce their operating costs and increase their resiliency by installing high-efficiency fixtures in their facilities.

WaterSense isn't a mandatory program or an example of overreaching and costly regulations. It is a voluntary, public-private partnership program where businesses and communities opt in to participate.

And they have overwhelmingly opted in. More than 1,700 partners build their businesses and support their communities by participating in the WaterSense program. Nearly 200 of them recently signed a letter asking EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt to continue to fund it into the future.

So how much money is it? WaterSense costs taxpayers a mere \$3.1 million per year to run—a meager federal expenditure for a significant economic benefit delivered to businesses and individuals. Continued public investment is key. A product labeling program run by the private sector would lack objectivity and credibility to consumers.

The WaterSense program is the best kind of government program. It leverages a small public investment into big savings for homeowners and businesses, while ensuring secure and sustainable water supplies. Let's make sure it stays in the 2018 budget.

# HONORING LOUIS S. D'ANTONIO ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

## HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join family, friends, and colleagues in paying tribute to Louis S. D'Antonio as he marks his retirement after more than three decades with Gateway Community College.

A native of New Haven, Lou has dedicated a lifetime of service to our community. Following his graduation from New Haven public schools, Lou earned both his bachelor and master's degrees at Fairfield University. I had the good fortune to get to know Lou when we worked together for Community Progress Inc., an anti-poverty agency focused on education and employment. From his earliest days, Lou understood the critical connection between education and the workforce. Prior to joining Gateway, Lou also held positions with the New Haven Office of Manpower and the New Haven Employment and Training Administration.

Lou began his career with Gateway Community College, known then as South Central Community College, in 1981 as the Director of Community Services and Continuing Education. He soon became Associate Dean of Community Affairs and in 1989 was appointed to his current position as Dean of Administrative Affairs. In this capacity, Lou was responsible for the oversight of a myriad of administrative and financial support services including

facilities, maintenance and event management, financial affairs, information technology, institutional research as well as safety and security. At its core, Lou ensured that the campus was prepared to meet the demands of faculty, students, and the community.

Lou's contributions to Gateway have been innumerable. His brought a unique perspective to various college committees including the health and safety committee as well as the NEASC committee. He represented the college as a member of the Board of Directors of the Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce and the Personnel and Finance Committee of Workforce Alliance. And in what has been the singularly most transformative measure for Gateway, Lou headed up the Building Committee for its new downtown campus which opened in 2015. The development of this state-of-the-art campus has ensured that Gateway Community College is ready to help prepare its students for the 21st century workforce today and for decades to come.

Today, as he celebrates his retirement after a distinguished career, I am honored to have this opportunity to extend my sincere thanks and heartfelt congratulations to Louis S. D'Antonio for all of his good work on behalf of Gateway Community College and the City of New Haven. I wish Lou and his wife, Adrienne, as well as their five children, Robert, Daniel, Lisa, Amy and Lisa; and their seven grandchildren the very best for many more years of health and happiness as they enjoy this next chapter.

#### HONORING RUDY CASTRO

#### HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to honor the life of Rudy Castro—a Marine Corps veteran, devoted educator, civic leader, and lifelong baseball player and coach.

Rudy was born and raised in Barrio Anita in Tucson, attended Davis Elementary, Roskrige Jr. High and graduated from Tucson High School in 1949. Since his first days playing with friends in Oury Park, Rudy's talent for baseball was clear; even at a young age, Rudy could be found playing with kids five years older than him just to find a challenge, and was so talented that he started playing with the Tucson High School varsity baseball team in 7th grade.

Rudy's remarkable athletic abilities were not just restricted to baseball—in high school, Rudy played football, baseball, and basketball, leading his teams to several championships all while serving on his school's student council and maintaining a high GPA. This earned him the attention of the baseball coach of Palo Verde Junior College who promptly offered him a baseball scholarship.

Rudy initially turned down the offer so that he could find a job and help support his family. Fortunately, when his mother heard about the scholarship, she immediately packed Rudy's bags for him. After just two years of junior college, Rudy joined the Marine Corps

during the Korean War and served in the infamous "E Company" for the next four years.

In 1951, Rudy and 100 other young servicemen tried out for the Camp Pendleton Baseball team, and Rudy was one of just 20 to make the cut. After touring with his team across the country and winning All-Marine honors as an outstanding shortstop, Rudy went back to school to play baseball at the University of Arizona on another full-ride scholarship. After graduating, Rudy began his career as a teacher, teaching at Safford Junior High, Roskrige K-8, and finally became the baseball coach at Cholla High School.

After returning to school for a dual master's degree, Rudy was named Director of the Extended Day School at Tucson High School, where he spent a decade encouraging students to keep working toward obtaining their diplomas. He was a devoted coach and teacher even outside of school, spending his summers and free time coaching baseball and volunteering as a referee and umpire for high school games. In addition, he is remembered by his former players and students as a person who was always willing to listen to their problems and offer them advice as they became older.

A prominent member of the Tucson political community as well, Rudy served as a Tucson City Councilman for nine years, as well as serving on the Selective Service Board, Pima County Grievance Committee, and as the first chairman of the Pima County Sports Authority. In retirement, Rudy played baseball well into his 70's, earning him membership in the Senior League Baseball Hall of Fame and the Southern Pima County Sports Hall of Fame. As a political leader, education advocate, friend, and father, Rudy made a huge impact on many lives and on the Tucson community at large—his passion for life and love for the people around him will never be forgotten.

He is survived by his wife, Carol; daughter, Linda (Tom) Spencer and son Rudy; daughters, Julie and Celina; sister, Alice Rice; brother, Rick (Helen) Acedo and half-brother, Albert; grandchildren, KC McCall, and Holly and Thomas Bolen as well as many other loving relatives. Rudy Castro's life is part of the unique and special character of Tucson, just as Rudy was a unique and special character himself.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK J. HOSO, JR.

#### HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Frank J. Hoso, Jr. who passed away on Friday, June 2, 2017. He was surrounded by his loving family. He leaves his wife Sylvia and 9 children behind.

Frank was born on May 17, 1934 in Niles, Ohio, and he remained a lifelong resident of Niles. Frank was a 1952 graduate of St. Mary's High School and then continued on to pursue a Bachelor Degree in Education at Kent State University. Frank also courageously served our country in the United

States Army Reserves. After leaving the Army, he went on to earn a Master Degree in Education in 1968 from Westminster College, and he took additional Post Graduate classes at Youngstown State University. Frank was married to wife Sylvia for 57 years, and together they shared 12 adoring children.

Frank worked as a teacher for much of his career. He began teaching junior high at Saints Peter and Paul School from 1959–1969 before going on to teach for 39 years at Warren City Schools. Even after he retired as a full-time teacher, he continued to assist as a substitute teacher.

Frank was also an active member of his community. He served with the United States Army Reserves for five years before being honorably discharged on November 20, 1962 with the rank of Corporal. Additionally, he was a faithful member of Saints Peter and Paul Byzantine Catholic Church in Warren, where he tended to the parish cemetery.

I extend my deepest condolences to Frank's family and friends. He was a wonderful man who leaves behind an extensive legacy. He will be dearly missed.

#### RECOGNIZING KATHERINE MURPHY

#### HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Katherine Murphy, a West Point appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Katherine is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Katherine has demonstrated her commitment to public service through her involvement in Student Government, Student Council, and Community Service Club. She was an active member of her high school's chapter of the National Honor Society as well as the Spanish National Honor Society. Additionally, in recognition of her outstanding athletic and academic achievements, Katherine was named "Rookie of the Year" for the Varsity Cross Country team and received the Colorado Girls State Outstanding Citizen Award.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Katherine and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Katherine.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Katherine Murphy as an appointee to West Point for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.



HONORING DR. ANTOINETTE  
IADAROLA ON THE OCCASION OF  
HER RETIREMENT

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with my sincere thanks and heartfelt congratulations that I rise today to join staff, faculty, students, board members, and alumnae in paying tribute to Dr. Antoinette "Toni" Iadarola, President of Luralton Hall, as she marks her retirement from an auspicious career in education and administration. Toni's leadership and vision over the course of her tenure as President has ensured that Luralton Hall will continue to meet its mission of empowering young women for life.

Toni earned her bachelor's degree in history and political science at St. Joseph College, her master's and doctoral degrees in European diplomatic history from Georgetown University, and post-doctoral grants for studies at Yale and Fordham Universities. A former Fulbright scholar associated with Oxford University, Toni held an impressive list of academic and administrative posts before coming to Luralton Hall; Chair of the History Department and Coordinator of Women Studies at Saint Joseph College in Connecticut, Dean of Faculty at the College of Mt. St. Joseph in Ohio, and Provost at Colby-Sawyer in New Hampshire, and 16 years as President and Professor of History of Cabrini College.

Toni's background extends far beyond academia. Her passion for community service led to her participation as a volunteer consultant on several projects funded by the State Department: working with women NGOs in Belarus, discussing privatization issues in higher education in Russia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. She was also invited to the United Nations to serve on the Commission for Disarmament Education, Conflict Resolution and Peace, an NGO established by the International Association of University Presidents, presenting on behalf of the Commission in South Africa, Australia, and Thailand. Toni has also done volunteer work in orphanages in Swaziland and Guyana.

It was this awe-inspiring world of experiences that she brought with her as she took the helm at Luralton Hall in 2009 and that she has shared with faculty, staff, and students. Over the course of her eight-year tenure as President, she has focused her attention on modernizing the campus, which has not only met the needs of today's educators and students, but has made Luralton Hall more competitive as a whole. The creation of an Internet Cafe, a Center for Guidance and College Planning, the addition of an athletic practice field, classroom renovations to accommodate today's technologies, and the conversion of the carriage barn for the music program are just some of the projects that have been started or completed under her guiding hand. Toni has given Luralton Hall a solid foundation on which to continue its success in preparing young women for their future success.

I would be remiss if I did not extend a special note of thanks to Toni for her friendship

over the years. Luralton Hall holds a special place in my heart—some of my fondest memories are of my time there. It has been an honor and privilege to work with Toni to build on the school's 108-year history and the incredible impact it has had on the young women who have matriculated there.

As an alumnus of Luralton Hall and as a friend, I am honored to stand today to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Antoinette Iadarola for her outstanding contributions as President of Luralton Hall. She leaves a legacy that will continue to inspire staff, faculty, students, and alumnae alike. I wish her all the best for many more years of health and happiness as she enjoys her retirement.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNTAIN LAKE PBS

**HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Public Broadcasting Service of Mountain Lake on their 40th Anniversary.

The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) is a non-profit organization with a mission of enriching and inspiring communities around the country. Through its 350 member stations, PBS is able to provide television and radio programming for all ages, ranging from local and national news, to educational shows for both children and adults. Reaching 82 percent of all American households, the work of PBS allows people from all walks of life to experience a broader world.

In my district, Mountain Lake PBS serves an especially important role, bringing news and entertainment to the people of Upstate New York, Vermont, Quebec, and Ontario. Their work has greatly expanded the options available to North Country residents, whether they are parents looking for fun and informational programming for their children, or adults looking for more choices in news or recreation.

I would like to thank Mountain Lake PBS for making the betterment of our community a priority during their 40 years of broadcasting.

HONORING JACK HEALY

**HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jack Healy, former President and CEO of the Massachusetts Manufacturing Extension Partnership, who passed away in late April. The City of Worcester was shaped by its manufacturing heritage, and thanks to Jack, manufacturing remains a part of Worcester's future. I had the pleasure of working with Jack for many years and was proud to call him a partner in revitalizing our manufacturing base and creating good paying jobs across Massachusetts.

In 1999, after a long and successful career at Presmet Corp., LEGO Systems, Squibb-

Beech-Nut Inc. and the Wellesley Group, Jack founded MassMEP to help manufacturers adapt to the evolving economic climate. Under Jack's guidance, many in-state manufacturers successfully pivoted to advanced manufacturing and management practices that helped them not only survive, but also grow.

Jack and MassMEP, through initiatives like the award-winning Mobile Outreach Skills Training (M.O.S.T.) Program, helped companies to compete with foreign advanced manufacturers by closing the skills gap, proving training and creating employment opportunities for people with little to no manufacturing experience. Thanks to the tireless work and dedication of Jack and the others at the Partnership, MassMEP has helped to create thousands of new jobs and has been recognized as a leader in manufacturing competitiveness. It's no wonder why Jack is known as the "voice of manufacturing" in Massachusetts.

Beyond his work with MassMEP, the City of Worcester is indebted to Jack for the key role he played in the "Manufacturing Our Future" effort in Central Massachusetts. These annual summits fostered partnerships between industry, academia, and government that have significantly advanced local manufacturing competitiveness. Notably, this partnership is responsible for developing Worcester's Gateway Park, formerly an underused, 11-acre industrial area, into a beautiful bioengineering research complex that is attracting significant private investment and generating hundreds of new jobs.

Jack had a razor sharp Irish wit matched with a New York City toughness that barely covered a heart of gold. His epic battles over federal funding for MassMEP are legendary, and showed what a tenacious and relentless advocate Jack was for the organization he led. He was among the most loyal and thoughtful business leaders I encountered, and he counseled and helped countless small manufacturers transition into the new reality of lean, precision manufacturing. He never lost sight of the worker on the shop floor who needed retraining and new job skills to survive and thrive in the age of automation.

Jack was a wonderful husband, father, grandfather, and great grandfather. He will be dearly missed by his beloved wife of over 60 years, Hilda, his children John, Robert, Mary, and Joseph, his son-in-law Dr. Mark Watkins, his daughters-in-law Grace, Paula, and Amy, and all of his grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Jack was an incredible partner in revitalizing the Massachusetts manufacturing base, and I'm proud to have called him a friend.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Jack Healy.

RECOGNIZING JULIA WYATT

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Julia Wyatt, a West Point Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's

brave men and women in uniform. Julia is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Julia has demonstrated her commitment to public service, holding a variety of leadership positions in her high school's chapter of the National Honor Society, Key Club, Leaders for Life, and Student Council. She also received numerous awards recognizing her outstanding athletic and academic achievements, including the Presidential Award, Honors Biology Academic Distinction Award, and Ironworks Academic Distinction Medal.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Julia and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Julia.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Julia Wyatt as an appointee to West Point for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.

#### IN MEMORY OF LARRY SULC

#### HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 2017, a thoughtful memorial service was conducted by Dr. Carl J. Broggi at Arlington National Cemetery for American Hero Larry Sulc.

The following obituary, published in The Washington Post on February 12, 2017, clearly identifies his devotion to promoting freedom:

Lawrence Bradley "Larry" Sulc, a former Intelligence Officer and founder of the Nathan Hale Foundation, died February 1, 2017, in Beaufort, SC, due to complications from Alzheimer's disease. The son of an electrician who moved his family from New Jersey to the Panama Canal Zone during the Great Depression, Larry, and his older brother David grew up exploring the jungles of Panama. He was a proud "Canal Zone Boy." In 1944, at 17, Larry joined the U.S. Navy and served in WWII in the Pacific theater. After graduating from Stanford, he was recruited by the CIA and served for 25 years in Latin America, Europe and the Far East. Early in his career as an operative, during the Korean War, he and future Commandant of the Marine Corps Robert Barrow, trained and led Nationalist Chinese guerrillas, conducting raids on the Chinese coast and Chinese shipping drawing Communist resources away from our boys in the Korean War. After retiring from the agency Larry served first in the U.S. House of Representatives on the Foreign Affairs Committee staff, then as Executive Director, House Republican Study Committee. He was later appointed by President Ronald Reagan as Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of State (Inter-Departmental Affairs, Bureau of Intelligence and Research). After leaving public service, he consulted on matters of risk assessment, corporate security, counterintel-

ligence and counterterrorism. Larry was predeceased by his parents and his older brother, David. He is survived by his wife of 33 years, Jean Luena Mestres Sulc of St. Helena Island, SC and his four children from his first marriage to Marian Sulc Scambos of Arlington, VA: Bradley Sulc (Carolyn), Wayne Sulc (Lourdes), Katherine Dwyer (Terrence) and Brian Sulc, residing in the Washington, DC capitol area. He is also survived by his 13 grandchildren, Michael, Brian, Moriah, Jackson, Elizabeth, Savanna, Hunter, Maggie, Sierra, Sonora, Stephanie, Michelle and Bojan. Remembrances are welcomed and appreciated for Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation, 300 New Jersey Avenue, NW Suite 900, Washington, DC 20001 and Community Bible Church's, Mission Programs, P.O. Box 119, Beaufort, SC 29901. An inurnment ceremony will take place at Arlington National Cemetery, at a later date.

#### SIXTEENTH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AWARDS

#### HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to law enforcement men and women who have provided distinctive service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

Law enforcement is a demanding profession that requires sacrifice, courage and a dedication to serve others. Every day, brave men and women put themselves in harm's way to enforce the laws of our society and protect public safety. They deserve our gratitude and respect.

Six years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Law Enforcement Awards, CLEA, to give special recognition to law enforcement officers, departments, or units for exceptional achievement.

This year, I will present congressional law enforcement awards to the following winners chosen by an independent panel comprised of current and retired law enforcement personnel representing a cross-section of the district's law enforcement community.

Officer Jason Nuttall of the Bradenton Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Captain John Walsh, Captain Debra Kaspar, Lieutenant Jon Varley, Community Affairs Director Kaitlyn Perez, Deputy Phillip Mockler, Detective Tim Speth and Investigator Lynn Thomson of the Sarasota County Sheriff's will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Richard Wilson of the Palmetto Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Officer Alan Bores of the Holmes Beach Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Justin Warren of the Manatee County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Sergeant Robert Armstrong of the Sarasota Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Deputy Kevin Smetana of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Master Sergeant George Taunton of The Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Career Service Award.

Troopers Caleb Kerr and Trooper Brett Fitzpatrick of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Preservation of Life Award.

Sergeant Patrick Roberts of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Above and Beyond the Call of Duty Award.

Pastor Patrick Miller, Pastor Vincent Smith, Doctor Harriet Moore, Geoffrey Gilot and Al-Muta Hawks all affiliated with the Boys and Girls Club of Sarasota will receive the Associate Service Award.

The Manatee County Special Investigations Division will receive the Unit Citation Award. The members of this unit are: Major William Jordan, Captain Todd Shear, Lieutenant Anthony Carr, Division Secretary Toni Burton, Administrative Assistant Cindy Hoffman, Sergeant Jason Powell, Detective James Parrish, Detective Kim Zink, Detective Greg Dunlap, Detective Mike Diaz, Bruce Benjamin (Crime Stoppers), Amber Hoffman (Manager), Erica Chenard (UCR Coordinator), Criminal Analyst Ashley Eannarino, Criminal Analyst Elicia Main, Intel Analyst Don Brown, Criminal Analyst John Ferrito, Intel Analyst Elizabeth Thomas, Sergeant Evelio Perez, Detective Joseph Petta, Detective Justin Warren, Detective Derek Pollock, Detective Eric Davis, Detective Ray Richter, Detective Patrick Thames, Detective Scott Williamson, Sergeant Gary Combee, Detective William Freely, Detective Maria Gillum, Detective Bryce Wilhelm, Detective Jonathan Kruse, Sergeant Steve Barron, Detective Randall Walker, Detective Brian Beck, Detective Shayne Rousseau, Detective Jeremy Martin, Detective Robert Brigham, Sergeant Isaac Redmond, Detective Rafael Ortega, Detective Christopher Gallagher, Detective Joel Taylor, Detective David Bocchino, and Detective Lourdes Santiago, Detective Aaron Bowling, Sergeant Brian Quiles, Detective Wendy Zarvis.

#### CELEBRATING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF MILTON

#### HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 225th Anniversary of Milton, New York.

Located on Kayaderosseras Creek in the heart of Saratoga County, the town of Milton demonstrates the rich and evolving history of Upstate New York. Even before it was officially established on March 7, 1792, Milton's forests and water supplies provided early pioneers with a fertile environment for their settlements. Included amongst these early establishments were the water mills, which provided the town's namesake and acted as a driving force for economic development into the 20th century.

In 1948, the Kesselring Site of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program came to West

Milton, becoming a major employer in the area. To this day, the site serves an important role in training the servicemen and women who operate our country's nuclear powered submarines and aircraft. Many Milton residents also commute to New York's Capital region, where they serve their community by working in local and state government.

While continuing to grow and develop, the town of Milton provides valuable services and a strong sense of community to its residents. Milton has five established parks for outdoor recreation, as well as a variety of other rural recreation areas for people to enjoy. Additionally, the town works with nearby Ballston Spa to preserve their shared environment and to care for the elderly in their populations.

I would like to congratulate the town of Milton on its 225th Anniversary. In New York's 21st District, we are proud of this momentous occasion and look forward to the many years which lie ahead

RECOGNIZING SEVEN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CHOSEN TO REPRESENT COLORADO AS DELEGATES AT THE CONGRESS OF FUTURE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LEADERS

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize seven high school students who have been chosen to represent the state of Colorado as delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. The students are Sebastian Comeaux, Dominic Plaia, Michael Bremd, Ethan Drake, Itzel Martinez Bernal, Crystal Kechter, and James Reeder.

The Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders is an honors program that recognizes exceptional high school students who are pursuing careers as engineers, scientists, or technologists.

These students are the future leaders of the STEM fields and our country. Through their studies, they have embodied the meaning of hard work and perseverance to achieve their goals, and will advance science and technology for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize these students from the fourth district of Colorado for their hard work and service to our community. I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING DORSEY L. KENDRICK, PH.D., PRESIDENT OF GATEWAY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound respect and admiration that I rise today to join family, friends, colleagues and commu-

nity leaders in extending my deepest thanks and appreciation to Dr. Dorsey L. Kendrick as she celebrates her retirement as President of Gateway Community College in New Haven, Connecticut. Over the course of her nearly two decades of leadership, Dorsey has both literally and figuratively changed the face of Gateway, leaving an indelible mark on the college and our community.

Dorsey's unique personal story is the core of her personal passion for education and creating opportunity for students. A native of Jackson, Tennessee, Dorsey was one of three African-American students—and the only woman—to initiate integration at Union University. After earning a Bachelor's of Science degree in business administration at Union, she went on to earn an M.S. in Business Administration at Cardinal Stritch University and a Ph.D. in Philosophy in Higher Education from Walden University. She is also a graduate of the Institute of Education Management at Harvard University. Prior to appointment at Gateway, Dorsey was the first African-American woman to be named associate dean and then dean of the School of Business Management at Milwaukee Area Technical College. She later became the school's executive vice-president and the highest-ranking African-American woman in Wisconsin's higher education system.

The legacy Dorsey leaves at Gateway Community College is nothing short of awe-inspiring. In her first eight years at the helm. The school's enrollment more than doubled and today Gateway is the largest of Connecticut's twelve community colleges, serving more than 12,000 undergraduates every year. Dorsey not only created a nursing program but under her leadership the college has bolstered program offerings in the fields of allied health, green technologies, the culinary arts, early childhood education, and business. She was one of the first to recognize the importance of working with local industries to develop curriculum and certificate programs that would ensure students are prepared for the needs of the local job market. Perhaps her crowning achievement has been the creation the Gateway's new campus in Downtown New Haven. The four-story, LEED Gold-certified complex opened in August 2012 and is home to extraordinary classrooms and state-of-the-art labs, creating a learning environment that is second to none.

During her tenure, I have had many opportunities to work with Dorsey and found a kindred spirit in the effort to expand access to higher education, enable students to realize their full potential, and make their dreams a reality. From creating partnerships with local industries to prepare students for the jobs of today to providing resources to local veterans, and from addressing a nursing shortage to preparing students for a changing manufacturing sector, it has been my honor to work side by side with her. I cannot thank her enough for her friendship and counsel over the years.

At her inauguration Dorsey stated "I plan to leave my footprints on this college"—she has done that and so much more. She has created lasting partnerships on which Gateway Community College can build future success. Her advocacy and dedication has ensured that the

doors of opportunity are open for Gateway's students, and her innovative vision has created a campus ready to prepare a 21st century workforce. Though her retirement marks the end of an era, I have no doubt that Dorsey will continue to find ways to make a difference in our community. It is my great honor to rise today to thank Dr. Dorsey L. Kendrick for her outstanding leadership and invaluable contributions to our community as well as extend my very best wishes to her for many more years of health and happiness as she begins this next chapter of her life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. KEITH ELLISON**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, due to other commitments, I missed the following roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call No. 286, I would have voted yes,

Roll Call No. 287, I would have voted yes.

HONORING THE STAFF AND COMMUNITY AT GOOD OLD LOWER EAST SIDE

**HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the staff and community at Good Old Lower East Side (GOLES). Through tireless efforts, GOLES works to provide housing services for New York's most vulnerable residents. On the occasion of their 39th Annual Celebration, let us pause to say thank you for such life-changing work.

Founded in 1977, GOLES has seen the Lower East Side change through rapid gentrification. Facing a shifting landscape, many New Yorkers and small businesses have already lost or fear losing their homes.

GOLES actively works to meet the challenges of gentrification by offering tenant rights and eviction prevention counseling, successfully helping over 2,000 families avoid eviction each year.

By working directly with community members living in rent-regulated public housing, the staff at GOLES are committed to preserving affordable housing and diversity on the Lower East Side.

It is my honor to salute and thank GOLES for helping to keep New Yorkers in the places they call home. My sincerest wishes for a joyful and successful celebration and to many more years of groundbreaking work.

RECOGNIZING FIVE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CHOSEN TO REPRESENT COLORADO AS DELEGATES AT THE CONGRESS FOR FUTURE MEDICAL LEADERS

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize five high school students who were selected to represent the state of Colorado as delegates at the Congress for Future Medical Leaders. The students are Conor McDaniel, Mariah Pell, Robert Vanderschaaff, Keely Zeimet, and Hailey Archuleta.

The Congress of Future Medical Leaders is an honors program that recognizes exceptional high school students who are pursuing careers as a physician or in medical research.

These students are the future leaders of the medical field and our country. Through their studies, they have embodied the meaning of hard work and perseverance to achieve their goals, and will better the health of future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize these students from the fourth district of Colorado for their hard work and service to our community. I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING JAKE HANSEN

**HON. KEN BUCK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jake Hansen, owner and founder of Bricktree Customs.

Bricktree Customs, a custom LEGO Kit Company in Longmont, Colorado, was founded by Jake in 2015, at the young age of 16. He has created over a dozen carnival-themed

custom LEGO kits to date, all of which he designed. Jake's kits are available at local toy stores in Longmont, as well as online in a global marketplace.

Entrepreneurs and small businesses are the backbone of our economy and communities. It is the ingenuity and hard work of Coloradans like Jake that make America a global leader. He has shown true creativity and innovation in his business and community.

On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Jake as he pursues his future undertakings.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Jake Hansen for his accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF MICHAEL SMITH

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Michael A. Smith, an outstanding member of a special family in the Shenandoah Valley, whose generosity of time, energy, and money has made a significant difference in the lives of my Shenandoah Valley constituents. Mr. Smith recently received the President's Award of Shepherd University, in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, for his extraordinary service and contributions to that university.

With the passing of their father, Gerald F. Smith, in 2003, Michael and his brother, Gerald Smith, Jr. have led the family owned business, Valley Proteins, Inc., through a period of remarkable growth. Established in 1949 by their grandfather, Clyde A. Smith, as a one-truck service for recycling waste meat byproducts and spent cooking oils, Valley Proteins is now one of the largest independent rendering companies in North America, operating 12 plants in seven states.

Although the Smith family enterprise has consumed most of the brothers' time, they have both given back to the community in sig-

nificant ways. Michael has served as the President of the Winchester Youth Development Center, which provides recreational and enrichment opportunities for the youth of Winchester, the Vice President of the Virginia Community College Foundation, which raises funds to provide access to post-secondary education to all Virginians, the Treasurer and Annual Giving Chairman for Powhatan School, and the President of the Board of Directors of the Upperville Colt and Horse Show.

Since graduating from Shepherd University with a business degree in 1989, Michael Smith has also generously given of his time and money to his alma mater. Today, he is president of the Shepherd University Foundation, which receives and administers private gifts for student scholarships, academic and program support, faculty excellence awards and other university initiatives. In addition to starting two endowed funds in the name of his grandfather and father, Smith assisted with the university's efforts to create a school of business, by issuing a generous challenge grant which resulted in the raising of more than \$650,000 for the school.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in honoring Michael Smith, Vice President of Valley Proteins, Inc., for his special recognition from Shepherd University and his extraordinary contributions to the residents of the northern Shenandoah Valley and the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. CARLOS CURBELO**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2017*

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on account of my flight being cancelled from MIA-DCA. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 300 and YEA on Roll Call No. 301.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 14, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 14, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

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

Almighty God, on a day when violence has come to this assembly, we ask Your blessing on our brother Representative STEVE SCALISE, the two officers, and the staffer who have been shot. Bless the hands of those who tend to their injuries.

We as Americans are blessed by a free and open society, with rights secured by law and the Constitution. But once again we are reminded that there is a vulnerability that comes with that openness.

May we all be vigilant in being good citizens, neighbors, and defenders of our way of life at a time when so many challenges to our way of life and government seem under siege.

We thank You for the men and women who respond to the crises that befall us, especially the Capitol Police, and all first responders. May their heroism and generosity of spirit be an inspiration to us all, and may they be as-

sured of our appreciation of their service.

And in this great silence, as we are gathered most dramatically as this assembly at the people's House, may Republicans and Democrats be mindful of the rare companionship they share, men and women who have taken very public responsibility for our country, that carries so many burdens and, today, the reminder, shared danger.

May this day be characterized by kindness, goodwill, and compassion one to another.

God, bless America, and may all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### WE ARE UNITED

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are very strong emotions throughout this House today. We are all horrified by this dreadful attack on our friends and colleagues, and those who serve and protect this Capitol.

We are all praying for those who were attacked and for their families: STEVE SCALISE, Zachary Barth, Matt Mika, Special Agent David Bailey, Special Agent Crystal Griner.

We are all giving our thoughts to those currently being treated for their injuries at this moment.

And we are united. We are united in our shock. We are united in our anguish. An attack on one of us is an attack on all of us.

I know we want to give our thanks to the first responders and to the Alexandria Police Department, who were on

the scene in minutes. And I know this House wants to state, unequivocally, that we are, as ever, awed by the tremendous bravery of the Capitol Police.

I spoke with Special Agent Bailey and Special Agent Griner this morning. One was being treated, and one was about to go into surgery. I expressed our profound gratitude to them. It is clear to me, based on various eyewitness accounts, that without these two heroes, Agent Bailey and Agent Griner, many lives would have been lost.

I know that we all want to learn as much as we can about what happened. We just received a briefing from the Sergeant at Arms. I have complete confidence in the investigation that is being conducted by the Capitol Police and the FBI, who are also working with local law enforcement.

I know we want to extend our gratitude for the outpouring of support we have received from throughout the Capitol and from around the country.

And now, knowing STEVE SCALISE as we all do, he is likely really frustrated that he is not going to be able to play in the baseball game. I also know that STEVE wants all of us to commend the bravery of those who came to the aid of the wounded. In the coming days, we will hear their stories, and we will have a chance to hold up their heroism.

My colleagues, there are so many memories from this day that we will want to forget, and there are so many images that we will not want to see again. But there is one image in particular that this House should keep, and that is a photo I saw this morning of our Democratic colleagues gathered in prayer this morning after hearing the news.

You know, every day we come here to test and to challenge each other. We feel so deeply about the things that we fight for and the things that we believe in. At times, our emotions can clearly get the best of us. We are all imperfect, but we do not shed our humanity when we enter this Chamber.

For all the noise and all the fury, we are one family. These were our brothers and sisters in the line of fire. These were our brothers and sisters who ran into danger and saved countless lives.

So before this House returns to its business, let's just slow down and reflect to think about how we are all being tested right now, because we are being tested right now.

I ask each of you to join me to resolve to come together, to lift each other up, and to show the country, to

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

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

show the world, that we are one House, the people's House, united in our humanity. It is that humanity which will win the day, and it always will.

God bless.

#### WE ARE UNITED

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished Speaker in paying tribute to the brave men and women of the Capitol Police force, and also, in sadness, for the assault that was made on our colleagues and members of the staff.

To my colleagues, you will hear me say something you have never heard me say before: I identify myself with the remarks of the Speaker. They were beautiful remarks, Mr. Speaker. Thank you so much for the sentiments that they represent. Thank you so much.

Again, we are not one caucus or the other in this House today, but I can speak for each other in saying that we send our thoughts and prayers to our colleague, STEVE SCALISE.

Personally, we have our Italian-American connection, so as soon as I heard his name, I was filled with concern, as I would be for anyone here, but we have that special connection. So our hopes and prayers—and I said to the Speaker: “I will be asking you every 5 minutes, ‘How is Steve coming along?’” And also, for Zach Barth in Congressman ROGER WILLIAMS’ office; Matt Mika, who was a former staffer, and, of course, as the Speaker acknowledged, Crystal Griner and David Bailey.

In acknowledging their sacrifice and how fortunate we all were that they were on the scene, because other lives would have probably been lost, I want us to remember that every single day the Capitol Police protect all of us, take risks for us. And while a day like this is a time where we can focus on it so sadly, it doesn't mean that other days aren't as challenging.

I especially want to call attention to Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut, who, almost 19 years ago, July 24, 1998, lost their lives protecting the Congress, the Capitol, but not just the Members of Congress, the staff, the press, and our visitors, people who come to see this Capitol, this great edifice to democracy known throughout the world. So they are protecting a great deal, and it is an attraction, and that makes it all the more risky.

You may not know this, my colleagues, but every time I pray, which is very frequently, and certainly every Sunday, I pray for all of you, all of you together. In the earlier years, I used to pray for your happiness, for the fact that we would, working together, heed the words of President Kennedy in the

closing of his inaugural address when he said: “. . . God's work must truly be our own.”

How do we view what God's will is for us? How do we come together to give confidence to the American people? As our Founders intended, we would have our disagreements and we would debate them, and we would have confidence in our beliefs and humility to listen to others.

But in more recent years, I have been praying not only for that, but for our safety because I, above anyone in here, and I can say that quite clearly, have been probably the target of more—a political target and, therefore, the target of more threats than anyone, perhaps other than the President of the United States, Barack Obama.

And so I prayed for Barack Obama, and now I continue to pray for him. And I pray for Donald Trump, that his Presidency will be successful and that his family will be safe, because it is about family.

We are called for a purpose to this body. It is a great thing, and we know what it means to each of us to serve, and we recognize that in others. And we also recognize that you have your constituents. We have ours, and we respect you and your constituents who sent you here, all worthy of respect.

But we do have our differences, and so I pray. My prayer is that we can resolve our differences in a way that furthers the preamble to the Constitution, takes us closer to “e pluribus unum.” And today, again, it is in the family. It is an injury in the family for the staff and for our colleague and for his leadership.

As I mentioned just a minute ago in a meeting, sports are a wonderful thing in our country. They are probably one of the most unifying things. I think the arts, we like to say music, or plays, or whatever, but sports really bring us together in our cities. You see, people have the biggest differences of opinion on politics, and yet when their team is on the field, people come together. People come together.

So when this team was on the field practicing with such camaraderie and such brotherhood—I don't know if you have any sisters on your team. We have two on our team—for this person to take this action was so cowardly, so cowardly.

We will learn more about motivation and the rest of that, but it seems particularly sad—although any violent death, of course, is sad, but particularly sad at a time when people want us to come together, and we are prepared to come together tomorrow night—that this assault would be made.

But we cannot let that be a victory for the assailant, or anyone who would think that way. So tomorrow, we will go out on the field. We will root for our team. We want everyone to do his or

her very best, and we will use this occasion as one that brings us together and not separates us further.

Again, I want to thank the Speaker for bringing us together, and, again, with endless gratitude to our Capitol Police, and, in particular today, of course, Crystal Griner, David Bailey; but never out of our prayers, Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to share some thoughts with you on this sad day. STEVE, Zach, and Matt, you are deeply in our prayers. We count the minutes until STEVE returns.

Please convey that to him, Mr. Speaker.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 14, 2017, at 9:24 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 831.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the “Police Officer Scott Bashium Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1661. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of multiple violations of the



Antideficiency Act, Army case number 16-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1662. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army case number 16-03, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1663. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing 12 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1664. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a follow-up to the Department's FY 2016 Evaluation of the TRICARE Program report to Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1073 note; Public Law 104-106, Sec. 717(c); (110 Stat. 376); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1665. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Humanitarian Use Devices; 21st Century Cures Act; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2017-N-0011] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1666. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Physical Security Hardware — Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria [NUREG-0800] received June 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1667. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2016 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1668. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Presidential Records [FDMS No.: NARA-16-0005; NARA-2017-042] (RIN: 3095-AB87) received June 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1669. A letter from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination and change in previously submitted reported information, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1670. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; 2017 and 2018 Sector Operations Plans and 2017 Allocation of Northeast Multispecies Annual Catch Entitlements [Docket No.: 170104016-7016-01] (RIN: 0648-

XF138) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1671. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northern Red Hake Accountability Measure [Docket No.: 170126124-7124-01] (RIN: 0648-BG63) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1672. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF449) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1673. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2017 and 2018 Commercial Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 161031999-7314-02] (RIN: 0648-BG41) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1674. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF458) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1675. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF413) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1676. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Increase for the Small Vessel Category of the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 151211999-6343-02] (RIN: 0648-XF313) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1677. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries,

NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF333) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1678. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 160808696-7010-02] (RIN: 0648-BG86) received June 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1679. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulation Policy and Management (00REG), Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fisher Houses and Other Temporary Lodging (RIN: 2900-AP45) received June 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1680. A letter from the Office Program Manager, Office of Regulation Policy & Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expanded Delegation Authority for Procedures Related to Representation of Claimants (RIN: 2900-AP96) received June 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2900. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the prevention and treatment of the use of synthetic recreational drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the United States Capitol Police and their role in securing the United States Capitol complex and protecting Members of Congress, their staff, and the general public; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 384. A resolution congratulating the Webster University chess team for winning a record-breaking fifth consecutive national title at the President's Cup collegiate chess championship in New York City; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

# CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and

among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 98: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 233: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 350: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 389: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 898: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1136: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1291: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1498: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1566: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1676: Mr. LONG, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1874: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1970: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2315: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2327: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 2478: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2479: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2501: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2711: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2756: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2798: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 88: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 307: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H. Res. 327: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN.

**SENATE—Wednesday, June 14, 2017**

The Senate met at 10:45 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

**PRAYER**

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

Let us pray.

Gracious Father, our shield and defense, we look to You in these challenging times. Lord, the shooting at the congressional baseball practice reminds us of the importance of numbering our days. May we refuse to boast about tomorrow, for we know not what a day may bring.

Lord, surround our lawmakers with the shields of your protection and favor. Fill them with Your Spirit, causing them to walk in Your statutes and keep Your judgments.

Lord, You know better than we what lies ahead for our lives. So lead us like a gentle shepherd.

We claim Your promise in Hebrews 13:5 that You will never leave or forsake us. Guide and inspire us all to follow Your plan for our lives.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

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

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2017.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

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

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

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

**CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know the entire Senate will join me in echoing the sentiments of the President this morning. We are deeply saddened. We are all concerned for those injured. We will keep them in our prayers, and we will continue to send them every wish for a quick and full recovery.

We are grateful for all those who stepped in to help—those practicing on the field, the first responders and, of course, the Capitol police officers on the scene. We are deeply indebted for their service. We again salute their continuing and unfailing bravery on behalf of the Capitol community.

The Congressional Baseball Game is a bipartisan charity event. I know the Senate will embrace that spirit today as we come together in expressing both our concern and our gratitude.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

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

**CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING**

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader in offering our prayers for those who are injured.

I was absolutely shaken by the news of a shooting early this morning at the baseball field in Alexandria where many of my friends and colleagues were practicing for the annual Congressional Baseball Game, an event that brings us together each year.

It has been reported that Representative SCALISE, the House whip, was shot during the attack, as were two brave members of the Capitol Police Force and others, including a staffer. Let us pray that they and any others who were injured are able to recover quickly.

This morning is the most sobering reminder of how thankful we should be for the service of the Capitol Police Force, who put their lives on the line day in and day out for us to be safe. I could not be more grateful that Capitol Police was there at a time to prevent

this attack from being any worse than it was. I was in the gym with Senator PAUL, who had been there, and he had told me that, had these two Capitol police officers, who were part of Congressman SCALISE's detail, not been there, it might have been a massacre because there would have been no one to respond. But their bravery is exemplary of all the Capitol Police Force, and we thank them.

The entire Senate family sends its thoughts and prayers to those who were wounded and our gratitude to the police officers and first responders who were at the scene.

I yield the floor.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

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

**CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

**COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 722) to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Pending

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 232, to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation and to combat terrorism and illicit financing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017, which passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month by a vote of 18 to 3.

I would like to thank the members of our committee and the coauthors of this bill for working in a constructive, bipartisan fashion to craft this legislation. I think it is a good example of how the Senate can still work together to tackle complex and difficult issues.

I was in the SCIF recently—it is a place where Senators go to read classified information—reviewing intelligence. It truly is astounding—I know the Acting President *pro tempore* knows this well—what Iran continues to do around the world. For a people who are capable of so much, their foreign policy is shockingly counter to their own interests. We see destabilizing act after destabilizing act, from missile launches to arms transfers, to terrorist training, to illicit financial activities, to targeting Navy ships and detaining American citizens. The list goes on and on, and it is past time for us to take steps to protect the interests of the United States and our allies.

This bill is the first time Congress has come together since the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal, to do just that. For far too long the agreement—which I strongly opposed, as did our ranking member, as did our Acting President *pro tempore*—has dictated U.S. policy throughout the Middle East.

It is worth noting that the JCPOA is not unlike the Paris climate accord. I don't think many people in our country nor many people in this body realize it is a nonbinding political agreement that was entered into by one man using Presidential Executive authority and can easily be undone by one man using Presidential Executive authority. In fact, in many ways it is easier than the Paris accords, considering the President doesn't have to take action to exit this agreement. I don't think most Americans understand that he doesn't even have to take action to exit the agreement. All he has to do is decline to waive sanctions. I think that has been missed. I know the Acting President *pro tempore* is very aware of that. I know the ranking member is very aware of that. No matter what the President decides, this bill makes it clear that Congress intends to remain involved and will hold Iran accountable for their nonnuclear destabilizing activities.

What the nuclear agreement failed to do was allow us to push back against terrorism, human rights issues, there are violations of U.N. Security Council resolutions relative to ballistic missile testing, and to push back against conventional arms purchases which they are not supposed to be involved in. As many of us predicted at the time, Iran's rogue behavior has only escalated since implementation of the agreement, and this bipartisan bill will give the administration tools for holding Tehran accountable.

Let me say this. I don't think there is anybody in this Chamber who doesn't believe the Trump administration—and I know there has been a lot of disagreements recently about foreign policy issues in the administration—but I don't think there is anybody here who believes they are not

going to do everything they can to push back against these destabilizing activities. What we will be doing today and tomorrow with passage of this legislation is standing hand in hand with them as they do that. It also sends an important signal that the United States will no longer look the other way in the face of continued Iran aggression.

I want to recognize the important work of my colleagues in making this legislation possible. Senator MENENDEZ has been a champion for holding Iran accountable in this bill but also in decades of work on this issue. He is truly an asset to the Senate, and I thank him for his commitment to many issues but especially this one. Senators CORTON, RUBIO, and CRUZ all played an important role in crafting this legislation as well.

Finally, let me say this. This would not have been possible without the support and tireless effort of the ranking member, Senator CARDIN, and his great staff. It has truly been a pleasure for me to work with him on the Russia bill that we will be voting on today at 2 p.m. but also this legislation—we have come from two very different places, representing two very different States, and yet are joined by the fact that we care deeply about making sure the foreign policy of this country is in the national interests of our citizens and that we as a Congress and as U.S. Senators are doing everything we can to help write positive foreign policy. I thank him for that, and I am proud of the strong bipartisan momentum behind this legislation, which his leadership has helped to happen, and I look forward to passage of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me return the compliment to Senator CORKER.

Senator CORKER announced in his opening remarks about the bipartisan vote in our committee on the Iran sanctions bill. In the last Congress, we were able to get a unanimous vote on the Iran bill. We, under the leadership of Senator CORKER, fully recognized that particularly on foreign policy, our country is much stronger when we speak with a united voice, so bringing Democrats and Republicans together is in our national interest.

Senator CORKER has listened to different views. He and I do have different views on many issues concerning foreign policy, but in almost every one of those cases, we have been able to reconcile those differences. That is true and it was very clear on the Iran sanctions and it is also very true on the Russia sanctions amendment that we will be voting on later today.

To Senator CORKER, I just want my colleagues to know we have a leader on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who puts America's national in-

terests first and has respected the rights of every Senator, not only in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but in the U.S. Senate, that can add to the richness of our discussions and debate. I think we are much stronger today because of that. This is a good example of that, and I am very proud to be supportive of all these efforts and supportive of how this came about because I think it is important for our colleagues and the American people to know about that.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, Senator CORKER and I both want to express, before we start our debate on this issue, our concerns for our colleagues who were victimized by the shooting that took place in Virginia—an outrageous event—and for our security people as well as the innocent bystanders who were struck by the gunfire. Our prayers are with those who are recovering. We hope they will have a complete recovery. We are committed to making sure we keep our Senate and congressional family safe, and we will do everything we can to make sure that takes place. We will continue to work to make sure we preserve the democratic ideals of this Nation and the free society we live in. We know there are rifts, and we know we can do service and stand by those democratic commitments but also keep America safe.

I think the work on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had those goals in mind, and Senator CORKER, through the Chair, I thank you for your attention to those details.

Mr. President, let me talk for a few minutes about S. 722, the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act. This bill will impose new sanctions on Iran for its nonnuclear violations. I want to make that clear—nonnuclear violations. Their responsibilities on the nuclear side is now judged by the nuclear agreement that was entered into. We had a great debate about it last year, and we are not going to rehash that debate. I think every Member of this Chamber wants to make sure Iran complies with its nuclear obligations, but that is a separate debate.

The debate we have here is on the nonnuclear activities of Iran that violate international norms and international agreements. We saw, for example, ballistic missile tests that violated their U.N. obligations that took place in January and in March.

We have seen a significant increase in illicit arms shipments being done by Iran, causing destabilizing activities in many parts of the region. We see it in Bahrain. We see it in Yemen. We see it in Iraq. We know they are supporting Hezbollah in Lebanon. We see they are supporting Hamas in Gaza, and we know about their activities in support of the Assad regime in Syria. This all violates international norms.

Iran today has violated, in an incredible way, human rights issues that violate international norms. Yesterday we saw a part of the impact of that as we had a debate on the Saudi arms sale, and we can argue the Saudi's culpability with what is going on in Yemen, but there is no question about Iran's activities supporting the Houthis in Yemen causing atrocities in that country. They are clearly very actively engaged in violating internationally recognized human rights. We also see cyber attacks on the United States that have come from Iran, and they are detaining at least five U.S. citizens today illegally.

There are increased activities in Iran in relation to the nonnuclear side of their activities. For that reason, S. 722 looks at strengthening the sanctions regime so we can make it clear, yes, we will comply with the JCPOA, the nuclear agreement, but we need to have better activities—improvement on the nonnuclear side.

Basically, the bill increases the sanctions menus that are available for ballistic missile violations, for support of terrorism, for human rights violations, and for violating the arms embargo. Those who knowingly do those violations or materially assist will be subject to additional sanctions by the United States.

We codify the IRGC, that was done by Executive order, and we codify some of these other Executive orders as it relates to Iran. We coordinate. This is done in a way that it coordinates with what Europe is doing and making sure it is a consistent approach that we have taken in the past.

We ask the administration to develop a regional strategy so the Congress and the American people know our policies in the Middle East. That provision was drafted before the Trump administration. This is a desire by Congress to have a better articulated regional strategy, recognizing the dangers in that region. Iran is a major player in the region against U.S. interests, and we need to know what our strategy is in confronting those challenges. Quite frankly, with the Trump administration, we haven't heard that coordinated strategy, and this legislation will require that report be given not just to Congress on a regular basis but to the American people.

I want to underscore how this agreement is totally consistent with the nuclear agreement that was entered into 2 years ago—the JCPOA, as it is referred to. I want to go through quickly how this came about. Senator CORKER talked a little bit about it.

Senator CORKER is absolutely correct. Senator MENENDEZ has been a leader on Iran sanctions way before this Congress. He was very much involved in the original sanctions legislation passed by Congress. That led to putting enough pressure on the inter-

national community to join us, which ultimately led to Iran having no choice but to negotiate. Senator CORKER and Senator MENENDEZ had introduced legislation that was out there, and we had a chance to review it, which is how the process should work. As a result of that review, both Senator CORKER, Senator MENENDEZ, and I—all three of us—reached out to interested groups to understand what the Congress has done. Many of the people we talked to were involved in the negotiations with Iran who had different views than we did on the final outcome of that agreement, but we wanted to make sure we weren't violating any of the provisions of the JCPOA so we sought their input. As a result, there was revised legislation that was offered known as Corker-Menendez-Cardin, which incorporated the ideas of all three of us, but really the outside groups working with us, to make sure it was totally consistent with the JCPOA and consistent with the intent of the original bill. I think that bill was well scrubbed. I think it did not violate the JCPOA, but we went through another process, another review, another opportunity for those who could perhaps see things we don't see quite as clearly when it comes to Iran and our European allies. We went through a second scrubbing, and we had a managers' amendment that was offered in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that tightened the bill up even more dealing with those issues.

I think I can state very confidently that there is nothing in the underlying bill that violates the U.S. commitment under the JCPOA nuclear agreement. It is my intent, and I think the intent of almost every member of this committee that the United States should comply with the JCPOA. Even though I didn't support it, I think it is important we comply with it today.

The other aspect I wanted to go through is that—and I don't want to give the wrong impression. There are people who are involved in the negotiations of the nuclear agreement who would state—some would say they oppose the bill, some might say it is not helpful, some might say Iran might take it the wrong way. Any one of those arguments aside, I do not think you will find anyone who says that it violates the JCPOA.

I want to give a little bit of history here because this was anticipated, that we would need this bill, when we acted on the JCPOA, by those of us who supported and opposed the nuclear agreement.

As the chairman will recall, shortly after the failure to reject the JCPOA—that action—I filed additional legislation that I thought was necessary, along with many of my colleagues, who voted for and voted against the JCPOA. I voted against it. Those who voted for it thought it was necessary. It included the regional strategy so that we would

know what the administration was doing. We expedited procedures to deal with nonnuclear violations if Iran used the sanction relief they got under the nuclear agreement to increase their terrorist activities or ballistic missile activities or human rights violations. In fact, they have done that, and that is why we filed the bill right after the action on the nuclear agreement.

This is consistent with what we thought would be necessary. Yes, we had hoped Iran would change its activities, but we were not naive about it. We knew that this was going to be a long road. We knew that Iran did not respond to niceties and that we were going to have to keep the pressure up for them to be able to take the action that was needed.

I know many of us were encouraged when we saw the votes a couple of weeks ago in Iran whereby the Iranians voted for a more open society, a more transparent society. I must say that Iran has a wonderful history of very talented people who want democratic principles, and I am sure that is true among many of the people in Iran today. It is their leaders with whom we have an objection, not with the people of Iran. The people of Iran want a more open, democratic society. This legislation will help get to that point by making it clear to the leaders in Iran that they must change their behavior as it relates to terrorism, as it relates to human rights violations, as it relates to their other international obligations. That is the reason this bill has become so important.

Let me give one more example on the consistency.

There are many provisions that we have changed. One is that we all acknowledge that the United States and our partners are fully at liberty to take action against Iran for terrorist activities, which is not part of the nuclear agreement, but there is some confusion as to how that is done in relationship to the sanctions relief that is provided under the JCPOA. In listening to their concerns, we will set up an independent review process within the next 5 years that will resolve that issue before we hit the 8-year mark so that we are not jeopardizing thwarting a crisis in the future that might occur. I really just want to point that out because this bill is totally consistent with the obligations of the United States under the Iran nuclear agreement.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

I talked briefly yesterday about the amendment that is pending. I want to spend just a moment, if I might, in underscoring some of the details of the amendment that is passing.

I am for S. 722, and I am for the amendment that was crafted in the same spirit as was the underlying bill—in a bipartisan agreement. It involved not just the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee but the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee because the jurisdictions on sanctions do overlap between the two committees.

As I said yesterday, I thank Senators CRAPO and BROWN—and Chairman CORKER has already mentioned this—as they were extremely helpful in making sure that we tailored the financial sanctions in a way that is workable and consistent with that of our European partners so that we can make sure we have collective strength.

I am sure the Presiding Officer has been in meetings with our European friends and knows how they feel about Russia. He knows how they feel—that they are the direct bull's-eye with regard to what Russia is doing. They want the United States to be strong, and they want the United States to provide leadership, but we need to provide it in a manner that is consistent with their security interests. With regard to the way this bill has evolved, I think we have a better bill that is consistent with those concerns.

With Russia, we know their activities. We know their cyber activities against our democratic institutions. As we have said frequently, all countries collect cyber information, but the use of that cyber information to attack our democratic institutions is an attack on our country. That cannot go unchallenged. We have to protect ourselves and take action when we have been attacked. This bill does that.

We also know, not just recently but historically, that Russia has been very aggressive in its interfering with the sovereignty of other countries. Today, in Moldova and Georgia, you see the consequences of Russia's aggression. Of course, in Ukraine, with the annexation by Russia of Crimea and its continued activities in eastern Ukraine, Russia has violated every single commitment of the OSCE's Helsinki Accords and has violated the sovereignty of other countries.

We also know about Russia's activities in support of the Assad regime in Syria and, by the way, in other countries in that region. It has assisted in horrible human rights violations—just terrible. We have seen some of the videos of the tragedies of innocent children as a result of Mr. Putin's support of the Assad regime.

In January of this year, Senator MCCAIN and I introduced legislation that would have imposed new sanctions on Russia because of these activities. We wanted to make sure that this was bipartisan, so we had 18 Senators cosponsor the bill with us—10 Democrats, 10 Republicans—to make it clear that this was not an attack on one administration but that this was America and that we had to be together in a strong message against the Putin regime. That bill included sanctions on cyber activities. It included sanctions on

their Ukrainian activities. It included sanctions in regard to their Syrian activities. The legislation also incorporated what has been known as the Democracy Initiative, which provides ways in which we can provide a more unified front with our European allies in defending against the cyber attacks we have seen coming from Russia.

At the same time, Senator GRAHAM filed a bill, with my cosponsorship, that would require congressional review before the President could give sanction relief to Russia. The review was patterned very similarly to the review we had under the Iran nuclear agreement.

So those two bills were pending, and there has been a lot of debate about them.

We then received a draft bill from Senators CRAPO and BROWN as it related to the sanctions. It was focused—I would not say exclusively but primarily—on the financial and energy sectors in order to make sure those sanctions were drafted in the proper way, and we went through considerable negotiations. Senator CORKER, as I pointed out before, brought additional text to the discussion in an effort to try to bring this together.

Although I am mentioning Senators' names, we know it is the staff. Our staffs have been working around the clock to try to make sure we get this done right. So I thank the majority and minority staffs on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee and on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There are many parts to the amendment that will be voted on at 2 p.m. One part codifies additional sanctions against Russia. I have already mentioned Senator MENENDEZ's role in Iran. He was very instrumental as it relates to Russia. Senator DURBIN has been very active. I must tell you that there has been no Member on the Democratic side who has been more vocal than Senator SHAHEEN on the need to take action against Russia. There are many Members on our side who were active on this. I thank my colleagues for their contribution.

We do codify the Executive orders that were issued that were related to both Ukraine and cyber attacks. With the adoption of this amendment, we would be codifying—giving congressional support for what took place by President Obama.

It expands the list of where sanctions can apply to the energy projects and foreign financial institutions that facilitate such projects. For actors who try to undermine cyber security, it provides for their being subject to sanctions, and it provides secondary sanctions for those who materially assist those actors in undermining our cyber security. It provides sanctions against suppliers of Russian arms to Syria. It goes after the actors who are

involved in the corrupt privatization of Russia's governmental assets. We do not support those who are supporting Mr. Putin's corrupt regime. It deals with sanctions against Russia's activities on pipelines, the Russia railway, metals, mining, and shipping. So it is comprehensive, and most of these sanctions are mandatory. It is not “may”; rather, it is that the President “shall” in most of these circumstances.

As is the tradition, the President also has the ability, if there is a significant national security issue, to weigh whether that sanction should be applied. Yet we use a different standard in most of these sanctions that requires the President to certify before he issues those waivers that there has been, basically, significant progress made by Russia in removing these sanctionable activities. So we have a pretty strong hand that we are giving President Trump in his negotiations with Mr. Putin.

In addition, this bill provides for congressional review. We talked about that—a bill that was originally introduced by Senator GRAHAM and me. As I indicated, it is very similar to the Iran Review Act. I think this is very important in that it puts a lot of transparency into the negotiations between the Trump administration and the Putin administration.

As Senator CORKER was talking about earlier as to how one President can do something by himself—and I hope that the amendment is adopted and that the bill passes the House and becomes law—the President cannot by himself remove a sanction until he has given Congress notice and an opportunity to review that. We can have congressional hearings. We can put a spotlight on it. Then we will have an expedited process whereby we could reject the President's decision to give relief, and all during that process the sanctions will remain in place.

It is a very strong congressional review, and it is our responsibility to do that, but it also brings in the American people and brings in a more transparent process. What we have found is that, with that transparency, it is a much stronger hand that President Trump has in his negotiations, knowing that he has to go through this process at the end of the day in his negotiations with Russia.

Sometimes we call it the strength of our independent branches of government. The executive branch can say “Look, we would like to move faster, but we have to do this with the legislative branch” or “We would like to do this, but we cannot get it through Congress.” Use the independence of the Congress. We are certainly very strongly against what Russia is doing. Use that to increase the pressure on Russia to do the right thing. That is what this bill does. This is why it is helpful to the President of the United States to have this congressional review.

It would reply to anything from cyber sanctions that had been imposed under the Obama executive order to the attempt to return the compounds that are located in Maryland and New York. All of that would be subject to a congressional review before the action by the President could become effective.

I mentioned earlier that the bill does include the authorization of democracy funds, as I call it, that assist our allies in their fight against Russia's aggression, particularly in cyber. It authorizes \$250 million, and it applies to our work with the EU member states, the NATO member States, as well as with candidate nations. It is a pretty strong opportunity for us to work together.

I have had many meetings with our European colleagues and friends. Yes, every country recognizes that it is vulnerable against Russia's attacks—believe me, they do—and they are doing everything they can to protect themselves. What I find disappointing is that there is not enough coordination. We know how they acted in the United States and how they acted in France and now how they are likely to act in Germany and what they did in Moldova. We know how they are likely to proceed, but do we have a common strategy to prevent this type of manipulation by Russia of our democratic institutions?

This authorization and the funding—I thank Senator GRAHAM and Senator LEAHY for putting money into the fiscal year 2017 budget to start this process going forward. We have approved that, and that is now in the budget. It allows us to coordinate those efforts among the United States and our European friends to protect against what we know is going to be continued activity by Russia.

There are obviously investigations going on. Part of the investigation is to understand what Russia is doing, quite frankly, so that we can protect ourselves. I think that will be very helpful, this information, and the role of the United States in working with our European allies to protect against certain continued malicious activities by the Russian Federation.

There is a provision in this bill that deals with Ukraine. We make it clear that we will not recognize Crimea's annexation of Ukraine, that we will continue to stand with the people of Ukraine in regard to their sovereignty, and we ask for a plan to reduce Ukraine's dependence on Russia energy imports.

We know that Ukraine is vulnerable because of energy, and we know that we have to develop a plan to deal with that. There are many Members involved in that, and I wish to acknowledge my friend from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, for his work in regard to the Ukraine provisions.

There are new counterterrorism financing provisions, which are pretty

comprehensive, so that we make sure that we have all the tools we need in order to track the financing of terrorism activities. That is in there.

So let me just tell my colleague how proud I am to be associated with the underlying bill as well as the amendment that we are going to vote on at 2 o'clock. Both the underlying bill and the amendment were developed in the best of the bipartisan manners of the U.S. Senate.

I wish to thank, again, all of those who were involved to give us this opportunity to speak with a strong, united voice against the activities that Iran is doing globally and that are destabilizing so many countries through their terrorism and ballistic missiles and human rights violations and arms embargo violations, and to make it clear to the Russian Federation that we are not going to let them attack our country, that we are going to stand up to that and work to be sure to keep our allies safe.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was in Maine over the weekend, and people said: How do you feel about healthcare? What do you think we ought to be doing? I said: I like the President's plan. I think President Trump has it just right. He says we need healthcare that will cover everyone, low premiums and low deductibles, no preexisting conditions. That is the right formulation, and I hope that is what we can work toward, and that is what we should be working toward.

He also said yesterday that the bill that passed the House was mean. Well, a couple of weeks ago I said it was cruel, but I will accept mean; both mean the same thing. It is a terrible blow to literally millions of people across this country and thousands in my State of Maine.

By the way, the problem with the House bill is that it is so bad that some kind of compromise has developed here that is halfway, and it is still mean or cruel. Now people are talking about a "soft landing." That is a euphemism for stretching out the crash. It is not a soft landing. Whether we take Medicaid and healthcare coverage away from people in 2 years, 4 years, or 7 years, it is still going to happen, and it is a crash. It is not a soft landing. That is just stretching it out into beyond the next couple of elections, but it doesn't really get to the core of the

issue, which is taking healthcare and health insurance away from millions of people.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, before I began, I meant to acknowledge what happened this morning to our colleagues across the way at the baseball practice—tragic, inexplicable, horrible, and just inexcusable. My heart goes out to the Capitol Police who, I understand, were incredibly brave and met their responsibilities admirably to Representative SCALISE and to any others who were injured—a terrible incident and one that we hope we never see the likes of again.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Going back to healthcare, I think it is important for people to understand the big picture of what is going on with this issue that is now before both the House and the Senate.

What we are really talking about is a massive tax increase on middle-class and lower middle-class people and a massive tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. It is as simple as that. It is a gigantic transfer of wealth—probably one of the greatest in a short time in recent American history—where we have millions of people across the country who have health insurance under the Affordable Care Act and are protected under Medicaid and Medicaid expansion, and we are taking that away. The Affordable Care Act exchange policies are a tax credit. So when you take that away, you are increasing people's taxes; you are increasing the taxes of people who are making between \$15,000 and \$45,000, \$60,000, \$70,000 a year, and you are decreasing taxes in a huge way only for people who make more than \$200,000 a year.

The 400 highest taxpayers in the country will get a tax cut of \$7 million apiece. That makes no sense. We are taking resources away from the people who need it—the middle class—and we are giving it to the people who don't need it. It is Robin Hood in reverse.

That is the fundamental point of this legislation. It is all about that big tax cut for the rich—for the really rich—and I just don't understand why we are even thinking about that, because the American people need help with the cost of healthcare. If you divide the total healthcare bill in this country by the number of people, you come up with about \$8,500 a year per person, on average, or \$35,000 a year for a family of four. That is the cost of healthcare. That cost has to be paid, and I would argue that people who are in the middle income can't afford it. They can't afford to pay those costs, and they need some help, and that is what the Affordable Care Act does. But, instead, we are talking about repealing it—knocking those millions of people off.

In Maine we have 75,000 people on the exchanges. And then, of course, we have hundreds of thousands on Medicaid. We are talking about severely



constricting their access to healthcare. That is just wrong, ethically, morally, and in any other way. We are taking healthcare away from people so we can give a massive tax cut to the people who don't really need it.

In Maine, if the House had taken a blank sheet of paper and said "How can we design a healthcare plan that would really hammer the people of Maine?" it would have been the AHCA—misnamed the American Healthcare Act; it ought to be the anti-healthcare act because that is what it is all about—taking healthcare away from people. It could not be more tailored to harm people in Maine.

We are the oldest State in the country. We have more people in the older age brackets—50 and up—than any other State in the United States as a percentage of our population. We also are a relatively low-income State. You put those things together, and you really get hurt. Also, in Maine, as in the Presiding Officer's home State, we have a lot of hazardous occupations—logging, agriculture, fishing, the iconic Maine lobsterman.

This is a guy named David Osgood from Vinalhaven, an incredibly beautiful island off the coast of Maine. Lobstering is an essential part of the Maine economy. It is a part of our way of life. Vinalhaven, where Dave lives, has a population of about 1,200. It is really hard work. It is all-weather, and it is dangerous. You have to haul tracks, repair them, be out on the water in the wintertime, which is no fun. David Osgood has been lobstering since he was 13, like his father and grandfather before him.

As of this spring, all three of David's and Elaine's children have finished college. That is amazing. That is a real achievement for any family, but fishing is challenging and tough.

The Osgoods are really thankful for the fact that they can get affordable health insurance through the Affordable Care Act. Once, they weren't covered, and David had a back problem that required surgery. Like a lot of people in Maine, he paid it off, month by month by month. But the ACA, according to Elaine, has given them some comfort and peace of mind.

I don't think those of us who have pretty much had health insurance all of our lives realize the importance of that peace of mind, of not being anxious about a health problem that could wipe you out, make you lose your house—an illness or an injury. Elaine said: We will be OK.

The deductibles are a problem. They are too high. I agree. What we ought to be working on is how to get the deductibles down, how to work on the premiums, how to work on the cost of healthcare.

All of this debate about the Affordable Care Act and Medicare and Medicaid and a public option and single

payer—all of that is about who pays, when a big part of the problem is how much we are all paying. We pay roughly twice as much per person for healthcare than anyone else in the industrialized world. That is a real problem that we have to start debating. We have to start talking about that because, whoever pays, whatever the insurance plan is, if the underlying cost is something that people just can't afford, then we are going to be arguing about who pays, how much, and what part. We have to get at that \$8,500 per person.

People say: Yes, but we have the best healthcare system in the world. Yes, we do, for the people who can afford it. But for the millions of people who don't have health insurance, who get treated only in emergency rooms or more often don't want to get treated at all because they don't want to go in because they know they can't pay for it, the healthcare system does not deliver for them.

By all objective measures—longevity, infant mortality—we are not first in the world. We are like 20th in the world. We are way below our colleagues, and yet we are paying much more. We have to address high deductibles, high premiums, and high costs, but also, in the meantime, we have to keep people covered.

Another couple in Maine, Jonathan Edwards and Jennifer Schroth, live in Hancock County. It is another coastal county. They are farmers, and they raise vegetables.

Here is a great Maine story. I have known Jen's mother for about 40 years. I just met Jen at a healthcare forum in Bangor a few weeks ago, but I knew her mother way back. Everybody in Maine knows everybody else. I suspect it is like in Alaska. We are a big small town with very long roads.

Jonathan and Jennifer own and operate a farm. By the way, this farm is in a town called Brooklin, but this is the real Brooklin—Brooklin, ME. They grow potatoes, vegetables, strawberries, raspberries, and asparagus. They make maple syrup. They could never afford healthcare until the ACA came along because they were essentially a small business, but they were not a big enough business to have a group plan. They didn't have employer-based health insurance. They just didn't have it.

They are both in their fifties, and one of the changes made under the Affordable Care Act was that the ratio between the premiums for younger people and older people can't be more than three times. It reflects the reality that older people have more healthcare needs and cost the system more. So there is a reflection. It is allowed to be a three-times basis. The House bill changes that to five times. That is a huge shift directly toward people in their fifties and early sixties.

When Jen was pregnant with each of their two boys, they had no insurance. They paid the hospital. Just like my friend David Osgood, they paid the hospital. That is what Maine people do. But what if there had been complications? They were pretty straightforward births, but what if there had been complications? They would have been wiped out because they had no health insurance. Jen says she doesn't feel it is responsible to go without health insurance, especially when you have a family.

It is critical to them that the ACA is affordable, and it is because of the tax credits. They also appreciate that they have real insurance that really covers things. There are no exclusions. People say: Well, I have this really cheap insurance policy, but it doesn't cover anything. It may not even cover hospitalization or it doesn't cover doctor visits or it doesn't cover drugs. It doesn't cover what you really need. That is not insurance. That is illusory. But now, Jen says, they have peace of mind because they have coverage. She told me that face-to-face not long ago.

Running a small business is tough. It is tough because you generally can't get group policies. Sometimes you can join a small business association, but generally you can't. This is a way to have coverage that people can afford.

Imagine if somebody came to this body and said: I have a great idea for a bill. I am going to raise taxes on the middle class and give a great big break to hedge fund managers. We wouldn't even think about it. It wouldn't even get out of committee. Yet that is essentially what this is all about.

How much of a tax increase is it on somebody? Well, in Hancock County, where these folks live, for a 60-year-old making \$40,000 a year—these are real numbers from the Kaiser Family Foundation—under the Affordable Care Act the premium is \$4,080 a year, about 10 percent of your income. That is still substantial. But under the bill passed by the House, that would go to \$17,090 on a \$40,000 gross income. It is ridiculous to go from \$4,000 to \$17,000.

Where does that difference come from? It is going back to the people who don't need it. It is going back to the people who make \$200,000, \$400,000, \$800,000, \$1 million, \$5 million a year—a 300-percent increase in out-of-pocket costs for healthcare. In Knox County—I think David is younger than 60, but if he were 60—his premium goes from \$4,080 to \$10,590, more than doubled.

This just doesn't make sense to me. This whole discussion doesn't make sense to me. I agree that we need to talk about healthcare, and I agree that we need to do something about it, but we are doing the wrong thing. We are making it worse.

There are two problems with healthcare in this country. We can boil it down to two issues—cost and access.

The Affordable Care Act, although it dealt somewhat with cost, was mostly about access—allowing people who don't have health insurance to get it, whether through Medicaid expansion or through the exchanges.

Cost is a bigger issue, and it is one that we also have to deal with. But that is not what is on the floor now, or will be soon, and it is not what is being considered in Congress. But I would argue that we really have to pay attention to that issue as well.

So all of this and taking coverage away from my friend David or Jen and John and thousands—we know the number from the House bill, 23 million people in America—to give a massive tax break so a guy making a couple million dollars a year can buy an extra Maserati just doesn't pass the straight-face test for good public policy.

I am the first to agree that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. I think there are things about it that need to be fixed and adjusted, and we need to work on how we do the deductibles, how we improve that, and how we broaden the coverage and maybe make it more of a sliding scale. All of those things are things we can discuss and work on, and I am absolutely willing to do it—but the idea of repealing it just to check a box to meet a campaign promise and to be so divergent from what the President has said over and over in the campaign and since that time—that he wants coverage for everyone, no preexisting conditions, and lower premiums and deductibles. I am for it. But what we are doing is the exact opposite—the exact 180-degree opposite.

So let's take a breath. There is no deadline here of next week or the July 4th recess. Let's take a break and back off and start talking about it as Senators and Representatives from all over the country and all parties. I think we ought to be able to come to some agreement here.

Now, if there are people who are just hell-bent to provide a tax cut to multimillionaires, then, there isn't an agreement to be had. If that has to be part of the deal, include me out. But if we can start talking reasonably about how we can improve the Affordable Care Act—I don't care if we improve it, change it, tinker with it, and call it TrumpCare or McConnellCare or RyanCare. Call it what you want, but let's provide health insurance, which is so important to the American people.

I have told this story a couple of times, but I am going to conclude with why I am so passionate about this. Forty years ago, I worked here. I was a staff member, and I had insurance. For the first time in my young life, I think, I had health insurance. Part of the health insurance was a provision for preventive care, which is also required under the Affordable Care Act. So you could have a free physical. I was 28, 29

years old and immortal. We all were at that age. But I said: What the heck; it is free. I guess I will have a physical.

So I went in and had a physical. The doctor looked me over, looked at my eyes, and down my throat. But he happened to notice that on my black I had a black mole. He said: I don't like the looks of that. That ought to be taken off.

I didn't even notice it. I didn't even know it was there. He took it off, and it turned out to be something called malignant melanoma, which is one of the most virulent and serious forms of cancer. The thing about malignant melanoma is that, if you catch it in time, you are good. Here I am, 40 years later. If you don't, you are gone. I have had friends in Maine and in other parts of the country who have died of melanoma. It has always haunted me to this day that the only reason I caught it and my life was saved was because I had health insurance, and somewhere in this country there was a young man who also had a mole on his back or on his arm or on his neck and who didn't have health insurance, didn't go to the doctor, and he is gone. That is not fair. That is not right. In a country as advanced and wealthy as this is, it is not right that that guy died and I am here.

So don't ever tell me that health insurance doesn't save lives because it does. There is no doubt that it does. That is why it is so important for us to get this right and not just cavalierly and blithely rip health insurance away from people—many of whom have gotten it for the first time, many of whom are small business people—the very people we all talk about wanting to help.

We can't do it. It is a dereliction of our duty to serve the American people.

We need to figure out how to do it right. We need to figure out how to do it effectively and efficiently. In the end, we are here to help our fellow citizens. I am here for Maine, and I can't let my people suffer under a law that would take something away which they have come to depend upon and that has saved lives and means so much to them. We can do better. I am sure of it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I have just been informed that the alleged shooter at the Republican baseball practice this morning is someone who apparently volunteered on my

Presidential campaign. I am sickened by this despicable act.

Let me be as clear as I can be. Violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society, and I condemn this action in the strongest possible terms. Real change can only come about through nonviolent action, and anything else runs counter to our most deeply held American values.

I know I speak for the entire country in saying that my hopes and prayers are that Representative SCALISE, congressional staff, and the Capitol police officers who were wounded make a quick and full recovery. I also want to thank the Capitol Police for their heroic actions to prevent further harm.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I understand Senator MCCAIN has come to the floor. I will yield to him as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I rise in support of the Countering Russian Aggression and Cyber Attacks Act, an amendment to the Iran sanctions bill currently under consideration.

In just the last 3 years under Vladimir Putin, Russia has invaded Ukraine, annexed Crimea, threatened NATO allies, and intervened militarily in Syria, leaving a trail of death, destruction, and broken promises in his wake. And of course, last year, Russia attacked the foundations of American democracy with a cyber and information campaign to interfere in America's 2016 election.

It has been 8 months now since the U.S. intelligence community publicly concluded that the Russian Government had attempted to interfere in our last Presidential election. Since then, the intelligence community has concluded that it is confident that the Russian Government directed a campaign to compromise emails, American individuals, and political organizations; that Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign to undermine public faith in the democratic process; and that Moscow will apply lessons learned from this campaign to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes.

Months of congressional hearings, testimony, and investigative work have reinforced these conclusions that Russia deliberately interfered in our recent election with cyber attacks and a disinformation campaign designed to weaken America and undermine faith in our democracy and our values. Vladimir Putin's brazen attack on our democracy is a flagrant demonstration of his disdain and disrespect for our Nation. This should not just outrage every American; it should, at long last, compel us to action.

In the last 8 months, what price has Russia paid for attacking American democracy? Hardly any at all: Modest sanctions against a few Russian individuals and entities, some Russian diplomats and spies sent home to Russia, two spy compounds closed, at least for now—and all of this is reversible at the discretion of the President.

We must take our own side in this fight, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. It is time to respond to Russia's attack on American democracy with strength, with resolve, with common purpose and with action. So I am proud to support this amendment, which would begin to do just that.

This legislation incorporates some of the best ideas from different pieces of legislation already introduced in the Senate, ideas that have broad bipartisan support. The amendment would impose mandatory sanctions on transactions with the Russian defense or intelligence sectors, including the FSB and the GRU, the Russian military intelligence agency that was primarily responsible for Russia's attack on our election.

The amendment would impose mandatory visa bans and asset freezes on any individual who undermines the cyber security of public or private infrastructure and democratic institutions, and it would impose mandatory sanctions on those who assist or support such activities.

The amendment would codify existing sanctions on Russia by placing into law Executive orders signed by President Obama in response to both Russian interference in the 2016 election and its illegal actions in Ukraine, and it would take new steps to tighten those sanctions.

The amendment would target the Russian energy sector, which is controlled by Vladimir Putin's cronies, with sanctions on investments in Russian petroleum and natural gas development, as well as Russian energy pipelines.

We also need to put additional pressure on the ability of Putin and his cronies to move money they have looted from the Russian state. So this amendment would mandate that the Secretary of the Treasury establish a high-level task force within the Department's financial crimes and enforcement network that would focus on tracing, mapping, and prosecuting illicit financial flows linked to Russia, if such flows interact with the U.S. financial system. The task force would also work with liaison officers in key U.S. embassies, especially in Europe, to work with local authorities to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for the illicit Russian financial flows.

Finally, recognizing that Russia seeks to undermine not just American democracy but Western democracy altogether, this amendment would pro-

vide support to the State Department, Global Engagement Center, and USAID to help build the resilience of democratic institutions in Europe against Russian aggression exerted through corruption, propaganda, and other forms of political interference.

Importantly, the legislation also mandates congressional oversight of any decision to provide any relief from these sanctions. Administrations cannot waive or lift these sanctions without certifying that Russia is making concrete steps toward changing its behavior on the international stage. In particular, Russia needs to begin adhering to the Minsk Protocol, roll back its occupation of Crimea and destabilizing efforts in Ukraine, and cease its cyber operations aimed at undermining democracy in the United States and Europe.

We need a strong Russia sanctions amendment, we need it now, and we need it on this piece of legislation. We need this amendment because we have no time to waste. The United States of America needs to send a strong message to Vladimir Putin and any other aggressor that we will not tolerate attacks on our democracy. There is no greater threat to our freedoms than attacks on our ability to choose our own leaders, free from foreign interference, and so we must act accordingly and we must act now.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle—one of the really great remaining members of the Communist Party—who has allowed me to speak and give this statement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I appreciate my colleague's sense of humor.

#### TRANSPARENCY IN BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

Madam President, the United States of America has suffered an unprecedented intrusion into our American Presidential elections. In January, our intelligence agencies disclosed that agents of Russia, on the orders of President Vladimir Putin, engaged in a massive election influence campaign throughout 2016.

This effort strikes at the very heart of our representative democracy. All Americans should take this attack deadly seriously. Congress had to act against such interference decisively. By strengthening economic sanctions against the Russian gangster state, we hit them where it hurts, right in the oligarch. I am glad to see that Republican and Democratic Senators came together to do this.

Now the question will shift to the White House. Last July, as evidence of Russian election meddling began to emerge, then-candidate for Vice President MIKE PENCE said: "If it is Russia and they are interfering in our elec-

tions, I can assure you both parties in the United States government will ensure there are serious consequences."

Well, it is Russia, and they were interfering, but there has been little sign of consequences so far from the Trump White House.

Michael Flynn, as adviser to the President-elect, had illicit communications with the Russian Ambassador, about which he then lied. Trump appointees at the State Department alarmed career officials with their rush to craft a pro-Russia program. President Trump held an unprecedented, cozy meeting with Russian envoys—all smiles in the Oval Office—a meeting for which Putin says he has a transcript. In Europe, Trump, dropping the assurances about article 5 protections from his NATO speech, gave the Russians joy.

The Trump administration has been reportedly trying to return two compounds used by Russian intelligence to Russian control—compounds here in the United States. Former FBI Director James Comey told the Senate last week that President Trump never spoke to him, not even once, about defending against Russia's acts of aggression.

Well, the threat from Russia is severe. Chairman GRAHAM and I held hearings in our Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, exploring the Russian toolbox for interference in democracies across the globe—how Russia exploits the dark shadows of other countries' political and economic systems.

One tool is campaign money. Russia is reported to have funneled money to French far-right party Presidential candidate, Marine Le Pen, for instance, as part of a reward for her support of Russia's actions in Crimea. Ken Wainstein, Homeland Security Advisor to George W. Bush, cited Russia as a threat of that kind of foreign financial infiltration here in the United States. "It is critical that we effectively enforce the campaign finance laws that would prevent this type of financial influence by foreign actors," Wainstein told our subcommittee. But that task proves difficult in a system like ours that permits the free flow of dark money.

Since the Citizens United decision, we have seen unprecedented dark money flow into our elections from anonymous dark money organizations, groups that we allow to hide the identities of their big donors. We don't know who is behind that dark money or what they are demanding in return. Despite this risk, Congress has been unwilling to push back against the tide of dark money. Too many are too in tow to the big American dark money emperors, like the Koch brothers, but once you permit big money to flow through dark money channels, cash from Vladimir Putin is no more traceable than cash from Charles and David Koch.

"The Kremlin's Trojan Horses" is a study of Russian influence in Western Europe done by the Atlantic Council. Russia takes advantage of nontransparency in campaign financing and financial transactions, the report says, to build political alliances with ideologically friendly political groups and individuals, as well as to establish pro-Russian organizations in civil society, creating a shadowy web of political networks which help to propagate the regime's point of view.

Corruption is the grid on which the electrons of Russian influence flow. In the foreword to the "Kremlin's Trojan Horses" report, Radoslaw Sikorski, former Foreign Minister of Poland, who has seen a lot of this up close, described what he called "the financial networks that allow authoritarian regimes to export corruption to the West." He warns:

Electoral rules should be amended, so that publically funded political groups, primarily political parties, should at the very least be required to report the sources of their funding.

He continues:

The Kremlin's blatant attempts to influence and disrupt the U.S. Presidential election should serve as an inspiration for a democratic push back.

Well, we should certainly push back by requiring political entities in this country to report their sources of funding.

Another of our witnesses, Heather Conley at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, wrote about "The Kremlin Playbook." The CSIS report, "The Kremlin Playbook," calls corruption "the common thread" among these various drivers of Russian influence. It is, the authors write, "the lubricant on which this system operates." She testified just today in the Helsinki Commission that "corruption is a systemic weakness within a country that is exploited and influenced by adversaries and from which no country is immune, including the United States."

Where Russia can work in darkness, Russian agents systemically exploit democratic institutions to acquire influence over politicians and political systems using corruption. Russia has done this in the former Soviet Union and in Europe for decades, and we should be prepared in the United States, Ms. Conley says, for them to keep doing it here.

"The Kremlin Playbook" warns that to fight the corruption that gives Russia this channel of influence, "enhancing transparency and the effectiveness of the Western democratic tools, instruments, and institutions is critical to resilience against Russian influence."

Ms. Conley echoed the widespread warnings that the United States is particularly susceptible to Russian influence via dark money channels in our politics. That is widely agreed.

She and others have warned of a second vulnerability: lax incorporation laws that hide the true owners of shell corporations. In the same way that dark money channels can hide the hand of foreign influence, so can shell corporations, which obscure the hand of the entity behind the corporate screen. Interestingly, USA TODAY just reported: "Since President Trump won the Republican nomination, the majority of his companies' real estate sales are to secretive shell companies that obscure the buyers' identities."

Our lax incorporation laws have made the United States a destination for drug traffickers, terrorists, corrupt foreign officials, tax cheats, and other criminals from around the world. Former FBI Director Comey testified before the Judiciary Committee that the United States is becoming the last big haven for shell corporations—sickening but true. These crooks come here to America to form shell companies to hide assets and obscure illegal activities. For added safety, a foreign gangster or a crooked despot or an agent of Putin could put a shell corporation behind a shell corporation with another shell corporation behind that.

There are few safeguards in place to prevent foreign actors from funneling money into our elections through faceless shell companies. We actually already see shell companies used to hide the identities behind big political spending. This is not a potential. This is happening now. We just don't know whether foreign influence is behind it. Nothing prevents agents of Putin from being behind those hidden entities.

Part of the Kremlin's playbook is to use shell corporations and other devices to establish illicit financial relationships with prominent local figures. The shell entities allow Russian money to flow anonymously into crooked deals. The crooked deals give rise to corrupt relationships, and these corrupt relationships give Russia leverage, either through the carrot of continued bribery of the prominent local figure or the stick of threatened disclosure of the crooked deal imperiling the prominent local figure. The prominent local figure in the crooked deal is well and truly on the Russian hook. For what it is worth, Donald Trump is the very model of the Russian mark in this sort of scheme.

To close this avenue of foreign political influence, Ms. Conley told us: "Building and strengthening financial transparency requirements and beneficial ownership will go an extraordinary way to prevent these corrupt practices to further Russia's influence."

We really ought to be able to agree that we need to prevent these corrupt practices to further Russia's influence.

The answer to the problem of shell corporations is simple: Have each state track the actual owners of companies

they charter and make that information available to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies through proper process. That is what Ms. Conley means by that phrase she used, "beneficial ownership." It is the term of art for a simple concept, knowing who the real owner is.

The True Incorporation Transparency for Law Enforcement, or TITLE, Act, which Chairman GRASSLEY and I will reintroduce soon, would require States to identify the actual human beings who own the company they incorporate. The bill would provide funding to support the maintenance and retrieval of this information, which would be available to law enforcement officers who present valid, court-ordered subpoenas or search warrants. The bill has bipartisan support and has received strong endorsement from the law enforcement community, banks, and anti-trafficking organizations.

Transparency in business ownership is ever more vital around the world. The European Union understands very well the shadow of Russian influence that has been cast over it, and every member of the European Union has committed to ensuring incorporation transparency. The United Kingdom, Spain, Germany, Italy, and France have already enacted incorporation transparency laws. The light of corporate transparency is about to shine throughout Europe to help defend them from Russian influence. This means that money from those shell companies and schemes committed through those shell companies will be looking for new, dark homes, likely in American shell corporations. Again, we are supposed to be an example to the world. We are supposed to be the "City upon a Hill," not the place where the world's most corrupt and criminal evildoers come to hide their cash and their assets.

We know the Russian playbook for election interference exploits opaque incorporation laws. We know criminals and even terrorists view the United States as a haven to hide illegal activity and its proceeds. We even know, weirdly, that lax incorporation laws are affecting our real estate market. Some American cities are so loaded with real estate held by shell corporations that it is actually driving up the prices for real American home buyers. Of course, there are not a lot of people in the corner store when the property is held for a foreign owner as the safeguard for his illicit gains.

We must take commonsense steps to stop these activities and bring wrongdoers into the light. The measures that we will take against Russia are welcome and, as Senator McCAIN has said, even overdue, but we must remember that this is an ongoing battle and we have systemic weaknesses that have already been clearly identified to us over

and over by bipartisan experts in this field and renowned think tanks and study groups here in Washington. To quote Ms. Conley again, “the battle of Western democracies to defeat corruption” must be seen as “a matter of national security.”

Testifying before our Crime and Terrorism Subcommittee, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper agreed and urged Congress to act. He said:

I believe [the Russians] are now emboldened to continue such activities in the future both here and around the world, and to do so even more intensely. If there has ever been a clarion call for vigilance and action against a threat to the very foundation of our democratic political system, this episode is it.

I hope the American people recognize the severity of this threat and that we collectively counter it before it further erodes the fabric of our democracy.

This week the Senate takes strong steps to punish Russia for its disruptive meddling in the past, but we must do more. Dark money and the shell corporations that allow Russian influence are identified known vulnerabilities in the future. Every warning is that the Russians are not going away and that future elections will be marked by Russian mischief. We have to close both avenues of foreign influence and corruption: dark money and shell corporations. They are no good in any event. They are no good in any event, and now they bring the added contamination of Russian election manipulation. I hope we can work together to remedy that contamination.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, there are some days that are noisy in DC and in the Nation. It seems as if the disagreements and the discourse have paused for just a moment, and we remember again that we are all Americans and that there are issues we are facing as a nation.

Earlier this morning a group of baseball players who are also Members of Congress were getting together to practice for a congressional baseball game happening tomorrow night. It is a friendly game, a great competition for charity, and a few Members, Republicans and Democrats, from both the House and the Senate get together and practice and then play the game.

This morning at the Republican practice, a man walked onto the field and opened fire on guys just practicing baseball.

STEVE SCALISE, who is the majority whip, was hit, two members of his detail, Capitol Hill police, were injured, and other individuals who were there were injured as well. The Capitol Police saved many lives this morning. They were prepared and they returned fire and were able to stop the person

who was shooting over and over again at everybody he could see on that baseball field.

What has been interesting today—since I have come out this morning, as I have walked through the hallways heading back and forth to different meetings, I have been interested to see many doors that I have walked by, and when those doors were open, I could hear people inside praying. There have been at least three organized prayer meetings on the Hill today, specifically related just to that, and others spontaneously occurring. Just for a moment we have the opportunity to be able to reflect and say to God: Thank You so much for protecting the people on that field.

Thank you again to the Capitol Police, who literally put their lives on the line to protect the guests and the Members and staff here every single day.

Once again, we remember that we are a nation that solves things by conversation. We disagree, and that is OK. We have said for two centuries that we can disagree. We don't solve it this way, and we cannot.

I would like to be able to join what is happening all over this Hill for just a moment in this room—for us to be able to pray for a moment, as well, for the people who were there and for the people who are going through surgery right now and for their families. For every single staff member who is here, every single Member who is here, every member of the Capitol Hill police, their families are calling them and texting them and saying: Are you OK? These families are scattered all over the country, and they are worried.

We can help lead. We can set a tone to tell the Nation that we should disagree on things, but we don't ever do this. So I would like to ask for us to be able to take a moment of privilege and just be able to pray.

Father, thank You for the way that You have protected—for those individuals who are in surgery now and recovering now, for the Capitol Hill police, STEVE SCALISE, and for other individuals who were affected today, God, we pray that You would bring them healing.

We pray that You would take care of families who are worried and the Nation that is worried. We pray that You would cause something good to come out of something that is very evil. Help us to know how we respond as a nation.

I ask this in the Name of Jesus. Amen.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Madam President, we have a lot of issues that are moving right now and a lot of issues that we are discussing. Currently we are discussing sanctions. The sanctions for Russia are entirely appropriate.

I have no question in my mind that Russia has tried to interfere with our elections. I have no question in my

mind that Russia did work to interfere with the elections across Europe, especially Eastern Europe. There are individuals in Russia that mean to do our Nation economic harm, political harm, and to cause turmoil. For whatever reason, they believe they can strengthen their nation by trying to cause chaos everywhere else.

As Americans, we believe we strengthen our Nation by helping others to succeed. For whatever reason, the Russians believe they can strengthen their nation by trying to cause others to fall. It reminds me a lot of bullies on playgrounds and in middle schools. For whatever reason, they do not advance to the level that they find great joy in helping others; they find their pleasure in trying to diminish others. There is an appropriate response we can make back to that as a Nation; that is, to continue sanctions and to be able to press that.

With the sanctions conversation we have about Russia, we also have an ongoing conversation about sanctions on Iran, and that is one of the reasons I want to visit with this body today to put this word out. For whatever reason, the way sanctions are being organized right now against Russia and Iran, there are two different platforms for how to unwind those sanctions. The way this bill is currently offered, the sanctions against Russia cannot be unwound except by congressional action, but it is not so against Iran, and I am trying to figure out why.

This Congress came to this floor just about a year and a half ago with a bill called the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which passed 98 to 1 in this body. It was to be able to take authority back so that Congress should be able to vote on sanctions being lifted, in case there is ever a time that any President wants to be able to lift sanctions. Obviously, that debate was circling around the Iran nuclear negotiation at that time, and this body voted 98 to 1 that there should be accountability on any President, regardless of who it is, on the lifting of sanctions against the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world, which is Iran. So we added in those sanctions, but for whatever reason on this particular vote, those aren't there, and I have an issue with that.

I would say to this body: Can we learn our lesson? When Congress creates sanctions on nation-states and on individuals, we should also have the authority to determine whether they are lifted or not lifted. Because of that, I have filed simple language to be able to take the bill we have currently and to be able to add in simple language that says something very straightforward: The President can, for national security reasons, lift sanctions on the nation or on individuals for 120 days but cannot renew that until it comes back to Congress. If it is truly

for national security reasons, there will not be any problem convincing this Congress, either body, that it is essential to be able to do that. But if you can't convince this body that it is for national security reasons, you certainly are not convincing the American people of that.

It is simple, straightforward language that I believe we should have in all of our sanctions bills. Whether it is North Korea, Iran, Russia, or whatever it may be, we should simply say that the American people, through their elected Representatives, say that this group of individuals should be sanctioned, and no individual can pull that back unilaterally without it coming back to the American people again to be able to turn it off. That is how we work as a Nation. I believe that is how we should work in the days ahead.

This is not a hostile amendment. This is an amendment saying that we have learned our lesson as a body. We should actually apply this. This is not a partisan issue. Whether it is a Republican or Democrat President is irrelevant in this issue. If Congress creates sanctions, Congress should not release the authority to make decisions on and off. What we turned on, we should be able to turn off. That is the way our system works.

I look forward to the open debate on this simple issue, and I look forward to our determining as a body how we handle sanctions for any nation or any group in the days ahead.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Missouri.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor today, along with my colleague the Senator from Missouri, as the cochair of the bipartisan Law Enforcement Caucus. We have come to express our concern and our gratitude.

This morning our colleagues and our friends, including Congressman STEVE SCALISE from Louisiana, were senselessly attacked while at a practice in Alexandria for tomorrow's annual bipartisan congressional baseball game.

Our deepest thoughts and prayers are with the members of the Capitol Police and Congressman SCALISE and everyone who was injured, as well as their families.

While we still don't know all of the details of this morning's event, one fact is true. Were it not for the skill, bravery, prompt response, and professionalism of the Capitol Police and Alexandria police, this tragic event would have been much, much worse.

For those of us who serve and work every day in Congress at the Capitol,

we see the men and women of the Capitol Police. They protect the Members of Congress, our staffs, and the Capitol itself, but that doesn't begin to describe the vital and noble work they do, because the Capitol Police don't simply protect the people in the buildings on the Capitol campus. They protect, they serve, and they honor our Capitol, our country, and our democracy itself. They sacrifice and they risk their lives each and every day to ensure that this Capitol is a Capitol for the people, a Capitol for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is the Capitol Police, in close and important partnership with local police, who ensure that everyone and anyone can come to this place to make their voices heard and to take part in our democracy.

They make these sacrifices and take these risks every day, and this morning's events are a sobering reminder of what the men and women of law enforcement all across the country—and yes, today, here among the Capitol Police—take on each and every day.

I urge everyone who works and serves here in the Capitol to take a moment to pray for and be grateful for the men and women of the Capitol Police, the men and women of the Alexandria police, and the men and women of law enforcement all across the Nation.

With that, I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I thank my colleague for yielding.

When Senator COONS and I came to the Senate about 6 years ago, it was about the time we formed the Law Enforcement Caucus. Over that 6 years, we have been continually reminded of how those who run toward danger when others run away protect us. They don't know on any given day what they may be dealing with that day, and their family doesn't know either. They are here to protect those who might be the victims of crime.

What we saw today was a horrific and cowardly attack at baseball practice—someone who takes a weapon and decides they are going to harm people they don't know for whatever cowardly reason that person had.

Of course, we continue to pray for the swift recovery of those who were injured and for the caregivers who are helping them right now.

Every day, when I come to the Capitol grounds, the first person I see is almost always a member of the Capitol Police. No matter how late it is when I leave at night, the last person I see is almost always a member of the Capitol Police. They have a hard job to do. They do it with the highest level of professionalism and dedication. Their families see them leave for work at whatever time of the day their assignments have them leaving for work and are hopeful that those they love will come home. That accounts for all of

our law enforcement officers all over the country—the law enforcement officers and other first responders—who rush into dangerous situations not knowing what could be there.

We were very fortunate today. Our Members of Congress were there—Members of the House, Members of the Senate—and the people who were volunteering to make that game work the way it needs to work in order to have a bipartisan annual event to look forward to and to use that event to raise money for charity. There were staff who were there, supporting. Fortunately for all of them, STEVE SCALISE, who is the majority whip in the House, was there, which meant that there were Capitol Police and security people there with him. It is hard to imagine what might have happened if they had not been there. The Alexandria police would have done a great job and gotten there as quickly as they could, but we have these people who are committed to providing for the safety of Members of Congress, people who are visiting the Capitol, and people who are in the area of the Capitol when anything might happen. Over and over again, Senator COONS and I and others have seen the Capitol Police have to step forward.

I hope we will all remember to not only be grateful every day for those who are willing to serve but will also continue to pray today for the families of the people who were impacted today—the families who sent their sons and daughters here to be Members of Congress as well as to be staffers in the Congress. The first news they heard this morning was of some senseless attack that appeared to be an attack because people were Members of Congress.

No act of violence, no matter how evil or senseless, will ever come close to shaking the foundations of our democracy, but in moments like this, we are always brought back to the important recognition that we are Americans first. That is why our country will always be a beacon of freedom.

The things we debate every day are not nearly as big or powerful as the things that unite us every day, and moments like this bring that sense of unity and concern and commitment of maintaining a society that is free and secure and bring a greater appreciation for those who spend all day, every working day, with that as their principal obligation. We owe them a great debt of gratitude.

Today, we owe the Capitol Police, followed up by the Alexandria police, because of the countless lives that might have been taken if the Capitol Police had not been there at the instance this cowardly attack started.

Once again, Senator COONS and I are reminded of how important it is that the Law Enforcement Caucus really, truly respect those who serve and the families of those who serve.

Senator, I am glad to yield back to you for a final comment.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for the chance to work together to lift up in a bipartisan way the men and women of law enforcement and to express our prayers and our gratitude for the men and women of law enforcement—for the Alexandria police and everyone who serves in our entire Nation to help keep it safe and secure.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, this side of the Capitol is obviously sending our thoughts and prayers to colleagues in the House of Representatives—particularly, to Congressman SCALISE—and to the other wounded law enforcement individuals and staff. Certainly, our hearts and prayers go out to those individuals too.

These men and women who protect us every day here in the Capitol do an outstanding job. We really want to make sure they understand how important it is and how much we appreciate their protection of us and the security they provide to everyone here in the Capitol.

(The remarks of Ms. CANTWELL and Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1352 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to express the sentiments of all of us who were stunned and saddened to learn first thing this morning of the attack on our colleagues and their staff on the House side as they practiced for the Republican team for the annual Congressional Baseball Game.

Senator RAND PAUL, who was present, told us at lunch about what happened. He emphasized time and again the absolutely heroic behavior, the extraordinary bravery of the Capitol police officers who were part of Representative SCALISE's detail. He said that, without these two police officers, he has no doubt that many more people would have been injured and likely killed.

So I think it is important for us to pause and express our gratitude to the men and women of the Capitol Police Force, and, indeed, to the first responders and law enforcement officers everywhere, who, day after day, put their lives on the line for our country. With-

out their help today, the terrible attack would have been far, far worse. So I thank them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am here this afternoon to speak about the amendment to address sanctions on Russia, but I want to preface my remarks by saying, like all of us here in the Capitol today, that my thoughts are with Congressman SCALISE and with the staff member, the two Capitol police officers, and others who were part of the terrible tragedy this morning. In particular, I want to salute the officers involved, whose courage and professionalism undoubtedly saved many lives, and I join with the entire Senate family in hoping for a full recovery for everyone involved.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Mr. President, in a few minutes, we will vote on a bipartisan amendment to strengthen sanctions on Russia and to mandate rigorous congressional review of any effort to loosen the sanctions regime. I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment, which has real teeth, including provisions that I advocated for to prevent sanctioned individuals from using family members to circumvent sanctions.

I am also pleased that the amendment includes congressional review of any decision to restore Russia's access to non-Embassy compounds that were seized at the end of last year in the United States. I think this is not the time to grant Russia such privileges, especially given that it would bolster their intelligence-gathering capabilities.

I am pleased that this is a bipartisan amendment, thanks to the leadership of the chair and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, on which I serve, Chair CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN, as well as the chair and ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senator CRAPO, who is here, and Ranking Member BROWN. They worked very hard to come up with a bipartisan agreement.

I also want to recognize Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM, whose work on the underlying bill gave us a foundation to come up with this amendment.

Again, on a personal level, I want to especially thank the chair and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator CORKER had made a commitment to get this bill done after we got back from the break. He has been good on his word, and we have a bipartisan agreement.

I think these measures are necessary because the United States has been attacked by a hostile foreign power. As a result, we have a responsibility to respond in a way that punishes the attacker and that strives to prevent a recurrence in the future.

In January, the Director of National Intelligence released a declassified re-

port on Russia's interference in our election. I think it is important to reiterate what that report said. It states:

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine faith in the US democratic process.

While recently we have learned more about the scope of their interference, a classified National Security Agency report, prepared prior to the November election, concluded that Russian military intelligence executed a cyber attack on at least one U.S. voting software supplier and sent spear-fishing emails to more than 100 local election officials. Yesterday, Bloomberg reported that Russia's cyber attack on the U.S. electoral system included incursions into voter databases and software systems in as many as 39 States.

We are learning more and more about the extent to which Russia attacked our voting system and tried to undermine our elections. That is exactly why the Senate stands united behind this bipartisan amendment to stiffen sanctions. We must not allow this kind of interference in our elections to become a normal process.

What we have heard from experts in the intelligence community—they have warned us that if Russia gets a pass on this, that it will interfere in future U.S. elections. We have seen it in Europe and other Western democracies.

In testimony last month before the Judiciary Committee, the former Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, said:

I believe [the Russians] are now emboldened to continue such activities in the future both here and around the world, and to do so even more intensely.

He goes on to say:

I hope the American people recognize the severity of this threat and that we collectively counter it before it further erodes the fabric of our democracy.

Russia's interference in our electoral process should outrage every patriotic American. We need a bolder, more aggressive strategy for deterring Russia. This bipartisan agreement to stiffen sanctions is a critical step forward.

In concert with this legislation, we need to be focused on bolstering NATO and our European allies, and we need to demonstrate more vigorous support for Ukraine's efforts to strengthen its democracy and independence.

We need to be more aggressive in countering the Russia propaganda and disinformation campaign, including the Russia Today empire.

Finally, I want to again applaud the leadership of all of our committees who were involved in coming up with this bipartisan agreement. Also, I applaud the bipartisan leadership of Majority Leader MCCONNELL and Minority Leader SCHUMER because without their negotiations, we would not be here today.

I certainly urge all of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress to promptly



approve this legislation, and I hope the President will sign it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio speak next for 2 minutes, the Senator from Idaho speak after that for 5, and I will conclude with 5 minutes. The vote will be held thereafter.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic leader. I thank my friend, the chairman of the Banking Committee, and also Senator SHAHEEN.

Hardly a week goes by that we don't learn more about the efforts of the Russian Government to sow the seeds of dissent around the world. Apart from oil and gas, this seems to be Russia's primary export. One administration after another has tried to reason with President Putin, but appeals to reason clearly don't work.

Vladimir Putin needs to know he will pay an increasing price for his hostile actions. He needs to know we will stand up for our allies in Ukraine and throughout Europe. He needs to know we will not tolerate his interference in our democratic process, whether in the last election or the next election.

Instead of providing a firm, clear message that we will not tolerate Russia's bad behavior, this administration has been all over the diplomatic map—and that is just in its public pronouncements. Frankly, we don't know exactly what the Trump administration is doing privately with the oligarchs, the oilmen, the Kremlin, or even with President Putin himself.

This amendment sends a firm, clear message we need right now: The United States of America will not accept continued Russian aggression. We will put tough measures in place to punish past actions and to deter future aggressions. We will stand by our allies.

I commend Senators GRAHAM and BLUMENTHAL for their amendments. I thank Chairman CRAPO for his leadership. I thank Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN and all the Senators who have put time and effort into this issue.

On behalf of the Ukrainian community in my State, on behalf of fair play, and on behalf of the integrity of the American election system, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President. I rise to speak on behalf of the Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin Countering Russian Aggression and Cyber Attacks Act of 2017. This is filed as amendment No. 232 to the pending Iran sanctions bill, and as has been indicated, we will vote on it in just a few minutes. This amendment

is the result of a partnership between the Senate Banking Committee and Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Amendment 232 ratchets up pressure against the Russian Federation for its illegal invasion and annexation of Crimea, its continuing escalation of violence in eastern Ukraine, and its malign cyber activities against businesses and citizens of the United States. It also provides Congress with strong oversight over almost any termination or suspension of these sanctions.

I spoke yesterday about the hard work of Senators CORKER, BROWN, CARDIN, and their staffs. I thank them again for their leadership. I also thank Senators MCCAIN, GRAHAM, and SHAHEEN, who contributed to these efforts. I recognize our latest cosponsors, Senators PERDUE, MENENDEZ, WARREN, RUBIO, SCOTT, HEITKAMP, REED, and TOOMEY. I appreciate their cosponsorship and support as well. We appreciate the leadership of Majority Leader MCCONNELL and Democratic Leader SCHUMER, who helped ensure we could move a good Russia sanctions package. The need for this legislation is underlined by the fact that many Americans have deep concerns about Russia's behavior over the past few years.

Since coming to power, Russian President Putin has become increasingly belligerent, nationalistic, and autocratic. Americans are concerned about Russia's behavior in Ukraine and Syria, and they are concerned about Russia's increased cyber intrusions.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle feel the United States needs to be much stronger in its response to Russia. Americans want to see the United States stand firm in defense of our long-held values, which include respect for territorial integrity, human rights, and liberty.

The Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin amendment signals to the world that the United States has unflagging commitment to the sanctity of territorial integrity, human rights, and good governance. Our amendment also demonstrates our resolve in responding to cyber attacks against American citizens and entities and against our allies.

In summary, the Crapo-Brown-Corker amendment does the following things: It escalates and expands the current sanctions regime against Russia, it creates new sanctions against Russia, it engages Congress at a higher level than before by providing a mechanism for Congress to vote before lifting any sanctions on Russia, and it increases the Treasury Department's ability to track illicit finance, including illicit flows linked to Russia.

The amendment will result in some very powerful and new sanctions. Amendment No. 232 includes Congressional Review Act language to ensure Congress exerts proper oversight over the use of these powerful sanctions. It also requires the creation of a national

strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance. This strategy ensures that the United States pursues a coordinated and effective fight against illicit finance at all levels of the Russian Government.

As we move forward with this amendment, we must engage all of our allies and our trading partners. It is important that we work together to minimize collateral damage and unintended consequences.

This is a strong bipartisan measure that, in important respects, represents the next step forward. Even though unilateral actions are not the best option, America must lead on the issue now and encourage others to follow. The times call for clarity of purpose and a correct amount of pressure. We have that in this amendment.

Again, thank you to Senators CORKER, BROWN, and CARDIN for your hard work and support, and all of the other Senators I have mentioned. Thank you to our cosponsors, and especially to Leader MCCONNELL and Democratic Leader SCHUMER for all of your help and your support. I look forward to passing this measure in short order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we will vote on an amendment that consists of a package of Russia sanctions. I would like to endorse the amendment in the strongest possible terms and hope we can get all of our colleagues to vote for it.

It was negotiated by a bipartisan group of Senators who did a great job: Senators CORKER and CARDIN, CRAPO and BROWN, with a great deal of help from Senators SHAHEEN, DURBIN, MENENDEZ. Leader MCCONNELL and I worked extremely well on this issue together, which I hope portends future things we can do together in a bipartisan way. This amendment is as bipartisan as it gets, and rightly so because this is an issue that should unite Members of both parties and concern Americans of all political stripes.

Over the past several years, President Putin and his allies and the Russian oligarchy have committed several sanctionable offenses. President Putin has violated the sovereignty of its neighbor, Ukraine, by annexing Crimea. He is guilty of human rights abuses, including propping up the brutal Assad regime in Syria, and stifling political dissent and the human rights of his own people. In Mr. Putin's Russia, elections are neither fair nor free. The media is controlled by the state, and the political opposition is hardly tolerated.

This is a regime that has routinely flouted international norms and agreements; that severely and brutishly pursues its own self-interest without regard to legitimate rights of other nations and peoples. For that, the U.S.

Congress passed a series of economic sanctions to squeeze Putin and his allies and show them that the United States strongly condemns these actions, and that was before Russia conducted a high-level campaign to interfere in the American election.

The Russia sanctions legislation we are about to vote on would address these two critical issues. By codifying existing sanctions and creating a process for congressional review of any decision to weaken or lift them, we are ensuring that the United States continues to punish Putin for his reckless and destabilizing actions. It is particularly significant that a bipartisan coalition is seeking to reestablish Congress, not the President, as the final arbiter of sanctions relief, considering that this administration has been too eager—far too eager in my mind—to put sanctions relief on the table. These additional sanctions will send a powerful bipartisan statement that Russia and any other nation that might try to interfere with our elections will be punished.

There is no process more sacred in our democracy than the guarantee of free and fair elections, no principle more enshrined in our system of government than the people participating in our noble democratic experiment at the ballot box. That bedrock principle, the fundamental right was attacked by Mr. Putin. If we did nothing—or we reduce sanctions, as the President sometimes has talked about—we would eat at the wellspring of our democracy. Foreign powers influencing whom we elect is something the Founding Fathers feared, and we are doing everything we can in this body to try and stop.

With the upcoming vote, the U.S. Senate is saying to President Putin: You will be held accountable for your actions. Foreign interference in our democracy has been a concern since the founding of the Republic. It is the origin of the emoluments clause in the Constitution. In Federalist 68, Alexander Hamilton writes that “these most deadly adversaries of the republican government [come] chiefly from the desire in foreign powers to gain improper ascendant in our councils.” Every “practical obstacle,” Hamilton said, “should be opposed to [such] cabal, intrigue, and corruption.”

We cannot let Russia's meddling in our elections go unpunished, lest they ever consider such interference again, nor any other nation in the world. They must know that if any future attempts are made to degrade our democracy, the retribution of the U.S. Congress will be sure and will be swift.

I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 232, as

modified, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL.

The yeas and nays have previously been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Leg.]

#### YEAS—97

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

#### NAYS—2

Lee

Paul

#### NOT VOTING—1

Van Hollen

The amendment (No. 232), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CORKER], for Mr. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 240.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reaffirm the strategic importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty to the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its contribution to maintaining stability throughout the world)

At the end, add the following:

#### SEC. 13. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The principle of collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is immortalized in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty in which members pledge that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all”.

(2) For almost 7 decades, the principle of collective defense has effectively served as a strategic deterrent for the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and provided stability throughout the world, strengthening the security of the United States and all 28 other member nations.

(3) Following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, the Alliance agreed to invoke Article 5 for the first time, affirming its commitment to collective defense.

(4) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have made historic contributions and sacrifices while combating terrorism in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and the Resolute Support Mission.

(5) The recent attacks in the United Kingdom underscore the importance of an international alliance to combat hostile nation states and terrorist groups.

(6) At the 2014 NATO summit in Wales, the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization decided that all countries that are members of NATO would spend an amount equal to 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense by 2024.

(7) Collective defense unites the 29 members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, each committing to protecting and supporting one another from external adversaries, which bolsters the North Atlantic Alliance.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to express the vital importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as it continues to serve as a critical deterrent to potential hostile nations and terrorist organizations;

(2) to remember the first and only invocation of Article 5 by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in support of the United States after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

(3) to affirm that the United States remains fully committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will honor its obligations enshrined in Article 5; and

(4) to condemn any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom, or democracy of any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to express my deepest sympathy for the

victims of this morning's shooting, including for my good friend, Representative STEVE SCALISE. I pray that he, the congressional staff, and police officers who were injured in this horrific event can recover quickly.

Today is not a day to reflect on our differences but on our common commitment to upholding the Constitution and doing the work of the American people. This Chamber is often divided on matters of policy, but in the face of tragedy, we are united as one. Today, we are together, and together we recognize the local law enforcement officials who responded quickly and professionally to this morning's attack.

Each and every day, police officers across this great Nation risk their own well-being to ensure the safety of others, and they do so with little fanfare or recognition. In light of today's events, I recognize, in particular, the special sacrifice of our U.S. Capitol police officers—the selfless men and women—who, each and every day, assume significant risk to keep all of us safe.

I shudder to think of what may have happened this morning had it not been for the quick action taken by Representative SCALISE's security detail. These courageous special agents returned fire to apprehend the perpetrator of this senseless and appalling act of violence. Through their heroic actions, they prevented a massacre and saved the lives of dozens of elected Members of Congress and congressional staff. Today I wish to pay special tribute to these humble heroes.

As far as I am concerned, our Capitol Police officers are the finest professionals this Nation has to offer. We wave to them each morning as we walk in to work, we say goodbye to them each night as we leave, and we interact with them each day. Yet how often do we thank them for their service? How often do we reflect on the weight of their work? How often do we recognize them for their sacrifices? In my opinion, not often enough. Because these police officers are such a common presence here on Capitol Hill, I worry that all too often we take them for granted, but we should never take for granted the men and women who would willingly give up their lives to protect ours.

This morning's attack reminds us all of the thin line between peace and violence, and our Capitol police officers are the first to respond when that line is crossed. Today and every day, these selfless men and women deserve our heartfelt thanks and appreciation.

In paying tribute to our Capitol Police, I would be remiss if I were to fail to recognize the 23 members of my own security detail who work around the clock to keep Elaine and me safe. These men and women are like family to me. Over the past 2½ years, I have built a special bond with each of them.

Today I would like to recognize each of them individually:

Supervisory Special Agent David Rib, who leads the detail with assistance from team leaders Jason Marcello and Shane Powell; in addition, Special Agents Eric Boggs, John Britto, Jacqueline French, Eric Holzer, Eric Love, Paul Martin, Ronald Munar, Benjamin Odell, Richard Philius, Luis Pimentel, Ryan Rayball, Austin Reinshuttle, Henry Smith, John Whittle, Micah Harrison, Muhammed Khan, Gideon Maran, Arnold Pierre, Robert Schultz, and Charles Snead.

In all of my years of public service, these are among the most honorable men and women I have ever worked with. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

The fact that these special agents are willing to put their lives on the line to protect all of us speaks to their selflessness, their bravery, and their love of this institution and of country. Elaine and I love each of these special agents deeply, and we love their families too.

In these photos, you can see one of the team leaders, Jason, hard at work. Jason hates this photo, which is why I blew it up for national TV. The other photo is of the trip I took to all five of Utah's national parks last year. During this trip, my security detail was with me every step of the way. These men and women never leave my side.

Today I wish to thank them with all of my heart for their service and their sacrifice. These are really great people, and we have enjoyed being together. At least, I have enjoyed being with them. I will put it that way.

As Members of Congress, we stand united in the aftermath of today's attack. Thanks to our brave Capitol Police officers, we also stand protected from those who would do us harm. Because of them, we can confidently carry on the work of the American people.

These are really great human beings—men and women—who literally sacrifice a lot to serve us, back us up, strengthen us, and help us in times of need. They are people whom I really, really admire. All I can say is, I admire those who stood up this morning for Congressman SCALISE and the others who were there and especially for those who were wounded.

This is a wonderful institution, and we have wonderful people working with us—heroic people, people who care for this body, people who care for our country, people who care for us. I think we ought to all thank God every day that we have these good people around us and that we ought to all take the time to be kind to them, to show them how much we care, and to show them the friendship we truly have for them. I am grateful that I know a number of these people—quite a number. I am

grateful for them and for what they do for all of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, let me join my friend, the senior Senator from Utah and President pro tempore of the Senate, in his remarks about the U.S. Capitol Police.

All of us who work on Capitol Hill, all of our visitors who come here—our constituents from around the country—are in their debt because they literally do keep us safe and secure here on Capitol Hill. I do think the events this morning give rise to some additional concerns of what happens off the Hill, when ordinarily there might not be the sort of security measures in place that are necessary.

I think this is another wake-up call to all of us to be vigilant, to be aware of our situations, and to exercise concern for our own safety. Of course, we do need to continue to look at what the needs are of the Capitol Police, in terms of training and equipment and staffing, to make sure they can continue to do the outstanding job they have done here, yet again, this morning.

It is safe to say that without the Capitol Police being present, as a result of Congressman SCALISE's location there at the Congressional Baseball Game practice, the results of this might have been much more serious—much more tragic—than they already were.

Of course, we are continuing to keep Congressman SCALISE in our prayers. I was looking at the TV screen on the way out. It looks like he is out of surgery but is still in critical condition. Of course, we continue to think about him and his family and offer them our support and our prayers.

While there is a lot we do not know about this morning's incident, it is clear that this is a new environment we are living in, and we need to do everything we can to keep our constituents safe when they visit us on Capitol Hill as well as to keep safe all of the staff and everybody involved.

Mr. President, at a time when people do not believe anything bipartisan happens here in Washington, DC, I know we have seen a remarkable vote on these Iran-Russia sanctions with the vote of 97 to 2. Virtually every Republican Senator and virtually every Democratic Senator voted in favor of these sanctions which target two of the most aggressive regimes in the world.

The first is the Iranian regime, the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism. The second is the Russian regime, which, as we all know now, was so aggressively involved in trying to sow discord and chaos in the days leading up to the 2016 election.

It is staggering, really, to see the extent to which Russia has raised its game when it comes to disrupting core,

democratic undertakings like elections. We know they are doing that in the United States, and we know they have attempted to do that in France. This is the way they operate. This is part of their tradecraft. Through a combination of cyber espionage, propaganda, the use of social media, and then unfortunately sometimes too gullible a mainstream media, we know false stories have somehow been elevated to a level at which people actually begin to believe them and cause them to distrust their own government. This is a real threat to the United States and to our democratic institutions.

The talk of the Russian collusion that led up to the election is fading because, as so many people have said, including distinguished Democratic leaders like Senator FEINSTEIN, who served with distinction as chair of the Intelligence Committee and who serves on the Judiciary Committee and Intelligence Committee now, there is no evidence of there having been collusion in the election. What we need to turn to now is how we can countermeasure what Russia tried to do when it came to the so-called active measures, which was a combination of cyber espionage, the use of social media, and propaganda right here in our homeland.

We are a country that believes in freedom of speech and the First Amendment, and sometimes that makes us more vulnerable than perhaps others who have state-owned media because we let anybody who has a point of view express it freely. That is part of our DNA. It also means that aggressive, hostile regimes like Russia can take advantage of our open society and our freedoms to try to sow discord and distrust in our own country.

I hope, now that the allegations about collusion are fading, we will take a serious look at how to respond appropriately with countermeasures to this sort of aggressive action on the part of Russia. I am really pleased that with a vote of 97 to 2, we have voted to impose sanctions on the rogue nation of Iran and the rogue nation of Russia.

#### PROTECT OUR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. President, in turning to another topic, earlier this year, with the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Nevada—Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator HELLER—I introduced a bill that was called the PROTECT Our Children Act. I am proud to see it is moving through the Senate this week.

This is an important piece of legislation that most people will not hear or read much about because it is not particularly controversial, but that does not mean it is not important, which is why I want to talk about it briefly. This bill helps to stop the exploitation of children across the country and over the internet by reauthorizing the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program.

Years ago, when I was attorney general of Texas—from 1999 until the time I came to the Senate—we created in the Texas attorney general's office something we called, quaintly, the Texas Internet Bureau, which was cutting edge for the time. Now it is more of a cyber crimes unit that deals with, frankly, a lot of the same subject matter—child exploitation, child pornography, and other crimes—which are committed using the medium of the internet. I had a chance to see, sadly, how vulnerable children can quickly become victimized at the hands of some truly despicable individuals as well as the resources it takes to stop and to prosecute these predators.

One of the things we did at the Texas Internet Bureau back in the 1999 to 2000 timeframe was to link up, of course, with local law enforcement officials, but what we learned is that every municipal police department or county sheriff's department has the kind of expertise and has the sort of equipment they need in order to combat this new type of crime.

Through a national network of 61 coordinated task forces that represent 3,500 Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, we have now been able to comprehensively investigate and prosecute child predators. These task forces develop victim support programs, and they provide training and technical assistance and advanced forensic methods, which are very important when trying to track the online fingerprints or footsteps of these predators who operate online.

Through this legislation, these task forces will also help continue to facilitate community education, for example, by helping to inform parents and legal guardians what they can do to help protect their own children or the people for whom they are responsible.

Tragically, in this day and age, the internet's vast scope provides a dark, deep harbor for predators. Without the proper training and equipment, it can be difficult for our law enforcement officials to track down these child predators. This legislation ensures that they will have the resources they need to fight cyber crime and keep our communities safe by reauthorizing these important programs until the year 2022.

Last week's passage through the Judiciary Committee was the first key step. I am thankful for the work of my colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and one of our principal cosponsors, Senator HELLER from Nevada. I am hopeful we can keep moving forward with this legislation so we can get these essential programs reauthorized by passing this in the Senate and then moving it on through the House and swiftly to the President's desk for signature and enactment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today we are shaken and encouraged. My prayers remain with my friend STEVE SCALISE and his family; as well as with Zach Barth, the congressional staffer; Matt Mika, who was volunteering at the baseball field; and the two brave police officers, Crystal Griner and David Bailey.

I have played on the Republican baseball team. I have practiced on that field. I am sure that no one woke up this morning imagining this tragedy was possible, not a single player who woke up this morning and who wanted to make sure they invested their time and their energy in such a way to help nonprofits around the area benefit from drawing a crowd together to watch Republicans and Democrats play baseball for the express and specific benefit of helping those who cannot help themselves.

I am also encouraged today. I am encouraged specifically by law enforcement and, more specifically, the Capitol Police who, because of their swift action, saved lives this morning at the baseball field. Thank you to the men and women who put on the uniform to keep others safe and, as we can tell by the injuries of Crystal and David, put themselves in harm's way.

I am also encouraged that in the midst of this crisis, we have seen our country come together. We have seen this body come together. At noon today, we had a prayer vigil led by Senator COONS, a Democrat, and Senator LANKFORD, a Republican. We are no longer in the midst of a crisis—Black Americans and White Americans or liberal Americans or conservative Americans, Republicans or Democrats. We are not even swayed by the current environment of sensationalism. No, sir. We are simply Americans, blessed by God to be a part of the American family.

The polarization that pulls on the fabric of this great country is very, very dangerous. Too often, we find ourselves splitting into smaller factions. We stop listening to others' points of view. We react immediately with hostility, doubting the very intentions of folks who do not agree with our perspective. This is very dangerous for our future. We seem to have forgotten how to disagree without being disagreeable, and today's shooting is one of the manifestations of that.

This weekend marks 2 years since the massacre at Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, SC—my home—where a racist who wanted to start a race war decided that he could take advantage of the cracks in our foundation, that he could drive to Charleston, SC, and take advantage of those cracks. But the families of the victims, understanding and appreciating the notion of Matthew 5:44—loving those who seem to be our enemies—did not allow their grief

and their anger to overpower their senses. They believed in the power of love. They believed that love is more powerful than hate. They believed in each other. And because of their conviction, my city and my State stood together, Black South Carolinians and White South Carolinians, and said to the world: Not in my place, not in my city, not in my State, and not in my houses of worship. We stood together. We did not allow this spirit of oppression and division to separate us. We allowed the power of love to unite us.

So whether it is race or politics, whether it is gender or any other number of ways that we could be divided, we have to—I implore all of us—remember that we are first Americans.

As I think back to the funerals, to the vigils, I think of my good friend from Hawaii. She is not a Christian; she is of another faith. She is not a Republican; she is a Democrat. But she flew down to South Carolina only a couple of days after the massacre because two of her friends—myself and TREY GOWDY—were attending the funerals, attending the first major events. She wanted to worship with us. She wanted to be there with us. This is a classic example of when and how our Nation pulls together, setting aside our differences.

We must work together, ensuring opportunity for all, not profiting from the division in this Nation, not looking for ways to get more clicks on our pages. And why is that? It is simple—because America is stronger than this. America is better than this. We are the American family, and we must let love be the light to show us the way.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have some remarks to make with respect to healthcare that I will offer in a moment.

First, I want to address the events of this morning. The shooting that took place in Alexandria today was a horrendous, despicable act of violence. The victims—including Congressman SCALISE, two Capitol police officers, and two others—are still undergoing treatment. There is much that is still not known about what happened.

There are a few things that are known. First, it is thanks to the extraordinary heroics of the Capitol Police and first responders on the scene that this shooting did not become a massacre. Each and every one of us who comes to work in these buildings

every day is profoundly grateful for our Capitol Police, our first responders, and the incredible service and protection they provide.

Second, I think all of us know that this violence has visited too many of our communities. It has cost and ruined too many lives.

Finally, we know that the game our colleagues were practicing for—a charity game between rival parties that is held to benefit disadvantaged kids—is going to go on as planned. The game is a show of friendship. It is a show of bipartisanship. It is an indication that, as there are strong differences of opinion on the policies that we debate on the floor of the Senate, we still come together at urgent times like this. The game, which shows our commitment to friendship and bipartisanship, has never been needed more than it will be tomorrow.

Our thoughts are now with those who are injured. It seems that everyone you run into at the Capitol has said they are praying and they are rooting for a full and speedy recovery. It is one of those moments when people understand that there is legislation here—their bills, their amendments. Sometimes there is a lot of process—an amendment to the amendment to the amendment, as my wife calls it. Then there are other times like this morning, which are life and death.

As we reflect on those who did so much to keep it from being even worse—a massacre—we have our prayers for those who are injured. Once again, it puts into perspective what is so very important.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, to the topic at hand, there have, obviously, been dramatic headlines in the news pertaining to ties of the President with Russia. I want to be sure that what is happening here in the Senate with respect to healthcare doesn't get drowned out.

The fact is that here in the Senate, behind closed doors, 13 Senators—all from the same party, all of them men—are updating the Republican healthcare plan. The House passed its TrumpCare bill by the slimmest of margins just a few weeks ago.

The public has seen it, and, based on everything I can tell, it has gone over about as well as a prolonged root canal surgery. I have heard about every imaginable concern about that House bill from Oregonians. I have had 46 townhall meetings thus far this year, including 4 over this past weekend.

When the bill came to the Senate, my colleagues on the other side got out in the press, tamped down expectations, and claimed that everything would be starting over. They are starting from scratch. Now the public knows, because it is what Members of the majority party have said, that the Senate version isn't going to be all that different from what barely made it from the House this spring.

When the bill is finalized, we know it is going to be rushed to the floor, and it will not be long before debate is cut off and final votes are cast. It is a plan that relies on speed, forcing a devastating blow to American healthcare through the Senate before our citizens can actually catch on to what is happening.

This political process on this bill makes what the House has been up to look positively transparent. The basic framework of the Republican healthcare plan isn't going to change. Millions and millions of Americans will lose their health coverage. It is not my view. It is the view of the independent Congressional Budget Office. Costs are going to go up, especially for those who are elderly and sicker, and those who are the fortunate few are going to get an enormous tax break.

The basic framework isn't changing, and what that means is that the social safety net—led by Medicaid, which is a lifeline for kids and seniors and the disabled—is going to be under attack. The public health system in America has stood on two twin pillars since 1965. Those pillars are Medicare and Medicaid. The Republican majority has a plan to knock one of them out beginning this year.

Today, Medicaid comes with a guarantee that if you are sick, if you are injured or if you spend every day walking an economic tightrope, you are going to be able to get care when you need it. You will not be denied benefits. But TrumpCare ends that guarantee.

The plan Republicans have on offer would dismantle Medicaid as it is known today, putting hard dollar limits on the program. That puts caps on care. That is what it means—that there will be caps on care. It is a scheme that puts Medicaid in a vise, squeezing its funding year after year fix. The plan makes budget targets a bigger priority than real-world healthcare needs for some of the most vulnerable people in our country.

Seventy-four million Americans have health coverage through Medicaid. That includes 37 million children. It provides comprehensive care to millions of pregnant women. It is a leader in the fight against the opioid epidemic, and there is treatment for those who are dealing with mental health and substance abuse disorders.

Medicaid is a lifeline when it comes to helping kids and adults with disabilities. Then there is the nursing home benefit, something I know from my years as codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers. This is a benefit that is a bedrock protection, built into Medicaid to help pick up the tab for two out of three nursing home beds in America. If you roll that benefit back, I don't see how seniors across this country are going to avoid living in squalor. Maybe their kids can take them in, but the kids of the parents I am talking about

have told me they are working on an economic tightrope, trying to balance food against the fuel cost, the fuel cost against the rent cost.

So my guess is, if you squeeze the Medicaid Program tighter and tighter and States are forced to cut benefits and access to care, as will be inevitable under TrumpCare, I just don't see where you can ensure that seniors in nursing homes are going to be protected.

My own view—and this goes back to the days when I worked with seniors—the challenges with older people have evolved over the years. Back then, you had Part A. That was hospitals. Part B was doctors. That is not Medicare any more. Today, more than 90 percent of the spending deals with chronic illness—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, strokes. It is a very different program, but we are still going to need nursing home care for so many of our older people who have done everything right in life. They are our mothers, our fathers, our grandparents, our friends. They fought our wars. They started families. They built careers. They raised kids. They scrimped. They saved. They never went on that special vacation. They never bought the boat they would have loved to have, and they did it because they always wanted to pay for essentials and see if maybe they could set aside what they could for schooling for their kids and retirement for themselves.

But, as I have said, what I have seen over the years since those Gray Panther days is that growing old in America just keeps getting more expensive for so many older people. The bills don't stop coming when you retire. And most older people still live on a limited, fixed income. I saw that with my full-time work at the legal aid office for older people and the Gray Panthers, and I saw those seniors having to stretch every last penny, and even then, it was a struggle to cover the basics. So what happens—and I am afraid we are going to see a lot more of it—is seniors eventually spend down their savings. When they face challenges, they spend down their funds.

Today, when it comes time to pay for long-term care like nursing homes and home-based care, Medicaid steps up. It is the backstop, a guaranteed backstop to protect our senior citizens. I don't want to undersell how much that means to people in my State and across the land. Medicaid is the barrier that keeps millions of seniors from falling into isolation and utter destitution.

There was a time in our country when seniors were cast aside. They were sent to poor farms, what were called almshouses. The wealthiest Nation on Earth said goodbye to those poor farms with the creation of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Under the Republican healthcare plan, unfortunately, Medicaid would be

slashed so deeply, States are going to be forced into cutting benefits. Seniors could be nickel-and-dimed for basic everyday services. Nursing homes could be shuttered. Home-based care that allows seniors to live independently could be no more. I think you are going to have lots of seniors living in squalor, and some could be out on the street.

So in my view, the people of our country are owed answers to key questions about this Republican plan.

First, how are families supposed to support their loved ones if they lose the guarantee of Medicaid?

One year in a nursing home costs more than \$90,000 on average. That is two or three times the cost of a year of college tuition. Are families going to be forced into choosing between educating their kids and supporting their elderly parents? Is it going to be a fact of life for working Americans that they have to cram two or three or four generations of one family into the same house simply because they can't afford nursing home care?

Second, what is the backup plan for vulnerable, isolated seniors, particularly those who live in rural areas?

I recently held a series of eight healthcare roundtables in rural communities across Oregon just over the last few days, in Pendleton and Condon. The message I heard from healthcare providers again this past weekend throughout rural Oregon was that TrumpCare cuts could hit seniors in rural America especially hard.

Seniors in rural communities have higher rates of chronic illness, like heart disease and diabetes. The healthcare they need requires more attention and more services. They count on getting top-notch care in nursing homes and from home-based providers. Losing these benefits could mean being alone in a home that is unsafe, cut off from the care and the connections they need.

Colleagues, in the last few weeks of this debate, I heard Members flatly deny that gutting Medicaid by more than \$800 billion will mean anybody loses access to healthcare services. That is just untrue. Anybody who says that they can slash our healthcare programs by close to \$1 trillion without having a negative impact on access to healthcare services is just plain wrong.

Furthermore, I think it is time to recognize what the end goal of this debate appears to be. My Republican colleagues haven't put forward a proposal to protect seniors who can't get the Medicaid nursing home care they need or kids with disabilities who lose the services they depend on. What Republicans have on offer is not a plan that swaps one vision of healthcare for another.

These massive cuts to Medicaid and other health programs are going to pay for equally massive tax breaks for the fortunate few. Members of this body

are going to have to decide whether it is worth gutting Medicaid and endangering essential care, like nursing home care and important home-based services, to pay for these big tax breaks for the fortunate. In my view, it should be an easy choice.

My colleagues on the other side ought to drop this partisan approach—what is called reconciliation—that it seems the Senate is headed toward. At a minimum, the majority party ought to bring this process out from behind closed doors and give it a little bit of sunlight. There ought to be hearings convened in the Finance Committee and the other committees of jurisdiction, as there were again and again in 2008 and 2009.

When you are talking about one-sixth of the American economy and what is the premier issue and always will be, which is people and their loved ones having their health, I don't see how you make an argument for not having a debate out in the open. There has to be a public debate. The legislation ought to be written in the light of day, and then our people ought to have ample time to review it before it goes up for a single vote, either in committee or here on the floor.

I am going to close with something that I think about especially today—the big challenges of our time. You have to deal with them in a bipartisan fashion in order to, one, get them right, and two, make them sustainable. The Presiding Officer of the Senate knows this. He and I spent many months working on key economic issues and recently put together a bipartisan bill on infrastructure. Healthcare is particularly important because when you are talking about providing care for over 300 million Americans, you have to really think through what the consequences are. Often, when you take a step over here, it ripples over there. That is why it seems to me that it is so important that the Republican majority set aside this partisan “our way or the highway” approach and get back to working together to find common ground.

I had a piece of legislation when we were debating healthcare in 2008 and 2009—eight Democratic Senators and eight Republican Senators. That was the first time in the history of this body that we had that. There are Republicans and Democrats who continue to serve in this body who are cosponsors of that legislation. It is called the Healthy Americans Act.

We got some of what we thought was important into the Affordable Care Act—in particular, a provision that I think the American people really want to think about in the days ahead, and that is, in our bill with the 16 Senators, we had airtight, loophole-free protection for those with preexisting conditions. There wasn't any way to hit them with extra costs or discriminate

against them because they had a pre-existing condition. We said that we wouldn't stand for that because if you allow discrimination against those with preexisting conditions, you take America back to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy. If you are healthy, you don't have a preexisting condition, and if you are wealthy, you can pay for care. We can't go back there. But the House bill basically allows States to get waivers so they can start unraveling that and punch big holes into that guarantee of airtight protection for those with pre-existing conditions.

If the majority will set aside this partisan-only, "we are doing it our way" kind of approach, what you heard from colleagues on my side is that there is very significant interest in working together to deal with the key challenges. One of them, obviously, is more competition in the insurance markets, particularly as it relates to individual insurance. You do that, and you will take the insurers off this roller coaster so they have some certainty and predictability. You can stabilize the private insurance market.

We ought to work together on bringing down prescription drug prices. Our people tell us every time we are home that these prescription drug price increases are hitting them like a wrecking ball. I have introduced approaches that I think can get bipartisan support, and there are others who have as well. But that is how to do it right. That is how you find common ground: You take time to take each other's good ideas.

Bipartisanship isn't about taking each other's lousy ideas. Bipartisanship is about taking each other's good ideas, and there are good ideas on both sides of the aisle to stabilize the private insurance market, to hold down prescription drug prices. But this idea of reconciliation, where we are all just going to do it our way—that is the Republican approach, the partisan approach, and featured in that approach are devastating cuts to Medicaid. That is a nonstarter.

So I come to the floor this afternoon, particularly given years of interest in trying to find bipartisan common ground on healthcare, to urge my colleagues to abandon this approach that is being pursued behind closed doors, that nobody knows anything about, and that really seems unprecedented in terms of dealing with one-sixth of the economy. I urge my colleagues to abandon the partisan approach of reconciliation and work with colleagues on this side on a bipartisan basis.

I will close simply by way of saying that I wanted to come to the floor today, and I will try to be back tomorrow to outline other challenges ahead in healthcare. I urge the American people across this country, in every corner of our Nation, to make their voices heard.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am here today to urge support for the act that counters Iran's devastating and destabilizing activities. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill. This bill would expand sanctions on individuals who are contributing to Iran's ballistic missile program, supporting international terrorism, or violating the arms embargo against Iran.

Iran is one of the key principal state sponsors of terrorism in the world. In fact, the Obama administration said it was the No. 1 sponsor of state terrorism in the world. It is a destabilizing force for its neighbors, and it is a destabilizing force for a more peaceful world. The Iranians provide financial and material support to groups such as Hamas, Hezbollah, militias in Iraq, and a host of other terrorist groups. They have threatened to wipe out our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel. They said they would wipe them "off the map." They continue to violate international restrictions by advancing their ballistic missile program.

Former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, when he testified in front of the Senate Armed Services Committee in February of 2016, said: "Iran's ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East."

By one estimate, Iran may have conducted as many as 14 missile tests since the Obama administration's nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, went into effect. Apparently, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action meant that Iran could take any action it wanted, if you look at what Iran is doing today. They have violated multiple legally binding arms embargoes established by the U.N. Security Council.

On a trip to Saudi Arabia in April, Defense Secretary James Mattis noted that Iran continues to violate multiple arms embargoes, saying: "We see Iranian-supplied missiles being fired by the Houthis into Saudi Arabia." I think that, at one point, Secretary Mattis said that anywhere you look in the disrupted Middle East, Iran is there. This action and others directly violate what Iran agreed not to do when they agreed to the behavior that

they said would be their future behavior.

As to their ongoing support of international terrorist organizations, the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, testified in front of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in an open hearing on May 11, 2017. Just to double down on what his predecessor said, Director Coats said: "Iran continues to be the foremost state sponsor of terrorism."

If Iran is the principal state sponsor of terrorism—the foremost sponsor of state terrorism—certainly, we should take some action. This bill does that. Whether it is action supporting the rebels in Yemen or the brutal dictator Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Iran is clearly there and clearly a force for bad, not good.

The legislation the Senate is considering this week would go a long way toward holding Iran accountable. The Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act codifies sanctions that are directed at all three categories of illicit activities and behavior that we should condemn from Iran—ballistic missile tests, arms embargo violations, and support of terrorism, as well as Iran's own systemic abuse of human rights in its own country. There is no way to criticize that government without fear of abuse or worse.

Specifically, the bill directs the President to impose sanctions on any person who knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the Iranian ballistic missile program activities or to any other program for which a system to deliver weapons of mass destruction is involved or any person who contributes to the transfer of certain arms to or from Iran. The bill also directs the Secretary of State to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of people the State Department has determined to be responsible for gross human rights violations against individuals who seek to promote human rights. The bill further provides that the President may block any property these human rights abusers have in the United States.

This measure also addresses Iran's continued support for terrorism. Executive order 13224, issued soon after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, sanctions entities determined to be supporting international terrorism.

Let me remind the Presiding Officer that the last two Directors of National Intelligence have both said that the No. 1 supporter of international terrorism is Iran. Several Iran-related entities have already been sanctioned under that order, but not, surprisingly, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. This bill makes a finding that that corps is responsible for supporting terrorism and requires that the sanctions of the Executive order that I mentioned be applied.



This bill does not violate the nuclear agreement with Iran. As the Obama administration said repeatedly, the nuclear agreement was about providing Iran “relief from nuclear-related sanctions.” I may come back to that later, but this nuclear agreement does not require the United States to look the other way as Iran continues to violate international norms on ballistic missile testing and violates the arms embargo.

Let me also say that the Iran nuclear agreement was just an agreement between the leaders of the two governments. It isn’t a treaty. The President never tried to defend it as a treaty. The Congress didn’t approve it as a treaty. It is no more of a binding treaty than anything else that the President on his own would decide they would enter into, hoping that the next President would also agree with their decision.

Secretary of State John Kerry, in the final days of his service as Secretary of State said: “We still have serious differences with the Government of Iran, and will continue to push back on its support of terrorism, disregard for human rights, and destabilizing regional activities.”

This bill delivers the pushback that Secretary of State John Kerry called for.

Despite the hopes that the previous administration had for moderation—remember that debate about how, once we entered into this agreement, it would strengthen the forces of moderation in Iran?—Iran has increased its destructive activities since the 2015 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Strengthening sanctions on Iran is an appropriate response in Iran’s continued aggression. Again, because these sanctions are directed only at actions outside of the nuclear sphere, the legislation in no way violates the letter or spirit of that agreement. The Iran sanctions regime is the best tool we have to hold Iran accountable and one that we should continue to keep at the forefront of our policy.

In April, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson sent to Congress, as required by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, the latest certification that Iran is implementing the nuclear agreement. In his message, Secretary Tillerson pointed out that “Iran remains a leading state sponsor of terror.”

How could we ever have put a leading state sponsor of terror on a path to having a nuclear weapon? All the things we are concerned about in North Korea we have guaranteed in Iran, unless some future President—President Trump or some future President—decides that this is not the direction in which we can continue.

Secretary Tillerson also said that President Trump has ordered an inter-agency review to evaluate whether suspension of sanctions related to Iran,

pursuant to the JCPOA agreement, is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

He concluded by saying that, when this review is complete, “the administration looks forward to working with Congress on this issue.”

This is a positive step. That review need not constrain the use of sanctions to hold Iran accountable for its other bad behavior.

I would just like to remind everyone that under President Obama’s nuclear agreement, Iran has already gained access to more than \$100 billion in sanctions relief, some of which is likely to be fueled to terrorists aligned with Iran. Remember the delivery of cash to Iran and where our government said that some of that cash would likely go—what an outrageous thing for us to be a part of.

The No. 1 sponsor of terrorism in the world deserves to be sanctioned. Individuals who are part of those activities deserve to be specifically sanctioned. This bill will do that. I urge my colleagues to support the bill and the amendment that was voted on today, and look forward to that action being taken later this week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been more than 6 months since a major foreign adversary undertook a cyber act of war against our election.

The Russian attack sought to undermine faith in our democratic system and favor one candidate over another—in this case, one seen as more favorable to the Kremlin’s interests.

This was truly a historic event—one that requires a response of equal magnitude—not only to deter any such attacks on our future elections and those of our Western allies, but to make sure our election infrastructure is secure from any future cyber threats.

Unfortunately, President Trump has refused to even acknowledge the Russian act of cyber war and the Republican-controlled Congress has similarly refused to act to retaliate against Russia or strengthen our cyber defenses.

All the while, Russia has predictably continued its belligerent military and cyber actions against our NATO allies and Ukraine, as well as ongoing cyber attacks on the election of our democratic allies, most recently in France.

This should come as no surprise. We were warned by our own experts and our allies about the danger of American inaction.

For example, last month, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper warned, “An American citizen should be very concerned about a foreign government, particularly our primary adversary, interfering with the most important foundational process that we have in this country, which is free and fair elections.” And former FBI Director James Comey also recently warned about the Russians

“They’re coming after America . . . They will be back.”

I heard the same warnings in Eastern Europe, where our allies starkly warned that Russia would feel emboldened to continue its attacks if the United States did not even respond to the attack on its own election. So I am understandably pleased that, at least this week, we are taking action to maintain and toughen sanctions against Russia.

This bill takes a number of long overdue steps, including codifying existing sanctions against Russia put in place by the Obama administration, adding new sanctions on Russia, and making it harder for President Trump to lift any sanctions on Russia without congressional review.

I think these are important steps we must take to respond to Russia and to protect our democracy, but they are not nearly enough.

We must also pass legislation to help protect against any such future attacks on our election and to safeguard our electoral infrastructure.

We must get to the bottom of questions regarding possible collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians.

We must be prepared for President Trump to use the waivers and designation authority granted to him in this bill to ultimately do little to nothing to toughen sanctions against Russia.

You see, the way we usually write sanctions language is to instruct that the “President shall” take such action as described and then provide a national security waiver.

Well, this President has spent more time trying to endear himself to the Russians than warning them to never attack our Nation again. In fact, this President continues to deny that there was a Russian attack on our election. What can we expect this President to do with the discretion given in this bill dealing with these exact issues?

I hope he does the right thing to protect our national security and democratic system from foreign attack, but I and others will be watching to make sure he does and ready with additional measures if he does not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, Republicans continue to come to the floor to talk about the urgent need that we have to reform America’s healthcare system. The reason we continue to do this is because the pain of ObamaCare is getting worse.

We are seeing it all across the country. The healthcare system in this country has been devastated by a law known as ObamaCare. Every weekend, at home, I hear, as Republicans all around the country hear, about the costs that have been spiraling out of control—double on the ObamaCare exchange, we hear across the country,

but in many States even more than that.

In Wyoming it has gone up 107 percent over the past 4 years. We also hear from people at home about their specific premiums on the exchange and how they are worried about them going up even higher next year. Not only have they doubled, but they are worried about them going up again. Just this past week, we have heard stories about numbers that have been requested for increases in New Hampshire, New York, and Maine. We are hearing it all across the country. I hear it every weekend in Wyoming.

People are very concerned about the impact that ObamaCare has had on their lives personally. Many will tell you that they believe that the insurance they bought under ObamaCare has been of less value than they would have liked, and many people are not buying because they see that the value is not there.

When we hear about these increasing rates and we hear about the fact that it is going to only get worse, people are saying: The cost has gone up; maybe we ought to try to shop around, and maybe we can find more choices.

The problem is the choices are going down as well. Insurance companies are continuing to drop out of the ObamaCare plan. So people around the country are having fewer and fewer choices under ObamaCare.

Last Friday, a headline in the Wall Street Journal read: "Another Area Loses Last ACA Insurer." It is not just that they have fewer choices. Now we are looking at places in the country where there are no choices.

In Wyoming we had two. One of the companies went out of business. We are down to one. That company has lost money. The question is, How long will they stay? How much higher will they have to raise rates under ObamaCare? Will we be at a point where the counties in our State, instead of having one, have none?

This article in the Wall Street Journal last week says: "Washington state has no insurer willing to offer Affordable Care Act plans next year," in some of its 39 counties.

A few days earlier, we heard the news from people in a similar situation in Ohio. There are 18 counties in Ohio next year with no plans offered. So with ObamaCare you are going to get a subsidy, but there is no place to use the subsidy. You have no choices. But we warned from the beginning about the ObamaCare death spiral, and we are seeing it happen here. For those people living in those counties in Ohio and those counties in Washington, the insurance death spiral is complete. There is no insurance market. There is no one offering to sell insurance because of the damage done by ObamaCare to the insurance market in the United States.

We have millions of people across the country who have been harmed by the higher costs and the fewer and fewer choices available under ObamaCare. They have lost the coverage they had. Care is not available to them in the sense that their insurance is not available to them. The options are shrinking all across the country and have completely gone away in certain places.

Now, someone who is living with a preexisting condition is so much of the debate, and I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who come to the floor, talk about preexisting conditions. If you are someone in any of these counties and you have a preexisting condition and the company you buy your insurance from goes out of business and there is no one to sell you insurance in the county in which you live and you have a preexisting condition, under ObamaCare, you are out of luck. You may get a subsidy, but you cannot buy a policy. Under ObamaCare, preexisting conditions are not covered if there is no one available to sell a policy, and we are seeing more and more counties falling into that situation.

There was almost a full-page map in the New York Times earlier this week of the number of counties across the country in which there are only two insurance companies selling or one or none at all. That is the problem we have all across the country.

We predicted this. This disaster of ObamaCare was entirely predictable. Republicans came to the floor as it was being debated, as it was being discussed, as Democrats were voting on it, and we continued to point out that we would be in a situation of free fall, and we are now in that situation with ObamaCare.

Republicans know what we need to do. We are trying to stabilize the market. We want to protect people with preexisting conditions. We want to lower the cost of premiums. We do not want the rug to be pulled out from anyone, and we are trying to reform Medicaid in a way that provides long-term stability to that program.

Finally, after all of these years of talking about the problems with ObamaCare and with so many Democrats having blinders on, wanting to just apply a blank check to the problem and say: "More money. More ObamaCare," finally, now some Democrats are saying, yes, that there are problems with ObamaCare. The problem is that their solution is the wrong solution.

What they want to do is make the problem even bigger, and we have seen it in California this past year. Actually, just a week ago, the California State Senate—and it is a Democratic-controlled Senate—after calls from people throughout their political party and at their political convention a cou-

ple of weeks ago, said that we know what to do—single-payer healthcare. That is what they proposed, and it passed along party lines.

Who is that single payer? It is the American taxpayer. The Democratic-controlled Senate in California passed a single-payer healthcare bill. From cradle to grave, everyone is covered. Anything you need, you have it, says California.

I served in the Wyoming State Legislature—and I served at the Presiding Officer's level in the legislature—where we did something called a fiscal note. What is something like this going to cost? They did the same thing in California. The fiscal note was \$400 billion a year. Put it in perspective. How does that fit into the State budget? The general fund for the State of California for a year, when they have just passed a bill for \$400 billion, is only \$190 billion. The total cost of what the State Senate of California passed is twice the entire general fund for the State of California. In other places, when they have said that they have needed a single-payer plan, as they have done in Canada and England, what has happened is that it has led to longer lines, waiting periods, and the rationing of care. That is not what the American people want, but it is what the Democratic Party is proposing and actually voted for in the State of California.

This was a headline in the New York Times just the other day, "The Single-Payer Party? Democrats Shift Left on Health Care."

The article goes on to read in terms of the Democrats:

Cast out of power in Washington and most State capitals, Democrats and activist leaders seeking political redemption have embraced an unlikely-seeming cause: an actual government takeover of health care.

This was from the New York Times about what has passed in California and what Democrats around the country are proposing.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, which is right down the hall of this building, a majority of the Democrats has cosponsored legislation to go to a single-payer healthcare plan—for the majority of the Democrats in the House, a single-payer healthcare plan.

That is not what hard-working Americans want. That is not what struggling small business owners want. That is not what the people of Wyoming want. The people at home already cannot afford to pay for the insurance that has been mandated that they buy under the Obama healthcare law. They cannot afford the penalties. They cannot afford the insurance, and they want healthcare—care they need from doctors they choose at lower costs.

How in the world is this country going to afford higher taxes to pay for the Democrats' single-payer fantasy? Yet that is what they are looking at in California. To double the cost of the

State's general fund, you are talking about raising taxes as well as, probably, eliminating some services. Would you have to eliminate teachers, firefighters, public safety workers? Those are the things that you have to wonder about when they make such an irresponsible decision in the California State Senate.

Ronald Reagan, I think, said it best when he said that you cannot be for big government and big taxes and a big bureaucracy and still be for the little guy. Ronald Reagan had it right. Now Washington Democrats want to ignore that.

Small business owners know what Democrats in Washington, DC, and in California refuse to acknowledge right now. The small business owners know it, and the Democrats will not acknowledge it. People around the country realize ObamaCare is not working. It is why they elected a Republican House, a Republican Senate, a Republican President—because of the pain caused to the American people under the Obama healthcare law, which mandated that everybody buy a government-approved product. The costs have gone up, and the choices have gone down. People have been left in a state in which this is not what works for them.

So here we are. We are on the cusp of coming out with a Republican plan. We are trying to do it with our legislation. We are writing a reform plan to reduce healthcare costs and improve access to insurance without the mandates and the restrictions we have seen under the Obama healthcare law.

I think Democrats should join us in finding the best solutions for the American people. The time to act is now because we see that, from week to week, more of those who sell insurance are pulling out. People with pre-existing conditions who lose their coverage will have nowhere to turn under ObamaCare. We continue to fight for our patients. As a doctor, I know what patients need, and it is the care they need from doctors they choose at lower costs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like all of us here on Capitol Hill, I am still reeling from the attack on our colleagues this morning. My thoughts and prayers are with everyone who was injured, and with their families.

My friend and colleague STEVE SCALISE remains in critical condition right

now, and I am praying for a full and swift recovery.

I am grateful to hear that the young congressional staffer who was shot—a legislative correspondent for Representative ROGER WILLIAMS—is expected to make a complete recovery.

Legislative correspondents and the other young staffers who work in our offices don't get a lot of media attention, but not one of us could do our jobs serving our constituents without them. We are grateful for their work and dedication.

In the Gospel of John, Jesus says: "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Most of us have never been in a situation where we have a need to consider such a great sacrifice. But, every day, the men and women of the United States Capitol Police, and every police force in this country, get up and go about their jobs, knowing that they may have to lay down their lives, and they do so willingly. When others run from danger, they run into it. When bullets fly, they advance.

Today, violence threatened, and officers of the Capitol Police stepped up to meet it. Had it not been for the efforts of the heroic officers who were on site, today's attack could have been much, much worse. As it is, their actions have brought many safely home to their families tonight.

Events like today remind us that there is evil in the world, but they also remind us that there is good. Around every act of evil and violence, 100 acts of good spring up. The officers who risked their lives to defend those at the scene, the colleagues who hurried to provide medical care to STEVE SCALISE, the Alexandria police officers who came running to help, the Democratic congressional baseball team who united in prayer for their colleagues, the injured officer who went to check on the Member he was protecting before he thought of seeking treatment for himself—these are the things that endure.

Good endures. Sacrifice endures. Heroism endures. Long after the names of evildoers are forgotten, these things remain.

Again, my thoughts and prayers are with the injured and with their families. And, as always, my gratitude is with the Capitol police officers who defend us every single day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, this morning, an unbalanced individual carried out a cowardly attack, not only against Members and staff of this Congress but against democratic institutions. This terrorist—and he is a ter-

rorist—desired to destroy our democratic institutions. We as a country cannot allow this to happen. If anything, this must strengthen our resolve to do what is right for our country and for each other. We cannot let this shooter defeat good.

I have known STEVE SCALISE for decades. I served with STEVE in the Louisiana Senate, then in the U.S. House of Representatives. I called his wife Jennifer and will be available to help his family in any way I can.

STEVE is a man of good character. He loves the United States and Louisiana, loves the LSU Tigers, which, of course, is our mutual affection as well. It is a privilege to serve with someone who cares so deeply about the people whom we are both honored to represent. My prayers are with STEVE, Jennifer, and their children.

We also think of Zack Barth, Matt Mika, Agent David Bailey, and Agent Crystal Griner. We think of them, are gratified that they were able to receive medical treatment quickly, and ask that everyone join in keeping them and their families in our prayers as well. To all of them—we want them to know that we in the United States and in Louisiana support them.

I specifically commend the Capitol Police for all they do, and, again, Agents Bailey and Griner for their bravery and quick actions to protect those in danger. We are blessed by the service of the Capitol Police and fortunate they were there to prevent this attack from being even more tragic.

Where do we go from here? Frankly, we as a country need to come together to try and reinject civility into our political rhetoric. We can disagree on policy. It is that disagreement and our ability to discuss and debate these differences that makes democracies successful.

The key word here is "debate." There is a difference between debate and attacking the motives and good faith of another. Debates are healthy, productive, and you respect those in opposition. You discuss ideas, not perceived intentions. When respect and good faith in the intentions of the other are lost, though, perhaps it does more to hurt than to heal.

We as individuals need to look at how we use rhetoric—rhetoric that can cause someone who is unbalanced to commit an act of violence, as we saw this morning. Anyone saying things to vilify another or portray them as evil, we have to recognize that can drive some, again, to acts of violence. Let's do what we can to move this country to the era of respectful debate.

Now let me end where I began. We cannot let political terrorism win. We must stand firm in support of our democracy and democratic institutions. We must carry on, not letting evil triumph. We do that by recognizing that we are all, first, children of God, then

all Americans. We come together, stand united, doing that which is best for our country and for each other.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Congressman STEVE SCALISE; Special Agent Crystal Griner; Special Agent David Bailey; Zack Barth, a legislative aide to Congressman ROGER WILLIAMS; Matt Mika, who works for Tyson Foods—those five individuals were shot today, and I am asking and saying to every American who happens to be listening to the Senate at this time: If you believe in God, please pray for them as I have and as I do. If you don't believe in God, this is America, and that is your right. Send positive thoughts their way.

Like most Americans, I feel awful, I feel sad, and I feel mad.

I have known STEVE SCALISE a long time. I don't know, 20, 25 years. He is a political friend, but he is also a personal friend. STEVE works all the time. He loves his family. He will do anything for his constituents. I know that is what we always say about each other, but it is true with STEVE. He loves this place. I have never seen him in a bad mood. I know he must be; he is human. But I don't think I have ever seen STEVE in a bad mood. He is positive; he is can-do. Every time I go to a function, STEVE is there. I don't think he ever sleeps. He does an extraordinarily good job of representing the First Congressional District of Louisiana, and this is so unfair. I wish I understood why bad things happen to good people.

My thoughts and prayers, as all of our thoughts and prayers should be, are with Jennifer, STEVE's lovely wife. STEVE and Jennifer have two great kids, Madison and Harrison. I can't imagine what his family is going through right now. I am just so sorry.

We are also praying and hoping for a quick recovery for Matt and for Zack.

I thank Special Agent Griner and Special Agent Bailey. There were 30, 40, 50 Congressmen and Senators out there today. It was an open field. But for the bravery of these two special agents and other members of the Capitol Police, it would have been a turkey shoot: no cover. You have a person—that is as charitable as I can be right now—a person armed with an assault rifle and a handgun. I just want to tell those two agents and all the other law enforcement officials who support them and who keep us safe every day: Thank you so much for doing your job.

We have heard—and I hope it is not true—that this was a political shooting; that this person who decided to commit these despicable acts did it because he didn't like the political persuasion of the people at whom he decided to shoot. I hope that is not true. I hope members of the media come back tonight after the Secret Service investigates and tell us that is not true. Because if it is true, this represents a new low for America.

Reasonable people disagree, and you have the right under our Constitution to disagree. This is America. You can believe what you want. Within reason, you can say what you want. And most of us—I dare say, all of us in Congress—would do anything we could to protect that right.

I guess you have a constitutional right to hate, if you want to. But I don't understand people who hate other people just because they don't agree with them politically. It is not only nonsensical, it is un-American. If the reports are true, it breaks my heart that this is what we have come to. I think many of us have probably seen that attitude. It has not become prevalent in America, but it certainly has become more than just a mere occurrence. I will put it that way.

The internet has been an extraordinary thing for commerce and for the quality of life of all of us, but sometimes I read what people write on Facebook and I read comments. The worst are the ones where people can comment anonymously on newspaper articles. The vitriol, the hatred—I would hate to live with that much hate in my heart.

Our thoughts and prayers are with STEVE, Jennifer, Madison, and Harrison, and they are with Special Agent Griner, Special Agent Bailey, Zack Barth, and Matt Mika. My personal thoughts and prayers are with every American today who feels as I do, that this is just a sad, sad day for this great country.

I don't know if there is any good that can come out of this, but if there is, I hope the good that does come out of this is that we will all stop and think about the things that divide us and understand it is OK to disagree. I will say it again: Reasonable people do. But you can disagree with somebody without hate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to add to the voice of so many Senators today who expressed their prayers and

concerns for the five Americans who were wounded today in a terrible shooting in Alexandria, VA: STEVE SCALISE, a friend of mine from the House of Representatives, someone who took a bet on me early in my first campaign, as a neighboring State, aspiring young candidate, and with whom I served for 2 years; Matt Mika, who represents the Tyson Foods, a great Arkansas institution, and whom I have known since the beginning of my days of politics; Zack Barth, a young House staffer; and Crystal Griner and David Bailey, two brave Capitol police officers who were on the scene.

We don't yet know all of the details of what happened this morning. Here is what we do know: If it weren't for the bravery of those Capitol police officers—not just Crystal and David but the others present—there might have been many more killed.

We all sit here safely engaged in the great debates of American democracy—whether we are a Senator or whether we are Americans watching it—because there are brave men and women literally standing guard at our doors with guns, willing to put their lives on the line to defend all of us.

I want to join so many other Senators today to express my gratitude to the Capitol Police, not just for protecting us—535 elected Members of Congress—but also for protecting all of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who come here every single day of the year to see their Congress and their Representatives doing the people's business.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS LARRY ROBERTS

Mr. President, speaking of men who guard us with guns, I want to turn our attention to Arlington National Cemetery. After 74 years, an American patriot has finally come home.

PFC Larry Roberts, of Damascus, AK, was only 18 years old at the time of his final mission. It was November 1943—the height of World War II. Private Roberts had been assigned to the Special Weapons Group, 2nd Defense Battalion, Fleet Marine Force. U.S. forces were making their way across the Pacific, island by island. That month, those marines landed on tiny Betio in the Tarawa Atoll of the Gilbert Islands. The mission? Take the island and advance on to Tokyo and victory. Private Roberts and his battle buddies performed brilliantly, but the fighting was fierce. One thousand marines and sailors were killed and 2,000 were wounded. The Japanese fought to the last man standing. In the end we won but at steep cost.

Private Roberts, like so many others, was killed on November 25, 1943. In the 2 years after the war, the 604th Quartermaster Graves Registration Company tried to recover all of the remains on the battlefield, but they never found any sign of Private Roberts. In 1949, a

military review board declared his remains nonrecoverable.

Just 2 years ago, the nonprofit History Flight discovered an until-then unknown burial site on the island and recovered remains of 35 marines who had died there. It took 2 years, but thanks to the amazing work of the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, we were able to identify the remains of Private First Class Roberts. It was heartening news, especially to the Roberts family.

I am happy to say he has been laid to rest on American soil on our most hallowed ground—Arlington National Cemetery. I had the honor of attending his funeral earlier today. Now he rests amid the rolling green hills and the ghostly white crosses of that cemetery. I think it is more than fitting because his burial there is a symbol of what this one person, this young man so far away from home, did for our country. He gave his all-too-brief life in service to something greater than himself. He gave his life and service to his country. He gave all his tomorrows so you could have today and tomorrow.

I wanted to recognize him and his service on the Senate floor tonight. Standing here, I think of the words of the great British Parliamentarian William Gladstone: "Show me the manner in which a nation cares for its dead and I will measure with mathematical exactness the tender mercies of its people, their respect for the laws of the land, and their loyalty to high ideals."

To the men and women of our Armed Forces, I want you to know that if you are ever separated, captured, missing, or killed in action, our country will spare no expense and will suffer any burden to bring you back too.

PFC Larry Roberts died fighting for that highest ideal, that of freedom. He would have been 92 years old this year. It is because of him and his bravery and millions of Americans like him that our country is still here, still standing, still free, as it has been for 241 years.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, we are on the Senate floor today, yesterday, and tomorrow, and we will be continuing the debate on the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017. This is actually a very important bill, and I want to commend Senator CARDIN, Senator CORKER, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and many others on working hard to put this bill together in the Foreign Relations Committee.

There is a lot of interest in this. I am a cosponsor of the bill, and I think it is an important bill.

Let me just give a quick overview of what its core purpose is. There was a lot of discussion last year about the JCPOA—what it was going to do and what it wasn't going to do. I think a lot of us, even those who supported it—and I certainly did not support it. As a matter of fact, I thought it was a very misbegotten agreement that was going to undermine American interests and the interests of our allies in the region. But a number of us were concerned about what it didn't cover. The bill we are debating today does close some of those loopholes. For example, the core purpose of S. 722 is to impose sanctions on Iran for its ballistic missile program, which continues to violate U.N. Security Council resolutions, and its support of terrorism.

It is still listed by our State Department as the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world. As to its transfer of illicit weapons, which it is not supposed to do under U.N. Security Council resolutions, it continues to do that, and, of course, there is its continuing and widespread abuse of human rights. That is all still happening with regard to this Iranian regime, which the previous administration spent so much time negotiating with to get this nuclear deal that, I think, undermines our interests.

The bill we are focused on is very bipartisan. It sets to close some of these loopholes and impose sanctions for these kinds of violations. It does not violate the JCPOA. I think Senators CORKER and CARDIN worked hard to make sure that would not be the case in order to get bipartisan buy-in. I think it is an important bill, but it could have been stronger. Unfortunately, a number of us had provisions and amendments that were meant to strengthen it. Some of us don't sit on the Foreign Relations Committee, but we have a lot of interest and experience with these issues. What we could have done was to actually make this bill stronger by looking at some of the other amendments that Members of the Senate brought to the floor on this very bill.

Let me give you one example. I had an amendment that was a very simple amendment. It essentially stated that Iranian banks and financial institutions would not be able to use the U.S. financial system—our banking system, which is critical to global commerce to conduct any business around the world—until Iran was taken off the list of countries that sponsor state terrorism—very simple: not using the American financial system until you are not a terrorist designated by our State Department. This is important. These kinds of sanctions are important because Iran and other rogue nations—you see it all the time—want access to

our financial institutions and the dollar, the world's currency. Roughly 43 percent of international financial transactions and more than 60 percent of total allocated global floor exchange reserves are denominated in U.S. dollars.

We have tremendous leverage over other countries, even if we are acting just as the United States, with regard to accessing the U.S. financial system. When you have these kinds of sanctions, when other countries are not allowed to access our financial system, it puts a real strong bite on their economy.

We wanted to bring this down to the floor. Again, there is bipartisan support for this amendment. Unfortunately, not many but just a few of my colleagues wouldn't want to accept this. They didn't even want to vote on the amendment. They believed, incorrectly, that somehow this would undermine the JCPOA. Well, it wouldn't. As a matter of fact, former Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew stated that under the JCPOA, the Treasury Department was still going to prohibit Iranian banks from being able to use U.S. dollars through New York or to hold correspondent account relationships with U.S. financial institutions. He testified that the JCPOA would continue to bar Iranian financial institutions from using our financial system. So that is happening right now.

What we wanted to do with this amendment was to say that we are going to make that legislation; we are going to make that a statutory prohibition, and the biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world shouldn't be able to use our financial system until they are no longer a sponsor of terrorism—very simple. But we couldn't get that through the Senate. If we voted on it, I believe there would be a strong bipartisan majority of Senators who would agree with us, but there are a few who don't.

The JCPOA was sold in many ways as helping to ensure that Iran would moderate its behavior, that Iran would become part of the "community of nations" again.

Well, of course, despite claims by the former President and the former Secretary of State that this is what the agreement would do, that hasn't happened. To the contrary, the opposite has happened. Iran has undertaken activities to undermine U.S. interests, the interests of Israel—our sacred ally in the Middle East—and the interests of our gulf Arab allies in the Middle East on almost a daily basis.

Look at what has happened since that agreement was signed. Moderating behavior did not happen; much more aggressive behavior did. It is really important for people to remember that this isn't just the largest state sponsor of terrorism. This is a country whose activities have led to the deaths and

wounding of thousands of American soldiers and marines. The Iranian regime was supplying very sophisticated IEDs to Iraqi Shia militias that were killing, maiming, and wounding our troops in Iraq. That is a fact. This is a regime with the blood of U.S. soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen on its hands. This is not a regime we should trust. This is a regime about which we should do everything we have in our power to use our leverage to help undermine their nefarious activities around the world that they have been conducting for decades.

So again, my congratulations and I am going to vote for the bill. My congratulations go to Senators Corker and Cardin for this important bill, but it could be stronger. We need to look at ways to make this stronger. This was a missed opportunity, simply bringing an amendment like this to the floor for a vote. Let's see where people stand. It would be strongly supported by the American people, strongly supported by our allies, strongly supported by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

Unfortunately, there are a few in the Senate who seem more interested in protecting the legacy of the JCPOA than in really putting the screws to Iran and really limiting their ability to fund terrorism or their illicit businesses around the world. That is disappointing. These Senators will not say they are doing that, but that is what is going on here. The legacy of the JCPOA is not worth safeguarding if it means missing the opportunity to further leverage and undermine Iranian terrorist activities around the world. So that is a disappointment we have seen today.

I am going to continue to keep pushing to do more to make sure we take every action, every bit of leverage that the United States of America has to push back against the nefarious activities of the biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world—the Iranian regime and its leadership. I know that most of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—are interested in doing so today. We made a good start with this bill that hopefully is going to pass the Senate floor, but we can do much more. We need to do much more. I am going to continue to press my colleagues to do so.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. DAINES assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding rule XXII, to withdraw the cloture motions on the committee-reported substitute and S. 722; that the only further amendment in order be the Gardner amendment No. 250, as modified with the changes at the desk; further, that following leader remarks on Thursday, June 15, the time until 11 a.m. be

equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that at 11 a.m. the Senate vote in relation to the Gardner amendment No. 250, then vote in relation to the amendment No. 240; finally, following disposition of that amendment, the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 250, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. GARDNER] proposes an amendment numbered 250, as modified.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide an exception for activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration)

In Section 236, at the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

or

(2) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 144 on Senate amendment No. 232 to S. 722. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

#### VA ACCOUNTABILITY AND VACANCIES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, but this legislation does nothing to address one of the most critical problems at the VA. To improve the healthcare our returning heroes receive, we need a VA that is fully staffed with the best healthcare professionals we can find, and in many VA facilities throughout the Nation, including in Ohio, that is far from the case.

Across the U.S., there are more than 49,000 VA vacancies that this administration has yet to fill. In Ohio, as of April of this year, there were more than 1,700 VA vacancies, and more than 1,500 of those positions were considered critical to public health and safety.

That is a massive problem that needs immediate attention by the administration. These vacancies are not just numbers; they have serious consequences for our veterans who need care.

When the VA is understaffed, it means longer wait times. It means veterans unable to see the specialists they need. It means overstretched doctors.

Overworked doctors means mistakes are more likely and veterans are not getting the quality care they deserve.

Imagine a doctor tells an Ohio veteran she needs an MRI. Well, if there is no MRI tech at that facility because they have not hired one, she has to wait longer for the test and diagnosis. She might have to find someone to drive her to another town.

The last thing we ought to be doing is making it harder for these men and women who have sacrificed so much for our country to get the care they need. We owe all of our veterans—and the families who support them—our gratitude, our respect, and the best healthcare in the world. That means recruiting talented doctors, nurses, and other staff members has to be a priority for the VA.

The agency must improve outreach to prospective employees to show that it is a desirable place to work. It needs to demonstrate that employee's voices, including those of whistleblowers, will be heard and protected when necessary. Future VA employees need to know that all efforts by VA workers to improve the quality of services provided to our veterans will be encouraged, appreciated, and acted on.

We absolutely need to ensure that we are holding the workers who care for our veterans and servicemembers to the highest standards—but that is not enough.

We can improve the quality of care by the VA by making sure it is properly and fully staffed. That is currently not the case, and I will continue to press the VA to provide answers as to why more than 1,700 positions in Ohio—

positions that should be filled by Americans dedicated to serving our veterans—are vacant.

When our servicemembers return home, they should be able to focus on spending time with loved ones and rejoining their communities, not worrying about whether they will be able to get the quality healthcare they deserve.

#### TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN SCHLEY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, for centuries, families and communities throughout Maine were sustained by healthy working forests. During his 32 years with Pingree Associates, including 28 as president, Stephen Schley has exemplified the stewardship that defines Maine's forest products industry. His retirement provides an opportunity to celebrate his many contributions to the economy, environment, and the communities that make up the great State of Maine.

It can truly be said that Steve's commitment to Maine and our forests is in his DNA. In 1820, the year Maine became a State, Massachusetts shipping businessman David Pingree began investing in Maine forestlands. Nearly two centuries later, as a descendant of that visionary leader, Steve has helped to make Pingree Associates a model of sustainable forestry, environmental responsibility, economic development, and public access.

Today Pingree Associates' lands in Maine approach 1 million acres. Steve has always recognized that with those great holdings comes great responsibility, and he has always measured every initiative by its benefit to the communities and people of Maine. He has devoted time and effort to engaging with organizations statewide that seek to provide support for these communities and their development, both inside and outside his role in forest management.

Just a few examples from a long career demonstrate his commitment. In the 1990s, under Steve's leadership, the Pingree lands in Maine became the largest forest in North America to earn certification for sustainable forestry practices. In 2001, he guided the agreement that established a 750,000-acre conservation easement, also the largest on our continent, to ensure continued public recreational access to undeveloped woodlands. In recent years, as the industry has sought to address the challenges of a changing economy, Steve has been a leader in supporting research into forest bioproducts and developing new economic opportunities for the entire forest products industry. He has always recognized the value in engaging with all stakeholders and has worked in cooperation with the University of Maine to foster the next generation of foresters. Indeed, he worked to establish the endowment of the Univer-

sity's Forestry School, recognizing the unique perspective and unparalleled training that comes with working in the forests of Maine.

The people of Maine have always been faithful stewards of our forests because we appreciate their tremendous value to our way of life. As president of Pingree Associates, Steve Schley has honored our heritage and helped to shape the economic, environmental, and recreational future of our entire State. I commend him for his dedication to Maine's natural treasures and our way of life and thank him for his years of stewardship.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Steve Schley who is stepping down as president of Pingree Associates after nearly three decades of leadership later this month. Eight generations after his descendant initiated this effort, Steve Schley has, in his 32 years of service both to Pingree Associates, of which he was president for 28 years, and to the State of Maine, continued a tradition of leadership in the development and fiscal health of Maine's forest products industry as well as the sustainability of Maine's forests. Steve's retirement provides an opportunity to honor his wide array of accomplishments and contributions to the State of Maine—all achieved in the spirit and essence of his lineage.

In the year 1820, Maine, as included in the the Missouri Compromise, was ushered into the Union as a new State. That same year, a prominent Massachusetts shipping merchant named David Pingree initiated what would become a historic and indispensable string of investments in Maine forestlands. Over the next nearly 200 years, sudden growth and advancement of Maine's forest product industry, and thus statewide economic development, blossomed from the easement agreements signed and purchases made of Maine forest land by the Pingree family.

Today Pingree Associates is in possession of close to 1 million acres of Maine forest land, bringing a great burden of responsibility upon the president of the association. In every respect, Steve has thrived under this burden. During his tenure as president, he has undertaken initiatives to revitalize Maine's struggling wood-products industry by collaborating with the University of Maine's Forest Bio-products Research Institute to help nurture the next generation of innovators and leaders in the bioproducts industry, setting the stage for the development and integration of sustainable, forward-thinking forest products. By "paying it forward" through the youth of Maine, he is ensuring that his integrity and hard work will continue to live on through these kids for generations to come. Steve's sustainability and conservation efforts were not limited to just ensuring a bright future. Back in 2001, when

I was Governor, I announced Steve's success in closing the largest forestland conservation easement in the history of the United States between Pingree Associates and the New England Forestry Foundation, which independently protected 762,192 acres from development and opened up the land to recreation for Mainers and all U.S. citizens for time immemorial.

Because of Steve's hard work and leadership as president of Pingree Associates, Mainers of all ages will continue to benefit from his successes in Maine's forest industry, as well as in conserving land for their recreation. Steve has honored our collective heritage as well as his own, and I thank him for his friendship and his many contributions towards bettering our State.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL KAREN E. DYSON

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to honor an exceptional officer in the U.S. Army. LTG Karen E. Dyson will retire in July after more than 37 years of distinguished service to the Army and our great Nation. General Dyson's long and distinguished career admirably culminates as military deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller. This is the highest military position within that office.

For nearly four decades, General Dyson has personified the Army values of duty, integrity, and selfless service to our Nation's defense. She comes from a legacy of selfless service, as her father served as a special forces officer in Germany. Lieutenant General Dyson began her own legacy upon graduation and commissioning as a second lieutenant into the regular Army, Finance Branch, from the ROTC program at Southwest Missouri State University. Her extraordinary career is a testament to her hard work and dedication; she is an exemplary role model and mentor who made Army history as the first female finance officer to obtain the rank of lieutenant general.

Lieutenant General Dyson has commanded soldiers at all levels through brigade, leading soldiers in peacetime, stability operations, and war. During her command of the European-based 266th Finance Command, she deployed with her troops in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq. Her command funded each and every Army mission within the contingency operation, the infrastructure of all military operating bases, and critical equipment that ensured warfighters were ready to fight. She also commanded the 208th Finance Battalion during Operation Joint Guard and Operation Joint Forge in Bosnia; and the 66th Finance Detachment in the 101st Airborne Division



during Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia.

Lieutenant General Dyson was an integral part of the of the White House team during her time serving as the chief of staff and comptroller, White House Military Office. She is also a familiar and respected presence in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill. During her time as the military deputy for budget and the director of the Army budget under the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, she dedicated herself to engaging Congress on important financial issues for the Army, answering questions that ensured transparency and understanding of the Army's funding requirements. She served in numerous positions within the Pentagon to include the chief of the Army Coalition Provisional Authority Support Team, the director of Business Operations Office of Business Transformation, the director of operations and support Army Budget Office and the executive officer to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, and to the Under Secretary of the Army. She influenced the way the Army viewed auditability and was the driving force behind numerous initiatives to make every dollar count, ensuring accountability to Congress and our Nation's taxpayers.

Together with her husband James Chamberlain, a retired Air Force officer, she will undoubtedly continue her service to our Nation in some capacity following her retirement. On behalf of the State of West Virginia and the U.S. Senate and a grateful nation, I congratulate LTG Karen E. Dyson on her retirement from the U.S. Army. I wish Karen and Jim the best in their future endeavors and the next chapter of their lives.●

#### TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL REBECCA B. MCELWAIN

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to an exceptional officer in the U.S. Army. LTC Rebecca B. McElwain has served admirably as a senior budget integrator for the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, for the past year.

Lieutenant Colonel McElwain began her career in North Dakota where she spent time as a medic in the Army Reserves, later transferring to the Minnesota National Guard. After graduating with a bachelor's of science in business administration from North Dakota State University in 1997, she received a commission into the Finance Corps.

LTC Rebecca McElwain's earliest Active-Duty assignment was with the 125th Finance Battalion in Hawaii, where she assumed her first company-grade command and participated in

Asia-Pacific training exercises such as Cobra Gold in Thailand. After her time in Hawaii, she transitioned to Schweinfurt, Germany, where she assumed detachment command in the 106th Finance Battalion and deployed her unit to Kosovo in support of Task Force Falcon. She also served as a military mentor in support of the U.S. Ambassador's efforts to encourage Kosovar women to assume leadership positions in Kosovo's developing government.

After her return from Kosovo, she moved across Germany to support U.S. Army Europe transformation initiatives as the 266th Finance Command executive officer. Shortly after, she was selected for graduate school and attended Hawaii Pacific University, where she earned a master's degree in business administration with an international finance focus. After graduation, she returned to Germany, activated and assumed command of the 106th Financial Management Company, deploying her unit in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom to establish a new headquarters in southern Iraq.

While in Germany, Lieutenant Colonel McElwain was selected to attend the Australian Command and Staff College, a joint military school.

During her time in Australia, she earned an additional master's degree in strategy and management from the University of New South Wales and attended classes with 182 students from 22 different nations, to include China, India, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates.

Next, Lieutenant Colonel McElwain served as the chief of financial management security assistance in the CENTCOM J8, supporting the fiscal requirements of 17 security cooperation offices throughout CENTCOM. She also served as a primary member of the CENTCOM operational planning team for Afghanistan transition. As the division G8 comptroller for the 25th Infantry Division, she managed funding for five rapidly deployable brigades and received broad exposure to the ongoing Pacific partnership efforts within the PACOM footprint, as well as joint force engagements.

Lieutenant Colonel McElwain's husband, James, has deep family roots in West Virginia and served as an Army ordnance officer. Since leaving the military, he spends his time as a health and fitness consultant and independent chef. Together they have a 13-year-old son, Andrew, who enjoys Boy Scouts, loves all types of sports, and keeps them on their toes.

Throughout her career, Lieutenant Colonel McElwain has positively impacted her soldiers, peers, and superiors. Her extraordinary career is a testament to her hard work and dedication. Our Nation has been enriched by her leadership, thoughtful judgment, and exemplary work. On behalf of the

State of West Virginia and the U.S. Senate and a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Rebecca on her service to our Nation. We wish Rebecca, James, and Andrew all the best as they continue their journey in the Army.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:48 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2581. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2581. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 213. A bill to designate the wilderness within the Lake Clark National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska as the Jay S. Hammond Wilderness Area (Rept. No. 115-108).

S. 217. A bill to amend the Denali National Park Improvement Act to clarify certain provisions relating to the natural gas pipeline authorized in the Denali National Park and Preserve (Rept. No. 115-109).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 46. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York (Rept. No. 115-110).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 381. A bill to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as "Sky Point" (Rept. No. 115-111).

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

\*Pamela Hughes Patenaude, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

\*Kevin Allen Hassett, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

\*David Malpass, of New York, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

\*Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

\*Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

\*Andrew K. Maloney, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. ENZI for the Committee on the Budget.

Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

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

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1349. A bill to provide that the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisors to the commanders of the combatant commands shall be equivalent to the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. THUNE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1350. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1351. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the designation of general surgery shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1352. A bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1353. A bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. NELSON, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1354. A bill to establish an Individual Market Reinsurance fund to provide funding for State individual market stabilization reinsurance programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1355. A bill to combat the heroin epidemic and drug sample backlogs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1356. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to pursue independent study programs at certain educational institutions that are not institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1357. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic family care services in Medicaid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain direct primary care service arrangements and periodic provider fees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1359. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1360. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish an Insurance Policy Advisory Committee on International Capital Standards and Other Insurance Issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 65

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to address financial conflicts of interest of the President and Vice President.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 247

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 247, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 300

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 300, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that return information from tax-exempt organizations be made available in a searchable format and to provide the disclosure of the identity of contributors to certain tax-exempt organizations.

S. 324

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 324, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

S. 383

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 383, a bill to coordinate the provision of energy retrofitting assistance to schools.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth for individuals with stroke.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 548

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 548, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 721

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 721, a bill to require the disclosure of certain visitor access records.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes.

S. 921

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 921, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 100 year anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to transition away from fossil fuel sources of energy to 100 percent clean and renewable energy by 2050, and for other purposes.

S. 989

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 989, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes.

S. 999

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 999, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf in the Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, North Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students.

S. 1172

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care.

S. 1285

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1285, a bill to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands.

S. 1296

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

S. 1341

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1341, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor.

S. RES. 185

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 185, a resolution recognizing and expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month.

AMENDMENT NO. 230

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 230 intended to be proposed to S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 232

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator

from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 232 proposed to S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself,  
Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1352. A bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon with my colleague from Maine to talk about an important issue, as well, something we had long planned to introduce today and did so this morning—the reintroduction of a Senate bill focusing on apprentice programs.

My colleague Senator COLLINS and I, in the past Congress, wanted to make sure people understood how important we thought the apprentice program was, and we introduced legislation then to create a Federal incentive for apprentice programs. We are coming back now in this Congress and reintroducing this legislation.

I know there has been a lot of talk about apprentices this week. We just had a roundtable discussion this morning with some of our business and labor leaders talking about the skills gap and the need for more apprentice investing as it relates to manufacturing. I know the President is doing some discussion of the apprentice program too. Obviously, it is no surprise to anybody in America that the President knows—or at least has used—the word “apprentice” in a pretty aggressive way throughout his career. So I hope he will tune in and listen to what my colleague from Maine and I have to say about this.

We are saying that it is time in America to have a Federal priority on apprentices; that is, the first-ever tax incentive for hiring an apprentice. Why do we want a Federal priority? Because we know that in America we need to skill and train a workforce for tomorrow, and so many people in America aren't training and aren't skilling for those jobs.

In the downturn of our economy, a lot of people lost faith. What should they invest their time and money in? There was so much transition in the economy that people weren't sure where they should skill themselves. As

we see a transitioning economy now in various sectors, as they continue to modernize, and as technology continues to change, people also say to themselves: What should I skill myself in? What should I get trained in? Because they are not sure that, at the end of that period, they will be right there with what the job market wants. That is why apprenticeship is so important today.

By giving a Federal incentive for the apprentice program, we are saying: Hire and train. We are actually saying: The apprentice program is earning while you learn, and it will help so many Americans take that issue off the table where they weren't sure whether or how they should skill themselves. They actually are hired and trained on the job.

This is something we have known as a country for a long time. We know the apprentice program has worked. We have seen it across many sectors, in building trades and construction. We have seen it in other areas. In aviation, for example, in the Pacific Northwest, the Boeing Company has taken great advantage of the apprentice program. There are so many other sectors. The maritime sector has taken advantage of the apprentice programs. What we are saying today is that we need to make this a national priority in a more aggressive way. The Department of Labor and registered apprentice programs are part of what we make an investment in here in the Federal budget. But what we are not doing is putting it on steroids, and that is what we need to do now.

Our legislation would create enough incentives for 500,000 new apprentice program individuals over the next 10 years. We think this is critically important because we know how much the U.S. economy needs these skilled workers. According to the National Skills Coalition, 53 percent of U.S. jobs are middle-skilled, meaning that they require some postsecondary education. Yet only 43 percent of U.S. workers are trained at that level. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, 67 percent of their members report a shortage of available, qualified workers. We are going to need 3.5 million manufacturing jobs over the next decade, and this leaves us with a shortage of about 2 million.

So we need to give our businesses the skill levels they are looking for so they can be competitive, so they can meet their market needs, and so they can make profits and help grow our economy. We can't let them be deterred by the fact that they have the opening and they have the jobs, but they just don't have the skill level. By doing an incentive program, we can help get a national message out: The apprentice program is a key part of our economic strategy, and skilling a workforce for the jobs of today and tomorrow is the best recipe for growing our economy.

There has been an overall decline in employer-provided training over the last two decades. By making this investment now, we are going to help U.S. businesses with the investment that should be made and, further, as I said, expedite getting people into the programs we need to get them into. If we are going to be competitive and our businesses are going to compete in this global economy and they are going to continue to innovate, they need the workforce to do it.

I think about the chip fabrication industry. Before Intel came along, probably no one knew how to do chip fabrication. But there was a sector of our economy that taught and educated people on chip manufacturing. That will not be the last innovation our economy sees. In aerospace, we have been able to, with composite manufacturing, make lighter weight planes. That composite was a huge shift from the aluminum that dominated aerospace. But composite manufacturing is a whole new skill level in which we are still training and educating the workforce. We need to compete in that sector, which is so important to manufacturing jobs.

I would say that every aspect of our economy needs apprentices. But what does the apprentice get out of it? Not only do they get a job and they get to be skilled on the job, but they also earn more. Over the course of their career, a registered apprentice earns about \$300,000 more than a non-apprentice working in the same field. A study done by our State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board found that completing apprentices earned \$13,000 more per year just as they started.

So apprentices are a win-win for us and our economy. They give the employer the skills they are seeking to make their companies successful, and the individual worker gets trained and hired in a field that takes away this uncertainty about our economy, which has so plagued us over the last decade or two, and the community gets a more successful employment base and successful companies that add to the economy of a region and to our country.

I am so glad to be here with my colleague Senator COLLINS, who has known that this apprentice program has been a success, and that is why she and I have partnered for years on this program. We hope now that by reintroducing it and getting more of our colleagues to join in, they, too, will talk about why apprentices are so important today.

We hope there is a guy down the street in the White House, who had a program called “Apprentice,” who takes seriously the bipartisan effort of two Senators who have been at this for a few years, and says: This is where we should be spending our money and

making an investment to skill, educate, and employ Americans right now, for today.

I yield to my colleague from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the Apprenticeship and Jobs Training Act, which Senator CANTWELL and I are reintroducing today.

Few issues are as important to the American people as the availability of good jobs in our communities. It is crucial that we continue to improve job training initiatives to help people find jobs in fields with open positions. Many business owners in Maine have told me that they do, in fact, have jobs available, but they cannot find qualified workers to fill these highly skilled vacant positions. In fact, I cannot visit a machine shop in the State of Maine, no matter where it is located, and find that they are not looking for skilled machinists. There is such a shortage. And those are good jobs. They are jobs with good benefits and job security.

One way for employees to acquire the skills needed to succeed in these in-demand fields is through apprenticeship programs. Apprentices gain hands-on experience that is invaluable to them and to their employers. These programs help workers secure good-paying jobs.

According to the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration, more than 49,000 participants graduated from an apprenticeship program in fiscal year 2016. In Maine, we have some innovative job-training apprenticeship programs at places like Bath Iron Works, which builds naval destroyers, and the Portsmouth Naval Ship Yard, which has an extraordinary program. Partnering with employers like these and others, more than 2,220 individuals in Maine worked actively on industry-recognized skill certifications in just the last year. That number—impressive as it is—remains insufficient to meet the needs of employers statewide.

We must do all we can to ensure that an adequate pool of skilled workers is available. Our legislation would help achieve this goal by giving a \$5,000 tax credit to businesses that hire apprentices full time in high-demand mechanical, technical, healthcare, or technology professions. In order for a business to claim the credit, the apprentice must be employed for at least 7 months. What we find is that the people who go through these apprenticeship programs stay in these jobs, thus benefiting both the worker and the employer.

Our bill also provides incentives for experienced workers who spend at least 20 percent of their time passing their hard-earned knowledge on to the next generation. These workers would be allowed to receive some retirement income early without facing tax penalties. That is a way we can ensure

that the experienced older worker is passing knowledge on to the next generation.

Finally, our bill would ensure that the brave men and women who defend our country are given credit for the skills they learned in the military while wearing our Nation's uniform. Training received while serving in the Armed Forces would count toward an apprentice's training requirement.

This bill would help to better align the needs of our Nation's employers with potential employees. It would promote hiring and the creation of new jobs. It would enhance the skills that the people of our country need to obtain good-paying, secure employment. The Presiding Officer and I were talking about this very issue at lunch today and the need to bridge that skills gap.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support our bill, and I want to salute Senator CANTWELL for her leadership over many years in working on this issue. This is something that should unite us all—Democrats, Republicans, Independents. It is not a partisan issue; it is looking at ways that we can help more Americans secure good-paying jobs that will last them for a lifetime.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1353. A bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the right to vote is among the most sacred rights guaranteed by our Constitution. It forms the foundation for our democracy and inspires countless people across the world still striving for a meaningful opportunity to engage in the political process and shape their futures.

My friend JOHN LEWIS has often said that "the right to vote is the most powerful nonviolent tool we have in a democracy." I could not agree more with him. America is a stronger and greater country when more Americans participate in our democracy. We are better when our citizens hold their elected representatives accountable and voice their opinions on the critical issues facing our Nation. We can take a historic step to foster even greater participation in our democracy simply by modernizing the way Americans register to vote.

Today, I am proud to introduce the Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2017. This bill would require States to automatically register citizens who are eligible to vote when they interact with State and Federal agencies. Americans would have the option of declining automatic registration, but this bill would provide for a registration process that is easier for our citizens and one that is more efficient and accurate.

The bill I introduce today streamlines the voter registration process by providing for online registration and greater portability of registration when an individual moves to a different location in the same State. Under this bill, no one can be unfairly penalized for inadvertent registration, and punishment is limited to cases of intentional registration fraud or illegal voting. This bill also includes important privacy protections and makes clear that the information used to automatically register individuals will remain secure. These are commonsense reforms that would not only help Americans vote but also help maintain accurate and up-to-date voter registration rolls.

Last year, Vermont became one of the States leading the country on improving our citizens' access to the ballot by becoming one of just eight States to approve automatic voter registration. I want to commend Vermont secretary of state Jim Condos for his outstanding work on this issue and for the people of Vermont.

State election officials estimate that tens of thousands of Vermonters will now be registered to vote because of this new law. Implementing these types of reforms nationwide will make America stronger and increase participation of a broader electorate. A recent study by the Center for American Progress on Oregon's automatic voter registration law that went into effect in January 2016 found that more than 272,000 people were added to voter rolls, and 98,000 of them were new voters in the November 2016 Presidential election. That is a remarkable success story, and hopefully other State legislatures will take notice. The Brennan Center for Justice, which has been a leading voice protecting Americans' right to vote, concluded in a 2015 report that a comprehensive, nationwide automatic voter registration plan has the potential to increase voter registration by 50 million eligible voters. This would not only save money and increase accuracy, but it would also reduce the potential for fraud and protect the integrity of our elections.

I would like to thank the Brennan Center for Justice for its work on this issue and for working with me on this bill. I would also like to thank Senators DURBIN and KLOBUCHAR for joining me as original cosponsors. Congressman BRADY of Pennsylvania, the ranking member on the House Committee on House Administration, has been a leader on this issue and has introduced a House companion bill.

All members of Congress should support this legislation. We should all strive to make sure that our constituents have access to the ballot box and are able to have their voices heard. This is of course just one reform we must make to ensure that our citizens' voting rights are protected. In the

coming weeks, I intend to reintroduce legislation to restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. It has now been almost 4 years since the Supreme Court's devastating decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, and we have seen the effect of that disastrous ruling as States have attempted to enact discriminatory voter ID laws and other measures intended to prevent minority voters from going to the polls. That is disgraceful, and we must do better. Congress must act to ensure that millions of Americans are not disenfranchised.

The right to vote should not be a partisan issue. It is a right that forms the basis of our democracy, and it is incumbent on all Americans, Democratic and Republican, to ensure that no American's right to vote is infringed. Modernizing our voter registration system is one significant step forward.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today, June 14, 2017 marks the 240th observance of "Flag Day," a day which commemorates the adoption of the flag of the United States by a resolution of the Second Continental Congress in 1777. Deeply symbolic, our flag honors the sovereignty of each of our Nation's 50 States and the great sacrifices many Americans have made to uphold its bedrock principles of freedom and liberty. The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that over one million military service members have given their lives in the line of duty under our flag. Title 4 of United States Code, "The Flag Code" sets specific requirements for the handling and display of the flag, as a sign of respect to the symbol of our Nation.

In 1989, with a disappointing 5-4 vote, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Texas v. Johnson* that the desecration of the United States flag was a form of free speech under the First Amendment to the Constitution. Here, Chief Justice Rehnquist rightly observed in his dissent that "the flag is not simply another 'idea' or 'point of view' competing for recognition in the marketplace of ideas." Justice Kennedy, in his majority concurrence, recognized that many would be dismayed by the court's

decision, and himself called the result distasteful. Yet, he explained that the court was bound to its decision according to the provisions of the Constitution. The Supreme Court reaffirmed this decision in *United States v. Eichman* in 1990. It ruled, again by 5-4 vote, that as Constitutional free speech, desecration of the flag cannot be prohibited by Federal or State statute. At the time of the Supreme Court's ruling, 48 of the 50 States had enacted statutes prohibiting desecration of the United States Flag.

My resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution, establishing Congressional authority to prohibit the desecration of the flag of the United States. This resolution initiates the process to amend the Constitution, which must be agreed to by two-thirds of both houses of Congress, and ratified by three-fourths of the States. A high bar to meet, similar legislation passed the House of Representatives in 2006, and fell short of passage in the Senate by only one vote.

My resolution provides Congress with the authority that the Supreme Court decided it lacked in *Texas v. Johnson* and *United States v. Eichman*. This should remove any doubt in the mind of the Supreme Court on the Constitutionality of acts of flag desecration. A matter which has been long settled in the Court of public opinion.

#### S.J. RES. 46

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years after the date of its submission by the Congress:*

#### "ARTICLE—

"The Congress shall have power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States."

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 235. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 236. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 237. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 238. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NELSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be pro-

posed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 239. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 240. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. Kaine, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra.

SA 241. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 242. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 243. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 244. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 245. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 246. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 247. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 248. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 249. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 250. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. Kaine) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra.

SA 251. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 252. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 253. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 254. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.



## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 235.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 13. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO VIOLATIONS OF THE INF TREATY BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any Russian person that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) knowingly directs, implements, provides support for, or otherwise participates in actions or projects of the Government of the Russian Federation that constitute a material breach of the INF Treaty;

(2) is a successor entity to a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(4) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that would otherwise be imposed pursuant to paragraph (3);

(5) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4); or

(6) knowingly provides or attempts to provide financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4) or (5).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.

(c) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **INF TREATY.**—The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(2) **RUSSIAN PERSON.**—The term “Russian person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject

to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

**SEC. 14. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEES AND AGENTS OF KASPERSKY LAB.**

(a) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **FOUNDERS, DIRECTORS, AND SENIOR CORPORATE LEADERSHIP.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any citizen or national of the Russian Federation that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is a founder, director, or member of the senior corporate leadership of Kaspersky Lab.

(2) **EMPLOYEES AND AGENTS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b)(2) with respect to any citizen or national of the Russian Federation that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is an employee or agent of Kaspersky Lab.

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any individual subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any individual subject to subsection (a).

(c) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

**SA 236.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

**SEC. 11. REPORT ON IRANIAN ACTIVITIES IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.**

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on Iranian activities in Iraq and Syria.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of Iran's support for—

(A) Iraqi militias or political parties, including weapons, financing, and other forms of material support; and

(B) the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria; and

(2) a list of referrals to the relevant United Nations Security Council sanctions committees by the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

(c) **FORM.**—The President may submit the report required by subsection (a) in classified form if the President determines that it is necessary for the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

**SA 237.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FOREIGN PERSONS THREATENING PEACE OR STABILITY IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.**

(a) **SANCTIONS REQUIRED.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b)(1) with respect to any foreign person that—

(1) is responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly—

(A) actions that threaten the peace, security, or stability of Iraq or Syria;

(B) actions or policies that undermine efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform in Iraq; or

(C) the obstruction of the delivery or distribution of, or access to, humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq or Syria;

(2) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1); or

(3) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person that has carried out any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) or paragraph (2).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) **ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(i) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.



## (ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien subject to subsection (a), regardless of when issued.

(II) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subclause (I) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of the imposition of sanctions under this section.

(3) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that paragraph shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(4) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

## (c) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, on a case-by-case basis and for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a foreign person, and may renew the waiver for additional periods of not more than 180 days, if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees at least 15 days before the waiver or renewal of the waiver is to take effect that the waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(3) SUNSET.—The provisions of this subsection and any waivers issued pursuant to this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out this section.

## (e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this section.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not less than 10 days before the promulgation of regulations under paragraph (1), the President shall notify and provide to the appropriate congressional committees the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

## (f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

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

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means—

(A) an individual who is not a United States person;

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental entity that is not a United States person; or

(C) any representative, agent or instrumentality of, or an individual working on behalf of a foreign government.

(4) GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ.—The term “Government of Iraq” has the meaning given that term in section 576.310 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(5) GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA.—The term “Government of Syria” has the meaning given that term in section 542.305 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(6) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(7) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(8) PROPERTY; PROPERTY INTEREST.—The terms “property” and “property interest” have the meanings given those terms in section 576.312 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(9) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” has the meaning given that term in section 576.319 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(g) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to be effective beginning on January 1, 2022.

**SA 238.** Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NELSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE II—TREATMENT OF BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, OR SANCTIONS ACTIVITIES TARGETING ISRAEL**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Combating BDS Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 202. NONPREEMPTION OF MEASURES BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO DIVEST FROM ENTITIES THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, OR SANCTIONS ACTIVITIES TARGETING ISRAEL.**

(a) STATE AND LOCAL MEASURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State or local government may adopt and enforce measures that meet the requirements of subsection (b) to divest the assets of the State or local government from, prohibit investment of the assets of the State or local government in, or restrict contracting by the State or local government for goods and services with—

(1) an entity that the State or local government determines, using credible information available to the public, knowingly engages in a commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel;

(2) a successor entity or subunit of an entity described in paragraph (1); or

(3) an entity that owns or controls, is owned or controlled by, or is under common ownership or control with, an entity described in paragraph (1).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—A State or local government that seeks to adopt or enforce a measure under subsection (a) shall meet the following requirements:

(1) NOTICE.—The State or local government shall provide written notice to each entity to which a measure under subsection (a) is to be applied.

(2) TIMING.—The measure shall apply to an entity not earlier than the date that is 90 days after the date on which written notice is provided to the entity under paragraph (1).

(3) OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT.—The State or local government shall provide an opportunity to comment in writing to each entity to which a measure is to be applied. If the entity demonstrates to the State or local government that the entity has not engaged in a commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel, the measure shall not apply to the entity.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AVOIDING ERRONEOUS TARGETING.—It is the sense of Congress that a State or local government should not adopt a measure under subsection (a) with respect to an entity unless the State or local government has made every effort to avoid erroneously targeting the entity and has verified that the entity engages in a commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel.

(c) NOTICE TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 30 days after adopting a measure described in subsection (a), the State or local government that adopted the measure shall submit written notice to the Attorney General describing the measure.

(2) EXISTING MEASURES.—With respect to measures described in subsection (a) adopted before the date of the enactment of this Act, the State or local government that adopted the measure shall submit written notice to the Attorney General describing the measure not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) NONPREEMPTION.—A measure of a State or local government that is consistent with subsection (a) is not preempted by any Federal law.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to any measure adopted by a State or local government before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

## (f) PRIOR ENACTED MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (2), a State or local government may enforce a measure described in subsection (a) adopted by the State or local government before the date of the enactment of this Act without regard to the requirements of subsection (b).

(2) APPLICATION OF NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT.—A measure described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (b) on and after the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

## (g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) AUTHORITY OF STATES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to abridge the authority of a State to issue and enforce rules governing the safety, soundness, and solvency of a financial institution subject to its jurisdiction or the business of insurance pursuant to the Act of March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33, chapter 20; 15 U.S.C. 1011 et seq.) (commonly known as the “McCarran-Ferguson Act”).

(2) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the established policy of the United States concerning final status issues associated with the Arab-Israeli conflict, including border delineation, that can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties.

(3) SCOPE OF NONPREEMPTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as establishing a basis for preempting or implying preemption of State measures relating to boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel that are outside the scope of subsection (a).

## (h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

## (1) ASSETS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “assets” means any pension, retirement, annuity, or endowment fund, or similar instrument, that is controlled by a State or local government.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The term “assets” does not include employee benefit plans covered by title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(2) BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, OR SANCTIONS ACTIVITY TARGETING ISRAEL.—The term “boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel” means any activity that is intended to penalize, inflict economic harm on, or otherwise limit commercial relations with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories for purposes of coercing political action by, or imposing policy positions on, the Government of Israel.

## (3) ENTITY.—The term “entity” includes—

(A) any corporation, company, business association, partnership, or trust; and

(B) any governmental entity or instrumentality of a government, including a multilateral development institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(3) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(3))).

(4) INVESTMENT.—The term “investment” includes—

(A) a commitment or contribution of funds or property;

(B) a loan or other extension of credit; and

(C) the entry into or renewal of a contract for goods or services.

(5) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the United

States Virgin Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(6) STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term “State or local government” includes—

(A) any State and any agency or instrumentality thereof;

(B) any local government within a State and any agency or instrumentality thereof; and

(C) any other governmental instrumentality of a State or locality.

**SEC. 203. SAFE HARBOR FOR CHANGES IN INVESTMENT POLICIES BY ASSET MANAGERS.**

Section 13(c)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-13(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) engage in any boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel described in section 202 of the Combating BDS Act of 2017.”.

**SA 239.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON USE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT AND RELATED SERVICES FOR ILLEGAL MILITARY OR OTHER ACTIVITIES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran is designated as the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism and a direct threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies.

(2) Iran, through its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (in this section referred to as the “IRGC”), provides material and financial support to foreign terrorist organizations, including Hamas, Hezbollah, and Kata’ib Hezbollah, as well as to the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, which is responsible for more than 400,000 civilian deaths.

(3) Iran has systematically employed its national air carrier, Iran Air, as well as numerous private and publicly owned Iranian and Syrian air carriers, including Mahan Air, to ferry weapons, troops, and military equipment on behalf of the IRGC and Iran’s Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics (in this section referred to as “MODAF”) to foreign terrorist organizations and rogue regimes around the world.

(4) On June 23, 2011, the United States Department of the Treasury designated Iran Air for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters) for providing material support and services to the IRGC, including shipping military-related equipment on behalf of the IRGC since 2006 and transporting rockets or missiles to Syria.

(5) On January 16, 2016, Iran Air was removed from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons by the Department of the Treasury even though Iran Air

had not ceased its illicit and sanctionable activity.

(6) Iran Air remains owned and operated by the Government of Iran and has, since January 16, 2016, flown numerous unscheduled flights on well-known weapons supply routes between Iran and Syria.

(7) In correspondence with Members of Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to confirm that Iran Air has ceased its illicit activity. In a November 23, 2016, letter to Representative Peter Roskam, Thomas Patrick Maloney, Senior Advisor in the Office of Legislative Affairs of the Department of the Treasury wrote: “The United States retains the ability to designate any individual or entity that engages in sanctionable activities under our authorities targeting conduct outside the scope of the JCPOA, including Iran’s support for terrorism, human rights abuses, ballistic missile program, and other destabilizing activities in the region.”.

(8) Evidence supports that, despite being removed from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons on January 16, 2016, Iran Air has continued its illicit and sanctionable activity in support of the IRGC, MODAF, Hezbollah, and the Bashar al-Assad regime since January 16, 2016.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on use by the Government of Iran of commercial aircraft and related services for illicit military or other activities during—

(1) in the case of the first report, the 5-year period preceding submission of the report; and

(2) in the case of any subsequent report, the 180-day period preceding submission of the report.

(c) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (b) shall include a description of the extent to which—

(1) the Government of Iran has used commercial aircraft, including aircraft of Iran Air, or related services to transport illicit cargo to or from Iran, including military goods, weapons, military personnel, military-related electronic parts and mechanical equipment, or rocket or missile components;

(2) the commercial aviation sector of Iran, including Iran Air, has provided financial, material, or technological support to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, Iran’s Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics, the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Hezbollah, Hamas, Kata’ib Hezbollah, any other organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189), or any person on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury; and

(3) foreign governments and persons have facilitated the activities described in paragraph (1), including allowing the use of airports, services, or other resources.

(d) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—If, in a report submitted under this section, the President determines that Iran Air or any other Iranian commercial air carrier has used commercial aircraft for illicit military purposes on or after January 16, 2016, the President shall, not later than 90 days after making that determination, include the air carrier on the list of specially designated nationals

and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(e) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(f) **SUNSET.**—This section shall cease to be effective on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Iran has ceased providing support for acts of international terrorism.

**SA 240.** Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 13. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The principle of collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is immortalized in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty in which members pledge that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all”.

(2) For almost 7 decades, the principle of collective defense has effectively served as a strategic deterrent for the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and provided stability throughout the world, strengthening the security of the United States and all 28 other member nations.

(3) Following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, the Alliance agreed to invoke Article 5 for the first time, affirming its commitment to collective defense.

(4) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have made historic contributions and sacrifices while combating terrorism in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and the Resolute Support Mission.

(5) The recent attacks in the United Kingdom underscore the importance of an international alliance to combat hostile nation states and terrorist groups.

(6) At the 2014 NATO summit in Wales, the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization decided that all coun-

tries that are members of NATO would spend an amount equal to 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense by 2024.

(7) Collective defense unites the 29 members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, each committing to protecting and supporting one another from external adversaries, which bolsters the North Atlantic Alliance.

(b) **SENSE OF SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to express the vital importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as it continues to serve as a critical deterrent to potential hostile nations and terrorist organizations;

(2) to remember the first and only invocation of Article 5 by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in support of the United States after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

(3) to affirm that the United States remains fully committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will honor its obligations enshrined in Article 5; and

(4) to condemn any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom, or democracy of any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

**SA 241.** Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran’s ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE II—ISRAEL ANTI-BOYCOTT ACT**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Israel Anti-Boycott Act”.

**SEC. 202. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United Nations Human Rights Council (in this section referred to as the “UNHRC”) has long targeted Israel with systematic, politically motivated, assaults on its legitimacy designed to stigmatize and isolate Israel internationally.

(2) The UNHRC maintains a permanent agenda item known as “Item 7” to ensure that Israel will be criticized at every gathering of the UNHRC.

(3) At its 31st session on March 24, 2016, the UNHRC targeted Israel with a commercial boycott, calling for the establishment of a database, such as a “blacklist”, of companies that operate, or have business relations with entities that operate, beyond Israel’s 1949 Armistice lines, including East Jerusalem.

(4) At its 32nd session in March 2017, the UNHRC is considering a resolution pursuant to agenda item 7 to withhold assistance from and prevent trade with “territories occupied since 1967”, including East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and the Golan Heights, stating that businesses that engage in economic activity in those areas could face civil or criminal legal action.

(5) For a half century, Congress has combated anti-Israel boycotts and other discriminatory activity under the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), under part VI of title X of the Tax Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-455; 90

Stat. 1649) (commonly referred to as the “Ribicoff Amendment”), in free trade agreements with Bahrain and Oman, and in Saudi Arabia’s accession negotiations to the World Trade Organization.

(6) The recent action of the UNHRC is reminiscent of the Arab League Boycott, which also called for the establishment of a “blacklist” and promoted a primary, as well as a secondary and tertiary, boycott against Israel, targeting United States and other companies that trade or invest with or in Israel, designed to harm Israel, any business operating in, or doing business with, Israel, or companies that do business with companies operating in Israel.

(7) Congress recently passed anti-boycott, divestment, and sanctions measures in the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.) and section 909 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4452), which establish, among other things—

(A) the opposition of the United States to actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel;

(B) requirements that the United States utilize trade negotiations to combat state-led or international governmental organization-led actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel; and

(C) reporting requirements regarding the actions of foreign countries or international organizations that establish barriers to trade or investment for United States companies in or with Israel.

**SEC. 203. STATEMENT OF POLICY.**

Congress—

(1) opposes the United Nations Human Rights Council resolution of March 24, 2016, which urges countries to pressure their own companies to divest from, or break contracts with, Israel, and calls for the creation of a “blacklist” of companies that either operate, or have business relations with entities that operate, beyond Israel’s 1949 Armistice lines, including East Jerusalem;

(2) views such policies as actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel; and

(3) in order to counter the effects of actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel, encourages full implementation of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-296; 128 Stat. 4075) through enhanced, governmentwide, coordinated United States-Israel scientific and technological cooperation in civilian areas such as with respect to energy, water, agriculture, alternative fuel technology, civilian space technology, and security.

**SEC. 204. ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO FOREIGN BOYCOTTS UNDER EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.**

(a) **DECLARATION OF POLICY.**—Section 3(5) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4602(5)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) to oppose—

“(i) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries, or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries, against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person; and

“(ii) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or

requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any international governmental organization against Israel;"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "which have the effect" and all the follows and inserting the following: "which have the effect of furthering or supporting—

"(i) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country, or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any foreign country, against a country friendly to the United States or against any United States person; and

"(ii) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any international governmental organization against Israel; and".

(b) FOREIGN BOYCOTTS.—Section 8 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4607) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting "or request to impose any boycott by a foreign country," after "a foreign country";

(ii) by inserting "or support any boycott fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or request to impose any boycott by any international governmental organization against Israel" after "pursuant to United States law or regulation";

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "or international governmental organization (as the case may be)" after "of the boycotting country"; and

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting "or requesting the furnishing of information," after "Furnishing information"; and

(ii) by inserting "or with the international governmental organization (as the case may be)" after "in the boycotting country"; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting "or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries," after "foreign countries"; and

(B) by inserting "or restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any international governmental organization against Israel" before the period at the end.

(c) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 8(a).—Section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4610) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "or (j)" after "subsection (b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(j) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 8(a).—Whoever knowingly violates or conspires to or attempts to violate any provision of section 8(a) or any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder shall be fined in accordance with section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705)."

(d) DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION.—Section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) the term 'international governmental organization' includes the United Nations and the European Union;".

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to actions described in section 8(a) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) taken or knowingly agreed to be taken on or after such date of enactment.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President shall implement the amendments made by this section by exercising the authorities of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

#### SEC. 205. POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL UNDER EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945.

Section 2(b)(1)(B) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(B)) is amended in the sixth sentence by inserting after "child labor," the following: "or opposing policies and actions that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with citizens or residents of Israel, entities organized under the laws of Israel, or the Government of Israel,".

#### SEC. 206. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this title:

(1) ACTIONS TO BOYCOTT, DIVEST FROM, OR SANCTION ISRAEL.—The term "actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel" has the meaning given that term in section 102(b)(20)(B) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4201(b)(20)(B)).

(2) INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION.—The term "international governmental organization" includes the United Nations and the European Union.

(3) POLITICALLY MOTIVATED.—The term "politically motivated" means actions to impede or constrain commerce with Israel that are intended to coerce political action from or impose policy positions on Israel.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the established policy of the United States or to establish new United States policy concerning final status issues associated with the Arab-Israeli conflict, including border delineation, that can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties.

**SA 242.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### SEC. 13. FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION MODERNIZATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Foreign Agents Registration Modernization and Enforcement Act".

(b) CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND AUTHORITY.—The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 as sections 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (22 U.S.C. 617) the following:

#### "CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND AUTHORITY

"SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any person or enterprise may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material relevant to an investigation under this Act, the Attorney General, before initiating a civil or criminal proceeding with respect to the production of such material, may serve a written demand upon such person to produce such material for examination.

"(b) Each such demand under this section shall—

"(1) state the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged violation which is under investigation and the provision of law applicable to such violation;

"(2) describe the class or classes of documentary material required to be produced under such demand with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such material to be fairly identified;

"(3) state that the demand is immediately returnable or prescribe a return date which will provide a reasonable period within which the material may be assembled and made available for inspection and copying or reproduction; and

"(4) identify the custodian to whom such material shall be made available.

"(c) A demand under this section may not—

"(1) contain any requirement that would be considered unreasonable if contained in a subpoena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of grand jury investigation of such alleged violation; or

"(2) require the production of any documentary evidence that would be privileged from disclosure if demanded by a subpoena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of a grand jury investigation of such alleged violation."

#### (c) INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended—

(A) in subsection (1), by striking "Expect" and inserting "Except"; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

"(j) The term 'informational materials' means any oral, visual, graphic, written, or pictorial information or matter of any kind, including matter published by means of advertising, books, periodicals, newspapers, lectures, broadcasts, motion pictures, or any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or otherwise."

(2) INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS.—Section 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 614) is amended—

(A) in section (a)—

(i) by inserting "including electronic mail and social media," after "United States mails"; and

(ii) by striking "not later than forty-eight hours after the beginning of the transmittal thereof, file with the Attorney General two copies thereof" and inserting "file such materials with the Attorney General in conjunction with, and at the same intervals as, disclosures required under section 2(b)."; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "It shall" and inserting "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall"; and

(ii) by inserting at the end the following:

"(2) Foreign agents described in paragraph (1) may omit disclosure required under that paragraph in individual messages, posts, or

transmissions on social media on behalf of a foreign principal if the social media account or profile from which the information is sent includes a conspicuous statement that—

“(A) the account is operated by, and distributes information on behalf of, the foreign agent; and

“(B) additional information about the account is on file with the Department of Justice in Washington, District of Columbia.

“(3) Informational materials disseminated by an agent of a foreign principal as part of an activity that is exempt from registration, or an activity which by itself would not require registration, need not be filed under this subsection.”.

(d) FEES.—

(1) REPEAL.—The Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (title I of Public Law 102-395) is amended, under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES”, by striking “In addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, for fiscal year 1993 and thereafter, the Attorney General shall establish and collect fees to recover necessary expenses of the Registration Unit (to include salaries, supplies, equipment and training) pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and shall credit such fees to this appropriation, to remain available until expended.”.

(2) REGISTRATION FEE.—The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“FEES

“SEC. 16. The Attorney General shall establish and collect a registration fee, as part of the initial filing requirement and at no other time, to help defray the expenses of the Registration Unit, and shall credit such fees to this appropriation, to remain available until expended.”.

(e) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 12 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended to read as follows:

“REPORTS TO CONGRESS

“SEC. 12. The Assistant Attorney General for National Security, through the FARA Registration Unit of the Counterintelligence and Export Control Section, shall submit a semiannual report to Congress regarding the administration of this Act, including, for the reporting period, the identification of—

“(1) registrations filed pursuant to this Act;

“(2) the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated and distributed by agents of foreign principal;

“(3) the number of investigations initiated based upon a perceived violation of section 7; and

“(4) the number of such investigations that were referred to the Attorney General for prosecution.”.

**SA 243.** Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN AND BLOCKING OF PROPERTY WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT FACILITATE CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN.**

(a) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) ISSUANCE OF LICENSES TO CONDUCT OFFSHORE DOLLAR CLEARING.—The President may not issue any license under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars.

(2) U-TURN TRANSACTIONS.—Notwithstanding section 560.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act), a United States person may not process any transfer of funds to or from Iran, or for the direct or indirect benefit of persons in Iran or the Government of Iran, even if the transfer arises from, and is ordinarily incident and necessary to give effect to, an underlying transaction.

(b) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President shall, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any foreign financial institution that serves as an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(c) REPORT BEFORE PROVIDING IRAN ACCESS TO THE UNITED STATES DOLLAR.—Not later than 30 days before the President implements any measure that would provide access to the United States dollar to the Government of Iran or an Iranian person, the President shall submit to Congress a report that describes the measure.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate only on the date on which the termination criteria in the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) has been met and the Secretary of State certifies to Congress that Iran is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism (as defined in section 301 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8541)).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(i)).

(2) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “Iranian financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ CONSOLIDATION OF REPORTS.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), each report required by this Act or such section 135 to be submitted to a committee or member of Congress on an on-going basis shall be combined in one report that is submitted to each such committee or member once every 180 days.

**SA 244.** Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN AND BLOCKING OF PROPERTY WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT FACILITATE CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN.**

(a) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) ISSUANCE OF LICENSES TO CONDUCT OFFSHORE DOLLAR CLEARING.—The President may not issue any license under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars.

(2) U-TURN TRANSACTIONS.—Notwithstanding section 560.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act), a United States person may not process any transfer of funds to or from Iran, or for the direct or indirect benefit of persons in Iran or the Government of Iran, even if the transfer arises from, and is ordinarily incident and necessary to give effect to, an underlying transaction.

(b) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President shall, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any foreign financial institution that serves as an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(c) REPORT BEFORE PROVIDING IRAN ACCESS TO THE UNITED STATES DOLLAR.—Not later than 30 days before the President implements any measure that would provide access to the United States dollar to the Government of Iran or an Iranian person, the President shall submit to Congress a report that describes the measure.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate only on the date on which the termination criteria in the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) has been met and the Secretary of State certifies to Congress that Iran is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism (as defined in section 301 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8541)).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(i)).

(2) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “Iranian financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** CONSOLIDATION OF REPORTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), each report required by this Act or such section 135 to be submitted to a committee or member of Congress on an on-going basis shall be combined in one report that is submitted to each such committee or member once every 180 days.

**SA 245.** Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 10 through 20, and insert the following:

(4) The IRGC meets the criteria for designation as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(b) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to the IRGC and foreign persons that are officials, agents, or affiliates of the IRGC.

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions applicable with respect to—

(1) a foreign person pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and

(2) an organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

**SA 246.** Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON BOOK ENTRY TRANSFERS CONDUCTED BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH ASSETS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) An analysis of the legality of overseas book entry transfers conducted by financial institutions present in the United States in connection with assets in which the Government of Iran, or an agency or instrumentality of the Government of Iran, holds a beneficial ownership interest, under—

(A) Executive Order 13599 (77 Fed. Reg. 6659; relating to Blocking property of the Government of Iran and Iranian financial institutions);

(B) part 560 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the “Iranian Transactions and Sanctions Regulations”); or

(C) any other relevant statutes, executive orders, regulations, or judicial orders.

(2) Recommendations, if any, on how to maintain the integrity of United States sanctions and other financial regulations in light of transfers described in paragraph (1).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “financial institution” means any entity engaged in the business of dealing with monetary transactions, including banks, trust companies, insurance companies, brokerage firms, investment dealers, securities intermediaries, central securities depositories, and post trade services providers.

(2) The term “overseas book entry transfers” means a transaction in which cash is not moved from an account in the United States to an account overseas by wire or other analogous method, but instead is made accessible to an overseas client of a financial institution carrying out the transaction by entry of debits and credits in books or ledgers internal to that financial institution.

(3) The term “present in the United States”, with respect to a financial institution, means that the financial institution has sufficient nexus with the United States so as to be subject to the regulatory authority of the Department of the Treasury.

**SA 247.** Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN RELATING TO SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING UNITED STATES CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) INVESTIGATION.—The President shall initiate an investigation into the possible designation of an Iranian person under subsection (b) upon receipt by the President of credible information indicating that the person has engaged in conduct described in subsection (b).

(b) DESIGNATION.—The President shall designate under this subsection any Iranian person that the President determines has knowingly—

(1) engaged in significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity conducted by the Government of Iran; or

(2) acted for or on behalf of the Government of Iran in connection with such activities.

(c) SANCTIONS.—The President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any Iranian person designated under subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(d) SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may suspend the application of sanctions under subsection (c) with respect to an Iranian person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a certification described in paragraph (2) and a detailed justification for the certification.

(2) CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A certification described in this paragraph with respect to an Iranian person is a certification by the President that—

(i) the person has not, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date of the certification, knowingly engaged in activities that would qualify the person for designation under subsection (b); and

(ii) the person is not expected to resume any such activities.

(B) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(e) REIMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—If sanctions are suspended with respect to an Iranian person under subsection (d), such sanctions shall be reinstated if the President determines that the person has resumed the activity that resulted in the initial imposition of sanctions or has engaged in any other activity subject to sanctions relating to the involvement of the person in significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity on behalf of the Government of Iran.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), or any other provision of law.

(g) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity conducted by the Government of Iran, a person owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, or any person acting for or on behalf of that Government.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the extent to which a foreign government has provided material support to the Government of Iran, to any person owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, or to any person acting for or on behalf of that Government, in connection with the conduct of significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity.

(B) A strategy to counter efforts by Iran to conduct significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity that includes a description of efforts to engage foreign governments in preventing the Government of Iran, persons owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, and persons acting for or on behalf of that Government from conducting significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(h) CYBERSECURITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “cybersecurity” means the activity or process, ability or capability, or state whereby information and communications systems and the information contained therein are protected from or defended against damage, unauthorized use or modification, or exploitation.

**SA 248.** Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other



purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT ON IRAN AND NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR AND BALLISTIC MISSILE COOPERATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Iran developed a close working relationship with North Korea on many ballistic missile programs, dating back to an acquisition of Scud missiles from North Korea in the mid-1980s.

(2) By the mid-1980s North Korea reverse-engineered Scud B missiles originally received from Egypt, and developed the 500-kilometer range Scud C missile in 1991, and sold both the Scud B and Scud C, as well as missile production technology, to Iran.

(3) In 1992, then-Director of the Central Intelligence Robert Gates, in testimony to Congress, identified Iran as a recipient of North Korean Scud missiles.

(4) In 1993, then-Director of Central Intelligence James Woolsey provided more detail, stating that North Korea had sold Iran extended range Scud C missiles and agreed to sell other forms of missile technology.

(5) Annual threat assessments from the intelligence community during the 1990s showed that North Korea's ongoing export of ballistic missiles provided a qualitative increase in capabilities to countries such as Iran.

(6) The same threat assessments noted that Iran was using North Korean ballistic missile goods and services to achieve its goal of self-sufficiency in the production of medium-range ballistic missiles.

(7) The intelligence community assessed in the 1990s that Iran's acquisition of missile systems or key missile-related components could improve Iran's ability to produce an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

(8) Throughout the 2000s, the intelligence community continued to assess that North Korean cooperation with Iran's ballistic missile program was ongoing and significant.

(10) North Korea built the nuclear reactor in Syria that was bombed in 2007. Syria failed to report the construction of the reactor to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which was Syria's obligation under its safeguards agreement with the agency.

(11) Official sources confirm that Iran and North Korea have engaged in various forms of clandestine nuclear cooperation.

(12) North Korea and Iran obtained designs and materials related to uranium enrichment from a clandestine procurement network run by Abdul Qadeer Khan.

(13) In the early 2000s, North Korea exported, with the assistance of Abdul Qadeer Khan, uranium hexafluoride (UF<sub>6</sub>) gas to Libya, which was intended to be used in Libya's clandestine nuclear weapons program.

(14) On January 6, 2016, North Korea conducted its fourth nuclear weapons test.

(15) On September 9, 2016, North Korea conducted its fifth nuclear weapons test.

(16) Iranian officials reportedly traveled to North Korea to witness its three previous nuclear tests in 2006, 2009, and 2013.

(17) Before North Korea's 2013 test, a senior American official was quoted as saying "it's very possible that North Koreans are testing for two countries".

(18) In September 2012, Iran and North Korea signed an agreement for technological and scientific cooperation.

(19) In an April 2015 interview with CNN, then-Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter

said that North Korea and Iran "could be" cooperating to develop a nuclear weapon.

(20) On March 11, 2017, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats provided written testimony to Congress that stated that Pyongyang's "export of ballistic missiles and associated materials to several countries, including Iran and Syria, and its assistance to Syria's construction of a nuclear reactor . . . illustrate its willingness to proliferate dangerous technologies".

(21) A 2016 Congressional Research Service report confirmed that "ballistic missile technology cooperation between the two [Iran and North Korea] is significant and meaningful".

(22) Admiral Bill Gortney, Commander of United States Northern Command, testified to Congress on April 14, 2016, that "Iran's continuing pursuit of long-range missile capabilities and ballistic missile and space launch programs, in defiance of United Nations Security Council resolutions, remains a serious concern".

(23) There is substantial evidence that Iran and North Korea are working together on nuclear weapons development.

(24) Since the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-277) repealed requirements for the intelligence community to provide unclassified annual report to Congress on the "Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions", the number of unclassified reports to Congress on nuclear-weapons issues decreased considerably.

(25) Absent these reports, the President has not been required to detail to Congress the assessment of cooperation between North Korea and Iran on nuclear weapon or ballistic missile development.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ballistic missile programs of Iran and North Korea represent a serious threat to allies of the United States in the Middle East, Europe, and Asia, members of the Armed Forces deployed in those regions, and ultimately the United States;

(2) further cooperation between Iran and North Korea on nuclear weapons or ballistic missile technology is not in the security interests of the United States or our allies;

(3) United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015), which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council and supported by the international community, called upon Iran not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches of such missiles, for an eight year period beginning in 2015; and

(4) the Director of National Intelligence has assessed that Iran would use ballistic missiles as its "preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons" which could eventually threaten the United States.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of other relevant agencies, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes an assessment of the extent of cooperation on nuclear programs, ballistic missile development, chemical and biological weapons development, or conventional weapons programs between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of North

Korea, including the identity of Iranian and North Korean persons that have knowingly engaged in or directed the provision of material support or the exchange of information (including through the transfer of goods, services, technology, or intellectual property) between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea;

(2) And a determination whether any of the activities described in paragraph (1) violate United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), 2094 (2013), 2231 (2015), 2270 (2016) and 2321 (2016).

(3) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(4) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

**SA 249.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62 of the amendment, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(3) Activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

**SEC. 292. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON PROCUREMENT OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES RELATING TO SPACE LAUNCHES.**

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) the Department of Defense; or

(3) any other person.

**SA 250.** Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:



**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

- (1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;
- (2) the Department of Defense; or
- (3) any other person.

**SA 251.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SECTION 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or any other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any Russian Federation entity of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service, by any United States contractor or subcontractor or any other entity, related to or in connection with any space launch conducted for the Federal Government or under a federal contract

**SA 252.** Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62 of the amendment, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

- (3) Activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

**SEC. 292. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON PROCUREMENT OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES RELATING TO SPACE LAUNCHES.**

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

- (1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;
- (2) the Department of Defense; or
- (3) any non-United States Government person.

**SA 253.** Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Regional strategy for countering conventional and asymmetric Iranian threats in the Middle East and North Africa.
- Sec. 4. Imposition of additional sanctions in response to Iran's ballistic missile program.
- Sec. 5. Imposition of terrorism-related sanctions with respect to the IRGC.
- Sec. 6. Imposition of additional sanctions with respect to persons responsible for human rights abuses.
- Sec. 7. Enforcement of arms embargos.
- Sec. 8. Continuation in effect of sanctions for Iranian support relating to terrorism and Iran's ballistic missile program.
- Sec. 9. Review of applicability of sanctions relating to Iran's support for terrorism and its ballistic missile program.
- Sec. 10. Report on coordination of sanctions between the United States and the European Union.
- Sec. 11. Report on United States citizens detained by Iran.
- Sec. 12. Exceptions for national security and humanitarian assistance; rule of construction.
- Sec. 13. Waiver authority; termination of sanctions.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The term “act of international terrorism” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term “Iranian person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of Iran; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of Iran or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran.

(5) IRGC.—The term “IRGC” means Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

(6) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly” has the meaning given that term in section

14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(7) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

**SEC. 3. REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR COUNTERING CONVENTIONAL AND ASYMMETRIC IRANIAN THREATS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for deterring conventional and asymmetric Iranian activities and threats that directly threaten the United States and key allies in the Middle East, North Africa, and beyond.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include at a minimum the following:

(1) A summary of the near- and long-term United States objectives, plans, and means for countering Iran's destabilizing activities, including identification of countries that share the objective of countering Iran's destabilizing activities.

(2) A summary of the capabilities and contributions of individual countries to shared efforts to counter Iran's destabilizing activities, and a summary of additional actions or contributions that each country could take to further contribute.

(3) An assessment of Iran's conventional force capabilities and an assessment of Iran's plans to upgrade its conventional force capabilities, including its acquisition, development, and deployment of ballistic and cruise missile capabilities, unmanned aerial vehicles, and maritime offensive and anti-access or area denial capabilities.

(4) An assessment of Iran's chemical and biological weapons capabilities and an assessment of Iranian plans to upgrade its chemical or biological weapons capabilities.

(5) An assessment of Iran's asymmetric activities in the region, including—

(A) the size, capabilities, and activities of the IRGC, including the Quds Force;

(B) the size, capabilities, and activities of Iran's cyber operations;

(C) the types and amount of support, including funding, lethal and nonlethal contributions, and training, provided to Hezbollah, Hamas, special groups in Iraq, the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Houthi fighters in Yemen, and other violent groups across the Middle East; and

(D) the scope and objectives of Iran's information operations and use of propaganda.

(6) A summary of United States actions, unilaterally and in cooperation with foreign governments, to counter destabilizing Iranian activities, including—

(A) interdiction of Iranian lethal arms bound for groups designated as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) Iran's interference in international commercial shipping lanes;

(C) attempts by Iran to undermine or subvert internationally recognized governments in the Middle East region; and

(D) Iran's support for the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, including—

(i) financial assistance, military equipment and personnel, and other support provided to that regime; and

(ii) support and direction to other armed actors that are not Syrian or Iranian and are acting on behalf of that regime.

(c) **FORM OF STRATEGY.**—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS IN RESPONSE TO IRAN'S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**

(a) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(2) is a successor entity to a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(4) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that would otherwise be imposed pursuant to paragraph (3);

(5) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4); or

(6) knowingly provides or attempts to provide financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4) or (5).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.

(c) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) **REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO IRAN'S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing each person that—

(A) has, during the period specified in paragraph (2), conducted any activity that has materially contributed to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its

ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(B) is a successor entity to a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(D) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that could be imposed as a result of a relationship described in subparagraph (C);

(E) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

(F) is known or believed to have provided, or attempted to provide, during the period specified in paragraph (2), financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, any material contribution to a program described in subparagraph (A) carried out by a person described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E).

(2) **PERIOD SPECIFIED.**—The period specified in this paragraph is—

(A) in the case of the first report submitted under paragraph (1), the period beginning January 1, 2016, and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(B) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 5. IMPOSITION OF TERRORISM-RELATED SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IRGC.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The IRGC is subject to sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), Executive Order 13553 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of certain persons with respect to serious human rights abuses by the Government of Iran), and Executive Order 13606 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking the property and suspending entry into the United States of certain persons with respect to grave human rights abuses by the Governments of Iran and Syria via information technology).

(2) The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—Quds Force (in this section referred to as the “IRGC-QF”) is the primary arm of the Government of Iran for executing its policy of supporting terrorist and insurgent groups. The IRGC-QF provides material, logistical assistance, training, and financial support to militants and terrorist operatives throughout the Middle East and South Asia and was designated for the imposition of sanctions by the Secretary of Treasury pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism) in October 2007 for its support of terrorism.

(3) The IRGC, not just the IRGC-QF, is responsible for implementing Iran's international program of destabilizing activities, support for acts of international terrorism, and ballistic missile program.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to the IRGC and foreign persons that are officials, agents, or affiliates of the IRGC.

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions applicable with respect to a foreign person pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

**SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of each person the Secretary determines, based on credible evidence, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) is responsible for extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed against individuals in Iran who seek—

(A) to expose illegal activity carried out by officials of the Government of Iran; or

(B) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote internationally recognized human rights and freedoms, such as the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections; or

(2) acts as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign person in a matter relating to an activity described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person on the list required by subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

**SEC. 7. ENFORCEMENT OF ARMS EMBARGOS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (d), the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the supply, sale, or transfer directly or indirectly to or from Iran, or for the use in or benefit of Iran, of any battle tanks, armored combat vehicles, large caliber artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, missiles or missile systems, as defined for the purpose of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, or related materiel, including spare parts; or

(2) knowingly provides to Iran any technical training, financial resources or services, advice, other services or assistance related to the supply, sale, transfer, manufacture, maintenance, or use of arms and related materiel described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.

(c) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) **EXCEPTION.**—The President is not required to impose sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person for engaging in an activity described in that subsection if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) permitting the activity is in the national security interest of the United States;

(2) Iran no longer presents a significant threat to the national security of the United States and to the allies of the United States; and

(3) the Government of Iran has ceased providing operational or financial support for acts of international terrorism and no longer satisfies the requirements for designation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(e) **STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “state sponsor of terrorism” means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

(1) section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)(1)(A)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(2) section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a));

(3) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

(4) any other provision of law.

**SEC. 8. CONTINUATION IN EFFECT OF SANCTIONS FOR IRANIAN SUPPORT RELATING TO TERRORISM AND IRAN'S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—United States sanctions imposed with respect to a person under Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters) or Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism), and imposed as a result of activities described in subsection (b), that are in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the date that is 90 days

after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (c) with respect to the person.

(b) **ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.**—An activity described in this subsection is—

(1) any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program; or

(2) support by the Government of Iran for acts of international terrorism.

(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A certification described in this subsection is a certification that the person with respect to which sanctions were imposed under Executive Order 13382 or Executive Order 13224 has not, during the 3-month period immediately preceding the date of the certification, provided support for or otherwise facilitated or engaged in any activity described in subsection (b).

(2) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall submit the certification described in paragraph (1) to the appropriate congressional committees in writing and shall include a detailed justification for the certification.

(B) **FORM OF CERTIFICATION.**—The certification described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) **REIMPOSITION.**—If sanctions are suspended with respect to a person under this section, such sanctions shall be reinstated if the President determines that the person has resumed any activity described in subsection (b).

**SEC. 9. REVIEW OF APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO IRAN'S SUPPORT FOR TERRORISM AND ITS BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall conduct a review of all persons on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury for activities relating to Iran—

(1) to assess the conduct of such persons as that conduct relates to—

(A) any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program; or

(B) support by the Government of Iran for acts of international terrorism; and

(2) to determine the applicability of sanctions with respect to such persons under—

(A) Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters); or

(B) Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS.**—If the President determines under subsection (a) that sanctions under an Executive Order specified in paragraph (2) of that subsection are applicable with respect to a person, the President shall—

(1) impose sanctions with respect to that person pursuant to that Executive Order; or

(2) exercise the waiver authority provided under section 13.

**SEC. 10. REPORT ON COORDINATION OF SANCTIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN UNION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President

shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of each instance, during the period specified in subsection (b)—

(A) in which the United States has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the European Union has not imposed corresponding sanctions; and

(B) in which the European Union has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the United States has not imposed corresponding sanctions.

(2) An explanation for the reason for each discrepancy between sanctions imposed by the European Union and sanctions imposed by the United States described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) **PERIOD SPECIFIED.**—The period specified in this subsection is—

(1) in the case of the first report submitted under subsection (a), the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(2) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 11. REPORT ON UNITED STATES CITIZENS DETAINED BY IRAN.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United States citizens, including United States citizens who are also citizens of other countries, detained by Iran or groups supported by Iran that includes—

(1) information regarding any officials of the Government of Iran involved in any way in the detentions; and

(2) a summary of efforts the United States Government has taken to secure the swift release of those United States citizens.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 12. EXCEPTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under sections 4, 5, 6, and 7:

(1) Any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force

March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations of the United States.

(3) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Iran or for the provision of humanitarian assistance to the people of Iran, including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.

(b) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—A requirement or the authority to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under this Act shall not include the authority to impose sanctions with respect to the importation of goods.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this Act.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term “agricultural commodity” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) GOOD.—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term “medical device” has the meaning given the term “device” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) MEDICINE.—The term “medicine” has the meaning given the term “drug” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

#### SEC. 13. WAIVER AUTHORITY; TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) TEMPORARY WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the President may waive a requirement under this Act to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a person for one period of not more than 120 days.

(b) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—Sanctions waived under subsection (a) shall terminate if—

(1) not later than 30 days before the waiver under subsection (a) with respect to the sanctions expires, the President submits to Congress a request to terminate the sanctions; and

(2) during the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the President submits the request to Congress, a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law under subsection (c).

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “joint resolution of approval” means a joint resolution the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress approves the request of the President under section 12 of the Countering Iran’s Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017 submitted on \_\_\_\_\_ to terminate the application of sanctions with respect to \_\_\_\_\_”, with the first blank space being filled with the date and the second blank space being filled with the name of the person to which the request applies.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—On or after the day on which the President submits to Congress a request under subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval with respect to the request may be introduced—

(A) in the House, by the majority leader of the House, for the majority leader and the minority leader of the House, or by Members of the House designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the House; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader of the Senate, for the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate, or by Members of the Senate designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate.

(3) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval shall be referred by the presiding officers of the respective Houses to the appropriate committee.

(4) AMENDMENTS PROHIBITED.—No amendment to a joint resolution of approval shall be in order in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. It shall not be in order to suspend the application of this paragraph in either House or for the Presiding Officer to entertain a request to suspend the application of this paragraph by unanimous consent.

(5) PERIOD FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—If the committee of either House to which a joint resolution of approval has been referred has not reported the resolution at the close of the 15th day after the introduction of the resolution, the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and the resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(6) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A vote on final passage of a joint resolution of approval shall be taken in each House on or before the close of the 15th day after the resolution is reported by the committee of that House to which the resolution was referred, or after that committee has been discharged from further consideration of the resolution under paragraph (5).

(B) RESOLUTION PASSED BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, prior to the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval of that House, that House receives the same resolution from the other House, then—

(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had been received from the other House; but

(ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(7) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) MOTIONS TO PROCEED.—A motion in the House of Representatives to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval shall be highly privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) TIME FOR DEBATE.—Debate in the House of Representatives on a joint resolution of approval shall be limited to not more than 20 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to recommit a joint resolution of approval or to move to reconsider the vote by which a joint resolution of approval is agreed to or disagreed to.

(C) MOTIONS TO POSTPONE.—Motions to postpone, made in the House of Representatives with respect to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(D) APPEALS.—All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval shall be decided without debate.

(E) APPLICABILITY OF RULES.—Except to the extent specifically provided in the preceding provisions of this paragraph, consideration of a joint resolution of approval shall be governed by the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to other resolutions in similar circumstances.

(8) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) MOTIONS TO PROCEED.—A motion in the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval shall be privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) TIME FOR DEBATE.—Debate in the Senate on a joint resolution of approval, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(C) MOTIONS AND APPEALS.—Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a joint resolution of approval shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the resolution, except that in the event the manager of the resolution is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or the minority leader’s designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from time under their control on the passage of a joint resolution of approval, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(D) MOTIONS TO FURTHER LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a joint resolution of approval is not debatable.

(E) MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT.—A motion to recommit a joint resolution of approval is not in order.

(9) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of approval, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to impose sanctions under this Act with respect to a person with respect to which sanctions were terminated under this section.

**SA 254.** Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to

Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 13. RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN PAYMENTS RELATING TO CLAIMS BROUGHT BEFORE THE IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended for a payment described in subsection (b) until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Iran has paid all compensatory damages awarded to a United States person in a final judgment—

(1) issued by a district court of the United States under Federal or State law against the Government of Iran; and

(2) arising from an act of international terrorism, for which the Government of Iran was determined not to be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States or of the States under section 1605A of title 28, United States Code, or section 1605(a)(7) of such title (as in effect on January 27, 2008).

(b) PAYMENTS DESCRIBED.—A payment described in this subsection is a payment by the United States to the Government of Iran or a national of Iran relating to the settlement of a claim before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal.

(c) ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM DEFINED.—In this section, the term “act of international terrorism” includes—

(1) an act of torture, extrajudicial killing, aircraft sabotage, or hostage taking, as those terms are defined in section 1605A(h) of title 28, United States Code; and

(2) providing material support or resources, as defined in section 2339A of title 18, United States Code, for an act described in subparagraph (A).

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 2:15 p.m. to conduct an executive session to vote on the following nominations: Mr. Kevin Allen Hassett, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; and the Honorable Pamela Hughes Patenaude, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June

14, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a Hearing on “Paving the Way for Self-Driving Vehicles.”

**COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS**

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Legislative Hearing on S. 517, the Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act.”

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider favorably reporting pending nominations.

**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing titled “Ideology and Terror: Understanding the Tools, Tactics, and Techniques of Violent Extremism.”

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY**

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 14, 2017, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

**COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 3 p.m. in 428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Tax Reform: Removing Barriers to Small Business Growth.”

**COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget for Veterans' Programs and Fiscal Year 2019 Advance Appropriations Requests.

**COMMITTEE ON AGING**

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, to conduct a hearing entitled “Military Caregivers: Families Serving for the Long Run.” The Committee will meet in room 106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 2:30 p.m.

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER**

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Water and Power is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 2 p.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE**

The Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Southeast Europe: Strengthening Democracy and Countering Malign Foreign Influence.”

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to a member of my staff, Patrick Flanigan.

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

**PROVIDING FOR STAYS DURING A PERIOD THAT THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD LACKS A QUORUM**

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 1083.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

*Resolved*, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1083) entitled “An Act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.”, do pass with an amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. I move to concur in the House amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

**ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017**

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 15; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 722, as under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order and that our prayers be

with the Capitol Police and the Members of Congress who were hurt today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:44 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## HONORING MR. LARRY MARSICANO

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 14, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Larry Marsicano for his many years of tireless work to improve and protect Candlewood Lake. As Larry prepares to leave the Candlewood Lake Authority where he has served as Executive Director for fourteen years, I would like to take this opportunity to thank and recognize him. Larry has been a champion for conservation in western Connecticut, and his expertise and dedication have helped our community make significant progress to address pollution in Candlewood Lake.

As an undergraduate at Western Connecticut State University in the 1980s, Larry began collecting data on the water quality of Candlewood Lake, Connecticut's largest lake. After completing his Bachelor's degree, Larry worked as a laboratory manager, and then joined the Candlewood Lake Authority in 1998.

The Candlewood Lake Authority is an agency created by the five municipalities surrounding the lake to reduce pollution and improve its quality. Larry first worked as a Lake Preservation Director, supporting research and outreach, and in 2003, he became Executive Director. His work for the group has spanned environmental research, policy and advocacy, and education initiatives. Among his many accomplishments, Larry was instrumental in changing local land use regulations to protect surface water quality and in developing opportunities for high school students to learn about research on the lake.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Larry Marsicano has been a devoted public servant in spearheading the efforts to protect Candlewood Lake and promote conservation awareness. I thank him for his decades of hard work to bring together government and private sector leaders to solve the issues facing the lake. While our efforts on behalf of the lake will continue, he will be greatly missed. It is fitting and proper that we honor Larry here today for his service and extend our best wishes as he begins the next stage of his career.

HONORING BCCC STUDENTS FOR  
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
INNOVATION CHALLENGE**HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 14, 2017*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hard work and success of a group of students from my district attending

Bucks County Community College. This group, Nik Bertnio, Roshan Thomas, Alex White, and their faculty advisor, Christine Delahanty, were recently named as one of only ten finalists teams in the National Science Foundation's Community College Innovation Challenge. Their project, named Simply Secure, would produce a low-cost, portable device that small businesses and everyday consumers could use to confidently and securely connect to any wireless network, regardless of whether that network has been compromised. The group's hard work, and dedication to bettering their community and the world around them, should make all of us proud.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. KAY GRANGER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 14, 2017*

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal conflict, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall No. 302, yea on rollcall No. 303, yea on rollcall No. 304, nay on rollcall No. 305, and yea on rollcall No. 306.

RECOGNIZING EVALYN ORMOND  
FOR HER ACCOMPLISHED CAREER  
IN THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY**HON. MIKE JOHNSON**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 14, 2017*

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Evalyn Ormond for 40 years of dedicated service in the health care industry of Northwest Louisiana and for 25 years as CEO of Union General Hospital.

Evalyn graduated from Ouachita High School and Northeast Louisiana University in Monroe, Louisiana. She began her health care career in 1977 at Sterlington Hospital and, with much determination and hard work, became the hospital's administrator in 1988. Just four years later, Evalyn also took on the role as CEO of Union General Hospital in Farmerville, Louisiana. She remained CEO of both facilities for seven years until Sterlington Hospital closed in 1999. The health care industry is constantly advancing with new innovative technologies. Evalyn remains an active force in bringing those innovations to Louisiana and ensuring the people within our community receive the care they need.

Evalyn currently serves on numerous health care boards and committees, devoting her energy to providing quality and stable health care. She has long been a champion for rural

health care and regularly travels to Washington, D.C. to vocalize her concerns with Louisiana's elected officials. She is an active member of various organizations including the Louisiana Hospital Association, North East Louisiana Hospital Association, Rural Hospital Coalition and the National Rural Health Association.

In addition to her successful tenure as a health care administrator, Evalyn remains an active leader in her community. She has earned recognition by the Union Parish Chamber of Commerce for her service and was the first female invited to join the Farmerville Lion's Club. She currently serves as the organization's president paving the way for other women looking to serve their community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to congratulate Evalyn Ormond on her many accomplishments. I applaud her service to our community. She has truly been a blessing to the health care community. We are fortunate to have individuals like Evalyn who are committed to helping others through difficult times with kindness and compassion. My wife, Kelly, and I thank her for her service and dedication to the people of Louisiana and wish her continued success.

## TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM H. HECHT

**HON. KEN CALVERT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 14, 2017*

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to William H. Hecht, a dear friend of mine who passed away on Monday, June 12, 2017. Bill lived a rich life filled with a myriad of accomplishments. He would count his family as the greatest of those accomplishments. A true family man, he was the beloved husband of Susan; a devoted father to Herb, Robert David, Tim and Jim; a proud father-in-law to Dana, Jill and Melissa; and a doting grandfather to Caroline, Rachel, Will, Robbie, Christian, Danny, Hannah, Sammy, Holly and Johnny. Along with all of them, I will deeply miss Bill.

Born in 1933 in Tifton, Georgia, Bill received his Master's of Divinity from Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri and a degree in Philosophy from Washington University. He served as a Lutheran pastor and later became the campus pastor at the University of Oklahoma, also teaching in the Philosophy Department. Among the many tributes Bill received are the Miles Christi Award from Concordia Seminary, an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Concordia University, and the Silver Beaver Award from the National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America. In 2012, Bill received a commendation as an "Outstanding Georgian," one of only three people to receive that honor.

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

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



Bill was a lifelong participant in politics. In 1967, he became the Executive Director of the Missouri State Republican Party and later served as vice president of the American Security Council. Moving to Washington, DC, he was hired as the Executive Assistant to the Chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security and then moved on to be vice president of legislative affairs at the Tobacco Institute. He worked on the Reagan for President campaign before opening Hecht, Spencer & Associates, a firm that celebrated its 35th Anniversary last year.

I was a beneficiary of Bill's education and experience over many hours spent at his favorite table at the Capitol Hill Club. He could philosophize on any number of subjects and would hold all of us there at the table in rapt attention with stories from his past or explanations of why his St. Louis Cardinals were the greatest franchise in baseball history. The Club will never be the same without him and he will always be in my thoughts when I am there.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to the Hecht family and Bill's many friends. Although Bill may be gone, his legacy and memory will live on.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 14, 2017*

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal conflict, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall No. 307.

#### REMEMBERING XAVIER JOY

### HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 14, 2017*

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, Xavier Joy should have spent this week enjoying the summer, working with the students he loved so much and thinking about his future. Instead, we are mourning the loss of this exceptional young man, who wanted nothing more than to care for his family and friends and continue his commitment to community service.

Xavier had already accomplished so much in his far too-short life. He touched many, many lives, as witnessed by the outpouring of sorrow and love from friends, family, and community leaders. He was a help and an inspiration, especially for children and young students struggling to overcome barriers and improve their lives.

Xavier was the cherished son of Nykea Pippion-McGriff and Ra Joy. Ra served my office and the residents of the 9th Congressional District for six years and went on to lead the Illinois Arts Alliance and serve as executive director of CHANGE Illinois. Like his father, Xavier was drawn to people and excited about making a difference.

A graduate of Whitney Young Magnet High School, Xavier attended Morehouse College and played football. He certainly had many life choices ahead of him, but he clearly caught the bug for public service from both his parents, as was evident in his work as a special education classroom assistant, and his time at City Year Chicago. He chose the path of empowering others. He was a mentor and a role model for students in Chicago and Evanston schools. He already had achieved so much but sadly we will never know what heights he would have reached.

Tragically, Xavier was a victim of the epidemic of gun violence that is plaguing our country and destroying the futures of so many bright, smart and giving people. His senseless death is a cause of incredible grief and loss, but it should also inspire all of us to follow his call to serve, to end gun violence and to ensure that every child has the tools and the support he or she needs to succeed.

As a mother, I cannot begin to understand the grief that Xavier's parents are feeling. My heart is aching for Ra and his wife Falona, Nykea and her husband Arthur, his brothers and sister, and his friends and family. I hope there is some comfort in knowing how many people loved Xavier, how many were touched by his kindness and caring, and how many will continue to hold him in their thoughts and prayers.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 15, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

##### JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet  
To hold hearings to examine the Universal Service Fund and rural broadband.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Interior.

SD-366

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine reviewing Congressional authorizations for the use of military force.

SD-419

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the assault on the First Amendment on college campuses.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Food and Drug Administration.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Federal Communications Commission.

SD-138

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine collaborative initiatives, focusing on restoring watersheds and large landscapes across boundaries through state and Federal partnerships.

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife

To hold hearings to examine innovative financing and funding, focusing on addressing America's crumbling water infrastructure.

SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine concurrent congressional and criminal investigations, focusing on lessons from history.

SD-226

##### JUNE 21

9 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Interior.  
SD-124
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.  
SR-253
- Committee on Finance  
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 and the trade policy agenda.  
SD-215
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director, and Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, both of the Office of Management and Budget.  
SD-342
- Committee on the Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine the MS-13 problem, focusing on investigating gang membership, its nexus to illegal immigration, and Federal efforts to end the threat.  
SD-226
- 10:30 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of Defense  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Air Force.  
SD-192
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine cybersecurity regulation harmonization.  
SD-342
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy.  
SD-138
- Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 and 2019 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.  
SD-124
- Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness  
To hold hearings to examine reopening the American frontier, focusing on promoting partnerships between commercial space and the U.S. government to advance exploration and settlement.  
SR-253
- 3 p.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office.  
SD-192
- New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.  
SR-328A
- Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Richard V. Spencer, of Wyoming, to be Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense.  
SD-G50
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine fostering economic growth, focusing on regulator perspective.  
SD-538
- Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy.  
SD-366
- JUNE 27
- 10:30 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor.  
SD-138
- POSTPONEMENTS
- JUNE 20
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions  
To hold hearings to examine free speech on college campuses.  
SD-430
- JUNE 22
- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of J. Christopher Giancarlo, of

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 15, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARPER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 15, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### MINERAL RIGHTS IN PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have had the distinct honor to represent the Pennsylvania's oil region and the Allegheny National Forest.

Among our many economic drivers in Pennsylvania, energy development played a critical historical role in Pennsylvania and the country and continues to be among our essential legacy industries in the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

While some of this energy production originally started with mining in the 18th century, the Pennsylvania oil rush in the mid-1800s changed America and has since had profound impacts on the world abroad.

In the late 1850s, Edwin Drake, who later adopted the title of "colonel," came to Titusville in search of oil deposits. Unsuccessful at first, he eventually made a breakthrough by drilling vertically through iron piping.

In 1859, Drake drilled 70 feet down and finally struck oil in Titusville, Pennsylvania. The result was the world's first commercial oil well and the birth of the modern petroleum industry.

Immediately after this innovation, the great oil rush began in Pennsylvania, attracting John D. Rockefeller and Standard Oil, among others.

Due to this important history, 700 square miles of the region were designated in 2004 as the Oil Region National Heritage Area, as recognized by the U.S. National Park Service.

In the following decades, after Drake's well, the oil industry grew throughout northwestern Pennsylvania, along with the production of high-value hardwood timber and forest products.

Finally, in 1923, the Allegheny National Forest was established in four nearby counties: Warren, Elk, Forest, and McKean. When the Allegheny was created, the Federal Government only purchased the surface rights, intentionally leaving the mineral rights in private hands due to the then well-established oil industry and its importance to the local economy.

Since then, the Allegheny has largely operated harmoniously as a multiple-use forest, providing energy, forest products, good local jobs, recreation, conservation, wildlife habitat, and environmental benefits.

However, mineral rights owners and the local industry have had significant challenges in recent years due to efforts by some to force more Federal regulations on oil and gas production in the Allegheny.

In 2009, the Forest Service settled out of court with environmental activists to apply, for the first time, the National Energy Policy Act to the leasing and permitting process in the forest.

After nearly a decade in the courts, the settlement was correctly overturned when the court opined that the Forest Service lacked the legal authority to require new regulations because the Federal Government does not own the mineral rights.

Throughout this process, some tried to justify settlement by pointing to a provision contained in the Energy Policy Act of 1992, which directed the Forest Service to write new oil and gas regulations, specifically on the Allegheny because of its split estates.

In the years between 1992 and the settlement, this provision was never implemented because of the well-established working relationship between

the Forest Service and local mineral owners.

In short, there was no reason to move forward with new rules because production was already more than adequately regulated.

Since the courts have repeatedly spoken in favor of the mineral rights owners and ruled that the Federal Government has no authority to write such rules, I have introduced H.R. 2316, the Cooperative Management of Mineral Rights Act, to correct the existing law.

This legislation, if implemented, will repeal the requirements contained in the 1992 Energy Policy Act. By removing this language, the bill will help ensure that mineral rights owners and the Allegheny National Forest will be able to continue to access their property and the Forest Service does not write new rules in the forest.

This legislation will also help to prevent further litigation, additional economic hardship in the region, and further waste of taxpayer dollars. The bill does not affect existing environmental regulations in any way.

In the last Congress, the House passed the previous version with a bipartisan overwhelming vote.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues during the 115th Congress passing this legislation into law.

### REFLECTING ON YESTERDAY'S HORRIFIC INCIDENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to reflect just briefly on the horrific incident that occurred yesterday. It impacted so many friends and colleagues, and I certainly offer prayers for STEVE SCALISE and all those who were injured in that terrible incident.

I offer my appreciation for the bravery of the Capitol Police that prevented many deaths from occurring with their heroic efforts of running to the sounds of the gun, even after the one officer being wounded, pulling herself up to prevent further injury and certainly fatalities.

I also want to offer a call to replace, starting within this institution, on this floor, the attacks of hateful personal politics and resistance, and to replace that with respect, to return respect to this Capitol, to this floor, to our Nation, to our communities, and certainly to our families.

And I just pray to God that God—the Scripture talks about how God will take acts of evil and use them for good, and I just pray that the evil, the horrific evil that was conducted yesterday,

that this be an example that God will use that for good and that we replace the hateful rhetoric and resistance with respect.

#### RECOGNIZING NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP DAY OF ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Citizenship Day of Action on June 17.

I am a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, but I am also the proud daughter of immigrants from Mexico. I understand how important citizenship is to families.

When I was young, I remember watching my mother study for the exam. I would help ask her questions and make sure that she knew the history of this country so that she could pass, and I remember the day that she went in to take her exam and passed. It was a proud moment for our family.

June 17 is a day to encourage not just our colleagues to support initiatives to make the citizenship process more accessible to millions of people who are pursuing the American Dream but also to go into communities and educate them about the importance of citizenship.

8.8 million people are eligible to become citizens but have not yet begun the process, and 3.7 million of those are eligible for citizenship fee waivers. Becoming a citizen can cost over \$700, and there are significant language and access barriers for those who apply. I know my aunt had to take it five times because her English wasn't good enough, and it took her some time.

But I encourage those who can, to do it, to make sure that they can because legal permanent residents face an uphill battle to citizenship.

My father was one who actually never became a citizen. My father was older, so I never really had an opportunity to ask him why he didn't do it, but I see today the importance of it, especially in a day where immigrants are under attack, where more and more people who think they have a right to be here and have status here may do something that causes them to become deportable.

It is so very important for people, who can become citizens, to take that opportunity to do it. It is really a gateway to voting, to employment, receiving benefits, and investing in our family's future. Citizens receive higher wages, greater economic opportunity, and full access to the equal rights that are fundamental to becoming an American.

We should be promoting programs to ensure that these immigrants have the skills and the resources they need to learn, succeed, and give back to the

communities they call home. Organizations like the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights in Los Angeles are working hard to make citizenship more attainable for everyone by providing free citizenship services.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support these efforts on Saturday, June 17. Becoming a citizen is just the beginning of the American Dream.

#### RECOGNIZING YESTERDAY'S HORRIFIC INCIDENT

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to recognize what occurred yesterday. I actually play for the men's baseball team on the Democratic side. I was practicing when we were called in and got word of the horrific news. And immediately, about 5 minutes after hearing the initial news of just a shooting, we heard that a Member, one of ours, was shot, and we immediately went into prayer.

And I have to take a moment to send my prayers to those who were impacted because it is a big group, but also those who were shot, those who were on the field. Our hearts and prayers go out to Representative STEVE SCALISE, Matt Mika, Zack Barth, and the courageous actions of the Capitol Police, Crystal Griner and David Bailey.

Every day that I come to the Capitol, I see the men and women who serve, who are there to protect us, who are there to make sure to keep us safe, and sometimes we take it for granted.

So I wanted to take a moment to thank them all for their service. Tonight is the game at Nationals baseball field. I encourage everybody to come out. There couldn't be a better reason. It is for charity, to really play tonight for our heroes, to play for a good cause. It would be a great thing to see a big showing.

Last night, we had a bipartisan dinner where we had the two coaches from both sides of the aisle come out. Again, I want to stress this is not a partisan issue at all. This is a time where we come together, and we should remain united.

It was a tough day yesterday for me and for many of us here on the Hill. Come out and show your support. We would love to see you there.

#### REFLECTING ON YESTERDAY'S HORRIFIC INCIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I indicated to all those who would ask that it was a day of reflection and prayer, to give comfort to those who needed to have comfort, and to reassert over and over again that when tragedy strikes, we are family.

When tragedy strikes Americans from the East to the West Coast, to the North to the South, whether it be man-made or natural disasters, hurricanes

or tornadoes, terrible floods that we have experienced in different regions of the country, mass shootings, the horrific loss of life of children in Connecticut, the tragic Sandy Hook story that will live forever, the Pulse Nightclub, Virginia Tech, Columbine, and places beyond, San Bernardino, that, in actuality, we recognize that we are, in fact, family.

So I think it is important to raise up those who are still in the hospital, and the staff member who was released, in prayer, and to be able to explain to the American people how precious our democracy is.

Before I do that, I do want to praise our Capitol Police, Officers Griner and Bailey, and I want to express my deepest prayers for Majority Whip SCALISE, who is a neighbor. Those of us in the southern region, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and beyond, we are neighbors. We have that southern thing going on. Texas might argue a little bit that they have got a little western thing going on, but we are neighbors.

□ 1015

So many of our constituents travel back and forth between Louisiana and Texas—particularly, my city of Houston—and we welcome them. We wish our deepest prayers and a hardy and speedy recovery for Majority Whip SCALISE, and we thank him for his service to the Nation.

We also recognize two that are wounded—a staff member and volunteer—who just came to be helpful. That is the way we perform here. People who say: Send me. I will help you do this. You have got an event; I will come over and help.

That is the preciousness of this country and what is admired by people around the world. But I think it is also important to explain democracy.

Democracy generates great passions by Members of Congress, House, and Senate. If we went back over the ages and we were able to read the papers of those who were on this floor when we were a much smaller country, it was high and shrill because of their passion about democracy, because they wanted to put together a country that would respect people because they fled persecution, and they didn't want us to be a nation that would persecute.

So I think as we go forward, it is important to engage our constituents in the beauty of democracy and in the beauty of disagreement without being disagreeable and let them know that we welcome acting on their behalf. But violent acts or taking things into your own hands, let us calm our communities all over the Nation. Let us give them a sense of the beauty of our disagreement, because we have managed to keep this democracy sacred for so many years.

Let us not allow our good friends in the media, whom I respect with the

highest esteem because they are a product of the First Amendment, let us not jump immediately into blaming this one or that one.

So many of us have seen the tragedies of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, the assassination of Martin Luther King, and the terrible tragedy of Gabrielle Giffords, who maintained her dignity and love of the institution and has taken on a cause that she believes in and is still fighting as an American.

So now we have the opportunity not to raise up who this person was who is now deceased—we don't know his mental state, what his condition was, or why he was out. That it one issue. Let the investigation go forward. And whatever it is, let us still come together and say that we will disagree and not be disagreeable, and we will not encourage or rise up or try to not explain what democracy and love is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I leave this podium by saying: Love prevails over hate; and I know that the love that is being generated toward those who are wounded and being cared for is going to cause them to have, I pray to God, a speedy recovery.

And I say today: God bless all of you, and God bless the United States of America.

#### RECENT ICE RAIDS IN MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the ICE raids that have happened in Michigan.

I was alarmed by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement raids that have resulted in the detention and possible removal of Iraqi nationals, as well as other members of the Detroit community.

Why am I alarmed?

Mr. Speaker, what we saw happen on Sunday, June 11, was an all out push to just remove Iraqi nationals who have been in this country, some for up to 40 years, who have lived in this country, raised families, have worked, and were subject to raids. Over 100 Iraqi nationals, including Chaldeans and Muslims, were removed from their families and transported to a correctional facility in Youngstown, Ohio.

I have been in touch with community leaders, who are not only distressed by the ongoing situation, but also expressed concern regarding the dangers that await these individuals if they return to an active war zone in Iraq.

Many of the communities characterize these raids as having a deliberate and calculated motive. Understand that these deportations are part of an agreement made between Prime Minister Abadi and President Trump as

part of a deal to remove Iraq from the travel ban, an agreement that is not in writing, Mr. Speaker, an agreement that Congress nor the public has access to.

When ISIS reared its ugly head in 2014 in northern Iraq, its main targets for genocide, sexual slavery, and other gross human rights violations included these same people: Iraqi Christians, Muslims, and other ethnic and religious minorities.

In 2014, Congress passed a resolution, unanimously, recognizing Iraq's ethnic and religious minorities as victims of genocide in Iraq and Syria. Since then, both the Obama administration and Trump administration have referred to these acts of violence against Iraqi Chaldeans and others as genocide; yet still we are going to deport these same people back to a country where there will be, surely, a confrontation of death or slavery. Removing these individuals represents what many have described as a "death sentence" should they be deported into an active war zone.

The final orders, we are told, of people who were convicted of offenses are based on criminal activities; but we know for a fact, some were for driving without a license and some were for having possession of marijuana 25 years ago.

Furthermore, the removal orders are considered legal, and I support the legal process. They could be decades old. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, they don't reflect the current challenging conditions in the country of origin. Some of those being deported can't even speak Arabic because their entire life has been spent here in the United States.

These raids have really started confusion and fear in the community. It is not in line with the compassion and humanity that we, as the United States, have expressed over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I will also say that now is the time, more than ever, that we in this Congress should have the political courage to establish an immigration plan for America. This jumping up and saying we are going to go over here and we are going to do this is not reflective of a legislative process.

We must have an immigration plan in America so that we can address the correct and humanitarian deportation of those who should not be in our country, but also have a demonstrated and supported pathway to citizenship in these United States of America. It is amazing to me that in these United States of America, which was built from immigrants, we now have this unofficial immigration process in America.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, as a Member of Congress and representing Michigan with a significant Middle Eastern population, I stand here ready to do the job that I was sent

here to do and to get an immigration plan for these United States of America.

#### NO ROOM FOR HATE AND VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the heaviest of hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be crystal clear that there is not any room in our society for hate. There is no room for violence. Whatever we do and wherever we may stand, we must act in a peaceful, orderly, and nonviolent fashion.

We must understand that we are one people—the American people; we are one family—the American family; and we live in the same house—the American house.

Mr. Speaker, we must teach all of our people to respect the dignity and the worth of every human being. We must be the headlights, not the taillights, in loving and cherishing our brothers and sisters. We are brothers and sisters.

We must understand that our foremothers and our forefathers came to this great Nation in different ships, but we are all in the same boat now.

As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said:

We must all learn to live together as brothers and sisters; if not, we will perish as fools.

Yesterday, was a difficult and dark day. There was so much pain and suffering for so many people—for our fellow Members, for our families, and for our staffs. It shook the Congress and our Nation to its core. I, too, was in shock. My heart and my soul ached for those who were attacked and for those who witnessed the violence.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my love and my feelings for all of our colleagues, our friends, our staffs, the officers, and their families. In each and every moment, my thoughts and prayers have been with all of the victims and their families as they begin the long road to healing and recovery. They must understand that we are with them.

We are with you. You are not alone. We love you, and we are praying for your safety and recovery.

#### REMEMBERING XAVIER OMARI JOY

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, on a June summer evening in Chicago, Illinois, in my district on the south side, a young man, 23 years old, was shot down, killed, and robbed of his cell phone, which was a nonsensical killing.

Xavier Omari Joy was a teacher of our city, State, and Nation. He was

given so much potential. He carried with him so much promise, and in his heart breathed so much purpose and dedication.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, he spoke these words: "Living in Woodlawn and working at the South Side YMCA, I know the pitfalls and challenges my community faces. I strive to help the youth in my community by being a positive role model. I want to tangibly connect and aid youth to positively progress as students."

These were the words spoken by Xavier Omari Joy, a young man whose life was ended last Thursday.

Xavier graduated from one of Chicago's premier high schools, the Whitney M. Young High School. He played football for a year at the Harvard of the African American in the south, Morehouse College.

Mr. Speaker, in the year 2014, Xavier joined City Year Chicago as a volunteer. City Year is a program of AmeriCorps, whose purpose is to send young mentors into underserved communities to be of help, to provide guidance, and most importantly of all, to provide meaningful, substantive examples.

Xavier had so much promise, potential, and so much personality. He could walk into a room and the room would just light up. Friends always knew that they could come to Xavier to get a compassionate hearing of their issues and their problems. If you were down for a moment, hey, Xavier could lift you up for the rest of the day.

He didn't get to be this kind of excellent individual by accident. He was born into a family of community-conscious people. His father, Ra Joy, is the executive director of CHANGE Illinois, a coalition leading systemic political and development action. His mother, Nykea Pippion-McGriff, is the first African-American woman president of the Women's Council of Realtors in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I come here today to honor and ask the Members of this Chamber to honor the life and the memory of Xavier Joy.

Xavier, our Nation, our community, and the people in the First Congressional District of Illinois will not let your death be in vain. We want to extend the promise, the potential, and the purpose of your life into the lives of all the young people in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, "Living in Woodlawn and working at the Southside YMCA, I know the pitfalls and challenges my community faces. I strive to help the youth in my community by being a positive role model. I want to tangibly connect and aid youth to positively progress as students."

These were the words of Xavier Omari Joy who was murdered on the streets of Chicago on June 8th.

After graduating from one of Chicago's top high schools, Whitney Young, and playing col-

lege football for a year at Morehouse, Xavier returned home to the South Side.

In 2014, Xavier joined City Year Chicago, an AmeriCorps program that sends mentors into Chicago's most under-served schools to provide guidance and examples for youth.

Just 23 years old, Xavier envisioned a career as an elected official. He saw this as another way to directly impact his community and his city.

He was born into a family of community conscious parents. His father, Ra Joy is the executive director of CHANGE Illinois, a coalition leading systemic political and government reform. His mother, Nykea Pippion-Griff is the first elected African American woman president of the Women's Council of Realtors Chicago.

He further served his community as a tutor and mentor at the YMCA, as well as several schools in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Xavier made his life about giving back and ensuring that children had a positive male role model.

We will always remember Xavier's dedication to others, warmth, confidence, and benevolent spirit.

It is his loss of life that brought me to the House floor today. There are too many names, too many lives taken far too soon in my city, Chicago.

There is a perverse spirit rampant in our nation where life no longer carries its value.

That was demonstrated yesterday with the Alexandria shooting that wounded Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, Capitol Police Special Agents Crystal Griner and David Bailey, Congressional Staffer Zachary Barth, and lobbyist Matt Mika.

Life is valuable and we need to cherish its meaning.

As a father whose son was also killed by gun violence, I can empathize with Nykea's family and all the families across my district and the Nation who have experienced this tragedy. No parent should have to experience a loss such as this.

Xavier was the type of young man that we all want our children to grow up to be and his life was taken while doing something so many Americans take for granted every day: returning home from work.

My thoughts and prayers are with Nykea's family and the families across America who mourn those lost to senseless violence.

We deserve better. We are better.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

## PRAYER

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

Almighty God, thank You for giving us another day. In Your presence, dark nights of challenges are dispelled by the dawn of Your love, and You know our needs before we express them.

Thank You for daily providing our lawmakers with guidance and strength.

We pause to thank You for the courage and sacrificial service of our Capitol Police. Forgive us when we take their daily courageous service for granted.

Forgive us also when we seem to forget that words matter and can become seeds that will bring a bitter harvest.

Bring speedy healing to our brother STEVE SCALISE, and all those injured in yesterday's shooting. Bring peace and solace to all those affected by yesterday's tragedy.

Today, use the Members of this people's House as instruments of Your peace, bringing unity from division, light from darkness, joy from sadness, and hope from despair.

Dear God, continue to bless America, and may all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CRAWFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## RAISING AWARENESS FOR ALOPECIA AREATA

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

Ms ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention to alopecia areata, a common autoimmune disease affecting almost 7 million Americans today. This disease is characterized by hair loss in round patches

throughout the body and can affect everyone regardless of race, gender, or ethnicity.

Alopecia areata can have a devastating psychological consequence on patients, especially children whose confidence and emotional well-being can be severely impacted by the physical manifestation of the disease.

Although there is currently no cure for this disease, we are blessed to have organizations like the National Alopecia Areata Foundation working tirelessly to bring hope to those whose lives have been touched by this condition.

Through its wonderful staff and volunteers, the NAAF is lending essential support to research for a cure, which will happen, and serving as a helping hand to the families as they deal with this overwhelming disease.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that we can do to help patients, and especially caregivers, so I encourage everyone in my community in south Florida and around the Nation to visit [naaf.org](http://naaf.org) to learn more about alopecia areata and to find out how you can get involved and help find a cure for this disease.

#### U.S. EMBARGO ON CUBA

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, soon President Trump will announce plans to reinstitute an almost 60-year U.S. embargo on Cuba. This embargo was lifted by President Obama in 2014, and today, over 75 percent of Americans support continued normalized relationships with Cuba.

The new, open relationship with Cuba has helped grow the U.S. economy, and the President's plan to close Cuba will cost the U.S. economy over \$6.5 billion.

Roswell Park Cancer Institute in my home community of Buffalo, New York, is today partnered with the Center for Immunotherapy in Cuba to clinically test, in the United States, CIMAvax, a lung cancer vaccine giving advanced lung cancer patients new hope.

The Roswell Park-led clinical trial, approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration, was only possible because of normalized relationships with Cuba. President Trump wants to destroy that relationship, and this Congress needs to stand up to this President and on behalf of the millions of Americans who benefit, including millions of cancer patients, from open relationships between the United States and Cuba.

#### HONORING LIEUTENANT PATRICK WEATHERFORD

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a police officer from my district who lost his life in the line of duty just this week.

Lieutenant Patrick Weatherford was a 15-year veteran of the Newport police force in the criminal investigations division. He graduated from Arkansas State University-Newport, and University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Lieutenant Weatherford, 41, was the husband to Kristen Weatherford and a loving father to his daughter and young son.

At 6 p.m. on Monday, June 12, 2017, Weatherford responded to reports of a vehicle break-in. In pursuit of the suspect on foot, Lieutenant Weatherford was shot and taken to a local hospital where, shortly after, he succumbed to his wounds.

While I did not know Weatherford personally, what I do know is that he was deeply loved by his community of Newport. The police chief, Michael Scudder, described Weatherford as a very good friend and an excellent officer who wanted to make things better for Newport. Others remember him as a mentor and a fair, calming presence on the force at times when things can get tense.

Weatherford had graduated from Newport High School and dedicated his life to learning how to serve the community he loved better and better. Last year, Patrick had graduated from the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia. That same year, Weatherford was named the Jackson County Officer of the Year by Arkansas Attorney General Leslie Rutledge.

Weatherford's passing should be a reminder of what we ask of our police officers and first responders every day, year in and year out. The work they do is so often underappreciated, and yet their dedication and discipline allows all of us to live in peace and safety.

My thoughts continue to be with Lieutenant Weatherford's family, their police department, and the community of Newport. What our fellow men and women risk to protect us every day should humble us all.

#### ANGER AND HATRED IN POLITICAL ISSUES TODAY

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, this is my 29th year in Congress. I have followed the issues since my early teens more than 50 years ago. I have never seen anywhere close to the anger and hatred there is on political issues today.

Yesterday, on the "Chris Plante Show," he mentioned a professor, John Griffin, from the Art Institute of Washington. Last month, Professor Griffin posted a link to a Washington Post col-

umn, with the professor commenting that all Republican Members of the House "should be lined up and shot." He added, "That is not hyperbole. Blood is on their hands."

That was in support of a Washington Post column by Paul Waldman saying the Republican healthcare bill was an "act of monstrous cruelty" that should "stain those who supported it to the end of their days."

Those who have so much hatred and anger in their hearts and minds seriously need to seek religious or psychiatric help.

#### BRING MORE CIVILITY INTO OUR POLITICAL DISCOURSE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in Congress to express my deep sorrow after yesterday's shooting.

At the end of the day, we are not Republicans or Democrats; we are Americans. We may disagree with one another, but we cannot allow those disagreements to change how we treat each other as fellow human beings.

I believe we need to change our tone and bring more civility to our political discourse. Young people across the country look to us to set an example, and we all must rise to the occasion.

This horrible violence will not divide us and it will not stop us from getting back to business on behalf of the American people.

Let us come together as Americans above all else, and, of course, keep our good friend, STEVE SCALISE, and all of those affected by the shootings in our prayers.

#### SPEAK TRUTH TO THE POWERFUL LIBERAL MEDIA

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we must speak truth to the powerful liberal media. The invective, spite, and venom they hurl daily at the President contributes to an environment of hatred and violence. The media's constant barrage of personal attacks can incite someone to take irrational actions.

The shooter at the Virginia ballpark yesterday wounded five people. His Facebook page once read: "It is time to destroy Trump and company." That is not much different from the tone of many media articles.

A study last month found that the President had received a higher percentage of negative coverage than any recent President, and a public opinion poll showed the media's credibility at a record low.



The American people deserve better than a biased media. For the sake of our country, let's hope they will drop their abusive language.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 15, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 15, 2017, at 9:13 a.m.:

That the Senate concurs in House amendment to the bill S. 1083.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 2372, VETERANS EQUAL  
TREATMENT ENSURES RELIEF  
AND ACCESS NOW ACT, AND  
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 2579, BROADER OPTIONS  
FOR AMERICANS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 379 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 379

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2372) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2579) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended,

shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration for two very important measures. First, the resolution provides for the consideration of H.R. 2372, the VETERAN Act. This rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

In addition, the resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 2579, the Broader Options for Americans Act. This rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are a part of the House of Representatives' commitment to repair damage done by the Affordable Care Act. These bills seek to amend key parts of the American Health Care Act, which the House passed on May 4 of 2017.

The American Health Care Act expands health coverage options for Americans by allowing them to use advanceable, refundable tax credits to purchase State-approved plans in the individual market. The two bills will ensure the tax credits that Americans will use to purchase health insurance policies will be available to all who qualify.

When the House passed the American Health Care Act, the bill included individual, advanceable, flexible, refundable tax credits that individuals can use to purchase health insurance policies on the individual market. When the bill passed, however, procedural

reasons prevented the House from including two key groups of Americans: veterans who are eligible for coverage through the VA and individuals who need to get continuation of coverage through an employer's COBRA-sponsored plan. The two bills covered under this rule will remedy that same problem.

In recent years, the Internal Revenue Service has adopted a practice of providing eligible veterans the choice to get financial support for a private plan in lieu of enrolling in healthcare provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 2372, the VETERAN Act, will codify this and continue that practice retroactively for both the Affordable Care Act's Premium Tax Credit and the new tax credit created in the American Health Care Act. Veterans will continue to be able to get premium support when they opt out to purchase a private health plan instead of enrolling in the healthcare provided by the VA.

Similarly, H.R. 2579 will expand access to the new American Health Care Act tax credit to COBRA, in the continuation of that coverage. Under COBRA, group plans allow beneficiaries to keep their existing employer-sponsored coverage if they are laid off, work fewer hours, or lose insurance due to a change in family circumstances.

Often, those who need to use the COBRA coverage are those most in need, such as individuals who are in the middle of a treatment course and want to preserve their network of providers. COBRA coverage is frequently very expensive, since the individual policyholder must now pay all the premium for their policy.

H.R. 2579 will extend the new tax credits to include people receiving COBRA coverage and enable people who need it to continue taking advantage of their employer-sponsored healthcare coverage, even after a triggering event.

Mr. Speaker, the bills the House will consider under this rule will help fulfill the promise Republicans made to the American people. We made repealing and replacing the Affordable Care Act with something that works the highest priority. Six weeks ago, we took the first step in fulfilling that promise with the passage of the American Health Care Act, and today we will take another step forward creating a healthcare system that works for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, I urge support for the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes; and I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to both the Speaker of the House and

the minority leader for their presentations before the full House yesterday in the aftermath of this terrible tragedy, which has wounded our colleague, STEVE SCALISE, and two Capitol Police officers, and two staffers.

We were all horrified by what happened, but I thought both the Speaker and the minority leader came to the floor and set the right tone, not only for this Congress, but for the Nation. And Speaker RYAN, yesterday, I thought, truly was the Speaker of the entire House of Representatives because when he said that an attack against one of us is an attack against all of us, I think everyone feels that way.

I thought it was also important that both Speaker RYAN and Minority Leader PELOSI reminded us that we are all part of one family. Sometimes we might be a little bit dysfunctional, but the bottom line is we are all part of one family. And like all families, we have our disagreements, we have our points of view, and we fight for what we believe in, and there is nothing wrong with that. In fact, that is what is right about this country.

But, clearly, our politics in this country have gotten coarse and, in many cases, ugly, and what happened yesterday is something that I think that all of us are deeply shocked by. And so we pray for our colleague, STEVE SCALISE, we pray for Matt Mika, Zachary Barth, and the two Capitol Police officers, David Bailey and Crystal Griner. We pray for their speedy recovery.

I, too, want to echo the sentiments that were stated yesterday by our leadership, both in the Republican and the Democratic Parties, that we honor our Capitol Hill police officers. I mean, they protect us each and every day. They put their lives on the line for us. And if they weren't there, the situation could have been much, much worse, and so I thank God that they were there.

As far as the rule goes, the gentleman from Texas knows how I feel about closed rules. I voice my opinion on that often, and I will continue to voice my opinion on that. But I don't think today is the time for me to prolong this debate, and I think we should move on, and that is what I intend to do.

Just one final thing, Mr. Speaker, on a personal note. This is the last rule that David Vince will work on here in the Rules Committee. He has been a fixture over the past several years, both in committee meetings and here on the House floor. He has worked on everything from healthcare to national security and on complex legislation impacting the financial industry.

When David started working here in 2011, he went by his full name, David M. Cooper-Vince. But since he married his wife, Jessica, he now insists we

simply call him David Vince, so we are all still adjusting to the change.

But there is good news. While David Vince is leaving the House, he is not going far. He will attend graduate school at Georgetown University here in Washington to study business. We all wish David and his wife, Jessica, well, and we hope to welcome him back to government service again someday.

So, David, thank you very much for your incredible service to this House.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

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

Let me just say that I do agree with the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts. Yesterday, I think Speaker RYAN gave one of the finest speeches that I have heard on the floor of this House.

I also agree that there will be ample time for debate on all of the issues that are encompassed in today's rule, and I look forward to that spirited debate, as I always have in the past. But I also agree with the gentleman, that some of that debate may be best left for another day.

I also want to acknowledge the gentleman from Massachusetts and his comments about David Vince. Any time one of our staffers departs from either the minority or the majority side, it is obviously a time of gratitude for their service, and we look forward to what is next in their lives.

But I want to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts that we appreciate the service of David Vince to the minority and to the members of the Rules Committee in general.

So thank you for your service to the House, David.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues for all of their work on the rules and the underlying bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

#### VETERANS EQUAL TREATMENT ENSURES RELIEF AND ACCESS NOW ACT

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 379, I call up the bill (H.R. 2372) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to

House Resolution 379, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2372

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Equal Treatment Ensures Relief and Access Now Act" or the "VETERAN Act".*

#### SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION RELATING TO VETERAN HEALTH INSURANCE AND ELIGIBILITY FOR PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.

(a) AMENDMENT OF PRE-2020 CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 36B(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, prior to any amendment by section 214 of the American Health Care Act of 2017, is amended by adding at the end the following: "For purposes of the preceding sentence, an individual shall not be treated as eligible for coverage described in section 5000A(f)(1)(A)(v) unless such individual is enrolled in such coverage."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

(b) AMENDMENT OF POST-2019 CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 36B(d) of such Code, as amended by section 214 of the American Health Care Act of 2017 and in effect for months beginning after December 31, 2019, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"For purposes of paragraph (2)(B), an individual shall not be treated as eligible for coverage described in section 5000A(f)(1)(A)(v) unless such individual is enrolled in such coverage."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection is contingent upon the enactment of the American Health Care Act of 2017 and shall apply (if at all) to months beginning after December 31, 2019, in taxable years ending after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I would first like to thank Chairman BRADY for his strong support of this bill, the Veterans Equal Treatment Ensures Relief and Access Now Act, the VETERAN Act. This important legislation, which was reported out of the

Ways and Means Committee on a bipartisan basis, will ensure all eligible veterans have access to quality, affordable private health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber cannot underscore enough the sacrifices of our veterans and the sacrifices they have made to protect the freedom and individual liberty of each American. In return for their faithful service, these brave men and women are promised that, when they return home, they will have access to affordable healthcare through the Veterans Administration.

However, some veterans decide to forego their VA benefits and, instead, choose an alternative healthcare. Veterans should have the opportunity to choose the best healthcare option available to fit their needs. It is only right that our veterans are given the same opportunity as our other citizens have and the citizens that they defend.

There have been conflicting reports about the eligibility of certain veterans to receive tax credits for all health insurance under the American Health Care Act. Make no mistake about it, no veteran would see a change in their eligibility status as a result of the AHCA.

In fact, despite the Democrat's claims about veterans' eligibility for tax credits under the AHCA, when they voted for and signed ObamaCare into law, they failed to include this very same clarification in statute. Rather, they left it to the Department of the Treasury to issue a regulation clarifying that veterans are still eligible for a credit unless they are enrolled in a VA healthcare benefit plan.

So today this legislation, authorized by my friend and a veteran, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, should put into law current practice confirming that veterans can, without question, get a tax credit to purchase health insurance in the individual market if they choose not to enroll in VA coverage.

It is important to note that AHCA initially proposed to put into law this current practice, but that provision had to be removed due to Senate guidance about their Chamber's unique reconciliation rules. While I am disappointed that this happened, I am glad that this body is acting on this item today.

I would note that this legislation has received the support of several veterans' organizations, including the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Association of the United States Navy, and The Retired Enlisted Association.

I think that something we can all agree on is that our veterans should have the choice in where they receive their healthcare, just like the American citizens they defended. In that spirit, this bill is something we can all get behind.

To our veterans and their families, I thank them for their service. To my friend SAM JOHNSON, I thank him for

his leadership and the authoring of this important bill.

I ask my colleagues for their support of the VETERAN Act.

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

Mr. NEAL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to send my deepest thoughts and prayers to our colleague Whip SCALISE, the Capitol Police officers, and the staff members that were injured in yesterday's shooting.

Although my Republican colleagues and I have robust policy discussions, ultimately, we desire the same goals. Today is no different, and our institution is based on the respect and thoughtful debate that remain important pillars of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion and debate that we are about to have here is an honest disagreement. There is no suggestion here that there is anybody on this side of the aisle that is any less enthusiastic or less sincere in their support of what it is that our veterans need and desire. This is an honest policy dispute.

And I must tell you, based on long service in this institution, this is an unusual manner in which to proceed. We are actually being asked today to amend a piece of legislation that a month ago left this institution. I have not been witness to this, I believe, in the past; and I hope that, as we go on for the next hour, we will have a chance to connect the dots for our colleagues about why this underlying bill is less than desirable.

Last month, the Republicans brought TrumpCare to the House floor and every Democrat in this institution opposed it. This was the Republican leadership's second attempt to pass the repeal, and it seems that their first attempt was not harmful enough to the American people.

The measure, as passed, takes health insurance from millions of Americans, raises premiums for working families, and places an age tax on older Americans. Middle class Americans would end up on the losing end, while millionaires would receive a handsome, nearly \$1 trillion tax cut.

Perhaps most concerning is that Members voted in favor of this legislation without understanding its impact on the American people. There were no hearings on TrumpCare. Amendments were rushed to the floor without committee consideration, and the CBO score was not available at the time the House considered it.

CBO, based on nonpartisan career professionals, provides important context and independent advice for Members of Congress. It provides an opportunity for us to look at the long-term results and ramifications of policies we are considering.

Clearly, our Republican friends don't care about the jarring consequences

CBO foretold. The House has ignored certain procedures when considering these important measures.

First, since the Republican repeal bill passed, the CBO confirmed that the measure would leave 23 million Americans without health insurance. It would cut Medicaid by \$800 billion, discriminate against individuals with pre-existing conditions, and drastically raise premiums for older Americans.

Earlier this week, the CMS actuary confirmed that out-of-pocket costs will rise by 61 percent, and premiums will be 5 percent higher than under current law. Simply put, TrumpCare would force Americans to pay more for lower quality healthcare coverage.

Second, this bill is not appropriate to consider now because it amends the TrumpCare bill, as I noted a moment ago, that has not passed the Senate. And our Senate colleagues have stated they are rewriting a House bill that the President called "mean."

Now I would like to turn to my substantive concerns with this bill.

H.R. 2372 would amend the AHCA to allow veterans not enrolled in military-related coverage to receive tax credits. It does nothing to fix the issues in the TrumpCare bill.

Whether or not you initially supported the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—and I was one of the few in this institution that voted and spoke against the war in Iraq those years ago—these wars have created 1 million more veterans, and we need to do what we can to provide them with the support that we promised them.

Let me remind my colleagues that the TrumpCare bill would shift costs onto veterans through per capita caps, roll back Medicaid expansion for veterans, and erode essential health benefits and preexisting conditions protections.

The Republican health plan would dramatically cut Medicaid, a program that provides healthcare for nearly 2 million veterans. And the President's recently released budget takes it a step further by cutting veterans' programs, including disability benefits.

Even if this bill is incorporated into TrumpCare legislation, it would not undo the terrible cuts in the bill: enormous coverage losses, more than \$800 billion worth of cuts to Medicaid, unravel important consumer protections or cuts to programs designed to help address the opioid addiction crisis in my State of Massachusetts and throughout the Nation.

I am quite sure everyone in this institution at this moment and those who are viewing know somebody close to them who is addicted to opioids.

In addition, Medicaid is now a program that many middle class Americans rely on for long-term care. Thanks to Medicare and Medicaid, your parents are not living in your attic.

This bill does nothing to fix the Republican healthcare plan and could create new problems. If Republicans are

serious about addressing middle class American healthcare needs, they should go back to the drawing board and start over and work with us.

This exercise is a distraction from the real issue, which is the harm caused by the underlying TrumpCare bill. Instead, we should be considering issues that help hardworking Americans and their families.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Ranking Member NEAL that this is just a difference of opinion. It is a difference of policy opinion. There is no animosity on either side of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2372, the Veterans Equal Treatment Ensures Relief and Access Now, or VETERAN, Act, which I am proud to sponsor along with Congressman SAM JOHNSON from Texas and a number of our colleagues.

The VETERAN Act would codify an existing Internal Revenue Service regulation, allowing a veteran who is eligible for but not enrolled in the Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare system to use a tax credit to purchase health insurance. Language that would have codified that regulation in law was removed from a draft version of the American Health Care Act in 2017 earlier this year to comply with Senate rules.

While the removal of that language from the version of the bill that ultimately passed the House in no way changed existing regulation or a veteran's eligibility to receive a tax credit pursuant to it, it did form a basis for politically charged assertions that the American Health Care Act would harm veterans.

First, congressional intent is clear. Second, I am confident that the IRS would interpret the relevant language of the American Health Care Act in the same manner as it did similar language in the Affordable Care Act under the President Obama administration.

Nevertheless, I am glad that the passage of the VETERAN Act today will, once and for all, put an end to posturing over this issue and codify Congress' expectation that veterans who are eligible for but not enrolled in the VA healthcare system may continue to receive applicable tax credits to purchase health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of the VETERAN Act today.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the VETERAN Act, the legislation before us today, and I do so for a very simple reason: This merely codifies what is already existing law under the Affordable Care Act, or so-called ObamaCare, something that was done through rule-making that I presume has bipartisan support.

□ 1245

Yes, it is important to protect the veterans, but the reason we are on the floor today is another example of one of the greatest legislative malpractice acts ever committed in Congress: trying to pass a Republican healthcare bill with no oversight, with no hearing, no public input, and no experts testifying to run the traps for us as far as the intended and the unintended consequences.

The reason we are on the floor now 1 month after passage of that bill is to try to correct just one of the deficiencies that exist in it.

I say it is a so-called healthcare bill because what it really is is a \$900 billion tax break to the most wealthy individuals in our country, including insurance companies and drug companies, under the guise of healthcare reform and asking 23 million Americans, including 2 million veterans, as my friend from Massachusetts just pointed out, in Medicaid to give up their healthcare coverage to pay for that massive tax cut.

It also will discriminate against older Americans in a rural congressional district, such as mine in western and north central Wisconsin, by allowing insurance companies to charge them higher premiums. It will also allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against individuals that have preexisting conditions.

It does absolutely nothing to control the costs of healthcare—which have been rising—especially prescription drug costs that are affecting all Americans, and it was done in a way to jam this Congress and jam the American people about the consequences of this so-called healthcare bill.

So, yes, let's fix and make sure that we are protecting veterans who are getting their healthcare outside the VA medical center so that they, too, qualify for premium tax credits, which this legislation allows.

But let's do healthcare the right way by studying the implications of what will affect one-fifth of the entire U.S. economy and almost one-half of all Federal spending. Let's regroup and do it the right way, through normal legislative process. That is having bipartisan discussions, committee hearings, and talking to the experts—consumers and patients alike—so we know what we are getting into when we are trying to take a run at the importance of healthcare in our country.

One area that I think we can reach bipartisan agreement on or should be

focused on are further steps to reduce the cost of healthcare to make it more affordable for all Americans. Again, we are missing that opportunity because of the lack of hearings and because of how this legislation was rushed through this Chamber just a month ago.

We on this side didn't even get to see the language of it until late the night before it was on the House floor. That is no way to legislate healthcare policy.

Mr. Speaker, let's fix it today with this one small piece of legislation.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), who is a well-known advocate for veterans.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks by offering my thoughts and prayers to Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE and his family, as well as Special Agents David Bailey and Crystal Griner, and the two other members of our community who were injured in yesterday's attack.

We are a family—from Members to staff, to the Capitol Police officers who keep us safe. Families have disagreements and arguments, but, in the end, we support each other. Speaker RYAN got it absolutely right yesterday: an attack on one of us is an attack on all of us.

We owe it to the American people to hold a vigorous and public debate of our ideas, but we also owe it to them and to each other to do so without losing touch with our humanity.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2372, which would protect access to tax credits for up to 7 million veterans on the American Health Care Act. However, I am concerned by the process that led to this legislation.

In testimony to the Rules Committee and on the House floor, I described this loophole in the bill that jeopardizes access to tax credits for veterans who are eligible but not enrolled in the VA.

Repeatedly, supporters of the AHCA told me that veterans' tax credits would be protected by existing regulation. This bill is evidence that the loophole is an issue and that the existing regulation would no longer apply if the Affordable Care Act was repealed.

While I am glad we are making this fix, I am concerned that the rushed process for considering the AHCA led to the House passing disruptive healthcare legislation without fully understanding its impact on millions of Americans, especially our Nation's veterans.

The tax credit issue is relatively easy to solve, but there are more complicated issues for veterans under the AHCA that require more comprehensive solutions.

The \$334 billion cut to Medicaid could impact nearly 2 million veterans. The

potential for States to waive protections like essential health benefits could lead many veterans without health coverage for the invisible wounds of war. Indeed, military service could be construed as a preexisting condition.

As someone who repeatedly called out this veterans loophole, I feel compelled to support this fix, but my support is not an endorsement of the AHCA or its impact on veterans and their families.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the VETERAN Act, H.R. 2372.

Our Nation's veterans must have access to affordable, quality healthcare options. I know that is one thing, of course, everybody can agree on, particularly when it comes to our veterans.

The VETERAN Act codifies an important protection for those who served. Veterans who are not already enrolled in health insurance through the VA will continue to have the option to purchase coverage on the individual insurance market.

Under the American Health Care Act, those veterans seeking coverage on the individual market will be eligible for tax credits to purchase the plan that is right for them. It is only right. This bill ensures our veterans have more options and more control over their healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is something we can all agree on. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge passage.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 2372, the VETERAN Act. However, before I speak about this bill, I would like to take a moment to thank my colleagues, General BERGMAN and Dr. WENSTRUP, both colleagues of ours on the very bipartisan Veterans' Affairs Committee, for their bravery on the ball field yesterday.

Yesterday was a harrowing day for my colleagues, and their courage under fire made this Congress and America proud. While Majority Whip SCALISE is still in critical condition, our colleagues, who both served our country in uniform, gave Mr. SCALISE a fighting chance. Please keep Mr. SCALISE, Matt Mika, Zack Barth, and U.S. Capitol Police Officers Crystal Griner and David Bailey in your thoughts and prayers.

I rise before you today on the VETERAN Act to voice my concerns on the underlying bill it seeks to fix: the American Health Care Act.

My colleagues and I criticized the AHCA a few weeks ago because it did

not give veterans access to, and choice for, affordable healthcare. I am very glad to be here today now that my Republican colleagues have realized this error and are seeking to help veterans gain access to tax credits.

I renew my commitment to work in a bipartisan way to improve the healthcare system in America. Our goal should be a system that provides access to affordable healthcare to all Americans, including those who have served in uniform.

But no one should be under the illusion that the AHCA, with or without the VETERAN Act, will achieve these goals. The AHCA includes significant negative changes to Medicaid. This Congress and the American people should know that more than 2 million veterans rely upon Medicaid for their healthcare, and millions more spouses and children of veterans also rely on Medicaid. The AHCA would slash \$834 billion in Medicaid coverage.

When 40 percent of working-age veterans have no other coverage, passing the AHCA will mean that these veterans and their families have no access to lifesaving healthcare.

As co-chair of the bipartisan task force combating the opioid epidemic, I urge my colleagues to consider that Medicaid provides vital mental health and substance abuse treatment for many of these veterans and their families that they will not receive otherwise. For our veterans seeking treatment for combat wounds, PTSD, MST, and other conditions, under the AHCA, military service to our country could be considered a preexisting condition resulting in a denial of care.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to make sure that the American people understand the impact of the underlying bill that H.R. 2372 intends to amend.

The bill purports to make a fix to the Republicans' harmful healthcare bill, but the fix is inadequate for the harm the underlying legislation would cause.

We have independent verification from both the CMS actuary and the Congressional Budget Office to reinforce our position. The Republican healthcare bill would cause millions to lose health insurance, face higher premiums and out-of-pocket costs, and jeopardize the health security that Americans with preexisting conditions have today.

We should be working to improve our healthcare system, not making it more difficult and unaffordable for America's families. If this is such a great policy, let's not tie it to a bill that is doomed in the Senate. In fact, if anybody can find out where it is even being discussed or authored in the Sen-

ate, they should inform us. It clearly is not being done in the open. Let's not tie it to that simple provision, and pass it as it stands alone today.

Middle class Americans can't afford this recipe. I urge my colleagues to work over the next few months to educate the American people about the Republican health plan and how harmful it is to our Nation's health. Hospitals oppose it, doctors oppose it, and patient groups oppose it. The bill needs to be scrapped. We should instead be helping the middle class, not giving giant tax cuts to the wealthy.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to express my gratitude to Ranking Member NEAL and his hard work on the Ways and Means Committee and his keeping the issue before us.

But the AHCA makes no changes to veterans' healthcare. Under this bill, unless vets decide to enroll in VA coverage, they are eligible for financial support. Veterans should have the opportunity to choose the best healthcare option to meet their needs. It is only right that our veterans are given the same opportunities as the citizens that they defended.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the VETERAN Act. I ask for its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'd first like to thank Chairman BRADY for his strong support of my bill, the veterans Equal Treatment Ensures Relief and Access Now (VETERAN) Act. This important legislation, which passed the Ways and Means Committee with bipartisan support, seeks to ensure all eligible veterans have access to quality, affordable private health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I spent 29 years in the U.S. Air Force, so I understand the sacrifices our veterans have made to protect the freedom and individual liberties of each American. In return for their faithful service, these brave men and women are promised that when they return home, they will have access to affordable healthcare through the VA.

However, some of these veterans decide to forgo VA coverage and instead choose to enroll in other health coverage—as is their right. But regardless of their eligibility for VA health coverage, veterans should have the opportunity to choose the best health care option to meet their needs. It is only fair that our veterans are given the same opportunities as the citizens they defend.

With respect to the American Health Care Act, some folks have raised concerns about the eligibility of certain veterans to receive tax credits for health insurance. Specifically in question are veterans who are eligible for, but not enrolled in, VA Health Coverage. Make no mistake about it, we must ensure that these veterans have the same access to the tax credits provided by The American Health Care Act as any other American would.

That's where my bill, The Veteran Act, comes into play. My bill would simply put into

law a guarantee that veterans can indeed get these tax credits to purchase health insurance in the individual market. Without The Veteran Act, the eligibility of America's veterans for AHCA tax credits would be left in the hands of IRS bureaucrats. That would be a mistake. This is too important of an issue to leave in the hands of the IRS. Bottom-line: this is a belt-and-suspenders approach to ensure veterans have access to these tax credits.

It's important to note that the American Health Care Act initially proposed to provide tax credits to veterans, but this language had to be removed due to reconciliation rules. While I was disappointed that this section was removed, I am glad we are doing the right thing today.

I would note that this legislation has received the support of several veterans' organizations, including:

- (1) The Paralyzed Veterans of America;
- (2) The Association of the United States Navy; and
- (3) The Retired Enlisted Association.

As I stated earlier, our veterans should have choice in where they receive their healthcare, just like the American citizens they defend. I think that's something we can all agree upon. And in that spirit, I think this bill is something we can all get behind. I ask my colleagues for their support of The Veteran Act.

To our veterans and their families, I thank you for your service. God bless you, and God bless America. I salute you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 379, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

□ 1300

#### BROADER OPTIONS FOR AMERICANS ACT

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 379, I call up the bill (H.R. 2579) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 379, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2579

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Broader Options for Americans Act".*

#### SEC. 2. PREMIUM TAX CREDIT ALLOWED WITH RESPECT TO UNSUBSIDIZED COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 36B(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by inserting after "in section 9832(b))" the following: "offered in the individual health insurance market within a State (within the meaning of section 5000A(f)(1)(C)), or any unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage," and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

(b) *CERTIFICATION OF UNSUBSIDIZED COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE.*—Section 36B(g) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10) and by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(9) *SPECIAL RULE FOR UNSUBSIDIZED COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE.*—In the case of unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage—

"(A) subsection (d)(1) shall be applied by substituting 'COBRA continuation coverage which is certified by the plan administrator (as defined in section 414(g)) of the group health plan' for 'health insurance coverage which is certified by the State in which such insurance is offered', and

"(B) the requirements of paragraph (8) shall be treated as satisfied if the certification meets such requirements as the Secretary may provide."

(c) *UNSUBSIDIZED COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE.*—Section 36B of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) *UNSUBSIDIZED COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE.*—For purposes of this section—

"(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The term 'unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage' means COBRA continuation coverage the payment of applicable premiums (as defined in section 4980B(f)(4)) for which is solely the obligation of the taxpayer.

"(2) *COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE.*—The term 'COBRA continuation coverage' means continuation coverage provided—

"(A) pursuant to part 6 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (other than under sections 602(5) and 609), title XXII of the Public Health Service Act, section 4980B (other than subsection (f)(1) thereof insofar as it relates to pediatric vaccines), or section 8905a of title 5, United States Code,

"(B) under a State law or program that provides coverage comparable to coverage described in subparagraph (A), or

"(C) under a group health plan that is a church plan (as defined in section 414(e)) and is comparable to coverage provided pursuant to section 4980B.

Such term shall not include coverage under a health flexible spending arrangement."

(d) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—

(1) Section 36B(d)(2)(A) is amended by inserting "COBRA continuation coverage or" after "other than".

(2) Section 36B(g)(6) of such Code is amended by striking "subsection (f)(5)" and inserting "subsection (f)(4)".

(e) *AMENDMENT OF SECTION 36B AS AMENDED BY AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2017.*—Whenever in this section an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the reference shall be considered to be made to such section as amended by the American Health Care Act of 2017 and in effect for months beginning after December 31, 2019.

(f) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section are contingent upon the enactment of the American Health Care Act of 2017

and shall apply (if at all) to months beginning after December 31, 2019, in taxable years ending after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my thoughts and prayers for our colleague and friend, Congressman STEVE SCALISE, and the victims of yesterday's shooting. May God be with them during this time.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, Broader Options for Americans Act, is before us today.

We have all heard about COBRA continuation coverage, which allows someone with group health insurance who experiences a qualifying life event to keep their job-based coverage when they no longer have a job and, most importantly, their plan's networks of providers—doctors, hospitals, et cetera—for a certain amount of time.

Currently, consumers with COBRA coverage, who could face a cost of up to 102 percent of plan costs, are not eligible for ObamaCare's Federal subsidies. My bill allows individuals who pay for the full cost of such continuation of coverage to qualify for the tax credit established under the American Health Care Act.

This allows those consumers, including clergy, church lay workers, and their dependents who are experiencing similar circumstances and who get their coverage through church plans, who have been affected by sudden life changes to receive assistance to pay for their unsubsidized health premiums.

This bill represents another step forward in our continuing work to help Americans access more options for true patient-centered healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, this hits close to home for me. As a high school student, my dad lost his job of 25 years. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has heard that story before. We, as a family, lost our healthcare and went into COBRA coverage.

This is a solution that impacts people across America, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this legislation today.

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



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

Mr. Speaker, I want to express again, as I did earlier, the support we have for the Capitol Police and others for the good work they do every single day and extend our best wishes to Majority Whip SCALISE.

My friend, Mr. TIBERI, who is managing time on the Republican side, said he was, I think, 17 years old. If he were here and had supported the Clinton healthcare bill, that never would have happened. That would be another way that we might want to look at.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a bit ago, this is an unusual procedure. We are being asked to amend legislation that left the institution. Heaven knows where the Republican healthcare bill rests today. The President calls it mean; the Senate won't tell us where they are, as they write the bill, and when it might emerge; and we find ourselves offering amendments to something that is not going to happen.

H.R. 2579, the Broader Options for Americans Act, would allow premium tax credits to be used for unsubsidized COBRA coverage under TrumpCare. Unfortunately, this does nothing to fix the AHCA, the underlying measure this bill intends to amend.

Older Americans are likely to rely on COBRA, and the AHCA would allow insurers to charge older Americans up to five times more than they charge younger Americans. The tax credits in H.R. 2579 would not make COBRA coverage any more affordable for the American people. In addition, it could potentially weaken the risk pool coverage because it would encourage older and sicker workers to remain on COBRA that could hurt small businesses. This is simply a backdoor way for States to discriminate against existing conditions.

Because of weakening essential healthcare in the underlying TrumpCare bill, COBRA is going to be needed again to help people who leave employment for health reasons or have preexisting conditions.

Let me remind the American people how we got here in the first place. Last month, Republicans brought TrumpCare to the House floor and passed it without a single Democrat supporting it. The measure, as passed, would take away health insurance for millions of Americans, raise premiums for working families, and place an age tax on older Americans.

The bill is just one of the many promises the Republican leadership continues to make in an effort to twist arms for votes from their caucus to pass TrumpCare.

I am also concerned that the House ignored important procedures when considering bills that are on the floor today.

First, since the Republican bill passed, the CBO numbers confirmed the

measure would force Americans to pay more for lower quality healthcare coverage. That is not in dispute.

Second, this bill is not appropriate to consider now because it amends TrumpCare, and it hasn't even passed the Senate.

Even if this bill was incorporated into TrumpCare, it would not undo the terrible cuts included in the measure. It would leave 23 million Americans without health insurance, cut Medicaid by \$800 billion, discriminate against individuals with preexisting conditions; and will drastically raise premiums for older Americans.

It would unravel important consumer protections or cut programs designed to address the opioid addiction crisis in my State of Massachusetts, and throughout the Nation. I am quite certain everyone here and watching this debate has someone close to them dealing with a drug or alcohol addiction.

In addition, many middle class Americans rely on Medicaid for long-term care. That is beginning to resonate with the American people.

This bill does nothing to fix the Republican repeal measure, as I have noted, and it is likely to create more and new problems.

I encourage my Republican friends and colleagues to go back to the drawing board, craft a bill with us, and fix the problems in the Affordable Care Act. There is a chance to do that.

Twenty-three million more Americans have health insurance because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Now is not the time to retreat. In times like this, we should be advancing these arguments in this institution for hardworking Americans and their families.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on a personal basis, I have a tremendous amount of love and respect for Mr. NEAL.

We, obviously, have a disagreement. I tell my daughters about how a bill becomes law, and I don't need to tell the gentleman from Massachusetts how a bill becomes law, but we certainly, I think, believe that there are opportunities to not only improve what you say is the Affordable Care Act but the bill that we passed. That is what we are doing today.

I hope to work with him to continue to do that, as the Senate passes its own bill, and, hopefully, go to a conference committee. Hopefully, the gentleman will be on that conference committee.

Mr. NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIBERI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NEAL. What is a conference committee? When is the last time one of those occurred in this institution?

Mr. TIBERI. Reclaiming my time, not lately. Two years ago.

One of the frustrations about the CBO report that never gets reported is the fact that millions of people will choose not to have healthcare. That is what the CBO says.

It is not often repeated in the national media or on the floor here, but I would just kind of remind everybody that, often, the other side of the aisle speaks a lot about choice and the freedom to choose. And with respect to healthcare, that is what millions of people will do, according to CBO.

I would also like to remind my friend—and I do mean that—that there are millions of Americans in my State alone who have insurance but don't have the choice of provider they once had or the choice of a hospital they once had. That is pretty traumatic.

There are people who have insurance, but premiums have doubled and tripled in the last several years and out-of-pocket expenses for those who are not subsidized have gone to levels that are unprecedented.

I surely appreciate and would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that this bill before us today simply says that we expand choices, we expand options for Americans by allowing them for the very first time to receive financial assistance if they lose their healthcare insurance.

I know it is not perfect, but it is good. I hope that we can improve on all these aspects that the gentleman and I have talked about today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 379, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 267, nays 144, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

YEAS—267

|           |            |             |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Abraham   | Babin      | Bera        |
| Aderholt  | Bacon      | Bergman     |
| Allen     | Banks (IN) | Biggs       |
| Amash     | Barletta   | Bilirakis   |
| Amodei    | Barr       | Bishop (GA) |
| Arrington | Barton     | Bishop (MI) |



Bishop (UT) Griffith  
Black Grothman  
Blackburn Guthrie  
Blum Harper  
Bost Hartzler  
Brady (TX) Hensarling  
Brat Herrera Beutler  
Bridenstine Hice, Jody B.  
Brooks (AL) Higgins (LA)  
Brooks (IN) Hill  
Brownley (CA) Himes  
Buchanan Holding  
Buck Hollingsworth  
Bucshon Hudson  
Budd Huizenga  
Burgess Hultgren  
Bustos Hunter  
Byrne Hurd  
Calvert Issa  
Carbajal Jenkins (KS)  
Carter (GA) Jenkins (WV)  
Carter (TX) Johnson (OH)  
Chabot Jones  
Chaffetz Jordan  
Cheney Joyce (OH)  
Coffman Katko  
Cohen Kelly (MS)  
Collins (GA) Kelly (PA)  
Collins (NY) Kihuen  
Comer Kind  
Comstock King (IA)  
Conaway King (NY)  
Cook Kinzinger  
Correa Knight  
Costa Kustoff (TN)  
Costello (PA) LaHood  
Courtney LaMalfa  
Cramer Lamborn  
Crawford Lance  
Crist Latta  
Cuellar Lawson (FL)  
Culberson Lewis (MN)  
Curbelo (FL) Lieu, Ted  
Davidson Lipinski  
Davis, Rodney LoBiondo  
DeFazio Loeb sack  
Delaney Long  
Denham Loudermilk  
Dent Love  
DeSantis Lucas  
DesJarlais Luetkemeyer  
Diaz-Balart Lujan Grisham,  
Donovan M.  
Duffy Lynch  
Duncan (SC) MacArthur  
Duncan (TN) Maloney, Sean  
Dunn Marchant  
Emmer Marino  
Estes (KS) Marshall  
Esty (CT) Massie  
Farenthold Mast  
Faso McCarthy  
Ferguson McCaul  
Fitzpatrick McClintock  
Fleischmann McHenry  
Flores McKinley  
Fortenberry McMorris  
Foster Rodgers  
Foxy McSally  
Franks (AZ) Meadows  
Frelinghuysen Meehan  
Gaetz Messer  
Gallagher Mitchell  
Garrett Moolenaar  
Gibbs Mooney (WV)  
Gonzalez (TX) Mullin  
Goodlatte Murphy (FL)  
Gosar Murphy (PA)  
Gottheimer Newhouse  
Gowdy Noem  
Granger Nunes  
Graves (GA) O'Halleran  
Graves (LA) O'Rourke  
Graves (MO) Olson

## NAYS—144

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Cardenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright

Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schneider  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shea-Porter  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Evans  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.

Blunt Rochester  
Cole  
Cummings  
Gohmert  
Harris  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson, Sam

Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeke  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Pingree  
Pocan

## NOT VOTING—19

Labrador  
Napolitano  
Norcross  
Payne  
Reed  
Rouzer  
Scalise

Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)

Simpson  
Vela  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Weber (TX)

□ 1340

Messrs. CICILLINE, CONYERS, HECK, and BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CORREA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. LYNCH, COHEN, and BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 15, 2017, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 308: Passage of H.R. 2579, “Broader Options for Americans Act.” Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 15, I was absent from votes on account of attending funeral, and had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall No. 308—“yea.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the vote on passage of H.R. 2372 is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR THE  
HEROIC ACTIONS OF THE UNITED  
STATES CAPITOL POLICE AND  
OTHER FIRST RESPONDERS IN  
THE ATTACK ON MEMBERS OF  
CONGRESS ON JUNE 14, 2017, AND  
EXPRESSING HOPE FOR A FULL  
RECOVERY FOR THE INJURED

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House and, further, ask unanimous consent that it be read in full.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the resolution.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 385

Whereas on June 14, 2017, an armed gunman opened fire at a practice for the annual Congressional Baseball Game for Charity, wounding five individuals;

Whereas United States Capitol Police Special Agents Crystal Griner, David Bailey, and Henry Cabrera responded decisively to the attack, risking their own lives to save the lives of others;

Whereas Special Agent Griner, who has been a member of the Capitol Police since July 2008, was wounded in the course of confronting and subduing the attacker;

Whereas Special Agent Bailey, who has been a member of the Capitol Police since April 2008, was wounded in the course of confronting and subduing the attacker;

Whereas Matthew (Matt) Mika, who was formerly a legislative aide for Representative Nick Smith, Representative Dave Camp, and Representative Tim Walberg, was wounded in the attack;

Whereas Zachary (Zack) Barth, a legislative aide to Representative Roger Williams, was injured in the attack; and

Whereas Representative Steve Scalise, who has served the first congressional district of Louisiana since 2008, husband of Jennifer Scalise and father to Madison and Harrison, was wounded in the attack: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its deep gratitude to United States Capitol Police Special Agents Griner, Bailey, and Cabrera who bravely placed themselves in harm's way to protect and save the lives of scores of individuals;

(2) expresses its appreciation for the daily courage and dedication of the United States Capitol Police who protect the Capitol grounds, Members of Congress, and the public, to whom the Capitol belongs;

(3) expresses its thanks to the Alexandria Police Department, Alexandria Sheriff's Office, and Alexandria Fire Department for responding swiftly and effectively to aid the United States Capitol Police officers on the scene;

(4) expresses its thanks to the first responders and health care professionals who tended to the victims;

(5) expresses its hope for a speedy and full recovery for the injured;

(6) reaffirms that an attack on any Member of Congress is an attack on every Member, on the institution, and on the very principle of representative democracy; and

(7) stands firm in its belief that violence has no place in a pluralistic society where

differences are settled through debate, ballots, and a legislative process, which rests at the bedrock of our representative democracy.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1345

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of asking the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, I want to just make a comment.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, this House and, indeed, the Nation was shaken by the horrific shooting in Alexandria. We just, unanimously, passed the majority leader's resolution. All of us are praying for the safe recovery of our friend and colleague Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE and others who were injured yesterday.

STEVE is the majority whip and I am the minority whip, and we are, therefore, in some respects, adversaries, but we are also friends. I am keeping him, my wife, Jennifer, and their children in my thoughts today.

Mr. Speaker, as you probably know, STEVE loves baseball. All of us have seen the broad smile on his face as he has taken to the field as a pinch runner in games past, wearing his University of Louisiana Ragin' Cajun jersey and scoring runs for his Republican team.

I am saddened—and I know all of us are—that we won't be able to see him on the field today running, hitting, and scoring; but, Mr. Speaker, we know that STEVE is a fighter, and I am sure we will be seeing him running the bases again in next year's Congressional Baseball Game.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am going to wear a T-shirt that says "Team Scalise." His staff gave it to me yesterday. We took some pizza by their office and talked to each one of them. We have had good relations between our two offices. We have worked together on a lot of things and, yes, we have opposed from time to time, but we are friends.

I am also keeping in my thoughts the members of the Capitol Police, who keep us all safe. I am one of those who is blessed to have a detail because I am one of the leaders. Members of the Capitol Police are assigned specifically to try to make sure that I am safe—and, yes, those around me—as STEVE's detail did yesterday, courageously and heroically.

I know the majority leader shares my view that every day that a member of the Capitol Police gets out of bed, puts a badge in their wallet or on their chest, a gun on their hip, and leaves their home, they do so with a commit-

ment to protect this institution, its Members, and, yes, the public who visit their House, their Senate, their Congress. We cannot say enough about our Capitol Police. They are extraordinarily well trained, but, also, they are extraordinarily courageous and committed to serving this institution, its Members, and our country.

We are, of course, thankful for the courage and quick response of those officers who were at the ball field yesterday, and we pray for their full and speedy recovery. And we do the same for the staffer and the former staffer who were also injured in that attack.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, with whom I also have worked in a constructive way on so many occasions for the country.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his comments.

Yesterday was a long and emotional day for the people in this House. A cowardly act of violence was directed at our friends, our colleagues, and our democracy.

We are currently praying for all those injured and their families—Matt Mika, Zack Barth, Special Agent Crystal Griner, Special Agent David Bailey, and Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE. These individuals are strong and, as you said, they are fighters, and they should know that they have the full love and support of this House.

But, Mr. Speaker, even in the face of this great evil, we saw amazing bravery yesterday. Special Agents Griner and Bailey put their lives on the line. They saved countless others. There is no other way to put it, but they are heroes. Yesterday could have ended with many deaths. They ran out in order to draw the fire away from the Members.

This attacker moved down the third baseline to home base, where the majority of the players had been sitting in the dugout of first base, lying on the ground, and even a 10-year-old son, whom they would hover over on top of. He tried to make his movement there. Crystal had already been wounded.

But as I talked to the agents yesterday in the hospital, they said that they wished they could have even done more, having drawn the fire away and saving so many lives. We will be forever grateful for their courageous actions and those of all of our Capitol Police, who are truly the best in the business. As we end this week, I do want to take the time to thank our men and women in uniform and keep them all in our prayers for their recovery.

Yesterday I spent a large portion of the day at the hospital, yes, seeing the agents and seeing and praying for our majority whip. I have known STEVE SCALISE for more than 20 years. Before either of us were ever elected to any office, we got involved in politics in Young Republicans. I was the national

chairman, and he was the State chair of Louisiana. We developed a friendship, a camaraderie, and a passion for making the country better.

I know what Jennifer and the kids are going through, but our prayers are with them, and he will definitely come back and play in that baseball game.

So, Mr. Speaker, before I move on with the schedule for next week, because of everything that happened yesterday, I missed doing something important as well. I want to wish my friend, Mr. HOYER, a belated happy birthday. I hope my friend enjoyed a nice slice of his favorite desert: pineapple upside-down cake. I do want it noted that, even on his birthday, he took the time to make sure the staff of STEVE SCALISE had something to eat, and they appreciated that greatly. They appreciated his visit.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

□ 1400

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

One suspension worth highlighting is H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, sponsored by our own Representative GLENN THOMPSON. You may know him, Mr. Speaker.

This bill would expand experience-based learning opportunities and support greater collaboration between schools and employers.

Mr. Speaker, 65 percent of today's grade school kids will work in a job that is yet to be invented. It is vital we provide our students with the skills necessary to succeed in an ever-evolving workplace, and that is exactly what this bill aims to do.

Along those same lines, the House will consider H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, sponsored by Representative CARLOS CURBELO. Under this bill, employers would partner with State and local agencies in an effort to hire TANF recipients and provide them with on-the-job training.

There is no substitute for a good job, and, by passing this bill, the House will take a positive step toward getting more Americans back to work.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider two bills from the Natural Resources Committee. First, H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, sponsored by DOUG

LAMALFA. This bipartisan legislation would streamline the process for removing hazardous trees, helping to lower the risk of forest fires, while ensuring a reliable electrical infrastructure.

And second, H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, sponsored by Representative TOM MCCLINTOCK. This bill provides the framework for creating a one-stop-shop permitting agency, ensuring the vital water storage projects that are so badly needed are not delayed by red tape.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. Speaker, it is a time for us to be together, to be united as Americans, not as Republicans or Democrats, Liberals or Conservatives, and I thank the majority leader for his leadership in that effort and in remembering Officers Griner and Bailey and Cabrera, and all of their colleagues in the Capitol Police, and with our prayers for STEVE SCALISE and the others who have been injured. I thank the majority leader, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PERMISSION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) may be recognized on the legislative day of Wednesday, June 21, 2017, to offer the resolution that he noticed on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, without further notice under clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX.

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

There was no objection.

#### HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2017, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, June 20, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

#### HAPPY FATHER'S DAY TO STEVE SCALISE

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a determined spirit that I come to the

floor today to wish our friend, my friend, our colleague, STEVE SCALISE, a Happy Father's Day.

Mr. Speaker, we pray for STEVE's full recovery as he fights for his life at a hospital near here in our Nation's Capitol. We pray for STEVE's family, for their strength, and for their comfort during this most difficult time.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we all join together in a spirit of family and love, to send our love to STEVE. Jennifer, Harrison, Madison, you are in our prayers.

STEVE, get well soon. Happy Father's Day. In spite of it all, Happy Father's Day.

#### THANKING THE KELLETT FAMILY FOR THEIR SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, in light of yesterday's tragedy, I think it is important to remember those who keep our communities safe, including our military, law enforcement, and first responders. In addition to those groups, I believe educators are also heroes.

Today, I want to highlight a family from my hometown of Papillion, Nebraska, the Kelletts, whose story represents what it means to be heroes and servants of our Nation.

Bill Kellett recently retired as the director of the Papillion-La Vista South High School band, and was a music educator for 33 years. His students were featured in two Presidential inaugural parades and marched in the 2000 millennium celebration in London.

His wife, Andrea, is also a longtime educator who taught history and directed the Titan guard and legion units.

Three of their sons currently serve as airmen, and a fourth one is also a teacher in our community.

Last December, Captain Kyle Kellett, one of their sons, was recognized with the Lieutenant General William H. Tunner Award as the commander of the most outstanding airlift crew in the United States Air Force. As civil war was raging in Yemen, then-Secretary of Defense Ash Carter ordered all U.S. personnel out of the country, and that is when Captain Kellett and his crew put their lives on the line to protect their fellow Americans.

Their no-fail mission was flown at night, over the war-torn country, in bad weather, and with little time for planning. Captain Kellett and his crew quickly evacuated 70 Americans only hours before militants overran their location. His leadership and crew were nothing short of heroic.

This is a proud all-American family. I want to thank the Kellett family for their service to our country.

#### NEVADA WON'T BACK DOWN

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, today, Energy and Commerce's Environment Subcommittee advanced a bill that would ram Yucca Mountain down the throats of Nevadans. Among its many faults, the bill usurps the State's water rights. Now, this is unethical, it is certainly intellectually dishonest, and it is probably unconstitutional.

Republican lawmakers have long touted states' rights as a basic tenet of our democracy. What they must really mean is states' rights apply to their States but not to Nevada.

They also took great pride in opposing the waters of the U.S. regulations, saying it was Federal overreach and outrageous power grab. Well, so much for principle. Now it is a different story.

Taking a state's water rights sets a dangerous precedent. If they can do it to Nevada, they can do it to you. If they can take our water, they can take your water.

In the West, we say that water is worth fighting for. Whiskey is for drinking. Well, we are not giving up this fight.

#### WELCOMING PENNSYLVANIA FARM BUREAU INTERNS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, I had the opportunity to meet with students interning with the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau.

The Pennsylvania Farm Bureau is the Commonwealth's largest farm organization, with a volunteer membership of more than 60,000 members. Since 1950, it has provided legislative support, information, and services to Pennsylvania's farmers and rural families.

The Farm Bureau provides its members with representation, both in Washington and their State Capitol of Harrisburg concerning legislation and rulemaking. Its grassroots structure allows county farm bureaus and their leaders to develop and implement policies which are then determined at an annual meeting.

I am always pleased to meet with our farm leaders of tomorrow. Through this internship, students interested in pursuing a career in the agriculture sector are afforded a firsthand experience to further understand farmland preservation, commodity pricing, property rights, land management, and much more.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is Pennsylvania's number one industry. As vice chairman of the House Agriculture

Committee and chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, it gives me great hope for the future to see our youth engaging in policy issues that impact our farmers. I look forward to them pursuing their own careers in the agriculture sector.

#### GOD BLESS STEVE SCALISE AND ALL THOSE INJURED IN THE SHOOTING OF JUNE 14, 2017

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that my thoughts and prayers are with our colleague, STEVE SCALISE, and the others who were injured as a result of the horrific shooting yesterday morning. This makes us realize how vulnerable we all are and, in serving our country, we risk a lot of things from time to time.

The people who were injured, besides Congressman SCALISE, the brave first responders who probably saved many more lives as a result, what can we say, other than thank you to the first responders all over this country who save us day in and day out.

The other young people, the staffer and lobbyist, everyone who was injured yesterday, my thoughts and prayers are with them as well.

STEVE is a tough guy, and I know he is going to heal quickly, and I know he is going to get better and have a full recovery, so I just wanted to wish him a good Father's Day. Let the small pleasures of life come back to him because he deserves it.

I want him and his family to know that our thoughts are with them during this difficult time. We are all in the same family together, the congressional family. And it matters not what party you belong to, but the fact is we are all there to serve our constituents and help America.

So God bless America, God bless STEVE SCALISE and all the people who were injured. We are not going to stop until they are brought back home and mending and recovered 100 percent.

#### WELCOMING THE DEVIL BRIGADE BACK HOME

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, more than 3,000 soldiers with the Army's 1st Armored Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, are headed home to Fort Riley in my district this month after a 9-month deployment in South Korea.

Also known as the "Devil Brigade," these soldiers have been stationed in South Korea since October of last year. During their deployment, these American soldiers have trained closely with

their South Korean partners, deterring North Korean hostility and providing security in the Korean Peninsula. This service is invaluable.

These soldiers and families sacrificed greatly during their deployment. As the Devil Brigade begins to journey back home to Fort Riley, may I be the first to thank them for their service and say "Welcome Home."

#### CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on our colleagues and pray for their speedy recovery, let me stop for a moment to pay tribute to a very special time in certain parts of the United States now being celebrated, really, across the land.

As I go home this weekend, we will be celebrating, commemorating Juneteenth. As President Lincoln gave the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, my constituency's ancestors did not hear of the freeing of the slaves until more than 2½ years later when Major Granger landed in Galveston to announce that the slaves were free and emancipated.

It is a serious time to honor those and the legacies of all of those who gave to this country, and we celebrate it with excitement and honor and dignity.

Today, or this weekend, I am excited that we will rededicate the Emancipation Park. We will name the street Emancipation Street. We are delighted that the OST/Alameda TIRZ donated \$33 million, along with foundations, to the city of Houston and community dollars.

We will acknowledge those who bought the land, some many, many years ago, and this restoration will give the opportunity, not only for those in the Third Ward, where I am privileged to represent, and all of those heroes and sheroes, but it will be a park that will welcome everyone, from not only around the community and the city, but it will welcome those from across the Nation.

Today, I introduce a Juneteenth resolution honoring Juneteenth with 51-plus sponsors. I am proud to acknowledge that, yes, we got the news late, but we celebrate freedom and we recognize that America is at her greatest because we are free, and freedom is cherished.

To all the fathers across the land, to my husband and relatives, and in memory of my late father, Ezra C. Jackson, I honor those who celebrate Father's Day as well on Sunday. Happy Father's Day.

□ 1415

#### SUPPORTING STATEHOOD OF PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege last Sunday to be an observer in Puerto Rico for the plebiscite and watch the people of Puerto Rico make the decision that they would like to be the 51st State.

I think it is time for this Congress to make the 3,400,000 American citizens part of the United States—in full grandeur, as every one of us have—and have a chance of making sure we can vote for everyone to be part of this.

I think it is time that America should stop colonizing. If I am not mistaken, this is the last Nation that has a colony. The great America of the United States has a colony, and I think it is time that we change that. Vote in Congress to make sure that we have the 51st State.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend who has been such a great leader in dealing with those who have associations with our country but are not States. I join with his remarks.

The Puerto Rican election that was held overwhelmingly voted for statehood as the option of governance they wanted to pursue. It is now, it seems to me, the responsibility of the United States Congress and the administration to recognize the overwhelming sentiment of the Puerto Rican people, expressed in a free and open election.

#### SUPPORTING STATEHOOD OF PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his leadership on this effort, a Representative on the most recent State.

I didn't want to take all of his time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Maryland, STENY HOYER, for the support. It is going to take a lot of effort. There is a lot of naysayers out there. But, again, I believe so strongly that we treat every American equally.

This is a civil rights issue, and they have voted 97 percent in favor of statehood. As you know, I led this battle with your help in 1997. We had a vote, and, with your side, I won by one vote.

Puerto Rico and Alaska didn't go anywhere, but I ask every American to think about it.

Let's make this the last colony. Let's make this the 51st State.

#### PRAYING FOR VICTIMS OF CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL TRAGEDY

(Mrs. DEMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, 1 Corinthians 12:26 reads:

If one member suffers, all the members suffer together.

I stand today to show my support for my colleague, Congressman STEVE SCALISE, his wife, and his family. We pray for their strength, their courage, and their faith as they deal with the unthinkable.

I pray for STEVE's speedy recovery. We know he is a fighter, and we pray he will be back soon fighting for the people of Louisiana's First District.

We offer prayers for Matt and his family, who was also injured during the shooting.

I rise today to remember the courageous Capitol Police officers who were injured; our heroes. If not for their bravery, more people could have been wounded and possibly killed. They risk their lives to protect us. The U.S. Capitol Police do this every day for us, for our staff, and for the public.

We stand together during this challenging time. When it happens to one of us, it happens to all of us.

#### COMMENDING CAPITOL POLICE FOR OUTSTANDING BRAVERY AND COURAGE

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, "As a law enforcement officer, my fundamental duty is to serve mankind; to safeguard lives and property; to protect the innocent against deception, the weak against oppression or intimidation, and the peaceful against violence or disorder. . . ."

Mr. Speaker, that is the first paragraph of the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics that every law enforcement officer across this country swears to upon their becoming a law enforcement officer and accepting that badge.

I can tell you, yesterday, during the horrible event that took place, Officers Bailey and Griner with the Capitol Hill Police performed their duties above and beyond the expected.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity on behalf of law enforcement officers across America to thank them for doing their job with such outstanding bravery and courage.

I also want to let the Scalise family and the Mika family know that they

are in our prayers. We pray for their speedy recovery.

God bless.

#### LOVE NOTE TO MADISON AND HARRISON SCALISE AND SPEEDY RECOVERY TO ALL

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with all of my colleagues in recognizing the heroism of David Bailey and Crystal Griner, wishing them a speedy recovery, and that they take time to recover emotionally as well.

I also want to extend a love note to the children of STEVE SCALISE. This is a love note to Madison and Harrison:

Father's Day is on Sunday, and I know for both of you it is going to be really difficult because dad is in the hospital, and you are concerned about his well-being. He loves you very much, and he is beloved here in this Chamber. Know that he will recover. He will be able to read with you and play ball with you. And what he needs most from you on this Father's Day is just to have you there, to hug him, and to love him, and to kiss him, and to know that he is the best dad in the world.

God bless you both.

#### PRAYERS AND SPEEDY RECOVERY TO ALL INJURED IN BASEBALL SHOOTING

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor consumed by great sadness. Yesterday's attack, as we have all heard, was an attack on the entire United States Congress.

It is even more tragic that this attack occurred during a practice for one of the most bipartisan traditions in the Congress.

I stand here with my colleagues hoping for a speedy recovery for my dear colleague, Representative STEVE SCALISE. My thoughts and prayers are with him, but also for all of the others that were injured, for all of their families, and for all of their loved ones.

It is clear we all know that, without Capitol Police on duty with Representative SCALISE, there would have been many more victims.

I want to express my deepest gratitude to those officers who put their lives on the line, but I also want to pray for them and all those who were injured. I ask and I hope for their speedy recovery.

#### PRAYING FOR A FULL RECOVERY TO THOSE INJURED IN BASEBALL TRAGEDY

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, my heart is with the families and the loved ones of our colleagues, House Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, and all those injured yesterday: Crystal Griner, David Bailey, Matt Mika, and Zack Barth.

STEVE, we are all praying for you and your wife, Jennifer, and your children. We wish you a happy Father's Day and a full recovery.

To the U.S. Capitol Police, you showed yesterday why you are the best at what you do.

David Bailey and Crystal Griner, without hesitation, leaped into action. Had they not done that, the story could be very different today. We are grateful for your service yesterday and every day.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROUZER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1083. An act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 16, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1681. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spirotetramat; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0255; FRL-9961-95] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1682. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Imperial County Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Sources Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0621; FRL-9962-57-Region 9] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1683. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Isotetamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0263; FRL-9961-80] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1684. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cumene Sulfonic Acid and its Ammonium, Calcium, Magnesium, Potassium, Sodium and Zinc salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0467; FRL-9961-68] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1685. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Clean Air Act Requirements for Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance and Nonattainment New Source Review [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0833; FRL-9962-48-Region 6] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1686. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [WV105-6043; FRL-9961-19-Region 3] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1687. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approvals; TN; Prong 4-2010 NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0748; FRL-9963-48-Region 4] received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1688. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Nevada Air Plan Revisions, Clark County Department of Air Quality and Washoe County Health District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0653; FRL-9963-43-Region 9] received June 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District, and San Diego County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0647; FRL-9960-40-Region 9] received June 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1690. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Regional Haze Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0237;

FRL-9962-75-Region 6] received June 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Infrastructure and Interstate Transport for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0142; FRL-9958-61-Region 6] received June 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Accidental Release Prevention Requirements; Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act; Further Delay of Effective Date [EPA-HQ-OEM-2015-0725; FRL-9963-55-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AG91) received June 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1693. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-68, "Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Temporary Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1694. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-69, "Grocery Store Restrictive Covenant Prohibition Temporary Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1695. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the semi-annual report prepared by the Inspector General for the six-month period ending March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1696. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1697. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of the Dental Category [EPA-HQ-OW-2014-0693; FRL-9957-10-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF26) received June 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1393. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States (Rept. 115-180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2188. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the major metropolitan area counterterrorism training and exercise grant program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 625. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance matching grant program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2902. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2903. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations that establish a national standard for determining whether mobile and broadband services available in rural areas are reasonably comparable to those services provided in urban areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CORREA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER,

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2904. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2905. A bill to require the Attorney General to establish procedures for expedited review of the case of any person who unlawfully solicits personal information for purposes of committing identity theft, while purporting to be acting on behalf of the IRS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 2906. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the designation of general surgery shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop and publish an all-of-the-above quadrennial Federal onshore energy production strategy to meet domestic energy needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2908. A bill to direct Federal departments and agencies to perform certain functions to ensure that climate change-related impacts are fully considered in the development of national security doctrine, policies, and plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PERRY, Mr.

CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. AMASH, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 2909. A bill to require reciprocity between the District of Columbia and other States and jurisdictions with respect to the ability of individuals to carry certain concealed firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2910. A bill to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. HURD, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 2911. A bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 2912. A bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 2914. A bill to authorize assistance for anti-tunnel defense capabilities for Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JONES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of

New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 2915. A bill to repeal section 3003 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2917. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify when the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to prohibit the specification of a defined area, or deny or restrict the use of a defined area for specification, as a disposal site under section 404 of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2918. A bill to intensify stem cell research showing evidence of substantial clinical benefit to patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Ms. STEFANK, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2919. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual's period of consecutive years of employment as a full-time teacher is interrupted because the individual is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2920. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2921. A bill to establish a vegetation management pilot program on National Forest System land to better protect utility infrastructure from passing wildfire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as



fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2922. A bill to reform and improve the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Office of Emergency Communications, and the Office of Health Affairs of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2923. A bill to designate the Gulf of Mexico Alliance as a regional coordination partnership of Federal and State actions related to the management of the Gulf of Mexico ecosystem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2924. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to establish the National Russian Threat Response Center within the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2925. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for wigs as durable medical equipment under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2926. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing incidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include apprentices as members of targeted groups for purposes of the work opportunity credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. SIREN):

H.R. 2928. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to require air carriers to disclose to consumers the actual wheels-off and wheels-on times for certain domestic passenger flight segments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain combat zone compensation of civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 385. A resolution expressing gratitude for the heroic actions of the United States Capitol Police and other first responders in the attack on Members of Congress on June 14, 2017, and expressing hope for a full recovery for the injured; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VELA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Res. 386. A resolution recognizing June 19, 2017, as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 387. A resolution congratulating the Golden State Warriors for their historic championship victory in the 2017 National Basketball Association Finals; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H. Res. 388. A resolution congratulating and honoring Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on 50 years of groundbreaking discoveries; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 389. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to reduce the influence of money in politics; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

62. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, urging Congress not to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its most important provisions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

63. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 12, rescinding Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 78th Session of the Nevada Legislature and expressing support for the retention of federal management and control of federal public lands in this State; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

64. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 13, expressing the support of the Nevada Legislature for certain recommendations relating to the conservation of wildlife in this State; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

65. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, urging Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

66. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 4, urging Congress to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to allow the governments of the United States to regulate and limit political contributions and expenditures to protect the integrity of elections and the equal right of all Americans to effective representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

67. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 219, urging relevant federal and State authorities to investigate actions taken by Argentina's state-owned oil company, YPF S.A., to discharge its Superfund obligations in New Jersey through federal bankruptcy proceedings; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 2901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 2905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 clause 2

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 2909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, and Article 1, Section 8, which gives Congress the authority to legislate for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 2913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 3.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 2917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (relating to regulation of Commerce among the several states.)

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 2918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: “. . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in article IV section 3 clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 2922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections, and repel Invasions;

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to: Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 38: Mr. BACON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 44: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 113: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 299: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 303: Mr. WELCH, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 358: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 360: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 379: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 380: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 389: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 398: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 422: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 490: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 502: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 564: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 620: Mr. SUOZZI and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 635: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 638: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 719: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 721: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 741: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 778: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 820: Mr. COSTA, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms.

KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 830: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 846: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 848: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 849: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 911: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 964: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 976: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1006: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1017: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1057: Mr. ISSA, Mr. DUNN, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1083: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1090: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1143: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1158: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1164: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1247: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1253: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1291: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1344: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1361: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1377: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1379: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1406: Mr. MCEACHIN and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1413: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1419: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1441: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1445: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1467: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1480: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1501: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1539: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1551: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1552: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1617: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1626: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1652: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 1661: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1676: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1681: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1697: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1698: Mr. WALZ, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1730: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1733: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1759: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1771: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 1781: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1818: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TROTT, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1838: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1861: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1881: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1928: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1969: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1970: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1997: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2023: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 2056: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2059: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2069: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 2087: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 2091: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2106: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2130: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2135: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2142: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2150: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2152: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 2200: Mr. EVANS, Mr. HECK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2203: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2228: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 2240: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2245: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2248: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2262: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2276: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2315: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2321: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2327: Mr. NOLAN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2366: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2397: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2401: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2417: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2421: Mr. O'HALLERAN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2434: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 2437: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2484: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2491: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2495: Ms. NORTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2505: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2519: Mr. LOESACK.

H.R. 2589: Mr. PALAZZO and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2601: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2621: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 2651: Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2659: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2703: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 2712: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2746: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2747: Mr. SOTO and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 2756: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2788: Mr. POCAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2801: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2820: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2823: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2834: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 2840: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2847: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2851: Mr. FASO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2854: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 2856: Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BOST, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2858: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2866: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 2868: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2871: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 2875: Mr. MEEKS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2884: Mr. COSTA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2895: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.J. Res. 31: Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. BASS.

H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. BRAT.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. LABRADOR.

H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. POSEY.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Res. 15: Mr. PERRY and Mr. SMUCKER.

H. Res. 28: Mr. SMUCKER.

H. Res. 31: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 58: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. CHABOT.

H. Res. 85: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 188: Mr. SCHIFF and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 219: Mr. PETERSON.

H. Res. 276: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 279: Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Res. 311: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. HECK.

H. Res. 317: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. DONOVAN.

H. Res. 318: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H. Res. 353: Mr. EVANS and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 359: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Res. 372: Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 376: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 380: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MAST, and Mr. ENGEL.

**SENATE—Thursday, June 15, 2017**

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

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

Let us pray.

Holy God, in whose presence dark nights of challenges are dispelled by the dawn of Your love, You know our needs before we express them. Thank You for daily providing our lawmakers with guidance and strength.

Lord, we pause to thank You for the courage and sacrificial service of our Capitol Police. Forgive us when we take their daily courageous service for granted. Lord, forgive us, also, when we seem to forget that words matter and can become seeds that will bring a bitter harvest.

Bring speedy healing to all those injured in yesterday's shooting and solace for all of us affected by this tragedy.

Today, use our Senators as instruments of Your peace, bringing joy from division, light from darkness, joy from sadness, and hope from despair.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

**COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 722) to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Corker (for Graham) amendment No. 240, to reaffirm the strategic importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty to the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its contribution to maintaining stability throughout the world.

Gardner modified amendment No. 250, to provide an exception for activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

**PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning, the Senate continues to send its prayers to all the victims of yesterday's horrific shooting. We know our House colleagues are all thinking about their colleague, Majority Whip SCALISE. It has been an immensely difficult 24 hours for all the victims, including Matt Mika, who remains in ICU, Zach Barth, and, of course, Capitol Police Officers Crystal Griner and David Bailey. Those officers didn't back down when faced with this threat. Instead, as the Capitol Police always do, they put themselves in harm's way to help protect others. Without them, we know so many more would have been injured.

So we want to continue to express our gratitude to all those who graciously put their lives on the line to keep the Capitol community safe. In doing so, we are also reminded of the bravery of our colleagues on the field yesterday—those who stepped in to help friends who had been injured as they waited for first responders to arrive. I think it says something about the character of those people as well.

The events of yesterday were devastating, and we know it will take time to heal. But for now, the members of the congressional baseball team have made the decision to go forward with tonight's game, which will be played for charity. I know we will be thinking about each of them as they take the field tonight.

Mr. President, the Senate today will take a final vote on the bipartisan first step to hold Iran and Russia accountable. This follows overwhelmingly bipartisan action yesterday to approve the Russia sanctions amendment, an effort that would not have been possible without the good work of our Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Senator CORKER, and our Banking chair, Senator CRAPO, and their ranking members.

After 8 years of failed foreign policy under the Obama administration, 8 years of following the Obama administration's preferred strategy of drawing down both our forces and our commitments, we must take a stronger stance in deterring Iran and holding its regime accountable for its actions and addressing Russia's years-long pattern of provocations.

These sanctions, which are just one of our foreign policy tools, will only work as part of a broader effort to rebuild our military force structure and combat readiness in order to send a strong signal to friend and foe alike. The United States should no longer stand by and allow threats like these to go unaddressed.

When the administration completes its series of strategic reviews, I will look forward to hearing from the President and his advisers their recommendations for countering Iran's malign conduct across the Middle East and their recommendations for countering Russia's persistent efforts to undermine NATO.

As I said earlier this week, this Iran and Russia sanctions agreement reflects good bipartisan work. I want to thank Senators on both sides of the aisle for coming together to codify and strengthen existing sanctions. Let's come together again now and pass these sanctions later this morning.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, have you announced the business for the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have laid down the business.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

**DACA**

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the fifth anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. DACA provides temporary legal status to immigrant students who arrived in the United States as children and infants, if they register with the government, pay a fee, and pass a criminal background check.

The program is based on the DREAM Act, a piece of legislation I introduced

16 years ago in 2001. That legislation gave undocumented students who grew up in this country a chance to earn a path to legal status and citizenship. These young people have come to be known as DREAMers. What used to be a word reserved for rock-and-roll groups is now a word that has become part of our common language to describe an immigration challenge and opportunity.

These DREAMers came to the United States as children. They are American in every way except for their legal immigration status. We have already invested a lot of money in these kids. We educated them. We made them part of this country, and it makes no sense to squander their talents by deporting them at this moment in their lives.

In April 2010, I sent a letter to President Obama. Dick Lugar, the Republican Senator from Indiana, joined me. On a bipartisan basis, we said to President Obama: Stop deporting these young kids. They did nothing wrong. Their parents made the decision to come here. Give them a chance. The President responded. It is now clear the DACA Program he created by Executive order has been a great success. More than 780,000 DREAMers have come forward and received DACA protection and status that has allowed them to contribute more fully to this country as students, as teachers, as nurses, as engineers, as entrepreneurs.

A recent study by the Center for American Progress found that ending DACA—saying to these 780,000 young people they are no longer part of America—would cost us. It would cost our economy over \$400 billion in gross domestic product over the next 10 years. These are productive citizens doing good things for America. I should take that back. They are not citizens yet. They are productive people doing good things for America whom I want to make citizens if the DREAM Act becomes law.

I have many differences with President Trump on immigration. For example, the President's January 25 Executive order makes up to 8 million immigrants priorities for deportation, and seeks to create a deportation force by tripling the number of immigration agents. This ignores the reality that the vast majority of undocumented immigrants are law-abiding individuals who make important economic contributions to this country, and have deep roots in the United States.

I am grateful, and I say that publicly. I have said it before. I am grateful President Trump has decided to keep the DACA Program in place. Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service Director nominee, Francis Cissna, have promised me personally and publicly that they will maintain the existing guidelines for the DACA Program. I appreciate this

commitment. I intend to hold them to it.

Congress also has an obligation to do its job. We ought to do something we rarely do in the U.S. Senate—pass legislation, fix our broken immigration system. Think about this: On June 27, 2013—4 years ago—the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, passed comprehensive immigration reform by a vote of 68 to 32, better than 2 to 1. I was glad to be part of the Gang of 8 Democratic and Republican Senators who worked for months on the bill that passed by this margin. It strengthened border security, protected American workers, and it established a tough but fair path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented people in this country.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority of the House of Representatives would not debate it, would not consider it, would not bring it for a vote, and it died in the U.S. House of Representatives. If they had done their job, their work, it would have passed with a bipartisan majority. President Obama would have signed it into law. I might not be standing here today talking about this issue.

Over the years, I have come to the floor of the Senate to tell story after story about DREAMers, the young immigrant students who grew up in this country. These stories put a human face on the DACA Program and the DREAM legislation. They show that immigration makes our country stronger.

Today, I want to say a word about Gissel Escobedo. This is Gissel. She came to the United States at the age of 3. Her family emigrated from Mexico. She grew up in my home State of Illinois, in the town of Cicero. She was an honors student in high school. She attended their gifted program. She had a big responsibility personally. From a young age, she was one of the primary caregivers for her brother who suffers from severe autism. During the little spare time she had, Gissel was a volunteer in her community, helping organizations provide care for children with autism.

As an undocumented student though, Gissel was not eligible for any Federal assistance to go to college, but as a result of her academic achievements in high school, she received a private scholarship to attend the University of Illinois at Chicago. As a college student, Gissel was a writing tutor and a leader in student organizations for future teachers. In 2010, she graduated from the University of Illinois Chicago and the College of Education with a degree in elementary education. After the graduation ceremony, Gissel received a Dean's Merit Award. She delivered the graduation speech for her class.

She wanted to start using her degree as an elementary school teacher, but because she was undocumented, that

wasn't possible. Instead, she continued her education and earned a master's degree at the University of Illinois. She was accepted into a disability leadership program as a family advocate.

Then, in 2012, the world changed for the better for Gissel. President Obama established the DACA Program. She immediately applied for DACA. Then, in 2013, she completed her master's degree and became an elementary school teacher. For the last 4 years, Gissel has been a teacher in the Berwyn South School District. Last year, she was awarded a certificate of achievement for her leadership as one of two teachers to implement the first-ever dual-language program in the district.

Gissel sent me a letter. I would like to read part of it as part of the RECORD. Here is what she said:

DACA has enabled me to become a meaningful member of society by opening doors that would have otherwise not been accessible. DACA recipients, like myself, are more than just a policy. My hope is that when people listen to our stories, they will notice the kind of individuals that we are and the kind of contributions we make—not only to the economy, but to our society.

I reflect on that paragraph to think about this young woman, the challenges she has faced within her family, and challenges imposed by the fact that she was undocumented. She has never lost sight of her commitment to her family, to her disabled sibling, and to many others in her community.

Now she wants to be a teacher. Wouldn't you be proud and honored to have your child in a classroom with someone with Gissel's master's degree and values? I certainly would. Gissel and other DREAMers have so much to give to the United States, but without DACA and without the DREAM Act, Gissel would be deported back to Mexico—a country she hasn't lived in since she was 3 years old.

Will America be a stronger country if we send away people like Gissel, if we deport them and say we don't need them in our future? Of course not. The answer is clear. Gissel will make America a better place. Today we celebrate the DACA Program, which has given Gissel and hundreds of thousands of other DREAMers the chance to finally come out of the shadows, but we also recognize DACA as a temporary solution.

Ultimately, Congress—and especially the Senate—must step up and show leadership here; make certain that we address the failings and weaknesses of our broken immigration system; say to the 780,000 protected by DACA that you stepped forward, paid your fee, submitted yourself to a background check, and have been given a temporary opportunity to be part of America. Now it is our job to translate that into a permanent opportunity for these young people to make America a better place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

## THANKING SENATOR DURBIN

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my friend and colleague for his outstanding words on DACA. No one has fought more for the DACA kids than he has, not just in the last year but over the last decade. The fact that so many of them are here is, in good part, due to his great work and effort. Thank you.

## THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, we are still all a bit shaken by the horrors of yesterday's shooting. It was a senseless act of violence, made even more chilling by the circumstances at a baseball practice for a bipartisan charity event. I understand that Representative SCALISE is still in critical condition following surgery last night. When we hear the word "critical" attached to his condition, it sends shivers down our spines. We hope and pray for a quick and full recovery. I know that all of his House colleagues are wishing him well right now, and I want him to know his friends in the Senate do as well.

The same goes for the other four who were injured in the attack, including two members of our Capitol Police Force. Our thoughts and prayers go with them as well. We remain grateful for their service and bravery and for the service and bravery of all of our Capitol police officers. Their presence at the field yesterday—the presence of those two Capitol police officers at the field yesterday prevented a bad situation from getting worse and undoubtedly saved lives. Had the two brave police officers not acted or if they had not been there, it might well have been a massacre.

We would all be wise to reflect on the importance of civility in our Nation's politics this morning. We disagree vehemently at times in Congress and folks out in the country do, too, but the level of nastiness, vitriol, and hate that has seeped into our politics must be excised. Let us all strive at all times—whatever our disagreements—to respect those who disagree with us, to seek a greater understanding of them, to walk in their moccasins—as Native Americans have always said. Let us strive always to conduct our politics with civility.

I was heartened to hear that the congressional baseball game will still be played this evening. Let it be a symbol that hate and violence do not cast too long or too great a shadow, that we can and will come together this evening, and the game will go on. I will be going to the game with the three congressional leaders as a show of solidarity.

Mr. President, last evening, the Senate showed it can come together. Last night, we voted, in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, to strengthen a

package of sanctions against Russia. It was the product of diligent weeks of bipartisan negotiations. I saw the Senator from Maryland behind me a few minutes ago. He deserves lots of credit, as do the Senators from Ohio, Tennessee, and Idaho. The final result is a very good one for our country because yesterday the U.S. Senate said to Mr. Putin, in no uncertain terms, that when he violates international norms and interferes with our election, he will not escape reproach.

Not only did we pass a new round of tough sanctions for Russia's meddling in our election, we codified existing sanctions into law, making them harder to lift, and we moved to make the Congress—not the President—the final arbiter of sanctions relief when necessary. Any ideas of the President that he can lift sanctions on his own, for any reason, are dashed by this legislation.

The House of Representatives should take notice that 97 Senators voted in favor of this package. I hope Leader RYAN will move with the same haste to pass this package of sanctions through the House. I hope the President will sign it. The months-long effort to forge bipartisan consensus on Russia sanctions—an issue that gets to the vital interests of our country, the wellspring of our democracy—gives me hope that Democrats and Republicans can come together and work together on a number of big issues this year.

There are several issues coming before this body soon where we can come together: another budget—passing another budget; reauthorizing flood insurance and children's health insurance; raising the debt ceiling. Each of those issues will, by definition, demand bipartisan effort.

A lesson that all of us have learned here in the Senate is that legislation is made better and much more likely to pass when both parties are involved in crafting it.

I have noticed the media has been questioning all morning why Congress isn't more bipartisan. We should be. But when the Russia sanctions agreement passes and the budget deal passes, both major bipartisan efforts, they are proof that we can get things done together. If those agreements were given a little more recognition by the media—the fact that we can at times, at least, work in a bipartisan way—that would help. For too many of us on both sides of the aisle, it seems as though when there is divisiveness, it gets far more attention in the media than when there is comity between the parties.

## HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, finally, I would suggest to my colleagues that the most immediate place where we can translate the rhetoric calling for us to come together into reality is on healthcare. A goal many of us share on both sides

of the aisle is to improve the law, bring costs down for consumers, stabilize the marketplace, and make it easier for older Americans to afford the ever-rising out-of-pocket costs of prescription drugs.

I would conclude by stating that we can make the rhetoric of bipartisanship not empty by both parties coming together and working together on healthcare. We have shown thus far in this Congress with the passage of the budget and Russia sanctions that significant legislation can best be served by bipartisanship. Opening up the process and having us all come together on healthcare would be a very good, concrete reaffirmation of bipartisanship and would translate the rhetoric—not bad at all—that we have heard here today into reality.

In conclusion, the rhetoric about bipartisanship can be strengthened. Hopefully healthcare is a place where we can strengthen it, by opening up the process, having hearings, and having open discussion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls on S. 722 be charged equally to both sides.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senator from Alabama is presiding over this very important debate because one of the most important issues to both of our States, Colorado and Alabama, is the economy and the economic well-being of our great country. The amendment that I will be discussing today goes to the very heart of our opportunities in space, our opportunities in innovation, our opportunities to ensure that we have the most reliable information as it relates to weather and to weather events.

It is a great partnership that we have had with the Senator from Alabama, who has been absolutely critical and instrumental in ensuring a persistent, reliable space presence. I thank the Senator from Alabama, Mr. STRANGE, for his incredible leadership when it comes to making sure that we are able to reach space, that we are able to continue our space mission. Whether it is in the defense of this country or in understanding where the next tornado may strike, I thank the Senator from Alabama for the leadership that has

been provided to ensure that constant presence and persistence.

Of course, I rise to speak in support of the bipartisan Gardner-Nelson-Warner et al. amendment, amendment No. 250. Yet, truly, to the Senate—to my colleagues here—I rise in support of America's role and leadership in space.

I rise on behalf of the hardworking men and women across this Nation who make our country's aerospace industry second to none, because, over the past 70 years, the United States has led the way in space exploration. From the Apollo missions to the space shuttle to the Orion program, we are the leaders in exploring the great frontier of space. That is who this country is. That is who we are—explorers, pioneers. We were the first to the Moon, and I hope we are the first to Mars, but we cannot give up that pioneering innovation that has led this country to greatness.

I will share with colleagues of the Senate a CNBC story from March that China is building a manned spacecraft that is capable of sending astronauts to the Moon as well as to near-Earth orbit flight.

Can you imagine the day when the stars and stripes on the lunar surface stands not alone but stands next to the stars of a flag of another nation—perhaps China's, perhaps somebody else's?

When it comes to our access to space, this debate is absolutely critical because without the passage of amendment No. 250, we lose a tremendous portion of our access to space. We lose it for commercial applications, and we lose it for civil applications.

In the past few months, this China activity has shown the importance of U.S. leadership. That is why this bipartisan amendment comes with a very simple point. It ensures that NASA and our commercial space industry will continue to be the country's leader in aerospace.

The ranking member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator MARK WARNER, of Virginia, is coleading my amendment. The Senator has done a phenomenal job in leadership on the Intelligence Committee in leading this amendment.

I see that my colleague from Florida, Senator NELSON, has joined this debate. He has done a phenomenal job in leading this effort. As the ranking member of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, with jurisdiction over NASA, Senator BILL NELSON is the leading cosponsor of this effort.

They understand how important it is to address this issue for NASA and other space missions.

I stand here in support of the greater goals of the underlying bill that we will be amending today. I believe sanctions against our adversaries are warranted and justified and, indeed, should move forward. This amendment is not designed to undermine the intent of

the bill, but it seeks to ensure that space exploration may continue as it is currently planned.

Without this bipartisan amendment, multiple missions on the books today—that are already planned today—will be delayed or even canceled and will be subjecting the U.S. taxpayers to significant cost increases. Without this amendment, missions like the commercial resupply program, which delivers critical supplies to the International Space Station, will be jeopardized by the language of the bill as it is written. American astronauts at the International Space Station, as we speak, are dependent on those supplies, but we are cutting off the American lifeline without the adoption of this amendment. Future missions, like the commercial crew program—a partnership between NASA and private industry to bring astronauts to the International Space Station on a U.S.-manufactured spacecraft—will be put at risk without the adoption of this amendment.

Without this bipartisan amendment, we will continue to rely on Russian spacecraft to take U.S. astronauts to the International Space Station. Let me just make that more clear. Without the adoption of this amendment, NASA and our astronauts will be dependent on Russia for access to space for even longer. Rejection of this bipartisan amendment results in further Russian dependence.

I do not believe this was the intent of the language when the bill was first written. The Gardner-Nelson-Warner-Shelby et al. amendment creates the certainty that NASA needs and supports to ensure currently planned NASA and commercial launch missions can continue without interruption.

NASA contacted my office yesterday and said of amendment No. 250: "We believe this provides us the flexibility to maintain our commitments to our national space program."

It is not just the commercial crew and cargo missions that are going to be impacted. Several other missions will be subjected to delays—missions like the Joint Polar Satellite System. This constellation of satellites will give us the ability to constantly monitor the globe for significant weather events, such as floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes. As I stand here today, the three Senators on the floor who are listening to this important debate—with more on C-SPAN—have been impacted dramatically by floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes.

In 2013, we had dramatic flooding in Colorado that damaged thousands and thousands of homes and cost lives. I know the Presiding Officer has faced the same challenge when it has come to tornadoes and incredibly tragic weather events. The Senator from Florida has faced hurricanes, floods, and tornadoes. That is the importance of this amendment—to understand our weather systems and predictions.

I am proud to say that JPSS is being developed in my home State of Colorado. The JPSS and other essential programs in which we have already invested hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars already, are now put at risk of significant delays or cost increases to the taxpayer without the adoption of this amendment.

I am also on the floor to talk about a longer term mission that I truly believe in and hope to see our Nation achieve, one that goes to the very heart of our pioneering spirit of who we are as a people. It is our future manned mission to Mars.

As I have spoken on the floor before, as I child I wanted to be an astronaut. I was inspired as I watched NASA astronauts explore that next frontier. I believe that the next destination for human beings to explore is, indeed, Mars, but without this bipartisan amendment, the Mars 2020 rover, which will continue to prepare us for that future manned mission, will be put in doubt. It will be a significant setback and will make the future goal of getting to Mars seem that much further away.

This amendment, amendment No. 250, allows these missions to move forward with certainty and as scheduled. It is a bipartisan effort to affirm America's leadership in space.

Let's be clear. Last summer we had a debate on this very same issue—that by 2022 we were going to have an "America first" opportunity. That is the spirit of this amendment—to make sure that we have access to these vital and critical space missions, access to space, and to continue to grow economic opportunities for the American people. That is what this debate is all about.

I yield the floor to my colleague Senator NELSON and then, of course, will continue with debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank Senator GARDNER.

Indeed, this is an example of the Senate working together. There is, simply, a problem in the bill that was passed. It is a technical problem, but it goes to the heart of our military-civilian space program. It goes to the heart of the cooperation that we have had with Russia that goes back to the Soviet Union days when, in fact, in 1975, in the middle of the Cold War, a crew from America rendezvoused and docked with the crew from the Soviet Union. Ever since that crew, which was led by Lt. Gen. Tom Stafford, of the United States, and General Alexey Leonov, of the Soviet Union, we have had cooperation in space, and that program continues today on the International Space Station.

Before I get into talking about the details of the amendment, as Senator GARDNER has discussed so well already,



I hope that the Senate will treat it as technical in nature because it corrects what was not intended. Unless corrected, it will be disastrous not only for NASA but for all of the burgeoning commercial space industry, which we are bringing back to America. What has happened over the last four decades, in the meantime, is that a lot of that commercial space industry has flown the coop to other launchers from other nations. But it is coming back to America.

PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE  
CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, before I get into the substance, I just want to speak with regard to the terrible tragedy that occurred yesterday and of my feelings about this violence that has occurred. I don't know whether it has occurred because of the excessive rhetoric and the sharpness and the fact that politics has become a blood sport, but we are so divided.

This is what I want to say. We are Americans first, regardless of party. In times of threat, we come together. We are all on the same team.

This Senator has prayed, as I know others have, for the complete recovery of all of those who were wounded yesterday, two of whom were apparently grievously wounded. We pray for their full recovery. It was a heinous attack. Let's come together in bipartisanship.

AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

Mr. President, right here is an example of coming together. Recognizing there is a technical problem, we are coming together to fix that problem. Let's do this in the spirit of what Americans do. We are Americans first.

I am obviously here, as I demonstrated in my vote yesterday, for the Iran sanctions bill, as well as the Russia sanctions amendment, which we adopted yesterday. Both were bipartisan efforts. I wish to thank our colleagues, especially the members of the Banking and Foreign Relations Committees.

This Senator is a cosponsor of the sanctions bill which addresses Iran's support for terrorism, ballistic missile activity, and human rights violations—these destabilizing activities—and this bill strengthens the hand of the United States in countering Iran. These are destabilizing activities separate and apart from the Iran nuclear agreement, and to date, the United States has the evidence that they have complied with the Iran nuclear agreement.

At the same time, we are facing an aggressive Vladimir Putin. The Russia bill which we debated yesterday and which will come to final passage shortly strengthens our hand against Putin's Russia. The U.S. intelligence community has already made clear that Putin attempted to interfere in our election. Let me tell my colleagues, that didn't stop with the past election. It is continuing. And we bet-

ter be ready for it next year in the 2018 elections because Putin and the GRU have done all the groundwork. But that is nothing new because he had done it in elections before in Europe, and he has been doing it in elections right now, as we saw in France. It boomeranged on him, thank goodness. We will see an attempt on the upcoming German elections.

The intelligence community has made it very clear—the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee is here—that Putin and the GRU are likely to do this again. That is why I say beware. They have laid the groundwork for next year's elections to try to interfere. Putin's influence campaign struck at the very core of our democracy and simply must not be permitted to do it again.

Now is not the time to cozy up to Russia; rather, the United States must redouble our cyber defenses and our cyber offenses to deter him, to make him feel enough pain so that he won't do it again. The sanctions we will adopt today are tough. We need this, but we need more.

Shortly, we are going to vote on the amendment Senator GARDNER has explained. Interestingly, in all of this angst and conflict with Russia, we get along with Russia in the civilian and commercial space program. We have had peaceful cooperation in outer space ever since what I told my colleagues about; that is, since 1975, in the middle of the Cold War, the rendezvous and docking and living together in space for 9 days, a Soviet crew and an American crew. That has been the central theme of our space program since that time. The shining example of that now is the cooperation in the International Space Station, the football field-sized—it is 120 yards long; think one goalpost to another. People don't have any idea of how big it is on orbit. It circles the Earth every 90 minutes.

We have been working in space together with many nations but especially our partner the Russians for over 16 years. So the peaceful cooperation in space has been good for business. It has been good for jobs in America. And we are working to grow our share of an over \$300 billion global space economy.

That is what this amendment is about. It is about fixing the question on the purchase of those RD-180 engines, the Russian engine that is used in the Atlas V, that is used not only for defense launches but for commercial launches and will be one of the two rockets launching American astronauts within a year and a half to and from the International Space Station.

So this amendment is for the benefit of our economy, as well as the betterment of our civilization.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to thank my friend, the Sen-

ator from Florida, for his comments. There is no one in this body who is more familiar with and more knowledgeable about our space programs than is Senator NELSON.

I also want to associate myself with two comments he made. No. 1, as the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I echo what he said about the very real, tangible threat the Russians, their spy agencies, and their agents pose to not just our democratic process but—as the Senator from Florida has outlined, not only did they attack us in 2016, they attacked the Dutch, which is why they had to hand-count their ballots, and they attacked the French, and Facebook took down 30,000 Facebook accounts because of fear of Russian manipulation. They will attack the Germans.

One of the things that is so concerning to me is that if you add up the amount of disruption the Russians have caused in Western societies at large without firing a shot or shooting a missile—and all that for less than 5 percent of the cost of an aircraft carrier—it is a pretty good return.

Our country needs to be strong against Russia, and I support the Russia sanctions, but I also support, as the Senator has indicated, a really critical part—that we continue our space program. I stand here to join with Senator NELSON and my good friend, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. GARDNER, in support of this amendment No. 250, which will allow civilian agencies to continue to launch crucial science, civil, and commercial space missions and which will continue to support NOAA and NASA, which depend upon their research.

Without this amendment—and I think this is an amendment that corrects a mistake in the original bill—billions of dollars and years of planning that have gone into missions like, as the Senator mentioned, the International Space Station, commercial cargo, Mars 2020, and the Joint Polar Satellite System, just wouldn't be possible. In many ways, without this amendment, we could even become more dependent upon Russian technology.

Again, as the Senator mentioned, I think the overwhelming majority of this body is very supportive of sanctions against Iran. We are very supportive, and I appreciate the opportunity to add stronger sanctions against Russia and sanctions that this President cannot arbitrarily withdraw. But we have to make sure that in this bill we don't do unintentional harm to our space interests—space interests that I know are in Colorado and Florida and my home State of Virginia, where we have a flight facility at NASA Wallops, which is over on our Eastern Shore, where we launch both NASA and commercial satellites.

We have one of America's leading commercial and military companies,

Orbital ATK, which is headquartered in Virginia and launches the Antares rocket from Wallops. The fact is, without this amendment, Orbital ATK would be prevented from buying the Russian RD-181 engines for its Antares rockets. That will do nothing to help America's space mission. The fact is, without those engines, Orbital would not be able to fulfill a \$1.2 billion contract for launching from Wallops.

Quite simply, as the Senator indicated and I am repeating, this amendment is broadly bipartisan. My friend Senator GARDNER and I chair the Cyber Caucus. The amendment is supported by our leading expert in the Senate on space, Senator NELSON, as well as Senator SHELBY and Senator BENNET and a host of others. I imagine the Presiding Officer is also a supporter of this. The amendment would simply provide civil and commercial space parity with the defense industry, for which an exemption has already been provided. It is in the interests of defense and civil space to continue the current status quo in order to maintain a competitive environment until a domestic capability has been developed.

Let me be clear. I think it is important that over a very short time, we get away from purchasing Russian rockets, but we need that transition period, and the transition period the chairman of the Armed Services Committee laid out on the defense side ought to be extended as well on the commercial side.

So a "yes" vote on amendment No. 250 will support continued access to space for NASA, as well as for those equally important commercial space missions. One of the things that I feel is so important about the commercial space missions is that we have to have that competition, candidly, with NASA and to push our defense industry if we are going to bring down space costs. To put a dagger in the heart of our commercial space industry as it has been slowly evolving would be a grave mistake.

I have taken on this issue on the intelligence side as I have tried to get smarter on the whole question of our overhead capabilities. The amount of dollars that we spend and the lack of competitiveness that we have in terms of some of our more traditional government-purchased space assets are both a waste of taxpayer dollars, and, candidly, we have an architecture overhead that is not modern enough to recognize the threats that Russians, Chinese, and others pose in terms of the ability to jam our satellites and use laser beams and other things. In a sense, in many ways, it is almost as if our defense and the intelligence community, on overhead architecture—nobody ever saw a James Bond movie. We built these large, bulky platforms in the sky with the assumption that America would always dominate space.

That dominance—it is unfortunate because our adversary changes, it is coming to an end, and we need the competition from the commercial industry, quite honestly, to push the IC and push the defense toward smaller, more resilient, and more flexible platforms.

While I share the desire of the chairman of the Arms Services Committee to get us off this Russian hardware, we do need this transition. I think the amendment that has been put forward by the Senator from Colorado provides that transition, led by the transition that was laid out on defense. I believe commercial space needs that same type of transition.

I hope the amendment will pass. I look forward to our continued bipartisan support of both NASA and commercial space and obviously our defense assets and IC assets as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Russian sanctions amendment passed by this body 97 to 2 last year—I take it the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Virginia were here at the time; it was one person who was not—was negotiated between Senators of both parties on multiple committees, including Foreign Relations, Banking, and Armed Services. It was specifically designed to impose tough sanctions on Russian defense and intelligence sectors, to impose tough sanctions on the Russian military industrial complex and intelligence agencies that have made it possible for Russia to invade Ukraine, annex Crimea, terrorize Syria, threaten our NATO allies, and attack America's election in 2016. Have no doubt about what this amendment is, my dear colleagues and friends. It is a giveaway to the Russian military industrial complex.

There has always been a collection of lawmakers, executives, and lobbyists who have accepted continuing, even deepening, our Nation's dependence on Russian rocket engines. That is exactly what will happen if we allow this amendment to pass, and the door will once again fly open for taxpayer dollars to be used to subsidize purchases of Russian rocket engines—purchases which line the pockets of Vladimir Putin's cronies.

My friends, if you want to vote to buy more Russian rocket engines, just say it. That is fine. That is fine with me, but to cloak it in some kind of bipartisan agreement that somehow we are going to have to continue to buy these Russian rocket engines, after we had an agreement last year 97 to 2—97 to 2—what does this do? This undoes last year's 97-to-2 agreement. We don't need this amendment to meet America's needs in space.

As a result of last year's bipartisan agreement and the NDAA, the Department of Defense is on a path to gradu-

ally eliminate dependence on Russia as quickly as possible while fostering competition among American companies. NASA needs to do the same. NASA needs to do the same. NASA needs to do the same.

Sanctions, by definition, require tradeoffs. Sanctions are not free. Countries that impose sanctions must be willing to pay a cost, too, if and when a greater principle, a great national security interest, is at stake.

Let me conclude because I note the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the ranking member here. There are costs and tradeoffs the United States has been asking our European allies to make in the last few years. We have leaned on France to cancel a sale of naval vessels to Russia. We have been warning Central and Eastern European allies against deepening their dependence on Russian energy with various energy deals and infrastructure projects. We should not be asking our allies to make these sacrifices unless we are prepared to do the same.

We will probably pass this amendment. If there is ever a doubt in any of our constituents' minds about the influence of special interests, it will be with passage of this amendment—which, by the way, with all due respect to my friends and colleagues, was the one thing they didn't want. The one thing they didn't want was an on-the-record vote on this amendment, which is why I am confident it will lose, but I want every Member of the U.S. Senate to look in the eyes of the mother whose son was just killed by a Russian sniper, as I did, down in Mariupol not too long ago.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment. I know how it is going to come out, but Members of the U.S. Senate will at least be on record. I say this is not the most courageous chapter in the history of this institution. I urge a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am not involving myself in this debate.

I just want to say to Senator MCCAIN: You demonstrated yesterday the best of the U.S. Senate when an issue like this arose, and instead of blocking a vote, you said you were glad to have a vote. You are obviously in strong disagreement with the substance of this amendment.

I just want to tell you how much I personally appreciate your allowing a vote on this, the role you played in all things Russia and Iran, your forceful nature on these issues, your great leadership, and the role you have played in getting us today to a vote that isn't requiring cloture, where you have allowed this amendment to take place. I cannot tell you how much I appreciate that and appreciate the role you play in this body.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and my friend from Maryland.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Arizona as well for allowing this vote to move forward, but in his statements, he said NASA needs to do the same. He repeated it several times.

I would just say that this amendment could actually be titled "NASA Needs to Do the Same" because what we had agreed to last year, when it comes to defense, is a way forward on the Atlas V rocket, the RD-180. We agreed to that. I believe it was a unanimous consent agreement. If there was an objection at that time, then it should have been expressed when we made this agreement.

Our colleagues across the aisle, for a unanimous consent, it takes all of us 100 people to agree to a unanimous consent agreement. That agreement was made on the National Defense Authorization Act. NASA needs to do the same.

Our colleague, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, MARK WARNER, made the point of parity between civil, commercial, and defense. That is what this amendment does.

There are a lot of issues that we come to the floor and we talk about this issue not being rocket science: It is not that difficult. It is not rocket science. Well, we actually have an issue that is rocket science. The mission set before American astronauts is jeopardized if this amendment doesn't pass. The taxpayers of this country face billions of dollars in costs if this amendment doesn't pass. Reliance on Russian technology to get to the space station or resupplying American astronauts will increase if this amendment doesn't pass.

If we want to talk about protecting the people of this country, let's talk about the victims of floods in Colorado, let's talk about people who have died in tornadoes because we didn't have the most accurate ability to forecast where they were coming from, when they were going to strike, and who would be hit. This amendment will allow these weather satellites to go into space to protect the men and women of this country from natural disasters. Again, it brings parity to an agreement that was decided upon through unanimous consent last year.

I support the underlying legislation, and I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it as well. I thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for their leadership on this committee.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I applaud the bipartisan work that my Senate

colleagues have put into legislation to impose sanctions on Russia. Russia's interference in the 2016 election represents an assault on our democracy that, until this point, has gone largely unanswered by the Administration and Congress. Russia has also conducted cyber attacks on allies and illegally invaded and violated the sovereignty of Ukraine and Georgia. I know that my colleagues take this issue very seriously, and I support the bipartisan compromise, which will maintain existing sanctions on Russia for its cyber and military intrusions in Ukraine and require additional mandatory sanctions on Russia's energy sector, those providing arms to Syrian troops, corrupt Russian oligarchs and their networks, and human rights abusers. We cannot allow Russia's hostile actions toward Western democracies to go unchecked. This legislation sends an important message to Russia and the world that the United States stands strongly against Russia's anti-democratic actions.

At the same time, the original version of the legislation would have had unintended consequences for our nation's civil and commercial space sectors. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, and commercial space missions are critical to space exploration, weather data, and sending U.S. astronauts to the International Space Station, as well as supplying them with cargo and instruments for scientific research. Under the original legislation, these missions would have been threatened or prevented from moving forward. In response, Senator GARDNER introduced an amendment that would exempt NASA and commercial space-related launch activities from the sanctions bill. I was proud to cosponsor this amendment.

In addition to our defense assets, Virginia is at the epicenter of the Nation's civil space program and commercial space industry. For more than 70 years, NASA's Wallops Flight Facility has served as a key national asset to the U.S. space program, an economic driver for the Eastern Shore, and an invaluable benefit to the Commonwealth. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Spaceport at Wallops Island serves as a leader in commercial space, partnering with Virginia-headquartered Orbital ATK to launch critical cargo to the International Space Station. Finally, research projects at NASA Langley Research Center and Virginia's superb academic institutions are developing tomorrow's innovative technologies and scientific discoveries. As Governor and now Senator, I have remained a strong supporter of Virginia's booming industry, research, and launch services. Without Senator GARDNER's amendment, some of these activities in Virginia would cease to exist.

To be clear, I stand in agreement with my Senate colleagues on the issue

of Russian sanctions. I also believe that our space program must transition to American-made rocket engines and parts, and I know that U.S. companies are working hard in conjunction with NASA toward that goal. But we need time for that transition to occur, and this important amendment would make it possible without hurting our current capabilities. In addition, while the Department of Defense has been afforded the opportunity to develop new technologies while maintaining the status quo, it is only fair that we provide the same chance to civil and commercial space entities.

For these reasons, I was proud to cosponsor Senator GARDNER's bipartisan amendment to S. 722. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future to enhance and expand our Nation's space program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator CARDIN and I will speak for a few moments, and then we will have three votes, one of which will be on the RD-180 issue, one of which will be on the NATO issue, and then final passage; is that correct? Am I correct in that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 6 minutes remaining before the first vote on the Gardner amendment.

Mr. CORKER. Then there will be a series of votes, with no comments made in advance of those votes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I will be very brief, and we will split our time.

I want to say that, to me, today the U.S. Senate is functioning in the way our Founders intended for it to function.

It has been my goal, since the beginning of my leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee, for our committee and for this Senate to reaffirm its role in foreign policy issues. Today, the U.S. Senate, in a time of uncertainty around our Nation and uncertainty about some of our foreign policy issues, is asserting its responsibilities as it relates to foreign policy for the United States of America. I thank Senators on both sides of the aisle for the role they have played in getting us here.

This is a very strong piece of legislation that in many ways has almost occurred under the radar screen because of the way it has been done. The fact that we have had no cloture vote, the fact that we are having amendments, as has been discussed before, and the fact that this legislation sends a very strong signal to Russia that the nefarious activities they have been involved in—it does the same with Iran, with the activities outside of the JCPOA that they have been involved in, affirming our commitment to NATO,

which we will do to article 5, NATO, in just a few moments.

I thank this body. I thank Leaders MCCONNELL and SCHUMER for allowing the environment to exist for us to work in the manner we have. I thank our ranking member, Senator CARDIN, and those members—Senator CRAPO and BROWN and others—who have played such a significant role. Senator MCCAIN is on the floor, Senator GRAHAM, Senator RUBIO, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator SHAHEEN—so many members who have gotten us to this place.

This is a great moment for the U.S. Senate. This is the way the Senate is supposed to function, and this is the way the Senate is supposed to exercise its prerogatives as it relates to foreign policy, a great moment for our body.

Senator CARDIN.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, first, to Senator CORKER. There is a reason Members want to serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We had a long list of Members who wanted to join our committee in this Congress. Quite frankly, I think the reason they want to join is not only the challenges we have globally but the fact that this is a committee that works bipartisanship and respects the views of every single Member, both Democratic and Republican, on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The bill we have before us reflects that—in the best tradition of the U.S. Senate and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That is due, in large part, because of the talent, leadership, and commitment of our chairman. I thank Senator CORKER for allowing us to reach this very important moment in the U.S. Senate, to be able to vote on a bill that is consequential for America's national security.

I believe this is the first major bill we have had on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the first bill we have had amendments to, and I concur in the Senator's observations that our leaders allowed us to let the process work in the best traditions of the U.S. Senate.

It is difficult for many of us to explain how the Senate operates at times. It really is difficult, but it is a body which respects the rights of each Member, and they have certain abilities to slow things down or bring us to a stop, and the process doesn't work the way it is supposed to work, but this bill has been handled very quickly on a major subject because we respected the rights of every single Member of the U.S. Senate. It doesn't mean we reach total agreement. We didn't, but we have a bill that accomplishes three very important things:

First, it stands up to the aggression of Russia and Iran. Yes, we have been talking about this—and I am glad Senator MCCAIN is on the floor. Senator MCCAIN has been one of the most ardent crusaders to point out the risk factors of Russia to our national security and that of our allies.

I started with Senator MCCAIN in January. We sat down, and he informed me why we had to do certain things and make it very clear and not have any ambiguity because Russia would run right through that ambiguity. Thanks to that initial leadership, we have those provisions in the underlying bill. There will be no ambiguity as to what Congress is saying in regard to Russia's behavior.

I also acknowledge we have a review process in here. Senator GRAHAM brought that to our attention very early in the process in January so Congress can insert itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. That review process will give Congress the right role to review executive actions so we are stronger, working together. It also gives the President a stronger hand in negotiating with Mr. Putin and Russia because Congress has said: You must accomplish certain objectives, such as getting Russia's aggression to end in Ukraine or get Russia to stop supporting war crimes in Syria, to stop interfering with our democratic election systems. That is what we say, and we are very clear about that.

Then we take the third step, which I think is very important; that is, provide the wherewithal of U.S. leadership, working with our European allies, to protect our democratic institutions.

All of that is included in the bill that we are going to have a chance to vote on in a few minutes, and I want to thank all who were involved. I am going to include staff who worked so hard on this.

They were here 24/7 putting this bill together—Damian Murphy, in my office; Margaret Taylor; and Jessica Lewis, Dana Stroul, Lowell Schwartz, Sean Bartlett, Chris Barr, John Ryan, Leslie Bull, Danny Ricchetti, as well as Todd Womack, Rob Strayer, David Kinzler, and Ben Purser.

They were extraordinary in helping us reach this day.

Mr. CORKER. No question. I thank the Senator for those comments.

Our staffs have been remarkable, and the years of experience and knowledge they bring to this no doubt allowed us to do something so substantial in an amount of time, yet do so in a methodical way.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 250, as modified, offered by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. GARDNER.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Leg.]

YEAS—94

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Alexander    | Franken    | Nelson     |
| Baldwin      | Gardner    | Paul       |
| Barrasso     | Gillibrand | Perdue     |
| Bennet       | Grassley   | Peters     |
| Blunt        | Harris     | Portman    |
| Booker       | Hassan     | Reed       |
| Boozman      | Hatch      | Risch      |
| Brown        | Heinrich   | Roberts    |
| Burr         | Heitkamp   | Rounds     |
| Cantwell     | Heller     | Rubio      |
| Capito       | Hirono     | Sanders    |
| Cardin       | Hoeven     | Schatz     |
| Carper       | Inhofe     | Schumer    |
| Casey        | Isakson    | Scott      |
| Cassidy      | Johnson    | Shaheen    |
| Cochran      | Kaine      | Shelby     |
| Collins      | Kennedy    | Stabenow   |
| Coons        | King       | Strange    |
| Corker       | Klobuchar  | Tester     |
| Cornyn       | Lankford   | Thune      |
| Cortez Masto | Leahy      | Tillis     |
| Cotton       | Lee        | Toomey     |
| Crapo        | Manchin    | Udall      |
| Cruz         | Markey     | Van Hollen |
| Daines       | McCaskill  | Warner     |
| Donnelly     | McConnell  | Warren     |
| Duckworth    | Menendez   | Whitehouse |
| Durbin       | Merkley    | Wicker     |
| Enzi         | Moran      | Wyden      |
| Feinstein    | Murkowski  | Young      |
| Fischer      | Murphy     |            |
| Flake        | Murray     |            |

NAYS—6

|            |        |          |
|------------|--------|----------|
| Blumenthal | Graham | Sasse    |
| Ernst      | McCain | Sullivan |

The amendment (No. 250), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, evenly split between Senator CORKER and me, to speak on the NATO amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would add that my fellow Ohioan, Senator PORTMAN, is a cosponsor of this. Special thanks go to Senator GRAHAM—this is the Graham-Brown NATO amendment—also to Senators MCCAIN, RUBIO, CASEY, and JACK REED and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island.

This is especially important to the Ukrainian community in my State. A number of them have been in town the last couple of days. They know how critical support for our allies is and how important it is that this amendment sends a clear message that the United States will uphold our half-century commitment to NATO, combined with a strong signal to Russia to clean up its act. That is the importance of this amendment. I ask support from my colleagues.

I yield to Senator CORKER.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank all those involved in the message that is being sent. I support the amendment, and I urge a “yes” vote. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 240, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. CORKER.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 146 Leg.]

#### YEAS—100

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

The amendment (No. 240) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Under the previous order, the committee-reported substitute, as amended, is agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 147 Leg.]

#### YEAS—98

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

#### NAYS—2

Paul Sanders

The bill (S. 722), as amended, was passed, as follows:

#### S. 722

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Countering Iran’s Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Regional strategy for countering conventional and asymmetric Iranian threats in the Middle East and North Africa.

Sec. 4. Imposition of additional sanctions in response to Iran’s ballistic missile program.

Sec. 5. Imposition of terrorism-related sanctions with respect to the IRGC.

Sec. 6. Imposition of additional sanctions with respect to persons responsible for human rights abuses.

Sec. 7. Enforcement of arms embargos.

Sec. 8. Review of applicability of sanctions relating to Iran’s support for terrorism and its ballistic missile program.

Sec. 9. Report on coordination of sanctions between the United States and the European Union.

Sec. 10. Report on United States citizens detained by Iran.

Sec. 11. Exceptions for national security and humanitarian assistance; rule of construction.

Sec. 12. Presidential waiver authority.

#### TITLE II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND COMBATING TERRORISM AND ILLICIT FINANCING

Sec. 201. Short title.

Subtitle A—Sanctions and Other Measures With Respect to the Russian Federation

Sec. 211. Findings.

Sec. 212. Sense of Congress.

#### PART I—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Sec. 215. Short title.

Sec. 216. Congressional review of certain actions relating to sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation.

#### PART II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Sec. 221. Definitions.

Sec. 222. Codification of sanctions relating to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 223. Modification of implementation of Executive Order 13662.

Sec. 224. Imposition of sanctions with respect to activities of the Russian Federation undermining cybersecurity.

Sec. 225. Imposition of sanctions relating to special Russian crude oil projects.

Sec. 226. Imposition of sanctions with respect to Russian and other foreign financial institutions.

Sec. 227. Mandatory imposition of sanctions with respect to significant corruption in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 228. Mandatory imposition of sanctions with respect to certain transactions with foreign sanctions evaders and serious human rights abusers in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 229. Notifications to Congress under Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014.

Sec. 230. Standards for termination of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 231. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons engaging in transactions with the intelligence or defense sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 232. Sanctions with respect to the development of pipelines in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 233. Sanctions with respect to investment in or facilitation of privatization of state-owned assets by the Russian Federation.

Sec. 234. Sanctions with respect to the transfer of arms and related materiel to Syria.

Sec. 235. Sanctions described.

Sec. 236. Exceptions, waiver, and termination.

Sec. 237. Exception relating to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Sec. 238. Rule of construction.

#### PART III—REPORTS

Sec. 241. Report on oligarchs and parastatal entities of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 242. Report on effects of expanding sanctions to include sovereign debt and derivative products.

Sec. 243. Report on illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation.

Subtitle B—Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia

Sec. 251. Findings.

Sec. 252. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 253. Statement of policy.

Sec. 254. Coordinating aid and assistance across Europe and Eurasia.

Sec. 255. Report on media organizations controlled and funded by the Government of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 256. Report on Russian Federation influence on elections in Europe and Eurasia.

Sec. 257. Ukrainian energy security.

Sec. 258. Termination.

Sec. 259. Appropriate congressional committees defined.

Subtitle C—Combating Terrorism and Illicit Financing

PART I—NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORIST AND OTHER ILLICIT FINANCING

Sec. 261. Development of national strategy.

Sec. 262. Contents of national strategy.

PART II—ENHANCING ANTITERRORISM TOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Sec. 271. Improving antiterror finance monitoring of funds transfers.

Sec. 272. Sense of Congress on international cooperation regarding terrorist financing intelligence.

Sec. 273. Examining the counter-terror financing role of the Department of the Treasury in embassies.

Sec. 274. Inclusion of Secretary of the Treasury on the National Security Council.

Sec. 275. Inclusion of all funds.

PART III—DEFINITIONS

Sec. 281. Definitions.

Subtitle D—Rule of Construction

Sec. 291. Rule of construction.

Sec. 292. Sense of Senate on the strategic importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The term “act of international terrorism” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term “Iranian person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of Iran; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of Iran or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran.

(5) IRGC.—The term “IRGC” means Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

(6) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(7) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 3. REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR COUNTERING CONVENTIONAL AND ASYMMETRIC IRANIAN THREATS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly develop

and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for deterring conventional and asymmetric Iranian activities and threats that directly threaten the United States and key allies in the Middle East, North Africa, and beyond.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include at a minimum the following:

(1) A summary of the near- and long-term United States objectives, plans, and means for countering Iran’s destabilizing activities, including identification of countries that share the objective of countering Iran’s destabilizing activities.

(2) A summary of the capabilities and contributions of individual countries to shared efforts to counter Iran’s destabilizing activities, and a summary of additional actions or contributions that each country could take to further contribute.

(3) An assessment of Iran’s conventional force capabilities and an assessment of Iran’s plans to upgrade its conventional force capabilities, including its acquisition, development, and deployment of ballistic and cruise missile capabilities, unmanned aerial vehicles, and maritime offensive and anti-access or area denial capabilities.

(4) An assessment of Iran’s chemical and biological weapons capabilities and an assessment of Iranian plans to upgrade its chemical or biological weapons capabilities.

(5) An assessment of Iran’s asymmetric activities in the region, including—

(A) the size, capabilities, and activities of the IRGC, including the Quds Force;

(B) the size, capabilities, and activities of Iran’s cyber operations;

(C) the types and amount of support, including funding, lethal and nonlethal contributions, and training, provided to Hezbollah, Hamas, special groups in Iraq, the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Houthi fighters in Yemen, and other violent groups across the Middle East; and

(D) the scope and objectives of Iran’s information operations and use of propaganda.

(6) A summary of United States actions, unilaterally and in cooperation with foreign governments, to counter destabilizing Iranian activities, including—

(A) interdiction of Iranian lethal arms bound for groups designated as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) Iran’s interference in international commercial shipping lanes;

(C) attempts by Iran to undermine or subvert internationally recognized governments in the Middle East region; and

(D) Iran’s support for the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, including—

(i) financial assistance, military equipment and personnel, and other support provided to that regime; and

(ii) support and direction to other armed actors that are not Syrian or Iranian and are acting on behalf of that regime.

(c) FORM OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS IN RESPONSE TO IRAN’S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State should continue to implement Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters).

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to any person that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(2) is a successor entity to a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(4) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that would otherwise be imposed pursuant to paragraph (3);

(5) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4); or

(6) knowingly provides or attempts to provide financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4) or (5).

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (b) that is an alien.

(d) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (c)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(e) REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO IRAN’S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing each person that—

(A) has, during the period specified in paragraph (2), conducted any activity that has materially contributed to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(B) is a successor entity to a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(D) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that could be imposed as a

result of a relationship described in subparagraph (C);

(E) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

(F) is known or believed to have provided, or attempted to provide, during the period specified in paragraph (2), financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, any material contribution to a program described in subparagraph (A) carried out by a person described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E).

(2) **PERIOD SPECIFIED.**—The period specified in this paragraph is—

(A) in the case of the first report submitted under paragraph (1), the period beginning January 1, 2016, and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(B) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

#### **SEC. 5. IMPOSITION OF TERRORISM-RELATED SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IRGC.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The IRGC is subject to sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), Executive Order 13553 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of certain persons with respect to serious human rights abuses by the Government of Iran), and Executive Order 13606 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking the property and suspending entry into the United States of certain persons with respect to grave human rights abuses by the Governments of Iran and Syria via information technology).

(2) The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps-Quds Force (in this section referred to as the “IRGC-QF”) is the primary arm of the Government of Iran for executing its policy of supporting terrorist and insurgent groups. The IRGC-QF provides material, logistical assistance, training, and financial support to militants and terrorist operatives throughout the Middle East and South Asia and was designated for the imposition of sanctions by the Secretary of Treasury pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism) in October 2007 for its support of terrorism.

(3) The IRGC, not just the IRGC-QF, is responsible for implementing Iran’s international program of destabilizing activities, support for acts of international terrorism, and ballistic missile program.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to the IRGC and foreign persons that are officials, agents, or affiliates of the IRGC.

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions applicable with respect to a foreign person pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

#### **SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of each person the Secretary determines, based on credible evidence, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) is responsible for extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed against individuals in Iran who seek—

(A) to expose illegal activity carried out by officials of the Government of Iran; or

(B) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote internationally recognized human rights and freedoms, such as the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections; or

(2) acts as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign person in a matter relating to an activity described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person on the list required by subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

#### **SEC. 7. ENFORCEMENT OF ARMS EMBARGOS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (d), the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the supply, sale, or transfer directly or indirectly to or from Iran, or for the use in or benefit of Iran, of any battle tanks, armored combat vehicles, large caliber artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, missiles or missile systems, as defined for the purpose of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, or related materiel, including spare parts; or

(2) knowingly provides to Iran any technical training, financial resources or services, advice, other services or assistance related to the supply, sale, transfer, manufacture, maintenance, or use of arms and related materiel described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.

(c) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) **EXCEPTION.**—The President is not required to impose sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person for engaging in an activity described in that subsection if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) permitting the activity is in the national security interest of the United States;

(2) Iran no longer presents a significant threat to the national security of the United States and to the allies of the United States; and

(3) the Government of Iran has ceased providing operational or financial support for acts of international terrorism and no longer satisfies the requirements for designation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(e) **STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “state sponsor of terrorism” means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

(1) section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)(1)(A)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(2) section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a));

(3) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

(4) any other provision of law.

#### **SEC. 8. REVIEW OF APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO IRAN’S SUPPORT FOR TERRORISM AND ITS BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall conduct a review of all persons on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury for activities relating to Iran—

(1) to assess the conduct of such persons as that conduct relates to—

(A) any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program; or

(B) support by the Government of Iran for acts of international terrorism; and

(2) to determine the applicability of sanctions with respect to such persons under—

(A) Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters); or

(B) Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS.**—If the President determines under subsection (a) that sanctions under an Executive Order specified in paragraph (2) of that subsection



are applicable with respect to a person, the President shall—

- (1) impose sanctions with respect to that person pursuant to that Executive Order; or
- (2) exercise the waiver authority provided under section 12.

#### **SEC. 9. REPORT ON COORDINATION OF SANCTIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN UNION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of each instance, during the period specified in subsection (b)—

(A) in which the United States has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the European Union has not imposed corresponding sanctions; and

(B) in which the European Union has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the United States has not imposed corresponding sanctions.

(2) An explanation for the reason for each discrepancy between sanctions imposed by the European Union and sanctions imposed by the United States described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) **PERIOD SPECIFIED.**—The period specified in this subsection is—

(1) in the case of the first report submitted under subsection (a), the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(2) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

#### **SEC. 10. REPORT ON UNITED STATES CITIZENS DETAINED BY IRAN.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United States citizens, including United States citizens who are also citizens of other countries, detained by Iran or groups supported by Iran that includes—

(1) information regarding any officials of the Government of Iran involved in any way in the detentions; and

(2) a summary of efforts the United States Government has taken to secure the swift release of those United States citizens.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

#### **SEC. 11. EXCEPTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under sections 4, 5, 6, and 7:

(1) Any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.),

or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations of the United States.

(3) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Iran or for the provision of humanitarian assistance to the people of Iran, including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.

(b) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—A requirement or the authority to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 shall not include the authority to impose sanctions with respect to the importation of goods.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this Act.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act (other than subsection (b)) shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.**—The term “agricultural commodity” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) **GOOD.**—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) **MEDICAL DEVICE.**—The term “medical device” has the meaning given the term “device” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) **MEDICINE.**—The term “medicine” has the meaning given the term “drug” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

#### **SEC. 12. PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.**

(a) **CASE-BY-CASE WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis and for a period of not more than 180 days, a requirement under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a person, and may waive the continued imposition of such sanctions, not less than 30 days after the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to waive such sanctions.

(2) **RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.**—The President may, on a case-by-case basis, renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for an additional period of not more than 180 days if, not later than 15 days before that waiver expires, the President makes the determination and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report described in paragraph (1).

(3) **SUCCESSIVE RENEWAL.**—The renewal authority provided under paragraph (2) may be exercised for additional successive periods of not more than 180 days if the President follows the procedures set forth in paragraph (2), and submits the report described in paragraph (1), for each such renewal.

(b) **CONTENTS OF WAIVER REPORTS.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) in connection with a waiver of sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 with respect to a person, or the renewal of such a waiver, shall include—

(1) a specific and detailed rationale for the determination that the waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States;

(2) a description of the activity that resulted in the person being subject to sanctions;

(3) an explanation of any efforts made by the United States, as applicable, to secure the cooperation of the government with primary jurisdiction over the person or the location where the activity described in paragraph (2) occurred in terminating or, as appropriate, penalizing the activity; and

(4) an assessment of the significance of the activity described in paragraph (2) in contributing to the ability of Iran to threaten the interests of the United States or allies of the United States, develop systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, support acts of international terrorism, or violate the human rights of any person in Iran.

(c) **EFFECT OF REPORT ON WAIVER.**—If the President submits a report under subsection (a) in connection with a waiver of sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 with respect to a person, or the renewal of such a waiver, the President shall not be required to impose or maintain sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as applicable, with respect to the person described in the report during the 30-day period referred to in subsection (a).

#### **TITLE II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND COMBATING TERRORISM AND ILLICIT FINANCING**

##### **SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

##### **Subtitle A—Sanctions and Other Measures With Respect to the Russian Federation**

##### **SEC. 211. FINDINGS.**

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On March 6, 2014, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on those determined to be undermining democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine or threatening the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine. President Obama subsequently issued Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) and Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) to expand sanctions on certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine.

(2) On December 18, 2014, the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 was enacted (Public Law 113-272; 22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.), which includes provisions directing the President to

impose sanctions on foreign persons that the President determines to be entities owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or nationals of the Russian Federation that manufacture, sell, transfer, or otherwise provide certain defense articles into Syria.

(3) On April 1, 2015, President Obama issued Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on persons determined to be engaged in malicious cyber-hacking.

(4) On July 26, 2016, President Obama approved a Presidential Policy Directive on United States Cyber Incident Coordination, which states, “certain cyber incidents that have significant impacts on an entity, our national security, or the broader economy require a unique approach to response efforts”.

(5) On December 29, 2016, President Obama issued an annex to Executive Order 13694, which authorized sanctions on the following entities and individuals:

(A) The Main Intelligence Directorate (also known as Glavnoe Razvedyvatel’noe Upravlenie or the GRU) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(B) The Federal Security Service (also known as Federalnaya Sluzhba Bezopasnosti or the FSB) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(C) The Special Technology Center (also known as STLC, Ltd. Special Technology Center St. Petersburg) in St. Petersburg, Russian Federation.

(D) Zorsecurity (also known as Esage Lab) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(E) The autonomous noncommercial organization known as the Professional Association of Designers of Data Processing Systems (also known as ANO PO KSI) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(F) Igor Valentinovich Korobov.

(G) Sergey Aleksandrovich Gizunov.

(H) Igor Olegovich Kostyukov.

(I) Vladimir Stepanovich Alexseyev.

(6) On January 6, 2017, an assessment of the United States intelligence community entitled, “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections” stated, “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the United States presidential election.” The assessment warns that “Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes”.

#### SEC. 212. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the President—

(1) should engage to the fullest extent possible with partner governments with regard to closing loopholes, including the allowance of extended prepayment for the delivery of goods and commodities and other loopholes, in multilateral and unilateral restrictive measures against the Russian Federation, with the aim of maximizing alignment of those measures; and

(2) should increase efforts to vigorously enforce compliance with sanctions in place as of the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to the Russian Federation in response to the crisis in eastern Ukraine, cyber intrusions and attacks, and human rights violators in the Russian Federation.

### PART I—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

#### SEC. 215. SHORT TITLE.

The part may be cited as the “Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017”.

#### SEC. 216. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIONS RELATING TO SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before taking any action described in paragraph (2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes the proposed action and the reasons for that action.

(2) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An action described in this paragraph is—

(i) an action to terminate the application of any sanctions described in subparagraph (B);

(ii) with respect to sanctions described in subparagraph (B) imposed by the President with respect to a person, an action to waive the application of those sanctions with respect to that person; or

(iii) a licensing action that significantly alters United States’ foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subparagraph are—

(i) sanctions provided for under—

(I) this title or any provision of law amended by this title, including the Executive Orders codified under section 222;

(II) the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.); or

(III) the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.); and

(ii) the prohibition on access to the properties of the Government of the Russian Federation located in Maryland and New York that the President ordered vacated on December 29, 2016.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF ACTION.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) shall include a description of whether the action—

(A) is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; or

(B) is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(4) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation shall include a description of—

(i) the significant alteration to United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation;

(ii) the anticipated effect of the action on the national security interests of the United States; and

(iii) the policy objectives for which the sanctions affected by the action were initially imposed.

(B) REQUESTS FROM BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEES.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives may request the submission to the Committee of the matter described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a report

submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report; and

(B) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a)(1) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under paragraph (1) of a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not take that action unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that action is enacted in accordance with subsection (c).

(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action for a period of 12 calendar days after the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), and the President vetoes the joint resolution, the President may not take that action for a period of 10 calendar days after the date of the President’s veto.

(6) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) is enacted in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection:

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of approval” means

only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution approving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.”; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress approves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on relating to \_\_\_\_\_.”,

with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(2) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of disapproval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.”; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on relating to \_\_\_\_\_.”,

with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader’s designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader’s designee).

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

(i) referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs if the joint resolution relates to a report under section 216 A3 that is described as an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; and

(ii) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations if the joint resolution relates to a report under section 216 A3 that is described as an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to the Russian Federation.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of that House, that House receives an identical joint resolution from the other House, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the joint resolution from the other House—

(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(B) TREATMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of the other House shall be entitled to expedited procedures in that House under this subsection.

(C) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

(D) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

(7) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

## PART II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

### SEC. 221. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) GOOD.—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) **INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “international financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)).

(4) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(6) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

#### **SEC. 222. CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **CODIFICATION.**—United States sanctions provided for in Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine), Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), and Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including with respect to all persons sanctioned under such Executive Orders, shall remain in effect except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) **TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions described in subsection (a) that are imposed on a person in connection with activity conducted by the person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions described in subsection (a) in the future.

(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive Order 13694 or 13757 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) **APPLICATION OF NEW UKRAINE-RELATED SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive Order 13660, 13661, 13662, or 13685 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

#### **SEC. 223. MODIFICATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13662.**

(a) **DETERMINATION THAT CERTAIN ENTITIES ARE SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may determine that a person meets one or more of the criteria in section 1(a) of Executive Order 13662 if that person is a state-owned entity operating in the railway, shipping, or metals and mining sector of the economy of the Russian Federation.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 1 WITH RESPECT TO THE FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 14 days maturity or new equity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(c) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 2 WITH RESPECT TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 2 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 30 days maturity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(d) **MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 4.**—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 4, dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the provision, exportation, or reexportation, directly or indirectly, by United States persons or persons within the United States, of goods, services (except for financial services), or technology in support of exploration or production for deepwater, Arctic offshore, or shale projects—

(1) that have the potential to produce oil;

(2) in which a Russian energy firm is involved; and

(3) that involve any person determined to be subject to the directive or the property or interests in property of such a person.

#### **SEC. 224. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ACTIVITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(1) impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(A) knowingly engages in significant activities undermining cybersecurity against any person, including a democratic institution, or government on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person described in subparagraph (A);

(2) impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services (except financial services) in support of, an activity described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(3) impose 3 or more of the sanctions described in section 4(c) of the of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(c)) with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly provides financial services in support of an activity described in paragraph (1)(A).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.**—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) **SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “significant activities undermining cybersecurity” includes—

(1) significant efforts—

(A) to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy an information and communications technology system or network; or

(B) to exfiltrate, degrade, corrupt, destroy, or release information from such a system or network without authorization for purposes of—

- (i) conducting influence operations; or
- (ii) causing a significant misappropriation of funds, economic resources, trade secrets, personal identifications, or financial information for commercial or competitive advantage or private financial gain;
- (2) significant destructive malware attacks; and
- (3) significant denial of service activities.

**SEC. 225. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO SPECIAL RUSSIAN CRUDE OIL PROJECTS.**

Section 4(b)(1) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(b)(1)) is amended by striking “on and after the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may impose” and inserting “on and after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017, the President shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so.”.

**SEC. 226. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**

Section 5 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—
  - (A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so.”; and
  - (B) by striking “on or after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”; and
- (2) in subsection (b)—
  - (A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so.”; and
  - (B) by striking “on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 227. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908(a)) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—
  - (A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “is authorized and encouraged to” and inserting “shall”; and
  - (B) in paragraph (1)—
    - (i) by striking “President determines is” and inserting “President determines is, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017.”; and
    - (ii) by inserting “or elsewhere” after “in the Russian Federation”;
  - (2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);
  - (3) in subsection (c), by striking “The President” and inserting “except as provided in subsection (d), the President”; and
  - (4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.”.

**SEC. 228. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSERS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 10. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS THAT EVADE SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) materially violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any license, order, regulation, or prohibition contained in or issued pursuant to any covered Executive order; or

“(2) facilitates significant deceptive or structured transactions for or on behalf of—

“(A) any person subject to sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to the Russian Federation; or

“(B) any child, spouse, parent, or sibling of an individual described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b).

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(d) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application

of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act;

“(2) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine; and

“(3) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraphs (E) or (F) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

“(e) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice that—

“(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ‘covered Executive order’ means any of the following:

“(A) Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(B) Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(C) Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(D) Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

“(E) Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(F) Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ‘foreign person’ has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017).

“(3) **STRUCTURED.**—The term ‘structured’, with respect to a transaction, has the meaning given the term ‘structure’ in paragraph (xx) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).”

**“SEC. 11. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person, based on credible information, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation;

“(2) materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to, a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

“(3) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).”

“(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

“(1) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.**—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

“(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made efforts to reduce serious human rights abuses in territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by that Government.

“(d) **IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.**—

“(1) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b)(1).

“(2) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b)(1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c)

of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(e) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice—

“(A) that—

“(i) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future; or

“(B) that the President determines that insufficient basis exists for the determination by the President under subsection (a) with respect to the person.”

(b) **DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—Section 2(2) of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,” before “the Committee on Foreign Relations”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “the Committee on Financial Services” before “the Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

**SEC. 229. NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS UNDER UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014.**

(a) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO DEFENSE AND ENERGY SECTORS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**—Section 4 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) **NOTIFICATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign person under subsection (a) or (b).

“(2) **TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN PRODUCERS, TRANSFERORS, OR BROKERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.**—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a)(2) with respect to a foreign person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(A) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(B) a notice that—

“(i) the foreign person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the foreign person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a)(2) in the future.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (B)(ii) of subsection (a)(3), by striking “subsection (h)” and inserting “subsection (i)”.

(b) **SANCTIONS ON RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—Section 5 of

the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign financial institution under subsection (a) or (b).”; and

(3) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “section 4(h)” and inserting “section 4(i)”.

**SEC. 230. STANDARDS FOR TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING THE PEACE, SECURITY, STABILITY, SOVEREIGNTY, OR TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF UKRAINE.**—Section 8 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8907) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”

(b) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO CORRUPTION.**—Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”

**SEC. 231. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS ENGAGING IN TRANSACTIONS WITH THE INTELLIGENCE OR DEFENSE SECTORS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to a person the President determines knowingly, on or after such date of enactment, engages in a significant transaction with a person that is part of, or operates for or on behalf of, the defense or intelligence sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation, including the Main Intelligence Agency of the General Staff of the



Armed Forces of the Russian Federation or the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation.

(b) **APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

**SEC. 232. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PIPELINES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment described in subsection (b) or sells, leases, or provides to the Russian Federation, for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, goods, services, technology, information, or support described in subsection (c)—

(1) any of which has a fair market value of \$1,000,000 or more; or

(2) that, during a 12-month period, have an aggregate fair market value of \$5,000,000 or more.

(b) **INVESTMENT DESCRIBED.**—An investment described in this subsection is an investment that directly and significantly contributes to the enhancement of the ability of the Russian Federation to construct energy export pipelines.

(c) **GOODS, SERVICES, TECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION, OR SUPPORT DESCRIBED.**—Goods, services, technology, information, or support described in this subsection are goods, services, technology, information, or support that could directly and significantly facilitate the maintenance or expansion of the construction, modernization, or repair of energy pipelines by the Russian Federation.

**SEC. 233. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO INVESTMENT IN OR FACILITATION OF PRIVATIZATION OF STATE-OWNED ASSETS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 if the President determines that a person, with actual knowledge, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment of \$10,000,000 or more (or any combination of investments of not less than \$1,000,000 each, which in the aggregate equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period), or facilitates such an investment, if the investment directly and significantly contributes to the ability of the Russian Federation to privatize state-owned assets in a manner that unjustly benefits—

(1) officials of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) close associates or family members of those officials.

(b) **APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

**SEC. 234. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF ARMS AND RELATED MATERIAL TO SYRIA.**

(a) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose on a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that such foreign person has, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly exported, transferred, or otherwise provided to Syria significant financial, material, or technological support that contributes materially to the ability of the Government of Syria to—

(A) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies;

(B) acquire or develop ballistic or cruise missile capabilities;

(C) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

(D) acquire significant defense articles, defense services, or defense information (as such terms are defined under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.)); or

(E) acquire items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

(2) **APPLICABILITY TO OTHER FOREIGN PERSONS.**—The sanctions described in subsection (b) shall also be imposed on any foreign person that—

(A) is a successor entity to a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or has acted for or on behalf of, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions to be imposed on a foreign person described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall exercise all powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES.**—If the foreign person is an individual, the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, the foreign person.

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to the foreign person regardless of when issued.

(ii) **EFFECT OF REVOCATION.**—A revocation under clause (i) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any

other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the foreign person.

(c) **WAIVER.**—Subject to section 216, the President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FINANCIAL, MATERIAL, OR TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT.**—The term “financial, material, or technological support” has the meaning given such term in section 542.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(2) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” has the meaning given such term in section 594.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(3) **SYRIA.**—The term “Syria” has the meaning given such term in section 542.316 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

**SEC. 235. SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**

(a) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions to be imposed with respect to a person under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a) are the following:

(1) **EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ASSISTANCE FOR EXPORTS TO SANCTIONED PERSONS.**—The President may direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States not to give approval to the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in the extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the sanctioned person.

(2) **EXPORT SANCTION.**—The President may order the United States Government not to issue any specific license and not to grant any other specific permission or authority to export any goods or technology to the sanctioned person under—

(A) the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(B) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.);

(C) the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); or

(D) any other statute that requires the prior review and approval of the United States Government as a condition for the export or reexport of goods or services.

(3) **LOANS FROM UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The President may prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to the sanctioned person totaling more than \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period unless the person is engaged in activities to relieve human suffering and the loans or credits are provided for such activities.

(4) **LOANS FROM INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The President may direct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any loan from the international financial institution that would benefit the sanctioned person.

(5) **PROHIBITIONS ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The following prohibitions may be imposed against the sanctioned person if that person is a financial institution:

(A) **PROHIBITION ON DESIGNATION AS PRIMARY DEALER.**—Neither the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System nor the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may designate, or permit the continuation of any prior designation of, the financial institution



as a primary dealer in United States Government debt instruments.

(B) **PROHIBITION ON SERVICE AS A REPOSITORY OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS.**—The financial institution may not serve as agent of the United States Government or serve as repository for United States Government funds. The imposition of either sanction under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as 1 sanction for purposes of subsection (b), and the imposition of both such sanctions shall be treated as 2 sanctions for purposes of subsection (b).

(6) **PROCUREMENT SANCTION.**—The United States Government may not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from the sanctioned person.

(7) **FOREIGN EXCHANGE.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the sanctioned person has any interest.

(8) **BANKING TRANSACTIONS.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the sanctioned person.

(9) **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any person from—

(A) acquiring, holding, withholding, using, transferring, withdrawing, transporting, importing, or exporting any property that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and with respect to which the sanctioned person has any interest;

(B) dealing in or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to such property; or

(C) conducting any transaction involving such property.

(10) **BAN ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations or guidelines as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of the sanctioned person.

(11) **EXCLUSION OF CORPORATE OFFICERS.**—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, the sanctioned person.

(12) **SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—The President may impose on the principal executive officer or officers of the sanctioned person, or on persons performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions under this subsection.

(b) **SANCTIONED PERSON DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “sanctioned person” means a person subject to sanctions under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a).

#### **SEC. 236. EXCEPTIONS, WAIVER, AND TERMINATION.**

(a) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The provisions of this part and amendments made by this part shall not apply with respect to the following:

(1) Activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or under other international agreements.

(b) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—No requirement to impose sanctions under this part or an amendment made by this part shall include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(c) **WAIVER OF SANCTIONS THAT ARE IMPOSED.**—Subject to section 216, if the President imposes sanctions with respect to a person under this part or the amendments made by this part, the President may waive the application of those sanctions if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under section 224, 231, 232, 233, or 234 with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

(2) a notice that—

(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under this part in the future.

#### **SEC. 237. EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(2) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

#### **SEC. 238. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this part or the amendments made by this part shall be construed—

(1) to supersede the limitations or exceptions on the use of rocket engines for national security purposes under section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note), as amended by section 1607 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1100) and section 1602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2582); or

(2) to prohibit a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Defense from

acquiring components referred to in such section 1608.

### **PART III—REPORTS**

#### **SEC. 241. REPORT ON OLIGARCHS AND PARASTATAL ENTITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the following:

(1) Senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, including the following:

(A) An identification of the most significant senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, as determined by their closeness to the Russian regime and their net worth.

(B) An assessment of the relationship between individuals identified under subparagraph (A) and President Vladimir Putin or other members of the Russian ruling elite.

(C) An identification of any indices of corruption with respect to those individuals.

(D) The estimated net worth and known sources of income of those individuals and their family members (including spouses, children, parents, and siblings), including assets, investments, other business interests, and relevant beneficial ownership information.

(E) An identification of the non-Russian business affiliations of those individuals.

(2) Russian parastatal entities, including an assessment of the following:

(A) The emergence of Russian parastatal entities and their role in the economy of the Russian Federation.

(B) The leadership structures and beneficial ownership of those entities.

(C) The scope of the non-Russian business affiliations of those entities.

(3) The exposure of key economic sectors of the United States to Russian politically exposed persons and parastatal entities, including, at a minimum, the banking, securities, insurance, and real estate sectors.

(4) The likely effects of imposing debt and equity restrictions on Russian parastatal entities, as well as the anticipated effects of adding Russian parastatal entities to the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(5) The potential impacts of imposing secondary sanctions with respect to Russian oligarchs, Russian state-owned enterprises, and Russian parastatal entities, including impacts on the entities themselves and on the economy of the Russian Federation, as well as on the economies of the United States and allies of the United States.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.**—The term “senior foreign political figure” has

the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

**SEC. 242. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF EXPANDING SANCTIONS TO INCLUDE SOVEREIGN DEBT AND DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing in detail the potential effects of expanding sanctions under Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), or any successor directive, to include sovereign debt and the full range of derivative products.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 243. REPORT ON ILLICIT FINANCE RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the end of each one-year period thereafter until 2021, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing interagency efforts in the United States to combat illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain a summary of efforts by the United States to do the following:

(1) Identify, investigate, map, and disrupt illicit financial flows linked to the Russian Federation if such flows affect the United States financial system or those of major allies of the United States.

(2) Conduct outreach to the private sector, including information sharing efforts to strengthen compliance efforts by entities, including financial institutions, to prevent illicit financial flows described in paragraph (1).

(3) Engage and coordinate with allied international partners on illicit finance, especially in Europe, to coordinate efforts to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for illicit financial flows described in paragraph (1), including examples of that engagement and coordination.

(4) Identify foreign sanctions evaders and loopholes within the sanctions regimes of foreign partners of the United States.

(5) Expand the number of real estate geographic targeting orders or other regulatory actions, as appropriate, to degrade illicit financial activity relating to the Russian Federation in relation to the financial system of the United States.

(6) Provide support to counter those involved in illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation across all appropriate law

enforcement, intelligence, regulatory, and financial authorities of the Federal Government, including by imposing sanctions with respect to or prosecuting those involved.

(7) In the case of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice, investigate or otherwise develop major cases, including a description of those cases.

(c) **BRIEFING.**—After submitting a report under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide briefings to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to that report.

(d) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall coordinate with the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of State in preparing each report under this section.

(e) **FORM.**—Each report submitted under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **ILLICIT FINANCE.**—The term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President.

**Subtitle B—Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia**

**SEC. 251. FINDINGS.**

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the Russian Federation has sought to exert influence throughout Europe and Eurasia, including in the former states of the Soviet Union, by providing resources to political parties, think tanks, and civil society groups that sow distrust in democratic institutions and actors, promote xenophobic and illiberal views, and otherwise undermine European unity. The Government of the Russian Federation has also engaged in well-documented corruption practices as a means toward undermining and buying influence in European and Eurasian countries.

(2) The Government of the Russian Federation has largely eliminated a once-vibrant Russian-language independent media sector and severely curtails free and independent media within the borders of the Russian Federation. Russian-language media organizations that are funded and controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation and disseminate information within and outside of the Russian Federation routinely traffic in anti-Western disinformation, while few independent, fact-based media sources provide objective reporting for Russian-speaking audiences inside or outside of the Russian Federation.

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to violate its commitments under the Memorandum on Security Assurances in connection with Ukraine’s Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Budapest December 5, 1994, and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe Final Act, concluded at Helsinki August 1, 1975 (commonly referred to as the “Helsinki Final

Act”), which laid the ground-work for the establishment of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, of which the Russian Federation is a member, by its illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014, its illegal occupation of South Ossetia and Abkhazia in Georgia in 2008, and its ongoing destabilizing activities in eastern Ukraine.

(4) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to ignore the terms of the August 2008 ceasefire agreement relating to Georgia, which requires the withdrawal of Russian Federation troops, free access by humanitarian groups to the regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and monitoring of the conflict areas by the European Union Monitoring Mission.

(5) The Government of the Russian Federation is failing to comply with the terms of the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, as well as the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014.

(6) The Government of the Russian Federation is—

(A) in violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly known as the “INF Treaty”); and

(B) failing to meet its obligations under the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002 (commonly known as the “Open Skies Treaty”).

**SEC. 252. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation bears responsibility for the continuing violence in Eastern Ukraine, including the death on April 24, 2017, of Joseph Stone, a citizen of the United States working as a monitor for the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

(2) the President should call on the Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) to withdraw all of its forces from the territories of Georgia, Ukraine, and Moldova;

(B) to return control of the borders of those territories to their respective governments; and

(C) to cease all efforts to undermine the popularly elected governments of those countries;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation has applied, and continues to apply, to the countries and peoples of Georgia and Ukraine, traditional uses of force, intelligence operations, and influence campaigns, which represent clear and present threats to the countries of Europe and Eurasia;

(4) in response, the countries of Europe and Eurasia should redouble efforts to build resilience within their institutions, political systems, and civil societies;

(5) the United States supports the institutions that the Government of the Russian Federation seeks to undermine, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union;

(6) a strong North Atlantic Treaty Organization is critical to maintaining peace and security in Europe and Eurasia;

(7) the United States should continue to work with the European Union as a partner against aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation, coordinating aid programs, development assistance, and other counter-Russian efforts;

(8) the United States should encourage the establishment of a commission for media freedom within the Council of Europe, modeled on the Venice Commission regarding rule of law issues, that would be chartered to provide governments with expert recommendations on maintaining legal and regulatory regimes supportive of free and independent media and an informed citizenry able to distinguish between fact-based reporting, opinion, and disinformation;

(9) in addition to working to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, the United States should work with the individual countries of Europe and Eurasia—

(A) to identify vulnerabilities to aggression, disinformation, corruption, and so-called hybrid warfare by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(B) to establish strategic and technical plans for addressing those vulnerabilities;

(C) to ensure that the financial systems of those countries are not being used to shield illicit financial activity by officials of the Government of the Russian Federation or individuals in President Vladimir Putin's inner circle who have been enriched through corruption;

(D) to investigate and prosecute cases of corruption by Russian actors; and

(E) to work toward full compliance with the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (commonly referred to as the "Anti-Bribery Convention") of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development; and

(10) the President of the United States should use the authority of the President to impose sanctions under—

(A) the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112-208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note); and

(B) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

#### SEC. 253. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The United States, consistent with the principle of *ex injuria jus non oritur*, supports the policy known as the "Stimson Doctrine" and thus does not recognize territorial changes effected by force, including the illegal invasions and occupations of Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Crimea, Eastern Ukraine, and Transnistria.

#### SEC. 254. COORDINATING AID AND ASSISTANCE ACROSS EUROPE AND EURASIA.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Countering Russian Influence Fund \$250,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund shall be used to effectively implement, prioritized in the following order and subject to the availability of funds, the following goals:

(1) To assist in protecting critical infrastructure and electoral mechanisms from cyberattacks in the following countries:

(A) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union that the Secretary of State determines—

(i) are vulnerable to influence by the Russian Federation; and

(ii) lack the economic capability to effectively respond to aggression by the Russian Federation without the support of the United States.

(B) Countries that are participating in the enlargement process of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union, including Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Georgia, Macedonia, Moldova, Kosovo, Serbia, and Ukraine.

(2) To combat corruption, improve the rule of law, and otherwise strengthen independent judiciaries and prosecutors general offices in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(3) To respond to the humanitarian crises and instability caused or aggravated by the invasions and occupations of Georgia and Ukraine by the Russian Federation.

(4) To improve participatory legislative processes and legal education, political transparency and competition, and compliance with international obligations in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(5) To build the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations countering the influence and propaganda of the Russian Federation to combat corruption, prioritize access to truthful information, and operate freely in all regions in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(6) To assist the Secretary of State in executing the functions specified in section 1287(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) for the purposes of recognizing, understanding, exposing, and countering propaganda and disinformation efforts by foreign governments, in coordination with the relevant regional Assistant Secretary or Assistant Secretaries of the Department of State.

(c) **REVISION OF ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH AMOUNTS MAY BE USED.**—The Secretary of State may modify the goals described in subsection (b) if, not later than 15 days before revising such a goal, the Secretary notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the revision.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia (authorized pursuant to section 601 of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5461) and section 102 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5812)), and in consultation with the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, the Director of the Global Engagement Center of the Department of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, coordinate and carry out activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) **METHOD.**—Activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) shall be carried out through—

(A) initiatives of the United States Government;

(B) Federal grant programs such as the Information Access Fund; or

(C) nongovernmental or international organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Black Sea Trust, the Balkan Trust for Democracy, the Prague Civil Society Centre, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, the European Endowment for Democracy, and related organizations.

(3) **REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia, shall submit to the appropriate congressional com-

mittees a report on the programs and activities carried out to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) during the preceding fiscal year.

(B) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall include, with respect to each program or activity described in that subparagraph—

(i) the amount of funding for the program or activity;

(ii) the goal described in subsection (b) to which the program or activity relates; and

(iii) an assessment of whether or not the goal was met.

(e) **COORDINATION WITH GLOBAL PARTNERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to maximize cost efficiency, eliminate duplication, and speed the achievement of the goals described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall ensure coordination with—

(A) the European Union and its institutions;

(B) the governments of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union; and

(C) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) **REPORT BY SECRETARY OF STATE.**—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) the amount of funding provided to each country referred to in subsection (b) by—

(i) the European Union or its institutions;

(ii) the government of each country that is a member of the European Union or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(iii) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b); and

(B) an assessment of whether the funding described in subparagraph (A) is commensurate with funding provided by the United States for those goals.

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to or limit United States foreign assistance not provided using amounts available in the Countering Russian Influence Fund.

(g) **ENSURING ADEQUATE STAFFING FOR GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES.**—In order to ensure that the United States Government is properly focused on combating corruption, improving rule of law, and building the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations in countries described in subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of State shall establish a pilot program for Foreign Service officer positions focused on governance and anticorruption activities in such countries.

#### SEC. 255. REPORT ON MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS CONTROLLED AND FUNDED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a description of media organizations that are controlled and funded by the Government of the Russian Federation, and any affiliated entities, whether operating within or outside the Russian Federation, including broadcast and satellite-based television, radio, Internet, and print media organizations.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 256. REPORT ON RUSSIAN FEDERATION INFLUENCE ON ELECTIONS IN EUROPE AND EURASIA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on funds provided by, or funds the use of which was directed by, the Government of the Russian Federation or any Russian person with the intention of influencing the outcome of any election or campaign in any country in Europe or Eurasia during the preceding year, including through direct support to any political party, candidate, lobbying campaign, non-governmental organization, or civic organization.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) **RUSSIAN PERSON DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Russian person” means—

(1) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(2) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

**SEC. 257. UKRAINIAN ENERGY SECURITY.**

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereign and territorial integrity;

(2) to condemn and oppose all of the destabilizing efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine in violation of its obligations and international commitments;

(3) to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Government of the Russian Federation or the separation of any portion of Ukrainian territory through the use of military force;

(4) to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus;

(5) to assist in promoting reform in regulatory oversight and operations in Ukraine's energy sector, including the establishment and empowerment of an independent regulatory organization;

(6) to encourage and support fair competition, market liberalization, and reliability in Ukraine's energy sector;

(7) to help Ukraine and United States allies and partners in Europe reduce their dependence on Russian energy resources, especially natural gas, which the Government of the Russian Federation uses as a weapon to coerce, intimidate, and influence other countries;

(8) to work with European Union member states and European Union institutions to promote energy security through developing diversified and liberalized energy markets that provide diversified sources, suppliers, and routes;

(9) to continue to oppose the NordStream 2 pipeline given its detrimental impacts on the European Union's energy security, gas market development in Central and Eastern Europe, and energy reforms in Ukraine; and

(10) that the United States Government should prioritize the export of United States energy resources in order to create American jobs, help United States allies and partners, and strengthen United States foreign policy.

(b) **PLAN TO PROMOTE ENERGY SECURITY IN UKRAINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Energy, shall work with the Government of Ukraine to develop a plan to increase energy security in Ukraine, increase the amount of energy produced in Ukraine, and reduce Ukraine's reliance on energy imports from the Russian Federation.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall include strategies for market liberalization, effective regulation and oversight, supply diversification, energy reliability, and energy efficiency, such as through supporting—

(A) the promotion of advanced technology and modern operating practices in Ukraine's oil and gas sector;

(B) modern geophysical and meteorological survey work as needed followed by international tenders to help attract qualified investment into exploration and development of areas with untapped resources in Ukraine;

(C) a broadening of Ukraine's electric power transmission interconnection with Europe;

(D) the strengthening of Ukraine's capability to maintain electric power grid stability and reliability;

(E) independent regulatory oversight and operations of Ukraine's gas market and electricity sector;

(F) the implementation of primary gas law including pricing, tariff structure, and legal regulatory implementation;

(G) privatization of government owned energy companies through credible legal frameworks and a transparent process compliant with international best practices;

(H) procurement and transport of emergency fuel supplies, including reverse pipeline flows from Europe;

(I) provision of technical assistance for crisis planning, crisis response, and public outreach;

(J) repair of infrastructure to enable the transport of fuel supplies;

(K) repair of power generating or power transmission equipment or facilities; and

(L) improved building energy efficiency and other measures designed to reduce energy demand in Ukraine.

(3) **REPORTS.**—

(A) **IMPLEMENTATION OF UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014 PROVISIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the status of implementing the provisions required under section 7(c) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926(c)), including detailing the plans required under that section, the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth under that section, and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies developed pursuant to that section.

(B) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the plan developed under paragraph (1), the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth in paragraph (2), and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies.

(C) **BRIEFINGS.**—The Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall brief the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days after the submission of each report under subparagraph (B). In addition,

the Department of State shall make relevant officials available upon request to brief the appropriate congressional committees on all available information that relates directly or indirectly to Ukraine or energy security in Eastern Europe.

(D) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(C) **SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF COUNTRIES IN EUROPE AND EURASIA TO DECREASE THEIR DEPENDENCE ON RUSSIAN SOURCES OF ENERGY.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) The Government of the Russian Federation uses its strong position in the energy sector as leverage to manipulate the internal politics and foreign relations of the countries of Europe and Eurasia.

(B) This influence is based not only on the Russian Federation's oil and natural gas resources, but also on its state-owned nuclear power and electricity companies.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the United States should assist the efforts of the countries of Europe and Eurasia to enhance their energy security through diversification of energy supplies in order to lessen dependencies on Russian Federation energy resources and state-owned entities; and

(B) the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should play key roles in supporting critical energy projects that contribute to that goal.

(3) **USE OF COUNTERING RUSSIAN INFLUENCE FUND TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund pursuant to section 254 shall be used to provide technical advice to countries described in subsection (b)(1) of such section designed to enhance energy security and lessen dependence on energy from Russian Federation sources.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State a total of \$30,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 to carry out the strategies set forth in subsection (b)(2) and other activities under this section related to the promotion of energy security in Ukraine.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibilities required and authorities provided under section 7 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926).

**SEC. 258. TERMINATION.**

The provisions of this subtitle shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 259. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**

Except as otherwise provided, in this subtitle, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on

Homeland Security, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

**Subtitle C—Combating Terrorism and Illicit Financing**

**PART I—NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORIST AND OTHER ILLICIT FINANCING**

**SEC. 261. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President, acting through the Secretary, shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the appropriate Federal banking agencies and Federal functional regulators, develop a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance.

(b) **TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive national strategy developed in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) **UPDATES.**—Not later than January 31, 2020, and January 31, 2022, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees updated versions of the national strategy submitted under paragraph (1).

(c) **SEPARATE PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL.**—Any part of the national strategy that involves information that is properly classified under criteria established by the President shall be submitted to Congress separately in a classified annex and, if requested by the chairman or ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees, as a briefing at an appropriate level of security.

**SEC. 262. CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.**

The strategy described in section 261 shall contain the following:

(1) **EVALUATION OF EXISTING EFFORTS.**—An assessment of the effectiveness of and ways in which the United States is currently addressing the highest levels of risk of various forms of illicit finance, including those identified in the documents entitled “2015 National Money Laundering Risk Assessment” and “2015 National Terrorist Financing Risk Assessment”, published by the Department of the Treasury and a description of how the strategy is integrated into, and supports, the broader counter terrorism strategy of the United States.

(2) **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES.**—A comprehensive, research-based, long-range, quantifiable discussion of goals, objectives, and priorities for disrupting and preventing illicit finance activities within and transiting the financial system of the United States that outlines priorities to reduce the incidence, dollar value, and effects of illicit finance.

(3) **THREATS.**—An identification of the most significant illicit finance threats to the financial system of the United States.

(4) **REVIEWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES.**—Reviews of enforcement efforts, relevant regulations and relevant provisions of law and, if appropriate, discussions of proposed changes determined to be appropriate to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective efforts at all levels of government, and with international partners of the United States, in the fight against illicit finance.

(5) **DETECTION AND PROSECUTION INITIATIVES.**—A description of efforts to improve,

as necessary, detection and prosecution of illicit finance, including efforts to ensure that—

(A) subject to legal restrictions, all appropriate data collected by the Federal Government that is relevant to the efforts described in this section be available in a timely fashion to—

(i) all appropriate Federal departments and agencies; and

(ii) as appropriate and consistent with section 314 of the International Money Laundering Abatement and Financial Anti-Terrorism Act of 2001 (31 U.S.C. 5311 note), to financial institutions to assist the financial institutions in efforts to comply with laws aimed at curbing illicit finance; and

(B) appropriate efforts are undertaken to ensure that Federal departments and agencies charged with reducing and preventing illicit finance make thorough use of publicly available data in furtherance of this effort.

(6) **THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE FINANCIAL SECTOR IN PREVENTION OF ILLICIT FINANCE.**—A discussion of ways to enhance partnerships between the private financial sector and Federal departments and agencies with regard to the prevention and detection of illicit finance, including—

(A) efforts to facilitate compliance with laws aimed at stopping such illicit finance while maintaining the effectiveness of such efforts; and

(B) providing guidance to strengthen internal controls and to adopt on an industry-wide basis more effective policies.

(7) **ENHANCEMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION.**—A discussion of ways to combat illicit finance by enhancing—

(A) cooperative efforts between and among Federal, State, and local officials, including State regulators, State and local prosecutors, and other law enforcement officials; and

(B) cooperative efforts with and between governments of countries and with and between multinational institutions with expertise in fighting illicit finance, including the Financial Action Task Force and the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units.

(8) **TREND ANALYSIS OF EMERGING ILLICIT FINANCE THREATS.**—A discussion of and data regarding trends in illicit finance, including evolving forms of value transfer such as so-called cryptocurrencies, other methods that are computer, telecommunications, or Internet-based, cyber crime, or any other threats that the Secretary may choose to identify.

(9) **BUDGET PRIORITIES.**—A multiyear budget plan that identifies sufficient resources needed to successfully execute the full range of missions called for in this section.

(10) **TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENTS.**—An analysis of current and developing ways to leverage technology to improve the effectiveness of efforts to stop the financing of terrorism and other forms of illicit finance, including better integration of open-source data.

**PART II—ENHANCING ANTITERRORISM TOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

**SEC. 271. IMPROVING ANTITERROR FINANCE MONITORING OF FUNDS TRANSFERS.**

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To improve the ability of the Department of the Treasury to better track cross-border fund transfers and identify potential financing of terrorist or other forms of illicit finance, the Secretary shall carry out a study to assess—

(A) the potential efficacy of requiring banking regulators to establish a pilot pro-

gram to provide technical assistance to depository institutions and credit unions that wish to provide account services to money services businesses serving individuals in Somalia;

(B) whether such a pilot program could be a model for improving the ability of United States persons to make legitimate funds transfers through transparent and easily monitored channels while preserving strict compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act (Public Law 91-508; 84 Stat. 1114) and related controls aimed at stopping money laundering and the financing of terrorism; and

(C) consistent with current legal requirements regarding confidential supervisory information, the potential impact of allowing money services businesses to share certain State examination information with depository institutions and credit unions, or whether another appropriate mechanism could be identified to allow a similar exchange of information to give the depository institutions and credit unions a better understanding of whether an individual money services business is adequately meeting its anti-money laundering and counter-terror financing obligations to combat money laundering, the financing of terror, or related illicit finance.

(2) **PUBLIC INPUT.**—The Secretary should solicit and consider public input as appropriate in developing the study required under subsection (a).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

**SEC. 272. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION REGARDING TERRORIST FINANCING INTELLIGENCE.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, should intensify work with foreign partners to help the foreign partners develop intelligence analytic capacities, in a financial intelligence unit, finance ministry, or other appropriate agency, that are—

(1) commensurate to the threats faced by the foreign partner; and

(2) designed to better integrate intelligence efforts with the anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing regimes of the foreign partner.

**SEC. 273. EXAMINING THE COUNTER-TERROR FINANCING ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY IN EMBASSIES.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(1) a list of the United States embassies in which a full-time Department of the Treasury financial attaché is stationed and a description of how the interests of the Department of the Treasury relating to terrorist financing and money laundering are addressed (via regional attachés or otherwise) at United States embassies where no such attachés are present;

(2) a list of the United States embassies at which the Department of the Treasury has assigned a technical assistance advisor from the Office of Technical Assistance of the Department of the Treasury;

(3) an overview of how Department of the Treasury financial attachés and technical assistance advisors assist in efforts to counter illicit finance, to include money laundering, terrorist financing, and proliferation financing; and

(4) an overview of patterns, trends, or other issues identified by the Department of the Treasury and whether resources are sufficient to address these issues.

**SEC. 274. INCLUSION OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(c)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(c)(1)) is amended by inserting “the Secretary of the Treasury,” before “and such other officers”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) may not be construed to authorize the National Security Council to have a professional staff level that exceeds the limitation set forth under section 101(e)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(e)(3)).

**SEC. 275. INCLUSION OF ALL FUNDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5326 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by striking “coin and currency”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “subtitle and” and inserting “subtitle or to”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “United States coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in such order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in such order).”; and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “coins or currency (or monetary instruments)” and inserting “funds”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 5326 by striking “coin and currency”.

**PART III—DEFINITIONS**

**SEC. 281. DEFINITIONS.**

In this subtitle—

(1) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term “appropriate Federal banking agencies” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

(3) the term “Bank Secrecy Act” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91-508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code;

(4) the term “Federal functional regulator” has the meaning given that term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809);

(5) the term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President;

(6) the term “money services business” has the meaning given the term under section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations;

(7) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(8) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each territory or possession of the United States.

**Subtitle D—Rule of Construction**

**SEC. 291. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title (other than sections 216 and 236(b)) shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

**SEC. 292. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The principle of collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is immortalized in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty in which members pledge that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all”.

(2) For almost 7 decades, the principle of collective defense has effectively served as a strategic deterrent for the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and provided stability throughout the world, strengthening the security of the United States and all 28 other member nations.

(3) Following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, the Alliance agreed to invoke Article 5 for the first time, affirming its commitment to collective defense.

(4) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have made historic contributions and sacrifices while combating terrorism in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and the Resolute Support Mission.

(5) The recent attacks in the United Kingdom underscore the importance of an international alliance to combat hostile nation states and terrorist groups.

(6) At the 2014 NATO summit in Wales, the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization decided that all countries that are members of NATO would spend an amount equal to 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense by 2024.

(7) Collective defense unites the 29 members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, each committing to protecting and supporting one another from external adversaries, which bolsters the North Atlantic Alliance.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to express the vital importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organiza-

tion, as it continues to serve as a critical deterrent to potential hostile nations and terrorist organizations;

(2) to remember the first and only invocation of Article 5 by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in support of the United States after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

(3) to affirm that the United States remains fully committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will honor its obligations enshrined in Article 5; and

(4) to condemn any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom, or democracy of any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

**AMENDMENT NO. 255**

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment at the desk be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 255) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

“An Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments’ Aggression.”

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Monday, June 19, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of Executive Calendar No. 108. I further ask that there be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s actions.

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

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 94.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Orrin G. Hatch, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 97.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Steve Daines, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to both cloture motions be waived.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

#### INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MARKETPLACE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise to speak about the ongoing debate in the body concerning the next chapter in healthcare and what we can do about it together and, especially, to address one part of the healthcare market—the individual market.

As most know—and this has been an item about which we are deep into discussions, the people and the Members of this body—before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, Americans with preexisting conditions faced unfair barriers to accessing health insurance coverage, and healthcare costs had risen rapidly. Prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, my own family, which is probably like the healthiest family in America because the five of us have only had three hospitalizations for three childbirths—all for my wife—we had twice been turned down for insurance coverage for at least one member of our family because of preexisting conditions.

Since 2010, the rate of uninsured Americans has declined to a historic low. More than 20 million Americans have gained access to health insurance coverage—many for the first time in their lives. In Virginia, over 410,000 Virginians have accessed care on the individual marketplace and another 400,000 would be eligible if Virginia decided to expand Medicaid.

Many Virginians use the individual market, and they have shared their stories with me on my website. I have on my Senate website “ACA Stories,” where I encourage people to share their stories.

The individual marketplace, as folks know, is if you are buying health insurance, not through an employer, and you are buying individually—you may or may not be qualified for a subsidy—that particular marketplace is really important for people who aren’t employed by companies that offer group plans, but it also has its challenges.

One of my stories was from Lauren Carter, who lives in Lovingson, VA, in Nelson County. She wrote in to say:

My 39-year-old son has cerebral palsy and a blood clotting disorder. His “pre-existing conditions” started at conception. Three years ago, he lost his full time job with health insurance benefits.

The ACA allows him to continue receiving medical care and purchase his life saving medications. He supports himself through multiple part time jobs—

This young man with cerebral palsy—employer based insurance is not an option for him at this time.

Laura Kreynus from Mechanicsville, VA, near Richmond wrote:

My daughter was diagnosed with Crohn’s Disease in April of 2013. That September, my husband was diagnosed with Parkinson’s Disease. We are farmers, we raise the food for America. As such, we are independently insured.

They have no large employer to cover them.

Prior to finding a plan through the ACA in January 2015, our monthly insurance premiums were to increase to nearly \$3,000 a month . . . yes, each MONTH! On top of that, our health insurance had an annual cap on prescription coverage of \$5,000. The Humira that my daughter takes to combat her Crohn’s Disease retails for \$3,800 a month, and that is not the only medication she requires. So basically, after one month, we reached the prescription coverage cap, meaning we would have to pay \$3,800 a month for medication on top of \$3,000 a month premiums. Who has an extra \$6,800 a month to pay for this? That is way more than we earn monthly as farmers.

With the health insurance plan we got through the ACA, our premiums for 2015 were \$1,500 a month, less than half of what we would have been paying under the previous plan. But the real saving grace was no prescription cap, so my daughter’s medications are covered with a copay after we reach the deductible. This is still a lot of money, but at least we can treat our daughter’s disease and hopefully keep her healthy. And even though our premiums have gone up to nearly \$2,000 a month from \$1,500 a month under the ACA, at least we can still have insurance.

For families like Lauren’s and Laura’s, the individual marketplace is critical. But like Laura said, premiums are frequently too high. You have to have robust enrollment, competition, and certainty for premiums to come down.

Unfortunately, there has been increasing uncertainty in the individual market due to actions taken by the current administration. On January 20, 2017, President Trump signed an Executive order directing relevant agencies not to enforce key provisions of the Affordable Care Act. Later in January, the administration terminated components of outreach and enrollment spending, including advertising to encourage people to enroll in the individual marketplace.

The administration has also repeatedly threatened to end cost-sharing reduction payments, which reduce costs for approximately 6 million people with incomes below 250 percent of the poverty level. These actions, these statements, these inactions, and this uncertainty have created uncertainty in the individual marketplace, leading to instability for insurance carriers, higher premiums, and reduced competition.

In Virginia, we have seen Aetna and United leave the individual marketplace, and they have cited this uncertainty created by this administration as the principal reason. In other States, there are counties that are at risk to have no insurers offering coverage on the marketplace in particular States or sometimes in regions in the States.

So this is a problem we can address, and we don’t have to repeal the Affordable Care Act to do it. We just need to improve the Affordable Care Act, using a tool that has had bipartisan support in this body for some time.



So yesterday Senator CARPER and I introduced the Individual Health Insurance Marketplace Improvement Act, and I want to thank the other original cosponsors of the bill: Senators NELSON, SHAHEEN, and HASSAN.

One way to address uncertainty is to use a common insurance tool, reinsurance—a permanent reinsurance program to help stabilize premiums and increase competition. The Affordable Care Act originally had a reinsurance program. It was temporary. It lasted for the first 3 years of the program, and it did hold premiums down. What we would do is that we would take that idea, which worked, and we would make it permanent. We would make it permanent and modeled after a very successful and bipartisan program: Medicare Part D. Medicare Part D provides a prescription drug benefit for seniors. It was passed with bipartisan support during the administration of President George W. Bush, now more than a decade ago, and the reinsurance program has helped hold down costs.

This reinsurance program would provide funding to offset larger than expected insurance claims for health insurance companies participating in State and Federal marketplaces. It would encourage them to offer more plans in a greater number of markets, thereby improving competition and driving down costs for patients and families. Basically, if reinsurance can cover high costs, an insurance company will know it has a backstop, which gives it a measure of stability, and also can set premiums at a more reasonable level for everyone.

The bill would also do one other thing that is important. It would provide \$500 million a year from 2018 to 2020 to help States improve outreach and enrollment for the health insurance marketplaces, especially to draw in new members and educate the public—especially young people who are maybe moving just past their 26th birthdays and can no longer be contained on family policies—about the need to be insured. The outreach funding prioritizes counties where there are limited insurers left in the marketplace.

This is not the only improvement that is needed for our healthcare system. We need to do more to keep costs down, figure out a way to have prescription drugs be more affordable, and we can certainly use technology and data to drive better health outcomes, but this is a fix. It is a fix of an important part of our system, the individual market. It is a fix using an idea that has already worked and has already compelled the support of both Democrats and Republicans—reinsurance in Medicare Part D. This should be something Democrats and Republicans can agree to.

My worry is that we are participating now in a secretive effort to

write a healthcare bill behind closed doors and possibly put it on the floor for a vote without hearing from a single patient, without hearing from a single provider, a hospital, a business that has a hard time buying insurance for its employees, an insurance company, or pharmaceutical company.

We ought to be debating these bills in the world's greatest deliberative body and proposing amendments and hearing from stakeholders and then doing the best job we can when we are dealing with the most important expenditure that anybody ever makes in their life, healthcare. Healthcare is also one of the largest segments of the American economy, one-sixth of the economy. Why would we want to pass a bill in secret?

Senator CARPER, my colleagues, and I have introduced this bill as a good faith effort to say what I actually said when I first got on the HELP Committee in early January of 2015. There is a huge group of us just waiting for the door to open so that we can have a meaningful discussion about moving our system forward, and I believe this bill could be a very good part of stabilizing and improving the individual market and bringing relief to many Americans.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to reiterate my support for the resolution of disapproval related to the sale of certain defense articles to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. While the resolution, unfortunately, did not pass the Senate in a recent vote, I believe its goals remain important.

The Saudi-led military campaign in Yemen is fueling a humanitarian disaster. Over 10,000 people have died, and over 3 million people have been displaced as the conflict has exacerbated poverty, famine, and disease. According to UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, a cholera outbreak in Yemen could quadruple to infect 300,000 people in the coming weeks. Half of the current cholera cases affect children, and the ongoing conflict leaves few hospitals to turn to and almost no medical supplies.

In addition to deaths related to famine and the outbreak of other diseases, we are seeing civilian casualties as a direct result of Saudi military action. Earlier this year at a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, I asked General Votel, the commander of U.S. Central Command, which is responsible

for the Middle East, to assess the cause of the large number of civilian casualties in Yemen. General Votel responded: "I attribute those type situations more to the competence of the forces that are operating there, and their ability to properly target."

I am concerned that even with the precision munitions the United States has sold to Saudi Arabia in the past, air strikes continue to hit civilian targets. The number of civilian injuries and deaths shows that there is simply not enough progress to reduce civilian casualties.

I could not in good conscience vote to support providing advanced precision munitions—bombs capable of hitting targets guided by laser targeting or GPS—to a campaign conducted by forces unable or unwilling to limit strikes to targets of military necessity.

Civilian casualties are a tragedy, and they threaten to make us less safe by radicalizing populations that otherwise would not be sympathetic to violent extremist groups like al-Qaida. It is critical that the U.S. military is certainly able to hunt down terrorists wherever they operate or wherever they seek haven.

The deployment of remotely piloted aircraft has allowed for persistent intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, which is used to minimize the risk of civilian casualties. When the U.S. military carries out air strikes, we know our men and women in uniform are the best trained in the world and are informed by the best available intelligence.

Precision-guided munitions alone do not avoid preventable tragedies. It takes capable and fully trained personnel. This is what we must expect from our partners for the sake of innocent civilians caught in conflict zones and for our own national security. Failing to do so sets back the potential for a political solution.

We simply should not send precision munitions or any weapons system to any partner with personnel who are not capable or trained to use them. That is why I supported the resolution of disapproval, which specifically objects to the sale of three specific types of precision-guided munitions and related technology. While this measure failed, I will continue to work as a member of the Armed Services Committee to provide oversight and hold the Saudi Government and military accountable.

#### COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES BILL

Mr. President, I was proud to support the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act. This is important legislation that I was also proud to cosponsor. It will require sanctions on those supporting Iran's ballistic missile program and imposes terrorism-related sanctions on Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps.

For too long, Iran's state sponsorship of terrorism and their repeated ballistic missile tests in defiance of U.N. Security Council resolutions have destabilized the Middle East and threatened Israel, our strongest ally in the region. Their destabilizing actions are fueling the ongoing violence causing widespread humanitarian suffering in Yemen. Iran provides weapons and troops that fuel conflicts, and Iran's military consistently behaves in an unprofessional manner, putting American troops at risk.

I believe most Iranian citizens want to play a productive role in the world. It is their government that is the problem. I believe that pressure provided by additional sanctions for destabilizing activity can improve the behavior of the Iranian regime, and we must send a clear signal to this regime that their actions are simply unacceptable.

This legislation also provided a vehicle to address another nation's leadership whose actions have warranted international condemnation—Russia. This bill includes an amendment that I supported to enhance sanctions on Russia.

This amendment ensures that sanctions imposed by President Obama are codified in law and cannot be removed without congressional review. It also imposes new sanctions on Russians who facilitate human rights violations, supply weapons to the Syrian Government, conduct cyber attacks on behalf of the Russian Government, and do business in the Russian intelligence and defense sectors.

Let me be clear: Russia is not our friend. The Russian Government has conducted an information warfare campaign against our own country and sought to undermine our democratic process.

This is not a one-time incident. Russia continues to attempt to disrupt democratic institutions and interfere with our allies.

Congress has supported imposing tough sanctions on Russia, and it is important that Congress has an opportunity to review any attempt to remove them. I am glad this amendment was adopted on a broadly bipartisan basis.

Finally, I am a cosponsor of an amendment offered by Senator GRAHAM that reaffirms the importance of NATO, particularly article 5, the collective defense provision, which states that an attack on one is an attack on all. Article 5 has been invoked only once, in response to the September 11 attacks on the United States. With the inclusion of this amendment, the Senate sends a strong, clear signal that the United States stands by our commitment to security and stability throughout the world, and we always will.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### BUILDING AND SUSTAINING A LARGER NAVY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise to continue my discussion about the case for a bigger Navy, a bigger fleet, and to endorse the requirement of the experts in the Department of Defense that we move to a 355-ship Navy.

When a crisis strikes around the world, the President asks his national security team: Where are the carriers? Where are the aircraft carriers?

Each of our carriers is a 100,000-ton giant, accompanied by an entire carrier group that consists of mighty warships and aircraft. The carrier, itself, represents 4.5 acres of sovereign U.S. territory.

In early January of this year—and Senators do not know this—a strange and profoundly disturbing thing happened. The answer to the Commander in Chief's question, had it been asked at that point—where are the carriers?—would have been that none of them had been deployed—not a single one. For the first time since World War II, the United States had no carriers deployed anywhere—not in the Persian Gulf, not in the Mediterranean, not in the Western Pacific.

There is a gap in our global carrier presence, and there is a gap in our fleet. This comes from years of complacency. Also, it comes from a different set of facts that we are faced with and a different set of challenges that we are faced with in our quest to make our presence known and to protect our national security interests on the open seas. We have ignored the great naval competition that is taking place elsewhere—the fact that it is accelerating. We have taken our Navy and our sailors and marines for granted.

Simply put, the Navy we have today is too small. We cannot accomplish the critical missions that we have by preserving the status quo. Right now, we have 277 ships, and we need to get to 355 ships. That was reiterated today by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Secretary of the Navy in a hearing before the full Armed Services Committee.

I will reiterate to my colleagues and to the American people what the Navy does for America and why the current fleet is too small to meet current and emerging challenges.

First, the global presence of the Navy ship matters to American prosperity—to the quality of life of Americans. Ninety percent of global trade is seaborne. Maritime traffic has increased by 400 percent over the past quarter century. In addition to commerce, nearly all intercontinental telecommunications transit via a web of

undersea cables. Undersea cables are responsible for nearly all of our intercontinental telecommunications.

Second, a strong Navy deters aggressive behavior and reassures our allies as the Nation's first-on-the-scene force. A strong Navy can help keep bad situations from spiraling out of control and getting worse. For example, the President recently dispatched multiple carrier strike groups to the Sea of Japan following North Korea's missile tests. The President asked where the carriers were, and he dispatched them to a place of crisis. A mix of ships gives our Commander in Chief a range of military options, and their deployments to areas of instability can send a message of resolve to our friends and foes alike.

Third, if deterrence fails, our naval forces can provide a decisive response to aggression. Surface ships, submarines, and the aircraft on the carriers can launch missile strikes, control air and sea traffic, and intercept missile threats. The recent U.S. action in Syria is a good example, as the Presiding Officer knows. In using destroyers in the Mediterranean, the Commander in Chief delivered precision strikes against Syrian airfields. He enforced the redline against outlawed chemical weapons, and President Assad has not crossed that redline again.

Accomplishing these missions as the Nation's sentinel and first responder requires a big Navy. Admiral John Richardson, the Chief of Naval Operations, put it best in "The Future Navy" white paper that was released last month. He said:

Numbers matter. The number of ships in the Navy's fleet determines where we can be, and being there is a key to naval power.

Again, the current fleet of about 277 ships is way too small. It is important to remember that not all ships are deployed or deployable. In fact, only about 100 ships out of the 277 are currently deployed. The other two-thirds are undergoing heavy maintenance, routine sustainment, or are training to deploy. The Navy recently validated its requirement for 355 ships—a 47-ship increase over the previous requirement.

The lack of ships has created coverage gaps all over the world. I will give two examples.

First, the commander of Pacific Command, ADM Harry Harris, recently told Congress he has only half the submarines he needs. Admiral Harris is responsible for deterring China and North Korea, but he is missing half of the submarines he needs. Closer to home, the commander of Southern Command, ADM Kurt Tidd, has zero Navy ships permanently assigned to his area of operations. These are just two of the many alarming instances where the lack of ships is having major consequences.

While we watch our edge erode, America's real and potential adversaries are building the size and capability of their fleets. They are on the

field competing while, in America, many of our players are still in the locker room.

China is building a modern navy capable of projecting global power. China is modernizing every type of ship and submarine in its fleet. China commissioned 18 ships last year. In April, China launched its first domestically built carrier and plans to build at least six more carriers. By 2030, China will have more than twice as many attack submarines and four times as many small surface ships as the United States. Beijing is developing its first overseas naval base in the Horn of Africa. China's naval buildup may attempt to push the United States first out of the Western Pacific, away from critical trade chokepoints and our allies in South Korea and Japan.

I would call the attention of Members to the poster that I have, and I hope it is printed large enough for my colleagues to see. In terms of five types of ships, it compares where we were in 2000, where we are today, and where we are projected to be if current trends continue.

For example, on the farthest column shown on the chart, in attack submarines—and the black portion of each circle represents China's capability, and the blue represents our capability in the United States of America. In 2000, it was 64 to 55 in favor of the Chinese. In 2016, as we can see, 56 to 57. But under current projections, by the year 2030, when it comes to attack submarines, the Chinese will have 87 and the United States will have only 42—a disturbing trend which the Navy would like to reverse if we have the ability and the wisdom to give them the requirement they have said they need.

With regard to ballistic missile submarines, in 2000, quite a mismatch—only 1 for China as compared to 18 for the United States; then, only last year, 4 for China and 14 for the U.S. Navy; and then projected for 2030—and really that is in only 13 short years, which is hard to believe—there will be more Chinese ballistic missile submarines than American ballistic missile submarines unless we take the Navy's requirement to heart and take action beginning this year to rectify that situation.

With regard to small surface ships, as we can see, there was a 79-to-62 advantage in sheer numbers in 2000 and a 103-to-23 advantage of the Chinese in 2016. In 2030, there will still be a mismatch, in terms of numbers, of 123 small surface ships compared to only 40 for the United States of America.

With large surface ships, it was 20 to 79, then 19 to 84, and by the year 2030, as we can see, the Chinese are projected to have 34 large surface ships.

With regard to aircraft carriers, as I pointed out, they were not in that game at all in 2000. They delivered their first last year, and they are projected to go to four by the year 2013.

It all adds up to 260—a 260-ship fleet for China and only 199 for the United States unless we act, and act responsibly, in response to what the Navy and the Marine Corps and the best military minds in the Pentagon are telling us, and I hope we will do that.

An increasingly aggressive Russia is also modernizing. The Kremlin is pouring money into new attack and nuclear ballistic missile submarines. Russian submarine patrols have doubled, and those patrols are stretching closer to the U.S. homeland. The Russian Navy's operating areas have expanded to include regular operations in the Baltic, Black, Mediterranean, and Caspian Seas. Russia is also exploiting new opportunities in the Arctic by building naval bases in the High North.

So both China and Russia are investing heavily in their fleets and in new ballistic and cruise missiles that can target U.S. naval forces.

And, of course, we need to turn to the subject matter of North Korea. Kim Jong Un will stop at nothing to develop a nuclear weapon that can strike our allies and that can strike deployed U.S. forces and eventually our homeland. A nuclear ballistic submarine would essentially make North Korea impervious to threats of preemption. North Korea is building fortified submarine bunkers and began testing submarine-launched ballistic missiles within the last year.

Iran is another rogue state developing a massive fleet of fast attack boats and mini-submarines to deny the free passage of ships through the vital Strait of Hormuz.

Naval competition is a fact. China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran have clearly been building up the size and the sophistication of their fleets. The Chief of Naval Operations has a word to describe the pace of competition, and that word is "exponential." The CNO puts it this way:

Time is an unforgiving characteristic of the maritime [environment]. Things are moving faster, including our competitors.

So let's start competing again. Building a larger fleet is a national project. It will require sustained commitment by the President, the Congress, and the Department of Defense. As chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, I intend to begin laying a firm foundation this year for a significant buildup in the future, and I hope my colleagues will join me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to start this afternoon with a reflection on what happened yesterday. We are thinking today of the individuals who were hurt in the attack during the baseball practice in Virginia, and, of

course, we are praying for those who were injured. I will list them. Many of the names we already know, but it is important to list them.

Of course, Representative STEVE SCALISE from the State of Louisiana—we are thinking of his family and praying for them, and we hope for his speedy recovery. Matt Mika, who works for Tyson Foods, was also a shooting victim like Representative SCALISE. Zack Barth, who works for Congressman ROGER WILLIAMS, was a shooting victim, and Special Agent Crystal Griner, of course, of the Capitol Police, who exhibited such courage in the line of duty. We are thinking of Crystal at this time as well.

We know there were individuals injured at the scene, including Special Agent David Bailey of the Capitol Police, who was not shot, apparently, but suffered an injury and was released from the hospital. We are happy to hear he has been released. Representative ROGER WILLIAMS, who was hurt at the scene as well—not a shooting victim but hurt—and, of course, two of our colleagues were there at the time, Senator RAND PAUL and Senator JEFF FLAKE. We are thankful they were not injured in any way.

On these days, we come together as a family to remember those who have been the victims, and we are thinking of them and their families and praying for them.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the healthcare debate and in particular not just the issue of healthcare but the effort underway by Senate Republicans in their attempts to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I have grave concerns about the substance of the legislation—what we know about it. It has been kind of a secret process. We don't know a lot, but we have some general sense of where they are headed. I also have grave concern about the lack of transparency employed by the Republican majority around the development of this healthcare plan.

Like millions of Americans, I oppose this secretive process—and I have to say it is a partisan process as well—that could result in major legislation that would harm children who will lose their healthcare, especially by way of the cuts to Medicaid. It could harm individuals with disabilities—and by one recent estimate in Pennsylvania, that means over 720,000 Pennsylvanians with a disability who rely upon Medicaid; and, of course, seniors—a lot of seniors across the country cannot get into a nursing home absent the full support of the Medicaid Program, and we are concerned about them as well; and finally, middle-class families who may not be able to afford healthcare if the House bill were to become law or a substantially similar bill passed by the Senate.

In 2009, the legislation passed the Senate after a yearlong, open process that included a total of 44 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and summits. That was in the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, of which I was a member at the time and remember well those hours and hours and days and days of hearings. The Committee on Finance at that time also had many hearings over many months. This whole process by two committees led to the consideration of some 435 amendments offered by both parties, majority and minority, and a full debate on the Senate floor that lasted over 25 consecutive days. In fact, a number of Republican Senators were able to offer and get a vote on their amendments, some of which passed and became part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Yet, in the last 5 months, there have been no Senate hearings on this proposed legislation, no hearings on the House proposal, and certainly no hearings on what is being developed here in the Senate. If that is the case—if that remains the case over the next couple of days and weeks—then I believe we should institute a very basic rule: If you have no hearings, you have no vote. In other words, you can't have a vote on the Senate floor on a bill that will affect so many tens of millions of Americans and will change dramatically and, I would argue, adversely, to the detriment of a lot of people, our healthcare system. I hope the majority will agree with that—that if you don't have a hearing, you shouldn't have a vote on the Senate floor.

There have been no relevant bills considered in executive session by any of the committees of jurisdiction. Every indication is that the Republican majority will jam this legislation through with minimal opportunity for debate. This is unacceptable to me, but I also believe it is unacceptable to people across the country in both parties.

We know, for example, the reason—or one of the many reasons—folks would want a hearing before a vote, and that is because we are getting a sense of what the substance is. Just to give one example, I won't enter this whole report into the RECORD, but I am holding a full copy of the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate. This estimate is dated, May 24, 2017, analyzing H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017. This is the bill which passed the House. Page 17 of the CBO report says:

Medicaid enrollment would be lower throughout the coming decade, culminating in 14 million fewer Medicaid enrollees by 2026, a reduction of about 17 percent relative to the number under current law.

That is quoted directly from page 17 of the CBO report, that over the decade, 14 million people will lose their Medicaid coverage.

I know some here and across the city who were commenting on this legisla-

tion—either members of the administration, Members of Congress, or otherwise—are refuting this, but I think when you have a Congressional Budget Office report which is an independent entity that both parties have relied upon—and it is not only the CBO. This is a report authored by not just the Congressional Budget Office but also the Joint Committee on Taxation.

So 14 million fewer people on Medicaid—why is that relevant to the Senate debate if the CBO report was analyzing the House bill? Here is what one think tank, which has analyzed healthcare policy for years, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities—they put forth a report this Monday, June 12. In that report of just a couple of pages, they had a chart—I am holding it. I do not expect people to see it, but here is what it says. It has four columns. The first column has the major provisions of the House bill; and then what are likely, based upon reporting and information we can ascertain so far, major provisions of the House bill; what happens if the House bill passes; and then major provisions of the Senate bill.

There is a section entitled “Medicaid Expansion.” When the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities analyzed and compared the House bill to what we know so far about the Senate bill being proposed or at least the development of it, basically the Center on Budget says there is no long-term impact on any reported changes from one bill to the other. The Medicaid per capita cap—another very disturbing development that is being considered—when they compare the Senate bill to the House bill, they say no major changes.

So we are very concerned about what happens to Medicaid. I am very concerned because of the 1.1 million children in Pennsylvania, the disability number I mentioned before of over 722,000 people with disabilities who get Medicaid, and of course the seniors who depend upon Medicaid. So we are concerned about the elimination, even over time, of the Medicaid expansion. We are also concerned about the Medicaid Program itself.

In addition to those numbers, I want to highlight a few individual stories of people to get a sense of what is at stake when it comes to this bill and when it comes to Medicaid.

This past Friday, I met with German Parodi from Philadelphia. Here is his story:

In 2001, he was a victim of a carjacking and was shot in the neck, leaving him paralyzed and unable to use his legs and having limited use of his arms. He was nursed back to health by his grandmother and has worked for the past 16 years to be a full citizen, going to school, working, owning his home, now caring for his grandmother who once cared for him. German, who now uses a wheelchair to get around,

has worked to achieve what every American wants—to be a successful student, to own a home, and to care for his family. He can do this because of his knowledge, skills, and perseverance, and he has been able to achieve these goals because he gets direct care services paid for by Medicaid. His direct care professional helps him get out of bed in the morning, get showered, dressed, breakfast, and get to work. Medicaid and the services it provides makes it possible for him to use his skills to be successful.

German told me that without Medicaid, “I would end up having to live in an institution. This would dramatically affect my life and my grandmother's life.”

While talking with me, he said: “Please do everything in your power to protect my life and the lives of millions like me.”

I am short on time but here is another example. Latoya Maddox, whom I met at the same meeting, is from the Germantown section of Philadelphia. She was born with arthrogryposis multiplex congenital, a disability that limits the use of her limbs. Latoya also uses a wheelchair to get around, including getting to school and getting to work. She is smart, energetic, and the mother of a soon-to-be 6-year-old. She is now a junior at West Chester University working on her bachelor's degree in social work and works part time at Liberty Resources, Incorporated, one of Pennsylvania's independent living centers.

Like German, Latoya is a successful young professional because she works hard and takes advantage of the opportunities presented to her. She has support from Medicaid in the form of direct support professionals who help her with her daily tasks. Without Medicaid, the wheelchair and other medical equipment she needs and her direct care workers, Latoya would not be able to work, attend school, and care for her son.

While I was talking with Latoya, she told me: “Medicaid makes it possible for me to live a regular, full, productive life, to be a parent, to go to school, and to be a reliable employee.”

While talking with her, it was clear that Latoya was proud of her son and proud to be his mother. She was clear that the support she receives from Medicaid makes it possible for her to be that proud parent.

She closed her remarks by saying that Medicaid “makes it possible for me to be me.”

My last example is Karen Stauffer. Karen Stauffer is from Bucks County, PA. She is a small business owner. She operates the River of Life Natural Foods store. Karen purchased her healthcare policy from the Pennsylvania Affordable Care Act exchange. She said to me that prior to the passage of the ACA, she saw her

healthcare premiums increase from \$300 a month in the late 1990s to \$1,300 in the mid-2000s. She said to me that because of preexisting conditions such as high blood pressure and a long bout of Lyme disease, she was worried she would lose her healthcare. She said passage of the ACA was both an emotional and financial relief for her. Her premiums were reduced to \$500 a month after being as high as \$1,300, and she knew she had the protection of the law when it came to nondiscrimination because of her preexisting conditions.

As she spoke, she shared her fears from what she has been hearing about the House bill and what might come out of the Senate; that, at 61 years of age, her premiums could be five times that of younger policyholders and that the meager subsidies proposed by the Republican majority would make healthcare unaffordable for her. She said to me: I am frankly terrified about what could happen to me in the next 4 years. My income has gone down, I have preexisting conditions, and instead of making adjustments and improvements to the ACA, legislators are causing insurers to become concerned about the future.

Karen was distraught when talking about the future and reminded me that “we all could be one accident or illness away from disaster.” That is what Karen said.

So German, Karen, and Latoya, I think, give us a lot to think about. I hope the majority, when they are making the final edits to their bill, will make sure that any American with Medicaid, for example, who has it now—a child who comes from a low-income family, an adult or child with a disability or a senior trying to get into a nursing home—if they have Medicaid today and need it in the future, that there would be a guarantee that they don’t lose their Medicaid, that they don’t lose it this year or 5 years from now or 10 years from now, or longer. Stretching it out over many years and eliminating that coverage year after year, a little bit each year, is going to be just as bad in the long run.

I hope the majority would think of those families and the families in their own States when they are considering healthcare legislation in the Senate. We should have a vote only if there is a hearing on this legislation or, frankly, more than one hearing to consider something this complicated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday we had a horrific tragedy here in the capital area. I know I speak for all of my colleagues who are holding the victims of that attack in their hearts and in their prayers: Congressman STEVE SCALISE, still in critical

condition; Zack Barth, legislative correspondent who works for Congressman WILLIAMS of Texas, who was injured; Matt Mika of Tyson’s Foods, who represents them here on the Hill; and two of our police officers, David Bailey and Crystal Griner of the U.S. Capitol Police. Without those two police officers present, this could have been a much more tragic event.

We have to reinforce the understanding that we are blessed to have the opportunity to raise our voices in our democratic Republic. We are able to raise them by speaking to our members who are elected in local and State and Federal Government, by writing to them, by meeting with them in town-halls. In my State, you can call them up, and they will sit down with you in a cafe. We have an opportunity to weigh in through writing letters to the editor, by protesting in the streets, by overflowing the email lines and flooding the phone lines. We have all kinds of ways to weigh in, in America, but violence is absolutely unacceptable. We have to try to diminish and eliminate the hate speech, which so often becomes the foundation for hate violence.

We have had a very divisive 18 months here in America, where various folks have sought to increase the divisions between groups of Americans, to attack women, to attack African Americans, to attack Hispanics, to attack Muslims, to attack LGBT citizens. We need to eliminate that strategy of division.

Here, in America, we are a tapestry of talents from all over the world, of different cultural backgrounds who come together to make this Nation incredibly strong. Unless you are 100 percent Native American, you are either an immigrant yourself or the son or daughter of immigrants. We bring that diversity to bear and we make this Nation powerful in ways few other nations could even come close to having.

Let’s take this as a moment in which we seek to encourage public participation in all the legitimate forms of free speech but put hate speech out of bounds and hate violence out of bounds.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, it is ironic that this conversation takes place at a moment where we really have a unique process underway designed to limit political discourse. Everything I am saying about participation assumes you will have a chance to weigh in, whether you are elected or whether you are a citizen.

We have a process in the Senate that is designed to prevent the citizens of America from weighing in and to prevent debate by the Members of the Senate. That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable that in a “we the people” constitutional republic, a democratic republic designed to facilitate conversation and dialogue to produce deci-

sions that reflect the will of the people, that work for all Americans—instead, we have a secretive process, more the type of process you would expect in a kingdom where the King and the counselors hide themselves away, with no public input, and make decisions for the masses. That is not the design of our government. Our government is designed for public input.

Here is a phrase that should resonate: no public input, no vote; no hearing, no vote.

I am speaking specifically about the dialogue on TrumpCare. TrumpCare, which was passed by just a few votes in the House and came to the Senate, doesn’t reflect a process of the people, by the people, and for the people. In fact, it is by the privileged, for the privileged, and by the privileged.

The House deliberately excluded the public. They had their own consolidated, confined process to make sure it was difficult to have a full debate and an amendment process, for folks to weigh in and consider alternatives and improvements.

Here we are in the Senate, and it is even worse because we have the secret 13 crafting a plan, planning and plotting to bring it to the floor of the Senate probably 2 weeks from today in order to hold a vote, with only a few hours of debate and no committee process of any kind—not a single committee hearing, not a single committee opportunity to consider amendments—and no chance for the public to get a copy and read through it and weigh in with their Members of the Senate. There is no chance for healthcare stakeholders and experts to examine it and point out the difficulties and the flaws. What I think is most egregious of all is the complete exclusion of the United States of America. It is unacceptable.

I was fascinated by the fact that the majority decided to have this secret 13 committee. Thirteen is considered to be an unlucky number by much of America—Friday the 13th or buildings that don’t have a 13th floor. In this case, I hope that having 13 Members meet in secret is unlucky; that is, unlucky in terms of trying to fulfill their mission of passing a bill with no input by the public.

Last week, the majority leader started the process to make this happen without a committee. It is called the rule XIV process. It is a process designed to bring up a healthcare bill that would rip healthcare coverage from millions of Americans and, by the way, give away billions of dollars to the richest Americans, all in the same bill, straight to the Senate floor without a committee being involved—not the Finance Committee, which certainly has many elements related to the financing of healthcare in America, and not the HELP Committee, which has Members of both parties who have

worked for years to develop expertise and consult with stakeholders to understand what works and what doesn't work, and they benefit from each other's input.

I was part of the HELP Committee in 2009. For 5 weeks we sat in a room with a television camera operating so the public could see what we were doing, and we proposed amendments and debated them around this big square set of tables. There was full public scrutiny. There was 5 weeks of bipartisan dialogue about what should go in healthcare. That was 2009. The Finance Committee had a very similar process.

But now we have a different objective by the majority leader wanting to bring this bill with no Finance Committee involvement, no HELP Committee involvement, and no citizen involvement. In fact, there is no chance for Senators who aren't in the secret circle to participate and see the bill and hold townhalls and ask people what they think of this.

I do a lot of townhalls. I am doing a couple more this weekend. I have had 20 townhalls this year. I have had a townhall an average of every 10 days since I was elected in 2000 and came to the Senate in 2009. I am going to keep holding these townhalls.

I know that my citizens would like to see this bill and be able to go through the elements and give me feedback on what makes sense and what doesn't. That is a "we the people" democratic republic. This secrecy strategy—that is not. That is not. That is a strategy for nonconstitutional governments. That is a strategy for dictators. That is a strategy for Kings and Queens. That is a strategy for people who hate democracy.

Let's not have that process in the United States. Let's have colleagues from both sides of the aisle go to the leadership and say: This is unacceptable. I want my citizens to have a chance to see this bill. I want to benefit from talking to the hospitals in my community and my State and get their feedback. I want to talk to the healthcare clinics and get their feedback. I want to talk to the doctors and find out what they think. I want to hear from the nurses because they are so respected in their understanding of the direct delivery of healthcare.

That is what every Member of the Senate should be saying to our majority leader. This process of secrecy, no debate, and the public being excluded is totally unacceptable.

Why is this process going on? In fact, earlier today, the secret 13 went into a room off a hallway where the press is not allowed so they couldn't be seen coming and going from the room. When they were coming and going from the room, they couldn't be talked to by the press. Why all this secrecy? It boils down to this: They know the American people don't like what is in this bill.

They are terrified of getting that feedback. If they get that feedback, they might lose a majority in passing this bill.

How much public support is there for the TrumpCare bill? Just 21 percent, according to a recent Quinnipiac poll. That is not very much support for it.

Even President Trump said TrumpCare is terrible. He said it this way: That bill from the House is "mean." That was his exact quote, that it is "mean." Then he used another phrase, which I won't repeat on the floor of the Senate, to say just how absolutely awful that bill is.

Today in committee, I asked the Secretary of Health, Tom Price: Do you share, as Secretary of Health, the President's opinion that his own bill, his own TrumpCare bill passed out of the House, is an absolutely terrible bill, a mean bill?

He didn't want to answer the question. Certainly, I found that curious, that the Secretary of Health will not tell us whether he shares the President's opinion.

Then I asked him: Why did the President call it a mean bill? Is it because it throws 20 million people out of healthcare?

The Secretary didn't want to answer.

Did the President say it was a mean bill because it eliminates the guarantee of essential health benefits so that an insurance policy is, in fact, insuring you when you get sick rather than perhaps not even being worth the paper it is printed on?

There were a lot of healthcare insurance policies before we had an essential care package, essential benefits package. You paid the insurance company, but when you got sick, they didn't cover anything. Those policies weren't worth the paper they were printed on.

So I asked the Secretary of Health: Is that the reason the President said this is a mean process or a mean bill? Is that the reason he described this bill in terms that I won't repeat on the floor?

The Secretary of Health wasn't interested in relaying or giving insights into why the President said it was a mean bill.

I asked: Is it because the bill destroys the guarantee that if you have preexisting conditions, you can still get a policy at the same price as everyone else?

Again, there was no answer.

I said: Or is it a mean bill because if you are an older American, you have to pay perhaps up to eight times more for the same policy as you pay under current law?

You know, an individual who is 64 years old, a man who is earning \$26,500 a year, currently that individual would pay about \$140 a month for a policy under current law. The same policy under TrumpCare would cost \$1,200 a month. Is there anyone in this Senate Chamber who thinks an individual

earning \$26,500 a year can afford a healthcare policy that costs \$1,200 a month?

Let me translate this. If you are earning \$26,000 a year, you are earning a little over \$2,000 a month. Is there anyone in this Chamber who believes—please come to the floor and tell us if you do—that individual can buy a healthcare policy costing \$1,200 a month? Is there anyone who thinks it is an egregious mistake to use high pricing to force older Americans out of our healthcare system? I believe in treating our citizens of all ages graciously, not forcing them out of healthcare through an eightfold increase in their premiums. Is that the reason the President said that this healthcare bill, this TrumpCare bill from the House, is a mean bill and spoke of it in derogatory terms?

The TrumpCare bill isn't even popular in the President's own party. Just 48 percent of Republicans surveyed in the same poll supported President Trump and Speaker RYAN's healthcare plan. But when asked if they like the current healthcare plan, 55 percent said they do.

Right now, regular order, the regular legislative, deliberative process that makes sure there is a full debate before a significant bill comes to a vote, that makes sure there is significant and substantial time for the citizens of America to weigh in, that regular order or regular process is being run over by a steamroller. It is being crushed. It is being demolished. Why would my colleagues support destroying the fundamental principles of legislative debate? I would love to hear the answer. Perhaps it is because, like President Trump said, the bill is mean. Perhaps it is because it is extremely unpopular with the American people, who believe there should be affordable, quality healthcare available to every single American.

We have heard that the secret 13 have a plan to sweeten the bill, a little spoonful of sugar to make the medicine go down. What is that plan? Well, we are hearing that maybe they will put in extra funds to help take on the opioid addiction epidemic. That is a good thing. Why have they fought so hard against supporting such programs to help Americans on this crucial question?

We have heard they want to slow down the process of throwing people off healthcare so it will not hurt them in the 2018 elections and maybe not even hurt them so much in the 2020 elections. But if you are destroying something piece by piece, you are still destroying it. If you are cooking a lobster and you turn up the heat fast or you turn up the heat slowly, you still kill the lobster. And this bill is still going to kill healthcare for millions of Americans. Doing it more slowly doesn't make it a good thing. Putting in a

spoonful of sugar doesn't make a diabolical act better.

Franklin Roosevelt once said:

Let us never forget that government is ourselves.

And he continued:

The ultimate rulers of our democracy are not a President and Senators and Congressmen and Government officials but the voters of this country.

And isn't that what "we the people" means—government of, by, and for the people? But nowhere in the Republican secret 13 process can the voices of the people of the United States be heard. How about if one of the 13 comes to the floor now and distributes the bill? I mean we should have weeks to consider this. We should have maybe a month to consider it. We had a whole year of process in 2009.

Wouldn't that be the right thing to do, to clue in folks about what is in this bill so we can get the stakeholders engaged and the citizens engaged and hold those townhalls and get that feedback? Wouldn't that be the right thing to do?

Well, unfortunately, we are still waiting. We are still paused, saying: Please, bring the bill to the floor. Distribute it. Maybe it is not your final draft, but that is OK.

We had draft after draft after draft of the healthcare bill in 2009. We had, in the Senate Finance Committee, 53 hearings on healthcare reform. They spent 8 days marking up their version of the ACA—the committee's longest markup in 22 years. During those 8 days, 135 amendments were considered—amendments from both Republicans and Democrats. Then, there was the HELP Committee, which I served on, and it held 47 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs. There were 300 amendments during a month-long markup—one of the longest in the history of Congress. More than 100 Republican amendments, minority amendments, were accepted into the committee's version of healthcare reform.

Right here in this Chamber, we spent 25 days considering the bill before we voted—25 days considering a lot of floor amendments, a lot of floor time. Is there a single member of the majority party who will commit to having at least 25 days of debate on the floor of the Senate so we can get a full vetting of the issues, so we can get full input by the citizens of the United States of America?

Well, I am concerned that we are not on the path that values the construction of our government, our constitutional "we the people" government. I am concerned and afraid we are on a path where powerful special interests meeting secretly with 13 Members of the Senate are crafting a bill that is great for the powerful and the privileged but in fact is terrible for Americans, and that is why they are so afraid to show us the bill.

So this is unacceptable, and we need the citizens of America to pay attention because why is this happening right now? Well, because the fact that this secret process is going on, it can be camouflaged by all the conversation about Russiagate—how much did the Russians interfere in our elections, and what about all those secret meetings by members of the campaign team, were they coordinating or collaborating? We don't know the answer, but that question is central to whether there was treasonous conduct undermining the integrity of our elections.

So let's do this now, the secret healthcare plan, with no debate while America is trying to fight for the fairness and integrity of our elections. Let's do it now when schools are out of session and we are in summer and people are on vacation. Let's sneak it through now, this act that strips healthcare for millions of Americans.

Here is the principle we should come back to: No hearing; no vote. No hearing; no vote. No vote on a piece of legislation that affects the lives of millions of American families if we haven't had due deliberation by the key committees. No vote on a bill that destroys healthcare for millions of families if we haven't had the chance to consult with the experts in healthcare—the nurses, doctors, hospitals, and clinics.

No hearing; no vote. No vote if we haven't had a full chance for the citizens of America to weigh in, to see the full details, and say what they like and what they don't like and share that with their respective Senators. On an issue of this magnitude, one that will affect the peace of mind and the health of millions of Americans, we need a full, thorough legislative process.

The choices that are made in this Chamber over the next few weeks will have a big impact on the quality of life of millions of American citizens. A provision that eliminates Medicaid expansion, the Oregon health plan expansion in my State, whether it is implemented slowly or implemented fast is going to rip healthcare from 400,000 Oregonians. That is enough Oregonians that if they were holding hands, they would stretch from the Pacific Ocean to Idaho, 400 miles across the State. That is a profound impact.

In addition, those folks who are going to the clinics and hospitals who don't have healthcare, they will not be able to pay for it. So the finances of the clinics and the hospitals will be dramatically hurt. I asked Secretary Price today: Is that the reason the President said the TrumpCare bill out of the House is a mean bill? Is that the reason he used a derogatory phrase to attack the TrumpCare bill out of the House? Is it because of the fact it will undermine the finances of the clinics and the hospitals.

He said: You know, I don't accept the premise that will happen.

Well, covering your eyes and covering your ears and pretending, on such an important issue, is not a responsible act by a Secretary of Health. The clinics have been coming to us and saying this is how our finances improved when our citizens were able to pay for the services because our rate of uncompensated care dropped dramatically and, with that income, we hired a lot more people.

I have a clinic in the northeast corner of our State where the number of people employed, they told me, doubled from 20-something to 50-something. They are able to provide a lot more healthcare in that local, rural community, and that is true in clinic after clinic after clinic.

If one would take their hands off their ears or off from in front of their eyes and listen to the presidents or the executive directors of rural hospitals, they would hear them say: This will really hurt us. This will hurt, not just our ability to provide care to those who will not have insurance, it will hurt our finances. It will diminish our care for everyone in this rural community. Everyone will be hurt by TrumpCare.

Is that what the President meant when he said this bill is mean? Well, if that is what he meant, if what he meant is it is mean because it rips healthcare from 20 million Americans, then I agree with the President. If when the President criticizes the TrumpCare bill as being mean, if he meant that because it was going to destroy the guarantee of access by folks with preexisting conditions, then I agree with him. If he said it because it will destroy essential benefits and allow there to be insurance policies that aren't worth the paper they are written on, then I agree with the President.

If it does, it is going to greatly increase the cost of insurance for older Americans, up to eightfold times. If that is why the President said it is mean, I agree with the President.

The President should weigh in and say: No secret process on a bill so important to the healthcare of millions of Americans. President Trump should weigh in and say: I don't want a bill that looks anything like that House bill because it is defective in this area, in this area, and in this area, hurting everybody in the communities, undermining the clinics, undermining the hospitals, destroying insurance, destroying the opportunity of access for preexisting conditions, and ripping away the guarantee that essential benefits will be covered. That is what the President should do.

He thinks the bill is terrible because he finally looked at it. Well, he is going to think the bill crafted by the secret 13 is terrible too. He has a chance to stand up and fight for the American people and say: I will never



sign a bill that goes through a secret process that excluded the insights from our rural hospitals, insights from our rural clinics, insights from our nurses, and insights from our doctors. I will never sign a bill in the Oval Office that excluded the American people from being allowed to weigh in on the conversation. I will never sign a major bill that hurts so many people in my Oval Office if it never had a committee hearing and never had amendments, never had a chance to go through the legislative process the way envisioned in our “we the people” Constitution. That would be the right thing for President Trump to do.

He has recognized the bill is profoundly flawed. He has a chance to—not only a flawed bill but a profoundly, unacceptable process in our constitutional democratic Republic.

Former Chief Justice Hughes said: We are here not as masters but as servants, not to glory in power, but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by the people of the United States in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority.

Each one of us is here for a short period of time, but we take our constitutional roles as Senators from the foundation of the power of the American people, the “we the people” Constitution. To exclude them from the process is to violate the very premise on which our Nation is founded.

So we have to stop this process. We have to stop it in its tracks. Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, whether you come from a rural State or a highly populated State, it is a responsibility to stop this process, return to regular legislative deliberation so that we can, in fact, have a “we the people” conversation, fully honoring the experts and the feedback from ordinary citizens across our Nation.

No hearing, no legislative deliberation, no vote. No hearing; no vote.

Thank you, Mr. President.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from South Dakota.

**Mr. THUNE.** Mr. President, once again, we have more bad news about ObamaCare. Last week, Anthem announced it will pull out of Ohio’s health insurance exchange for 2018. That means that a minimum of 18 Ohio counties will be without an exchange insurer next year. Twenty-five Missouri counties are in the same boat, and more Americans are likely to find themselves in the same situation.

On June 2, the Omaha World-Herald announced that 100,000 Nebraskans could end up with zero options for individual coverage in 2018. Insurers have been pulling out of the exchanges right and left.

In February, Humana announced its decision to completely pull out of the exchanges for 2018. Three months later,

Aetna, which had already sharply reduced its exchange participation in 2017, also confirmed it would pull out completely in 2018.

In 2016, 7 percent of U.S. counties had just one choice of insurer on their healthcare exchange. In 2017, this year, roughly one-third of U.S. counties have just one choice of insurer. Based upon the information available so far, the New York Times is currently estimating that about 45 percent of U.S. counties will have one or no insurer next year.

One thing is for sure, Mr. President, Americans are facing fewer and fewer health insurance choices, and the prices of those choices are going up.

Proposed rates, proposed rate increases for 2018 are emerging, and once again they are not looking good. Some of the average rate hikes facing Americans around the country include 17.2 percent, 33.8 percent, 30 percent, 45 percent, 38 percent, 58.8 percent.

Three weeks ago, the Department of Health and Human Services released a report comparing the average individual market insurance premium in 2013, which is the year that most of ObamaCare’s regulations and mandates were implemented, with the average individual market exchange premium in 2017 in the 39 States that use healthcare.gov. What they found is that between 2013 and 2017, the average individual market monthly premium in the healthcare.gov States increased by 105 percent—105 percent.

In other words, on average, individual market premiums more than doubled in just 5 years. That is from HHS in their report that just came out in the last couple of weeks. Three States saw their premiums triple over the same period—triple in just 5 years.

I don’t know too many families who can afford to have their premiums triple over 5 years. What we know is that the ObamaCare status quo is unacceptable, and it is unsustainable.

More than one insurance CEO has suggested that ObamaCare is in a death spiral, and it is pretty hard to disagree. Combine soaring premiums with a steady insurer exodus, and sooner or later we get a partial or complete exchange collapse, which is what we are facing today, not to mention all the other ObamaCare problems, such as the deductibles that are so high that sometimes people can’t actually afford to use their healthcare plans or narrow plan networks with few provider choices. We have higher premiums, higher deductibles, higher costs, fewer options, fewer choices.

Republicans are currently working on legislation to help Americans struggling under ObamaCare. My colleagues in the House made a good start, and in the Senate we are working to build on the bill they passed.

We are committed to helping Americans trapped on the ObamaCare ex-

changes. We are committed to addressing ObamaCare’s skyrocketing premium increases. We are committed to preserving access to care for Americans with preexisting conditions, and we are committed to making Medicaid more sustainable by giving States greater flexibility while ensuring those who rely on this program don’t have the rug pulled out from under them. We need to make healthcare more affordable, more personal, more flexible, and less bureaucratic.

My colleague from Oregon was just talking about the complaints they have about the healthcare process, the discussions that are going on, and how much pain, if this passes, it is going to cause the American people. I can tell you one thing: Today, it is pretty darn painful for families I have talked to in my State of South Dakota, hard-working farm and ranch families who are having to pay \$2,000 a month, \$24,000 a year for insurance coverage—in some cases with \$5,000 deductibles, assuming they can even afford to use that expensive policy by being able to cover the deductible. There are people across this country who are hurting because of this failed healthcare insurance program. It is high time for us to fix it.

I believe the American people want to see Congress act in a way that will make healthcare insurance more affordable to them, more personal, so that they will have more choices, greater options, and more competition that will help bring those premiums down to a more reasonable level. They need to have more than one choice. When 45 percent of the counties in America have one choice or no options on the exchanges, that is an unacceptable situation and one that we have to fix.

#### COUNTERING IRAN’S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES BILL

**Mr. President,** I also want to take a few minutes today to discuss the national security bill the Senate just passed, the Countering Iran’s Destabilizing Activities Act.

I hardly need to recite the long list of Iranian activities that make this country a clear and present danger to peace and stability in the Middle East and outside it. Iran remains the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism. It engages in systematic human rights abuses from torture to the targeting of religious minorities. Of course, Iran has long provided critical support to Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, who is perhaps most notable for the repeated use of chemical weapons on his own people. The fact that Assad still remains in power after the long list of atrocities his regime has committed is due in no small part to the support that Iran has provided.

In addition to propping up Assad’s reign of terror, Iran also provides support to the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Secretary of Defense James Mattis recently noted: “We see Iranian-supplied

missiles being fired by the Houthis into Saudi Arabia.”

Well, providing these missiles puts Iran in violation of at least two U.N. Security Council resolutions—not that Iran appears to care. In fact, violating U.N. Security Council resolutions and international law is common practice for the Iranian Government, whether it involves supplying missiles to the Houthis or increasing Iran’s own stockpiles.

When it is not violating the letter of the law, Iran is also happy to violate the spirit of international agreements. After the misguided Iran deal went into effect, Iran resumed ballistic missile testing, even though the U.N. Security Council resolution endorsing the nuclear deal called upon Iran not to engage in these activities.

Most recently, Iran unsuccessfully tested a submarine missile in the Strait of Hormuz in May, following ground-based missile testing in January and March. Many of those missiles have a range to reach targets, not only throughout the Middle East but outside it.

Under the last administration, Iranian belligerence was too often ignored or even rewarded. That needs to end now. We cannot afford to let Iran continue to destabilize the Middle East. We need to make it clear that the United States and its new leadership will not tolerate Iranian aggression and the terrible human suffering that has resulted.

We need to assure our allies—especially Israel, our closest and most reliable ally in the Middle East—that we are committed to standing with them against Iranian threats. The Countering Iran’s Destabilizing Activities Act will send a clear signal to Iran that the United States and its new leadership are serious about cracking down on Iranian misconduct.

This bill will sanction individuals involved in Iran’s ballistic missile program or any other program designed to deliver weapons of mass destruction. It will sanction individuals who contribute to Iranian violations of arms embargoes. It will allow the President to impose sanctions on individuals who have perpetrated human rights violations against human rights crusaders in Iran. Perhaps most importantly, this legislation identifies and will hold accountable the entire Iranian Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, not just the Quds Force, for its role in implementing Iran’s destabilizing agenda.

There is no easy solution to the unrest and violence in the Middle East, but this bill offers one commonsense step forward.

Yesterday the Senate passed an amendment to this bill imposing additional sanctions against another country stirring up unrest in the Middle East, and that is Russia. Russia’s increasing boldness on the international

stage is a natural consequence of the Obama administration’s passive foreign policy. From annexing Crimea to supporting the murderous Assad regime in Syria, to meddling in elections, we cannot allow this level of Russian aggression to go unchallenged.

The Russia sanctions amendment codifies and strengthens existing Russia sanctions and imposes a number of new ones. Human rights abusers, individuals supplying weapons to Assad’s regime, hackers acting on behalf of the Russian Government, and Russians involved in corruption are all sanctioned in this amendment.

I am grateful to Senators CORKER and CRAPO, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Banking Committee, for all the work they have done on this bill and on the Russia sanctions amendment. It was a bipartisan bill. Our colleagues on the other side, the Senator from Maryland and others, were involved in crafting this legislation, and it is a demonstration that this body can come together and do consequential things. These are two big national security and foreign policy measures that we have moved today.

There have to be consequences for Iranian and Russian aggression, and this legislation makes sure there will be. I am pleased that it moved today with largely bipartisan support in the U.S. Senate because it will send a clear message.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

#### MINORITY HEALTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, April was National Minority Health Month. I point that out because I have worked with many of my colleagues in order to advance minority health.

We have done some very important things in recent years that I am very proud of, and many of those are included in the Affordable Care Act. I know that Senator CARPER and Senator BLUMENTHAL will be on the floor; Senator CARPER is here now. They have been instrumental in advancing quality healthcare for all Americans, but we do recognize that we have a special role in regard to historic discrimination on minority health. I was pleased that the Affordable Care Act included the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities so that we could have a focal point at NIH to deal with the historic problems and have a game plan to advance that.

I was also pleased that the Affordable Care Act provided coverage for minorities in greater numbers because when we looked at the number of uninsured, the number of minorities were a much higher percentage than the general population of uninsured. When we looked at inadequate coverage, we saw the same numbers. So we have made advancements.

In April, historically, I had filed a resolution in order to acknowledge the progress we made and to continue our commitment to make sure that all Americans have access to affordable, quality healthcare and that we do not discriminate. That resolution had always cleared without any difficulty until 2017. For reasons I cannot explain, there were Republican objections, and we were not able to adopt the resolution commemorating minority health month.

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

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

Promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2017, which include bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.

Whereas the origin of National Minority Health Month is National Negro Health Week, established in 1915 by Dr. Booker T. Washington;

Whereas the theme for National Minority Health Month in 2017 is “Bridging Health Equity Across Communities”;

Whereas, through the National Stakeholder Strategy for Achieving Health Equity and the HHS Action Plan to Reduce Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities, the Department of Health and Human Services has set goals and strategies to advance the safety, health, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas a study by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, entitled “The Economic Burden of Health Inequalities in the United States”, concludes that, between 2003 and 2006, the combined cost of health inequalities and premature death in the United States was \$1,240,000,000,000;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has identified 6 main categories in which racial and ethnic minorities experience the most disparate access to health care and health outcomes, including infant mortality, cancer screening and management, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, and immunizations;

Whereas, in 2012, African American women were as likely to have been diagnosed with breast cancer as non-Latina White women, but African American women were almost 40 percent more likely to die from breast cancer than non-Latina White women;

Whereas African American women are twice as likely to lose their lives to cervical cancer as non-Latina White women;

Whereas African American men are 60 percent more likely to die from a stroke than non-Latino White men;

Whereas Latinos are 1.7 times more likely to be diagnosed with diabetes by a physician, and are 40 percent more likely to die of diabetes, than non-Latino Whites;

Whereas Latino men are 3 times more likely to have HIV infections or AIDS than non-Latino White men;

Whereas Latina women are 4 times more likely to have AIDS than non-Latina White women;

Whereas, in 2014, although African Americans represented only 13 percent of the population of the United States, African Americans accounted for 43 percent of HIV infections;

Whereas, in 2010, African American youth accounted for an estimated 57 percent, and Latino youth accounted for an estimated 20 percent, of all new HIV infections among youth in the United States;

Whereas, between 2005 and 2014, the number of Asian Americans diagnosed with HIV increased by nearly 70 percent;

Whereas, in 2014, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders were 1.7 times more likely to be diagnosed with HIV than non-Latino whites;

Whereas Native Hawaiians living in the State of Hawaii are 5.7 times more likely to die of diabetes than non-Latino Whites living in Hawaii;

Whereas Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders are 30 percent more likely to be diagnosed with cancer than non-Latino whites;

Whereas, although the prevalence of obesity is high among all population groups in the United States, 42 percent of American Indian and Alaskan Natives, 41 percent of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, 40 percent of African Americans, 31 percent of Latinos, 24 percent of non-Latino whites, and 11 percent of Asian Americans are obese;

Whereas, in 2013, Asian Americans were 1.2 times more likely than non-Latino Whites to contract Hepatitis A;

Whereas, among all ethnic groups in 2013, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders had the highest incidence of Hepatitis A;

Whereas Asian American women are 1.3 times more likely than non-Latina Whites to die from viral hepatitis;

Whereas Asian Americans are 3 times more likely than non-Latino Whites to develop chronic Hepatitis B;

Whereas of the children living with diagnosed perinatal HIV in 2014, 65 percent were African American, 15 percent were Latino Americans, and 11 percent were non-Latino whites;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has identified heart disease, stroke, cancer, and diabetes as some of the leading causes of death among American Indians and Alaskan Natives;

Whereas American Indians and Alaskan Natives die from diabetes, alcoholism, unintentional injuries, homicide, and suicide at higher rates than other people in the United States;

Whereas American Indians and Alaskan Natives have a life expectancy that is 4.4 years shorter than the life expectancy of the overall population of the United States;

Whereas African American babies are 3.5 times more likely than non-Latino White babies to die due to complications related to low birth weight;

Whereas American Indian and Alaskan Native babies are twice as likely as non-Latino White babies to die from sudden infant death syndrome;

Whereas American Indian and Alaskan Natives have 1.5 times the infant mortality rate as that of non-Latino whites;

Whereas American Indian and Alaskan Native babies are 70 percent more likely to die from accidental deaths before their first birthday than non-Latino White babies;

Whereas only 5 percent of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, 6 percent of Asian Americans, 8 percent of Latinos, 9 percent of African Americans, and 14 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives received mental health treatment or counseling in

the past year, compared to 18 percent of non-Latino whites;

Whereas marked differences in the social determinants of health, described by the World Health Organization as “the high burden of illness responsible for appalling premature loss of life” that “arises in large part because of the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age”, lead to poor health outcomes and declines in longevity;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119)—

(1) has reduced the uninsured rate for minority communities by at least 35 percent;

(2) has helped further combat health disparities for low-income individuals through coverage expansions in the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and the individual health insurance marketplaces; and

(3) provides specific protections and rights for American Indians and Alaskan Natives, 21.4 percent of whom lack health insurance;

Whereas, despite the substantial improvements in health insurance coverage among women overall, women of color are more likely to be uninsured;

Whereas, in 2012, 36 percent of Latina women, 29 percent of American Indian women, 23 percent of African American women, 19 percent of Asian and Pacific Islander women, and 14 percent of non-Latina White women were uninsured;

Whereas community-based health care initiatives, such as prevention-focused programs, present a unique opportunity to use innovative approaches to improve health practices across the United States and to sharply reduce disparities among racial and ethnic minority populations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2017, which include bringing attention to the severe health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank Senators MENENDEZ, BLUMENTHAL, BROWN, HIRONO, MARKEY, KLOBUCHAR, VAN HOLLEN, BOOKER, PETERS, DUCKWORTH, and CARPER for their help in regard to minority health and the resolution.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

So we couldn't do that, which is a pretty easy thing to do, but now the Republicans are looking to bring out in the next 2 weeks a rewriting of our entire healthcare law, one-sixth of our economy, and they are talking about bringing this out for perhaps passage in the U.S. Senate during the next 2 weeks.

I don't know of anyone who has seen a copy of this bill. I certainly have not seen it, and I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee. Senator CARPER is a member of the Senate Finance Committee. We have not seen a copy of the bill, even though we are the committee of jurisdiction, along with the HELP Committee. I certainly want to be able to look at this bill, make sure that there are public hearings and an opportunity for input from all Members of the U.S. Senate—first those

who serve on the relevant committees through the committee markups and then on the floor of the U.S. Senate. But what I understand from the majority leader is that may not be the case. That would be an affront to our Democratic institution. That would be insulting the Members of the Senate and the committee that I serve on, the Senate Finance Committee.

I need to mention that because we do know what the House of Representatives sent over to us. We don't know if that is going to be the bill that is going to be brought out, but there hasn't been any hearing on the bill that the House of Representatives sent over to us.

Compare that to the passage of the Affordable Care Act. We had numerous, dozens of hearings on the Affordable Care Act. We had months of negotiations on the Affordable Care Act back and forth—bipartisan negotiations. We had committee markups in two of our committees, and hundreds of amendments were considered. Many Republican-sponsored amendments were adopted on the Affordable Care Act. We went through a regular legislative process.

Yet the Republican leadership is telling us that we are going to totally change the Affordable Care Act, totally change the healthcare system, and not offer the American people an opportunity to see what we are doing—or their elected Representatives to be able to offer comments or amendments to that? That is outrageous. That is not a democratic institution. We need to speak out about it.

Now we are all vulnerable to that, all Americans. I have thought about the people in my State, the 400,000 who have coverage under the Affordable Care Act, who didn't have coverage prior to the Affordable Care Act. They are very much at risk because, according to the Congressional Budget Office, if we have on the floor of the Senate anything similar to what the House passed, most of those 400,000 are going to lose their insurance coverage. What are they going to do?

Then we are talking about putting a cap on Medicaid. Well, have you talked to the Governor of your State? Have you talked to your State legislature as to how they are doing with their budgets? Do you really believe the States can pick up what we cut? The answer is obviously no.

We offered an expansion of Medicaid so more working families, more veterans, more people who are vulnerable could get coverage. That is gone under the caps that the Republicans are talking about, putting our most vulnerable at risk.

I started talking about minority health. Let me just underscore that with Medicaid. In my State and in every State, when you look at the percentage of people who are covered

under Medicaid, it is much higher for the minority community because they historically have been discriminated against. They do not have the coverage going into the Affordable Care Act. That is going to affect our most vulnerable. It is also interesting to note that a higher percentage of veterans is under the Medicaid system. That will affect our veterans. Of course, our seniors depend upon Medicaid for longer long-term care. They are going to be adversely affected by these caps under the Medicaid Program.

Then we have the impact on all of us who have insurance and may be able to keep our insurance after this type of legislation. We are going to be adversely affected. Why? Because who do you think pays for those who do not have health insurance? You get cost shifting, and it is done in a more costly, expensive way so our healthcare costs go up. Those of us who have insurance pay more, and those who do not have insurance do not get the early interventions they need in order to stay healthy.

The vulnerabilities continue because one of the things that was affected by the House-passed bill was what we call the essential health benefits. What we did is require that those benefits be provided under all healthcare plans, including Medicaid.

So, yes, I could talk about obstetrics for women, which would be covered under all plans, and that women who need obstetrics would not have to pay a much higher premium as they would be in a high-risk pool. Because of the way the insurance would be done, only women who would need that would get into the plan, and it would cost a lot more. Yes, that discriminates against women.

Again, I could also talk about minority communities that now have coverage for mental health and addiction because that is required under the Affordable Care Act. When it becomes discretionary with the States and they get into tight budget problems, they will lose that coverage.

We are all talking about the explosion of opioid addiction in our communities. In Maryland, I think the rate now is 60 percent higher this year than last year of overdose deaths. Do we really want to cut one of the major tools we have in trying to get this epidemic under control? That is what we are talking about in regard to what the House-passed bill does.

At a minimum, we need to have public hearings to know what we are doing. This is a democratic institution. Under the Affordable Care Act, we had dozens of hearings. The committees of jurisdiction need to work on this bill. They need to be able to mark it up. They need to be able to offer amendments, which was afforded to every Senator in this body under the Affordable Care Act. Many of our colleagues

who voted against the Affordable Care Act have amendments that were included in the Affordable Care Act. That is how a democracy works.

Everyone is affected by this process but particularly the vulnerable, particularly those who are uninsured and those who will become uninsured. Those who have insurance and who have very few other options are going to find their benefits reduced. Minorities, our disabled population, older Americans, and women all will be discriminated against.

At a time at which we want to focus on the progress that we have made to narrow the gap in minority health and health disparities, it would just be a tragedy to move in the wrong way, to reverse the progress we have made, and to do that without an appropriate process of transparency, which has been the hallmark of American democracy.

I urge my colleagues in that there is still time. If you have proposals, work with us—all 100 Senators. I, certainly, have worked with my Republican colleagues on many healthcare issues that are now the law of this land.

We offer to work with you. All we say is don't tell us that you are going to do this by repealing a bill and then come to us to try to fix it. Work with us to improve our healthcare system, and we will work with you. There is still time. Let's work together. Let's have public hearings. Let's get public input. Let's use the old-fashioned process of allowing us to offer amendments. Let's debate those amendments. The end result will not only be better legislation for the American people but legislation that we know will stand the test of time and give predictability to the healthcare stakeholders in our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, my neighbor from Maryland, for inviting a number of us to come to the floor today, this afternoon, to talk a bit about the Affordable Care Act. I am really honored to stand next to him here as we do sit next to each other on the Finance Committee and on the Environment and Public Works Committee. He is a great leader on both of those committees.

#### SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. President, Senator CARDIN and I were on the floor earlier today, along with the Presiding Officer, and we voted on legislation that attempts to send a message to Iran.

By the way, it just had elections, gosh, not even a month ago, whereby the reformist President Rouhani was reelected by a big margin. Reformists—moderates were elected as the mayor of Tehran and in other municipalities across the country. There are a lot of young people in that country who want a better relationship with this country,

and they actually had a chance to speak at the voting box. They elected a number of women to serve in positions of real responsibility, not just in their Parliament but as members, say, of Tehran's city council.

By the way, the Iranians are basically keeping their word with respect to the agreement between five nations, including the United States, China, Russia, Britain, France, and Germany. They are actually keeping their word with respect to complying with the nuclear agreement that was entered into, oh, gosh, 2 years ago. What they are doing and that we disagree with is they are testing ballistic missiles, and there is basically the U.N.'s strong message to Iran not to do that. "If you do, we will sanction you in different ways," but they have continued to test ballistic missiles. They say it is for defensive purposes, but you cannot be sure so we strengthened those sanctions.

With those sanctions, we also included sanctions that basically say to Russia—and all 17 intelligence agencies say Russia intervened in our last election—no question. They intervened on behalf of one candidate, Mr. Trump. They wanted to elect him, and they wanted to make sure Hillary Clinton did not get elected. They succeeded. That is not just Democratic messaging. Every one of our 17 intelligence agencies has come to the same conclusion and has testified publicly to that effect.

As a result, this legislation was initially focused just on Iran, but it refocused and pivoted—maybe refocused even more—on Russia in order to sanction them for their misdeeds, which I think are, in many ways, more significant than what the Iranians have done and have been sanctioned for again.

Why do I go back to this legislation that we just debated and adopted here this morning?

Consistent with what Senator CARDIN has talked about—and he is very much an architect involved right in the middle of the effort to bring that legislation to the floor. It came out of his committee. He is the senior Democrat, the ranking member. BOB CORKER, of Tennessee, is the chair. A number of members—Democratic and Republican—on that committee worked together to fashion that legislation, to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor.

I say to my colleague Senator CARDIN that I didn't know what the final vote count was. It was 98 to 2. That is what we can accomplish when we work together, and I think it is a great message as we pivot and talk about the Affordable Care Act.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, when our friend from South Dakota, Senator THUNE—a great friend for, I think, all of us and admired by both sides—was talking about how deplorable ObamaCare was and

how it is in a death spiral and so forth, I just wanted to stand up and ask him to yield to me so I can say that when Barack Obama and Joe Biden stepped down as President and Vice President of the United States, my recollection was that every county of every State in this country had access to healthcare through the health exchanges.

Where did the idea for health exchanges come from? It came from the Republicans in 1993, from the Heritage Foundation, the rightwing Republican think tank.

They came up with an idea that says: Let's create exchanges in every State, where people who don't have healthcare coverage can get their coverage through large purchasing pool. There would be one in every State. The legislation said: Let's have a sliding scale tax credit to make sure low-income families who do not have coverage can afford that coverage in the exchanges. As their income goes up, the tax credit buys down the cost of coverage. The exchange goes down, and it eventually goes away.

The Republican legislation in 1993, fashioned by Heritage, said there was going to be an individual mandate. People would have to get coverage in this country. If they did not, they would have to pay a fine. One could not make people get coverage, but there would be a fine. There was the idea that employers of a certain size and with a certain number of employees would have to get coverage. We call that an employer mandate. Finally, the health insurance companies could not deny coverage to people in this country because of preexisting conditions.

Those are all concepts that were in the 1993 legislation that was introduced by Senator John Chafee and was cosponsored by, among others, Senator HATCH, of Utah, Senator GRASSLEY, of Iowa, who are now two of the most senior Republicans in the Senate, including being the two most senior Republicans on the Finance Committee on which Senator CARDIN and I are privileged to serve.

I said as recently as last week, when the Secretary of Health and Human Services was before our committee to defend the President's budget, that I applauded Senator HATCH and I applauded Senator GRASSLEY for cosponsoring that 1993 legislation, which became the foundation for healthcare coverage in Massachusetts, which is where they cover everybody. It is called RomneyCare. It was adopted when he was the Governor, and it was fashioned very much under the same foundation.

Senator CARDIN and I are on the Finance Committee, and when we were debating the Affordable Care Act, we literally took those Republican ideas from Heritage, from Senator Chafee,

from the 23 Republican cosponsors for RomneyCare and sort of made them the foundation of ObamaCare. It is ironic just to hear my friend Senator THUNE talk today about the tale of horrors from the Affordable Care Act. Actually, the things my Republican friends are criticizing the most were their ideas from 24 years ago. Personally, I think they were pretty good ideas, and if they were given a fair chance, they could be very effective.

One of my Republican friends said the other day that when the Affordable Care Act was debated and voted on and so forth, the Republicans were pretty much shut out of the process. So it is too bad the Democrats are shut out of the process now as we revisit healthcare coverage with the terrible legislation that has come out of the House of Representatives. I think, if I am not mistaken—correct me if I am wrong, Senator CARDIN—they adopted it without a hearing. I think they adopted it on a straight party-line vote. I think they did it without any kind of score from the Congressional Budget Office and just sent it over here.

While they were doing that, I will just go back in time, if I can, to the year of 2009, when we debated the Affordable Care Act here. We had two committees of jurisdiction. One was the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. That committee held no fewer than 14 bipartisan roundtables. A roundtable is very much like a hearing, but it is not quite as formally structured. It held 14 bipartisan roundtables, which were designed to try to build a consensus around the Affordable Care Act, or healthcare coverage, in this country. Again, this was in 2009.

In 2009, the same committee—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, the HELP Committee—held 13 bipartisan hearings. So there were 14 bipartisan roundtables and 13 bipartisan hearings in all during the actual time they were debating on and voting on the legislation itself. During the HELP Committee's debate and in actually marking up the bill, some 300 amendments were considered that were offered by Democrats and Republicans. More than half of those were accepted. Of the more than half of those 300 accepted—we turned down 160 or so—160 of them happened to be offered by Republicans. Think about that. There were 14 bipartisan roundtables and 13 bipartisan hearings. There were 300 amendments offered, and over half of those were Republican amendments. Over half of those 300 were actually adopted, and 160 in all were Republican amendments. That does not sound like they were shut out on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

On the Finance Committee, on which Senator CARDIN and I serve, we had 17

roundtables and hearings. We held 13 member meetings, 38 negotiation meetings, and a 7-day-long actual business meeting and markup in public, during which we offered amendments and voted on amendments. I think, roughly, a dozen Republican amendments were offered and accepted.

I have a friend who, when you ask him how he is doing, always answers: "Compared to what?"

I would say, as to the process right now that we are looking at with the Republicans' belated response, if you will, to the Affordable Care Act that came out of the House and is now being negotiated in private—not debated but negotiated and some would say in secret. It is hard to keep a secret around here, but it is certainly in private. To my knowledge, there are no bipartisan roundtables and no bipartisan hearings. To my knowledge, there will not be an opportunity for markups or business meetings at which hundreds of amendments could be offered and debated and voted on—none of that. And it will use a process called reconciliation, where they will bring whatever they come up with in these closed meetings, and we have a chance to vote on it up or down.

The House never had it scored. The Congressional Budget Office never had a chance to say: This is how many people will lose coverage. This is what it is going to cost if people don't get help through Medicaid. This is what is going to happen to folks losing their coverage altogether.

They never did that in the House. I don't know if we will see that in the Senate either.

(Mr. CASSIDY assumed the Chair.)

There is a right way and a wrong way to do this stuff. Our Republican friends will probably never agree that we were trying to do it the right way in 2009. What we came up with was the Affordable Care Act at the end of the day, and I would be the first to say it is not perfect. There are things I would like to change. I am sure Senator CARDIN feels that way. I am sure the Presiding Officer who is with us today knows a lot about healthcare. He probably would be willing to change a number of things. For years, I have said: Why don't we just figure out as one, as a bipartisan group—as we were today on the sanctions legislation for Russia and Iran—why don't we try working together on this stuff? And we are sort of waiting to see if we might have a taker.

The Presiding Officer has been very good about reaching out, and I applaud him for that. I think he and I will be in a forum together maybe next week to talk about some of this stuff in public, but I applaud his efforts to reach out and see if we can't foster a better way forward.

Let me close with this: Some of you know I spent some of my years of life

in uniform. For a while, I was a civil air patrol cadet growing up in Virginia. I wanted to go to the Air Force Academy, but I just didn't know how to apply. I applied too late and missed it. I learned about the Navy ROTC and applied for a scholarship, was fortunate enough to win it, and went to Ohio State. I became a midshipman and 4 years later a naval flight officer and then off to Pensacola. I spent 5 years in Active Duty in Southeast Asia and after that in the Cold War as a P-3 Navy aircraft commander. I loved the Navy. I feel privileged that it helped me go to undergraduate school and, after Active Duty, to move to Delaware and get an MBA thanks to the GI Bill. I was privileged to be elected Governor and serve as the commander in chief of the Delaware National Guard for 8 years beyond that. Over half of my life has been involved in the military.

A lot of times when I was younger, I would think about who is helped in healthcare under Medicaid. I used to think that folks who are helped the most by Medicaid are women, poor women, and their children. As it turns out, today, especially as the baby boomers get older, more and more of them are being covered by Medicaid. They receive their coverage because they spend down their assets. A lot of them have dementia and have other disabilities, and they end up in nursing homes. More than half of the money we are spending on Medicaid these days is on those folks. A lot of them are part of my generation and older—our parents, uncles, and aunts.

As it turns out, unbeknownst to me, about 2 million of the roughly 23 million veterans we have in this country—22 million veterans we have in this country are served by Medicaid.

The day I showed up at Ohio State to be a Navy ROTC midshipman, we had only White males in our ROTC. It turned out that is what they had in the Army ROTC and in the Air Force ROTC at Ohio State. When I got to my squadron on Active Duty—in the many years I was in my Active Duty squadron, I think we had just two or three African-American officers. I don't remember ever having an Asian-American officer. There were no women who were officers or even among our enlisted personnel. That has all changed now. The face of our military officer corps and enlisted corps looks a whole lot more like America today than it used to.

As it turns out, the folks who are veterans in this country—those 22 million people—look a whole lot more like America today than maybe was the case a number of years ago. They are Caucasian, they are African American, they are Latino, they are Asian American—all of the above. A number of those 22 million veterans who are depending on Medicaid are minorities. They are going to be adversely affected if we are not careful of what we do in

the House or if we in the Senate replicate something like that or similar to that and ultimately in a conference try to represent a compromise between what we do in the Senate and what they have done in the House.

I will close with this: This story can end badly, or it can end in a better way. We have just gotten a good example of how to do it right with the legislation we just passed earlier today, the sanctions against Russia and Iran. My hope is that we will use that as a template to come back and make changes to the Affordable Care Act and that we will do it in a way that fixes what needs to be fixed and preserves what needs to be preserved.

I thank my friend from Maryland for his leadership on this and God knows how many other issues.

If I could have one more moment to say that Senator Kaine and I have offered legislation that I think has probably been shared with the Presiding Officer's office that seeks to help stabilize the exchanges and the ability of the health insurance companies to have some additional predictability and certainty through reinsurance. My hope is that we will have a chance to share what we have offered and maybe see if that is something the Presiding Officer would be interested in joining us in supporting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### THE DEBT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a train wreck that is coming to our country right before our very eyes.

Yesterday, the Federal Reserve, for the fourth time in the last year and a half, increased the Federal discount rate by one-quarter point—one-quarter point. That is a rounding error in most people's imaginations; yet, I think it is a very impactful number. That is the fourth increase in the last year and a half that amounts to 100 basis points or a 1 full percentage point increase in the discount rate. With a \$20 trillion debt, that equates to about \$200 billion of new interest that we will be required to pay out of the revenue we get off the backs of working men and women in America.

I have frequently come to this floor to speak about the \$20 trillion debt, but, as we see what is happening now, we see the reality of what has been predicted over the last few years; that is, as we start talking about growth in the economy, we see a demand for capital and interest rates rising. We also see the Federal Reserve talking about adjusting their balance sheet—some \$4.5 trillion on their balance sheet, the largest balance sheet they have had in history—they are now talking about unwinding that.

So these are dramatic impacts on what we are talking about right now;

that is, how we fund what we are going to be doing not only in healthcare but also our military, as well as the domestic programs we are here to talk about.

What is even more disturbing about the debt we are talking about and the increases in interest is the structure of that debt. Over the last 8 years, the prior administration decided strategically to keep our bond portfolio that supports this debt, the bonds we issue that pay for this debt—the average duration, the length of those bonds, is under 3 years. Some 60 percent, almost, of all the government debt we have in the United States today matures in 3 years or less. That means these increases we are talking about are going to roll on us and the backs of the American taxpayer almost immediately. This is not something that is going to happen in 10 or 15 years; it is right here on us.

Let me put that in perspective. Most every other country in the world that has significant debt—and there are a lot of them; not to the percentage that we do—have already dealt with this duration problem. The UK, for example, over the last 8 years, instead of going short when interest rates were virtually zero, they went long. Forty-eight percent of the United Kingdom's debt is 20 years or longer in maturity. Again, 60 percent of our debt, because of the last administration's strategic decision to stay short—borrow short and spend long—that is a prescription for failure, in business and in government.

Sixty percent of our debt matures in less than 3 years. That is a formula for absolute disaster, and that is what I am talking about.

But even more important than the debt and the duration and the way these interest rate increases are going to impact us almost readily is the fact that we have about 43 days—I came to the floor last week and reported that we had 50 days left, and today we have 43 working days left in this fiscal year before September 30. That means we have to fund the Federal Government for fiscal year 2018 by the end of September. In the last 43 years, this body—Congress—has only done that four times in regular order; according to the 1974 Budget Act, only four times.

What is worse than that is that in the 43 days that we have, from an effective standpoint, we really only have 25 working days left in this Senate. I would argue that with the debt ceiling, with healthcare, with the tax package, with the appropriations process, and the funding of the government, I just don't see any way that is possible. I think that when we are talking to the American public, we need to come clean.

I believe that, like in most years in the past, we are going to be pressured in this body again, just like we have 178 times. We have been forced into a



continuing resolution in this body in order to get past some arcade financing limitation we have had. So that means we have by the end of September to fund the Federal Government. Historically, we have only done that four times, according to regular order. The other times of the 43 years, either a CR or an omnibus was done. But 178 continuing resolutions got us past the end of the fiscal year, moved on to an omnibus of some sort, and then the release valve in all of those occasions was more debt, more spending.

It is very difficult because the budget process itself is broken. And because of that, between now and the end of September, I personally—I am just a business guy, but I have no imagination of how we are going to fund this government by passing 12 appropriations bills. As a matter of fact, since 1974, this body has only averaged passing 2.5 appropriations bills a year out of the 12. Now, you tell me, in the next 43 days, are we going to pass 12 bills to fund this Federal Government? There is no way.

So my call on our colleagues here on both sides of the aisle is, let's get busy right now. I don't care what the structure is, as long as it is not a continuing resolution because that ties the hands of our military. They cannot deal with that. It limits their ability to move money from one department to another. If they wanted to move money from armor to infantry just in the Army alone, they cannot do that. And with the risks we face around the world today, that is an impossibility.

We are working feverishly right now to change the budget process. It will not affect us this year. This is something we have to get serious on right now.

I believe we are poised to have a turnaround in this economy. Consumer confidence is up. It hasn't been higher than this level in 13 years. CEO confidence is higher than it has been in 15 years. Manufacturing confidence hasn't been this high in over 20 years. Why? Because they see some regulations being rolled back right now by this administration and this Senate.

We passed 13 bills out of 14 that we brought forward that pulled back onerous regulations. Just this week, we had the Secretary of Treasury tell us that some 70 percent of the limitations on our banks—not the controls that protect us against another 2008 and 2009 disaster but the controls that are unnecessary and keeping capital tied up in small and regional banks unnecessarily.

We have some \$6 trillion not at work in this economy because of bad fiscal policy right here in Washington. What we are trying to do is unwind that, get it back into the economy.

By the way, if the Federal Reserve releases their \$4.5 trillion and we don't find a way to unleash this \$6 trillion,

tell me where the capital is going to come from.

I am here to tell you that I believe we are on the brink of an economic turnaround if we can, in fact, effect a reasonable improvement in healthcare, get on and fund the government in a responsible way before September 30, and move on and get a tax package done this year.

People right now are working on their budgets for business for fiscal year 2018—right now. By the end of their Q3, they will have that done. Their capital budgets, which go out many years, are being done too. So they are handicapping right now whether we will in fact get that tax package done.

My argument is this: Let's get these things dealt with right now on a timely basis—the debt ceiling, funding the government—and move on to this tax package so we can, in fact, get that done so that business entities and our free enterprise system can, in fact, budget accordingly so that we can get some of these benefits into the economy as early as late next year. If we don't get that tax package done before Christmas, I don't believe we will have any impact in fiscal year 2018 from that.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, with the events this week, I would hope our body could find a way to lower the vitriol, to lower the hysteria when we have a difference of opinion and to find a way to look at what we might agree on, on an issue, as well as what we might disagree on. Yet, as I stand here today listening to some of the speeches, just today I am shocked because it is business as usual in this body. The vitriol is at a very high level. The misinformation is at an extremely high level.

Remember when then-President Obama said: If you like your insurance you can keep your insurance; if you like your doctor you can keep your doctor; premiums will go down under ObamaCare; deductibles will go down; everybody will have insurance. The CBO overestimated by 20 million the number of people who would sign up for ObamaCare, and, oh, by the way, we are going to institute a 30-hour work-week limitation to define "full-time work" and we are going to limit it so anybody with over 51 employees has to comply.

We now know—both sides even agree—that it is failing. What they are saying now, though, is that they are relying back on the argument: Let's move to regular order now; let's make sure we all get this done together. Where was that conversation in 2008 and 2009, when behind closed doors a supermajority crammed down the throat of the minority this thing called ObamaCare? Remember that in the House of Representatives then-Speaker PELOSI said: If you want to find out

what is in the bill, you have to vote for the bill. I think it was a matter of hours that day before when the Senate got the bill. They had to look at the bill before they had to vote on it that night.

But let's look at the reality. ObamaCare is collapsing under its own weight. We know rates are up over 105 percent nationally. In my State alone, they have more than doubled in the last 3 years. Deductibles are up even more than that. Forty-five percent of the counties in the United States are down to one carrier. In my State alone, Georgia, we have 159 counties and 96 are down to one carrier. States like Ohio, Virginia, Iowa, Tennessee, and Missouri are told now that they are losing their last carrier in the individual market.

But let me highlight the reality here. Before the Affordable Care Act, 48 million people in the United States did not have insurance. That was a catastrophe. We all agree with that. Today, however, what nobody on the other side talks about is that 28 million people today in America—the richest country in the history of the world—still do not have healthcare coverage. I can't see how that is a success by any measure. Of the 20 million who got insurance over the last 6 years, 16 million of them did not get it through ObamaCare. It came through the Medicaid expansion. Of the remaining 4 million, 2 million are like me and my wife, who were canceled and then had to come back into the Affordable Care Act unwillingly. That was our only choice. Oh, by the way, we had to have a program that had so many other features in it that our rates doubled over that period of time.

It just seems to me that what we have before us today is an opportunity to clean up this mess and provide for the things that were broken in 2008. We know we have to cover preexisting conditions. We don't want people to have their insurance canceled just because they get sick. That is not the American way. That had to be fixed, and we are going to continue that.

People have to have access, though, and right now, with the cost, many people are coming off of healthcare in the individual market because they simply can't make the financial equation work. The premiums are too much. In my own family, one of my sons can't understand the deductibles. So the financial equation for the very people who need it doesn't make any sense.

We can do things to get premiums down by allowing the free market to provide the types of services inside insurance products that people actually want and not ask them to pay for products they don't need.

We have to make sure Medicaid can be sustained long term.

Lastly, I think we have to make sure that, as we deal with the preexisting



conditions, we make sure that everybody in America has access to healthcare. Nobody is talking about taking away access from the American people in terms of healthcare.

Whether it is healthcare, the military, the VA, or any of our domestic programs, we have a serious funding problem. Our mechanism that funds the programs is broken. It has never worked since 1974, except for four times, and that was prior to 1980, and we have to fix it. But right now, in 43 days—between now and September 30—we have to fund this government, or all the other rhetoric will be idle chatter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for such time as I may consume as in morning business.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I am really glad the junior Senator from Georgia has taken this on. This is something that some of us who have been around a little bit longer have gone through before.

I think everyone realizes that what was attempted to be done by President Obama was a single-payer system. Ultimately, that is what liberals want. I remember back in the 1990s what was referred to at that time as Hillary healthcare during the Clinton administration. I remember so well the efforts that were taking place.

Sometimes I go back to my State of Oklahoma just to be around logical people, and they will ask the question: If this system is not working in Canada, is not working in Sweden, and is not working in Great Britain, why do they think it will work here? Liberal individuals will never tell you this, but what they are really thinking is this: It would work if I were running the show.

So we are going through a similar thing again, and I am so happy we have leaders, as the occupier of the Chair, and we have more doctors right now in the Senate. This is the time to make these changes and really accomplish things. But that is not why I am here.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE AND PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I noticed in the news this morning one more of these incidents happened where they had groups of people going to either the Antarctic or the Arctic to try to reaffirm their positions that somehow the world is coming to an end because of global warming and global warming is because of manmade gases, which, of course, we know is not the case. The interesting thing about yesterday was that a group of some scientists, some individuals, and some environmental extremist activists was going to the Arctic to show that things were melting, and they got stuck in the ice. This

is the fourth time this has happened in the last 4 years because they didn't anticipate the fact that we have actually some areas where it is increasing.

I thought, well, it is time to make one last compliment to the President when he had the courage to pull out of the Paris climate agreement.

A lot of people don't know what these climate agreements are. This was the 21st year we had a climate agreement. It was all started by the United Nations some 21 years ago. The idea was to go to exotic places around the world and invite all 192 countries to come in to convince them that they need to reduce their own greenhouse gases, their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Toward the end of the Obama administration, after eight such meetings they decided this wasn't going to work. They finally decided they would go ahead and try to make one look like an agreement, and, hence, there was the Paris Agreement—not a treaty but an agreement, not anything that would come through ratification, obviously.

I have been over there for some of these meetings. What is interesting about this is that most of the 192 countries involved in these meetings think that if the President says something, it is going to happen. They forget about the fact that we have another branch of government called Congress, and we have to ratify some of these decisions.

So I do want to make a couple of comments about what the President has accomplished by getting out of this agreement.

First, since there is a deliberate effort to make people who are reluctant to believe one narrow view, in terms that the world is coming to an end is a reality, they try to make it change into the argument that as to climate change, anyone who is against the idea that we are having these problems out there is opposed to the idea of climate change.

Look, we have said so many times on the floor that the climate has always changed. All the evidence—historic evidence, scriptural evidence, archeological evidence—shows very clearly that climate is always changing. The arrogance is that somehow climate change can be managed by man. Did man ever cause the ice age or any of the other extreme weather patterns the Earth has seen just over the last few thousand years? The answer is no.

But earlier this year, a climate change study was released which found that little agreement is found with climate modeling simulations and consistently overstate recent summer warming and underestimate preindustrial temperature changes. That was the study. It is no surprise they found forecasts to be inaccurate. According to the environmental extremists, every summer is going to be the hottest. I have yet to see a summer that wasn't going to be the hottest.

Every year they say that is going to take place.

In one of the charts from the study I have here, all you have to do is go back and look historically at what has happened in this country. We go through warming periods. We go through ice ages. I will tell you what is interesting about this chart. The largest increase we had in global warming happened right after World War II, in 1945. That was the year we had the largest number of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that took place. Historically, no one disagrees. That precipitated not a warming period but a 20-year cooling period. So we have been going through this for a very long period of time now.

Essentially, the findings of the study show that the climate patterns we see now are not significant in the grand scheme of things, as we can see by this chart. People like to vilify those of us who talk about this subject and openly question the inaccurate statements and so-called findings of fearmongering scientists who tell everyone the world is ending because of manmade gases. They think that just because many of us recognize that science is not settled and we question exactly how much man affects climate change, corruption must be involved, and so forth.

But we look at the real science. I have not yet met him personally, but I know about a guy named Dr. Richard Lindzen. Dr. Richard Lindzen is an MIT professor. He arguably could be considered the most knowledgeable person in this field. He made this statement: Regulating CO<sub>2</sub> is a bureaucrats dream. If you regulate CO, you regulate life. So that is what is behind this, and we have watched this play out now for about 20 years. To question the idea that man is single-handedly responsible for the changes in climate and doomsday is near due to the fact that we burn fossil fuels is entirely inappropriate and, frankly, unnecessary.

I remember very well a climate fanatic named Michael Mann. I mentioned that Paris was the 21st meeting the United Nations has had. In 2009, that meeting was held in Copenhagen. At that time, I chaired the Environment and Public Works Committee. The first year of the Obama administration, I remember getting ready to go to Copenhagen to explain to people they had been lied to. At that time, Obama was going over, Hillary Clinton was going over, John Kerry was going over, and all the rest, saying we in the United States were going to pass cap and trade. I wanted to make sure they knew we were not going to be passing cap and trade.

I was getting ready to go over. Lisa Jackson was the first Obama designee to be the Director of the EPA. I looked at her, and I said: I have a feeling that as soon as I leave town, you are going to have an endangerment finding so you can start regulating this stuff. She

kind of smiled. I said: When that happens, it has to be based on science. So tell me, what science will you base this on? She said: Well, it is going to be based on the IPCC.

IPCC stands for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. That is the United Nations.

As luck would have it, right after that, a matter of days after that statement was made by her, we had climategate. Do you remember climategate? Not many people remember it because the media didn't play it up here like they did in Europe and around the world. Climategate was where they caught two scientists—one was Michael Mann and one was Phil Jones—who had rigged—there was evidence of this through communications that were disclosed—they were actually rigging the science. They didn't pay much attention to it here in the United States, but I remember at the time that Christopher Booker of the UK Telegraph—that is one of the biggest communication operations in the UK—they called this the worst scientific scandal of our generation. That is climategate. That is cooking the books on science to make people believe things that weren't true.

Clive Cook of the Financial Times said:

The close-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any lengths to defend a preconceived message, is surprising, even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

That is the science on which they have relied for a long period of time. In fact, to give you an example of the hockey stick—that was what Michael Mann came up with in trying to show, instead of what we are showing on this chart here, that somehow this all happened in a recent period of time. It is another research exploration that was wrong.

I started off talking about what happened on the climate change research exploration that just took place in the last few days. Many of these were postponed in the Arctic because of the unusual amount of ice that has taken place. Before a research team could embark on their exploration to study climate change—keep in mind, this group went there to try to show what things are happening, that ice is melting all over the world. Their ship, the Canadian research icebreaker Amundsen, had to be borrowed by the Canadian Coast Guard for search and rescue efforts to help fishing boats and supply ships that were trapped in the unexpected, large amount of ice.

This is at least the fourth time this has happened in recent years to research ships around the world. There was a situation a few years ago where a Russian ship carrying climate scientists and journalists and activists and tourists and an entire crew became trapped in ice that was at least 10 feet

thick. An Australian icebreaker arrived 6 days later to rescue them, but it was unable to do so because of the ice. A few days after that, a Chinese icebreaker sent out a helicopter that was able to airlift 52 of the passengers from the Russian ship to safety on the Australian icebreaker. Unfortunately, during the rescue effort, the Chinese icebreaker became trapped as well.

I tell you these stories because all of these expeditions that were going to the various posts were doing so to try to prove that ice was not accumulating, and they got stuck in the ice.

Most of the predictions that have been published over the last few decades have been widely inaccurate, but most have been accepted by the environmental groups and some of the extremists because they are maintaining their war on fossil fuels, although Trump has ended that.

I have to say that one of the reasons I go back to my State of Oklahoma every weekend is to talk to real people. They will ask a question. I remember that during the Obama administration, he had a war on fossil fuels—fossil fuels are coal, oil, and gas—but he also didn't like nuclear. You don't get these questions asked in Washington. They asked me: Inhofe, explain this to me. We have a President who is trying to do away with fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gas—and nuclear, and we are currently dependent upon coal, oil, gas, and nuclear for 89 percent of the power it takes to run this machine called America. What is going to happen if we are not able to do it?

Of course, as I said, you don't hear those questions around Washington.

Anyway, by fearmongering techniques, environmental extremists and the Al Gore fan club can easily convince a large number of people that regulatory burdens like the EPA's Clean Power Plan, the Quad Oa, the venting and flaring rules, and the waters of the United States rule are a good thing and that we can save the Earth without any consideration of the effect these rules have on energy.

By the way, for any conservatives who are out there, I would like to remind them that even though it didn't get much play in the media, this President in the first 100 days in office has been able to do away with some 47 of the regulations. The two ways of doing away with a regulation—one is through Executive order, and the other is the CRA, the Congressional Review Act. In fact, I was proud that the first signing ceremony our new President had was signing a bill that I had passed. It is one that has really made an effort to try to save enough of the oil and gas industry to run this machine, as I mentioned, called America.

Now we are actively working to face the problems inherited from the previous administration. For the past 8 years under the Obama administration,

the American economy suffered under the effects of his climate agenda. That era is over. President Trump has delivered on his campaign promises since he was sworn in. The strongest signal of this was President Trump's decision to pull out of the Paris climate accord.

It was just a few weeks ago that I was on the Senate floor urging President Trump to pull out of this Paris Agreement. That same day, 21 of my Senate colleagues and I sent a letter to the White House with that same request. Our message resonated with the President, and it was clear that our voices were heard because it was exactly 1 week later that the President announced to the world he was getting out of a bad deal.

Let me mention one thing about this Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement supposedly is something that 192 countries—each said what it was going to do to reduce greenhouse gases, their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. For example, the agreement President Obama said at that time—he said: We commit that we will reduce our CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by between 26 and 28 percent by 2096.

The interesting thing about that is that it can't be done. In fact, immediately after he made that statement, we had a televised public hearing of the EPA to ask them how in the world we could reduce by some 27 percent greenhouse gases in the United States of America. They said it is impossible and we couldn't do it. So what the President was doing then was telling people that we in the United States were able to do something—were going to do something that was very meaningful by our reduction, even though he knew at the time it could not be done.

Then we have the other countries—China, for example. China is the second largest emitter of CO<sub>2</sub>. Currently, as we speak right now, they are cranking out one coal-fired powerplant every 10 days. What did they agree to in this Paris accord? They said: Well, we will continue to increase our output in China. We will continue to have a new powerplant every 10 days or so until 2025. At that time, we will consider reducing it.

Then along comes India, the third largest emitter of CO<sub>2</sub>. India said: Yes, as long as we get \$2.5 trillion, we are willing to do it. Well, where would that \$2.5 trillion come from? The good old United States. The big green fund.

That is how ridiculous that whole thing was. It was the right decision for him to make this a reality.

Many believe that if we lose our ability to negotiate with other nations—this is the only legitimate complaint I have gotten that I really heard during the time. They said: Well, if we don't have a place at the table, then we are not going to be able to be in on any future discussions.

That was wrong, and those who are using that argument were wrong because the agreement that gave us a

seat at the table has already been ratified by the United States, meaning the Senate gave its advice and consent. It is known as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. This was in the 1992 treaty that supports all of the big parties that are held every December. We are still at that table. That decision was made a long period of time ago. We will be at any future activities that take place.

I will wrap up by saying that this was the right thing to do. Stop and think about it. The previous speaker on the floor, the junior Senator from Georgia, was talking about the dilemma we have in this country, the spending dilemma, and how we are going to have to do something about it. We are going to eventually have to get to some of the entitlements, the big spending items.

If we had stayed with the program that the President had outlined and had committed to the other 192 countries, that would have constituted arguably the largest single tax increase in the history of America, and there would have been nothing that would have been accomplished by it.

My final thought. I would like to thank President Trump for pulling out of the Paris Agreement. It is the right decision, and it will without question help the United States in the long run.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

#### COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES BILL

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I joined our colleagues today at lunch, and one of the conversations I had with one of my Democratic colleagues was how surprising, perhaps, but certainly how pleasing it was that today the Senate, in a bipartisan fashion, addressed some contentious issues related to sanctions in regard to Iran; issues related to sanctions in regard to Russia. Both of those issues, because of the political climate and because of past history, could be fraught with great opportunity for partisanship to be exhibited in full force. The conversation I had with my colleague was how surprising and, more importantly, how pleasing it was that didn't happen.

I commend the Senate and its leadership for working together to resolve their potential differences and creating

this opportunity for us to have a debate, a discussion, both on public policy—that I think is important to the security of the world—and the safety of Americans here in the United States.

I am here, in part, to express my support for the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act, the legislation we addressed today. It permits our government to target those individuals and institutions responsible for a foreign policy that puts American lives at risk and undermines the security, particularly in the Middle East, but really of the globe.

The theocratic, autocratic regime's survival in Iran depends currently on the human rights abuses and political oppression. Eight years after the Green Movement's protests, the group's leaders remain under house arrest. Members of that movement were tortured. Still, today, Iranian Americans are unreasonably detained without hope for release in Iran. The Iranian regime's survival depends further on its control of its economy. When it was brokered, proponents of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action argued it would provide economic benefit to the Iranian people.

So when President Obama negotiated—and this Congress, this Senate, failed to reject the JCPOA—one of the arguments about its benefits is that everyday Iranians would enjoy greater economic opportunity. Instead, a recent Reuters study shows businesses directly tied to the Supreme Leader and the IRGC are the main beneficiaries of those changes in our relationship with Iran. Despite renewed economic growth, Iran's unemployment rate is estimated to be as high as 12 percent, and that figure could be as high as almost 30 percent among Iranian youth.

Survival of Khamenei's regime depends on stoking hatred of America as a way to whip up support. Iran uses small boats to swarm American Navy ships protecting the free navigation of the Strait of Hormuz in the Persian Gulf. This is disturbing for a number of reasons, but the importance of that Strait's role in global economy certainly is one of them. In addition, it is linked to scouting soft American targets for terrorism.

So we continue to see bad behavior, threatening behavior by the Iranian government toward the United States and our global interest in the Strait of Hormuz and the suggestion that Iran is preparing and looking for opportunities for terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies in the Middle East.

Last week, two Hezbollah operatives were arrested here in the United States. They were doing surveillance on targets in New York and on our embassies as well in Israel and Panama. Two terrorism specialists, Dan Byman of Georgetown and Scott Stewart of Stratfor, tweeted in reaction to this news that this could be a case of Iran

sending us an ominous message; that Iran can play the terror card if it wants to. If that is indeed the signal Tehran is sending to us, it is important—it is imperative, in fact, that we send a message of our own that no civilized country resorts to planning to kill innocent civilians. The legislation we passed today informs that regime that the JCPOA does not provide impunity for Iran to make such plans.

Iran threatens its neighbors with its ongoing ballistic missile development, which was not part of the JCPOA. Hezbollah is armed with tens of thousands of rockets, threatening Israel's security. This is the same group which has been instrumental in propping up the Assad regime in Syria and which is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands. The head of the IRGC forces was seen on the Syria and Iraq border just this past weekend. We know Assad's regime would have not survived without Iran's continued financial and military support. Again, this legislation underscores the Senate's belief that the Iranian regime must not be allowed to continue conducting and destabilizing activities under the shield of the JCPOA.

I was an opponent to the JCPOA, but today's actions are unrelated to undermining that agreement, which is now in place. They are designed to hold back further activities by the Iranian regime against America and its interests. It is really a requirement that Iran act within the nation-states' Code of Conduct—the normal behavior of a country around the globe.

Previous administrations, in my view, failed to challenge Iran on way too many fronts. With this legislation, the Senate is intent on pushing back on Iran's adventurism in the Middle East and beyond. By imposing appropriate sanctions and requiring the Secretaries of State, Defense and Treasury, as well as Director of National Intelligence, to formulate a coherent strategy to counter Iran's influence in the region, we say to the regime that their activities will be countered every step of the way.

This legislation plays a part in doing what Dan Byman, the professor—the terrorism expert—testified to our House counterparts last month. His words were to 'highlight the costs of Iran's adventurism to ordinary Iranians to raise domestic awareness of, and discontent with, the regime's foreign policy.'

There remains more that can be done to challenge Iran and constrict its resources. Many amendments were filed to strengthen this legislation that were not ultimately considered. One of those was mine. Last year, the Obama administration announced it would pay \$1.7 billion to Iran in an effort to settle a longstanding financial dispute. Transferring cash to a leading state sponsor of terror was a bad idea when

the Senate considered the 2015 nuclear agreement, and it remains a bad idea, a terrible idea today.

The amendment I offered to today's legislation would limit the President's ability to transfer funds to Iran. This amendment directs that the U.S. Government puts justice for American victims of Iranian terrorism ahead of the payments to the Iranian's regime. No administration should transfer funds related to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal without first requiring settlement of all damages already awarded in judgments made in the U.S. courts against Iran for their terrorism crimes against our own citizens. Paying our own citizens from that fund before any money is transferred to the Iranian regime makes sense, common sense, and it is surrounded by the sense of justice and right.

While my amendment was not one of those considered by the Senate yet, we will be introducing this concept as freestanding legislation in the near future.

I know sanctions alone will not change Iran's regime's behavior. Incidentally, we need our allies and friends to join us in this sanction effort. Yet we know the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act remains an important bill to impose costs on the regime in Iran and, hopefully, to encourage more of the discontent we saw during the recent elections. Perhaps there will rise an equivalent to the 2009 Green Movement that offers Iranians one more opportunity to throw off the yoke of theocratic rule of tyranny and get the government they deserve—one that respects their rights and has the desire to coexist peacefully with its neighbors.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks on healthcare and what is ahead over the next couple of weeks in this way.

For almost 7 years before I got elected to the Congress, I was the director of the Oregon Gray Panthers, which is a senior citizens group, and I ran a legal aid office for the elderly. I made the judgment then that healthcare was and always would be the most important issue. I made that judgment because I have always felt that if you and your loved ones do not have their health, then pretty much everything else does not matter.

The Presiding Officer of the Senate, of course, is a skilled healthcare pro-

vider and knows a lot about these issues, and I am really going to use that as my reference point today in making the judgment that having quality, affordable healthcare for your families and yourselves is paramount to everything else.

My view is that the proposal being considered here in the Senate of cutting hundreds of billions of dollars in funds from the social safety net—the Medicaid Program, which is the lifeline for seniors and kids with special needs and for the disabled—is going to put at risk the health and well-being of millions of Americans if it is passed.

It is why I want to take some time to explain what it actually does so that people all across this country will be in a position to make their voices heard—to speak up, to do their part—so that when this debate comes to the floor of the U.S. Senate, as I believe it will in the next couple of weeks—and it moves very quickly—every Member of this body will have heard, loud and clear, what Americans think of this proposal, and I do not think that that assessment is going to be too kind.

Now, the House passed their version of TrumpCare by a razor's edge, and to put it in a pleasant way, over here, Senators looked at it and said: No way. No thanks. My colleagues in the Senate majority said: We are throwing this bill out, starting fresh, and we are going to do it right. So I am going to start with where that process got lost.

The majority convened a special working group made up of 13 Republican Senators, all of them men, and it turns out, based on comments that have been reported, the Senate bill isn't going to be all that different from what the House was talking about. So Republicans in the Senate are pretty much picking up where the House left off on TrumpCare, and the legislation that is being crafted stays hidden—stays behind closed doors and in a position where, for example, if you are a Democrat on the Finance Committee, you don't even know what is in it. It is not going before committees. It will not be put forward for amendment in a markup. With barely any public notice, the bill will hit this floor for 28 hours of debate—that is that.

I will just briefly describe a session we had in the Finance Committee this week where there was discussion from the other side of the aisle that maybe there was a big partisan divide with respect to healthcare. I listened a bit. Finally, I said: I don't know how you can have a partisan divide about a bill that you can't read.

I am the senior Democrat on the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee is the committee that has jurisdiction over hundreds of billions of dollars in payments for Medicare and Medicaid and the various tax credits that are part of the Affordable Care Act. This is the committee with the author-

ity to address the management of hundreds of billions of dollars for those programs—Medicare, Medicaid, tax credits—and we see nothing. Not only have there been no hearings, we haven't seen anything. Something has been sent to the Congressional Budget Office. Who knows the answer to that. We haven't seen that either.

So that is the process that would dictate a radical transformation of one-sixth of the American economy—the American healthcare system—affecting millions and millions of Americans.

That is what we are looking at right now for the next couple of weeks, and it is pretty different than what happened during the Affordable Care Act.

I want to focus on a few points just with respect to that. The first is especially important, as I have said, to the Finance Committee that deals with Medicare and Medicaid and these crucial aspects of healthcare in America. The Senate Finance Committee has been cut out of this process. The chairman, Senator HATCH, I, and 24 other committee members—there has been nothing for us to examine as a group to do what the Finance Committee tries to do best, which is to work in a bipartisan way. That is what we have done so often in the past, which is to sit down and try to take the good ideas that come from both sides, from the staff who knows healthcare inside and out, with years of experience working on healthcare matters.

I have a little bit of a special interest in this because I wrote something called the Healthy Americans Act before the Presiding Officer was here in this body. Eight Democratic Senators and eight Republican Senators joined together in comprehensive healthcare reform for the first time—for the first time ever before.

We have done a lot of good work on issues that represent the big challenges ahead. We know, for example, Medicare today isn't the Medicare of 1965, when it was about broken ankles, Part A or Part B, a bad case of the flu. Today Medicare is about chronic illness—diabetes and heart disease and strokes and cancer. We have worked on that in a bipartisan way. Bipartisanship is what the Finance Committee is all about.

So in the runup to the Affordable Care Act, we held more than 50 hearings, roundtables, walk-through sessions. It wasn't exactly exciting. We always used to say: If you are having trouble sleeping, come by for a while and you will be knocked out in a matter of minutes. But that is where you do the hard work of legislating.

When the Finance Committee finished the drafting process, the legislation sat online for 6 days before we went through the formal committee consideration—what we know up here as a markup. A total of 564 amendments were posted online before the markup began for all to read. The

markup lasted 8 days. There were 130 amendments in the longest markup in 22 years. Two dozen Republican amendments were adopted, and the bill passed with a bipartisan vote.

We all got pretty sick of the hearing room by the time it was over. I will just read a quote from Senator GRASSLEY with respect to the Finance Committee markup of the Affordable Care Act. Senator GRASSLEY is the chairman, of course, of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the former committee chairman of the Finance Committee, and a very careful, thoughtful legislator. He said: "This was the most open and inclusive process the committee has undertaken in its history. . . ."

He went on to say: ". . . I believe, since I have been on the committee."

So that is not a Democrat. That is Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am sure Senator MURRAY has similar accounts of the process under the late Senator KENNEDY. That legislation was online for days as well.

That is what the legislative process is supposed to look like. It is a process that starts from the bottom up, and it is out in the open. Sunlight has always been the best disinfectant. You get hearings. You get study. You get debate. You marry the best ideas of both sides.

I have always felt that bipartisanship is not about taking each other's lousy ideas; bipartisanship is about taking each other's good ideas, but because of the process the Republican leader is insisting on, that is not what the majority has on offer. What is in the works is hidden away so the public and Americans across this country who might be sitting in a coffee shop and would like to pull up a proposal on their laptop, they can't do it, and there aren't any hearings on what might be going in the bill as well. That, in my view, is the wrong way to build a sweeping, massive proposal like this, which, for so many of those who are walking on an economic tightrope, balancing their food against their fuel and their fuel against their medical care, this isn't some abstract issue for them. It is a matter of life and death.

This proposal is built around an attack on Medicaid. The last version of the bill that anybody has been allowed to see cut the program by more than \$800 billion, but there haven't been any hearings on what that would mean for the 74 million Americans who get their healthcare coverage through Medicaid. Nobody has been brought before the Finance Committee to talk about how you would not endanger the Medicaid nursing home benefit with this proposal, and that benefit pays for two out of three nursing home beds in America. There hasn't been a hearing examining the effect of the staggering implications of Medicaid cuts on 37 million kids enrolled in the program, particu-

larly what it means for kids with disabilities and kids in special education classes.

At home in Oregon, when we had town meetings and roundtables on it, I just brought up—just raised the issue very gently—about the prospect of those special needs kids being hurt with this proposal, and the room just broke out in sobs.

There haven't been any hearings on how much worse the opioid epidemic will get in States across the country when people enrolled in Medicaid lose access to treatment for mental health and substance abuse disorders. Just this morning, I talked about a brand new idea that seems to be picking up some interest in the majority about basically coming up with kind of a separate way to fund the coverage for opioids. Instead of it being a guarantee of being able to get access to services, it would sort of be a separate program, which also is not in line with sensible healthcare policy. As the Presiding Officer knows, so often those addicted to opioids have multiple conditions. In other words, if you are a young person who is addicted to opioids, you might well need mental health services. If you are an older person who is addicted to opioids, you might need services relating to chronic illness.

So I want everybody in those States across the country—particularly in the Midwest and in the industrial Northeast—although opioid addiction has hit this country like a wrecking ball from Portland, OR, to Portland, ME. There are a lot of people paying attention to what is going to happen with respect to coverage for those addicted to opioids, and based on this proposal I have been reading about that is being floated, this is a prescription for trouble for those trying to come back from opioid addiction.

Then, I want to mention the bill's provisions on preexisting conditions. When the Affordable Care Act was written in committee, the bedrock guarantee of protection against discrimination for those who have preexisting conditions and protecting those who have preexisting conditions with airtight, loophole-free protection—that was at the heart of the Affordable Care Act. My view is TrumpCare takes a jackhammer to that bedrock protection, cracking open loopholes that benefit insurance companies. Americans are aghast that their elected representatives would support the idea. I know that because I have had 46 townhall meetings in my State this year, and I hear about it at nearly every one.

So one would think this would generate a lot of interest in the Senate Finance Committee—the committee with jurisdiction over Medicaid, for example—because there are a lot of those folks who have preexisting conditions. No discussion. Zero discussion—zero—

of any proposal that the Senate could be considering over the next couple of weeks that rolls back protections on preexisting conditions.

I gather the House bill just basically takes the waiver process, which in the Affordable Care Act was designed to let States do better; in the House, they let States do worse—considerably worse—and one of the most objectionable features is the States can get a waiver and unravel some of those strong protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Now, if the healthcare changes I have mentioned aren't bad enough, TrumpCare also takes hundreds of billions of dollars of healthcare from needy and vulnerable people and, in effect, hands it in tax breaks to the most fortunate. Nobody has come before the Senate Finance Committee with authority over taxes to explain why the Congress ought to raid healthcare programs for the vulnerable to fund tax cuts for the fortunate few.

Our committee—the chairman and I, along with all the Democrats and several of the Republicans—has been prevented from legislating out in the open on this proposal because the Senate TrumpCare plan has essentially been pushed out of view. It is clear that this isn't just sidestepping the Finance Committee. The public—the American people—have been cut out of the process when healthcare policy that will affect millions for years to come is being written here.

The majority leader has said he pretty much is not interested in input from Democrats. The Republican healthcare plan is going to move by reconciliation. That is a Washington word, folks—when you are at a coffee shop, nobody is talking about reconciliation, but it is basically our way or the highway. We are going to do it our way, and that is that. It is the most partisan road you can go down in the Senate. It relies on moving as quickly as possible with the least possible sunlight.

As far as I can tell, the Senate bill is going to be hidden until virtually the last minute, at which point it will come straight to the floor for a very short, abbreviated debate.

That is not what happened when the Affordable Care Act came up. The Senate spent 25 consecutive days in session on healthcare reform, the second longest consecutive session in history—week after week, spirited debate, mid-November into late December, vote after vote after vote. In total, the Senate debated the Affordable Care Act for nearly 220 hours. That kind of extended give-and-take from both political parties you just can't have under this partisan "our way or the highway" approach known as reconciliation.

When the Senate plan hits the floor, there will be 20 hours of debate before time expires and the final votes are cast. That is it. That is it. We won't

have seen a bill until the last minute, and then one-sixth of our economy is going to be handled and framed for decades to come in a short and regrettably partisan debate.

I have said from day one that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. No major piece of legislation ever is. For major legislation to work and for it to last, it has to be bipartisan. That is why I mentioned that I put in a bipartisan bill—eight Democrats and eight Republicans. But you don't get it exactly your way. So I was very glad when the Affordable Care Act took that portion of our bill—the portion of the bill that had airtight, guaranteed protection for Americans from discrimination when they had preexisting conditions.

The reason we felt it was so important—the 16 of us, eight Democrats and eight Republicans—is that if we open up the opportunity for discriminating against people with preexisting conditions again, we take America back to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and the wealthy. That is what happens if you allow that discrimination. If you are healthy, there is no problem. If you are wealthy, there is no problem, either. You can just write out the checks if you have preexisting conditions.

The process the Senate is headed down now is as partisan as it gets. Unfortunately, what Senate Republicans are doing now makes what the House was up to almost transparent.

I am going to close here with just one last comment. Now is the time for the American people to get loud about healthcare—really loud—because the well-being and health of millions of Americans is at stake here in the Senate over the next 2 weeks. For older people who could need nursing home care, for seniors who aren't yet eligible for Medicare who are between 55 and 65 and who could face huge premium hikes, for the millions who work for employers who thought they were safe, the House bill removes the caps on the out-of-pocket expenses they have. If somebody gets cancer in America, they bust those caps in a hurry. Yet that is what the House is willing to do, and I don't see any evidence the Senate is willing to change.

This debate didn't end when the theatrical production on the South Lawn of the White House took place a few weeks after the vote in the House of Representatives. My hope is—and I sure heard about it from Oregonians last week when we had townhall meetings across the State; there is concern, there is fear, and there is frustration about why they can't be told what is in this bill—that there is still time for Americans to make a difference because political change doesn't start from the top and go down. It is bottom up. It is not top down. It is bottom up. There is still time for the American

people to be heard and to make sure their Senator understands how they feel about this, what is at stake, and, in particular, to get an explanation about why they can't be told now what is in this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The Senator from Texas, the majority whip.

#### PROTECT OUR CHILDREN ACT OF 2017

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad to see my friend from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, on the floor because last week the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the PROTECT Our Children Act, which helps protect children across the country from exploitation over the internet.

This is a bipartisan bill, not surprisingly so because last time this legislation passed, originally back in 2008, it had 60 cosponsors, including 41 Democrats and 18 Republicans. But I have introduced this reauthorization with Senator HELLER from Nevada and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut. It is something we call the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program. It reauthorizes those.

I have had the sad experience of seeing how dangerous the internet can be for our vulnerable children. When I was attorney general of Texas, I launched something we quaintly called at the time the Texas Internet Bureau. That was a long time ago, about 2000. Today, they call it the cyber crime unit, and they do a lot of even more sophisticated things. But the idea back then and the idea still today is to fight internet crimes and to work with law enforcement agencies around the State, including a Dallas-based task force.

Now, 17 years later, these task forces are a national network of 61 coordinated units dedicated to protecting children from internet predators and investigating perpetrators who engage in these horrific crimes. These task forces are on the frontline every day, protecting our children online and rescuing victims of exploitation and abuse. They also work with local agencies to create victim support programs and encourage proactive community education; for example, educating parents and adults of the sorts of things their children might be exposed to online that they might not know about. So we need to educate families and children about the risks the internet can hold, together with the wonderful opportunities it also presents. This is really the dark underbelly of the internet.

It requires a depth of resources to fight child predators online. My experience as attorney general was that local law enforcement agencies didn't have the tax base. They didn't have the ex-

pertise. They didn't have the computers and the other sophistication they needed in order to combat this in their local communities.

Over the past few years we have been able to save many lives from crime online, and it would be a mistake now to change course. We cannot lose this critical tool.

Just for the information of colleagues, we put this on the hotline which, for those who don't work in the Senate, means we asked all Members of the Senate to comment on this and to let us know if they had any objection to its passage.

Hearing none, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 122, S. 782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 782) to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 782) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 782

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology To Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017" or the "PROTECT Our Children Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN TASK FORCE PROGRAM.

Title I of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 17601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 105(h) (42 U.S.C. 17615(h)), by striking "2016" and inserting "2022"; and

(2) in section 107(a)(10) (42 U.S.C. 17617(a)(10)), by striking "fiscal year 2018" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022".

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about healthcare, but I wanted to be here on this occasion to join my distinguished colleague from Texas in supporting this measure because it is so vital to protecting children.

Like the distinguished Senator from Texas, I, too, was attorney general, and we in Connecticut have been at the

forefront of fighting this internet and cyber threat to the welfare of our children.

So I want to express my thanks to him for working in a very bipartisan way. At a time when the public, many commentators, and media question whether we work together across the aisle, this bill is a very apt example of how we can and we must work together to protect our children, to advance our national interests, and to make sure that criminal justice is effectively enforced in this country.

I look forward to working with my colleague in making sure this measure becomes law.

I yield the floor.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, one of the things we are debating right now is, What is the future of the Affordable Care Act or, I should say, healthcare in the United States? One thing we can all agree to is that the individual market under the Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare, as it is commonly called—is not doing well.

I will put up this Facebook post from a constituent in Louisiana named Brian. He wrote in to say:

My family plan is \$1,700 a month. Me, my wife, and 2 children. The ACA has brought me to my knees.

He doesn't say this, but we know that, most likely, his family deductible is \$13,000.

I hope we can get something done. . . . The middle class is dwindling away. Can everyone just come together and figure this out?

So his family is putting out \$20,000 a year for insurance. They most likely have a \$13,000 family deductible. They have two children, a young family, \$33,000 of out-of-pocket expenses before they would see significant benefit from their policy. Clearly, we have a problem.

When he was campaigning, Candidate Trump recognized this, and he said over and over that his contract with the voters was to maintain coverage, lower premiums, address and care for those with preexisting conditions, and to eliminate the ObamaCare mandates. This, if you will, was his contract with the voters—a pretty good contract. I think it is something both parties can get behind.

Candidate Trump and then President-elect Trump doubled down on this just before taking the oath of office, saying: "People covered under the law"—meaning the law that he would support to replace the Affordable Care Act—"can expect to have great healthcare. It will be in a much simplified form. Much less expensive and much better."

Indeed, the President of the United States seemed, again, to renew this

commitment this past week at a lunch with 15 Senators at the White House, once more saying how we have to have a law that lowers premiums and cares for those with preexisting conditions.

That is the baseline. Some would argue, has President Trump committed himself to some right that previously did not exist that all Americans would have healthcare?

I am a physician, a doctor. I worked in a public hospital for the uninsured for so long. I can tell you, Congress created a right to healthcare when it passed the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act. I think President Clinton was the one who signed it into law. This said that anyone—whether they were a U.S. citizen or not—could come to an emergency room and receive all the care they needed, and if they could not pay, they would still receive care.

Whenever somebody says "My gosh, folks don't have a right to healthcare," I note that when I was in the emergency room at 2 o'clock in the morning, as long as those emergency door rooms were open, there were people coming through. They would have congestive heart failure, COPD, diabetes out of control, gunshot wounds, or vomiting blood. They could be schizophrenic or a drug overdose. As long as that patient or those patients came through the door, we treated them, and someone paid.

I would say that it is the fiscally conservative way that if Congress is going to say "My gosh, everybody has a right to healthcare," then we should come up with a considered way to pay for it, as opposed to forcing the hospital to shift the cost of this care to other sources—principally, by the way, small businesses paying higher premiums for their employees, higher rates to pay for the uninsured. The fiscally conservative way is "Let's address these needs."

As a physician, I will also say that the best business practice ways to address somebody with chronic health conditions is to actually manage the disease. If you have a diabetic who doesn't have insurance, she may come to the hospital once a month with diabetes out of control. You have to start an IV and put her in the hospital, perhaps overnight, sometimes in the hospital for longer. This can cost thousands of dollars. Contrast this with having that patient with a primary care physician so that you can manage her disease. Not only is her health better, but you spend a lot less money.

In fact, the wisest corporations in our country now consider the health of their employees as a cost center. What can we do to have the best outcomes at the lowest price? This is the most fiscally conservative way. I think that is the approach we should take as a country.

This brings us to the next point. How do we achieve that which President

Trump suggested, which was that we would maintain coverage, lower premiums, care for those with preexisting conditions, and eliminate mandates in a way that we could achieve it? Some folks say that you cannot achieve this. I disagree with this.

The way to achieve it is to embrace each of President Trump's goals. SUSAN COLLINS and four other Senators and I have put forward a bill called the Patient Freedom Act. In the Patient Freedom Act, the approach we take is to first maintain the coverage President Trump spoke of, but we do it by eliminating mandates. We give the States the options of doing something called automatic enrollment. It means it is easy to be enrolled.

On our income taxes, for example, Republicans have always said: We want to make it easy to pay your taxes—not 16 pages of forms that you have to fill out with a CPA and an attorney but, rather, something you can do on one page. We need to make enrollment in insurance easy.

The second thing—if you can expand the enrollment, we can take from what we know works, which is on Medicare. When someone turns 65, he or she is automatically on Medicare. They don't have to fill out a bunch of forms online. Rather, they are just on Medicare. They get a card. Here is your Medicare card. You are in unless you don't want to be.

If you don't want to be, we make it easy to get out. You just call up and say: I don't want to be on Medicare. And you are not. It turns out that 99 percent of Americans like this simple approach, and they stay on Medicare.

We could expand coverage and make it simple, still eliminating mandates by giving States the option to say to their residents, you are in unless you are out. We are going to make it simple.

If you are eligible for this credit, you would get the credit. And unless you call us up and say that you don't want it, you would be enrolled in an insurance program.

In this way, we care for those with preexisting conditions. How is that the case? If you have a few sick people in the insurance pool, then the only people whom you can spread that risk among are the few and the sick in the pool. Every year they pay higher and higher premiums.

On the other hand, if you can expand the risk pool to include all the young "healthies"—the folks who think themselves immortal, who on an average year may only have \$500 or \$800 worth of healthcare expenses—if you can incorporate all of them in your risk pool, then the expense of the few and the sick is spread out over the many and the healthy. Instead of premiums rising because of one person's illness, premiums hardly budge because the cost of that care is spread over so many.



We call it a risk pool for a reason. If you take a cup of water and you pour it in a large swimming pool, the level of that swimming pool does not change because that big pool absorbs the water. If you take a cup of water and you pour it in a smaller cup of water, it overflows.

We need to make it where it is the former situation—where we have a big risk pool with lots of young, healthy people with whom we can share that risk over the many and not the few. In this way, we can lower premiums.

It was modeled that if we did automatic enrollment in my State, still maintain the enrollment of the older and the sicker who are already in, we would lower premiums by 20 percent. That is the power of giving the States the option to make it simpler for people to be enrolled in their insurance.

The conservative way to approach our healthcare reform is to recognize that President Trump's contract with the voter on the campaign trail is the pathway to achieving his goals. As we do that in a fiscally conservative way, we recognize that we should not move this cost of care off to small businesses. We should go ahead and pay for it. It is fiscally conservative to manage these patients' illnesses, as opposed to have them going to an emergency room every so often for emergency room care.

Lastly, we have to say that if we embrace Republican ideas of making it simpler to be in a plan, as opposed to more complicated, we are more likely to have that risk pool that is inclusive of many who are healthy, not just a few who are sick.

I look forward to replacing the Affordable Care Act—the un-Affordable Care Act as it has become—with something that embraces conservative principles and fulfills President Trump's campaign pledges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, it is nice to see the Presiding Officer again today—again and again. I don't know if I will be your last speaker, but I will try not to keep you here too long just in case.

I know the Presiding Officer has been through Delaware a time or two and the Senator from Louisiana has been through my State. I have been through theirs.

I am going to talk about a 14-year-old young man who lives in Delaware. I used to say to my friend from Louisiana: Thanks for working, trying to get us to pull together and do something across the aisle on healthcare. We will see how it turns out.

If you come up I-95 on your way to Philadelphia, PA, Trenton, NJ, New York City, Boston, or Maine, you pass through Delaware. As you cross from Maryland into Delaware heading north,

you cross into Delaware and go through the toll plaza, and then almost immediately you are at the intersection of a road called State Route 896, a north-south highway.

If you happen to go north on 896, you go into Newark, DE, and you go right by the University of Delaware, which is there in Newark, DE. We don't pronounce it Newark. We pronounce it New-ark, as if it were two words—New-ark. Even though it is one word, we pronounce it as if it were two words, New-ark.

If you go north, you go on 896, you go right into the University of Delaware. I took that road over 40 years ago while I was still in the Navy and on leave with the Navy, trying to figure out where to go to graduate school. I went north on 896 and ended up falling in love with the University of Delaware and applied to graduate school there, and I made my life in Delaware.

If you go south on 896—when you intersect 896 and I-95, you don't go to the University of Delaware. You don't go to Newark. You go south to a town called Middletown. It is one word. There are some extraordinary athletes, high school athletes in Middletown.

For many years, their principal high school was Middletown High School. They have a couple of other schools there now, but one is Appoquinimink High School. In Middletown, they are the Cavaliers. The other is the Jaguars. The Jaguars have a new school; Appoquinimink is a newer school. Middletown has been around forever. They have a history of great athletes.

Year after year, they have won championships, including football—State football championships—and men's sports and women's sports. The key to their successes is that these kids grew up together, and they played sports when they were Peewees. They played sports when they were in middle school. By the time they got to high school, they had worked together, trained together, and knew each other, and they did well as a team.

I met another athlete from Middletown a couple of weeks ago. He came by my office with, I believe, his mom. I think it was his mom. We have a photograph of him right here. He is an unlikely athlete. He is 14 years old. He is from Middletown, DE. His mom's name is Jennifer.

They told me what it was like for Michael—Michael Davis—to grow up in and live with a disease called cystic fibrosis. Before we talked much about cystic fibrosis and his preexisting condition, we talked about something we have a passion about, and that is running.

I am all of 70 years old. I still work out every day. I have been doing this since I was a brand new ensign in the Navy and on my way to Pensacola, FL, to become a naval flight officer and serve our country around the world.

I like to run every day. This guy does, too—almost every day. There is a difference. The difference is that he has cystic fibrosis. I will talk about what that means in a minute, but despite the lung condition he has, he has defied the odds to be alive today—and not just to be alive today, but to become quite an athlete.

I don't know how many people in the Chamber—I look at our new pages who are here, their first week on the job, and I don't know how many of them have run half marathons. I run have run quite a few in Delaware over the years, but I don't have cystic fibrosis. This guy can run a half marathon and beat me into the floor and beat me into the road, at least. I need to yield to him when he goes by.

We have been joined on the floor today by the majority leader. When he shows up, along with a guy who is a fast runner, I yield to them. I will yield to the leader so he can take care of business, and then I will pick up when he finishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Delaware.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one thing we learn at a young age is the very basic principle that, when you give your word, you keep it. On June 1, on the international stage, President Trump signaled to the rest of the world that America cannot be relied upon to meet this very basic tenet. On one warm afternoon in Washington, President Trump withdrew the United States from one of the most sweeping global environmental accords in generations. Abandoning our obligations to the Paris climate accords doesn't make America great. It doesn't reflect America's traditional role as innovator, leader, and standard bearer in our shared commitment to protecting the environment.

The chief U.S. negotiator of those accords, Todd Stern, is a former member of my staff. No one among the ranks of our government was closer to these negotiations, which led to a deal that was a win for American workers and businesses and a first step toward ensuring the survival of our planet. His words, published by the Washington Post on

June 1, should be required reading for every American, including the President.

By reneging on our pledge to honor these accords, which were forged through U.S. leadership, President Trump is ceding American leadership in emerging clean energy technologies and worsening one of the genuine existential threats to the world. The President's decision was a serious setback in our fight to save our planet. But as Mr. Stern writes, "This is not the end of the line. This is a call to arms."

Governors and mayors and State and local officials are heeding this call, rejecting the President's decision, and pledging to move forward with aggressive efforts to curb climate change. President Trump may think this is the end of America's involvement in the Paris climate accord. But, like Todd Stern, I believe a majority of Americans will reject this move. I, too, hope they will double down on our shared commitment to protecting our environment and our world for generations to come.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stern's column, "Trump just betrayed the world. Now the world will fight back," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 2017]

TRUMP JUST BETRAYED THE WORLD. NOW THE WORLD WILL FIGHT BACK.

(By Todd Stern)

President Trump has made a colossal mistake in deciding to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement. There is simply no case for withdrawal, other than a desire to double down on an ill-informed campaign promise, while the case for staying in is overwhelming. But damaging as it is, this decision is not the beginning of the end for efforts to contain climate change. The world decided in Paris to confront the climate threat, and it is not turning back.

Around the world, climate change is a metastasizing danger, for some countries even an existential threat. It was understood in the years leading up to the Paris negotiation that the climate challenge could be met only with a new kind of agreement premised on concerted effort by all. That agreement—ambitious, universal, transparent, balanced—was reached in Paris, with the help of U.S. leadership every step of the way.

Trump's suggestion Thursday that he is willing to renegotiate the deal to make it fairer to the United States doesn't pass the straight-face test. The Paris agreement—for anyone who actually understands it—is entirely fair to the United States. The idea that 194 other countries will listen to Trump's insulting Rose Garden blather and say, "Sure, let's sit down and negotiate a new deal" is ridiculous.

Instead, Trump's decision will be seen as an ugly betrayal—self-centered, callous, hollow, cruel. The ravages of climate change have been on display in recent years in the superstorms, floods, rising sea levels, droughts, fires and deadly heat waves that will only get worse as the carbon index mounts. Vulnerable countries will look at the United States, the richest power on

Earth, the largest historic emitter of greenhouse gases, and think—even if they do not say—how dare you?

President Barack Obama once said to business leaders, in a Roosevelt Room meeting I attended, that climate change was the one threat, other than nuclear weapons, with the potential to alter the course of human progress. A near-consensus of major U.S. companies urged the Trump administration to stay in the agreement because they know climate change is real, that the Paris agreement is a good and balanced deal, that their own concerns on matters such as intellectual property and trade will be defended only if U.S. negotiators are at the table and that turning the United States into a climate-change pariah will be bad for business, for access to markets and for investment. But our chief-executive president decided to leave U.S. business in the lurch.

All this is more than disappointing. And watching the so-called internal battle on this issue play out between determined antagonists on the one side and diffident, sotto voce defenders on the other was downright depressing.

But let's be clear: This is not the end of the line. This is a call to arms.

Countries won't follow Trump out of the Paris climate agreement and over a cliff. They won't give Trump the satisfaction of "canceling" the agreement, as he promised during his campaign. They will want to show that they can carry on without the United States. And they know too well that climate change is real and that if the Paris regime fell apart, they'd just have to build it again. They will hold on to the hope that the current administration will be a one-term wonder. It is true that, in the longer run, it would be difficult for the Paris regime to produce accelerated action at the level that is needed without the United States. But other countries will probably bet that the United States will come back.

Progressive U.S. states and cities also have a crucial role to play, not only in extending the good work they are already doing on climate change, but also by sending a clear and resounding message to the global community: that while Trump's Washington may have gone dark on climate change, inspired centers of innovation and commitment are lighting the way forward all over the country. In states such as California and New York, Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Illinois and North Carolina, and in New England; in cities such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston and New Orleans, among many others. These entities account for a sizable chunk of both U.S. gross domestic product and carbon emissions. They may not be able to get the United States all the way to our 2025 Paris emissions target, but they have the potential to go far.

Private companies, too, have been instrumental in driving the clean-energy revolution, pursuing the massive economic opportunities presented by the need to decarbonize our energy system. And consumers are increasingly demanding that companies not only provide desirable products or services, but also stand as good corporate citizens.

Finally, for citizens, it is time to hold our leaders accountable at all levels of government. Protecting our nation, our children and our American heritage should not be optional for an elected leader. Nor should preserving America's singular standing in the world.

Thursday was not a good day for climate change, and it was not a good day for the United States. Nothing we say now can

change that. But it is a day that needs to be remembered as the visible moment the rear-guard opposition went too far. It is a day to spark action and resolve. It is a day that needs to count.

#### RUSSIA SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the United States must send an unequivocal message to Vladimir Putin: we will not tolerate attacks on democracy in the United States or in Europe. That is why I have long pressed for harsher sanctions on Russia, including with Secretary of State Tillerson in his June 13 appearance before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations. I am a strong supporter of amendment No. 232 to S. 722 on Russia sanctions. While I missed the vote on June 14 due to an unanticipated illness, I would have voted yes had I been present. I voted yes on the passage of S. 722 today.

The Kremlin's ambitions are clear. It interferes in elections in the United States and Europe, in an attempt to undermine public faith in the democratic process. It wants to erode the cohesion and strength of our NATO alliance. It bolsters the hand of brutal dictators like Bashar al-Assad. It wages wars in Ukraine and Georgia, supporting insurrections against the government. It seeks to reestablish a leading role on the world's stage through an unraveling of the international order.

Russia's use of subversion, disinformation, and irregular warfare are nothing new. However, in this last U.S. presidential cycle, Russia launched an unprecedented and multifaceted campaign to undermine our elections—a view corroborated by our entire intelligence community. Russia paid more than 1,000 people—human trolls—to work out of a facility in St. Petersburg. These trolls spent their waking hours creating anti-Clinton fake news reports and disseminating these stories in key States and districts. Russia also used thousands of botnets to echo and amplify these fake news stories. Russia also targeted the election boards of 39 States in our country, successfully infiltrating at least four voter registration databases and gaining access to hundreds of thousands of voter records. They even attempted to infiltrate the Maryland State Elections Board, but were not successful.

In response to these attacks, I filed an amendment to S. 722 that would ensure the United States develops a strategic, long-term approach to combat Russia's cyber warfare. My amendment requires a unified strategy developed with our NATO allies and European partners to counter Russia's cyber attacks, including Russia's efforts to undermine our democratic elections. It would also require the FBI to establish

a high-level cybersecurity liaison for Presidential campaigns and major national campaign committees, so that the United States is prepared for Russia's next attempt to interfere with our elections. The liaison would share cyber threats as they arise and cyber security protocols with these organizations to stave off cyber attacks. Given the critical importance of shoring up our own cyber defenses, I plan to introduce this amendment as standalone legislation at a later point.

I also filed a second amendment to S. 722 that prohibits the President from returning diplomatic compounds in Maryland and New York that the United States seized last December, in response to Russian interference in our elections. It is outrageous that President Trump is considering allowing the Russians access to these facilities, which they used to spy on the United States. I am proud to have worked with Senator CARDIN to incorporate this provision into the larger Russia sanctions bill. Senator CARDIN and I will keep working to hold Russia and the Trump administration accountable.

This legislation demonstrates to our allies and partners around the world that the United States will not stand idly when our democracy is under attack. I commend my colleagues for working across the aisle to impose tougher sanctions on Russia. Today the Senate put patriotism over partisan ship.

#### PRIDE ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Police Reporting of Information Data and Evidence Act, or PRIDE Act—legislation I introduced on Thursday, May 25, 2017. This bill would increase accountability and transparency for law enforcement by requiring States to report to the Department of Justice use of force incidents that occur between police officers and civilians. I am proud to have introduced this important bill and I want to thank Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN for joining the legislation as an original cosponsor. I also want to thank Representative JOAQUIN CASTRO for introducing a House companion of the PRIDE Act.

Across our Nation, law enforcement officers put their lives on the line each day to protect our communities. These individuals have answered the call to serve, and we owe these brave men and women our deepest respect and gratitude. As mayor of Newark, NJ, I saw firsthand the dangers police officers face each and every day. They must make tough, split-second decisions that have life and death consequences. They truly have one of the toughest jobs in America.

We must provide law enforcement with the tools and resources they need to do their jobs safely and effectively.

That is why I have been a strong advocate for robust funding for the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant program, Bulletproof Vest Partnership program, and the Community Oriented Policing Services Hiring program. These programs support law enforcement in their mission and help make our communities safe.

While the vast majority of police officers serve with integrity and perform their duties without incident, we know that there are instances when officers engage in inappropriate uses of force. These cases are not emblematic of law enforcement as the whole; however, these incidents have eroded trust between law enforcement and the communities they are sworn to protect. This is especially the case today due to the number of incidents that are caught on video and shared on the internet. This phenomena only exacerbates the difficult job police officers have and fails to lend clarity to the actual number of cases of excessive use of force that occur nationwide.

We must work to shore up that trust deficit and ensure that those who break the law and use excessive force are held accountable and those who rightfully uphold the law are viewed in the correct light. We must collect more data on use of force incidents between law enforcement and civilians. As former Federal Bureau of Investigations Director James Comey said in an address to Georgetown University, "Without complete and accurate data, we are left with 'ideological thunderbolts.' And that helps spark unrest and distrust and does not help us get better."

For those reasons, I introduced the PRIDE Act. This legislation would require States to report to the Justice Department any incident where use of force is used against a civilian or against a law enforcement officer. It would mandate the collection of certain information such as national origin, sex, race, ethnicity, age, physical disability, mental disability, English language proficiency, housing status, and school status of each civilian against whom law enforcement used force. It would require officers to record the date, time, and location of the incident and whether the jurisdiction allows for the open-carry or concealed-carry of a firearm. It would require the officer to detail whether the civilian was armed and the type of force used and the types of weapons used in the incident. The bill would require the officer to explain why force was used, provide a description of any injuries sustained as a result of the incident, detail how many officers and civilians were involved, and provide a brief description of the circumstances surrounding the incident.

The bill would create a grant program to help smaller law enforcement agencies—those with 100 employees or

less—comply with the provisions of the bill. Also, it would allow those agencies to use the grant money to create public awareness campaigns designed to gain information regarding shootings and use of force incidents against police officers. Lastly, the legislation would allow agencies to use the funds to conduct use-of-force training, including deescalation and bias training.

There is no excuse not to collect more data on use of force incidents between law enforcement officers and civilians. Shining a spotlight on these instances will improve police-community relations, vindicate wrongly accused law enforcement officers, and provide lawmakers with the information they need to devise smart and effective policy. I am proud to have introduced the PRIDE Act, and I urge its speedy passage.

#### 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF LEBANON, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Lebanon, ME. Lebanon was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

The year of Lebanon's incorporation, 1767, was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. For thousands of years, the land of fields, streams, and forests of what is now southwestern Maine was the home of the Abenaki, who called the area "Towwoh," meaning "a place to grind corn." The many archeological treasures unearthed in the region include a large ancient stone mortar used by the Abenaki for that very purpose.

In 1733, the Massachusetts General Court granted Towwoh Plantation to 60 colonists, and European settlement began. When the town was incorporated on June 11, 1767, the name Lebanon was chosen in reference to the Biblical land of fertile soil and towering trees.

With the Salmon Falls River and Little River providing power, Lebanon soon was home to many lumber, grain, and textile mills. The wealth produced by the land and by hard work and determination was invested in schools and churches to create a true community.

Among the many prominent residents of the town over the years was the Reverend Oren Burbank Cheney, who established the Lebanon Academy in 1849. His courage and vision as an outspoken opponent of slavery and advocate for full rights for women and Native Americans so impressed Boston industrialist Benjamin Bates that, when Bates College was established in Lewiston in 1864, the Reverend Cheney

was named as the first president of the esteemed school.

The coming of the railroads in the late 1800s helped to make Lebanon a tourism destination, with fine hotels, inns, and restaurants. An early visitor was the famed Norwegian violinist, Ole Bornemann Bull, who performed a concert at one of the town's remarkable attractions, the enormous cavern entrance known as Gully Oven, in 1871. The virtuoso was so impressed by the acoustics of the natural amphitheater that he bought a home in Lebanon, becoming one of the town's first summer residents.

Today visitors and residents alike enjoy Lebanon's quiet parks, beautiful historic buildings, and exciting outdoor recreation opportunities. The energy and planning that are going into Lebanon's 250th anniversary celebration this July demonstrate the pride townspeople have in their town.

The celebration of Lebanon's 250th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time; it is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for longer than America has been a nation, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Lebanon, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

#### TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER SANTOS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend Jennifer Santos for her service on the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

She has served for 5 years as a very capable budget analyst for the Subcommittee on Defense. Her accomplishments have been very impressive and a credit to the Senate.

After graduating from Wheeling Jesuit University with a degree in mathematics, Jennifer joined a defense contractor in support of the Air Force's F-22 program. She played an important role in that program and can be proud of her contribution to fielding the most capable fighter aircraft ever developed.

Her talent was soon recognized by the Air Force where she served in a series of important positions, including those involving special programs that are key to protecting our national security. Jennifer established a reputation for competence in working with leaders from Department of Defense, Congress, and other agencies to ensure the responsible allocation of taxpayer dollars.

Jennifer's detailed knowledge of military budgeting and acquisition systems allowed her to make insightful recommendations to the subcommittee, which have resulted in the better investment of tens of billions of taxpayer dollars over her Senate tenure. In particular, her efforts have supported increased Army helicopter pro-

curement, important research and development projects funding, and legislation to improve the management of the Department of Defense.

Jennifer Santos has upheld the highest standards of a budget analyst, congressional staffer, and defense professional. Although she is soon leaving the committee, I wish her all the best on her next steps in her distinguished career and thank her for her work in the U.S. Senate.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL SARAH B. GOLDMAN

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to my constituent LTC Sarah B. Goldman for her exemplary dedication to duty and service to the U.S. Army and to the United States of America. She has served the last year as the chief of Congressional Affairs, Office of the Army Surgeon General. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman was born and raised in Nashville, TN, and received her commission as a lieutenant junior grade in the U.S. Navy in 1998. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman transferred to the U.S. Army in 2008.

Prior to her current assignment, LTC Sarah Goldman served as a congressional liaison in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, as the medical liaison for the Army Surgeon General.

Lieutenant Colonel Goldman served as the Army Traumatic Brain Injury Program director at the Office of the Surgeon General, Rehabilitation and Reintegration Division, in Falls Church, VA, from 2010-2013. In 2011, she deployed to Afghanistan as a member of the International Security Assistance Force Joint Command's special assistant for Health Affairs Health Service Support Assessment Team to review traumatic brain injury care in the Combined Joint Operations Area-Afghanistan.

Lieutenant Colonel Goldman served as the Army's service representative to multiple Department of Defense traumatic brain injury working groups and, in 2010, was appointed as a member of the NATO Technical Team "Mild traumatic brain injury in a Military Operational Setting." At the U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine's Military Performance Division Lieutenant Colonel Goldman conducted research studies related to rehabilitation from traumatic brain injury and upper extremity neuromusculoskeletal injuries. She deployed to Balad, Iraq, from August 2009 to February 2010 as a senior scientist with the Joint Combat Casualty Research Team. Her Navy assignments include assistant department head, Physical and Occupational Therapy Department,

Naval Hospital Jacksonville, and division officer, Educational and Developmental Intervention Services, Naval Hospital Yokosuka, Japan. In 2004, the Navy selected Lieutenant Colonel Goldman as the "Navy Occupational Therapist of the Year."

She holds a Ph.D. from Indiana University in kinesiology and is a graduate of Washington University in St. Louis, master's degree in occupational therapy and a bachelor of arts degree, with a follow-on fellowship at Vanderbilt University. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman has presented at numerous national conferences, authored peer-reviewed professional articles in five different scientific journals, has published a book chapter, and served as a reviewer for two major rehabilitation journals. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman was the first Department of Defense representative appointed to the American Occupational Therapy Association's research advisory panel and is a member of the American Hand Therapy Foundation Board.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending LTC Sarah Goldman for nearly two decades of Active service to her country. We wish Sarah and her family all the best as they continue their journey of service.●

##### TRIBUTE TO PAM MOORE

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Pam Moore, the Benchmark plant manager in Lewis and Clark County. Pam has spent many years supervising a staff of hard-working Montanans doing their best to produce useful products for a variety of government agencies.

For well over three decades, the Benchmark Manufacturing Plant in Helena has produced tens of thousands of backpacks that have been distributed across the United States. For nearly 18 years, Pam has supervised production at the plant. Over half of Pam's team at the plant are disabled Montanans, and that team has done highly respectable work under her guidance. Their quality products help U.S. Forest Service wildland firefighters carry their equipment. With our abundant forests in Montana, we know how important it is to have the proper equipment in the hands of our firefighters, and over the years, the employees at the Benchmark Manufacturing Plant have had abundant success getting the right equipment to the right customer. For that, we are very grateful.

Montanans have earned a well-deserved reputation for being reliable and hard-working, and Pam and her team are great examples of that assessment. When asked about her favorite part of the job, Pam said she enjoys that her teammates are able to work. Valuing

work is a Montana tradition. Thank you, Pam, for having a steady hand helping others to overcome obstacles, reach their potential, and get the job done.●

#### REMEMBERING QUARRIER "Q" COOK

● Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, from the moment she arrived in Santa Fe in 1983, Quarrier "Q" Cook gave back. She gave her time to the Santa Fe Community Foundation as a board member. She gave her knack for fundraising to the Santa Fe Chamber Music Festival as cochair of several endowment campaigns and as board president from 2002 to 2005. She gave her energy and attention to many of New Mexico's social services organizations.

She gave whatever she could give to make New Mexico a better place.

Last year, Q Cook and her husband Phillip Cook received the Santa Fe Community Foundation's Philanthropic Leadership Award during the annual Pinon Awards Ceremony. In her acceptance speech, she remarked that in order to be part of a community, "you have to help the community" in small and large ways.

Q Cook's commitment to these values and her interest in helping others came from growing up in a family that always gave back and expected their children to do the same. She was born on April 7, 1935, in Wheeling, WV, to Thomas Moffat Block and Nancy Fulton and grew up seeing her parents' commitment to activism and public service. She attended Vassar College, earned a political science degree, and became involved in political activism herself.

She had three children: Thomas McKittrick Jones, Nancy Jones Carter, and Clarke Fitz-Gerald Jones. She shared her love for the Southwest's culture with her daughter Nancy, with whom she opened a southwestern home furnishings boutique in Washington, DC, called Santa Fe Style. As the buyer for the store, Q made sure that New Mexico had a presence in our Nation's Capital.

Back at home, she was known as a driving force who achieved whatever goal she set out to reach. She was someone any New Mexican would want on their side, someone who was generous, always willing to open her home, and give her time.

At the Pinon Awards, she said, "We hope that a little bit of what we have done has made the world a better place for some people."

Q Cook made the world a better place for lots of us, and New Mexico is indebted to her lifetime of service.●

#### RECOGNIZING BALLARD FAMILY DAIRY AND CHEESE

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, it is not every day that we take a moment to

commemorate America's family-owned businesses that dedicate themselves to serving their local communities. I stand before you today to recognize a small business that emphasizes service, tradition, and family values. In my home State of Idaho, I have had the privilege of seeing firsthand Idahoans' dynamic use of natural resources. In our State, we continue to watch our agricultural small businesses advance and thrive. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my privilege to honor Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese of Gooding as the Senate Small Business of the Month for June 2017. Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese has been a pioneer in Idaho's artisan cheesemaking community and is a remarkable example of entrepreneurial innovation.

With just a few Jersey calves and a strong work ethic, the Ballard family started their dairy farm in 1995. Steve and Stacie Ballard, along with their children, Travis and Jessica, have worked hard to perfect cheeses that are distinctive and can only be cultivated in Idaho's unique climate. Their goal was to create a cheese that was specific to Idaho. Since then, the Ballard family has developed a successful in-house cheese facility that has produced numerous award-winning specialty cheeses. The Ballard family gained the skills to produce artisan cheeses over years of hard work and trial and error. Their determination has allowed them to produce a fresh and original-tasting commodity unique to Idaho.

The Ballard family produces numerous types of hand-crafted cheeses, including cheddar, gouda, and cheese curds. Their facility produces approximately 3,000 pounds of cheese daily. Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese cows are individually cared for, which ensures that the calves are healthy and allows for the finest cheese. This well-executed cheese production system combined with small batch sizes enables the Ballard family to achieve the right consistencies for high-quality cheeses.

Award-winning cheese is not the only noted accomplishments this family-run business has attained. In 2013, the Ballards' cheese facility was distinguished by the Innovation Center for U.S. Dairy as having "Outstanding Achievement in Energy Efficiency." By adjusting their operational processes, their facility in Gooding has reduced their energy costs by about \$23,000 annually.

Beyond the Ballard family's thriving retail throughout the State, the Ballards also provide educational resources with their cheese purchasing information to Idahoans who are interested in learning about cheesemaking methods. Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese is an exceptional example of the entrepreneurial spirit of Idaho agri-

culture and of innovative energy practices from a family-owned business. I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to the Ballard family and all of the employees of Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese for being selected as the June 2017 Small Business of the Month. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

##### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1083. An act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

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

At 2:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2372. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit.

H.R. 2579. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1083. An act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 304. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to allow the Indian Health Service to cover the cost of a copayment of an Indian or Alaska Native veteran receiving medical care or services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–112).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 346. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System (Rept. No. 115–113).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

\*Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2022.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Vishal J. Amin, of Michigan, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President.

Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

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

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1361. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1362. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to consolidate certain eligibility tiers under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1363. A bill to streamline the process for broadband facility location applications on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1364. A bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1365. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to include victims of acts of terror in the evaluation and treatment of veterans and civilians at military treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1366. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1367. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study and issue a report that quantifies the energy savings benefits of operational efficiency programs and services for commercial, institutional, industrial, and governmental entities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1368. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an excise tax on certain prescription drugs which have been subject to a price spike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1370. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, Mr.

SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1371. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1372. A bill to require updated limits on levels of lead in fruit juice beverages and an updated tolerable daily level of lead exposure from foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1373. A bill to designate the Gulf of Mexico Alliance as a Regional Coordination Partnership of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1374. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1375. A bill to repeal section 3003 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr.

DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1376. A bill to ensure that all fast-tracked reconciliation bills are subject to a committee hearing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORKER, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. STRANGE, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. Res. 191. A resolution designating June 20, 2017, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 192. A resolution congratulating the Golden State Warriors for their historic championship victory in the 2017 National Basketball Association Finals; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER,



Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 193. A resolution commending the bravery of the United States Capitol Police, the Police Department of Alexandria, Virginia, and all first responders who protected Members of Congress, their staff, and others during the shooting on June 14, 2017, at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in the Del Ray neighborhood of Alexandria, Virginia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. Res. 194. A resolution designating June 15, 2017, as "World Elder Abuse Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 236

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 372

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 372, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that merchandise arriving through the mail shall be sub-

ject to review by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and to require the provision of advance electronic information on shipments of mail to U.S. Customs and Border Protection and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, *supra*.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 593

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 635

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 667, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, 37, and 38, United States Code, to ensure that an

order to serve on active duty under section 12304a or 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services and veterans for certain benefits and for calculating the deadlines for certain benefits.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

S. 967

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 967, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program, and for other purposes.



S. 981

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency materials pilot program.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1268

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1268, a bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse and to reauthorize grants to improve the well-being of families affected by substance abuse.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as co-

sponsors of S. 1311, a bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. RES. 49

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 49, a resolution declaring that achieving the primary goal of the National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease of the Department of Health and Human Services to prevent and effectively treat Alzheimer's disease by 2025 is an urgent national priority.

AMENDMENT NO. 232

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 232 proposed to S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 240 proposed to S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

AMENDMENT NO. 250

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 250 proposed to S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 250 proposed to S. 722, supra.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1374. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the introduction of the bipartisan Compassionate Access, Research Expansion, and Respect States Act, or CARERS Act. The bill would make our Federal laws dealing with medical marijuana fairer and help ensure that Americans have access to the care they need. I am proud to introduce this legislation, and I want to thank Senators RAND PAUL and KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND for working with me on this bill. I also want to thank Senators LISA MURKOWSKI, AL FRANKEN, and MIKE LEE for joining the CARERS Act as original cosponsors and Representatives STEVE COHEN and DON YOUNG for introducing a House companion bill.

Right now, regardless of whether you are in a State that has legalized medical marijuana, it is illegal under Federal law. This inconsistency puts growers, distributors, and patients at great risk of Federal prosecution even though they are in compliance with State law.

In 2013, the Department of Justice issued guidance to Federal prosecutors to refrain from prosecuting individuals that use, purchase, or sell marijuana in States where it is legal as long as a State regulatory framework exists that maintains certain standards, such as a ban on sales to minors. As a result of this guidance, more and more States have taken steps to legalize medical marijuana.

Sadly, despite this guidance, the inability of the Federal Government to be aligned with States regarding the legality of medical marijuana has resulted in confusion and uncertainty for State lawmakers and the public about what the law requires. This lack of clarity is only part of the problem. Individual users of medical marijuana in States with legalized medical marijuana continue to be targeted by the Drug Enforcement Agency.

And now, more than ever, I am especially concerned with Attorney General Jeff Sessions as our Nation's top law enforcement officer. His radical stance on marijuana is way out of the mainstream, and he has taken steps to reinvigorate the failed War on Drugs. Recently, he wrote a letter to Senate and House leadership asking them not to renew an appropriations rider that prevents the Justice Department from spending money on cases that involve individuals who are in compliance with State medical marijuana laws. He said, "I believe it would be unwise for Congress to restrict the discretion of the

Department to fund particular prosecutions, particularly in the midst of an historic drug epidemic and potentially long-term uptick in violent crime.” Contrary to Attorney General Sessions’ views, this is not a problem we can jail ourselves out of.

Individuals who use medical marijuana in States where it is legal should not fear prosecution simply based on prosecutorial discretion. It is time for Congress to act.

Today, I reintroduced the CARERS Act. First, and most importantly, the bill would end the Federal prohibition of medical marijuana. Millions of Americans need to gain access to the medicine that works best for them. The Federal Government’s current stance on medical marijuana has only created confusion and uncertainty. This bill would prohibit the Federal Government from prosecuting persons who are in compliance with State medical marijuana laws and let people gain access to the care they need.

The bill would also allow States to import cannabidiol, commonly called CBD for short. CBD is an oil substance made from a marijuana plant that contains virtually no THC—meaning you experience no high from the drug. CBD is the medicine so many children need—along with thousands of other individuals with Dravet syndrome—to control seizures. We must make this important drug more available so people can access the medication they need.

The bill would promote research. A large problem for our Nation is that not enough research exists on the impact of medical marijuana. We know there are legitimate medical uses of the drug, but we can learn much more. We need to allow experts to access the drug to conduct tests and clinical trials to fully understand the effects of the drug and how it can best be utilized. This will only benefit the doctors that prescribe it, the lawmakers that regulate it, and the people that need it.

Finally, the bill would allow VA doctors to recommend medical marijuana to veterans in States that have legalized medical marijuana. Many men and women in uniform who have bravely served our Nation come home with invisible wounds of war, and they deserve the best care available. This means allowing them access to the medicine they need to heal or control their condition. Those who have served our Nation deserve to be served by us, and that means receiving the best care available.

The CARERS Act was the first medical marijuana bill introduced in the Senate. Unfortunately, we did not pass it in the last Congress, but I am hopeful that in the 115th Congress we can get this bill across the finish line and send it to the President’s desk for signature. I, again, want to thank my colleagues who worked with me on this bill, and I urge its speedy passage.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1376. A bill to ensure that all fast-tracked reconciliation bills are subject to a committee hearing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

#### S. 1376

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “No Hearing, No Vote Act of 2017”.

#### SEC. 2. COMMITTEE HEARINGS FOR RECONCILIATION BILLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) COMMITTEE HEARINGS FOR RECONCILIATION BILLS.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution, unless—

“(1) the reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution was—

“(A) ordered reported to the Senate under subsection (b)(1) by the committee of the Senate receiving reconciliation instructions; or

“(B) reported by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate under subsection (b)(2) after receiving recommendations ordered to be reported to the Committee on the Budget by 1 or more committees of the Senate receiving reconciliation instructions; and

“(2) each committee that ordered reported the reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution or ordered recommendations to be reported to the Committee on the Budget held not less than 1 hearing regarding any major provision of the reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution within the jurisdiction of such committee.”.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “310(h),” after “310(d)(2),”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting “310(h),” after “310(d)(2),”.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 191—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2017, AS “AMERICAN EAGLE DAY” AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORKER, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. STRANGE, and Mr. PERDUE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

#### S. RES. 191

Whereas the bald eagle was chosen as the central image of the Great Seal of the United States on June 20, 1782, by the Founding Fathers at the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is widely known as the living national symbol of the United States and for many generations has represented values, such as—

- (1) freedom;
- (2) democracy;
- (3) courage;
- (4) strength;
- (5) spirit;
- (6) independence;
- (7) justice; and
- (8) excellence;

Whereas the bald eagle is unique to North America and cannot be found naturally in any other part of the world, which was one of the primary reasons the Founding Fathers selected the bald eagle to symbolize the Government of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the official logos of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

- (1) the Executive Office of the President;
- (2) Congress;
- (3) the Supreme Court of the United States;
- (4) the Department of Defense;
- (5) the Department of the Treasury;
- (6) the Department of Justice;
- (7) the Department of State;
- (8) the Department of Commerce;
- (9) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (10) the Department of Veterans Affairs;
- (11) the Department of Labor;
- (12) the Department of Health and Human Services;
- (13) the Department of Energy;
- (14) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (15) the Central Intelligence Agency; and
- (16) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas the image and symbolism of the bald eagle has—

- (1) played a significant role in art, music, literature, architecture, commerce, education, and culture in the United States; and
- (2) appeared on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the bald eagle was endangered and facing possible extinction in the lower 48 States but has made a gradual and encouraging comeback to the land, waterways, and skies of the United States;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the national bird of the United States is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example to other environmental, natural resource, and wildlife conservation efforts worldwide;

Whereas, in 1940, noting that the bald eagle was threatened with extinction, Congress passed the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), which prohibited killing, selling, or possessing the species, and a 1962 amendment expanded protection to the golden eagle;

Whereas, by 1963, there were only an estimated 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remaining in the lower 48 States, with loss of habitat, poaching, and the use of pesticides and other environmental contaminants contributing to the near demise of the national bird of the United States;

Whereas, in 1967, the bald eagle was officially declared an endangered species under Public Law 89-669 (80 Stat. 926) (commonly known as the “Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966”) in areas in the United States south of the 40th parallel due to the dramatic decline in the population of the bald eagle in the lower 48 States;

Whereas the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) was enacted in 1973, and in 1978, the bald eagle was listed as an endangered species throughout the lower 48 States, except in the States of Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, in which the bald eagle was listed as a threatened species;

Whereas, in July 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced that in the lower 48 States, the bald eagle had recovered sufficiently to change the status of the species from endangered to threatened;

Whereas, by 2007, bald eagles residing in the lower 48 States had rebounded to approximately 11,000 pairs;

Whereas, on June 28, 2007, the Secretary the Interior and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service removed the bald eagle from protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but the bald eagle continues to be protected under the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the “Lacey Act”), and the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.);

Whereas Challenger, the trained, educational bald eagle of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee, was invited by the Secretary of the Interior to perform a free-flight demonstration during the official bald eagle delisting ceremony held at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas experts and population growth charts estimate that the bald eagle population could reach 15,000 pairs, even though a physical count has not been conducted by State and Federal wildlife agencies since 2007;

Whereas caring and concerned agencies, corporations, organizations, and people of the United States representing Federal and State governments and the private sector passionately and resourcefully banded together, determined to save and protect the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the recovery of the bald eagle population in the United States was largely accomplished through—

- (1) the dedicated and vigilant efforts of Federal and State wildlife agencies and nonprofit organizations, such as the American Eagle Foundation;
- (2) public education;
- (3) captive breeding and release programs;
- (4) hacking and release programs; and

(5) the translocation of bald eagles from places in the United States with dense bald eagle populations to suitable locations in the lower 48 States that had suffered a decrease in bald eagle populations;

Whereas various nonprofit organizations, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, contribute to the continuing recovery of the bald eagle through rehabilitation and educational efforts;

Whereas the bald eagle might have been lost permanently if not for dedicated conservation efforts and strict protection laws such as—

- (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
- (2) the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);
- (3) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);
- (4) section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the “Lacey Act”); and
- (5) the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.); and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle population will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs to ensure that the population numbers and habitat of the bald eagle remain healthy and secure for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2017, as “American Eagle Day”;

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury to generate critical funds for the protection of the bald eagle; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 192—CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR THEIR HISTORIC CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY IN THE 2017 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION FINALS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a resolution recognizing and heartily commending the Golden State Warriors for their dazzling season and 2017 World Championship victory.

After going 16 and 1 in the postseason, earning the highest win percentage in NBA playoff history, and defeating the Cleveland Cavaliers 129 to 120 in game five of the NBA Finals, the Warriors have become champions for the second time in just 3 years. The best part: they did something for their fans that had never been done before—they won the title at home, in Oracle Arena. As a bay area native myself, I

know how much this means to all of Dub Nation.

Everyone who is a part of the Warriors Organization—the video staff, the trainers, the owners, coaches, players and fans—deserves praise for a hard-fought and historic 2016 to 2017 season. The year was primarily marked by highs. Among my favorites was Klay Thompson’s astonishing 29-minute, 60-point performance against the Indiana Pacers. And who could forget Steph Curry’s mind-boggling, half-court buzzer-beater against the Clippers?

The Warriors undoubtedly played remarkable basketball this year, but they also overcame their share of obstacles. When Coach Kerr was forced to take a leave of absence, the team rallied behind him and, under Mike Brown’s leadership, continued to earn wins in his honor. When starters were sidelined due to injury, bench players stepped in and stepped up, demonstrating the team’s depth and heart. When the Warriors were knocked down by the Cavaliers in game four of the finals, they woke up the next morning, flew home, and got straight to work—running hours of drills so they could come back stronger in game five.

The Warriors are a team with resolve and great character. They are highly focused but still manage to have fun together. They take care of each other, and equally as important, they take care of their community. The Warriors recognize that they are in a unique position to give back and effect positive change.

Over the past several years, the Warriors Foundation has awarded \$5 million in grants to support educational initiatives in Alameda and San Francisco Counties. The foundation, along with individual players, has also refurbished over 60 basketball courts throughout the bay area, creating safe and beautiful places for our young people to play.

So, to MVP Kevin Durant, Coach Kerr, Coach Brown, Joe Lacob, Peter Guber, Rick Welts, Bob Myers and all of the players, coaches, staff, family, friends and fans, I say thank you. Thank you for making California proud both on and off the court, and congratulations on a job well done.

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

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

S. RES. 192

Whereas, on June 12, 2017, the Golden State Warriors defeated the Cleveland Cavaliers by a score of 129-120 in an extraordinary game 5 at Oracle Arena in Oakland, California, to win the 2017 National Basketball Association (referred to in the preamble as the “NBA”) Finals;

Whereas the Golden State Warriors captured their second championship in 3 years, and their fifth championship in franchise history;

Whereas the 2017 championship victory marks the first time a Bay Area professional sports team has clinched a championship title at home in 43 years;

Whereas in 2017 the Golden State Warriors had the NBA's best regular-season record with 67 wins, capping an extraordinary 3-year run, during which the Warriors won a record-setting 207 regular season games;

Whereas the Golden State Warriors finished the post-season 16-1, which constitutes the best post-season record in the 71-year history of the NBA;

Whereas every single member of the 2016-2017 Golden State Warriors team contributed to this championship, including Matt Barnes, Ian Clark, Stephen Curry, Kevin Durant, Draymond Green, Andre Iguodala, Damian Jones, Shaun Livingston, Kevon Looney, James Michael McAdoo, Patrick McCaw, JaVale McGee, Zaza Pachulia, Klay Thompson, and David West;

Whereas Kevin Durant became just the sixth player to score 30 or more points in each game of a championship round, and was named Most Valuable Player of the NBA Finals;

Whereas Steve Kerr, Mike Brown, and the entire team of coaches and staff have been instrumental in developing the Golden State Warriors' dynamic and record-setting style of play, and have fostered a positive, selfless team spirit;

Whereas Joe Lacob and Peter Guber have built one of the most exciting and high-performing franchises in NBA history;

Whereas the dedicated fan base of Golden State Warriors has offered unrelenting, passionate support to the team; and

Whereas, both on and off the court, the Golden State Warriors are an immense source of pride for the Bay Area and the entire Golden State Warrior fan base: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2017 National Basketball Association Finals;

(2) recognizes the historic achievements of all the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the 2016-2017 season; and

(3) celebrates the selfless teamwork and extraordinary character, pride, determination, and hard-work of the Golden State Warriors.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 193—COM-  
MENDING THE BRAVERY OF THE  
UNITED STATES CAPITOL PO-  
LICE, THE POLICE DEPARTMENT  
OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, AND  
ALL FIRST RESPONDERS WHO  
PROTECTED MEMBERS OF CON-  
GRESS, THEIR STAFF, AND OTH-  
ERS DURING THE SHOOTING ON  
JUNE 14, 2017, AT EUGENE SIMP-  
SON STADIUM PARK IN THE DEL  
RAY NEIGHBORHOOD OF ALEX-  
ANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BAR-  
RASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr.

DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 193

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the heroism of United States Capitol Police Special Agents David Bailey and Crystal Griner, both of whom sustained injuries, and Henry Cabrera, after responding to, containing, and ultimately ending the threat to Members of Congress, their staff, and others during the shooting at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in Alexandria, Virginia, on the morning of June 14, 2017;

(2) recognizes the Police Department, the Office of the Sheriff, and the Fire Department of Alexandria, Virginia, who reported to the scene without hesitation, and the first responders who treated the wounded;

(3) recognizes the additional victims who survived the shooting and supports their continued recovery from physical and psychological wounds, including—

(A) Steve Scalise, the Majority Whip of the House of Representatives;

(B) Zachary Barth, a staffer for Representative Roger Williams; and

(C) Matthew Mika, a former legislative staffer;

(4) offers sympathy and support to the families and friends of the survivors;

(5) recognizes that threats to Members of Congress also operate to threaten the foundations of our representative democracy; and

(6) recognizes the United States Capitol Police—

(A) who protect Members of Congress and employees, visitors, and facilities of Congress; and

(B) whose professionalism, vigilance, and self-sacrifice is a daily example of the steadfast patriotism that civil servants should strive for in service to one another and to the United States.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 194—DESIG-  
NATING JUNE 15, 2017, AS  
“WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARE-  
NESS DAY”**

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted the fol-

lowing resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 194

Whereas the Federal Government estimates that more than 1 in 10 persons over the age of 60 are victims of elder abuse each year;

Whereas abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults in the United States goes unidentified and unreported due to an inability to report or a fear of reporting;

Whereas only 1 in 14 cases of financial abuse of older adults is reported;

Whereas at least \$2,900,000,000 is taken from older adults each year due to financial abuse and exploitation;

Whereas elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation have no boundaries and cross all racial, social, class, gender, and geographic lines;

Whereas older adults who are abused are 3 times more likely to die earlier than older adults of the same age who are not abused;

Whereas ½ of all older adults with dementia will experience abuse;

Whereas providing unwanted medical treatment can be a form of elder abuse and exploitation;

Whereas public awareness has the potential to increase the identification and reporting of elder abuse by the public, professionals, and victims, and can act as a catalyst to promote issue-based education and long-term prevention;

Whereas private individuals and public agencies must work together on the Federal, State, and local levels to combat increasing occurrences of abuse, neglect, exploitation crime, and violence against vulnerable older adults and vulnerable adults, particularly in light of limited resources for vital protective services; and

Whereas 2017 is the 12th anniversary of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 15, 2017, as “World Elder Abuse Awareness Day”;

(2) recognizes judges, lawyers, adult protective services professionals, law enforcement officers, long-term care ombudsmen, social workers, health care providers, professional guardians, advocates for victims, and other professionals and agencies for the efforts to advance awareness of elder abuse; and

(3) encourages members of the public and professionals who work with older adults to act as catalysts to promote awareness and long-term prevention of elder abuse by reaching out to local adult protective services agencies, long-term care ombudsman programs, and the National Center on Elder Abuse, and by learning to recognize, detect, report, and respond to elder abuse.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 255. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CORKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 722, to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 255.** Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CORKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 722, to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:  
 “An Act to Provide Congressional Review  
 and to Counter Iranian and Russian Govern-  
 ments’ Aggression.”

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., in 328A Russell Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled “Agricultural Research: Perspectives on Past and Future Successes for the 2018 Farm Bill.”

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2018 and the future years defense program.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 9:45 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Fostering Economic Growth: Mid-sized, Regional and Large Institution Perspective.”

#### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 10 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 10:15 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate, on June 15, 2017, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 11 a.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing on legislation pending before the committee.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 1:30 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed briefing followed by a closed hearing.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled, “Agency Approaches to Reorganization: Examining OMB’s Memorandum on the Federal Workforce.”

#### AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 191, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 191) designating June 20, 2017, as “American Eagle Day” and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 191) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR THEIR HISTORIC CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY IN THE 2017 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION FINALS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 192, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 192) congratulating the Golden State Warriors for their historic championship victory in the 2017 National Basketball Association Finals.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### COMMENDING THE BRAVERY OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, AND ALL FIRST RESPONDERS WHO PROTECTED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, THEIR STAFF, AND OTHERS DURING THE SHOOTING OF JUNE 14, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 193, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 193) commending the bravery of the United States Capitol Police, the Police Department of Alexandria, Virginia, and all first responders who protected Members of Congress, their staff, and others during the shooting on June 14, 2017, at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in the Del Ray neighborhood of Alexandria, Virginia.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, June 19; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 5 p.m.; finally, that at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session, as under the previous order.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator CARPER.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, earlier, just before the leader came to give his closing remarks for the day, I was talking about that Michael Davis is going to be a freshman at Middletown High School about 20 miles south of Newark where 896 intersects with I-95.

I was mentioning that Michael has succeeded in life as an athlete in ways that a lot of people think could just never happen. He has a disease called cystic fibrosis, and it was diagnosed very early in his life, but it is a genetic disease.

I talked with him and his mom Jennifer about that disease and how it affects our bodies. It is a disease that causes persistent lung infection. According to the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the condition is caused apparently by a defective gene that causes a thick buildup of mucus in our lungs and in other organs; and that mucus can clog our airways and trap bacteria that leads to infection, can lead to extensive lung damage and, in worst cases, to respiratory failure and then possibly maybe even likely death.

This is a disease that 14-year-old Michael Davis lives with. I have heard, for somebody who has cystic fibrosis to run any distance at all, they—I ran this morning, and I felt like I had some kind of disease. It was humid out there. I think it was probably higher levels of ozone than I like to run in.

For folks with cystic fibrosis like Michael, breathing is like they are breathing through a straw. Imagine that, trying to run 5 kilometers or a half marathon, which is 13.1 miles, and to be able to breathe through a straw effectively and still run distances like

that is truly, truly remarkable, but that is what he does.

Earlier this year, he completed, as I said, the New York City half marathon, and one of the people who ran with him was my son Christopher, who is a triathlete in his own right. He is 28 years old and a great runner. He, also like Michael, can run me into the ground, and I am proud of them both.

Michael was diagnosed during a screening, I think, just 3 weeks after he was born. He was 3 weeks old, and he was diagnosed with this disease. His mom said she was shocked. To her knowledge, there weren't any members of her family on her side or the father's side who had cystic fibrosis, but this was a diagnosis made 3 weeks into Michael's life—imagine that, 3 weeks.

After the diagnosis, his mom Jennifer faced some scary unknowns as she learned more about his condition, including average life expectancy for those who have cystic fibrosis.

She immediately sought care for Michael at the Children's Hospital that is up the road from us—I live in Wilmington, DE—but it is up the road 25 miles north of Wilmington. For the last 14 years, Michael has been treated at that hospital. Obviously, the fact that he can run a half marathon with cystic fibrosis suggests that he is getting exceptional care there.

Michael sees the doctor about every 8 weeks when he is feeling well. He sees a doctor more often when he is not feeling well, when he is feeling really sick.

He wakes up every morning at 4:30. I get up around 5:30, and he has already been up for an hour when I get up in Wilmington, DE. He does it to use a high-frequency chest wall oscillation device. They call it The Vest. What it does is, it helps break up the mucus in his lungs, and he continues to use The Vest several times throughout the day. He must also take over—are you ready for this—40 medications every day. So that is his regimen.

He gets up every day at 4:30, straps on The Vest, uses it several times throughout the day. The Vest shakes up his lungs and the mucus there so he can live, and he takes all his medications as well.

He told me, when we met with him and his mom a couple weeks ago, that cystic fibrosis is very frustrating, but he copes by trying to lead a healthy lifestyle. Just last week, Michael received national attention when he was named the Boomer Esiason Co-Athlete of the Year. Boomer was a great football quarterback, if I am not mistaken—I am tempted to say with the Cincinnati Bengals. I am looking for the pages to tell me whether I am right or wrong, but I think I am right. The Boomer Esiason Co-Athlete of the Year is Delaware's own Michael, and we are very proud of Michael, very proud of Michael.

The fact is, access to these treatments and medications are really a matter of life and death for people with cystic fibrosis. If something should happen and Michael and his family would lose healthcare, they would reach out and try to get coverage. Before we had the Affordable Care Act, there was a pretty good likelihood that finding that coverage would be very difficult, and it would be difficult because he has cystic fibrosis. He is not an inexpensive young man to take care of. To keep him alive and well and able to go to school and do the amazing regimen that he does takes money and resources, medicine and medical technology.

The way healthcare used to be provided in this country, when somebody had a preexisting condition like cystic fibrosis and they lost their healthcare—maybe a parent was working, had coverage, and lost the healthcare, lost the job—the person, in this case Michael, would have been out of luck because a lot of the health insurers used to say: Well, we don't want to cover this person because it is going to cost us a boatload of money.

I know there are problems with the Affordable Care Act. There are things I would like to change. What I hope we will do at the end of the day is not get rid of it and not just repeal it, but I hope we will retain that which is good and fix the things that ought to be fixed.

One of the things that needs to be retained is the idea that there should be a prohibition against insurance companies simply saying that if somebody has a preexisting condition and they lose coverage, they can continue to be denied coverage. They can get the coverage they need, and that is one of the very, very good things about the Affordable Care Act.

Our new pages here, you guys are about 2 years older than Michael Davis. Hopefully, you guys will live to be 100 or more. The only reason he is alive today is because he has access to the kind of healthcare we all want for our children and really for our parents.

I am a big believer—our pages hear me. I know they will only be here for 3 weeks, but they will probably hear me, when they come to the floor, talk about the Golden Rule. It is something that was impressed upon me at an early age, about the age of all of you. The Golden Rule goes something like this: Treat other people the way we want to be treated. It is pretty simple.

I grew up in a Protestant Church, but I don't care whether you are Protestant, Catholic, Jew, I don't care if you are Muslim, I don't care if you are Buddhist, Hindu—you name it—all of those religions, every one of them, has something in their Sacred Scriptures something like the Golden Rule: Treat other people the way you want to be treated.

I think we try to do that in the Affordable Care Act, imperfect as it is. I

think one of the best examples of the Golden Rule in the legislation, in the law, is the idea that if somebody loses coverage and they have a preexisting condition, we don't just cast them aside and say: Well, that is too bad. We give them another shot to get the coverage they need.

In the case of Michael Davis, the coverage, the access to healthcare, keeps him alive and not just alive to mope around and feel sorry for himself but to go out and run circles around the rest of us. He is an inspiration to me, and I think he is an inspiration to all who know him.

Mr. President, I think I may possibly be the last speaker. I am going to bid you good night and see you next week.

### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2017, AT 4 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:41 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 19, 2017, at 4 p.m.

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LUCIAN NIEMEYER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE SHARON E. BURKE, RESIGNED.

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2015. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JEFFREY GERRISH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (ASIA, EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST, AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE ROBERT W. HOLLEYMAN II.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

LYNN A. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FAMILY SUPPORT, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE CARMEN R. NAZARIO.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KELLY KNIGHT CRAFT, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO CANADA.

SHARON DAY, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA. KATHLEEN TROIA MCFARLAND, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE.

NATHAN ALEXANDER SALES, OF OHIO, TO BE COORDINATOR FOR COUNTERTERRORISM, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, VICE TINA S. K Aidanow, RESIGNED.

ERIC M. UELAND, OF OREGON, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (MANAGEMENT), VICE PATRICK FRANCIS KENNEDY.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ELINORE F. MCCANCE-KATZ, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE PAMELA S. HYDE.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

D. MICHAEL DUNAVANT, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE EDWARD L. STANTON III, RESIGNED.

LOUIS V. FRANKLIN, SR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE GEORGE L. BECK, JR., RESIGNED.

JUSTIN E. HERDMAN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CAROLE SCHWARTZ RENDON, RESIGNED.

JOHN W. HUBER, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

JESSIE K. LIU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD C. MACHEN, JR., RESIGNED.

RICHARD W. MOORE, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KENYEN RAY BROWN, RESIGNED.

JOHN E. TOWN, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOYCE WHITE VANCE, RESIGNED.

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. LEE K. LEVY II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN B. COOPER

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN B. DUNLAP III  
COL. DONALD R. EMERSON  
COL. DAVID FLEMING III  
COL. RYAN T. PACE  
COL. ANDREW M. ROMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. DEBORAH Y. HOWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN R. LYONS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES W. HOOPER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. EDWARD M. DALY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. MICHELLE M. ROSE

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DANIEL W. DWYER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ROSS A. MYERS

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN J. BROADMEADOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH F. MCKENZIE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. VINCENT R. STEWART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. HERMAN S. CLARDY III

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

#### To be major

LISA E. DONOVAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be colonel

KIRT L. STALLINGS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL G. RHODE  
SCOTT D. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be colonel

RICHARD L. ALLEN

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major

JAMES C. BENSON  
SHANNON R. KAY  
JARED W. KRUGER  
JACOB S. LOTFICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

TIMOTHY D. LITKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

#### To be colonel

SCOTT D. BLACKWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL A. ADAMS  
ALICE L. ALVERIO  
MATTHEW S. ANGELIDIS  
FERDINAND K. BACOMO  
DREW C. BAIRD  
DARRELL F. BARKER  
ELEANE M. BEADLE  
ETHAN S. BERGVALL  
KATHRYN E. BERRYMAN  
AARON M. BETTS  
DAVID V. BODE  
BRIAN W. BRENNAN  
ANGELA R. BRYAN  
SUMMER D. BRYANT  
JOHN B. CLARK  
MICHELLE S. CLARK  
GUY T. CLIFTON  
SHAWN P. CORCORAN  
CHRISTOPHER COWAN  
DEBORAH J. CROWLEY



CRISTINA CRUZCRESPO  
JUSTIN M. CURLEY  
JOSEPH DAI  
LEO A. DAMASCO  
MATTHEW R. DEBIEC  
ANDREW S. DELMAS  
JESSE P. DELUCA  
SALLY P. DELVECCHIO  
RAMONA A. DEVENEY  
JONATHAN F. DICKENS  
MICHAEL M. DICKMAN  
MARY DIGIULIO  
KIM EDHEGARD  
KATHRYN P. EDWARDS  
DELNORA L. ERICKSON  
RUTH S. FAIRCLOTH  
DARRELL J. FERGUSON  
COLBY A. FERNELIUS  
PHILLIP T. FIVECOAT  
RYAN P. FLANAGAN  
REBECCA A. FLORES  
ANTHONY R. FRATTALONE  
VINCENT T. FRY  
DENNIS T. FUJII  
ANDREW C. GALLO  
JOHN J. GARTSIDE  
SUZANNE M. GILLERN  
ROSCO S. GORE  
DAVID W. GRANT  
JON R. GRAY  
SKY D. GRAYBILL  
AMIT K. GUPTA  
JEFFREY A. GUTHRIE  
MITCHELL T. HAMELE  
MELINDA J. HAMER  
BRIAN R. HANEY  
STEPHEN A. HARPER  
JASON N. HARRIS  
PAUL W. HENDRIX  
TIMOTHY J. HEPLER  
JACOB S. HOGUE  
MARC H. HOHMAN  
SONNY S. HUITRON  
PAUL R. HUNT  
PAUL F. HWANG  
BENJAMIN J. INGRAM  
KHALID JABOORI  
SEYED A. JALALI  
JONATHAN JI  
BRYAN M. JOHNSON  
ROBERT A. JONES  
BENJAMIN KASE  
SEAN P. KEARNEY  
DAVID M. KELLER  
MICHAEL J. KILBOURNE  
JEEHUN M. KIM  
CHARLES A. KITLEY  
RYAN M. KNIGHT  
CAROLINE M. KOLB  
GREGORY P. KRAUS  
MATTHEW D. KUHNLE  
MARY L. KWOK  
JOSEPH T. LANZI, JR.  
NOELLE S. LARSON  
GARY LEVY  
JAMES E. MACE  
ANTHONY L. MARK  
ANA E. MARKELZ  
NATHAN A. MARSH  
TRAVIS MASON  
RYAN J. MCDONOUGH  
SHANE P. MCENTIRE  
BRANDI S. MCLEOD  
NATHAN E. MCWHORTER  
GARRETT J. MEYERS  
MICHAEL R. MOORE  
JOHN E. MUSSER  
JAMES R. NEINER  
JAMES NICHOLSON  
JAMISON S. NIELSEN  
FREDERICK P. OBRIEN  
MOROHUNRANTI O. OGUNTTOYE  
BRIAN OREILLY  
RASTISLAV OSADSKY  
CHRISTOPHER J. OTT  
HAINE S. K. PAIK  
STEPHEN PARADA  
ANGELO H. PAREDES  
SHIMUL S. PATEL  
TANVI D. PATEL  
JESSICA J. PECK  
KEITH H. PENSKA  
PAUL G. PETERSON  
SAMUEL C. PHINNEY  
JENNI PICKINPAUGHINOCENCIO  
TIMOTHY P. PLACKETT  
TORIE C. PLOWDEN  
GREGORY J. POSTAL  
JOHN J. POULIN  
DOUGLAS F. POWELL  
NADER Z. RABIE  
LUIGI K. F. RAO  
KURT J. REYES  
ROBERT D. RICE  
BRADLEY A. RITTENHOUSE  
PAUL M. ROBBEN  
MATTHEW D. RODGERS  
DEREK J. ROGERS  
CHRISTOPHER J. ROSEMEYER  
FRANCISCO C. RUBIO  
JENNY L. RYAN  
KATHLEEN C. RYAN

SHARI L. SAMMS  
ERIN S. SEEFELDT  
JOHN W. SIMMONS  
NIKOLAUS T. SNESHKOFF  
KEVAN M. SPENCER  
DANIELLE A. STACKHOUSE  
DANIEL STINNER  
ZOE E. SUNDELL  
ERIC M. SWANSON  
NATHANIEL TEAGUE  
JARED M. THELER  
DANIEL J. TOLSON  
PRISCILLA WEST  
KELLY J. WINTER  
SEAN R. WISE  
VLADIMIR S. YAKOPSON  
PAULA YOUNG  
D012118

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be major*

TODD R. ANDERSON  
MARK E. BEAMAN  
ALEXANDER L. BOROWICZ  
MARK L. BREWER  
MARGIA E. BRITO  
JEFFERY M. CURRY  
ANDREW J. DANTONI  
AARON FANNON  
HERSCHEL H. FLOWERS, JR.  
ADAM C. FORRESTER  
THOMAS J. FREEDMAN  
SEAN J. FULLAN  
TIANE R. GARNER  
MATTHEW S. GLAZENER  
BRENTON D. GRIFFITH  
JAMES D. HANNIGAN  
ANDREA D. JOHNSON  
RICHARD L. JONES  
MARK D. JUNTUNEN  
JAMES R. LEMLEY  
MICHAEL S. LOHRENTZ  
JOSEPH L. MARSHALL  
RAY G. MCCULLOCH  
JOSEPH O. OKUNBANJO  
JOHN W. PEYERL  
KATLYN I. SHAGORY  
OROCH K. SISOURA  
CHARLES V. SLIDER  
GLENN G. THIEL  
RYAN J. VANDROVEC  
ROBERT A. YAGGI III  
JOHN F. YANIKOV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be colonel*

DOUGLAS A. ALLEN  
ANDREW W. BALLENGER  
GORDON F. BJORMAN  
OLEN C. BRIDGES  
JAMES E. HESTERBERG  
GARY W. D. LEWIS  
BRIAN C. MCNEIL  
PETER V. MONDELLI  
ELISEO NOGUERAS  
TIMOTHY J. PALMER  
THOMAS K. SARROUF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U. S. C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

CHARLES E. BANE  
CHAD C. BLACK  
STEPHEN E. CASSLE  
SCOTT C. CHAMBERLIN  
PATTI K. GLEN  
DAREN C. HARRISON  
CHRISTIAN C. HOFER  
SHANNON T. MARKO  
JEREMIAH L. NELSON  
GREGORY T. REPPAS  
JOSEPH M. ROYAL  
JODI K. SANGSTER  
CHRISTOPHER SCHELLHASE  
ANGELA M. SCHMILLEN  
BRIAN W. SMITH  
CARL SOFFLER  
SUZANNE R. TODD  
MATTHEW D. WEGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be major*

DAREEN A. DOUCHI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

ADRIAN L. NELSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

BRANDON J. BAER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

BARRY MURRAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

FRANCIS K. AGYAPONG  
ALEXANDER D. ARISTIZABAL  
MARTA E. ARTIGA  
PETER J. ATTILIO  
ANGELIKA R. AVERY  
KATHERYN A. BAKER  
JULIE A. BANTA  
MARK S. BARROWS  
AMY R. BEASLEY  
MARGARET S. BERRYMAN  
OLGA BETANCOURT  
TRISHA A. BIELSKI  
KRISTINE P. BROGER  
MARIA I. BRUTON  
DEVIN Y. BRYANT  
CYNTHIA BUCHANAN  
BRIAN P. CAHILL  
ROBERT M. CARTER  
BENJAMIN G. CARTWRIGHT  
JACQUELYN M. CLINE  
RONALD D. COLE  
BRIAN M. COOLEY  
DENISE L. COOPER  
RAMONA I. DECKER  
CHARLES W. DENSEVICH  
LAKISHA S. DIXON  
IDONGESIT EBEUTE  
MASHANDRA D. ELAM  
LAKISHA N. FLAGG  
LAURA D. FOWLE  
SHAWN P. GALLAGHER  
RICHELLE L. GOODIN  
ANITA E. GOULD  
RACHEL C. GREVE  
JADE M. HAMEL  
BENITA L. HARRIS  
FELISIA M. HIBBLER  
JEFFREY S. HILLIS  
ANDREW J. HOVER  
MYRNA B. HOWSON  
NEIL S. HURD  
KYONG S. HYATT  
KYNDRA A. JACKSON  
LAURA JEFFREY  
JOSEPH P. LYNN  
JACOB H. MACGREGOR  
JASON K. MARQUART  
MATTHEW K. MARSH  
BARBARA A. MCCOTTRY  
MEGAN C. MOAKLER  
DANIELLE L. MOLINAR  
NORMAN E. MORRIS  
ANTOINETTE C. MYLES  
MICHAEL J. NEILL  
EVAN S. NONAKA  
LINDA F. NONNPRIDGEN  
ELIZABETH M. NUTTER  
MONICA OFFENBACHERLOONEY  
ADRIANA C. ORTIZCOFFIE  
SUSAN K. PIERSON  
UTE C. POEPSSEL  
CINDY L. ROBERTS  
DANIELLE K. RODONDI  
LUIS R. RODRIGUEZ  
JEANETTE B. RODRIGUEZTORRES  
ANGELA L. ROSARIO  
MATTHEW W. RUEMMLER  
PEGGY S. SALINAS  
CHRISTINA M. STEIMLE  
KYLE T. SUNADA  
MESHELLE A. TAYLOR  
TOMMY L. THOMPSON  
KELLEY C. TOGHOLA  
DOLORES P. TONEY  
WILLIAM L. VANASSE III  
VIRGINIA C. VARDONSMITH  
KENORA L. WALKER  
TIMOTHY R. WHOLERY  
JOHN E. WILSON, JR.  
MICHELLE L. WOLF  
DAN M. WOOD  
SASHI A. ZICKEFOOSE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JOSEPH H. AFANADOR  
SEAN ALLEN  
CASEY ARRIAGA  
JEFFREY I. BASS

CLEMENT R. BERMUDEZ  
JEFFERY K. BLACKWELL  
LISA M. BOHLER  
ANTHONY A. BOROWSKI  
LANDON R. BRETHOUWER  
LEXIE B. BUENAVENTURA  
JIMMIE J. BUTCHER  
WILLIAM H. CALLAHAN  
JONATHAN R. CATALANO  
CHANI A. CORDERO  
TAMBA DAUDA  
JASON T. DEBOER  
ERIK F. DEFREITAS  
JESSE DELGADO  
LISA M. DENNIS  
KEVIN M. DOHERTY  
GRACE L. Y. DUMAYAS  
DEANNA DURAN  
STEPHEN M. DURYEA  
TRENT J. ELLIOTT  
CHRISTOPHER L. EVANS  
JOHNATHAN J. EVANS  
ROBERT P. FEDERIGAN  
SETH T. FRENCH  
LAURIE L. GODIN  
CHRISTOPHER M. GREENE  
MELISSA GUE  
CHRISTOPHER J. GUENTHNER  
ERIC R. GUZMAN  
JOSHUA J. HANDORF  
JAYME K. HANSEN  
DEEPA HARIPRASAD  
LATAYA E. HAWKINS  
WALTER L. HAWKINS  
HEATH D. HOLT  
JASON W. HUGHES  
BRYAN J. HUNSAKER  
LEIF O. IBSEN  
DALMAR A. JACKSON  
JACOB D. JOHNSON  
RACQUEL O. JUNIO  
GERALD G. KELLAR  
STEFAN M. KOCHIS  
CHARLOTTE A. LANTERI  
RANDOLPH A. LEONPIEVE  
AUTUMN T. LEVERIDGE  
JERED D. LITTLE  
LEWIS S. LONG  
AARON LOZANO  
GORDON J. LYONS  
CHANDA M. MANEVAL  
JARROD A. MCGEE  
MICHELLE G. MEDWICK  
BILL D. MICHIE, JR.  
DENISE M. MILHORN  
CASSANDRA L. MIMS  
CHARLES A. MOORE  
ELIZABETH C. MOORE  
KRISTI M. MORRIS  
MARCUS L. MOSS  
SCOTT D. MRAS  
PATRICK M. MUSISI  
CHRISTIAN NELSON  
PETER V. NUNN  
FELIX A. ORTIZ  
RUBEN I. ORTIZCAMPOS  
SHERYL E. PEDERSEN  
FRANK A. PETRASSI  
TONY PIERSON  
EDWARD O. PRICE  
BENJAMIN QI  
EDGARDO RAMIREZ  
KIRK A. REED  
LUIS A. ROCHA  
GREGORY A. RUSHTON  
ERIK N. RUSSELL  
MARK C. SCHILLING  
KEITH H. SCHMIDT  
STEPHEN T. SCHMIDT  
ALEXANDER S. SHILMAN  
NICHOLAS R. SONG  
JON C. SONNEMAN  
MOISES SOTO  
MARTHA A. STANY  
GARY STAPOLSKY  
SETH O. SWARTZ  
SUSAN M. TALLMAN  
JOHN W. TAYLOR  
FRED B. TERRADO, JR.  
CHARLES M. TESSMAN, SR.  
JOSHUA C. THOMPSON  
BRIAN C. TRIPP  
ALYSON M. TUCKER  
JERRY D. VANVACTOR  
JANET N. VAUGHN  
CHAD D. VERMILLION  
HILDEHARDO F. VIADO, JR.  
SCOTT L. VIAL  
RORY K. WALLEY  
LASHONIA R. WHITE  
FELICIA L. WILLIAMS  
RICHARD E. WOOD  
DON H. YAMASHITA  
JASON R. YELLMAN  
DOI3069

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

BERT M. BAKER

BETHANY A. BELANGER  
AVERY J. CARNEY  
SCOTT D. CAROW  
MONICA L. CASMAER  
NICOLE K. CHARBONNEAU  
AARON J. CROWIN  
MICHAEL S. CROWELL  
TIN Q. DANG  
COLLEEN A. DANIELS  
CHARLES D. DAY  
JOHN T. ELLIOTT  
WALTER D. ENGLE  
CHAD M. FLICK  
CHRISTOPHER J. GEORGIANA  
JOSEPH R. KARDOUNI  
SCOTT M. KULLA  
SHARON L. ROSSER  
TANJA C. ROY  
JONATHAN L. SAXE  
MATTHEW R. SCHERER  
ERIN J. STIBRAL  
DERIK H. SWEE  
CLEVE B. SYLVESTER  
LARRY A. WYATT  
MARIA R. S. YATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

MICHAEL B. LOVEALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

BRECK S. BREWER  
DANIEL G. CHATTERLEY  
PETER N. DROUILLARD  
NICKOLI DUBYK  
JOSEPH M. DUTNER  
NASSER I. FIQIA  
BRANDON M. GAGE  
ROBERT N. GILLIAM  
KAREN E. GONZALEZTORRES  
ZACHARY H. HIGHBERGER  
NGHIA N. HO  
ANTHONY C. KIGHT  
JACOB L. KITSON  
AGNIESZKA KUCHARSKA  
DAVID H. KWON  
SLOAN D. MC LAUGHLIN  
LARRY L. MUNK  
ELIZABETH R. OATES  
ADAM R. OCHSNER  
PIERRE R. PIERCE  
SAMUEL E. POINDESTER  
DAVID L. REDMOND  
MARC M. SERRA  
CHRISTOPHER D. SWAGERTY  
SAMIRA F. THOMPSON  
JOHN F. UNDERWOOD  
ALAN D. WALKER  
DIANA W. WEBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

DAMIAN R. TONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

DANIEL F. ALEMANY  
BRITTANY E. MCCROAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

WIL B. NEUBAUER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

MARK C. GILLESPIE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be major*

TODD M. CHARD

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

CAMERON M. BALMA  
KEVIN D. BARNARD  
BRIAN M. BARRICK

MATTHEW R. BLANCHETTE  
REUBEN BLOFSTEIN  
JOSEPH P. BOBROWSKI  
PETER N. BOURAS  
JACOB B. CATALOGNA  
ANDREW J. CLARK  
DAVID B. CLARK  
CHRISTOPHER F. CLAUSEN  
STEPHEN R. DRAPER  
NATHAN A. DURIKA  
DEVRON L. EAKINS  
TODD C. EICHORST  
GREGORY J. ENGLISH  
DANIEL S. FISHER  
BRIAN E. HARPUDER  
ANGELA L. HUSS  
SHANE P. JACOBS  
SEAN M. JARVIS  
GREGORY R. KIPPE  
RENATA A. KLIMA  
JENNIFER L. LARISH  
CHRISTOPHER M. LÉPORE  
SIEGFRIED W. MELBOURNE  
JOSEPH W. MICHAELS  
JASON L. MILLER  
DAVID M. MROSEK  
CHRISTOPHER D. NELSON  
STEPHANIE L. PHILLIPS  
PATRICK W. PRAG  
JONATHAN C. RAIA  
TIMOTHY L. RAYMIE  
DANIEL W. ROBISON  
SARAH A. SHERWOOD  
MARLENE Z. SILVACOLLAZO  
MICHELLE L. SIMMONS  
JUSTIN M. SPRAGUE  
PETER J. TAMMINGA  
JESSICA E. D. VANDA  
DANIEL P. VARDIMAN  
RONALD L. WIENER  
SCOTT D. ZIEGENHORN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

RICHARD A. ACKERMAN  
ROBERT S. BAIR  
BRIAN R. BAKER  
JAYSON L. BEIER  
JASON B. BLACKMON  
BLYTHE A. BLAKISTONE  
TRISTAN M. BORNE  
ANTHONY A. BUMATAY  
HENRY L. BUSH  
BRIAN A. EVANS  
TAYLOR R. FORESTER  
AARON C. GEARY  
STEPHEN C. GRAY  
ERVIN B. HATCHER  
MICHAEL R. LARAYA  
OMAR J. SANCHEZ  
RALPH J. STEPHENS  
BRIAN K. TYLER  
PATRICIA R. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

SARAH R. BOUTWELL  
JEFFERY L. BURKE  
CHRISTOPHER G. CARR  
CHARLES Y. CHA  
TREVOR A. DAY  
DAVID E. DWIGGINS, JR.  
DEREK J. DYE  
ANTONIO J. GARCIA  
HENRY T. GILBERT IV  
DAVID M. GUTIERREZ  
JASON D. HANSER  
PETER M. B. HARLEY  
JONATHAN M. HAY  
PHILLIP L. HICKMAN, JR.  
GENE J. JACKSON  
ERIC L. KIRK  
KARL W. KRAUT  
COLIN G. LARKINS  
STEVEN C. LAYFIELD  
CORNELIUS L. MASON  
JORDAN A. MCCALEB  
MICHAEL K. MEADOR  
SEAN R. MULDER  
MEREDITH K. SCHLEY  
TROY A. SMITH  
KENNETH W. STGERMAIN  
DURKE A. WRIGHT  
ANDREW F. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

JEREMIAH E. CHAPLIN  
DAVID W. DAMRON  
CASEY J. GON  
ANGELA S. LEFLER  
RAMON P. MARTINEZ, JR.  
STEPHEN A. MCINTYRE  
JEANETTE SHEETS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

LINWOOD O. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

BRIAN A. EVICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

KRISTOPHER M. BRAZIL  
CHRISTOPHER J. CARMICHAEL  
ANDREA M. CASSIDY  
JAMES J. CULNEN, JR.  
MARY C. DECKER  
CHRISTINE L. FLETCHER  
RICHARD G. GLASGOW II  
CHRISTOPHER C. MULLER  
ROGER D. PHELPS, JR.  
CHRISTY N. SIBLEY  
JAY S. VIGNOLA  
DEREK S. WAISANEN  
CLARENCE D. WASHINGTON  
DOUGLAS WILLIAMS  
SHEREE T. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

BRYCE D. ABBOTT  
JOSEPH H. ADAMS II  
KYLE A. ADUSKEVICH  
JONATHAN V. AHLSTROM  
JASON A. AHMANSON  
ROBERT AHO  
JOSHUA M. ALES  
ROBEN E. ALFONSO  
PATRICK M. ALFONZO  
MARK B. ALLEN  
JOHN L. ALUMS  
CHRISTOPHER M. AMIS  
ERIC R. ANDREWS  
LARRY J. ARBUCKLE  
ALEXANDER P. ARMATAS  
TODD A. ARNOLD  
DAVID K. ASHBY  
VICTOR H. AVILA  
FRANK J. AZZARELLO  
VERNON C. BACHMANN  
MARK E. BAIR  
JEREMIAH C. BALDWIN  
ROBERT J. BALLARD  
TIMOTHY R. BARKLEY  
ANDREW K. BARNETT  
MEGAN M. BARNETT  
RAYMOND T. BARR, JR.  
NATHAN S. BARTON  
GUY M. BATCHELDER  
KATE S. BATTEN  
MATTHEW H. BEACH  
ANDREW R. BEARD  
KEVIN A. BEATLEY  
JOHN A. BENDA  
DANIEL R. BERGSTROM  
COLIN J. BERNARD  
JASON M. BERWANGER  
DAVID M. BIGAY  
DEREK W. BINTZ  
MEGHAN L. BODNAR  
DUANE S. BOGATKO  
PHILLIP E. BOICE  
BRANDON M. BOOHER  
PATRICK B. BOOKEY  
VICTOR J. BOZA  
BRADLEY C. BOZIN  
CHRISTOPHER J. BRADSHAW  
JERMAINE B. BROOMS  
KURTIS J. BROUWER  
PHILIP L. BROWN  
ZACHARY R. BROWN  
WILLIAM S. BUFORD  
THOMAS W. BULLOCK  
THOMAS R. BUTTS, JR.  
JOHN K. CALDWELL  
ALEXANDER T. CAMPBELL  
RYAN G. CAMPOAMOR  
JONATHAN B. CANTOR  
AARON J. CARLSON  
WILLIAM L. CARR  
CHRISTOPHER M. CARREON  
BENJAMIN R. CARTER  
CHRISTOPHER J. CARTER  
LINDSAY A. CARTER  
PHILLIP R. CASHA  
PAUL W. CASSUTTI  
JAMES C. CATALINE  
BRALYN E. CATHEY  
KEVIN M. CHAMBLEY  
ROBERT H. CHANDLER  
GREGORY R. CHAPMAN  
MICHAEL G. CHARNOTA  
ANDREW J. CHAUVIN

BRYAN J. CHRISTIANSEN  
RICHARD M. CHRISTOFF  
JAMES L. CLARK III  
RYAN F. CLARKE  
TOMMY M. CLARKE  
KEVIN C. CLOPPER  
JUSTIN M. COBB  
STEVEN J. COBOS  
JOHN S. COCCA  
MICHAEL P. CODINGTON  
DOUGLAS E. COLE  
TERENCE A. COLEMAN  
RYAN P. CONOLE  
BENJAMIN J. COOPER  
JUSTIN P. COOPER  
LLOYD L. COORE  
JOSHUA P. CORBIN  
CHARLES C. CORNELY  
JAMES L. CORREIA  
VICTOR D. COSTELLO  
CALEB T. CRAMER  
GREGORY M. CRESCENZO  
DAVID M. CRESITELLI  
JOHN G. CULPEPPER  
NICHOLAS F. CUNNINGHAM  
MATTHEW E. CURNEN  
BRYAN S. DAHLQUIST  
ANDREW F. DAMBROSIO, JR.  
MARK C. DAVID  
MATTHEW E. DAVIN  
JUSTIN P. DAVIS  
KATHRYN J. DAWLEY  
STEVEN A. DAWLEY  
JARROD D. DAY  
JEREMY A. DEBONS  
LANCE M. DENHAM  
JEFFREY M. DESMOND  
TROY J. DICKEY  
DAVID P. DIZ  
MICHAEL P. DONOVAN  
PAMELA S. DONOVAN  
RONALD A. DRAKE  
TIMOTHY G. DROSINOS  
MICHAEL F. DUEZ  
JEFFREY R. DUNDON, JR.  
KEVIN P. DURKIN  
JAMES P. DUVALL  
WILLIAM T. DVORAK  
BRETT E. ELKO  
DONALD W. EMERSON  
JORDAN D. ENETE  
MATTHEW L. ENOS  
RODNEY C. ERLER, JR.  
CHARLES E. ESCHER  
MICHAEL C. ESCOBAR  
ROGELIO ESPINOZA  
JOHN R. ESPOSITO  
HARRY C. EVANS III  
JAMES L. EVANS  
JOHNPAUL A. FALARDEAU  
PETER R. FANNO  
JONATHAN J. FARACO  
MATTHEW A. FAY  
HARRY R. FEIGEL III  
BLAINE S. FELLONE  
JEFFREY M. FELLOWS  
WILLIAM A. FENSTERER  
BRIAN W. FICHTER  
JAVIER A. FIGUEROA  
MATTHEW G. FISHER  
JOHN E. FITZPATRICK  
SEAN C. FLANAGAN  
ERIN E. FLINT  
SYLVESTER R. FOLEY IV  
DANIEL A. FOLLETT  
MARC E. FOREMAN  
TYLER W. FORRESTER  
BRIAN A. FORSTER  
BENJAMIN W. FOSTER  
MATTHEW O. FOUNTAIN  
ERICH C. FRANDRUP  
ROBERT L. FRANKLIN III  
CHRISTOPHER A. GAHL  
MARK P. GALLAGHER  
MATTHEW K. GARCIA  
BRYAN E. GEISERT  
THOMAS C. GENEST  
KIMBERLY N. GEORGE  
JUSTIN F. GERLE  
PHILIP D. GIFT  
PRESTON W. GILMORE  
JASON N. GLAB  
CHRISTOPHER D. GLANDON  
MATTHEW D. GLEASON  
JOHN Q. GODBEHERE  
JOSEPH P. GORGOL  
LORA M. GORSKY  
BENJAMIN P. GRANT  
RICHARD B. GRANT  
BRENDAN T. GRAY  
SEAN P. GRAY  
ADAM B. GREEN  
NICHOLAS M. GREEN  
DANIEL GROVER II  
MEGAN M. GRUBBS  
WILLIAM M. GUHEEN III  
KEVIN R. HAAKSMA  
JARROD S. HAIR  
DANIEL A. HANCOCK  
STANTON R. HANLEY  
MICHAEL G. HANNER, JR.  
CHARLES A. HARRIS II

ISAAC A. HARRIS  
CHAD H. HARVEY  
BRIAN J. HASSE  
RYAN D. HASTINGS  
NATHANIEL M. HATHAWAY  
RUDOLF A. HAWKINS  
JEFFREY E. HEILMAN  
RYAN C. HEINEMAN  
BRANDON J. HEIRONIMUS  
COURTNEY S. HERDT  
TREVOR F. HERMANN  
DIRK H. HERON  
KERRY P. HICKS  
STEPHEN A. HIERS  
BRIAN R. HIGGINS  
EDWARD F. V. HILL  
NICHOLAS S. HILL  
ROBERT B. HINES  
WILBUR R. HINES, JR.  
DEVON M. HOCKADAY  
GREGORY S. HOLLEY  
DAVID C. HOLLON  
KENNETH C. HOLLON  
ROBERT D. HOLT  
JOEL I. HOLWITT  
JASON R. HORNING  
MATTHEW G. HORTON  
LYLE K. HOSKIN  
JOHN J. HOY  
JOSEPH J. HUBLEY  
JENNIFER A. HUCK  
JAMES D. HUDDLESTON  
WILLIAM T. HUEBNER, JR.  
ERIC C. HUI  
BRANDON C. HUNTER  
MICHAEL Y. HUNTSMAN  
TIMOTHY P. HURLEY  
JACOB D. HURT  
DOUGLAS J. IVANAC  
KRISTAFAER Y. JARBOE  
DEREK C. JASKOWIAK  
BRANDON L. JENKINS  
ERIC H. JEWELL  
THOMAS G. JILLSON  
ERIC R. JOHNSON  
JOSHUA P. JOHNSON  
LUKE R. JOHNSON  
MELISSA E. JOHNSON  
JEREMY M. JOHNSTON  
ANDREW T. JONES  
JOSHUA F. JONES  
CHAD T. KALOCINSKI  
JUSTIN M. KAPER  
EREK A. KASSE  
JAMES W. KAUBER  
DOUGLAS L. KAY  
KENNETH P. KEEPER  
CHRISTOPHER S. KELLEY  
JONATHAN A. KELLEY  
MARK E. KENNEDY  
ERIK J. KENNY  
CHRISTOPHER P. KENT  
HENRY N. KEYSER IV  
SHAWN P. KIERNAN  
THOMAS Y. KIM  
MICHAEL G. KING  
RORY M. KIPPER  
CHRISTOPHER M. KLUTCH  
BRYAN F. KOEHLER  
ANDREW J. KOPACZ  
STEPHEN C. KRATOVIL, JR.  
MATTHEW I. KRULL  
DANIEL D. KUITU  
GEORGE G. KULCZYCKI  
ROBERT W. KURRLE, JR.  
JOSEPH M. LAHER  
KYLE P. LAMBERT  
STEPHEN V. LAMOURE  
VICTOR M. LANGE  
GREGORY A. LANGSTON  
DAVID J. LATTI  
JASON A. LAUTAR  
JEFFREY B. LAVERY  
JIMMY L. LAWTON  
JONATHAN D. LEEWARNER  
DANIELLE L. LEIBY  
GREGORY P. LEMBO  
MATTHEW K. LEWIS  
WAYNE G. LEWIS, JR.  
MARK T. LICKTEIG  
CASEY K. LIGGETT  
RICHARD B. LITCHEFIELD  
CHARLES C. LITTON  
PETE S. LOGSDON  
JOHNNY R. LYKINS, JR.  
JEREMY N. LYON  
ADAM M. MADSON  
LAWRENCE J. MAHAN  
JAMES M. MALVASIO  
KRISTA R. MANN  
ALAN T. MARDEGIAN  
ROBERT W. MARRS  
SCOTT G. MARSH  
MATTHEW L. MARTIN  
RION W. MARTIN  
CARLOS F. MARTINEZ  
SAMUEL P. MASON  
ANTHONY S. MASSEY  
RYAN T. MATTSOON  
CHRISTOPHER L. MAURE  
RICHARD T. MCCANDLESS  
NEVIN A. MCCHESENEY

DAVID S. MCCLINTOCK  
 ANDREW P. MCCLUNE  
 KEVIN S. MCCORMICK, JR.  
 TAMMY S. MCCREARY  
 SEAN H. MCCRINK  
 ROBERT J. MCDOWELL, JR.  
 LOUIS P. MCFADDEN III  
 JOHN K. MCGEE  
 ROBERT J. MCMILLAN  
 DANIEL J. MCNAB  
 NICHOLAS A. MEYERS  
 COREY L. MILLIS  
 JOHNNY L. MINCEY  
 MICHAEL V. MINERVINI  
 MICHAEL L. MINUKAS  
 MATTHEW L. MINZES  
 RODRIGO D. MIRANDA  
 SEAN D. MOLLAHAN  
 DANIEL A. MORREIRA  
 JASON B. MORTON  
 JARROD L. MOSLEY  
 JOHN S. MULLEN  
 JEFFERY J. MURAWSKI  
 BRIAN T. MURPHY  
 PETER J. MUSCHEK  
 BRIAN L. MUSFELDT  
 KONSTANTINOS T. NAKOS  
 KELECHI R. NDUKWE  
 ELIZABETH A. NELSON  
 PAUL W. NICKELL  
 CHRISTOPHER J. NICOLETTI  
 ROBERT W. NIEMEYER  
 JOHN P. NILLES  
 MATTHEW W. NOLAND  
 CHRISTOPHER M. NORRIS  
 JEREMY L. NUTTALL  
 TIMOTHY D. OBRIEN  
 COREY D. ODOM  
 MATTHEW P. OLSON  
 PATRICK C. ONEILL  
 JARED M. OTT  
 CHRISTOPHER J. OTTO  
 ELI C. OWRE  
 ADAM C. PACE  
 JASON N. PAPADOPOULOS  
 JOHN W. PARKER  
 JOSEPH D. PARSONS  
 LESTER O. PATTERSON  
 LEWIS J. PATTERSON  
 BRIAN H. PENNELL  
 MICHAEL A. PEREZ  
 JOSHUA J. PETERS  
 BRENT M. PETERSON  
 TODD M. PETRIE  
 CHRISTOPHER W. PETRO  
 CHARLES W. PHILLIPS  
 MATTHEW M. PIANETTA  
 BRYAN S. PINCKNEY  
 SUSAN M. PINCKNEY  
 JOSEPH J. PISONI  
 MICHAEL T. PLAGEMAN  
 DYLAN G. PORTER  
 ROBERT A. PRINCE  
 SCOTT J. PURCELL  
 JOHN P. QUALTERS  
 DEREK A. RADER  
 THOMAS F. RADICH III  
 JEREMIAH N. RAGADIO  
 COURTNEY L. RANK  
 SCOTT D. RATHKE  
 RANDOLPH W. REED II  
 ERIC T. REEVES  
 STEVE C. REIS  
 BRIAN J. REITTER  
 JAMES J. REYNOLDS  
 BRIAN M. RHOADES  
 QUINN J. RHODES  
 NOAH S. RICH  
 DAWN T. RICKETTS  
 TREVOR J. RITLAND  
 ANDREW P. RIVAS  
 COLIN M. ROBERTS  
 SPENCER A. ROBERTS  
 MATT W. RODGERS  
 ARTHUR S. RODRIGUEZ  
 SCOTT J. ROSE  
 EMILY Y. ROYSE  
 ROBERT S. RUBY  
 RONALD H. RUMFELT  
 SETH A. RUMLER  
 JOHN P. RUMMEL IV  
 EDISON C. RUSH  
 ROBERT J. RUZICKA II  
 CRAIG R. SALVESON  
 JAMES O. SAMMAN  
 JARED W. SAMUELSON  
 DAVID C. SANDOMIR  
 HOUSSAIN T. SAREINI  
 DANIEL J. SCHLESINGER

BRYAN W. SCHNEIDER  
 JEFFREY R. SCHWAB  
 NATHAN A. SCOTT  
 SAMUEL M. SCOVILL  
 BRYAN D. SCULLIN  
 JEFFREY T. SERVELLO  
 ERIC D. SEVERSON  
 JAMES S. SHARROW III  
 KENNETH M. SHEFFIELD  
 JASON M. SIMON  
 ANDREW J. SIMONS  
 MICHAEL J. SIMPSON  
 PAOLO J. S. SINGH  
 JEFFREY A. SIZEMORE  
 JONATHAN J. SLAGER  
 BRANDON D. SMITH  
 BRIAN C. SMITH  
 CHARLES R. SMITH  
 DENNIS H. SMITH  
 JAMES L. SMITH  
 JARED C. SMITH  
 JASON C. SMITH  
 NICHOLAS H. SMITH  
 SCOTT J. SMITH  
 STEVEN R. SMITH  
 JOHN W. SOKOL  
 ADAM C. SOUKUP  
 KIRK A. SOWERS  
 ANDREW H. SPARKS  
 WAYNE O. SPARROW  
 BARCLEY W. STAMEY  
 MICHAEL B. STANFIELD  
 PETER STAVRIDES  
 JOHN W. STIGI  
 ROBERT G. STIMIS  
 GARTH W. STORZ  
 TIMOTHY S. SULICK  
 JASON T. SUROWIEC  
 MATHEW J. SWENSON  
 MICAH T. SYBOR  
 CHRISTOPHER M. TABERT  
 JASON S. TARRANT  
 DOUGLAS M. TEMPEST  
 TIMOTHY A. TETI  
 MATTHEW S. THATCHER  
 DANIEL J. THOMAS  
 JEFFREY W. THOMAS  
 ROBERT M. THOMPSON  
 JOHN M. THORPE  
 MARTY D. TIMMONS  
 RYAN A. TOMKINS  
 DEXTER J. TRIPLETT  
 JAMES G. TUTTHILL III  
 THOMAS J. UHL  
 PHILIP S. UJIE  
 JAMIE E. VANDYKE  
 THOMAS H. VANHOOZER III  
 PATRICK M. VEITH  
 CLAY S. WADDILL  
 DAVID WAGENBORG  
 ROBERT A. WALLS  
 ROBERT W. WARD  
 ROBERT C. WATTS IV  
 CHRISTOPHER D. WEAVER  
 SEAN M. WELCH  
 CHARLES R. WEYDERT  
 CARL E. WHITE  
 WILLIAM R. WHITE  
 SEAN E. WHITEMAN  
 ADAM R. WHITT  
 STEVEN S. WHITWORTH  
 NICHOLAS A. WILLET  
 RYAN S. WILLETTE  
 WILLIAM L. WILLIAMS, JR.  
 MICHAEL A. WITHERILL  
 ROBERT E. WOODARDS  
 ALEXANDER L. WRIGHT  
 GRANVILLE C. WRIGHT, JR.  
 MATTHEW A. WRIGHT  
 EVAN T. YOUNG  
 NEAL A. YOUNG  
 JOSHUA P. ZELFER  
 SHANE M. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

JEREMIAH P. ANDERSON  
 TRAVIS J. ANDERSON  
 DARRIN E. BARBER  
 MOLLIE A. BILY  
 JOHN F. BOSEMAN  
 NATHANIEL S. COSTELLO  
 RYAN D. CRISMAN  
 JOHN E. DALTON  
 RICHARD L. DULDULAO  
 MATTHEW C. FRYE

JOHN A. GENTA  
 WILLIAM A. GIBSON  
 TIMOTHY J. HOUSEHOLDER  
 DOUGLAS E. JONART  
 SUNNY G. LAU  
 BENSON W. LO  
 CHRISTOPHER K. MATASSA  
 PAUL W. MURCH  
 DANIEL T. NEVEROSKY  
 ANGELA C. OWENS  
 THOMAS C. PARKER  
 ANDREW J. PRIVETTE  
 JAMES W. ROCHELLE  
 JONATHAN F. SCHIEL  
 CHRISTOPHER M. SCHINDLER  
 DANIEL SORIA  
 ZACHARIAH H. STILES  
 HOANG N. TRAN  
 MICHAEL A. WOEHRMAN  
 JEREMY R. WOODY  
 AARON L. WOOLSEY  
 ASHLEY S. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

STACY J. G. ARENSTEIN  
 MATTHEW P. BLAZEL  
 CHARLES J. BORGES  
 DAVID L. CALHOUN  
 CHRISTOPHER B. DEBONS  
 GABRIEL J. HOHNER  
 BRANDON J. HOUSE  
 COLETTE B. LAZENKA  
 JEDEDIAH J. MAGDA  
 ANDREW M. MCKEE  
 JAMIE H. ROGERS  
 JASON SAGLIMBENE  
 JONATHAN S. SCHIFFELBEIN  
 STEVEN D. SENEY  
 NICHOLAS A. SINNOGRAK  
 TYLER R. TENNILLE  
 HENRY L. THOMASON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

KELLY W. BOWMAN, JR.  
 DEREK H. BURNS  
 TOMMIE G. CRAWFORD  
 WILLIAM J. GRAY  
 CHRISTOPHER H. GRIMES  
 JOSEPH M. HOLT  
 JOSEPH A. KAMARA  
 ANDREI L. MCARTHUR  
 MICHAEL D. PHILLIPS  
 ANDRES V. PICO  
 DANIEL D. REID  
 JAMES L. RORER  
 SHANNON P. THOMPSON  
 ROBERT H. VOHRER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

LARA R. BOLLINGER  
 NATHAN J. CHRISTENSEN  
 CATHERINE F. COOK  
 SARAH M. FLAHERTY  
 GREGORY L. FLORES  
 ALANA F. GARAS  
 PAUL D. MACAPAGAL  
 STEPHANIE B. MURDOCK  
 REBECCA L. REBARICH  
 CANDICE C. TRESCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

PATRICK P. DAVIS  
 TIMOTHY M. DERBYSHIRE  
 TOMASZ DMITRUKOWSKI  
 VON H. FERNANDES  
 CHAD W. GAGNON  
 JOSHUA W. HENSLEY  
 BARBARA E. JONAS  
 TAEKO E. MCFADDEN  
 BRANDON M. OBERLING  
 CHRISTINA E. ORTEGA  
 JACOB M. PLICHTA  
 DONALD L. SHRADER  
 SEAN C. STEVENS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

JEFFRY A. ALSUP  
ROSS M. ANDERSON  
MICHAEL J. BALDWIN  
ANTHONY C. BARBER  
BRAD A. BAUER  
BRENT J. BENLIEN  
KELLY V. BORDEN  
SATONYA A. BROWN  
HARRY A. CHENG  
JOHN A. COURTIAL  
MARCUS A. CREIGHTON

ROBERT P. CROCETTA III  
JON R. DAVIS  
ALAN V. DUNN  
SCOTT M. DURDLE  
JOHN S. FAIRWEATHER  
SHAUN W. FISCHER  
ROBERT C. FRY  
PHILIP L. GESAMAN  
CHAD M. HAMM  
HOMER F. HENSY  
ANDREW M. HOFFMAN  
DWIGHT A. JEFFERSON  
BRANDON L. JOHNSON  
FREDDIE B. KOONCE  
KURTIS J. KRUG  
MICHAEL A. MASONER

KEITH M. MORRIS  
LELAND M. MURPHY  
DANIEL K. NICHOLS  
GREGORY P. NOTARO  
DAVID W. PIERCE  
BLAINE C. PITKIN  
BRIAN R. RATKOVICH  
GREGORY K. RING  
WAYNE N. SALGADO, JR.  
JUSTIN M. SANTOS  
BOBBY C. STANCIL  
MARK D. STANLEY  
ANTOINE D. THORNTON  
GARY A. TINCHER  
TERRY N. TRAWEEK, JR.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## RECOGNIZING CAROLYN LERNER

## HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Ms. Carolyn Lerner for her service as Special Counsel at the Office of Special Counsel (OSC). This is her last week at OSC after six years leading the Office.

OSC has the enormous and important task of policing the executive branch against prohibited personnel practices, including retaliation against whistleblowers.

Ms. Lerner began her work at OSC in June 2011, and her impact there has been extremely positive. With her at the helm, OSC increased both the number of complaints it investigated and the number of cases it resolved. The agency has won widespread bipartisan praise for its work, including resolving multiple cases of retaliation against whistleblowers at the Veterans Administration.

As co-chairman of the House Whistleblower Protection Caucus and member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I know how vitally important whistleblowers are to Congressional oversight of the federal government. The brave men and women who have the courage to expose abuse and fraud in their workplaces deserve to be protected, and under Ms. Lerner's leadership, OSC has done just that.

It has been a pleasure to work with Ms. Lerner since coming to Congress. As her time at OSC comes to an end, I wish again to thank her for her service to our nation and her tireless commitment to protecting whistleblowers. I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING THE DEER  
PARK DEER FOR THEIR STATE  
CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY

## HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Deer Park High School Deer for winning the Texas University Interscholastic League (UIL) 6A Baseball State Championship. The Deer accumulated a record of 35–8 on the way to the state title with playoff wins against: Summer Creek, Pearland, Clear Springs, Ridge Point, Fort Bend Travis, and Southlake Carroll. This is the first baseball championship for Deer Park and the fourth time the school has made it to the state tournament.

On June 10, 2017, the Deer dispatched San Antonio Reagan in the championship game by

a score of 7–2 at the Dell Diamond in Round Rock. Four players were named to the All-Tournament Team: Clay Aguilar, Chase Keng, Blake Martin, and Adrian Gonzales who was named Tournament Most Valuable Player (MVP). These young men have shown incredible persistence, hard work, passion and commitment to accomplish this feat and I applaud each and every one of them. I would like to personally recognize each student and their coaches.

Players: Mark Barrow, Connor Berry, Tyler Stenberg, Blaine Holden, Reece Moon, Jacobo Martinez, Clay Aguilar, Chase Keng, Christian Vela, Dylan Pullig, Josiah Ortiz, Austin Mitchell, Taylor Lee, Connor Williams, Jordan Phillips, JT Satterwhite, Peyton Sherlin, Chase Duncan, Adrian Gonzales, Blake Martin, and Kolton Fowler. Head Coach: Chris Rupp. Assistant Coaches: Donnie Elliott, Darren Schneider, Austin Yager, Jacob Rhame, and David White. Athletic Trainers: Jim Davidson, Lori Mahan, and David Viaclovsky. Managers: Gabby Gallegos and McKade Whittington. Student Trainer: Zachary Domingue.

I wish each one of them continued success on and off the baseball field. Go Deer!

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BORBA  
FAMILY

## HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Borba family's contribution to the agriculture industry of California and their strong presence in California's Central Valley for over one hundred years.

The Borba family's legacy began when Ms. Anna Borba emigrated from the Azores, Portugal to the United States in the late 1800's. Anna's son, A.J. Borba, moved to California's Central Valley in the early 1900's to begin the family's agriculture venture, and established a dairy in Riverdale, California. In the 1940's, A.J. and his sons, Ross, Sr., and Darril, began focusing on a row crop operation with the goal of introducing cotton to the Central Valley. In 1958, the brothers officially began Borba Brothers Farms on the west side of Fresno County.

In 1942, Ross, Sr. married Justina "Tina" Urrizola and continued to farm in Riverdale while raising their two sons, Ross, Jr. and Mark, and their daughter, Dwayne. In 1976, Ross, Jr. and Mark acquired the family business after their father and uncle retired. In their retirement, Ross, Sr. and Tina established the Rancho Vista del Rio on San Joaquin River near Fresno. Currently, Rancho Vista del Rio serves as the home and horse ranch of Mark and his wife, Peggy Borba, and

is often used as a venue for Fresno County community events.

Today, the fifth generation of Borbas is represented by Mark and Peggy's son, Derek. Derek and his wife, Jennifer, operate the farming and custom farm management business. As custom farm operators, they perform machine operations on partnered farms in Westlands Water District. Having survived years of drought, the farming operation encompasses 9,000 acres of almonds, tomatoes, garlic, melons, lettuce, wheat, and Pima cotton on the Valley's west side.

The Borba family has significantly contributed to the Central Valley's agriculture industry through philanthropy, financial support, and leadership of organizations including the California Agriculture Leadership Foundation, Sequoia Council Boy Scouts, Valley Teen Ranch, and Ag One. The family has also made a lasting impression on many in their community. The Borba family understands the incredible importance of education, and has continuously supported Riverdale Unified School District, San Joaquin College of Law, and Pacific Legal Foundation. Members of the Borba family have volunteered and provided support to their local health and wellness organizations and support services including Community Medical Center, Saint Agnes Medical Center, Valley Children's Hospital, and the Marjaree Mason Center. In acknowledgment of his and his family's contributions and accomplishments, Mark Borba was awarded the U.C. Davis 1996 Award of Distinction. Mark was also influential in establishing the Ross Borba, Sr. Scholarship Endowment for agricultural college students. Additionally, Borba Farms, Inc. received the 2007 Baker, Peterson, and Franklin, CPA, LLP, Agricultural Business Award in recognition of its impact on the agricultural industry and Central San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Borba family for their contributions to the Central Valley and their presence in the agriculture industry for over five generations.

RECOGNIZING THE VIETNAMESE  
ARMED FORCES DAY CEREMONY

## HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize the Vietnamese Armed Forces Day Ceremony at the Vietnam War Memorial in Denver, Colorado. This ceremony seeks to honor the efforts of all of those who fought in Vietnam and commemorate the 42nd Anniversary of the Fall of Saigon.

As a U.S. Marine Corps combat veteran, I understand the importance that duty and sacrifice for one's country is not something unique

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

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

to the United States military. In fact, the Vietnam Memorial in Denver serves as a reminder of those sacrifices made not only by the Americans who fought there, but reminds us here in the U.S. of the hardships endured by the South Vietnamese themselves. Most importantly, the Memorial also serves as a symbol of friendship and shared struggle to defend freedom and liberty, in which the United States and Republic of Vietnam together sacrificed so much and fought so bravely. This year is the 2nd Anniversary of the Vietnam War Memorial in Denver, and it truly represents an important and meaningful addition to our community.

I am proud to recognize the efforts put forth by these men and women in the defense of democracy in our two countries. The United States of America is stronger and more enriched because of their contributions and for this, I thank them.

I would also like to thank True Nguyen, President of the Vietnamese American Community of Colorado and Thanh Nguyen, the Chair of the Vietnamese Armed Forces Day Organizing Committee for helping to make this ceremony and special day possible.

---

#### CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH 2017

---

### HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Juneteenth. On June 19 (Juneteenth), 1865, Major General Gordon Granger landed at Galveston Island and issued General Order Number 3 which read, "the people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with a proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free." With this action the last American slaves, nearly 250,000 Texans, were freed two and a half years after President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

Early Juneteenth celebrations were political rallies to teach freed African Americans about their freedoms, including voting rights. Over the years Juneteenth is celebrated at a wide variety of public events, prayer services, ceremonies, family gatherings, parades, barbecues, rodeos, and sporting events. Modern Juneteenth celebrations encourage self-development and respect for all cultures.

Today, Juneteenth remains the oldest known celebration of the end of slavery. In 1979 Governor William "Bill" Clements, Jr. signed legislation declaring Juneteenth as a state holiday. By 2016 forty-five of the fifty states in the Union have followed suit recognizing Juneteenth as either a state holiday, ceremonial day, or day of observance.

Mr. Speaker I rise, with my fellow Texans, to celebrate Juneteenth in the United States House of Representatives.

#### HONORING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF MR. LAWRENCE REEDUS

### HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and with great respect that I congratulate Mr. Lawrence Reedus on a momentous milestone, his 80th birthday. Lawrence will be celebrating with family and friends on Friday, June 16, 2017, at the Calumet Township Multi-Purpose Center in Gary, Indiana.

Lawrence Wesley Reedus was born on June 5, 1937, in Gary, Indiana, the second oldest of five children. As a young man, he attended Roosevelt High School, where he excelled in his athletic pursuits, lettering in both football and basketball. After graduating in 1956, Lawrence continued his educational pursuits in Indiana at Manchester College. After working various jobs, Mr. Reedus found his calling as a career fireman for the Gary Fire Department, serving the city and its residents for more than twenty years. Known for his leadership and his political interest, Lawrence was determined to obtain a union for his fellow firefighters, so it is no surprise that he would go on to become the first African American president for the Gary Firefighters Association IAFF Local 359. For his unwavering dedication to his colleagues and to the community of Gary, Lawrence Reedus is worthy of the highest praise.

Mr. Reedus's greatest source of pride is his amazing family. He has three beloved children and three adoring grandchildren. Lawrence now resides in Memphis, Tennessee, but we are honored by his loyal service to the people of Gary for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending Lawrence Reedus on this special day. His outstanding dedication to his community and fellow firefighters is truly admirable. It is my pleasure to join Lawrence's family and friends in wishing him a very happy 80th birthday.

---

#### HONORING MRS. DOLIA GONZALEZ

### HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Dolia Gonzalez, who at the age of 88, received her high school diploma.

Mrs. Gonzalez is the embodiment of hard work and selflessness. After completing the 7th grade, Dolia left school to help her mother raise her five siblings. She then became a full-time mother to her own son, Alfredo Gonzalez, who sacrificed his life for our country in the Vietnam War.

After losing Freddy in the Vietnam War, Mrs. Gonzalez continued to work at the Echo Hotel in Edinburg. Unfortunately, she eventually lost the compensation previously promised to her by the United States Department of Vet-

erans Affairs. Then after being forced to leave her job at the Echo due to health concerns, she began working at her local H.E.B. in Edinburg, Texas, where she is currently employed.

On Saturday, June 3, Mrs. Gonzalez received an honorary high school diploma from McAllen High School in McAllen, Texas. Alongside Dolia were her niece, Emily Acosta, and the rest of the McAllen High School Class of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I again offer my congratulations to Mrs. Gonzalez and her family. Her perseverance, fortitude, and dedication to her family and to our country have not gone unnoticed. She has made the South Texas community a better place, and it is my honor to acknowledge her today.

---

#### TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE SILICON VALLEY LEADERSHIP GROUP ON ITS FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY

---

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) as it celebrates its fortieth anniversary. Founded by David Packard in 1978, SVLG advocates on behalf of Silicon Valley businesses in the interest of expanding the economy and maintaining a high quality of life in Silicon Valley. Under the superb leadership of CEO Carl Guardino, the approximately 400 member companies constitute one in every three private sector jobs in Silicon Valley.

The Leadership Group has built mightily upon David Packard's legacy by playing a key role in many critical undertakings, including: the establishment of a permanent U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in Silicon Valley; establishing the Housing Trust Fund to create affordable housing; creating new employment opportunities for women; and advocating for comprehensive immigration reform. SVLG has been the unquestioned leader in the development of transportation improvements, including securing funding for the electrification of Caltrain to replace diesel trains with high-performance electric-powered trains; several successful efforts to expand BART to San Jose; and the enhancement of expressways, local roads, transit and highways to provide safer and more efficient commutes for Silicon Valley employees.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in expressing our collective gratitude to the premier organization of Silicon Valley for its extraordinary contributions to the economic health and quality of life in Silicon Valley. We offer our congratulations on the occasion of its four decades of accomplishments which have made our region the economic engine of our nation's economy and have strengthened our country in countless ways.



CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FORT GEORGE G. MEADE

**HON. JOHN P. SARBANES**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Fort George G. Meade. For a century, Fort Meade has been an integral part of both our national security system as well as the Maryland community.

First constructed to house troops shipping off to fight in World War I, Camp Meade—as it was then known—was named for Civil War hero Major General George Gordon Meade, whose victory at the Battle of Gettysburg halted the Confederacy's invasion of the Union and turned the tide of the war. Over the course of World War I, more than 400,000 service members left from Camp Meade to fight in the war.

During the interwar period, Fort Meade housed the Army Tank School as well as the Experimental Motorized Forces. During World War II, approximately 3.5 million soldiers trained at Fort Meade, which was also used to house Italian and German prisoners of war.

After WWII, the Fort reverted to peacetime activities. The Fort's importance grew when the Second U.S. Army moved to Fort Meade, and again when the First U.S. Army merged with the Second and moved to Fort Meade. In 1953, the Fort became the first to deploy the Nike I antiaircraft missile system. Later renamed the Nike Ajax, the Nike I was the world's first surface-to-air missile defense system and was designed to protect the capital region from Soviet bombers.

The Cold War period initiated a shift at the base to a greater intelligence focus. Fort Meade has been vital to the intelligence mission of the United States since the 1950s, when it became the headquarters for the National Security Agency (NSA). The Fort's mission expanded in 1995 when the Defense Information School moved there. Since that time the School has expanded to include both the Defense Visual Information School and the Defense Photography School. More recently US Cyber Command was moved to Fort Meade. Today, six cyber headquarters are housed at Fort Meade, making it the epicenter of our 21st century defense.

The 2005 BRAC ushered in some of the most significant growth in the history of the Fort. The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA), which provides complete information technology services to the Department of Defense, moved its headquarters to Fort Meade, bringing 4,300 workers to a new 1.1 million-square-foot headquarters. The Defense Media Activity and Defense Adjudication Activities also relocated to the base, bringing a combined total of over 1,300 positions employees with them. The continued growth of Fort Meade during a time of downsizing and shrinking budgets speaks to its efficacy and its essential mission.

The NSA presence at Fort Meade makes the base one of the most important to the security of our nation. The work done by thou-

sands of Marylanders at the Fort every day is crucial for maintaining day to day IT stability for all Americans and disrupting terrorist networks and plans. In addition to its vital impact on our nation's intelligence mission, Fort Meade has sent many active duty service members abroad. Collectively, around 2,700 personnel from 42 units were deployed from the base during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm.

I also want to emphasize the enormous impact Fort George G. Meade has on the economy of our state. Fort Meade employs over 56,000 personnel across 119 agencies and has a supported population of over 145,000, providing a significant boost to the local economy. Fort George G. Meade is the largest employer in Maryland, the fifth-largest employment center in the state, and has the third-largest workforce of any U.S. Army installation.

In the past 100 years, Fort Meade has made a profound impact on Maryland, the United States, and the world. I am confident that legacy will continue over the next 100 years and beyond, and once again congratulate Fort George G. Meade and all who have served there on this momentous anniversary.

**AFRICA'S CURRENT AND POTENTIAL FAMINES**

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Bible, in the Book of Ecclesiastes Chapter 3, Verse 2, tells us that: "There is a time to plant and a time to harvest." That ancient prescription has allowed multitudes to be fed over the millennia, but now ruthless men seeking power have disrupted this cycle, causing man-made famine where none should exist in African countries from South Sudan to Nigeria to Somalia.

Potential famine conditions in Africa and Yemen have been called the worst since World War II, even worse than the catastrophic 2011 famine in East Africa. What makes this round of potential famine even more tragic is how preventable it is. For example, South Sudan contains the most arable land in what was once a united Sudan. Aside from oil reserves, agriculture was seen as the key to South Sudan's future success. Now, areas such as the Equatoria provinces, South Sudan's breadbasket, are engulfed in conflict with citizens fleeing the country in the thousands daily.

There are more than 4.8 million displaced South Sudanese—1.8 million refugees in neighboring countries and at least 2 million internally displaced persons (IDPs). South Sudan is experiencing heightened levels of food insecurity with as high as 27 percent of the population in some areas facing famine. Despite the government's contention that people are merely being frightened by rumors of conflict, South Sudan has quickly surpassed Eritrea to become the world's fastest emptying country.

Another country seeing a major exodus due to conflict is Somalia. There are an estimated

881,000 Somali refugees, and the anticipated scale of population displacement from Somalia due to pervasive conflict and the threat of starvation will increase refugee flows throughout the region and into Europe. In Somalia, nearly 6.2 million people are currently in need of humanitarian assistance, and more than 2.9 million people are facing crisis or emergency levels of acute food insecurity, including nearly a million children under the age of five.

Nigeria is yet another country close to experiencing famine due to conflict. There are 14 million people in northeast Nigeria who are in urgent need of humanitarian assistance, including more than 8 million children, and almost 6 million people are also facing severe food insecurity. Almost 9 million Nigerians are projected to suffer from food insecurity by August 2017, including more than 3 million people living in the northeast state of Borno.

We focus on the part Boko Haram has played in creating chaos and near famine in Nigeria, and quite rightly so. More than 30,000 lives have been lost in violence related to Nigeria's Boko Haram insurgency, but there is a developing threat that could widen the likelihood of food insecurity there. Attacks by Fulani extremists on farmers in Nigeria's Middle Belt are increasing in intensity and could further exacerbate hunger in the region.

The El Niño-La Niña weather cycles have caused drought as well as flooding in parts of Africa in recent years. The possibility of drought currently threatens famine in countries ranging from Angola to Sudan to Mozambique to Madagascar. Nevertheless, it is conflict that poses an even greater threat of famine in countries such as the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Mali and could cause or exacerbate famine should fighting disrupt planting-harvesting cycles and markets where locally produced food can be purchased.

Ranking Member BASS and I just returned from a mission to South Sudan and Uganda. Humanitarian aid officials repeatedly told us that no matter how much aid is provided, it will not be enough to meet the ever-expanding need. Although we need to do more, no amount of assistance will do the job unless the conflict in South Sudan is definitively ended. Currently, there is not enough food to keep pace with the growing flow of refugees from South Sudan, and rations have been cut at times by half.

There has been a cease-fire declared in South Sudan, but many observers believe that is due more to the rainy season preventing large movements of troops and heavy equipment than a genuine determination to end the conflict. This week, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development has convened a conference aimed at bringing the South Sudan conflict to an end. After numerous efforts to reach a lasting cease-fire, one can only hope the realization of the immensity of this crisis will lead the warring parties to actually seek a lasting peace.

The hearing I held today was intended to make the appeal both for continued humanitarian aid from our government and others in the international community, but also for a more robust international effort to end conflict in the countries where people are scattered in the millions and desperate levels of hunger

are rampant. We must contend with the vagaries of weather, but we shouldn't have to see people suffer for the ambitions of those without mercy seeking power at any cost.

THE OCCASION OF BARBARA  
GRIJALVA'S RETIREMENT

**HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize and celebrate Barbara Grijalva on her retirement from KOLD News 13, Tucson.

Barbara has been a fixture of our community from her first time on screen in 1983. Born and raised in Tucson, and a graduate of the University of Arizona, Barbara is a unique, homegrown personality. For 34 years, Barbara worked tirelessly to provide Tucson and Southern Arizona with the most relevant and updated news, both local and national, and is considered a living legend by her coworkers and viewers. During her time on KOLD News 13, Barbara was flexible in her reporting, working as both an anchor and a reporter in the field; in times of need, Barbara could always be counted on by her team to get the job done. Above all, Barbara Grijalva is a trusted professional whose reporting is always defined by the facts. In these times, the loss of a journalist of Barbara's caliber is significant.

Her talent, demeanor, and style will be missed coming into our homes and our minds. We thank Barbara for the contributions and impact she has given us, and we wish her well in her next adventure.

MARKING ONE YEAR SINCE THE  
PULSE NIGHTCLUB SHOOTING

**HON. STEPHANIE N. MURPHY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one year ago this week, 49 beautiful, innocent lives were stolen from us and countless others were forever changed as a result of the tragedy at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando.

The losses were staggering. The act shocking. And the stories heartbreaking.

It was a tragedy that did not represent the Orlando I know, a vibrant city that prides itself on its love, inclusion and hospitality.

Orlando is not a perfect city, but it is a great city. In the aftermath of this tragedy, our city was tested, but it was never broken.

Everyone in Orlando from courageous police officers and first responders to compassionate medical professionals and complete strangers, came together in our darkest hour. Ordinary citizens did extraordinary things. We proved we were Orlando strong and Orlando united.

That's why Monday—Orlando United Day—and everything it represents, is so important for Orlando, and our nation.

I stood alongside thousands of people at the Pulse memorial in Orlando on Monday morning.

The memory of that event is still vivid, but the love and unity within our city has never been stronger.

I remember the first time I visited those sacred grounds after that tragic night. I was overcome with emotion by the outpouring of love written onto walls, within picture frames, and in notes tied to flowers. I came across a simple message written in chalk with a heart drawn around it: "Keep Dancing."

We owe it to the victims and their families to keep dancing, and to do everything within our power to prevent tragedies like this from happening again.

That's why Congress must lead. We must continue to work together, Democrats and Republicans, to protect our communities from these horrific acts.

Hope that things can and will change should drive our efforts. While 49 voices were forever silenced here one year ago, hope, as Harvey Milk once said, hope will never be silent.

We must honor the lives and legacies of the Pulse victims by putting aside that which divides us and rededicating ourselves to treating one another with love and respect.

Today, let's remember 49 beautiful lives that were lost one year ago. Their names and faces must inspire us to be better people, and a better nation.

May God bless the memories of the Pulse victims and their families, and may we all keep dancing.

ASHLEY GARCIA GOMEZ

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ashley Garcia Gomez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ashley Garcia Gomez is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ashley Garcia Gomez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ashley Garcia Gomez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE 75TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF JAMES AND MADELINE PETRASKE, RESIDENTS OF NISKAYUNA IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

**HON. PAUL TONKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th Wedding Anniversary of

James and Madeline Petraske of Niskayuna, New York.

James and Madeline met when James—who was dating a friend of Madeline's—offered her a ride home from her job at the National Baseball Manufacturing Company in Schenectady, New York.

The couple married two years later on Flag Day, June 14, 1942.

In 1944, as World War II raged on around the world, James and Madeline answered the call to serve. James left his job at General Electric to serve our country overseas. Madeline joined the war effort here at home as a nurse aid for the Red Cross.

The two wrote to each other regularly until James returned home on June 25, 1946. James returned to his job at General Electric where he worked until he retired as a Manager of Shop Operations in 1961.

In addition to their service to our country, James and Madeline volunteered with Meals On Wheels throughout their lives, stopping only after Madeline and James had turned 89 and 90, respectively. Madeline, at the age of 97, continues to volunteer for the Disabled American Veterans.

James and Madeline are the proud parents of three children, five grandchildren, eleven great grandchildren and one great great grandchild.

Each night before they go to sleep, James tells Madeline she is the best thing that ever happened to him.

Congratulations to James and Madeline on their 75th Wedding Anniversary. We thank them for their lifetimes of service to their community and country.

HONORING FAGEN ELEVATOR

**HON. DAVID LOESACK**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. LOESACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Fagen Elevator, a family owned and operated business celebrating its 100th year of operation, in Keota, Iowa.

Fagen Elevator was established in 1917 by Walter L. Fagen. It has been continually owned and managed by members of the Fagen family since its establishment. Today, Fagen Elevators is operated by the fourth generation of Fagens, Larry and David. The Fagen family has accomplished an incredible amount in the 100 years that they have owned and operated the Fagen Elevator business in Keota.

Fagen Elevators has contributed greatly to Keota, and will continue to better the area for many more years to come. Again, I want to offer my congratulations to the Fagen family as they celebrate this exciting milestone and to thank them for their hard work as a pillar of the Keota community.

ASIA MONDRAGON

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Asia Mondragon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Asia Mondragon is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Asia Mondragon is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Asia Mondragon for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

RECOGNIZING HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FROM NEW YORK'S 22ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WHO WILL SERVE IN THE MILITARY

**HON. CLAUDIA TENNEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize and to express my gratitude to the following individuals from New York's 22nd Congressional District who upon graduation from high school will serve in the military:

Kevin Riggs, NYS Army National Guard; Kayla Thompson, NYS Army National Guard; Alexander J. Leggett, U.S. Army; Sayre P. Palmer, U.S. Navy; Joseph S. Podhayski, U.S. Army; Nicolas Tarbox, NYS Army National Guard; Justin Mallory, U.S. Army National Guard; Johnathan D. Sbarra, U.S. Air Force; James L. Wachter III, U.S. Air Force; Kristian R. Woolston, U.S. Air Force; Corey Mies, U.S. Marines; Joseph M. Maerkl, U.S. Air Force; Garrett M. Miller, U.S. Air Force; Tyler M. Thorick, U.S. Air Force; Kaitlin R. Johnson, U.S. Air Force; Gabriel Woods, NYS Army National Guard; Joshua M. Ledford, U.S. Army; Zaccary A. King, U.S. Navy.

Marissa Urban, NYS Army National Guard; Joshua P. Cortes, U.S. Navy; Monique M. Szczpanski, U.S. Marines; Timothy J. Thompson, U.S. Air Force; Nathan S. Gibson, U.S. Air Force; Nicholas V. Scherrer, U.S. Army; Briana Tillotson, NYS Army National Guard; Jarret Gates, U.S. Marines; Ethan M. Parker, U.S. Army; Jason M. Spear, U.S. Army; Rachel M. Van Alstine, U.S. Navy; Talia A. Jones, U.S. Army; Morgan R. Vymislicky, U.S. Air Force; Krystal Doane, U.S. Army; Seth A. Dickson, U.S. Navy; Gunnar C. Ford, U.S. Air Force; Thomas J. Fuimo III, U.S. Air Force.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN ALVERIO

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Susan Alverio of Norwalk, Iowa, for earning the Congressional Award Gold Medal.

Established in 1979 by the United States Congress, the Congressional Award was created to recognize outstanding achievements made by young people who dedicate themselves to public service, physical fitness and personal development. Overall, there are two levels of achievement that must be earned before obtaining the Gold Congressional Award Medal. Before achieving the third and final level, participants must contribute 400 hours to voluntary public service, 200 hours of personal development and physical fitness, and a four consecutive night expedition or exploration.

Susan has had great success in all areas of achievement on her journey towards ultimately earning the Congressional Award Gold Medal. She volunteered at the Blank Park Zoo, learned how to read music as well as play the piano and the guitar, and dedicated herself to physical fitness through long-distance running. Overall, Susan said, "I grew as a person while working towards the Gold Congressional Award."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Susan for earning this outstanding award. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on this momentous occasion and in wishing her nothing but continued success in all of her endeavors.

ANTHONY MONROY-SANCE

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anthony Monroy-Sance for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Anthony Monroy-Sance is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Anthony Monroy-Sance is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Anthony Monroy-Sance for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

STEVEN BAKOTIC

**HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Steven Bakotic as a member of the United States Naval Academy Class of 2017.

Steven graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy with a Bachelor of Science and he was commissioned as an Ensign in the United States Navy on May 26, 2017.

His career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Steven's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation.

The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

South Mississippi is proud of Steven and his accomplishments, and we look forward to him continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Navy officer.

As Steven embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Naval Academy.

I would like to send Steven my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors, thank him for his service, and congratulate him on this momentous occasion.

---

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MS. JUNE MARIE ROBERSON FOR HER WORK IN THE YPSILANTI COMMUNITY

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Ms. June Marie Roberson. Ms. Roberson was accomplished and well-known for her work in the local Baptist community.

Ms. Roberson moved to Ypsilanti at a young age and became known for her work and activism in the community. She began her career as a dietitian with St. Joseph Mercy Hospital, and then moved to University of Michigan Hospital. She then took a new position as an assembler at Ford Motor Company. She was also active with several Baptist churches in the area throughout her life. Ms. June was a member of the Metropolitan Memorial Baptist Church, where she served as the congregation's Baptist Youth Fellowship and was a member of the church choir. She eventually moved to Second Baptist Church when her husband was named as the church's Deacon, where she continued her work with children by teaching Sunday School. She then moved to Mt. Olive Baptist Church, where she championed several initiatives, including serving as Director of the Children's Mission and President of the Mission Department.

Ms. Roberson was a kind and dedicated member of the Ypsilanti community who was

committed to helping others and working on behalf of the community's children. She was strongly supportive of the children in the Baptist congregations in which she was a member, and was well-regarded in the community for her involvement with the church. She also attended the National Baptists Congress of Christian Education and National Baptist Convention, and her involvement with these religious forums underscores her commitment to the well-being of others. As a committed mother of three children, Ms. Roberson was active in their lives and supportive of her grandchildren. Her kindness, commitment to the community, and support of those in need will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. June Marie Roberson. Ms. Roberson was a pillar of the Ypsilanti community whose life had a tremendous impact.

—  
AVERY NOEL

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Avery Noel for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Avery Noel is a student at Two Roads Charter School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Avery Noel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Avery Noel for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

—  
CONGRATULATING TURNING NATURAL, INC. AND CELEBRATING D.C. SMALL BUSINESSES

### HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Jerri Evans and her company, Turning Natural, Inc., this year's D.C. Small Business of the Year. This unique honor is part of our annual Small Business Fair, which we are holding today at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center.

This year, we are proud to honor Small Business of the Year Turning Natural, Inc., a juice bar located in the Southeast part of the city. Turning Natural has been a welcome fixture in the neighborhood for almost a decade. Growing up, Evans witnessed her family's dif-

ficulty accessing healthy foods. Neighborhoods where Evans grew up in Southeast were considered food deserts, and, sadly, many still are today. With the juice bar, Evans provides her neighbors a healthy alternative to fast food, carry-outs and corner stores. Today, she keeps things fresh with creative juice names like "Green Latifah," "Swizz Beets" and "Mi'Kale Jackson," and by adding a variety of new juice types to her menu, including the increasingly popular cold-press juices. Evans' mother, Annette Turner, founded Turning Natural after surviving a bout with Stage II breast cancer. Sadly, when the cancer returned in 2010, she lost that fight. Jerri continued the business and her mother's legacy, and, today, continues to run the company and to advocate for healthy living among Washingtonians.

This is the 20th time we are hosting our Small Business Fair to highlight the importance of small businesses in the District. The Fair provides critical information, counseling and resources to aspiring and current D.C. business owners. Small businesses are an essential lifeline in our local economy, and the District thrives because of their success. I thank the Washington Convention Center for hosting us again this year; the workshop experts who are providing valuable information and assistance to small businesses; and, of course, all of the small businesses who participate this year.

I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the D.C. Small Business of the Year, Turning Natural, Inc., as well as in celebrating our small businesses across the District. In the District and in districts around the country, we know the social, cultural and economic importance of small businesses.

—  
STAFFORD TEACHER RETIRES

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Norma Menchaca of Stafford, TX, for her outstanding contributions as a teacher the past 38 years.

Norma began her teaching career with the Stafford Municipal School District as a kindergarten teacher in 1983. After graduating from the University of Texas-Pan American, she worked for the Brownsville Independent School District, but moved to Houston after her husband became a Houston Firefighter. Norma loves the small town atmosphere of the school district and looks forward to high school graduation ceremonies so she can see her former students graduate. Today she's the longest serving teacher in the school district and said her retirement will be bittersweet. She will be missed.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, I thank Norma again for her time teaching our children. She has been an important and influential member of our community shaping the minds of generations of students. We wish her a happy retirement.

AUGUSTA MAE PENN

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Augusta Mae Penn for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Augusta Mae Penn is a student at Two Roads Charter School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Augusta Mae Penn is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Augusta Mae Penn for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

—  
U.S.S. "HOBSON"

### HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's been over 66 years since the sinking of the USS *Hobson*. However, for those involved, that fateful day feels like it was just yesterday. The *Hobson* was a Destroyer as well as a mine-sweeping ship that survived multiple battles during World War II, including the invasion of Normandy and the assault on Okinawa. Yet, it was not an enemy ship or plane that took the *Hobson* down, but a U.S. aircraft carrier.

Late in the night of April 26, 1952, the *Hobson* was participating in a naval exercise with the carriers *Wasp* and *Rodman*. The USS *Wasp*, in preparation for airplanes to land on its deck, turned into the wind. In order to avoid the *Wasp's* new position, the *Hobson* needed to maneuver out of its path. Instead of slowing down and passing behind the *Wasp*, the *Hobson* cut across the *Wasp's* bow. This proved to be a fatal mistake.

The *Wasp* struck the *Hobson* in its middle. The impact caused the *Hobson* to split in two. Within four minutes, the ship had sunk to the bottom of the ocean, taking 176 crew members with it. Most of the crew was asleep at the time of the accident, thus having no chance at surviving the crash. Fortunately, sixty-one crew members were able to be rescued from the sea by the *Wasp* and the *Rodman*.

The sinking of the USS *Hobson* and its crew members was a terrible tragedy for our country. The crew members who lost their lives that night will forever be remembered for their bravery and dedication. We must do our best to keep our heroes safe, both in and out of war.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING MR. WILLIE SPAN

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Willie Span of Tamarac, Florida. Willie was a constituent of mine, who tragically passed away on October 2, 2014, after being struck by a vehicle while on his way to the William "Bill" Kling VA Clinic in Sunrise, Florida.

Since this heartbreaking accident, Willie became a symbol for pedestrian safety and for veterans in our community. Veterans had advocated long and hard for a crosswalk and traffic light to the Bill Kling Clinic, yet they were told that there were not enough pedestrians crossing the street to warrant the changes. In the time since the accident, Willie's wife, Doris Span, has continued to push for a safer way for veterans to cross the street from the bus stop to get to the clinic.

The bus stop has been temporarily removed and replaced with paratransit service for veterans, and we are all anticipating a lasting solution to avoid future tragedies. We must do everything we can to create safe places for pedestrians through the placements of crosswalks and lights. Too often, this does not happen until a terrible accident occurs.

Mr. Speaker, Willie Span was a veteran of the war in Vietnam, having served as a private in the United States Army, 8th Infantry Division. He and his wife had been married for eight years before purchasing their first home together, something that had always been his dream.

On Monday, June 19, 2017, Willie's family, friends, and representatives of the U.S. Army, the Miami VA Healthcare System, the William "Bill" Kling Veterans Clinic, the Broward County Veterans Coalition, and Broward County Transit will gather at the location of the accident to honor his memory and place a memorial plaque. He is remembered as a soft-spoken and honorable man, beloved by his family and friends. I am very pleased to honor his life and legacy.

APRIL PYRON

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud April Pyron for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

April Pyron is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by April Pyron is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to April Pyron for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHRISTOPHER THOMAS FOR HIS SERVICE AS MICHIGAN'S DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christopher Thomas for his distinguished service on behalf of the State of Michigan. As the state's Director of Elections for the past 36 years, Mr. Thomas has served Michigan voters well through his rigorous oversight of the state's electoral processes.

Mr. Thomas began his career in 1974 managing campaign finance regulations at U.S. House of Representatives and later moved to the Federal Election Commission, where he worked with candidates to ensure compliance with federal election laws. As a result of his performance, Mr. Thomas was appointed to be Michigan's Director of Elections in 1981 by Michigan Secretary of State Richard Austin. As Director of Elections, Mr. Thomas has overseen 1,600 clerks in counties, townships and cities across the state to run Michigan elections and work to staff and train workers. Throughout his time as director, Mr. Thomas has earned a reputation as an effective administrator who impartially handled Michigan's elections. He is also well-regarded among his peers, having served as president of the National Association of State Election Directors, a national forum that shares best practices on running accurate and transparent elections in 2013.

Mr. Thomas has been a model Director of Elections who has served the State of Michigan with distinction. Under his leadership, Michigan has successfully leveraged advances in technology to improve the functioning of our state's electoral processes. In addition, Mr. Thomas is well-known for his nonpartisan handling of elections and thorough knowledge of procedure and election law. He also served on President Obama's Presidential Commission on Election Administration, which enabled him to utilize his decades of knowledge to improve the election experience for America's voters. He has been an outstanding leader during his career in election administration, and I wish him well as he retires after an extraordinary career serving Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Christopher Thomas for his 36 years of public service as Michigan's Director of Elections and his leadership in the nation for ensuring fair elections throughout the country. Mr. Thomas's work has helped ensure the integrity and accessibility of Michigan's elections.

PITTSBURGH PENGUINS STANLEY CUP VICTORY

**HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I'm very excited to say congratulations, once again, to the Pittsburgh Penguins on winning the 2017 Stanley Cup.

For those of you who don't know, the Penguins also won the Stanley Cup last year—making them back-to-back champions. That hasn't been done since the late 1990s and since the salary cap was put in place. It was truly a historic achievement, and the City of Pittsburgh could not be more excited. This is the 5th Stanley Cup for the Penguins franchise.

Over the course of the season—and particularly the playoffs—the Penguins showed the grit, resiliency, and determination that is emblematic of the City of Pittsburgh. They battled through injury after injury, tough games, hostile arenas, changing rosters—you name it, they faced it. And yet they came out on top every time.

Throughout the course of the playoffs, they bested the Columbus Blue Jackets in the first round, winning handily in a 4-1 series. Next, they came here to D.C. and faced the No. 1-seed Washington Capitals. Well, for the ninth time in 10 playoff matchups, the Pens defeated the Capitals in a brutal 7-game series that also (temporarily) knocked out our Captain, Sidney Crosby. But the thing about Pittsburgh—and the Pens—is that a knock-out punch just won't keep us down for long. They moved right along and trucked through the Ottawa Senators 4-2 to make it back to the Stanley Cup Finals for the second year in a row.

Now, I would like to congratulate the Nashville Predators on a magical run through the playoffs and a hard-fought final series. But ultimately, it wasn't enough to overcome the Penguins' skill, experience, hustle, and determination.

In a riveting Game 6, neither team had scored a goal and the end of regulation was quickly approaching. With only 95 seconds left on the clock, Patric Hornqvist managed to use the Predator's goalie himself to get the puck in the net. Left with few options, the Preds had to pull their goalie which allowed the Penguins to get an empty-net goal with seconds remaining. It was the perfect end to a historic season.

I would particularly like to congratulate Sidney Crosby on winning his second back-to-back Conn Smythe Trophy, one of only three players ever to do so. The last player to win back-to-back? The Pens very own Mario Lemieux.

The City of Pittsburgh is welcoming home another championship trophy, and for that I would like to once again thank and congratulate the 2017 Stanley Cup Champion Pittsburgh Penguins. Welcome back to Pittsburgh, Lord Stanley.

RED ROCKS COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
INNOVATION CHALLENGE**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the team from Red Rocks Community College on becoming a finalist for a third year in a row in the National Science Foundation's Community College Innovation Challenge. This program serves as an innovative way for community college students to partner with local industries to create pioneering STEM-based solutions for real world issues. The Community College Innovation Challenge is an important example of encouraging STEM education and research for our nation's students and future leaders. I congratulate all of the competition's participants for their work on a variety of important projects.

The Red Rocks team tackled the important issue of practical cyber workforce training. By creating a cyber-lab learning environment, students can expand real-world skills in practical work situations in a safer and more controlled environment. This project demonstrates how we can enhance classroom learning by allowing students to apply their skills in real-world situations and be better prepared for the skills and tasks necessary in the workforce.

I congratulate the Red Rocks Team of Bill Cherrington, Isaac Kerley, Joseph Murdock, Bruno Salvatico and John Sanchez for their success. I applaud this group for their dedication to this important project and their leadership and commitment to STEM education blazing a path for our country's future leaders and innovators. I am proud of the work Red Rocks Community College does every day and I look forward to seeing what the school and these students accomplish in the years to come.

HONORING SERVICE ACADEMY  
STUDENTS**HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend heartfelt congratulations to Karrington Evans, John Paul Post of Altus, Randall Parker Ross of Hot Springs, Katie Welch of Percy, Briston Yarbrough of Danville. These star students from the Fourth District of Arkansas will have the honor of attending the service academies this Fall. Briston will attend the Air Force Academy; Parker will attend West Point; John Paul and Katie will attend the Naval Academy; and Karrington will attend the Naval Academy Preparatory School.

Arkansas has a history of academy alumni. These include General Douglas MacArthur—Supreme Allied Commander in the Pacific during World War II, and Brigadier General William O. Darby, leader of what would later become the Army Rangers. Their example is one

of courage and excellence under any circumstances. With this rich tradition before them and through their own accomplishments, there's no doubt these students will do their very best—bringing honor to themselves, their families, and their state.

I wish them well in their service careers and success in whatever they pursue.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE COMPASSIONATE ACCESS, RESEARCH EXPANSION AND RESPECT STATES (CARERS) ACT

**HON. STEVE COHEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Compassionate Access, Research Expansion and Respect States Act, also known as the CARERS Act. This bipartisan, bicameral bill would allow states to set their own policies on medical marijuana, allow states to import Cannabidiol to treat patients with seizures, give the Veterans Administration physicians the ability to recommend medical marijuana to patients and improve opportunities for research on marijuana.

The consensus on medical marijuana is already overwhelming and continues to build. According to a Quinnipiac University poll, 93 percent of Americans believe people should be allowed to use medically prescribed marijuana.

93 percent of Americans rarely agree on anything.

In November, North Dakota, Montana, Florida and Arkansas joined a growing majority of states that have legalized medical marijuana. Twenty-nine states plus the District of Columbia have approved medical marijuana.

Even CNN's Chief Medical Correspondent Dr. Sanjay Gupta, who was once skeptical of medical marijuana, has publicly endorsed it.

Yet, our federal laws continue to treat patients and the doctors and families who care for them like criminals.

It is long overdue for our federal law to reflect the common sense views of 93 percent of Americans and stop adding to the suffering of those with horrible illnesses.

One such patient was my constituent, Chloe Grauer. At 3 years old, Chloe suffered from a rare neurological disease that caused her to have 100 to 200 seizures a day. She tried dozens of medications and underwent surgical procedures but nothing stopped the seizures.

Her family tried desperately to treat her with Cannabidiol—also known as “Charlotte’s Web” or “CBD” for short—which has been shown to treat certain diseases that cause seizures, such as the disease from which Chloe suffered. CBD is derived from cannabis plants, and even though it contains just trace amounts of the psychoactive ingredient in marijuana—nowhere near enough to produce a high—but it is currently illegal under federal law. Even this tiny amount of the ingredient, THC, was enough for the federal government to keep a potentially life-saving drug away from Chloe.

Chloe died without receiving CBD.

This should never have happened. We must ensure that this never happens again.

Just as our children deserve to be treated compassionately, so, too, do our veterans. Federal law currently prohibits VA doctors from prescribing medical marijuana when they feel it is medically beneficial. Our veterans deserve the best medical advice from their doctors, not arbitrary limits on what their doctors can do to help them. Veterans are tough. They can handle frank advice from their doctors.

I want to thank my colleague DON YOUNG of Alaska for his partnership on this bill as well as Senators CORY BOOKER, KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, RAND PAUL, MIKE LEE, AL FRANKEN and LISA MURKOWSKI for their leadership on this legislation. I urge both the House and Senate to pass this swiftly.

## ANNASELIA SAMORA

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Annaselia Samora for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Annaselia Samora is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Annaselia Samora is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Annaselia Samora for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

MISSOURI CITY TEACHER  
PARTICIPATES IN PBS PROGRAM**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Krissy Venosdale of Missouri City, TX, for being selected as a participant in the 2017 PBS Digital Innovators Program.

Krissy, who serves as the Kinkaid School's lower school innovation coordinator, was recognized for developing the “Launch Pad” at her school. The “Launch Pad” is a space for students to expand their horizons in both a creative and technological fashion, using a blend of bright colors and high-tech tools to help students practice out-of-the-box methods. Out of the 52 participants selected, Krissy is the only educator from TX to participate in the PBS Digital Innovators Program. As part of this program, Krissy will have access to ongoing professional development, share her ideas

on PBS platforms, utilize the PBS LearningMedia resources and attend the 2017 PBS Digital Summit this summer.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Krissy Venosdale for being selected as a participant in the 2017 PBS Digital Innovators Program. We are extremely proud and are looking forward to her future innovative educational platforms.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WALTER R.  
BOYNTON

**HON. STENY H. HOYER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career and contributions to Maryland's Fifth District of estuarine ecologist Dr. Walter R. Boynton of St. Leonard, Maryland, on the occasion of his retirement.

A native of Massachusetts, Dr. Boynton first came to Maryland and encountered the majestic waters of the Chesapeake Bay, something which would become the focus of his scientific studies for the remainder of his career, in 1969 as a summer student at the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory (CBL) in Solomons, Maryland. Following the receipt of his Ph.D. in ecology from the University of Florida, Dr. Boynton returned to CBL in 1975 as a young professor. At that time his research focused on the decline of submerged aquatic vegetation. He recognized that these declines were related to increases in nutrients flowing into the Chesapeake that caused an over-abundance of single-celled algae, which reduced the clarity of the water and ultimately led to deeper portions of the Bay becoming devoid of oxygen. Dr. Boynton was part of a team of CBL researchers, including Chris D'Elia, Jim Sanderson, and Don Heinle, that redefined what we know about nutrient dynamics and how they bring about eutrophication—or the overabundance of plant life at the expense of animal life in bodies of water.

A long-standing relationship, forged on the softball diamond, between CBL researchers and the local community led to a close working partnership and deep personal friendship between Dr. Boynton and then-State Senator Bernie Fowler, who remains a close friend of mine. It was Senator Fowler who led efforts in federal court to force regional jurisdictions to adhere to the Clean Water Act. Former Senator Fowler credits Dr. Boynton with deepening his own understanding of the ecology of the Bay and the Patuxent River, allowing him to become an effective advocate and well-respected citizen-scientist, bringing attention to the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. On June 11, I joined former Senator Fowler for his annual "wade-in" to check the clarity of the Patuxent River and learned of Dr. Boynton's upcoming retirement.

In addition to an internationally respected research career, Dr. Boynton has been a highly effective educator, teaching generations of graduate students. CBL Director Thomas Miller credits Dr. Boynton's success to his contagious enthusiasm for his work. He called him

"a gifted, passionate, and supportive educator" and "an amazing teacher and advisor." Director Miller further noted that his "largest and most long lasting impact will be the generation of young minds that he has touched and impacted over his career."

Dr. Boynton is a two-time recipient of the Distinguished Service Award from the Coastal & Estuarine Research Federation. He received its Odum Award for lifetime achievement (with UMCES colleague W. M. Kemp), and served as its President. In 2015, Dr. Boynton was named an Admiral of the Chesapeake for his work toward greater understanding of the Chesapeake Bay and its restoration by then-Governor Martin O'Malley. In the following year, he received the Mathias Medal from the Maryland Sea Grant College, the Virginia Sea Grant, and the Chesapeake Research Consortium—the highest regional recognition in environmental sciences. This year Dr. Boynton was awarded the Ruth Patrick Award from the American Society of Limnology and Oceanography.

Dr. Boynton's legacy spans areas beyond academia. He has worked closely with the Maryland/DC Chapter of the Nature Conservancy and served as a member of the Calvert County Planning and Zoning Committee for many years. He and his wife Mary-Ellen also host a shelter for Calvert County's homeless each spring.

I join Dr. Boynton's colleagues at CBL and with members of the community in Maryland's Fifth District to congratulate him on his impactful and distinguished career. I thank him for his service to our state, to our country, and all those who live by and rely on the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

ANGELINA SALAZAR

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angelina Salazar for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Angelina Salazar is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angelina Salazar is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angelina Salazar for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

FLAG DAY WEAVES THE NATION  
TOGETHER

**HON. RANDY HULTGREN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate the 101 years after President Wilson proclaimed June 14th Flag Day, forever weaving together two Illinois families.

The day created to recognize the national importance of that star spangled banner followed a years-long campaign by Batavia teacher Dr. Bernard Cigrand.

Our flag's woven seams connect more than stitches of red, white and blue, however.

On that fateful 1916 day, the daughter of the "Father of Flag Day" happened to share a seventh-grade classroom with a young Marion Moon.

53 years later, Marion Moon Aldrin's intrepid son planted the first American flag—or any flag, for that matter—on the surface of the Moon.

Pioneering the reaches of space and armed with the American symbol of national identity, Buzz Aldrin lived up to his mother's maiden name, and honored the legacy of the Cigrand family.

One Illinois city, two families and our entire nation have been woven together by Flag Day.

May the red, white and blue forever be a beautiful reminder of the great spirit of our nation.

HONORING DR. ALICE CHEN FOR  
HER ADVOCACY EFFORTS AND  
EXEMPLARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO  
PUBLIC HEALTH

**HON. RAUL RUIZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize the extraordinary contributions Dr. Alice Chen has made to the health and well-being of all Americans as Executive Director of Doctors for America. Throughout her career, she has been an exemplary physician, taking on her medical vocation with a sense of duty and strength of character that is needed to accomplish such a noble calling.

As a medical student at Weill Cornell Medical College of Cornell University, Dr. Chen volunteered for the American Red Cross and provided assistance to the director of the largest service center after September 11, 2001. Dr. Chen also shared her passion for medicine as the co-director of Big Buddies, a mentorship program that connected Cornell medical students with underserved youth.

Dr. Chen earned her M.D. in 2005 and completed her internal medicine residency at UCLA in 2008. She then joined the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA as an Adjunct Assistant Clinical Professor, and became the co-director of the Resident Elective in Malawi, Africa for the UCLA Department of Medicine and Program in Global Health.



In 2009, she joined Doctors for America, a coalition of physicians and medical students who have joined together to advocate for the improvement of our health care system. Her dedication and advocacy efforts for health reform led her to become the Executive Director from 2011 to 2017. Since then, Dr. Chen has strived to address gun violence prevention as a public health issue, advocate for affordable health coverage and prescription drugs, protect women's reproductive rights, and battle against racial disparities in access to health care. Today, I am elated to honor her stellar achievements, and I am honored to call her my friend. She is truly an inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize and honor Dr. Alice Chen. On behalf of California's 36th Congressional District, it is with deepest respect that I commend her for a remarkable career dedicated to health advocacy. I wish her and her husband Vivek all my best in the years to come.

---

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-  
EN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY  
SERGEANT (SGT) TERRANCE  
DELAN LEE, SR.

---

**HON. TRENT KELLY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Army Sergeant (SGT) Terrance Delan Lee Sr. who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on June 11, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Lee was killed when his armored personnel carrier was hit by an improvised explosive device in Owesat Village, Iraq. Staff Sergeant (SSG) Larry Richard Arnold Sr. was also killed.

SGT Lee was assigned to the 150th Combat Engineer Battalion, 155th Brigade Combat Team, Mississippi Army National Guard, Lucedale, Mississippi. The 150th is part of the 155th Brigade Combat Team which is known as "Dixie Thunder". SGT Lee joined the Mississippi Army National Guard in 2003.

According to the Associated Press, 250 people gathered for SGT Lee's funeral at First Missionary Baptist Church. Reverend James E. Powell of Solomon Temple AME Zion Church in Moss Point was his pastor. In the eulogy, Rev. Powell quoted Psalm 23 which describes God as a shepherd and man as the flock. Rev. Powell said that SGT Lee understood what that meant and that he knew Jesus Christ was his personal savior.

SGT Lee is survived by his parents, Dedrick and Dinah Lee; siblings, LaDarrius Lee and Demetrice Jones; and children, Terrence Junior, Ra'Mone, and Marchelle Elyse Lee.

SGT Lee's sacrifice for our freedoms will always be remembered.

**AUZRIELL SCHICKER**

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Auzriell Schicker for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Auzriell Schicker is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Auzriell Schicker is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Auzriell Schicker for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

---

HONORING RODERICK OLSON

---

**HON. JIMMY PANETTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor a man who served California's Central Coast and the United States as a Marine and a public servant. Roderick Olson, a proud veteran of the Vietnam War from Santa Cruz, California passed away but left a legacy in place for LGBT Californians and service members.

Roderick Olson arrived in Santa Cruz in 1997 after serving in Vietnam. During his time in Santa Cruz, he dedicated his time to serving the community, especially his brothers and sisters in the LGBT community. He joined the Board of Directors of the Santa Cruz AIDS project, focused on a community-based response towards reducing the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Roderick also served as a coordinator at the Santa Cruz Diversity Center, a member of the Pride Committee, the Program Committee and the Executive Committee. Further, he focused his time on protecting individuals from domestic violence and founded the 60 Plus program to support LGBT seniors.

Additionally, he established the first gay veterans group in the Santa Cruz region dedicated towards supporting LGBT service members. Roderick dedicated his life towards assisting LGBT veterans prior to the repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell, helping future LGBT service members serve openly.

Mr. Olson passed late last year and will be interred with military honors this week at the California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery. However, his life and dedication to the Central Coast will not be forgotten. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life of Roderick Olson.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. KATHLEEN M. RICE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 2017, I inadvertently voted Nay on Roll Call No. 307 (On Passage of S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017). My intention was to vote Yea.

---

KATY POLICE OFFICER NAMED  
MISS TEXAS

---

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Shannon Dresser of Katy for winning the Miss Texas 2017 title.

Shannon has been competing in pageants since she was 12 years-old, and has competed in 15 overall. As Miss Texas, Shannon has partnered with the Teen and Police Services Academy, to help with their mentoring program to reduce the social gap between police officers and at risk youth. This organization is important to Shannon as she is a police officer for the Katy Independent School District. Being a fourth generation police officer, Shannon continues to take steps to help and motivate people.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Shannon Dresser for being named Miss Texas. Her work to encourage and motivate kids, while keeping our community safe is an inspiration. Great work.

---

HONORING COLONEL ABRAHAM S.  
CONN

---

**HON. CARLOS CURBELO**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 15, 2017*

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Colonel Abraham S. Conn on his retirement. COL Abraham S. Conn was commissioned through the ROTC at Canisius College located in Buffalo, NY, in May 1987, where he first entered the United States Army.

COL Conn is a graduate of State University of New York at Buffalo State College and holds a Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice. COL Conn also holds a Masters in Strategic Studies and is a graduate of the U.S. Army War College, Class of 2010, located in Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

COL Conn was originally branched as a Military Intelligence Officer. He has attended the Military Intelligence Officer Basic Course, the Quartermaster Officer Advance Course, the Air Defense Officer Transition Course, the Command and General Staff College, and the Pre-Command Courses.

COL Conn has either Commanded or held duty positions at the Platoon, Company, Battalion, Brigade, Division, Corps, and Joint-Staff

levels. COL Conn has completed three, 1-year deployments to Afghanistan, of Operations Enduring Freedom.

Some of COL Conn's awards include the Bronze Star Medal 2nd Award, the Meritorious Service 2nd Award Medal, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal 2nd Award, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal 5th Award, the National Defense Service Medal 2nd Award, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Army Overseas Service ribbon, the Army Reserve Component Overseas Training Ribbon 3rd Award, the NATO Medal for Service in Afghanistan 2nd Award, the Florida Cross, the Florida State Distinguished Service Medal, the Florida State Commendation Medal, the Florida State Active Duty Ribbon, the New York Long and Faithful Service Medal, the New York State Counter-Drug Service Medal and the Mississippi Emergency Service Medal.

COL Conn is also the recipient of the Joint Meritorious Unit Commendation, the Meritorious Unit Commendation, and the Florida Governors Meritorious Unit 3rd Award.

COL Conn recently completed Command of the 930th Digital Liaison Team in Homestead, located in Florida's 26th Congressional District. COL Conn is currently assigned to JIATF-S as a Reserve Officer, in the Policy and Plans Directorate. COL Conn is also currently employed in his civilian capacity, as a Special Agent for the Drug Enforcement Administration, in Key West, Florida—also located in the 26th District. COL Conn resides with his wife Mindy in Key West, Florida. They have two children, Emily and Joshua.

It is an honor for me to recognize a man who has served our country with such distinction.

U.S. ARMY 1ST ARMORED BRIGADE  
COMBAT TEAM, 1ST INFANTRY  
DIVISION

### HON. ROGER W. MARSHALL

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2017

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, more than 3,000 soldiers with the Army's 1st Armored Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division are headed home to Fort Riley this month after a nine-month deployment in South Korea.

Also, known as the "Devil" brigade, these soldiers have been stationed in South Korea since October of last year. During their deployment, these American soldiers have trained closely with their South Korean partners, deterring North Korean hostility and providing security in the Korean peninsula. Their service is invaluable.

These Soldiers and families sacrifice greatly during deployment. As the "Devil" brigade begins their journey back to Fort Riley, may I be the first to thank them for their service and say, "welcome home."

HONORING DR. VIVEK MURTHY  
FOR HIS INVALUABLE WORK  
AND DEDICATION AS THE 19TH  
U.S. SURGEON GENERAL

### HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2017

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the outstanding service and accomplishments of Dr. Vivek Murthy, who served as Surgeon General from 2014 to 2017. His dedication to protecting the public health of our nation is an inspiration for us all. The lives of millions of Americans across the country are better because of his public service. Throughout his career, Dr. Murthy has served with humility and passion, and I want to recognize his lifelong advocacy for all Americans.

Dr. Vivek Murthy's social entrepreneurship started as a freshman at Harvard University, when he co-founded the non-profit VISIONS Worldwide to educate people on HIV/AIDS issues in the U.S. and India. Upon graduating Magna Cum Laude from Harvard in 1997, he formed Swasthya Community Health Partnership with the mission to train women to provide health care in rural areas in India.

In 2003, Dr. Murthy graduated from Yale University receiving both an M.D. and an M.B.A. in Health Care Management. He completed his internal medicine residency at Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School in 2006, where he continued to work as an attending physician and an instructor of medicine. In 2009, he co-founded Doctors for America (DFA), a coalition of physicians and medical students who have joined together to advocate for the improvement of our health care system. He served as president of DFA until his confirmation as U.S. Surgeon General in 2014.

Becoming the first Surgeon General of Indian descent is truly a historic achievement. His department released the first Surgeon General's Report on Alcohol, Drugs, and Health; promoted prevention and treatment of opioid epidemic; started a national conversation on healthy eating habits and food insecurity; and emphasized the importance of vaccines. Under his leadership, his department assisted Americans during the Flint water crisis, hurricanes, and the Ebola and Zika outbreaks. I am proud to honor his extraordinary accomplishments as Surgeon General. His distinguished career is an example of what can be achieved through hard work, dedication, and service.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Dr. Vivek Murthy and honored to call him my friend. On behalf of California's 36th Congressional District, I congratulate him for his exceptional commitment to public service and look forward to the significant contributions he will continue to make in service of others. I wish him and his wife Alice all my best in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER STAFF SERGEANT (SSG) LARRY RICHARD ARNOLD, SR.

### HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to rise today in memory of Army Staff Sergeant (SSG) Larry Richard Arnold, Sr. who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on June 11, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SSG Arnold was killed when his armored personnel carrier was hit by an improvised explosive device in Owesat Village, Iraq. Sergeant (SGT) Terrance D. Lee, Sr. was also killed.

SSG Arnold was assigned to the 150th Combat Engineer Battalion, 155th Brigade Combat Team, Mississippi Army National Guard, Lucedale, Mississippi.

According to the Associated Press article, 200 people packed a Baptist church where the funeral service was held. Reverend Donnie Boutwell, pastor of Lee's Chapel No. 1 Baptist Church in Carriere, spoke about SSG Arnold's service.

"This is not a final respect for this man," Rev. Boutwell said. "For every time a young child stands in the schoolroom and covers his heart and pledges allegiance to the flag, we continue to show our respect for him. Every time we stand at a ballgame and 'The Star Spangled Banner' is played, we continue to show our respect for Larry and all the other soldiers."

Mississippi Army National Guard Brigadier General (BG) Ben Gaston also offered his thoughts during the funeral service.

"He could have easily walked away and said, 'I've done that. I've done my time,'" said BG Gaston. "Larry didn't do that. He was a mature NCO the younger soldiers looked up to."

During the service, BG Gaston presented SSG Arnold's family with the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and the Mississippi Medal of Valor. SSG Arnold is buried at Mill Creek Cemetery in Pearl River County.

SSG Arnold is survived by his mother, Betty Mackey; his wife, Melinda; sons, Larry, Robert, and Howard Arnold; siblings Garry Arnold, Peggy Alford, Beverly Hicks, Janet Brandes, Joann Arnold, and Debbie Arnold; and grandchildren Anthony and Heather Arnold.

SSG Arnold died while fighting to protect the freedoms we all enjoy

SUGAR LAND NURSE NAMED TOP  
10 NURSE

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chung-Win (Joy) Fey of Houston, TX, for being named one of the Houston Chronicle's "Top 10 Nurses" of 2017.

Joy, a nurse at Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital, spends time with her patients

and their families listening to their concerns, offering them a shoulder to cry on and praying with them. Her colleagues have described her as often going out of her way to provide comfort for those she's caring for. In 2016, Joy won Houston Methodist System's Quality and

Patient Safety Everyday Award, and was nominated for this award by three people. After 37 years of being a nurse, it's clear that Joy is an extraordinary, compassionate, enthusiastic and caring individual.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Joy for being named one of the Houston Chronicle's "Top 10 Nurses" of 2017. We're proud to have such an exemplarily nurse caring for patients in TX-22.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 16, 2017

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 16, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In this Chamber where the people's House gathers, we pause to offer You gratitude for the gift of this good land on which we live, and for this great Nation which You have inspired in developing over so many years. Continue to inspire the American people, that through the difficulties of these days we might keep liberty and justice alive in our Nation and in our world.

We thank You for a great evening of recreation and celebration of what we

have in common as Americans last night at the annual Congressional Baseball Game. Bless all those who contributed to making the event such a success, and continue to send Your healing spirit upon our brother STEVE SCALISE, and all who were injured at last Wednesday's practice.

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

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 15, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 15, 2017, at 3:10 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 722.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon, Tuesday, June 20, 2017, for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 20, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

| Name of Member or employee | Date    |           | Country              | Per diem <sup>1</sup> |                                                      | Transportation   |                                                      | Other purposes   |                                                      | Total            |                                                      |
|----------------------------|---------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
|                            | Arrival | Departure |                      | Foreign currency      | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> |
| Kelly Ann Shaw .....       | 3/13    | 3/15      | Chile .....          |                       | 417.80                                               |                  | 10,758.16                                            |                  |                                                      |                  | 11,175.96                                            |
| Angela Ellard .....        | 3/13    | 3/15      | Chile .....          |                       | 417.80                                               |                  | 10,758.16                                            |                  | 340.54                                               |                  | 11,516.50                                            |
| Katherine Tai .....        | 3/13    | 3/15      | Chile .....          |                       | 417.80                                               |                  | 10,758.16                                            |                  |                                                      |                  | 11,175.96                                            |
| Jason Smith .....          | 2/18    | 2/19      | United Kingdom ..... |                       | 455.50                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 455.50                                               |
|                            | 2/20    | 2/23      | India .....          |                       | 1,136.37                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 1,136.67                                             |
|                            | 2/23    | 2/25      | Sri Lanka .....      |                       | 662.53                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 662.53                                               |
|                            | 2/25    | 2/26      | Austria .....        |                       |                                                      |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |
| George Holding .....       | 2/18    | 2/19      | United Kingdom ..... |                       | 455.50                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 455.50                                               |
|                            | 2/20    | 2/23      | India .....          |                       | 1,136.37                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 1,136.37                                             |
|                            | 2/23    | 2/25      | Sri Lanka .....      |                       | 662.53                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 662.53                                               |
|                            | 2/25    | 2/26      | Austria .....        |                       |                                                      |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |
|                            | 1/15    | 1/19      | Switzerland .....    |                       | 2,268.56                                             |                  | 1,061.86                                             |                  |                                                      |                  | 3,330.42                                             |
| Lloyd Doggett .....        | 2/19    | 2/20      | Jordan .....         |                       | 255.05                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 255.05                                               |
|                            | 2/22    | 2/25      | Austria .....        |                       | 1,470.44                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 1,470.44                                             |
|                            | 2/18    | 2/19      | Italy .....          |                       | 825.64                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 825.64                                               |
|                            | 2/21    | 2/22      | Israel .....         |                       | 935.63                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 935.63                                               |
| Vern Buchanan .....        | 2/18    | 2/19      | Czech Republic ..... |                       | 357.73                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 357.73                                               |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/19      | Ukraine .....        |                       |                                                      |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/20      | Israel .....         |                       | 568.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 568.00                                               |
|                            | 2/20    | 2/21      | UAE .....            |                       | 415.81                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 415.81                                               |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/19      | Ethiopia .....       |                       | 707.49                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 707.49                                               |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/19      | Uganda .....         |                       | 340.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 340.00                                               |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/19      | Benin .....          |                       | 189.87                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 189.87                                               |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/19      | Ghana .....          |                       | 361.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 361.00                                               |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/19      | Algeria .....        |                       |                                                      |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |
|                            | 2/19    | 2/19      | Spain .....          |                       | 287.85                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  | 287.85                                               |

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

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

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017—  
Continued

| Name of Member or employee | Date    |           | Country | Per diem <sup>1</sup> |                                                      | Transportation   |                                                      | Other purposes   |                                                      | Total            |                                                      |
|----------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
|                            | Arrival | Departure |         | Foreign currency      | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> |
| Committee total            |         |           |         |                       | 14,745.27                                            |                  | 33,336.34                                            |                  | 340.54                                               |                  | 48,422.15                                            |

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. KEVIN BRADY, Chairman, May 31, 2017.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1698. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's FY 2017 Operational Energy Budget Certification Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2926(c)(4); Public Law 113-291, div. A, title IX, Sec. 901(g)(1); (128 Stat. 3465); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1699. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Economic Development Administration Regulatory Revision [Docket No.: 110726429-4508-02] (RIN: 0610-AA66) received June 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1700. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period of February 1, 2017 — March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1701. A letter from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2016 Annual Report to the President and Congress, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2076(j); Public Law 92-573, Sec. 27(j) (as amended by Public Law 110-314, Sec. 209(a)); (122 Stat. 3046); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1702. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1703. A letter from the Acting Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report from the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1704. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh's 2016 Statement on the System of Internal Controls and 2016 audited financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1705. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Constituent Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fishing Capacity Reduction Program for the Crab Species Covered by the Fishery Management Plan for the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crabs [Docket No.: 020424095-3252-02; I.D. 032801B] (RIN: 0648-AP25) received June 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1706. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report providing an FY 2018 Estimate for the Free Clinic Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 233(o)(6)(C); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title II, Sec. 224(o)(6)(C) (as added by Public Law 104-191, Sec. 194); (110 Stat. 1988); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1707. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Report of Lobbying Disclosure Act Enforcement for January 1, 2016, through June 30, 2016, pursuant to Public Law 104-65, as amended by Public Law 110-81, codified at 2 U.S.C. Sec. 1605(b)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1708. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technology Innovation — Personnel Exchanges [Docket No.: 160311228-6788-02] (RIN: 0693-AB62) received June 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1709. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certification Program for Access to the Death Master File [Docket No.: 160511004-4999-04] (RIN: 0692-AA21) received June 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1710. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign-Trade Zones in the United States [Docket No.: 090210156-1664-02; Order No.: 1815] (RIN: 0625-AA81) received June 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1711. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extension of Time for Returns Filed Solely to Elect Portability (Rev. Proc. 2017-34) received June 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1712. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Reissuance of Announcement 2016-34; Announcement of the Results of the Phase III Allocation Round of the Qualifying Gasification Project Program [Announcement 2017-06] received June 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1713. A letter from the Executive Director, World War I Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's periodic report for the period ended March 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, Sec. 5(b)(1); (126 Stat. 2450); jointly to the Committees on Financial Services, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2930. A bill to develop a civil unmanned aircraft policy framework, a pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2931. A bill to expand certain empowerment zone provisions to communities receiving a Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act notice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2932. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for a net benefit review of certain covered transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Mr. KHANNA,

Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2933. A bill to promote effective registered apprenticeships, for skills, credentials, and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2934. A bill to prohibit access to and use of certain Russian-owned diplomatic facilities and properties by the Government of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2935. A bill to codify Executive Order 13694 (relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities) and to codify certain Executive orders imposing sanctions in relation to the situation in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAR-

SEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANTETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H. Res. 390. A resolution expressing strong disapproval of the President's announcement to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H. Res. 391. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of June 2017 as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Month" and June 27, 2017, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

68. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 22, memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota:

H.R. 2930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 259: Mrs. RADEWAGEN and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 260: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 261: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 333: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 389: Ms. MATSUI.

- H.R. 490: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 535: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. SIRES.  
H.R. 790: Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 797: Mr. SOTO and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.  
H.R. 798: Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 845: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H.R. 1002: Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 1057: Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 1059: Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 1148: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 1173: Mr. YARMUTH and Ms. JAYAPAL.  
H.R. 1192: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.  
H.R. 1225: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 1243: Ms. MENG and Mr. AMODEI.  
H.R. 1456: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1537: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
H.R. 1566: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. CROWLEY.  
H.R. 1676: Mr. TONKO and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H.R. 1697: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
H.R. 1820: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 1865: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TURNER, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. GARRETT.  
H.R. 1884: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Ms. SINEMA.  
H.R. 1904: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1970: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 2147: Mr. POLIQUIN.  
H.R. 2148: Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 2290: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 2404: Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 2431: Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 2432: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 2475: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 2478: Mr. POLIQUIN.  
H.R. 2482: Mr. KIND, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAL-LONE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 2530: Mr. SOTO and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 2531: Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2652: Mr. POLIQUIN.  
H.R. 2690: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 2759: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 2760: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 2761: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. VEASEY.  
H.R. 2798: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 2826: Mr. BRAT and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
H.R. 2851: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 2862: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 2866: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 2908: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H. Res. 195: Mr. LANCE.  
H. Res. 335: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H. Res. 386: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MICHAEL DILLABOUGH,  
ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RE-  
TIREMENT

### HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Congressman MIKE THOMPSON in recognition of Michael Dillabough, as he retires from the United States Army Corps of Engineers after a stellar 23-year career.

After graduating from California State University at Chico with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering, Michael Dillabough began his professional career as an officer with the U.S. Air Force in 1979. His early work included Logistics Analyst at Westinghouse Electrical Corporation and Senior Engineer and Technical Writer at Martin Marietta Aerospace at Vandenberg Air Force Base.

In 1988 he began working for the United States Navy as the Facility Manager assigned to Mare Island Naval Shipyard. For 6 years he managed more than 550 facilities and 25 miles of roads. He then transferred to the United States Army Corps of Engineers in 1994 and began his 23-year career with the San Francisco District. Initially brought on to work with the Earthquake Preparedness Center of Expertise, he became the first Project Manager assigned to a remote site, Warm Springs Dam at Lake Sonoma in 2001. In 2003, he became responsible for the district's Emergency Management Office, Dredge Material Management Office, Office of Technical Services and Natural Resource Management, two flood-control/water-supply projects, the Navigational Debris Removal Section, as well as management of the Warm Springs Fish Hatchery and the Bay Model Visitor Center.

In 2003 Michael Dillabough deployed to Kuwait and Iraq where he served as Senior Project Manager for the Gulf Regional Engineering Office and as the Chief Engineer for the Humanitarian Operations Center. The same year, Michael Dillabough was promoted to the position he retires from today, Chief of the Operations and Readiness Division for the San Francisco District. Over the course of his career he has been recognized with the Meritorious Civilian Service Award, two Humanitarian Medals and the Air Force Commendation Medal.

We have personally worked with Michael Dillabough and seen first-hand his outstanding dedication to the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the public. His career is one of steadfast service to his country and is worthy of the highest distinction. Please join us in congratulating him on his retirement and expressing our deep appreciation for his outstanding contributions to our nation.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. JASON LEWIS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2017

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 2017, during Roll Call Vote No. 306 on the passage of H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, I was recorded as not voting. Although I was present on the floor at the time, my vote was misreported, and I fully intended to vote "Yes" on Roll Call Vote No. 306.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2017

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during Roll Call Vote No. 308 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on H.R. 2579, Broader Options for Americans Act.

### DENOUNCING IMPACT OF TRUMP CARE ON OUR NATION'S VETERANS

#### HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, on behalf of the men and women who have served our country, I want to apologize that the majority excluded our Nation's Veterans when they voted for Trumpcare.

Make no mistake, Trumpcare, would disallow any veteran eligible for government healthcare from receiving a tax credit even if the veteran has an individual health plan. The majority had an opportunity to fix this but they chose to exclude Veterans so they could pass their bill through reconciliation. Veterans lost in the Majority's procedural gimmicks. Today, they are trying to fix this mess but it simply isn't enough. The underlying bill, Trumpcare, would only make health coverage less accessible and affordable for Veterans.

Political expediency should never be used as an excuse to use Veterans as an afterthought.

As others have mentioned, this bill is like adding new tires to a car you're sending to the junkyard. This bill does nothing to improve the inadequate tax credits under Trumpcare for all Americans, nothing to eliminate the age-tax in Trumpcare causing older Veterans to pay more, and nothing to protect Veterans when

their state opts to waive essential health benefits or reinstate lifetime caps.

The majority of House Republicans voted for Trumpcare, which caps and guts Medicaid by \$800 billion. Trump proposes another \$600 billion from Medicaid in his budget.

Almost 2 million veterans and 660,000 veterans spouses rely on Medicaid for their health services. In my home state of Alabama, around 28,000 veterans are enrolled in Medicaid. According to a study by the Urban Institute, the rate of uninsured veterans fell by 42 percent between 2013 and 2015.

States that expanded Medicaid saw a 34 percent increase in the number of Medicaid-enrolled veterans, whereas states that declined the expansion saw a 3 percent increase. In Alabama, percent about 13,000 uninsured Veterans would have qualified for health coverage had the state expanded. The President and the majority aim to cut Medicaid in all states, and therefore cap coverage and benefits to hundreds of thousands of Veterans across this country. Recalcitrance didn't work for Alabama and it will not work in the rest of the country.

Now is the time to build on the progress the ACA made for our Veterans, not roll it back by dismantling coverage and access for millions of Veterans. Veterans deserve better than stale lip service.

### COMMEMORATING FIFTH ANNI- VERSARY OF DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS (DACA) INITIATIVE

#### HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, five years ago, on June 15, 2012, President Obama signed the DACA initiative radically changing the lives of thousands of young immigrants by giving them the opportunity to earn degrees, legalize their status and be able to openly contribute their talents to make our country a better place.

President Obama's DACA allows thousands of young people the opportunity to dream of a better place, a safer home, and a brighter and more prosperous future.

Immigrants in our nation are now under siege by a divisive and misguided political rhetoric that dehumanizes their immigrant experiences by relying on hateful stereotypes.

As the DACA program and its beneficiaries come under attack, we must work together to responsibly reform our broken immigration system to ensure that families in immigrant communities can live in this nation freely and without fear.

According to the Migration Policy Institute, over 68,000 people in Harris County benefit from the DACA initiative.

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

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

DACA beneficiaries and immigrants live among us; they are our neighbors, our family members, our classmates, and our friends.

Mr. Speaker, Houston is one of the most diverse cities in the nation and immigrants are essential to create Houston's beautiful mosaic of diversity that makes it one of the most dynamic and vibrant cities in America.

America is a land of opportunity for those who are willing to work hard and abide by the laws.

We must assure that DACA beneficiaries continue to enjoy the opportunity to pursue their American dreams.

We are a better country for doing so.

#### HITACHI AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS AMERICAS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. JODY B. HICE**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Hitachi Automotive Systems Americas, Inc.'s Monroe-based manufacturing facility on its 20th Anniversary. It is with a great sense of pride that I rise to celebrate its achievements and the positive contributions it has made to Georgia's 10th Congressional District.

Built in 1996, the plant has undergone three expansions over the years and employs a myriad of Georgia workers in the manufacturing industry. In 2014, Hitachi continued its commitment to the citizens of Georgia by approving the latest expansion, which increased its size to include 520,000 square feet of manufacturing space and doubled its workforce to provide more than 600 jobs in the 10th District.

Monroe's Hitachi facility remains extremely competitive and was named the 2014 Manufacturer of the Year for the State of Georgia for its commitment to manufacturing in education, community service, and economic growth. These achievements are a result of the partnership of several organizations working together to improve Georgia's economy and workforce potential. I would further like to recognize Athens Technical College, which has joined with Hitachi Automotive Systems to create an internship program as part of Georgia's Quick Start program, providing customized training programs to fill vital skilled-labor positions necessary to employers like Hitachi.

For these reasons, it is my honor to recognize Hitachi's Monroe facility on the occasion of its 20th Anniversary as well as the partners that contribute to its continued success. Furthermore, I extend my personal appreciation to those who have joined in improving Georgia's workforce to ensure that we succeed today and in the future.

TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE J. "BUD"  
BROWN, JR.

**HON. JIM JORDAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the admirable service of former Congressman Clarence J. "Bud" Brown, Jr., on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday on June 18.

Born in Columbus in 1927, Bud spent much of his youth in the Washington area, as his father, the late former Congressman Clarence J. Brown, Sr., represented Ohio's Seventh Congressional District in the House from 1939 to 1965. A Navy veteran of World War II and the Korean War, Bud was a 1947 graduate of Duke University and a 1949 graduate of Harvard Business School.

Bud succeeded his father in Congress in 1965, representing the people of the Seventh District with distinction until 1983. Following his House service, he was tapped by President Reagan to serve as the nation's fifth Deputy Secretary of Commerce. He ably filled the role of Acting Secretary for several months following the 1987 death of Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige.

From 1992 to 1999, Bud served as President and Chief Executive Officer of the United States Capitol Historical Society, a congressionally chartered non-profit organization dedicated to preserving the heritage and history of the Capitol. The Society honored him with its Freedom Award in 2000, created to recognize those who advance the understanding and appreciation of representative government.

Throughout his life, Bud worked in various roles at the family-owned Brown Publishing Company, a vast nationwide network of local newspapers that was in business through 2010. Bud oversaw company operations from its headquarters in Urbana, Ohio, as President and later as Chairman of the Board for many years.

Bud and his wife, Joyce, are the proud parents of four children: Cate, Clancy, Roy, and Beth. Beth died in 1964 at age seven after a three-year battle with leukemia; Bud and Joyce established the Beth Brown Memorial Foundation in her name later that year. Foundation scholarships have helped hundreds of high school graduates from Champaign County study medical and related careers in college.

Bud and Joyce have both been active in promoting the Cedar Bog Nature Preserve, a 450-acre site south of Urbana that is considered a crown jewel of Ohio's natural areas. They were instrumental in building the Preserve's endowment fund and in making its new education center a reality.

This Sunday in Urbana, Bud's family and friends will gather at an open house in his honor. I look forward to joining so many other well-wishers on this occasion to thank Bud and Joyce for their years of selfless sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, Bud Brown has been a personal friend and mentor for many years who has made service to others the foundation of his life. We are grateful that good men like Bud commit their lives to public service and inspire others to follow in their footsteps.

RECOGNIZING ELLEN JOHNSON  
SIRLEAF, PRESIDENT OF LIBERIA

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a world leader for her tireless work in securing peace for their home country. President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf of Liberia has spent decades advocating for peace and democracy in Liberia. She is a role model for all those who believe world peace is achievable through public service.

Throughout her career President Sirleaf has never been afraid to stand up and speak out for what she believed was best for Liberians. Her career in public service began in 1972 as an assistant minister of finance under President William Tolbert. She was forced to flee Liberia in 1980 after publicly speaking out against the government of Samuel Doe. She returned to Liberia in 1985 to seek public office only to be sentenced to ten years in prison for her comments criticizing the government. President Sirleaf watched from afar as Liberia was terrorized and almost destroyed through two violent civil wars. She advocated for Liberians to put down their weapons and come to a peaceful resolution to the conflicts that plagued the country.

In 2005, President Sirleaf was elected by the citizens of Liberia to be the country's 24th President, shattering the glass ceiling and becoming the first democratically elected female head of state in Africa. President Sirleaf has helped her country and its people recover from the unrest and violence that preceded her presidency. Her hard work and dedication has revived national hope by strengthening the institutions of national security and good governance, leading to the revitalization of infrastructure within the country along with the national economy. President Sirleaf's persistence in transforming the image of Liberia has restored the country's credibility and reputation on the global stage.

In 2011, President Sirleaf, among others, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for her work in advocating for peace, democracy and gender equality in Liberia. When the Norwegian Committee granted this prize, it was their hope President Sirleaf would help bring an end to the suppression of women, to realize the great potential for democracy, and to epitomize the peace that women can represent.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Sirleaf for working towards that goal, for her many accomplishments, and for being a pioneer in African politics. She is truly an inspiration to not just the women in Liberia, but to women around the world. Because of President Sirleaf, the world is stronger, smarter, more diverse, and more equal than it has ever been before, and the future of Liberia is forever brighter.

EXTENDING BEST WISHES TO CONGRESSMAN STEVE SCALISE WHO WAS WOUNDED IN THE MASS SHOOTING AT SIMPSON PARK IN ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish our colleague Congressman STEVE SCALISE a full and speedy recovery in the wake of this most recent act of senseless violence.

Wednesday morning, June 14, 2017, a deranged assailant launched an unprovoked attack against several Members of Congress, who along with some staff members, were practicing at Simpson Park in Alexandria, Virginia for the 56th Annual Congressional Baseball Game, an event designed to build amity across the aisle and raise funds for charity.

Among the five persons wounded was Congressman STEVE SCALISE, the Majority Whip, who sustained serious injuries and remains in critical condition.

Our hearts and prayers are with Congressman SCALISE and his family. Our thanks and appreciation go to the first responders who rescued and treated the wounded, and the U.S. Capitol Police officers who subdued the shooter and neutralized the threat of this vicious attack.

Mr. Speaker, the damage from this mass shooting would have been much greater if not for the heroism, courage, professionalism, and skill of the U.S. Capitol Police Special Agents David Bailey and Crystal Griner, who swiftly responded to sound of gunshots and both of whom were struck and injured in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, it is no exaggeration to say that political discourse is too charged, too inflammatory, too uncivil these days, and I urge all of us in positions of leadership and influence to exercise calm and restraint and to be mindful of the impact of our words and rhetoric on others.

But we also cannot ignore that Wednesday's attack constitutes the 154th mass shooting in our country since the beginning of the year, or that the too easy access to guns helps to make these terrible attacks possible.

Today, however, is not the day to debate gun violence prevention policy, but the occasion to wish Congressman SCALISE a speedy recovery and a Happy Father's Day: and to hope he will soon be reunited with his wonderful wife Jennifer and their two children, Madison and Harrison.

**RECOGNIZING ELENA BOAL**

**HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Elena Boal—a remarkable young woman who, this year, received the 2017 Congressional Gold Medal.

A resident of Princeton Junction, Ms. Boal has demonstrated an immeasurable passion

for theater and the arts. A crew member for a number of theater productions, buildings sets, and working backstage on shows she has made it her mission to elevate the importance of arts in her own community. She continues to give back to youth that will become our nation's future leaders by volunteering with the West Windsor-Plainsboro Alliance for the prevention of alcoholism and drug abuse and through Urban Promise Trenton serves as a tutor at the Trenton Free Public Library. Her dedication to greater good, devotion to her local community and the improvement of the lives of those around her speak to her character and is to be admired.

While being a pillar of hope and progress for her community—Ms. Boal remained committed to being a well-rounded student athlete as a member of the lacrosse team and skilled sailor, successfully charting a course through the Chesapeake Bay.

Beyond the Congressional Gold Medal Award program, extraordinary individuals like Ms. Boal exemplify the best and brightest of our nation's future. As a resident of New Jersey's 12th congressional district, I couldn't be more proud of her for taking up such a difficult challenge and making a positive change for themselves and their community.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Ms. Boal on her amazing accomplishment.

**FRANK A. PECORA**

**HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former Pennsylvania State Senator Frank A. Pecora, who passed away on June 12, 2017, at the age of 86. He was a dedicated public servant and a wonderful, warm-hearted man. It was my privilege to know him, work with him, and call him a close friend for many, many years.

Frank was born on August 8, 1930, in Pittsburgh to Frank L. and Elizabeth Cristillo Pecora. Frank attended Westinghouse High School and Robert Morris College. He obtained his licenses in insurance and real estate and worked in that field. He served as a Penn Hills Township Commissioner from 1971 to 1975. Frank was then elected as a Councilman-at-Large in 1975 and reelected in 1977.

Soon after I graduated from college, I was elected to serve on Borough Council in my home town of Swissvale. Not long after that, I met Frank, who was a councilman in neighboring Penn Hills and we really hit it off. We both shared a love for the game of golf and we would discuss local government and politics during the many rounds we played together. Frank told me he was considering running for the Pennsylvania State Senate and I was proud to join his campaign team. He was considered a heavy underdog, but his hard work and determination carried the day, and Frank was elected to serve the residents of the 44th District in the Pennsylvania State Senate in 1978.

Frank asked me to join his team and I had the privilege to serve as his Chief-of-Staff for 16 years. It was during that time that I came to really know and learn from this remarkable public servant whose life was dedicated to advocating for the little guy. Sometimes his votes put him at odds with his Senate Leadership, but Frank never flinched. He knew who he came to Harrisburg to represent, and it wasn't the rich and powerful.

Senator Pecora was likeable and approachable. He enjoyed meeting his constituents and learning about their families. When he entered a restaurant, he wouldn't sit down at his table until he had spoken to every person who worked there. He knew their names, he made their concerns his concern, and he fought for them in Harrisburg. He was a man of integrity, compassion and unquestionable loyalty to his family, friends and constituents. In spite of a huge registration deficit, the residents of the 44th District re-elected Frank 3 more times. In 1991, reapportionment moved his Allegheny/Westmoreland district over 200 miles east to Chester County in the middle of his 4th term. Frank was no quitter however, he was determined to keep his seat and serve the people of Pennsylvania's 44th Senate District, wherever its boundary lines were drawn. He rented an apartment in Chester County to serve his constituents, and when the Senate wasn't in session, he and I would drive up to the new district and meet with people in the different communities. In 1992, Frank ran for the U.S. House of Representatives in the 18th District of Pennsylvania. He won a 12-way Democratic primary, but he lost the general election. Frank continued serving his constituents in Chester County until his retirement from the State Senate at the end of his term in 1994.

The only thing Frank loved more than serving his constituents was his family. He was proud of his two children, Frank and Barbara. His wife Barbara was his best friend, his "Bella Mia," and they did everything together. They were married for 60 years and were sweethearts to the very end.

Frank Pecora was a good man. I was proud to know him, learn from him, work for him and love him as a second father. I miss him and think of him often. He and his family will always be in my thoughts and prayers.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. TOM COLE**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. However, had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 308.

**HONORING THE MATTATUCK DRUM BAND**

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 16, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Mattatuck Drum Band,

which this week commemorates the 250th Anniversary of its founding. This band is our nation's oldest continuously active fife and drum band and is a celebrated institution of our Waterbury, Connecticut community.

The Mattatuck Drum Band was founded in 1767, and over the past two and a half centuries, the band has been an invaluable group in supporting our country's battles and preserving the heritage of our state and country. The band was first formed to play martial music for military training exercises in the towns of Farmington and Waterbury. The fifers

and drummers were some of the earliest patriots to join the American Revolution in the spring of 1775, at a time when musicians and drummers were instrumental in maintaining order and routine for military camps.

The band joined many parades in support of President Lincoln's 1860 campaign, and then joined recruiting efforts to support the Union's fight in the Civil War. Almost a century later during World War II, despite gas rationing and the deployment of many members, the band still turned out to play in parades to support our country's service members and maintain

solidarity during a difficult time for the country. Today, the dedicated members of the band keep musical tradition alive, and the band's performances are an essential part of our community's celebrations.

Mr. Speaker, the Mattatuck Drum Band celebrates our history in Connecticut and America, and its dedicated musicians and leaders have preserved an important part of our community's heritage for the past 250 years. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor the band and everyone who has ensured its preservation and success here today.

**SENATE—Monday, June 19, 2017**

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our hope for years to come, so much seems to be happening in our Nation and world. Lord, we pray for those affected by the latest London terror attack, for the families of those killed aboard the USS *Fitzgerald*, for the police who were attacked in Paris, and for those recovering from last week's baseball field shooting.

Let Your peace stay with us all during these turbulent times. Surround our lawmakers with Your favor, enabling them to believe that You will empower them to persevere through every challenge, as they trust You to bring them to Your desired destination. May they not lose confidence in the power of Your everlasting arms as You continue to give them a moral and ethical resilience that will not shrink in the heat of testing.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

**LONDON ATTACK**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, today we are learning about new attacks in Europe. I would like to start by offering the Senate's condolences to the victims and their families in London. As our allies in the United Kingdom develop a better understanding of the nature of that attack, let me again reiterate that our commitment to our friends in Europe remains very strong. We will continue to stand by you.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, what has happened in the years since ObamaCare was im-

posed on our country? Year after year, it drove up costs. Year after year, it drove down choice. Year after year, it continues to literally unravel right before our eyes. It is a trend that continues today, one that will only get worse unless we act.

Just last week we got more evidence of ObamaCare's failures as the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services released reports that identified a trend of Americans who had enrolled in the ObamaCare exchanges but then canceled their coverage. Often these Americans didn't even pay their first premium. Within just a couple of months of enrolling, nearly 2 million people literally dropped out of ObamaCare.

Why did so many Americans drop their coverage? The reasons shouldn't surprise anyone. The most common explanation these Americans gave for having canceled their coverage was ObamaCare's outrageous costs. These numbers underline what Republicans have been saying all along. ObamaCare is collapsing around us, and the American people are desperately searching for relief. Costs continue to shoot upward, and insurance providers are fleeing from the marketplaces across the country, leaving precious few options.

It is clear that ObamaCare just isn't working. In fact, it is not working for millions of Americans, like those living in nearly 1,400 counties—about 50 percent of all counties nationwide—who would have zero or just one insurance option on the exchanges next year. Of course, one option isn't really an option at all.

These shrinking choices and increased costs under ObamaCare are not an indication of a new pattern; they are just the latest in what has been a years-long assault on far too many families by this failed healthcare law. While this isn't a new trend, it is one that has grown increasingly more unsustainable and one that we must work to change very soon. That is why we have repeatedly called for a different approach to healthcare. That is why we are working hard to move in a different direction on healthcare today.

For months now, the entire Senate Republican conference has been active and engaged on legislation to move beyond the failures of ObamaCare and bring relief to the American people. We have had numerous productive discussions on the way forward. We believe we can and must do better than ObamaCare's status quo.

Working together and listening to our constituents, we are focused on the following: stabilizing insurance mar-

kets which are collapsing under ObamaCare; freeing Americans from ObamaCare's mandates, which force them to buy insurance they don't want; improving the affordability of health insurance, which is spiking under ObamaCare; strengthening Medicaid for those who need it most; and preserving access to care for patients with preexisting conditions.

Senate Republicans will continue working because it is clear that we cannot allow Americans' healthcare to continue on its current downward trajectory, taking so many families right along with it.

The ObamaCare status quo is simply unsustainable. The American people deserve relief, and we will keep working to provide it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

**ORDER OF PROCEDURE**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 108 occur at 11 a.m. tomorrow morning, with the pending cloture motions ripening after disposition of the Long nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask to speak under leaders' time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

### CONDITION OF REPRESENTATIVE SCALISE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before I begin, I want to express how glad we all are to hear that Representative SCALISE is doing better. Over the weekend, his condition changed from critical to serious. It seems he has a ways to go, but we are all very happy to hear that the signs are more positive and moving in the right direction.

### USS "FITZGERALD" TRAGEDY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I would also like to express my heartfelt condolences to the families of the seven U.S. Navy sailors who were lost in the crash of the USS *Fitzgerald*. The loss of these seven men in peacetime, in such a bizarre and rare accident, is nothing short of a tragedy. I expect the Navy will conduct a thorough and full investigation to figure out what went wrong and hold all responsible parties accountable. For now, our prayers are with the families of the seven sailors who lost their lives in service to this great country.

### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on healthcare, we are only 2 weeks away from the July 4th recess, and my friends on the other side say we are going to vote on a healthcare bill before the break. Democrats still have not seen the bill. The Republican Health and Human Services Secretary has not seen the bill. The American people have not seen the bill. I am sure many Republican Senators have not seen the bill either. The White House spokesman could not even say if the President has seen the bill.

This is a bill that would likely reorder one-sixth of the American economy and have life-and-death consequences for millions of Americans. It is being discussed in secret, with no committee hearings, no debate, no amendments, no input from the minority. This is the most glaring departure from normal legislative procedure that I have ever seen. My friend the majority leader used to sing the praises of regular order and wax poetic about the wisdom of the committee process and an open amendment process.

Republicans criticized Democrats vehemently for passing the Affordable Care Act with only Democratic votes, and that is after we accepted dozens of Republican amendments during a robust hearing process. Now that the shoe is on the other foot and Republicans are in charge, all of those concerns and criticisms have disappeared. No committee process, no hearings, nothing—quite the opposite of what they called for 5 years ago. What gall.

Why are my Republican friends engaging in this farce of a legislative

process? Why are Republicans willing to engage in such blatant hypocrisy, contradicting all of the things they have said about good procedure in the Senate? What are they afraid of? There is only one reason Republicans are doing this: They are ashamed of their bill. The Republicans are writing their healthcare bill under the cover of darkness because they are ashamed of it, plain and simple. They are ashamed that the bill will likely cause millions to lose their healthcare insurance. They are ashamed because it will increase costs for older and sicker Americans—all to pass along a big, fat tax break to the wealthiest among us, the folks who need it the least. No wonder they do not want to show anyone the bill. They are ashamed of it.

This radical departure from normal procedure on a bill of such consequence leaves the Senate minority little choice but to depart from normal procedure as well. Starting this evening, Democrats will begin objecting to all unanimous consent requests in the Senate, save for honorary resolutions. We will seek, in as many ways as we can, as many times as we can, to refer the House-passed healthcare bill to committee, where it can be vetted, debated, and amended in the open for the American people to see, as is their right.

Tonight, Democrats will hold the floor late into the evening in a series of speeches to highlight just how unprecedented this process is. If Republicans are not going to allow debate on their bill on the floor or in committee, Democrats will make opportunities to debate.

These are merely the first steps we are prepared to take in order to shine a light on the shameful TrumpCare bill and reveal to the public the GOP's backroom deal-making.

Of course there is another way. On Friday, I sent a letter to my friend the majority leader requesting that we hold an all-Senators meeting in the Old Senate Chamber to discuss a bipartisan way forward on healthcare. We should all share common goals—improving the healthcare system by lowering costs, raising the quality of care, and stabilizing the marketplaces. Let's sit down together, all 100 of us, and talk about how we can achieve those results together.

That option, I say to the Republican leader, is on the table, and I hope he will not refuse it, but if Republicans will not relent and debate their healthcare bill in the open for the American people to see, they should not expect business as usual in the Senate.

### SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, on another matter entirely, I continue to be alarmed by the wave of

criticism from the far right of Special Counsel Robert Mueller. It seems obvious that, because Mr. Mueller—one of the most respected and trusted men in Washington—is in charge of investigating Russian interference in our elections and any other issues that arise out of that investigation, the far-right, special interest partisans have set out on a despicable campaign to smear his character and muddy the waters of his investigation.

I just want to remind my colleagues and the American people that there is no one more qualified or more trusted to do this job than Robert Mueller. He spent almost his entire adult life in service to his country. He is a decorated veteran of the Vietnam war and served as U.S. attorney for 12 years. He was appointed by a Republican President, President George Bush, to lead the FBI in 2001 and served his full 10-year term with distinction, and then he was asked to spend an additional 2 years under President Obama. Congress had to pass a special waiver to allow him to continue in his FBI post, and the vote was unanimous. Every Republican—many in this Chamber—voted unanimously to ratify Robert Mueller for another 2 years as FBI Director. What an endorsement—a great endorsement. That vote made Mr. Mueller the longest serving FBI Director since J. Edgar Hoover and the only FBI Director to serve under Presidents of both parties.

Mr. Mueller represents the best of public service. He will pursue this investigation without regard to politics or pressure of any kind, and that is exactly what America needs.

The chorus of extreme commentators and media personalities who seek to curry favor with the President by trying to tear down this man of great integrity is only heaping dishonor on themselves. Worse yet, they are trying to discredit our most important democratic institution—the rule of law. These critics know Mr. Mueller is a straight arrow, and many of them said as much when he was appointed, but because he is in a position to examine the President's actions and perhaps to take action, they are attacking his character.

This is not, my colleagues, a political game. This is a very serious investigation about foreign interference in our elections—something that eats at, that corrodes the roots of our democracy, the very wellspring of our being and pride as a nation.

The man leading this investigation ought to be trusted by the American people, and over the course of his long, distinguished career, he has certainly earned that trust.

Again, I urge that these attacks on Mr. Mueller cease and that my friends on the other side of the aisle join me in defending his reputation. The critics are going much too far.

I yield the floor and ask that the Senator wait 1 minute so that I might have a word with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, over the last several months, there has been an important debate about healthcare—a debate between those who believe we can strengthen the American healthcare system by improving the Affordable Care Act and those who believe the law must be repealed and replaced. If you listen closely, however, the question at the heart of both sides of this debate sound oddly the same—how do we make sure Americans have access to quality healthcare they can afford? It is this shared concern about the affordability of quality healthcare and the recent actions of the Trump administration that I would like to discuss today.

For a moment, let's set aside the healthcare reform debate because whether we agree to work together in a bipartisan way to improve our healthcare system, as I strongly believe we should, or whether Republicans push through a partisan proposal to significantly change the way in which Americans receive healthcare, we should all be able to agree that we want to protect the stability of the insurance markets and access to quality, affordable healthcare. Yet, despite this shared objective, protecting the stability of our healthcare system has not been the approach of this administration. Instead, it has done the opposite. It has tried to drive change by creating instability and chaos.

On his first day in office, the President did not ask how he could fix the Affordable Care Act or improve the healthcare system. Instead, he began a deliberate, strategic effort to undermine the healthcare system, to drive up costs, and to create a scenario so painful for regular folks that we would have no choice but to rebuild the healthcare system from scratch.

On the day he was sworn in, President Trump signed an Executive order to exempt, to delay, and to defer the implementation and enforcement of the law, creating instability in the marketplaces where millions of Americans obtained the coverage they needed. The administration canceled enrollment efforts to attract younger and healthier Americans into the insurance markets. This resulted in an estimated 500,000 fewer Americans purchasing coverage. Most notably, the administration has refused to commit to continuing critical payments that lower deductibles and copays for our families. This drives up the costs for our friends and neighbors, and in some States, it drives insurance companies out of the market completely.

To be fair, though, the President has been straightforward about his strategy to undermine the Affordable Care Act, noting that the best thing we can do “is to let ObamaCare explode. Let it be a disaster because we can blame that on the Democrats.”

For the President and many in Washington, healthcare seems to be a political exercise. I can assure you that for the citizens of my State back home in Terre Haute, in Richmond, in Fort Wayne, in Indianapolis, in Lawrenceburg, and in Evansville—particularly for those with preexisting conditions, including children, older Hoosiers, and people with disabilities—this is about a lot more. It is about the health and the well-being of our loved ones. It is about the financial security of our families. For many, it is a life-and-death issue.

This week, Indiana's insurance companies will submit their proposed healthcare rates for 2018 to the Indiana Department of Insurance. It is the first step in a routine process that determines how much Hoosiers will be paid for critical healthcare coverage in the coming year. The 2018 filings, however, are likely to be anything but routine. Growing evidence across the country shows that the actions taken by the President and the administration, along with legislative uncertainty in Congress, have created instability and have created chaos in the insurance markets, resulting in significant cost increases for consumers.

Let me share just a few examples of what I am hearing from the insurance companies in my home State of Indiana. The president and CEO of CareSource, an insurer that offers plans to Hoosiers through the insurance marketplace, told me that at the beginning of this year, the company was seeing rates stabilize, and if there was certainty regarding cost-sharing payments—those payments I previously discussed—rates would increase by about 2 percent—2 percent—in 2018 compared to 2017.

Now, though, the company is saying that, if the administration stops cost-sharing payments—and they have refused to commit to making those payments—rates for silver plans would increase by a minimum of 15 percent.

This is real money, real families, real healthcare, and real life-and-death decisions.

The president and CEO said: “In addition, we believe that ceasing CSR payments may adversely impact the risk pools, potentially leading to further increases in future years.”

The chairman and CEO of Indianapolis-based Anthem said, in part, in a letter:

As I have stated publicly over the previous few months, without certainty of CSR funding . . . Anthem will have no choice but to reevaluate our approach to filing 2018 rates.

Such adjustments could include reducing service area participation, requesting additional rate increases, eliminating certain

product offerings, and/or exiting certain individual ACA-compliant markets altogether.

Let me be clear. These cost increases, limits on product offerings, and market exits are not the result of the current law or even the healthcare system. This is a deliberate choice. They are the result of a deliberate choice by the President to undermine the healthcare law at the expense of real people—moms, dads, sisters, brothers, sons, and daughters.

This makes no sense. If your house needs repairs, you don't set the house on fire. You work to fix the issues.

If we are serious about improving healthcare in this country, we can do it, and we can do it by working together. In my home State of Indiana, I was proud to work with then-Indiana Governor and now Vice President MIKE PENCE when he used ObamaCare to establish a program we call the Healthy Indiana Plan, or HIP, 2.0. The innovative plan expanded healthcare coverage to over 200,000 Hoosiers, and it helped to reduce the uninsured rate in Indiana by 30 percent—30 percent.

Our Vice President called this program a “national model” to provide affordable healthcare to our most vulnerable citizens and treatment to those struggling with opioid abuse and heroin use, which is an absolute scourge on our country.

We can improve our healthcare system by working together, but the first step is to do no harm—to stop doing damage to the current system and to the people who rely on it.

Healthcare is not a game. It is life and death. This is about people's health. It is about economic security. It is about real lives.

I hope my Republican colleagues and the administration will immediately stop these efforts to damage our healthcare system and will work with all of us on our shared goal to make quality healthcare more affordable. There is way too much at stake for Hoosiers and for all the people in our beloved country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 115.

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



The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2022.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2022.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to resume morning business as under the previous order.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the American people have spent the last several weeks hearing that the Senate will vote on its new version of TrumpCare by the end of the month. It is now June 19, and the American people are still in the dark about this bill. There is no text. There is no legislative analysis of this bill and no scoring of what the financial ramifications are. The American people—and much of this Senate—are in the dark. We are in the dark about how much costs are going to rise, in the dark about how many people are going to lose insurance, and in the dark about whether a preexisting condition will once again be used as a weapon against them by insurance companies.

If news reports are to be believed—and that is all we have right now—a

vote on this massive proposal affecting the lives of virtually all our people is days away. No one outside of a group of 13 men—all Republicans—knows what is being considered. In my view, this is as stark an example of legislative malpractice as I can remember.

It is time for Americans to get loud, to do their part, and to make sure their voices are heard on an issue that is so personal and so vital to our people and their families.

If and when this bill hits the floor, the debate is going to go by very quickly. By the standards of the Senate, it will be over in a flash. So this afternoon, I want to be direct with a few key points for those across this country to remember over the next two weeks.

First, the Republican healthcare plan is going to raise costs for the typical American. If you are an older person nearing retirement—55, 58, 61—you are going to get hammered with an age tax. You are going to be forced to pay several times as much as a younger person for health insurance.

Under the House TrumpCare bill, 64-year-old seniors of modest means are going to see their premiums shoot up by 800 percent. I would like to hear somebody try to explain to a lifelong trucker or to someone who has spent decades cleaning offices to put food on their family's table why that is an improvement in American healthcare.

These are older people who already struggle to make ends meet, and they have been told for the last 7 years that repealing and replacing the Affordable Care Act is going to lower their healthcare costs. Now they face the reality of TrumpCare, which says that they will somehow have to spend the bulk of their income on health insurance and, in some cases, it will take up nearly all of it.

It is not just older people who face this age tax that will see their costs rise. TrumpCare cuts middle-class tax benefits for healthcare that were put in place under the Affordable Care Act, particularly in rural areas. That means premiums are going to be a much bigger burden on typical middle-class families.

The Republican healthcare plan ends the air-tight, loophole-free guarantee that protects Americans from being discriminated against for a preexisting condition. Working adults—30, 40, 50 years old—who thought they were home free with employer-sponsored insurance, under this bill could, once again, face some of the worst insurance company abuses, including annual and lifetime limits on benefits.

One new report says 27 million Americans could get hit by annual limits and 20 million could face lifetime limits.

Here is what this means: A 35-year-old, for example, who develops cancer could bust that cap in a hurry. If you

have to go through expensive surgeries and chemotherapy, busting those caps could mean facing decades—decades—digging out from medical debt.

Second, TrumpCare is built around the \$800 billion attack on Medicaid. Today, Medicaid comes with a guarantee: If you walk an economic tightrope, are sick or injured, you will get the care you need. You can't be denied benefits, but slashing the program by hundreds of billions of dollars ends that guarantee because States are going to have to cut benefits. The best way to understand the consequences of that plan is to look at seniors who need nursing home care.

The Medicaid nursing home benefit helps pick up the tab for two out of three nursing home beds in America because, the fact is, growing old in America gets expensive. You can do everything right through a lifetime of hard work, scrimping and saving, putting off vacations or big purchases to be financially prudent, but still, a lot of people go through their savings. That is when Medicaid steps in for seniors to help cover the cost of nursing homes and other long-term care. One year in a nursing home now costs more than \$90,000, on average. That is two or three times as much as a year of college education. If TrumpCare slashes Medicaid so deeply that seniors are in danger of losing the nursing home benefit, how are families, fighting hard to pay their own bills, going to be in a position to take care of older loved ones?

Of course, Medicaid does a lot more than cover nursing home care. Thirty-seven million kids are enrolled in Medicaid, a vital source of support for kids and adults with disabilities.

Medicaid is the only lifeline that thousands and thousands of Americans fighting opioid addiction have to be able to put their lives back together. No community anywhere in this country has escaped the opioid epidemic. Since Medicaid was expanded under the Affordable Care Act, it has been leading the fight against the opioid epidemic by improving access for millions of people for treatment of mental health and substance abuse orders, but with the Republican plan's enormous cuts, thousands of people could lose their best shot to recover from addiction and lead healthy lives.

Finally, what is especially unfortunate about this legislation is the process for writing this bill. It is being written behind closed doors, no input from across the aisle and particularly from the American people.

I serve as the ranking member on the Senate Finance Committee. Our committee has authority over hundreds of billions of dollars in payments for Medicare, Medicaid, and tax credits. We haven't had any hearings. We haven't seen a bill. There is not the traditional process of a committee markup to consider legislation. We are

also the committee that on a staff level, always has tried to work back and forth between Democrats and Republicans to try to find common ground, but with the majority leader keeping the process locked behind closed doors, Chairman HATCH and I, along with all of the Democrats and most of the Republicans on our committee, have simply been cut out.

Back in the runup to the Affordable Care Act—the one that President Obama was involved in, in 2009—the Finance Committee held more than 50 hearings and roundtables, and we walked through carefully the healthcare reform bill. When the legislation was introduced, it sat online for 6 days before it was voted on in the committee, 564 amendments were posted online, more than 130 amendments were considered during the markup, more than two dozen Republican amendments were adopted, and the bill passed on a bipartisan basis.

Again, let me highlight: More than two dozen Republican amendments were adopted in the Finance Committee. As of now, there will not be a single Democratic amendment adopted in the Finance Committee. When the legislation went to the floor, the Senate spent 25 consecutive legislative days on healthcare reform—the second longest consecutive session in history.

That is how the legislative process ought to look: The committees do the hard work in the open, gather input from the American people, have a chance—Democrats and Republicans—to work together. That is not what is happening on TrumpCare. This is a bill shrouded in secrecy and the public is kept in the dark. There aren't going to be any hearings on the impact it is going to have on the millions of people who rely on Medicaid for health insurance, no hearings on what it means if you have all these loopholes in the guarantee of protection Americans now have against discrimination for a pre-existing condition, no hearings asking how a 64-year-old of limited means is supposed to deal with an age tax that swallows up most of their income. When the Senate Republican healthcare bill hits the floor, there will be a very short debate before time expires and the final votes are cast.

I am going to close by saying now is the time for Americans to be heard on healthcare. It is the time for Americans to speak out. For those who have a story about how TrumpCare will affect their family, you can share it on my website at [wyden.senate.gov](http://wyden.senate.gov) or you can use the hashtag "America Speaks Out."

I intend to be back on the floor with my colleagues, and many of us will be here often in the hours and days ahead, but I want to close by way of saying political change doesn't start at the top and then trickle down. Political change is bottoms up, as Americans

across the country speak out and speak loudly. Now is the time to do that because this debate is coming fast.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to speak on healthcare, but I ask unanimous consent that I be able to conclude my remarks prior to going into executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to speak against the Republican effort and what it appears to be thus far to repeal the Affordable Care Act and the process they are using to do it.

I just have to say, this is the least transparent process for a major piece of legislation I have seen in my 24 years in the Senate. Former Senate Historian Don Ritchie said that you have to look back before World War I to find another example of such a secret, partisan process for passing a major bill.

The Senate healthcare bill in fact is being written behind closed doors. There is no draft for public review. No Democratic Senator has seen the bill. Republican Senators all say they haven't seen the bill either.

When Republican Senators are asked what is in the bill, unless they are the 13 privileged ones, they say they have no idea. Everyone except the 13 Republicans drafting this bill has been excluded, and these 13 Senators represent just 10 States out of our 50. Health experts and health advocacy organizations have been shut out. No one representing doctors, nurses, patients, children, the elderly, hospitals, community clinics, or health plans is able to provide any feedback at all on how the bill would affect people.

Over the weekend, the Los Angeles Times reported that a coalition of more than 15 patient groups, including the American Heart Association, the March of Dimes, and the American Lung Association, tried to get a meeting with Senator MCCONNELL or his staff and were told no. That is unbelievable.

Think of it. Think of the American Heart Association, the March of Dimes, the American Lung Association asking to meet with either the leader or his staff, and somebody says no. Do my Republican colleagues really believe that groups like the American Heart Association don't deserve an opportunity to weigh in on a healthcare bill when our healthcare system affects every single person in this country? Healthcare is the last subject that should be addressed behind closed doors, hidden from public view. Yet, apparently, Republicans intend to bring the bill to the floor without a single hearing. Senator MCCONNELL wants to vote on a bill by next Thursday, I am told. That is 10

days from now. Well, if there is not going to be a hearing, we shouldn't vote. I think: no hearing, no vote.

It is important to point out the contrast between what is happening now and our consideration of the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare. There were 100 hearings, meetings, roundtables, and walkthroughs of the bill between the Senate Finance and the HELP Committees. There were 25 consecutive days and 160 hours of debate on the Senate floor. There were 300 HELP Committee amendments, including more than 160 Republican amendments.

Was our process in 2009 and 2010 perfect? No, it wasn't, but it was infinitely better than what is happening now. This process is such an affront to our democratic system of government.

Senator HARRIS and I represent California. We are the sixth largest economy in the world. We represent more than 40 million people. That is more than 22 other States combined.

Fourteen million Californians are covered by the Medicaid Program, the program the House bill says we are going to stop the funding for. Fourteen million Californians are more people than the entire population of 9 of the 10 States represented in the secret healthcare negotiations. Four million Californians gained health coverage under the Affordable Care Act—more people than the population of 4 of the 10 States represented in the secret negotiations. Despite the significant effects that any healthcare bill would have on California, both of its Senators have been shut out.

I want to work to improve the Affordable Care Act. I know there are challenges we need to address, and I want to be part of the process, but there is no opportunity to do so.

If the Senate bill is anything like the House bill, the effects would be devastating to my State. If the Senate bill is like the House bill, here is what it would do: It would take healthcare coverage away from 23 million working and middle-class families to finance a tax cut for the richest 5 percent of Americans. This is indefensible. There is no justification for giving millionaires a \$50,000 tax break by taking healthcare away from our most vulnerable citizens. I don't know of any who are asking for it. It is some kind of blighted political agenda that you could leave the elderly and the sick untended, and it justifies a \$50,000 tax break for a millionaire.

This would end Medicaid as we have known it for 50 years by cutting \$834 billion. It eliminates protections for people with preexisting conditions. It defunds Planned Parenthood. It denies all Californians and New Yorkers—all of them—tax credits, unless the States change their laws requiring insurance companies to cover reproductive care, including abortion services. It is almost a blackmail provision.

I am going to talk more about the potential changes to Medicaid, known as Medi-Cal, because they are startling. Everyone needs to understand that the changes Republicans have proposed—and we think are proposing for the Senate bill—go much further than repealing the expansion of the program, which was a big part of the Affordable Care Act.

It has been reported in the media that Senate Republicans are looking at changes to Medicaid that are similar to what is in the House bill. There are rumors that the Senate bill would delay the drastic cuts by a few years. But, regardless, when cuts to the program come, they will be devastating.

Whom does Medicaid provide healthcare for? It is not the wealthy. It is elderly people in nursing homes. It is pregnant women. It is children. It is people with disabilities, and it is low-income adults who typically work but don't get health insurance through their jobs.

Medicaid covers one in three Californians; that is 14 million people. It covers one in two children. It covers three out of five residents in nursing homes. It covers one in two people with disabilities.

Here is something the American people need to understand about Medicaid: The majority of Medicaid dollars are spent on elderly people and people with disabilities. They are the most in need, and they have the most serious health issues.

Let me give you one story. A woman by the name of Kristen from Sacramento wrote to us about her daughter Riley, who is autistic. Riley is covered by Medi-Cal. It provides critical services that allow her to lead a more normal childhood. Here is what the mother said:

When my daughter Riley was born we quickly learned that she had difficulty with basic tasks like sleeping and eating.

She developed pneumonia multiple times and was continually sick.

After turning three, she was diagnosed with autism. Riley is now eight years old and is thriving thanks to Medicaid-funded support programs like physical therapy, speech therapy, and feeding therapy.

She is now verbal, learning to write, and reading above grade level. She wouldn't be doing this well if it weren't for Medicaid. I am counting on you to protect Medicaid.

Every community in California depends on Medicaid. Let me give you a few examples.

Members of both political parties go to Los Angeles to raise money. Forty percent of L.A. County is covered by Medicaid. Do you know how many that is? It is not a half a million. It is not a million. It is not a million and a half. It is not 2 or 3 million. It is 4 million people who could lose Medicaid funding.

Twenty-eight percent of San Diego is covered by Medi-Cal; that is more than 900,000 people. And 37 percent of Sac-

ramento County is covered by Medi-Cal; that is 560,000 people. Half of Fresno County is covered by Medi-Cal; that is one-half million people.

I was in Fresno just a week ago. There is a wonderful children's hospital. The director of that hospital came over to me and was practically in tears. He said: We treat 300,000 children up and down this area of the State, and if we lose our Medicaid, we cannot continue to provide that treatment—if that takes place.

Fresno has 31 assisted living facilities for the sick, for the elderly, and three out of five beds in that facility are Medicaid. Twenty-seven percent of San Francisco County, my home county, is covered by Medi-Cal; that is 230,000 people. What Republicans, we have learned, may likely propose would end the Medicaid program as we have known it for more than 50 years.

Under current law, the Federal Government pays a certain percentage of all healthcare costs for Medi-Cal beneficiaries. We will likely see a phase-out of the current structure of the program that would amount to \$834 billion, cut over 10 years, with 14 million people losing Medicaid coverage nationwide.

They will be in your State, Madam President. They will be in every State on the Republican side of the aisle, and I don't know how a civilized society or a Senate of the United States could do that to people.

The effects of this change could devastate access to healthcare for our most vulnerable citizens and crush State budgets nationwide if they try to replace those funds.

Bottom line, in my State, by 2027, California would need to find \$24 billion to cover those who depend on Medicaid for their healthcare today.

What is going to happen with pre-existing conditions? We all know that the ObamaCare legislation covers pre-existing conditions, so if you have breast cancer, you can get coverage. But you could be charged \$28,000 more per year if the preexisting condition of breast cancer isn't covered. It goes on and on like this. If you take away coverage for preexisting conditions and you have, as we have, 52 million people nationwide—including 6 million in California—who have preexisting conditions today, that will be a huge problem for them.

Let me give you one case of a woman from Hesperia, CA. She wrote to us about her 37-year-old son. He has battled Crohn's disease for 28 years. Lisa writes:

My son was without insurance for 10 years because of his pre-existing condition.

That was before ObamaCare.

During this time the disease caused severe damage to his small intestine. He was finally able to get insurance through Covered California and received treatment.

That was after ObamaCare passed.

He had surgery to remove various blockages and scar tissue and probably saved

his life. I am so scared that his coverage may be taken away.

How can we do that?

Sherry, from Sierra Madre, CA, wrote to me about her two sons. They both have preexisting conditions. She says:

As a single mother of two young men just out of college, each with pre-existing conditions, I fear they will not be able to afford health care under the GOP plan.

One son has Lyme disease and requires infusions every three weeks.

This is a huge expense that is currently manageable under my health care plan and has been a life-saver for him as the Lyme impacted his immune system.

Under TrumpCare this treatment would probably not be financially available for him. That would be devastating for him.

Let me tell you about something we have found out about. I look at my phone calls, and we get a lot of calls. I know something is serious when we get more than 100,000 calls, and we did on this subject. These were largely people between the ages of 50 and 64, and they weren't in the group market. They were in the individual market, which means you go out to find your own insurance company and you pay the premium.

Under ObamaCare, there is a subsidy for these premiums if you earn under 400 percent of poverty; 400 percent of poverty is about \$47,000 a year. If you earn under \$47,000 a year, it is much easier to get healthcare. If you are at \$50,000 a year, you exceed the 400 percent of poverty.

I am told by Covered California that the current premium in my city for someone 50 to 64 would be \$800 a month. That is 20 percent of someone's income—20 percent of an annual income.

This is where the complaints are coming throughout the United States, and this is where we can make an easy fix. A number of us have submitted legislation to do just that. What it would do is take the subsidy, and instead of going off the cliff at \$47,000 a year—so that at \$50,000 your premium costs 20 percent of your income—we changed it so that an individual would not pay more than 9.69 percent of their income toward the premium.

This is one example of how we could improve current law and, I believe, take away one of the biggest criticisms and fix it rather easily.

Here is another problem. I wish to share a story from Monica of Ocean-side, CA. These are real cases. She was diagnosed with breast cancer shortly after gaining coverage through California's individual market. Her doctor told her she would have been dead, had she not been covered by her new plan. She had cared for her father 10 years prior to his death from Parkinson's disease. She didn't have access to employer-provided insurance and wasn't eligible for Medicaid at the time.

By the time the Affordable Care Act was implemented, she qualified for a plan through Covered California. She

wrote: "Without the ACA, I would not be alive to write this post."

I wonder if that means anything to anyone on the Republican side of the aisle. No one comes forward; no one says what they would need. This is such a big issue. It affects every single one of us and every single one of our constituents.

Let me correct something. They also say: Well, ObamaCare is dead; it is imploding.

They say this to build support for repealing the law, but they are wrong. In California, which has worked hard to implement the law effectively, the marketplace to buy health coverage functions at a high level.

There are 1.5 million people signed up through the website Covered California. Enrollments have been stable, and there has been no uptick in healthy people leaving the insurance market.

The general consensus among experts is that the Federal healthcare market is not collapsing. Standard & Poor's said that "2016 results and the market enrollment so far in 2017 show that the ACA individual market is not in a 'death spiral.'" So, please, stop saying that.

In closing, I would like to just say to my Republican colleagues: Don't do this. Don't write a bill in secret. Don't take healthcare away from millions of people to cut taxes for the rich. Don't undermine protections for people with preexisting conditions. Don't allow insurers to go back to the days of selling junk plans. Don't end Medicaid. We have known it for so long. It is working. It is covering poor and elderly all across this country.

Those of us on this side of the aisle want to make the Affordable Care Act better. We want to work to improve our system. We stand ready to work together on behalf of our constituents, but if our colleagues continue down this path, we will fight this bill with all we have. The stakes are too high not to.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brock Long, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I rise in strong support of William B. "Brock" Long as the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and I might add that supposedly, in 12 minutes, we were going to vote on his confirmation, and unfortunately because of this unbelievable weather throughout the country, we have Members who can't make it back in so this will roll until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Brock is a fellow North Carolinian, alumnus of Appalachian State University, and currently lives with his family in Hickory, NC. I believe he is an exceptional nominee to lead FEMA, and he is well prepared to lead the Agency as it responds to disasters, regardless of where they are in this country.

When we met in my office a few weeks ago, we discussed the ongoing efforts in North Carolina to recover from Hurricane Matthew. Many might remember that. That was last year. It affected millions of people from Florida to Virginia. The storm caused historic flooding in cities and towns across the eastern half of my State. FEMA was in North Carolina before the storm, and Agency personnel have been in the State ever since that storm happened. As many in this Chamber know, once the camera crews leave, there is a perception by the American people the disaster is over. The truth is, Brock and I both know that isn't the case. Even 8 months after Matthew, there are still over 50 families being housed in local hotels utilizing FEMA assistance. It will take years for my State to fully recover.

Even as the recovery from Matthew continues, another hurricane season has already begun. If not a hurricane on the east coast, there will be fires, tornadoes, and other natural and man-made disasters that FEMA will be called to respond to. A key facet in responding to these disasters is the cooperation among local and State emergency management officials, as well as the Federal stakeholders led by FEMA.

Brock understands why this cooperation is imperative. He is bringing his own deep knowledge and experience of emergency management to FEMA. He began his career with the Georgia Emergency Management Agency before moving on to FEMA region IV in Atlanta. While at FEMA, Brock was a regional hurricane program manager and hurricane and evacuation liaison team leader.

After leaving FEMA, Brock was selected by my good friend Gov. Bob Riley of Alabama to serve as the director of Alabama's Emergency Management Agency. Brock served in that po-

sition from 2007 to 2011, where he led the State's efforts to respond to 14 disasters, including eight presidentially declared events. Specifically, Brock was charged with leading the State's response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in 2009.

He is a man of immense qualifications and experience. More recently, Brock has worked in the private sector, where he provided emergency management advice and expertise to his firm's clients. Brock has also served as the private sector chairman for the National Emergency Management Association. I believe we must take advantage of assets in and out of government when preparing for disasters. Leveraging the private sector can supplement State emergency management agencies with knowledge and expertise that is difficult to build independently when State budgets are tight. Brock agrees with this approach and will build on these important partnerships at FEMA.

The combination of his work for FEMA, State emergency management, and the private sector makes Brock Long well suited for this nomination by the President. Because of his experience, Brock understands it is the work done before a storm that saves lives. Helping States and cities establish emergency management plans allows funding and assistance to flow almost immediately after the storm has passed. If public officials are developing plans after the storm, it is already too late.

In closing, let me say to my colleagues again, reiterate my strong support for Brock Long, and urge my colleagues to vote for his confirmation—especially now that we have entered the 2017 hurricane season. It is my hope the Senate will confirm him tomorrow at 11 a.m. with broad bipartisan support, allowing him to quickly begin the work of strengthening FEMA and helping the Agency to respond to the disasters yet to happen.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### TRIBUTE TO LEE JORDAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, for the last few months, I have been coming down to the floor to recognize someone in my State who, through acts both small and large, has made the State better for all of us. I call this person our Alaskan of the Week. What I am going to do is I am going to talk a little bit about baseball as part of the Alaskan of the Week.

We saw how important baseball is with regard to a sport that can bring Americans together. Just last week, I think people all across the country—certainly in DC and certainly here in the Senate—saw how important that is.

We had that great game—Democrats and Republicans last week coming together. I am a little biased here about the Republican team, with Senator FLAKE and Senator PAUL. We didn't win, but it was a good game. I know we are all still praying for those injured last week, Congressman SCALISE and others, but it is important to see how that great American pastime brings us together as a Nation.

There are many great things about my wonderful State. But in Alaska, baseball also brings us together. So I would like to recognize today one of the many people throughout the State who keeps the special institution of baseball alive in Alaska. This gentleman's name is Lee Jordan. He is from Eagle River.

Now, I would venture to guess that most people, when they think of Alaska, think about our spectacular mountains and glaciers. They might think about fishing, our delicious salmon, thousands of miles of State and Federal parks, and our vast wilderness. But baseball probably isn't the first thing that comes to many people's mind when they think about Alaska.

Actually, those who follow baseball understand how important Alaska summers are to taking young college students with raw talent and growing them under the midnight Sun into seasoned, professional baseball players. This is the Alaska Baseball League, and it is one of the premier baseball leagues in the summer in the United States.

Let me give you a few names of those who have come up through the Alaska Baseball League. It has produced some of the most important Major League stars, including Mark McGwire, Barry Bonds, Tom Seaver, Dave Winfield, and Randy Johnson, just to name a few. I think those are all hall of famers.

Alaska's six-team league includes two teams in Anchorage, one in Fairbanks, one in Palmer, one in Kenai, and—thanks to the unrelenting enthusiasm of Lee Jordan—one in Chugiak-Eagle River, AK, a picturesque area about 20 minutes from Anchorage, nestled in the Chugiak Mountains. It is part of Anchorage, but it is also very much its own place, with a sense of pride and people who live there like Lee.

Let me tell you a little bit about Lee Jordan. He was originally from Alabama, where football, not baseball, was king. When he enlisted in the Army in 1947, his choice of overseas assignments was, according to him, "anything but Alaska"—"anyplace but Alaska." But he got Alaska, and he stayed and he

loved it, and he settled in Chugiak-Eagle River.

Before long, he owned the local newspaper, the Alaska Star—now the Chugiak-Eagle River Star—and he was coaching his son's Little League baseball team. When they got too old for Little League, he began to form new leagues for them to play in, which his boys did. Eventually, his sons got too old for all the leagues, but Lee kept up the love of the game.

Then he and former State Senator Bill Stoltze, a good friend of mine and another huge booster of baseball in Alaska, hatched a plan to get a team to their area as part of the Alaska Baseball League. So the first Chugiak-Eagle River-Chinook game was in 2011, and it is now called the Lee Jordan Field and the Loretta French Sports Complex, and they have been going strong ever since.

This is such a beautiful place. Right now in Alaska every year, we have a midnight Sun baseball game in Fairbanks played on June 21, the summer solstice, the longest day of the year. That game begins at 10:30 p.m. and goes until the wee hours of the morning under a never-setting midnight Sun.

But there are few more beautiful places in the world than Chugiak-Eagle River. Lee Jordan thinks the ballpark is the most beautiful ballpark anywhere, and I can't disagree.

As I have mentioned many times on the floor, it is all about communities. It is all about communities coming together, and Lee has made that happen for Alaskans and baseball lovers, not only in our great State but throughout the country. For that reason, he is our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we have a number of us gathered here this evening because we are so, so appalled—and that is the word—by the process that is going on with healthcare.

The idea that we could affect one-sixth of the Nation's economy—the life and death, literally, of millions of Americans; the whole structure of our healthcare system, affecting doctors, nurses, and rural hospital workers—and that we could do all of that in such darkness, behind such closed doors is the greatest miscarriage of legislative practice that I have seen since I have been here in the House and Senate.

We heard our colleagues, when the ACA came up, talk about an open process: Read the bill. My good friend the leader will say: Well, we are going to have an amendment process. No, we are not. Unless we change reconciliation, we will have a mere 10 hours of debate on our side and then amendments seriatim for something as important as this? To say that we are having regular

order, to say that we are having an amendment process, in all due respect, is a joke.

Let me go over when we were in charge to show the complete contradiction. The Senate Finance Committee held more than 50 hearings—Democrats and Republicans.

How many hearings has the Senate Finance Committee had on this bill, this unknown bill? None. On the House bill—they are using the House bill, as I understand it, as a model. None.

A markup, 8 days—can we get any commitment from our friends on the Republican side that we will have 8 days of markup in the Finance Committee when their bill is ready? I doubt it. Some 130 amendments were considered. Two dozen Republican amendments were agreed to—all in the committee process.

Then, a bill went to the HELP Committee. There were 47 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs. They considered nearly 300 amendments during the 13-day markup. That was one of the longest in history, as it should have been on such a major bill. There were 160 Republican amendments. Our ranking member on the HELP Committee couldn't be here because of plane delays, but she will augment that when she gets here.

The Senate Finance Committee posted its legislation online for 6 days before the markup. I ask rhetorically of my friend the majority leader: When his bill is ready, is it going to be posted for 6 days prior to debate or markup? Are the American people, our doctors, our nurses, our patients, and the cancer care groups going to get a chance to see it? I doubt it. That is not what it seems like.

The Senate spent 25 consecutive days in session on healthcare reform. Again, I would ask my friend the leader, rhetorically: How many days are we going to spend on it under reconciliation?

So, my friends, this is a travesty. Ask yourself, America: Why are our Republican colleagues rushing through a bill in the dark of night?

I will tell you why. They don't want you, Mr. and Mrs. American, to know about this bill. They don't want you to see that it cuts healthcare for millions. They don't want you to see that it will reduce opioid treatment. They don't want you to see that it will hurt people in nursing homes. They don't want you to see that millions will lose coverage and many more will get such minimal coverage that it will not help them unless, God forbid, they get the most serious of illnesses. That is what they don't want you to see.

They are not going to get away with it because we know one thing: Even if the Senators don't get to see the bill and even if the leader, who is a very good political person, gets 51 votes, the American people will then see the bill, and they will be aghast. They will wonder why they believed President

Trump's promises that costs would go down and benefits would go up. They will wonder why they believed the promises that he would not cut Medicaid, Medicare, or Social Security.

It is no conciliation to us, but our Republican friends—House, Senate, White House—will reap the whirlwind. It would be better for them—for them—to debate the bill in open process, even if they keep all their votes, because people will learn about the bill.

When you do a bill in the dark of night, things happen that no one knows about. There are unintended consequences that only a thorough vetting can reveal. When you do things in the dark of night, there are individual accommodations that are made that are going to look ugly when they become public. So the only consolation we will have on this side—small consolation that it is—the political blunder that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are making that will not serve them well.

I would make one more point. So why are they doing it this way? Why are they being so irrational, hurting people, doing it in the dark of night? One reason. We know who the paymaster is here, we know who the motivator is—the handful of wealthy Americans who will get a huge tax break, benefiting from taking the dollars of healthcare away from millions of average Americans. That is what really runs the other side of the aisle. I had hoped it wouldn't run Donald Trump. He didn't campaign like that, but it is running him too. That is the reason and the only reason.

We will fight hard to prevent this bill from occurring. We will use the procedural means we have, small as they might be. We will. It is a small consolation to us, again, that our Republican colleagues will pay such an awful price to help their wealthy donors.

Maybe it is not too late. Maybe the leader or maybe some of his colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say that as much as they might disagree with the ACA, to have a process in the dark of night is wrong.

We would welcome discussion. That is why we wrote the leader and asked him to have a closed session in the Old Senate Chamber with Democrats and Republicans—without the press, without anything else—to talk to each other. Maybe he will reconsider his rejection of that.

I have a few parliamentary inquiries.

First, is the Chair aware of the number of consecutive days in session and the number of hours the Senate considered H.R. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary of the Senate's office notes that H.R. 3590 was considered on each of 25 consecutive days of session, and the Senate Library estimates approximately 169 hours in total consideration.

Mr. SCHUMER. Twenty-five days of consecutive session on a bill that was partisan in the sense that Republicans were angry with it, but we still had the courage of our convictions to have a debate on the floor.

The second Parliamentary inquiry: Is the Chair aware that a 25-consecutive-day period of session ranks second in terms of the longest period of consecutive session in the history of the U.S. Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the Chair is aware of that.

Mr. SCHUMER. Again, when the shoe was on the other foot, we Democrats, knowing we would take brickbats, knowing there would be criticism, but for the good of the process and the good of the country, we were willing to have debate, hearings, and amendments. Unless there is a dramatic change or I am misreading where my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going, they are not going there.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.R. 1628

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that no motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, be in order until the bill has been the subject of a public hearing in the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I remember full well 7 years ago. Senator Reid was the majority leader, and we were called into session the Monday after Thanksgiving, and we stayed here 7 days a week until Christmas Eve. So why did we stay in session 7 days a week, from the Monday after Thanksgiving until Christmas Eve? Our Democratic friends didn't want anybody to go home. They didn't want anybody to go home and have to explain what they were in the process of writing in the majority leader's office.

I think it is pretty safe to say that this subject has been very partisan from the beginning. Not a single Republican voted for the bill, and our friends on the other side have made it perfectly clear that no Democrats will be voting to replace it.

So through that process, when our colleagues on the other side had 60 votes at the time, ObamaCare was imposed on our country. Over the last 7 years, we have all witnessed and debated its many failures. Over the last 7 years, Republicans have offered ideas on a better way forward. Over the last 7 years, Democrats have worked to prevent Congress from acting. Basically, it is the same dynamic that we see today: ObamaCare continues to collapse, Republicans are working to implement better ideas, and Democrats are trying to prevent Congress from acting. I regret that Democrats announced their intention early on that they didn't want to be a part of a serious bipartisan process to move past the

failures of this law. Congress still has a responsibility to act, and the reconciliation process will allow us to do so.

Later, after that period in late 2009, our Democratic friends used reconciliation to force ObamaCare on Americans. It is a process that can be used in 2017, the same way they used it in 2010, to move beyond its failures.

I would remind colleagues of what happens when legislation comes to the floor under reconciliation. The minority leader is somehow arguing that reconciliation is not an open process. It is an open process. There is an unlimited number of amendments.

First, the bill text is received. Then a CBO score is issued. Members will have time to review both. After that, there is an open amendment process and a robust debate. It is the one type of amendment we have on the floor of the Senate on which no one can prevent amendments. Ultimately, at the end of the process, the Senate votes. That is how reconciliation works.

We have been debating ObamaCare's failures and what to do about them for so many years now. Members are very, very familiar with this issue. We have heard so many anguished stories from constituents who have been hurt by ObamaCare. Thankfully, at the end of the process, the Senate will have a chance to turn the page on this failed law.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I heard what the leader had to say. I think anyone who has observed the reconciliation vote-a-rama process knows it is not a robust amendment process. There are ways to correct that. Certainly, we have our differences pretty much on partisan lines between repealing ACA and amending it and making it better, but what we ought to be doing is discussing it with one another.

So I would renew my request to the majority leader. What is the harm in us gathering in the Old Senate Chamber, 100 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, and maybe trying to come together? Is there any harm? I would renew my request that he join us in that because what the American people clamor for is some kind of bipartisan coming together. We have different views on how that should occur.

You say: Repeal. Join us in repeal.

We think that would hurt millions of people.

We say: Make it better.

You say that the ACA is irretrievable. I don't agree. But why can't we join together 100 strong in the Senate Chamber, no press, and just discuss our views with one another? Maybe something bipartisan and helpful could come out of this instead of this dark, hidden process. I would renew my request.



Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I would just say to my friend, we can have a meeting of all 100 Senators here on the Senate floor with an unlimited amendment process. There will be no failure of opportunity for anybody to offer an amendment, to get a vote on it, to try to change the law. That is the way reconciliation works.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would just renew my request for one other—the leader said no. I get it.

One more. Will we have time—more than 10 hours since this is a complicated bill—to review the bill? Will it be available to us and the public for more than 10 hours before we have to vote for it, since our Republican leader has said there will be plenty of time for a process where people can make amendments? We need time to prepare those amendments.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I think we will have ample opportunity to read and amend the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will it be more than 10 hours? That is my question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I think we will have ample opportunity to read and amend the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I rest my case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, as a senior member of the U.S. Senate Finance Committee, which held more than 50 hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs on health care reform—we spent 8 days just marking up the bill in committee, considered more than 130 amendments, and more than two dozen Republican amendments were agreed to at that time in the committee—a committee that posted their legislation online for 6 days before the original committee markup; a committee that spent, with the Senate, 25 consecutive days in session on health reform—the second longest consecutive session in the history of the U.S. Senate. In total, the Senate spent more than 160 hours considering the healthcare reform legislation.

Based on that, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendments be considered in order to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, until the bill is referred jointly to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and reported favorably from the committees. This means no hearings, no bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. I have information that indicates that approximately 300 amendments were considered and that of those amendments, 161 amendments offered by Republican

members of the committee were adopted during the consideration of S. 1679. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary of the Senate's office, through the Senate Library, cannot confirm the total number considered but can confirm that 161 Republican amendments were adopted.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, be referred to the Committee on Finance for the purpose of conducting a public hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Am I correct in stating that the text of S. 1796 and S. 1679 were posted on the websites for the respective committees, each for 6 days? The Affordable Care Act was posted on the websites of the respective committees, each of them, actually for 6 days prior to committee consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary of the Senate's office, through the Senate Library, confirms that each committee posted its legislation online for 6 days prior to consideration.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, with the hope for regular order, the hope for committee process, the hope for transparency, the hope for the chance for the Senate to work as it was intended, I ask unanimous consent that no motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, be in order until the bill has been the subject of executive session meetings in the Committee on Finance, during which amendments from the majority and minority received votes, and the bill has been favorably reported from the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider H.R. 1628 or any amendment offered to H.R. 1628 unless the Director of the Congressional Budget Office certifies that H.R. 1628 or any amendment offered to the bill will not cause a single veteran to lose health insurance coverage as a result of the bill's Medicaid cuts, potential loss of marketplace tax credits for veterans, or removal of critical patient protections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, this past Friday, when I was back in Penn-

sylvania, I had the opportunity to meet a family whom I have referred to very often on the floor—the Simpson family. Rowan Simpson, their son, is on the autism spectrum. I have talked a lot about Rowan's disability in the context of the healthcare debate.

We have now the beginnings of a debate about what will be in the Senate bill, if one emerges. If we are going to be up front about what happens to families and individuals like Rowan, I think it would be important to know what happens to a family who has a loved one with a disability in the context of both the Senate bill and the House bill merging.

Madam President, on behalf of Rowan and families who have loved ones with disabilities, I ask unanimous consent that no motion to proceed to calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, be in order until the bill is jointly referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, one of the things that I would most like to work on is the cost of prescription drugs. I think we should be making sensible changes to the Affordable Care Act, but the bill that came over from the House does not really do that at all. Whether it is bringing the cost of drugs down for seniors by having negotiations under Medicare Part D or whether it is allowing for less expensive drugs to come in—probably generic drugs or from other countries—the bill just does not do that. Now, supposedly, a bill is being considered here, but it is being done in secret. So I cannot have my say.

For any bill in the Senate, committees meet and debate and vote on amendments that are offered by Senators on both sides of the aisle. We need to hear ideas from Members of both parties as to how to fix this bill—in the HELP Committee, for starters. I ask that we agree today that the bill will not come to the floor until the HELP Committee has had an open meeting and has considered amendments from both parties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, be in order until the bill has been the subject of executive session meetings in the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, during which amendments from the majority and minority will have received votes and the bill will have been reported favorably from the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Is there objection?



Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1376

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, this healthcare bill will affect over 5 million Californians. That is why it is so important that this bill goes to the committees that are in charge of healthcare. It is so that it can get a hearing and members can discuss it and consider changes, and so that the public can understand what is in it. Any bill that is going to bypass our normal floor procedures and be voted on with only one party being heard and being on board should at least go through committee and have an open hearing process.

The Democrats introduced a bill to change our process in order to say exactly that any bill that gets the expedited, simple majority reconciliation process of passing the Senate has to at least go through committee and have a hearing.

I now ask my colleagues to agree to immediately consider that bill so that we can fix this process before this healthcare bill comes to the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget be discharged from further consideration of S. 1376 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.R. 1628

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, last year, nearly 2,000 people in Massachusetts died from opioid overdoses. If the same number had died in America, it would have been 100,000 people. Thank God that because of the Affordable Care Act, many of those people received treatment who otherwise would have passed away last year. The number would have been a much larger number across our State and across the country. Because of the Affordable Care Act, the number was low, but that number was still much too high.

I want to be able to tell the people in Massachusetts what the impact of the Republican healthcare bill will be on their families in terms of getting access to the opioid addiction treatment they will need so that the number does not continue to go up but to go down. I want to be able to tell them what that coverage will be before I vote upon it, but the majority will just not let that happen. They are keeping the bill hidden. They do not plan to make it public until the very last minute, with our having less than a day to view it before we vote upon it. That will be catastrophic for those families who need opioid addiction treatment—absolutely catastrophic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, be in order until the bill has been the subject of executive session meetings in the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, during which amendments from the majority and minority received votes and the bill has been reported favorably from the committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I am very worried about people who have preexisting conditions. I have watched two of my best friends survive cancer this year. They have both had intensive treatments, surgeries, and chemotherapy. They both have young daughters. I cannot imagine how worried they are right now because they do not know what is in this healthcare bill, and they do not know whether or not they will actually be able to afford any insurance coverage. I am worried about millions of Americans who may not have access to affordable insurance under this bill because we have not read it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it not be in order to proceed to Calendar No. 120, otherwise known as the American Health Care Act, until the full text of the bill is available to the public for review and comment for a minimum of 30 days—that is the same amount of time we give everyday regulations that come out of our agencies—because this bill could have such a negative effect on millions of Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not think we should vote on a bill that would touch every single human being in this country when one party is locked out of the debate—not able to read the bill and not able to discuss it and help make suggestions and changes. I think that families all across this country should be able to see this bill and be able to evaluate the impact on themselves and on their families.

I am here today, in part, because of a little boy named Nicholas, who was born way too early, who is 2 years old, and who just received a diagnosis of autism, in addition to his other medical challenges. Nicholas is a recipient of Medicaid. I talked to his mother today. She wants to know whether this bill is going to cut Nicholas' care and what this means for Nicholas and his future.

I think it is wrong for Republicans to push through a bill when Nicholas' mother cannot evaluate what the impact will be on her and on her child. So I believe we should post online any bill that is going to affect families like theirs.

Mr. President, for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that a substitute or perfecting substitute amendment offered to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, not be in order if the text of the amendment has not been filed at the desk and made available on a public website for at least 72 hours, along with an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office of the bill's budgetary, coverage, and cost implications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Hawaii.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, we Democrats are here on the floor to take a stand against a bill that is a disaster for our Nation's healthcare—Medicaid patients, families with loved ones in nursing homes, people who struggle with opioid addiction, women who rely on Planned Parenthood, and people who work in the healthcare industry. We stand with them and for them tonight, but we also stand for the American public, who is being left in the dark about what TrumpCare will mean for them.

This is not the normal order of Senate business. The Republicans are going about this in a way that is so procedurally flawed that it is an embarrassment to democracy itself. They are hiding this bill. They are hiding this bill because people will be outraged when they find out what is in it.

That is why a Republican aide said that they are not releasing the bill—because “we aren't stupid.” Think about what that statement means. First, it means that they have a bill. Second, it means that they think it is political suicide to make the bill public. So they are bypassing the normal and necessary process that is needed to make good legislation.

The way you make legislation is to allow the Sun to shine in, and that starts with hearings. Every legislative body in the country—from a school board to a county council—has hearings because we have figured out over the centuries—for all of our flaws—that you need hearings, not just to placate the masses but to figure out whether your legislation is any good or not.

Republicans have not held a single hearing on TrumpCare. No one who knows anything about healthcare is allowed to say anything about this bill because they are not even allowed to see it, but anyone who has ever tried to understand the American healthcare

system knows that it is complicated. The President said so himself. You need expert testimony, public input, and time to talk to your home State. That is the way you get a good product, but Republicans have totally bypassed the two committees that exist in order to consider legislation like this.

Think about it. Under normal circumstances, this legislation would be in the Finance and HELP Committees' jurisdictions. There would be hearings, and there would be a markup, but that is not the process that is being used. There is no markup. There are no committee hearings. It is just 13 dudes, and they are rushing to pass a bill without women, without Democrats, and without input from the American people. Here is the order of the people who get to see the healthcare bill: 13 men in secret, Republican lobbyists, POLITICO, Republicans, Democrats, and, then, the American people.

This is shameful. This is a violation of the way democracy itself should work. When they are done, the product will be the fruit from the poisonous tree. It will not be good because the process that will have produced it will have been so flawed.

There are many, many Americans who do not support this bill, and I am going to highlight just three groups who stand to lose.

First, you have people who are going to pay more for insurance, lose their insurance altogether, or lose the ability to choose their providers. Families will not be able to afford nursing home care for their loved ones or to pay the hospital bills for a parent after she has had a heart attack. Americans who have preexisting conditions will struggle to buy insurance because insurance companies will be able to charge more for conditions like diabetes or cancer or asthma. Women will be blocked from getting annual checkups or cancer screenings at their local Planned Parenthood clinics. All of these people stand to lose if the bill moves forward.

Second, you have people whose jobs may be at risk. Healthcare makes up about one-sixth of the American economy, and it does not exist in a vacuum. It is an industry that impacts millions of workers, and you can bet that those jobs will be affected by this bill. One study found that TrumpCare will take away nearly 1 million jobs by the year 2026. We are supposed to be helping American workers, not taking away their jobs or making it harder for them to get healthcare.

Finally, this bill hurts the working poor. These are the people who will struggle even more under TrumpCare, and I do not know why we would punish them. Why would we leave them with nowhere to turn? I know that millions of Americans feel the same way that I do. They care deeply about the poor, the vulnerable, and the sick

among us, because they have made news in standing up for their neighbors.

One woman named Jessie went to a town hall to make her voice heard on TrumpCare, and I want to read what she said:

It is my understanding the ACA mandate requires everybody to have insurance because the healthy people pull up the sick people, right? And as a Christian, my whole philosophy on life is pull up the unfortunate. So the individual mandate, that's what it does. The healthy people pull up the sick. If we take those people and put them in high-risk insurance pools, they're costlier and there's less coverage for them. That's the way it's been in the past, and that's the way it will be again. So we are effectively punishing our sickest people.

Look, we may not agree on policy, but I hope we can agree on the process. So what will it take? What will it take for this process to be restored and for TrumpCare to be considered in the way that it ought to be considered?

The answer is actually very straightforward. We need three Republicans. It only takes three Republicans, and you can be a person who hates the Affordable Care Act or has mixed feelings about the Affordable Care Act or anywhere in between. It only takes three Republicans in the U.S. Senate to restore the U.S. Senate itself—to restore the hearing process, to restore public confidence, and to restore bipartisanship.

All we need are three Republican Senators to say: I will not vote for anything if there hasn't been a public hearing. I will not vote for anything that is being jammed down Americans' throats. I will not vote for anything without being able to go back home and figure out how it will impact my State's hospitals.

This is not an unreasonable task. We are just asking for three Republicans to say: Let's be a Senate again. Let's restore order and transparency and do things the right way because that is the only way this bill will not be a total disaster.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am grateful for the recognition. I am grateful for my colleague from Hawaii and for my colleagues from across the country who are going to be coming to the floor tonight.

This is going to be a long evening because there are a lot of folks who are frustrated. There is frustration not just about the actual bill itself, a lot of this frustration right now is building because of the brokenness of this process. It is a process that is right now about secrecy. It is a process that has been conducted behind closed doors in back rooms. It is a process that is not reflective of our history, of our traditions, or of the many calls from both sides of the aisle, in my short time in

the Senate, hearing echoes of a chorus from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who talk about regular order, regular order, regular order.

Several of my colleagues and I earlier were asking for unanimous consent—trying to use the process of the Senate to bring about a better process—a process that would bring this legislation out into the light of day and create an opportunity reflective of the Affordable Care Act, where we would have people able to put input into this process. A debate would happen. Discussion would happen. Actually, we would come forward with a bill the American public would see go through the debates.

In fact, through the process, the very Constitutional Convention of this country—perhaps some of the biggest issues of humanity—were debated in an open forum. We have records of those discussions, records of those deliberations. Everything from the representation that each State should have to issues as profound as slavery were right there, out in the open. Tonight, it is remarkable to me, it is almost tragic to me, to see a process that is so broken, a process that is so secretive, a process happening in back rooms—everything Americans dislike about politics of old—people working in secret on a bill they are going to try to force through Congress with no public input, no hearings, no meetings, no markups, no debate, no public accountability.

So there will be a lot of voices tonight speaking about the realities of this legislation. I am one of those folks. I came from a children's hospital this afternoon with parents and with children who suffered accidents—car accidents and more—telling me how they were relying on Medicaid. I think it is one of the most terrifying things that is about to happen because people look at the House bill—a bill our President even called mean—and they are fearing for their own communities, fearing for families like theirs.

I understand the substance of this bill should have many people afraid about what kind of country we are going to be when we look at the House version of the bill and see that it violates our common values and ideals as a nation—to give massive tax breaks worth hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars to the wealthiest and, at the same time, cut the social safety net to a degree we haven't seen in my lifetime. The substance of this is frightening, but the process, to me, violates the values I know so many of my colleagues hold and that any of us, watching this happen in an objective way, would criticize.

We know the starting place in the House. We know the details of that bill—23 million Americans losing health insurance, the gutting of Medicaid by \$800 billion, throwing one-sixth of our economy into crisis, but it

is the process that is fundamentally at odds with the principles and the values of especially this body, the Senate. When I was running for this office, I had so many people come to me and say: This is the greatest deliberative body on the planet Earth—the Senate—which slows things down, the saucer that cools the tea as our ancestors said. This body has a history of grappling with issues. This process is so at odds with everything I believe about this body and how it is supposed to operate. The Senate is meant to be a place of powerful consideration of debate, of discussion.

Now, the history of this body and its debates and discussions is really interesting. The longest consecutive session in Senate history was a debate during the First World War about whether to arm merchant ships. That is the record. By the way, issues of war and peace I would hope would bring about substantive, deliberative debate, discussion, open air. This body is probably—in fact, the elder statesmen and women in this body I have spoken to on both sides of the aisle, sometimes the most difficult decisions they have made are involving war and peace. What is interesting, if you look at the history of the body, the longest consecutive session debate was about war and whether to arm merchant ships in the First World War.

What was the second longest debate? The second longest consecutive session in Senate history was actually healthcare, or, more specifically, it was the healthcare debate in 2010 about the Affordable Care Act or so-called ObamaCare. In fact, here we are looking at a process that seems to be screaming something to the floor: No hearings, no markups, no committee sessions—screaming to the floor in the shadow of the second longest consecutive session of debate. That, to me, is a contrast that speaks volumes about the wrongness of this moment in history. Anyone objectively standing back would agree and concur that for something that is so deeply at the core of what our country is about—we literally founded this Nation because of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—life. What more fundamental aspect of life is there?

A critical constituent part of that has to be how we preserve life, how we embolden life. What is the state of our healthcare? For this great, historic, deliberative body to be doing that without so much as a pause, with the brilliant minds on both sides of this aisle, with the thoughtful people on both sides of this aisle, people who have come through portals and processes where they expose themselves and their lives to public discussion, public debate—that is what a democracy is, and that is what this Republic was founded upon, not secrecy, not back rooms.

This body reflects the best of what democratic principles are. Now we are rushing something through that fundamentally affects life, and we are pushing it to the floor with an insult to our history, an insult to our values.

It has been said before, but I remind my colleagues that the Affordable Care Act had a lengthy process before that near recordbreaking consecutive days of session. The Senate's HELP Committee held 14 bipartisan roundtables, 13 bipartisan hearings, 20 bipartisan walkthroughs, and considered nearly 300 amendments. The Affordable Care Act actually accepted over 160 amendments—160 Republican amendments to shape the bill.

The Finance Committee held 17 roundtables, summits, and hearings; 13 bipartisan Member meetings and walkthroughs, 38 meetings and negotiations, and then a 7-day markup on the bill—the longest markup in over 20 years. That is our history. In the end, the Affordable Care Act went through a lengthy process, through which the policy experts, market experts, medical professionals, health nonprofits, insurers, hospitals, and families all came to this Senate and put forward their input and their ideas.

This wasn't a Republican bill or a Democratic bill by the politicians themselves. America was invited to the table. Hours and hours of hearing records show that people—whether the bill ended up reflecting their ideas or not—had their say. That is what is beautiful about this democracy, is that the dignity and the voice and the opinions of others is brought into the process.

I was mayor of Newark during the time that this process was going on. People in my community were riveted by it. They knew that issues that would affect their lives were going on here in the U.S. Senate, at a time when the No. 1 reason for personal bankruptcy in my State was because people were declaring bankruptcy because of their healthcare bills—something that is not happening now at those levels.

People were caring and concerned about what was going on, and representatives from my community came down. I saw how that process shaped the bill. I saw how Republican ideas shaped the bill. I saw how hospitals and insurers and advocates and doctors and nonprofits, the AARP, and others let their voices be heard, shaped the process, had input, had voice, and their dignity and perspectives were respected.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a moment? The majority leader has returned to the floor to hear a unanimous consent request—actually two of them—which we will make very brief and then yield back to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I fully yield to the majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.R. 1628

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this weekend, I was out doing townhalls in rural Oregon. I was in Klamath County and Lake County—counties that on any map would be described as solidly red. At my townhalls, people were turning out with one huge anxiety; that is, the healthcare bill that might be considered next week, with no consideration in committee, no consideration for amendments, no opportunity for experts to weigh in, and, most importantly, no opportunity for the citizens of America to weigh in.

So two veterans came up to me after one of the townhalls, at the Paisley Saloon, and they asked: Does DC understand the despair, the anxiety in rural Oregon over this healthcare bill plan? The answer, of course, at this point is no, but we hope the answer will be yes.

Then I was visiting a nursing home, and two different individuals I spoke to noted that virtually everyone on long-term care was there through Medicaid. They said: You know, if we lose Medicaid, we are out on the street. As one woman said: I will be out on the street, and I can't walk so that is a problem. Well, yes, it is a problem for folks on long-term care to be dumped onto the street.

That is why, at this moment, I am asking for our normal process for any bill, any modest bill, but certainly a major bill to get thorough democratic consideration in this beautiful, "we the people," democratic Republic, and that means committee hearings, that means experts testifying, and that means input from citizens.

Mr. President, that is why I ask unanimous consent that no motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, be in order until the bill has been the subject of executive session meetings in the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, during which amendments from the majority and the minority have the opportunity to be presented and considered, and the American people have the chance to weigh in, and the bill has been reported favorably from the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, when I was home in Massachusetts this weekend, I constantly had people coming up to me and asking me about the secret Republican healthcare bill—what is in it and how it is going to affect their families—because, to use Donald Trump's words, they are afraid that it is going to increase premiums, and that would be mean; that it is going to make it possible for insurers to deny coverage for preexisting conditions,

and that would be mean; that it would create an age tax for older Americans, and that would be mean; that it would cut Medicaid coverage for grandma and grandpa to get a nursing home bed if they had Alzheimer's, and that would be mean.

So the question that kept coming to me all weekend was, is this secret bill really meant to cut all of the funding that goes for the poor, the sick, the elderly, and the disabled so they can give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America? Can we get that out so people can see that?

They also said to me that they didn't want to be fooled, because their fear is that TrumpCare is as much a healthcare bill as Trump University was a college institution and that there really isn't any healthcare in it and that it is cruel, inhumane, and immoral.

So we are demanding that the Republicans show us the bill so the American people can see the bill and understand what is in it because the consequences for their family's health are so dramatic.

As a result, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, be referred jointly to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report the bill with changes to eliminate provisions that, No. 1, increase health insurance costs; No. 2, reduce coverage; No. 3, make healthcare less affordable for those with preexisting conditions; and No. 4, reduce tax liabilities for corporations and individuals with incomes over \$1 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I recognize my more senior Senator is here from Delaware, so I suspend at this time in deference to an opportunity for the senior Senator from Delaware to have a few words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank my friend for yielding. I take the train back and forth from time to time to my home State. I am going to try to get on a train later tonight to go home. Thank you for letting me have a few minutes.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I was elected to the Senate in 2000. I came here in 2001. Two days after I was elected, I called Tom Daschle, the Democratic leader in the Senate, and I said: I understand I need to explain my choice and preferences for committees to you.

He said: Yes. You should give me a letter today that tells me which committees you would like to be on.

I am not sure how they work it on the Republican side, but that is the way we did it here and, I presume, still do.

I said: My first three choices to be on committees would be—my first choice would be the Finance Committee, my second choice would be the Finance Committee, and my third choice would be the Finance Committee.

He said: You want to be on the Finance Committee, don't you?

I said: Yes, I do.

He said: So does everybody else. You have to get in line.

So I did. It took me 8 years. I got on some great committees in the interim, including the Banking Committee, Commerce, Environment and Public Works, Homeland Security, Governmental Affairs, and others as well, even Aging for a while. Eventually I got on the Finance Committee—in 2009. That was the year we had a new President, Barack Obama, and a new Vice President, Joe Biden. The hope from our new leaders was that we would do something Presidents since Harry Truman have wanted to do, and that was to provide healthcare coverage for just about everybody in our country. We weren't sure exactly how to go about it.

We did our homework and found that in 1993, when First Lady Hillary Clinton came up and worked on something called HillaryCare, the Republicans felt like they had to come up with an alternative, which was provided by the people at Heritage, a Republican think tank. What they came up with had five components to it and was introduced as stand-alone legislation by John Chafee and cosponsored by ORRIN HATCH, CHUCK GRASSLEY, and I think about 20 other Republican Senators.

In the end, HillaryCare didn't go anywhere. The Chafee bill didn't go anywhere, but it lived on beyond 1993 and that Congress. When Mitt Romney was Governor of Massachusetts and was going to run for President, he took that 1993 legislation, which called for creating exchanges in every State and marketplaces and large purchasing pools where people who didn't have healthcare coverage could buy healthcare coverage in their State. The 1993 legislation had sliding-scale tax credits so people buying coverage on the exchanges could get a tax credit to help buy down the cost of their coverage. The idea was that folks whose incomes were low would get a bigger tax credit, and those whose incomes got larger and larger would eventually not qualify for anything at all. But there was a sliding-scale tax credit.

Another provision in the 1993 legislation Mitt Romney borrowed was the idea of having individual mandates so that people had to get coverage in Massachusetts, and if they didn't, they had to pay a fine. The idea was that we need for folks to get coverage. We need

to make sure these exchanges—if they were going to have them in the State, that they wouldn't have people just sign up for coverage in the exchanges when they get sick and run up the tab a lot for the insurance companies. The insurance companies said they couldn't make money doing that. So in Massachusetts, they had the individual mandate.

They also had an employer mandate that employers with a certain number of employees had to provide coverage for their people. They didn't have to pay for it all, but they had to offer them coverage.

The last thing Governor Romney took from the 1993 legislation by Senator Chafee and others was the idea that insurance companies could not deny coverage to folks with preexisting conditions.

Mitt Romney thought those were pretty good ideas and made them sort of the centerpiece of what they called RomneyCare in Massachusetts, which became the law and ultimately extended coverage to a lot of people who didn't have it.

Initially, they didn't do a very good job on affordability. I am told by folks in Massachusetts that one of the reasons was that the fine associated with the individual mandate wasn't very big. Eventually it was scaled up, but it took a while to get to a point where young people said: I am paying this fine; I may as well get coverage and stop paying the fine and get something for my money.

RomneyCare ended up being pretty successful. He ran for President, and one of the linchpins he used is, look, we have already done what Barack Obama wants to do. We are already providing healthcare coverage for people in my state.

In any event, in 2009 I ended up on the Finance Committee. We spent a huge amount of time in 2009 trying to figure out what this healthcare plan should look like that our new President and new Vice President wanted us to do. It looked a lot like what was offered in 1993, and it looked a lot like what was actually adopted and I think worked with relative success in Massachusetts.

We held a lot of hearings. I remember being on the Finance Committee. It seemed like for week after week after week, we had hearings, we had roundtables, we had discussions, we had meetings off the floor and on the floor to talk about whether it made sense. We went for an extended period of time where we had three Democrats and three Republicans on the committee who met endlessly to try to figure out what the reasonable compromises were that would enable us to extend coverage to everybody in an affordable kind of way.

We ended up having an extensive markup, voting, and debating the legislation in both the Finance Committee

and the HELP Committee. People had the opportunity to offer amendments, a number of which were offered and adopted by Democrats and Republicans alike. I don't remember exactly, but I seem to recall that in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, something like 300 amendments may have been offered, 160 by Republicans that were adopted.

Long story short, we finally had a chance to finish the debate, and it became law.

I know our Republican friends don't feel like they had much of a chance to be involved, but my recollection is that there was a lot of involvement by both sides. I thought at times that the debate on this legislation would never end. It finally did, and we finally passed it on a close margin.

The reason I bring this up is that was my first year on the Finance Committee. I loved it. I was on there with Senator STABENOW and a number of others, and we were actually legislating. It was fun. It was challenging. We were trying to develop consensus. I want us to do that again.

As good as we think the Affordable Care Act is, I know it is not perfect. I think everybody in this Chamber knows it is not perfect. But the idea of preserving what needs to be preserved and fixing what needs to be fixed is what we ought to be about.

As smart as our Republican friends are, they can't do this by themselves, and as smart as we like to think we are, neither can we. In this case, we would be a lot better off doing this together. I know Senator SCHUMER has asked the Republican leader for us to meet later this week—maybe Thursday—in the Old Senate Chamber and just talk it over.

John Kennedy used to say that we shouldn't be afraid to negotiate. He had a great quote about being afraid. He basically said we should never be afraid to negotiate or talk. I think that probably pertains to us today.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding his time to me to give me a chance to say something again to my Republican colleagues.

I was in Tanzania, Africa, a couple of years ago for an Aspen Institute seminar with Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate. I learned a lot about Africa. One of the things I learned was a great African proverb. A lot of people have heard it; I had never heard it before. It goes something like this: If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together. On something this important, we need to go together, and we will be glad we did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, Senator CARPER talked about Tanzania. It reminds me of a greeting I have often heard from people who live in various African countries. When you meet

someone for the first time, instead of what we would normally say—"Pleased to meet you"—the greeting is "I see you." I see you. I think that really is part of our concern here: Do we see the people who will be impacted in the way they are actually living their lives, and do we understand, if we see them, that this bill will not be in their best interests?

Right now, for example, we know 13 Senators—all Republicans—are crafting a bill. This bill would restructure our Nation's entire healthcare system, which, when we add up what Americans spend on hospitals, doctors, prescription drugs, and all the rest, we understand it makes up one-sixth of our economy. It would affect the lives of everyone—our parents, grandparents, those who are in need of caregiving, our children struggling with asthma or opioid abuse, our spouses, who may be battling cancer.

What is equally distressing is that this bill is being written in secret. The chairman of the Finance Committee says he has not seen the bill. The Secretary of Health and Human Services says he has not seen the bill. The American people, the people we all represent, have certainly not seen the bill.

I think the American people deserve better. This bill is being written entirely along partisan lines without any attempt to bring Democrats on board, and the American people deserve better. This bill is being written and rushed through the Senate with hardly any time to debate the cost or the details of this proposal, and the American people deserve better.

I remember when our colleagues across the aisle said the Affordable Care Act was being rammed down the American people's throats in the middle of the night. The ACA, in fact, went through 106 public hearings. It incorporated more than 170 Republican amendments. The whole process took an entire year. But this healthcare plan involves no hearings, no bill text, and no transparency at all.

As Senators, we were sent here to represent the American people. We answer to the American people.

Why are my colleagues from across the aisle trying to put one over on the American people? I have met folks all across California and this country, and they see what is happening. They know that if this bill were as wonderful as its proponents would like us to believe, it would be out in the open.

The American people deserve greater transparency. Even though the authors of this proposal have tried to conceal the details of their plan, we know enough to know this bill would be nothing short of a disaster. We know because we have been told it is about 80 percent the same as the bill that was passed by the House—a bill so catastrophic that even the President of the United States who hailed its passage now calls it "mean."

We know it would throw 23 million Americans off their health insurance within a decade, including putting 4 to 5 million Californians at risk of losing coverage. We know it would raise costs for middle-class families and seniors. In every county of California, average monthly premium costs would go up while financial support to pay premiums would fall.

We know it would put Americans with preexisting conditions at risk and leave people who need maternity care or opioid treatment without coverage or force them to pay huge out-of-pocket costs. We know it would cut about \$834 billion from Medicaid, which means less money for families to pay for nursing homes, to support children with special needs, or to treat substance abuse. We need the Affordable Care Act to be in place, in a way that we fix what is wrong, but we mend what is broken and not repeal it altogether.

I recently visited a really remarkable treatment clinic in Los Angeles. It is called the Martin Luther King Jr. Outpatient Center. Everyone from the doctors to the patients can tell you that when 4,600 Californians are dying every year from substance abuse and opioid overdoses, it is wrong and irrational to cut Medicaid.

It really makes you wonder why anyone would support this bill. How does this bill help real people with real challenges?

At a healthcare rally in Los Angeles in January, I met a woman named Tonia. Before the ACA, she had signed up for insurance just long enough to see a doctor, have a few tests done, and fill a prescription. Then she would realize she couldn't pay and couldn't afford to pay for the insurance beyond that. She said:

It's the worst feeling in the world to have to tell your doctor—who is trying to make you well—that you cannot afford the treatment prescribed.

Tonia told me:

Before the Affordable Care Act, living without health coverage was a nightmare in this country.

She went on to say:

But that has all changed, and thanks to the ACA I can now see a doctor when I need to, monitor my condition, and stay healthy so that I can keep working and contribute to our nation's economy. If the Republicans in Congress repeal the law, I don't know what I will do.

I ask, How does the Republican healthcare plan help Tonia?

Another woman, Krista, told me:

I am married with four children, one of whom is a 10-year-old type one diabetic. He requires daily active insulin management to stay alive—24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

She went on to say:

Healthcare is not optional for us; even with health insurance, diabetes management is the type of thing that can bankrupt you. Without health insurance, I can't imagine. ACA is a huge relief for my family.

I ask, How does this bill help Krista and her family?

Then, there is Rhett, in Marin County. More than 7 years ago, he was diagnosed with leukemia. Rhett is 9 years old. He says:

Cancer cells are the bad guys.

This is what he wrote me.

For 3½ years I took chemo to get the bad guys out. I had more than one thousand doses of chemotherapy. . . . My parents had to tell my sister that I might die of cancer.

And then he went on to write:

Thanks to my doctors and nurses, my family and friends, my church and my community, and the Affordable Care Act . . . now I'm Gone-with-the-Cancer. I have a pre-existing condition. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, my parents don't worry about losing coverage.

A 9-year-old Rhett is showing us the way. How does this bill help Rhett?

I don't know the party affiliation of any of these folks. I don't know if they are Democrats. I don't know if they are Republicans. I don't know if they are Independents. I don't know if they are members of the Green Party. I am not asking them those questions. I am asking them: How are you doing? What is helping you? What do you need? How will this impact you?

I know I am one of two Senators whom they have. When it comes to their needs and their need to be represented in the U.S. Congress and their need to be heard and their need to be seen, party affiliation should not matter. What should matter are the needs of the American people.

Regardless of whom they vote for in a partisan election, I am certain of this. This healthcare plan that is being proposed by my colleagues from across the aisle will not solve their problems. It will only create more problems and potentially devastate people's lives.

To my colleagues I say, this shouldn't be a matter of supporting this bill automatically if you are a Republican or objecting just because you are a Democrat; this is about what is right and what is wrong.

If you know this bill is bad, stand up and stop it. Speak that truth. Now is not the time to keep quiet and hope nobody notices. Forget the politics. Forget partisan pressure and talk radio and primary ads. Instead, just listen to the voices of the American people, not just in California but in Nevada, in Arizona, in Ohio, in Alaska, in Maine, in Pennsylvania, in West Virginia because they have made themselves overwhelmingly clear. Only 20 percent of Americans support this bill.

A majority opposes it in every State in this country. It is the least popular piece of legislation in modern history. I am asking you to think about the American people. I am asking you to think about Tonia. Think about Krista. Think about Rhett living with leukemia since he was just 2½ years old, undergoing 2½-hour infusions every night with such incredible bravery.

Let the determination of Americans like Rhett bring us together—a 9-year-old boy who tells us, in his words: "Don't repeal the Affordable Care Act, Improve it!" We all agree, the ACA can be improved. It must be improved. It isn't perfect. I am ready to work with anyone who really wants to make it better.

Instead of playing politics, instead of playing politics with public health and people's lives, we can actually work together to strengthen our healthcare system.

In fact, I am proud to have recently cosponsored a bill with Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN and a number of my Democratic colleagues. Our bill would make it safer and easier for middle-class Americans to buy insurance if they currently don't qualify for any help paying their premiums.

These are the kinds of solutions Democrats can get behind. These are the kinds of solutions that would help and not hurt the people we represent. We took an oath to represent all the people. I am asking every Member of this Chamber to think long and hard about the consequences of this bill. Think about the responsibility we have been entrusted with.

We owe it to the American people to tell the truth, not to hide it. We owe it to the American people to solve real problems, not to manufacture new ones. We owe it to the American people to do the job we were sent here to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this bill and stand up for the people we represent and serve.

I yield back.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

MS. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues to speak out on the secret healthcare legislation that Republicans are attempting to jam through the Senate without any public review or consideration.

This is an insult to the American people. It is a shameful abdication of the role of a U.S. Senator to represent the concerns and priorities of the people of a State and country. We were elected to be a voice for the people of our individual States. What I am hearing loud and clear from my State is: Keep the Affordable Care Act. Do not repeal it. Keep it, and work together to improve it.

Like my colleagues, I wish to share the story of one of the many Nevadans who have contacted me to share their story about the ACA and why they so desperately want to avoid its repeal.

Jessica and her husband own a brewery in Reno, NV, and I was lucky enough to get to meet and speak with her in person when I was home last month touring the Community Health Alliance Center.

After meeting with her, I had the opportunity to sit and talk with so many incredible people—doctors, nurses, peo-

ple who care about the very faces of women, men, and children we are talking about tonight. This is Jessica's letter to me, and this is what I would like to share with you, what she wrote to me.

Dear Senator Cortez Masto,

I am a resident of Nevada, a small business owner, and a mother. I am writing to express my views about the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act has had a tremendously positive effect on my life, and I would like to share my story with you.

The Affordable Care Act saved my small business.

When the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) was signed into law in 2010, and when it was upheld by the Supreme Court in 2012, my husband and I were in the planning stages of our small business. At the time, my family was provided health insurance through my corporate job. Knowing the ACA would take effect gave me the peace of mind to leave my job and become a full time small business owner. Today, our business, Under the Rose Brewing Company, is celebrating our 4th year in existence, and we are in the beginning stages of a large expansion, which will create many new jobs in Reno. This business would not have survived without my full-time dedication. I would not have been able to leave my corporate job without the ability to procure affordable healthcare for my family.

The Affordable Care Act allowed me to start my family in a healthy way.

As my husband and I prepared to sign up for our first year of health care with the ACA, we found out that I was pregnant. Prior to the ACA, health insurers were allowed to consider pregnancy a "pre-existing condition." Instead of being denied coverage or charged higher premiums, I was able to receive appropriate and affordable care during my pregnancy through the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act saved my life and my baby's life.

30 weeks into my pregnancy, at a regular checkup with our midwife, my husband and I were advised to see a doctor. Since I didn't look sick or feel sick, we hesitated, but our midwife was positive it would be for the best. Our insurance through ACA allowed us to see the recommended OBGYN. Half way through our appointment he became very concerned and rushed me into the hospital. My son was born by emergency C-section a few hours later. Several doctors agreed that neither the baby nor myself would have survived a further 24 hours of pregnancy. Having health insurance through the ACA allowed my husband and I to seek treatment and care without having to worry about the affordability of following doctor's orders. This is the first time I could say that the ACA saved my life and the life of my beautiful baby boy.

The Affordable Care Act saved my baby's health [and provided us with health insurance].

Thus my son was born 9 weeks early and was admitted into the NICU. He stayed in the NICU for 32 days and was under constant doctor care. By the time he left the hospital, we had incurred well over 1 million dollars in total costs. The ACA allowed him to start his life without a cap on his total lifetime healthcare coverage. Prior to the ACA, many NICU babies reach their lifetime limits before even feeling the sunshine on their faces. I am eternally grateful for this provision of the ACA.

One week after bringing our beautiful baby boy home from our hospital's NICU, I found



myself in need of emergency care for a second time. I suffered a postpartum stroke. I was taken to the emergency room and admitted to the hospital for the second time in 2 months. Again, the ACA allowed me to seek treatment and care without worrying about coverage.

The Affordable Care Act will save my son's healthcare. My son now has a medical issue with his growth. Should the ACA be repealed, amended, or replaced with something less inclusive, this issue will be considered a preexisting condition. The thought of my 18-month-old son being denied coverage, or potentially not being able to afford the healthcare offered to him, makes me sick to my stomach. Why would our lawmakers vote to take this away from him? I implore you to consider the great lengths the Affordable Care Act has gone to not only improve and save lives in my family, but families across the Great State of Nevada. I further implore you to consider the children currently covered and benefitting from the ACA as you contemplate your vote on this significant matter. I strongly urge you to defend this crucial legislation. Too many of your Nevadan constituents rely on this lifesaving, health-saving and financial-saving legislation.

Thank you for reading my story and considering my views. I am happy to speak directly with you.

Sincerely, [Jessica] and family.

Mr. President, I know Jessica's story is one of thousands. I hope my colleagues across the aisle think of Jesse and her family and the millions of Americans like her who have so much at stake while continuing to secretly rewrite our country's healthcare laws.

Thank you for listening.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the Senator from Nevada. We are so pleased that she is here and her voice is so strong for the citizens of Nevada and appreciate very much her comments this evening.

I am rising this evening to talk about an issue that affects every single person, every single family in Michigan and all across the Nation, and that is healthcare. I feel very confident that I can say that each one of the 48 members of the Democratic caucus—each and every one of us would love to be on this floor working with Republican colleagues across the aisle to lower the costs of prescription drugs, to lower the out-of-pocket costs of healthcare, to create more competition and more insurance choices for people in the insurance pools than are there now—to basically fix the problems.

I am proud to be with colleagues tonight because we are not willing to support anything that unravels the healthcare system, raises costs, takes away healthcare for people, and, on top of that, gives a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans, insurance executives, and pharmaceutical companies with the dollars that are cut.

So here we are. The House has passed a bill that, in fact, raises costs, takes away healthcare, gives the tax cuts I

talked about. Now we are in the Senate. The Republicans have a healthcare bill, but they will not let us see it.

I am the ranking Democrat on the Health Subcommittee of the Finance Committee. You would think someone would have reached out to have conversations with me and members of our subcommittee—members of our whole committee—but that has not happened. They are letting the Trump administration see it, but not the American public. They are letting K Street lobbyists see it. That is probably where I will get a copy first—through lobbyists—but not the American public, who will lose their healthcare and pay more.

If you have cancer and you are not going to be able to get coverage, if you are going to potentially be dropped or have preexisting conditions or get caps put on the number of cancer treatments you can receive, I believe you have a right to see this bill. If you have epilepsy and will lose your insurance, you have a right to see this bill. If you are a woman who will be charged more for insurance and be considered to have a preexisting condition just because you are a woman, you have a right to see this bill. If you are senior whose rates are going to go skyrocketing upward, you have a right to see this bill. But the sad fact is, Republicans don't think the American people have a right to know or to see this bill or to review it or to comment on it—to have a chance to give their opinion on it.

The difference in process couldn't be more clear between the way the Affordable Care Act was originally worked on for about 18 months and then passed and what is happening right now. In 2009, Republicans called for a fair, collaborative, and deliberative legislative process. I agree. In fact, we all agree.

From 2009 to 2010, the Senate Finance Committee held more than 53 hearings on health reform—hearings, open committee meetings, work sessions. As a new member of Finance at that time, I was involved in every single one of those, with hours and hours of listening, deliberating, people sharing their opinions, and debating. Counting the HELP Committee deliberations, there were 100 hearings and committee meetings before the bill was finalized and debated to be reported out of committee.

The Republicans have had no hearings—zero hearings. They have had no public meetings—zero public meetings.

During the Finance Committee markup, when we were working through and voting out the bill, we considered 135 amendments, often late into the night. The final Senate bill included 147 Republican amendments. In the end, we were trying to do everything we could to get bipartisan support, when it was clear that politically there was not a desire—even with 147 Republican amendments in the bill—to have a bipartisan healthcare bill.

Republicans will not even allow us to see the bill, let alone amend it. Our position is very clear. If there is no hearing, there is no vote. We need them to show us the bill.

There is, I think, a really good reason they will not show us the bill. They will not let us see it because it is a disaster for the American people. It is a disaster for the people in Michigan whom I represent.

From the House bill, we know that 14 million fewer people will be insured after the first year; 23 million fewer people will be insured after 10 years. This may change somewhat back and forth. We have no idea. But we know the general framework the Senate is working in is the same general framework as the House. We know that in 2026, according to the Congressional Budget Office, 51 million people under the age of 65 will be uninsured—no insurance.

We are told that premiums would go up 20 percent next year, and States would be allowed to opt out of key insurance laws that protect consumers. To really understand what that means—that means all of the decisions about your care go back to the insurance companies, not your doctor. Laws that protect people with preexisting conditions are gone. Rules that prevent women from being charged more are gone. Laws that prevent seniors from being charged more are gone. And the way it used to be is that if you got sick, the insurance company could decide to drop you. It was the insurance company that said how many cancer treatments you were able to receive or mental health visits, if any, you would receive. You always paid more than for physical health—the same with addiction.

This all goes away with what is being talked about here. In other words, costs are going to go up, and care is going to go down. To add insult to injury, all of this is going to go to tax cuts for multimillionaires and billionaires, to drug companies and insurance companies—while someone is losing nursing home care, cancer treatments, maternity care, and children will be unable to go to the doctor and parents forced to go back to using the emergency room.

I want to share with my colleagues what these changes would mean for people in Michigan. There are so many people I have talked to, so many stories I have heard. I received a letter from a woman named Amy who owns a small retail business in Michigan. She has health insurance through her husband's job—a small business owner. Amy has chronic myeloid leukemia. It is managed with a medication that costs \$20,000 a month—not a year, a month. After her deductible and 10-percent copay, she said she quickly reaches the maximum out-of-pocket expense on her insurance each year. Amy wrote:



Preexisting conditions, maximum out-of-pocket costs and lifetime cap costs are important to me. . . . [Without them] I could never afford my health care. Without the ACA, I could quickly bankrupt my family and still die. . . . Please consider my situation when deciding your vote on any changes to the ACA. I need your help. I want and need to stay alive and raise my children.

Healthcare reform allows Amy to stay on her husband's insurance plan and pay for the cancer treatments that are keeping her alive. The Republican plan would put people with preexisting conditions like cancer at the mercy of health insurance companies.

Here is another way the Republican plan would hurt American families. Thanks to the Medicaid expansion, 650,000 people are newly covered under what we call the Healthy Michigan Plan. The good news is, 97 percent of Michigan children can now go to the doctor. They don't have to wait and go to the emergency room. If they have a cold, their mom or dad can take them to a doctor. They can get preventive care, rather than waiting until something awful happens and going to the emergency room. What is the good news for the State of Michigan out of that? Michigan will end up, this year going into next year, with \$432 million more in the treasury. Taxpayer dollars aren't going to have to be used on healthcare because the right thing was done—creating a way for children to see a doctor. What has happened? We have a 50-percent reduction on folks who don't have insurance going into the emergency room, and it saves money when you do that. The number of people treated has gone down 50 percent—the number of people treated without insurance.

The great thing about healthcare to understand is that if we ignore it, it doesn't mean people don't get sick, that they don't get cancer, that they don't need a nursing home or that their child doesn't get sick. If you just ignore it, the costs go up because people ultimately use the most expensive ways to get treated.

If you actually plan it out and do the right thing on the front end and people can see a doctor and they can get the checkups and the care they need and the treatments they need, you actually save money. That is the example of the State of Michigan.

The Republican plan would end the Medicaid expansion. Healthy Michigan would go away. One young man in Michigan only 19 years old shared his story of living with his single mom when he was diagnosed with testicular cancer. He was working, but his employer didn't offer health insurance. He didn't have transportation to get to his appointments or treatments.

Thanks to Healthy Michigan, he got insurance and treatment at Munson Healthcare in Traverse City. He is now free from cancer, has a job with benefits, and is engaged to be married, and

we wish him well. Healthy Michigan and the Medicaid expansion saved this young man's life.

The Republican plan would end the Healthy Michigan plan, ripping coverage from 650,000 people in Michigan, including cancer patients. And for what? And for what? To pay for tax breaks for drug companies and the ultrawealthy one more time. This means Michigan families will be unable to care for their loved ones when they need it most.

In January, I led a forum on Secretary Price's healthcare policies, and a woman came from Michigan to tell her story. Ann was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis when she was 40 years old, and she has very limited use of her arms and legs. We are so grateful that she made the trip to DC to share her story. Medicare and secondary insurance cover most of the cost of her medication, which costs an astonishing \$75,000 a year. That is nearly her entire household income, including Social Security benefits.

Ann had been caring for her aging mom when her mom's dementia worsened. Ann didn't know where she would find the \$6,000 a month for nursing home care. How many families are in that situation?

Fortunately, Ann's mom qualified for Medicaid. By the way, three out of five seniors in Michigan are able to get their nursing home care through Medicaid. Three out of five are getting nursing home care because of Medicaid, including Ann's mom.

This nursing home care paid for the final 3 years of her life. Here is what Ann said:

It was only because of Medicaid that she was able to get the help that she needed at the end of her life. I don't know how I could have cared for my mother on top of managing my own care. My family would have lost our home and all our savings in trying to keep up with their bills.

Medicaid helped Ann care for her mom at the end of her life. This is a good thing.

Again, the Republican plan would cut Medicaid by \$834 billion. That is the House plan coming over. We don't know how much would be cut here, but we know whatever will be cut will be used to pay for tax breaks for drug companies, insurance CEOs, millionaires, and billionaires. How does that reflect American values?

In conclusion, Republicans are hiding their bill because they know it is a bad deal for American families. It is a bad deal. The President of the United States called it "mean." I agree with him. It is mean, and it is definitely a bad deal for the people I represent in Michigan. Costs go up and care goes down, all to cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires. We are better than this as a country. Our Nation is better than this.

It is time for Republicans to show us the bill so we can work on it together.

Give us a chance. Give the American people a chance to have input, to say what they think before it is forced on them in a secret process that is rammed through this floor. It is time to move beyond partisanship to get something done for the American people.

Again, I know that the 48 Democratic Senators in this Chamber want to work on lowering the cost of prescription drugs, reducing out-of-pocket costs, helping small businesses that want to provide coverage for their employees, and making the healthcare system better.

Let's stop this bad bill and work together on behalf of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, when a Pope dies, the cardinals meet in secret to select the next Pope. A white cloud goes up in smoke. When the Senate Republicans meet in secret to craft a healthcare bill, coverage for the sick, the disabled, and the elderly is what goes up in smoke—all of that coverage. The only thing more secret than the Republican healthcare bill is Donald Trump's tax returns.

We might need ultimately to have a special counsel to go and to find out what is inside of that healthcare bill because right now the Democrats don't know, the American public doesn't know, and no one knows what is in that bill. While we may not have details on the Republicans' secretive proposal to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, we know that they are not completely rewriting the House-passed legislation that eviscerates the Medicaid Program and reduces coverage and increases costs for most Americans and for the individuals, the families, and the communities caught in an opioid crisis. This bill will be a complete calamity, and it is being done totally in secret.

Right now, the press is being stifled. The White House didn't even let reporters audiotape the press briefing today. Last week, the Senate Republicans tried to keep the press from asking questions of Senators in the hall. They don't want the press to know about this bill or to cover it.

But for families who need treatment for opioids, the Republicans want to take the money from substance use disorder coverage and care and use it to offset a \$5.5 trillion tax cut for the healthy wealthy and for massive corporations. That would be cruel. It would be immoral. It would be inhumane. Like President Trump himself has said, it would be "mean."

We know the opioid epidemic knows no demographic, economic, or political boundaries. It has ruined the lives of men and women from Lexington, MA, to Lexington, KY. It is an equal opportunity destroyer. That is one of the

reasons why, over the last year, combating the opioid epidemic has been a bipartisan issue.

Eleven months ago, this body passed and sent to the President's desk the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. Known as CARA, this bipartisan law strengthens the States' responses to the opioid crisis, and it passed the Senate 92 to 2.

Six months ago, the Senate passed the 21st Century Cures Act 94 to 5. This bill quickly became law and allocated \$1 billion to States to provide much needed resources to help them address the opioid epidemic on the ground and in their communities.

Yet today Senate Republicans are singlehandedly attempting to betray that progress and to erase it from the history books. They are doing so by crafting in secret a bill to gut Medicaid and repeal the Affordable Care Act and replace it with a shell that hides a massive tax break for the wealthiest people in our country—people who do not need or deserve a tax break, especially if it is coming from the healthcare coverage of those people who are sickest, those people who are oldest, those people who are most disabled, those people who are most vulnerable to having an addiction to opioids and need treatment. It would be wrong to take their money for that healthcare coverage and give it as a tax break to the wealthiest billionaires in America, who already have enough money for their healthcare coverage.

This would be a death sentence to the 2.8 million Americans with substance use disorders, including 220,000 with an opioid use disorder at risk of losing their insurance coverage altogether in order to ensure that their family member can get treatment.

For those who do manage to get insurance coverage, TrumpCare will make it more expensive to get the treatment and the care they need. The Congressional Budget Office explicitly said that out-of-pocket spending on mental health and substance abuse services could increase by thousands of dollars per individual in any one given year. For a disease as critical as an opioid use disorder, any delay in treatment can be the difference between life and death, not to mention that, because TrumpCare reduces protections for people with preexisting conditions, even those with insurance may find out that the coverage they have won't work for them when they need it the most. Under the Republican proposal, a substance use disorder could be classified as a preexisting condition and, therefore, you couldn't get coverage for it.

The Congressional Budget Office also said that TrumpCare would slash Medicaid by \$834 billion, permanently decapitating Medicaid. They say they are moving to a per capita system. Another way of saying that, if you are an

ordinary person, is decapitation of Medicaid for the families across our country who need it.

If this becomes law, there is no Narcan for Medicaid. Once it is cut by TrumpCare, it is dead.

Those devastating cuts would grind the progress we have made in expanding access to opioid treatment to a screeching halt and kick people currently in treatment to the curb. Medicaid spent \$7 billion on substance use disorder treatment alone in 2014. That money facilitated access to care, access to recovery, and access to hope for millions of Americans. Medicaid can cover in-patient detox treatment, care coordination, access to naloxone.

Additionally, Medicaid pays for one-third of the medication-assisted treatments in the country, more than any other payer. In Massachusetts, Medicaid pays for nearly one-half of the medication-assisted treatment provided in the Commonwealth. So think about that. One half of the people who get medication-assisted treatment for opioid addiction will lose their coverage, and, then, the Republicans are going to take the money they save and give it to the wealthiest people in our country, who also need the same coverage, leaving them with the money needed for those who are the one-half who won't have it. What happens to those other individuals? It could be a death sentence without treatment.

Those of us from States hardest hit by the opioid epidemic hear time and again how Medicaid coverage of those services saves lives.

Dawn from Swansea, MA, shared the story of her son, who became addicted to opioids after experimenting with prescription pain pills from a family member. Through Medicaid, he was able to access medication-assisted treatment to help treat his substance use disorder. Dawn said:

He has done very well with his recovery so far but I fear that without insurance coverage that will allow him to continue obtaining his medication and counseling . . . he may lose all that he has gained and fall back into the cycle of addiction. His medical insurance is literally his lifeline. Please don't abandon my son and others like him who need Medicaid assistance to continue their fight against addiction.

Instead of recognizing the importance of Medicaid for families like Dawn's across the country, Republicans are proposing to starve this life-saving program from Federal funding through TrumpCare by cutting more than a quarter of its budget. Because that is not enough to fund the massive tax breaks that Republicans want for their donor friends, President Trump has proposed in his budget to cut the program by an additional \$600 billion, leaving Medicaid a shell of its former self.

Although Republicans refer to the changes as capping the Medicaid Program, for Dawn's son, what that really

means is they will decapitate his access to medication-assisted treatment, decapitate his ability to seek counseling, and decapitate the peace of mind Dawn receives in knowing her son is accessing the help he needs.

We also have to consider the Affordable Care Act's Prevention and Public Health Fund and its role in the opioid epidemic. It is the Federal Government's single largest investment in prevention.

Since 2010, Massachusetts has received more than \$95 million through the prevention fund. Importantly for Massachusetts, nearly \$4.5 million has been given to the preventive health services block grant that has helped the State respond to the heroin, prescription drug, and fentanyl drug crisis. Eliminating this fund will only hurt our ability to respond to the opioid and other drug epidemics popping up in every one of our communities.

We should not be building bridges to recovery with money that is stolen from those programs in order to be spent on a wall that is going to pretend to block the drugs from coming in from overseas. We should be building bridges to recovery, not walls to isolation.

Instead of more commissions, we need more commitments from the administration and congressional Republicans to not undo the progress we have made in preventing and treating substance abuse disorder. It is unfortunate that Republicans who touted our progress on opioid issues aren't standing up to the policies in TrumpCare that would negate their hard work. By supporting this, they are betraying the families and communities who have suffered from the relentless grip of substance use disorders. When discussing the opioid crisis, the only thing the GOP stands for right now is Gutting Overdose Prevention. That is the new GOP—Gutting Overdose Prevention.

While devastating, this isn't surprising for those of us who have been watching many congressional Republicans salivate over ways to annihilate Medicaid for decades. Republicans harbor an ancient animosity toward Medicaid. Raiding the Medicaid coffers achieves two of their goals: First, it kills a lifeline for more than 70 million low-income and working-class Americans. Second, it provides the GOP a piggybank to aid their donors and pay for these tax breaks for their friends. In fact, TrumpCare alone would provide the wealthiest individuals and national corporations with over \$660 billion in tax breaks over 10 years. Included in this figure is the repeal of the health insurance tax, which gives a \$145 billion tax break to insurance conglomerations and their CEOs. Millionaires will get a tax break of \$50,000 a year—more than three times the income of most Medicaid beneficiaries—and the top 400 highest income earners

would save \$7 million in taxes annually. All of this comes at the expense of the 23 million Americans who will lose health insurance coverage under TrumpCare.

Don't let the GOP fool you—TrumpCare is not about creating health, it is about concentrating wealth in the hands of a small number of Americans. It is about making middle-class and working Americans pay for a tax break for people who need it least.

We can do better than this. We owe it to the families of the 33,000 Americans who died from an opioid overdose last year. The proposals under consideration with Republicans is going to only add to the tally of overdose deaths. We are hearing that Senate Republicans could create an opioid fund as a paltry attempt to appease those who have called out the cruelties in this bill. That extra funding would be crumbs. It would be like trading a full-body cast for a bandaid, like trading land for a couple of beads, like trading a Cadillac for a tricycle.

We will not be fooled. We know it took Republicans more than 1 year to agree to providing the funding for emergency opioid response in the CURES bill. One can only imagine how long it will take to get any money the Republicans are promoting as a consolation prize out to the communities who need it. We know that a vote for TrumpCare is a vote to perpetuate overdose deaths. Passing this bill will be just adding and abetting one of public health's most wanted and most notorious serial killers.

Americans from both political parties are not fooled by President Trump's tax cut shell game on the backs of families and communities who have been ravaged by opioids. That is why Democrats will continue to be a public megaphone and shout from the rooftops that eviscerating Medicaid to give a tax cut to the healthy and wealthy is mean, inhumane, and immoral, and we are not going to stand for it, and the American people are not going to stand for it.

The best vote I ever cast in my political career of 41 years in Congress was for the Affordable Care Act. The second best vote I will ever cast is to block the repeal of the Affordable Care Act because of the good it has done for tens of millions of families in our country who otherwise would not have the coverage they need.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his very cogent and important remarks.

Let me just start off by asking the Chair, asking the leader of the Republican party, what are you afraid of?

What are you afraid of? Health care constitutes one-sixth of the American economy. It impacts every man, woman, and child in our Nation. Yet we have 13 Republicans, all men, working behind closed doors to produce legislation that will be brought to the Senate at the last moment so the American people don't know the disaster that it is.

You know, what politics is about or should be about is, if you are proud of what you do, you tell the world about it. You explain to the American people and to your constituents why this is what you are proposing, this is how you voted, and this is why it is good for the people in your State and your country.

It should tell every American—whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, or an Independent, whether you are conservative or progressive, it should tell you something that major legislation is being written at this moment and that most Republicans don't have a clue as to what is in that legislation, let alone the Democrats, let alone average Americans.

So I say to the Republican leadership, what are you afraid of? Bring out that bill.

I am a member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, the HELP Committee. The HELP Committee is supposed to be the committee that deals with health issues.

I see Senator MURRAY is here, the ranking member of that committee. She will concur with me that the HELP Committee has held zero hearings.

It is the HELP Committee. We have had not one hearing to ask members of the administration, people throughout this country, what the impact of this legislation will be on the children, on the elderly, on working families, on those who have chronic diseases, on ordinary Americans. What impact will this legislation have on the lives of 300-plus million people? We have not had one hearing, not one open discussion. I would think that every Republican would be embarrassed by this. I know many of them are embarrassed by it.

So before there is any vote on any health care legislation, we need to have a series of hearings to discuss the implications of what the legislation is about.

Mr. President, as I think you heard during the debate on the Affordable Care Act—and I am a member of that committee, and we had 47 bipartisan hearings, not only in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee but also in the Finance Committee and other committees. There were roundtables and there were walkthroughs of the Affordable Care Act. There was consideration of more than 300 amendments. Some 150 amendments offered by Republicans were accepted.

In 2009 and 2010, the Finance Committee held 53 hearings, meetings, negotiations, and walkthroughs on the Affordable Care Act. That committee marked up the Affordable Care Act for 8 days. A markup means you accept amendments and you have debates on amendments. That was the longest markup in 22 years, and adopted during that process were over 10 Republican amendments.

When the bill was considered on the Senate floor, the Senate spent 25 consecutive days in session on health reform—the second longest session in history. Oddly enough and interestingly enough, many of my Republican colleagues, during that process—after 25 consecutive days on the Senate floor and after numerous hearings in the HELP Committee and in the Finance Committee, there were Senators who said that wasn't enough time. They said: This is such an important piece of legislation, and it is going to impact so many people. We need even more time.

Senator ENZI said that "cutting off Senate debate and deliberation with a budget reconciliation process would shortchange legislation with enormous impact."

Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER said:

I don't think people are going to feel as good about a bill that restructures one-sixth of our economy, that affects every single American's health, and the healthcare bill is being written behind closed doors in the Democratic leader's office.

In other words, you had Republican leaders thinking that the hundreds and hundreds of hours of discussion and debate on the Affordable Care Act was not enough. I find it amazing that those same Republicans seem to think it is OK for legislation to be written behind closed doors and not have one single committee hearing.

Now the truth is, I can understand why Republicans do not want open discussion and open debate on this issue—because the bill they are working on, which is based on the disastrous bill passed in the House last month, is a bill that would do incalculable harm to people all over our country and really should not be considered as a healthcare bill.

How do you talk about a so-called healthcare bill when you are throwing 23 million people off of health insurance? When we talk about a healthcare bill, the assumption is that we are improving healthcare in America, not doing what the Republican House bill does—wants to throw 23 million Americans off of health insurance. Surely that is not improving healthcare for the American people.

Cutting Medicaid by over \$800 billion—and God only knows what the implication of that will be for the children, for the elderly, for people who are in nursing homes.

You are not improving healthcare when you defund Planned Parenthood.

After all the rhetoric about choice, choice, choice—we want the American people to be able to go to their provider of choice—oh, 2.5 million women who today get their healthcare through Planned Parenthood, I guess their choice doesn't matter.

We hear about the needs of working-class people. We had the candidate Donald Trump who talked about the needs of working-class people. The House Republican bill—and we think the Senate bill will be very close to it—substantially raises premiums for older workers. That is why, among other groups opposing the House bill, the AARP made the point that this would be a disaster for older workers.

The truth is, this is not a healthcare bill; this is a tax break for the rich and multinational corporations bill. This is a bill that would provide over \$200 billion in tax breaks to the top 2 percent. This is a bill that would provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the drug companies and the insurance companies. Last information I received, the pharmaceutical corporations, the major drug companies, made over \$50 billion in profit, but this legislation would throw Americans off of health insurance to give drug companies even more profit.

This legislation, the House bill—and, I think, similarly, the bill being worked on behind closed doors—is not only opposed by the AARP, which is the largest seniors group in America, but it is opposed by the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the March of Dimes, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and the American Medical Association because the doctors know what a disaster this will be for healthcare for millions of Americans—also, by the American Nurses Association and the American Hospital Association. You have all of these groups that are the pillars of healthcare in America saying: No, no, this is a disastrous bill. Yet we have the Republican leadership and a dozen or so Members who are working behind closed doors.

Nobody here has suggested that the Affordable Care Act should not be improved. In my view, it should be improved. In my view, deductibles are too high, copayments are too high, and premiums are too high. Certainly, the fact that we are paying twice as much as any other country for prescription drugs has to be dealt with also.

The task right now, among sensible people, is to put it on the table and to be honest about it. What are the problems of the Affordable Care Act? How do we lower deductibles? How do we lower copayments? How do we control the escalating cost of healthcare?

Those are reasonable questions that honest people should debate, but the answer is not to throw 23 million

Americans off of health insurance. That is not a solution to the problem. That is an insult to the American people.

Let me just conclude by stating this. Our job right now is to make sure that this disastrous Republican proposal never sees the light of day. I would urge my Democratic colleagues, on behalf of the American people—the vast majority of whom know how bad this legislation is—to stand up and fight in an unprecedented way to make sure that that legislation never sees the light of day.

After we win that struggle, I would hope that we would come forward as a nation and join every other major country on Earth, whether it is Canada—and I live 50 miles away from the Canadian border—the United Kingdom, France, or Germany—and say that healthcare is a right of all people, not a privilege. If you are an American, you are entitled to healthcare. You should not be one of the 23 million people thrown off of healthcare, bringing the total of uninsured in America to over 50 million people. That is outrageous.

I think you are going to hear the American people stand up loudly and clearly and demand transparency and demand serious debate on an issue of this consequence. I think, at the end of the day, this legislation will be defeated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Democrats come to the floor this evening as a voice for the people we represent, to fight back against Republican plans to jam TrumpCare through this Senate, increase healthcare costs, and hurt families across the country. Republican leaders may hope that nobody pays attention. They can hope that they can go into these secret rooms and cut secret deals and come out with a TrumpCare bill that they can jam through before anybody notices.

We are not going to allow that to happen. We are here. We are going to fight back. I can only hope that just a few Republicans will decide to listen to their constituents, reverse course, and work with us to improve healthcare instead of standing with President Trump to destroy it.

I start by talking about a constituent of mine whose story I heard and whose voice and perspective should be a part of this debate.

Her name is Lisa. She is from Spokane, which is in my home State of Washington. Lisa served our country in the Navy for 6 years. She goes to school. She works part time, and she says she relies on Medicaid to afford the healthcare she needs. She is very worried that, if TrumpCare passes, she will not only suffer from cuts to Medicaid, but she will lose her coverage al-

together because, like many Americans, she has a preexisting condition—asthma.

Lisa is not alone. There are millions of people just like her in Washington State and across this country, and each of them—every patient, every family—has a stake in this fight. They deserve to be a part of this debate, and they have a right to know how TrumpCare would impact them if it is signed into law.

That should not be a partisan sentiment. I have heard Republicans come to the floor time and again, demanding transparency, railing against secrecy, calling for hearings. One Republican Senator who is now the chairman of the Senate HELP Committee came here to the Senate floor back in 2009 to blast Democrats for writing an amendment “in secret.” He said: “None of us on the Republican side knew what was in it,” and he accused Democrats of trying to pass our bill “before the American people find out what’s in it.”

My friend, the chairman of the HELP Committee, is certainly not alone. Back then, the current Republican majority leader said: “This massive piece of legislation that seeks to restructure one-sixth of our economy is being written behind closed doors, without input from anyone, in an effort to jam it past not only the Senate but the American people.”

That was not true back then. We held dozens of bipartisan hearings and meetings over months and months and months. But it is what Republicans are doing right now.

The chairman of the Senate HELP Committee, whom I respect and would never think would be a part of an effort like this, told me that he was not planning to hold a single hearing on TrumpCare. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, which is where a lot of work on this bill should be getting done, told my friend the Senator from Missouri that he was not going to hold a hearing either.

There are reports now that Republicans actually have the text of their bill—something is written and almost ready. Democrats do not get to see that bill. People across the country are being kept in the dark. Republican leaders are treating it like President Trump's tax returns and are not allowing it to see the light of day. It is absurd, and it is unprecedented.

We could be just days away from a massive bill being jammed through this Senate, and many Republican Senators are telling press and constituents that they could not even say what was in the bill if they wanted to because they have not seen it either. This bill is so secret that even President Trump's top health adviser, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, told us in a hearing last week that he has not seen how TrumpCare is being changed in the back rooms of the Senate.

Let me ask this. Why are Republican leaders so focused on keeping their TrumpCare work secret? Why are they keeping it locked down so tight and not letting people see what is even in it? What are they so ashamed of?

One Republican Senate aide was quoted as saying: "We aren't stupid." In other words, Republicans know it would be "stupid" to put this bill in the public because they know that people across the country—the people they are supposed to represent—would hate it.

That explains a lot.

Republican leaders—those who are writing this TrumpCare bill in secret—know that they would not be able to go back home and defend it. They know that the more people who learn about what is actually in it and what the fine print might mean for them and their families the more people back home are going to rise up and fight back. So they want to keep it wrapped up tight, under lock and key—no hearings, no scrutiny, no public input. When they first announced their secret working group, not even any women were in it. Republican leaders are in their back rooms, desperately trying to cut those final deals, doing whatever they can to bully those last few Republicans into supporting something they know their constituents will hate.

We are here tonight to say that enough is enough. This has to end. Healthcare is too important, and TrumpCare would be too devastating to allow this kind of secrecy to continue.

We do not know exactly what is in the TrumpCare bill that is being written in secret, but—do you know what?—we have a pretty good idea. No matter how much lipstick they put on this pig, based on everything we have heard, this is going the same way that TrumpCare went in the House, and the impact on patients and families would be just as bad. There would be higher costs for families, especially seniors and people with preexisting conditions. Insurance companies would no longer be required to cover basic healthcare—things like maternity care or mental health services, and much more. Women would lose access to see their doctors and the care they need at Planned Parenthood, and millions of people across the country would see their Medicaid coverage taken away.

That means that, nationwide, people who are finally getting treatment for substance use disorders, like opioid addiction, or mental healthcare or access to a primary care doctor under Medicaid are going to lose that access.

This would be so devastating for families across the country. Over the past year, I have had so many families in my home State who have lost a loved one to the opioid crisis. In Bellingham, in Spokane—in community after community—the story is always the same. I have heard directly from people on

the path to recovery, like Tyler in Yakima and Mechele in the Tri-Cities, who told me how getting treatment changed their lives for the better.

I could not imagine that any Senator would want to go home, look in his constituents' eyes, and tell them that he helped pass a bill that would take away the tools that those communities need to fight this crisis, but that is what my Republican colleagues are planning to do as we speak.

Let's remember that all of this damage would be done—why?—to give a massive tax break to special interests in the health industry and to hand President Trump a hollow political win. It is truly shameful and it needs to stop.

Last week, we learned that President Trump is now saying that the House bill is "mean." That is, certainly, an understatement from a President who does not often do subtlety, and it is pretty surprising to hear after we all saw him celebrate the House bill at the White House when it passed.

Here is the truth: The House TrumpCare bill is not just mean; it is devastating. The Senate TrumpCare bill is going to be just as bad, no matter how they try to spin it or how many side deals they cut to claim it has changed.

I have a message for Senate Republicans who are so ashamed of what is in this bill that they are keeping it secret: It is not too late to change course. It is not too late to bring this process out from the shadows. It is not too late to be honest with people across the country about what you are doing. It is not too late to listen to the voices of people like Lisa. It is not too late to abandon this plan to jam TrumpCare through Congress. If you do that, if you stop, Democrats stand ready, as we always have, to work with you to actually make healthcare more affordable and accessible for patients and families across the country.

People across the country are watching. They are paying attention to this. They are not going to allow Republicans to slip this through without any scrutiny, and we Democrats are here to say, loud and clear, that we are going to keep fighting to make sure they have a voice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleagues tonight because this Nation stands at a precipice—on the verge of a tragic mistake, about to embark on a travesty that mocks the democratic process. Truly, the combination of secrecy and speed are a toxic recipe in our democracy. Secrecy and speed will bring us recklessly over the edge of that precipice to tragic mistakes that belie and betray the people of America and the values that we all share in this Chamber, be-

cause they are basic to the American way of life.

Healthcare is a right, and it should be recognized as a right. The goal of extensive and comprehensive insurance coverage has to be, ultimately, a goal that we share in common, but, right now, we are speeding secretly toward a betrayal of American values and even of our constitutional duties. I am deeply disappointed that the secrecy employed by my colleagues has brought us, recklessly and reprehensibly, to the verge of gutting the Affordable Care Act.

The absence of hearings before the committee, the absence of public debate, the absence of any text of a bill that can be debated and offered for public comment leaves us without the democratic bedrock principle of listening to the people of America and listening to the people who are most affected, who know the most—the experts and the patients. In fact, it is the patients who deserve to be heard here perhaps most of all. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seemingly will go to any length to suppress the cruelty that lies in their alleged healthcare bill. President Trump has called it mean, and that is an understatement. It is cruel beyond words and costly in lives and in dollars and cents because it will deepen and worsen healthcare issues that can be prevented and made curable or more palatable.

Let's be clear. This secrecy—a small group of men making decisions about our entire healthcare system, with no input from women, from Medicaid beneficiaries, from people with substance use disorders, from patients struggling with mental health illness, or struggling with any disease at all—is irresponsible and deadly and truly cruel and costly to our democracy.

The way these discussions have been done are a stain on this body and a slap in the face to every American who relies on us to make decisions that are in the best interests of their family as well as themselves. My colleagues seemingly would prefer to ram and rush a deeply flawed and unpopular bill through this body, ignoring the needs and will of the people they represent. That is a sad day in this Chamber.

We need public hearings, not for their own sake, not for our sake but for the individual recovering from substance use disorder thanks to Medicaid; for the mother of a little girl with a preexisting condition, terrified of how she will pay for her care and able to do so now because of the Affordable Care Act; for the woman who is at a Planned Parenthood clinic today receiving a mammogram and other cancer screenings and other preventive healthcare testing, as well as men, because of the coverage provided to them by Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act. Defunding Planned Parenthood, risking, again, preexisting conditions,

eliminating the guarantee of essential health benefits, such as maternity care, is a war on women's healthcare and a disservice to our democracy done in secrecy.

My colleagues across the aisle may succeed in gutting our Nation's healthcare system, but the people who pay the highest price will be ordinary Americans, working men and women and their families who now have healthcare coverage to prevent more serious illness and who will now go without it.

Secrecy is the reason I convened an emergency field hearing on healthcare today in Connecticut, on very short notice—literally 24, 48 hours—and people came from across Connecticut at 9 a.m. on a Monday morning. My staff did yeoman's work putting together the logistics. The outpouring of anxiety and anger was remarkable, as was the eloquence and power of the insights offered by people about their own situations as well as about others whose interests they advocate. Many decided to stay and stand, even though the room afforded inadequate numbers of seats for everyone. It was standing room only, and they literally streamed out the door. The stories they told are worth hearing, and we have an obligation to listen to these Americans.

I told them I would personally bring their voices and their faces to this Chamber, to the floor of the U.S. Senate. In the coming days, that is exactly what I will do because people need to hear the story of a beautiful young woman who now is incapacitated because she suffered from an overdose after seeking treatment, and the effect on others similarly seeking treatment will be so dire and damaging if coverage for addiction treatment and abuse treatment is eliminated.

They need to hear the story of Sean, who similarly sought to overcome a substance abuse problem. They need to hear about individuals who would suffer from preexisting conditions. Those stories are what I will be recounting in the coming days, as I share word for word their fears, their anxiety and apprehension, and their worry for America about what will happen if the Affordable Care Act is repealed and gutted.

We must build on that act. We must improve its defects and make sure it is worthy of the great goals we share but not destroy it or decimate it, and building on it, acting constructively, coming together is what we owe the American people.

The folks who came today to the State capitol in Hartford at my emergency healthcare hearing recognized that if they fail to stand up for Planned Parenthood or mental health or those people with preexisting conditions or Medicaid or their loved one who is battling a dreadful disease, no one will.

I am so proud of them and the people of Connecticut who have spoken up and stood up for the Affordable Care Act, and I am proud to bring their voices to the U.S. Senate—literally bring their voices here, as I will do over the coming days, as I read into the RECORD and put in the RECORD their testimony. I will hold a second hearing, probably later this week, because we couldn't hear from everyone who came to speak out and stand up.

I hope my Republican colleagues will stop their denial, cease ignoring and disregarding those voices, and come to listen to them instead and recognize they cannot conceal the fact that the Affordable Care Act has helped our Nation's health.

Gutting it without any hearings or public debate is unconscionable and reprehensible. It is a move they will regret. I stand ready to build on the great strides made by the Affordable Care Act, and I hope my colleagues are ready to do the same.

If this Chamber proceeds down this reckless and reprehensible path of secrecy and speed toward repeal and gutting the Affordable Care Act, I promise to do everything in my power and use every tool at our disposal to stop this process. We cannot go about normal business in the U.S. Senate while so many back in our States demand that we fight, and we must fight.

I will stand with hundreds of thousands in Connecticut who will lose their insurance—more than 220,000. I will stand with the people of Connecticut who will lose billions of dollars in investment in healthcare. I will stand with more than 20,000 people in Connecticut and 1 million around the country who will lose jobs. According to a study recently done by the Commonwealth Fund, job losses are inevitably the result, at some point in the future, of gutting this program. I will stand with the people of America and my colleagues who will resist—indeed, resist—this secrecy and speed that so disrespects the values and betrays the ethos and traditions of this body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight to join my colleagues to raise concern about a proposed Senate healthcare bill that might move through the U.S. Senate, as my colleagues are pointing out, without a hearing, without attention to details, actually almost in secret. I guess it would be secret—if we didn't know exactly what was in the House bill, it would be even more secret. People have said it is probably going to be 80 percent of what is in the House bill.

I can tell you, I agree with President Trump. That was a mean bill. So if it is just 80 percent mean, I guarantee it is still going to be mean.

I say that because I have been at home listening to my constituents, and

they do not appreciate it one bit. If you are Harborview Medical Center and you are a public hospital and you are going to cut \$627 million out of their budget because of your cap on Medicaid and you are going to leave a regional hospital without resources, they are mad.

If you are talking about children's hospitals and they see children who are on Medicaid and they are not going to be able to see those children or get coverage, they are mad.

Just Saturday I was with veterans in Vancouver, WA. People don't understand, but veterans of the United States of America do not get all of their healthcare coverage through the VA. They get it with Medicaid at individual clinics for services. I have met several of these people in my State, and they have told me point-blank, without access to Medicaid, they would not get the benefits they need as veterans of our country.

I think it is mean to break our promise to veterans and not give them access to Medicaid. I think this whole discussion is basically the fact that we are trying to box with these guys on a proposal. If their proposal is so great, they should come to the Senate floor and just—don't even talk about the bill, talk about the principles.

I want to know, in the Republican proposal, what ideas do you have to lower costs, increase the quality of care, or improve access. Those are the milestones by which you should be debating healthcare.

Now, if your goal is to just cut Medicaid and cut people off Medicaid and cut their benefits so you can give tax breaks to the rich, OK, you might convince me that, yes, you have a proposal—because I think that is exactly what their proposal is—but if your proposal is about reducing costs, then come out here and debate it. Don't even tell me what is in the bill; just show up on the Senate floor and debate us and say: Here is our idea for reducing costs.

I will tell you what my idea of reducing costs is because I wrote it into the Affordable Care Act and some States are doing it and it was a good idea. It was called give the individual who doesn't work for a big employer the ability to negotiate with clout and be bundled up with other people. That is what they did for the working poor in New York. So 650,000 people in New York are now on something called the Basic Health Program. Why? Because they didn't work for an employer that could negotiate a big discount for them.

We asked, on our side of the aisle: Why would we let poor people just get thrown around in the market and not be able to drive a decent price? I call it the Costco model. So we said to them: We are going to let you be bundled up like the big employer is and you are going to be able to drive a decent price

in the marketplace. That plan is giving a family, with \$40,000 a year of income and four individuals in the family, a yearly annual premium of about \$500 instead of \$1,500 on the exchange.

So that is an idea. So come out here and discuss that or, if you want to tell me you have figured out a way to give better quality of care, I would love to hear that idea. I would love for you to come out and tell me how you are going to deliver better quality of care because I can tell you there are things in this bill that are about quality of care. They are about improving the way that organizations deliver care so they are rewarded for achieving better outcomes for patients.

The whole idea of accountable care organizations are that you put the patient at the center of the delivery system, and you reward them for doing a good job of delivering better outcomes. We have innovated. We have innovated in the Affordable Care Act. If you are talking about access, come out and tell us what proposal you have that is about increasing the access to healthcare. I would love to hear it because in the Affordable Care Act, we already did that too. We said: You know what. It is kind of crazy and expensive to think that everybody who ages, particularly in Medicaid, should spend time in a nursing home. Why? It is more expensive, and I don't think I have met one Washingtonian who told me they really wanted to go to a nursing home. They want to stay at home.

So we wrote into the Affordable Care Act incentives for States to change the delivery system, as we have done in the State of Washington, and deliver affordable care to people at home in their communities. By gosh, actually some States—Texas, Arizona, Indiana, other States—took us up on it. They said: What a great idea. We want to reduce costs.

So if that is such a great working aspect of the Affordable Care Act and you think it works and it increases access to care by giving people community-based care and reduces Medicaid costs, come out here and talk about it. Talk about what you want to do to put that program on steroids so more people in America can benefit from better access to care and not think they are going to spend their last days in a nursing home. That is what we should be debating. But we can't even see or hear or have a hearing about what this proposal is. Yet my colleagues can't even come out here and throw a concept on the table.

But the fact that you want to affect over 1 million veterans who have fought for our country and you are going to cut many of them off of the Medicaid care they deserve to have access to—that is a broken promise. It is just as broken a promise as what President Trump said. President Trump tweeted: I was the first and only GOP

candidate to state that there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. So I am not surprised that he calls it a mean bill. But he should also own up that it cuts Medicaid.

We all have an office budget. I see my colleague from Virginia here. If we took our office budget and said: We are going to cut it and cap it, and next year it is going to be lower, and next year it is going to be lower, and next year—in perpetuity—that is what their idea is, it is to put a cap on Medicaid and cut it in perpetuity and basically cut it out of existence.

I don't know why they are beating up on Medicaid, because Medicaid has provided great stability to so many people in our country. It has lifted people out of poverty, provided healthcare, stabilized communities, and raised the economic standard of living in many communities in our country.

I received a letter from a superintendent from the Vancouver School District. He wrote to me about the devastating impacts that capping Medicaid would have on his students. He wrote:

Our school-based Medicaid programs serve as a lifeline to children who can't access critical healthcare and services outside of their school.

He goes on to say:

Restructuring Medicaid to a per capita cap system would undermine Vancouver Public Schools' ability to provide America's neediest children access to vital healthcare [insurance].

So why would we do this?

I met a veteran, Kristina, who is 46 years old and a full-time student. She suffers from chronic and disabling injuries and needs a high level of care. The care she gets from Medicaid helps her access the medication that manages her chronic care and keeps her going, and she is working toward that degree. Why would we cut somebody like that—a veteran—off of Medicaid just because someone's idea over here is to cap and reduce Medicaid?

These stories are from all over the country, and people are wondering: Why would you take this level of investment in Medicaid out of our entire economic system? Why would you impact our school districts, our regional hospitals, our veterans, our Medicaid population? Why would you affect a community that has a large Medicaid base?

And that is the way they serve them. Our hospitals have told us: We have stabilized private insurance premiums because more of the population is covered and has access to Medicaid.

You rip that back, and we will be back to skyrocketing costs, with people in the emergency room, no access to care other than that facility, with impacts on everybody on private insurance and on Medicaid. It is just not a good idea.

So I ask my colleagues, come out here. Don't say you want a patient-cen-

tered healthcare delivery system, because we are all for that, and we actually put things in the Affordable Care Act that did that and are working. If you want to make that claim, come out here and say what it is that you don't like about the patient-centered delivery system that we are working on promoting, and how you want to change it. If you say your proposal increases access to Americans, let's hear it, if it is about better quality. But I don't hear any of that. I just hear a drumbeat by some people who want to be heartless and cut people who have access to healthcare, people who are less fortunate in our society, because they want to cut Medicaid.

The President promised he wasn't going to do that. I ask my colleagues to live up to that, and let's start talking about the substance that truly will increase access, lower costs, and give better care to our constituents and the people of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I also rise to talk about the healthcare of every American. This is critically important to every person and every family in this country. It is critically important to every local, State, and Federal budget in this country. It is also critical to the economic productivity of our Nation.

In a purely partisan move, the House barely passed a bill that would take health insurance away from 23 million American people over the next 10 years, dramatically increase premiums to seniors, jeopardize coverage of people with preexisting conditions, and impose huge burdens on States.

One of the reasons the House bill was so bad—condemned even by President Trump, who labeled it “mean”—was because it flowed from a bad process. The House held no hearings on the final bill. There was no meaningful testimony from patients or healthcare providers. They did not accept any amendments from Democrats. They rushed the bill through to vote before the Congressional Budget Office could score the bill. So no wonder. No wonder the House bill is opposed by the American Medical Association, the AARP, nurses, hospitals, patient organizations, Democratic and Republican Governors. Yet the Senate is poised to make exactly the same mistake—preparing a secret bill, with no testimony, no public scrutiny, no opportunity for meaningful amendments, no opportunity for Democrats to participate.

We have the opportunity to get this right, and we have the responsibility to get this right.

There are so many problems with the House bill. As a member of the HELP Committee, I went on Friday to the Culpeper Free Clinic about 75 miles from here to talk about the need for



real improvement in our healthcare system, not a repeal that would hurt vulnerable people. At this clinic, which is celebrating its 25th year, I saw dedicated staffers and volunteers, and I talked to patients. I talked to them about how this organization has provided compassionate care to working people in this region of Northern Virginia who don't have health insurance.

The fact that Virginia has refused to expand Medicaid is one of the reasons the need for their care is so significant. Fully 70 percent of the free clinic patients in Virginia would be eligible for Medicaid if the State would just join the 35 other States that have expanded Medicaid.

What I heard at the Culpeper Free Clinic is that they are already bursting at the seams because we haven't expanded Medicaid.

If there are additional cuts to Medicaid, it would overwhelm the ability of the 60 free clinics in Virginia to provide compassionate care.

Just a few hours ago, earlier today, I went to Albemarle County near Charlottesville and had a roundtable session with educators, families, and children's advocates to highlight another key problem with the Republican approach. By dramatically cutting Medicaid, who is the most likely victim? Children. The most numerous victims of Medicaid cuts are children.

In Virginia and nationally, nearly 60 percent of the recipients of Medicaid are kids. Yet the President, through the TrumpCare bill and the President's submitted budget, proposes to cut Medicaid by \$1.3 trillion over the next 10 years—\$1.3 trillion over the next 10 years—and this deeply frightens parents, educators, and kids I talked to today.

I heard from parents of kids with cerebral palsy and autism, parents whose kids are receiving support through Medicaid to buy a wheelchair or get services so they can learn to adjust with autism. This will help them grow into adults who have a chance of living independently. These parents had heartbreaking stories, often telling me: I had no idea of the challenges of parenting a disabled child until I had one myself. They view Medicaid as absolutely critical to their children's educational and life success.

They talked about the current shortfalls in the Medicaid funding that leave their kids on waiting lists for services. One mom has been on a waiting list for a developmental disability waiver. I asked her what they told her about the waiting list, and this was her quote: "They have told me my child will die before he is off the waiting list." And that is under the current program, before \$1.3 trillion is cut out of it.

I heard from school administrators who talked about the importance of Medicaid funding for their programs that serve students and special ed

teachers who are worried about the effect on their work if Medicaid is slashed.

Local superintendents and school board members talked about the difficult challenges of funding their school budget if Medicaid funding is cut. They posed it as a difficult choice. If the Feds cut \$1.3 trillion out of Medicaid, do they reduce their funding for their students with disabilities, or do they take local funds away from other important programs to backstop those programs, or do they have to raise their own State and local taxes to make up for the Federal cuts?

I heard from child service advocates today who would see their program slashed if Medicaid is cut. Here is an example. Many of them serve court-involved young people—not kids charged with crime but kids who are in court because of difficult home lives and challenging situations with their parents or guardian, and they are in danger of being pushed into the foster care system or into institutions because of problems at home. Medicaid pays for support services to help stabilize their family lives. If these services are reduced and more children get institutionalized, how does that help anyone? How does it help these kids? How does it help society? How does it help our budget? It is much more expensive to put a child in a group home or an institution than to provide a few hours of Medicaid services in their home once a week.

The 60 percent of Virginia Medicaid recipients who are children and the parents and teachers and nurses and others who worry about them and help them don't see this as a partisan issue. It is fundamentally an issue of compassion. We will and should be judged by how we treat our children. Why slash funds that are used to help our kids? Is it really important to cut Medicaid by \$1.3 trillion, hurting millions of children, so we can give a few adults a \$900 billion tax cut?

I am on the Budget Committee. We had a hearing recently with OMB Director Mulvaney, within the last 2 weeks. Director Mulvaney tried to reassure us in his opening statement that the Medicaid cuts were really about doing people a favor—about doing people a favor. He testified: We are no longer going to measure compassion by the number of programs or the number of people on programs like Medicaid; we are going to measure compassion by the number of people we get off these programs and back in charge of their own lives.

I want to repeat that, from the President's chief budget official: We are going to measure compassion by the number of people we get off these programs and back in charge of their own lives. What a cruel thought. That reads like something a villain in a novel by Charles Dickens would say, but that is

the philosophy of this administration and this effort. Will we now tell a kid who loses the wheelchair that is partly paid for by Medicaid "You are now back in charge of your own life"? Will we tell a single mom whose child is receiving services to help with autism but now loses access to these services "Guess what. You are back in charge of your own life"? Will we tell a teenager in a broken home whose Medicaid services are the only difference between staying in the community and being put in an institution "Guess what. You are now back in charge of your own life"?

Since Medicaid also provides funding for our parents and grandparents who can no longer care for themselves and have to be cared for in nursing homes, will we go to those seniors who lose places in nursing homes and say "Guess what. Now you are back in charge of your own life"?

Slashing Medicaid isn't about putting anyone back in charge of their own life. Medicaid enables kids to go to school and succeed. Medicaid enables disabled people to function well enough to go to work and pay taxes. Medicaid enables seniors to receive compassionate care when they can't care for themselves, and cutting Medicaid jeopardizes the ability of people to live with independence and dignity.

No, folks, let's not kid ourselves. This is not an effort to empower anyone. It is about casting them aside because they are too young or too old or too sick or too poor, and it is about giving a tax break to some people with the very funds we are taking away from the most vulnerable members of our society.

That is why I oppose this "mean" effort by the majority as a secretly crafted bill to repeal the ACA. We can improve healthcare if we work together. Let the Finance and the HELP Committees discuss any bill, hear from patients and providers, allow amendments and debates before rushing anything to a vote that would so cruelly affect the lives of millions and millions of people.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I get letters and emails every day from families begging me not to let Republicans in Congress tear up healthcare in this country. People aren't writing because they find themselves with a lot of extra time on their hands. They are not writing because they are professional activists or political organizers. They are not writing because they like writing letters and emails. They are writing because they are scared. They set aside all the other things they need to do in their day—the sink full of dishes, the load of laundry, the overflowing inbox—and they steal some time to write these letters.

They write these letters because they are terrified—terrified down to their bones that if they don't speak out, their family is going to lose their healthcare coverage, their children will be shut out from care, their elderly parents will lose the assistance they need to pay for nursing home care, their own insurance costs will be going up, and their financial security could be hanging by a thread.

A lot of people write letters and send emails, and a lot of people make calls too. Every week since the Republicans started their cruel effort to take away healthcare from tens of millions of people in this country, my office has been getting phone calls from worried constituents.

Last week, something changed. We went from our regular quota of calls about this terrible Republican healthcare bill to an avalanche of voice mails and phones ringing off the hook.

Since last week, I have gotten more than a thousand phone calls from people who are pleading with me to do whatever I can to stop Republicans who are going forward with their brutal plans. People are literally in tears on the phone. They are scared, and they are angry. They are calling because they know that 13 Senate Republicans—13 men—are locked away in a secret room, behind closed doors, writing a secret plan to trade their health insurance for tax cuts that will go to the wealthiest Americans in this country.

The bill the Republicans are negotiating behind closed doors isn't a healthcare bill. It is a tax cut for billionaires bill, and it is paid for by cutting healthcare for tens of millions of other Americans.

The Republican healthcare bill has \$663 billion in tax cuts in it—\$663 billion in tax cuts for the richest people in this country and for wealthy corporations, tax cuts that would blow a giant hole in the American budget.

The Republicans didn't let that slow them down. They kept their eye on the prize. For the Republicans, the most important thing about this healthcare bill is the tax cuts for the rich. They decided to cut Medicaid by \$834 billion in the same bill so they can pay for their tax cuts.

This is a straight-up trade. The Senate Republicans say that Americans should cut health insurance for little babies or for seniors in nursing homes or for people getting treatment for opioid addiction—all so that millionaires and billionaires can get their tax cuts.

That is not a healthcare bill. That is a statement of values. And it says that tax cuts for a handful of millionaires and billionaires are more important than healthcare for millions of hard-working Americans and their families. There is only one word for what the Senate Republicans are doing with this bill—"shameful." It is shameful.

The Republicans negotiate in secret, behind closed doors. They refuse to let anyone see the bill. They will not tell anyone what is in it.

Senator MCCASKILL asked Chairman HATCH on the Finance Committee if he would hold a hearing on the bill, and he said no. Senator MURRAY asked Chairman ALEXANDER on the HELP Committee if he would hold a hearing on the bill, and he said no, no plans to do so—no, no hearings, no reviews, no public look at what the Republicans are up to.

What is going on here? I will tell you what is going on. Senate Republicans don't dare let the people back home see this bill. Instead, they have decided to try to ram this bill through with no hearings, no public discussion, and get it signed into law.

They hope, once that is done, people will not see much point in learning about the details and holding Republicans accountable. They hope that if they can do a quick vote, everyone else will just give up.

I have news for Senate Republicans. That is not going to happen. Senate Republicans may not want to hear from families who are worried about losing their insurance coverage in the middle of a battle with breast cancer. They may not have time for stories about premature babies who need Medicaid so they can get lifesaving care. And maybe they don't want to hear about the grandparents with Alzheimer's who could get kicked out of nursing homes.

Senate Republicans may not want to hear from these people, but I have a message for these Senate Republicans. We don't care how long we have to stand up here. We don't care how many times you try to dodge the question about what is in your secret healthcare bill. Democrats are here to keep demanding that you show us this bill, and we are going to keep insisting that you account for its shameful contents.

I know you would prefer to take the phone off the hook so you don't have to hear it ring, and I know you would like to pretend that there aren't families in your State who would be hurt by this bill, but I am going to take some time to read you a handful of the letters I have been receiving about exactly what is at stake in this debate about healthcare. These families deserve to be heard.

A few months ago I received a letter from Jenny in Worthington, MA. She wrote to me about how she and her husband got good healthcare coverage through the Affordable Care Act and how Medicaid was there when they needed it most, when Jenny was diagnosed with breast cancer.

A few days after President Trump's inauguration, Jenny's son Liam wrote a letter to the President. Liam asked President Trump not to take away his

mother's healthcare. I don't know if President Trump ever read that letter, but I am going to read it right now into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dear President Trump,

My name is Liam Barry, and I am ten years old. My mother has been very ill. Thanks to the ACA, my mother has been able to have the care and medication she needs. If you repeal the ACA, my mother will not be able to get the care she needs. I know there are millions of kids in the same situation as me. Please think of them when you read this.

Sincerely,

Liam Barry

Thank you for speaking out, Liam. We are fighting for your mom, and we are fighting for you.

Kristine from Cambridge also wrote to me about her fight against cancer. She wrote:

I ask that you and fellow Senators PLEASE fight for the Affordable Care Act. I am a cancer survivor. When I was 28 years old, I got the news no one ever wants to hear, "You have cancer." Luckily, for me, I had a job that had wonderful insurance, and I was able to get medication, surgeries, and treatment to win the fight—and to not go broke doing so.

However, I know many young people and old people and children who would not be here today if it was not for ACA. I know people who are still fighting their battles with cancer. They are frightened and losing hope, not because of cancer, but because they don't know whether they will be able to continue to get the treatments necessary to stay in the fight.

I am now 30 years old, and have my whole life in front of me. Because of what [President] Trump is proposing, I am now afraid that if I lose my job or if I wish to change jobs, I might not be able to get the necessary coverage, because I no longer qualify.

I really didn't think this is what I would be worried about two years ago after having been through 8 rounds of chemo, 20 rounds of radiation and surgery to clear me of this disease.

Please, I ask that you fight for us. Fight for those who are in the chemo chair right now, at this very moment, who are miserable, bald and bloated. Fight for the cancer warrior who is now crying with worry because she doesn't know, come a month from now, if she will be able to continue to receive the life-saving treatment she is entitled to!

That is why we are here tonight. We are fighting for you, Kristine. We are in this fight. Thank you for speaking out about your own fight against cancer and for others who are currently battling cancer and worried about the future of their healthcare.

I also heard from Sarah, who lives in Shrewsbury, MA, and who wrote to me about her concerns that the Republican healthcare bill would endanger coverage of birth control and access to services at Planned Parenthood. Sarah wrote to me this past weekend, while I was out dancing in the Boston Pride parade.

As I type this you are at Boston Pride, which I would have loved to be at to support my friends, but, due to my endometriosis pain, here I sit.

I am extremely concerned about the GOP plan to reduce or strip away insurance coverage for birth control. As a 21-year-old

woman suffering from endometriosis, a very common disease among young women, I know firsthand that birth control does more than just prevent pregnancy—in fact, for many, it is the only treatment for them.

In 10 days I will be undergoing endometriosis surgery, and for the past 6 months since I've been diagnosed until the surgery, birth control was the only thing enabling me to stand up straight most days. Even while taking oral contraceptives, there were many days I was unable to get out of bed (today being one).

I am so lucky to have access to an amazing endo specialist at Brigham & Women's Hospital, and to have access to the medication and surgery that I need. But every time I groan about having to go to an appointment, I think about how many women are suffering from the same debilitating pain, but without the resources to overcome it. Many women rely on Planned Parenthood not just for abortions, but to provide them with the medicine that will enable them to stand up straight in spite of the pain they deal with every day. Endometriosis doesn't discriminate, and it cannot be cured, only treated. Until endometriosis becomes a prominent focus of medical research, which I feel it should be, we must protect the right to be treated for it, which means protecting insurance coverage of birth control, and protecting Planned Parenthood.

I know that you are a warrior for women's rights, and you are the patron saint of Planned Parenthood. I know these are issues you fight for, and I cannot even begin to thank you enough for all you have done thus far. I hope that by adding my voice and my personal story, I can fuel your fire and somehow be a small part in protecting my fellow females and my fellow endometriosis sufferers (1 in 10 women in the US).

Thank you for fighting for us. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Sarah, thank you for writing, and thank you for fighting. We are going to fight to save your coverage, and next year I expect to see you on the parade route at Pride.

I also heard from Dr. Hemal Sampat, who is a doctor at MGH in Boston. He wrote in with his personal story, and I want to read parts of his letter.

I actually grew up in a low-income family myself. My parents immigrated to the U.S. My mother is brilliant but only had a 7th grade education because my grandfather couldn't afford to send her to school. My father is college-educated, but struggled frequently with unemployment. My older brother has multiple disabilities. He's blind and brain-damaged from a stroke during childhood, epileptic, intellectually disabled, and has a transplanted kidney. I am fortunate enough to have been healthy my entire life.

For most of my life, my family was on Medicaid, as well as other forms of public assistance. . . . My brother, additionally, due to his kidney disease, got Medicare as well, but Medicaid was always his secondary insurance. He sees multiple different specialists and has done very well over these years.

In spite of us having multiple financial struggles, we never had to worry about his healthcare being paid for. His transplant from childhood lasted 19 years, and then about 10 years ago he was transplanted again and has done well with that.

My parents still live in the same house I grew up in, in Maryland. Right now, they're cared for by Medicare and Medicaid. My

brother lives with them, receives SSI, and his health needs are met by Medicare and Medicaid. Although none of his chronic medical conditions can be cured, they are all well taken care of.

In the meantime, I grew up healthy, was able to attend Georgetown through need-based financial aid, was able to get into medical school at the University of Maryland and pay for it using Federal student loans (which I'm repaying through the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program), got into a dual-specialty residency of Internal Medicine and Pediatrics at Penn State, and am now working at Harvard and MGH.

My family's story goes to show that Medicaid is about helping families that struggle, about helping children with complex medical needs, and about how providing for the good health of a family can achieve positive outcomes for the long-term future.

Today, Dr. Sampat works at Harvard at MGH. He makes sure his patients on Medicaid get excellent care. He told me about one of his patients who came in to urgent care in Chelsea. This little girl wasn't even 2 years old yet and was wheezing and had a fever. Here is what the doctor said:

This child and her mother were on Medicaid through MassHealth. [As] I asked questions, I found out more about this mother. She was working two to three jobs in order to make ends meet. Her daughter was in daycare during the day and then [the] grandmother took care of [the little girl] most evenings. This mom took care of her daughter on the rare days she had off and clearly loved and cared for her daughter.

This young girl's wheezing was probably some of the earliest signs of what will become asthma. [Her] mom has asthma, too, and it runs in their family. Asthma is a completely controllable illness with medication, but it requires monitoring by a doctor and access to medication. Because the child has Medicaid, I feel much more confident that, in spite of how much the mother is struggling financially, the child has a good shot at growing up healthy. Without Medicaid, this child could live a life in poor health from a treatable condition.

These are some of the people the Senate Republicans want to kick to the curb so they can deliver a big tax cut for millionaires and billionaires—a 10-year-old kid with a sick mom, a cancer survivor, a woman with endometriosis, a boy kept healthy by Medicaid so he could grow up to become a doctor at one of the best hospitals in this country and help a little girl with asthma.

Senate Republicans are willing to tear away health insurance from these families to deliver tax cuts for their buddies, but we are not going to let that happen. We can't let that happen. You are fighting back, we are fighting back, and we will keep right on fighting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I will start tonight with one of the questions that we have, and this will be a procedural question. I want to alert the Chair, I am going to pose this question initially before I make my remarks

about the debate we are having on healthcare.

Is the Chair able to confirm that the Committee on Finance considered S. 1796, the America's Healthy Future Act, which was ultimately incorporated into H.R. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, in executive session on eight separate calendar days prior to reporting the bill favorably?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary of the Senate's office, through the Senate Library, confirms that.

Mr. CASEY. Thank you.

Mr. President, I rise tonight to provide some context about what is at stake for children in the United States with regard to the debate we are having on healthcare and, in particular, what would happen—some of the adverse impacts on children with disabilities.

I will start with the broad view, but I think it is important to frame our discussions. Sometimes our debate on healthcare comes down to a discussion of big numbers. How many people will be impacted? For example, the Congressional Budget Office told us that 23 million people would lose their healthcare coverage over the course of a decade if the House bill were to become law. So healthcare coverage would be ripped away from 23 million people or we hear about the impact on the deficit one way or the other or we hear about broad numbers. Probably the best way to think about the impact of these policies is, if the House bill were to become law or some version of it because of what a few Senate Republicans are working on right now—maybe the better way to think about it is in terms of a couple of individuals, children.

I will give you two examples for now. Angelica and Rowan—two different children, two different stories. We received a letter in the last couple—I am sorry. Angelica is the parent. I should have said Amaya. Amaya is the child whom her mom wrote to us about. Her mom is Angelica.

She wrote to us and said:

I am writing to you because I am appalled by all that is happening to this country. I have an amazing story about my daughter Amaya. She was basically born with no bones and she received a miracle drug that regrew her bones. She will have to take this medicine for the rest of her life but the fact that she is doing so amazing has to do with all the help that she received from Medicaid. She is the youngest patient in the U.S. to take the drug. I don't only want to talk about her but I am concerned about the future of our party. Looking forward to hearing from you.

So said Angelica. Then, later on, she talks about what happened in her case to her child. She says she decided with a counselor to check with the Allegheny County officials about whether or not Medicaid expansion would cover Amaya's treatment. She said they

made an inquiry. She said by the next day, "Someone from the State had called me, and later that week her treatment was approved. Thanks to the Medicaid expansion, my daughter receives her lifesaving treatment."

So I make that reference to one letter about one child, Amaya. Then, of course, there are so many other letters. I will just highlight one I received months ago now from Pam Simpson. She is from Coatesville, PA—Southeastern Pennsylvania just outside the city of Philadelphia. Now you are talking about Rowan in Southeastern Pennsylvania and Amaya in Southwestern Pennsylvania, two corners of the State—two children facing challenges that most of us can't even imagine.

In this case, Pam Simpson wrote to me about her son Rowan and talked about his life before a diagnosis of autism and before he was getting the help he is getting now. Pam talked about all of the challenges she and families like her face. She talked about the fact that he was having all kinds of difficulties, but then they finally got the word that Rowan would be covered by Medical Assistance. That is the Pennsylvania version of Medicaid at the State level. She said she applied in January of 2016. After Pam got the word that Rowan would be enrolled, she said:

We were able to obtain wraparound services, which included a behavioral specialist consultant—so-called BSC—and a therapeutic staff support worker. The wraparound services have been a godsend—

Referring to the services provided to her son Rowan. Then she goes on later in the letter and says:

Without Medicaid, I am confident I could not work full time to support our family. We would be bankrupt or my son would go without the therapies he sincerely needs.

Here is how Pam concludes her letter:

Please think of my dear Rowan and his happy face, his big blue eyes, and his lovely strawberry blonde hair. Please think of me and my husband, working every day to support our family, and please think of my 9-month-old daughter Luna.

I will stop there just to explain. She is talking about Rowan, who is a couple of years older. The reference here is to his younger sister Luna.

Please think of my 9-month-old daughter Luna who smiles and laughs at her brother daily. She will have to care for Rowan later in her life when we are gone. Overall, we are desperately in need of Rowan's Medical Assistance and would be devastated if we lost these benefits.

That is what Pam Simpson wrote to me months ago. After referring to her story and Rowan's story over the last couple of months, I finally had the chance to meet her and to meet Rowan and his dad and his sister Luna. So I met this family—four people in a family. I met them on Friday. It is one thing to read about it and to get a sense of what a family is up against

every day, and it is another thing to meet them. Right now, the Simpson family has what they need for Rowan. That doesn't mean they don't have challenges. It doesn't mean it will not be difficult in the years ahead, but they have the benefit of Medicaid right now—Medical Assistance, as we call it in Pennsylvania.

Rowan now, because he has autism, has the benefit of those behavioral specialists and Medical Assistance. There was a person with them the day I met them, to work with Rowan every day so the parents can work and have the peace of mind to know they can go to work, and they can raise their family with the benefit of the kind of healthcare every child should have. Some might say: You know what. If the Republicans get their way on this bill, maybe the Medicaid provisions will not apply to Rowan. Maybe he will be protected or maybe in Allegheny County, maybe Amaya will be protected. Maybe it will not reach that far. Maybe when the Congressional Budget Office—I will read directly from page 17 of the report by the Congressional Budget Office analyzing the House bill when it says: Medicaid enrollment would be lower throughout the coming decade, culminating in 14 million fewer Medicaid enrollees by 2026, a reduction of 17 percent relative to the number under current law. That is what the Congressional Budget Office says about the impact of the House bill on Medicaid—14 million people lose their Medicaid.

Some might say: Let's assume for purposes of this argument that those two children we just spoke about might be protected from those cuts. We don't know that, of course, and they can't guarantee that because what they are doing when they go at these Medicaid provisions is taking away the guarantee that has been there for 50 years and, over time, eliminating the Medicaid expansion. That is what we expect to happen. That is certainly what the House bill did.

Let's assume for the sake of argument that they could come in here and make an ironclad guarantee that those two children, Rowan and Amaya, won't be affected. You know what. That is not good enough. That is not good enough because there are a lot of other children who will be affected, children who might have a disability.

Sixty percent of children with disabilities are enrolled in Medicaid. We know that. We know that millions of other children who come from low-income families get the benefit of Medicaid. We know that a lot of seniors depend upon Medicaid to get into a nursing home. But no family who has a child with disabilities who benefits from Medicaid should have to worry for 15 minutes about what would happen in this Chamber—because a small group of Republican Senators are meeting in

secret, and they are supposed to produce a bill that we are all supposed to consider in a short timeframe—no product of that secret process should in any way give any parent who has a child with a disability any concern at all that that benefit will be taken away. That is not who we are as a country. We are America. We take care of people who need those kinds of services, that kind of benefit.

So if a child like Rowan, who is receiving the benefits of Medicaid today because of his disability—if a child like that is receiving those services today, we should guarantee that he will receive those benefits for as long as he needs those benefits. Even if it goes the length and breadth of his life, we should guarantee that, take it off the table so that family doesn't have to worry.

That, I hope, would be the result of this process undertaken by a small group of Republican Senators. I have been waiting to hear that, waiting to hear whether they will guarantee that to that child, to give that family some peace of mind with all the challenges they have, even with Medicaid, even with the great support they get. It is not easy. It is a very difficult life many families lead when they have a child with a disability. But we should do everything we can to make sure that if a child with a disability—just one category of people who benefit—any child with a disability who gets the benefit of Medicaid should have that protection for as long as they need it. And I will be waiting to hear that from our colleagues when they finally emerge from this secretive process with the bill. So I hope that is what they are working on in their meetings because we know that it affects a lot of children.

As I said before, Medicaid covers 60 percent of all children with disabilities, ranging from autism, like Rowan, to traumatic brain injuries. We know that children on Medicaid receive what many consider the gold standard for children's healthcare—early and periodic screening, diagnostic and treatment options, so-called EPSTD—so they can get the screenings they need, so they can get preventive healthcare when they need it.

All of these protections should be not just a goal, they should be guaranteed for those children. I am hoping our friends who are working on this right now will consider Rowan and Amaya and children like them.

We will come back to it later. We will have other stories to tell about children and what they are up against. But on a night like tonight, I am thinking of those children and worried about some of the headlines we are seeing on some analysis.

I will wrap up with this: The Center for American Progress report dated May of 2017 is titled "Cuts to Medicaid

Would Harm Young Children With Disabilities.” That is one report. Another report is from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, May 18, 2017: “Medicaid Cuts in House ACA Repeal Bill Will Limit Availability of Home- and Community-Based Services.” That is another headline. We won’t get into the details of those reports now.

We have a lot to work on here to make sure that nothing that happens in this process will rip away healthcare from children with disabilities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKELY. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Pennsylvania, who is putting forth a powerful message about our values, and that is that every child in America should have access to healthcare, and no one in this Chamber should vote in a process or for a bill that eviscerates that coverage. In fact, our value is that no one in America, including our adults, including our older Americans, including our seniors, and including our children for sure—everyone should have access to affordable healthcare and never have the stress of being worried that if their loved one gets sick, they might not receive the care they need. They should never have the stress of concern that their family member might go bankrupt because they need medical care. It is that value which we are here tonight fighting for, and it is that value which the Republican bill will destroy, ripping healthcare away from millions of Americans. So we come here tonight with a battle cry, and that cry is: No hearing, no vote. No hearing, no vote.

We are a democratic republic. We are a legislative Chamber. Have Members of this Chamber forgotten that we are a “we the people” form of government where the people are in charge? The people are not in charge if a secret 13 group of Senators is hiding in the basement crafting a bill to rip healthcare away from millions of people. The people are not in charge if they are afraid to show their bill to everyday Americans. They are not in charge if they are planning to destroy healthcare so those with preexisting conditions can’t gain access to care.

Never have we seen a group in the majority so against the fundamental principles of our democratic Republic, so against the “we the people” vision of our Constitution, and that is why we are calling on them to stop, rethink, remember, absorb the values embedded in our beautiful “we the people” Constitution. They want no public disclosure—fear of how the public will respond. They want no committee hearings—fear of how the people in America will respond. They want no committee amendments because that will take time in which the people can see what is going on and respond. And they want no substantial floor consideration in

order to shove this through so they can go and celebrate the Fourth of July with their constituents, while having eviscerated the Constitution of the United States in the process of attending that Fourth of July gathering.

This has been called the vampire bill, the Republican vampire bill. Why? Because the writers of it, the secret 13 writers, are afraid for the bill to see the light of day. It is hiding in the darkness. And it is called the vampire bill because its general intent is to suck the life out of the healthcare system for struggling families, suck the life out of the healthcare system for working families and for middle-class families.

This is quite different from the consideration when we created the system that we have now back in 2009. In that year, in the HELP Committee—Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—there were 47 hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs, a markup that went for more than a month—the longest markup in that committee in the history of the United States of America; a markup that considered over 300 amendments; a markup with, in fact, a group of Senators, bipartisan, sitting around the table with the television cameras rolling while they debated those amendments and voted on those amendments. And in that committee, they accepted or approved by vote more than 100 minority amendments.

Then there is the Finance Committee, which held 53 hearings and roundtables. In fact, the minutes of the roundtable are available, and if you want to print them out and read them, they go for 800 pages—just the roundtable minutes. And then they had their own Finance Committee markup, where they considered 135 amendments. Then the bill came to the floor in December 2009, and there was 25 days of debate on the floor.

Let’s compare that to the plan of the majority leader and the secret 13. Well, how many hearings do they want? They want zero in the HELP Committee. How many hearings do they want in the Finance Committee? They want zero. How many Democratic amendments do they want to consider—or Republican amendments—in the HELP or Finance Committee? The answer is zero. How much floor time do they want to have? They want to have just 1 day—just 1 day. They want to introduce it as an amendment to the House TrumpCare bill and pass it on the same day. And how many days do they want experts to be able to weigh in on a healthcare system? Zero. But here is the most important zero of all: How much time do they want for the American citizens to be able to see this bill and respond to this bill? They want zero time. That is completely against all the premises of our responsibility as legislators. It is against all the funda-

mental visions of a body that will deliberate and debate and take into account the opinions of the people and the insights of the experts.

Well, we can turn the clock back not so long ago to the majority leader, who said: “Fast-tracking a major legislative overhaul such as healthcare reform . . . without the benefit of a full and transparent debate does a disservice to the American people.” That was Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL speaking not so long ago. What happened to that value? That was being said when we had 25 days of debate here on the floor; when we had over 100 minority amendments—that is, Republican amendments—accepted; when we had a lengthy debate in the Finance Committee and a lengthy debate in the HELP Committee, but the majority leader wanted more time. Here he is today leading the effort to have zero input from the American public, zero input from healthcare experts, zero committee deliberation, zero bipartisan discussion of the pros and cons.

Well, we can turn to PAUL RYAN. What did he think back in 2009? He said: “Congress is moving fast to rush through a health care overhaul that lacks a key ingredient: The full participation of you, the American people.”

He went on to write: “Congress and the White House have focused their public efforts on platitudes and press conferences, while the substance and the details have remained behind closed doors.”

Well, it was kind of a rewriting of history even at that moment in time when he said that when there was a record-setting debate in the HELP Committee, the second longest debate in history in the Finance Committee, television cameras running the whole time, 100 Republican amendments adopted, more than 100 meetings and walkthroughs and roundtables and committee meetings, and 25 days on the floor. But PAUL RYAN said that what it was lacking was full participation of you, the American people.

Well, if it was lacking in 2009, what do we say about this when the majority deliberately wants to exclude the American people, when the American people are standing at the door, when they are standing at the windows and they are leaning in and saying: What is in this bill? We want to have a say because it is so important to our families.

And the Republicans are slamming the door, and they are shuttering the windows and saying: We will not share one word with you because we know you won’t like what we are doing.

That is not the way democracy is supposed to work.

Erin from Portland wrote because she has been diagnosed with diabetes and is terrified that if the Republican plan goes into effect, she won’t be able

to afford coverage because of her pre-existing condition. Jeannette from Portland wrote. She is in her sixties and desperately waiting to turn 65 and qualify for Medicare. She is on the Oregon Health Plan and terrified that she will lose that plan before she qualifies for Medicare. The list goes on and on and on.

This weekend, I was out conducting townhall meetings in 4 different counties of my 36 counties. I go to every county every year. And these four counties are counties that voted—I am sorry to say—overwhelmingly against me when I ran for the U.S. Senate and overwhelmingly against me when I ran for reelection. They are red counties; they are Republican counties.

Folks came out to my townhalls this weekend, and they sent one message to our Republican leadership in the Senate: We the American people demand the chance to participate in this debate. It so profoundly affects our quality of life.

So I carry their messages from Klamath County and from Lake County, and I carry their messages from Grant County and Wheeler County to the Republican majority: Listen to the American people. Listen to rural America. Listen to the families who will be devastated by the plan you are concocting with the secret 13. It is not right. It is not moral. In fact, we need to work together to improve healthcare, not to devastate it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues, to speak out, and to ask for a normal process here and to ask for hearings, to ask for debate, and to ask for amendments because the healthcare repeal bill is a major step backward, throwing over 20 million people off of health insurance. It is strongly opposed by AARP.

We don't know what is being concocted here in the Senate, but clearly something is going on, and we would like to have a say, and, most importantly, the people of my State would like to have a say.

Look at Laura from North St. Paul, who wrote to me about her concerns about that health bill. Laura is recently retired, but she will not be eligible for Medicare until next year, and she has a daughter with several chronic health conditions. Laura is worried that if the proposal goes through this Chamber, she will end up paying far more for her health insurance, and her daughter might lose her coverage altogether. Like so many others, Laura asked that we work across the aisle to make improvements to the bill that her family needs and that so many families across the country need.

Take Mike from Grand Marais, which is in the far corner of Minnesota, right

at the tip of our State, not too far from Canada. Mike knows the kind of healthcare they have across the border in Canada. He knows what the prices are for the prescription drugs there, but here in America that healthcare bill doesn't do anything to bring down the cost of prescription drugs.

Mike has been self-employed his whole life and is now approaching retirement. He told me that he is very worried that, just as he is about to retire, he will not be able to afford health insurance because the premiums that are under that bill for older Minnesotans like him would skyrocket.

Take a woman from Andover, MN. She wrote to me to say that she is so worried "about the GOP's slam dunk attempt to check off a box on their to do list" with the healthcare proposal. She asked me to put a face on the type of person that will be a part of that checklist on that to-do list, and that would be her 28-year-old son. She says that Medicaid coverage has been a lifesaver for her son because it helps him afford the treatment he needs to strive for an independent, productive life.

The truth of the matter is that I have heard so many people like these three, from all corners of my State, from the old to the young to the middle-aged. I have heard from so many people from the rural parts of my State about this bill. They are especially worried about the \$834 billion in cuts to Medicaid. Medicaid covers more than 1.2 million Minnesotans, including more than one-fifth of our rural population. That is 20 percent of our rural population. This funding is vital for our rural hospitals and the healthcare providers' ability in those parts of our State to stay open and serve their patients.

Many people who work in rural hospitals and those who are served by rural hospitals have come up to me to talk about their concerns. These hospitals are not like big urban hospitals.

I see the Senator from Hawaii here. I thank him for organizing this along with Senator MURRAY.

Our rural hospitals actually treat a lot of accidents, people out snowmobiling or on ATVs. In fact one of them has a chart every summer showing all the places where they had to remove fish hooks from people's hands. They usually have over 100 of them by the end of the summer. You wouldn't see that in an urban area—that is for sure—but it just shows that different parts of our country, different parts of our State have different issues they are dealing with.

Rural hospitals are particularly concerned about these cuts. These drastic cuts would cause many of our rural hospitals to close, forcing families to drive 60, 70, 80 miles or more when they need the healthcare the most.

The other issue that this bill brings up to me, when looking at rural areas, is the opioid epidemic that is hitting

communities across the country. In my State, deaths from prescription drug use now claim more lives than homicides or car crashes. While there is more work to do to combat this epidemic, I want to recognize that we have made meaningful progress so far in a bipartisan way. We passed the framework bill, the CARA bill. We passed the Cures Act last December, as well as money to fund treatment. Unfortunately, just as we are starting to move forward on this issue, the healthcare repeal bill passed by the House would put us at the risk of moving backward. There is money in that bill for opioid treatment, but guess what. Medicaid and children's health insurance covers 3 out of every 10 people with an opioid addiction. But according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, mental health and substance abuse benefits could be cut under the House bill, increasing out-of-pocket costs.

It is clear that this healthcare legislation has massive life-changing implications for families all over this country. Yet we haven't even seen a draft in the Senate. What we do know is that, just last week, the President of the United States, who is known for not really mincing words and known for using direct language, called the House bill "mean."

He called it "mean." He didn't need a poll or a focus group. He didn't need to know every detail of the bill, but when you hear that 20 million people can lose health insurance, that is a pretty good word to describe it—mean. What we don't want to have in the Senate is that we bring forward the Senate mean, or mean 2. But guess what. We don't even know what we have because we haven't seen it, because the legislation is being drafted behind closed doors. Most of us agree that we must make changes to the Affordable Care Act. I certainly think so. I would love to pass my bills or include them in amendments to the Affordable Care Act to bring down the cost of prescription drugs.

My bill would allow 41 million seniors to harness their negotiating power to bring drug prices down. Right now they are banned to do that. That is wrong.

I would love to see more competition come into the market in the form of less expensive drugs from other countries, like Canada—a bill I have with Senator KAINE or a bill to make it easier to get generics on the market, like the bill Senator GRASSLEY and I have to stop something that is called "pay for delay." I think the American people would be surprised that the big pharmaceutical companies are paying their generic competitors to keep their products off the market. These are improvements to the bill.

We can make improvements to the exchanges. Just as we have done some



of that work in the State of Minnesota, we can do that nationally. We can make improvements to small business rates. Those are things we can do, but we cannot do it if we can't get through the door because the door is closed. When the door is closed, it is not just closed to the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, but the door is closed to the American people.

What it all comes down to is that we need to work in a bipartisan way to make healthcare better and less expensive for the people in our country. Last week, we all came together. I was at that Congressional Baseball Game. It was an amazing moment, with 25,000 people in the stands. All four leaders were out there looking like they actually liked each other. There they were, and there our teams were—two teams, a Republican team and a Democratic team. In the end it was a hard fought game. One team won. The Democratic team won, but do you know what they did with their trophy? They handed it to the Republican team, and they said: Put it in Representative SCALISE's office.

We want to take that spirit and go even further—instead of two teams, one team for America. That is the way we make the changes to an issue that has been long fought on both sides. I know Republicans weren't happy with everything that happened during the debate on the Affordable Care Act. They have made that clear. But now we have a moment in time where we could come together and make some sensible changes and make things better for the people of this country. Let's do it.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Minnesota.

**MR. FRANKEN.** Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise today to talk about the Republican effort happening in total secrecy behind closed doors under the direction of Leader MCCONNELL to repeal the Affordable Care Act and gut Medicaid in order to give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest Georgians, the wealthiest Americans.

Just about 5 months ago, I came before this body. I issued a simple request to Republicans. I asked you to show me your plan to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

I asked you to show me the plan that was going to be "terrific."

As to the bill that President Trump promised during his campaign and the one Republicans had 7 years to come up with, I asked you to explain how you would meet the standards set by one of President Trump's top advisers, Kelly Anne Conway, who said: "We don't want anyone who currently has insurance to not have insurance."

I asked you all to show me the plan that retains coverage for the nearly 20 million people who have gained it, continues to contain healthcare costs, and

ensures that nobody gets denied or has to pay more because of their gender or because of preexisting conditions.

I never got that plan from you. Instead, what we received was the American Health Care Act, or the AHCA, a heartless, terrible bill that passed the House in early May, a bill that President Trump heralded in the Rose Garden, after its passage, as "great."

The AHCA is a far cry from what President Trump and his allies promised. If the AHCA becomes law, 23 million more people would be uninsured. The bill ends protections for people with preexisting conditions and drives up healthcare costs dramatically for older, sicker folks. Worse still, the AHCA would end the Medicaid expansion and slash Medicaid by \$834 billion over 10 years. For what? To offer massive tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans, for the wealthiest Georgians in the Presiding Officer's State. The average tax savings for the 400 richest families under this plan is \$7 million apiece each year—\$7 million each for every year, because they need it.

No wonder people are outraged. Just 8 percent of Americans think the Senate should pass this bill into law unchanged. Well, 8 percent has to be a new low.

Americans do not want TrumpCare. Three in four Americans want President Trump and his administration to do what he can to make the ACA work rather than undermining it.

Even President Trump reportedly now considers the House bill to be "mean." It went from "great" to "mean." In the Rose Garden, it was great. Now, a few weeks later, that same great bill is mean.

Instead of listening to the American people, Republicans are pursuing a strategy that former Acting Administrator of CMS Andy Slavitt has described as sabotage, secrecy, and speed. Up first, sabotage.

In a few years, Republicans have choked off the Risk Corridors Program, which was designed to help stabilize premiums in the first years of the new exchanges. The Trump administration has gone even further. It has stopped enforcing the individual mandate, has undermined outreach efforts to help people sign up for health insurance, and has cut in half the amount of time that people have to sign up for health insurance coverage.

Perhaps the most troubling of all is that Republicans have refused to commit to funding cost-sharing reduction payments. These payments help low-income families cover their out-of-pocket costs. Since insurers are not sure if they can count on the administration to continue to provide these payments, some are pulling out of the individual market or are dramatically increasing their premiums to account for this instability, this uncertainty.

There is much more we can do to shore up the individual market, but my

colleague Senator STABENOW had it right when she said to Secretary Price, of the Presiding Officer's State, regarding the administration's sabotage efforts: "It's like pulling the rug out from under somebody and going, 'Oh, my gosh. They fell down.'"

That was from DEBBIE STABENOW, of Michigan.

The next tenet of the Republican approach is secrecy.

A group of 13 men has been meeting in secret to draft the Senate version of the AHCA. What little we do know is that Senator CORNYN estimates there will be about an 80-percent overlap between the Senate and House bills. Prior to now, our understanding was that the Senate Republicans would completely rewrite the bill, with Senator BURR even saying the House bill was "dead on arrival." It sounds like that plan has been jettisoned, but we cannot be sure because the Senate has had precisely zero hearings, zero days of public floor debate, and we have yet to see or hear about the revised draft of the AHCA, despite the forthcoming vote.

I urge my Republican colleagues to recall that during the long debate over the Affordable Care Act, the Senate held nearly 100 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs, and had 25 consecutive days of public floor debate. Let me repeat that—nearly 100 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs in the Senate alone, with 25 consecutive days of public floor debate on a bill that affects one-sixth of our economy. In the Senate HELP Committee, Senators considered nearly 300 amendments during a 13-day markup—one of the longest in congressional history—and ultimately accepted more than 160 Republican amendments in the process.

In 2009, then-House Budget Committee Ranking Member PAUL RYAN argued:

Before Congress changes healthcare as the American people know it, we must know the likely consequences of the House Democrat legislation, including the number of people who would lose access to their current insurance.

The irony is palpable. Feel the palpable irony. Do you feel it? Does everybody feel it?

That brings me to the final component of the Republican approach, and that is speed.

Leader MCCONNELL would prefer to have a vote on the Senate plan before the July 4 recess or shortly thereafter. That timing only leaves us with a few days to go. There will just not be enough time to truly understand how this bill would affect the healthcare system, which, again, is one-sixth of our economy and affects all of the millions of Americans who rely on it.

Republicans plan to schedule the vote in such a way as to keep the American people in the dark about this bill for as long as possible. The American people deserve a chance to weigh



in on a bill that would affect their lives and those of their friends and families in my State of Minnesota and the Presiding Officer's State of Georgia.

My office has received over 15,000 letters from very worried Minnesotans these past few months, and I have gone to visit rural healthcare facilities that would be among the hardest hit by the AHCA. My constituents—the people of Minnesota—are frankly scared about what will happen to them or their families if they lose their health insurance, and I am too.

As I did in January, I would like to encourage my Republican colleagues to join me on a trip to Minnesota to meet Leanna. Leanna's 3-year-old son Henry has been diagnosed with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. His treatment will last until at least April of 2018. He needs around-the-clock care to manage his nausea, vomiting, pain, and sleepless nights. Henry's immune system is so compromised that he is not supposed to go to daycare so Leanna left her job to care for him. Henry and Leanna are supported by Leanna's spouse, but they cannot pay for his treatment on one salary.

Leanna says:

It is because of the ACA that Henry gets proper healthcare. Henry can get therapy and the things he needs to maintain his health and work towards beating cancer. Henry is still with us because of the ACA.

He is 3.

Let me say that again: "Henry is still with us because of the ACA."

I will do everything I can to fight the Republican effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act, strip away consumer protections, and gut Medicaid.

To all of my constituents who care about this, I need you to keep fighting. Now is the time to make your voices heard.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his attention.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to follow the Senator from Minnesota, as because of him I had the chance to be on the HELP Committee during all of those hearings—all of those dozens and dozens of Republican amendments that took place during the vibrant, robust, bipartisan process in the HELP Committee. Senator FRANKEN was still in litigation over his election so his seat on the HELP Committee was vacant, and Harry Reid asked if I would take that seat. My senior Senator JACK REED and I, both of Rhode Island, were there in the room day after day, week after week, while this exhaustive, public, bipartisan process went forward.

I can even remember working with Senator ISAKSON, of Georgia, and supporting his amendment that would allow a doctor to be paid for having a conversation with a very ill patient

about what his desires were if his condition did not get better. What type of end-of-life care did he want? Did he want every possible intervention or did he want dignified time at home with his family? What were his desires? That is a conversation that is important for doctors to have with those patients.

In the environment of the time, that became the death panel phony story. So I was there. I saw it happen. Thanks to Senator FRANKEN's delay in getting here, JACK REED and I were in the room.

Why does this matter? This matters because, like the story of Leanna and Henry, there are people on the other side of what is—apparently, for our Republican colleagues—a purely political piece of parliamentary chicanery.

I have a constituent, a woman named Pamela, who lives in Jamestown, RI. She works with people and nonprofit organizations that advocate for people who have very rare diseases so, in her work, she has seen the before and after of the Affordable Care Act.

"Before the Affordable Care Act," she wrote to me, "I saw many patients and families distraught by medical bankruptcy."

Then it came even closer to home for Pamela when she was diagnosed with stage IV breast cancer. If there were an annual or a lifetime limit on health benefits, she would be in deep trouble. If the protection for people with pre-existing conditions were undone, that would imperil her ability to get insurance in the future.

She wrote to me:

As a patient myself, with a chronic, costly medical condition, I am very worried that [these] protections will be taken away, making my life-sustaining care unaffordable.

Pamela deserves to be heard, but nobody can speak up for her with a bill that nobody can see.

From Cumberland, Marilyn wrote to me. Marilyn is a family physician. She knows the healthcare system. She also has severe asthma. She has had asthma since she was a little child, and she manages her severe asthma with very expensive medication. Her husband is retired, and Marilyn purchased her health insurance through HealthSource RI—our ObamaCare health insurance marketplace—which, by the way, is working very well. There is no need to undo what is going on in Rhode Island. It gives her peace of mind, and she wrote to me to say she was terrified by the possibility that the preexisting condition clause will be allowed back in.

She wrote:

I am not a specialist but a family medicine physician, doing the best I can to pay my student loans and daily expenses. I could not afford the lifesaving treatment I require to function. . . . I do not know how I would survive financially if the current legislation the House has approved is allowed to become law.

Gina wrote to me from Lincoln, RI. Gina's daughter, Sofia, is 6. Sofia has cerebral palsy. We think we have problems here. I tell you, whatever the political problems we have over the Affordable Care Act, have a 6-year-old with cerebral palsy, and then come back and tell me you have a problem not liking ObamaCare.

Sofia needs round-the-clock care and she gets it because of Medicaid. Gina wrote to me: "From her home nursing care to her wheelchair, we could not live without [Medicaid]."

Before Sofia came along, Gina and her husband never imagined they would need Medicaid; it never crossed their minds. But now, the welfare of their little daughter is entirely dependent on Medicaid. Depending on what we do here, Gina wrote:

Will there even be a Medicaid then? This administration is stripping benefits from the most vulnerable in our society. How will they survive?

The last story I will share is from Tony and his family, who live in North Kingstown, RI. Tony has a son whose name is Michael. Michael, right after he was born, was diagnosed with something called mitochondrial disorder. It is a severely, catastrophically debilitating illness. It left Michael severely disabled. Michael is 10 years old now, but developmentally he is more like a 3-month-old. He can't walk, he can't talk, he can't feed himself, but he is happy, and he is sweet, and he is a source of joy for his parents and his four siblings.

Through Medicaid, Michael can receive up to 30 hours per week of care from a certified nursing assistant. It is this program—it is Medicaid—supporting the certified nursing assistant those 30 hours per week that lets Michael live at home with his parents and those four siblings. Otherwise, he would have to be institutionalized. Somebody explain to me why a political victory shoved through this body after secret proceedings is worth explaining to Michael's parents that he is at risk of losing that coverage.

When President Trump said that the House bill was mean, he was not kidding around. It is mean, mean, mean—dirty, rotten mean. And if you think the one on the Senate side is going to be any better, there is one little phrase I would like to bring to your attention: "We're not stupid."

"We're not stupid" is what a Republican staffer said when he was asked, Why aren't you guys having a public process? Why are you trying to jam this through in secret? His answer: "We're not stupid."

Well, what can you logically deduce from that? What kind of bill would be stupid to show the American public? If this was a bill that was going to be greeted with great applause and joy and relief and satisfaction by the American public, would you hide it?

No. If it were terrible, if it would threaten people all across this country, then you wouldn't want them to see it. That would be stupid.

So that is what they are up to. They know perfectly well that this bill is not good for America. That is why showing it to the American people would be, by their own words, stupid.

Let me switch to my geek point before I go, because this is something I talk about a lot, and it bothers the heck out of me. This is a graph that shows healthcare in most of the countries that compete with us—the OECD nations.

This chart shows life expectancy in years. At the bottom is 72, at the top is 86, so where you fall in this shows where your life expectancy is in the different countries, and life expectancy is a pretty good measure of how good the healthcare system is.

Here is the cost of healthcare per capita, averaged across the population. And as you will notice, most everybody is right up in here—Japan, Switzerland, Netherlands, United Kingdom. Most of our competitors, including France and Germany—they are up in here. Where are we? Out here. The most expensive other country in the world is Switzerland, which doesn't break \$6,000 per person; we are over \$8,000. The average in here, where Japan comes in, above where the United Kingdom comes in, is \$4,000 per person; we are above \$8,000. We are 100 percent more expensive than the average and more than 50 percent more expensive than the least efficient other country in the world.

So there is progress to be made at bringing costs down, if we would pay attention to this real problem instead of the imaginary problem of Americans having too much healthcare.

And over here—look at the life expectancy in years. Look where we come in. We match the Czech Republic. So there is progress to be made on cost and on outcomes in this country. And, believe it or not, we are actually starting to make a little progress. Let me take my colleagues through this graph, and then I will leave you be.

This top line was drawn by the Congressional Budget Office back in 2010. They project forward into the future where they think healthcare costs are going to go. These are all Federal healthcare costs; the whole Federal healthcare costs, all of them piled up—Medicare, Medicaid, veterans—all of it. So here is what they projected it would be, this top line, in 2010. Then, they got to 2016, and they did another projection because they realized that as of 2014, things were coming in below their expectations. After the Affordable Care Act, things started to change. So they did another projection in 2016, and they projected this line right here.

Those of us who serve on the Budget Committee know that we think in 10-

year increments. So here is a 10-year increment from 2017 to 2027. And if you look just at the difference between what CBO predicted in 2010, before the Affordable Care Act, and what they predicted in 2016, after the Affordable Care Act: \$3.3 trillion in savings—\$3.3 trillion in savings. Think of what a difference that makes for our country if you can save \$3.3 trillion in our healthcare costs.

Healthcare costs are what is driving most of our debt and our deficit, so \$3.3 trillion in savings? I tell you what, I want to see this bill because I want to know what CBO thinks about what happens to that \$3.3 trillion in savings. If the cost of this Republican parliamentary chicanery is going to be losing \$3.3 trillion in savings, the American people ought to know about that.

So I call on my Republican colleagues to have a process. I don't know if the Presiding Officer has seen the bill yet. It is so close hold, I don't think all of the Republicans have even seen it. But for gosh sake, when you have these stories from Rhode Island and from all the other States around the country, when you have real fellow Americans counting on the healthcare that the Affordable Care Act made possible, the idea that you throw that out to score political points and to give super rich people a tax break is disgraceful. It is a disgrace.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I want to give a status report on this bill. Right now, we think it is with the 13 men who are working on it in secret; they will show it to Republican lobbyists, and then they will send it over to the CBO for a score, and eventually the American public and the Senate will be able to see the bill.

We will have a process called vote-arama, which is mostly nonsense, and there will be lots of opportunities to offer amendments, but let's be clear about what happens at the end of vote-arama. The leader will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. So what does that mean? That means all of the amendments that were adopted along the way get taken out, with one 51-vote margin, and all of that vote-arama was for show because MITCH MCCONNELL will put his bill on the floor that was negotiated in secret with those 13 people.

If there was any question that our democracy is being rolled over by Senate Republicans, I want you to think about these 13 men. They are drafting a bill without any input from women, from Democrats, from experts, and by working in secret they are cutting out about 250 million people who are from the 40 States who aren't represented among those 13 men. You can bet that those 40 States have unique healthcare

needs and unique healthcare laws. And without the right language, the bill could throw healthcare in each of those States or any of those States into total chaos.

They have also cut out Senators on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Finance Committee, even though these committees are actually constructed for the purpose of working on legislation like this. They know how to get things done like this. There are members of the HELP Committee and the Finance Committee who are among the experts on this issue, yet they don't get a chance to even see the bill. These Senators have jurisdiction over this legislation, but they are being left out. This is just not the way it is supposed to work.

We need transparency. We need bipartisanship. But now the Republicans will try to tell us that the hearings are bypassed all the time. That is not true. In fact, this body will hold a hearing on almost anything. In 2017 alone, the Senate has had hearings on hot tub safety, self-driving cars, a treaty for outer space, multimodal shipping, the maritime administration, and dozens of other issues. Look, those are actually not to be trivialized. It is important for the Senate to have hearings. It is important for subcommittees to do their work. But nobody can tell me that hot tub safety, self-driving cars, a treaty for outer space, multimodal shipping, and the maritime administration are more important than one-sixth of the American economy. It is a joke.

We are talking about one-sixth of the American economy, about millions of jobs, and about people with life-threatening diseases and life-changing medical bills, so we know how important hearings are to do legislation. When the Senate took up the ACA, there were almost 100 hearings. Think about that: 100 hearings versus 0. There were roundtables and walk-throughs held by the two committees. We considered hundreds of amendments and accepted more than 150 amendments from Republicans. But, for this bill, no mark-up, no transparency, no bipartisanship—just 13 men meeting in secret outside of the regular process.

The only thing that has changed is now the market is under siege, but the market is under siege because of the Republican administration. They are purposefully creating uncertainty. That is not a rhetorical flourish; they are saying they are doing that. President Trump actually said he wanted to create uncertainty in the healthcare market in order to create leverage with Democrats.

Think about how unusual that is. Think about how offensive that is. It is perfectly appropriate for one party to try to generate leverage in a negotiation against the other. That is part of politics, either in an election context

or in the public policy context. But the way that this President and Tom Price are trying to generate leverage is by raising healthcare premiums in order to force Democrats to buckle. That is unheard of. It really is unheard of. And it hurts everybody across the country to create this uncertainty.

It is bad enough that the Republicans are trying to take healthcare away from 23 million people—from nursing home patients and their families, from women who are pregnant or fighting breast cancer, from sons and daughters and moms and dads who struggle with opioids. But to add insult to injury, they are going to jam it down your throat. You don't get to read what it is about before it passes or hear from doctors or nurses or experts about how it will affect you.

So why are they working on this bill in secret? The answer is very simple. The bill stinks. They are ashamed of it. The bill itself is an embarrassment. The process is an embarrassment. They have said so themselves. No matter how you look at this, this bill is a disaster for people and their families. It will be a disaster for anyone who relies on Medicaid, which will be cut by at least \$800 billion, and Medicaid is a safety net for people who need care but can't afford it.

Look at nursing home care. Medicaid covers three out of every four long-stay nursing home residents. My wife's grandmother was in a nursing home and just passed away, had great care, and wouldn't have been able to get the care she needed were it not for Medicaid. This is not an uncommon story—millions of Americans across the country of all income levels. People think of Medicaid as for people who are not financially in a position to get care in any given moment. That is true. It does take care of the poor. But it also takes care of nursing home care for people who worked all their lives and just don't have enough. It is \$9,000 a month in the State of Hawaii for nursing home care. It is more than that for hospice care. We all know that nobody escapes end-of-life care. Rich or poor, left or right, red, blue, purple, nobody escapes this part of your life, and everybody needs help. There might be a few people who save up enough cash money to be able to shell out \$10,000 a month for that kind of care, but for the rest of us, Medicaid is that lifeline.

There are actually some Republicans who don't want to cut Medicaid. They have seen how the program improves people's lives. Arkansas and Kentucky, for example, expanded Medicaid. These States have seen big jumps in the number of the people who now have their own doctor or have gotten a checkup in the past year, people who are now more likely to say they are in excellent health. But under TrumpCare, we will be back to the bad old days.

This bill is also a disaster for older people, who will be hit with what the

AARP is calling an age tax. This will get a little wonky—not as wonky as that referred to by my colleague who spoke about 5 minutes ago but a little wonky. Right now, companies are not allowed to charge any more than three times as much for an older person as a younger person. Three times is the cap. But TrumpCare will increase that rate to five times. So what happens is every year, as you get older, your insurance costs will go up and up and up. That is why they call it an age tax. In other words, many seniors will see premium increases that can cost them thousands of dollars more each year at a time when people are already struggling to find money to pay for healthcare.

This is also a disaster for patients who don't want to lose their healthcare provider. Right now, an estimated one in five women goes to Planned Parenthood clinics. I understand we have different views about reproductive choice. I understand that. But we also understand—when we are talking on the level about Planned Parenthood and when we are talking about Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, everybody who pays any bit of attention to this understands what Planned Parenthood does for women across the country—again, conservative women, progressive women; Planned Parenthood doesn't care. Planned Parenthood is not using Federal funding for abortion. We all know that by now. It is cancer screenings, and it is quality healthcare and birth control.

People talk about giving more choices for healthcare and saving taxpayers' money, but the CBO estimates that defunding Planned Parenthood will take away options for nearly 400,000 women across the country and will cost taxpayers more than \$130 million.

It is also a disaster for those struggling with opioid addiction. This bill will take away treatment for mental health and addiction, leaving hundreds of thousands of people fighting opioid addiction without adequate health insurance. We saw the statistics that opioid addiction, I believe, is killing more people annually than HIV/AIDS killed at its apex. I believe it has either surpassed or is comparable, in terms of cause of death, with car accidents. This is one of the leading killers in the country, and Medicaid is the program that funds opioid addiction for most of the people who get help.

This bill is also a disaster for patients with preexisting conditions because it means we will be going back to the dark days when insurance companies could charge you more for having a preexisting condition.

I have heard from people back home in Hawaii who are terrified of what this could mean for their health. One woman wrote that she is in the middle of a fight for her life against breast cancer, and she is scared that under

TrumpCare, she will lose her insurance, that she will have to stop her treatments and could lose her life. A husband wrote to me that his wife has stage IV breast cancer. She has had every possible treatment and surgery imaginable to extend her life, but without the guarantee of affordable coverage for all, her fight will quickly come to an end. She is 29.

Even people without serious medical conditions will be affected by this preexisting condition's nonsense. We know that because before the Affordable Care Act became law, insurance companies were able to discriminate based on what they determined to be a preexisting condition.

One woman in Hawaii told me that in the days before the Affordable Care Act, she was rejected by insurance companies because she had back pain at one point in her life. The pain never came back, and she never needed treatment again. She was young and healthy, but the insurance company wouldn't give her insurance.

We cannot accept the end of nationwide protections for people with preexisting conditions. We cannot accept high premiums or so-called high-risk pools that have historically failed in giving people the coverage they need and deserve. We don't have to do it this way.

We don't have the majority, and this is being done under a process called reconciliation, which means that you don't need a filibuster-proof majority; you just need 51 votes. So if you are proud of your bill—we have Senator HATCH, chairman of the Finance Committee and one of the most respected Republicans in the country, actually. We have Senator ALEXANDER, chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. Both have a long history of being able to do deals—ORRIN HATCH with Teddy Kennedy and my predecessor, Dan Inouye; LAMAR ALEXANDER with just about everybody—CHUCK SCHUMER, PATTY MURRAY. These are conservative Members of the Senate. There is no doubt about their Republican credentials. But they are also people who are capable of crafting legislation in the right way. I have no doubt they like their gavels. I have no doubt they like chairing hearings. I have no doubt they have the personal, intellectual, emotional, and political stamina to go through a process which may take more than a couple of days.

I will tell you, this is the world's greatest deliberative body—it is—and these are a bunch of impressive people I serve within the Senate. But without a hearing, you get a garbage product. You get a bill that just stinks, that staffers say they are keeping secret because “we're not stupid.” They are so embarrassed at this product that they are keeping it secret, because they know the moment this thing gets posted, everybody from everybody's home

State—and not just Democratic States and not just purple States, but every home State is going to say: My community health center is going to get shut down. My opioid treatment center is going to get shut down. My hospital may no longer exist.

They know this bill stinks.

There is a simple solution. All we need is three Republicans to say: Let the Senate be the Senate. The House did whatever the House was going to do.

There was a weird White House Rose Garden signing ceremony without a bill even being enacted. It was the most bizarre thing I have ever seen, where everybody was congratulating each other for inflicting pain on the American people.

But the Senate has to be the Senate here, and what that means is that we have to be that cooling saucer. We have to actually slow down and have a deliberative process. All we need is three Members of the Senate on the Republican side to say a very simple thing. They can be as critical of ObamaCare as they want, they can be as partisan against us as they want, but all they have to say is this: I am not voting for a bill that doesn't get a hearing. I am not voting for a bill that doesn't get a hearing. Let this thing see the light of day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Connecticut. Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Hawaii for convening us here tonight.

This isn't theoretical. This isn't about numbers. This is about real people. We know them. They exist throughout our States.

I have told this story a few times before on the floor of the Senate. When I think about the progress that has been made over the course of the last 6 years, I think about Betty Burger. Betty is a woman who lives in Meriden, CT. Betty and her husband did everything we asked them to do. They were morally upstanding citizens, contributed to their community, had full employment, raised good kids.

Her husband switched jobs. He switched jobs, and he had a 1-week, maybe a 2-week period of time in between those two jobs. As luck—or lack of it—would have it, during that brief intermission between employment, their son was diagnosed with cancer. The cancer then became a preexisting condition, which meant her husband's new employer would not cover the son as part of a family plan. The cancer progressed and progressed and progressed, and this family, the Burgers, had no means to keep up with the payments.

Their story, unfortunately, is not foreign to folks who have heard from constituents who have gone bankrupt because of healthcare costs. The Burg-

ers lost everything. The Burgers first went through their savings, then they went into their son's college account, then they sold their car, then they sold their house. They lost everything they had trying to make sure they had healthcare for their son simply because he got diagnosed with cancer during the one tiny interim between their family's insurance coverage. That pre-existing condition doomed that family. There but for the grace of God—that could be us. That could happen to any one of us.

Yet, today, medical bankruptcy is, frankly, a thing of the past. Why? Well, it is not because healthcare costs any less; it is because we said we are not going to allow insurance companies to deny coverage to someone because they have a cancer diagnosis. In fact, we are not going to allow insurance companies to charge you more just because you are sick. Guess what. People have been able to keep their college savings account. They have been able to keep their car. They have been able to keep their house even if they get sick. That is what this bill has meant. Twenty million more people are insured, yes, but the number of personal bankruptcies in this country has plummeted by 50 percent, almost entirely because there aren't Burgers any longer. There aren't people who had to live through what the Burger family had to live through.

That is what this is about. This is about real people who are going to go through miserable, terrible experiences because of the bill Senate Republicans are just days away from putting onto the floor.

I know my colleagues have covered this exhaustively, but I just want to show visually what CBO says the House bill does.

I know it is in vogue for the President and Republicans to say that ObamaCare is in a death spiral, but that is not what CBO says. CBO says that if you keep the Affordable Healthcare Act and actually implement it rather than undermine it, rather than sabotage it, as the President of the United States is today, the number of people who don't have health insurance will remain fairly stable from 2017 to 2026. It is about 28 million people. But if you enact the American Health Care Act, the bill that passed through the House, that number goes almost immediately from about 26 million up to 40 million. Right about 14 million people lose insurance right off the bat. Like within a heartbeat of passing this bill, about 14 million people will lose insurance, and then, over time, it grows to 51 million people. That is not the affordable healthcare act in a death spiral. That is market stability. This is a death spiral. The death spiral starts upon passage of the act being secretly negotiated today.

I get it that 23 million is kind of a hard number to get your head wrapped

around. What does 23 million people really mean? These numbers are so huge. So here is what 23 million people is. It is the entire population of Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, and let's just throw in West Virginia. That is what 23 million people is. That is a humanitarian catastrophe.

Remember, 23 million people is what you get to at the end of 10 years, but 14 million people lose it right off the bat. There is no way for our healthcare system to provide coverage to 14 million people who had insurance one day and then don't have it the next. By the way, they tend to be the sickest people because that is who is going to lose healthcare first.

Why are we doing this? Why would you choose to inflict this kind of pain on people? Why would you ask to run for Congress in order to put this kind of hurt on the American public?

Here is the answer. I wish this weren't the answer. I wish there were a different answer, but here is the answer. Twenty-three million people lose health insurance, and the cost of that is about \$800 billion of money out of the healthcare system. It is not coincidence that that then gets transferred into 650 or so odd-billion dollars in tax breaks for the pharmaceutical companies, the insurance companies, and for really, really rich people. It is not just by accident that it worked out that the amount of money you took from poor people and from middle-class people and from sick people is the exact amount of money you are transferring to the pharmaceutical industry, the insurance industry, and rich people.

Here is another way of looking at it. Here is where the tax cuts go: The lowest quintile, the second quintile, the middle quintile, even the fourth quintile don't get a lot of money out of this tax break. It is the top quintile, the top 20 percent of income earners who get an average tax cut of \$2,700.

Here is the big benefit: The top 1 percent of income earners—a \$37,000 tax cut out of this bill. The top 1 percent of income earners get a \$37,000 tax cut from this bill. Let me say that again: 23 million people lose healthcare so that the top 1 percent of income earners get a \$37,000 tax cut. Who runs for Congress to do that? What constituency is asking for the U.S. Congress to pass a bill that takes health insurance from all sorts of working Americans, people who are playing by the rules—people like the Burgers—in order to pass a tax cut for the super wealthy?

I don't know what is happening behind those closed doors. I don't know exactly what they are talking about, but I am going to guarantee you that it is not fundamentally different than what the House bill did, which is what I am describing here. There are still

massive numbers of people losing healthcare, rich people getting a tax cut, and lots of folks getting hurt. Why? Just because Republicans made a political promise to do this.

I know I have other colleagues who want to talk. Let me turn for a moment to this process because the process does matter. The majority is breaking the Senate. They are breaking the Senate. Don't think this will not be how this works if you are in the minority. The fact is, we acknowledge that there is a lot that is still very wrong with the American healthcare system. Our constituents command us to try to make those things better. We would love nothing more than to sit down with the Republicans and try to figure out how we can come together on a path forward to make this healthcare system better. I know you don't believe us, but you didn't even try.

I am not sure we believed you at the beginning of 2009 when you said: We want to help people get insurance. We watched Republicans have control of the Presidency and the House and the time Senate for a long time without a lot of progress being made, but Democrats tried.

Democrats spent a whole year sitting down with the Republicans, trying to figure out if there was common ground—holding committee processes, exhaustive hearings. There were 30 days of Senate debate on the floor. I get it; in the end Republicans didn't support that package. I get that Republicans can lay blame at the feet of Democrats for not crafting something that could win Republican support. I understand how that argument works.

The fact is that when Democrats were in the majority, they tried. They opened up the committee process. They let everyone in the public see the debate we were having. Why? Because it is a big deal.

We are talking about one-fifth to one-sixth of the American economy. If you are talking about reordering that biggest segment of the U.S. economy, if you are talking about millions of people benefiting or losing, that shouldn't happen behind closed doors.

My constituents, even though they are represented by Democrats, have no fewer rights than the citizens of Iowa or the citizens of Texas who are represented by Republicans. Why are my constituents not allowed to see the details of what is about to happen to their lives? Why are only a select group of Americans able to have a voice inside that room? Why are the people of Connecticut going to get 3 minutes to look at this bill once it hits the Senate floor? My constituents are Americans, just as the constituents in Republican States are Americans. They deserve to know what is about to happen to them.

You are breaking the Senate. It will not get put back together that easily. These are tough questions. They are

partisan questions, but it doesn't mean there is not an obligation to try to find common ground. If you can't find common ground, don't bury the proceedings behind closed doors where nobody can see it.

People hate this bill. They hate this bill. They hate it in part because they don't trust the process. When they see this balance—tax breaks for pharma, insurance, and rich people—and then losing coverage, they want to know why they lose and why super rich people win, but they can't get answers because it is all happening behind closed doors.

It is not too late. I will just end there. Senator SCHATZ said it right: It is not too late. My Republican colleagues can reject this and say: Let's start over. Let's sit down and see if there are some Democrats who want to work on stabilizing these exchanges, seeing if there is some middle ground, being able to build a bipartisan consensus when it comes to the future of the healthcare system.

It is not too late. I think you are going hear that consistently from my colleagues this evening.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOOKER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. I have yielded the floor, but I will happily engage in a colloquy.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, can I ask the Senator from Connecticut a question?

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

Mr. BOOKER. Thank you very much.

The Senator's charts plainly showed who benefits from the Republican bill that we saw in the House. The CBO, as he pointed out, plainly demonstrates that 23 million Americans will lose healthcare. I have heard him talk about this on other issues—how we as Americans are far more connected than we realize and that while one family might suffer from lack of health insurance—like the folks he talked about in the beginning of his remarks—the reality is that when that child doesn't get the healthcare they deserve, when they don't achieve in life the great potential they might have, others suffer as well. You see this as you travel to European countries. They have vastly more people insured, vastly more investments in childhood education and childhood healthcare.

I am wondering if the Senator can extrapolate for me for a moment that this isn't just about individual families who are vulnerable. It is really all Americans, who suffer when other Americans are not getting the benefit of healthcare in this country.

Mr. MURPHY. I think we all got a gut punch earlier today. We received news that the young man who just returned from North Korea, after being abused and tortured there, had passed.

If you read the statement from his family, it was hard to read. You couldn't help but read that without feeling your heart drop into your stomach. Why? Because this was a young man with such promise ahead of him, who had that future robbed from him.

I didn't know him. My colleague didn't know him. The people in my State who were similarly affected didn't know him, yet they felt something.

I think the reason this bill is so wildly unpopular is that people are going to die. The fact is, if people don't get coverage for addiction, if folks who are mentally ill don't get to see a doctor, they aren't going to survive. Even those who have enough money to be able to pay for the premium increases in this bill—they know there is something a little evil in wanting to do this to people.

As my colleague remarked, even if you are not amongst the 23 million people who lose insurance, the CBO also says your rates are going up because when those people don't get health insurance, they show up somewhere else in the system. They show up at the emergency rooms. They get much more expensive care. That cost gets passed on to the rest of us.

Even if you are lucky enough not to be amongst the 23 million, you are going to be personally, financially affected by this. The CBO says that everyone's rates will go up by 15 to 20 percent. Even if it is not the money you care about, we are all connected, and nobody should want this to happen to people. We are all weaker if we pass a piece of legislation that ends up hurting people in such a real, meaningful, and devastating way.

Mr. BOOKER. If I can ask the Senator from Connecticut one more question—that interrelatedness is a part of a larger system. We all benefit from these systems. My colleague mentioned hospitals, and whether it is my family who gets injured and is rushed to a hospital or a wealthy family or a poor family, those hospitals are a critical part of the healthcare system.

I was mayor of a city, and I imagine my experience is similar to that of the Senator from Connecticut. Our hospitals before the Affordable Care Act were having a really difficult time because so many of those costs at the most expensive point—when a disease had become so much more acute—were being pushed into hospital emergency rooms. My State was having a very difficult time with the costs of that charity care. They literally had tough choices. They weren't going to close their doors when somebody went into diabetic shock or someone had an asthma attack or some of those diseases were not treated at an earlier stage.

I am wondering if the Senator can help explain, in terms of Connecticut's perspective, why this has an impact on

all of us in terms of the systemic healthcare systems that sustain our communities.

Mr. MURPHY. I think it is important to understand what the law says. The law says there is only one healthcare provider that by law has to treat every single person who comes in the door; they can't turn away individuals based upon their ability to pay. That is the emergency room.

What we also know is that the emergency room is the place you get the most expensive care. By the time you get there, you are often in crisis. The care you receive in the emergency room is expensive, and then all of the care you need afterward is expensive as well.

I always remember a woman from Connecticut who lost her Medicaid coverage. In losing her Medicaid coverage, she didn't end up being able to see a doctor for an infection she had in her foot. It was hurting her for a long time, that infection. She didn't have Medicaid any longer, so she just decided to let it hurt. She popped some Tylenol and hoped it would go away. One day it was so painful that she went to the emergency room, and it was too late. It was too late. Her foot had become so badly infected that she had to have that foot—that leg below her knee—amputated.

She had no insurance, so we all picked up the cost of that, but she had her life altered in a way that is hard for us to fathom, and there is not a single winner in that scenario because, obviously, her entire life is changed because of that.

It is not as if we had saved any money in treating her so shabbily because we ended up having to cover all of those costs. That is one story. If you think about what the House bill does, it repeats that story millions of times over. It is morally bankrupt, but it is also fiscally imprudent and foolish.

Mr. BOOKER. That brings up one more issue, if the Senator will indulge me, because I just visited his State. As I was talking to a lot of his members—being from New Jersey, there might be a small rivalry between our two northeastern States. A couple of folks came up to me and got in my face in a polite and joking way about how our Constitution was formed. They talked about the Connecticut Compromise. As you well know, this was a compromise that allowed our Republic to form, understanding they would have two bodies, the House and Senate. Every State would have two Members representing it. In many ways, the Founders of our country, coming out of this, viewed this body very differently than the other body.

Now, the other body, you served in. I am hoping maybe you can shine some light. I have been here 3½ years. You had experience as a House Member and as a Senator. You said something some

people at home might dismiss as hyperbolic partisanship, but I have been here 3½ years, and I have seen this body change. What frustrates me is that when I was here for a brief period of time and Democrats were in the majority, I heard Republicans talk about regular order, how urgent regular order is. When we are in charge, we will have regular order. The leader spoke publicly about this thing called “regular order.” The House operates on majority rule. Our Founders saw that as a very different body than this, which is in many ways talked about as a different rhythm—a different way of doing things. In fact, one Senator over here can have a lot of power within this system, sometimes to the frustration of folks, to slow things down.

You made the claim about this being broken. This is a perfect example of it—this idea that this would be the body, on such a big issue, that would have a chance to be deliberative and to focus on this. I think you are right. We have seen this body, in the very short period of time I have been here, begin to undermine not just things that happened under the Obama administration but to undermine traditions that go back decades, if not more than a century.

I wonder if, being that State, as I was told, so critical to our Constitution, you could give some light on why you really are substantively, factually saying that this is probably one of the low moments of the Senate in the way that this process is being done.

Mr. MURPHY. There is, right outside this Chamber, a picture of the authors of the Connecticut Compromise, two of the Connecticut delegates to the Constitutional Convention.

Mr. BOOKER. They might have been born in New Jersey.

Mr. MURPHY. I appreciate that shout out to Connecticut. You are right. The idea of the House is that it is supposed to respond, perhaps, more quickly to the temporary passions of the public, which is ironic, given that the passion of the public today is in deep opposition to this piece of legislation. Unfortunately, the House is responding to the passions of one very small portion of the public, which is the extreme Republican base, which maybe is the only remaining segment of this country that supports the American Health Care Act.

This place is supposed to be able to step back and look at the long term and look at the long view. That is why we have 6-year terms, so we don't do something that may feel good in the moment politically but has devastating impacts over the course of time. That is exactly what this debate is about. It is about a massive reordering of one-fifth of our economy that has just enormous consequences over time, when these people who lose insurance start to feel the effects of that as they

bleed through their savings over 5 or 10 years and go bankrupt at the back end of that time period.

So this is a place where both parties should be able to sit down and talk about what this really means for folks. I thought Senator SCHATZ put it well. When you don't engage in regular order, not only do you do things that are very partisan and political, but you also do things that don't make sense.

One of the things that regular order brings is the ability to talk to experts. We all sit on committees, and those committees bring experts to the table to tell us what the impact of legislation is. There has been no committee process on this bill. We haven't had a single committee meeting. We had one hearing in the HELP committee upon which I sit.

So as Senator SCHATZ said, the result is a product that is garbage—that, logistically, does not work because neither the House nor the Senate engaged in the kind of deliberation that would get you to the facts. Yes, this place is supposed to work differently, but also you are supposed to use the committee process to make sure that you are not passing something that just makes sense politically but makes sense from a policy standpoint as well.

Mr. BOOKER. I thank Senator MURPHY for giving me those few moments.

I wonder if the Chair would recognize me to give a few remarks myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. BOOKER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I want to pick up on that conversation that we were having, in which Senator MURPHY laid plain on his charts about larger issues with this bill. I want to get back to the point he was just talking about and that I observed here in the Senate for about 3½ years, and that is the functioning of this body. I love history. I am one of these guys who doesn't read any fiction any more. I love reading about this country, about its past leaders, about great moments in history.

What is interesting about this body is that, being someone who has the privilege to stand on this floor—quite literally, given to me by the State that I love, New Jersey—I walk on this floor and I feel a sense of history every time I am here. It has been 3½ years, and it hasn't lost its “wow” factor for me that I get to stand on this floor. I have to say that I love my State, and in my campaigning, I don't think the issue that I am New Jersey's first Black Senator came up that much. New Jerseyans wanted to know: Would I come down here and fight for them? I was aware of the history of being the fourth African American popularly elected in the history of this body. I came down here as a student of many of the great moments in time on this floor and many of the records that were set.



I think some of those records are really germane to this moment right now. The longest filibuster on this floor is where one Senator could actually grind the workings of the Senate down to a crawl because of Senate rules and Senate traditions. In this case, it is something I wasn't even alive for, but something that, to me, is frustrating. But it is a moment of history that shows what regular order is. It slows down this body.

A filibuster takes 60 votes to overcome. So here was this moment. It was actually almost exactly 60 years ago. That was the 1957 Civil Rights Act. It was Strom Thurmond who gave this long filibuster, trying to block something that—yes, indeed—was going to have societal impacts on this country—the 1957 Civil Rights Act. This is one illustration of how, when monumental pieces of legislation come to this floor, the history of this body and the traditions of this body are to slow things down, to have a process, to have rules—especially for things that are so monumental. In this case, it was the 1957 Civil Rights Act—something on which we look back in the past and say: Wow, it took them a long time to get there, but it demonstrates what this body's rules have been about for a long time.

Let me go with another record that I mentioned earlier tonight, but it shows, again, that when monumental pieces of legislation are coming, this is a body that looks closely, takes its time, is deliberative, and has a time-honored process. That is the other record set by the longest consecutive session in Senate history. It was a debate about truly one of the more important things in our society, which is issues of war and peace. The longest consecutive session in the Senate history of debate and of deliberation—open and public, not just for the Nation to see but for the world to see—was a debate during the First World War about whether to arm merchant ships. It brought about tremendous consternation, tremendous debate, as we did the lead up to the First World War. What is interesting is, if you think about the forming of our country in that debate—again, the Constitutional Convention was public, open, transparent—issues were debated. One of the fundamental reasons for organizing our government was seen as the protection of the American people, the ideals of a common defense, and the public welfare. These were the things, literally, put into the preamble of our Constitution, about what this government is about—that these are the most important ideals. In fact, we herald some of these ideals. They have become part of our civic gospel. Everyone knows when they hear the words “liberty and justice for all” that they are part of our civic gospel.

Part of that gospel, as well—in the core center of our country—is that this

is a nation about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As to that word “life,” this government, this Republic is affirming the ideals of life. It is only understandable when we are debating epic pieces of legislation that will go to affect the lives of tens of millions of Americans.

I was in the children's hospital today. Families in peril, families in crisis were talking about the lives of their children. I have seen it happen, unfortunately, to neighbors and people of my community. When the lives of their children are at stake or threatened or afflicted with disease, it puts so many things in perspective.

So here we have legislation speeding its way to the Senate floor that goes to the fundamental ideals of this Nation. Will we be a country that has a system of healthcare that affirms life?

When we are talking about records in the Senate, it is no coincidence to me that one of the longest times that there was a consecutive session in Senate history for debate—no coincidence to me—was about war and peace. It was the rush, as some people saw it then, toward war in World War I. What is fascinating is that folks should know that the second longest consecutive session in Senate history was about healthcare. It was in 2010. It was over the Affordable Care Act, a bill that the full Senate spent 25 consecutive days considering, 160 hours. Those 160 hours in session does not include hundreds more hours in committee hearings, in meetings. All that took place in the development of a bill that came to this floor and set a record about being the second longest debate.

It is perfectly justifiable that the bill should have taken so much time, so much focus—that the world's greatest deliberative body would deliberate, would do its job. As for that piece of legislation, don't believe the lie; it wasn't rushed through here. It didn't get the express train through the Senate. It set records for discussion, deliberation, debate, and a process that included comments, input, thoughts, and testimony from Americans across the country—not just red States, not just blue States, but of all Americans. It was justifiable. It was absolutely justifiable.

I wasn't here. I was at home in Newark. I was mayor of the city.

This debate went on and on and on, and it captured the attention of the Nation. It was something I had never seen before and I haven't seen since. The President of the United States then, Barack Obama—this to me was stunning; it caught my attention—was on national TV cameras. Sure, it was C-SPAN—not what I turn to first when I am home relaxing on my couch. But the President of the United States invited Congress in—Republicans, some of the smartest minds. I have served here 3½ years now. Some of the smart-

est minds I have met in this country are here in the Senate on the Republican side. He invited the Congress in to discuss and debate with him on live TV healthcare. I don't know if Reagan did that. I don't know if Bill Clinton did that. I can't remember that they did. So here was something that was done fully in the light, vetted, debated, deliberated, discussed in open air.

The hearing numbers are incredible. I have been here 3½ years, and I have never seen anything like it. In the Senate's so-called HELP Committee—Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions—they held 14 bipartisan roundtables, 13 bipartisan hearings, 20 bipartisan walkthroughs, and they considered 300 amendments. This is the thing I didn't know until I got to the Senate because of all the rhetoric on 24-hour cable news. This wasn't a purely Democratic bill. They actually accepted over 160 amendments from Republicans. The stories I have heard from people on both sides of the aisle is that they were bending over backward trying to pick up one Republican vote, so they incurred and took on amendments that actually shaped the bill, Republican ideas onto this healthcare bill, 160 amendments. But stop, that is only in the HELP Committee.

In the Senate Finance Committee, they held 17 bipartisan roundtables, they held summits and hearings, 13 member meetings and walkthroughs, 38 meetings and negotiations, bipartisan. They held a markup. I have been to lots of markups. I have never seen them last or scarcely can think of times they have lasted for more than a day, but they held, in the Finance Committee, a 7-day markup on the bill. That 7-day markup—talk about records—that 7-day markup was the longest markup on a bill in 20 years. That was the process.

A bill affecting that fundamental American ideal that this Nation—founded like no other, not a theocracy, not a monarchy. It is the oldest constitutional democracy on the planet Earth that affirmed ideals that put into the ether of Earth, for the first time, this Constitution, talking about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This healthcare bill involved such debate and discussion and the Nation participated. Policy experts, market experts, medical professionals, health nonprofits, insurers, hospitals, Americans all got to put forward their input, their ideas. Sure, all of them were not accepted, but everything went into the mix.

This should be shocking to the consciousness of all people of good conscience who aren't reflexively partisan, but look at the history of this country, a history that is proud, a history that should be shameful about how things got done in matters of war and peace, in matters of foreign policy and domestic, in matters like integration and



civil rights that made it possible for me to stand on the Senate floor. There was a process, and somehow in the last 3½ years—in the name of what? A vicious brand of partisanship that somehow undercuts not just the voice of Democrats, not just the voice of policy experts, not just the voice of hospital experts, not just the voice of medical professionals—it doesn't just undercut their involvement in the process, but it is an insult to the history and the traditions of this body.

This was not the constitutional intent that something as important as healthcare should be done in a back room where a small handful of Senators are trying to hammer out amongst themselves a piece of legislation that is going to affect tens of millions of Americans and change our economy and change our communities. There is honor in this place that isn't on TV. There are good folks on both sides of the aisle. I have gotten to know them. I consider folks my friends. I know their hearts. This does not sit well the way this is being handled. I know it.

This is one of those moments of history that somebody just needs to raise their hand and say: You know what. I might even like that bill that comes out of that back room. I may like that bill that was hammered out by 12 Republicans, but this process is wrong. It is an insult to our history. I wouldn't want this done to me.

This is the moment. It is a test. History will look back and see what this body did at this moment in history. I fear we are going to fail the test.

What is even more painful than that, for me, is not just the sadness or the anguish I feel about a body contorting its traditions, breaking its way, what even hurts me more than that is what they are going to be pushing through. We saw it in the House.

Instead of this body coming together—and literally there is agreement on this. All of us believe the Affordable Care Act needs to be improved. I have had it in conversations, formal and informal, that we could build upon the Affordable Care Act. We could correct for its deficiencies, and we could build upon its extraordinary successes.

I see those extraordinary successes in my State. I have Republicans and Democrats who are now fearful about the consequences should a bill like the House Republican healthcare bill be made law. There are folks who fear for their families, fear for their children, who don't want to go back to the Nation we had before, where the No. 1 reason for bankruptcy was not being able to afford your medical bills, where people with preexisting conditions were denied insurance, when mental healthcare wasn't in parity with physical healthcare. I can go through all the things I have seen make a huge dif-

ference in New Jersey in communities, rural and urban, for Americans.

I want to highlight some of those right now, some of those questions that people are asking at home about what happens if a bill like the House bill becomes law, if they take that bill here in the Senate and push it through, send it back to the House this bill that subverted process, inclusion and debate and deliberation, and go to that process called reconciliation. There are questions that are being asked.

Here is one: What happens to a mother who is pregnant with, say, her second child who suddenly loses Medicaid coverage? Now, understand, a very large percentage of the children born in the United States of America are born covered by Medicaid, which we already see in this House bill is being gutted, which is the biggest rollback in the safety net in our country in my lifetime and more.

What happens to that mother who is pregnant with her second child and loses her Medicaid coverage and her prenatal care? If she loses her prenatal care along with it, what happens to that American citizen? What happens to that baby?

Well, we know that according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, babies born to mothers who receive no prenatal care are five times more likely to die than those whose mothers did receive prenatal care. Tragically, women without prenatal care are three to four times more likely to suffer maternal mortality—that means dying in childbirth—than women with prenatal care, and these rates significantly increase for women of color.

What happens to the tens of thousands of mothers who may lose access to maternity services, and what happens to the already dismal infant mortality rate and maternal mortality rates in our country if this plan goes through? That is a legitimate question. The data is clear. You restrict access to prenatal care, you endanger children, Americans, and you endanger mothers.

Let's keep asking those questions. What happens to the healthcare worker who works 60 hours a week taking care of others but loses their own healthcare coverage and then is unable to afford getting screened themselves, preventive screenings for cancer—let's say ovarian cancer. What happens to them? We don't have to imagine what happens when millions of Americans forgo preventive screenings. We have factual data on what happens should access to those preventive screenings—like what happened with the House healthcare bill—what would happen.

The American Cancer Society tells us clearly that inadequate health coverage is a barrier to preventive care, early detection, and optimal treatment. They find, for example, that pa-

tients with stage II colorectal cancer who have it detected have higher survival rates. In fact, they point out that people with stage II colorectal cancer with adequate health insurance have better survival rates than people with stage I colorectal cancer who have no health coverage. In other words, the American Cancer Society shows that access leads to survival and denial leads to higher rates of death.

A recent cancer study found that “the number of Americans whose cancers were diagnosed at the earliest stage when it was most likely to be cured increased after ObamaCare went into effect, and more citizens had access to health coverage.” You take away the expanded coverage that was founded through ObamaCare, you decrease preventive screenings, you decrease early detection and, as indicated by the American Cancer Society, death rates go up.

Another question, in general: What happens to cancer rates in America when these gains are reversed? What happens when these gains are reversed? What happens to the father of two who is diagnosed with a rare cancer who can't afford the additional estimated \$82,000? His cancer treatment goes up if this bill, like the Republican House bill, passes. That is what is estimated—\$82,000 is what his cancer treatments would go up. What happens when he can't afford that care, when he is forced to choose between his family's home, for example, and treating his cancer?

Well, this is what we know. These are the facts that from 2010 to 2016, personal bankruptcy filings have dropped close to 50 percent in the United States of America. One of the collateral benefits of ObamaCare is there was a 50-percent drop in personal bankruptcy filings, with experts agreeing that the Affordable Care Act played an important role in this significant decrease.

A group of economists has estimated that the House Republican bill would cost the average enrollee more than \$1,500 more per year than the current system. This is despite the fact the surveys have found that the majority of Americans have less than \$1,000 in savings, with one study finding that 63 percent of Americans don't have the savings to cover a \$500 emergency.

Remember what Senator MURPHY showed? That is a bill that gives massive tax cuts to the wealthiest of Americans, shifting the cost burden so the average enrollee now under this bill is going to see a \$1,500-more-per-year payment when the average American doesn't have the savings to cover about a \$500 emergency.

Another question that folks are asking is, What happens to the family whose child with a disability loses their access to home and support services—the physical and speech therapy they receive through Medicaid—if the Republican plan goes forward?

I was in a hospital today with such parents telling me about children who—the only way they got the coverage was because of the expanded Medicaid. Now what happens under the Republican plan? We know that Medicaid is a critical lifeline for people and families with disabilities, providing access to services such as rehabilitative therapy to help children meet developmental goals.

One of the incredible young women, girls, I met today—because of developmental therapy, she went from not being able to walk to now continuing to do the things that her normal teenage peers and her twin sister are able to do.

We know that today, 15 percent of kids are growing up with developmental disabilities. In New Jersey, 1 in 41 children lives with autism. But this plan that was passed in the House threatens to make it more difficult for children with disabilities to receive the care they need, to go to school, and to live healthy lives. Losing coverage could mean the difference between a child with a disability achieving a developmental milestone or falling further behind. Unfortunately, in the Republican bill that passed the House, that is exactly what will happen if it should become law.

If that bill passes, what will happen to older Americans who qualify for Medicare but still need access to critical health services? We know that insurance companies would likely be allowed to charge older Americans much higher premiums under the Republican plan. Remember, it used to be capped. The cost for older Americans used to be capped. It is now being estimated that Americans between the ages 55 and 64 would pay some of the highest increases. That increase would be \$5,200 more per year. Standard & Poor's actually estimated that premiums for a 64-year-old could increase by 30 percent under the Republican bill that passed the House.

The Congressional Budget Office noted in their report on the House Republican health care plan that "although the agencies expect that the legislation would increase the number of uninsured broadly, the increase would be disproportionately large among older people with lower incomes, particularly people between 50 and 64 years of age with incomes of less than 200 percent of the Federal poverty level." Think about that for a second. Executives of insurance companies, pharma companies—the richest will get tax breaks into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, but the poorest folks, the elderly in our community, according to the CBO, would see their costs go up considerably.

The New Jersey Hospital Association noted that "under current law, a 64-year-old making \$26,500 a year will pay an average of \$1,700 in annual pre-

miums." Under the AHCA—the Republican plan in the House—that same individual making just above minimum wage will pay, under their plan, between \$13,600 and \$16,100 in premiums. That is the increase for older Americans, working Americans. That is the increase.

We know that as more older Americans lose their health coverage and in turn enter Medicare in worse health, our entire Medicare system is made weaker and less solvent.

If this bill passes, what happens to older Americans who have already spent their life savings in nursing homes? We know that right now for elder Americans in nursing homes, Medicaid actually covers the cost of two out of three of those individuals.

I will quote from a piece that ran just this past weekend in the New York Times: "Roughly one in three people now turning 65 will require nursing home care at some point during his or her life."

Over three-quarters of long stay nursing home residents will eventually be covered by Medicaid.

Many American voters think Medicaid is only for low-income adults and their children, for people who aren't "like them." But Medicaid is not somebody else's insurance; it is an insurance for all of our mothers and fathers and eventually for ourselves.

I continue the quote:

Mr. Trump and the Republicans would lower spending on the frailest and most vulnerable people in our healthcare system. They would like most Americans to believe that these cuts will not affect them, only their "undeserving neighbors," but that hides the truth that draconian cuts to Medicaid affect all of our families. They are a direct attack on our elderly or disabled and are dangerous.

I want to wrap up with this concluding thought: We know right now that we are at a turning point in our country, that the process that has made this deliberative body known throughout the land, throughout humanity—that this deliberative body is about to alter its tradition and have a bill that affects tens of millions of Americans done and crafted in a back room without public input and rushed to this floor. That is what the process is right now.

As Martin Luther King said in a speech to the medical community for human rights in 1966, "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and inhumane."

This bill will perpetuate injustice in our Nation. It will further the gulf between the haves and have-nots. But it does not just target the vulnerable, the elderly, the poor; it targets all of us. It targets our character as a country, our highest ideals, the very core of many, if not all, of our States. The least of these. The least of these.

We cannot allow this legislation that will so hurt our country to be crafted

in darkness behind closed doors. It subverts a mighty tradition of the world's most deliberative body to be rushed through and cause so much damage to so many Americans and indeed the very soul of our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Indiana.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

### TRIBUTE TO DR. M. LYNNE CORN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to submit to the RECORD of the U.S. Senate a statement to celebrate the career of public service of Dr. M. Lynne Corn, offer my heartfelt congratulations on the occasion of her retirement from the Congressional Research Service, and wish her happiness and prosperity in the next chapter of her life.

For over three decades, Dr. Corn dedicated the better portion of her professional career to serving the Congress of the United States from within the halls of the Library of Congress. As a specialist in the study of natural resources, Federal land management, earth sciences, agriculture, and endangered, species recovery, she has guided and informed the decisionmaking of countless Members of Congress and Senators, and their staffs, on the major, related issues of her time.

As a Senator representing the State of Utah and as a Westerner, her policy acumen has on countless occasions aided legislative efforts that have had a substantial impact on my constituency. She has served as an invaluable guide in the drafting of legislation and helped inform some of the most difficult votes I have cast, and I can say without question that she has helped guide the process of passing some of the most difficult pieces of legislation into law. As well, as some of my most senior staff can attest, she leaves her position with a reputation of being among the most informed and insightful research and policy advisors on Capitol Hill.

Let the record show that Dr. Corn began working at the Congressional Research Service in 1985, after having served for almost 6 years in a congressional office, including as an AAAS—American Association for the Advancement of Science—congressional science fellow from 1979 to 1980. Dr. Corn came to Capitol Hill after sharing her enthusiasm for the ecology of all types of

animals and plants with students at Middlebury College, VT; Stockton State College, NJ; and Arizona State University.

Dr. Corn adeptly transitioned from pedagogy to informing congressional deliberations on policy development, especially related to the Endangered Species Act. Although her doctoral research at Harvard University was related to a tropical ant species, Congress put her biological expertise to work researching and writing on the Pacific Northwest's spotted owl and the species and habitat of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Dr. Corn also became an expert in various conservation related trust funds, as well as the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, which is critical to the rural inhabitants of my home state of Utah. Dr. Corn excelled in the use of visual aids, such as maps, to explain complex issues to congressional audiences.

But the work of a congressional researcher can sometimes be more lighthearted. I will share one incident, as it has been told to me, when it was the staff that provided the visual aid. Dr. Corn was asked to come to a Senate office to identify a dead snake coiled in a coffee tin. Upon examination, she identified the snake, a corn snake, just as the Senator walked into the office. As a country-raised man, he knew well the species that was native to his region, and a memorable conversation with the Senator followed, about the quiddities of that particular species, which both the Senator and Dr. Corn had caught on multiple occasions. When I learned of this incident, it struck me uniquely because, as it turns out, this incident occurred in the office of a former President Pro Tempore of the Senate, Senator Robert Byrd. I can say that those are the types of moments that make our jobs worthwhile.

I will conclude with what is perhaps most important: Dr. Corn has served her country and worked with her colleagues in Congress with a unique charisma that has so often breathed life into the absolutely critical, but sometimes tedious task of researching policy decisions and legislation. By way of an example, there is something revealing about the word "critters"—which she so often used—that reflects not only the authentic passion that she held for her subject area, but also her flare for artfully transforming arcane concepts into digestible and actionable information, which is a distinguished trait that Members of Congress so appreciably rely upon.

Again I reiterate my gratitude for Dr. Corn's service, and I wish her a blessed and relaxing future, with her dearly beloved dogs, as she departs from her career in the Congressional Research Service.

#### TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN SARA A. JOYNER

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I honor a superb leader, liaison, and warrior. After more than 2 years of service as Director of the Navy Senate Liaison Office, CAPT Sara Annette Joyner is very deservedly moving on and moving up to assume the responsibilities of a rear admiral, lower half. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize Captain Joyner's distinguished service and dedication to fostering the relationship between the U.S. Navy and this Chamber.

Captain Joyner is a 1989 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. An attack pilot by designation, Captain Joyner has not only been training and teaching to fight aerial adversaries, she has been attacking history. Call sign "Clutch," Captain Joyner is a groundbreaking leader, as the Navy's first female strike fighter squadron commanding officer at VFA-105 and the first female Carrier Air Wing Commander at CVW-3 aboard the USS *Harry S. Truman*. Captain Joyner has held numerous other leadership positions in the Navy, including assignment as the joint strike fighter requirements officer, with the CNO's strategic studies group, and most recently as director, Navy Senate liaison, from 2015 to 2017.

Over the course of the last 3 years, Captain Joyner has led 37 Congressional Delegations to 47 different countries. She has escorted 44 Members of Congress and over 48 personal and professional staff members. I have had the pleasure of traveling with Captain Joyner on many of these trips. She has distinguished herself by going above and beyond the call of duty to facilitate and successfully execute each and every trip, despite any number of weather, aircraft, and diplomatic complications.

This Chamber will feel Captain Joyner's absence. I join many past and present Members of Congress in my gratitude and appreciation to Captain Joyner for her outstanding leadership and unwavering support of the missions of the U.S. Navy, and especially to her patient and supportive family, Commander James "Bud" Mitchell Joyner, Sara Elizabeth Joyner, and Mark Samuel Joyner. I wish "fair winds and following seas."

#### TRIBUTE TO CHERYL BULLOCK

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to commend Cheryl Bullock as she retires from public service. Cheryl has honorably served the people of Pennsylvania for 9 years through her role as my southeastern Pennsylvania regional director. She has been a valuable asset to my office, the city of Philadelphia, and the Commonwealth.

Prior to joining my office, Cheryl spent the majority of her career with

WPHL-TV. Cheryl spent over 20 years with the station handling media buys and marketing for local and national advertisers, including sports sponsorships and advertising with the Philadelphia Phillies, Flyers, and 76ers. Her tenacity and infectious laugh made her a natural at WPHL. She was later appointed governor of the Philadelphia Advertising Club from 2012 through 2014 after they recognized her strong leadership and dedication to her work—in and outside of the office.

Upon her departure from WPHL-TV, Cheryl transitioned to the public relations team within the Community College of Philadelphia. From 2007 to 2008, Cheryl managed strategic messaging, communications, and campus activities and events—skills she later utilized throughout her work for the people of Pennsylvania. Due to her creative nature and way with words, she was trusted to write multiple articles for three community college publications.

In addition to her professional pursuits, Cheryl has held leadership roles in several organizations geared towards community empowerment and service. Cheryl served as the vice president of Philadelphia Chapter of the Links, Incorporated, as well as president of the National Coalition of 100 Black Women. The National Coalition of 100 Black Women was created to establish a leadership forum for Black women from all geopolitical and socioeconomic groups. Cheryl's service within these organizations is a clear demonstration of her long-standing commitment to improving the lives of others.

Over the course of the last 9 years, the Commonwealth has benefited from Cheryl's thoughtful guidance, driven attitude, attention to detail, and overall leadership. We will all miss her passion for service and commitment to helping others. I wish Cheryl well in her retirement as she plans to spend more time with her husband, George, and son Jordan.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

# INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 1377. A bill to remove the limitation on certain amounts for which large non-rural hospitals may be reimbursed under the Healthcare Connect Fund of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1378. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an element in pre-separation counseling for members of the Armed Forces on assistance and support services for caregivers of certain veterans through the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. LEE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit fellowship and stipend compensation to be saved in an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Finance.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 58, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 207

At the request of Mrs. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to members of the Armed Forces who fought in defense of Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippine Archipelago between December 7, 1941 and May 10, 1942, and who died or were imprisoned by the Japanese military in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, Wake Island, and Guam from April 9, 1942 until September 2, 1945, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to the United States.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 694

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 694, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard charitable mileage rate for delivery of meals to elderly, disabled, frail, and at risk individuals.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to prohibit mandatory or compulsory checkoff programs.

S. 741

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 741, a bill to prohibit certain practices relating to certain commodity promotion programs, to require greater transparency by those programs, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 911, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1028

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1028, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1044

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1044, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1057

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1057, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to address harmful algal blooms, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.

S. 1152

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1152, a bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1172

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1172, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human

rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1270

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1270, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes.

S. 1292

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

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1311, a bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1357

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1357, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic family care services in Medicaid.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an excise tax on certain prescription drugs which have been subject to a price spike, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 46

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 46, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 15

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 15, a concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation of October 28, 2017, as "Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day".

S. RES. 162

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 162, a resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promoting religious freedom, and for other purposes.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 2017

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 20; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Mandelker nomination; finally, that the time until the vote on the Long nomination be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The Senator from Wisconsin.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise tonight to join my colleagues in our fight to protect the health and economic security of the American people.

I am here to express my deep concern, anguish, and disgust with the fact that instead of working across party lines, working together to protect healthcare, instead, the majority is writing secret legislation behind closed doors—legislation that is going to

make the American people pay more for less care and take healthcare coverage away from millions of American families.

I am disgusted because this issue is very personal to me. When I was 9 years old, I got sick. I got very sick. I was hospitalized for 3 months. I eventually recovered, but when it came to health insurance, it was as if I had a scarlet letter. My grandparents who raised me couldn't find a policy that would cover me, not from any insurer and not at any price. They had to pay for my healthcare out of their pockets, and they made incredible sacrifices to do so—all because I was a child who had been branded with those words "preexisting condition."

No parents or grandparents should have to lie awake at night worried that if their child has an illness or an injury, they will have no way to pay to cover their care. No child should have to lie awake at night hearing the whispered tones of their parents wondering how they might pay the bills to care for an ill child. It is not right, it is not fair, and it is not fundamentally who we are, but that is exactly what people were wondering last night in America, and they will do so again tonight. Families across this country will go to bed anxious and scared because of the partisan politics happening right here in Washington—the politics that is moving forward with a plan that will make things worse and not better for the American people.

This isn't just personal for me, it is personal for the Wisconsin families I work for. I have listened to them, and I am here to give them a voice.

This is personal for Jim from Appleton, WI, and for Jim's daughter who has multiple sclerosis. Jim told me that his family needs strong protections for people with preexisting conditions so that his daughter can continue to receive treatment that her family can afford.

This is personal for Greg from Stoddard, WI, who has no idea how he and other older Wisconsinites will be able to afford higher costs for their healthcare and for Greg's two sons, both of whom have diabetes and are already struggling with skyrocketing prices for insulin.

This is personal for Barbara from Madison, who is deeply concerned about cuts to Medicaid because her son has a disability and he relies on Medicaid to work and to live independently.

This is personal for Chelsey from Shelby, WI, whose daughter Zoe was born with a congenital heart defect. Right now, Zoe is guaranteed access to coverage without being denied or charged more because of her preexisting condition. Chelsey wrote to me and said: "I'm pleading to you as a mother to fight for the . . . kids in Wisconsin with preexisting conditions

that are counting on you to protect that right."

Does the congressional majority really care more about finding 50 votes for a secret plan than it does about the health and well-being of Zoe? Sadly, it appears they do. It appears they are more concerned with finding 50 votes for any legislation, no matter how harmful it is, just so they can notch up another partisan victory and so that they can move on to other things on their political agenda. They are not listening to American families or Wisconsin families, who will be left behind.

I want to tell you what the consequences are going to be when Washington does not listen to Wisconsinites like Jim and his daughter, from Appleton, or Greg and his two sons, from Stoddard, or moms like Barbara, from Madison, and Chelsey, from Shelby. The consequences are that things are going to get worse, like they do under the House-passed Republican plan.

If you are older, you are going to pay an age tax. A 64-year-old in Wisconsin might have to pay increases in excess of \$10,000 more in premiums. If you have a preexisting condition, like I do or like almost 2.5 million Wisconsinites do, the guaranteed protections and care that you have today may not be here tomorrow.

If you live in rural Wisconsin, this plan will only make it harder to access affordable, quality healthcare. For some living in northern Wisconsin, this plan could cost them up to \$6,000 more a year than they pay today.

Our rural hospitals are already struggling to keep their doors open, and this plan could make those challenges even worse. By the way, rural hospitals are often the lifeblood of their communities, the largest employers in many counties in which they exist. So if rural hospitals—even a few of them—are forced to close, it will not only make it harder for people to gain healthcare, it will also mean that people will lose their jobs.

If you rely on Medicaid for nursing home care or if, like Barbara, you have a disabled child who relies on Medicaid to live independently in the community, the House-passed bill cuts Medicaid and puts that care at risk. If you are one of the 35,000 veterans in Wisconsin or nearly 2 million veterans across the country who rely on Medicaid for healthcare coverage, your care will be at risk.

The House Republican proposal will both dramatically increase and shift healthcare costs to Wisconsin taxpayers and onto the shoulders of families for things like substance abuse treatment and mental health services. It will make it harder in our State's fight and America's fight against the opioid crisis and could make the epidemic our country is facing even worse. Put simply, this plan will hand over

more control to insurance companies, weaken health insurance protections, raise costs, and provide less care for the American people.

The American people cannot afford to sell a home or take out a second mortgage or home equity loan or spend their life savings or max out their credit cards or go bankrupt just to get the healthcare they need. It is not right. It is not fair. It is not who we are.

It is time to stop this partisan nonsense. The people of Wisconsin did not send me to the Senate to take away people's healthcare. They sent me to fight for people like Jim and Greg and Barbara and Chelsey and their children. Let's listen to these Wisconsinites. Let's take repeal off the table, and let's work in a bipartisan way. Let's work together to improve the healthcare people have today and make it more affordable, not more costly. Let's work in a bipartisan way. Let's work together to make things better, not pursue partisan plans to make things worse.

I call on my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come out from behind their closed doors to join us in this fight to stop leaving people behind and start helping them get ahead.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon.

**Mr. MERKLEY.** Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks from my colleague from Wisconsin, who came here to champion the citizens of her State and the citizens of all of America. As she spoke so passionately about the need to make sure we have affordable, quality healthcare, that is really the theme that we are talking about. That is the value we are talking about, that in this great big, beautiful, wonderful Nation, the United States of America, everyone should have access to affordable, quality healthcare.

There are some colleagues here who do not share that value. They consider healthcare to be a privilege for the wealthy—healthcare for the wealthy, healthcare for the healthy—but not healthcare for all Americans. They say: You can't afford healthcare? Too bad.

They have a plan of 13 Republicans meeting in secret—the secret 13—even meeting in a room to which the hallway is not accessible to press because they are afraid to have the cameras showing them as they go into the room and out of the room. If you are ashamed to see yourself going in and out of a room and for your constituents to see that, shouldn't you be ashamed of what you are concocting? Shouldn't you really wonder if you are doing the right thing in saying to your constituents: I am not going to show you the bill because I know you will not like it. I am going to keep it secret, and I am going to bring it out at the last minute. I am going to employ a tactic that does not belong in the Senate.

This is supposed to be a deliberative body—once called the world's greatest deliberative body—but under this leadership, it is now the body of zero deliberation, zero committee meetings, zero markups, zero chance for the public to weigh in, zero chance of hearing the experts and taking their insights into account. That has to change.

We need three of our colleagues who believe in this Nation, who believe in the Constitution, written with those beautiful three words "We the People." They need to stop thinking about "we the powerful" and "we the privileged." They have to stop thinking about how they help their friends in the gated communities of America or in the corporate suites of America. How do you help working Americans? How do you help struggling Americans?

Franklin Roosevelt said that the test of our progress should not be whether we do more—add to the abundance of those who have much—but whether we do enough for those who have little. Yet the philosophy of this bill that the secret 13 is cooking up is about giving more to the abundance of those who have much and taking away from those who have little. It is the opposite. It is government by and for the wealthy and government by and for the powerful and government by and for the privileged.

Have they forgotten the first three words of our Constitution? Have they forgotten that the philosophy, as Jefferson put it, was that we would have outcomes that would reflect the will of the people? If you are afraid to share the bill with the people of America, you are certainly not pursuing the will of the people of the United States of America.

What is really in this bill?

On the one hand, we understand that it is going to take healthcare away from millions of Americans. They are saying that it might do it a little more slowly than did the TrumpCare bill.

As for the TrumpCare bill, the President himself said it was "mean," and he used a derogative slogan, which I will not repeat on this floor, to say how terrible it was. Why did the President call it "mean"? Was it that it was taking away healthcare from an estimated 23 million people? My colleagues, we understand, are going to do it more slowly, inflict that damage over a number of extra years. Does that make it right to hurt people? Does that make it right? In the meantime, they are going to hand out an insurance bag of goodies to the health insurers of \$127 billion. Strip healthcare over here. Give goodies to the insurance companies over here.

What happens to those who are in long-term care and nursing homes? More than 6 out of 10 Americans who are in long-term care are there because they are paid through Medicaid. They have to pay down all of their income

and their wealth before they can use Medicaid. This is the last resort. It is the last thing they have. Medicaid comes to the rescue.

I visited a couple of nursing homes over the weekend, one in an urban area and one in a rural area. I encourage my colleagues to go visit a nursing home and talk to the men and women who are there. They are so thankful that they have that care.

One woman said to me: "Medicaid is how I am paid for."

Her name is Deborah.

Deborah said: "Medicaid is how I can afford to be here. If you take it away, I am out on the street. Being on the street is a problem because my legs do not work."

Picture that individual being thrown into the street. She is in her wheelchair because her legs do not work. Where is she going to sleep? How is she going to feed herself? Where is she going to bathe?

Then I went to a nursing home in rural Oregon, which was down in the south, Klamath County. At that nursing home, they told me that almost 100 percent of their long-term care patients are paid for by Medicaid—almost one 100 percent. Imagine that entire hallway of individuals swept out, tossed out.

And why? What else do we have in this bill? Oh. Give tax deductions and gifts to the health insurance executives. First we have gifts to the health insurers and then another \$18 billion to the health insurance executives.

Then my colleagues say: Let's make insurance cheaper by getting rid of the essential benefits. That way, people can have an insurance policy for less.

But unfortunately it is not worth the paper it is written on. We have been there. We have seen that. There is a reason you set a floor as to what the benefits are. It is so that when you actually get sick and need to go to the emergency room, you can actually go. When you actually get sick and need an operation, you can actually get it. When you break a leg, you can actually get it set. When you need treatment for a disease, you can actually get the treatment. When you are having a child, you can actually get maternity care. These are the fundamentals. They are not the fancy end of healthcare. It is not the fancy end that you might find with some executive healthcare packages. These are the basics, the essential basics. My colleagues want to strip that away.

On the other hand, they say: Hey, we have so much money that we can give tax giveaways to the prescription drugmakers—\$29 billion to the prescription drugmakers.

Then they want to destroy the rural healthcare clinics and hospitals. I was in four of my rural counties this weekend. I was in Klamath and Lake, and I was in Grant and Wheeler. I held town-

halls. People came out and spoke to me.

These folks said: Do you know that our rural clinics are the heart of our communities, and they are what allow people to live here with the confidence that they can get the healthcare they need instead of having to go to some city that is hundreds of miles away or maybe not even be able to get care at all on a timely basis?

They love their hospitals that provide care in the bit larger communities in rural Oregon.

Yet, as for the heads of these hospitals and the heads of these clinics, what do they say? They say that without the Affordable Care Act and the vast decrease in uncompensated coverage, they would have to fire a whole lot of employees and provide a whole lot less healthcare.

One doctor from a clinic in the northeast corner of the State came to me and said: We doubled—roughly doubled—the amount of healthcare we are able to provide, and we are so remote, and it is so important to be able to have that nearby.

So why do my colleagues really dislike healthcare in rural America? Why do they want to undermine it? Well, they can give away more money to medical device makers—\$20 billion to medical device makers—and all of this is before we look at the fact that they are giving more than \$200 billion away to the richest Americans. So over here, let's strip the essential benefits. Let's destroy the health clinics. Let's undermine the rural hospitals. Let's make it challenging for those with preexisting conditions. Let's take those in nursing homes and make sure they are not able to be in nursing homes and, magically, maybe they will get cared for some other way so we can give tax giveaways to the health insurers, tax gifts to the insurance executives, tax goodies to the prescription drug makers, and special tax provisions to the medical device makers, and then give \$200 billion to the richest Americans. Isn't that the opposite of the test of our progress? Here, in the United States of America, under a system of government that is supposed to be of the people, by the people, for the people—this bill is by the privileged and powerful, for the privileged and powerful. And not just that, but let's really hurt ordinary working people and struggling Americans in the process right where it really gets them—right here—at the fundamental heart of the peace of mind they get from knowing that currently they have access to healthcare.

I don't know that anything is quite so disturbing as worrying about the fact that if your loved one gets sick, will he or she be able to get the care he or she needs? If your loved one gets sick, will he or she go broke? And what about your neighbor, and what about your extended family? This Republican

bill is all about creating stress and anxiety and bad outcomes for ordinary working Americans, ordinary middle-class Americans, ordinary struggling Americans.

They didn't send us here to the Senate to do this. That is why the secret 13 are meeting in secret. That is why they don't want to meet in a room that has a hallway where the reporters can be. That is why they don't want to answer the questions in the hallway about whether they will vote to proceed to a bill without letting the people of America weigh in on it.

Shouldn't everyone here be willing to answer that question: Are you willing to vote to move to a bill that has had no public process? Aren't you working for the people of America? Or, as this bill says, are you just working for the companies and the rich? That is it, and too bad for everyone else.

Ahron in Portland wrote to me. Because she has been diagnosed with diabetes, she is terrified that if TrumpCare goes through, her condition will be considered a preexisting condition, and she won't be able to afford the coverage she needs. She says: "Although through committed lifestyle changes and family support, I have done well managing this condition, I will be marked as high risk along with my age."

Ellen from Medford, the southern part of our State, tells me that she has the challenge that her baby daughter was in a catastrophic accident just days before her second birthday. Her husband had just switched jobs and didn't have health insurance yet. But, fortunately, Medicaid—that would be the Oregon Health Plan—was there for them, and her daughter got the life-saving care she needed. That is anxiety for an ordinary person. Do you have health coverage when you are switching jobs? Is there one health insurance you can afford?

My colleagues want to strip healthcare from Ellen in Medford so they can cut \$800 billion in Medicaid overall, so they can give tax giveaways to powerful corporations and the richest Americans. It is just wrong, morally wrong, and wrong in every possible way.

Marilyn from Ontario says that she is living with two autoimmune diseases—difficult to pronounce, so I won't. She was diagnosed before the ACA became law, but rather than be denied coverage outright by her insurance company, she was told she could be covered if she paid a monthly premium of about \$1,000 with a \$20,000 deductible—\$20,000 deductible. Needless to say, that wasn't helpful to her. Marilyn went 5 years without insurance, and she ended up being very sick. She had to borrow against her home, leverage her home. She had to deplete her retirement savings. And she had to make payments on \$64,000 worth of



credit card debt, run up in order to cover her healthcare.

Then the ACA came along, and Marilyn was able to afford insurance, and she got community pricing. In other words, despite these preexisting conditions, you pay the same price as everyone else. That is so important to peace of mind about healthcare. Just saying that you will have “access to healthcare”—a favorite phrase some of my colleagues use—if you can pay extraordinarily high prices that I know you will not be able to pay, that is not access. That is teasing people. That is cruelty to say: Oh, yes, we are going to make sure you have access; as long as you are a millionaire and you can pay a ton every month, you have access. We have taken care of you. You have access. No, that is not access. Affordability is critical to having a functioning healthcare system, and Marilyn will probably be priced out of the market again with the Republican strategy.

How about Lisa in Corvallis, a single parent of three children, two with serious medical conditions that have placed them on permanent disability. Lisa faces some hard times, and I will let her words speak for themselves. She says:

Our family was very fortunate and eternally grateful that the ACA passed while I held that job, because in 2015, my middle child was hospitalized for the first of four times in the last two years. And, in March of 2016, I developed a serious heart condition which my doctor attributes in part to stress.

She goes on to say:

In June of 2016, my employer declined to renew my contract, and if it weren't for the ACA, I would have been out of a job and completely without medical coverage, this time with a serious and expensive preexisting condition.

The stories are coming in through emails. They are coming in through my townhalls. They are coming in over the phones. They are letting us all know—and not just in States represented by folks on this side of the aisle, but every Senator here is getting these letters.

So I say to my fellow Senators: Read these letters from your constituents because I know that your constituents are in the same position my constituents are in. Be a champion for them. Be a champion for struggling families, for working families, for middle-class families. Honor the role and responsibility of representing all of the people of your State, not simply powerful companies and your richest constituents but all of your citizens. That was the vision on which our country was founded, and that is the spirit in which Franklin Roosevelt said: This test of our progress is not whether we give more of the abundance to those who have the most, but enough to those who have little.

Enough means affordable, accessible healthcare for every single person in America. Tearing that down is wrong

morally and wrong to do it secretly and wrong in terms of the enormous damage that it will cause.

I am pleased to see my colleague from Pennsylvania, who has been a champion for working Americans every day he serves in this Chamber. He particularly makes sure that all of us are thinking about the impact on children, and there is so much of this secret Republican plan that is going to hurt the children of America. I appreciate the insights that he shares with all of us as he urges us to ponder and do better every time we consider legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Oregon for bringing the passion and the determination that he brings to his work, especially when it comes to healthcare.

I spoke earlier tonight about the potential impact of any Senate bill, but of course the impact that we know already with regard to the House bill, because the House bill is legislation that passed and legislation that we can analyze as it relates to the impact on children, especially children with disabilities.

Of course, when it comes to healthcare generally, but, in particular, Medicaid and what Medicaid provides to children, we know the impact nationwide. In my home State of Pennsylvania, we have 1.1 million children who are covered by Medicaid. So I am very concerned about any effort that would undermine or ultimately extinguish the ability of Americans—especially children—to have the benefit of Medicaid expansion, but, of course, the Medicaid program itself. It is especially insulting when some would support cuts to the Medicaid Program that would undermine or even threaten to undermine healthcare for children with disabilities. I spoke earlier of two children in particular.

I will come back to children in a moment, but I wanted to go to the other end of the age scale—older Americans. So many people think of healthcare for people over the age of 65 to be solely limited to Medicare, not Medicaid. But, of course, we know that Medicaid plays a role as well.

One of the parts of our healthcare infrastructure that may not be as well known is the impact that Medicaid has on supporting aging older adults, in particular, with regard to supports and services. We know Medicaid is critical to supporting aging older adults, providing them dignity and choice as they age. Medicaid covers long-term services and support for low-income, older adults and adults with disabilities, including nursing home and home community-based programs.

Generally, health insurance does not cover long-term supports and service costs. Medicare coverage for those

services can be limited, and private, long-term care insurance is unaffordable for many Americans. So spending on long-term supports and services for older citizens accounts for almost two-thirds of all Medicaid spending. I said Medicaid, not Medicare. A lot of people don't know that we spend that much in terms of long-term supports and services.

To give this perspective, in 2016, the median annual cost for a year of home health aide services was over \$46,000—for home health aide services. The median cost for a semiprivate room at a nursing facility was \$82,000—a much greater cost. So we know the impact of those numbers. About a third of the people turning 65 will require nursing home care at some point during their life. So these are big costs, and we have to make sure that as we move forward, we can provide this kind of care for aging adults.

Three-fourths of nursing home residents will eventually be covered by Medicaid. So if you are going to a nursing home and you spend down, the only option for you in most instances is Medicaid. We know that in about a 1-year timeframe, between July of 2015 to June of 2016 in Pennsylvania, 123,000 Pennsylvanians aged 55 and older received long-term supports and services through Medicaid. One group of about 80,000 Pennsylvanians received those long-term supports and services at a nursing home. Another group of about 50,000 Pennsylvanians 55 and older received Medicaid home and community-based services.

There are lots of numbers there and lots of data, but the key thing is, we know the great dependence folks have on the Medicaid Program in addition to the obvious benefits provided by Medicare. So cuts or per capita caps on Medicaid would have a devastating impact on older Americans.

I know the closed-door secret discussions taking place in the Senate between among only a small group of Republicans so far—we know those kinds of discussions are taking place. What will they do with regard to Medicaid? Will they cut it outright or will they put a per capita cap on it or will they send it back to the States and tell the Governors and State legislatures they have to balance their budget? It is up to you to provide most of the Medicaid services. The Federal Government is getting out of that business or at least transferring substantial responsibility to the States.

So we have to be vigilant about that and make sure we do everything we can to put the interests of older citizens and the priority of taking care of them at the front of the agenda.

Research also shows that Medicaid dollars play a role in supporting a lot of good-paying jobs in a State like Pennsylvania. We are told that over a quarter of a million jobs in the long-

term care field—meaning long-term supports and services—are Pennsylvania jobs right now. So any change there could have an adverse job impact. The Commonwealth Fund and George Washington's Milken Institute released a report projecting 942,000 fewer jobs in 2026 and that nearly every State would experience an economic downturn if the Republican bill were to become law based upon the House bill as we know it. As we were told most recently by a Republican Senator, the Senate bill will reflect the House bill about 80 percent. So we have a sense of the outlines of the Senate bill, if not all the details yet.

In Pennsylvania, this same report by George Washington University's Milken Institute said that just in Pennsylvania, the job impact would be 85,000 fewer jobs by 2026, and of those 85,000, more than 52,000 of those jobs would be healthcare jobs which would be lost if the Republican bill were to be enacted into law.

We get a sense of the job impact, we get a sense of the healthcare impact when it comes to cuts to Medicaid that are substantial. As we know, the Congressional Budget Office told us that were the House bill to be enacted into law, in that decade, 14 million folks on Medicaid would lose their coverage. That is on page 17 of the CBO report.

When we look at it by county in Pennsylvania, we can see the impact in this age category of 55 and up. Allegheny County—our second largest county by population—over 10,000 Pennsylvanians over the age of 55 receive care in a nursing home or at home because of Medicaid. That generated nearly \$360 million in payments to providers in the county, a huge impact in addition to the impact on the care people receive.

I will not go through every county, of course, but just to give a sense of it. Cambria County, a much smaller county by way of population—where Johnstown is in the southwestern corner of our State—1,100 individuals in Cambria County age 55 and older receive care in a nursing home or at home because of Medicaid. That is about a \$36 million impact on that county. In my home county, Lackawanna County, where Scranton is located, 2,500 Pennsylvanians over the age of 55 receiving nursing home care because of Medicaid, a \$96 million impact just in Lackawanna County. I will not go through all the counties, but we can see the impact on both care and jobs when it comes to the impact of Medicaid on long-term care, support, and services.

We talked earlier about Medicaid and the impact on children. I don't think it has been at all clear until recently the reach and scope of Medicaid when it comes to children. Forty percent of every child in the country is covered by Medicaid. I mentioned earlier tonight, and I will say it again: Sixty

percent of all children with disabilities ranging from autism to traumatic brain injury, and a lot of disabilities on that list in between, rely upon Medicaid.

I said the Republican plan at the bare minimum should guarantee every child with a disability who has Medicaid coverage today would in fact have that coverage going forward for whatever time they need it because I think that is part of who we are as a country. When a child has a disability that is so substantial in terms of the impact on that child and his or her family and they have Medicaid, nothing the U.S. Senate should do should undermine that in any way. I would hope, at a minimum, our Republican colleagues would ensure that. I think it is insulting to even create doubt or uncertainty or create any degree of anxiety for a family to have to watch this bill proceed—either the House bill that was passed or the Senate bill which is in formation right now. For any family who has the benefit of Medicaid and has a child with a disability to in any way be anxious or uncertain because of what might happen here, I think is an insult to them and to our values as Americans.

We are a great country. We can make sure children with disabilities have the benefit that comes from the early periodic screening and diagnosis, preventive care, the quality care that comes from services provided by Medicaid for kids with disabilities. We are a great country. We can pay for that and still be a growing economy, still have the greatest military in the world, still have the strongest GDP in the world. We can do all of that and still take care of the children.

I guess some believe the only way to prosperity is to say we have to substantially cut back on Medicaid, to the point where 14 million Americans lose their coverage over 10 years, but we still, at the same time, have to give tax cuts to the very wealthy. One estimate showed the original House bill—the one that didn't get a vote but was substantially similar to the one that did get a vote—the first bill gave to 400 Americans a tax cut of some \$7 million each. How does that make the country stronger when you are cutting back on Medicaid and giving gross substantial tax cuts to people who already are worth hundreds of millions of dollars or maybe even billions of dollars? I don't see how that moves the country forward to shortchange folks on Medicaid, especially if it were to adversely impact a child with a disability.

We mentioned all of those impacts, but I think it is especially devastating when it gets down to an individual family. I talked earlier about Rowan Simpson whose mom wrote to me months ago. I had the chance to meet Rowan and his mom and dad just last week for the first time in person, but

the idea that Pam Simpson—or any parent—would be at all uncertain or worried about what would happen here in the next couple of days or weeks is really an insult to who we are as a people.

I hope those who are behind closed doors making decisions as we speak—maybe they are done for the day now, but I hope they will be thinking about Rowan and his mom and their family.

I mentioned the overall impact of Medicaid on children. In particular, we know the Medicaid Program, of course, in addition to covering children with disabilities, covers adults with disabilities as well. In my State, by one estimate, it is over 720,000 people. Across the country, in 2015, there were 15 million people with disabilities who were Medicaid beneficiaries. Through Medicaid, those 15 million people receive assistance with their healthcare. They get the benefit of durable medical equipment, such as wheelchairs or assistive speaking devices. They get long-term supports for daily living, such as personal care attendance because of their disability. So Medicaid is now the primary payer for healthcare services for those with disabilities. It is also the primary payer for long-term supports and services that help people with disabilities live independent lives.

In many cases, these long-term care supports and services also make it possible for a person with a disability to hold down a job because of the support they get from Medicaid.

We know that in 2014, across the country, the average spending for a person with a disability enrolled in Medicaid was a little more than \$19,000. In Pennsylvania, it was a little more than 18,300. The average annual growth in enrollee spending for persons with a disability between 2000 and 2011 was 4.5 percent. In my State, it is a little more than that almost. It is almost 5.7 percent, and we have seen the outline of a proposal that would limit that annual growth to about 2.4 percent. I would hope those who are working on the Medicaid provisions would take into account the reality of what it costs to provide help to someone with a disability and not come up with some arbitrary number to cap or limit what an individual with a disability would have available to them, especially by way of Medicaid or otherwise. They are dependent upon and have a right to expect that kind of healthcare would continue to be provided.

We will see what happens. I know those who are behind closed doors have a sense of those numbers. I hope they would be very determined to make sure no one with a disability is worse off as a result of their efforts, but that is the reality people with disabilities live with. I think when we consider what some families are up against right now, many families have just barely come out of the last recession. Some families

lost their home, some families lost their home and their job or even if they lost a job and have since recovered because they are employed or partially recovered, sometimes the job they have isn't the job they had prior to the recession.

I can only imagine what it is like to have the kind of economic stress some live with because they have lost a job or the job they have now doesn't pay what their old job paid. On top of all that, if your son or daughter or someone in your family has a disability and the only thing that has kept you above water or allowed you to get from one day to the next to make ends meet is the availability of Medicaid for that individual and the family who needs that kind of help—we will see what the bill drafters come up with. Every indication so far has been very negative and very much adverse to the interests of those families—those millions of families who depend upon Medicaid for basic healthcare, especially the basic healthcare that would be connected to a disability, whether that disability is a physical disability of one kind or another or whether it is a disability because that child or adult is on the autism spectrum or whether it is a child with Down syndrome who is dependent upon Medicaid or is dependent upon some other healthcare program that would be adversely affected.

We can debate the outlines and the broad numbers of this legislation, but what I hope would not be up for debate is that those who now have the benefit of Medicaid because of a substantial burden in their life—meaning a disability because of circumstances that require one individual to have the benefit of long-term care, where the family has spent down their assets to such an extent that only Medicaid can allow

that loved one to get into a nursing home—I would hope that it would not be much of a debate that we should continue to help those families and those individuals.

At a minimum, I think we can agree between the two parties that vulnerable Americans who depend upon Medicaid and other healthcare programs will be protected. I think that is something on which both parties should be able to agree. Unfortunately, the House bill in no way agreed with that assertion. That is why it was particularly objectionable, and that is why you have an array of organizations across the country that came out against the bill, those who have experience delivering healthcare to the vulnerable, those who have experience making sure people with disabilities are given that kind of help and that kind of care. If the Senate bill is substantially similar to the House bill, those with disabilities will be substantially and adversely and, I am afraid, irreversibly impacted to such an extent that we wouldn't be the same country we are today if those individuals lost their healthcare and lost the benefit of those healthcare services.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TODAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:03 a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 20, 2017, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN H. GIBSON II, OF TEXAS, TO BE DEPUTY CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE PETER LEVINE.

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SPENCER BACHUS III, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE LARRY W. WALTHER, TERM EXPIRED.

#### FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

JAMES CLINGER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE JEREMIAH O'HEAR NORTON, RESIGNED.

JAMES CLINGER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE MARTIN J. GRUENBERG, TERM EXPIRING.

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SCOTT GARRETT, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE FRED P. HOCHBERG, RESIGNED.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MICHAEL PLATT, JR., OF ARKANSAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE STEVEN MICHAEL HARO, RESIGNED.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

GREGORY DOUD, OF KANSAS, TO BE CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE DARCI L. VETTER.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GEORGE EDWARD GLASS, OF OREGON, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PORTUGUESE REPUBLIC.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ISABEL MARIE KEENAN PATELUNAS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, VICE S. LESLIE IRELAND.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ROBERT P. STORCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY. (NEW POSITION)

#### THE JUDICIARY

STEPHANOS BIBAS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, VICE MARJORIE O. RENDELL, RETIRED.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 20, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## JUNE 21

9 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on SeaPower  
To hold hearings to examine Navy ship-building programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-232A

9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Interior.  
SD-124

Select Committee on Intelligence  
To hold hearings to examine Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. elections.  
SH-216

10 a.m.  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.  
SR-253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director, and Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, both of the Office of Management and Budget.  
SD-342

## Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the MS-13 problem, focusing on investigating gang membership, its nexus to illegal immigration, and Federal efforts to end the threat.  
SD-226

10:15 a.m.

## Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 and the trade policy agenda.  
SD-215

10:30 a.m.

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Air Force.  
SD-192

## Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine cybersecurity regulation harmonization.  
SD-342

11 a.m.

## Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed briefing on preparing for the 2017 Trafficking in Persons Report.  
S-116

2:30 p.m.

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy.  
SD-138

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 and 2019 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.  
SD-124

## Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

## Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness

To hold hearings to examine reopening the American frontier, focusing on promoting partnerships between commercial space and the U.S. government to advance exploration and settlement.  
SR-253

3 p.m.

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office.  
SD-192

## JUNE 22

9:30 a.m.

## Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.  
SR-328A

## Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Richard V. Spencer, of Wyoming, to be Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense.  
SD-G50

10 a.m.

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the National Institutes of Health.  
SD-138

## Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine fostering economic growth, focusing on regulator perspective.  
SD-538

## Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

## Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine efforts on marine debris in the oceans and Great Lakes.  
SR-253

## Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy.  
SD-366

## Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 1312, to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States, S. 1311, to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States, and the nomination of Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General.  
SD-226

11 a.m.

## Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive closed briefings on North Korea, focusing on recent developments.  
SVC-217

2 p.m.

## Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.  
SH-219

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

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

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>JUNE 26</p> <p>4 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services<br/>Subcommittee on Airland</p> <p>Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-232A</p>                             | <p>11 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services<br/>Subcommittee on Cybersecurity</p> <p>Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-232A</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <p>5:30 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services<br/>Subcommittee on Strategic Forces</p> <p>Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-232A</p>                                                                                                                             |
| <p>JUNE 27</p> <p>9:30 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services<br/>Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support</p> <p>Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-232A</p> | <p>2 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services<br/>Subcommittee on Personnel</p> <p>Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SD-G50</p> <p>3:30 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services<br/>Subcommittee on SeaPower</p> <p>Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-232A</p> | <p>JUNE 28</p> <p>9:30 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-222</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <p>10:30 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Appropriations<br/>Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor.</p> <p>SD-138</p>               | <p>4:30 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services<br/>Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities</p> <p>Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SD-G50</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <p>JUNE 29</p> <p>9:30 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-222</p> <p>JUNE 30</p> <p>9:30 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.</p> <p>SR-222</p> |

**SENATE—Tuesday, June 20, 2017**

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

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

Let us pray.

Gracious Lord, who has given us life, we praise You for Your faithful reliability.

Bless our lawmakers today in the work they will do. May they seek in all their labors to please and glorify You as You fill them with Your grace. May they not become weary in doing what is right, knowing that in due season they will reap if they faint not.

Lord, let Your peace flood their hearts and help them to realize that it is by Your permission that they will breathe their next breath. May they permit life's problems to make them more dependent on Your guidance and strength.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we have been debating ObamaCare's failures and what to do about them for so many years now. We have heard so many distress stories from constituents who have been hurt. Thankfully, the Senate will soon have the chance to turn the page on this failed law.

As I said yesterday, the entire Senate Republican conference has been active and engaged on legislation to move beyond the failures of ObamaCare for quite some time. We have had many productive discussions on the way forward. We are united in our belief that the American people deserve better than ObamaCare's unsustainable status quo.

While it is disappointing that our Democratic colleagues decided early on that they didn't want to work seriously with us on finding solutions, Senate

Republicans remain focused on the following: stabilizing insurance markets, which are collapsing under ObamaCare; improving the affordability of health insurance, which is spiking under ObamaCare; freeing Americans from ObamaCare's mandates, which force them to buy insurance they don't want; strengthening Medicaid for those who need it the most; and preserving access to care for patients with preexisting conditions.

Insurance markets are collapsing under ObamaCare. We want to stabilize them. ObamaCare's champions said that the law would bring more healthcare choices, but for far too many, just the opposite has occurred. In the years since ObamaCare's passage, we have read story after story about co-ops collapsing, insurers fleeing, families losing the plans they liked, and trusted doctors and hospitals slipping out of reach.

Today ObamaCare is nearing full collapse. Americans in nearly one of every two counties could find themselves left with just one option under ObamaCare next year—which of course really isn't a choice at all—or even worse, find themselves without any option, period. This long-term ObamaCare trend is not sustainable. We have to act, and we are.

Healthcare costs are spiking under ObamaCare. We want to improve affordability. ObamaCare's champions said that the law would make healthcare more affordable, but for too many just the opposite has occurred.

In the years since ObamaCare's passage, we have received so many calls and letters from families who have been hit with soaring out-of-pocket costs and skyrocketing premiums. In fact, a recent Health and Human Services report showed that premiums in the individual market rose by an average of 105 percent since the law was fully implemented in 2013.

Today the situation continues to spiral out of control. Americans in States across the country could find themselves facing more double-digit premium increases next year—as high as 30 percent, we learned just yesterday, in Washington State or 32 percent in North Carolina or 40 percent in Maine.

Another recent report found that nearly 2 million Americans who selected an ObamaCare plan ended up canceling their coverage after just a few weeks, and the most common reason they cited for doing so was that it was too expensive. This long-term ObamaCare trend is not sustainable. We have to act, and we are.

Americans are being forced to buy insurance they don't want under

ObamaCare. We want to free them from that mandate. When ObamaCare's champions pushed their health law on the American people, they enacted onerous mandates that forced too many families into plans they didn't like or couldn't afford. In the years since ObamaCare's passage, we heard from Americans who decided it was simply more affordable for them to take their chance and pay the fine and go without insurance altogether.

Today ObamaCare's collapse is making the situation even more unfair. Insurance markets are collapsing, leaving Americans with fewer options. Health costs are spiking, making many of the remaining options even more expensive. That means Americans could be left trapped, forced by law to purchase ObamaCare insurance but left without the means to do so. This long-term ObamaCare trend is not sustainable. We have to act, and we are.

These are just a few of the major areas that Senate Republicans are focused on as we continue working on legislative solutions to move away from ObamaCare. In doing so, we will also work toward strengthening Medicaid and preserving access to care for patients with preexisting conditions—two areas of concern for many across the Nation.

I regret that Democrats announced early on that they did not want to be part of a serious bipartisan process to move past the failures of this law. Their ObamaCare law is collapsing all around us. It is hurting Americans. It will continue to hurt even more if we allow the unsustainable status quo to continue. So we have a responsibility to act, and Senate Republicans are working together, guided by the principles I mentioned, and acting on behalf of Americans, who deserve better than the status quo, better than continuing the pain of ObamaCare.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION****EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume

consideration of the Mandelker nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we continue to make progress on legislation to clean up the mess left by the meltdown of ObamaCare, at least insofar as it affects the lives of millions of people who buy their insurance on the individual markets. These are individuals and small businesses that don't have the benefit of large employer healthcare plans, and they have been devastated by ObamaCare.

This is a rescue mission. ObamaCare is collapsing for millions of people, and we have to act in the interest of countless families and small businesses that are suffering tremendous harm.

I have told the stories myself; others have likewise told the stories. We have seen those reported in the media. For many people, healthcare costs, their insurance premiums are skyrocketing. We also know that because of the distortion in the insurance markets, many insurance companies are simply pulling out of counties and States around the country, so people have no choices when it comes to purchasing their healthcare on the exchanges. Of course, many people continue to lose access to their doctors.

We need to contrast this with what was promised when ObamaCare was passed. I know it sounds repetitive, but I am afraid that if we lose sight of what the promises were with ObamaCare, we can't actually calculate the tremendous harm and the deception that was involved in actually delivering on that promise.

President Obama said that if you liked your policy, you could keep it—not true. He said if you liked your doctor, you could keep your doctor—also not true. He also said that a family of four could see an average decrease in premiums of \$2,500 a year—also not true.

What is the response of our Democratic friends? We saw last night that they took to the Senate floor, and they gave impassioned speeches.

First of all, they criticized the Republicans for coming forward to try to

rescue the people who were being hurt by the failures of ObamaCare. They criticized us for that. Then they said that it was a secret bill after they had rejected every entreaty—every request—for them to work with us on a bipartisan basis to rescue the people who are being hurt by the failures of ObamaCare. They rejected that.

What did they do? They came to the Senate floor. They said that they hate the bill that they have not seen yet. Then they said: Oh, it is secret. So I guess it should be one or the other. Either they hate it because they know what is in it or it is secret. It cannot be both.

The fact is that we are working hard to meet our own internal deadline because we want to make sure that the people who will be hurt in 2018, when the insurance companies raise their premiums by digits—and they are in the process of getting those approved. It will occur in the July-August timeframe when insurance companies will have to calculate what the premium is that they will have to charge. Then they will have to go to the State regulators and get approval for that premium increase. What we are being told is that the 105-percent increase in premiums on the exchanges since 2013—that is right, a 105-percent increase—is going to go up 20 percent or more next year unless we come to the rescue of those who are being harmed by ObamaCare.

We would say to our Democratic colleagues: Please do not wear yourselves out by doing something that is going to accomplish nothing. Channel all of that energy and that passion into trying to do something that will actually help the people who are being hurt today by the failures of ObamaCare.

They went even further. They said, well, they may decide just to obstruct the Senate's business on other matters that are not healthcare related until they can see the bill, which they will get to see soon.

As soon as we see the final product, we will get it scored by the Congressional Budget Office. Then we will have, literally, a vote-arama, where there will be an opportunity to debate in a fulsome and comprehensive sort of way and an opportunity to offer dozens—if not hundreds—of amendments to the bill, and we will vote. We will vote, as that is what we do.

There is nothing happening in secret here. In the fullness of time, we will all see the product we have been working on. As a result of their refusal to work with us, we have been working on it the best we can to try to accomplish something better than the failed status quo of ObamaCare.

We are told that they may obstruct the Senate's other business, including committee work. That is unrelated to the healthcare debate but, I guess, is just their lashing out in trying to find

some way that they can make life a little more difficult here in the Senate with regard to our accomplishing other important work as well.

I happen to serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee. One of the things that we are doing is a comprehensive investigation of Russia's active measures undertaken during the last election. We have a committee meeting this afternoon.

Are Democrats really going to obstruct the Senate Intelligence Committee's work in conducting and completing its investigation into Russian activities in the 2016 election? Are they really going to do that? It strikes me as nuts.

On Thursday, for example, we also have a Judiciary Committee meeting that is scheduled to consider a critically important bill that I introduced with my colleague from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR, to help fight human trafficking.

Are Democrats going to obstruct our ability to conduct our business and block our consideration of bills involving human trafficking and providing relief for the victims?

This bill reauthorizes key programs that support survivors, and it provides additional resources to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials who are on the frontlines of fighting this heinous crime.

Will the Democratic leader from New York jeopardize the committee's ability to actually consider and pass this law? Does he plan to block a Member of his own political party from advancing her bill to fight human trafficking as well?

This strikes me as wrong for a number of reasons, and I think it would actually be appalling if our Democratic colleagues, out of their frustration—frankly, borne out of their failure to do their job and work with us to find a solution to the meltdown of ObamaCare—lashed out in a way that affected victims of human trafficking and affected the Senate's ability to conduct its investigation into the Russian activities involved in our election.

Now is not the time to grandstand and make damaging, symbolic gestures like this because, while our Democratic colleagues talked a lot last night, we did not hear anything from them about the current realities of ObamaCare and how it has failed the American people. They seem to be whistling by the graveyard. We did not hear anything about rising costs or the lack of choices.

I talked to one of my Democratic colleagues this morning. He told me that his own son was looking at \$7,500 premiums a year and at a \$5,000 deductible. This friend, a Democrat—and I will not reveal his name because I do not think it would be appropriate to do so—told me that his own son had to spend \$12,500 out of pocket before his



insurance actually kicked in. That is a disaster, not just for his son but for millions of people who are negatively affected by ObamaCare. Yet our friends across the aisle want to flail about and threaten to block trafficking legislation or an investigation into the Russian involvement in the election.

The only thing they have not done is offer a constructive alternative. That is the only thing they have not done. They have tried about everything else. You know why, of course. It is that we know what the alternative is.

Basically, they did ObamaCare all by themselves. I remember. I was here on the Senate floor, in 2010, on Christmas Eve. I think it was at about 7:30 in the morning when we had the vote out of the Senate that passed ObamaCare. It was a pure party-line vote. So the Democrats have had it all to themselves—the ability to design a healthcare system that they thought America should have. It has failed time and again.

Do you know what their current proposal is right now? It is a single-payer option that puts our country even more in debt and that we know does not work.

The reason we know it does not work is that it will, no doubt, emulate things like the British National Health Service, which has resulted in two-tiered healthcare—healthcare for people who cannot otherwise afford to pay out of their pockets to get better healthcare, with all of the problems of government-run healthcare added to it, but far-left elements of the Democratic Party want a plan that goes even further than ObamaCare. That, I believe, could ultimately be their goal—one that would increase government spending on healthcare by \$518.9 billion just this year, ballooning to \$6.6 trillion between 2017 and 2026, according to the Urban Institute.

Take a look at the State of California, where a similar proposal—a single-payer system—was pushed at the State level there to enact a single-payer system that would add \$400 billion each year to the California State budget. I think that is roughly double the amount of the whole budget for the State of California—\$400 billion each year.

It strikes me that at least one conclusion you might draw from this is that our Democratic friends' solution, rather than trying to work with us in a bipartisan way to save people who are being hurt from the failures of ObamaCare, is to say: Let's throw more money at it. That is not going to work. What it will do is add to our national debt without solving the healthcare problem, and it will further burden future generations who will have to pay that money back at some point.

We already have about \$20 trillion in national debt. These young people up here who are serving as pages are going

to have to deal with that, I guess, unless we have the courage to do it ourselves. It strikes me as profoundly immoral for us to spend the money today and say: Well, our kids and grandkids are going to have to pay it back later. That is immoral.

If we thought ObamaCare crushed any semblance of competition in the healthcare marketplace, the single-payer plan from our friend Senator BERNIE SANDERS, from Vermont, who is the chief spokesman for the Democrats in the Senate on what an alternative might look like, removes competition completely because it is a government takeover. It takes away even more authority from State and local governments, and it takes away choices from individuals. Forget "if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. If you like your plan, you can keep your plan." Forget all of that because it is the opposite of what American families have repeatedly asked for.

This is what the extreme factions in the Democratic Party want. They want to expand government. They want an even larger takeover of healthcare, and they want to simply throw more money at it—as if we are not spending enough money already. Throwing more money at the problem certainly will not fix it. I suggest that it will only make things worse.

We need to be realistic about what it will take to rework our healthcare system and put patients first. I am under no illusion as to what Republicans are going to be able to come up with on our own, given the constraints of the fact that the Democrats will not work with us at all and appear not to be in the business of lifting a finger to help the millions of people who are being hurt. I am not under any illusion that what we are going to be able to come up with—and it is an interim step—is going to be perfect, as no legislation ever is, but I think we are obligated to do our best. The fact that our Democratic friends will not help at all makes it a lot harder, but I do not think we can say: It is too hard. We cannot do it. We give up.

We are committed on this side of the aisle and invite our colleagues on that side of the aisle to work with us to fix the problems that are caused by ObamaCare and to implement real healthcare reforms that will work.

First of all, we need to stabilize the market—I mentioned this earlier—and rescue millions of folks who are losing all of their access to coverage because insurance companies are simply quitting because they are bleeding money. They cannot charge a high enough premium that somebody will actually pay, so they leave the market. In Texas, alone, there are dozens of counties that have only one insurance marketplace option. If we do nothing, I fear there will be no choices. When there is only one choice, the economic backlash is

pretty simple. There is no competition to drive down costs and improve the quality of coverage.

I think this is, really, in some ways, a test of our convictions. If you really do believe that competition in the marketplace improves quality and cost for the consumer, as I do, then going to a single-payer system or even trying to repair ObamaCare is the opposite of what we should do. We need to return the market to a competitive one so that families can have the ability to make choices about their healthcare, what suits their needs, not what government is going to force you to buy, and if you do not buy the government-approved plan, it is going to punish you by fining you. That is what the status quo is like under ObamaCare.

ObamaCare is so bad that, currently, we have almost 30 million people who are still uninsured. About 6.5 million of them simply pay the penalty—I think it is \$695 a year now—instead of buying the government-approved healthcare plan. They figure that paying the penalty is better than buying the insurance for them. Then there are others—millions more—who simply opt out because of hardship. If the goal of ObamaCare were universal coverage, it has failed that goal as well. So we need to stabilize the market.

Secondly, we need to address ObamaCare's skyrocketing premium increases. We all know that if ObamaCare stays in place, premiums will stand only to rise for consumers. That is something I think our friends across the aisle are missing as well. Doing nothing is not an option because people are going to be even more priced out of the marketplace, assuming they can find an insurance company to sell them healthcare.

In Texas, a Houston-area insurer has asked for a 16-percent annual rate hike for its 2018 ObamaCare coverage—a 16-percent increase over this year they want for next year. That is what doing nothing will do. It warns it might even need a greater increase just to cover its costs.

Private businesses can't actually operate in the red like the Federal Government does. Private businesses can't just print more money or run up \$20 trillion in debt. So when they can't make money, they simply have to raise premiums or they have to quit the market.

The third thing we need to do is this. Remember, the first thing I said is stabilize the market. The second is attack premiums to bring them down, and the third thing we need to do is make sure we continue to protect American citizens from preexisting conditions. This is something I think everybody believes that needs to happen, without regard to political or ideological affiliation. No one should be denied basic

healthcare because they have a pre-existing condition, and we want to preserve those protections. That is the third goal.

The fourth goal is to make Medicaid, which is the medical safety net for millions of people, sustainable into the future. Right now we know it is not sustainable, like our other entitlement programs. The way we want to do that is by giving States more flexibility. We want to make sure that those who rely on the program don't have the rug pulled out from under them, and we want to make sure that it continues to grow year after year, but at a sustainable rate.

Right now, there is no cap, no rate of increase provided. So it is an unlimited entitlement. One of the suggestions from the House bill is to grow it each year at the rate of the consumer price index for medical costs; that is, medical inflation plus 1 percent. In other words, more money would be spent next year than this year. Even more money than next year will be spent the following year and so on, but it will be done at a sustainable rate.

Finally, we want to free the American people from the onerous ObamaCare mandates that require them to purchase insurance they don't want and can't afford. It shouldn't be a surprise to anybody that if you take the penalty away and don't force the American people to buy insurance they don't want, many of them—the younger, healthy ones, in particular—will decide not to buy it. That is called freedom of choice. That is not what ObamaCare did. ObamaCare forced people to buy something they didn't want and penalized them if they didn't. So many people will choose not to purchase it and decide to handle their healthcare in other ways—perhaps, at the emergency room, where under Federal law everybody who comes in as a medical emergency is entitled to be treated. It is not what I would tell my daughters. It is not what I would recommend for anybody, but if somebody wants to make that choice, it is certainly their right.

So I would just conclude by observing that it is shameful that Members on the other side of the aisle sit on their hands and do nothing to fix a law that continues to hurt American families. We know that regardless of who won the last election—whether it was Hillary Clinton or whether it was Donald Trump—we would have to take steps to address this failed law. So I would implore our Democratic friends to listen to their own stories, which some have recounted to me in confidence. So I won't repeat their names here, but they know this is a problem. They have heard from their constituents just like we have. So we would implore them to work with us to try to help us help our constituents. That is what I thought we were here for.

Americans are ready for healthcare reform that actually works, and it is our responsibility to do our very best to provide that to them, and that is what we intend to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I listened to the majority leader this morning saying that ObamaCare was collapsing and Republicans are on a rescue mission. Honestly, the gall it must take to say, after Republicans and President Trump have spent all year sabotaging the marketplace, that ObamaCare is collapsing. They have threatened to stop critical cost-sharing payments that help keep deductibles and premiums down, hurting millions of people and sowing uncertainty in the market.

There is an easy way to fix it. Instead of crying crocodile tears, Republicans should guarantee that the cost-sharing payments will be made. That is not just Democrats saying it. That is the insurers. Listen to the insurers. What do they want? They want to keep premiums down and prevent them from leaving the exchanges. They want cost-sharing, which our Republican colleagues refuse to do, and, then, in a cynical ploy, they try to blame ObamaCare.

Listen to AHIP, the Nation's largest trade group of insurers. It is non-partisan. It is a business group. Listen to what they said about the uncertainty about cost-sharing payments. They said it was "the single most destabilizing factor in the individual market." A series of insurance companies, including Blue Cross Blue Shield and Anthem, have said explicitly that uncertainty caused by President Trump and Republicans about cost-sharing is causing them to pull out of certain markets.

So this idea, this cynical ploy—after sabotaging the bill and then blaming someone else other than themselves—is pitiful.

The House bill, of course, was so bad—TrumpCare was so bad—that our Republican friends are trying to switch the blame to ObamaCare. It is not true, and it will not work.

Now, last night, Democrats held the floor well into the night to discuss the Republican plan to pass a healthcare bill in just 2 weeks that no one in America has seen, without holding a

single committee hearing or a robust debate on the floor. They want to bring the bill to the floor and rush it in the dark of night for a simple reason: They are ashamed of their bill. They don't want anybody to see it, least of all the public.

Last evening, I asked the majority leader if the minority would have more than 10 hours to debate and amend the final bill. He replied that "there will be ample opportunity to debate and amend the bill." So I asked again: Will we get more than 10 hours? Ten hours is the maximum the rules allow us under reconciliation. He could only reply that "There will be ample time."

I have a feeling the majority leader and I disagree on the definition of "ample," because 10 hours of debate time—a total of 10 hours of debate time on an issue this important—is a sham. It is a farce. We would have to read the bill, prepare amendments, and consider its consequences, all in 10 hours.

This is a bill that affects one-sixth of our economy, millions of Americans. For them, it is life and death, and we are supposed to rush it through.

The Affordable Care Act, for the sake of comparison, was debated for 25 consecutive days of Senate session and 169 cumulative hours of debate time, and that was after a robust hearing and committee process. Yesterday, the majority leader basically confirmed that we Democrats might only have 10 hours total—no committee hearings, no committee markups, no airing the bill—10 hours of debate. Can my colleagues believe it? This is supposed to be a democracy where we debate the greatest issues of our time.

I asked another question of the majority leader, and I ask him now and I hope he will answer: Will our 10 hours of debate time be on the House bill or will it be on the new Senate bill that he is crafting behind closed doors? Will he let us debate the full 10 hours on the new Senate bill—hardly enough—or is he even being more cynical and doing the 10 hours of debate on the existing House bill and then putting a substitute in—the Senate bill they have written behind closed doors—and have no debate on that? With everything terrible that is happening, that could make it even worse. So I am asking the majority leader to publicly state what his plan is in that regard.

I have never heard of a more radical or a more reckless process in my entire career in politics—10 hours of total debate on a bill that would affect one-sixth of the American economy and millions of Americans. If the Senate bill, like the House bill, results in 23 million fewer Americans with insurance—23 million Americans losing their insurance—each hour of debate time would represent 2.3 million Americans losing their insurance. Each minute of debate time would represent 40,000 Americans losing their insurance. One minute, and 40,000 people's

lives are changed; 40,000 people don't have the coverage they need.

It boggles the mind that the Republican leader is moving forward this way without letting anyone but Members of the Republican Senate caucus see the bill, and even many of them have said they haven't seen it. There is only one possible reason why my friends on the other side are going along with this process—only one reason: They are ashamed of the bill they are writing.

If they were proud of the bill, they would announce it. They would have brass bands going down Main Street America, saying: Look at our great bill. They can't even whisper what it is about, they are so, so ashamed of it. That is why they are hiding it. They must be ashamed that, just like the House bill, the Senate TrumpCare bill will put healthcare out of the reach of millions of Americans just to put another tax break into the pockets of the very wealthy.

President Trump likes to end many of his tweets with one word, almost like punctuation: "Sad," "unfair," "wrong." It turns out the President has one word to sum up his healthcare plan as well: "Mean."

Last week, at a White House lunch with Republican Senators, the President reportedly told them he thought the House-passed healthcare bill was mean. That is what Donald Trump said on June 13, 2017.

For once, on the topic of healthcare, I find myself agreeing with the President. His healthcare bill is mean. Cutting Medicaid to the bone is mean. Cutting treatment for opioid abuse is mean. Cutting support for families with someone in a nursing home is mean. Allowing insurers to once again discriminate against Americans with preexisting conditions is mean. Charging older Americans five times or more for their health insurance is mean.

Passing a law which would cause millions of Americans to lose their health insurance in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest among us is pretty much the textbook definition of a mean bill—a mean bill—and even the President thinks so, but just like the Republicans in the Senate, President Trump doesn't want the American people to know what he really thinks of their healthcare plan. That is why he said it was mean behind closed doors at the White House, while in public a few weeks earlier he said it is a "great plan," "very, very incredibly well-crafted." Those are his words, the same bill—the same bill—out to the public: Great bill, great plan; while behind closed doors, what it really is: mean.

All the plaudits the President gave the House bill turned out to be flimsy salesmanship. Speaking candidly to fellow Republicans, the President didn't say: Take up and pass the House bill. He didn't say it was a great plan or that it was very, very incredibly

well-crafted. He said it was mean. My Republican friends ought to take this to heart. Even President Trump thinks what Republicans are doing on healthcare is a cruelty to the American people.

As we on this side of the aisle have said before, there is a better way. Republicans shouldn't feel like this mean bill cooked up in secret is their only option. I have invited my Republican friends to meet in the Old Senate Chamber to discuss a bipartisan way forward on healthcare. The Republican leader seems to have foreclosed that option, but the invitation remains and the sentiment remains.

Democrats are willing to work with our Republican friends on improving our healthcare system. We have significant disagreements, sure, but Republicans haven't even tried to sit down with us to hash them out. We would like to try, but if Republicans continue down this path, ignoring the principles of transparency and the open debate that defined this legislative body, we Democrats will continue to do everything we can to shine light on what our Republican friends are doing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in support of Ms. Sigal Mandelker, President Trump's nominee to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Five weeks ago, at Ms. Mandelker's hearing, members of the Banking Committee were moved by her heartfelt story of her parents' escape from the Holocaust. As her father proudly sat behind her, she explained to the committee how, as Holocaust survivors who narrowly avoided death, her parents raised her to never take for granted our safety, security, or freedom.

It was this that motivated Ms. Mandelker to public service, where she had an impressive career in law enforcement and national security at the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security before joining the private sector.

Like many Americans, she was compelled to action following 9/11 and joined to serve in Justice's counterterrorism and national security mission. Throughout the nomination process, it was obvious Ms. Mandelker would be a strong leader to defend our Nation against terrorism and illicit finance threats. She received bipartisan support from the Banking Committee in a 16-to-7 vote advancing her nomination.

Also, with bipartisan support, just last week the Senate voted on the Iran sanctions bill and our Russia sanctions amendment. Part of Ms. Mandelker's

job as Under Secretary would be directly overseeing sanctions policy on Iran, Russia, North Korea, Syria, and some 25 other programs.

In fact, when asked what her top priorities would be in assuming office, she noted that, first and foremost, she will focus on the areas posing the greatest threats—those being North Korea, Iran, ISIS, Syria, and Russia. She also affirmed that she would work closely with the Banking Committee and Congress in carrying out her duties.

I don't need to stress the importance of confirming Ms. Mandelker's nomination so Treasury can carry out this important mission, especially given that the Senate vote on our sanctions package last week was so strong. The two leaders and many Senators of both parties were able to work together to pass this important, comprehensive sanctions legislation, as they should, to ensure Senate confirmation of this nomination.

Given Ms. Mandelker's strong qualifications, dedication to service and mission, and bipartisan support from this committee of jurisdiction, I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Long nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brock Long, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Long nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 148 Ex.]

#### YEAS—95

|            |         |              |
|------------|---------|--------------|
| Alexander  | Capito  | Cortez Masto |
| Baldwin    | Cardin  | Cotton       |
| Barrasso   | Carper  | Crapo        |
| Bennet     | Casey   | Cruz         |
| Blumenthal | Cassidy | Daines       |
| Blunt      | Cochran | Donnelly     |
| Boozman    | Collins | Duckworth    |
| Brown      | Coons   | Durbin       |
| Burr       | Corker  | Enzi         |
| Cantwell   | Cornyn  | Ernst        |

What the Richardson case, on one hand, and the Callahan case, on the other hand, show us are two things: First, if we are going to reform the criminal justice system, we shouldn't focus on merely reducing sentences. That doesn't do all that much to help our society. Instead, we should focus on rehabilitating people while they are in prison, whatever the length of their sentence. They need serious help if they can ever hope to redeem themselves and, once they are out of jail, stay out for good. And we should give them that help, not only because it is good for them—though it is—but because it is good for us as a society. This is why I support real reform that will make our prisons safer for inmates and correction officers alike and take

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

Unfortunately, nothing good has come from this decision. Now, less than a year later, Carol Richardson is going back to prison. As part of her release, she was put on a 10-year probation, which meant she had to check in regularly with her probation officers, but she did not. She did not tell them she had left her job. She did not tell them she had moved. She did not even tell them she had been arrested.

real steps to help inmates leave their lives of crime behind once and for all.

The second lesson is this: We need to know far more than we do now about how many people we release early from prison go back to a life of crime. What types of crimes do they commit? How many murders? How many robberies? How many drug arrests? Those numbers can be small or they can be large, but we need to know them to understand the full scope of our problem. And having that information will help the President decide each case as he considers when and how to use his pardon power.

But, today, the Federal Government doesn't even compile these data.

That is why I, along with Senators HATCH, Sessions, and PERDUE, introduced a bill last year to require that the government collect and report on these numbers. Unfortunately, the bill did not pass into law. So I want to announce today that I intend to reintroduce the bill with a renewed sense of urgency. This is just one story, after all. We don't know how many people granted clemency are returning to crime. But that is all the more reason to start collecting more data. We need to thoroughly evaluate cold, hard evidence before we make any sweeping changes to our criminal laws.

Carol Richardson's story should warn us of the perils of letting ideology get the better of common sense. We owe it to our neighbors to keep their families safe, and we owe it to the Carol Richardsons of the world to give them a real and honest chance at life once they complete their sentence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, on May 4 of this year, there was a party at the White House, a celebration—a celebration that the House had passed TrumpCare. Indeed, the President wanted to invite people over and say what a great job they had done and what a great bill they had passed. He called it a “great plan.” He said the House plan was “very, very incredibly well-crafted.”

That was on May 4—a party at the White House, a celebration—but what a difference a month can make. A week ago, on Tuesday, June 13, the President had another gathering, and at this gathering he said that the bill from the House was “mean,” and he went on to use a very derogatory phrase to describe it.

So what happened between May 4 and June 13? Did the bill change in some way? Absolutely not. It had already been passed out of the House. Apparently what happened is that someone explained to the President what was in it, and he said: That is terrible. We can't do that. It is a mean bill. And he used other vivid language to say just how bad it was.

What feature of the TrumpCare bill did the President get briefed on that made him say that it was mean? It certainly is a mean-spirited bill. It certainly is a hard-hearted bill. It certainly is destructive to the quality of life of millions and millions of Americans. So which aspect of the bill was he referring to?

I asked that question of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tom Price, when he came to the Senate for a hearing last week. I asked the Secretary if he shared the President's opinion that the TrumpCare bill was a mean bill. He didn't have an answer for that. He wouldn't say whether, as a leader in the administration on healthcare, he shared the President's opinion.

I asked whether he thought the President thought it was a mean-spirited bill because it ripped healthcare from 23 million Americans. The Secretary of healthcare didn't answer.

I asked whether it was mean because it eliminated essential health benefits like emergency care and rehabilitation services and mental health and addiction treatment and maternity coverage for women having a child. The Secretary again refused to answer.

And he proceeded to say things like “Well, I wasn't in the meeting,” and that he hadn't talked to the President about why the President didn't like the bill. One would think that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, upon hearing that the President thought that the bill he had advocated for was terrible, would actually go to him and say: What is it you thought was so terrible? That might inform the conversations here in the Senate. But he said that he hadn't talked to the President about it. The Secretary of Health and Human Services didn't want to know why the President disliked this bill.

I asked if the President thought that this was a mean bill because it has vast premium increases for older Americans. An individual in their mid-sixties, prior to the age for Medicare, a 64-year-old earning \$26,500—how much would they pay under current law and how much would they pay under TrumpCare? Under current law, the answer is about \$140 a month. And under TrumpCare from the House, the answer is \$1,200 per month—an eightfold increase. How can anyone earning a little over \$2,000 a month spend \$1,200 on health insurance? It is an impossible situation.

So, of course, those Americans in that situation would not be able to buy health insurance, would not be able to access healthcare. Is that why the President thought it was mean? Did the President get briefed on the damage it would do to our older Americans? Or was the President concerned about the impact on our older Americans who need to have care in a nurs-

ing home? Is the President finally aware that Medicaid pays for more than 6 out of 10 individuals who are in a nursing home because they need a level of care that can't be provided in the home?

I went and visited a nursing home over the weekend in urban Oregon and then visited one in rural Oregon, in Klamath County. In Klamath County they told me that almost 100 percent of their citizens in long-term care are paid for by Medicaid. Nationally, it is a little more than 6 out of 10, but in this rural community, almost 100 percent. I thought about the residents there and what happens to them. Under this bill, when Medicaid is slashed massively and 23 million folks lose access to it, what happens to them? One woman, Deborah, said: Senator, Medicaid pays for my bill and if it doesn't exist for me—if it is taken away—I am on the street, and that is a problem because I can't walk.

So picture an older American, a senior American who needs an intensive level of care that can't be provided in the home being thrown into the street in a wheelchair, unable to walk, and, by the way, no support structure because in order to qualify for Medicaid to pay your bill, you have to have spent down all your own resources, so it isn't like somebody has a backup plan. Maybe there are family members who will take them in and provide an intensive level of care. Maybe a few will have friends who will take them in and provide an intensive level of care. But for the vast majority, that support structure isn't there, and that means they are going to be on the street. Is that why the President said it was mean?

Was it because the bill said States can charge more, allow insurance companies to charge more for individuals with preexisting conditions? That is certainly a huge problem. Community pricing has given access to insurance at the same price to everyone in America, regardless of preexisting conditions, but, unfortunately, TrumpCare changes that.

I think we need to recognize that now, here in the Senate, 13 Senators are working to craft a Senate version of TrumpCare, and they are terrified—terrified of the public seeing their bill. It is a vampire bill. It is afraid of the sunlight—the sunlight of public commentary, input, even a public discussion from experts. They are afraid of their citizens. They are afraid of the expert commentary. And they want to hide it until the last second so they can bring it to the floor—next Thursday, a week from this Thursday—and try to pass it in a moment's time, less than a day.

I was fascinated that our Secretary of Health and Human Services—after there were more than 100 hearings and roundtables and walk-throughs of the

healthcare bill in 2009, after consideration of more than 300 amendments in the Senate, after more than 100 Republican amendments that were adopted, minority amendments adopted, after more than 25 days of debate on the Senate floor—complained that the bill and the process were not transparent. If that wasn't transparent, how do you score the transparency of a bill where there have been zero committee meetings, zero chance for legislators to weigh in, zero chance for public input by experts, zero chance for the citizens of the United States to see this bill and share their feelings, zero chance for us to go back to our own States and have townhalls and ask for input? Well, you give it an F. It is a process completely out of sync with the responsibilities that every Senator took when they took the oath of office to be a Member of a legislative body—not a secret body, a legislative body, which implies deliberation in committee and deliberation on the floor and deliberation with constituents back home.

There is a phrase for the Senate—probably not merited; in fact, I am sure it is no longer merited—that the Senate was the world's greatest deliberative body. But crafting legislation in secret that affects the quality of life of millions and millions of Americans, with no deliberation, that is not a legislative process. That is not what was envisioned under our Constitution, our "we the people" Constitution. It wasn't a "we the secret group of powerful folks accommodating powerful special interests, government by and for the powerful." That wasn't the introduction to our Constitution. Perhaps Members might read the first three words of the Constitution. Perhaps folks might go back and look at our history of why we have this floor to debate the issues, because that is what a system of government of, by, and for the people is all about.

In my home State, the elimination of Medicaid expansion—that is, the Oregon Health Plan expansion—would throw 400,000 people off of healthcare. Stretching that timeline from a couple years to 7 years doesn't change the fact that 400,000 people lose healthcare. That is mean-spirited. That is hard-hearted. That is terrible healthcare policy.

It is not just those individuals who are affected. The uncompensated care rate has dropped enormously in Oregon, from 15 percent to 5 percent. The result is that there is much more income to our clinics and to our hospitals, and the result is better healthcare for everyone—everyone in our rural communities, everyone in our urban communities. Nonetheless, the majority persists in wanting to destroy this improvement.

I am hearing from people like Elizabeth from Portland, who wrote to say that the Oregon Health Plan saved her

life. The Oregon Health Plan, or Medicaid, saved her life. She was in school, and she had some health problems that were getting worse because of stress. But she didn't have a job and didn't have insurance, and things were getting bad. Then the Affordable Care Act came around, and it extended coverage. Since then, she has gotten her health problems under control, finished school, and was able to get a job. In Elizabeth's own words:

I am once again contributing to society. I just need a little bit of time and help and I'm back on my feet.

Isn't it the right thing to provide a foundation for every single American to have access to quality healthcare, so that when they get sick, it helps them get back on their feet?

Ask yourself: What is your value? Is it your value that every American should have access to affordable healthcare? That is my value. That is what I am fighting for. What are you fighting for? Are you fighting to destroy healthcare for millions of Americans? Is that your value—to make life difficult and hard and mean-spirited and hard-hearted and terrible and painful for millions of Americans? Is that your value? If so, then keep up with this secret plan to destroy healthcare for millions of Americans. But if you value your constituents' quality of life, if you value their peace of mind, then put a stop to this abomination, this anti-democratic process. Insist that there is at least a month of consideration of the bill so that citizens can weigh in, so experts can weigh in, so committees can deliberate, so committees can propose amendments and improvements. Insist on that.

We just need three Members of the majority party to believe in the responsibility of this Chamber to hold a public debate and insist that they will not vote to proceed to the bill unless we have at least a month of opportunity. That is only one-ninth of what we had in 2009. It is only a fraction of the committee meetings, roundtables, and walk-throughs we had in 2009. It would be only a fraction of the amendments offered in 2009. It would only be a fraction of the time here on the Senate floor we had in 2009. Don't you believe we should have at least a fraction of the public deliberation we had just 8 years ago before jamming this through and destroying healthcare for millions of Americans? What does peace of mind mean to you?

I will tell you what it means to my constituents. It means that when their loved one gets sick, their loved one will get the care they need. It means that when their loved one gets sick, they won't go bankrupt. That is the peace of mind we are talking about, and that is the peace of mind that is so profoundly disturbed when you have a secret group meeting with powerful special interests, devising a bill they are afraid to

show to the public of the United States of America. I would never want to have to vote on such a major bill without being able to hear what my citizens in Oregon think. I don't think any Member of this Senate should agree to vote on a bill with no deliberation and no public hearing.

So we need three champions. Just three out of 52. It should be 52 out of 52 who insist on a quality public process. We have heard the comments in the hallways, many Members of the majority dislike the fact that there is a secret process that their majority leader is insisting on. We have heard that they don't like it. It is not right. But do you know what? Every Member here has a chance to say no to the secret operation, the secret committee of 13, and the last-second presentation of such a bill on the floor.

The issue of the changes in healthcare without public deliberation terrifies folks like Deborah from Hillsboro, OR. She was diagnosed with Crohn's disease 8 years ago and has to take regular injections and medications to keep it under control. She does a lot of things right. She doesn't smoke, she exercises, and she follows her doctor's recommended diet. Other than her regular medications, she lives a normal, healthy life, and she is looking forward to retiring in the near future with her husband. They have been working hard their whole lives. They have been saving up for it. It is so close that they can almost taste it. But it is a dream that could be shattered by the Republican healthcare plan—the TrumpCare plan—being concocted secretly by 13 Members of this body. As she says:

Without affordable coverage for pre-existing conditions I cannot even switch jobs easily. If Medicare is reduced or eliminated, as the GOP is trying to do, I may never be able to retire . . . we should not now, or ever, eliminate coverage for pre-existing conditions (or price that coverage such that most of us will never be able to afford it).

She is worried that changes that refer to Medicaid and the Oregon Health Plan will ruin her ability to retire and her ability to access healthcare.

I don't know exactly what the President was briefed on that made him call TrumpCare "mean" and then speak in a very derogatory fashion about the bill from the House. I don't know exactly what he learned. I don't know if it was because he learned that folks on long-term care could lose that long-term care and Medicaid pays for more than 6 out of 10 Americans who are in long-term care. I don't know if it was because he learned about preexisting conditions. I don't know if it was because he learned it would throw 23 million people out of the healthcare system. I don't know if it was because he learned this would have devastating consequences to rural healthcare because of the impact on the finances of clinics and hospitals.

Whatever he meant, he was right. He was right to make that transition from a month earlier when he held a celebration at the White House because this terrific, wonderful bill had been passed by the House, and when he sobered up and discovered that it was a mean-spirited, hard-hearted bill. But for all these reasons, no healthcare should be crafted and jammed through without deliberation. No significant bill affecting the lives of Americans should be pushed through in this manner. Americans deserve better. They expect more from this Chamber than such a secret, callous, poorly informed process. They don't like that powerful special interests are meeting with the Senators in private—those private 13—to develop a plan, because here is what they have heard:

They know this bill gives huge tax breaks to powerful parts of the healthcare industry, that it gives huge amounts of money away to those who make medical equipment and huge amounts of money away to health insurance companies, meanwhile stripping healthcare from millions of Americans. They know it also gives a massive tax break to the richest Americans.

So here we are with a bill that Trump has called “mean,” giving away the Treasury to powerful special interests, meeting in private with my colleagues, giving away the Treasury to the richest Americans, while on the other hand lowering the boom on our seniors in long-term care, lowering the boom on struggling and working families, lowering the boom on 20 million or so Americans who would lose healthcare, and lowering the boom on the clinics and hospitals that provide care for everyone.

That is what they see: special favors for the powerful and thrown into the street the working and struggling families. That is morally wrong. That is wrong from a policy point of trying to improve the quality of life of Americans, and it is why every Senator here should absolutely say no to moving to this bill on the floor without a full month, at least, for committee deliberations and for the citizens of the United States to weigh in.

That is the difference between what happens in a dictatorship with no deliberation and a democratic republic with a legislative process that values deliberation and openness. That is the difference. Which model do my colleagues support?

Let's fight for the “we the people” vision of our Constitution, and let's fight for quality healthcare for every American, and let's say no to moving to any bill that hasn't had public deliberation and at least a full month of deliberation in this Chamber.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their comments today on the damage TrumpCare would do. Democrats, patients, and families have been fighting back against TrumpCare and Republican efforts to jam it through Congress for months.

I want to take a moment and recall some of the promises President Trump and Republicans made at the very beginning of this process because there truly is a Grand Canyon between President Trump's promises and the TrumpCare bill he has now admitted himself is “mean.”

At the start, President Trump promised to provide insurance for everybody that was both cheaper and higher quality. When TrumpCare was introduced in the House, Secretary Price said that “no one would be worse off financially” under the law. And when Speaker RYAN was asked whether millions of people would lose their insurance coverage under TrumpCare, he said “no.”

Families were told again and again that TrumpCare would lower costs and keep people covered. As we know, TrumpCare would do the exact opposite. It will raise healthcare costs for people across the country, astronomically for those with preexisting conditions and for seniors, who could pay as much as 850 percent more in premiums. Medicaid would be gutted. Women and men would be unable to get care from the providers they trust and choose at Planned Parenthood. New mothers would pay as much as \$1,000 more a month just to get maternity care. Tens of millions of people would see their healthcare coverage taken away.

I could continue. And I want to be clear that those facts came from the nonpartisan, independent Congressional Budget Office.

Unfortunately and unsurprisingly, when TrumpCare passed the House, President Trump ignored those facts and doubled down on his broken promises. He championed TrumpCare, calling it “very, very well-crafted.” He promised to get TrumpCare through the Senate, predicting that it would be an unbelievable victory. His Secretary of Health and Human Services called this bill—which would take healthcare coverage away from 23 million people—a victory for the American people. Which people? Maybe President Trump. Maybe special interests who are going to get these massive tax breaks. But

not the hundreds of thousands of people in Washington State who are rightly scared of TrumpCare or millions more across the country.

Democrats have come to the Senate floor with story after story about how our constituents would suffer under this legislation, workers who would not be able to make ends meet between jobs without losing health insurance, seniors who know they will go bankrupt if TrumpCare becomes law, moms who stay up at night worrying about whether their child who has a pre-existing condition will be priced out of coverage, patients fighting for their lives who are afraid that TrumpCare will kill them and who are literally begging Congress not to do this.

To these patients and families, President Trump's decision to finally admit the incredibly obvious—that TrumpCare is “mean”—doesn't begin to cover it. To them, that bill is a gut punch. It is the bottom dropping out. It could be a death sentence. And this is especially true because, as hard as Senate Republicans have tried to keep their version of TrumpCare secret, behind closed doors, and in back rooms, as often as some have made promises just like those President Trump and House Republicans were making to try to reassure their constituents somehow that the Senate version of TrumpCare would be somehow less mean, the truth is, we know the Senate version of TrumpCare will be just as damaging.

Senate Republican leaders have already admitted that they expect their TrumpCare bill to mirror 80 percent of the House's. We have House conservatives writing letters to Senate Republicans making demands even meaner than many Senate Republicans want. And we all have a good idea how this is going to end up. “Mean” doesn't even begin to cover what TrumpCare would do to my constituents in Washington and to people across the country, but it is a start.

I haven't said this often, but I hope Senate Republicans listen to President Trump. This is a man who knows about mean—from making fun of a reporter with disabilities, to belittling our friend the junior Senator from Florida, to even impugning the senior Senator from Arizona, a war hero. When President Trump says something is mean, that certainly means something.

Mr. President, I hope they think about why he had to make that comment. They realize just how hard it will be to defend this truly appalling legislation, especially after it has been jammed through Congress, hidden from patients, and hidden from families without seeing the light of day. I hope they do what we tell preschoolers to do when they do something mean—apologize and make sure to do better next time. In Senate Republicans' case, that means dropping this effort to undermine families' healthcare once and for



all and then joining with us to continue fixing healthcare for the people we serve by making healthcare more affordable, getting more families covered, and maintaining quality of care.

Democrats have ideas. We are at the table. We are ready to get to work as soon as Republicans are. It is not too late to make the right choice. The wrong choice is far more than mean. If my Republican colleagues do continue down this deeply harmful path, they should know they will own every bit of the hurt they cause, and they will be held fully accountable.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senator LEAHY be recognized next.

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

#### NATIONAL GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Montanans can tell you that nothing beats getting outdoors for hunting, skiing, fishing, backpacking—you name it; it is our way of life. In fact, after I graduated from Montana State University, I had to leave Montana to start my business career, but I came back to Montana while my knees were still good so I could spend my time enjoying all that Montana's outdoors have to offer. That is why I am excited that June is National Great Outdoors Month.

Montana's outdoors have a special meaning for me. In fact, I even proposed to my sweet wife Cindy some 31 years ago next month on the summit of Hyalite Peak, just south of Bozeman.

The value of Montana's outdoors is simply incredible. In fact, according to the Outdoor Industry Association, there are 64,000 Montanans whose jobs are directly tied to our outdoor recreation industry. In 2012, outdoor recreation generated almost \$6 billion in consumer spending in Montana alone. Nationally—taking this to the big picture of our great country—outdoor recreation generates \$887 billion in consumer spending each year and provides 7.6 million jobs.

Folks travel across our Nation, even from around the world, to come visit America's great outdoors. It is all right here in our backyard—in fact, for me

literally. I grew up just about 90 miles from Yellowstone National Park. I went to kindergarten through college just 90 miles away from Yellowstone National Park, and I can tell you, I go back there every year with my family.

Whether it is hiking in Glacier National Park up in Northwest Montana, fly fishing the Gallatin River that Brad Pitt and Robert Redford made famous with that great movie "A River Runs Through It"—which runs right by my hometown—or skiing at Whitefish, Big Sky, or floating down the Madison on a hot summer day, we can take these things for granted. That is why it is so important to recognize the value of the outdoors during National Great Outdoors Month. If you visit one of our national parks or if you go on a white water rafting tour, you are not only getting a great experience yourself, you know you are giving back to our local economy, and you are helping create jobs.

I want to encourage everyone to recognize National Great Outdoors Month by joining me and getting out there. Don't just talk about it. Get outdoors and experience all that the outdoors has to offer.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Montana. I have hiked in his State before, and it is a wonderful place. Their mountains are a tad higher than ours, but both my wife and I love hiking in the mountains, and I have enjoyed his State.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, for the last 7 years, we have heard Republicans in Congress campaign on the pledge to repeal the Affordable Care Act. For 7 years they have said: We are going to repeal it and replace it. State to State, district to district, like President Trump, they pledged to repeal and replace the health reform bill that made access to affordable healthcare a reality for millions of Americans.

One would think—and what I get asked in Vermont is—when they campaigned for 7 years that they were going to repeal and replace it as soon as they were in power, you would think they would have a plan to do that. But it seems there is no plan. Instead, there are a dozen or so Republican lawmakers meeting behind closed doors. And they are shielded from public view. I don't think any other Members of Congress are allowed in their presence—lobbyists, but no Members of Congress. They say they have negotiated, finally, a grand plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act—and oh, by the way, a plan that makes devastating cuts to the Medicaid Program. And they have done this with no hearings, no debate, no process, no showing what the cost would be, and no bill. They are keeping a tight lid on the decisions

they are making for the rest of America. What I get asked back home in Vermont is: What are they so afraid of? We are about to find out.

We hear they still intend to bring this yet-to-be-finalized bill to the Senate floor very soon under the expedited reconciliation process, without even the most basic vetting and transparency. Not only is this latest TrumpCare plan that is about to be foisted on the American people and on the Senate not ready for prime time; it is not fit for prime time. It is really nothing short of shameful.

Certainly, in my decades here in the Senate, I have never seen anything by either Republican or Democratic majorities done like this. In fact, I will give you an idea of how it can be done differently.

When the Democrats were in control, before we passed the Affordable Care Act, the Senate held over 100 hearings on the issue. Republicans haven't held one. We had over 100 hearings. We had roundtables on health reform. Hundreds of amendments were considered by the Senate Finance and HELP Committees during an exhaustive markup process, with 160 amendments by Republican Senators adopted. The process itself stretched for so long—more than a year—in the vain hope that Republicans would come to the table and stay at the table. In fact, the final Senate bill included more than 145 Republican-authored amendments, and it was posted for every single person in America to see for nearly a week before the Finance Committee marked it up. The same can be said for the HELP Committee. Then, more than 160 hours were spent on this Senate floor in considering the Affordable Care Act. Everybody had an opportunity to speak on it. That is when the Democrats controlled the Senate.

What is happening with the Republicans? Will they have 100 hearings? No, they have not had one single hearing, and they are not having any debate and not having any process. We don't even know what this is going to cost. And as of right now, there is no bill.

In the House and now in the Senate, this charade boils down to bumper sticker politics. It is not a solid, seriously vetted, workable, fair and equitable plan or policy. Let's see what happens when you do it this way.

After this bill passed in the House—a bill that no one had read—even the Secretary admitted he hadn't read it. After it passed and people had a chance to see what was in it, what did we find out? That 23 million Americans were going to lose coverage. And then the President proposed a budget that assumes savings from the repeal of the Affordable Care Act through big, big cuts to the Medicaid Program.

Under the House-passed TrumpCare bill, the State of Vermont will spend hundreds of millions more on Medicaid

to compensate for the loss of Federal funds targeted by President Trump and the House Republicans. Under the House-passed TrumpCare bill, premiums are expected to rise by 20 percent. Seniors—many of whom live on fixed incomes—will be charged five times more than younger enrollees under the House-passed TrumpCare bill. Well, that translates north of \$4,400 in increased healthcare costs for Vermonters between the ages of 55 and 64.

Notwithstanding the millions of people being thrown off the list, notwithstanding the cuts to Medicaid, President Trump joined Republicans at the White House, and he celebrated the House-passed bill. He celebrated. He said: Look what we can do with me as President. They all applauded, and they were all so happy.

Then somebody must have finally read the bill. Somebody at the White House must have read the bill and actually told the President what was in the bill that he was praising. And then, in a sudden about-face, he described the House-passed bill as “mean.” “Mean” is what President Trump said of the House GOP healthcare plan.

Some back home may find it a surprise that I could be in agreement with President Trump, but do you know what? President Trump is right. I am saying it right here on the floor: President Trump is right. The House-passed bill that he praised is mean. It is mean because it would do so much harm to so many Americans.

It is untenable. It is unrealistic. And if Senate Republicans think they can fix it behind closed doors, they are wrong. We should be working together, Republicans and Democrats—together—to improve the Affordable Care Act. If there are parts where it is flawed, let's fix it. If there are parts where it could be improved, let's join together and strengthen it. Let's not double down on Americans at a time when their President is turning his back on the very programs that support our social safety net. Women and children and low-income Americans and small businesses alike are all going to suffer under his plans.

We 100, as representatives of our constituents—I think we have a responsibility to give voice to their concerns. We 100 Senators are elected to represent 350 million Americans. We are supposed to be the conscience of the Nation. Maybe it is time that each one of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, started listening to what Americans say about healthcare.

A family physician from Manchester, VT, wrote to me saying: “I do not support efforts to roll back or eliminate the patient-centered insurance reforms established in recent years that prohibit discrimination against patients due to their race, gender, health status, or geographic location. These re-

forms matter to the everyday lives of our patients.”

Someone from Brattleboro, VT, wrote: “I am writing to ask what I can do to help stop Medicaid from being changed to the system being promoted by the Republican majority.”

From Jericho, VT: “I had Hodgkin's lymphoma 3 years ago and was fortunate to have insurance to cover most of the roughly \$100,000 bill. Having had cancer is stressful enough without constantly worrying about severe financial consequences if it strikes again.”

From Bennington, VT: “Being patient-centered means we put the patient first. As a physician and advocate for my patients, I do not want any of them to be hurt by the actions Congress takes or fails to take.”

And then from Manchester Center, VT: “I will be one of the [20 million] people to lose their health insurance when the Trump administration almost certainly repeals the ACA in a few months. Tax credits will not help me to regain it.”

And from the small town of Sandgate, VT: “My son has a chronic illness that, without our insurance, would cost \$1,000 per month in prescriptions alone. That doesn't even cover the regular checkups. Right now he is covered, but, as I'm sure you remember from when you first got out of college or high school, we know that he may not have as good coverage when he gets out on his own. The Republican plan is a death sentence for him.”

The Republican plan is a death sentence for him.

These are real people. These are real stories about their lives, and I am willing to guess that there are similar people in virtually every State in this country with more stories like these.

This isn't a political campaign. This is about life and death and access to healthcare. For these Vermonters and for millions of Americans across the country, the decisions we make here will have consequences—real consequences in their lives. Every Senator should think about that before we hastily undo years of progress to increase affordable access to healthcare for millions of Americans.

The Republican majority, led on, cheered on by President Trump, passed a bill which would take so many millions of people off of healthcare. It would devastate Medicaid. It would make it so much more difficult for people to get healthcare. Then the bill they fought so hard to pass, the bill they cheered on, the bill they celebrated in the Rose Garden with President Trump, finally, somebody read what they passed. What a novel idea. They had all voted on it. They had all gone home. The President had praised them. I remember the pictures of them beaming in the praise of the President. Well, somebody finally read the bill and told the President, and he said

that bill is “mean.” The House GOP healthcare plan—that bill is “mean.”

Well, I agree with President Trump, but you know what they are pushing now—he and his administration—the Senate bill; yet nobody has seen the Senate bill. Nobody knows how many people are being cut off the roll. Nobody knows how many people are going to be without healthcare. Nobody knows how large the cuts will be to Medicaid. Nobody knows how much our 50 States are going to be hurt by it. Nobody knows which millions of Americans—good, hard-working, honest Americans—are going to lose healthcare in the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth.

Will that be celebrated? Then, after it is passed, will somebody at the White House whisper to the President: The Senate bill is pretty mean, too. The Senate bill is pretty mean, but by golly, we got it passed. We had it on our bumper stickers that we would, and we got it passed. We are wealthy. We will have our healthcare. Too bad for those tens of millions of Americans who won't.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REQUESTS FOR AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have nine requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They do not have the approval of the Democratic leader; therefore, they will not be permitted to meet.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of committees requesting authority to meet be printed in the RECORD.

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

Committee on Armed Services  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
Committee on Foreign Relations  
Committee on the Judiciary  
Committee on Intelligence  
Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet  
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining  
Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy  
Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism  
40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE SYSTEM

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this afternoon to mark the 40th anniversary of the first oil moving through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. In Alaska, we

call it TAPS. This is an 800-mile-long engineering marvel that runs from the North Slope of Alaska to tidewater in Valdez.

Forty years is a good, long history. I recognize that, and so this afternoon, in the interest of time, I will abbreviate the history, but I want to start the story of our pipeline in the late 1960s. Believe it or not, this was a pretty bleak moment for oil exploration in Alaska. Despite great promise, many companies had given up on exploration on the North Slope. By some accounts, at that point in time, there were at least 14 dry holes that had been drilled before ARCO and Humble Oil Company decided they were going to sink just one last well. It was actually an ARCO executive who described it "more as a decision not to cancel a well already scheduled to go ahead."

That well, Prudhoe Bay State No. 1, would prove to be a game changer for Alaska. We had discovered oil. We discovered oil on the North Slope and a lot of it. We quickly learned that Prudhoe Bay would be one of the largest oilfields in global history, by far the largest ever discovered in the United States. Early estimates, at that time, suggested as much as 9 billion barrels of oil could be recovered from it. We have learned over these intervening 40 years that we so far underestimated that.

Yet it was not just the issue of discovering the oil. Prudhoe Bay is located in a very remote part of the State, as far north as you can go—a pretty inhospitable area given the climate—far away from population centers in the lower 48. So a lot of challenges needed to be overcome before production could begin.

Initially, it was like, OK, how do we move significant quantities of oil? How do we transport this oil to market? It was Dan Yergin, in his book "The Prize," who did a great job of describing the various choices that were out there.

He wrote: "Icebreaker tankers that would travel through the frozen Arctic seas to the Atlantic were seriously considered. Other suggestions included a monorail or fleet of trucks in permanent circulation on an eight-lane highway across Alaska."

They then "calculated that it would require most of the trucks in America" to do this. There was also "a prominent nuclear physicist recommended a fleet of nuclear-powered submarine tankers that would travel under the polar ice cap to a deepwater port in Greenland—the port to be created, in turn, by a nuclear explosion. Boeing and Lockheed explored the idea of jumbo jet oil tankers."

Obviously, none of those ideas came about, and some probably for very good reason, but after significant study and debate, a pipeline emerged as the best way to transport Alaska's oil. While

two routes were considered—one over land, which would run across Canada—an all-Alaska route was ultimately chosen as the best way to go.

Yet, even then, pipeline construction could not begin right away. There were serious debates in the State over issues like taxes and tariffs and pipeline ownership, and it really consumed our State's legislature for years. The land claims of the Alaska Natives needed to be settled. This occurred in the landmark legislation that passed in 1971.

Then it was in 1973 that Congress took up the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act. As part of that debate here on the Senate floor, Alaska's Senators offered an amendment to deem the environmental impact statement for the pipeline to be sufficient and to shield it from what could have been decades of litigation by its opponents. This was a critically important aspect to the debate and really to the future of the pipeline in order to ensure that this construction would not be delayed by litigation.

The vote was as close as votes get here in the Senate. It was deadlocked 49 to 49, and sitting in that chair, the Vice President at the time, Spiro Agnew, cast the deciding vote in Alaska's favor. So every time I see the bust out here of Vice President Agnew, I look at him. Other people reflect on Vice President Agnew in different ways. I reflect on that deciding vote that allowed us to proceed with our Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

The pipeline bill went on to pass the Senate on a strong bipartisan basis. Not long after that, then-President Richard Nixon signed it into law. This was tremendous news for Alaska because we would be allowed to move forward with the construction.

The construction of this pipeline was a monumental undertaking, but that monumental undertaking was also done with considerable speed. In April of 1974, construction on a 360-mile haul road began. We now call it the Dalton Highway. It was finished in 154 days.

For those of you who have heard my plea on the floor and to colleagues who have been in committees when I have talked about the history of my efforts to try to get a 10-mile, one-lane, gravel, noncommercial-use road for the people of King Cove, I think about what we were able to accomplish in 154 days with that haul road that allowed us to then help to facilitate the build-out of the pipeline.

The pipeline itself was the largest privately funded infrastructure project ever undertaken in America at the time. It was significant. It was significant for Alaska, of course, but it was significant for the Nation as well. Its total cost came to be about \$8 billion. In October of 1975, there were about 28,000 people who were working to make this pipeline a reality, and that pipeline was completed in 1977. Again,

initial construction of the haul road began in 1974. It was completed in October 1977, which was just 3 years and 2 months after construction began. I am told it was actually 10 days ahead of schedule, according to one estimate, which is pretty remarkable.

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline—and I cannot find a picture that really shows the line well—an extraordinary line, which again, is 800 miles long, running from the North Slope to an ice-free Port of Valdez at tidewater. It crosses three mountain ranges, including Atigun Pass, which has an elevation of more than 4,800 feet. It reaches a grade of 55 degrees at one point in the Chugach Range. So it goes up incredible mountains and down the other side. It crosses more than 600 streams and rivers, and more than 400 miles of it are elevated above the ground.

We have it elevated aboveground here, but in certain areas, you can follow the pipeline either by air, or occasionally, you can see it from the road. It is probably one of the most photographed pipelines in the country, but you will see it go underground in many areas. About half of it is buried underground.

This was part of the engineering that allowed for the recognition that you are building in a permafrost area, so it is how you ensure that you are not having an impact in the ground and the area around it.

It crosses a major fault line, the Denali Fault. Back in November of 2002, we had a 7.9 magnitude earthquake just about 90 miles from Fairbanks on that Denali Fault. The pipe moved 7½ feet horizontally—moving back and forth this way—and 2½ feet vertically. This pipeline was designed for an 8.5 earthquake. It allows for 20 feet of horizontal movement and 5 feet of vertical movement.

The engineers not only worked to cross some extraordinary terrain but also recognized that this was in an area in which earthquakes did happen. It is extraordinary to listen to the stories of the engineers who inspected every inch of that line after that earthquake in 2002 and to hear their comments about, truly, this engineering marvel.

There are so many stories about the construction of the pipeline just as Alaskans, as we have lived through those pipeline years. It is hard to really capture what it was like to be in Alaska during the time of the construction of that line. We saw our population boom as we saw new workers come into the State. I was living in Fairbanks at the time. I was a high school student and was going into college there. Obviously, that was my town. In my town, all of a sudden there were people from Louisiana, Texas, and Oklahoma. I can remember seeing guys in cowboy boots in Fairbanks in the winter on the ice and thinking that these guys are going to figure out how

to change their footwear. But we worked to welcome these people who were there to really help make a difference.

There were pressures on our community. You could not find a hotel room. You couldn't find a rental car. It was hard for the grocery stores to keep the shelves stocked in many of the towns. We saw a significant investment in our communities in many different ways. There were a lot of wild stories and tales, some which are appropriate to tell years afterward, some which still keep us smiling, but we do not talk too much about them. There are many good stories out there.

I am proud of this extraordinary infrastructure that we have in Alaska—an extraordinary energy asset—and to be celebrating the fact that, for 40 years now, this pipeline has been not only contributing to Alaska, but contributing to the Nation as something that, as Alaskans, we do look to with pride.

This pipeline is not just a piece of pipe; it is an economic lifeline for the State of Alaska. Over the course of 40 years, TAPS has become the veritable backbone of our State's economy. It has helped us create jobs to the point at which our oil and gas industry either employs or supports fully one-third of the Alaskan workforce. So it is pretty significant in terms of its impact.

It has generated tremendous revenue for our State, some \$168 billion at last count, which has been used for everything from roads, to schools, to essential services. It really has helped build the State and continues to allow our State to operate.

TAPS has allowed us to create our permanent fund, which we have used to convert the revenues from a nonrenewable resource—oil—into something that will make an enduring contribution to the growth and the prosperity of future generations.

Our pipeline has also allowed us to keep our tax burdens low, which is critical in a State like Alaska, where the cost of living is extraordinarily high. Alaska has one of the lowest tax burdens of any State, and that is thanks to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. It also allows us to keep other industries, whether it is fishing or tourism—keep their taxes much lower than they would otherwise be. The scale of this is often hard to imagine.

Dr. Terrence Cole, who is a history professor at the University of Alaska, put it this way back in 2004: "Prudhoe Bay oil was worth more than everything that has been dug out, cut down, caught, or killed in Alaska since the beginning of time. The discovery of the Prudhoe Bay oil field in the late 1960s fulfilled even the most optimistic dreams for statehood."

From day one, Alaska's pipeline has also strengthened the energy security

of our Nation. Remember, TAPS began operating in the wake of the first Arab oil embargo. It helped tide us over during the 1979 oil crisis. It has insulated us from OPEC and has lessened our dependence on nations who do not share our interests. It has provided reliable and affordable energy that is needed by millions of Americans all up and down the west coast. It really is hard to imagine Alaska without the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. It is hard to imagine the consequences that America would have faced without the 17.5 billion barrels of oil that it has now safely carried to market. Think about that—17.5 billion barrels of oil over the past 40 years. It is no exaggeration to say that, while we built a pipeline, that pipeline helped us build our State.

Today, as we mark the 40th anniversary of TAPS, we can also take stock of the challenges that it faces. Many are a direct result of the decisions made—or perhaps not made—in this very Chamber. While our pipeline once carried 2.1 million barrels of oil per day, accounting for a full quarter of America's supply, today, that amount has been crimped down to just over 500,000 barrels a day. It is not due to lack of resources—not at all—but instead it is due to our lack of access to those resources. Alaska has never lacked for energy, just the permission to produce it, despite the promises that had been made to us at statehood and beyond.

According to the Federal Energy Information Administration, we have at least 36.9 billion barrels of oil. That is enough to produce 1 million barrels a day for the next 100 years. We have prolific potential in our National Petroleum Reserve, which was specifically set aside for oil production. We have world-class resources in our offshore areas, in the Beaufort, and in the Chukchi Seas in our Arctic Outer Continental Shelf. We have what is believed to be North America's largest untapped conventional oil field, which would occupy about one ten-thousandth of the nonwilderness 1002 Area within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Again, this is an area that was specifically set aside for development, and the Federal Government recommended that it be opened for that purpose back in 1987—a 30-year anniversary there.

So while we have the resources, what we need are partners at the Federal level who will work with us to restore throughput to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. I welcome the new administration and its commitment to helping us produce energy—energy for Alaska, energy for the Nation.

I want to end with a quote from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner. This is an opinion piece by VADM Tom Barrett, who is the president of Alyeska Pipeline Service Company. This is the TAPS operator. He has written this

opinion piece, and he states as follows: "Though there has been a lot of change on TAPS in 40 years, one unwavering constant remains: the commitment of the people who work on TAPS today to provide safe, reliable, operational excellence, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, resilient amid all of Alaska's extreme geography and weather."

I think about the men and women—the engineers, the workers, the contractors, and all those who do such an incredible job to deal with the day-to-day to keep that oil flowing safely. Again, as we recognize 40 years of safely transporting this oil, I want to repeat to my colleagues: TAPS, or the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, is not just a pipeline; it is an economic lifeline for us. It is source of security and prosperity for us as a nation.

So I join my delegation and my colleagues—Senator SULLIVAN and Congressman YOUNG—and all of the Alaskans who are marking this anniversary today, as TAPS reaches 40 good years. We look back, and we appreciate the past, but we also look forward and set our sights on another good 40 years to come.

Mr. President, I thank you, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from New Mexico.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I am happy to be joined today on the floor by Senator HEINRICH, who has been a real fighter for healthcare for New Mexicans, and I am looking forward to staying on the floor and hearing him talk about how he feels about this Republican healthcare bill as well.

I rise today for the third time this session to oppose plans by President Trump and the Republicans to gut our healthcare system and to throw millions of Americans off their health insurance.

On May 4 of this year, the day that House Republicans narrowly passed their TrumpCare bill, the President held a celebration at the White House in the Rose Garden and pronounced the bill a great plan.

Well, TrumpCare may be a great plan if you are wealthy and healthy, because if you are wealthy you get big tax cuts and if you are healthy, your premiums may not go up, and may even go down—that is, until you are sick.

TrumpCare is not a great plan if you are over the age of 62, if you are a hard-working family trying to make ends meet, if you live in a rural area, if you have or have not had an illness like cancer or heart disease or diabetes, or if you are a woman. Twenty-three million Americans will be left high and dry—out of health insurance by 2026. They don't think TrumpCare is a great plan. To them, it is a mean plan. Actually, those were President Trump's own

words several weeks after the Rose Garden celebration. President Trump came clean with the Senate Republicans, admonishing them that the bill is “mean” and needs to be more “generous, kind, and with heart.” For the first time since his inauguration, I agree with the President on healthcare.

Since day one of the 115th Congress, Republicans have had the Affordable Care Act in their sights, and so has the President. They have tried mightily to do away with the rights and benefits under the ACA. But there is good news. The American people have rallied. They have called, they have emailed, and they have gone to town halls. They have marched, they have made their views known, and they have shared their stories. So far, they have stopped Republicans from gutting our healthcare system.

Just this past Saturday in my home State, simultaneous rallies in opposition to TrumpCare took place in 20 counties. I say to them: Keep up the fight, and I will continue to fight as hard as I can. We need to do all we can to stop this attack on healthcare.

The consequences of upending our healthcare system are enormous. They are enormous for the 20 million Americans who now have healthcare because of the ACA through private insurance and through Medicaid expansion. TrumpCare hurts the most vulnerable—the elderly, the disabled, and those with fewer resources.

The consequences of gutting the ACA and restructuring Medicaid are enormous for our economy, one-sixth of which is related to healthcare. They are enormous for hospitals that rely on third-party reimbursements under the ACA and Medicaid expansion. These hospitals need those revenues, and even more so for rural hospitals that keep their doors open thanks to the ACA, as well as the Indian Healthcare Service facilities, which have reduced wait times and added services because of the ACA.

But the majority in Congress refuses to hold hearings, and they are blocking all public participation. This is unconscionable, and it is undemocratic.

Before Democrats voted on ObamaCare, the Senate held 100 committee hearings, roundtables, and walk-throughs. The final Senate bill included 147 Republican amendments. The majority leader has missed an opportunity for political and moral leadership on one of the most important issues we face. Senator McConnell should have an honest and open process, including Senate committee hearings, with full public participation and a chance for patients to tell Congress how this proposal impacts them—not hidden meanings, not limited debate and a simple majority vote.

Americans deserve an open process from their elected leaders. That is why I introduced a bill last week with my

Democratic colleagues called the No Hearing, No Vote Act. This bill would require a public committee hearing for any legislation that goes through the fast-track budget reconciliation process, including the TrumpCare legislation.

Members of Congress were elected to improve lives, not destroy them, and I believe we need bipartisan cooperation to ensure we don't do that.

If we wanted to improve on ObamaCare, we could: No 1, make sure that all Americans have healthcare; and No. 2, make healthcare more affordable.

So I will tell my colleagues what is really happening here. The American people don't want the benefits they have gained through ObamaCare to be repealed and replaced with an inferior plan. They do not support TrumpCare. Only 17 percent of Americans support the House Republicans' current bill. With this degree of public opposition, it is baffling that Republicans keep pushing the bill that kicks 23 million Americans off their healthcare.

But the moral underpinnings of TrumpCare are as bankrupt as Trump's New Jersey casinos. The winners of TrumpCare are the wealthy, and the Republicans are plainly serving those interests. The Republicans can keep trying to hide TrumpCare, but Americans understand that it is just plain wrong.

I want to talk about a few of the ways that it is just plain wrong. While women make up half of our population, no women serve on Senator McConnell's healthcare working group. Yet women are uniquely affected by TrumpCare. For example, the range of cost-free preventive services under the Affordable Care Act includes screenings for breast cancer, including mammograms, bone density screenings, cervical cancer screenings, domestic violence screenings and counseling, breast feeding counseling and equipment, contraception, and folic acid supplements. All of these services were critical to maintaining women's health and the health of their babies as well.

New Mexico leads the Nation in the percentage of births that are covered by Medicaid at 72 percent of all births in the State. So these services that are now available to every woman are essential.

TrumpCare would repeal the cost-free preventive care requirements for the Medicaid expansion population. Not only would this repeal risk the health of women and their babies, but it would result in increased medical care costs overall. Preventive medical services save money in the long run.

The Affordable Care Act requires insurance plans to provide a range of essential health benefits. For women, these required services include maternity and newborn child care. But

TrumpCare would allow States to apply for a waiver to define their own essential health benefits beginning in 2020. So States could choose to exclude maternity and newborn care, and women would end up paying more for this care. The result is women not getting the care they need.

TrumpCare would cut Medicaid funding to Planned Parenthood for 1 year. Planned Parenthood provides preventive medical and reproductive health services to women and men, and Planned Parenthood funding provides a safety net to low-income women. According to the CBO, cutting off Medicaid payments to Planned Parenthood for 1 year would mean a total loss of access to services in some low-income communities because Planned Parenthood is the only public provider in some regions.

Take Elena from Albuquerque, NM. When she was 30 years old and in law school, Elena found out that she had the BRCA gene mutation, which puts her at a much higher risk for breast and ovarian cancer. The treatments for the BRCA gene mutation include a mastectomy and ovary removal—treatments she couldn't afford.

Thankfully, Elena qualified for Medicaid under the expansion. She got her breast cancer screenings and decided to have a mastectomy because of the cancer scare. Elena had three surgeries, costing thousands of dollars, covered by Medicaid, and now the chances of her getting breast cancer are very low. But Elena now worries that if she decides to have her ovaries removed and TrumpCare becomes law, she will not be able to have this potentially life-saving surgery. If she has had a lapse in Medicaid coverage, her Medicaid expansion coverage will be gone, and because TrumpCare would end the ban against insurance companies denying coverage for people with preexisting conditions, she may never be able to get insurance or surgery.

Public schools and schoolchildren will be hurt by TrumpCare. Schools are now eligible to receive Medicaid funds for necessary medical services for children with disabilities. Schools are reimbursed for vision, hearing, and mental health screenings. These services help children get services early so they can be ready to learn.

Right now, New Mexico schools are reimbursed \$18 million from Medicaid, but under TrumpCare, States would not have to consider schools' Medicaid-eligible providers, and the costs would be on the public schools. The problem is, New Mexico public schools cannot take on these kinds of costs. That might mean hundreds of schoolchildren each year will go without vision, hearing, and mental health treatment because no one else will be able to provide them.

Dr. Lynn McIlroy, superintendent of the Loving Municipal Schools, a rural

school district in Southeastern New Mexico, said:

Medicaid funding is vital to our continuum of care and service to the majority of our students. Often, our school nurse is the only medical professional our students ever see.

New Mexico has one of the highest percent Native American populations in the country, more than 10 percent of our residents. Even though many Native Americans receive healthcare through the Indian Health Service, IHS has not always been able to provide needed care due to a lack of funding. Medicaid expansion has changed that and changed that dramatically.

Dr. Valory Wangler, who works with the Zuni Pueblo, says: Since the Affordable Care Act, patients of Zuni have access to special services that were once difficult to fund and often delayed or denied.

An IHS physician working on the Zuni Reservation had a patient with severe arthritis that was making it difficult for her to stay physically active and work at a local school. She needed knee replacement surgery. Before Medicaid expansion, IHS had trouble funding knee replacements, and the surgery was denied for years because IHS could only afford to pay for life and loss of limb services. This patient is now on the Medicaid expansion. She was able to get a total knee replacement, is working full time, staying fit, and is no longer in pain.

One of the ACA's most popular provisions is the protection from discrimination if you have a preexisting condition. This is one of the most mystifying parts of TrumpCare. Republicans would end that protection by allowing States to waive out and set up high-risk pools.

All of us know someone with a serious illness or condition, like Kitt here. Kitt is 4½ years old and has type I diabetes that will require lifelong care. Her mother Dana is worried about TrumpCare. Dana says: It breaks my heart that elected officials are leaning toward dropping the Federal mandate to guarantee affordable health insurance for those with preexisting conditions. Sit down with a child who has an unbearable disease and be their warrior in DC to make everything possible for that special soul and their family to have an easier tomorrow.

I hope we will all be those warriors to protect that healthcare program which has been put in place for them.

I yield to Senator HEINRICH.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking my colleague

from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, for his advocacy on behalf of the pieces and parts of our healthcare system that are so important to the State of New Mexico. Things like rural hospitals, opioid treatment, Indian Country, he has been an incredible champion on those. That is part of the reason why both of us come to the floor today, given what is at stake.

Last month, President Trump and House Republicans rushed through a disastrous healthcare bill that would leave average New Mexico families paying thousands of dollars more for less healthcare coverage. It would destroy the Medicaid Program as it currently exists in our State and throw our entire healthcare system into chaos. Now Senate Republicans are drafting their own version of a similar healthcare bill in complete secret, behind closed doors, with absolutely none—bipartisan input.

This lack of transparency and departure from regular order is unacceptable and deeply irresponsible, especially when every single American family's healthcare coverage is at stake if this bill ever becomes law.

While we don't know for sure what the Senate Republicans' version of TrumpCare will look like, media reports say it is shaping up to look more and more like the train wreck of a bill that President Trump and House Republicans celebrated in the White House Rose Garden just a couple months ago, a bill President Trump reportedly said in another closed-door meeting with Republican Senators last week was, in his words, "mean" and cold-hearted.

The House-passed TrumpCare bill is devastating to low-income families, to seniors, to Americans living with preexisting conditions. This isn't so much a healthcare bill as it is a tax cut for the ultrarich masquerading as healthcare reform. You don't have to take my word for it. You can look at how the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office described its projected impacts of the House-passed TrumpCare bill.

According to the CBO's analysis, TrumpCare would strip 14 million of their health insurance next year and 23 million by 2026, all to give tax breaks to the wealthiest of Americans. That is reckless, and frankly it is inexcusable by any measure.

How would the bill do that? The House-passed bill, which again seems to be the baseline for the ongoing secret negotiations here in the Senate, would slash funding for the Medicaid Program by hundreds of billions of dollars and end the need-based tax credits for individual healthcare market plans under the ACA.

I have heard from so many New Mexicans who have told me how access to healthcare coverage has helped their families and, in some cases, even saved their lives.

I recently met with patients at the Ben Archer Health Center, a rural health clinic in Hatch, NM, and heard firsthand how important Medicaid coverage can be to families in Southern New Mexico. One of the New Mexicans I met there was Anna Marie, a Las Cruces native who worked for the Las Cruces public food service for 22 years.

Anna Marie's husband passed away in 2008, and when she found herself unable to keep working following a minor stroke, she could not afford healthcare coverage on her own. When she reached out to my office last year, she had bronchitis and walking pneumonia. My staff helped her enroll in Medicaid, and now she is able to get access to the care she needs.

I want to take a moment to explain why the Medicaid Program is so critical in my home State of New Mexico. As a Medicaid expansion State, New Mexico has seen dramatic gains over the last 5 years in coverage for the folks who need it the most. Stories like Anna Marie's illustrate just how important Medicaid can be for hard-working New Mexicans.

Medicaid currently provides affordable healthcare coverage to over 900,000 New Mexicans, including many schoolchildren, seniors in nursing homes and long-term care facilities, people with disabilities, and people who need treatment for mental health and addiction.

Just one example of the wide-ranging consequences of the Republican healthcare plan's drastic cuts to the Medicaid Program would be the end to any possible progress we have made so far in fighting the opioid and heroin epidemic. The opioid addiction epidemic has been deeply felt in communities across the State of New Mexico. For years, without adequate treatment resources, our State has suffered through some of the highest rates of opioid and heroin addiction in the Nation.

I would just note that today a story came out about how we hospitalized in the ER long-term care or hospital care 1.3 million Americans last year because of this epidemic. However, when provided with an opportunity to receive comprehensive treatment and rehabilitation, people who have suffered through the trials of opioid addiction can and do turn their lives around.

Evidence-based treatment works, but it is only possible when we devote real resources to pay for it. So much of that comes directly through the Medicaid Program. As we can see on this chart, Medicaid pays for 30 percent of opioid medication-assisted treatment in New Mexico—30 percent. It is the foundation to build on for opioid treatment.

In States like West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky, Medicaid pays for nearly half of opioid treatment payments. This came up just last Friday when the White House hosted its first meeting for President Trump's Commission on

Combating Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis. The President's top advisers probably didn't hear what they would have liked to from the advocates who have been on the front lines of fighting the growing opioid crisis.

For example, Dr. Joe Parks, the medical director for the National Council for Behavioral Health, told the President's Commission:

Medicaid is the largest national payer for addiction and mental health treatment. Since the majority of increased opiate deaths and suicide occur in young and middle-aged adults, which is the Medicaid expansion population, the Medicaid expansions must be maintained and completed.

It is nothing short of hypocrisy for the Trump White House to claim it is taking steps to address the opioid epidemic when it is helping Republicans in Congress push through legislation that would end the Medicaid Program as we know it. Slashing hundreds of billions of dollars in Federal funding from the Medicaid Program will ultimately pass all of those costs on to the States. Let me give a sense for just how big a burden that would be.

In New Mexico, it is estimated that our State government would have to either come up with a way to raise \$11 billion of new taxes over the next decade or cut the equivalent amount of coverage for the hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans who rely on the program. That is a hit to the State budget of 1 billion-plus dollars a year. This would have an especially hard impact on our State's rural communities.

When you go to small towns in New Mexico, like Clayton, Raton, and Santa Rosa, as I did last fall on a rural healthcare listening tour, you see right away the vital role hospitals play in rural communities. In most cases, these hospitals are the only healthcare providers for many miles in any direction.

Hospitals are also often the major employer in these small towns. Rural healthcare providers face enormous challenges because it is financially difficult to provide care to populations that live over vast spaces and are, on average, older, less affluent, and more prone to chronic diseases than those in more urban and suburban communities.

Medicaid expansion and the need-based tax credits for individual healthcare market plans in the ACA have been critical financial lifelines for rural healthcare providers. Thanks to the coverage gains we have seen in New Mexico, instead of seeing uninsured patients coming to the emergency room during expensive medical emergencies, our rural healthcare providers are able to help New Mexicans live healthier lives with primary care and a preventive medicine approach.

When medical emergencies do arise, New Mexicans have coverage that helps rural healthcare providers cover those

expenses. If President Trump and Republicans in the Senate pass their healthcare bill, all of that could go away, and some of our rural healthcare providers may very well have to close up shop.

Right now, more than one-third of rural hospitals are already at risk of closure. If you look at where the hospitals that have been forced to shut down in recent years are located, they are almost all in States that chose not to expand Medicaid. We should learn a lesson from that.

I know for a fact that if hospitals shut down, healthcare delivery in rural New Mexico would be decimated and economic impact would be severe in these small towns. It is estimated that when a single hospital closes in a small rural community, nearly 100 jobs are lost, taking more than \$5 million directly out of the local economy.

A recent report by the Economic Policy Institute estimates that if Congress passes TrumpCare into law, New Mexico alone would see a loss of almost 50,000 jobs by the year 2022. Thanks in large part to the major coverage gains that we have seen under the ACA, the healthcare sector has been New Mexico's strongest area of job growth for the last 5 years. New Mexico added over 4,000 healthcare jobs in 2015 alone.

A couple of months ago, I met with students at Central New Mexico Community College, CNM, in Albuquerque, who were training for those healthcare jobs. These bright young people want to make careers out of making their communities healthier and safer. With this dangerous legislation moving through Washington, they are all worried about what it might mean for their future career plans.

Why would we want to rip the rug out from under them by wreaking havoc on the Nation's healthcare system? Again, you really have to ask yourself why Republicans are so intent on rushing through a massive piece of legislation before we can even understand its potential harmful consequences.

As I said earlier, I have heard from literally thousands of New Mexicans who have called in or written or come up to me on the street to oppose this legislation. Many of them have told me how it will directly impact their families. I could pick any one of these stories to demonstrate what is at stake in this debate, but I will leave you with just one.

Brittany, from Aztec, NM, wrote me about her two young children who were diagnosed with a rare form of food allergies that created absolutely unaffordable costs through her husband's employer-provided healthcare plan.

Brittany said that she and her husband were averaging three doctors' visits a week and were "barely keeping [their] heads above water just from paying co-pays."

After applying for Medicaid, she and her husband have full coverage for their children's medical costs. Brittany wrote to me and said:

For us Medicaid is literally lifesaving. Please do not take away this program or any of the ACA! It may not be perfect and could use some work, but taking it away altogether would be catastrophic for so many people like my family.

That is what she wrote to me.

I want to urge President Trump and I certainly want to urge my Republican colleagues in the Senate to listen to that urgent message. It is time to turn the page on the disastrous policy path that is "repeal and replace" so we can finally get to work on actually fixing those things in the current healthcare system that we all agree need work.

Our common goal—regardless of whether we are Republicans or Democrats—that we should all be working toward is making quality healthcare more accessible, more affordable for all Americans.

I would welcome a good-faith effort to tackle that challenge because healthcare policies shouldn't be a political football. It should be about giving peace of mind to the millions of Americans like Anna Marie in Las Cruces, like Brittany in Aztec, who are only one diagnosis away from a crisis if we don't get this right.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, over the past few years, the Affordable Care Act has made tremendous strides in expanding healthcare coverage for hard-working Americans and the families who need it. I thank my colleague for his stories, and I would like to add some of my own.

While the law could certainly be improved, the way to do it is not by passing TrumpCare, which even President Trump has admitted is a "mean" bill. Unfortunately, Republican Senate leadership has indicated whatever it is that the Republicans are crafting in secret, behind closed doors, is going to be very similar to the version of TrumpCare that has passed the House. That is simply bad news.

The version of TrumpCare that passed the House could cost 23 million Americans, including 385,000 Illinoisans, to lose healthcare coverage. It would make it more expensive for older Americans and working people, especially those with preexisting conditions, to purchase insurance.

TrumpCare would cause their premiums and their out-of-pocket costs to simply skyrocket. The premiums of the average Illinoisan would increase by \$700.

TrumpCare would also make critical services like maternity care for new moms and mental health and substance abuse services significantly more expensive, even though they are desperately needed. That is extremely mean-spirited.



Making matters worse, it would also put veterans on the chopping block. Specifically, TrumpCare would prohibit veterans who are eligible for VA healthcare from receiving tax credits to help them afford insurance in the individual marketplace. However, there is a big difference between being eligible for VA healthcare and being enrolled in VA. Oftentimes, that is not even a choice you can make.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, as many as 7 million of our veterans are eligible for VA care but are not enrolled. Preventing them from receiving tax credits would amount to a massive tax hike that would force them to pay thousands of dollars extra each year. That is not just mean; it is unacceptable.

There has been ample reporting indicating that Republicans knew exactly what they were doing. They could have included a fix to this but purposefully did not because that would have made their bill ineligible to be considered under the Senate's budget reconciliation process, which requires only 51 votes. That is because to remedy this huge flaw, the veterans tax credit language would need to be considered in committees of jurisdiction. That would entail holding public hearings and markups in committees, which would then reveal to the American people what exactly is in the Republican bill.

Apparently, the cost of public scrutiny is too high for Senate Republican leaders who are willing to raise taxes on veterans so they can hide this bad bill from the American people. As a result, the appalling flaws in their bill remain unfixed, and up to 7 million veterans remain on the chopping block.

That is not the only way TrumpCare would harm veterans either. Its massive cuts to Medicaid would have a direct impact on veterans, since nearly 2 million veterans across our country, including 60,000 veterans in my own home State of Illinois, rely on Medicaid for their healthcare coverage. That is 1 in 10 veterans.

For nearly 1 million of these veterans, Medicaid is their only source of coverage. Many of them are eligible for VA care only for the injuries they sustained in the military but not for any of their other health needs.

I shouldn't have to remind my colleagues that veterans are at a higher risk for serious health issues because of the sacrifices they made for our Nation. Yet, if TrumpCare becomes law, many of them will lose the coverage they gained from Medicaid expansion under the ACA.

Right now, 13 Republican Senators are sitting behind closed doors in some secret room on Capitol Hill, gambling with the lives of millions of Americans and people who have honorably served their country. One of those lives belongs to Robin Schmidt, a veteran from the North Side of Chicago.

Robin served during Desert Storm in Army military intelligence. Robin loved her job in the military because it had always been her dream to serve her country. As a 13-year-old girl, Robin stood at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington, DC. She knew that serving her country was her true calling. However, she was eventually forced to end her military career because, in her words, "the Army refused to allow my husband to come back overseas to live with me."

When she was pregnant with her child, she was forced to leave the military in order to return home to Arkansas to be with her husband to raise their children. When she was stateside, the VA denied her benefits because they were not service-connected, thus forcing her and her husband to pay the costs of maternity care and childbirth out of pocket.

She faced medical complications and developed endometriosis, a preexisting condition, and had to have a Cesarean section during delivery. After she delivered her baby, she ended up with \$500,000 in hospital debt.

This enormous debt followed Robin and her husband throughout their marriage, and it eventually left them in divorce, medical bankruptcy, and with all of the repercussions that come from extreme financial hardship. She was also blocked from accessing affordable healthcare coverage because she now had a preexisting condition and could not afford good coverage on an \$8.50-an-hour wage, so she went without care.

Robin remained uninsured for a total of 22 years, until she remarried and gained healthcare coverage under her husband's insurance. This was especially devastating because in 2007, Robin was diagnosed with cancer. Even though Robin was covered by her husband's insurance, insurance companies were not required to cover chemotherapy in 2007, and chemotherapy was too expensive for Robin and her family to pay for out of pocket. Instead, she had to choose debilitating surgeries.

After her cancer diagnosis, Robin developed severe autoimmune arthritis. Her autoimmune treatments started at \$5,000 a month and soon increased to \$14,000 a month. Insurance companies wanted Robin to pay for her medication upfront, with no guarantee of reimbursement.

As her medical costs grew and grew, Robin had to choose between her medical care and her mortgage payment. After the Affordable Care Act became law, insurance companies were mandated to cover Robin's medications and treatments. They were no longer able to refuse her the medications she needed. Her insurance premium prior to the Affordable Care Act was \$1,600 a month, which was more than her family paid for their monthly mortgage and household bills. Now she pays just \$300 a month for her entire family.

There was no more redtape, constant stress, or fear that she might not be able to work—or worse, might not be able to stay alive.

Unfortunately, the coverage, relief, and peace of mind the ACA brought to Robin and her family is now under attack by congressional Republicans. Robin is afraid that if TrumpCare becomes law, she will once again become nothing more than an uninsurable preexisting condition. She is afraid she would be considered a high-risk pool patient who will be able to have insurance but will not be able to actually afford any of her treatments. She is afraid that if Republicans push through TrumpCare, she will not be able to walk, work, and will have absolutely no quality of life.

Her dream was to serve her country in our Armed Forces. She took two oaths to serve this country, and she kept those oaths—promises that she would defend this great Nation.

Robin may not be in uniform anymore, but she certainly deserves that we in Congress and here in the Senate defend her right to access quality healthcare.

For Robin and for nearly 7 million veterans, middle-class families, our seniors, and some of our most vulnerable Americans, I urge my Republican counterparts to stop these secret negotiations, take repeal off the table, and work with Democrats to improve our healthcare system. Just like Robin, each of these Americans has a story, a family, and a valued place in society. Robin's family and all Americans deserve better than having their coverage stripped away from them behind closed doors.

I yield back.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess, following my and Senator NELSON's remarks, until 5 p.m. for the all-Senators briefing and that the time count postcloture.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized to speak on issues not associated with the present subject of debate.

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

#### COUP ATTEMPT IN MONTENEGRO

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last week, the Senate voted 97 to 2 to strengthen sanctions against Vladimir Putin's Russia for its attack on America's 2016 election and its other aggressive and illegal behavior. I hope the other body will take swift action to send this legislation to the President's desk.

We need strong Russia sanctions now because it has been 8 months since the U.S. intelligence community said publicly that the Russian Government directed this attack on our democracy.

Yet, in the last 8 months, the Russian Government has hardly paid any price for its aggression. Thus, Vladimir Putin has been learning all over again that aggression pays. He learned that in Georgia in 2008. He learned that in Ukraine in 2014. He has learned that in Syria since 2015. So Vladimir Putin remains on the offense. This year, Russia attempted to interfere in France's election. We have already seen attempts to influence German public opinion ahead of elections in September. And there is every expectation that Russia will do the same thing in the Czech Republic, Italy, and elsewhere in future elections.

But perhaps the most disturbing indication of how far Vladimir Putin is willing to go to advance his dark and dangerous view of the world is what happened in October 2016 in the small Balkan country of Montenegro, when Russian intelligence operatives, in league with Serbia nationalists and others, attempted to overthrow the democratically elected Government of Montenegro and murder its Prime Minister on the country's election day. Why would Vladimir Putin go this far? To answer this, one must understand why Russia was so interested in the outcome of Montenegro's election.

Russia opposes the spread of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law across Europe, which is advanced by the European Union and protected by the NATO alliance. To Russia's great frustration, Montenegro's Government had committed the country to a Euro-Atlantic future and pursued membership in both the EU and NATO.

Indeed, NATO's invitation to Montenegro to join the NATO alliance in December 2015 was considered particularly insulting and threatening by Moscow. After all, Montenegro had once been part of Russia's traditional Slavic ally, Serbia. Montenegro has long been a favorite destination for Russian tourists. Russian politicians and oligarchs are reported to own as much as 40 percent of the real estate in that country. A few years ago, when it feared losing its naval base in Syria due to the civil war, Russia reportedly sought a naval base in Montenegro but was rejected. Now, if Montenegro joined NATO, the entire Adriatic Sea would fall completely within NATO's borders.

Montenegro's accession into NATO would also send a signal that NATO membership was a real possibility for other nations of the Western Balkans—Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and, according to some optimistic voices in the region, perhaps even Serbia.

That is why Montenegro's October 16 election was no ordinary one. In Russia's eyes, it was a last chance to stop Montenegro from joining NATO, to thwart Montenegro's pursuit of a Euro-Atlantic future, and to reassert Russian influence in southeastern Europe.

That is why there was little doubt that Russia would exert heavy pressure on Montenegro ahead of the election. Russia had already been accused of fomenting anti-government demonstrations and funding opposition parties. Yet few would have guessed how far Russia was willing to go. But now we know.

This April, as part of my visit to seven countries in southeastern Europe to reaffirm America's commitment to the region, I visited Montenegro and was briefed by Montenegrin officials on the status of the investigation into the coup attempt. On April 14, Montenegro's special prosecutor filed indictments against 2 Russians and 12 other people for their roles in the coup attempt. This past weekend, a Montenegrin court accepted the indictments. As a result, the evidence before the court is now public.

I believe it is critically important that my colleagues and the American people are aware of the allegations made in these indictments. Pieced together, they reveal another blatant attack on democracy by the Russian Government—an attempt to smash a small, brave country that had the nerve to defy its will. And it is another unmistakable warning that Vladimir Putin will do whatever it takes to achieve his ambition to restore the Russian Empire.

According to the indictments, the coup planning got off to a slow start in March 2016. That was when opposition leaders in Montenegro allegedly sent an emissary known as Nino to Belgrade to meet with Slavko Nikic. In the first meeting at Slavko's office, Nino said that he had been doing business for years in Russia, and he claimed that he was in contact with powerful men in Russia. He claimed that one of the men with him was a Russian FSB agent in charge of special tasks. Nino tried to enlist Slavko and his men to lead a plot to destabilize Montenegro, and Slavko indicated he was able and willing to participate. Later, Nino and Slavko met on the Pupin Bridge in Belgrade, this time with the supposed FSB agent in tow. The Russian told Slavko it would be good if he traveled to Moscow.

After these encounters in Belgrade, Nino enlisted the help of Bratislav Dikic, the former chief of Serbia's special police and someone we will meet later in this story, to use his contacts to check into Slavko's reliability. He didn't pass the test, and this original version of the coup plot was abandoned.

It was at this point that the two Russians, Eduard Shishmakov and Vladimir Popov, stepped in to take control of the plans for destabilization operations in Montenegro. Both of these men are believed to be members of the Russian military agency, the GRU.

Shishmakov in particular already had a colorful past. In 2014,

Shishmakov had been serving as deputy military attache in Russia's Embassy in Warsaw, Poland. After a scandal involving a Russian spy network within the Polish Government, the Polish Government identified Shishmakov as a GRU agent, declared him *persona non grata*, and ejected him from Poland.

Having taken over the Montenegrin operation, Shishmakov moved quickly to contact Sasa Sindjelic. The two had first met in Russia back in 2014, when they discussed their opposition to the EU and NATO. Shishmakov even offered to help support Sindjelic's organization, the Serbian Wolves, which promotes Pan-Slavism and close relations between Russians and Serbs and opposes NATO and the Government of Montenegro.

The two met again in Moscow in 2015. This time, Shishmakov had Sindjelic submitted to a polygraph test that lasted for hours. After the test went well, he sent Sindjelic home with \$5,000 and a promise to contact him if something urgent came up. That was in the spring of 2016. Shishmakov wrote that Montenegro's Prime Minister, Milo Djukanovic, and his government must be removed immediately and that the people of Montenegro must rebel in order for this to happen.

Then in September 2016, Shishmakov told Sindjelic to urgently come to Moscow. Shishmakov even sent \$800 to Sindjelic to buy his ticket. It was no trouble for Shishmakov to send the money—after all, he sent it from a Western Union conveniently located on the same street as GRU headquarters in Moscow. Once in Moscow, Shishmakov and Sindjelic discussed the planning and operation of the plot to overthrow the Montenegrin Government, install the opposition in power, and abandon all plans for Montenegro to enter NATO. Shishmakov said opposition leaders from Montenegro had already visited Moscow a number of times and were in agreement with the plan.

In total, Sindjelic received more than \$200,000 to support the operation. He used those funds to pay personnel, acquire police uniforms and equipment, and purchase weapons, including rifles, gas masks, bulletproof vests, electrical tranquilizers, and a drone with a camera. He was also provided encrypted phones to enable secure communications between the coup plotters and GRU agents.

Sindjelic and Shishmakov stayed in close touch as preparations continued ahead of the October elections. The plan was this:

On election day, the Montenegrin opposition was planning large protests in front of the Parliament, expecting to draw nearly 5,000 people. Sindjelic and his coconspirators, including Bratislav Dikic, the former commander of the Serbian special police, would recruit as

many Serbian nationalists as they could to travel from Serbia to Montenegro to join the demonstrations. They were hoping 500 would join the protests and be ready to act when called upon.

As the protests were underway, a group of 50 armed men recruited by Shishmakov and wearing police uniforms provided by Sindjelic would ambush and kill the members of Montenegro's Special Anti-Terrorist Unit to prevent them from interfering with the coup. The armed men, still wearing their police uniforms, would then proceed to the Parliament building, where they would begin shooting at members of the police defending the Parliament building. They hoped to create the impression that some members of the police were changing sides and joining the protesters against the government. As the coup plotters saw it, this was poetic justice—reminiscent of how former Serbian President and convicted war criminal Slobodan Milosevic had fallen from power.

Led by the coup plotters and the Serbian nationalists, who would wear blue ribbons to be recognizable to one another, the protesters would then storm the Parliament building and declare victory for the opposition. Within 48 hours, the new government would be formed and arrests would be made across the capital, including Prime Minister Djukanovic. If the Prime Minister could not be captured, he would be killed.

The coup plotters obviously wanted to create chaos, and it appears they may have had someone in mind to blame for the violence. Ahead of the election, the Montenegrin opposition hired a U.S. company to provide services, including countersurveillance and planning to extract personnel from the Montenegrin capital, around the time of the election. It is still unclear, the precise nature of this outreach to the U.S. company by the Montenegrin opposition or what services the company may have ended up providing, if any. Now, this is speculation, but if I know the Russians, American security personnel—some likely to have military or intelligence background—on the ground during the coup in the Montenegrin capital would have made excellent patsies for stories on Sputnik and Russia Today.

Fortunately—one might even say luckily—the plan never got off the ground. Four days before election day, one of the coup plotters got cold feet and informed the Montenegrin authorities. On election day, Montenegrin police arrested 20 Serbian citizens, including the on-the-ground leader of the nationalist protesters, Bratislav Dikic, the former commander of the Serbian special police. News of the arrests sparked fear among others involved in the plot, many of whom retreated to Serbia.

Furious that the plot had been disrupted, Shishmakov, the Russian GRU

agent, grasped at straws for new ways of bringing down the Montenegrin Government. He ordered Sindjelic to procure an assassin to kill the Prime Minister. Sindjelic did not carry out that order and later turned himself into police, fearing he would be next for assassination by the GRU.

Shishmakov also ordered a false flag attack on the opposition party headquarters to create the appearance of an attack by the government. He even hoped to entice one of the political parties that was part of the Prime Minister's coalition to leave the government with a bribe using Russian money funneled through Chechnya. Again, fortunately none of this worked.

Montenegrin police made several arrests in the aftermath of this failed coup attempt, but those arrests did not include the alleged GRU agents, Mr. Shishmakov and Mr. Popov. They were in Belgrade, Serbia's capital. Presumably, Montenegrin authorities hoped the Serbian Government would consider expediting the pair to Montenegro as the government had done with some of the lower level coup plotters, but that did not happen, and the two Russian agents returned to Moscow.

I know that sounded a little complicated. Every American should be disturbed by what happened in Montenegro. We should admire the courage of the country's leaders who resisted Russian pressure and persevered to bring Montenegro into the NATO alliance, which finally took place officially 2 weeks ago.

If there is one thing we should take away from this heinous plot, it is that we cannot treat Russia's interference in America's election in 2016 as an isolated incident. We have to stop looking at this through the warped lens of politics and see this attack on our democracy for what it is—just one phase of Vladimir Putin's long-term campaign to weaken the United States, to destabilize Europe, to break the NATO alliance, to undermine confidence in Western values, and to erode any and all resistance to his dark and dangerous view of the world.

That is why Putin attacked our 2016 election. That is why Putin attempted to overthrow the Government of Montenegro. That is why he tried to influence the election in France and will try the same in Germany and elsewhere throughout Europe. That is why it probably will not be long before Putin attempts some punitive actions in Montenegro to show other countries in the Western Balkans what happens when you try to defy Russia.

That is why it will not be long before Putin takes interest in another American election. The victim may be a Republican. It may be a Democrat. To Putin, it will not matter as long as he succeeds in dividing us from one another, weakening our resolve, undermining confidence in ourselves, and eroding our belief in our own values.

I urge my colleagues again that we must take our own side in this fight, not as Republicans, not as Democrats but as Americans. It is time to respond to Russia's attack on American democracy and that of our European allies with strength, with resolve, with common purpose, and with action.

I would like to finally add we will be holding a hearing in the Armed Services Committee on this whole situation that took place in Montenegro.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arizona leaves the floor, he and I are very much in syncoption on the question of what he has just eloquently addressed about the Russian attempts to interfere in other countries as well as in our country with regard to the elections.

I just wanted to pose a question to the Senator. Is the Senator aware, as he obviously is—but it is my rhetorical question—that the Russians have already intervened in the elections of other countries and indeed tried and it boomeranged against them against France and are probably in the midst of trying to interfere with the German election?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, every indication, I would say to my friend from Florida, a most valued member of the Armed Services Committee, they will continue to try to interfere in any election they possibly can. They are spending large amounts of money. They have certainly, to some degree, undermined confidence between countries in the NATO alliance, and that, coupled with the degree of uncertainty here in Washington, has probably put as great a strain on the NATO alliance as you have seen since its very beginning. I thank my colleague from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, one further question. Has the Senator been—well, he obviously is aware, and he has obviously been briefed—but can he help convey the gravity of the situation of Russia's interference in the upcoming elections in 2018 and 2020, where not only is it a question of whether they would change the vote count by getting in and hacking, but they could change the registration records so that a voter could show up to vote on election day and suddenly the registrar says: But you are not registered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would just say to my colleague from Florida that when you look at their early attempts versus their latest attempts, they learn with every experience. It is a lot easier—as my colleague from Florida knows, it is a lot easier to play offense than defense.

We are going to have a hearing on this whole Montenegrin thing, and I know the Senator from Florida will play a very significant role. Every time we turn around, we have a new revelation of some of the activities that have

been carried out, not just by Russian hackers but by Chinese, by Iranian, even by single individuals. This is probably the national security challenge that may not be the greatest, but I would say we are the least prepared for.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this Senator certainly looks forward to that hearing in the Senate Armed Services Committee. I thank the chairman for his leadership in constantly bringing up and reminding the American people of the threat that is coming through cyber attacks into this Nation and others.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I wanted to speak about what is going on here in this Capitol at this moment. It has been the subject of a lot of discussion last night and again as we have been in session today; that is, trying to hatch a plan to overturn the Affordable Care Act and to find something that would replace it. In fact, it is being done in secret.

I would just merely pose the question, Why is it being done in secret if it is to be something that is to help the American people more than what the existing law is? Why wouldn't that be something you would want to expose to the light of day? If it is to improve the existing law, why in the world would that not want to be done on a bipartisan basis?

Yet we find ourselves confronting a situation where the majority leader has said he is trying to cobble together 50 votes to overturn the existing law, and it must be something that is not very palatable in what it is to overturn the existing law. Otherwise, it would be done in the open and in the sunshine.

Now, the existing law is not perfect so we ought to improve it, but the existing law, as we have heard in some of these dramatic townhall meetings, is the reason some people are alive today. It is the reason some folks no longer have to worry about being denied coverage for a preexisting condition.

By the way, that requirement of not allowing an insurance company to deny you coverage because you have a preexisting condition is not applicable just to those who are on the State and Federal exchanges. That is applicable to all insurance policies.

So if you have that kind of condition, which I can tell you might be a condition such as asthma, we are not going to insure you for the rest of your life because you had asthma or, if you want to go to the extreme—and it has been done—an insurance company saying: I am not going to insure you because you have had a rash. The flip side of that is insurance companies put a lifetime limit on it so if they pay out up to a certain amount—let's say \$50,000—the insurance policy stops, no more payouts.

That is not according to the existing law. In the existing law, they can't say

you are going to lose your coverage because you hit that lifetime limit cap that their payout is.

Every day I hear from Floridians who tell me how the House-passed bill would affect them and what we speculate, since we don't know, that the Senate bill that is attempting to be brought out at the last minute next week—what we suspect is going to be in it. Every day I hear from people.

So take, for example, the lady from Sebring, FL, Christine Gregory. She has allowed me to use her name.

My daughter has Juvenile Diabetes (Type 1). She was diagnosed at age 15 . . . when the Affordable Care Act was signed into law. I absolutely rejoiced about the end of all the horrible things that come along with having a pre-existing condition. She no longer had to worry about cancellation of her insurance, waiting periods, denial of coverage, annual and lifetime limits, higher premiums, and the dreaded high-risk pools.

Then she continues to write:

Fast forward to 2017. All the fear and the worry are back. Our President and Congress plan to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. Now she has the very real prospect of having to enter a very expensive high-risk pool. That could mean bankruptcy and denial of needed medicines and care.

Take, for example, an unnamed constituent from Florida's panhandle who wrote me. I got this today.

I have chronic and persistent illnesses that would be debilitating without affordable and comprehensive care. I have chronic back pain from degenerative disc disease in every part of my spine. I have had innumerable procedures to help manage the pain, including epidural and targeted nerve block injections at multiple levels.

This unnamed individual, a constituent of mine, continues:

I am now planning to get radio frequency ablation of the nerves. Using pre-ACA rules—

Before the existing law—

I would have hit my lifetime limit at least 1 year ago and been unable to continue getting pain-managing treatment. I often feel like I am a burden to my wife who is one of the most understanding and supportive people I know.

He concludes:

If the AHCA passes and our insurance and total health costs go up significantly, the burden I feel I am right now will become a reality. Please, I deserve more than to suffer from uncontrollable pain. And my wife deserves more than to have to care for me in that condition.

The existing law is not perfect, but it has given millions of people, including those with preexisting conditions like juvenile diabetes, access to healthcare they otherwise would not receive. This healthcare bill that passed the House that is the model for apparently something—for taking it out of that—if they are ever going to get an agreement between the two Houses, that Republican healthcare bill will take us back to the days when it was nearly impossible for people with a preexisting condition to get health insurance coverage. People with asthma

could be forced to pay more than \$4,000 more because of that preexisting condition. People with rheumatoid arthritis could be forced to pay up to \$26,000, and people who are pregnant could pay more and more and more.

Let me tell you about another constituent from Volusia County who shared how the repeal of this would affect her.

She writes:

My husband, a 50-year-old leukemia survivor, would lose his ability to obtain comprehensive health insurance due to the lack of protections for people with preexisting conditions.

My daughter, who has asthma and rheumatoid arthritis, would lose her ability to obtain comprehensive health insurance due to the lack of protections for people with pre-existing conditions. Our family, all hard working, tax paying Americans, will once again be subjected to annual and lifetime limits which could easily bankrupt us.

My daughter, who is a young woman just starting her career, would lose her ability to purchase affordable health insurance and receive tax subsidies that she currently receives under the Affordable Care Act.

She goes on to say that she is afraid that TrumpCare would relegate them, if you change all of that, to second class citizens.

Why am I saying this about preexisting conditions with regard to what was passed at the other end of this hallway, down at the House of Representatives? They say: No, no, preexisting conditions are not eliminated down there. But that does not tell you the whole story. The whole story is that, in the House-passed bill, it is left up to the States, and the States see that as a way of so-called lowering their premiums. If you start doing that for some and do not keep it spread over the millions and millions of people who are now under the protection of the preexisting conditions, it is going to become a select few more, and it is going to spike the cost of that insurance.

I conclude by telling you another part of what happened down there in the House. In effect, they changed Medicaid as we know it by cutting out of it over \$800 billion over a 10-year period.

Donna Krajewski, from Sebastian, FL, wrote to me recently to tell me what Medicaid is for her family.

She writes:

I am writing this letter on behalf of my son . . . who has Down syndrome. . . . These blocks—

That is the technical term they are using in the House of Representatives. In other words, it is capping Medicaid to each of the States—

or caps [on Medicaid] will cause States to strip critical supports that my son needs to live, learn and work in the community.

These [Medicaid] funds have enabled him to participate in an adult supervised day program and transportation to and from the site. This program involves classes, such as daily living skills, social skills, and daily life skills. He is also able to go out once or twice

a week to socialize. . . . He has become more confident and happy with his life.

We need to find ways to improve the healthcare system. We need to fix the existing law. We do not need to unwind all of the good things that we have done. We need to fix it in a bipartisan way so that, when folks come to me and ask, "Senator, what are we going to do to fix it?" what I will then say is that it is my responsibility to do something.

Last week, I filed a bill, with a number of other Senators, that would lower healthcare premiums for people in Florida by up to 13 percent. What it would do is help to stabilize the existing law's insurance marketplace by creating a permanent reinsurance fund that would lower the risk that insurance companies face—a risk pool, a reinsurance fund.

It is kind of like what we did back when I was the elected insurance commissioner of Florida in the aftermath of the monster hurricane—Hurricane Andrew. Insurance companies just simply could not take the risk that a category 5 would come along, hit directly on the coast, and just wipe out everything—wipe out all of the capital reserve the insurance companies had. What they did was to go to a reinsurance fund for hurricanes, which we actually created in Florida—the catastrophic reinsurance fund—so that the insurance companies could reinsure themselves against a catastrophic hurricane loss.

That is exactly what this proposal is. It would lower premiums by 13 percent and create a reinsurance fund—a permanent one—that would lower the risk to the insurance companies that are insuring people's health.

At least one Florida insurer estimates that this bill, if passed, would reduce premiums for Floridians who get their coverage from healthcare.gov by 13 percent between 2018 and 2020.

So you ask: What is a suggestion? I figured that it was my responsibility to come up with a suggestion on how to fix it. This is one of several fixes, and it is a tangible fix, and it is, in fact, filed as legislation.

What we are facing in the suggestion that I have made is not the ultimate solution to solving the healthcare system, but it is one small step in the right direction to making health insurance available and affordable for the people who need it the most.

How are we going to fix it?

You are not going to do it by running around in the dead of night, secretly putting together a plan that is only going to be a partisan plan. If you are going to fix the healthcare system, you are going to have to do it together, in a bipartisan way, building consensus. That is what I urge the Senate to do instead of what we are seeing happen behind closed doors.

Let's get together. Let's work together to make healthcare more afford-

able for people and stop all of this stuff behind the closed doors. The American people deserve better.

I yield the floor.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 5 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:25 p.m., recessed until 5 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. JOHNSON).

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it is hard to argue that ObamaCare is not a failing law. Seven years after it became law, its laundry list of problems continues to grow: higher premiums, higher deductibles, customers losing healthcare plans, patients losing doctors, fewer choices, failed co-ops, unraveling exchanges. And, unfortunately, without action, that list will only get longer and the consequences will only become more severe. Republicans know that. Democrats know that. Unfortunately, many Americans know it firsthand.

The American people deserve better, and they rightly expect us to act. That is why choosing to watch from the sidelines as ObamaCare fails is not an option.

To say that ObamaCare has created significant problems for the American people is an understatement. That is why Senate Republicans are working to fix the mess created by ObamaCare to provide real solutions to this failed law. We want to save the millions of hard-working families who are trapped by ObamaCare's taxes and mandates.

Average annual individual market premiums have increased by \$2,928—an increase of 105 percent—since 2013 in the 39 States that use healthcare.gov. And 62 percent of States using healthcare.gov, including my home State of South Dakota, saw premiums double between 2013 and 2017. We will help stabilize these collapsing insurance markets that have left millions of Americans with little or no options.

Today, one in three counties has only one insurer on its ObamaCare exchange. According to CMS, 47 counties nationwide are projected to have no insurers, which means Americans in these counties could be without coverage on the exchanges for 2018. As many as 1,200 counties—nearly 40 percent of counties nationwide—could have only one issuer in 2018. It is hard to argue that you have a market, that you have competition, when you have one option. That is 40 percent of the counties in America in 2018.

We will improve the affordability of healthcare by eliminating the ObamaCare taxes and mandates that are causing premiums to increase the most. These taxes and mandates have cost the American economy \$1 trillion—a cost that was ultimately incurred by patients in the form of higher costs and larger tax bills. Reversing these taxes will provide millions of American families and businesses with much needed tax relief.

We will also preserve access to care for individuals with preexisting conditions. There has been a lot of debate and misinformation, I might add, about this issue over the past few months. In the Senate, we will ensure that individuals with preexisting conditions continue to have access to the care they depend upon.

We will also safeguard Medicaid by giving States more flexibility, while ensuring that those who rely on this program will not have the rug pulled out from under them. States should have the flexibility to design and operate Medicaid programs in a fiscally responsible way and not be stymied by the Federal Government.

Making these critical reforms to Medicaid will empower States with the tools they need to implement healthcare programs that best meet their residents' needs.

We must also ensure that those Americans who already rely on this program will not be left in the lurch. Republicans recognize our responsibility to make sure that Medicaid continues to provide quality care for these vulnerable citizens. We will balance the needs of the individuals who have Medicaid coverage, while ensuring sustainability of the Medicaid Program.

Finally, we will free the American people from the onerous ObamaCare mandates that, in some cases, forced them to purchase insurance they don't want or can't afford. These mandates have resulted in burdensome taxes that have been levied against most small businesses and the American people. The Republican healthcare plan will revoke these burdensome mandates and put the American people—not Washington—back in charge of their healthcare. This will be a huge leap in the right direction for hard-working families and small businesses.

Reforming America's healthcare system isn't easy, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't try. We have spent years—literally years—debating this issue, and we have had lots of ideas along the way. Now it is time to take action.

The core principles of the Republican healthcare plan are as follows: helping to stabilize collapsing insurance markets; improving the affordability of health insurance; preserving access to care for those with preexisting conditions; safeguarding Medicaid for those who need it the most; and freeing the

American people from onerous ObamaCare mandates.

Without meaningful action, ObamaCare's problems aren't going anywhere. Without action, the individual market will continue to collapse, and more and more Americans will be without insurance options. Without action, Americans will continue to experience rising healthcare costs because of the law's costly taxes and mandates. Without action, States will continue to be hamstrung by Medicaid's bureaucracy, and we will not be able to put this critical program on a more sustainable path for the folks who need it the most. Without action, the "Washington knows best" approach to healthcare will live on.

We cannot let that happen, which is why we plan to deliver patient-centered healthcare reforms that lower costs and increase access to care for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we are about to embark on something that is pretty amazing to me. Next week, I am told, we are going to take up the Senate healthcare bill that is going to be the first cousin of the House bill. There are a lot of things that are referred to as putting lipstick on a pig, but this is truly putting lipstick on a pig, where we are going to take healthcare away from millions of Americans.

We might make it a little better by extending some Medicare or Medicaid monies, but in the end that will go away. We will potentially set up some high-risk pools for people with pre-existing conditions. I will tell you, from my time in the State legislature when we dealt with high-risk pools, that gives access to healthcare for the rich folks.

In essence, what we are going to do next week, because some folks in this body forgot to read the Affordable Care Act when it came up, is we are going to repeal it and we are going to replace it with a piece of garbage.

Today I rise on behalf of the 48 rural and frontier hospitals in Montana—48 rural and frontier hospitals that are the backbone of our State.

I rise for the 77,000 hard-working Montanans who now have healthcare because of Medicaid expansion, and the 41,000 jobs of our State of 1 million people sustained by our healthcare industry today.

I rise on behalf of every Montanan who deserves to know what is going on in Washington, DC. What is going on

back there? Are you guys really talking about jerking my healthcare away from me? Are you guys actually talking about taking something up that is really not going to do much for the 30 million Americans getting pounded by high premiums and high deductibles? Are you doing this to give the top one-tenth of 1 percent of the Americans in this country a tax break?

Right now, the Senate majority in this body is playing Russian roulette with people's lives. A handful of Washington politicians are crafting a secret healthcare bill in a smoke-filled room, probably a little whiskey is involved, a few steaks. They are crafting a bill that will impact every man, woman, and child in this country.

I heard earlier today, they said these meetings were open. It would be nice to know where they are. I would love to go in and give my two bits on what rural America feels about how we need to move forward with healthcare in this country. This is a problem that is not going away unless we address it in a commonsense way.

So they are crafting this bill in secret. We don't know what is in it, but we have indication it is going to be very similar—a first cousin—to the American Health Care Act passed in the House so we should be deeply concerned. This is irresponsible legislation that jeopardizes healthcare for over 250,000 Montanans, denying coverage to over 150,000 Montanans who have a pre-existing condition like cancer, heart disease, even high blood pressure, and, quite frankly, would put many of our rural hospitals at risk—at risk of closure; at the very best, changing the methods by which they deliver healthcare to these rural communities, by the way, that are hanging on by their fingernails. This House bill is creating uncertainty in Montana, it is creating uncertainty across this Nation, it will fundamentally change our lives forever, and I do not believe it will be for the better.

My office has received over 3,600 pieces of correspondence related to the American Health Care Act. Many Montanans are terrified of the implications of this horrible bill. As elected officials, we are obligated to answer the tough questions, defend our positions, and advocate for our constituents. That is not what is happening here. As a result, the Senate, through their secret meetings and through a potential rushed-through healthcare bill next week—and I see no reason why it will not be—we are not doing right by our constituents.

The process and this bill are a disservice to folks like Julie Williams from smalltown Montana—Shepherd, MT. Julie was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis, MS, in 2011, 5 months before the Supreme Court was set to make their decision on the Affordable Care Act. She spent those 5 months terrified

that she was in for a constant fight with insurance companies over coverage, but the Supreme Court upheld the ACA, and Julie has insurance and doesn't have to worry about being denied coverage if she moves, changes jobs, or—God forbid—becomes unemployed because she now has a pre-existing condition. Julie also doesn't have to worry about insurance companies cutting off her treatments because she happens to hit a lifetime cap, which is a very real concern for a healthy young woman with a disease like MS. She didn't have to worry—she didn't have to worry until now. If a bill like the American Health Care Act passes, Julie could be charged more because of her disease. She is unable to afford that coverage. The plan may not pay for the healthcare services she needs.

This legislation is also a disservice to a lady with the same last name, no relation, Jennifer Williams, of East Glacier, MT, one of the most beautiful parts of the world. Thanks to the preventive care provisions in the current healthcare system, Jennifer and her husband have been able to catch a few conditions early and avoid bigger problems in the future. That is going away.

Unfortunately, their premiums are rising. Congress needs to address that problem head on. I couldn't agree more. This bill that passed from the House doesn't do that. It will send folks like Julie and 250,000 Montanans on Medicaid out into the cold, no access to affordable care, jack up the cost of healthcare for folks with health insurance, and jack up the cost of healthcare for folks in their fifties and sixties. We can and should be working together to lower those costs for folks like Jennifer, Julie, and other Montana families. Instead, we are here scoring political points—or trying to—upending all the good things in the ACA and the current healthcare system. Instead, we should be working together in Congress. The Senate should be working together—not in some back room but right here on the floor—to lower premiums, copays, and deductibles, while increasing access to lifesaving medical care.

Look, we have said it before, we will say it again: The Affordable Care Act isn't perfect, but it has a lot of good things. Let's fix the things wrong with it and keep the progress we have made, but instead, we hear in Washington, particularly the Republican majority, is creating chaos in the marketplace and driving costs up. This chaos is putting our rural hospitals and community health centers at risk. That is not just the statement. That is a statement of fact.

Every day, folks in rural communities rely on their local hospitals, clinics, everything from basic checkup to emergency treatments. Thanks to Medicaid expansion, in Montana, these



hospitals and community health centers have seen a reduction in charity care, and they have been able to keep their doors open, but the American Health Care Act puts those funds at risk and puts these frontier medical centers on the chopping block. These medical professionals are sworn by oath to provide healthcare for folks. If Medicaid expansion goes away, the hospital will be forced to absorb those costs.

Over the last 10 months, I have held over a dozen listening sessions, eyeball-to-eyeball listening sessions with Montanans. We are going to be holding some more. The sessions have been over health. I have heard one thing loud and clear from people: If Medicaid expansion goes away, these rural frontier hospitals will have to fundamentally change how they deliver healthcare or they may be forced to shut down altogether. These hospitals operate on razor-thin margins, and they cannot afford to see these funds disappear.

Take my hometown, Big Sandy, MT. Back in 1910, my grandfather came out, took a look around, saw grass as tall as the belly on a horse, and said: "This is where we are going to homestead." He went back and got my grandmother. The farm that Sharla and I farm today was started, patented back in 1915. They worked together with their neighbors, the homesteaders of that area. They built barns, they built businesses, but it took them 50 years to build a hospital. In the mid-1960s, a hospital was finally built in Big Sandy, MT—50 years of people working together to get that hospital built.

I am going to tell you, if we don't do smart things in this body, if we take steps backward and not very many—and this bill I have seen from the House is horrible, and I don't think the bill in the Senate is going to be much better because it is a low bar. Hospitals like the hospital in Big Sandy will go away. I am going to tell you something, when that hospital goes away, Big Sandy goes away. Rural America goes away.

Big Sandy is just an example of hundreds of small towns in Montana and throughout this country that depend upon rural hospitals for healthcare. Without hospitals, Montana frontier communities will be forced to drive 100 miles to deliver a baby or take an expensive ambulance ride after an accident. People are not going to be able to afford or they are not going to choose to live there because of a lack of healthcare. They are not going to take that risk. They are going to move out of those small towns, and they are going to move to places where they have healthcare. In some cases, families who have lived in those house and on that property for generations will be forced to move. These hospitals just don't keep patients alive, they keep

communities alive. The House bill would kill those rural hospitals and would be the death of rural America.

That is not the only uncertainty facing rural America. In Montana, insurance companies filed their proposed rates with the insurance commissioner last year, but these insurers are left without vital information for their proposals. They don't know if this administration will continue the cost-saving reduction payments that help make healthcare more affordable. Insurers have said if these payments go away, consumers will face double-digit rate increases. Montanans deserve to know from their elected officials what kind of impact this action has on premiums, and yet the insurance commissioners are leaving consumers and Montanans in the dark.

Transparency builds a more effective government. Hiding important information from the public is unacceptable at any level of elected official. We live in a country where citizens can hold their government accountable, and the American people make good decisions when they have good information, but right now, a select few in this body are shielding the American public from what is really going on. We hear about a bill that is going to impact one-sixth of the economy, we hear about a piece of legislation that will rip healthcare away from 23 million Americans, we hear about a bill that will take us back to the days when Montanans couldn't afford to get sick, but we haven't seen it.

Families across Montana are sitting at the kitchen table wondering if their healthcare coverage is going to go away. Folks are walking out of the doctors' offices with newfound conditions and wondering: Will I be able to get treatment if something similar to the American Healthcare Act is passed by the Senate? Children are being born prematurely, with asthma and cerebral palsy, and parents are left fearing their son or daughter will never be able to afford insurance.

These families deserve more from Congress. At a bare minimum, they deserve hearings. They deserve a panel of experts discussing how we can lower premiums, reduce healthcare costs, and put transparency into prescription drugs. They deserve smart action, not political action. They deserve a Congress that will work together to improve the lives of all Americans, not one that works behind closed doors to draft secret legislation that will send shock waves through homes across this country.

Our Founders expected more from this body. Quite frankly, I expected more from this body before I got here. Montanans expect their U.S. Senate to work for them.

I am going to leave you with one story. I was in Butte, MT, at one of my listening sessions. A gentleman was

sitting at the table. He was probably 45 years old. He said: You know, I have two kids and I can't work. I have had diabetes since I was a teenager. I have had some issues with mental health for a good portion of my adult life.

He said: I haven't been able to work, haven't been able to support my family, and then the Affordable Care Act came along, and the State of Montana was wise enough to pass Medicaid expansion. I was able to go to a doctor. I was able to get my diabetes handled because of Medicaid expansion. I was able to see a psychologist and get my mental health issues under control, and I was able to go back to work. I was able to support my family.

He said: And now you guys in Washington, DC, want to take all that away from me.

I will tell you, I will fight like hell to make sure that never happens. And if the majority leader wants to try to ram this down the people's throats, I will spend the rest of my life telling them why and who did what to them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor, like many of my colleagues, shocked at the Republican majority's brazen, secretive effort to hijack the legislative process and pass a bill that would hurt millions of Americans.

I have served in public office for more than four decades, and never once in my 45 years as a mayor, a State legislator, a Congressman, or a Senator has it been so hard to understand the motivations of an opposing party. What kind of problems are Republicans trying to solve with legislation that raises premiums, reduces coverage, decimates Medicaid, and increases costs for everyone? Certainly not any of the concerns I have heard in New Jersey. Never has someone come up to me at the local diner to say that their premiums are too low or that Medicaid covers too many children or that cancer patients don't pay enough out of pocket.

There is only one place in America where these bad ideas have any traction, and that is behind closed doors in Washington, where 13 Republican men are working on a secret bill to take healthcare away from millions of people and raise costs on millions and millions more. They want no transparency, no bipartisan input, no hearings.

Those are the same Republicans who in 2009 and 2010 accused Democrats of ramming healthcare reform through Congress too quickly. In fact, it was the majority leader who said at the time: "This massive piece of legislation that seeks to restructure one-sixth of our economy is being written behind closed doors without input from anyone." Even the Vice President—a



Congressman at the time—said it is “wrong for legislation that’ll affect 100 percent of the American people to be negotiated behind closed doors.” Mind you, all of these complaints came during what was a far more open, transparent process.

I sit on the Senate Finance Committee. I remember the process quite well. I remember our chairman at the time, Senator Baucus, bending over backward to get Republican input. We held 53 meetings—hearings, roundtables, briefings, and negotiations—on healthcare reform. Afterward, we held the longest Finance Committee markup in over 20 years—a markup that led to the adoption of nearly a dozen Republican amendments, on top of the two dozen amendments we accepted before the markup began.

Democrats also made huge bipartisan overtures on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. They, too, held a transparent process and adopted over 160 Republican amendments—160 Republican amendments.

Then and only then did we bring the bill to the floor of the Senate, and when we did, we spent 25 consecutive days in session debating the bill on the Senate floor in front of the American people.

In short, Democrats spent months making compromise after compromise in the hopes of getting Republicans on board, only to learn that they never had any intention of working with us at all. They never cared about expanding access to care or reducing prescription drug costs for seniors or making insurance affordable. They didn’t work with us then, and they certainly are not working with us now.

Behind closed doors, 13 Republican men are debating just how many millions of Americans will lose their coverage under this bill. Is it 23 million? Is it 20 million? Is it 16 million? Behind closed doors, they are discussing just how high the age tax should be on middle-aged workers. Is it \$8,000 a year or \$10,000 a year or \$12,000 a year?

Behind closed doors, they are picking and choosing which consumer protections to gut. Should they bring back lifetime limits on coverage, which is a real problem if you have a serious disease? Before, there were lifetime limits. So you had coverage, and then all of a sudden, you hit that ceiling. If you had challenges, for example, with cancer, and you expended all of your coverage, you still had an illness that needed to be treated. Now you were one illness away from bankruptcy.

Would you let patients with pre-existing conditions sink or swim in high-risk pools, allowing insurers to once again charge women more than men simply because they are women? Same age, same bracket, same geography.

It is easy to see why Republicans want to keep this bill out of the public

eye. If it is anything like the House version passed earlier this year, it is going to be a terrible, mean-spirited bill—a bill that the Congressional Budget Office said would take insurance away from 23 million people. It would raise premiums by 20 percent a year and price middle-aged consumers out of the market. It is a bill that, according to reports, even President Trump said is too mean. I have to tell you something. If a bill is too mean for President Trump, it is certainly too mean for New Jersey.

Today, I understand that a comment was attributed to the President. He was meeting with a group of business leaders. He says he wants a health bill with heart—with heart. I can tell you, it is not this bill because the House bill—and, from what I am hearing, behind closed doors, the potential Senate bill—is a heartless bill.

I am not the only one with that view. I was glad that most of my New Jersey colleagues in the House of Representatives rejected this bill in a bipartisan way. Indeed, every House Democrat and nearly every House Republican in our delegation understood why this bill would devastate New Jersey.

This bill will price thousands of New Jerseyans out of the private health insurance market, especially those nearing retirement age. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, premiums for a 60-year-old worker who earns \$20,000 a year in Monmouth County will see their premiums increase by 900 percent—900 percent. That is an increase of nearly \$9,000.

Every day, New Jerseyans are reaching out to tell me what is at stake in this debate and what this secretive effort will mean for their health and their financial security. Take Dr. Howard Fredrics, a 54-year-old constituent from Park Ridge who emailed to say:

Without subsidies provided under the ACA, my 51-year-old wife and I would have no insurance. . . . We could not afford premiums in excess of \$1100 a month. . . . Without these subsidies, millions will go uninsured and many of these people, myself included, will die.

Of course, my Republican colleagues like to say their plan will give Americans more choice. We don’t know what the plan is, but they keep saying—at least the House plan—we are going to give Americans more choice. But if all the choices are unaffordable, what good are they? What good is it to have “more choices” if you can’t afford any of the choices?

If they provide significantly less coverage, what good is it to say I have insurance when the moment I get sick, I don’t have the coverage for it? So I have been paying for a policy that doesn’t really help me at the moment I need it.

They also say their plan will give States more choice on how to run Medicaid. When you cut Medicaid by \$800

billion, you leave States no choice but to scale back the health services they provide. That is not choice. That is not choice.

Leaving nursing home patients out in the cold, ending respite care for children with disabilities, denying low-income children a fair shot of the American dream—that is not choice.

New Jersey alone will face \$30 billion in cuts to Medicaid over the next decade—cuts that will not only leave thousands of families uninsured but, according to the Milken Institute, will cost New Jerseyans more than 41,000 jobs. It is no wonder Senate Republicans are terrified of having to defend this bill. It is a terrible, mean bill, and they don’t have the guts to tell the American people what is in it, even though they want to pass it next week. If only they had the courage that so many New Jerseyans have shown me in recent weeks as I have toured our State—hard-working Americans who have been willing to share their personal healthcare stories.

It is not easy to share a serious illness you have with everybody in the world, but so compelled are they and so courageous, I would add, that they do. People like Irma Rivera, a constituent I recently met in Jersey City, told me about her battle with uterine cancer nearly a decade ago. She was fortunate to survive, but without the Affordable Care Act, she would be blacklisted by health insurance companies for the rest of her life, simply because she is a survivor of that cancer. Today Irma is covered and receiving world-class care.

I also met with Samantha Williams, a young mother in Burlington City. She told me about her son’s brush with a life-threatening asthma attack. They were uninsured so they avoided going to the emergency room, as so many people do. The illness gets worse and worse, more consequential to your life, more consequential to the cost, but eventually his breathing got so bad, she had no choice. The doctor said if they had waited any longer, her son might have never made it. She credits Medicaid with saving his life.

I also want to know how my Republican colleagues can reconcile their concern with the opioid epidemic with their plan to end the Medicaid expansion that is saving so many lives. Just yesterday, I received an email from Irene in Oakhurst, NJ. She writes:

My daughter is a recovering drug addict on the Medicaid program which pays for mental health care and services. . . . She’s part of the opioid epidemic that has taken the lives of so many young people like her. She’s been drug free for almost a year. Taking money from this program would be disastrous not only for her but for so many people who cannot afford any other healthcare.

So I listen to those compelling stories. They are courageous to tell their stories to the whole world—very personal stories. Yet there isn’t the courage here to come forth with a bill and

let's debate it open, in public. This bill leaves millions of low-income Americans who depend on Medicaid expansion with no options at all. And for what? To give insurance health executives, real estate moguls, and hedge fund managers a massive tax cut they don't need. If there was ever such a thing as class warfare, this is it.

In my home State of New Jersey, 250 millionaires are slated to get a collective tax cut of \$14 million. You heard it right—250 millionaires get a tax cut, while over half a million New Jerseyans lose their healthcare coverage. That is a pretty awesome thought—an incredible thought. It is totally mean-spirited. It is certainly without heart. Many of them are people who work in some of the toughest jobs, but they don't get healthcare benefits at the job where they work, from dishwashers and cashiers and home health aides, just to mention a few. These were my neighbors growing up in the tenement in Union City—people who worked tirelessly to give their children a better life and so often put their own health on the back burner.

Many of us thought the cruel legislation Republicans passed through the House would be dead on arrival in the Senate. Instead, an incredibly unpopular bill has a new lease on life. Why? Because padding the pockets of the health insurance industry, capping Medicaid spending, and cutting taxes for millionaires have been at the top of Republican wish lists for years.

The notion that the GOP can pass this secret bill with no debate is insulting to our democracy, and the idea that they can dismantle this historic law without hurting millions of people is just not true because, make no mistake, when you take \$800 billion out of Medicaid, everyone feels the pain. When you add 23 million people to the ranks of the uninsured, everyone feels the pain. When you send more people back to the emergency room as their way of getting healthcare, saddle consumers with higher out-of-pocket costs, and end protections against insurance company abuses for patients, everyone feels the pain.

What really boggles my mind—what I just can't understand is, there is no shortage of problems in our healthcare system—real problems that need real solutions. Ask anyone, and I mean anyone, about our healthcare system. I will guarantee you will get an earful about what is wrong with it. You will hear from parents about deductibles that are too high, from workers about how hard it is to find in-network doctors, from seniors about generic drugs that suddenly cost thousands of dollars, police officers about the opioid crisis tearing apart our communities, and hospital staff concerned about the nursing shortage, business owners, like the group I met from Cumberland County, NJ, yesterday who want Con-

gress to work in a bipartisan way to lower employees' healthcare costs.

Imagine, just for a moment, how thrilled Americans would be if Republicans actually had a bill that solved some of their problems instead of bringing back old ones. Imagine how excited my Republican colleagues would be to show off a bill that improved, instead of endangered, people's lives, but my Republican friends are not excited to show off this bill because when you are excited to show a bill—when you have a great product, you want the whole world to know about it. When you have a terrible product, you don't want anyone to know about it, and they don't want to defend it because they know it is indefensible.

For 7 years, my Republican colleagues put politics over policy. For 7 years, they demonized ObamaCare, with no substance behind their rhetoric. Now their poll-tested platitudes have caught up with them, and they know it. That is why they let 13 Senators, who represent less than one-quarter of the country, meet behind closed doors, and that is why their hope is to keep this bill a secret until the very last minute.

So today I have come to the floor with a message for my Republican colleagues: If you want to have a debate about how to improve our healthcare system and about how to help more families get covered and about how to lower costs more and create a healthy, more productive nation, these are issues Democrats have been ready to have that debate on. I have said it in the Senate Finance Committee. We did remarkable things under the Affordable Care Act, but there is still room for improvement. We are ready to have that debate because Democrats know that while the Affordable Care Act was a historic law—a law that stopped insurance companies from dropping your coverage if you got sick, that covered 90 percent of Americans for the first time in our history, that required healthcare plans to cover essential health benefits like visits with specialists, prenatal care, mental health and addiction treatment, hospital stays, and more—despite all of the positive steps forward, in spite of all the good the Affordable Care Act did, Democrats have never stopped believing we could even make it better.

Before we can make our health system better, we must stop Republicans from making it worse. We cannot go back to a time when healthcare was a privilege granted only to those who could afford it, when it was always, I think, a right afforded to all Americans. The only way we can go forward is by working together with bipartisan input, with open debate, with full transparency on an issue that affects virtually every American, in full view of the American people we were elected to serve. They deserve no less, but they

are getting a lot less by the majority as it relates to this bill—behind closed doors, in secret, that even the President of the United States says is mean. The only thing I can agree with President Trump on is we need a bill with heart, and from what I have seen and heard so far, this is pretty heartless.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from New Jersey for his excellent remarks on the Affordable Care Act and its future and really spotlight the point he made. He and I have been around legislatures for a long time, both at the local level, State level, and here in Washington. If you have something you are really proud of—a bill—you can't wait to roll it out. We have a place for a press conference about every 15 feet in the corridors around here. We have a press corps that fills the Gallery when they all show up, and they are anxious to hear our story. If you have something you are proud of—and each of us has had that legislation—you put it in a press release and do the social media and the whole number.

If you are unfortunate to be in the position to bring a bill to the floor you are not very proud of—you don't know how you can explain it back home—you keep it secret. You do it behind closed doors.

What the Senator has said is exactly the truth—and we know it, as our colleagues on the other side know it. They have, for the past several weeks, since the House passed their bill, been meeting behind closed doors. So 13 male Senators—why they couldn't invite the women Republicans in the Senate—it is their decision—I can't understand. They have not produced one thing for public consumption—nothing. Yet, Senator McCONNELL, the Republican leader, tells us: Well, you have 10 days. We are going to pass the new healthcare system for the United States of America in 10 days, and pretty soon we are going to show you what we are going to propose.

It tells you the whole story. There is something in there that is painful, that hurts them politically, and that they can't really explain. After all these years—"Repeal ObamaCare, repeal ObamaCare," they can't come up with an alternative they can sell to the American people.

I thank the Senator for pointing out his experience, and the experience he is finding in New Jersey. I am finding the same thing back in Illinois.

I thank my colleague from New Jersey for his statement.

This last Saturday, I was invited to debate a Republican House Member from my hometown of Springfield, IL, on his vote in favor of TrumpCare—if you want to call it that—the Republican healthcare plan in the House. We

were invited by the Ministerial Alliance of Springfield, the African-American ministers. I accepted the invitation on a Saturday afternoon, and he did as well.

He put conditions on it. No. 1, no media coverage. This is not open to the public. Really? We are going to debate a healthcare system change for America that is going to affect millions of people, and we will not talk about it in public? But that was his ground rule. And then in the midst of it, he thought someone was taping him while it was going on and stopped full sentence and said: I don't want this taped. Well, here is a bill he voted for to change the healthcare system for the people he represents, including the folks in that room, and he didn't want to be on the record or public about that discussion. That tells me a lot as well.

It isn't just a secret bill we haven't seen, it is a lot of Republican House Members who voted for it—and they were all Republicans—passed by, I believe, two or three votes, and now they don't want to talk about it. Well, there is a message there.

Here is what I have concluded after looking at this in a lot of different ways. Where you stand on healthcare in America depends on where you start on the question: Do you believe every American has a right to affordable, quality healthcare? If the answer is, no, that is for people who are lucky or rich or have the right job, then you can reach the same conclusion they did in the House when they passed the Republican measure because, you see, their bill removed health insurance coverage from 23 million Americans, instead of expanding the percentage of Americans with health insurance coverage, which we set out to do with the Affordable Care Act. The Republicans have reversed field. They are taking away health insurance from more people than the Affordable Care Act gave.

Is that a press release from the Democratic National Committee I just quoted? No. It was the Congressional Budget Office—a bipartisan group here, an agency in Washington that analyzes our legislation and gives us their analysis. They looked at the Republican bill and said it will cost 23 million people in America their health insurance.

If you started with the position that healthcare is a right, you would stop at that point and say: Well, this bill clearly doesn't work because it takes away healthcare coverage instead of creating healthcare coverage.

Where you start is where you stand. The second question is this: If you believe the highest priority of this effort is to cut taxes on wealthy people, then, of course, you would vote for what they passed in the House—\$700 billion in tax cuts. Now, that tax cut came right out of the healthcare system of America. That is the tax revenue that is used to expand Medicaid

insurance coverage to those who are lower income workers. That is the money that is used to help subsidize the premium payments of middle-income workers who can't afford the monthly premium.

But they believed—the Republicans who voted in the House—that there is a higher priority than helping those people to have health insurance, and that is cutting the tax burden of the wealthiest people in America. So if you start with that premise—that you have to cut taxes by \$700 billion regardless of what happens—this is what you end up with, the measure that came over from the House of Representatives. I don't know what the Senate Republicans will come up with in response to that, but clearly it must be parallel or close to what the House of Representatives did.

Let's take a close look at this measure and take a look at the history that brought us to this moment. As I mentioned, we still don't have the text of the Republican secret bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Six years and counting, they can't produce a replacement. It looks like we are going to vote on this in a few days. By congressional standards, this is a high crime and misdemeanor. To think that we are going to consider a bill within 10 days affecting every American, affecting one-sixth of the American economy—a bill that will say to some people: You are going to lose your health insurance, and to others: We are going to offer you a health insurance policy that really isn't worth the paper it is written on, and we haven't seen the bill.

Well, what is the history of this? Is this the way the Republicans always operate? Not really. In December 2009, Republican Senator MCCONNELL, their leader, said, when we were debating the Affordable Care Act: "This massive piece of legislation that seeks to restructure one-sixth of our economy is being written behind closed doors without input from anyone in an effort to jam it past, not only the Senate, but the American people." That was Senator MCCONNELL about the Affordable Care Act when it was being proposed by President Obama.

Well, what is the fact? During the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the Senate held over 50 bipartisan hearings on the bill. How many bipartisan hearings have we held on the new Republican healthcare proposal? None, not one.

At that time, 6 years ago, we had a week-long markup in the Finance Committee and a month-long markup in the HELP Committee. The Senate spent—and I remember this well—25 consecutive days in session on the floor of the Senate debating this bill. It is the second longest consecutive period of time ever spent on a bill in the Senate.

We considered on the floor of the Senate hundreds of amendments. You

know, we ended up adopting 150 Republican amendments to the Affordable Care Act. Not a single one of them would vote for it, but we took their proposals to make it better seriously and adopted 150 changes.

How much of a chance will we have to amend the Senate Republican bill that may come before us as soon as this week? It remains to be seen. It could be what we call a vote-arama around here, which is a corruption of what this grand institution really established as a standard of operation for generations and centuries. The vote-arama lets you vote on an amendment offered to the bill, with 2 minutes of debate.

You are changing the healthcare system and you have 1 minute on each side to debate your amendment? Is that a serious undertaking with something that is that consequential for so many Americans? No one has seen this secret bill—not Democrats, not many Republican Senators.

I asked Secretary of Health and Human Services Tom Price last week in a hearing: Have you seen the bill? You are the one that is going to have to implement it.

He said: No, I haven't seen it either.

This weekend the Presiding Officer, Senator RUBIO, a Republican from Florida, said:

The Senate is not a place where you can just cook up something behind closed doors and rush it for a vote on the floor.

Mr. President, I couldn't agree more.

Senator RON JOHNSON, a Republican from Wisconsin, said:

I want to make sure the American people, I want to make sure the members of Congress have enough time to evaluate it. I want to have enough time to really take a look at what we're voting on.

That was Republican Senator RON JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

Senator BOB CORKER, a Republican Senator from Tennessee, said:

I've said from Day 1 and I'll say it again: The process is better if you do it in public. Obviously, that's not the route that is being taken.

I didn't pull these quotes from months and years ago. They are from the weekend. The comments were made over the weekend by Republican Members about their very own leadership and the process they are following in preparing to change America's healthcare system.

Let's talk about some numbers. Let's start with zero. How many hearings have we had on the Senate bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act? Zero. How many markups have we had? Zero. How much time has the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the man responsible for implementing this bill, spent on it to review it? Zero. How much Democratic input has been allowed for this secret negotiation? Zero. How many women Senators have been involved in crafting the bill? Zero. How

many medical organizations or patient groups support the secret Senate bill? Zero. And most concerning of all, how much time has the public had to even read this bill? Zero.

Let's take a look at another number: 23 million. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 23 million Americans will lose their health insurance under the House-passed repeal bill—1 million in Illinois.

I have said it before, but I will say it again—and this is a driving factor in terms of my views on the subject: If you have ever in your life been the parent of a seriously ill child and didn't have health insurance, you will never forget it as long as you live. I know. I have been there.

I was a law student, newly married, with a brand new baby girl with a really serious health issue, and I had no health insurance. My wife and I sat in the charity section at Children's Hospital waiting for them to call our name so we could take our little girl in to the latest resident, with a hundred questions and who wanted to go through them all over again. I thought to myself: DURBIN, how did you ever reach this point where you don't have health insurance?

I fixated on health insurance from that point forward. From the time I got out of law school, for years afterwards while my daughter was growing up, I not only had health insurance, but I sometimes had two health insurance policies. I was so worried about having coverage if I ever really needed it.

So we want to take health insurance away from 23 million Americans? Do you want it to be your family, your son, your daughter? I sure wouldn't.

Here is another number: 750. Lower income older Americans would see their premiums increase 750 percent under the House-passed repeal bill, from \$1,700 under ACA to \$14,000 under the Republican plan. Now, how can that happen? How can you see the premiums go up that fast? We built into the affordable care bill a guaranteed protection for disparity in premium payments of no more than three to one. The most expensive health insurance policy cannot be more than three times the lowest cost policy. The Republicans changed that to five to one. Well, who does that affect?

If you are between 50 and 64 years of age, you are in a category of people not yet eligible for Medicare. If you are now facing chronic illnesses that could make health insurance more expensive, you will pay the higher premiums. The higher premiums, when calculated, are dramatically higher for this group. That is why the American Association of Retired Persons has come out four-square against the Republican TrumpCare, the Republican repeal bill. It is just unfair to those between the ages of 50 and 64.

Some 130 million, that is how many people nationwide have preexisting conditions. Almost half of the people in Illinois have a preexisting condition. Several weeks ago, I had a procedure for an atrial flutter. It worked out just fine. Now I have a preexisting condition. I am in that category. What does that mean? If you went out to buy health insurance with a preexisting condition, you are charged more, if you could buy insurance at all.

So when the Republican bill that passed the House does not guarantee, as the Affordable Care Act, that you cannot be discriminated against because of a preexisting condition, it makes millions of Americans—130 million—more vulnerable.

Is that what they wanted to achieve?

Where you stand depends on where you start. If you think everyone is entitled to health insurance, then you can't be standing for something that allows preexisting conditions to be used against you. A lot of the people whom I am talking about have employer insurance, but what about those who shop on the individual market or purchase individual insurance in the future? Under the House repeal bill, insurers would, once again, be allowed to charge people with preexisting conditions more money for insurance.

The next number is 33,000. Senator MENENDEZ referred to it. That is how many people are dying every year because of the opioid or heroin overdose—33,000, and 1,800 a year in Illinois.

Now, listen to this. The Republican bill dramatically cuts the Medicaid Program, the Nation's largest provider of substance abuse treatment services, and it allows insurers, once again, to refuse coverage for those needed services.

I have been here a few years, and I can remember that desk because that is where Paul Wellstone of Minnesota sat, and I remember that desk because that is where Pete Domenici of New Mexico sat. You couldn't ask for two more polar opposites politically. Paul Wellstone was a garrulous, proud liberal. Pete Domenici was a proud conservative. One was from Minnesota, and one was from New Mexico, and they came together on an issue.

Do you know what the issue was? Each of them had someone they loved in their family who suffered from a mental illness, and they said: Why in the world will health insurance companies refuse to write coverage for people with mental illness? They fought for years against the insurance companies, and they finally won.

We included, in the Affordable Care Act, the requirement that your health insurance policy cover not only physical illness but mental illness. It was a breakthrough. For the first time, we stopped treating mental illness like a curse and treated it like an illness that could be treated.

They added a section at the end that most of us didn't even notice: mental illness and substance abuse treatment. I didn't know it was there until the opioid crisis, and I started going to these rehab facilities and saying to these people there: How are you paying for this care? Some of them were under Medicaid, but those under private health insurance said: My policy covers it. It covers it because Wellstone and Domenici insisted on putting it in.

After that historic victory, you would think the Republicans would include mental illness and substance abuse treatment as one of the basic essential services for health insurance, but they don't.

When they say we are going to write a bill that gives Americans more choice in their health insurance—oh, that sounds appealing—the choice is whether you want mental illness and substance abuse treatment or you don't.

Well, from where I am sitting, that is the kind of insurance coverage that should be basic to everyone. You never know whether that little girl that you are raising—that beautiful little girl—6 years from now is going to be struggling with an addiction. At that point, you better hope that your health insurance policy has some coverage so that you can save her life and bring her back from that addiction.

Now, 280,000 is the next number. That is how many children in Illinois depend on Medicaid for school-based health and medical services, from feeding tubes and handicapped buses to special education teachers. I made a point this last week when I was home to visit the schools in Chicago and Bloomington and hear firsthand what cuts in Medicaid meant to local school districts.

Many Senators don't realize this, but the kids with whom you are dealing who have learning disabilities and other disabilities, many of them are supported at your local schools by Medicaid dollars. The Medicaid dollars pay for the counselors, pay for the special buses, and pay for the feeding tubes for these kids to survive. So when you make a dramatic cut in Medicaid, as the Republican bill that came out of the House does, you endanger the very services and the very benefits that these special ed kids need. The school districts are mandated by law to help these kids, but if the money is cut off from Medicaid, what are they going to do?

The Republican repeal bill that every Republican Congressman in my State voted for slashes \$40 billion in Medicaid funding to Illinois, including money to school districts.

Three—this is the most important single number in the next 10 days in the Senate—3. That is the number of Republican Senators needed to stop this. Surely, there are three Republican Senators who are concerned

enough about this secret, behind-closed-doors process that we are witnessing when it comes to rewriting healthcare in America—at least three Republican Senators who want to take time to properly review this legislation that affects one-sixth of our economy.

Just the Senators who have publicly stated their personal concerns about this process—if the three of them would come together, we could stop this and do it the right way.

I said privately to a Republican Senator last week, after the tragedy where a Republican Congressman was shot at a baseball practice: Isn't this the moment when we ought to get together quietly—Democrats and Republicans—when we ought to sit down and write a bill we can both be proud of? I am hoping he was listening.

I am hoping that three Republican Senators, if they stand up for it, will help us achieve that goal. Surely there are three Republican Senators who are worried about the kids in their States like I am worried about the kids in mine, who do not want to make the opioid epidemic any worse, who want to make certain—underline the word “certain”—that they are protecting the people they represent from discrimination because of preexisting conditions. Surely there are at least three Republican Senators who do not want to throw millions of Americans off of health insurance coverage. Maybe some of the Senators who represent States that have been ravaged by the opioid epidemic will step forward. There are a lot of them. It only takes three to change this.

To Republican Senators, I say: Do not do this. Do not do this secret process. Democrats are willing to work with you to improve our healthcare system. I have said before that the only perfect law that I know of was carried down a mountain on clay tablets by Senator Moses. All of the other efforts can use some work, and in this case, we are willing to work with you. Take repeal off the table, and we will put a chair up to the table.

Over the past week, I have received thousands of emails and letters from Illinoisans who are worried about what is happening in the Senate today.

Helen, from River Forest, IL, is 47 years old. She is a primary caregiver for her parents. Her mom has Alzheimer's and is in a nursing home.

Here is what Helen writes:

Just before Thanksgiving, my dad's health deteriorated. He is now in hospice in the same nursing home. I have spent all of their savings—my mom and dad's savings—on healthcare. My mom is finally eligible for Medicaid. Without Medicaid, I would need to bring my parents to my home and quit my job to personally nurse them myself because I don't have the money myself to keep them in the nursing home and pay for private care. Please protect ObamaCare and Medicaid.

Here is Madeline from Chicago, who writes:

My younger sister is disabled. Before the Affordable Care Act went into effect, she was just about to hit the maximum lifetime limit on her private insurance policy.

That used to be the case. You would sign up for insurance, and you would say: Oh, great coverage—no copays, no extra charges. Then you would find in the fine print that there is a limit to the coverage of \$100,000. My friends, I can tell you that we are—each and every one of us—one diagnosis or one accident away from having more than \$100,000 in medical bills. It happens pretty quickly. That used to be built into insurance policies. We outlawed it under the Affordable Care Act. Now, in the name of “choice,” the Republicans want to bring that back.

Madeline writes:

Before the ACA went into effect and my daughter was about to hit the maximum lifetime limit on her private insurance policy, she was going to have to apply to be part of a high-risk pool, but that was going to involve a long wait, without any insurance, plus high premiums if and when she was accepted into the pool. The Affordable Care Act came just in time for my sister and for our family.

When the Republicans in the House say not to worry about people with pre-existing conditions, that they have set aside \$8 billion to take care of them in private risk pools, it is sad and, in a way, tragic that they would say that. That is not nearly enough money, and there is no guarantee that private risk pools that never worked before the Affordable Care Act would work in the future. It is a way to give an answer to the obvious question of why they are dropping so many people with pre-existing conditions from guaranteed coverage.

The last note is from Erin of Chicago, who writes:

I implore you to force a public hearing on the ACA repeal that the Republicans are trying to sneak through. If this bill passes, many of my friends and family will lose coverage either due to preexisting conditions or because the deductibles are too high. Additionally, my parents are self-employed and getting older. Under the proposed act, their health insurance premiums will likely increase to \$14,000 a year. They cannot afford it. They just can't. They will not have coverage, will get sick, and be unable to afford care.

If the Republicans have a better idea than the Affordable Care Act, for goodness' sake, stop hiding it from the American people. Stop talking about it behind closed doors. If it is such a good idea, bring it out for the world to take a look at. There will be critics. There were certainly critics with regard to the Affordable Care Act. I remember that very well. Yet that is what this body is all about.

The Senate is supposed to be a place where we deliberate on the important issues of our time. Is there anything more important than your health, the health of the people whom you love, and your opportunity to get basic

healthcare so that you can protect them?

I implore the Republicans and those who know that this is the wrong way to go to stand up and say so. It only takes three Republican Senators to do this a much different way so as to bring credit to this institution and create a bill—create a change—that makes healthcare more affordable, more accessible, and more fair to more Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

#### USS “FITZGERALD” TRAGEDY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, before beginning my remarks about the requirement for a larger Navy, I do want to extend my deepest condolences to the loved ones of those who lost their lives aboard the USS *Fitzgerald* recently.

During Saturday morning's early hours, the USS *Fitzgerald*—a guided-missile destroyer—collided with a Filipino merchant ship off the coast of Honshu, Japan. The USS *Fitzgerald* sustained significant damage, including the rapid flooding of three compartment areas, and seven sailors lost their lives. These young Americans were on board because they chose to serve their country, and they are heroes whose names will be added to the list of those who will be forever honored by our country.

Questions remain about the collision, and I am hopeful that they will be answered soon. Administrative and safety investigations into this tragedy are already underway, but we cannot change the horrific turn of events that occurred at 2 a.m. off the coast of Japan.

Our hearts go out to the loved ones who are dealing with the grief this accident has caused. We wish a quick recovery for those who were injured, and our gratitude goes to the many sailors who acted swiftly and resolutely to save lives and prevent further damage aboard.

Does the distinguished majority leader wish me to yield for some business?

Mr. MCCONNELL. If the Senator would yield so that I may do wrapup here.

Mr. WICKER. I would be delighted.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

#### TRIBUTE TO JOAN B. CLAYBROOK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to acknowledge my friend, Joan Claybrook. Joan is a legend. She is one of the most effective champions this Nation has ever seen—and she is still leading the charge. Last week, Joan celebrated her 80th birthday, and one thing is clear, Joan Claybrook isn't slowing down.

Like so many bright young people in Washington, Joan began her career right here in the U.S. Congress, working for Senator Walter Mondale and Representative James Mackay as a congressional fellow. In the summer of 1966, the Senate unanimously passed the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, the first major legislation to improve auto safety in this country. This effort was led by consumer advocate, Ralph Nader, and working right by his side was Joan Claybrook. It led to important safety standards we take for granted today: seatbelts, windshield wipers, outside mirrors, and dashboards. This landmark legislation also launched Joan's impressive career as a consumer advocate.

During the Carter administration, Joan served as the head of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, where she led efforts to improve vehicle safety and increased consumer access to safety information. Prior to her time with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, she ran Congress Watch, worked for the Public Interest Research Group, National Traffic Safety Bureau, Social Security Administration, and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 2009, Joan retired as president of Public Citizen, after nearly three decades of service championing consumer interests and campaigning on issues from campaign finance reform, to truck safety, and business regulation. Among her many accolades at Public Citizen, Joan was able to limit the number of triple- and longer double-trailer trucks on the road, and she helped to ensure that health, safety, and environmental agencies were able to continue its important work protecting the American people, but her proudest, and perhaps most impactful, achievement was winning a 20-year battle with the auto industry to install airbags in cars. Because of Joan's work, countless lives have been saved. I want to thank her for these contributions that improved the health and safety for so many across the country.

Joan Claybrook has been honored by numerous organizations, including the Philip Hart Distinguished Consumer Service Award from the Consumer Federation of America, an Excellence in Public Service Award from the Georgetown University Law Center, and an award for Superior Achievement from the National Traffic Safety Bureau—just to name a few. In her precious spare time, Joan serves on the board of Citizens for Tax Justice and Public Justice. She also cochairs the Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety and Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways.

It is not simply Joan Claybrook's extraordinary resume that earned her

such great respect; it was her approach to the job. Joan brought humility, integrity, and fairness to every challenge she faced. Her energy, passion, and optimism are infectious, and her continued drive to ensure all Americans have the chance to lead safe and equitable lives make her an inspiration. Joan may have retired, but her commitment to those values has never wavered. She is a force of nature.

I will close with this. I strongly believe in the role of public service to create change and make a difference. Joan Claybrook's years of service reflect these values and prove that, with the right approach, change is possible. I am lucky to count Joan as a friend. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Joan Claybrook's 80th birthday and congratulate her on an outstanding career. I hope Joan enjoys this special day, and I wish her many more wonderful years.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VERMONT LEAGUE OF CITIES AND TOWNS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in Vermont, we believe in forging resilient communities through strong local governments and in fostering well-informed leaders to understand and respond to the many complex issues facing us today. The Vermont League of Cities and Towns, VLCT, embodies these principles and more, and I am delighted to contribute in honoring the league and its members on its 50th anniversary.

Established in 1967, the VLCT was created to help improve local governance. Local officials needed a way to help towns best serve their constituents and to connect members of their communities with their local governments. In response, a handful of municipalities formed the organization that provided these services. Beginning with VLCT's first executive director and continuing through today, this organization has consistently worked to represent the values of all Vermonters. For the first time in 1995, every city and town in Vermont had joined as members of VLCT, demonstrating how valuable this institution is for all of our communities regardless of their size.

For many years, I too have worked alongside VLCT to improve the lives of Vermonters. Whether through their efforts supporting the State's recovery from Tropical Storm Irene or improving the water quality of Vermont's rivers and streams, their dedication to Vermont's way of life and quality of life makes us all better. They provide direction and advice and support our municipalities in their timely and im-

portant but often underfunded responsibilities.

As a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, VLCT will always be there to support us, to support Vermont communities. Our great State is made better by the involvement of organizations like the VLCT, and I wish them continued success over the next 50 years in bettering the lives of all Vermonters.

#### CBO COST ESTIMATE—S. 512

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, in compliance with paragraph 11(a) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has obtained from the Congressional Budget Office an estimate of the costs of S. 512, the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act, as reported from the committee on May 25, 2017.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cost estimate be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### S. 512—NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION AND MODERNIZATION ACT

As reported by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on May 25, 2017

#### SUMMARY

S. 512 would direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)—which licenses and regulates the use of radioactive materials at civilian facilities such as nuclear reactors—to undertake certain activities related to establishing a regulatory framework for licensing nuclear reactors that use advanced technologies for either commercial or research-related purposes. The bill also would modify the NRC's underlying authority to charge fees to entities that the agency regulates and would authorize the Department of Energy (DOE) to provide grants to developers of advanced nuclear technologies to help pay for the costs of developing and licensing such technologies. Finally, S. 512 would amend existing law regarding the disposition of excess uranium materials managed by DOE.

CBO estimates that implementing S. 512 would cost \$386 million over the 2018–2022 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. Pay-as-you-go procedures apply because enacting the bill would affect direct spending; however, CBO estimates that any such effects would be insignificant. Enacting S. 512 would not affect revenues.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 512 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

S. 512 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

#### ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary effect of S. 512 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 270 (energy).



|                                                             | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars— |      |      |      |      |      |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|
|                                                             | 2017                                    | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2017–2022 |
| INCREASES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION <sup>a</sup> |                                         |      |      |      |      |      |           |
| Advanced Nuclear Energy Licensing Cost-Share Grants:        |                                         |      |      |      |      |      |           |
| Estimated Authorization Level .....                         | 0                                       | 87   | 88   | 90   | 92   | 93   | 450       |
| Estimated Outlays .....                                     | 0                                       | 26   | 53   | 80   | 90   | 91   | 340       |
| Accelerated NRC Activities:                                 |                                         |      |      |      |      |      |           |
| Estimated Authorization Level .....                         | 0                                       | 10   | 10   | 10   | 10   | 10   | 50        |
| Estimated Outlays .....                                     | 0                                       | 7    | 9    | 10   | 10   | 10   | 46        |
| Total Changes:                                              |                                         |      |      |      |      |      |           |
| Estimated Authorization Level .....                         | 0                                       | 97   | 98   | 100  | 102  | 103  | 500       |
| Estimated Outlays .....                                     | 0                                       | 33   | 62   | 90   | 100  | 101  | 386       |

Note: NRC = Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

<sup>a</sup> CBO estimates that enacting the bill would have no significant effect on direct spending.

#### BASIS OF ESTIMATE

For this estimate, CBO assumes that S. 512 will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2018 and that amounts estimated to be necessary will be provided at the start of each year. Estimated outlays are based on historical spending patterns for affected activities. Advanced Nuclear Energy Licensing Cost-Share Grants

S. 512 would authorize DOE to provide grants to developers of advanced nuclear technologies to accelerate the development, licensing, and commercial deployment of those technologies. Such grants would be available for a range of costs related to those efforts, including fees charged by the NRC for licensing-related activities. Based on an analysis of information from DOE, CBO estimates that spending for such assistance under S. 512 would require appropriations totaling \$450 million over the 2018–2022 period. That estimate is in line with the total amount of funding provided by the Congress for a six-year effort, now largely completed, to support the development, certification, and licensing of small modular reactors (a type of advanced nuclear technology). Assuming appropriation of those amounts, CBO estimates that outlays would total \$340 million over the 2018–2022 period and \$110 million after 2022.

#### Accelerated NRC Activities

Funding for the NRC—which totals approximately \$1 billion in 2017—is provided in annual appropriation acts. Under current law, the agency is required to recover most of its funding through fees charged to licensees and applicants; CBO estimates that such fees, which are classified as discretionary offsetting collections, will total nearly \$900 million this year.

S. 512 would require the NRC to establish a regulatory framework for licensing advanced nuclear reactors, defined in the bill as reactors that involve significant technological improvements relative to those currently being constructed. The bill specifies that any funding provided to the NRC for activities related to developing that framework would be excluded from the portion of the agency's budget that is offset by fees the NRC collects. Based on an analysis of information from the NRC about the anticipated costs of establishing the proposed licensing regime within the timeframe specified by the bill, CBO estimates that implementing S. 512 would cost \$46 million over the 2018–2022 period, mostly for salaries and expenses for technical experts required to develop the necessary analyses and regulations.

In addition, starting in 2020, the bill would modify the existing formula used to determine the amount of NRC fees. CBO expects that the proposed modifications to the formula used to set regulatory fees charged by the NRC could change the amount of such fees collected in future years. Under both current law and S. 512, the amount of such

fees would depend on the level of funding provided for a range of specific NRC activities. Because CBO has no basis for predicting how much funding will be provided for such activities in future years, CBO cannot determine whether the resulting fees would be higher or lower under S. 512 than under current law.

#### PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS

S. 512 would amend existing law regarding the disposition of uranium materials managed by DOE. Under the bill, DOE would be required to develop plans for marketing those materials and to comply with annual limits on the volume of uranium materials placed into commercial markets. Specifically, the bill would cap sales and transfers at 2,100 metric tons per year through 2025 and at 2,700 metric tons starting in 2026. The bill also would expressly authorize DOE to market materials derived from depleted uranium, which is one of the by-products of the uranium enrichment process.

According to DOE, uranium sales and transfers averaged about 2,450 metric tons a year over the 2012–2015 period, but fell to 2,100 metric tons in 2016. Using information from studies done for the department on uranium markets, CBO estimates that the quantity of uranium that will be disposed over the 2018–2027 period under current law probably will remain below 2,100 metric tons a year. Thus, CBO estimates that the caps on sales and transfers of uranium materials in S. 512 would have no significant effect on offsetting receipts from those activities over the 2018–2027 period. (Under current law, CBO estimates that the sales of those materials will total about \$800 million over the 2018–2027 period; however, CBO expects that only a portion of that value, or \$80 million, will be deposited in the Treasury as offsetting receipts because of uncertainty surrounding DOE's budgetary treatment of these transactions.)

#### INCREASE IN LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING AND DEFICITS

CBO estimates that enacting S. 512 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT

S. 512 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

#### PREVIOUS CBO ESTIMATE

On June 12, 2017, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for S. 97, the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on March 30, 2017. Both bills contain provisions that would authorize DOE to provide cost-share grants to support the expedited development, licensing, and commercial deployment of advanced

nuclear technologies. Because those provisions are substantively the same and the estimated costs of implementing those provisions are the same in both bills. The estimated increase in spending subject to appropriation under S. 512 is greater than under S. 97 because the estimate for S. 512 includes additional costs for the NRC to meet new requirements specified by that bill.

#### ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:

Federal Costs: Megan Carroll and Kathleen Gramp; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Jon Sperl; Impact on the Private Sector: Amy Petz.

#### ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:

H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

#### NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of Steven A. Engel, of the District of Columbia, to be the Assistant Attorney General for the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel until Mr. Engel responds to questions I posed to him in a June 12, 2017, letter concerning a May 1, 2017, opinion by the Office of Legal Counsel entitled, "Authority of Individual Members of Congress to Conduct Oversight of the Executive Branch."

The Senate Judiciary Committee approved Mr. Engel's nomination on June 8, 2017, and my objection is not intended to question the credentials of Mr. Engel in any way. However, at that time, no member had sufficient opportunity to pose questions to Mr. Engel concerning the May 1, 2017, OLC opinion. I believe each Member of my committee and of the Senate should have the benefit of his views on the opinion as they consider his nomination to lead the office that created it.

The opinion erroneously states that individual Members of Congress are not constitutionally authorized to conduct oversight. It creates a false distinction between oversight and what it calls "nonoversight" requests, and it relegates requests from individual Members for information from the Executive branch to Freedom of Information Act requests. I have written a letter to the President requesting that the OLC opinion be rescinded. The Executive branch should properly recognize that individual Members of Congress have a constitutional role in seeking information from the Executive branch and



should work to voluntarily accommodate those requests.

My June 12, 2017, letter to Mr. Engel asks him several questions about the opinion, including whether the opinion met the OLC's own internal standards requiring impartial analysis, whether individual Members of Congress are "authorized" to seek information from the Executive branch, and what level of deference the Executive branch should provide to individual Member requests. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I look forward to Mr. Engel's responses.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, June 12, 2017.

STEVEN A. ENGEL,  
Care of the Office of Legislative Affairs, United  
States Department of Justice, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: recently, the Committee obtained a copy of a May 1, 2017, Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) opinion entitled "Authority of Individual Members of Congress to Conduct Oversight of the Executive Branch." That opinion asserts that individual Members of Congress in fact do not have that authority. Specifically, the opinion states, quite remarkably, that individual Members of Congress are not Constitutionally authorized to request information from the Executive Branch. It further states that requests from non-Chairmen essentially are subject to the same level of deference as a request submitted from a private, unelected member of the public pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

As you know, the Constitution imposes significant responsibilities on each and every Member of Congress that require them to make informed decisions and cast votes in the best interests of their constituents on a vast array of matters. Those responsibilities in many instances require that the Members have access to Executive Branch information. The OLC opinion did not entertain this and other key points and did not attempt to address the significant and dangerous implications it creates for the separation of powers, bipartisan congressional oversight, transparency in government, and accountability to the American people. Your views on this opinion, its incomplete analysis, and its highly problematic conclusions are very important for "individual Members" of the United States Senate to carefully weigh as they consider your nomination.

Thus, please respond to the following questions by June 26, 2017. Please number your answers according to their corresponding questions.

1. Are you familiar with the May 1, 2017 OLC opinion?

2. In your view, does this opinion meet the standards described in OLC guidance that require impartial analysis of competing authorities or authorities that may challenge an opinion's conclusions? If so, can you please point to the portion of the opinion which you believe fully discusses contrary authority or arguments for non-Chairmen's need for information from the Executive Branch to carry out their constitutional function?

3. Do you believe that individual Members of Congress, who are not Chairmen of com-

mittees, are "authorized" to seek information from the Executive Branch to inform their participation in the legislative powers of Congress? Do you believe they are authorized by the Constitution? Why or why not? Do you believe that they are authorized by Congress? Why or why not?

4. In your experience, what percentage of congressional requests for information are answered by the Executive Branch on a voluntary basis?

5. In your view, what is an appropriate reason for withholding information requested by an individual Member of Congress?

6. In your view, does the Executive Branch have any Constitutional responsibility to respond to requests for information from individual Members of Congress as part of a process of accommodation in order to promote comity between the branches? If not, why not?

7. Is a request from an individual, elected Member of Congress entitled to any greater weight than a FOIA request, given the Member's broad Constitutionally mandated legislative responsibilities? Why or why not?

Thank you for your cooperation in this important matter. Should you have questions, please contact DeLisa Lay of my Committee staff.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO LARRY VOYLES

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to congratulate Larry Voyles, the former executive director of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, for his 40 years of dedicated service to the State of Arizona and the Nation.

Larry recently retired from the helm of my home State's wildlife management agency. He leaves with a litany of accolades and achievements that underscore a remarkable career. During his time at the department, Larry also served in a variety of national posts that advanced Federal policies important to outdoor sports and wildlife conservation, including as president of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Larry first began at the department as a district manager and eventually ascended to become the agency's top training officer and later a regional director before being selected by the Arizona Game and Fish Commission to serve as the executive director for the past 8 years.

Faced with daunting challenges like regional drought and catastrophic wildfires, Larry proved time and again that the department understands how to care for the land and the large variety of animal life in the Grand Canyon State. Larry also knows the importance of safeguarding a State's right to manage wildlife populations without undue interference from the Federal Government, and he remains a tireless advocate for sportsmen community and those pursuing meaningful wildlife conservation.

I thank Larry, my friend, for his honorable service at the Arizona Department of Game and Fish and wish him the best in his future endeavors.●

##### TRIBUTE TO DARYL DELABBIO

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to mark the distinguished 40-year public service career of Daryl Delabbio of Kent County, MI. Mr. Delabbio is widely regarded as one of the Nation's preeminent municipal managers, helping lead his region to growth and prosperity with an unwavering devotion to financial stability and customer service. Mr. Delabbio is retiring as the administrator of Kent County, a position he has held for the past 19 years. Prior to that role, he served as assistant Kent County administrator for 3 years and as manager of the city of Rockford, MI, for 11 years. Mr. Delabbio began his municipal career in 1977 as administrative coordinator for the city of Rockwood, before joining Garden City, MI, as director of administrative services.

Mr. Delabbio has presided over a county that emerged from Michigan's historic economic downturn as the fastest growing county in the State. His success has stemmed from building important partnerships, while prioritizing excellent citizen services and encouraging diversity and inclusion throughout the county. He has distinguished himself by spearheading many of the successful public and private partnerships that have become the hallmark of Kent County's prosperity. Mr. Delabbio was one of the founders of the Kent County/Grand Rapids Convention and Arena Authority, an organization whose work has greatly advanced the economic development of Kent County. The authority's development of a downtown convention center and sports and entertainment arena have become catalysts for the economic vitality of Grand Rapids, Michigan's second-largest city.

Mr. Delabbio has shown a dedication to lifelong learning by creating various educational programs for county staff and a strong commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion. In 2001, he helped create the Cultural Insight Council. This self-directed, interdepartmental workgroup is comprised of employees from diverse backgrounds, representing all levels of the organization.

Under his stewardship as county administrator and controller, Kent County has attained the highest possible bond ratings for 19 consecutive years. These triple-A ratings have allowed the county to finance important community projects at the lowest cost possible. Kent County has achieved many milestones under Mr. Delabbio's tenure, from the construction of Millennium Park and the Kent County courthouse, to the expansion of the Kent County jail and the transition of the county Department of Aeronautics to a

regional airport authority. Mr. Delabbio has worked with over 60 elected Kent County commissioners and is held in the highest regard by his peers around the country and globe. He has served as a regional vice president of the International City County Management Association, an organization with over 9,000 members worldwide, as well as a board member on many other organizations, including the Grand Valley Metropolitan Council, Experience Grand Rapids, and The Right Place, Inc.

Mr. Delabbio holds a bachelor of science degree in political science and master of management from Aquinas College, as well as a master of public administration from Wayne State University and a Ph.D. from Western Michigan University. He has been an adjunct professor at Davenport University and plans to continue teaching and sharing his expertise with others in his retirement.

Mr. Delabbio's colleagues in Kent County have praised him for work that has embodied what it means to be a public servant: resourceful, thoughtful, creative, and dedicated. Mr. Delabbio's decades of work have set the standard for excellence and integrity for municipal managers throughout the State of Michigan, while mentoring many others who share his passion for public service. Those that know him will also attest that Mr. Delabbio is a humble man of impeccable character.

I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Daryl Delabbio for his decades of public service to the citizens of Kent County, MI. His selfless, quiet leadership has left behind a legacy of growth and achievement that will benefit them for decades to come.●

#### REMEMBERING JOHN BERLIN MCCANTS

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor the life of a dear friend and a true American hero, Mr. John Berlin McCants of Goose Creek, SC.

He served around the world in the U.S. Army for 22 years before retiring in 1975 and settling in Goose Creek with his wife and children. In 1992, he was elected to a seat on the Goose Creek City Council where he served for an outstanding 24 years. John was a lifetime leader with a compassionate spirit. He dedicated so much of his life helping those who cannot help themselves. For that, he will be remembered not only as a devoted public servant, but also an inspiration to so many people around South Carolina.

I can tell you that he certainly had a positive impact on my life. John was my political mentor. He taught me the ABCs of being an effective leader and a public servant who remains committed to the greater good of our State and country.

The A stands for personal accountability. John taught me that, as a Member, I should always be accountable for my decisions and choices. B is for backbone. John once told me that we seldom find that Members have backbones, and that it is critical for me to use it when necessary, to stand up for what is right. C is for common sense. He taught me that it is important to not let fear and political ideology deter me from common sense. These great lessons stick with me everyday as I walk the halls of the U.S. Capitol and make decisions on behalf of South Carolina and the entire Nation.

Simply put, John was a great person and a mentor to many; I am thankful to have known him. He truly did represent the very best of our State. To Christina, his wife, and their wonderful family, John is forever in our hearts, and I would like to add his legacy to our June 20, 2017, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.●

#### REMEMBERING HAROLD HAUGLAND

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of a brave Montanan and American, Harold Haugland.

Harold's story begins in Glendive, MT, where he was born in 1928 to Peter and Alma Haugland. Harold and his family were well known in the community for their compassionate hearts and unrelenting work ethic. Harold took these Montana values to the U.S. Army in 1949, where he quickly became a highly decorated soldier, receiving a number of medals and citations.

In late November 1950, Harold joined the Company D, 15th antiaircraft Artillery Battalion, 7th Infantry Division.

Two thousand five hundred U.S. and 700 South Korean soldiers were deployed east of the Chosin Reservoir in North Korea when they were engaged by an overwhelming number of Chinese forces. By early December, the U.S. Army evacuated approximately 1,500 wounded servicemembers; the remaining soldiers had been either captured or killed in enemy territory.

Because Harold could not be accounted for by his unit at the end of the battle, he was reported missing in action as of December 2, 1950. Harold's name did not appear on any prisoner of war lists, and no returning soldiers reported him as a prisoner of war. The U.S. Army declared him deceased as of December 31, 1953.

In 1954, a number of remains were recovered from north of the Korean Demilitarized Zone. However, Harold's remains were not included and he was declared nonrecoverable. After his death, Harold was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for his heroism and leadership.

During a joint recovery operation in 2004, Harold's remains were found in a

mass grave on the eastern bank of the Chosin Reservoir in North Korea. Thanks to recent technological advancements in forensic science, the U.S. Department of Defense positively identified one of the individuals as Harold Haugland. After nearly 66 years, an American hero has been brought home to Montana for a full and proper military burial.

Harold represents the very best that this Nation has to offer with his profound bravery and dedication to service. Like many before him and after him, Harold paid the ultimate sacrifice to protect the freedoms that make the United States the greatest Nation in the world.

To Harold and his family, on behalf of myself, Montana, and a grateful nation, I extend our deepest thanks for Harold's service, sacrifice, and valor.●

#### REMEMBERING FRANK MCCAULEY

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor an American hero.

Frank McCauley passed away last week peacefully in Hamilton, MT. Frank was the oldest living fighter pilot ace from World War II.

He originally joined the Army at the beginning of America's entry into the war, but quickly then turned to the Air Force where he discovered his passion and skill as one of our Nation's first fighter pilots.

Frank flew his P-47 fighter "Rat Racer" on 46 missions while supporting B-17 bombers in the European Theatre, and he is credited with shooting down five and a half Nazi aircrafts. For this he received a Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, and four Air Medals.

In 2015, Frank and his family were flown to Washington, DC, and he was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honor that Congress can bestow on an individual for his service during World War II.

After leaving the Air Force, Frank had three sons—Craig, Kirk, and Kevin—and he built a life on the west coast with a successful career in the construction business. In 1974, Frank retired, married the love of his life, Bobbie, and moved to the Bitterroot Valley in western Montana.

It was in Montana where Frank and Bobbie enjoyed their retirement years by traveling in their motor home and organizing numerous parties for their friends, family, and neighbors.

Frank McCauley embodies the Greatest Generation, and he is a symbol for the American dream.

He is survived by his wife, Bobbie McCauley; sons, Craig, Kirk, and Kevin; stepdaughter, Nancy Cook; and numerous grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and great-great-grandchildren.

To ensure Frank's life story is preserved and to honor the contributions

he has made to our country, I am proud to enshrine his story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1913. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Whistleblower Awards Process" (RIN3038-AE50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1914. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2017-2018 Marketing Year" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0107) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1915. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations" (Docket No. AMS-LPS-15-0084) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1916. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report entitled, "Acceptance of Contributions for Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account" and a semiannual listing of personal property contributed by coalition partners; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1917. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an increase in the Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) for the Chemical Demilitarization—Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1918. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) transmitting, pursuant to law, the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) 2016 Accreditation Report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1919. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Reporting and Notification Requirements and Other Clarifying Changes for Imported Fruits, Vegetables, and Specialty Crops" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0083) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1920. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Lease Continuation Through Operations" (RIN1014-AA35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1921. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1922. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Materials from Peru" (RIN1515-AE29) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1923. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Open Payments Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1924. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Merchandise Produced by Convict, Forced, or Indentured Labor; Conforming Amendment and Technical Corrections" (RIN1515-AE22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1925. A communication from the Chair of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1926. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Humanitarian Use Devices; 21st Century Cures Act; Technical Amendment" (Docket No. FDA-2017-N-0011)

received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1927. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the actuarial status of the railroad retirement system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1928. A communication from the Acting Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1929. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Updating Amendments to Executive Branch Financial Disclosure and Standards of Ethical Conduct Regulations" (RIN3209-AA00 and RIN3209-AA04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1930. A communication from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report from the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1931. A communication from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1932. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments" (RIN0648-BG86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1933. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Marine Events and Fireworks Displays within the Fifth Coast Guard District" ((RIN1625-AA08 and RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0064)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1934. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Detroit Symphony Orchestra Fireworks, Lake St. Clair, Grosse Pointe Shores, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0349)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1935. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River,

Vidalia, LA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0451)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1936. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; PUSH Beaver County/Beaver County Boom, Ohio River, Miles 25.2 to 25.6, Beaver, PA” (Docket No. USCG-2017-0390) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1937. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones; Coast Guard Sector Ohio Valley Annual and Recurring Safety Zones Update” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1938. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0300)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1939. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Mill Creek, Hampton, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0075)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1940. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0399)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1941. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Chicago River, Chicago, IL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0347)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1942. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Chincoteague Channel, Chincoteague Islands, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0248)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1943. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Columbia River, Goble, OR” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0488)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1944. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Navy Underwater Detonation (UNDET) Exercise, Apra Outer Harbor, GU” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0412)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1945. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Hope Chest Buffalo Niagara Dragon Boat Festival, Buffalo River, Buffalo, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0275)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1946. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Local Regulation; Motor City Mile; Detroit River, Detroit, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0372)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1947. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; East River and Buttermilk Channel, Brooklyn, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0401)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1948. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the global defense posture (OSS-2017-0589); to the Committees on Armed Services; Appropriations; and Foreign Relations.

EC-1949. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Spirotetramat; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9961-95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1950. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Isometamid; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9961-80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1951. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cumene Sulfonic Acid and its Ammonium, Calcium, Magnesium, Potassium, Sodium and Zinc salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9961-68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1952. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Read-

ness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense’s Evaluation of the TRICARE Program for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1953. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility (Washington County, IN, et al.)” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2017-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1954. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Wassenaar Arrangement 2015 Plenary Agreements Implementation, Removal of Foreign National Review Requirements, and Information Security Updates; Corrections” (RIN0694-AG85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1955. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Economic Development Administration Regulatory Revision” (RIN0610-AA66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1956. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of New Reactors, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Physical Security Hardware - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria” (NUREG-0800, Section 14.3.12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1957. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approvals; TN; Prong 4-2010 NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS” (FRL No. 9963-48-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1958. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9961-19-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1959. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Clean Air Act Requirements for Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance and Nonattainment Source Review” (FRL No. 9962-48-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1960. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Imperial County Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Sources Permits" (FRL No. 9962-57-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1961. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Dental Category" (FRL No. 9957-10-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1962. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous" (Rev. Proc. 2017-34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1963. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Announcement of the Results of the Phase III Allocation Round of the Qualifying Gasification Project Program" (Announcement 2017-06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1964. A communication from the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Foreign-Trade Zones in the United States" (RIN0625-AA81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1965. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS-2017-0624); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1966. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-68, "Child Neglect and Sex Trafficking Temporary Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1967. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-69, "Grocery Store Restrictive Covenant Prohibition Temporary Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1968. A communication from the Inspector General of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period from October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1969. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1970. A communication from the Acting Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity

Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1971. A communication from the Chief of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisher Houses and Other Temporary Lodging" (RIN2900-AP45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1972. A communication from the Chief of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expanded Delegation Authority for Procedures Related to Representation of Claimants" (RIN2900-AP96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2017; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1973. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF333) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1974. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of International Affairs and Seafood Inspection, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fish and Fish Product Import Provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act" (RIN0648-AY15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1975. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Annual Catch Limits; National Standard Guidelines" (RIN0648-AV60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

H.R. 494. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-114).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Ronald J. Place, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Capt. William C. Greene, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. William S. Dillon, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Karl O. Thomas, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Jay B. Silveria, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Samuel J. Paparo, Jr., to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Gregory N. Harris, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Army nomination of Col. John P. Lawlor, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Dion B. Moten, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Bowlman T. Bowles III, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Daniel J. MacDonnell, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Daniel B. Hendrickson and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Matthew A. Zirkle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nomination of Capt. Jacquelyn McClelland, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. James M. Butler, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Eugene A. Burcher and ending with Capt. Richard A. Rodriguez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Keith M. Jones, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Bret C. Batchelder, to be Rear Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Col. DeAnna M. Burt, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Stephen R. Hogan, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Janson D. Boyles, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Steven W. Ainsworth and ending with Col. Irene M. Zoppi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Gregory L. Kennedy and ending with Brig. Gen. Andrew P. Schafer, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Christopher P. Callahan, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. James P. Begley III and ending with Brig. Gen. Gary S. Yaple, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Ann M. Burkhardt, to be Rear Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Scott A. Howell, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. James C. Vechery, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Horlander, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Andrew L. Lewis, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Matthew J. Kohler, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Kevin M. Donegan, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert F. Hedelund, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. James G. Foggio III, to be Admiral.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of

reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Jered N. Fry, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Christopher R. Boney and ending with Daniel D. Reyes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Air Force nomination of Jeffrey A. Garrett, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Roger A. Lee and ending with Jeffrey R. Rosenberry, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Air Force nomination of Theodore L. Wilson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jason S. Cross, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Angela M. Mike, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Matthew V. Chauviere and ending with Lauren A. May, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michael E. Bruhn and ending with Victor D. Weeden, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jeffrey W. Drake and ending with Jack Vilardi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Air Force nominations beginning with Megan E. Anderson and ending with Rajeev S. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Air Force nomination of Jose G. Bal, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Jennifer M. Bager and ending with Ramey L. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 27, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Alfred C. Anderson and ending with Kelley Tomsett, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 27, 2017.

Army nomination of William F. McClintock, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with David S. Allen and ending with Barry K. Vincent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 18, 2017.

Army nomination of Jeffrey L. Washington, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Joseph B. Dore, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher M. Chung and ending with Heath D. Holt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Devin G. Mccane and ending with Sharri L. Ormsbee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Army nomination of Janna X. Gaddy, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Bradley H. Stephens and ending with Amilyn M.

Taplin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Army nomination of Terry Kim, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Jeff A. Burchfield and ending with Brian D. Wieck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2017.

Marine Corps nomination of Jason K. Fettig, to be Colonel.

Navy nominations beginning with Juanito F. Boydon, Jr. and ending with Suresh K. Thadhani, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony L. Bayungan and ending with Michael A. Leachman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Todd M. Boland and ending with Kail C. Swindle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with James G. Adams and ending with Charles C. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Shawn G. Denihan and ending with Chad A. Runyon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Kelvin J. Askew and ending with Erika L. Berry, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Kathleen A. Allen and ending with Christopher Frye, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Navy nomination of Bruce E. Osborne, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Colette M. Murphy and ending with John A. Robinson III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Nathan R. Anderson and ending with Jodie M. C. Yim, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nomination of Adria R. Schneck, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Mary A. Ponce and ending with Brian K. Reed, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Ryan K. Mahelona and ending with Philip L. Notz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Joseph T. Bailey and ending with Jonpaul Stefani, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nomination of David W. Shaieb, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Lee A. Axtell and ending with Mark S. Winward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Thomas M. Bestafka and ending with Francis J.

Stavish, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nomination of Danny W. King, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Babak A. Barakat and ending with Stephen M. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael J. Allanson and ending with Gerard J. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew L. Beran and ending with Ian S. Wexler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Garland H. Andrews and ending with Meredith L. Yeager, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Oladapo A. Akintonde and ending with Sean R. Wise, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeff A. Bleile and ending with Jeffrey G. Zeller, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Grady G. Duffey, Jr. and ending with David A. Vondrak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with William M. Kafka and ending with William R. Urban, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel E. Fillion and ending with Jason D. Weddle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Damon B. Dixon and ending with Jonathan J. Vorrath, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with James W. Adkisson III and ending with Sherri R. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Cory S. Brummett and ending with David J. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Julie M. Alfieri and ending with Brett A. Wise, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew E. Arnold and ending with Anthony C. Taranto, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Peter A. Arrobbio and ending with Kevin J. Watkins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with John A. Anderson and ending with Jay A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.



Navy nominations beginning with Lawrence H. Kennedy and ending with Tracie A. Severson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Jose G. Hernandez and ending with Derek A. Vestal, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with David A. Abernathy and ending with Jesse J. Zimbauer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nomination of Kenneth M. King, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Garry P. Closas, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul D. Melvey and ending with Alexander Woldemariam, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with William J. Bailey, Jr. and ending with Christopher D. Tucker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Gina A. Buono and ending with Sandra F. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with David J. Allen and ending with Tracie M. Zielinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with David M. Buzzetti and ending with Eric R. Vetter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with David E. Bailey and ending with Christopher J. Stewart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with John R. Adams and ending with Mary C. Wise, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Sean A. Cox and ending with Luis A. Perez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Elizabeth W. Bundt and ending with Michael G. Watson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2017.

Navy nomination of Miguel A. Santiesteban, to be Commander.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1380. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize officers to opt out of promotion board consideration for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1381. A bill to require a report on the extension of authorities to the United States Special Operations Command for the development, acquisition, and sustainment of special operations-peculiar technology, equipment, and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1382. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to temporarily suspend officer grade tables to attract more talent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1384. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1385. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1386. A bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation and to ensure that employers consider these requests, and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain occupations with evidence of unpredictable and unstable scheduling practices that negatively affect employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. Kaine, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 195. A resolution recognizing June 20, 2017, as "World Refugee Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that

major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 34

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 34, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes.

S. 58

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 58, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 75

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 75, a bill to provide for the reconsideration of claims for disability compensation for veterans who were the subjects of experiments by the Department of Defense during World War II that were conducted to assess the effects of mustard gas or lewisite on people, and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 167, a bill to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for non-preemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 374

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 374, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit.



S. 534

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 913

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 913, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish an initiative, carried out by the Assistant Secretary for Aging, to coordinate Federal efforts and programs for home modifications enabling older individuals to live independently and safely in a home environment, and for other purposes.

S. 929

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 929, a bill to improve the HUBZone program.

S. 1008

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1008, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1237

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1237, a bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1320, a bill to reform apportionments to general aviation airports under the airport improvement program, to improve project delivery at certain airports, and to designate certain airports as disaster relief airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1349

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to provide that the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisors to the commanders of the combatant commands shall be equivalent to the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for other purposes.

S. 1354

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1354, a bill to establish an Individual Market Reinsurance fund to provide funding for State individual market stabilization reinsurance programs.

S.J. RES. 46

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 46, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 154, a resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

S. RES. 194

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 194, a resolution designating June 15, 2017, as "World Elder Abuse Awareness Day".

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, ensuring that more Americans are better prepared financially for their retirement is one of my top priorities.

That is why I rise to reintroduce with my colleague, Senator NELSON, the Retirement Security Act of 2017. Our bill would encourage more small employers to offer retirement plans, provide incentives for employees to save more for retirement, and make it easier for low- and middle-income taxpayers to claim tax benefits for retirement savings already authorized in law.

According to the non-partisan Center for Retirement Research, there is an estimated \$7.7 trillion gap between the savings American households need to maintain their standard of living in retirement and what they actually have. A recent Gallup poll found that only 54 percent of working Americans believe that they will have enough money to live comfortably in retirement. We must continue to work to ensure that more Americans will have the resources they need to enjoy their "golden years."

The Social Security Administration's most recent report noted that 61 percent of all beneficiaries rely on Social Security for more than half of their income. Many seniors in my State rely almost entirely on Social Security to cover their monthly expenses, despite the fact that the average annual benefit is only about \$16,000 per year. It is hard to imagine stretching those dollars far enough to pay the bills—certainly a "comfortable retirement" is out of the question.

Sadly, they fare no better when it comes to savings: a survey by the Federal Reserve found that nearly half of individuals do not have enough savings to cover an emergency expense of \$400. That is not even enough to buy new tires for a car. For this reason, among others, Americans need to increase their personal savings so that we can better weather financial emergencies without raiding our retirement accounts.

There are many reasons why Americans have struggled to save for retirement, including the shift away from employer-based "defined benefit" plans, or pensions; the severity of the recent financial crisis; rising health care costs; the need for expensive long-term care; and most of all, the fact that Americans are living far longer than they did in the past. Many Americans reaching retirement age also have more debt than retirees of previous generations.

Another contributing factor is that employees of small businesses are much less likely to participate in employer-based retirement plans. According to a study by the PEW Charitable Trusts, more than 30 million U.S. workers lack access to a work-based plan to save for retirement.

Making it easier for smaller businesses to offer retirement plans for their workers would make a significant difference in the financial security of many Americans. That is why the bill we are introducing today focuses on reducing the cost and complexity of retirement plans, especially for small businesses, and on encouraging individuals to save more for retirement. Let me describe the provisions of the bill:

First, our bill would make it easier for businesses to enter into multiple employer plans, known as MEPs, to offer retirement programs to their employees. MEPs permit small companies to share the administrative burden of a retirement plan, which helps lower costs. Current law discourages the use of MEPs because it requires a connection, or “nexus,” between unrelated businesses in order to join a MEP, such as membership in the same trade association. Our bill would waive the nexus requirement for businesses.

Second, our bill makes joining a MEP a more attractive option for small businesses. Under current law, if one employer in a MEP fails to meet the minimum criteria necessary for retirement plans to obtain tax benefits, all employers and their employees could lose these tax benefits—which are substantial. For employees, benefits include delaying the taxation of income contributed to a plan until funds are withdrawn. For employers, plan disqualification could result in limited deductions and a higher tax burden. Our bill would address this uncertainty, and protect members of a MEP from the failure of one bad apple to meet its obligations.

Third, our bill would reduce the cost of maintaining a retirement plan. Current law requires that participants in a retirement plan receive a variety of notices. Our bill would direct Treasury to simplify, clarify, and consolidate these required notices to lessen costs.

Fourth, the Retirement Security Act would encourage those still in the workforce to save more for retirement. Retirement plans are often designed to comply with existing safe harbors to prevent the IRS from challenging the tax benefits that flow to employees and employers. The existing safe harbor for so-called “automatic enrollment” plans effectively caps employee contributions at ten percent of annual pay, with the employer contributing a “matching” amount of up to six percent. Our bill would create an additional safe harbor for these plans that would allow employees to receive an employer match on contributions of up

to ten percent of their pay. Employees would be able to contribute more than ten percent, albeit without an employer match for contributions above ten percent.

I recognize that businesses that choose to adopt a plan with this new optional safe harbor may face additional costs due to the increased employer match. That is why our bill would also help the smallest businesses—those with fewer than 100 employees—offset this cost by providing a new tax credit equal to the increased match.

I should note that the new retirement plan options for businesses included in our bill are just that—options. No business, large or small, would be required to offer its employees a retirement plan under the Retirement Security Act.

Finally, our bill would ensure that current measures to encourage savings are functioning as they were intended. One such measure is the so-called “saver’s credit,” which reduces the tax burden on low- and middle-income individuals who contribute to retirement plans, including IRAs and 401(k) plans. Yet the credit cannot be claimed on a Form 1040EZ, which is frequently used by these individuals. A 2013 Transamerica Center for Retirement Studies survey found that only 23 percent of people with household incomes of less than \$50,000 per year, the group most likely to qualify, were aware of the saver’s credit. To address this, our bill directs Treasury to make the credit available on Form 1040 EZ.

Mr. President, during my time as chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, I have heard countless stories of retirees whose savings did not go as far as they anticipated. Adequate savings reduce poverty among our seniors. As the HELP Committee noted in a July 2012 report, poverty among our seniors also increases Medicare and Medicaid costs and strains our social safety net. Giving those not yet at retirement age more opportunities to save, and to save more, would help ease this additional burden on entitlement programs that already are projected to be unsustainable.

In light of the positive effects this bill would have in strengthening retirement security for millions of Americans, I urge my colleagues to join Senator NELSON and me in supporting the Retirement Security Act of 2017.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1385. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

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

S. 1385

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “North American Development Bank Improvement Act of 2017”.

#### SEC. 2. GENERAL CAPITAL INCREASE.

Part 2 of subtitle D of title V of Public Law 103-182 (22 U.S.C. 290m et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SEC. 547. FIRST CAPITAL INCREASE.

“(a) SUBSCRIPTION AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to subscribe on behalf of the United States to, and make payment for, 150,000 additional shares of the capital stock of the Bank.

“(b) LIMITATION.—Any subscription by the United States to the capital stock of the Bank shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.”.

#### SEC. 3. POLICY GOALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to projects within the mission and scope of the North American Development Bank on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and pursuant to section 2 of article II of the Charter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the representatives of the United States to the Board of Directors of the Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to support the financing of projects related to—

(1) environmental infrastructure relating to water pollution, wastewater treatment, water conservation, municipal solid waste, and related matters;

(2) natural gas, including natural gas pipelines and combined cycle power plants, with major emphasis on cross-border energy distribution and consumption and the energy security of the United States and Mexico; and

(3) the expansion or new construction of international land border crossings to help facilitate the flow of goods and people across the international land border between the United States and Mexico while reducing wait times at border crossings and improving air quality by reducing pollution related to vehicular and commercial traffic.

(b) CHARTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Charter” means the Agreement Concerning the Establishment of a Border Environment Cooperation Commission and a North American Development Bank, signed at Washington and Mexico November 16 and 18, 1993, and entered into force January 1, 1994 (TIAS 12516), between the United States and Mexico.

#### SEC. 4. EFFICIENCIES AND STREAMLINING.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the representatives of the United States to the Board of Directors of the North American Development Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to seek to require the Bank to develop and implement efficiency improvements to streamline and accelerate the project certification and financing process, including through initiatives such as single certifications for revolving facilities, programmatic certification of similar groups of small projects, expansion of internal authority to approve qualified projects below certain monetary thresholds, and expedited certification for public sector projects subject to lender bidding processes.

**SEC. 5. PERFORMANCE MEASURES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the representatives of the United States to the Board of Directors of the North American Development Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to seek to require the Bank to develop performance measures that—

(1) demonstrate how projects and financing approved by the Bank are meeting the Bank's mission and providing added value to the region near the international land border between the United States and Mexico; and

(2) are reviewed and updated not less frequently than annually.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress, with the submission to Congress of the budget of the President for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a report on progress in imposing the performance measures described in subsection (a).

---

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

---

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 195—RECOGNIZING JUNE 20, 2017, AS “WORLD REFUGEE DAY”

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution to mark World Refugee Day, and to address the ongoing displacement crisis across the globe. War, conflict and persecution have forced millions of people to leave their homes, creating more refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced people than at any other time in history. Today, there are more than 65 million displaced men, women, and children worldwide, the highest level ever recorded in history. To put this number into perspective—if the global displaced population were a country, it would be the 21st largest country, more populated than the United Kingdom.

The global displacement trends we are witnessing now, due to conflict, severe human rights abuses, and climate change, are not going away. U.S. leadership in responding to these crises, whether it is the immense suffering of refugees from South Sudan or the plight of the internally-displaced in Syria and Iraq, is critical. How we respond—or whether we respond at all—will undoubtedly shape the landscape and the lives of future generations for years to come.

The United States has a long and proud history of providing safe harbor to the world's most vulnerable refugees—women and children, survivors of torture and other violence, and those with severe medical conditions. This included after World War II and after

the fall of Saigon, when we resettled hundreds of thousands of refugees.

At the same time, we take the security of our citizens seriously. That is the reason the United States has the most rigorous refugee screening process in the world, involving the Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and National Counter Terrorism Center. The process includes biometric checks, medical screenings, forensic testing of documents, DNA testing for family reunification cases, and in-person interviews with highly trained homeland security officials.

The U.S. Refugee Resettlement program has been and should remain open to those of all nationalities and religions who face persecution. The Trump Administration's proposals that would have the U.S. State Department disqualify refugees from protection based on their nationality or religion fly in the face of the very principles this Nation was built upon. They also contradict the legacy of leadership our country has historically demonstrated, and dishonor our shared humanity.

It is clear, however, that the Trump Administration is determined to undermine longstanding American tradition and values, and in doing so they weaken our National security. As we all know, one of President Trump's first executive orders sought to drastically reduce the number of refugees entering the United States and turn away refugees from Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. This un-American policy, rooted in fear not fact, cannot be tolerated. We collectively must reject the misplaced notion that some refugees are more deserving of protection than others.

Again and again, the Federal courts are signaling to the White House a real need for the President to immediately rescind his discriminatory executive order targeting Muslim refugees and travelers. Even while stayed by the courts, President Trump's executive orders have made America less safe, damaged our relationships with our allies, and harmed countless numbers of law-abiding citizens, travelers, and their families. America is a compassionate nation steeped with a history of welcoming immigrants and refugees.

I was proud to join Members of Congress who filed legal briefs in opposition to the President's discriminatory executive orders, along with HIAS in Silver Spring, Maryland, whose motto is to “welcome the stranger” and “protect the refugee.” Recently the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit provided a valuable check and balance on the President's authority. The court correctly pointed out that the President's most recent Executive Order “speaks with vague words of national security, but in context drips with religious intolerance, animus, and dis-

crimination” which violates the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. No American president is above the law.

Turning away refugees—whether they are from Syria or Somalia, Burma or Iraq, whether they are Muslims or Christians, Hindus or Jews—means turning our backs on the international humanitarian system and the mechanisms of stability and security that are the bedrocks of international order. Refugees remain powerful ambassadors of the American Dream and our Nation's founding principles of equal opportunity, religious freedom, and liberty and justice for all.

The Trump Administration again revealed its determination to erode American leadership with the release of its Fiscal Year 2018 Budget request. Their FY18 budget represents a wholesale repudiation of U.S. global leadership on virtually every critical matter, including humanitarian assistance and protection of the most vulnerable populations. The President's budget called for a 44 percent cut in humanitarian assistance—a truly horrifying reduction made even more appalling given the level of global need. According to a group of leading NGOs, the human cost of these cuts could be staggering. The proposed 18 percent cut to the Migration and Refugee Assistance account could result in over 3.5 million refugees and internally displaced persons not receiving assistance globally, including about 1 million in the Middle East and 1.1 million in Africa.

The United States has been a beacon of hope for so many around the world for centuries, and it is imperative that we remain so for others in this century, and beyond. We need to be unified on this and the United States must lead by example. It is a universal human desire to live in peace and security and to create a better life for our families and loved ones. We must do our part to facilitate that. We need to keep our doors—and our hearts—open to those who so desperately need safe harbor.

#### S. RES. 195

Whereas World Refugee Day is an opportunity to acknowledge the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children forced to flee their homes due to conflict, violence, and persecution;

Whereas according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this Resolution as “UNHCR”)—

(1) there are more than 65,600,000 displaced people worldwide, the highest level ever recorded, including nearly 22,500,000 refugees, more than 40,300,000 internally displaced people, and 2,800,000 people seeking asylum;

(2) children account for 51 percent of the global refugee population, millions of whom are unable to access basic services, including education;

(3) 10,300,000 people were newly displaced due to conflict or persecution in 2016;

(4) more than 5,500,000 refugees have fled Syria since the start of the conflict, and more than 6,300,000 people are displaced inside Syria;

(5) since January 2014, more than 3,000,000 Iraqis fleeing violence have been internally displaced, and 257,000 refugees have fled to neighboring countries;

(6) South Sudan has the world's fastest-growing refugee crisis, which is now the largest refugee crisis in Africa, with more than 1,800,000 refugees, including 1,000,000 children;

(7) increasing violence in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras has led to a growing number of unaccompanied child refugees, who are particularly vulnerable to sexual violence, human trafficking, and kidnapping; and

(8) ongoing conflict, violence, and persecution have resulted in the displacement of millions in Ukraine, Colombia, and the Central African Republic;

Whereas 84 percent of the world's refugees are hosted in developing regions, with more than 28 percent hosted in the world's least developed countries;

Whereas refugees who are women and children are often at greater risk of violence, human trafficking, exploitation, and gender-based violence;

Whereas the United States resettlement program is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which reflects American values, strengthens global security, and alleviates the burden placed on front-line host countries;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted travelers to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas refugees contribute to their communities by starting businesses, paying taxes, and sharing their cultural traditions; and

Whereas refugees contribute more than they consume in state-funded services, including schooling and health care:

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of the millions of refugees;

(2) recognizes those individuals who have risked their lives working individually and for nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, such as UNHCR, to provide life-saving assistance and protection for people displaced by conflict around the world;

(3) underscores the importance of the United States Refugee Resettlement Program as a critical tool for United States global leadership;

(4) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue providing robust funding for refugee protection overseas and resettlement in the United States;

(B) to uphold its international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance and protection of the most vulnerable populations; and

(C) to alleviate the burden on refugee host countries through humanitarian and development support while maintaining the United States' long-standing tradition of resettling the most vulnerable refugees regardless of their country of origin or religious beliefs;

(5) reaffirms the goals of World Refugee Day; and

(6) reiterates the strong commitment of the United States to seek to protect the millions of refugees who live without material, social, or legal protections.

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Steven Andrew Engel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Attorney General for the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel, dated June 20, 2017.

## ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Wednesday, June 21; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Mandelker nomination postcloture; finally, that all time during morning business, recess, adjournment, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Mandelker nomination.

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

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WICKER and Senator HASSAN.

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

The Senator from Mississippi.

### BUILDING AND SUSTAINING A LARGER NAVY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, let's talk about the size of our Navy's fleet.

The current fleet has 276 ships, but the Navy's requirement is now for 355 ships—a figure supported by congressionally mandated future fleet architecture studies.

Last week, I spoke on the floor about the national imperative to build a larger Navy. I outlined the critical missions that our Navy performs every day to help secure the country's vital interests. I also described an intense naval competition with our real and potential adversaries. This is a competition America cannot afford to lose.

America needs a bigger Navy. How do we get there? Related to that question is when we get to a 355-ship fleet. According to the Chief of Naval Operations, ADM John Richardson, we should reach our 355-ship objective in the mid-2020s. To do that, we should have started yesterday. Building and sustaining technologically advanced

ships is a long-term national project. It cannot happen overnight. It takes years.

As chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, I intend to lay a firm foundation this year to help support a buildup. Based on my subcommittee's work, I am convinced that Congress has a critical role to play in determining how we get to 355. All options should be on the table. Here are four ideas to consider.

No. 1, ramp up hot production lines.

The Navy's accelerated fleet plan states that over the next 7 years, the shipbuilding industrial base can support building more ships than are currently planned. The Navy plans to build 59, but the shipbuilders can actually complete 88. We should do this. Many hot production lines have excess capacity. Congress should authorize the Navy to "buy in bulk," using multiyear and block buy contracts. These contracts would help solidify the skilled workforce, stimulate suppliers, and drive down costs. We can also authorize advance procurement funding to buy long-lead-time pieces and parts.

No. 2, extend the service life of ships in the fleet.

A quarter century ago, the Navy had 450 ships and deployments that averaged 167 days. Now the average deployment exceeds 200 days. In other words, the Navy is smaller, but the tempo of its operations has accelerated. An extra month of deployment puts additional wear and tear on ships, and this can force early retirement and ultimately squander taxpayer dollars.

Better maintenance can extend ships' service lives, delay retirement, and help us reach the 355-ship goal faster. I applaud the President's budget request for fully funding ship depot maintenance. We must build new ships and maintain the current fleet better.

In a recent speech to the Naval War College, the CNO, Admiral Richardson, noted that extending the lives of *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers could help the Navy reach the 355-ship objective 10 to 15 years earlier. The commander of Navy Sea Systems Command, VADM Thomas Moore, agreed with the CNO in a recent speech in which he stated that proper maintenance would extend service lives and help grow the fleet more rapidly.

No. 3, reactivate ships in the Ready Reserve fleet.

During the Reagan buildup, the Navy brought ships out of mothballs, including battleships with massive guns, to help grow the fleet size. The Navy should look at the Reserve fleet ship by ship to determine if any can be restored to operational status.

In his Naval War College speech, the CNO revealed that he is considering bringing some retired *Oliver Hazard Perry*-class frigates out of mothballs. Vice Admiral Moore also suggested examining the merits of returning some logistics ships to the force.

Reactivating retired ships does not simply mean bringing back less capable ships. Jerry Hendrix and Robert C. O'Brien wrote in *POLITICO* in April that reactivated ships could be outfitted with modern missile systems and potentially cutting-edge electromagnetic railguns and directed energy weapons. In other words, reactivated ships could perform completely different and relevant missions at a fraction of the cost of new construction.

No. 4, develop and deploy unmanned maritime systems.

The fleet of the future will include new types of ships. Again, according to the CNO, "There is no question that unmanned systems must also be an integral part of the future fleet." Unmanned undersea and surface ships can offer significant advantages, such as the ability to conduct persistent operations. We have seen drones revolutionize combat from the skies. The same is possible on the seas.

I believe the Navy needs a dedicated range to test unmanned systems with other manned and unmanned platforms, while also training new operators and maintainers. I applaud the Navy for including substantial R&D funding for unmanned underwater vehicles, UUVs, in its unfunded priorities list. I am hopeful that Congress will provide the resources that are necessary to rapidly develop and deploy new unmanned systems.

To conclude, we should be considering all options for building up our naval capacity. I do not dismiss the fact that these options cost money and some are controversial, but they deserve to be explored. It would be irresponsible for Congress not to do the work now to ensure that the Navy of the future has what it needs to respond to challenges and fulfill its missions. That means 355 ships, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to set this imperative national project into motion.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Mississippi for his remarks about the brave men and women in the Navy and their need for support.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I rise today to join my Democratic colleagues in speaking out against the dangerous TrumpCare bill which is currently being drafted behind closed doors by our Republican colleagues.

The secrecy around this bill shows that Senate Republicans know they cannot defend it to their constituents. That is why Senate Republicans are refusing to even hold a single hearing on the bill. In my State of New Hampshire, you can't pass a bill if it has not had a hearing, and the Senate here in

Washington should work the same way. I continue to urge my colleagues to hold public hearings on this bill so that we can examine the bill for ourselves and get feedback from our constituents and stakeholders.

We do know that this legislation will be very similar to the House TrumpCare bill, which President Trump himself called mean, and calling it mean is even putting it lightly. TrumpCare threatens to have devastating impacts on millions of Americans. Today I am going to address three specific ways that TrumpCare is mean to people in New Hampshire and across the Nation. First, it undermines the Medicaid Program; second, it hurts our seniors; and third, it continues this administration's efforts to roll back women's access to healthcare.

As Governor, I worked to pass and then reauthorize New Hampshire's bipartisan Medicaid expansion plan that provides coverage now to over 50,000 hard-working Granite Staters. And TrumpCare, by proposing to repeal Medicaid expansion, hurts many of the hard-working people who are served now by that expansion program and whose care depends on the expansion program being continued. This includes people like Jo from Portsmouth.

I met Jo at a roundtable earlier this year. Jo has a painful, precancerous disease that eats at her abdominal organs. She has had it for most of her life. Prior to the Great Recession, she had a job that provided health insurance and allowed her to get treatment for this chronic health condition. But in 2009 Jo was laid off from her job. Then unable to find reliable, full-time work, she worked several part-time jobs, but they didn't offer health insurance.

In 2012, she desperately needed surgery. She didn't have health insurance. She couldn't get the surgery. Her health declined, the recession continued, and her ability to support herself also declined.

In 2014, after New Hampshire came together and passed its bipartisan Medicaid expansion program, she was able to get healthcare coverage. The Medicaid expansion program helps her get 8 to 12 prescriptions, necessary medical tests, physical therapy, treatment, and specialists. This has also meant that Jo is healthy enough to work again. TrumpCare would end Medicaid expansion, putting people like Jo at risk.

TrumpCare also changes Medicaid into a per-capita cap system. That is a fancy label for massive cuts to the Medicaid Program that would force States to choose between slashing benefits, reducing the number of people who can get care, or both. Under TrumpCare, States will be faced with cutting services that children, people with disabilities, and seniors depend on.

This brings me to the second point I would like to highlight today about

this mean bill and whom it impacts. It is clear that TrumpCare would hurt seniors across the Granite State. The majority of nursing home residents in New Hampshire are served by Medicaid. TrumpCare would jeopardize the ability of seniors to stay in nursing homes. It would also threaten services for seniors who receive at-home care. And these cuts to Medicaid are just one of the ways seniors would be hurt under this mean proposal, because TrumpCare would also create an age tax, letting insurance plans charge older adults five times more than younger people. If you are between the ages of 50 and 64, you will be especially hard hit.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, under TrumpCare, you could face 20 percent higher premiums in 2018, with especially high premium hikes for older Americans. And the AARP opposes TrumpCare because it would "make healthcare less secure and less affordable."

Finally, my third point is that it is clear that TrumpCare would continue this administration's efforts to roll back women's access to critical healthcare services. To compete economically on a level playing field, women must be able to make their own decisions about if and when to start a family. They should not have to pay more than men for healthcare, and they should be able to visit providers of their own choice who understand their healthcare needs. To fully participate not only in our economy, but also in our democracy, women must be recognized for their capacity to make their own healthcare decisions, just as men are.

Under TrumpCare, if you are a mother, giving birth could now be considered a preexisting condition. TrumpCare would also undermine the requirement that insurance companies have to cover essential health benefits, including maternity care. And TrumpCare's Medicaid cuts would have drastic impacts for women across the country. According to the Congressional Budget Office, Medicaid pays for nearly half of all births in the United States, and it provides healthcare coverage for one in three children across our country.

TrumpCare also defunds Planned Parenthood, which provides critical primary and preventive healthcare services to thousands of New Hampshire women, including preventive care, birth control, and cancer screenings.

My Democratic colleagues and I are ready to work with anyone who is serious about working to build on the Affordable Care Act and lower healthcare costs for hard-working people, but what we do not need is legislation that even the President himself admits is mean.

I will continue working with my colleagues to speak out against and defeat TrumpCare, and I urge the people of New Hampshire and people all across America to keep making their voices heard and make clear that this mean bill is simply unacceptable.

I yield the floor.

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 21, 2017, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ANNA MARIA FARIAS, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE GUSTAVO VELASQUEZ AGUILAR, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

MARVIN KAPLAN, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2020, VICE HARRY I. JOHNSON III, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

PATRICK PIZZELLA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE CHRISTOPHER P. LU, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

LANCE ALLEN ROBERTSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AGING, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE KATHY J. GREENLEE.

---

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 20, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

BROCK LONG, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 20, 2017

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### CLOSING THE SKILLS GAP

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is good news that the jobless rate has dropped to 4.3 percent, the lowest level in more than a decade. However, we still face tough challenges in building an economy that supplies employers with the talent needed to be competitive and in educating workers with the skills needed for success in today's economy.

Because our economy increasingly requires a more skilled workforce, the next generation of workers needs education beyond the traditional high school degree to find good-paying jobs that enable them to move up the career ladder and firmly into the middle class.

To solve these challenges, we need a strong demand-driven workforce development system that aligns education with the needs of employers. That is why the Committee on Education and the Workforce, which I am proud to chair, recently advanced, with unanimous support, legislation that will strengthen skills-focused education and help equip more students with the skills they need to achieve success.

However, the real solutions lie outside of Washington. That is why I am pleased the private sector is leading the way so that workers in industries have the skills to compete and prosper in the global economy.

I want to commend companies like JPMorgan Chase, Toyota, IBM, Boeing, and so many others for their commitment to creating public-private partnerships aimed at closing our skills gap and helping America's employers and workers succeed.

Recently, I had the opportunity to join a roundtable discussion with work-

force development experts from a wide array of nonprofits, educational institutions, and workforce development leaders. They are working with employers to build sustainable and robust pipelines of talent to fill growing needs in critical sectors, such as healthcare and technology.

Communities across the country are looking to power their businesses with talent from their local communities, and they are doing this by developing partnerships that focus on employer engagement strategies, creating or expanding career pathways, reducing barriers to employment, and more effectively connecting students and graduates to jobs.

Helping people gain the skills they need to compete in the workforce is also a powerful approach to expanding access to opportunity and promoting economic mobility, because even as the economy improves, there are still vulnerable people at risk of being left behind.

Without the right skills and meaningful postsecondary credentials, these young people face entering the workforce without very bright prospects or, worse, unemployed and out of school.

We also need to create more opportunities for workers to obtain good-paying jobs that require more than a high school diploma but less than a college degree. This can help reduce unemployment by aligning education programs with the skills employers need.

As an example, JPMorgan Chase's New Skills for Youth initiative is helping expand high-quality education programs that begin in high school and end with postsecondary credentials and lead to long-term careers. Young people can gain the skills needed to enter high-paying occupations in growing fields, such as robotics, medical science, and coding, to build a promising future.

Failing to prepare young people with the right skills and education for these jobs is a missed opportunity for them personally, for our country, and our economy.

By working together on educational initiatives like New Skills for Youth, employers, nonprofits, and educational institutions can drive economic growth, promote greater mobility in communities throughout the country, and help more Americans achieve a lifetime of success.

### HONORING FALLEN SAILORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The Chair recognizes the gen-

tleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, firstly, I could not take this microphone on this occasion and not remember Congressman SCALISE, his injuries, and wish him and his family well, and the other victims of the cowardly and horrific assault on our colleagues and on our government last week in Virginia, but I came here specifically to honor seven Americans who died on the USS *Fitzgerald*.

Seven United States naval soldiers died when the *Fitzgerald* collided with a Japanese freighter. And there was a story this morning in *The New York Times*, another on the *Daily Beast*, and I am sure there are others, that caught my attention.

The *New York Times* story showed the divergent backgrounds of these seven sailors. They are all Americans, but one has roots in Okinawa, another's roots were in the Philippines, another Vietnam, another Guatemala, then there was an Ohioan and a Virginian and a sailor named Martin from Maryland.

They are representative of our United States Navy, from different backgrounds, given an opportunity to serve our country, some because they are helping their families, some to gain citizenship, but all to serve our Nation, and all seven of these gentlemen lost their lives.

I had the honor of going on a naval sub about 10 days ago, the *Providence*, and I saw the camaraderie on that ship. There were no Caucasian sailors or African-American sailors or Asian-American or Latin-American; there weren't gay or straight sailors. They were United States sailors, United States Navy personnel. And they come together in a camaraderie to serve our country and to serve each other as shipmates in a way that is gratifying to witness and is special for our Nation.

Now, I want to mention who these sailors were, because they need to be memorialized here. Xavier Martin was from Maryland; Shingo Douglass was from Okinawa and San Diego, California; Dakota Rigsby, Palmyra, Virginia; Carlos Sibayan from Chula Vista, California, but the Philippines was the spot of origin, and his grandfather, who is a Filipino, also served in our United States Navy; Ngoc Truong Huynh, Vietnam, Oakville, Connecticut; Noe Hernandez was from Texas by way of Guatemala; and finally, Gary Rehm, Jr., from Ohio.

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

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



The Daily Beast told me something about Gary Rehm, Jr., that I wouldn't have garnered from The New York Times story that was so wonderful as it described the backgrounds and really the rainbow that these seven men made of America.

Gary Rehm was due to finish his service in 3 months, and he considered everybody on that ship, all the sailors, his kids. He had no children of his own, but the sailors were his kids. He rescued up to 20 sailors to see to it after the crash that they survived and then went to try to rescue six others, and it is at that point that Gary Rehm lost his life. He lost his life serving his shipmates, as he called them, his kids, his fellow sailors.

They were shipmates and sailors and United States naval personnel. They weren't Filipinos or Vietnamese or any other description. Gary Rehm, Jr., was a hero trying to save others. The other six were heroes, too, serving our country, and they lost their lives.

It was a great experience to be on the *Providence*, and it is a great honor to represent Millington Naval Air Base, which serves our country for personnel and recruitment purposes.

I am honored to be in this Congress, but more honored to represent people in the United States Naval Academy. I thank those seven for their valiant efforts and for giving their lives in service to their country.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God, Father of us all, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Please send Your spirit upon this assembly, that the men and women who serve the United States in contentious times such as these might better work together for the benefit of our Nation. This is not easy, so bless them with Your wisdom and give them the patience and understanding to rise to the demands of their calling.

So also we ask Your blessing upon our world, where so many live and unfortunately die in nations and regions cursed by violence and division. Lord, have mercy.

Lord, be with us this day and all days, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### WORLD REFUGEE DAY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on World Refugee Day to share the remarkable story of one of my younger constituents, 8-year-old Raul Ortiz.

Raul was born amidst the gang-driven violence in Honduras. When he was 5, Raul was kidnapped and held for ransom by a crime cartel. Following his release, he and his mother later fled to the safety and the security offered by the United States.

Raul and his mom rightly worried for their security if they were forced to return to Honduras, and are seeking asylum in our country.

Raul is visiting Washington today to share a letter he wrote to President Trump to remember and protect refugee children like himself.

Writing of what the United States means to him, Raul writes: "Here we are safe, and we have hope to see another tomorrow."

Mr. Speaker, we are a country that was founded and built by immigrants and refugees, many fleeing oppression and violence.

Raul's story is our story. We cannot allow the door of opportunity and safety to close on the next generation of Americans like Raul seeking refuge here.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 19, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 19, 2017, at 1:49 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 782.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1506

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY) at 3 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

#### MOBILE WORKFORCE STATE INCOME TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1393) to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1393

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON STATE WITHHOLDING AND TAXATION OF EMPLOYEE INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No part of the wages or other remuneration earned by an employee who performs employment duties in more than one State shall be subject to income tax in any State other than—

(1) the State of the employee's residence; and

(2) the State within which the employee is present and performing employment duties for more than 30 days during the calendar year in which the wages or other remuneration is earned.

(b) **WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.**—Wages or other remuneration earned in any calendar year shall not be subject to State income tax withholding and reporting requirements unless the employee is subject to income tax in such State under subsection (a). Income tax withholding and reporting requirements under subsection (a)(2) shall apply to wages or other remuneration earned as of the commencement date of employment duties in the State during the calendar year.

(c) **OPERATING RULES.**—For purposes of determining penalties related to an employer's State income tax withholding and reporting requirements—

(1) an employer may rely on an employee's annual determination of the time expected to be spent by such employee in the States in which the employee will perform duties absent—

(A) the employer's actual knowledge of fraud by the employee in making the determination; or

(B) collusion between the employer and the employee to evade tax;

(2) except as provided in paragraph (3), if records are maintained by an employer in the regular course of business that record the location of an employee, such records shall not preclude an employer's ability to rely on an employee's determination under paragraph (1); and

(3) notwithstanding paragraph (2), if an employer, at its sole discretion, maintains a time and attendance system that tracks where the employee performs duties on a daily basis, data from the time and attendance system shall be used instead of the employee's determination under paragraph (1).

(d) **DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.**—For purposes of this Act:

(1) **DAY.**—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an employee is considered present and performing employment duties within a State for a day if the employee performs more of the employee's employment duties within such State than in any other State during a day.

(B) If an employee performs employment duties in a resident State and in only one nonresident State during one day, such employee shall be considered to have performed more of the employee's employment duties in the nonresident State than in the resident State for such day.

(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the portion of the day during which the employee is in transit shall not be considered in determining the location of an employee's performance of employment duties.

(2) **EMPLOYEE.**—The term "employee" has the same meaning given to it by the State in which the employment duties are performed, except that the term "employee" shall not include a professional athlete, professional entertainer, qualified production employee, or certain public figures.

(3) **PROFESSIONAL ATHLETE.**—The term "professional athlete" means a person who performs services in a professional athletic event, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional athlete.

(4) **PROFESSIONAL ENTERTAINER.**—The term "professional entertainer" means a person of

prominence who performs services in the professional performing arts for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional entertainer.

(5) **QUALIFIED PRODUCTION EMPLOYEE.**—The term "qualified production employee" means a person who performs production services of any nature directly in connection with a State qualified, certified or approved film, television or other commercial video production for wages or other remuneration, provided that the wages or other remuneration paid to such person are qualified production costs or expenditures under such State's qualified, certified or approved film incentive program, and that such wages or other remuneration must be subject to withholding under such film incentive program as a condition to treating such wages or other remuneration as a qualified production cost or expenditure.

(6) **CERTAIN PUBLIC FIGURES.**—The term "certain public figures" means persons of prominence who perform services for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for services provided at a discrete event, in the nature of a speech, public appearance, or similar event.

(7) **EMPLOYER.**—The term "employer" has the meaning given such term in section 3401(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3401(d)), unless such term is defined by the State in which the employee's employment duties are performed, in which case the State's definition shall prevail.

(8) **STATE.**—The term "State" means any of the several States.

(9) **TIME AND ATTENDANCE SYSTEM.**—The term "time and attendance system" means a system in which—

(A) the employee is required on a contemporaneous basis to record his work location for every day worked outside of the State in which the employee's employment duties are primarily performed; and

(B) the system is designed to allow the employer to allocate the employee's wages for income tax purposes among all States in which the employee performs employment duties for such employer.

(10) **WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.**—The term "wages or other remuneration" may be limited by the State in which the employment duties are performed.

### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act shall take effect on January 1 of the second calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—This Act shall not apply to any tax obligation that accrues before the effective date of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1393, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act provides a clear, uniform framework for when States may tax nonresident employees who travel to the taxing State to perform work. In particular, this bill prevents States from imposing income tax compliance burdens on nonresidents who work in a foreign State for 30 days or fewer in a year.

The State tax laws that determine when a nonresident must pay a foreign State's income tax and when employers must withhold this tax are numerous and varied. Some States tax income earned within their borders by nonresidents even if the employee only works in the State for just 1 day.

These complicated rules impact everyone who travels for work and many industries. As just one example, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony in 2015 that the patchwork of State laws resulted in a manufacturing company issuing 50 W-2s to a single employee for a single year. The company executive also noted, regarding the compliance burden, that "many of our affected employees make less than \$50,000 per year and have limited resources to seek professional advice."

States generally allow a credit for income taxes paid to another State; however, it is not always dollar for dollar when local taxes are factored in. Credits also do not relieve workers of substantial paperwork burdens.

There are substantial burdens on employers as well. The committee heard testimony in 2014 that businesses, including small businesses, that operate interstate are subject to significant regulatory burdens with regard to compliance with nonresident State income tax withholding laws. These burdens distract from productive activity and job creation.

Nevertheless, some object that the States will lose revenue if the bill is enacted. However, an analysis from Ernst & Young found that the bill's revenue impact is minimal. There is little motive for fraud and gaming because the amount of money at issue, taxes on less than 30 days' wages, is minimal.

Also, the income tax generally has to be paid; the question is merely to whom. Nor does this bill violate federalism principles. On the contrary, it is an exercise of Congress' Commerce Clause authority in precisely the situation for which it was intended.

The Supreme Court has explained that the Commerce Clause was informed by structural concerns about the effects of State regulation on the

national economy. Under the Articles of Confederation, State taxes and duties hindered and suppressed interstate commerce. The Framers intended the Commerce Clause as a cure for these structural ills. This bill fits squarely within this authority by bringing uniformity to cases of de minimis presence by interstate workers in order to reduce compliance costs.

Last year's version of the bill passed the House on suspension by voice vote. This year's version is nearly identical, with two changes:

The professional entertainer exemption is narrowed from "a person who performs services" to "a person of prominence who performs services" in order to ensure that other entertainers retain the benefit of the bill's protections.

Second, the list of exclusions is expanded to cover film production employees if associated tax credits for instate productions are contingent on withholding film production wages earned in the State. This avoids disruption in such arrangements.

I commend the bill's lead sponsors, Representatives BISHOP and JOHNSON, and thank all of the bill's cosponsors.

Madam Speaker, I urge the bill's passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1393. This bill represents a major assault on the sovereignty of the States, and it does particular damage to my home State of New York, depriving it of more than \$100 million a year of its own tax revenue, which hardly fits the de minimis description by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act would prohibit States from collecting income tax from an individual unless the person works more than 30 days in that State in a calendar year.

Simplifying and harmonizing the rules on tax collection across the country is a worthy goal, and I support efforts by the States and the Multistate Tax Commission to resolve the issue. New York has been an active participant in these negotiations and wants to reach a fair solution. But imposing a solution on States, and one that would cause a large financial burden on particular States, is clearly not the answer.

The power to tax is a key index of sovereignty; yet this legislation would prohibit States from taxing activity solely within their own borders except as prescribed in the bill. I think that is constitutionally dubious. Although I take a broad view generally of the Commerce Clause, I doubt it extends to authorizing Federal regulation of a State's ability to tax a person doing business within that State's own borders.

This bill is also deeply troubling as a matter of policy. Under this legislation, if you work in a State of which you are not a resident for fewer than 30 days, your income will not be subject to tax by that State. That amounts to 6 weeks of 5-day workweeks. While a de minimis exception may make some sense, I hardly think that 6 weeks is de minimis.

Ultimately, the threshold for taxation is for each State to decide for itself. If I were still a member of the New York Legislature, I would consider the political and economic merits of taxing out-of-State business activity, and I would vote based on what I thought was best for my State. But by what right does Congress step in to tell New York that it must forego more than \$100 million a year based on economic activity that occurs entirely within its borders?

In some States, the 30-day threshold may not have a great fiscal impact. But New York State, for example, is home to New York City, the Nation's center of commerce, which also sits right across the river from New Jersey and a very short distance from Connecticut. This makes New York a major destination for out-of-State business travelers and makes it, by far, the hardest hit State under this bill. According to the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, losses could be up to \$120 million a year for New York.

□ 1515

This enormous financial loss would come at a time that the President and the Republican Congress are proposing to shift significant responsibilities to the States, while simultaneously slashing Federal assistance. If we further deprive New York of \$120 million each year, and limit its ability to tax activity occurring within its own borders, vital services like education, law enforcement, and healthcare could all be on the chopping block.

During consideration of H.R. 1393 in the Judiciary Committee, I offered two amendments that would have mitigated its impact. The first would have reduced the bill's 30-day threshold to a far more reasonable 14 days, which is still almost 3 weeks of work without being subject to taxation. The other would have added highly paid individuals to the bill's list of exemptions, which would help avoid loopholes that could allow wealthy people to escape millions of dollars of taxation.

Had my amendments been accepted, the expected impact on New York would have been reduced by as much as \$85 million a year. While still causing a significant drain on resources, these amendments would have gone a long way to making the bill fairer, while still achieving its underlying goals. Unfortunately, these amendments were defeated, and, therefore, I must oppose the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman from New York.

I would like to point out that those revenues that might flow to New York because of their onerous system of imposing taxation for as little as one day's work in New York redounds to the benefit of the other 49 States, who would then receive that tax benefit, as it properly should.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), the lead sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I am grateful for this opportunity to speak on my bipartisan, bicameral bill, H.R. 1393, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act.

Madam Speaker, the 10th Amendment gives States the freedom to set their own public policy. It is important, however, that they do so in a way that does not infringe upon the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, which gives jurisdiction over interstate commerce to Congress.

With our constitutional mandate in mind, at a time of rapid expansion in our workforce and an increasingly global and mobile economy, it is incumbent upon Congress to simplify and ease the complex burden that is imposed on interstate commerce activity.

In my 25 years as an attorney and a small-business owner, I am uniquely aware of the task of complying with the complexities of the various State income taxes, especially when you travel to another State for business.

The burden to comply is a particular burden to small businesses, as well as their employees, because they simply do not have the resources and cannot absorb the compliance costs. As a result, the current tax framework puts smaller businesses, the very backbone of our economy, at a substantial competitive disadvantage relative to larger businesses.

And complex reporting requirements punish the employees, too. The time and overall expenses that result from filing all of this paperwork is overwhelming, and, in many cases, financially devastating. It is all because they had the audacity to work outside of their home State.

Rather than driving profits back into their businesses and community by expanding payrolls and reducing the price of consumer goods, businesses are being forced to spend their hard-earned, scarce resources on complying with a menagerie of convoluted and ridiculous State income tax laws.

While crafting this legislation in committee, we heard a lot of anecdotal information and a lot of personal testimonials. In fact, we heard firsthand testimony from an employee, indicating that his employer had to file

over 10,000 W-2s on behalf of their numerous employees, primarily because they had crossed State lines for work. He went on to tell us one of his co-workers had to file 50 W-2s—that is 50 W-2s—just for himself.

That didn't make sense to us, and it certainly doesn't make sense to most Americans. Imagine an individual, making less than \$50,000 a year, having to file 10, 20, or even 50 W-2s. It is ridiculous, and it is unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, I am an ardent defender of the United States Constitution—in particular, the 10th Amendment—which delegates authority not granted to the Federal Government, to the States.

That said, the Constitution gives plenary jurisdiction to Congress relative to the regulation of interstate commerce, under Article I, section 8. It is, therefore, as in this case, the constitutional responsibility of Congress to identify and respond to an increasingly mobile and global economy and relieve it of unnecessary burdensome compliance requirements resulting from a patchwork of unique State income tax laws.

And that is why many groups that advocate on behalf of States, such as the American Legislative Exchange Council, agree with this legislation, because H.R. 1393 is the type of simple and streamlined interstate commerce regulation Congress should be enacting. In fact, there are more than 300 outside organizations that have encouraged support of this bill.

With the help of my colleague, HANK JOHNSON, on the other side of the aisle, our Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act is a carefully crafted, bipartisan, and bicameral measure that streamlines State income tax laws across the Nation.

It creates a uniform threshold, giving nonresidents 30 days to work in another State without being liable for that State's income tax. This simple and straightforward language ensures employees will have a clear understanding of their tax liability, and it gives employers a clear and consistent rule so that they can plan and accurately predict their tax liability, knowing the same rule applies for all States with an income tax.

It also means much less paperwork and reduced compliance costs for both States and businesses and their employees.

The goal of H.R. 1393 is to protect our mobile workers, and that includes traveling emergency workers and first responders; trade union workers; non-profit staff; teachers; Federal, State, and local government employees; and much more. Any organization that has employees who cross State lines for temporary periods will benefit from this law.

I would also note that great care was taken with this bill to diminish the im-

pact on State revenues. You heard testimony earlier relative to its impact on State governments. In fact, a 2015 study by Ernst & Young found that H.R. 1393 would actually raise State income tax revenues, while other States would only see a de minimis change.

With that said, I would like to take this time to thank all of the members of the Mobile Workforce Coalition who support our bill; Chairman GOODLATTE and his world class staff for all of their work; my 57 colleagues who cosponsored this in the House; as well as Senator THUNE, Senator BROWN, and nearly half of the United States Senate who have cosponsored our companion bill.

Madam Speaker, as Congress continues to work on comprehensive tax reform to jump start our economy and to provide relief for American families and businesses, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act is a great start to streamline the Tax Code and roll back unnecessary and costly administrative burdens.

With so much red tape interwoven in today's Tax Code, this bill is a commonsense way to cut through the clutter and simplify part of the filing process moving forward. Together, we can make our workforce the priority and help our small businesses grow and prosper.

Madam Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1393.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman NADLER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1393, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2017, is an important, bipartisan bill that will help workers and small businesses across the country—large businesses, also.

As the proud sponsor of this legislation in both the 110th and 111th Congresses, I am very familiar with how hard legislators on both sides of the aisle have worked since then to bring this bill to this point. I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman BOB GOODLATTE, for ushering this bill to the House to this point, and I ask my colleagues to please vote in favor of this legislation.

H.R. 1393 would provide for a uniform and easily administrable law that will simplify the patchwork of existing inconsistent and confusing State rules. It would also reduce administrative costs to the States and lessen compliance burdens on consumers.

Take my home State of Georgia as an example. If an Atlanta-based employee of a St. Louis company travels to headquarters on a business trip once a year, that employee would be subject to Missouri tax, even if the annual visit only lasts for 1 day. However, if that employee travels to Maine, her trip would only be subject to tax if her trip lasts

for 10 days. If she travels to New Mexico on business, she would only be subject to tax if she was in the State for 15 days.

Acuity Brands is a leading Georgia-based lighting manufacturer that employs over 1,000 associates and has over 3,200 associates nationwide who travel extensively across the country for training, conferences, and other business.

In a letter in support of a prior, nearly identical version of this bill, Richard Reece, Acuity's executive vice president, writes that current State laws are numerous, varied, and often changing, requiring that the company expend significant resources merely interpreting and satisfying States' requirements. He concludes that "unified, clear rules and definitions for nonresident reporting and withholding obligations would undoubtedly improve compliance rates, and it would strike the correct balance between State sovereignty and ensuring that America's modern mobile workforce is not unduly encumbered."

We should heed the concerns of Acuity, and numerous other businesses across the country, by enacting H.R. 1393 into law.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. With over 57 cosponsors during this Congress, it is clear that the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2017 is an idea whose time has come.

I thank my colleagues for their work on this bill and, in particular, Congressman BISHOP, for his leadership on this bill in the 115th Congress. He has carried the torch for our esteemed former colleague, the late Howard Coble, who passed this bill out of the House in the 112th Congress.

I also thank our staffs, who have worked tirelessly to build support for this legislation along bipartisan lines.

This bill is a testament to the good that can come from working across the aisle on bipartisan tax fairness reforms. I am optimistic that the passage of H.R. 1393 augurs well for the passage of other e-fairness legislation, which is critical to countless small businesses across the country, during this Congress.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to bring this bill up for a vote soon. This country's employees and businesses deserve quick action.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I am the only speaker remaining and

prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 12 minutes remaining.

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

I want to quote from a letter from the president of the Federation of Tax Administrators and commissioner of the Oklahoma Tax Commission regarding this bill. She writes:

This bill breaches the core of the relationship between the Federal Government and State governments, a relationship that is fundamentally important to the voters of Virginia and of Michigan. It is a clear example of the Federal Government crossing a line that is seldom breached and, in this instance, should not be. The attached resolution from the State tax agencies, all of them, offers in detail to explain the State's positions against the mobile workforce.

□ 1530

Here are the three most compelling facts:

One, States have in place a combination of laws, rules, and compliance standards that effectively eliminate an unfair outcome when it comes to recordkeeping and taxation of wages earned in a State by a nonresident;

Two, these approaches, which include model legislation developed by the Multistate Tax Commission, take into account information that is available to employers and de minimis activities; and

Three, H.R. 1393 goes beyond what is necessary to ensure fair outcomes and a reasonable reporting burden, in particular, because the bill takes away the states' rights to require proper wage reporting and withholding even when the employer already has the information to easily do so. It opens up opportunities for tax avoidance.

In closing, let me note that this legislation would not just harm New York and not just to a de minimis amount—\$100 million to \$120 million is hardly de minimis—but it would also have a similar effect on other States. That is why this bill is opposed by a broad coalition of labor and tax organizations, including the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, the International Union of Police Associations, Federation of Tax Administrators, Multistate Tax Commission, and many others.

Whether or not your State is hurt financially by this bill, however, all Members should be concerned by legislation that so brazenly strips from a State one of the fundamental hallmarks of sovereignty: the ability to tax economic activity that occurs entirely within its own borders. If we can target New York and other States with this bill, what is to say we won't come after your State next.

I must also add that this bill is one in a series of bills that we have seen over the last few years that chip away at the revenue-raising and taxing ability of the States. Especially as the current majority and the current President seek to shift more responsibilities

to the States and away from the Federal Government, we should not be depriving the States of their ability to raise revenues as they see fit within their own sovereignty.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This bill enjoys broad bipartisan support. It has 57 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. This bill will minimize compliance burdens on both workers and employers so they can get back to being productive, creating and performing jobs. We have received letters of support from hundreds of entities across the employment spectrum.

But this bill is not just about business; it is about individuals. One businessman told the Judiciary Committee that the compliance burdens from the patchwork of State laws falls on his employees, who make less than \$50,000 per year and have limited resources to seek professional advice.

It has been questioned whether there will be revenue lost to the States. Analysis shows the impact is minimal, affecting mainly the allocation of revenues, not the overall size of the tax revenue pot.

Similarly, concerns about tax evasion are unfounded. Unlike in the general income tax context, there is little motive here for fraud or gaming.

The amount of money at issue, taxes on less than 30 days' wages, is minimal. More importantly, except in nine States, the employee will have to pay the tax, in any event, to the employee's home State, so the only savings would be from minor rate differentials between the two jurisdictions.

This legislation is a great example of Congress working in a bipartisan way to relieve burdens on hardworking Americans.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for their bipartisan work on this legislation. I urge all of our colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a common sense bill, H.R. 1393 which would set a national standard of 30 days for states to subject non-residents to income tax requirements within that state.

Under current law, many of the 41 states with a broad based personal income tax rate subject out of state residents to income tax in that state on the first day they "work" in the state.

This patchwork of state laws have created a confusing and unworkable nationwide system where individuals who travel to another state for a conference or meeting can find themselves subject to income tax requirements in a state where they only spent a few days.

In fact, these overburdensome requirements can create a scenario in which a company of 7,000 employees who travel for domestic busi-

ness may have to file 10,500 W-2's over the course of a given year. This burden can be even worse for a small business.

One small business, which operates several customer service centers throughout the United States and has 600 employees working in 46 states, faces a significant burden trying to comply. Most of these 600 employees work out of one of the customer service centers, but 12 employees travel out of state to do a job occasionally. The manager of this company has to spend 3 plus hours every week figuring out the tax reporting requirements for these employees, even though most of them only pay \$30 to \$100 a year into these different taxing authorities.

Is this really a good use of the time of a small business? Wouldn't we rather have these individuals working to create jobs and grow our economy then wasting time complying with the burdensome reporting requirements for 42 different taxing authorities?

H.R. 1393 is a common sense solution to this problem. 30 days is a fair baseline standard that can be applied nationwide. It allows U.S. workers to travel and work around the country for a reasonable amount of time without subjecting them to reporting requirements for taxation in all of the jurisdictions in which they travel. If they stay longer than 30 days in any particular state then the state is free to tax them according to their own state laws.

With this new standard, American business will know what the rules of the road are across the country and they can plan their business accordingly.

I thank the Chairman for moving this important bill through the committee, and urge your support.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1393, the "Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2017."

I agree with the bill's sponsors that a uniform framework specifying when an employer must withhold state income tax could help ensure simplicity and be more administrable than the current varied state standards. However the means by which H.R. 1393 achieves this result would lead to significant state revenue losses and could actually encourage income tax avoidance.

To begin with, rather than promoting uniformity, H.R. 1393 would have a significant adverse impact on income tax revenues for certain states.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, for example, New York could lose between \$55 million and \$120 million annually if this measure was signed into law.

Other states that would be adversely impacted include Illinois, Massachusetts, and California.

And, as a result of the lost revenues from non-resident taxpayers, these states could be forced to make up their losses by shifting the tax burden to resident taxpayers or levying new taxes.

And states may even have to cut governmental services, such as funding for education and critical infrastructure improvements.

Another problem with H.R. 1393 is that it essentially provides a roadmap for state income tax liability avoidance.

By allowing an employer to rely on the employee's determination of the time he or she is

expected to spend working in another state during the year, the bill prevents the employer from withholding an employee's state income taxes to a non-resident state.

This would be the result even if the employer is aware that the employee has been working in a state more than 30 days, as long as that state cannot prove that the employee committed fraud in making his annual determination and that the employer knew it.

Rather than proceeding with this flawed bill, the House should be considering a fair and uniform framework to allow states to collect taxes owed on remote sales.

By staying silent since the Supreme Court's 1992 Quill decision, Congress has failed to ensure that states have the authority to collect the sales and use tax on Internet purchases.

Placing brick and mortar businesses at a competitive disadvantage hurts main street Americans and means fewer local jobs and fewer opportunities.

Lost tax revenues mean that state and local governments will have fewer resources to provide their residents essential services, such as education and police and fire protection.

We owe it to our local communities, our local retailers, and state and local governments to act this Congress.

I am disappointed that rather than moving the bipartisan eFairness legislation that our communities need, we are considering H.R. 1393 instead.

Accordingly, I oppose H.R. 1393.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1393.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## IMPROVING SERVICES FOR OLDER YOUTH IN FOSTER CARE ACT

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2847) to make improvements to the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and related provisions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2847

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act".

### SEC. 2. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE JOHN H. CHAFEE FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM AND RELATED PROVISIONS.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO SERVE FORMER FOSTER YOUTH UP TO AGE 23.**—Section 477 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 677) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5), by inserting "(or 23 years of age, in the case of a State with a certification under subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii) to provide assistance and services to youths

who have aged out of foster care and have not attained such age, in accordance with such subsection)" after "21 years of age";

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(A)—

(A) by inserting "(i)" before "A certification";

(B) by striking "children who have left foster care" and all that follows through the period and inserting "youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 21 years of age."; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) If the State has elected under section 475(8)(B) to extend eligibility for foster care to all children who have not attained 21 years of age, or if the Secretary determines that the State agency responsible for administering the State plans under this part and part B uses State funds or any other funds not provided under this part to provide services and assistance for youths who have aged out of foster care that are comparable to the services and assistance the youths would receive if the State had made such an election, the certification required under clause (i) may provide that the State will provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 23 years of age."; and

(3) in subsection (b)(3)(B), by striking "children who have left foster care" and all that follows through the period and inserting "youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 21 years of age (or 23 years of age, in the case of a State with a certification under subparagraph (A)(i) to provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained such age, in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii)).";

(b) **AUTHORITY TO REDISTRIBUTE UNSPENT FUNDS.**—Section 477(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by inserting "or does not expend allocated funds within the time period specified under section 477(d)(3)" after "provided by the Secretary"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) **REDISTRIBUTION OF UNEXPENDED AMOUNTS.**—

"(A) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.**—To the extent that amounts paid to States under this section in a fiscal year remain unexpended by the States at the end of the succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary may make the amounts available for redistribution in the second succeeding fiscal year among the States that apply for additional funds under this section for that second succeeding fiscal year.

"(B) **REDISTRIBUTION.**—

"(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall redistribute the amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year among eligible applicant States. In this subparagraph, the term 'eligible applicant State' means a State that has applied for additional funds for the fiscal year under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the State will use the funds for the purpose for which originally allotted under this section.

"(ii) **AMOUNT TO BE REDISTRIBUTED.**—The amount to be redistributed to each eligible applicant State shall be the amount so made available multiplied by the State foster care ratio (as defined in subsection (c)(4), except that, in such subsection, 'all eligible applicant States (as defined in subsection (d)(5)(B)(i))' shall be substituted for 'all States').

"(iii) **TREATMENT OF REDISTRIBUTED AMOUNT.**—Any amount made available to a State under this paragraph shall be regarded as part of the allotment of the State under

this section for the fiscal year in which the redistribution is made.

"(C) **TRIBES.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State' includes an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that receives an allotment under this section.".

(c) **EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING THE USE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING VOUCHERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 477(i)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(i)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking "on the date" and all that follows through "23" and inserting "to remain eligible until they attain 26"; and

(B) by inserting ", but in no event may a youth participate in the program for more than 5 years (whether or not consecutive)" before the period.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 477(i)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(i)(1)) is amended by inserting "who have attained 14 years of age" before the period.

(d) **OTHER IMPROVEMENTS.**—Section 477 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677), as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "**INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM**" and inserting "**PROGRAM FOR SUCCESSFUL TRANSITION TO ADULTHOOD**";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "identify children who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age and to help these children make the transition to self-sufficiency by providing services" and inserting "support all youth who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older in their transition to adulthood through transitional services";

(ii) by inserting "and post-secondary education" after "high school diploma"; and

(iii) by striking "training in daily living skills, training in budgeting and financial management skills" and inserting "training and opportunities to practice daily living skills (such as financial literacy training and driving instruction)";

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age receive the education, training, and services necessary to obtain employment" and inserting "who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older achieve meaningful, permanent connections with a caring adult";

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking "who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age prepare for and enter postsecondary training and education institutions" and inserting "who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities, positive youth development, and experiential learning that reflects what their peers in intact families experience"; and

(D) by striking paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (7);

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking "adolescents" and inserting "youth"; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting "including training on youth development" after "to provide training"; and

(II) by striking "adolescents preparing for independent living" and all that follows through the period and inserting "youth preparing for a successful transition to adulthood and making a permanent connection with a caring adult";

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking "adolescents" each place it appears and inserting "youth"; and



(iii) in subparagraph (K)—

(I) by striking “an adolescent” and inserting “a youth”; and

(II) by striking “the adolescent” each place it appears and inserting “the youth”; and

(4) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the National Youth in Transition Database and any other databases in which States report outcome measures relating to children in foster care and children who have aged out of foster care or left foster care for kinship guardianship or adoption. The report shall include the following:

“(A) A description of the reasons for entry into foster care and of the foster care experiences, such as length of stay, number of placement settings, case goal, and discharge reason of 17-year-olds who are surveyed by the National Youth in Transition Database and an analysis of the comparison of that description with the reasons for entry and foster care experiences of children of other ages who exit from foster care before attaining age 17.

“(B) A description of the characteristics of the individuals who report poor outcomes at ages 19 and 21 to the National Youth in Transition Database.

“(C) Benchmarks for determining what constitutes a poor outcome for youth who remain in or have exited from foster care and plans the executive branch will take to incorporate these benchmarks in efforts to evaluate child welfare agency performance in providing services to children transitioning from foster care.

“(D) An analysis of the association between types of placement, number of overall placements, time spent in foster care, and other factors, and outcomes at ages 19 and 21.

“(E) An analysis of the differences in outcomes for children in and formerly in foster care at age 19 and 21 among States.”.

(e) CLARIFYING DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO FOSTER YOUTH LEAVING FOSTER CARE.—Section 475(5)(I) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(I)) is amended by inserting after “REAL ID Act of 2005” the following: “, and any official documentation necessary to prove that the child was previously in foster care”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2847.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act.

In fiscal year 2015, almost 21,000 youth aged out of foster care, meaning they left foster care without a permanent family connection. Many of them are often poorly prepared for adulthood and lack some of the basic skills they need to be successful adults.

Last year, the House passed the Family First Prevention Services Act, a bill that would improve the lives of children and families by making sure more children can stay safely at home and not enter foster care in the first place, helping to make sure fewer children age out of care. The bill also updated the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program to allow States to assist older former foster youth up to the age of 23, including providing education and training vouchers, to help those young people who do age out to have a better future. Unfortunately, it did not pass the Senate, so it never became law.

I am glad my good friend, Mr. FASO, introduced the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act to highlight the needs of these older youth, and I know many will benefit from the changes made by his bill.

Specifically, this bill would support older youth leaving foster care by allowing existing funds used for financial housing, counseling, and employment support to support older youth leaving care. It would also allow HHS to redistribute unspent funds if a State has money remaining at the end of the fiscal year so more youth can be helped with existing resources. And through this bill, we will also be able to learn more about youth leaving foster care and their outcomes, which will help us develop better policies in the years ahead.

I am grateful for the opportunity we have today to support this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 2847, the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act, which would help to ensure that all the congressional resources that would be provided for foster youth will indeed be utilized and make sure they are used to help them in the furtherance of their education and becoming independent.

My colleague, KAREN BASS, who visited me just a few weeks ago, has been a leader on this legislation and on foster youth issues for a number of years, and our committee has worked closely with her to move it forward today.

I want to note that this is one of five bills the House is considering today to help at-risk families and children in foster care. All of these bills passed the House last year as part of the Family First Prevention Services Act, which also provided significant new investment in substance abuse, mental

health, and parenting skills services to help kids and families avoid foster care when possible.

We continue to work on a bipartisan basis with our leadership and our colleagues in the Senate to find a way to move forward on broader foster care improvements, but today's action provides a good opportunity to once again highlight the sharp rise of children in foster care in the United States and, indeed, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, fueled in part by the opiate crisis.

In Massachusetts, between 2011 and 2015, the number of petitions to remove children from their homes grew 38 percent. Today, Massachusetts is home to nearly 10,000 kids in foster care. Over 1,000 of them are considered at risk of reaching adulthood without being adopted or safely reunified with their birth families. That is why it is so important that we do everything we can to help them finish their education and develop mentoring relationships with supportive adults.

While I am pleased that our committee and the full House are working together to help these young people, we can't ignore the bigger picture, which is the President's attempt to overturn the Affordable Care Act, because it will have real and measurable negative effects on these kids.

Republican Medicaid cuts jeopardize health coverage for older foster youth, the same youth we are trying to help with this bill. By cutting the essential health benefits and Medicaid, there will be a consequence. In turn, this endangers access to substance abuse treatment and, by extension, many of the treatment centers themselves.

Republican proposals to end the Social Services Block Grant would reduce States' abilities to provide substance abuse, mental healthcare, and supportive services to foster parents.

While these larger issues are deeply troubling, today's five children welfare bills, including the one before us now, represent an improvement over the status quo, and it is refreshing to note the bipartisan collaboration that is involved.

In addition to Congresswoman BASS' leadership on this bill to help foster youth, let me also recognize my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee who are providing great leadership on these very issues—Mr. DAVIS, Ms. CHU, and Ms. SEWELL—for their work on behalf of foster children as reflected in these bills that they have co-authored and that we are considering today.

I urge our colleagues to support this bill and the other bipartisan child welfare improvements being considered today and to work with us to even do more to help foster youth succeed.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K.



DAVIS), be allowed to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to express support and ask my colleagues to support our legislation, H.R. 2847, the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank the cosponsors of this legislation, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Our legislation is designed to help support older foster youth as they transition into adulthood by making limited but much-needed changes to the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program.

While the Chafee program has largely enhanced outcomes for former foster youth, there is still room for improvement. Of the individuals who age out of foster care, nearly 20 percent will be homeless after 18, only half will be employed at age 24, and less than 3 percent will earn a college degree. This legislation seeks to improve on those results.

If enacted, our legislation would support the education of foster youth who leave care by extending the age of eligibility for education and training vouchers up to the age of 26. By changing the eligibility, we can help improve employment outcomes and job opportunities for older youth as they leave the system.

Additionally, this legislation will help youth who age out to maintain benefits by ensuring that they are provided with the necessary documentation that proves they were previously in foster care.

Finally, our legislation would extend the financial, housing, counseling, employment, and other services for former foster care youth. Currently, support services are only available to youth between the ages of 18 and 21. Under this legislation, States would be able to extend coverage up to the age of 23.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that this legislation is supported by many organizations throughout the Nation, including the Alliance for Children's Rights, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the California State Association of Counties, the Child Welfare League of America, Children Now, County Welfare Di-

rectors Association of California, the March of Dimes, and the National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners.

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

Mr. FASO. I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation so that we can help improve outcomes for some of our Nation's most vulnerable individuals.

□ 1545

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I strongly support H.R. 2847, the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act. This bill would expand eligibility for the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program services and education for older foster youth, and ensure that all funds and education vouchers are used. I want to commend my colleague, Representative BASS, for her longstanding leadership on this bill.

As has been indicated by the ranking member, this important bill, and the other child welfare bills we will consider today, come from the Families First Prevention Services Act. The Families First Prevention Services Act begins a fundamental shift in Federal child welfare policy to preserving families rather than separating them. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that we enact the larger bill with these important child welfare provisions and as we consider the other bills separately today.

I would like to note that there are, indeed, five child welfare bills on the floor this afternoon, which is a real testament to the leadership of Chairman BRADY and Ranking Member NEAL. So I commend both of them for their leadership in bringing the Ways and Means Committee together to the extent that we can have five bills that have been researched, that have been debated; levels of agreement have been reached.

I strongly support the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), my good friend.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I also want to sincerely thank Chairman KEVIN BRADY and the members of the Ways and Means Committee for their continued and invaluable work to protect America's children and strengthening our child welfare policy, as is in evidence in these five bills we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, foster care issues rarely drive our national media headlines, yet, to the children who are in the child welfare system, the importance of finding solutions and eliminating the barriers that would ensure better futures, better outcomes, and a permanent connection to a loving family can make fundamental, lifelong differences to those who are some of America's most vulnerable children.

The goal of the Family First legislation, of which these bills are components, is to respond to the devastating data pertaining to the outcomes for foster youth who age out of care, often without any permanent connection and without the life skills and support systems necessary to thrive as independent adults.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard so many times from the States that there is a need to make our Federal child welfare funding flexible enough so that we never incentivize the placement of children into foster care who would safely receive care in their homes or with safe, loving relatives. This bipartisan package of child welfare system improvements makes important steps toward improving our child welfare system to better protect children and families, and I am certainly delighted to support its passage.

I want to thank, Mr. Speaker, again, those colleagues that have worked on this for their invaluable work on this critically important legislation.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member DAVIS for yielding.

I want to give a big thanks to my friend and colleague, Representative KAREN BASS of California. She is a true champion for our foster youth. I was happy to participate in her Foster Youth Shadow Day last month, which gave me the opportunity to meet with a constituent of mine that directly benefits from the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to host a foster child next year.

I also want to voice my strong support for Representative BASS' bill, H.R. 2847, the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act. The current Chafee Foster Care Independence Program plays an important role in our larger foster care system, and the services it provides should be extended to cover older youth up to the age of 23.

I was able to hear firsthand from my foster youth shadow, Khadejah Moore, about the struggles that foster youth face when they age out of the system. These young adults are thrown into the real world with little to no support system. It is an incredibly frightening time for these young youth. But if we can extend the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and also allow

youth more time to use education vouchers, they have a better chance of having the opportunity to graduate college and successfully enter the workforce.

This is an important, commonsense bill, and I want to thank both Representative BASS and Representative FASO for introducing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2847.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, having no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2847, the bill offered by my friend and colleague, KAREN BASS, a tireless leader on foster youth and child welfare.

I recently hosted an amazing young woman named Ruth during Foster Youth Shadow Day here on the Hill. The message Ruth wanted lawmakers to hear is that the obstacles she faces every day as a 19-year-old have not suddenly stopped now that she has aged out of foster care. Ruth has a resilient spirit and unstoppable determination, but she should not be left out in the cold as she pursues her education and her goal of helping other foster youth in the future.

The Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act will help people like Ruth by making vital changes to the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program, an important source of funding for foster youth.

Currently, foster youth are only eligible for Chafee services if they are between the ages of 16 and 21. This bill expands access to the services provided by the program to include youth between the ages of 14 and 23. This is such a crucial change to the program since foster youth like Ruth face so many daunting challenges during the period of young adulthood as they transition toward independence and self-sufficiency.

Providing essential services such as access to older mentors and role models, connections to employment opportunities, and education vouchers for foster youth after they reach the age of 18 are key sources of support for foster youth. This bill helps ensure that foster youth have the resources needed to become healthy, thriving adults.

Thanks again to Representative BASS for her work on this bill.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my legislation, in conjunction

with Representative FASO, to support the education and advancement of foster youth. I want to thank the Representative for his leadership on this issue. I also want to thank Chairman BRADY and Ranking Member NEAL for their leadership on behalf of the Nation's foster youth.

I do think it is very remarkable, as several other speakers have said, that today we are bringing forward five bipartisan bills to improve the Nation's foster care system. Each one of the bills addresses a serious challenge or gap in that system.

H.R. 2847, the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act, allows States to expand the Chafee Grant Program to foster youth up to the age of 23. Currently, the program ends at 21. The Chafee Grant Program provides educational grants and other services to help young people transition into adulthood and become independent.

In May, as part of National Foster Youth Shadow Day that is organized by the National Foster Youth Institute, I had the opportunity to meet a young woman named Doniesha Thomas. Doniesha is from Los Angeles, and spent 20 years in foster care before she aged out. She described her foster home as abusive, and eventually she had to move several times.

Against tremendous odds, Doniesha has continued to persevere and is currently a college student at Los Angeles Trade Tech College, majoring in the administration of justice and minoring in paralegal studies.

Doniesha is just one of a small number of foster youth who actually make it to college. This is despite nearly 70 percent of foster youth expressing a desire to attend college. Those, like Doniesha, who are accepted and attend college face another hurdle, which is graduating. Currently, only 3 percent of foster youth who attend college graduate. Programs like Chafee are designed to help foster youth advance in college, trade school, and employment.

During National Foster Youth Shadow Day, I had the opportunity to speak to many other young people, and several of them described challenges that they face after—well, if they were lucky to graduate high school, where they attend college and then something happens; either they run out of resources or their housing falls through and they have to leave college, so their college is interrupted.

That is why this legislation is so important, because it allows for the flexibility; if the young person is not able to complete college in 4 years, they do have a couple of other years.

One of the things that many people don't realize is that when young people age out of the foster youth system—which typically is at 18, sometimes is at 21, depending on the State—that many times we literally put these young people on the street. They are 18

years old. They are in their foster home. They are given a bag, typically a large-sized trash bag, with all of their belongings, and they are put out on the street left to fend for themselves. With today's economic challenges, there are no 18-year-olds that can fend for themselves without a safety net.

If we think of middle class children, transitioning into adulthood is typically what happens at college. They go to college and they have housing. But if they have any challenges, they can always call home. They can text their parents. Their parents are there to rescue them in case they run out of money or something happens with their housing or their grades.

If we think of a young person out of the child welfare system who is literally put on the streets at the age of 18, you can only imagine what happens; which is why so many children in the foster care system wind up incarcerated. Many young girls wind up trafficked; and we did legislation on that a few weeks ago.

So if we want to stop what happens on the other end, with many young children winding up incarcerated, or early pregnancies, or other challenges, we need to make sure that we provide support for them early on.

H.R. 2847 will allow the flexibility for a student, again, who might need more time to complete their education. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, to give foster youth the same type of flexibility and support that we provide our own children.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

H.R. 2847 would provide important assistance for youth aging out of foster care.

In my State of Illinois, 22 percent of the more than 16,000 children placed in foster care in 2015 are aging out. Illinois is widely regarded as a leader among States when it comes to foster youth aging out of care; therefore, it is, indeed, one of the first jurisdictions in which young people who are in foster care on their 18th birthday were able to remain in beyond the age of 18.

Research conducted by the University of Chicago found that allowing foster youth to remain in care beyond the age of 18 is associated with an increase in child well-being, including postsecondary educational attainment. Specifically, former foster youth from Illinois are twice as likely to have ever attended college, and more than twice as likely to have completed at least 1 year of college by age 21, compared with foster youth in other States that have not been given the option to stay in care beyond 18 years of age.

□ 1600

Due to school mobility issues experienced in high school, only 58 percent of foster youth graduate from high school by age 19, which makes it unlikely that they would be graduated from college by age 21.

Extending access to Chafee Independence Act programs to age 23 rather than cutting these young people off at age 21 would ensure these youth are able to be supported beyond their first year of college. We know that when students lose access to critical financial aid resources such as the education training voucher in the middle of their college journey, it forces them to drop out of college in search of employment.

Last Saturday, I spent 2 hours with a group of young people who had been organized by a young fellow, Kenneth Bennett's son. His name is Taylor Bennett. Taylor is the younger brother of Chance the Rapper. He is 21 years of age and had organized young people who were transgender, who were homeless, who were out of school, who were in need of assistance and help, and they were pleased to know that we were going to be considering this legislation today, which I strongly support.

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

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

I want to thank Mr. FASO and Mr. REED from New York and Ms. BASS from California for introducing this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2847.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## REDUCING UNNECESSARY BARRIERS FOR RELATIVE FOSTER PARENTS ACT

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2866) to review and improve licensing standards for placement in a relative foster family home, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2866

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reducing Unnecessary Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act".

### SEC. 2. REVIEWING AND IMPROVING LICENSING STANDARDS FOR PLACEMENT IN A RELATIVE FOSTER FAMILY HOME.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF REPUTABLE MODEL LICENSING STANDARDS.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall identify reputable model licensing standards with respect to the licensing of foster family homes (as defined in section 472(c)(1) of the Social Security Act).

(b) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 422(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (19), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(20) provide that, not later than April 1, 2019, the State shall submit to the Secretary information addressing—

"(A) whether the State licensing standards are in accord with model standards identified by the Secretary, and if not, the reason for the specific deviation and a description as to why having a standard that is reasonably in accord with the corresponding national model standards is not appropriate for the State;

"(B) whether the State has elected to waive standards established in 471(a)(10)(A) for relative foster family homes (pursuant to waiver authority provided by 471(a)(10)(D)), a description of which standards the State most commonly waives, and if the State has not elected to waive the standards, the reason for not waiving these standards;

"(C) if the State has elected to waive standards specified in subparagraph (B), how caseworkers are trained to use the waiver authority and whether the State has developed a process or provided tools to assist caseworkers in waiving nonsafety standards per the authority provided in 471(a)(10)(D) to quickly place children with relatives; and

"(D) a description of the steps the State is taking to improve caseworker training or the process, if any."

### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subject to subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State plan under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(2) APPLICATION TO PROGRAMS OPERATED BY INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium which the Secretary of Health

and Human Services determines requires time to take action necessary to comply with the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act (whether the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium has a plan under section 479B of the Social Security Act or a cooperative agreement or contract entered into with a State), the Secretary shall provide the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium with such additional time as the Secretary determines is necessary for the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium to take the action to comply with the additional requirements before being regarded as failing to comply with the requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2866, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on H.R. 2866, the Reducing Unnecessary Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act, introduced by my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Introducing this legislation, Congressman SMUCKER was joined by our Ways and Means colleague, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL from across the aisle. The bill has strong bipartisan support, including mine. I am a cosponsor. And the Child Welfare League of America has strongly endorsed this legislation.

So what does this bill do? Well, in short, the bill will reduce the bureaucratic process for placing children in foster care with relatives, when possible, and is in the best interest of the child.

Now, this just makes common sense. Last year alone, there were almost a half million children in foster care, more than 16,000 children in my home State of Pennsylvania alone. Now, there are countless family members of these foster children who are not only willing, but they are ready to have these children placed in their homes when one of their relatives can't take care of them.

As a matter of good public policy, we should be making the placement process much easier for family members, not more difficult, because it is often in the best interest of the child.

Studies show that placing foster children with relatives solves many of the

problems children face when being placed into foster care; moreover, it improves the outcomes for these children. Children are more likely to succeed when they can stay with a family member of their own and someone they are already familiar with and know. Children placed with relatives tend to spend less time in foster care and also experience much more stability.

The problem is that, while current law allows States to waive certain licensing standards when placing children with relatives, many States have been slow to implement the law. One of the purported reasons is that caseworkers are slow or they simply don't know how to place children with relatives because of a lack of training on their part.

Today, caseworkers may not be adequately trained regarding their ability to waive certain standards when licensing relatives. This has resulted in delays in placing children with relatives.

And when these children are already facing a tremendous amount of turmoil and uncertainty in their lives, we shouldn't be tying them up in bureaucratic red tape. We need to do more to place these children with a loving family member whenever possible.

Now, how do we do that? Well, Representative SMUCKER's bill, H.R. 2866, will help remedy this problem by making our foster care system more family friendly, by ensuring States take proactive steps to speed up the licensing process for relatives.

Specifically, the bill would require Health and Human Services to identify reputable model standards for licensing foster family homes by October 1, 2018. States, subsequently, would need to do their part by submitting their plans to be in compliance with model standards for family foster care placement. Additionally, States would need to explain how caseworkers in their respective States are being trained.

This commonsense bill is at absolutely no cost to taxpayers, but it would pay tremendous dividends for our Nation's children. Every child deserves to be raised in a loving home. The Smucker-Sewell bill will ensure that many more children can live safely and happily with loving family members when they cannot stay in their own home with their nuclear family.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation. Passing this legislation is the very least we can do for these children.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member DAVIS for yielding me the time.

At this time, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

As we have discussed, H.R. 2866 requires HHS to identify reputable model licensing standards so that States can determine whether their current requirements are in accord.

Is it your expectation that the National Association for Regulatory Administration's Model Family Foster Home Licensing Standards would be the kind of standards envisioned by the bill?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

My feeling is the National Association for Regulatory Administration's Model Foster Home Licensing Standards would be a prime example of what HHS should consider.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that response.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER), the sponsor of this important legislation, from my home State and a key member of the Keystone Coalition.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of and to ask my colleagues' support for H.R. 2866, the Reducing Unnecessary Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act.

I would like to first thank my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania for his leadership and sponsorship of this bill. I would like to thank the chair of the Ways and Means Committee, Representative BRADY, and members of the Ways and Means Committee for bringing this bill to the floor, and I would like to thank my cotroducer of the bill, Representative SEWELL from Alabama, as well, for the work that she has done in regards to foster care issues over the years.

Every child, Mr. Speaker, deserves a loving home; but when a child's home is no longer safe, often because of abuse, neglect, or behavioral issues, children are placed in foster homes. In fact, in 2015, more than 670,000 American children—16,000 in Pennsylvania, the State, including in my district, more than 16,000 there have spent time in foster care.

Countless families across the country are willing and eager to accept foster children into their homes, and research shows that placement with relatives is better for the child. Therefore, Federal policy should make it easier for foster children to be placed with family members.

Our bill is being considered today on the floor, and again, I ask for my colleagues' support. When it comes to

finding loving homes for children, this is a bipartisan issue. There are no Republicans or Democrats, just mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles, and sons and daughters who believe each child should have a bed to be tucked into at night in a loving home.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also note that the following organizations have expressed support for H.R. 2866: the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Child Welfare League of America, First Focus, March of Dimes, and the National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners.

Again, I would like to thank Representative SEWELL from Alabama for her work on foster care issues and for her leadership on this bill. We really appreciate her work.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support H.R. 2866, the Reducing Unnecessary Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act.

This important bill helps relative caregivers by requiring States to examine whether their licensing standards align with the best practices in licensing family foster homes. In so doing, H.R. 2866 requires States to set reasonable requirements for family homes, standards that consider community norms and cultural differences and standards that remove artificial barriers to family care.

I have advocated these provisions within my own bill to improve support for kinship caregivers, and I am proud to support Congresswoman SEWELL and Congressman SMUCKER's bill.

More than 25 percent of children in care live with a grandparent or other relative. My congressional district has the highest percentage of children living with grandparent caregivers in the Nation, followed closely by two other congressional districts in Illinois.

In Illinois, 37 percent of all children placed in out-of-home care are placed with relatives; however, less than half of these children are placed with relatives in homes that are licensed.

The vast majority of relative caregivers are not able to become licensed caregivers because the standards do not make sense with their circumstances, such as requiring a grandmother in an expensive city like Chicago to have one bedroom for each of her three grandbabies or requiring her to take dozens of hours of parent training each year.

In 2008, I worked with Congressman Jerry Weller from Illinois to allow States the ability to waive nonsafety licensing standards on a case-by-case basis to help kinship caregivers via the Fostering Connections Act. Unfortunately, many States chose not to exercise this waiver authority to assist kin caregivers.

For example, in 2011, although Illinois had more than 3,600 nonlicensed

relatives caring for youth, only 72 licensing waivers for relatives were approved. Less than 2 percent received waivers.

H.R. 2866 requires States to modernize their licensing standards to align with the best practices in licensing. This is a commonsense and important change.

□ 1615

Further, this bill advances our goal of ensuring that States follow the waivers to meet the best interests of the children. To understand the use of waivers, Children's Bureau should collect data on State's granting waivers for nonsafety licensing standards for relatives, including the number of relatives applying for waivers, the number of waivers issued or denied, and the reason for denial.

I strongly support H.R. 2866, the Reducing Unnecessary Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act and urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) who is a sponsor of this bill.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member DAVIS for yielding me the time.

H.R. 2866, the Reducing Unnecessary Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act, is a commonsense piece of legislation that has strong bipartisan support right here in the House. I want to especially thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) who is joining me in introducing this bill. I want to thank him for his leadership on foster care and foster youth and again say thank you for looking for what is in the best interests of the most vulnerable children in our society.

H.R. 2866 has been supported by not only bipartisan support here in the House but has the support of many foster care advocacy groups, including Generations United, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the American Academy of Pediatrics.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do everything in our power to make the foster care system family friendly, and H.R. 2866 takes an important step in that direction. By motivating States to update the foster care licensing regulations, we can reduce red tape and make it easier for family members to become foster parents.

Research conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, academics, and advocacy groups all show that children experience better outcomes when they are in the care of family members compared to children in nonrelative care.

When kids are placed with a relative like a grandparent, they experience

fewer school changes, are less likely to reenter the foster care system, and are more likely to be adopted. Moreover, data shows that foster youth experience better behavioral and mental health outcomes, are more likely to report that they "feel loved," and are more likely to stay connected with their communities.

I want to again thank Representative SMUCKER from Pennsylvania for his leadership and sponsorship of this bill with me, as well as my Democrat and Republican colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee for unanimously supporting this legislation.

I am encouraged to see that this body values our foster youth, and I hope we can continue to keep up the spirit of bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2866, and I want to congratulate my good friends, Representatives SEWELL, KELLY, and SMUCKER for this legislation to reduce barriers for relative caregivers.

Ironically, in the 1990s, when the crack cocaine epidemic hit, that was the first time that women started using drugs equal to men. It hadn't happened before, and so families fell apart. One of the things that happened, in the early 1990s, was in the middle of the night a grandmother might be called and three grandchildren delivered to her by Children's Protective Services. The grandmother would take the children without any support and without any knowledge of how to deal with the trauma that the children faced.

During those years, we actually discriminated against relatives. We said very negative things about them such as: the apple doesn't fall far from the tree; and, if your daughter wound up on drugs, why should we give the children to you?

So during those years, we would rather pay a stranger—and there can be wonderful foster parents—but a stranger to take care of children instead of families.

One of the things we did in Los Angeles was we organized the grandmothers, and we trained them how to go before the board of supervisors and advocate on their own behalf. That happened all around the country. So there really was a movement of relatives who rose up and said: We want our children; we just need help. We might be on a fixed income, and we can't really support the children.

It is actually more expensive to put a child in foster care. So there began a national movement for relative care-

givers to fighting for their rights and for services. So over the years, we really evolved to the point where we have legislation like this where we recognize the benefit of having relatives take care of children.

Ironically, the last piece of legislation we were talking about was about children aging out of the system. Before we prioritized relatives, what would happen is a young child who was aging out of foster care, we would put them on the street, and the first thing they would do would be to go look for their families because they might have family somewhere, and they would often do that.

This legislation, I think, is extremely important to allow flexibility for licensing of relative caregivers. Examples of grandmothers who I worked with directly who wanted to take in their grandchildren but they were told they didn't have enough bedrooms in their house, and so we were going to put the children in more expensive foster care and break them up and send them to different foster homes instead of leaving them with the grandmother or assist her in moving.

So legislation like H.R. 2866, I believe, will begin to address some of these challenges and do what every child needs, which is to be in a loving home with family.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

H.R. 2866 is important because it supports kinship caregivers. Research shows that children placed in kinship care are safer, more stable placements and are more likely to be connected with their siblings and community than children placed in nonrelative placements.

In addition to these positive outcomes for children in relative care, research shows that kinship care placements are more cost effective. In Illinois, cost studies estimated an average of \$4,778 in savings of title IV-E administrative expenses over an 8-year period compared to a match control group that did not have this option.

More than 400,000 children make up our Nation's foster care population with more than one in four of these vulnerable children living with a grandparent or other relative. We should do as much as we can to strengthen these families and children. H.R. 2866 takes an important step forward.

Mr. Speaker, I have two facilities in my congressional district that have outstanding programs. They are 45-unit buildings that have been constructed for grandparents raising grandchildren. One is operated by the Sankofa Safe Child Initiative, the other by the

Coppin AME Church Community Development Agency. Both of these are tremendous examples of what can happen when children have the opportunity to be nurtured by grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a minute because I think today is one of those days where the American people look to the people's House and say: Isn't it something that they can actually agree? Isn't it something that they actually think with their hearts? Isn't it actually something that they can come together on an issue that is so basic, so simple, and so easy to understand?

We are talking about our most precious asset and the country's best hope for the future: our children.

As I heard Ms. SEWELL talk and Ms. BASS talk, I know in their hearts how they feel about this. I know this is not something they just thought about today or this week or thought this would be a good piece of legislation; they think it is good because it is good for American people.

Mr. SMUCKER joined with Ms. SEWELL to have this legislation come forward. It is a breath of fresh air for the people's House. This is legislation that protects children, legislation that puts children with their families in case they can't be taken care of in their own homes, and it is an incredible effort by both sides.

I want to tell you what a great privilege it is to serve with you today and to be on the floor with you. Mr. DAVIS is eloquent. Ms. BASS, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. SMUCKER of Pennsylvania are good friends of mine. So it is good to be here today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2866, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### MODIFICATIONS OF CREDIT FOR PRODUCTION FROM ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER FACILITIES

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (H.R. 1551) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1551

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

#### SECTION 1. MODIFICATIONS OF CREDIT FOR PRODUCTION FROM ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER FACILITIES.

(a) TREATMENT OF UNUTILIZED LIMITATION AMOUNTS.—Section 45J(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by inserting “or any amendment to” after “enactment of”, and

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

“(5) ALLOCATION OF UNUTILIZED LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any unutilized national megawatt capacity limitation shall be allocated by the Secretary under paragraph (3) as rapidly as is practicable after December 31, 2020—

“(i) first to facilities placed in service on or before such date to the extent that such facilities did not receive an allocation equal to their full nameplate capacity, and

“(ii) then to facilities placed in service after such date in the order in which such facilities are placed in service.

“(B) UNUTILIZED NATIONAL MEGAWATT CAPACITY LIMITATION.—The term ‘unutilized national megawatt capacity limitation’ means the excess (if any) of—

“(i) 6,000 megawatts, over

“(ii) the aggregate amount of national megawatt capacity limitation allocated by the Secretary before January 1, 2021, reduced by any amount of such limitation which was allocated to a facility which was not placed in service before such date.

“(C) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—In the case of any unutilized national megawatt capacity limitation allocated by the Secretary pursuant to this paragraph—

“(i) such allocation shall be treated for purposes of this section in the same manner as an allocation of national megawatt capacity limitation, and

“(ii) subsection (d)(1)(B) shall not apply to any facility which receives such allocation.”.

(b) TRANSFER OF CREDIT BY CERTAIN PUBLIC ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 45J of such Code is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f), and

(B) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) TRANSFER OF CREDIT BY CERTAIN PUBLIC ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If, with respect to a credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year—

“(A) the taxpayer would be a qualified public entity, and

“(B) such entity elects the application of this paragraph for such taxable year with respect to all (or any portion specified in such election) of such credit,

the eligible project partner specified in such election (and not the qualified public entity) shall be treated as the taxpayer for purposes of this title with respect to such credit (or such portion thereof).

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) QUALIFIED PUBLIC ENTITY.—The term ‘qualified public entity’ means—

“(i) a Federal, State, or local government entity, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof,

“(ii) a mutual or cooperative electric company described in section 501(c)(12) or section 1381(a)(2), or

“(iii) a not-for-profit electric utility which has or had received a loan or loan guarantee under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

“(B) ELIGIBLE PROJECT PARTNER.—The term ‘eligible project partner’ means—

“(i) any person responsible for, or participating in, the design or construction of the advanced nuclear power facility to which the credit under subsection (a) relates,

“(ii) any person who participates in the provision of the nuclear steam supply system to the advanced nuclear power facility to which the credit under subsection (a) relates,

“(iii) any person who participates in the provision of nuclear fuel to the advanced nuclear power facility to which the credit under subsection (a) relates, or

“(iv) any person who has an ownership interest in such facility.

“(3) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(A) APPLICATION TO PARTNERSHIPS.—In the case of a credit under subsection (a) which is determined at the partnership level—

“(i) for purposes of paragraph (1)(A), a qualified public entity shall be treated as the taxpayer with respect to such entity's distributive share of such credit, and

“(ii) the term ‘eligible project partner’ shall include any partner of the partnership.

“(B) TAXABLE YEAR IN WHICH CREDIT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—In the case of any credit (or portion thereof) with respect to which an election is made under paragraph (1), such credit shall be taken into account in the first taxable year of the eligible project partner ending with, or after, the qualified public entity's taxable year with respect to which the credit was determined.

“(C) TREATMENT OF TRANSFER UNDER PRIVATE USE RULES.—For purposes of section 141(b)(1), any benefit derived by an eligible project partner in connection with an election under this subsection shall not be taken into account as a private business use.”.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR PROCEEDS OF TRANSFERS FOR MUTUAL OR COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC COMPANIES.—Section 501(c)(12) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(I) In the case of a mutual or cooperative electric company described in this paragraph or an organization described in section 1381(a)(2), income received or accrued in connection with an election under section 45J(e)(1) shall be treated as an amount collected from members for the sole purpose of meeting losses and expenses.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) TREATMENT OF UNUTILIZED LIMITATION AMOUNTS.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSFER OF CREDIT BY CERTAIN PUBLIC ENTITIES.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous



material on H.R. 1551, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 1551, a bill I have sponsored that modifies the advanced nuclear production tax credit.

The nuclear production tax credit has been a vital incentive to jumpstart a nuclear industry that has been dormant for almost 40 years. Unfortunately, due to overregulation, ambiguities in the law, and other unanticipated events, the first-in-a-generation nuclear plants that began construction because of this tax credit are in danger of being shut down midconstruction.

Without certainty that these facilities will have full access to the allocation of their tax credits, it may be another 30 or 40 years before this country builds another cutting-edge nuclear facility. Thankfully, the legislation we are considering today provides these facilities the certainty they so desperately need to move forward.

□ 1630

Almost 12 years ago, Congress established the nuclear production tax credit as part of a broader package designed to ensure our energy independence. Not wanting to oversubsidize the nuclear industry, Congress set out to limit the credit in a number of ways, including a national production capacity that effectively capped the amount of this credit available.

South Carolina and Georgia responded to this incentive, making large investments in nuclear facilities that represented the pinnacle of safety and innovation in the industry. After years of applications, planning, and rigorous oversight by multiple regulatory authorities, these plants began construction in 2013, receiving sizable allocations of the nuclear production tax credit's national capacity.

Yet, it quickly became clear changes to the underlying provision were necessary in order for these plants to fulfill the capacity allocation as Congress originally intended. For example, right now, not-for-profit entities like public utilities are unable to utilize or transfer their share of the credits, leaving the majority of the tax credits allocated to these two plants unusable.

Additionally, strict placed-in-service date rules would force these plants to make decisions between finishing before a deadline or making sure they are constructed in the safest way possible.

Recently, to make matters worse, a third-party contractor for both plants unexpectedly filed for bankruptcy, putting the projects in jeopardy of finishing before the placed-in-service date, if at all.

In the coming weeks, both plants must go before State regulators and provide a plan for how they will continue construction. The full availability of the \$2 billion in tax credits will be a key factor in the regulators' assessment of whether to approve the plans to continue with the facilities or shut down the construction completely.

Taking a step back for a second, I think it is important to note that one of my top priorities in Congress is to help restore our country's competitiveness through a comprehensive overhaul of our Tax Code. An ideal tax system promotes parity between different energy sources and gets the government out of the business of picking winners and losers.

Before we get to that ideal tax system, we must create a smooth transition from our current system to the new system. This legislation is an important part of that transition. As Ways and Means Committee Chairman BRADY said at our markup last week: "Nuclear power is a critical component of an all-of-the-above strategy for energy independence and national security."

Without this legislation, the nuclear power industry may cease to exist as we know it today in this country, which is exactly why passing this legislation today is more important now than ever. Nuclear power is crucial to our energy independence.

Additionally, if these facilities shut down tomorrow, it will immediately cost 12,000 jobs in South Carolina and Georgia. It will cost the ratepayers hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars in increases in their annual utility bills. And most alarming, our national security will be jeopardized, as countries like China and Russia continue to make massive investments in nuclear power production.

We need to give these plants the certainty of the tax credits as Congress originally intended, not just for South Carolina and Georgia, but for the continued innovation of nuclear energy and the security of our Nation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1551, a bipartisan bill to modify the section 45J production tax credit for advanced power.

This bill is sponsored by two of my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER from Oregon and Mr. RICE from South Carolina. It enjoys bipartisan support of members of the committee as well.

Passage of this bill is critical to thousands of jobs in South Carolina and Georgia. As you know, I am committed to passing good, bipartisan legislation that puts and keeps Americans to work in good-paying jobs.

However, I must highlight my disappointment that the committee at this moment has not acted on other important priorities in the energy tax space. For example, there is bipartisan interest in this Congress for extending section 48 investment tax credit for non-solar, section 48-eligible technologies. H.R. 1090, the Technology for Energy Security Act, introduced by our colleagues, Mr. REED from New York and Mr. THOMPSON from California, is supported by a bipartisan group of 93 Members of Congress.

The committee is overdue in considering this important piece of legislation, as well as other provisions vital to renewable energy, renewable fuels, and energy efficiency and alternative fuel vehicles that expired at the end of 2016. As the gentleman from South Carolina noted, all of the above.

I hope we can act before the eleventh hour to extend these provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by reminding my colleagues that the United States Government invests a tremendous amount of money on energy policy through our Tax Code. These investments have helped to grow our economy and create good-paying jobs nationwide. Therefore, as we continue the discussions on tax reform, I hope and anticipate Chairman BRADY will consider focusing on comprehensive, fully integrated energy strategy reform as well.

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) for his work on this.

I rise today to keep the lights on for American nuclear energy.

America is being left behind in the nuclear energy race. Nuclear energy in the United States is lagging behind our competition. The four new generation reactors being built in South Carolina and Georgia are the first new reactor construction since the 1970s. The Watts Bar 2 reactor in Tennessee, which was first permitted in the 1970s, only recently came online in 2016.

Mr. Speaker, America needs to get serious about nuclear energy. These new reactors not only keep our economy pumping with 24/7 base-load electricity, they are also the foundation for America's national security. A successful civilian nuclear energy sector is key to supporting America's military needs.

Nuclear needs to be approached holistically. From new production at plants like V.C. Summer in South Carolina, to treatment and disposal facilities at the Savannah River Site, it is in America's national security interest that policies keep all aspects of the nuclear life



cycle competitive with the rest of the world.

Passing this legislation now will send a clear signal to the regulatory authorities at home and nations abroad that America is serious about national security. Without such a signal, the chances that the regulatory authorities disregard the tax credits for the purposes of evaluating the project are much higher, likely leading to the authorities not approving the continued construction of the plants.

The United States must not turn over leadership in nuclear technology to Russia and China. China's recent nuclear deals are with Sudan, South Africa, Kenya, Egypt, Argentina, and Great Britain.

Rosatom, which administers the former Soviet weapons complex, says it has received orders for 34 nuclear power reactors in 13 countries, including Iran. Together, Russia and China are constructing almost 30 new advanced nuclear units, whereas the four units at the V.C. Summer and Vogtle plants would be our first nuclear units in almost 40 years.

Nuclear energy is the cornerstone of American economic and national security. I urge my colleagues to not turn the lights out on nuclear energy, and to vote in favor of H.R. 1551.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader and my friend.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend, Mr. NEAL, for yielding and for his support of this bill. It is very important to the States of South Carolina and Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1551 will make two critical modifications to the nuclear production tax credit program. This bill will allow government-owned electric utilities and nonprofit electric cooperatives to utilize the credit, which current law restricts to for-profit utilities only. It will also remove the placed-in-service deadline for facilities to be completed.

Since the tax credit's original passage in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, four new advanced nuclear plants, the V.C. Summer site in South Carolina, and the Vogtle site in Georgia, have been licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and are under construction.

Both projects are partly owned by State or municipal-owned utilities or nonprofit electric cooperatives. These public power entities, which have taken the first steps in constructing new advanced nuclear facilities, should not be penalized, but should, instead, be treated similarly to the for-profit utilities for the purpose of these tax incentives.

The construction that is currently underway in South Carolina and Georgia employ over 12,000 skilled workers and represent billions of dollars of in-

vestment. When complete, they will be the largest addition of carbon-free energy in either State and will replace older fossil fuel-emitting plants.

Recently, the contractor building both the South Carolina and Georgia facilities has entered into bankruptcy proceedings, raising the possibility of further delays in the completion of these projects. It is critical that the placed-in-service deadline be extended so that these projects, the first new advanced nuclear construction projects in this country in over 30 years, may be completed.

While Russia, China, and other countries around the world are investing in nuclear energy, we cannot afford to walk away from these important sources of clean energy for future generations.

The modifications in this bill do not expand the tax credit and, as such, have little additional cost to the taxpayer.

I want to thank my colleagues, TOM RICE and EARL BLUMENAUER, for sponsoring this legislation; and Chairman KEVIN BRADY and Ranking Member RICHARD NEAL for the support they have given to it.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for the comments that have been made regarding this very important piece of legislation.

We all know that securing American energy independence is absolutely critical to the future prosperity of this Nation, and nuclear power plays a major role in that mission.

At the Vogtle plant in Georgia, thousands of engineers and craftsmen, many of whom live in my district, are hard at work putting the United States at the forefront of advanced nuclear technology. The Vogtle plant and its sister plant in South Carolina, V.C. Summer, have four new, state-of-the-art reactors under construction. The clean, low-cost, safe energy that is produced from both Vogtle and V.C. Summer will pave the way for future reactors and mark a new era for nuclear power in the United States.

H.R. 1551 makes relatively small changes to already established tax credits, but this legislation will have an enormous impact on ensuring nuclear power remains a viable source of energy.

So I, again, just want to thank my good friend, Mr. RICE, for introducing this sincerely important piece of legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues here to support H.R. 1551.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), my friend.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, how very appropriate it is today that this Congress is interrupting consideration of child welfare and foster care bills in order to address a gift for the nuclear industry. An indifferent Congress that refuses to put an extra dime in addressing the deficiencies of our foster care system doesn't hesitate for a moment in giving a few more million dollars to the nuclear industry.

Isn't it amazing to hear what we will accomplish with a mere \$16 million additional tax subsidy?

Our national security will be protected. This is the first concern I have heard here on the floor in months from a Republican about giving things to Russia and China. Maybe the better place to look than this bill is down the street at the White House, if the real concern is what we are giving to the Russians.

To hear supporters of this bill talk about the dangers to Georgia and South Carolina, you would think that Sherman's March on Atlanta, Georgia, and South Carolina was nothing compared to the harm this Congress would do if it failed to enact this bill.

Well, the devastation that faces consumers in these States has nothing to do with what Congress has or has not done, but it has to do with the nuclear industry seeking special treatment, much as it is seeking taxpayer subsidies here today.

□ 1645

It is an industry that has disregarded longstanding utility law to compel Georgians to pay higher electric bills for utility investments before they ever deliver one kilowatt of power. And it may, in fact, never get around to providing any power for all the money that is wasted on them.

This is a bill that is masquerading as an incentive for the future. A glorious new day for nuclear power. And yet it makes this tax credit available to 20-year-old nuclear technology and for last-century uranium mining.

This bill hardly matches its cover. It is true that \$16 million of additional help to the nuclear industry is a mere footnote compared to the billions of taxpayer dollars, taxpayer resources, that have been lavished on this industry in the past.

In Georgia, the nuclear power industry literally turned decades of utility law upside down in demanding that electric ratepayers pay for what stockholders traditionally have paid for. Even after doing that, Westinghouse, a once distinguished American company, a blue ribbon company, went belly up. It has been nuked, and so have those local utility ratepayers.

As The New York Times reported recently:

"Many of the company's injuries are self-inflicted. . . ."

"Bankruptcy will make it harder for Westinghouse's business partners to

collect money they are owed by the nuclear-plant maker.”

“Now, it is unclear whether the company will be able to complete any of its projects, which in the United States are about 3 years late and billions over budget.”

“The cost estimates are already running \$1 billion to \$1.3 billion higher than originally expected, according to a recent report from Morgan Stanley, and could eventually exceed \$8 billion . . .” right onto the shoulders of those ratepayers in Georgia and South Carolina.

Of course, you would have thought, after the disaster at Fukushima and the many questions raised about nuclear power in Japan, that Congress would be rethinking nuclear power as a panacea. But even if you overlook this human disaster and the dangers to health and safety, a recognition that when the nuclear industry makes a mistake it is a mistake that lasts forever, if you just look at the economics alone, this kind of tax subsidy is unjustified.

With an ample amount of natural gas coming on the market, with so much renewable energy, nuclear simply has not made economic sense, and the history of this particular legislation demonstrates that.

When this tax break was originally set up back in 2005, there were some 32 nuclear plants that were going to take advantage of it, and it hasn't been because of the failure of Congress that they didn't. Out of that 32, exactly four have even begun to be built, and not one of them, not a single one of them, has been completed in over a decade and a half.

After this record of miserable failures, there is good reason to ask why taxpayers should be called on to give even more.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 13 environmental groups expressing opposition to the legislation.

JUNE 20, 2017.

Re Opposition to H.R. 1551—amending tax credit provisions for “advanced” nuclear power.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of our millions of members we are writing to register our strong opposition to H.R. 1551 that would eliminate the placed-in-service date for the nuclear production tax credit, which is currently January 1, 2021. It would also allow public power companies to receive the benefit of the federal production tax credit even though they pay no taxes.

Despite H.R. 1551's misleading title, the production tax credit it extends is not designated solely for new, supposed “advanced” nuclear technologies. Rather, reactor designs that were approved over twenty years ago are eligible as described in the bill analysis by the Joint Committee on Taxation, “An advanced nuclear facility is any nuclear facility for the production of electricity, the reactor design for which was approved after 1993 by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.”

The nuclear industry is once again demonstrating that it is not only dirty and dangerous but that it is also not cost competitive. Despite promises that this time would be different, the four Toshiba-Westinghouse AP1000 nuclear reactors under construction in the U.S., two at Southern Company's Plant Vogtle in Georgia and two at SCANA's V.C. Summer plant in South Carolina, have yet again shown that the nuclear industry is incapable of building new reactors within budget or on time even with significant federal and state financial incentives and new, streamlined federal licensing processes.

Reports issued in recent weeks show that the costs of these projects are out of control, and falling further and further behind schedule. Both are approximately 40% complete in terms of construction, yet have already more than doubled in cost and projected construction time. When construction started in 2009, Vogtle 3 and 4 were projected to cost a total of \$14 billion and to begin generating electricity in 2016 and 2017, respectively. Eight years later, the reactors may not be completed until 2022 and 2023, if ever, and at an estimated total project cost of \$29 billion. Summer 2 and 3 were projected to cost \$11 billion, but overruns have pushed the total to at least \$22.9 billion. Consequently, utility customers in both states are suffering as they are paying in advance for the financing costs associated with the projects far longer than initially predicted and will ultimately face increasing bills because of the projects' cost overruns.

H.R. 1551 would unfairly reward Southern Company and SCANA Corp. for not being able to complete these projects on time, providing them each with more than \$1 billion in taxpayer-provided handouts to shield their shareholders from the financial responsibility of pursuing inherently risky, uneconomical projects. Perhaps even worse, eliminating the placed-in-service date will provide an incentive for yet other utilities to make the same mistakes.

The purpose of tax incentives, whether for nuclear, renewable energy, or other technologies, is to support innovation and technological leadership in the energy sector and to drive the commercialization of promising new technologies. When the nuclear production tax credit was created in 2005, Congress hoped to support a revival of nuclear reactor construction. Only four out of thirty-two reactors proposed since 2005 ever began construction, and the vast majority of the rest have been cancelled or indefinitely shelved.

The failures to bring any of the four reactors online within the fifteen-year period of the tax credit program demonstrates that the technology is an even greater failure than the first generation of reactors, and it will never be widely commercialized. It is simply not a justified or worthy investment of taxpayers' money to grant the owners of these reactors the extraordinary relief of billions of dollars in subsidies for projects that hold no promise for the U.S. energy sector. It should not be forgotten that Southern Company's expansion of Plant Vogtle has already received substantial taxpayer support through the \$8.3 billion in federal nuclear loan guarantees and the public/private cost-sharing support during the permitting and licensing process.

Finally, we oppose H.R. 1551 because the legislation establishes an expensive precedent by creating brand-new tax credit value for any not-for-profit project partners that can only be transferred to all for-profit project partners. Both the Vogtle and Summer projects feature a combination of both

for-profit and not-for-profit utilities. Not-for-profit utilities, such as rural cooperatives, municipal or state-owned utilities, have no federal tax liability and therefore are not entitled to tax credits. But under H.R. 1551, the tax credit is made available for not-for-profit entities that can only be transferred to the project's for-profit partners. Furthermore, H.R. 1551 specifies that rural cooperatives may treat tax credit transfers as funds collected for “the sole purpose of meeting losses and expenses”—that is, as a form of debt relief, for which production tax credits were not intended. These measures amount to a brand-new, taxpayer-shouldered giveaway for both Southern Company and SCANA Corp.

Furthermore, the definition of “eligible partners” that can receive the tax credits from the not-for-profit partner(s) is troubling as it “includes any person who designed or constructed the nuclear power plant, participates in the provision of nuclear steam or nuclear fuel to the power plant, or has an ownership interest in the facility.” Providing tax credits to reactor suppliers or the uranium mining industry is objectionable and goes beyond the original intent of the law to provide incentives to actual nuclear utilities that were among the first to pursue new nuclear generation.

The rationales provided for eliminating the placed-in-service date for the nuclear production tax credit are irrelevant and have no merit:

“The cost of H.R. 1551 is minimal.” The cost of the nuclear production tax credits is at least \$5.2 billion. Due to both eliminating the placed-in-service date and by permitting qualified public entities to transfer credits to an eligible project partner, the latter provision would actually increase the cost of the tax credits by allowing non-profit, tax-exempt owners of reactors to take a large federal tax credit. State and municipal utilities and rural cooperatives are major owners of both the Vogtle and Summer projects: rural cooperatives own 54.3% of the Vogtle 3 and 4 reactors; and Santee Cooper owns 45% of the Summer 2 and 3 reactors. By permitting these tax-exempt entities to transfer tax credits to private sector partners, H.R. 1551 would double the anticipated amount of the tax credits for the Summer and Vogtle projects. The credits are valued at \$18 per megawatt-hour of electricity generated for the first eight years. This would amount to about \$160 million per year for each reactor—\$1.3 billion each, or \$5.2 billion for all four reactors. Taxpayers stand to avoid a \$5.2 billion expense if none of the reactors come online before the tax credits expire at the end of 2020. By eliminating the placed-in-service date, H.R. 1551 could cost taxpayers billions of dollars for a failed technology.

“The tax credits are essential to the completion of the Vogtle and Summer projects.” It is not clear that the tax credits will have any effect on the outcome of the Vogtle and Summer projects at this point. Each of the reactors under construction is now \$5 billion to \$7 billion over budget. Even \$1.3 billion in tax credits is not enough offset such massive cost overruns; and, in any case, the benefits of the production tax credit were assumed when the utilities began building the reactors. If the utilities determine to complete the reactors despite the cost overruns, the value of the tax credits will not be a decisive factor.

“The tax credits are essential to maintaining U.S. leadership in the global nuclear industry.” Extending the nuclear production tax credit will do nothing to promote U.S.

leadership in nuclear technology or reactor exports. The tax credits themselves will derive to the domestic utilities that will own and operate the Vogtle and Summer reactors, not the manufacturers that design, export, and build reactors. The nuclear divisions of Westinghouse and General Electric are the only two U.S.-based companies actively involved in the global reactor market, but both are now owned by Japanese corporations (Toshiba and Hitachi). As a result of Westinghouse's bankruptcy, Toshiba has determined not to build any more new reactors, and not to continue supporting the AP1000 reactor design. GE-Hitachi's prospects are no better. The company has only two reactors in construction globally (both in Japan and long-delayed).

"A viable commercial nuclear power industry is necessary to support the nation's defense nuclear complex." This would be a hypocritical reason to provide a subsidy to reactors, and could prove dangerous to peace and security domestically and globally. The U.S. is under international treaty obligations to maintain a strict separation of civilian and military applications of nuclear technology. Historically, the U.S. government's purpose in promoting commercial nuclear power was to encourage the peaceful application of atomic energy, not to advance nuclear weapons. If the U.S. is perceived as promoting civilian nuclear power as a means of bolstering our nuclear weapons program, then it will undermine our credibility in the non-proliferation arena. It could also encourage enemies to view nuclear power plants as extensions of our military establishment, and hence as legitimate targets in armed conflict.

We strongly oppose this bill and urge you to vote against this undeserved industry bailout. We urge Congress to oppose this provision and instead focus on low- or no-carbon energy choices that can be deployed affordably in the near-term, at low risk, that will lead us to a clean and sustainable future.

Sincerely,

Beyond Nuclear, Center for Biological Diversity, Clean Water Action, Environment America, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, League of Conservation Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Nuclear Information And Resource Service, Public Citizens, Sierra Club, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Southern Oregon Climate Action Now.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is an important additional concern raised by our colleague Mr. NEAL already.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEAL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DOGGETT. And that is the fact that there are so many other additional measures that our colleagues' bipartisan efforts that are pending in our committee on energy-efficient residential property, on fuel cells, on small wind energy, on geothermal heat pumps, to mention only a few. These represent forms of energy and energy conservation that will help us address climate change while achieving our energy objectives.

Mr. Speaker, instead of today's measure, our focus should be on safe,

healthy forms of energy instead of an industry that costs too much and poses too much danger to humans.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1551, legislation supported by Republicans and Democrats, focused on strengthening America's energy security.

This bill is sponsored and led by Congressman TOM RICE, and it clarifies an existing law dealing with tax credits for nuclear energy production and making sure these credits work effectively for America. It addresses an urgent problem that now poses a threat to America's energy security and, by extension, our national security.

As a result of an uncertainty with respect to the nuclear production tax credit, there is a risk of construction grinding to a halt on several cutting-edge nuclear power plants in our country. Meanwhile, our global competitors like Russia and China are pushing forward nuclear power to bolster their own energy sectors.

Nuclear power is critical to an all-of-the-above strategy for American energy independence and our national security. It is urgent that we take action now to solve this issue in our Tax Code and provide the certainty that our energy innovators need to continue moving forward with construction. That is exactly what Congressman RICE's bill will do.

To be clear, I would rather be standing here today to announce that this important bill is part of overall tax reform. But the fact is that our focus on that important goal doesn't prevent us from acting to solve urgent problems in existing law like this.

The fact is this bill is not what Washington calls a tax extender. That circus isn't coming back to town. This bill is a solution to a serious and immediate problem in our Tax Code that threatens our energy security. That is why we are moving it forward right now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman RICE for his leadership on H.R. 1551 and the strong support from the South Carolina and Georgia delegations, all who have weighed in on this. And as we continue working with President Trump in the Senate to deliver comprehensive tax reform this year, we should pass this bill now, provide greater certainty for our nuclear energy innovators.

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman RICE for his introduction of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and I agree on many issues facing our Nation today. We share our number one priority: national security. Energy independence is critical to our mutual mission to safeguard the United States. That is why I stand before my colleagues in the Nation today in support of H.R. 1551 to modify the nuclear production tax credit.

Enacted in 2005, the Energy Policy Act provided production tax credits for reactors with a deadline of 2020. When the law was enacted, Congress did not anticipate the sunset date would place a hardship on energy producers. As every businessowner knows, the unexpected happens in the real world.

My district is leading the way in the expansion of our Nation's nuclear energy resources, constructing two of the first nuclear reactors in the United States in more than 30 years. In fact, the 12th District of Georgia will have more than 75 percent of the nuclear generating capacity of the Southern Company.

Also, because Georgia has been ranked as the number one place to locate your business for the last 4 years is because we enjoy extremely low power rates.

In an unfortunate turn of events, Westinghouse filed for bankruptcy, which could result in the nuclear units coming online at Plant Vogtle a little later than 2020. H.R. 1551 will assist our Nation's energy producers to complete Plant Vogtle's units 3 and 4. Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely critical. This change will not cost the taxpayer an additional dime.

You may ask: Why is this a national security issue? As it has been mentioned, China and Russia continue to make heavy investments in nuclear energy. We cannot send a signal to the rest of the world that nondemocratic countries are leading the way in nuclear production and that America is not investing in our own energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, Plant Vogtle is critical to provide clean low-cost energy to Georgians. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical important legislation.

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 1551, and I want to thank Mr. RICE for his hard work on this bill and the way he shepherded it through the legislative process. I think it is awfully important for a number of different reasons. I think it is important for the reason of the environment.

I come from the low country of South Carolina, and we are seeing firsthand sea level rise and its effect. We can have a huge debate on what is causing

that, what is not causing that. But in the meantime, there is a clear scientific consensus on the idea of increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions being tied to this notion of global warming, which very much impacts my congressional district. It impacts a lot of places around the world.

So I think that there is no perfect energy source out there, in fairness to my colleague. But of the available choices out there, I think that something that does address the CO<sub>2</sub> emission question is awfully important, and nuclear does.

I think it is also important from the standpoint of base load in terms of energy in this country and its importance in terms of competitiveness around the world.

Gordon Sullivan wrote a book entitled "Hope is not a Method," and he talked about we may hope for a whole host of different breakthroughs in terms of alternatives, and I do hope that they come through, whether that is solar or tidal or who knows what. I think that there are emerging technologies there, but, in the meantime, we have to handle this issue of base load from the standpoint of our ability to compete with the rest of the world in terms of baseline energy as it relates to business and it relates to, frankly, the ability to cool one's house in the warm air of South Carolina, or I guess the southwest these days.

I think it is also important from the standpoint of energy independence. This idea of domestic production becomes incredibly important given the way in which we are dealing with a whole host of different places around the globe that at times don't want what is best for America but want what is best for their region to the exclusion, at times, of what is best for America.

Mr. Speaker, this idea of energy independence, I think, is also an important consideration into H.R. 1551. It is for that reason that I come by for a second to thank TOM RICE for his hard work in shepherding this bill forward.

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

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the previous gentleman's comments, it is helpful for the acknowledgment that there is broad agreement among scientists as to how global warming is occurring. There is a suggestion that it is because of problems that have been generated by man- and womankind. I think that President Obama said clearly all of the above as part of the solution.

So the suggestion that we have had on this side as this legislation advances is also to use the pulpit of the Ways and Means Committee to move forward with advancing meaningful job creation in terms of alternative and renewable energy as well, and creating greater energy efficiencies.

I would think that there should be an opportunity in this House to find some

common agreements on legislation, similar to what we are witnessing today, on the renewable front as well. Greater energy efficiency for all of us should be of paramount concern.

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I cannot overstate the importance this legislation represents to the future of nuclear energy production in the United States.

As the Ways and Means Committee noted when it approved this same measure last year, while the committee continues to work on comprehensive tax reform as a critical means of promoting economic growth and job creation, it is important to provide immediate clarity and certainty on tax issues affecting American businesses, and this legislation will provide just that.

I would also like to thank Chairman BRADY for his continued support of H.R. 1551, as well as the bipartisan support we received when this bill was voted out of committee by voice vote last week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for continued bipartisan support from my colleagues here in the House in passing this legislation, not just because it makes commonsense changes to the credit but because of the extreme sense of urgency to provide certainty for our nuclear industry.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1551, I would like to thank Mr. RICE and Mr. BLUMENAUER for authoring this bill that modifies the credit for energy production from advanced nuclear facilities. I would also like to thank Chairman KEVIN BRADY for guiding this legislation favorably through the Committee on Ways and Means, and House leadership for helping to bring it to the floor today.

My congressional district in North Texas is home to many people that are currently employed and actively engaged in the planning, approval, and construction of advanced nuclear facilities. One such constituent company, Fluor Corporation, is headquartered in Irving, Texas. This US-based engineering and construction company employs 15,000 employees working on energy and power, infrastructure, mining, and industrial projects in Texas alone. Currently, Fluor supervises the construction of the four reactors at two sites employing almost 6,000 people.

Employees at this and other companies nationwide work to advance the construction of these nuclear facilities. Finishing these projects is crucial for the employees, engineers, and the industrial base that we need to retain in the United States.

I believe, and I am sure my colleagues agree, that the impacts of these projects are important for both our civilian and military markets. In addition, the changes presented in

H.R. 1551 will potentially benefit many companies involved in design, fabrication, and construction of additional nuclear units.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1551, which improves the Section 45(J) nuclear production tax credit (NPTC), as authorized by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation and thank Congressman RICE of South Carolina and Congressman BLUMENAUER of Oregon for their leadership on this issue.

The NPTC encourages the development of advanced nuclear power plants that make strides in safety and reliability but is limited to the first 6,000 megawatts of new generating capacity constructed by 2020. Since passage of the Act, more advanced reactors, including small modular reactors (SMRs), have moved steadily through the research and development stage and could be ready for commercial deployment by the middle of the next decade.

Once approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), these technologies will provide reliable, carbon-free baseload electricity with safety features that nearly eliminate the possibility of a radiological release. The first SMRs in the United States will most likely be in the West. Arizona energy providers like the Salt River Project and Arizona Public Service are both evaluating the potential use of small modular reactors as they replace aging generation capacity.

When the NPTC expires in 2020, it will likely do so without reaching the megawatt cap. H.R. 1551 makes the remaining credit available beyond 2020, providing a powerful incentive for the next generation of advanced nuclear and SMR projects. I strongly support these efforts and encourage you to consider the positive impact these changes would have on incentivizing a new generation of safe, reliable, and carbon-free advanced nuclear power.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and to move America toward energy independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1551, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

#### MODERNIZING THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE ACT

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2742) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to adopt an electronic system to help expedite the placement of children in foster care or guardianship, or for

adoption, across State lines, and to provide funding to aid States in developing such a system, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2742

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) when a child in foster care cannot return safely home, the child deserves to be placed in a setting that is best for that child, regardless of whether it is in the child’s State or another State;

(2) the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) was established in 1960 to provide a uniform legal framework for the placement of children across State lines in foster and adoptive homes;

(3) frequently, children waiting to be placed with an adoptive family, relative, or foster parent in another State spend more time waiting for this to occur than children who are placed with an adoptive, family, relative, or foster parent in the same State, because of the outdated, administratively burdensome ICPC process;

(4) no child should have to wait longer to be placed in a loving home simply because the child must cross a State line;

(5) the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE) was launched in August 2014 in Indiana, Nevada, Florida, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia, has since expanded into Illinois, Virginia, Rhode Island, California, Alaska, Nebraska, and Georgia, and is expected to be expanded into additional States to improve the administrative process by which children are placed with families across State lines;

(6) States using this electronic interstate case-processing system have reduced administrative costs and the amount of staff time required to process these cases, and caseworkers can spend more time helping children instead of copying and mailing paperwork between States;

(7) since NEICE was launched, placement time has decreased by 30 percent for interstate foster care placements; and

(8) on average, States using this electronic interstate case-processing system have been able to reduce from 24 business days to 13 business days the time it takes to identify a family for a child and prepare the paperwork required to start the ICPC process.

#### SEC. 3. STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 471(a)(25) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(25)) is amended—

(1) by striking “provide” and insert “provides”; and

(2) by inserting “, which in the case of a State other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, not later than October 1, 2027, shall include the use of an electronic interstate case-processing system” before the 1st semicolon.

(b) EXEMPTION OF INDIAN TRIBES.—Section 479B(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679c(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) INAPPLICABILITY OF STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT TO HAVE IN EFFECT PROCEDURES PROVIDING FOR THE USE AN ELECTRONIC INTER-

STATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM.—The requirement in section 471(a)(25) that a State plan provide that the State shall have in effect procedures providing for the use of an electronic interstate case-processing system shall not apply to an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that elects to operate a program under this part.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to payments under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act for calendar quarters beginning on or after such date.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirement imposed by the amendments made by subsection (a), the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, if the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

#### SEC. 4. FUNDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.

Section 437 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) FUNDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.—

“(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to facilitate the development of an electronic interstate case-processing system for the exchange of data and documents to expedite the placements of children in foster, guardianship, or adoptive homes across State lines.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A State that seeks funding under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary the following information:

“(A) A description of the goals and outcomes to be achieved, which goals and outcomes must result in—

“(i) reducing the time it takes for a child to be provided with a safe and appropriate permanent living arrangement across State lines;

“(ii) improving administrative processes and reducing costs in the foster care system; and

“(iii) the secure exchange of relevant case files and other necessary materials in real time, and timely communications and placement decisions regarding interstate placements of children.

“(B) A description of the activities to be funded in whole or in part with the funds, including the sequencing of the activities.

“(C) A description of the strategies for integrating programs and services for children who are placed across State lines.

“(D) Such other information as the Secretary may require.

“(3) FUNDING AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may provide funds to a State that complies

with paragraph (2). In providing funds under this section, the Secretary shall prioritize States that are not yet connected with the electronic interstate case-processing system referred to in paragraph (1).

“(4) USE OF FUNDS.—A State to which funding is provided under this subsection shall use the funding to support the State in connecting with, or enhancing or expediting services provided under, the electronic interstate case-processing system referred to in paragraph (1).

“(5) EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the final year in which funds are awarded under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress, and make available to the general public by posting on a website, a report that contains the following information:

“(A) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) has changed the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

“(B) The number of cases subject to the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children that were processed through the electronic interstate case-processing system, and the number of interstate child placement cases that were processed outside the electronic interstate case-processing system, by each State in each year.

“(C) The progress made by States in implementing the electronic interstate case-processing system.

“(D) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected various metrics related to child safety and well-being, including the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

“(E) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected administrative costs and caseworker time spent on placing children across State lines.

“(6) DATA INTEGRATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretariat for the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children and the States, shall assess how the electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) could be used to better serve and protect children that come to the attention of the child welfare system, by—

“(A) connecting the system with other data systems (such as systems operated by State law enforcement and judicial agencies, systems operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purposes of the Innocence Lost National Initiative, and other systems);

“(B) simplifying and improving reporting related to paragraphs (34) and (35) of section 471(a) regarding children or youth who have been identified as being a sex trafficking victim or children missing from foster care; and

“(C) improving the ability of States to quickly comply with background check requirements of section 471(a)(20), including checks of child abuse and neglect registries as required by section 471(a)(20)(B).”.

#### SEC. 5. CONTINUATION OF DISCRETIONARY FUNDING TO PROMOTE SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES.

Section 437(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(a)) is amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2018”.

#### SEC. 6. RESERVATION OF FUNDS TO IMPROVE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.

Section 437(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) IMPROVING THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.—The Secretary shall reserve

\$5,000,000 of the amount made available for fiscal year 2018 for providing funding under subsection (g), and the amount so reserved shall remain available through fiscal year 2022.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2742, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2742, Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act, which I introduced along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), my friend.

We know full well the importance of a stable home environment for a child's development and success later in life. Unfortunately, we don't live in an ideal world. We have seen too many instances when abuse, neglect, physical or mental illness, addiction, incarceration, or death necessitates removing a child from their home.

Right now, in my State of Indiana, there are more than 10,000 children in the foster care system than there were 18 months ago. This is due in large part to the opioid epidemic that has swept across our country. Our child welfare system is under unprecedented strain.

Yet, in spite of this great need for foster care and adoption, if a child needs to be placed in another State, caseworkers from both States must literally print and fill out hundreds of pages of paperwork and mail them back and forth. This cumbersome process takes months, and just one missing page can set it back even further. These are precious months that an at-risk child is stuck in limbo, waiting for the certainty of a more permanent home. It is time to bring this process into the 21st century.

Luckily, there is an effort underway already to do just that. In November 2013, five States, including my home State of Indiana, and the District of Columbia, launched the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise, or NEICE. This is a cloud-based electronic system that allows for the electronic exchange of data between States. It started as a pilot project, but the results have been crystal clear: placement wait times dropped by a month and a half, States spent less

time and money on copying and mailing, and caseworkers saved valuable time.

NEICE is now effective in 16 States, including Mr. DAVIS' home State of Illinois, but we can't stop at 16. As it stands today, if a child in my district in South Bend, Indiana, needed to be placed with their grandparents just 11 miles away in Niles, Michigan, the two States would have to undertake that arduous paperwork process because Michigan is not a part of NEICE yet. All States need to be a part of this system in order to realize its full benefits.

That is where the bill before us comes in. H.R. 2742 represents a very important investment in the future of at-risk youth. It requires States to join the NEICE system by October 1, 2027, and sets aside \$5 million in existing Federal funds to facilitate States in joining or expanding their services under NEICE.

That money doesn't come without strings. States must apply for the funds and submit detailed plans. The Secretary of Health and Human Services will have to submit periodic reports to Congress so that we can monitor progress as States join and ensure that this program continues to cut wait times for children and administrative costs for States.

In the 114th Congress, this legislation passed the House of Representatives, but, unfortunately, did not come up for a vote in the Senate. It is our hope that we can cross the finish line this year and help at-risk youth find their forever home more quickly.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for being a great partner in introducing this legislation. I would like to thank Senators YOUNG, GRASSLEY, and GILLIBRAND for introducing companion legislation in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I enter into the RECORD a list of 17 organizations that wrote in support of H.R. 2742.

1. American Academy of Adoption Attorneys/American Academy of Assisted Reproductive Technology Attorneys
2. American Academy of Pediatrics
3. American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
4. American Public Human Services Association
5. California County Welfare Directors Association
6. Child Advocates, Indianapolis, IN
7. Child Welfare League of America
8. Children's Home Society of America
9. First Focus
10. Generations United
11. Indiana Department of Child Services
12. March of Dimes
13. National Association of Counties
14. National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
15. Partnership for Strong Families
16. The Villages of Indiana
17. Voice for Adoption

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this important bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support H.R. 2742, the Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act.

Cross-State placement of youth in foster care is particularly salient to children living with kinship caregivers. Given that my congressional district has one of the highest percentages of grandparent caregivers in the Nation, I am pleased to join with Congresswoman WALORSKI in leading this important legislation.

This bill helps reduce the barriers and delays that continue to exist when the best new home for a child is in a different State than the unsafe home the child had to leave. Removing barriers that delay or prevent interstate child placement is a longtime bipartisan goal within Congress.

This bill addresses an important factor in those delays: the ability of State computer systems to link up to process the paperwork. The current paper-based system is antiquated and slow.

As part of an HHS pilot project, seven States, and the District of Columbia, currently participate in the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise, or NEICE, an online tool that allows State office systems to talk to each other and process interstate placements more quickly. I am, indeed, proud that Illinois is one of those States.

An early evaluation found that this system reduced waiting times for affected children by about one-third. Ten of the States have already announced plans to join the exchange over the next 2 years. H.R. 2742 would accelerate the number of participating States in the short run and ensure that all States participate in the long run. The more States that join, the more it speeds up the process for everyone.

The director of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services often emphasizes that we need to operate in “kid time” and not “adult time,” meaning that we need to recognize the urgency of restoring permanency for children in child welfare rather than allowing adult bureaucracy to impede permanency.

Modernizing the technology to increase efficiencies and quicken placements is common sense and respects the urgency of finding permanent, loving homes for children.

This is a good bill, and I thank Congresswoman WALORSKI and her staff for their excellent work. Our States are joined together, so we join with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), an outstanding legislator.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I salute all of those who are here today offering the bills—this one, and the four other related bills—that are being considered; particularly, Mr. DAVIS, who now holds the position as ranking Democrat on the Human Resources Subcommittee, a job that I have held for the last several years; and Ms. BASS, who has so ably led our Foster Care Caucus. I think it is unfortunate that they are here; unfortunate because all of this business should have been resolved last year.

All five of these modest bills would already be helping children today but for the way the so-called Family First Prevention Services Act was bungled last year. Each of these five bills were a part of it. But, unfortunately, families, and particularly families caring for foster children, have not, and are still not, among the first priorities of this Congress.

Of course, here in the House, there were many speeches. We had extensive hearings year after year concerning foster children and the horrors of child abuse. But speeches alone can't do the job.

There are also many people of goodwill who genuinely care about this foster care problem in both parties. Mrs. WALORSKI is certainly one of those individuals.

But all of us encountered a big problem last year in the Ways and Means Committee when the Family First Prevention Services Act came up. It was the same problem we faced in the last Congress when Senator WYDEN and I offered a larger version of the same piece of legislation.

The Ways and Means Committee majority leadership objects to adding a dime of additional revenue to accompany our speeches. The majority rejected my recommendation for a tax compliance measure to simply require the reporting of alimony payments. If you get alimony, it is a form of income, but there is no report required. This is not an increased tax. It is a way of avoiding tax evasion. And it would have raised the revenues necessary to fund the additional Family First prevention services.

When this bill reached the Senate, the House's decision to reject that approach, or any other reasonable pay-for, was, instead, relying on what you could call basically a "rob Peter to pay Paul" approach by cutting funds in support of adoptions and shifting funds from one part of the foster care system to another part. That, unfortunately, became the excuse in the Senate to block the bill from being passed. I have to say that my home State of Texas, under Federal court order, to correct its many unconstitutional abuses in

the foster care system, wrongfully led the way in blocking the Family First bill.

As to the particular bills that we have up today, this one recognizes how mobile our society is and how much we need to be able to go across the country in addressing this problem.

The earlier bill that we considered concerning children who age out of the foster system that Ms. BASS sponsored—really important—we heard time and again about the challenges that those children face when they are, essentially, dumped out on the street at age 18 or age 21, depending on which State they are in; and challenges particularly for young women who find themselves in that situation without adequate preparation or adult help.

This bill that we considered addressed the primary problem of limited Federal investment in helping these vulnerable older youth prepare for independence. I don't have any objection to it or to any of the bills that are being considered today. I object only to the ideological insistence of some in the majority that any additional revenue from any source, no matter how reasonable, cannot be placed in a deficient foster care system, which too many of our States will not fix.

And today's changes do not appear to add any actual new resources to foster care, and, indeed, they are likely to be overwhelmed by one cut after another that President Trump is proposing, particularly the Medicaid cuts that are being forced through this Congress, that are very important to foster youth and to all children.

So in this Congress—so indifferent to the education and social service and health needs of children of all types across our country—perhaps only taking a little step is the best we can expect to meet the needs of the most vulnerable children in our society.

But I think all of us must be committed to work together to find a day when we are willing to take truly meaningful action before, rather than after, children—more children—are needlessly lost.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2742, the Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act.

Children who cannot be safely returned home deserve to be placed in the best setting possible for them, regardless of the State where the setting is located; and no child should have to wait to move to that best setting because it is across the State line.

□ 1715

Separation from a parent or long-term caregiver is always traumatic for

a child. Even if relatives come forward right away, it may take months to get licensed, months in which the child may bond with the foster family. When the relative lives in another State, the licensing process can often take as long as 6 months, so that might mean 6 months in foster care. Sometimes our well-intentioned efforts to protect children actually do them more harm.

H.R. 2742 provides States with resources to automate this process so that social workers no longer have to photocopy documents and submit them on paper through a succession of offices.

Last year, the National Foster Youth Institute organized a listening tour in Representative VICKY HARTZLER's district; and during a meeting with child welfare professionals, they described the challenges they face when relatives are identified in different States and they are unable to quickly place the child with family and must keep the child in foster care. The judges, social workers, and families specifically requested Members of Congress to change the law and asked the National Foster Youth Institute to please advocate for change. I look forward to communicating with Representative HARTZLER and her constituents about this legislation.

I ask my colleagues to support the legislation sponsored by Representatives WALORSKI and DAVIS, H.R. 2742.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but I will say that my staff and I have been delightfully pleased to work with Representative WALORSKI and her staff in preparing this very commonsense, good legislation. I strongly support it and urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with the words from someone on the ground living this every day. Sharon Pierce is the president and CEO of The Villages of Indiana, the largest not-for-profit child and family services provider in my State and a supporter of H.R. 2742: "The NEICE system is going to be invaluable in helping both the public and private sector child welfare agencies reduce considerably the length of time a child needs to wait for a forever family."

This isn't just a good government bill, Mr. Speaker. Sure, we are reducing costs and paperwork and we can attach all sorts of numbers and dollar figures to that, but the most important thing we are doing here is we are giving at-risk youth a more permanent home sooner. We are giving them hope sooner. We are giving them a chance to actually thrive sooner.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by



the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2742.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# PARTNERSHIP GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AF- FECTED BY PARENTAL SUB- STANCE ABUSE ACT

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2834) to improve the well-being of, and improve permanency outcomes for, children and families affected by heroin, opioids, and other substance abuse, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2834

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

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Partnership Grants to Strengthen Families Affected by Parental Substance Abuse Act”.

## SEC. 2. ENHANCEMENTS TO GRANTS TO IMPROVE WELL-BEING OF FAMILIES AFFECTED BY SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

Section 437(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “INCREASE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND TO IMPROVE THE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AFFECTED BY” and inserting “IMPLEMENT IV—E PREVENTION SERVICES, AND IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND IMPROVE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AFFECTED BY HEROIN, OPIOIDS, AND OTHER”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘regional partnership’ means a collaborative agreement (which may be established on an interstate, State, or intrastate basis) entered into by the following:

“(A) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR ALL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—

“(i) The State child welfare agency that is responsible for the administration of the State plan under this part and part E.

“(ii) The State agency responsible for administering the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant provided under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act.

“(B) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROPOSING TO SERVE CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS.—If the partnership proposes to serve children in out-of-home placements, the Juvenile Court or Administrative Office of the Court that is most appropriate to oversee the administration of court programs in the region to address the population of families who come to the attention of the court due to child abuse or neglect.

“(C) OPTIONAL PARTNERS.—At the option of the partnership, any of the following:

“(i) An Indian tribe or tribal consortium.

“(ii) Nonprofit child welfare service providers.

“(iii) For-profit child welfare service providers.

“(iv) Community health service providers, including substance abuse treatment providers.

“(v) Community mental health providers.

“(vi) Local law enforcement agencies.

“(vii) School personnel.

“(viii) Tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortium of the agencies).

“(ix) Any other providers, agencies, personnel, officials, or entities that are related to the provision of child and family services under a State plan approved under this subpart.

“(D) EXCEPTION FOR REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS WHERE THE LEAD APPLICANT IS AN INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL CONSORTIA.—If an Indian tribe or tribal consortium enters into a regional partnership for purposes of this subsection, the Indian tribe or tribal consortium—

“(i) may (but is not required to) include the State child welfare agency as a partner in the collaborative agreement;

“(ii) may not enter into a collaborative agreement only with tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortium of the agencies); and

“(iii) if the condition described in paragraph (2)(B) applies, may include tribal court organizations in lieu of other judicial partners.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$500,000 and not more than \$1,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000 and not more than \$1,000,000”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “; PLANNING” after “APPROVAL”;

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “clauses (ii) and (iii)”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) SUFFICIENT PLANNING.—A grant awarded under this subsection shall be disbursed in two phases: a planning phase (not to exceed 2 years) and an implementation phase. The total disbursement to a grantee for the planning phase may not exceed \$250,000, and may not exceed the total anticipated funding for the implementation phase.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT FOR A FISCAL YEAR.—No payment shall be made under subparagraph (A) or (C) for a fiscal year until the Secretary determines that the eligible partnership has made sufficient progress in meeting the goals of the grant and that the members of the eligible partnership are coordinating to a reasonable degree with the other members of the eligible partnership.”;

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “, parents, and families” after “children”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “safety and permanence for such children; and” and inserting “safe, permanent caregiving relationships for the children”;

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking “or” and inserting “increase reunification rates for children who have been placed in out-of-home care, or decrease”;

(iv) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (v) and inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) improve the substance abuse treatment outcomes for parents including retention in treatment and successful completion of treatment;

“(iv) facilitate the implementation, delivery, and effectiveness of prevention services and programs under section 471(e); and”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “where appropriate.”; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) and inserting the following:

“(E) A description of a plan for sustaining the services provided by or activities funded under the grant after the conclusion of the grant period, including through the use of prevention services and programs under section 471(e) and other funds provided to the State for child welfare and substance abuse prevention and treatment services.

“(F) Additional information needed by the Secretary to determine that the proposed activities and implementation will be consistent with research or evaluations showing which practices and approaches are most effective.”;

(5) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking “abuse treatment” and inserting “use disorder treatment including medication assisted treatment and in-home substance abuse disorder treatment and recovery”;

(6) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) demonstrate a track record of successful collaboration among child welfare, substance abuse disorder treatment and mental health agencies; and”;

(7) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “establish indicators that will be” and inserting “review indicators that are”; and

(ii) by striking “in using funds made available under such grants to achieve the purpose of this subsection” and inserting “and establish a set of core indicators related to child safety, parental recovery, parenting capacity, and family well-being. In developing the core indicators, to the extent possible, indicators shall be made consistent with the outcome measures described in section 471(e)(6)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “base the performance measures on lessons learned from prior rounds of regional partnership grants under this subsection, and” before “consult”;

(ii) by striking clauses (iii) and (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iii) Other stakeholders or constituencies as determined by the Secretary.”;

(8) in paragraph (9)(A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than September 30 of each fiscal year in which a recipient of a grant under this subsection is paid funds under the grant, and every 6 months thereafter, the grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report on the services provided and activities carried out during the reporting period, progress made in achieving the goals of the program, the number of children, adults, and families receiving services, and such additional information as the Secretary determines is necessary. The report due not later than September 30 of the last such fiscal year shall include, at a minimum, data on each of the performance indicators included in the evaluation of the regional partnership.”.

## SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

(b) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State plan under part B of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and

Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(2) APPLICATION TO PROGRAMS OPERATED BY INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires time to take action necessary to comply with the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act (whether the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium has a plan under section 479B of the Social Security Act or a cooperative agreement or contract entered into with a State), the Secretary shall provide the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium with such additional time as the Secretary determines is necessary for the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium to take the action to comply with the additional requirements before being regarded as failing to comply with the requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2834, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Partnership Grants to Strengthen Families Affected by Parental Substance Abuse Act. I applaud Mr. DAVIS for all of the excellent work he has done on this issue.

Most substantiated child abuse and neglect cases involve substance abuse by a parent or a guardian. This is something we are seeing all too often in places like my home State of South Dakota. Substance abuse, especially alcohol and meth, result in far too many instances of child abuse, domestic abuse, and other kinds of violent crime and behavior.

Historically, a lack of coordination and collaboration has hindered the ability of those working in the fields of child welfare and substance abuse, and even the courts, from fully supporting families in substance abuse crisis.

Families involved with child welfare have complex needs. No two cases are alike. It is for this reason that improving outcomes for parents and children require a coordinated effort among all systems.

This bill strengthens the Regional Partnership Grants program, which provides funding to State and regional grantees seeking to provide evidence-based services to prevent child abuse and neglect related to substance abuse. Most importantly, this bill updates the RPG program to specifically address the opioid and heroin epidemics.

By ensuring better coordination, this bill will also encourage States to address the well-being of the family as a whole, using evidence-based approaches to help parents and children at the same time, so many children can stay safely at home with their families.

Finally, this bill is noncontroversial and it is bipartisan. Provisions in this bill were contained in the Family First Prevention Services Act last Congress, which passed the House by a voice vote. The Family First Act, as you recall, was supported by over 500 State and local organizations representing a wide range of practitioners and advocacy organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to stand with Mr. DAVIS in supporting this bill today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support H.R. 2834, the Partnership Grants to Strengthen Families Affected by Parental Substance Abuse Act.

I am pleased to join with Congresswoman NOEM in leading this bill to strengthen families by addressing parental substance abuse and decreasing the number of children entering foster care. Our bill is common sense. It takes the research lessons from the smaller scale Regional Partnership Grants and expands those efforts to the State level.

We know that substance abuse underlies a substantial percentage of child welfare cases, affecting between one-third to two-thirds of children in care. Aside from neglect, alcohol or other drug use is the number one reason for removal from the home. In 2014, over 77,000 youths were removed from their homes due to drug abuse.

What is exciting is that we have strong empirical evidence that working with parents experiencing substance abuse significantly helps children and families; specifically, working with these families helps children to experience fewer days in foster care, higher reunification rates, less recurrence of child maltreatment, and better permanency over time.

H.R. 2834 provides the opportunity to scale up these successes from smaller, targeted interventions into full State

interventions, while building the research to better inform Federal policy overall.

My home State of Illinois has led the Nation in addressing substance abuse issues in child welfare. We know that we need to do more to address this problem, but we know what works and we know we can work bipartisanship to support families in addressing substance abuse so that we can increase permanency and safety.

When I ask foster youth what policymakers could do to make child welfare better, they almost always say: "You could have helped my mom and dad." That is what we do today.

I urge passage of this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2834, the Partnership Grants to Strengthen Families Affected by Parental Substance Abuse Act.

This piece of legislation is responsive to countless pleas of youth and families seeking necessary assistance and support without fracturing critical family bonds and relationships.

The majority of children who are removed from home are actually removed for neglect and not physical or sexual abuse. Over 60 percent of children are removed for neglect, and neglect is secondary to substance abuse, mental health issues, and abject poverty.

In the 1990s, when the crack cocaine epidemic hit, we didn't understand much about addiction, and so we were angry. We punished the mothers. We imprisoned the mothers. We took the children away, and we didn't realize that actually not addressing the underlying substance abuse issue would really be more harmful to the children than removing them and putting them into foster care.

Now that we are experiencing another epidemic related to drugs, both with meth and with heroin, at least our knowledge base has grown a lot. We have drug courts. We have evidence-based treatments. We have a lot of ways that we can address families.

One of the things that we have learned is that, if you can put the entire family in treatment, then, that way, one, the parents are not separated from their children, the children can get help, and the parents can get help as well.

What often happens if you remove the child from the parent is that you set the parent up to relapse or to never actually go into treatment because they will cycle into depression, and they will continue their cycle of addiction.

We have had many children who actually wound up growing up in foster care because their parents were removed ask us, why didn't we help the family, why didn't we help their parents. Sadly, what has happened to many of these children, when they grow up, they continue the same cycle of going into depression, winding up in addiction.

Over the years, the National Foster Youth Institute in conjunction with the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth have organized many different delegations and trips around the country looking at the different foster care systems. Our very first listening tour was in Los Angeles, and we visited a program called SHIELDS for Families.

SHIELDS for Families is a very large drug treatment program that has functioned for over 20 years by keeping the entire family together, and some of these families can remain in residential care for as long as a year. They have been able to reduce the number of children who were removed and go into the foster care system because they provide treatment for the family as a whole.

This bill would modify the award criteria for Health and Human Services to consider whether a partnership has a track record of selective collaboration among child welfare, substance abuse disorder treatment, and mental health agencies. Simply put, this bill is designed to keep families together.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2834.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, over a decade of research shows the successes of helping families involved in the child welfare system who struggle with substance abuse. Through this research, we know that there are seven common ingredients that help improve families' outcomes: a system of identifying families, earlier access to assessment and treatment services, increased management of recovery services and compliance, increased judicial oversight, responses to participant behavior based on proven contingency management approaches, collaborative approaches across service systems and courts, and improved family-centered services and repair of parent-child relationships.

□ 1730

Again, Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure for my staff and I to have the opportunity to work with Mrs. NOEM and her staff in preparing this legislation.

And I might note that on Saturday of this past week, a group of us in Illinois took two busloads of children to a special program run by the Illinois Department of Corrections at the Sheri-

dan Correctional Center to see their fathers, who were all involved in a special program established for individuals who were incarcerated for crimes dealing with substance and who, themselves, were substance users. This experience was so exciting in terms of these individuals finding help, and their children being able to interact with them, even though they were incarcerated.

So someone asked me what was I going to do for Father's Day, and I told them after we returned that I have had my Father's Day experience. If we can help these individuals to rid themselves of the tremendous habits and difficulty that they have of substance use, then Father's Day would be good enough.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, again, want to applaud Mr. DAVIS for all of his work on this issue. I know he is passionate and has a big heart for our children, especially those that are in difficult situations such as we are discussing today.

This bill will help us protect the fundamental element of our society, and that is the family. It will keep families together. It will empower courts and child welfare workers to coordinate for the good of children, and I am proud to support this bill.

I ask for the support of this legislation that is before us, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2834, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPORTING FAMILIES IN SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT ACT

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2857) to support foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2857

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act".

#### SEC. 2. FOSTER CARE MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS FOR CHILDREN WITH PARENTS IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(C), by striking "or" and inserting ", with a parent residing in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility, but only to the extent permitted under subsection (j), or in a"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) CHILDREN PLACED WITH A PARENT RESIDING IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a child who is eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this section shall be eligible for the payments for a period of not more than 12 months during which the child is placed with a parent who is in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse, but only if—

“(A) the recommendation for the placement is specified in the child's case plan before the placement;

“(B) the treatment facility provides, as part of the treatment for substance abuse, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling; and

“(C) the substance abuse treatment, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling is provided under an organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma and in accordance with recognized principles of a trauma-informed approach and trauma-specific interventions to address the consequences of trauma and facilitate healing.

“(2) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The amount the State may receive under section 474(a)(1) for a child placed with a parent who is in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse shall not exceed the amount the State would otherwise be eligible to receive under such section based on where the child would be appropriately placed in a setting described in section 472(a)(2)(C) if such treatment setting were not available.

“(3) APPLICATION.—With respect to children for whom foster care maintenance payments are made under paragraph (1), only the children who satisfy the requirements of paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (a) shall be considered to be children with respect to whom foster care maintenance payments are made under this section for purposes of subsection (h) or section 473(b)(3)(B).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 474(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “subject to section 472(j),” before “an amount equal to the Federal” the first place it appears.

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATES.—Subject to subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

(b) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State plan under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely

on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(2) APPLICATION TO PROGRAMS OPERATED BY INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires time to take action necessary to comply with the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act (whether the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium has a plan under section 479B of the Social Security Act or a cooperative agreement or contract entered into with a State), the Secretary shall provide the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium with such additional time as the Secretary determines is necessary for the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium to take the action to comply with the additional requirements before being regarded as failing to comply with the requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2857, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act, which I have cosponsored with my colleague, Ms. JUDY CHU from California.

Across the country, opioid abuse has reached epidemic proportions. In my home State of South Dakota, drug use tears families apart. It results in gang activity, domestic abuse, and other kinds of violence, including many of our Native American communities throughout the State.

Congress has worked to provide first responders and healthcare providers with tools they need to address this crisis, but we need to do more. We need to do more to ensure the stability of families affected by these terrible drugs.

The Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act provides much-needed support to families fighting to endure through substance abuse. The bill permits Federal foster care payments for children in foster care who are placed with a parent in a li-

censed residential family-based treatment facility for a period of up to 12 months.

Programs that address parental substance abuse by housing families together have been found to be highly effective in supporting parent-child bonding and reducing substance abuse relapses. Unfortunately, these programs aren't utilized to their fullest extent.

This bill ensures that States incur little to no additional cost if a child is safely placed with a parent in a family substance abuse treatment program, rather than separating the child from their parent and placing the parent in an individual program.

I would remind my colleagues that provisions in this bill were included in the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016, which passed the House by voice vote and received support from over 500 different State and local groups representing a wide range of practitioners and advocacy organizations. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2857, the Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act.

Substance abuse has had a devastating impact on families in the U.S. Between 60 to 80 percent of substantiated child abuse and neglect cases involve substance use by a custodial parent or guardian.

Early access to substance use treatment improves parental, family, and child-focused outcomes. However, treatment access can come at the cost of removing a child from their parents' care. This separation disrupts opportunities for mothers and children to develop emotional bonds, increasing the likelihood of childhood emotional and behavior problems.

Although research shows that keeping children in a parent's care while they seek treatment has benefits to the parent and the child, access to parent-child treatment centers have been limited. To address this concern, a significant number of programs in Illinois and nationally have led the way in family substance abuse treatment.

One example in my congressional district is the Haymarket Center, with a 16-bed pregnant and postpartum program that allows patients to bring up to two children with them. Using evidence-based practices for trauma, family reunification and children's development, the Haymarket Center has demonstrated significant positive outcomes through an independent evaluation.

For example, women experienced significant declines in substance use at both 3- and 6-month follow-ups; im-

provements in mental and physical health; less victimization, homelessness and criminal activity; increased safe and healthy pregnancies, and improved birth outcomes.

In addition, the Haymarket Center has expanded its residential treatment center services to include a responsible fatherhood program, which they document as playing a crucial part in achieving strong outcomes.

Another example is on what we in Chicago call the South Side of Chicago and the West Side of Chicago and the North Side of Chicago and the East Side of Chicago, but on the South Side of Chicago, the Harriet Tubman Program, which is a 16-bed facility that can accommodate up to 10 children under the age of 5. Women who participate in these programs remain in the program longer and have lower rates of recidivism.

There is also The Women's Treatment Center on the West Side. This center has a pregnant and postpartum women's program for up to 12 women and up to 12 children, as well as a residential rehab for up to 14 women and up to 23 children. All of these programs provide real assistance to strengthen real families.

H.R. 2857 is common sense. These family-based treatment programs have demonstrated success, lower relapse rates, decreased attachment trauma for children, and they build families and health.

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

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, having no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), who is a sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2857, the Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act. I am pleased to cosponsor this bipartisan bill with Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM. This important legislation would encourage States to prioritize keeping families together when a parent is receiving substance abuse treatment.

Under current law, States cannot receive Federal reimbursement if they choose to place both a parent and child in a family substance abuse treatment program. However, if that child is separated from their parent and placed with a foster family, the State can receive a match in Federal funding of 50 percent or more. This discrepancy effectively creates an incentive to separate children from their parents when one is receiving substance abuse treatment.

However, studies have shown that keeping children in the care of their

parents while they seek treatment can increase family bonding, child attachment, and family functioning, all while minimizing the trauma of separation for children.

Today, solutions to parental drug abuse that prioritize the family are increasingly necessary as the opioid epidemic continues to place unprecedented strains on our communities. According to one estimate, drug overdoses may now be the leading cause of death among Americans under the age of 50. And as more parents require substance abuse treatment, more children are placed into foster care. In fact, studies found that between one-third and two-thirds of children enter foster care at least partly because of parental substance abuse.

Now, we know that foster care does wonders for many children every day, but it may not be the best match for every child, and the decision should not come down to cost.

In my district of Los Angeles, for instance, we have a program called the Exodus program, where formerly homeless families live in an on-site apartment complex and receive comprehensive services, including substance abuse treatment, counseling, child development, and family reunification services. Over the last 7 years, more than 80 percent of enrolled families have completed the program, and 95 percent have been able to keep their families together.

Even though we know that parent-child substance abuse models like Exodus have shown promising results, current law does not financially incentivize States to utilize these programs where they are available.

The Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act would address this problem by ensuring that if parents and children are placed in these programs and stay together, the State can receive the full Federal match for the child's living costs. States would retain full authority to decide which placement is best, but that consideration will now be based on what is best for the child, not what is most affordable for the State.

States should be given the option to use family-based treatment options without risking the loss of Federal foster care reimbursement. I urge my colleagues to consider our Nation's families and how this legislation may impact those with heads of household who are struggling with addiction. We can heal them without creating new trauma or pain for their children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2857.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, having no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2857, to support fos-

ter care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential facility.

Last month, when the National Foster Youth Institute sponsored Foster Youth Shadow Day, several of the youth, in a townhall meeting that we had, described their parents' challenges with substance abuse. One young lady said that both of her parents were addicted to heroin, and that she was taken into court and, in front of her, the judge said to her parents: "If you don't clean up, we're going to take your children away."

□ 1745

After she left court, she was taken away. She was removed from her parents. Ultimately, her parents continued to use, and, sadly, both of them died. This young woman grew up feeling guilty and feeling that part of the reason why her parents passed away was because she was used as leverage, and that if her parents had been kept together in drug treatment along with her maybe she wouldn't be an orphan today and her parents would have lived and she wouldn't have had to grow up in foster care. H.R. 2857 will allow programs like SHIELDS for Families that does address parental substance abuse and keeps families together to have the resources to expand their programs.

Today, we heard five bills that addressed challenges in the child welfare system. We know that there is a lot more that needs to be done, but today we passed bills addressing substance abuse, relative caregivers, we identified and addressed barriers to placement, and I am hoping that one next step we could take would be to extend the kinship navigator programs so that organizations like Community Coalition can continue to provide support to relatives and expand their Kinship in Action program.

As we improve various parts of the system, at some point we need to address the structural problem with how the system is financed. Right now, we have to remove a child and break up a family in order to have the resources to help the child. We know much more now. We know what leads a parent to neglect the child: substance abuse, mental health issues, poverty. We need to continue to reform the system and provide the resources to prevent a crisis. When problems are identified, why should we wait for the neglect to occur?

Once again, I want to thank Chairman BRADY, Ranking Member NEAL, and all of the sponsors of the legislation today, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2857.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to commend Representative NOEM and all of the cosponsors of this

important bill. These are programs that have been proven to work. They are what are called evidence based, where the research demonstrates that, with them, individuals have been able to improve the quality of not only their lives, but certainly the lives of their children and the lives of everyone with whom they come into contact.

I agree that today has been a tremendous day for the Ways and Means Committee and also a tremendous day for the people of the United States of America, where we have come together with five bills that will be passed at the end of the day dealing with the needs, hopes, and aspirations of our vulnerable population of children. You really can't have a better day than that.

And so again, I commend Chairman BRADY, Ranking Member NEAL, and all of the Members for their participation, engagement, and involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I want to thank all of my colleagues for working with me on this legislation and collaborating on the Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act that is before us today.

This is a critical step in addressing the needs that we have in our communities with the urgent opioid and methamphetamine crisis in our country while protecting the foundation of our society, which is the family.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this legislation that is before us today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2857, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WOMEN, PEACE, AND SECURITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2484) to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2484

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Around the world, women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention, conflict resolution, and post-conflict peace building efforts.

(2) Women in conflict-affected regions have achieved significant success in—

(A) moderating violent extremism;

(B) countering terrorism;

(C) resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation; and

(D) stabilizing societies by enhancing the effectiveness of security services, peacekeeping efforts, institutions, and decision-making processes.

(3) Research suggests that peace negotiations are more likely to succeed and to result in durable peace agreements when women participate in the peace process.

**SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the meaningful participation of women in conflict prevention and conflict resolution processes helps to promote more inclusive and democratic societies and is critical to the long-term stability of countries and regions;

(2) the political participation, and leadership of women in fragile environments, particularly during democratic transitions, is critical to sustaining lasting democratic institutions; and

(3) the United States should be a global leader in promoting the meaningful participation of women in conflict prevention, management, and resolution, and post-conflict relief and recovery efforts.

**SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.**

It shall be the policy of the United States to promote the meaningful participation of women in all aspects of overseas conflict prevention, management, and resolution, and post-conflict relief and recovery efforts, reinforced through diplomatic efforts and programs that—

(1) integrate the perspectives and interests of affected women into conflict-prevention activities and strategies;

(2) encourage partner governments to adopt plans to improve the meaningful participation of women in peace and security processes and decision-making institutions;

(3) promote the physical safety, economic security, and dignity of women and girls;

(4) support the equal access of women to aid distribution mechanisms and services;

(5) collect and analyze gender data for the purpose of developing and enhancing early warning systems of conflict and violence;

(6) adjust policies and programs to improve outcomes in gender equality and the empowerment of women; and

(7) monitor, analyze, and evaluate the efforts related to each strategy submitted under section 5 and the impact of such efforts.

**SEC. 5. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO PROMOTE THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE BUILDING.**

(a) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and again four years thereafter, the President, in consultation with the heads of the relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make publicly available a single government-wide strategy, to be known as the Women, Peace, and Security Strategy, that provides a detailed descrip-

tion of how the United States intends to fulfill the policy objectives in section 4. The strategy shall—

(1) support and be aligned with plans developed by other countries to improve the meaningful participation of women in peace and security processes, conflict prevention, peace building, transitional processes, and decision-making institutions; and

(2) include specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, performance metrics, timetables, and monitoring and evaluation plans to ensure the accountability and effectiveness of all policies and initiatives carried out under the strategy.

(b) **SPECIFIC PLANS FOR DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—Each strategy under subsection (a) shall include a specific implementation plan from each of the relevant Federal departments and agencies that describes—

(1) the anticipated contributions of the department or agency, including technical, financial, and in-kind contributions, to implement the strategy; and

(2) the efforts of the department or agency to ensure that the policies and initiatives carried out pursuant to the strategy are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability.

(c) **COORDINATION.**—The President should promote the meaningful participation of women in conflict prevention, in coordination and consultation with international partners, including, as appropriate, multilateral organizations, stakeholders, and other relevant international organizations, particularly in situations in which the direct engagement of the United States Government is not appropriate or advisable.

(d) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the President, in implementing each strategy submitted under subsection (a), should—

(1) provide technical assistance, training, and logistical support to female negotiators, mediators, peace builders, and stakeholders;

(2) address security-related barriers to the meaningful participation of women;

(3) encourage increased participation of women in existing programs funded by the United States Government that provide training to foreign nationals regarding law enforcement, the rule of law, or professional military education;

(4) support appropriate local organizations, especially women's peace building organizations;

(5) support the training, education, and mobilization of men and boys as partners in support of the meaningful participation of women;

(6) encourage the development of transitional justice and accountability mechanisms that are inclusive of the experiences and perspectives of women and girls;

(7) expand and apply gender analysis, as appropriate, to improve program design and targeting; and

(8) conduct assessments that include the perspectives of women regarding new initiatives in support of peace negotiations, transitional justice and accountability, efforts to counter violent extremism, or security sector reform.

**SEC. 6. TRAINING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE BUILDING.**

(a) **FOREIGN SERVICE.**—The Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall ensure that all appropriate personnel (including special envoys, members of mediation or negotiation teams, relevant members of the civil service

or Foreign Service, and contractors) responsible for or deploying to countries or regions considered to be at risk of, undergoing, or emerging from violent conflict obtain training, as appropriate, in the following areas, each of which shall include a focus on women and ensuring meaningful participation by women:

(1) Conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution.

(2) Protecting civilians from violence, exploitation, and trafficking in persons.

(3) International human rights law and international humanitarian law.

(b) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that relevant personnel receive training, as appropriate, in the following areas:

(1) Training in conflict prevention, peace processes, mitigation, resolution, and security initiatives that specifically addresses the importance of meaningful participation by women.

(2) Gender considerations and meaningful participation by women, including training regarding—

(A) international human rights law and international humanitarian law, as relevant; and

(B) protecting civilians from violence, exploitation, and trafficking in persons.

(3) Effective strategies and best practices for ensuring meaningful participation by women.

**SEC. 7. CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development may establish guidelines or take other steps to ensure overseas United States personnel of the Department of State or the United States Agency for International Development, as the case may be, consult with appropriate stakeholders, including local women, youth, ethnic and religious minorities, and other politically underrepresented or marginalized populations, regarding United States efforts to—

(1) prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict; and

(2) enhance the success of mediation and negotiation processes by ensuring the meaningful participation of women.

(b) **COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION.**—The Secretary of State should work with international, regional, national, and local organizations to increase the meaningful participation of women in international peacekeeping operations, and should promote training that provides international peacekeeping personnel with the substantive knowledge and skills needed to ensure effective physical security and meaningful participation of women in conflict prevention and peace building.

**SEC. 8. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**

(a) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the first submission of a strategy required under section 5, the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Defense, shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on existing, enhanced, or newly established training carried out pursuant to section 6.

(b) **REPORT ON WOMEN, PEACE, AND SECURITY STRATEGY.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the submission of each strategy required under section 5, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(1) summarizes and evaluates the implementation of such strategy and the impact



of United States diplomatic efforts and foreign assistance programs, projects, and activities to promote the meaningful participation of women;

(2) describes the nature and extent of the coordination among the relevant Federal departments and agencies on the implementation of such strategy;

(3) outlines the monitoring and evaluation tools, mechanisms, and common indicators to assess progress made on the policy objectives set forth in section 4; and

(4) describes the existing, enhanced, or newly established training carried out pursuant to section 6.

#### SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) **RELEVANT FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—The term “relevant Federal departments and agencies” means—

(A) the United States Agency for International Development;

(B) the Department of State;

(C) the Department of Defense;

(D) the Department of Homeland Security; and

(E) any other department or agency specified by the President for purposes of this Act.

(3) **STAKEHOLDERS.**—The term “stakeholders” means nongovernmental and private sector entities engaged in or affected by conflict prevention and stabilization, peace building, protection, security, transition initiatives, humanitarian response, or related efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 2484.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Women, Peace, and Security Act, H.R. 2484.

I want to recognize Representatives KRISTI NOEM and JAN SCHAKOWSKY. I want to recognize the two of them for their bipartisan effort in putting together this legislation, this important piece of legislation. I think it is going to have a great impact.

I also want to thank Mr. ENGEL for his important leadership.

Our consideration of this measure is really the culmination of many years of bipartisan work by Members of the House, including Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY and Representative KRISTI NOEM, and by our prior administration officials, as well, who have worked on this, and many advocates—many advocates—who want to see better, more sustainable solutions to ending wars, to combating terrorism, and to improving human rights around the world. What we are seeing today is that women's participation is really essential to confronting these fundamental challenges.

Last year, the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing where we heard powerful testimony about the importance of including women in peace negotiations and in the security negotiations and security institutions that have been set up around the globe. Women, of course, have the fundamental human right to have their voices heard in discussions affecting their lives and their families' lives, and that is a case in and of itself that we must continue to make.

But women's participation is also critical to realizing better outcomes with respect to these negotiations. Simply put, when women are at the negotiating table and it affects their community, peace is more likely. Compelling research shows that peace agreements are much more likely to be reached, and certainly more likely to last, when women's groups are genuinely involved.

Women peacemakers often press warring parties to move beyond mere power-sharing agreements—which, of course, benefit only a small percentage of fighters—to more comprehensive and longer term accords which benefit the civilian population as a whole.

We have seen this play out from Colombia to Rwanda, to Sri Lanka, where women's groups have pushed for practical solutions to deescalate and resolve the conflict, and certainly, in Northern Ireland, where, indisputably, the bravery and perseverance in the face of reprisal and pressure led women on both sides of that conflict to stay engaged until there was a lasting peace; at least, until today, there is a lasting peace in Northern Ireland, and that is because of their involvement.

Efforts to keep the peace through policing and peacemaking missions also—this is an additional point—benefit from women's participation because it leads to better crime reporting and higher levels of trust within the communities they serve.

Women are essential to confronting one of the greatest national security threats of our time, and that is the spread of violent extremism because, if we think about it, women, of course, are truly on the front lines of this fight. They possess unique insights into the community, into their fami-

lies, and are capable of gathering information often that men cannot or do not see. Yet their input is frequently overlooked, and I would just give one example, of many.

Activist Wazhma Frogh in Afghanistan recalls when women from a small Afghan village tried desperately to warn a government official that young men in their community were being recruited by Islamist militants at the local weddings, the minister laughed them off. He said: The militants that we are fighting are much too sophisticated to go and recruit at the weddings here in the community. Well, of course, a month later, unfortunately, some of those same young men that had been recruited attacked a bus, killing 32 civilians.

My committee has heard similar stories from women around the world who want to reclaim their communities from the spread of radical ideologies. We must acknowledge women as partners in this fight, and that is why the legislation before us today recognizes that it is in our national interest to promote women's participation in resolving violence and conflict.

This concept has been building support for some time. The Bush administration was right to press hard for women's participation in peace negotiations and political processes in Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere, and the Obama administration expanded on these programs to require a governmentwide approach to women's inclusion in conflict resolution overseas.

Today, this bipartisan legislation before us builds on these efforts. It will continue to require a governmentwide strategy to promote women's participation, along with specific goals and benchmarks and regular reporting to Congress in order to gauge progress.

It also requires that appropriate State, USAID, and Defense Department personnel receive training in how to facilitate women's participation in conflict resolution, security initiatives, and efforts to protect civilians from violence and to protect them from exploitation.

I urge all Members to support this measure's passage.

I again thank KRISTI NOEM and JAN SCHAKOWSKY for their good work on this bill.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 12, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 2484, the “Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017.” There are certain provisions in the bill which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important legislation, I am



willing to waive this committee's further consideration of H.R. 2484. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Armed Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the legislation which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,  
WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,  
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 12, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,  
*Chairman, House Armed Services Committee,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 2484, the Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to consideration by the House.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 2484 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,  
EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
*Chairman.*

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

I want to thank the bill's authors, Representative SCHAKOWSKY and Representative NOEM, for their years' worth of work on this measure. I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for helping move it forward.

Wherever there are conflicts around the world, women and girls face particular vulnerabilities, but they also possess unique abilities to bring peace and prosperity to their communities.

Research has shown that getting women involved in conflict resolution and peace building leads to better outcomes. That is why the Obama administration launched its executive order on Women, Peace, and Security in 2011 to make sure women had a seat at the table when it came to conflict prevention and resolution.

Thanks to the Obama administration's efforts, the United States has

worked to include women in conflict prevention, negotiation, and resolution. We have promoted efforts to enhance the physical and economic security of women around the world, and we have sought to break through the barriers that have stopped women from being full participants in peace processes.

□ 1800

The bill we are considering will make these policies permanent. It would build on what the Obama administration has accomplished by making sure agency personnel across our government are fully trained on the unique strengths women bring to conflict prevention and resolution. It would also require annual reporting so Congress can stay apprised of these efforts.

Making this strategy permanent is absolutely imperative. It is important that we fully recognize and appreciate how women's participation can help make our foreign policy stronger.

I am pleased to support this measure, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the author of this important bill.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, you can't hardly turn on the TV today or open a newspaper, scroll through your news feed without learning of another outbreak of violence around the globe. Especially in a world as volatile and insecure as ours is today, we have a responsibility to take full advantage of proven peace-building tactics. This includes involving women in conflict prevention and resolution.

Research covering conflicts from Northern Ireland to Africa has shown that peace agreements are 35 percent more likely to last at least 15 years when women are involved. Even knowing this, women are many times left out during negotiations.

The truth is that conflict knows no gender, just as peace should know no gender. With that said, women are many times impacted by conflict in different ways than their male counterparts.

ISIL, for instance, has used human trafficking and sex slavery, which disproportionately impacts women, as an income-generating business for their terrorist activities. Women need to be able to play a major role in addressing this and finding solutions to combat it.

Moreover, in many war-torn countries, women control large segments of the economy. In fact, women are the sole income earners in nearly one-third of all households worldwide. While their husbands and sons are serving as soldiers, women are running the mar-

kets, the schools, other public and private institutions. By virtue of that, they are running the local economy and have an unmistakable voice in community discussions. Their understanding can prove invaluable when mitigating conflict and building peace.

Particularly in areas where increased stability creates greater security for the United States, we must make sure that the work that we are doing produces lasting results.

I am confident the Women, Peace, and Security Act and the accountability it provides will help produce sustainable outcomes for Americans, and that also touches on our national security.

While our U.S. Government, in recent years, has made efforts to include women in peace negotiations, the bipartisan Women, Peace, and Security Act better ensures that women have a seat at the table during these discussions through meaningful congressional oversight. It is but one instrument in a toolbox our military and diplomatic leaders can use when looking at producing long-term results, and leaders can use it when looking to produce peace, but it is still a tool that we should not ignore.

I am grateful to my colleagues: Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY for all of her passionate work on this issue; Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for their efforts on this legislation as well.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the coauthor of this bill, a true advocate for women, and my colleague.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman JOAQUIN CASTRO, for yielding to me.

I am so proud to rise in support of H.R. 2484, the Women, Peace, and Security Act, which I introduced along with my partner, KRISTI NOEM. We have been working on this bill for quite a while.

I want to really thank Chairman ED ROYCE for not only his eloquent words today and his clear description about why this is so important, but for working closely with us to make this day a reality. I am hopeful that we will be able to go through the Senate and get this bill finally enacted.

The Women, Peace, and Security Act promotes the participation of women in the peace process and is a step forward for our security and our economic prosperity as well. When women are involved in peace negotiations, a peace agreement is more likely to last. In fact, the International Peace Institute found that a peace agreement is 35 percent more likely to last for at least 15 years if women participate in drafting the agreement. The study also found that with each 5 percent increase in women's participation in the political

process, a nation is five times less likely to use violence when faced with international crisis or conflict.

When women and girls are equal partners in all aspects of decision-making, countries are more likely to be peaceful and economically prosperous.

Despite the strong evidence in favor of women's political participation, women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention, conflict resolution, and the post-conflict peace-building efforts that are happening around the world, and the United States can help to change that.

The Women, Peace, and Security Act will build upon the 2011 National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, which made clear that the meaningful inclusion of women in peace and security processes is imperative for national and global security. And you heard how in Northern Ireland and all the way to Rwanda, the participation of women has been absolutely essential.

Our legislation establishes women's participation as a permanent element of U.S. foreign policy. It would encourage the United States to assist women mediators and negotiators by addressing barriers to their equal and secure participation in the peace process.

It would institute comprehensive training modules on the protection, rights, and specific needs of women in conflict and require the administration to evaluate the impact of U.S. foreign assistance on women's meaningful participation.

In addition, Women, Peace, and Security Act would require the President to report to Congress its strategy to promote women's participation in conflict prevention and resolution, and it would empower Congress to exercise oversight of that strategy's implementation.

The United States plays a crucial role in encouraging peace agreements all over the world. By making sure that we bring women into the peace process, we can improve national and global security.

So, once again, I just want to thank Congresswoman NOEM, my partner on this bipartisan legislation, as well as Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, for their support. I want to thank the many advocacy groups who have been persistent throughout these years in bringing it to us, the evidence of the success of women when women participate in the peace process.

So I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, seeing no other speakers on my side, I am prepared to close as long as there are no other speakers on the majority side.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, once again, Chairman ED ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and Representatives SCHAKOWSKY and NOEM for their hard work.

I again urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, from Liberia to Northern Ireland, to, frankly, all over the planet, we have watched women play pivotal roles in pushing their governments, in pushing combatants and politicians to bring an end to conflict.

In recent years, we have seen armed conflicts flare around the world, producing the largest number of refugees on record. Efforts to negotiate an end to these conflicts are more important than ever. We know that when women are included in these discussions, we are more likely to see an enduring peace.

As a witness at our hearing on women's participation explained: "Including women is not only the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do."

The legislation before us today will strengthen U.S. efforts to promote the inclusion of women in peace negotiations in order to create more sustainable agreements and more stable partners for the United States and for the U.S. allies.

So, again, I want to thank Representatives NOEM and SCHAKOWSKY for their bipartisan work. I also want to particularly thank the staff on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard over the past couple of years, including Jessica Kelch, Cassandra Varanka, Brittany Comins, Elizabeth Cunningham, and Janice Kaguyutan. We appreciate all of your good work.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I ask for an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2484, the Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017 which expresses that the United States should be a global leader in promoting the meaningful participation of women in efforts directed at conflict prevention, management, and resolution.

This bill directs the President to develop and submit to Congress a Women, Peace, and Security Strategy that will:

1. Be aligned with other nations' plans to improve and encourage women to participate in peace and security over processes, conflict prevention, peace building, and decision making; and

2. Lay out goals and evaluation plans to measure strategy effectiveness.

Additionally, H.R. 2484 directs that employees and contractors of the Department of State, Department of Defense, and the U.S. Agency for International Development that personnel deployed to countries or regions at risk or emerging from violent conflict be provided training in conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution.

This training will allow those deployed to these regions to collaborate and support

women who live in these conflict ridden communities to develop peace and security strategies.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I understand the importance of women's security and its role in conflict prevention and resolution.

This is why in the 114th Congress I introduced H. Res. 528 that seeks to create a Victims of Terror Protection Fund for the displaced refugees, migrants and victims of Boko Haram's terror in the region, many of which are women and children.

One reason women play such a critical role in the peacebuilding process is because they constitute half of every community.

Educating women and men to work in tandem is an imperative step toward instilling peace in communities and mending broken bonds.

An important aspect of H.R. 2484 is the inclusion of training personnel who work firsthand in these conflicted regions regarding international human rights laws and the protection of trafficked people.

Nearly 21 million people have fallen victim to human trafficking globally, and more than half of them are women and girls.

These numbers are staggering, and victims who have been liberated from this awful slavery require special consideration and support to overcome the horrors they have experienced with the aid of women peacekeepers.

Women serve as incredible advocates for peace as central caretakers of the family and have already played prominent roles in peace processes in the Horn of Africa.

Overall, H.R. 2484 makes an important contribution by requiring the agencies that focus abroad to collaborate on incorporating women in the peacebuilding processes.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2484, the Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of Representative KRISTI NOEM's Women, Peace and Security Act (H.R. 2484). Among other things, it highlights the role women must play in peacemaking.

In the limited time we have, I would just like to highlight the role of one woman who served as a peacemaker, whom I have had the opportunity to get to know—Nuala O'Loan, who served as the Police Ombudsman in Northern Ireland from 2000 to 2007, and someone who has contributed to our understanding in the Congress as she twice testified at hearings held on the Northern Ireland peace process.

Baroness O'Loan—she was made a Dame of the British Empire and a member of the House of Lords in recognition for her role in the cause of peace—had the difficult task of looking into how the police handled the Omagh bombing. That bombing, by a splinter group of the Irish Republican Army, was intended to reignite sectarian tension and stop the movement towards peace that was memorialized in the Good Friday Agreement. The bomb was indiscriminate, however, killing both Protestant and Catholic alike, and helped underscore the need for peace.

In the ensuing years, Baroness O'Loan became known as an even-handed intermediary. Indeed, she was so even-handed that she was

criticized by extremists on both sides, and her retirement party was boycotted by hardliners from the Unionist and Republican camps. On the other hand, the average citizen, whether Protestant or Catholic, supported her in her role as Police Ombudsman in roughly equal numbers, something that was borne out by independent polling.

Nuala O'Loan is but one example of a woman serving as peacemaker. There are many more Nualas around the world, and I applaud Congresswoman NOEM for encouraging us to recognize the role these women play in helping bring a little light to the darkness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2484.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SECURING OUR AGRICULTURE AND FOOD ACT

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1238) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

(1) On page 4, lines 1 and 2, strike [relating to food and agriculture] and insert "or the Secretary of Health and Human Services".

(2) On page 4, strike line 3 and all that follows through the end of the matter following line 6 and insert the following:

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) by striking the items relating to sections 523, 524, 525, 526, and 527; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 522 the following:

"Sec. 523. Guidance and recommendations.

"Sec. 524. Voluntary private sector preparedness accreditation and certification program.

"Sec. 525. Acceptance of gifts.

"Sec. 526. Integrated public alert and warning system modernization.

"Sec. 527. National planning and education.

"Sec. 528. Coordination of Department of Homeland Security efforts related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism."

Mr. KATKO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TRAVELER REDRESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2132) to require the implementation of a redress process and review of the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules for aviation security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2132

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Traveler Redress Improvement Act of 2017".

### SEC. 2. IMPLEMENTATION OF REDRESS PROCESS AND REVIEW OF THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S INTELLIGENCE-BASED SCREENING RULES FOR AVIATION SECURITY.

(a) REDRESS PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall, using existing resources, systems, and processes, ensure the availability of the Department of Homeland Security Traveler Redress Inquiry Program (DHS TRIP) redress process to adjudicate inquiries for individuals who—

(A) are citizens of the United States or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

(B) have filed an inquiry with DHS TRIP after receiving enhanced screening at an airport passenger security checkpoint more than three times in any 60-day period; and

(C) believe they have been wrongly identified as being a threat to aviation security.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the implementation of the redress process required under paragraph (1).

(b) PRIVACY IMPACT REVIEW AND UPDATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall review and update the Privacy Impact Assessment for the Secure Flight programs to ensure such Assessment accurately reflects the operation of such programs.

(2) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—The Secure Flight Privacy Impact Assessment review required under paragraph (1) shall be published on a publically accessible Internet webpage of the Transportation Security Administration and submitted to the Committee on

Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(c) TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION RULE REVIEW AND NOTIFICATION PROCESS.—

(1) RULE REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 120 days thereafter, the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Intelligence Analysis of the Transportation Security Administration, in coordination with the entities specified in paragraph (2), shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules.

(2) NOTIFICATION PROCESS.—Not later than 48 hours after changing, updating, implementing, or suspending a Transportation Security Administration intelligence-based screening rule, the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Intelligence Analysis of the Transportation Security Administration shall notify the following entities of any such change, update, implementation, or suspension, as the case may be:

(A) The Office of Civil Rights and Liberties of the Transportation Security Administration.

(B) The Office of the Ombudsman of the Administration.

(C) The Office of Traveler Engagement of the Administration.

(D) The Office of Civil Rights and Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security.

(E) The Office of Chief Counsel of the Administration.

(F) The Office of General Counsel of the Department.

(G) The Privacy Office of the Administration.

(H) The Privacy Office of the Department.

(I) The Federal Air Marshal Service.

(J) The Traveler Redress Inquiry Program of the Department.

(d) FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall ensure that the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules are incorporated in the risk analysis conducted during the Federal Air Marshal mission scheduling process.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on how the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules are incorporated in the risk analysis conducted during the Federal Air Marshal mission scheduling process.

(e) GAO REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a study on the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules and the effectiveness of such rules in identifying and mitigating potential threats to aviation security. Such study shall also examine coordination between the Transportation Security Administration, the Department of Homeland Security, and other relevant partners

relating to changing, updating, implementing, or suspending such rules as necessary.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation seeks to expand the Department of Homeland Security's Traveler Redress Inquiry Program, commonly referred to as TRIP, to assist travelers who feel that they have been repeatedly selected for enhanced screening in an unfair manner.

Currently, the TRIP process only provides redress to individuals who have been placed on the no-fly list. However, for reasons unknown to the individual, they can be perpetually selected for enhanced screening without any opportunity to correct the record, if he or she fails, that this is due to an error.

This issue first came to our attention when an individual who works for a Washington, D.C.-based nonprofit organization alerted the committee that he had been subject to enhanced pat-downs by TSA agents every time he traveled through an airport for over 3 years.

Although he twice submitted inquiries to the Department of Homeland Security through the TRIP process, he remained unable to obtain information as to why he was currently getting flagged as a potential security threat at the airport.

As you can imagine, this can cause a great deal of stress and worry for someone who feels that they have been targeted by the U.S. Government for unknown reasons.

After continued prodding of TSA by my subcommittee staff, this individual, a U.S. citizen, was cleared by Homeland Security and is now able to travel hassle free.

Unfortunately, this example is not an isolated case. Several weeks ago, a member of the committee staff also was repeatedly selected for enhanced screening on multiple flights after traveling to the Middle East as part of an official congressional staff delegation.

When my staff looked into this case, the staffer had been mistakenly

flagged for enhanced screening due to erroneous information that was entered into the Terrorist Screening Database, or TSDB.

As these anecdotes demonstrate, Homeland Security needs to establish a formal mechanism to handle these cases. My legislation requires the Department to do just that.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Congressmen KING and VELA, and Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN for their support of this bipartisan legislation. I thank the Speaker for allowing today's consideration of the bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

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

□ 1815

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2132, the Traveler Redress Improvement Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the American flying public has seen many changes in how aviation security is handled since the devastating morning of September 11, 2001. Among the most prominent changes has been the screening of passenger names against the so-called no-fly list that contains the information on tens of thousands of people who are deemed by our intelligence and law enforcement community as threats to aviation.

H.R. 2132 seeks to ensure a traveler, who has repeatedly received enhanced security screening at Transportation Security Administration checkpoints and believes they have wrongly been identified as posing a threat to aviation security, can receive timely redress from the Department of Homeland Security's Traveler Redress Inquiry Program, or DHS TRIP program.

Specifically, this bill directs TSA to ensure that an individual who has received enhanced screening from TSA more than three times in a 60-day period can access the Department's redress process.

This bipartisan bill, which was unanimously approved by the Homeland Security Committee on May 3, is informed by the committee's oversight finding. As such, I support the bill and urge my colleagues to join me in passing this measure to increase transparency and accountability on behalf of travelers.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, H.R. 2132, the Traveler Redress Improvement Act of 2017, would improve DHS redress processes for passengers who have repeatedly been selected for enhanced security screening and feel they have been wrongly identified as posing a threat to aviation security.

While TSA has a duty to protect classified and sensitive information from those who wish to do us harm, we must

ensure TSA's operations are transparent as they can be for the vast majority of passengers who are simply trying to travel from point A to point B with as little stress as possible.

Before I yield back, I thank Subcommittee Chairman KATKO and Ranking Member WATSON COLEMAN for their long and enduring work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Before I close, I want to note briefly that this is yet another bill that has come out of Homeland Security that has been done so in a purely bipartisan manner. I think that serves as an example of how Congress can abide, going forward, in getting things done, big issues and small. There are no small issues when it comes to terrorism, but we seem to be united in our quest to make this country as safe as we can.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues once again to support H.R. 2132, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 2132, "Traveler Redress Improvement Act of 2017," which requires the implementation of a redress process and review of the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules for aviation security.

The DHS Traveler Redress Inquiry Program (DHS TRIP) provides a redress process for individuals who have been denied or delayed airline boarding, entry into or exit from the United States at a port of entry or border crossing, or have been repeatedly referred for additional (secondary) screening.

I thank the Committee for accepting the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2132, which extends the time for GAO to submit its report from 180 days to one year.

The Jackson Lee Amendment gives GAO additional time to do its work after TSA concludes its work on the Privacy Impact Assessment for the Secure Flight program.

In 2015, there were 178 days when TSA screened more than 2 million passengers in a single day.

George Bush International and William P. Hobby Airports are essential hubs for domestic and international air travel for Houston and the region.

Nearly 40 million passengers traveled through Bush International Airport (IAH) and an additional 10 million traveled through William P. Hobby (HOU).

Persons who routinely undergo secondary screening or incur delays in boarding flights only have the DHS TRIP as their sole means of redress.

DHS TRIP is a single point of contact for individuals who have inquiries or seek resolution regarding travel difficulties that may be caused by watch list issues, screening problems at ports of entry, and situations where travelers believe they have been unfairly or incorrectly delayed, denied boarding or identified for additional screening at our nation's transportation hubs.

H.R. 2132 requires TSA, to report within 180 days on the implementation of the redress process to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

TSA is also required to review and update the Privacy Impact Assessment Act for the Secure Flight programs in order to make sure this assessment reflects the operation of the DHS TRIP.

As an added measure to ensure DHS TRIP has the most up to date information, the TSA Assistant Administrator of the Office of Intelligence Analysis must conduct a comprehensive review of TSA's intelligence-based screening rules every 120 days.

Once this review is completed, the Office of Intelligence Analysis of TSA has 48 hours to notify relevant DHS offices if there is any change, update, implementation, or suspension of any rule or method.

Reviewing the screening rules allows TSA to keep the methods that are used for security as up to date as possible and to ensure that air travelers are treated fairly.

I am a strong proponent of privacy, civil liberties, and due process.

The Federal Privacy Act assures that when agencies use electronic databases to collect, retain, process, or make decisions regarding U.S. citizens that their privacy is protected.

I ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.R. 2132.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2132, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REPORTING EFFICIENTLY TO PROPER OFFICIALS IN RESPONSE TO TERRORISM ACT OF 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 625) to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 625

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act of 2017" or the "REPORT Act".

### SEC. 2. DUTY TO REPORT.

(a) DUTY IMPOSED.—Whenever an act of terrorism occurs in the United States, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and, as appropriate, the head of the National

Counterterrorism Center, to submit, within one year of the completion of the investigation concerning such act by the primary Government agency conducting such investigation, an unclassified report (which may be accompanied by a classified annex) to Congress concerning such act.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORTS.—A report under this section shall—

(1) include a statement of the facts of the act of terrorism referred to in subsection (a), as known at the time of the report;

(2) identify any gaps in national security that could be addressed to prevent future acts of terrorism; and

(3) any recommendations for additional measures that could be taken to improve homeland security, including potential changes in law enforcement practices or changes in law, with particular attention to changes that could help prevent future acts of terrorism.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The duty established under subsection (a) shall not apply in instances in which the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or the head of the National Counterterrorism Center determines that the information required to be reported could jeopardize an ongoing investigation or prosecution. In such instances, the Secretary shall notify Congress of such prior to the first anniversary of the completion of the investigation described in such subsection.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "act of terrorism" has the meaning given such term in section 3077 of title 18, United States Code.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Congress has an obligation to ensure that our national counterterrorism programs and policies are as effective as possible. At every opportunity, we should assess gaps and weaknesses and work to find opportunities for improvement.

For example, the committee's investigation into the 2013 tragic Boston Marathon bombings revealed a series of weaknesses we have worked to correct; and many of the recent attacks, including the San Bernardino and Garland shootings, the Orlando Pulse nightclub attack, and other small-scale plots have each prompted review, reflection, and action.

The REPORT Act will provide valuable assistance in this work by requiring the Department of Homeland Security,

in coordination with other Federal officials, to submit a report to Congress on incidents of terrorism within 1 year of completion of the investigation.

Importantly, this report will provide Congress with the facts of the incident, a review of security gaps, and recommendations to improve homeland security efforts.

As the committee has learned over the years, it can often be a challenge to obtain timely and comprehensive sharing of information by the executive branch in the aftermath of a terrorist attack. While perhaps understandable, the REPORT Act, offered by Congressman AGUILAR, will help ensure that Congress receives the information it needs. This is a valuable addition, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman AGUILAR for introducing this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 625, the Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the REPORT Act creates an important new congressional oversight process with respect to incidents of terrorism on U.S. soil. H.R. 625 requires the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the FBI, and, as appropriate, the National Counterterrorism Center, to submit an unclassified report, which may be accompanied by a classified annex, to Congress within a year of the completion of an investigation of an act of terrorism.

The report to Congress must outline the facts and information related to the terrorist act but may also discuss national security gaps that come to light in the investigation that may be addressed by changes in law enforcement practices or changes in the law.

The gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR), introduced the REPORT Act to ensure that this body has the benefit of learning, long after the press attention has moved to other matters, the facts surrounding terrorist incidents.

The legislation is informed by the gentleman's experience as the representative for San Bernardino, California, which, of course, was the target of a vicious December 2015 attack that resulted in the death of 14 innocent victims.

I would note that, in order to protect any ongoing investigation or prosecution, the congressional notification can be waived if doing so presents a danger of interference to any ongoing terrorist investigation.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 625, I strongly believe that this legislation will enhance our ability as Members of Congress to help heal our communities

after an attack and help prevent future terrorist attacks to keep Americans safe.

I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act, or the REPORT Act.

I introduced the REPORT Act a year after the San Bernardino terrorist attack. Our community has seen more than its fair share of gun violence, but this terrorist mass shooting claimed 14 lives, injured another 22 people, and shook my community. In the days and weeks after, we pledged to do all we could to prevent another attack like this from happening ever again. This is what this bill seeks to do.

The REPORT Act requires the Department of Homeland Security to submit a report to Congress when a terror attack occurs in the United States. Under the bill, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the United States Attorney General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the head of the National Counterterrorism Center will produce a report detailing the attack and how to prevent future attacks.

The idea is to have a uniform after-action report following a terrorist attack here in the United States. There is currently no legal requirement to create such a report. Specifically, this report will include policy recommendations for lawmakers to make our communities safer and to prevent the next San Bernardino, Boston, New York, or Orlando.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill. It also has the support of regional leaders in communities impacted by acts of terror. It has been endorsed by my region's law enforcement community: San Bernardino Police Chief Jarrod Burguan and Sheriff John McMahon. Chief Burguan and Sheriff McMahon are my community's law enforcement leaders who led the heroic response on December 2, 2015, and stopped the violent rampage, preventing further loss of life.

The REPORT Act is a commonsense bill that will empower lawmakers with the facts they need to create meaningful laws to thwart future attacks of terror.

This bill is for the 14 killed and 22 injured in San Bernardino. It is for my community. It is also for every American city touched by these heinous acts of terrorism.

We can and must work together to protect our homeland, and I believe this is a smart, bipartisan step to achieve that.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, H.R. 625 is an important piece of legislation that has strong support on both sides of the aisle.

Effective communication and unity of effort is critical immediately following a terrorist attack. It is our duty as Members of Congress to give law enforcement space to do their investigation but then, when the facts are known, to get them and then use that knowledge to inform policymaking. H.R. 625 seeks to do just that. As such, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 625.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 625, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 625, the Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act of 2017, or the "REPORT Act."

The REPORT Act bridges an information and preparedness gap that has for too long clouded the information Congress receives about acts of terrorism that happen in our homeland.

The REPORT Act requires the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and, if appropriate, the head of the National Counterterrorism Center, to submit an unclassified report to Congress, within one year of the completion of an investigation of act of terrorism in the United States.

This report will include a statement of the facts regarding the act of terrorism; identify any possible national security gaps that could prevent future acts of terrorism, and any recommendations for additional homeland security improvement measures.

The report will help Congress to enact legislation to effectively address security gaps in our national security efforts.

The REPORT Act fosters accountability, collaboration, and preparedness.

Acts of terror and violence have been at the forefront of the American collective memory for more than a decade now.

Americans have become accustomed to hearing about attacks all across our homeland and around the world.

The Bookings Institute labeled 2016 as the year of the "Lone Wolf" terrorist.

Radicalized individuals acting on their own pose a strategic and institutional threat to our national security.

This phenomenon requires us to think creatively and collectively to be prepared to address the idiosyncratic aspects of this new wave of terror.

The REPORT Act relies on our current security structure to prepare us for the future.

Attacks such as the attack on LGBT people of color in Pulse, the attacks in the City of San Bernardino, and recent attacks in London highlight the importance of collaboration and

sharing of knowledge to prevent more attacks from happening.

This common sense bill relies on our current expertise to prepare for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we share the responsibility with the President to keep Americans safe and this bill is a step towards improving the way we go about protecting the American people.

I support the REPORT Act and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 625, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1873, ELECTRICITY RELIABILITY AND FOREST PROTECTION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1654, WATER SUPPLY PERMITTING COORDINATION ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-186) on the resolution (H. Res. 392) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1830

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2847, by the yeas and nays, and H.R. 2866, by the yeas and nays.

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



electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

### IMPROVING SERVICES FOR OLDER YOUTH IN FOSTER CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2847) to make improvements to the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and related provisions, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 8, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—391

|                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham         | Coffman        | Flores          |
| Adams           | Cohen          | Fortenberry     |
| Aguilar         | Cole           | Foster          |
| Allen           | Collins (GA)   | Foxx            |
| Amodei          | Collins (NY)   | Frankel (FL)    |
| Arrington       | Comer          | Franks (AZ)     |
| Babin           | Comstock       | Frelinghuysen   |
| Bacon           | Conaway        | Gaetz           |
| Banks (IN)      | Connolly       | Gallagher       |
| Barletta        | Conyers        | Galleo          |
| Barr            | Cook           | Garamendi       |
| Barragán        | Cooper         | Garrett         |
| Bass            | Correa         | Gibbs           |
| Beatty          | Costa          | Gohmert         |
| Bera            | Costello (PA)  | Gonzalez (TX)   |
| Bergman         | Courtney       | Goodlatte       |
| Beyer           | Cramer         | Gosar           |
| Bilirakis       | Crawford       | Gottheimer      |
| Bishop (GA)     | Crist          | Gotthy          |
| Bishop (MI)     | Crowley        | Granger         |
| Bishop (UT)     | Cuellar        | Graves (GA)     |
| Black           | Culberson      | Graves (LA)     |
| Blackburn       | Curbelo (FL)   | Graves (MO)     |
| Blum            | Davidson       | Green, Al       |
| Blumenauer      | Davis (CA)     | Green, Gene     |
| Blunt Rochester | Davis, Danny   | Griffith        |
| Bonamici        | Davis, Rodney  | Grijalva        |
| Bost            | DeFazio        | Grothman        |
| Boyle, Brendan  | DeGette        | Guthrie         |
| F.              | Delaney        | Hanabusa        |
| Brady (PA)      | DeLauro        | Harper          |
| Brady (TX)      | DelBene        | Harris          |
| Bridenstine     | Demings        | Hartzler        |
| Brooks (IN)     | Denham         | Hastings        |
| Brown (MD)      | Dent           | Heck            |
| Brownley (CA)   | DeSantis       | Hensarling      |
| Buchanan        | DeSaulnier     | Herrera Beutler |
| Bucshon         | DesJarlais     | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Budd            | Deutch         | Higgins (LA)    |
| Burgess         | Diaz-Balart    | Higgins (NY)    |
| Bustos          | Dingell        | Hill            |
| Butterfield     | Doggett        | Holding         |
| Byrne           | Donovan        | Hollingsworth   |
| Calvert         | Doyle, Michael | Hoyer           |
| Capuano         | F.             | Hudson          |
| Carbajal        | Duffy          | Huffman         |
| Cárdenas        | Duncan (SC)    | Huizenga        |
| Carson (IN)     | Duncan (TN)    | Hultgren        |
| Carter (GA)     | Dunn           | Hunter          |
| Carter (TX)     | Ellison        | Hurd            |
| Cartwright      | Emmer          | Issa            |
| Castor (FL)     | Engel          | Jackson Lee     |
| Castro (TX)     | Eshoo          | Jayapal         |
| Chabot          | Españillat     | Jeffries        |
| Chaffetz        | Estes (KS)     | Jenkins (KS)    |
| Cheney          | Esty (CT)      | Jenkins (WV)    |
| Chu, Judy       | Evans          | Johnson (GA)    |
| Clark (MA)      | Farenthold     | Johnson (LA)    |
| Clarke (NY)     | Faso           | Johnson (OH)    |
| Clay            | Ferguson       | Johnson, E. B.  |
| Cleaver         | Fitzpatrick    | Jones           |
| Clyburn         | Fleischmann    | Jordan          |

|                |                 |                |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Joyce (OH)     | Mitchell        | Scott (VA)     |
| Kaptur         | Moolenaar       | Scott, Austin  |
| Katko          | Mooney (WV)     | Scott, David   |
| Keating        | Moore           | Sensenbrenner  |
| Kelly (IL)     | Moulton         | Serrano        |
| Kelly (MS)     | Mullin          | Sessions       |
| Kelly (PA)     | Murphy (FL)     | Sewell (AL)    |
| Khanna         | Murphy (PA)     | Sherman        |
| Kihuen         | Nadler          | Shimkus        |
| Kildee         | Neal            | Shuster        |
| Kilmer         | Newhouse        | Simpson        |
| Kind           | Noem            | Sinema         |
| King (IA)      | Nolan           | Sires          |
| King (NY)      | Norcross        | Slaughter      |
| Kinziger       | Nunes           | Smith (MO)     |
| Knight         | O'Halleran      | Smith (NE)     |
| Krishnamoorthi | O'Rourke        | Smith (TX)     |
| Kuster (NH)    | Olson           | Smith (WA)     |
| Kustoff (TN)   | Palazzo         | Smucker        |
| LaHood         | Pallone         | Soto           |
| LaMalfa        | Palmer          | Stefanik       |
| Lamborn        | Panetta         | Stewart        |
| Lance          | Pascrell        | Stivers        |
| Langevin       | Paulsen         | Suozzi         |
| Larson (CT)    | Payne           | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Latta          | Pearce          | Takano         |
| Lawrence       | Perlmutter      | Taylor         |
| Lawson (FL)    | Perry           | Tenney         |
| Lee            | Peters          | Thompson (CA)  |
| Levin          | Peterson        | Thompson (MS)  |
| Lewis (MN)     | Pittenger       | Thompson (PA)  |
| Lieu, Ted      | Pocan           | Thornberry     |
| Lipinski       | Poe (TX)        | Tiberi         |
| LoBiondo       | Poliquin        | Tipton         |
| Loebach        | Polis           | Titus          |
| Lofgren        | Price (NC)      | Torres         |
| Long           | Quigley         | Torres         |
| Longtermilk    | Raskin          | Trott          |
| Love           | Ratcliffe       | Tsongas        |
| Lowe           | Reed            | Turner         |
| Lucas          | Reichert        | Upton          |
| Luetkemeyer    | Rice (SC)       | Valadao        |
| Lujan Grisham, | Richmond        | Vargas         |
| M.             | Roby            | Veasey         |
| Luján, Ben Ray | Roe (TN)        | Vela           |
| Lynch          | Rogers (AL)     | Velázquez      |
| MacArthur      | Rogers (KY)     | Visclosky      |
| Maloney,       | Rokita          | Walberg        |
| Carolyn B.     | Rooney, Francis | Walden         |
| Maloney, Sean  | Rooney, Thomas  | Walker         |
| Marino         | J.              | Walorski       |
| Marshall       | Ros-Lehtinen    | Walters, Mimi  |
| Masse          | Rosen           | Walsh          |
| Mast           | Roskam          | Walz           |
| Matsui         | Ross            | Wasserman      |
| McCarthy       | Rothfus         | Schultz        |
| McCaul         | Rouzer          | Watson Coleman |
| McCollum       | Roybal-Allard   | Webster (FL)   |
| McEachin       | Royce (CA)      | Welch          |
| McGovern       | Ruiz            | Wenstrup       |
| McHenry        | Ruppersberger   | Westerman      |
| McKinley       | Rush            | Williams       |
| McMorris       | Russell         | Wilson (SC)    |
| Rodgers        | Rutherford      | Wittman        |
| McNerney       | Ryan (OH)       | Womack         |
| McSally        | Sarbanes        | Woodall        |
| Meadows        | Schakowsky      | Yarmuth        |
| Meehan         | Schiff          | Yoder          |
| Meeks          | Schneider       | Young (AK)     |
| Meng           | Schrader        | Young (IA)     |
| Messer         | Schweikert      | Zeldin         |

NAYS—8

|       |            |         |
|-------|------------|---------|
| Amash | Buck       | Sanford |
| Biggs | Labrador   | Yoho    |
| Brat  | McClintock |         |

NOT VOTING—31

|              |             |                |
|--------------|-------------|----------------|
| Aderholt     | Larsen (WA) | Sánchez        |
| Barton       | Lewis (GA)  | Scalise        |
| Brooks (AL)  | Lowenthal   | Shea-Porter    |
| Cicilline    | Marchant    | Smith (NJ)     |
| Cummings     | Napolitano  | Speier         |
| Fudge        | Pelosi      | Wagner         |
| Gabbard      | Pingree     | Waters, Maxine |
| Gutiérrez    | Posey       | Weber (TX)     |
| Himes        | Renacci     | Wilson (FL)    |
| Johnson, Sam | Rice (NY)   |                |
| Kennedy      | Rohrabacher |                |

□ 1851

Ms. FOXX changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### REDUCING UNNECESSARY BARRIERS FOR RELATIVE FOSTER PARENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2866) to review and improve licensing standards for placement in a relative foster family home, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 19, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—382

|                 |               |                 |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham         | Castro (TX)   | Doyle, Michael  |
| Adams           | Chabot        | F.              |
| Aderholt        | Chaffetz      | Duffy           |
| Aguilar         | Chu, Judy     | Duncan (SC)     |
| Allen           | Clark (MA)    | Duncan (TN)     |
| Amodei          | Clarke (NY)   | Dunn            |
| Arrington       | Clay          | Ellison         |
| Bacon           | Cleaver       | Emmer           |
| Banks (IN)      | Clyburn       | Engel           |
| Barletta        | Coffman       | Eshoo           |
| Barr            | Cohen         | Españillat      |
| Barragán        | Cole          | Estes (KS)      |
| Barton          | Collins (GA)  | Esty (CT)       |
| Bass            | Collins (NY)  | Evans           |
| Beatty          | Comer         | Farenthold      |
| Bera            | Comstock      | Faso            |
| Bergman         | Conaway       | Ferguson        |
| Beyer           | Connolly      | Fitzpatrick     |
| Bilirakis       | Conyers       | Fleischmann     |
| Bishop (GA)     | Cook          | Flores          |
| Bishop (MI)     | Cooper        | Fortenberry     |
| Bishop (UT)     | Correa        | Foster          |
| Black           | Costa         | Foxx            |
| Blackburn       | Costello (PA) | Frankel (FL)    |
| Blum            | Courtney      | Franks (AZ)     |
| Blumenauer      | Cramer        | Frelinghuysen   |
| Blunt Rochester | Crawford      | Gallagher       |
| Bonamici        | Crist         | Galleo          |
| Bost            | Crowley       | Garamendi       |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Cuellar       | Gonzalez (TX)   |
| F.              | Culberson     | Goodlatte       |
| Brady (PA)      | Curbelo (FL)  | Gottheimer      |
| Brady (TX)      | Davidson      | Gowdy           |
| Bridenstine     | Davis (CA)    | Granger         |
| Brooks (IN)     | Davis, Danny  | Graves (GA)     |
| Brown (MD)      | Davis, Rodney | Graves (LA)     |
| Brownley (CA)   | DeFazio       | Graves (MO)     |
| Buchanan        | DeGette       | Green, Al       |
| Bucshon         | Delaney       | Green, Gene     |
| Budd            | DeLauro       | Griffith        |
| Burgess         | DelBene       | Grijalva        |
| Bustos          | Demings       | Guthrie         |
| Butterfield     | Denham        | Hanabusa        |
| Byrne           | Dent          | Harper          |
| Calvert         | DeSantis      | Harris          |
| Capuano         | DeSaulnier    | Hartzler        |
| Carbajal        | DesJarlais    | Hastings        |
| Cárdenas        | Deutch        | Heck            |
| Carson (IN)     | Diaz-Balart   | Hensarling      |
| Carter (GA)     | Dingell       | Herrera Beutler |
| Carter (TX)     | Doggett       | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Cartwright      | Donovan       | Higgins (LA)    |
| Castor (FL)     |               | Higgins (NY)    |



|                |                 |                |             |                |             |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Hill           | McCollum        | Schakowsky     | Sánchez     | Smith (NJ)     | Weber (TX)  |
| Holding        | McEachin        | Schiff         | Scalise     | Wagner         | Wilson (FL) |
| Hollingsworth  | McGovern        | Schneider      | Shea-Porter | Waters, Maxine |             |
| Hoyer          | McHenry         | Schrader       |             |                |             |
| Hudson         | McKinley        | Schweikert     |             |                |             |
| Huffman        | McMorris        | Scott (VA)     |             |                |             |
| Huizenga       | Rodgers         | Scott, Austin  |             |                |             |
| Hultgren       | McNerney        | Scott, David   |             |                |             |
| Hunter         | McSally         | Sensenbrenner  |             |                |             |
| Hurd           | Meadows         | Serrano        |             |                |             |
| Issa           | Meehan          | Sessions       |             |                |             |
| Jackson Lee    | Meeks           | Sewell (AL)    |             |                |             |
| Jayapal        | Meng            | Sherman        |             |                |             |
| Jeffries       | Messer          | Shimkus        |             |                |             |
| Jenkins (KS)   | Mitchell        | Shuster        |             |                |             |
| Jenkins (WV)   | Moolenaar       | Simpson        |             |                |             |
| Johnson (GA)   | Moore           | Sinema         |             |                |             |
| Johnson (LA)   | Moulton         | Sires          |             |                |             |
| Johnson (OH)   | Mullin          | Slaughter      |             |                |             |
| Johnson, E. B. | Murphy (FL)     | Smith (MO)     |             |                |             |
| Joyce (OH)     | Murphy (PA)     | Smith (NE)     |             |                |             |
| Kaptur         | Nadler          | Smith (TX)     |             |                |             |
| Katko          | Neal            | Smith (WA)     |             |                |             |
| Keating        | Newhouse        | Smucker        |             |                |             |
| Kelly (IL)     | Noem            | Soto           |             |                |             |
| Kelly (MS)     | Nolan           | Speier         |             |                |             |
| Kelly (PA)     | Norcross        | Stefanik       |             |                |             |
| Khanna         | Nunes           | Stewart        |             |                |             |
| Kihuen         | O'Halleran      | Stivers        |             |                |             |
| Kildee         | O'Rourke        | Suozi          |             |                |             |
| Kilmer         | Olson           | Swalwell (CA)  |             |                |             |
| Kind           | Palazzo         | Takano         |             |                |             |
| King (IA)      | Pallone         | Taylor         |             |                |             |
| King (NY)      | Panetta         | Tenney         |             |                |             |
| Kinzinger      | Pascrell        | Thompson (CA)  |             |                |             |
| Knight         | Paulsen         | Thompson (MS)  |             |                |             |
| Krishnamoorthi | Payne           | Thompson (PA)  |             |                |             |
| Kuster (NH)    | Pearce          | Thornberry     |             |                |             |
| Kustoff (TN)   | Perlmutter      | Tiberti        |             |                |             |
| LaHood         | Perry           | Tipton         |             |                |             |
| LaMalfa        | Peters          | Titus          |             |                |             |
| Lamborn        | Peterson        | Tonko          |             |                |             |
| Lance          | Pittenger       | Torres         |             |                |             |
| Langevin       | Pocan           | Trott          |             |                |             |
| Larson (CT)    | Poliquin        | Tsongas        |             |                |             |
| Latta          | Polis           | Turner         |             |                |             |
| Lawrence       | Price (NC)      | Upton          |             |                |             |
| Lawson (FL)    | Quigley         | Valadao        |             |                |             |
| Lee            | Raskin          | Vargas         |             |                |             |
| Levin          | Reed            | Veasey         |             |                |             |
| Lewis (MN)     | Reichert        | Vela           |             |                |             |
| Lieu, Ted      | Rice (NY)       | Velázquez      |             |                |             |
| Lipinski       | Rice (SC)       | Visclosky      |             |                |             |
| LoBiondo       | Richmond        | Walberg        |             |                |             |
| Loeback        | Roby            | Walden         |             |                |             |
| Lofgren        | Roe (TN)        | Walker         |             |                |             |
| Long           | Rogers (AL)     | Walorski       |             |                |             |
| Loudermilk     | Rogers (KY)     | Walters, Mimi  |             |                |             |
| Love           | Rokita          | Walz           |             |                |             |
| Lowey          | Rooney, Francis | Wasserman      |             |                |             |
| Lucas          | Rooney, Thomas  | Schultz        |             |                |             |
| Luetkemeyer    | J.              | Watson Coleman |             |                |             |
| Lujan Grisham, | Ros-Lehtinen    | Webster (FL)   |             |                |             |
| M.             | Rosen           | Welch          |             |                |             |
| Lujan, Ben Ray | Roskam          | Wenstrup       |             |                |             |
| Lynch          | Ross            | Westerman      |             |                |             |
| MacArthur      | Rothfus         | Williams       |             |                |             |
| Maloney,       | Rouzer          | Wilson (SC)    |             |                |             |
| Carolyn B.     | Roybal-Allard   | Wittman        |             |                |             |
| Maloney, Sean  | Royce (CA)      | Womack         |             |                |             |
| Marino         | Ruiz            | Woodall        |             |                |             |
| Marshall       | Ruppersberger   | Yarmuth        |             |                |             |
| Mast           | Rush            | Yoder          |             |                |             |
| Matsui         | Russell         | Yoho           |             |                |             |
| McCarthy       | Rutherford      | Young (AK)     |             |                |             |
| McCaul         | Ryan (OH)       | Young (IA)     |             |                |             |
| McClintock     | Sarbanes        | Zeldin         |             |                |             |

## NAYS—19

|         |          |             |
|---------|----------|-------------|
| Amash   | Gohmert  | Mooney (WV) |
| Biggs   | Gosar    | Palmer      |
| Brat    | Grothman | Poe (TX)    |
| Buck    | Jones    | Ratcliffe   |
| Gaetz   | Jordan   | Sanford     |
| Garrett | Labrador |             |
| Gibbs   | Massie   |             |

## NOT VOTING—29

|             |              |             |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Babin       | Gutiérrez    | Marchant    |
| Brooks (AL) | Himes        | Napolitano  |
| Cheney      | Johnson, Sam | Pelosi      |
| Cicilline   | Kennedy      | Pingree     |
| Cummings    | Larsen (WA)  | Posey       |
| Fudge       | Lewis (GA)   | Renacci     |
| Gabbard     | Lowenthal    | Rohrabacher |

□ 1900

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 310.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 310.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY  
MORALE, RECOGNITION,  
LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT  
ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2283) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2283

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

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Homeland Security Morale, Recognition, Learning and Engagement Act of 2017” or the “DHS MORALE Act”.

## SEC. 2. CHIEF HUMAN CAPITAL OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 704 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “, including with respect to leader development and employee engagement,” after “policies”;

(ii) by striking “and in line” and inserting “, in line”; and

(iii) by inserting “and informed by best practices within the Federal government and the private sector,” after “priorities,”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “develop performance measures to provide a basis for monitoring and evaluating” and inserting “evaluate, on an ongoing basis,”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting “that, to the extent practicable, are informed by employee feedback,” after “policies”;

(D) in paragraph (4), by inserting “including leader development and employee engagement programs,” before “in coordination”;

(E) in paragraph (5), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “that is informed by an assessment, carried out by the Chief Human Capital Officer, of the learning and developmental needs of employees in supervisory and non-supervisory roles across the Department and appropriate workforce planning initiatives”;

(F) by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as paragraphs (11) and (12), respectively; and

(G) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraphs:

“(9) maintain a catalogue of available employee development opportunities, including the Homeland Security Rotation Program pursuant to section 844, departmental leadership development programs, interagency development programs, and other rotational programs;

“(10) ensure that employee discipline and adverse action programs comply with the requirements of all pertinent laws, rules, regulations, and Federal guidance, and ensure due process for employees;”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

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

“(d) CHIEF LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT OFFICER.—The Chief Human Capital Officer may designate an employee of the Department to serve as a Chief Learning and Engagement Officer to assist the Chief Human Capital Officer in carrying out this section.”;

and

(4) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

“(2) information on employee development opportunities catalogued pursuant to paragraph (9) of subsection (b) and any available data on participation rates, attrition rates, and impacts on retention and employee satisfaction;

“(3) information on the progress of Department-wide strategic workforce planning efforts as determined under paragraph (2) of subsection (b);

“(4) information on the activities of the steering committee established pursuant to section 710(a), including the number of meetings, types of materials developed and distributed, and recommendations made to the Secretary.”;

## SEC. 3. EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE AND ACTION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

## “SEC. 710. EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT.

“(a) STEERING COMMITTEE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish an employee engagement steering committee, including representatives from operational components, headquarters, and field personnel, including supervisory and non-supervisory personnel, and employee labor organizations that represent Department employees, and chaired by the Under Secretary for

Management, to carry out the following activities:

“(1) Identify factors that have a negative impact on employee engagement, morale, and communications within the Department, such as perceptions about limitations on career progression, mobility, or development opportunities, collected through employee feedback platforms, including through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate.

“(2) Identify, develop, and distribute initiatives and best practices to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications within the Department, including through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate.

“(3) Monitor efforts of each component to address employee engagement, morale, and communications based on employee feedback provided through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate.

“(4) Advise the Secretary on efforts to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications within specific components and across the Department.

“(5) Conduct regular meetings and report, not less than once per quarter, to the Under Secretary for Management, the head of each component, and the Secretary on Department-wide efforts to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications.

“(b) ACTION PLAN; REPORTING.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief Human Capital Officer, shall—

“(1) not later than 120 days after the date of the establishment of the steering committee under subsection (a), issue a Department-wide employee engagement action plan, reflecting input from the employee engagement steering committee established pursuant to subsection (a) and employee feedback provided through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications in accordance with paragraph (1) of such subsection, to execute strategies to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications within the Department; and

“(2) require the head of each component to—

“(A) develop and implement a component-specific employee engagement plan to advance the action plan required under paragraph (1) that includes performance measures and objectives, is informed by employee feedback provided through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate, and sets forth how employees and, where applicable, their labor representatives are to be integrated in developing programs and initiatives;

“(B) monitor progress on implementation of such action plan; and

“(C) provide to the Chief Human Capital Officer and the steering committee quarterly reports on actions planned and progress made under this paragraph.

“(c) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 709 the following new item:

“Sec. 710. Employee engagement.”.

(c) SUBMISSIONS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) DEPARTMENT-WIDE EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ACTION PLAN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, shall submit to the

Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate the Department-wide employee engagement action plan required under subsection (b)(1) of section 710 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a) of this section) not later than 30 days after the issuance of such plan under such subsection (b)(1).

(2) COMPONENT-SPECIFIC EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT PLANS.—Each head of a component of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate the component-specific employee engagement plan of each such component required under subsection (b)(2) of section 710 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a) of this section) not later than 30 days after the issuance of each such plan under such subsection (b)(2).

#### SEC. 4. ANNUAL EMPLOYEE AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.), as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### “SEC. 711. ANNUAL EMPLOYEE AWARD PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish an annual employee award program to recognize Department employees or groups of employees for significant contributions to the achievement of the Department's goals and missions. If such a program is established, the Secretary shall—

“(1) establish within such program categories of awards, each with specific criteria, that emphasizes honoring employees who are at the non-supervisory level;

“(2) publicize within the Department how any employee or group of employees may be nominated for an award;

“(3) establish an internal review board comprised of representatives from Department components, headquarters, and field personnel to submit to the Secretary award recommendations regarding specific employees or groups of employees;

“(4) select recipients from the pool of nominees submitted by the internal review board under paragraph (3) and convene a ceremony at which employees or groups of employees receive such awards from the Secretary; and

“(5) publicize such program within the Department.

“(b) INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD.—The internal review board described in subsection (a)(3) shall, when carrying out its function under such subsection, consult with representatives from operational components and headquarters, including supervisory and non-supervisory personnel, and employee labor organizations that represent Department employees.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize additional funds to carry out the requirements of this section or to require the Secretary to provide monetary bonuses to recipients of an award under this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 710 the following new item:

“Sec. 711. Annual employee award program.”.

#### SEC. 5. INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act or the issuance of a report by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security on the extent to which the Department has an equitable and consistent disciplinary process, whichever is later, but in no case later than one year after such date of enactment, the Comptroller General of the United States shall utilize, if available, such report and investigate whether the application of discipline and adverse actions are administered in an equitable and consistent manner that results in the same or substantially similar disciplinary outcomes across the Department for misconduct by a non-supervisory or supervisor employee who engaged in the same or substantially similar misconduct.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the investigation described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with the employee engagement steering committee established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of section 710 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by section 3(a) of this Act).

(c) ACTION BY UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT.—Upon completion of the investigation described in subsection (a), the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security shall review the findings and recommendations of such investigation and implement a plan, in consultation with the employee engagement steering committee established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of section 710 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to correct any relevant deficiencies identified by the Comptroller General of the United States. The Under Secretary for Management shall direct the employee engagement steering committee to review such plan to inform committee activities and action plans authorized under such section 710.

#### SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2283. According to the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, after 6 straight years of decline, DHS improved by 3 percentage points in 2016, from 53 percent in 2015 to 56 percent.

However, since its inception, DHS has consistently reported low employee job satisfaction and today remains last out of large agencies in employee satisfaction.

According to the FEVS, the Department slightly improved its overall response rate to about 50 percent in 2016. Former Secretary Jeh Johnson attributed much of the success to the Department's employee engagement steering committee and efforts he and other leaders have made in strengthening employee morale and engagement. H.R. 2283 seeks to codify many of these efforts.

The purpose of H.R. 2283 is to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program.

The security of our homeland depends on focused, efficient, and dedicated individuals who feel confident and empowered in the workplace.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON for introducing this legislation and for working in such a bipartisan manner on it. I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense, thoughtful legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2283, the Department of Homeland Security Morale, Recognition, Learning and Engagement Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, since its inception in 2003, the Department of Homeland Security has faced a number of challenges, one of the most prominent being managing a workforce of more than 240,000 employees.

I am pleased to see that, after 6 straight years of decline, DHS employee engagement and participation scores have improved by 3 percentage points each in the latest Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. However, DHS still ranks amongst the lowest of Federal agencies in employee morale.

It has been a personal priority of mine to examine the root cause of DHS's longstanding employee morale problems and find ways to move the Department in a positive direction.

My legislation, the DHS MORALE Act, does just that by authorizing DHS-wide employee engagement, leadership development, rotational opportunities, as well as an employee engagement steering committee.

Additionally, H.R. 2283 authorizes an annual employee award program to recognize employees who make significant contributions to the Department's operations.

Finally, H.R. 2283 adds transparency and fairness to DHS's disciplinary

process by directing an independent, Department-wide review of how discipline is applied by components.

This legislation, which is cosponsored by every Democratic member of the committee, has received tremendous support from the labor organization representing the DHS workforce.

I include these letters of support in the RECORD.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT  
EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,  
May 1, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,  
Chairman, House of Representatives, Committee  
on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,  
Ranking Member, House of Representatives,  
Committee on Homeland Security, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the 80,000 employees at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) represented by the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, I express our union's support for the DHS Morale, Recognition, Learning and Engagement Act of 2017, or the DHS MORALE Act. The DHS MORALE Act accurately recognizes that the contributions of the DHS workers and their unions are essential to addressing serious and sustained morale issues.

Each year reports and surveys confirm the sad state of morale among DHS employees who are on the front lines of national security. Given the diversity in mission, duties, and experience, their direct input is necessary to address issues of importance to their colleagues, including fair treatment and that their voices are heard by management. Steps to resolve these issues will enable the workforce to better serve the public.

The DHS MORALE Act is a good first step in resolving institutional issues that hamper the workforce that protects the homeland. AFGE supports these efforts.

Sincerely,

J. DAVID COX, SR.,  
National President.

NATIONAL BORDER PATROL COUNCIL,  
April 17, 2017.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,  
Committee on Homeland Security,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the members of the National Border Patrol Council, I write to support your legislation, "The Department of Homeland Security Morale, Recognition, Learning, and Engagement Act of 2017." Your bill is a step forward to improve employee morale amongst Border Patrol Agents.

We are especially pleased that the bill addresses two issues requiring immediate attention, accountability and mobility. An independent audit of DHS disciplinary processes would end DHS's current penchant for punishing line agents more severely than managers for the same offense. A uniform and transparent system would hold those accountable for violations of law and policy, while also ensuring due process for employees and accountability from the top down.

The proposed Employee Engagement Steering Committee would give line agents another tool to express limitations on issues such as career progression and mobility to CBP management. Too often, newly hired agents are promised they will be able to move from a duty location to another after a few years. Unfortunately, that just isn't the case. Many are effectively stuck in a lo-

cation and end up leaving the agency altogether out of frustration. Simply put, the lack of current employee engagement causes the Border Patrol to lose good agents, and consequently, threatens the security of the border.

I appreciate your leadership to protect the rights of federal employees and look forward to continuing to work with you to find a solution. Thank you for your efforts and for considering our comments.

With kindest regard I am,

BRANDON JUDD,  
President, National Border Patrol Council

THE NATIONAL TREASURY  
EMPLOYEES UNION,  
April 21, 2017.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representative, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the 25,000 Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officers and trade enforcement specialists at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) who are stationed at 328 land, sea and air ports of entry represented by the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), I am writing to thank you for introducing the "Department of Homeland Security Morale, Recognition, Learning and Engagement Act of 2017" or the "DHS MORALE Act."

Low morale has been a consistent challenge at DHS. Factors that contribute to low morale are echoed in the 2016 Office of Personnel Management's Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. Though DHS has made some gains in 2016, it remains the lowest ranked large agency for employee engagement, global satisfaction and inclusiveness.

The DHS MORALE Act proposes to improve morale within the DHS workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans and authorizing an annual employee award program.

Even though the major factors contributing to low morale at CBP ports of entry are insufficient staffing and resources, the provisions in the DHS MORALE Act will help address non-staffing issues that affect employee morale by improving frontline employee engagement and establishing an annual awards program that emphasizes honoring non-supervisory employees. Importantly, your bill ensures that the perspective of frontline employees is considered by, and fully integrated into the Department's workforce activities.

NTEU greatly appreciates your leadership on this important issue and stands ready to work with you to pass this legislation.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,  
National President.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. My legislation sends a positive message to the DHS workforce that their contributions to the DHS mission are valued and they have not been forgotten as they endure new stresses and challenges under the Trump administration.

My legislation is intended to advance greater employee engagement, leadership development, and workforce planning at the Department of Homeland Security. This legislation seeks to equip DHS leaders, such as the Chief

Human Capital Officer, with the necessary tools to promote employee engagement, learning, and morale.

The MORALE Act was unanimously approved by the full committee on May 3, and for good reason. It has wide bipartisan support.

Given the criticality of the DHS mission and the increasingly scarce availability of resources, it is essential that the DHS workforce be prioritized, as they are responsible for carrying out a diverse range of programs to make our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 2283.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2283, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 2283, the "Department of Homeland Security Morale, Recognition, Learning and Engagement Act," which will amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

This bill requires the Chief Human Capital Officer to develop and implement policies related to leadership development, employee engagement, and career progression.

The CHCO must evaluate strategic workforce planning efforts, identify methods for managing and overseeing human capital programs, and maintain a catalogue of available employee development opportunities.

It is imperative that employees be aware of the opportunities available for them no matter what their current title or role may be.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will also authorize the Chief Learning and Engagement Officer to assist the Chief Human Capital Officer on employee development and will also authorize the Employee Engagement Steering Committee.

The Employee Engagement Steering Committee will be comprised of representatives from across the Department as well as representatives from employee labor organizations.

Having a committee that is representative of the Department's workforce will ensure that a diverse voice is representative in any decisions made that will affect employees.

The Steering Committee will identify factors that have a negative impact on employee engagement and morale and will monitor components' efforts in addressing morale.

The Component heads are tasked with developing and implementing a component-specific action plan that addresses employee engagement and advances the overall Department action plan.

This bill will authorize the Secretary to establish an annual employee awards program to recognize non-supervisory DHS employees who have made significant contributions to the Department.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will also require the Secretary to provide an independent assessment of DHS programs to Congress.

Congress must ensure that programs are working in the way that they were created to.

This bill is endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council, the National Treasury Employ-

ees Union, and the American Federation of Government Employees.

These organizations have recognized that this bill is a step forward in the right direction which helps employees of the Department have a higher morale.

DHS was ranked low in best places to work in a recent poll conducted.

Recognition and employee engagement is important to reduce turnover, improve team culture, and increase employee performance.

I urge my colleagues to also support this bill and help create a Department of Homeland Security that is professional, efficient, effective, and employee friendly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2283, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STREAMLINING DHS OVERHEAD ACT

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2190) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's real property portfolio, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2190

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Streamlining DHS Overhead Act".

#### SEC. 2. LONG TERM REAL PROPERTY STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

##### "SEC. 710. CHIEF FACILITIES AND LOGISTICS OFFICER.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is a Chief Facilities and Logistics Officer of the Department who shall report directly to the Under Secretary for Management. The Chief Facilities and Logistics Officer shall be career reserved for a member of the senior executive service.

"(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Chief Facilities and Logistics Officer shall—

"(1) develop policies and procedures and provide program oversight to manage real property, facilities, personal property, mobile assets, equipment, and other material resources of the Department;

"(2) manage and execute, in consultation with the component heads, mission support services within the National Capital Region for real property, facilities, and other common headquarters and field activities for the Department; and

"(3) provide tactical and transactional services for the Department, including trans-

portation, facility operations, and maintenance.

#### "SEC. 711. LONG TERM REAL PROPERTY STRATEGIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) FIRST STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Under Secretary for Management shall develop an initial 5-year regional real property strategy for the Department that covers the five fiscal years immediately following such date of enactment. Such strategy shall be geographically organized, as designated by the Under Secretary for Management.

"(2) SECOND STRATEGY.—Not later than the first day of the fourth fiscal year covered by the first strategy under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary for Management shall develop a second 5-year real property strategy for the Department that covers the five fiscal years immediately following the conclusion of such first strategy.

"(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) INITIAL STRATEGY.—The initial 5-year strategy developed in accordance with paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall—

"(A) identify opportunities to consolidate real property, optimize the usage of Federal assets, and decrease the number of commercial leases and square footage within the Department's real property portfolio;

"(B) provide alternate housing and consolidation plans to increase efficiency through joint use of Department spaces while decreasing the cost of leased space;

"(C) concentrate on geographical areas with a significant Department presence, as identified by the Under Secretary for Management;

"(D) examine the establishment of central Department locations in each such geographical region and the co-location of Department components based on the mission sets and responsibilities of such components;

"(E) identify opportunities to reduce overhead costs through co-location or consolidation of real property interests or mission support activities, such as shared mail screening and processing, centralized transportation and shuttle services, regional transit benefit programs, common contracting for custodial and other services, and leveraging strategic sourcing contracts and sharing of specialized facilities, such as training facilities and resources;

"(F) manage the current Department Workspace Standard for Office Space in accordance with the Department office workspace design process to develop the most efficient and effective spaces within the workspace standard usable square foot ranges for all leased for office space entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this section, including the renewal of any leases for office space existing as of such date;

"(G) define, based on square footage, what constitutes a major real property acquisition;

"(H) prioritize actions to be taken to improve the operations and management of the Department's real property inventory, based on life-cycle cost estimations, in consultation with component heads; and

"(I) include any additional information determined appropriate or relevant by the Under Secretary for Management.

"(2) SECOND STRATEGY.—The second 5-year strategy developed in accordance with paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall include information required in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (E), (F), (G), (H), and (I) of paragraph (1)

and information on the effectiveness of implementation efforts pursuant to the Department-wide policy required in accordance with subsection (c), including—

“(A) the impact of such implementation on departmental operations and costs; and

“(B) the degree to which the Department established central Department locations and co-located Department components pursuant to the results of the examination required by subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1).

“(C) IMPLEMENTATION POLICIES.—Not later than 90 days after the development of each of the regional real property strategies developed in accordance with subsection (a), the Under Secretary for Management shall develop or update, as applicable, a Department-wide policy implementing such strategies.

“(d) CERTIFICATIONS.—Subject to subsection (g)(3), the implementation policies developed pursuant to subsection (c) shall require component heads to certify to the Under Secretary for Management that such heads have complied with the requirements specified in subsection (b) before making any major real property decision or recommendation, as defined by the Under Secretary, including matters related to new leased space, renewing any existing leases, or agreeing to extend or newly occupy any Federal space or new construction, in accordance with the applicable regional real property strategy developed in accordance with subsection (a).

“(e) UNDERUTILIZED SPACE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The implementing policies developed pursuant to subsection (c) shall require component heads, acting through regional property managers under subsection (f), to annually report to the Under Secretary for Management on underutilized space and identify space that may be made available for use, as applicable, by other components or Federal agencies.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Under Secretary for Management may grant an exception to the workspace standard usable square foot ranges described in subsection (b)(1)(F) for specific office locations at which a reduction or elimination of otherwise underutilized space would negatively impact a component's ability to execute its mission based on readiness performance measures or would increase the cost of such space.

“(3) UNDERUTILIZED SPACE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘underutilized space’ means any space with respect to which utilization is greater than the workplace standard usable square foot ranges pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(F).

“(f) COMPONENT RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(1) REGIONAL PROPERTY MANAGERS.—Each component head shall identify a senior career employee of each such component for each geographic region included in the regional real property strategies developed in accordance with subsection (a) to serve as each such component's regional property manager. Each such regional property manager shall serve as a single point of contact for Department headquarters and other Department components for all real property matters relating to each such component within the region in which each such component is located, and provide data and any other support necessary for the DHS Regional Mission Support Coordinator strategic asset and portfolio planning and execution.

“(2) DATA.—Regional property managers under paragraph (1) shall provide annually to the Under Secretary for Management, via a standardized and centralized system, data on each component's real property holdings, as

specified by the Under Secretary for Management, including relating to underutilized space under subsection (e) (as such term is defined in such subsection), total square footage leased, annual cost, and total number of staff, for each geographic region included in the regional real property strategies developed in accordance with subsection (a).

“(g) ONGOING OVERSIGHT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Management shall monitor components' adherence to the regional real property strategies developed in accordance with subsection (a) and the implementation policies developed pursuant to subsection (c).

“(2) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Under Secretary for Management shall annually review the data submitted pursuant to subsection (f)(2) to ensure all underutilized space (as such term is defined in subsection (e)) is properly identified.

“(3) CERTIFICATION REVIEW.—The Under Secretary for Management shall review, and if appropriate, approve, component certifications under subsection (d) before such components may make any major real property decision, including matters related to new leased space, renewing any existing leases, or agreeing to extend or newly occupy any Federal space or new construction, in accordance with the applicable regional real property strategy developed in accordance with subsection (a).

“(4) CONGRESSIONAL REPORTING.—The Under Secretary for Management shall annually provide information to the Committee on Homeland Security and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Inspector General of the Department on the Department's real property portfolio, including information relating to the following:

“(A) A summary of the Department's real property holdings in each region described in the regional strategies developed in accordance with subsection (a), and for each such property, information including the total square footage leased, the total cost, the total number of staff at each such property, and the square foot per person utilization rate for office space (and whether or not such conforms with the workspace standard usable square foot ranges established pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(F)).

“(B) An accounting of all underutilized space (as such term is defined in subsection (e)).

“(C) An accounting of all instances in which the Department or its components consolidated their real property holdings or co-located with another entity within the Department.

“(D) A list of all certifications provided pursuant to subsection (d) and all such certifications approved pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection.

“(5) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 120 days after the last day of the fifth fiscal year covered in each of the initial and second regional real property strategies developed in accordance with subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Department shall review the information submitted pursuant to paragraph (4) and issue findings regarding the effectiveness of the implementation of the Department-wide policy and oversight efforts of the management of real property facilities, personal property, mobile assets, equipment and the Department's other material resources as required under this section.”.

(b) REPORTING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate copies of the regional strategies developed in accordance with section 710(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a) of this section) not later than 90 days after the date of the development of each such strategy.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 709 the following new items:

“Sec. 710. Chief Facilities and Logistics Officer.

“Sec. 711. Long term real property strategies.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2190, the Streamlining DHS Overhead Act.

Despite being the Nation's third largest Federal department, the Department of Homeland Security continues to struggle with challenges from its integration of 22 different Federal departments and agencies.

One example of these challenges is the Department's management of its real estate portfolio. DHS pays \$2 billion a year to occupy more than 100 million square feet of space. Weak internal oversight and a lack of property management processes have further intensified the problem.

Collaboration and coordination is important in these instances, and doing nothing has led to a footprint larger than what DHS needs to carry out its mission.

This legislation directly addresses these challenges by mandating the development of regional real property strategies that focus on consolidating leases, where appropriate, to the mission. It also gives the Under Secretary for Management oversight tools to ensure DHS property is being managed efficiently.

Another important part of this legislation is its outlining of responsibilities for the Chief Facilities and Logistics Officer to achieve cost savings.

As we have seen from the 2-year majority staff investigation, increased accountability and promoting efficiency

is needed so DHS can more effectively use its resources to focus on its mission of securing the homeland while also saving taxpayer funds.

Improving the Department's operation and promoting efficiencies within its real property portfolio is an issue that both sides of the aisle and the Department should be able to work together on.

H.R. 2190 is commonsense legislation. I urge my colleagues' support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2190, the Streamlining DHS Overhead Act. Each year, the Department of Homeland Security spends nearly one-fourth of its entire budget on acquisitions.

DHS has a vast and diversified portfolio of assets and real property. Given the importance of these assets to DHS' mission, it is essential that DHS manage its real property investments efficiently and effectively. This legislation establishes a chief facilities and logistics officer to not only oversee real property, but to seek efficiencies in how the properties are managed.

H.R. 2190 also requires a 5-year regional real property strategy to help decisionmakers pinpoint opportunities to reduce overhead costs through co-location or consolidation efforts. This bipartisan bill was approved unanimously by the Committee on Homeland Security on May 3.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge passage of H.R. 2190, Streamlining DHS Overhead Act. Enactment of this legislation conveys our interest in ensuring that the Department makes smart choices when it comes to managing its vast real estate property portfolio.

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2190, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2190, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN ENTREPRENEURSHIP AWARD

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize George Logothetis, the CEO and chairman of the Libra Group, a private organization based in my congressional district that is dedicated to bolstering local communities through educational and business programs.

George is a visionary who recognizes the value of promoting startup businesses as a catalyst for financial self-sufficiency, economic development, and job creation. In 2015, George created the American Entrepreneurship Award, a nonprofit with one goal in mind: to make free enterprise accessible to every underserved community across our Nation.

This Friday, June 23, George will host AEA's annual awards ceremony in our home city of Miami, where George will announce the winners of the 2017 Business Plan Competition from Miami and the Bronx. The awardees will receive a cash prize as well as vital consultation and mentorship to get their new business ventures off the ground.

I would like to thank George for his leadership in promoting innovation, and I look forward to his future success, as well as the AEA's.

#### THE SENATE'S SECRET HEALTHCARE BILL

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, the healthcare bill the Senate leadership is writing has not been subjected to any public hearings or debate and, to this day, the contents of the bill remain a secret. This bill is being written by 13 men—Republican men. And because it is being written in secret, only those in the room have a say.

Under normal circumstances, every Senator would have the chance to read and debate a bill, just as we had in the House. But these are not normal circumstances.

As that secret committee reshapes our healthcare system behind closed doors, no woman has a seat at the table, no Democrat has a seat at the table, and 77 percent of Americans do not have a Senator at the table.

The Senate leadership has deprived nearly 250 million Americans of representation in the writing of this healthcare bill because they thought no one would notice. They will be proven wrong.

#### RECOGNIZING ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alzheimer's and

Brain Awareness Month. Alzheimer's is the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States, and more than 5 million Americans are currently living with it. Every 66 seconds, someone in the United States cultivates the disease.

This disease is not only deadly, but it is also costly. Alzheimer's, as well as other forms of dementia, cost the Nation roughly \$259 billion annually.

Our communities are stepping up. Last year, I joined the Walk 2 End Alzheimer's event at Target Field, where more than 12,000 people turned out for the cause. It is this passion that has led to initiatives like the Alzheimer's Breakthrough Act, of which I am a co-sponsor. This is an important step in finding a cure through the forming of public-private partnerships to pursue different and new research opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a reflection point—an important reflection point for Alzheimer's research. The more commitment we put forward, the more progress that we will make in finding a cure. While we have made significant progress, we will not be satisfied until a cure has been found.

#### RECOGNIZING THE ST. PETE PRIDE PARADE

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

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the St. Pete Pride Parade for the significance to Pinellas County, Florida, and our LGBTQ community.

Every June, for the past 15 years, the St. Pete Pride Parade has brightened the streets of my hometown, leaving joy, love, and equality in its wake. It has become one of the largest pride celebrations in the country, hosting over 200,000 attendees last year alone; all possible, thanks to our large, diverse LGBTQ community and city leadership that understands this community as a source of our strength.

As we mark 1 year since the 49 souls were taken from us at the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, this pride is much more than a celebration. It is a vibrant act of strength for a community that has endured persecution simply for being who they are and who they love.

As St. Pete looks forward to the celebration this weekend, I wish the community happy pride. Be loud and be proud because we are proud of you.

#### RECOGNIZING THE PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PAUL LYSKAVA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the professional accomplishments of



Paul Lyskava, who has served diligently as the executive director of the Pennsylvania Forest Products Association since 2002.

Paul has been instrumental in working closely with members of the forest products industry. Even through a recession, Paul worked to put the Commonwealth in a good position. Today, Pennsylvania is the leading hardwood lumber producing State in the Nation.

In 2015, Paul was the recipient of the Joseph T. Rothrock Conservationist of the Year Award, which recognizes actions and service that contribute to the continued conservation of Pennsylvania's forest resources in the spirit of Pennsylvania Forestry Association founder, Joseph T. Rothrock.

Never before has the award been presented to an individual that served in a capacity at all similar to Paul's. For the 4 years before he took the helm at the Pennsylvania Forest Products Association, Paul served as the executive director of the Pennsylvania Hardwoods Development Council.

On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania, I want to recognize Paul for all he has done for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

We are deeply grateful for your dedication and knowledge, Paul. Thank you, my friend.

#### WORLD REFUGEE DAY

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of World Refugee Day.

We are facing the worst refugee crisis in history, with over 65 million refugees; half of them are children.

When I served on Active Duty in the U.S. Air Force, I participated in Operation Pacific Haven. The U.S. military went into northern Iraq. We extracted thousands of Kurdish refugees, brought them to Andersen Air Force Base in Guam, and then sent most of them to the United States. We saved their lives, and, to this day, the Kurds remain one of America's strongest allies.

Helping refugees is not only the moral thing to do; it helps our national security. That is why I am honored to introduce bipartisan legislation with Representative ROS-LEHTINEN to promote the health, safety, and well-being of refugees.

#### LITTLE KIM THE TERRORIST

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, North Korea released Otto Warmbier last week after 17 months of imprisonment and torture. Otto returned home in a coma, never again to speak or see

his parents. Yesterday, he died—murdered, actually—from brain damage because of the Korean beatings that he endured.

North Korea had humiliated Otto for allegedly stealing a pro-government placard, forcing him to publicly beg for forgiveness. Now, these are the tactics of terrorists.

We need to ramp up the pressure on North Korea. Three other Americans are still being held in North Korea for apparent political reasons. We must prioritize saving their lives.

It is time to call it like it is: designate North Korea as a state sponsor of terrorism. Doing so would isolate the country and publicly categorize North Korea with many other rogue nations.

The House has already passed my bill to designate North Korea as a state sponsor of terrorism. Now the Senate needs to do the same.

Little Kim has American blood on his hands. Give him and his outlaw regime the designation it deserves, a terrorist state.

And that is just the way it is.

#### TRUMPCARE IS FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, when President Trump calls your healthcare legislation mean and coldhearted, you know that it is time to reconsider your approach to the Nation's healthcare system. The President was referring, of course, to the House-passed TrumpCare legislation, which pulls the rug from under millions of Americans, raising their costs, gutting their protections, and, for many, taking away their coverage.

And while we do not know the extent of the damage the Senate Republicans' secret health bill would cause, we do know its consequences would be disastrous. We do know, for instance, that the Senate Republicans plan to gut essential health benefits and destroy the Medicaid expansion.

TrumpCare is fundamentally flawed. Higher costs, less coverage, fewer protections, that is the gift from the Republican Party to the American people. The bill would also destroy millions of jobs—nearly 14,000 jobs in my State of New Jersey next year alone.

TrumpCare is an ugly bill being advanced through an ugly process. Senate Republicans can hide the details from their bill, but they cannot hide that simple fact from the American people.

#### WORLD REFUGEE DAY

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor World Refugee Day, a day that is very special to the famous city of Utica, New York, in the heart of the 22nd Congressional District, a place that I have represented and lived my entire life.

Utica was recognized recently as the home to refugees, and I am so honored to be a part of this great tradition in Utica.

In quite an unusual portion of my background, I had the opportunity to spend time in the former Yugoslavia. I also was the sole employee at the former Yugoslav Consulate before the tragic war in Yugoslavia, which broke the country up in the early nineties.

As a part of my commitment to and interest in the people from Yugoslavia, I was instrumental in helping bring a huge number of Bosnian refugees to Utica, New York, back in the early nineties and into the late nineties. And I am so pleased that I was able to have the opportunity, with my family business, to create the very first Bosnian newspaper in Utica, known as Mostovi, which means bridges in Bosnian.

Today, the Bosnian refugees make up one of the largest, if not the largest, Bosnian refugee communities in the Nation. They have done a wonderful job in Utica in successfully starting businesses and contributing greatly to our community, along with many other refugees.

I just wanted to take this moment to recognize Utica and to thank our tremendous Bosnian refugees for their contributions to our Nation and especially to our community because without them, we would never see the prosperity and the growth that we have seen in our small-business community from their ingenuity and their kindness and their generosity to us.

□ 1930

#### SUPPORT OUR REFUGEES

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the United States has been a leader welcoming refugees for decades. Refugees seek our shores to escape war, political and religious persecution, and sometimes fear of imminent death. People flee danger seeking refuge and safety. As Americans, we should be the last to perpetuate an environment that causes refugees to live in a state of fear and terror right here in America.

I represent the residents of Clarkston, Georgia. As a refugee resettlement hub, Clarkston is often referred to as the most diverse square mile in America. Clarkston's refugees have established themselves as taxpayers; they have started thriving businesses; and 91 percent obtain jobs



and become completely self-sufficient within 6 months of arriving in the U.S.

The great diversity and cultural richness that they bring to our communities has made the Fourth District a better place to live, work, and play. Today we show our support for refugees. Today we should all stand to send a message that we will continue our work to support refugees as they continue to boost local economies and contribute to our communities with their unique and enriching cultures.

#### WORLD REFUGEE DAY

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, right now we are facing one of the greatest humanitarian crises of our time. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has reported that over 65 million people are currently displaced due to war, famine, persecution, or human rights violations. That is why, on World Refugee Day, we must resist the urge to close our doors when the world's most vulnerable need our support.

As a cornerstone of American global humanitarian leadership for nearly four decades, the United States' refugee program has resettled more than 3 million refugees. I was honored to welcome one of these refugees as my guest for President Trump's joint session to Congress earlier this year.

Bothina Matar and her family were forced out of their home in Syria, and after spending months in a Jordanian camp, were resettled in Dallas, Texas. Following a rigorous vetting process, the al Sharaa family successfully resettled, and they are rebuilding their lives while contributing greatly to our country and economy, just like refugees before them.

Our country is a welcoming place where we can both protect the American people and extend our hand to people who need it. Let us not forget that fact, Mr. Speaker.

#### WORLD REFUGEE DAY

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on World Refugee Day, to share some facts on the United States Refugee Resettlement Program.

America's Refugee Resettlement Program is a small but powerful humanitarian expression of American values and founding principles. And just as important, it makes us safer.

Refugees go through vetting that is already extreme. If there is any doubt about a refugee's identity, he or she is not admitted. The process is so rigorous, there hasn't been a single fatal

terrorist attack carried out by a refugee in the United States since the Refugee Act became law in 1980.

Americans across our great country support resettlement. America's faith communities are leading the call for America to stand by her principles and shelter the fleeing victims of our enemies, including the Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Albany in my own 20th District of New York. That is because it speaks directly to American values of strength, inclusiveness, and compassion.

New Yorkers have played a vital role in the resettlement program, and refugees are positively contributing to communities across New York State and beyond. The United States Committee for Refugees and Immigrants' Albany field office has helped resettle refugees from Afghanistan, from Burma, Iraq, Ukraine, and the Congo, just to name a few. Some of these refugees are single mothers seeking a better life for themselves and their children; others are families fleeing war and persecution.

We have the strength, the means, and the capacity to welcome these refugees with open arms. Let us stand with these huddled masses and remain a beacon of freedom around the world.

#### ELIMINATE NEW YORK STATE MEDICAID MANDATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise this evening with my colleagues from upstate New York to discuss a matter that is extraordinarily important to all of the people throughout New York State, but particularly to those who reside in New York State outside of New York City.

New York State is one of the few States in America that requires a portion of its share of Medicaid costs, which is healthcare for the poor and the elderly, its share of Medicaid costs to be paid by local property taxpayers. It has now been 51 years that New York State, since the days of Governor Nelson Rockefeller, that New York State imposed this incredibly onerous burden on the local property taxpayers in our State.

In fact, in the entire United States of America, there is approximately \$9.5

billion being spent by local governments on Medicaid costs which, in virtually every other State, are paid for by the State government—\$9.5 billion. But in New York State, our taxpayers pay \$7.2 billion of that \$9.5 billion in Medicaid costs mandated by New York State, mandated by Albany.

This is an outrageous burden. The county property taxpayers—those are homeowners and commercial property taxpayers in our State—pay over \$2.2 billion each year in property taxes, in mandated costs, over which the county governments have no control whatsoever.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I rise, and I am pleased to have organized this Special Order with my colleagues from New York State, to discuss this dire situation that our taxpayers endure and what our recommended solution is.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I were successful in including in the American Health Care Act a provision which would, as of 2020, eliminate the ability of Albany to impose this burden on local homeowners and commercial property taxpayers. It would improve the real estate values in our State. It would be one more reason for people to stay in New York rather than to flee New York.

The thing that I hear from people over and over again in my district, in the 19th District in the Catskills and the Hudson Valley of New York, is their kids and grandchildren are being driven out of State because there are no jobs, and they are being driven out of State by high property taxes.

One of the reasons for those high property taxes is the New York State Medicaid mandate. So, with Mr. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. STEFANIK, we were successful in including in the American Health Care Act a provision which would, as of 2020, eliminate this burden on local homeowners and require Albany to do what other States, the 49 other States, do, which is to take control of its own Medicaid system and not impose these burdens on the counties.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, you can see in the 11 counties that I represent in the Mid-Hudson and in the Catskills of New York State, over \$224 million a year is coming out of homeowners' pockets, coming out of commercial real estate owners' pockets and going to pay for Albany's costs. We are ending that as of 2020 under the provision in the legislation that I have authored with Mr. COLLINS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. STEFANIK because we know that this burden is unjust and it is uncalled for.

So, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am delighted at this time to yield to the gentleman from western New York (Mr. REED), from the Southern Tier.

Mr. REED. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the

gentlemen, Mr. FASO and Mr. COLLINS, for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, in my district, the 23rd Congressional District, where we sit on the border of the State of Pennsylvania, when you talk about the tax burden that is placed on my hardworking residents that are struggling, that are trying to pay utility bills, that are trying to pay for food to put on their tables, that are trying to take care of their families and put their kids through school, when you talk about a tax burden that is driven by the Medicaid shift in New York State to the local level, at our county level—a very unique circumstance across the country—to the tune of \$145 million a year in each of the counties I represent, that type of burden is not sustainable.

I thank the leadership of Mr. FASO and Mr. COLLINS for looking for a solution in the American Health Care Act that will alleviate this, that will once and for all shift this burden from our hardworking citizens, our hardworking taxpayers in western New York back to where it belongs: to our State capital, our State capital where they have mandated, under the Federal Medicaid program, essentially every optional service that is authorized under the program; where you see numbers in New York State where we spend approximately \$4,000 per enrollee versus California, another State that has invested tremendously in expanding Medicaid and Medicaid services, at \$2,500; where you see reports that in New York State our average costs are 44 percent, in New York State, under Medicaid spending than the national average.

And then you look at small things that do add up: taxi services that are reimbursed under Medicaid in New York State to the tune of \$2.20 a mile. Mr. Speaker, every hardworking resident in my district that is watching tonight knows that if they go to submit a mileage reimbursement to their employer or they go and try to get reimbursement from their local government that they work at, they are getting 55 cents or maybe 53.5 cents. That money adds up.

You also see a Medicaid program in New York that is ripe with waste, fraud, and abuse; and by putting that \$145 million tax burden on our local taxpayers, our counties cannot address that waste, fraud, and abuse. That can only be done in our State capital. So I think it is only right that we put the burden on our State capital, who has the authority, the flexibility, and the ability to address these issues, to have to deal with this burden at the same time they can implement solutions.

If our Governor so chooses to make this type of waste, fraud, and abuse rampant through Medicaid, that is his choice. But he shouldn't put it on our backs, our local residents' backs, to the tune of \$145 million of taxpayer

dollars that they have no ability to address at the local level.

I also remember, vividly, a story from one of our first responders, an Olean firefighter who came in and talked about him being part of ObamaCare ambulance service where they would pick up individuals who would call for services and claim to be experiencing a medical emergency; and then as they delivered the patient to the hospital, that same patient would refuse service at the ER so they could go to the mall across the street—a ride in an ambulance that is paid for by our hardworking residents in western New York.

We are generous people. We don't mind helping people out. But when you put a burden like this on our backs and you don't give us the flexibility and ability to address these concerns, that is wrong. And what this amendment does, and I am proud to support it and stand here with my colleagues, is right this wrong once and for all and put the burden where it needs to be: in our State capital. Let our Governor own this and, hopefully, wise up and deal with it at that level and take this burden off our hardworking taxpayers.

Thank you, Mr. FASO and Mr. COLLINS for this leadership, and we are wholeheartedly behind you.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. REED. I think he raises a very timely and very good point.

The fact is the level of government that designs the program, that confers the benefit, that says who is eligible should also be the level of government that has to go to its citizens and say: "Here is why we need to raise the revenue to pay for that benefit."

□ 1945

But, indeed, what New York does is wholly different. What New York does is they simply say: Here is the benefit, and we are going to shift part of the cost of that benefit to taxpayers at the local level, to the homeowners and to the property taxpayers, and their county governments have nothing to say over how that program is run or operated or administered. They just have to send the bill to Albany once a month.

This is what we are seeking to address.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS) who is from Erie County.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of the Property Tax Reduction Act introduced by my colleague and friend from New York, Representative JOHN FASO.

I am committed to working to provide tax relief to my constituents, which is why Representative FASO and I worked to include a similar measure in the Affordable Health Care Act, and I urge the Senate and Leader MCCONNELL to include that measure in their healthcare bill.

The State of New York saddles its residents with the highest overall tax burden in the Nation. A main driver of this hardship remains New York's persistently exorbitant local property taxes, which are a symptom of irresponsible governing from Albany. Governor Cuomo continues to rely on New York counties to foot the bill for New York State's outrageous Cadillac Medicaid plan, which costs each recipient 44 percent more than the national average.

The Governor essentially runs up a tab and then demands that the counties find a way to pay the bill. This is an unconscionable shift of cost. The entity of government that spends taxpayers' money should be the entity that pays the bill. Instead, Governor Cuomo wants this scheme to continue shielding his outrageous spending and keeping his actions from public scrutiny. The Governor's sleight of hand costs the eight counties I represent over \$470 million a year and my home county of Erie almost \$204 million a year—nearly 83 percent of the total county property tax.

The Property Tax Reduction Act will end this outrageous cost shift, hold Governor Cuomo accountable for the State's Medicaid spending, and deliver much-needed tax relief to the hardworking taxpayers in my district.

I want to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. FASO, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. COLLINS' strong support. As a former county executive in Erie County, you had that experience of having to write the check every month to Albany for a program and services that you had no control over. I very much appreciate it.

One of the ironies here is that New York State, with 19 million people, spends more on its Medicaid system than Texas and Florida combined. Those two States have more than double our population, yet we spend more than those two States—Texas and Florida—combined. It is no wonder so many New Yorkers have fled to places like Texas and Florida through the years.

So I appreciate Mr. COLLINS' consistent leadership on this issue from the time the gentleman was the county executive in Erie County.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. We should put it into perspective because New York spends too much on everything. Florida now has more people than New York. Florida's entire budget is \$80 billion a year for more than 20 million people. New York, with fewer people, has a budget of \$160 billion—you almost can't make this up—double Florida.

Now, a point that I have tried to make when you see what the position of New York is, there was a day New York had 45 Members of Congress. Congress is apportioned by population.

Today, we have fallen from 45 to 27. We have lost 40 percent of our representation in New York because of the high tax burden. And I know, as sure as I am standing here, we are going to lose another seat, possibly two, in the Census coming up in 2020.

Now, contrast to Florida that doesn't have an income tax and has much lower property taxes, half of the budget of New York. When we had 45, they had 7 Members of Congress—45 versus 7. Today, they also have 27. In the next Census, they are going to grow from 28 to 29. You almost can't make this up. Certainly the property tax burden is a big thing that drives these people out of New York State.

They want to live there. People want their kids to be there. There was a day in Erie County—and I was the county executive—we had 1.25 million people in Erie County in 1972, 1973. We are down to 900,000. Forget about relative growth. We have actually lost 25 percent of our absolute population over the last 40 years because of the high tax burden in New York, so much so, they coined the phrase of our airport. They called it the Runway of Tears because the parents were watching their children and grandchildren fly off to Florida, to North Carolina, and to other States where there were jobs and opportunities—the Runway of Tears.

So anything we can do to help reduce that tax burden in New York and to let our kids come home and be able to afford to live in New York State, maybe one day again we will be the Empire State.

So I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this. Certainly I am going to be fighting side by side with the gentleman and the other New Yorkers to get this through.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support.

The fact of the matter is that New York has driven away so many people. In my 19th Congressional District, every single county has lost population in the last 5 years. School district populations are down 30, 40 percent. Part of the reason is because of a lack of jobs and high property taxes. What we are simply saying is there should be accountability.

When I ran for office last year, I promised the people of my district that I would introduce a measure, because then people would say: how can the Federal Government get involved in this question?

The reason is because the Federal law authorized the States to impose part of their costs on the counties or on the local governments. The fact is that only New York State did it to the degree that New York did. That is why it is going to require us to amend the Federal legislation to preclude New York from doing this.

We are giving Albany 2½ years to reform their program, to eliminate

waste, and to make other priorities in its spending. There is no reason for cuts to hospitals or nursing homes, as Governor Cuomo has alleged falsely. What he needs to do is take full responsibility for this program, as most of the Governors in the 49 other States do, and then we will be able to relieve this burden on our local homeowners.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), who was also elected with me in 2016, for her comments on this important matter.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman FASO for his leadership, and also for the great comments from Congressman COLLINS in the western New York district and for coming up with this really great piece of legislation.

It is no secret that New York residents pay among the highest taxes in the Nation. Combined State and local taxes consume over 13 percent of the average household income.

Decades of tax-and-spend policies have depleted the wallets of hardworking middle class families and forced many small businesses—including family farms; once a tradition in New York—into closure, and driven lifelong residents out of our State in record numbers forever. These burdensome taxes, coupled with crushing regulations, have led to the worst business climate in the country. Small businesses, which create over 70 percent of the new jobs, face the threat of extinction in New York.

Year after year, New York continues to be ranked the highest in out-migration in the entire Nation. Nearly 200,000 people have left the Empire State, and two of the worst hit regions—the Mohawk Valley and the southern tier—are located in the 22nd District. Additionally, the two largest cities in our district—Utica and Binghamton—are ranked last and second to last in economic growth.

Hardworking families and our job creators desperately need tax relief. That is why I am working with the New York delegation and the Republican congressional delegation to lead the charge by cosponsoring the Property Tax Reduction Act sponsored by Mr. FASO and Mr. COLLINS and cosponsored by the rest of us.

As a note, I would just like to mention that, as a former member of the State assembly, I did sponsor legislation very similar to the type of relief being proposed in this wonderful piece of legislation known as the Property Tax Reduction Act. That legislation was cosponsored in a bipartisan way with Democrats who also recognized the need to change the paradigm in New York State.

The Property Tax Reduction Act will bring the largest local mandate relief initiative to my area in my lifetime, potentially saving the taxpayers in the

22nd District more than \$167 million annually in unfunded State Medicaid mandates. This bill relieves county governments from the burden forced upon them by Albany bureaucrats led by our Governor.

Currently, in New York State, the law requires approximately \$2.3 billion, as was mentioned earlier, that is taken from our local county governments and given to the State for the Medicaid program. This amounts to about \$140 million per week.

In 2015, Oneida County was forced to divert more than 80 percent of the property tax levies to subsidize Albany's bloated budgets. This amounts to \$54.4 million annually in Oneida County losses every year to cover the cost of their share of Medicaid.

In Broome County, more than half of the county's \$70 million in property tax revenue, about \$37 million, was taken from the county last year and diverted to Albany—a loss of more than, as I said, \$37 million. This is money that would otherwise go to reduce property taxes, fund our schools, make much-needed improvements to infrastructure, and support our first responders, among many other programs, that we need on a county level.

Combined property and sales tax rates as a percentage of value rank many of New York's counties among the highest taxed counties in the Nation, with Oneida County being ranked 19 in the latest Tax Foundation survey. No other State in the country abuses its local governments and taxpayers quite like Albany does in order to fund its most expansive and really overly generous Medicaid programs in the Nation.

New York's Medicaid program has the highest incidents of fraud, abuse, and waste in the country. If other States can provide high-quality healthcare to vulnerable citizens without taking advantage of local taxpayers, so can New York. The imposition of over \$2.5 billion in Medicaid costs on to the counties is nearly seven times costlier than what counties in California pay, despite having higher enrollments and expenditures.

The Property Tax Reduction Act requires Governor Cuomo and the State to pay its full share of the Medicaid program that it should be paying in full and that it also forces on to the county and local governments.

This bill does not propose cuts to the programs in the 22nd District. Rather, it requires Albany to put its fiscal house in order. It requires Albany to take stock of the money that it has been using, sending these unfunded mandates to our strapped local governments.

This legislation, as the sponsor has indicated, gives the State ample time to realign the budget, to rein in out-of-control spending, and to give the taxpayers relief once and for all at the county level.

If Governor Cuomo chooses to hurt the citizens by slashing programs that upstate New Yorkers want and need with a mammoth State budget that was over \$152 billion this year for fiscal year 2017, that is his choice, not something that has been brought on by that act. His failed leadership continues to produce budgets laden with unconstitutional executive pork and wasteful spending.

In fact, let's just take a look at a couple of the items. Over \$370 million in Albany's budget these past few years was spent on the corrupt and mismanaged StartUP New York program, which produced only one-third of the promised jobs. Over \$1.3 billion in tax breaks have been handed over to Hollywood filmmakers in the last 2 years. In all, Albany spends over \$8 billion in taxpayer money on a job-creation program with little results to show for it.

The bill will simply force the State to work over a period of several years to responsibly reduce the unfair and unreasonable Medicaid liability that has been forced on to our counties. Upstate New York is in desperate need of property tax relief.

This bill is the first step in making the relief a reality. County executives and local governments across the State have voiced their support of this legislation.

While hardworking families struggle, Albany sits idly by. That is why we are taking the lead on the Federal level to help revive our region and bring business and people back to beautiful upstate New York. By giving county governments a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to reduce property taxes, this bill will save millions of dollars and hard-earned tax dollars for working families.

On behalf of the 22nd District, I just want to thank my colleagues for really taking the effort to bring this to the floor and showing true leadership in the face of difficult circumstances in finding a real solution, a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for all of us as taxpayers in New York to finally have some relief, to grow our business community, and to find some kind of dynamism in our economy. I thank again the sponsors, Mr. FASO and Mr. COLLINS.

□ 2000

Mr. FASO. I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks and her strong support for this reform measure.

I would also point out that a 2015 report from the New York State Comptroller indicated \$513 million in improper payments in the Medicaid program were identified. In the same report, the Comptroller questioned an additional \$361 million in transactions that would require agency actions to reduce costs or recover funds.

In the past decade, the Office of Inspector General for the Federal Depart-

ment of Health and Human Services found 10 specific instances in which New York State received improper Federal Medicaid payments in excess of \$50 million, with six of those instances each exceeding over \$170 million apiece.

So there is a lot of room in the New York State Medicaid program to reduce improper payments and outright fraud that we have seen. I know my colleague, Ms. TENNEY, from her experience in the State legislature, has seen firsthand what was going on with New York State's Medicaid system.

Part of the reason this has occurred is because Albany was able to spend someone else's money. The old iron rule of government and the iron rule of family budget is that it is always easier to spend someone else's money. What Albany has been doing for 51 years has been shifting part of its Medicaid responsibility from the State level down to the local level, and so Albany was less responsible.

This wasn't a Democrat or Republican thing, either. This happened under the Republican Governors. It happened under Democratic Governors. It is true, through the years, New York State has partially reduced the burden that was falling upon the county property taxpayers, but they have never eliminated it.

Do you know what? The leadership in Albany today shows no signs of ever taking steps to finally eliminate this.

In Ms. TENNEY's district, it is over \$167 million a year in property tax relief. In my district, it is over \$224 million. In Mr. COLLINS' district, it is close to \$400 million. In Nassau County, it is over \$300 million; in Suffolk County, over \$300 million; Westchester County, over \$200 million.

All throughout the State of New York, outside of New York City, the property taxpayers are being crushed. They are being driven away. Our jobs and our economy are being driven away, in part, because of Albany's Medicaid mandate.

We can change it by changing Federal law. That is what we are going to do. We have placed this provision in the healthcare legislation. It is my hope and expectation that it can be included in the final legislation that is passed. But regardless, I know Ms. TENNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. COLLINS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ZELDIN, and the rest of us will be fighting very hard to make sure that we can finally eliminate this injustice.

What Albany does is taxation without any representation. In my District, in Ulster County, almost half of their entire property tax levy goes to pay for Albany's Medicaid costs.

In Rensselaer County, about 57 percent of every nickel the county raises in property tax levy goes to pay for Albany's Medicaid costs, and they have no say over how those funds are ex-

pendent, over how the program is operated. It is truly taxation without representation.

I yield to the gentlewoman if she has anything to add in conclusion.

Ms. TENNEY. I want to mention one thing that I think is really important. Both Congressman FASO and I served as members of the State Assembly prior to serving in Congress. One thing that we both know is that we are truly interested in helping people who are needy.

It isn't about the people who are truly needy; it is about the people who are abusing the system and taking resources that are desperately needed by our seniors and by people who really are, as I said, truly needy. This is a way of providing more resources to them without having the fraud, the abuse and waste, the mismanagement in Albany, and forcing Albany into being more fiscally conservative, protecting our counties so that we can provide those services for our communities.

I just want to make sure that we characterize that, because that is something that we all care about as people who take an oath of office, not just to uphold our Federal Constitution but also our State constitution. We take that seriously.

I know we are all committed to helping those people, but also remembering that we need to respect the taxpayers. The taxpayers need to have proper management of their funds.

I want to commend the gentleman for his work and efforts in making sure this comes to the floor and making sure we get this passed on the Federal level, because it has been a struggle for all of us through many years. Having this come to reality is going to be, honestly, one of the greatest mandate relief packages that I have experienced in my lifetime, and I am grateful.

Mr. FASO. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

I would close, Mr. Speaker, simply by pointing out that New York State has among, depending on what the measure is, either the highest or second highest real property taxes in the entire Nation. We are the only State that imposes this type of burden on local homeowners, local property taxpayers.

If you look at the gross amount that people pay in their real estate taxes, the downstate counties—Westchester, Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland—pay the highest in gross amount. But if you calculate the property tax burden as a percentage of the home value, the counties in upstate New York; in western New York; along the southern tier; in the Mohawk Valley, where Ms. TENNEY lives; in the Catskills and Mid-Hudson, where I live; and in the Adirondacks, which Ms. STEFANIK represents, those counties are being crushed. Those homeowners are being crushed by the burden of real estate taxes.

A large part of that reason is this 50-year mandate that started under Nelson Rockefeller that has been imposed on New York homeowners, which is crushing them, driving them out of their homes, and this is what we are intending to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support of my colleagues here tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel (airline) difficulties.

Mr. CORREA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight diverted for airline issues.

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 12 through 23.

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through June 23.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 782. An act to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 21, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1714. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary of Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2016 Armed Forces Retirement Home Accreditation Report, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 418(e)(2); Public Law 101-510, Sec. 518(e)(2) (as amended by Public Law 110-181, Sec. 1422(f)); (122 Stat. 422); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1715. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-70, "Early Learning Equity in Funding Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1716. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-71, "Child Development Facili-

ties Regulations Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1717. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-72, "Child Care Study Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1718. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9524; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-049-AD; Amendment 39-18891; AD 2017-10-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1719. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Seats California LLC Seating Systems [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5595; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-18871; AD 2017-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1720. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0506; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-019-AD; Amendment 39-18907; AD 2017-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1721. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0114; Directorate Identifier 2017-NE-03-AD; Amendment 39-18880; AD 2017-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1722. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0186; Directorate Identifier 2017-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-18899; AD 2017-10-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1723. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8849; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-18892; AD 2017-10-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1724. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8428; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-18898; AD 2017-10-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1725. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9413; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-18897; AD 2017-10-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1726. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8179; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-201-AD; Amendment 39-18913; AD 2017-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1727. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0084; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-18879; AD 2017-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1728. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; NavWorx, Inc. Automatic Dependent Surveillance Broadcast Universal Access Transceiver Units [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9226; Directorate Identifier 2016-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-18910; AD 2017-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1729. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9075; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-082-AD; Amendment 39-18890; AD 2017-10-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1730. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8848; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-054-AD; Amendment 39-18895; AD 2017-10-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1731. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0124; Directorate Identifier

2016-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-18911; AD 2017-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1732. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Slingsby Aviation Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0048; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-035-AD; Amendment 39-18876; AD 2017-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1733. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9550; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-026-AD; Amendment 39-18894; AD 2017-10-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1734. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9507; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-18878; AD 2017-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1735. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0158; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-040-AD; Amendment 39-18902; AD 2017-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1736. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9438; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-18873; AD 2017-09-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1737. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0123; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-18889; AD 2017-10-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1738. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Management Sys-

tem for Domestic, Flag and Supplemental Operations Certificate Holders; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0671; Amdt. No.: 5-1A] (RIN: 2120-AJ86) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1739. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31138; Amdt. No.: 533] received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1740. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Grass Range, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0047; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-1] received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1741. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kyle-Oakley Field Airport, Murray, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9443; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-17] received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1742. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace, Bar Harbor, ME [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9285; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANE-2] received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1743. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Proposed Amendment of Class D Airspace; Kingsville, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9511; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-20] received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities; with an amendment (Rept. 115-183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2190. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's real property portfolio, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2842. A bill to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients; with an amendment (Rept. 115-185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 392. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-186). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 2936. A bill to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and improve forest management activities on National Forest System lands, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on Tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to authorize partnerships between States and nongovernmental entities for the purpose of reclaiming and restoring land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining activities before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2938. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to remove barriers to access to residential substance use disorder treatment services under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance



Program (CHIP); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 2939. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 2940. A bill to allow Members of Congress to carry a concealed firearm anywhere in the United States, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 2941. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System land within Kisatchie National Forest in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MENG, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2942. A bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation and to ensure that employers consider these requests, and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain occupations with evidence of unpredictable and unstable scheduling practices that negatively affect employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Com-

mittees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BACON, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2943. A bill to provide grants for projects to acquire land and water for parks and other outdoor recreation purposes and to develop new or renovate existing outdoor recreation facilities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIREs, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2944. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for in-State tuition rates for refugees and asylees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2945. A bill to grant Members of Congress the right to carry a firearm anywhere in the United States, except in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 2946. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2947. A bill to replace certain Coastal Barrier Resources System maps; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 2948. A bill to amend the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to provide a temporary license for loan originators transitioning between employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 2949. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to

separate joint consolidation loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 2950. A bill to amend section 200303 of title 54, United States Code, to ensure that amounts are made available for projects to provide recreational public access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2951. A bill to allow Members of Congress to carry a concealed handgun anywhere in the United States, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2952. A bill to support the establishment or expansion and operation of programs using a network of public and private community entities to provide mentoring for children in foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BERA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2953. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. LUTKEMEYER):

H.R. 2954. A bill to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit the installation of pulsating light systems for high mounted stop lamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 2956. A bill to provide for parental notification and intervention in the case of an unemancipated minor seeking an abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2957. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for enhanced payments to rural health care providers under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and



Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. LEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. ELLISON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2958. A bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the climate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2959. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to allow for parent mentors to be eligible to receive outreach and enrollment grants under the Children's Health Insurance Program under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2960. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish and carry out a grant program to make grants to eligible institutions to plan and implement programs that provide comprehensive support services and resources designed to increase transfer and graduation rates at community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2961. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve remedial education programs that train students in the competencies needed to succeed in higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2962. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to prohibiting the use of electronic cigarettes on passenger flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 2963. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to provide investment authority to support rural infrastructure development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 2964. A bill to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to stop a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa and to provide that any future increases in such minimum wage shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2965. A bill to require all gas stations offering self-service to meet certain accessibility standards for individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2966. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2967. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to establish a grant program to appoint nutrition coordinators to oversee local school nutrition policies in local educational agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 2968. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to provide each borrower with an individualized repayment guide; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 2969. A bill to amend the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 to allow the Federal Government to lease or sell abandoned or unused Federal civilian real properties for use as makerspaces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. VELA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LANDEVIN):

H.R. 2970. A bill to amend section 428K(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include certain cultural workers, museum professionals, artistic professionals, arts and humanities professors, and music and arts educators among the individuals eligible for loan forgiveness for service in areas of national need; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H. Res. 393. A resolution expressing support for addressing the Arab-Israeli conflict in a concurrent track with the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and commending Arab and Muslim-majority states that have improved bilateral relations with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H. Res. 394. A resolution supporting international academic freedom and American universities abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALONE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr.

SCHNEIDER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 395. A resolution reaffirming the leadership of the United States in promoting the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 2971) for the relief of Martin Martinez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 2936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 2937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section VIII, Clause 1

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 2940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution & the 2nd Amendment to the Bill of Rights

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 2941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. DELAULO:

H.R. 2942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 2943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

Article I, Section 8: "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution that states that Congress shall have Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution which states that "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 2946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 1, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1, "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare" of Americans. In the Department of Education Organization (P.L. 96-88), Congress declared that "the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively." The Department of Education's mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access."

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 2950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have the power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment 2: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Article 1, Section 5-2: Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 2952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any "other" powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 2954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare) and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (Commerce) of the Constitution.

The bill makes several changes to the way hospitals are regulated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). This includes transaction between hospitals, CMS, and third parties, which constitutes commerce. Further, Medicare is considered to be constitutional as part of providing for the general welfare and therefore any changes to Medicare would fall under this provision as well.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 2961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 2963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;" as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 2964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 2968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

## Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 19: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 91: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 93: Mr. LYNCH.  
H.R. 149: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 291: Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 299: Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 303: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.  
H.R. 313: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.  
H.R. 350: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 351: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 361: Mr. ZELDIN.  
H.R. 365: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 367: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.  
H.R. 398: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 435: Mr. CRIST, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
H.R. 442: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 468: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. SIREs.  
H.R. 490: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. COLE, and Mr. LONG.  
H.R. 495: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 535: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 545: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. HUIZENGA.  
H.R. 632: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 664: Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 671: Mr. ESPAILLAT.  
H.R. 719: Mr. RATCLIFFE.  
H.R. 721: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DUNN.  
H.R. 747: Mr. REED, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. BARLETTA.  
H.R. 750: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 801: Mr. O'HALLERAN and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.  
H.R. 807: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 820: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
H.R. 828: Mr. DELANEY.  
H.R. 830: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. POLIQUIN.  
H.R. 846: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 848: Mr. BRAT.  
H.R. 849: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VELA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
H.R. 860: Mr. CRAMER and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.  
H.R. 866: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 873: Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr.

VARGAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 880: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. HILL.  
H.R. 895: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 911: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 927: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 959: Mr. FASO and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 960: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 997: Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1002: Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
H.R. 1006: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1017: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. LOVE.  
H.R. 1078: Mrs. LOVE and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 1092: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1094: Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1114: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1120: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1133: Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H.R. 1136: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1146: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1148: Mr. STEWART.  
H.R. 1156: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1158: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1160: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1163: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 1164: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1190: Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H.R. 1212: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1247: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1267: Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 1279: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1291: Mr. KIHUEN and Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 1298: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1316: Mr. BYRNE.  
H.R. 1322: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1334: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.R. 1358: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1361: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. YODER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1392: Ms. ROSEN.  
H.R. 1406: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1437: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 1444: Mr. KILMER and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1456: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. ZELDIN.  
H.R. 1457: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1472: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VELA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1474: Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 1487: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1528: Mr. COOK.  
H.R. 1537: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1542: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 1555: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1566: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 1614: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1626: Mr. EVANS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1639: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1651: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1652: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 1661: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1666: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. AMASH.  
H.R. 1669: Mr. COLE and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1676: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1686: Mr. TIBERI.  
H.R. 1722: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1739: Ms. TSONGAS.  
H.R. 1741: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1802: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1815: Mr. SCHRADER.  
H.R. 1833: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1838: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1861: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.  
H.R. 1865: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1874: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 1881: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1889: Mr. COHEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1898: Ms. TSONGAS.  
H.R. 1899: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1904: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1911: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1928: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
H.R. 1953: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1960: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 1997: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2000: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H.R. 2001: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2023: Mr. ABRAHAM.  
H.R. 2073: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2077: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2091: Mr. KATKO, Mr. MESSER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2092: Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 2101: Mr. BARLETTA.  
H.R. 2121: Mr. BARR, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2134: Mrs. WAGNER.  
H.R. 2142: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2149: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 2151: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2158: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 2181: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2197: Ms. MENG.  
H.R. 2248: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. GALLEGGO.

H.R. 2272: Ms. ADAMS.  
H.R. 2276: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 2286: Mr. BABIN.  
H.R. 2307: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2308: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 2315: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2319: Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 2327: Ms. BORDALLO and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 2340: Mr. O'HALLERAN.  
H.R. 2351: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 2358: Mr. KIHUEN and Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 2359: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 2383: Mr. COMER and Mr. KING of Iowa.  
H.R. 2392: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mrs. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2437: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 2460: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2478: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BACON, Mr. YODER, and Mr. WESTERMAN.  
H.R. 2484: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2499: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2505: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2514: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2515: Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2526: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2539: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2545: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HECK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2578: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. PIN-GREE.

H.R. 2584: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2589: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2594: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2620: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2628: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2657: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2659: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2661: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2663: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2670: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2676: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2677: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2678: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2688: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2715: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2723: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2740: Mr. BEYER, Ms. MENG, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2742: Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2747: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2756: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2763: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2771: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2777: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2790: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2797: Mr. O'HALLERAN and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2822: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2826: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2834: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2840: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2842: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2845: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 2851: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2854: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2858: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2870: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 2877: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2878: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2881: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2886: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2908: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 2909: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 2911: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CUELLAR, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 2918: Mr. MESSER and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2924: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2930: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.J. Res. 33: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. VELA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. DENT.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. JONES.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H. Con. Res. 57: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. PLASKETT and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H. Res. 15: Mr. BERA, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Res. 30: Mr. KATKO.

H. Res. 129: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. TURNER.

H. Res. 185: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. YOHO.

H. Res. 188: Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 218: Mr. BURGESS.

H. Res. 220: Ms. MENG, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 252: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H. Res. 257: Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 276: Ms. MENG, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. GRANGER.

H. Res. 313: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H. Res. 317: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. RASKIN.

H. Res. 318: Mrs. NOEM.

H. Res. 319: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 332: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Res. 351: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 359: Ms. MENG, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. FOSTER.

H. Res. 390: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

## CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

### OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2742, the Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

### OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2834, the Partnership Grants to Strengthen Families Affected by Parental Substance Abuse Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

### OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2847, the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

### OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2857, the Supporting Families in Substance Abuse Treatment Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

### OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2866, the Reducing Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative LAMALFA, or a designee, to H.R. 1654 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING COLLEEN MURRAY ON RECEIVING THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD GOLD MEDAL

### HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Miami Springs resident Colleen Murray for her dedication to bettering our community and receiving Congress's highest honor, the Congressional Award Gold Medal.

To receive the Congressional Award Gold Medal, one must demonstrate immense dedication and be willing to sacrifice a great amount of time. All recipients must participate in 400 hours of voluntary community service, 200 hours of personal development, 200 hours of physical activities, and an additional four night mission of their choosing. This is all done within a two year time frame.

For Colleen's public service, she chose to highlight her appreciation for classical music and opera. Colleen volunteered at local hospitals and provided music therapy to patients. By utilizing her passion, Colleen not only improved her musical skills but also helped others in our community. Colleen incorporated her love of music for her personal development requirement as well. She dedicated time to improve her harp skills in order to compete in regional and national competitions. Most notably, she performed with the New World Symphony. For her physical fitness requirement, Colleen built up her stamina and ran one mile at a consistent pace despite a persistent knee injury.

As Colleen was nearing her goal, she had to complete her four days of exploration. With an interest in history, she visited a variety of sites in Tennessee, South Carolina and Georgia, ranging from the Revolutionary War to the Civil Rights era. During the evening, Colleen stayed with local families to fully immerse herself in the experience. With all of the activities Colleen completed, she not only bettered the community, but herself.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to congratulate Colleen Murray on her accomplishment, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing her outstanding achievement. It is an honor to know that Florida's 25th District has an individual with such a bright future.

BERNADETTE CHAMBERS

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Bernadette

Chambers for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Bernadette Chambers is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Bernadette Chambers is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Bernadette Chambers for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

### FOCUS ON THE FAMILY'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of Focus on the Family, a vital American institution dedicated to preserving one of our country's most foundational pillars—the family.

Forty years ago, there were dire warning signs of the erosion of the family and the Judeo-Christian roots that have brought such benefit and blessing to the United States of America, and to the entire world. Dr. James Dobson saw these threats and could not ignore them.

In Psalm 11:3, King David asks, "When the foundations are being destroyed, what can the righteous do?" That question has been viewed by some as a lament—a rhetorical question that signals defeat or resignation. But others take it as a rallying cry—to weigh that question, to search one's heart, and to resolve to do something about the foundations that are being destroyed.

It was in this spirit that Dr. James Dobson founded Focus on the Family. Instead of retreating or shrugging off the problem to the next generation, Focus on the Family has proven what the righteous can truly do. Under the vision and leadership of Dr. Dobson and more recently Jim Daly, by the grace of God, incredible things have been accomplished to preserve, promote, and protect the family.

It would be impossible to quantify the full impact that Focus on the Family has had in our own nation as well as across the world. We do know that thousands of marriages have been revived, prodigal sons and daughters have been brought home, life changes have been successfully navigated, young adults have been equipped, children have been lov-

ingly disciplined, and families have been encouraged and strengthened.

I do want to highlight a significant impact that can be quantified. Through Focus on the Family's Option Ultrasound, over 720 grants have been awarded to pregnancy centers to purchase ultrasound machines. As a direct result, over 382,000 lives have been saved by mothers choosing life over abortion.

In Colorado Springs, our local pregnancy centers have benefitted greatly from the generosity of Focus on the Family. Many of the materials given to women facing unexpected pregnancies come from Focus. In fact, since Life Network obtained its very first ultrasound machine through Focus on the Family, over 2000 women who have seen their babies on ultrasounds have chosen life. What an incalculable, multi-generational blessing.

Although Focus on the Family was founded in California, we are glad that they saw the light and relocated to Colorado Springs when they did in 1991. I wonder for how many children around the country—even the world—their first knowledge of Colorado Springs is through Adventures in Odyssey.

It is truly a privilege to celebrate with Focus on the Family on the occasion of their 40th anniversary. Focus on the Family has fortified our families and our country, and for that, I am truly grateful.

### PASSING OF WALKER A. WILLIAMS

### HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the life and memory of Walker Alexander Williams.

Born in East Orange, New Jersey in 1940, Walker lifted his eyes well beyond our shores and developed an international reputation as a businessman and an advocate for the African and Caribbean diaspora communities. His passion for economic empowerment led him to create Alternative Marketing Access, Leadership Global (formerly Leadership Africa USA) and NiQuan Energy as platforms for development. Walker leaves behind a legacy of uplifting others and promoting the advancement of under-represented groups, especially those of African and African American descent.

Walker also recognized the importance of training people to fill leadership roles and developing talent to serve in African political and economic contexts. He had a vision for developing countries in which their diverse communities and nations overall could reach their full potential. His distinguished career included testifying in Congress on "The Future of Energy in Africa" where he urged this body to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

support and encourage partnerships to improve Africa's access to energy. He also provided vital leadership around the initial passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), arranging several Congressional briefings for African Ambassadors, key members of Congress, and Administration officials on AGOA and its potential effect on infrastructure, energy, agriculture, health, nutrition, and security.

During his long career as a businessman, advocate, and philanthropist, Walker remained committed to mentoring and empowering young people and professionals, and he always aimed to make those who worked with him feel valued. He worked with more than 100 non-governmental organizations over thirty-plus years, and he facilitated scholarship and educational opportunities in Africa and the Caribbean through the Education Africa Presidential and Premier Education Awards, Nelson Mandela Presidential Medallions, and the Walter Sisulu Scholarship and Training Fund. He encouraged Africans and Americans alike to envision and achieve personal power and a more prosperous future. Walker believed that a better Africa and Caribbean meant a better United States of America.

Walker is remembered by his partner, children, and grandchildren as a humble and dedicated man. I would like to celebrate a life of service while I offer condolences to those he has left behind.

#### RECOGNIZING JANINE KIERAN

##### HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Principal Janine Kieran for her lifelong passion for education.

Born and raised in Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, Janine always knew that she wanted to be an educator. After graduating from high school and college, she met the love of her life, Brian, to whom she has been married for over 28 years. At the same time, she started her 33-year long career in education as a Special Education teacher at Brooklyn's George Westinghouse High School, where she has worked ever since. She then went on to serve as a Guidance Counselor, Assistant Principal, and Principal. It is obvious that her students over the years loved having her as a teacher and principal, especially because she made learning fun and exciting. After all, it is hard to imagine a teacher who used to sing and play guitar boring her students.

I cannot say enough about Janine's compassion. Throughout her many years at George Westinghouse High School, she always had an open door if her students ever needed help with their schoolwork or just wanted advice. Her selflessness truly showed in her work. Putting aside the fact that she had a husband and two children at home, Janine was always able to devote equal energy to students and fellow staff members. Furthermore, her kindness and altruism certainly goes without saying. Nevertheless, I am certain that even though she is retiring, she

will always treasure her many years as an educator.

Mr. Speaker, after 33 years of nonstop commitment to George Westinghouse High School, Janine Kiernan will soon start her well-deserved retirement. I am sure she will travel a lot more, which she always enjoys. Most importantly, however, she will get to spend more time with her husband and her two sons, Connor and Ryan. I thank her for her decades-long devotion to educating the next generation of leaders, and I wish her a very happy retirement.

#### CHLOE EAGAN

##### HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chloe Eagan from North Fort Myers High School.

The National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists has selected Chloe as one of the delegates to attend the Congress of Future Medical Leaders at the University of Massachusetts Lowell later this month.

Chloe will be joining hundreds of other students from around the country in an honors-only program for high schoolers who wish to become physicians or go into the medical research field. I am proud that Chloe is representing our southwest Florida community.

She and her fellow delegates will be meeting with a distinguished group that includes Nobel Prize-winning laureates, top medical school deans, and leaders in medical research. The goal of the program is to honor, inspire and direct top students like Chloe toward their desired goals in the medical field.

I commend Chloe for her outstanding performance in her studies which led to her selection to the Congress of Future Medical Leaders. I wish her continued success on her path to fulfilling her aspirations in the medical field.

#### HONORING THE SERVICE OF CHRISTOPHER BARADAT

##### HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Staff Sergeant Christopher Baradat for heroic actions that were essential in rescuing 150 coalition soldiers in Afghanistan on April 6, 2013, and ultimately earned him the Air Force Cross which was presented to him on April 20, 2017.

Raised in Marin County, Mr. Baradat graduated from San Marin High School in 2007, and enlisted in the United States Air Force shortly thereafter. He served his country for eight years, and is now studying welding and technical skills at Laney College in Oakland, where he lives with his wife Kellie and his three children.

On April 6, 2013, Staff Sgt. Baradat, a special tactics airman assigned to the 21st Spe-

cial Tactics Squadron, was attached to a U.S. Army Special Forces Team in eastern Afghanistan. He was on his third deployment in Afghanistan. That day, his unit was called to support coalition soldiers who were surrounded and pinned down by Taliban fighters in a valley in the Kunar Province. Upon entering the valley his unit took direct fire from the ridge lines and other surrounding structures, forcing his team to take cover in a compound 400 meters away from coalition forces. Staff Sgt. Baradat's responsibility was to communicate with supporting aircraft and provide pilots with targeting information to strike enemy positions.

Not being able to communicate with support aircraft through the compound walls, Staff Sgt. Baradat rushed out into the direct line of fire in order to communicate Taliban positions. Over the course of the next two hours, Staff Sgt. Baradat utilized 8 aircraft to drop 13 five hundred pound bombs and more than 1,100 rounds of ammunition on enemy positions surrounding his team and the coalition forces. The consistent barrage of fire created the conditions necessary for coalition forces and his team to withdraw from the valley. His heroism did not end there however, as he continued his communication with support aircraft throughout the exit out of the valley. Still putting himself in the direct line of fire, Staff Sgt. Baradat placed himself partially out of an armored carrier in order to maintain a secure communication signal with support aircraft. He would continue to do this until his entire team made it out of the valley.

Because his actions had a decisive impact on the outcome of that day, Staff Sgt. Baradat received the Air Force Cross, which is the second highest military award that a member of the United States Air Force can receive. Staff Sgt. Baradat is only the ninth service member to have received the award since 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing deep appreciation for Christopher Baradat's extraordinary heroism that day, and for the sacrifices he and his family have made for this country.

#### HONORING MR. LARRY CASE FOR HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE MISSOURI ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS AFTER 30 YEARS OF SERVICE

##### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, in 1987, Mr. Case began his employment as the Executive Vice President of the Missouri Association of Professional Insurance Agents. In a few years' time, this organization and the Independent Agents of Missouri consolidated to form what is now known as the Missouri Association of Insurance Agents. In March 1992, he became the Vice President of Membership Services. On October 30, 1997, he was appointed as the Executive Director of Missouri Association of Insurance Agents. Mr. Case was then appointed to the position of Executive Vice President of the Missouri Association

of Insurance Agents on September 1, 1999. The Missouri Association of Insurance Agents is the oldest and largest association of insurance agents in the state of Missouri. With that long standing tradition, approximately 500 independent agencies that are operated by 4,000 agents, brokers, and their employees are members of the association. In 2002, Mr. Case was awarded the Insurance Person of the Year Award for the significant contributions that he has made to the insurance industry.

Mr. Case is passionate about the legislative and regulatory advocacy side of the insurance field and has played an integral part in passing legislation that has helped advance the causes of independent insurance agents in Missouri. He has served in various roles at the national level with the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America and the National Association of Professional Insurance Agents, not to mention the numerous committees and task forces he has volunteered to serve on during his illustrious career. Additionally, Mr. Case has routinely shared his expertise at the Mid-America Insurance Conference and has earned the respect of many lawmakers, company personnel, and independent insurance agents throughout the great state of Missouri.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Mr. Larry Case on his retirement. The commitment he has shown to the Missouri Association of Insurance Agents and to his community for 30 years is a commendable accomplishment.

CAMERON CHAVEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cameron Chavez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Cameron Chavez is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cameron Chavez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cameron Chavez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING FAIRVOTE

HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, since its founding in June 1992, FairVote has fought cre-

atively all over America to advance significant voting and electoral reforms that make American democracy more responsive, more accountable, and more representative. I rise to celebrate this visionary non-partisan and non-profit organization which, I am proud to say, is headquartered in the 8th District of Maryland.

Under the exemplary leadership of its Executive Director Rob Richie and board chairs, former Congressman John B. Anderson and musician Krist Novoselic and with the energy of its youthful, talented staff, FairVote has worked with purpose and imagination to implement ranked-choice voting, proportional representation, redistricting reform, the National Popular Vote agreement and voter preregistration for teenagers nationwide. FairVote's sophisticated educational campaigns have been teaching Americans across the country that these changes are all effective tools of democracy and can help us make certain that all Americans have their voices heard and views represented.

Mr. Richie's distinguished career in public life has been devoted to democratic ideals, voting rights, and the realization of responsive and representative government. He has played a key role in implementing ranked-choice voting in over a dozen cities; in advocating the National Popular Vote plan across the country as states equal to 165 electoral votes have joined the agreement; and in promoting voter registration, voter access and voter participation.

On behalf of FairVote, Mr. Richie has appeared regularly in the media, written for leading national publications, published nine books, and addressed important groups such as the American Political Science Association and National Conference of State Legislatures. Through FairVote, Richie's luminous work has changed America's conception of how we vote, what democracy means and how we can make strong progress this century. Standing with him throughout as a colleague and inspirational reform leader in her own right has been his wife Cynthia Terrell.

As FairVote celebrates 25 years of thoughtful advocacy, I want to commend the group, its leaders and all affiliated with it for their hard work and passionate commitment not only to the principles of democratic inclusion and governance but to the difficult and urgently necessary process of electoral reform across the country. As a champion of electoral reform and the proud Representative from Maryland's 8th Congressional District, I look forward to watching the many important accomplishments still yet to come from Rob Richie and FairVote, American idealists and democratic patriots all.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NOE  
HERNANDEZ

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Weslaco native, Gunner's Mate 2nd Class Noe Hernandez, one of the seven sailors lost in the tragic colli-

sion between the U.S.S. *Fitzgerald* and the *ACX Crystal* in the Philippine Sea on June 17, 2017.

Noe attended Weslaco High School where he participated in United States Army Junior Reserve Officer Training for four years. By the time he graduated in 2009, Noe had reached the rank of cadet major and served as the program's executive officer. Following graduation, he reported to the U.S. Navy Recruit Training Command in Great Lakes, Illinois.

He was a student at the Recruit Training Command and the Center for Surface Combat Systems in Great Lakes until March 2010. He then served at the Navy Munitions Command in Sigonella, Italy, for three years and reported to San Diego, California, for Littoral Combat Ship Training and classes at the Center for Surface Combat Systems until October 2015. Later that year, Noe and his family moved to Yokosuka, Japan, where he was stationed at Navy Force Japan and subsequently on the U.S.S. *Fitzgerald*. During his time in the U.S. Navy, Noe became an Enlisted Surface Warfare Specialist and earned the rank of Gunner's Mate 2nd Class.

Noe was a first-generation patriot who cared deeply for the United States of America and took pride in serving his country. His friends and family describe him as modest, loving, and kind and many remember him for his selflessness and unwavering faith in God.

Noe is survived by his wife Dora and his son Leon. He loved his country, and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincerest condolences to Dora, Leon, the Hernandez family, friends, and loved ones. Our country has lost one of the best South Texas has to offer and I hope his family can find peace in this trying time. I am proud to commemorate the life of Gunner's Mate 2nd Class Noe Hernandez and I thank him for his service to our great nation.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT  
OF EILEEN SEVANO

HON. JOSH GOTTHEIMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Eileen Sevano and her unwavering service as a pillar of the Teaneck Public School system for nearly thirty years. On the occasion of her retirement, I applaud Eileen for an incredible forty years of teaching, spanning from Teaneck and Englewood Cliffs, in New Jersey to Brooklyn and Chinatown in New York. During the course of her career, Eileen touched the lives of many students and helped shaped the minds of the next generation.

William Arthur Ward once said, "The mediocre teacher tells. The good teacher explains. The superior teacher demonstrates. The great teacher inspires." As a public-school teacher in elementary and middle school, Eileen inspired her students both inside and outside of the classroom. For years, Eileen coached softball in Teaneck, empowering young women on the field. For fourteen years, as Director of Camp Kookooskoos, Eileen inspired young



campers through the arts, science, sports, and by exploring and nurturing the environment. Eileen helped our young people create memories that last a lifetime. By focusing on the breadth of learning, even beyond the classroom, Eileen put the best interests of her students first and helped them grow and thrive.

Generations of students, who Eileen taught, have had limitless potential. They have and continue to launch new businesses in New Jersey, find cures for diseases like cancer, create the next breakthrough in technology, and much more. With the help of a supportive teacher like Eileen, all of this has been possible.

Nobody is surprised to hear that in retirement Eileen will continue her lifetime of service by volunteering with students in her community and babysitting her granddaughters. Encouraging learning and creating a supportive environment for young people is what Eileen enjoys most.

I am lucky to know Eileen and am profoundly thankful for her lifetime of service. I commend her for being a wonderful role model to my children and to many students from across the Fifth District. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Eileen's hard work, and wish her, her husband Dennis, her daughters Brenna and Perri, and her granddaughters Maddy and Sydney, all the best as Eileen celebrates this new chapter.

In closing, I join countless families across the Fifth District in saying thank you to Eileen for her dedication to children and to her community. The world just would not be the same without her hard work and inspiration.

**SUPPORTING H.R. 2866—THE REDUCING BARRIERS FOR RELATIVE FOSTER PARENTS ACT**

**HON. TERRI A. SEWELL**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on June 8th, I joined my colleague Rep. LLOYD SMUCKER, in introducing H.R. 2866—the Reducing Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act. This bipartisan bill encourages states to update their licensing requirements for foster parents in order to ensure that relatives have the ability to become foster parents.

Under current law, states have tremendous flexibility to set their own rules and guidelines for licensing foster homes. Unfortunately, many states have outdated regulations that make it difficult for family members to become foster parents. For example, some states fail to notify family members when relative children enter the foster care system. In other states, children can be removed from a family member's home and thrown into the foster care system if the relative adult does not have a separate bedroom for the child.

H.R. 2866 would require that the Department of Health and Human Services create model licensing requirements. States then must either adopt the HHS requirements, or provide an explanation for why the licensing requirements are not ideal for the state. My home state of Alabama has updated, family-

friendly licensing standards, so compliance with HHS's standards will be simple. However, families residing in states with antiquated standards would face fewer barriers when trying to become a foster parent.

Many studies prove how beneficial placement with family members can be for foster children. According to Generations United, children in the care of family members experience higher stability, permanency, and positive mental health outcomes. Furthermore, allowing children to stay with their family members gives children the opportunity to maintain strong connections to their community.

I was very pleased that my bill was unanimously supported in the Ways and Means Committee, and I look forward to its passage through the House this evening.

**HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY  
MR. LEO SHEY**

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Leo Shey of Pembroke Pines, Florida. Leo was a dear friend of mine who sadly passed away on June 13, 2017.

Leo was born in the Bronx, New York. He served honorably in the United States Navy, and after marrying his wife Bunny in 1950, they moved to Dade County in South Florida in 1958. As a mortgage banker, Leo dedicated many years of his career specializing in low-income housing in Dade and Broward counties, and also served on the board of directors of the Park Place Association for 40 years. Through his contributions, Leo made a profound impact in South Florida.

Leo went on to establish himself in Atlanta, Georgia where he emerged as an ally of the African American business community. At the forefront of civil rights activism, Leo became an esteemed member of the 100 percent Wrong Club.

Distinguishing himself through extraordinary involvement in the community, Leo touched countless lives. He is survived by his wife Bunny, and adored by father of Nina Voges (Dan), Michael (Barbara), like-a-son Seth Brown, and predeceased by Douglas. Beloved and wise grandfather of Tim (Rachel), Caitlin (Todd), Sherri and Terri (Cesar), and blended family Danielle (Jorge del Valle, Arya and Jayley) and Sean Voges (Alice). Adoring Pop-pop of Wilhelmina, Sebastian and Violette Leo.

Mr. Speaker, words cannot express how deeply saddened I am for the passing of such a kind soul. I was devastated to learn of the death of one of the nicest people I have ever known. Leo was not a large man, but he was most among men. It is with a heavy heart that I honor his life and accomplishments, but most of all, to honor our friendship. My thoughts are with his loved ones, during this most difficult time.

**CAMERON GONZALES**

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cameron Gonzales for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Cameron Gonzales is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cameron Gonzales is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cameron Gonzales for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF GEORGE  
CANON**

**HON. ELISE M. STEFANK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Ms. STEFANK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize a staunch advocate for the Adirondacks and beloved member of our community.

George Canon was a fixture in local politics. After retiring from the National Lead mines in Newcomb's Tahawus hamlet, Mr. Canon devoted himself to public service by working in many local organizations. Most notably, he was Newcomb supervisor from 1990 to 2015, serving 13 terms in office. During his long and inspiring tenure, Mr. Canon played a significant role in successfully preserving the Satanoni Great Camp and the historic railroad between North Creek and Tahawus.

A lifelong resident of the North Country, Mr. Canon loved the Adirondack Park deeply, cherishing both its history and natural beauty. This appreciation for his surroundings led George to seek out balanced environmental policies by working as a member of the Northern Forest Lands Council Advisory Committee. Through these efforts, Canon coupled his appreciation for the environment with a pragmatic understanding of his constituents' needs.

George Canon also served as president of the Adirondack Association of Towns and Villages, where he spent a decade representing and advocating for the citizens of the North Country. I am honored to have taken part in celebrating Mr. Canon's retirement in 2015, and hold a deep admiration for the lasting impact that his service has had on our area.

I would like to offer my deepest condolences to George Canon's family and friends, particularly his wife Monica. He was a true

community leader and his legacy of service will endure in New York's 21st District.

DAN CZAHOR AND MADISON  
HEINRICH

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dan Czahor of Fort Myers and Madison Heinrich of Naples. It has come to my attention that these two students have been selected to represent the state of Florida at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders in Lowell, Massachusetts later this month.

The Congress is an event headed by the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists and is an honors-only program whose intention is to motivate the top students of the country, who are interested in a career in science or technology, to achieve their goals. The Academy selects all delegates based on nominations from teachers, proven academic excellence, and leadership ability. Further, their alumni include Nobel Prize winners, top scientific university deans, and other leaders in the STEM field.

It is encouraging to know that Dan and Madison are among these five hundred nationally selected students to go to the conference. I look forward to the work these two individuals will do in the years to come and wish them the best of luck in their future academic studies.

RECOGNIZING KYLIE HUTCHISON,  
ASHLEY JOPLIN, KATRIANA  
SEFCOVIC AND PAIGE SIMPSON

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize four high school students who were selected to represent the state of Colorado as delegates at the Congress for Future Medical Leaders. The students are Kylie Hutchison, Ashley Joplin, Katriana Sefcovic, and Paige Simpson.

The Congress of Future Medical Leaders is an honors program that recognizes exceptional high school students who are pursuing career's as a physician or in medical research.

These students are the future leaders of the medical field and our country. Through their studies, they have embodied the meaning of hard work and perseverance to achieve their goals, and will better the health of future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize these students from the fourth district of Colorado for their hard work and service to our community. I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE AND  
ACHIEVEMENTS OF MRS. IDA  
JOHNSON

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and achievements of Mrs. Ida Johnson. Mrs. Johnson dedicated her career to serving her community, both in education and as an advocate for low income youth and families in Merced County. Mrs. Johnson was passionate about the pursuit of equality, driven by her love and compassion for others, and committed to creating opportunities for students and teachers in Merced County.

Mrs. Johnson was born in Nashville, Tennessee. She attended the University of San Francisco, where she earned a Bachelor's degree in Human Relations and Organizational Behavior in 1984. Mrs. Johnson then continued her education at Chapman University, where she received a Master's degree in Educational Systems Management in 1988. She worked on gender equity as Director and Coordinator for the California Department of Education for almost 12 years, and also worked for 33 years for the Merced County Schools in various capacities, including teaching computing and business classes.

Beyond her professional career, Mrs. Johnson was elected to the Merced Union High School Governing Board in 2005, where she served 8 years as a Trustee. Additionally, Mrs. Johnson was involved with numerous community and educational organizations, including the Boys and Girls Club, League of Women Voters, and the 4-H Club. She also worked with the Merced Equals Program, where she spent countless hours providing teachers, parents, and students with the tools necessary to improve math skills within the county, and she secured a significant amount of grant money.

With Mrs. Johnson's passing, the Merced community mourns her loss but also rejoices in her lasting impact and legacy. The lives Mrs. Johnson touched with her career in education and devotion to her community will not be forgotten. Her spirit will live on in the hearts of her family, friends, colleagues, and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and achievements of Mrs. Ida Johnson. Mrs. Johnson's achievements cannot be measured through grants or educational programs, but in the lives she touched. Mrs. Johnson's trajectory as an educator has given students and teachers in Merced County a role model to admire and emulate as they move towards the future.

TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last year Al-Qaeda nearly downed an airliner in Somalia using an explosive disguised as a laptop. This

bomb got past X-ray machines and blew a gaping hole in the aircraft.

Al-Qaeda has been working for years to create sophisticated explosives that can target airplanes. It came as no surprise that last week the Department of Homeland Security announced new security restrictions on electronics on board certain U.S.-bound flights.

These new restrictions are deadly serious. Al-Qaeda has units deployed in places like Syria, Pakistan, and Turkey that are dedicated to planning attacks against the West.

The hysteria around this announcement is purely political. Everyone should be concerned about the growing threat from al-Qaeda. We must not allow politics to divide us in the face of a mortal enemy seeking to kill and injure as many Americans as possible.

I commend the Department of Homeland Security for responding to crucial intelligence and taking this step to protect the American people. And that's just the way it is.

BRIAHNA HORTON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Briahna Horton for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Briahna Horton is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Briahna Horton is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Briahna Horton for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING TECHNICAL SERGEANT  
MARSHALL PRICE

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with great respect and admiration to honor Technical Sergeant Marshall Price.

After 12 years of active duty, Technical Sergeant Price is medically retiring from the United States Air Force following injuries sustained during his deployments to Africa. Technical Sergeant Price has been a dedicated servant to our Nation since 2005, when he first enlisted at the age of 19, and today we celebrate his service.

Throughout his notable career, Technical Sergeant Price has been stationed at Moody

AFB in Valdosta, Georgia, Fairchild AFB in Spokane, Washington, and Hulburt Field in Florida's First Congressional District. Marshall has been an active supporter of our national security interests, participating in various undisclosed missions in both Djibouti and Afghanistan. Additionally, he has earned recognition for his distinguished service from the 9th Special Operations Squadron.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, and a grateful community, I am privileged to recognize Technical Sergeant Price for his commitment to our country and the sacrifices he has made on its behalf. On his retirement from the United States Air Force, I thank him and his family for his honorable service, and wish them all the best going forward.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDWARD BATOR, PRESIDENT OF THE TAMINENT REGULAR DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my dear friend and longtime staff member Edward Babor, as he steps down from his twenty-six year tenure as the president of the Taminent Regular Democratic Club.

The Taminent Regular Democratic Club (the Taminent) was founded in 1933 in the Astoria neighborhood of Queens County. Today, the members of the Taminent work tirelessly to advocate for Astoria residents on issues affecting the community. I have attended countless events hosted by the Taminent and I am extraordinarily grateful to Ed Babor for his leadership as club president and the extraordinary number of hours he has volunteered to ensure the club continues to thrive in the 21st century. In fact the only thing that might be more apparent than Ed's dedication to the Taminent is the universal respect and admiration that the club's members show for Ed. While Ed Babor may be stepping down as president, I am confident that he will always be a proud member of the Taminent. For decades, Ed has offered his advice and mentorship to younger generations of Western Queens advocates including incoming Taminent president, Loren Amor.

Ed Babor serves on a host of civic, political, cultural, and service organizations in the Astoria and Long Island City neighborhoods. Along with his work with the Taminent, Ed is on the board of the Powhatan and Pocahontas Regular Democratic Club, another Astoria political organization. He has been an active member of Queens Community Board Number 1 for over a decade, and is currently the Executive Secretary. Ed also serves on the boards of the Astoria Civic Association, which advocates for the needs of Astoria residents and runs the successful Judge Charles J. Vallone Scholarship Fund, and SHAREing and CAREing, a nonprofit dedicated to working with cancer patients and their families without

regard to insurance status to provide education on prevention and wellness, links to cancer treatment and practical needs, and ongoing cancer support.

In his career, Ed Babor has demonstrated the same commitment to community and public service. Ed Babor worked for the New York Department of Motor Vehicles for over thirty years. Ed has been an invaluable addition to my staff for over eight years. He has an encyclopedic knowledge about the neighborhoods of Western Queens and the issues which they face. This institutional knowledge comes both from the fact that Ed is at every meeting that takes place in Western Queens and from his sincere interest in the neighborhoods' well-being, because Ed truly loves Queens.

Ed lives in Astoria with his wife Patricia Babor, to whom he has been married for 39 years. Ed and Pat are active parishioners at Immaculate Conception Church in Astoria. Ed has been actively involved with Catholic War-Veterans Post No. 1, having served with the National Guard. Proud of his Czech heritage, Ed is involved with several cultural organizations including the Czech Catholic Union and the Bohemian Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the many accomplishments of Edward Babor. His hard work, character, and love for his community and the people who live there, make him an outstanding leader and an incredible friend.

HONORING CORPORAL RICK COSTELLO

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my constituent, Corporal Rick Costello, who will be departing from his role with the Purcellville Police Department after over 15 years of service to our community.

Corporal Costello's commitment to serving others did not start until 1999 when he began volunteering with the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office. In fact, he served with the U.S. Navy during the Vietnam War before starting his career for a building supply company, where he worked for over thirty years. As a volunteer with the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, Corporal Costello served as a member of the community advisory committee, assisting police officers in Loudoun County, but soon afterwards, the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office offered him a position on the force. Despite his age difference with the majority of the other trainees, Corporal Costello passed the six-month, rigorous training and served for three years with the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office and twelve more years with the Purcellville Police Department.

As an officer, Corporal Costello became well known for his information technology skills, helping advance the Purcellville Police Department's communications systems and managing the department's accreditation process. In fact just last month, The Virginia Law Enforcement Professional Standards Commission unanimously voted to award the Purcellville

Police Department with its second re-accreditation certificate, largely due to the framework that Corporal Costello has set up over the years.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire 10th District, I thank Corporal Rick Costello for his dedicated career of service to Loudoun County, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a truly commendable public servant. I wish him and his family all of the best in their future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF NANCY KRUPIARZ FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE WITH THE MICHIGAN TRAILS AND GREENWAYS ALLIANCE

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Nancy Krupiarz for her outstanding career working on behalf of the State of Michigan and its residents. As Executive Director for the Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance, Ms. Krupiarz has helped promote a healthy and more prosperous Michigan by making it one of the foremost trail states in the country.

Originally founded in 1986, the Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance is a nonprofit organization that promotes the development of non-motorized trails throughout Michigan and provides a statewide voice for users of these trails. The group consists of approximately 1,000 members and provides information for Michiganders about trails throughout the state. Additionally, it advocates for assistance at the state and federal level to safeguard state and federal funding for the preservation of Michigan's natural heritage and the upkeep of its trails. As a result of the efforts of the MTGA, Michigan has built and maintained a comprehensive network of over 3,000 miles of non-motorized trails throughout the state. These include cross-state trails from South Haven to Port Huron, as well as from Ironwood to Belle Isle.

Ms. Krupiarz has served as the organization's executive director since the group's founding and has been a catalyst for the growth and success of MTGA. Her tireless efforts have helped create a cohesive and effective organization that has effectively served the people of Michigan by coordinating efforts to build trails and preserve Michigan's natural areas. Due to her leadership and efforts, Michigan now boasts the most trail miles out of any U.S. state and is widely recognized for its conservation efforts and outdoor recreation offerings. Ms. Krupiarz's career with MTGA has left a lasting legacy, and it is my hope that the new leadership of the organization continues to build on her work in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Nancy Krupiarz for her leadership with the Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance. Her career has resulted in a more livable state for Michigan's residents.

BERNADETTE KIBERINKA

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Bernadette Kiberinka for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Bernadette Kiberinka is a student at Everitt Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Bernadette Kiberinka is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Bernadette Kiberinka for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

**HONORING THE MATTATUCK DRUM BAND****HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Mattatuck Drum Band, which this week commemorates the 250th Anniversary of its founding. This band is our nation's oldest continuously active fife and drum band and is a celebrated institution of our Waterbury, Connecticut community.

The Mattatuck Drum Band was founded in 1767, and over the past two and a half centuries, the band has been an invaluable group in supporting our country's battles and preserving the heritage of our state and country. The band was first formed to play martial music for military training exercises in the towns of Farmingbury and Waterbury. The fifers and drummers were some of the earliest patriots to join the American Revolution in the spring of 1775, at a time when musicians and drummers were instrumental in maintaining order and routine for military camps.

The band joined many parades in support of President Lincoln's 1860 campaign, and then joined recruiting efforts to support the Union's fight in the Civil War. Almost a century later during World War II, despite gas rationing and the deployment of many members, the band still turned out to play in parades to support our country's service members and maintain solidarity during a difficult time for the country. Today, the dedicated members of the band keep musical tradition alive, and the band's performances are an essential part of our community's celebrations.

Mr. Speaker, the Mattatuck Drum Band celebrates our history in Connecticut and America, and its dedicated musicians and leaders have preserved an important part of

our community's heritage for the past 250 years. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor the band and everyone who has ensured its preservation and success here today.

**RECOGNIZING PRIYA VULCHI****HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Priya Vulchi—a remarkable young woman who, this year, earned the 2017 Congressional Gold Medal.

A resident of Princeton, Ms. Vulchi demonstrated an immeasurable passion for the education and advancement of our nation's leaders. Working with Princeton Public Schools, Ms. Vulchi created a racial literacy tool to assist educators initiate dialogues around race-related topics in the classroom. Ms. Vulchi is also a co-founder of Princeton CHOOSE—a student-led organization that aims to overcome racism and inspire harmony through exposure, education and empowerment. Further, Ms. Vulchi is a published author of a racial literacy teaching tool that was piloted in Princeton Public school in the spring of 2016 and officially used by all 5th grade teachers in the school district for the 2016–2017 school years.

Along with her commitment to education, Ms. Vulchi pursued journalism and became the Head Copy Editor for her school's monthly newspaper. Finally, Ms. Vulchi crossed the country in her travels to Hawaii to visit the Haleakal National Park. There she visited the Eats Maui Volcano and learned more about volcanism and the ecosystems of the National Park.

Beyond the Congressional Gold Medal program, extraordinary individuals like Ms. Vulchi exemplify the best and brightest of our nation's future. As a resident of New Jersey's 12th Congressional District, I couldn't be more proud of her for taking up such a difficult challenge and making a positive change for themselves in their community.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Ms. Vulchi on her amazing accomplishment.

**HONORING STEVE SHISSLER ON HIS RETIREMENT AFTER MORE THAN 26 YEARS OF SERVICE IN LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT****HON. SCOTT PERRY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my sincere congratulations to my constituent, Lieutenant Steve Shissler, on his upcoming retirement after more than 26 years of service to the Hampden Township Police Department in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania.

Lt. Shissler climbed the ranks of the Hampden Township Police Department, starting as a patrolman, then to Corporal, Sergeant and,

ultimately, Lieutenant. He has been in charge of the Department's Criminal Investigation Division for the last several years.

Lt. Shissler's tireless dedication, professionalism and sacrifice has touched the lives of countless people and challenged all with whom he served to be the best. His legacy of service to our community truly is admirable.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I thank and congratulate Steve Shissler on his service to our Nation and wish him and his family continued great success in their future adventures.

**IN RECOGNITION OF SEAN RATTAY ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY****HON. ROBERT E. LATTA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Sean Rattay of Monclova, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Sean's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2021. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Sean brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2021. While attending St. John's Jesuit High School in Toledo, Ohio, Sean was a member of the National Honor Society, a peer tutor and a school ambassador.

Throughout high school, Sean participated in varsity football, earning numerous achievements and accolades along the way. Sean also led Christmas on Campus and volunteered at Swan Creek Care Center, an assisted living center in Toledo, Ohio. I am confident that Sean will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Sean Rattay on his offer of appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Sean will excel during his career at Annapolis, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

**DANTE PORCHETTA****HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dante

Porchetta for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Dante Porchetta is a student at Wayne Carle Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Dante Porchetta is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Dante Porchetta for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

---

JEFFREY PASSANTINO

**HON. FRANCIS ROONEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Jeffrey Passantino, who was drafted by the Chicago Cubs in the 2017 Major League Baseball draft. Passantino is an alumnus of Bishop Verot High School in Fort Myers, and most recently played at Limpscomb University.

This season at Limpscomb, Jeffrey had a 4–3 record with a 3.09 Earned Run Average and 95 strikeouts. During his career at Bishop Verot, he helped lead the Vikings to three straight state title appearances, which included one championship in 2011. It was during this time that he also posted an impressive 22–4 record on the mound.

I would like to congratulate Jeffrey for his hard-work, dedication, and leadership on and off the field. I look forward to hearing about his future accomplishments.

---

HONORING TONY NAPOLI

**HON. J. LUIS CORREA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time today to honor one of my constituents, Mr. Tony Napoli, for his immense dedication to serving Santa Ana's youth.

Mr. Napoli is an accomplished businessman with a background in technology, having graduated from the Connecticut College of Electricians as an electronic technician. But Mr. Napoli is far more than just a businessman. In his spare time, Mr. Napoli volunteers as a Chamber Ambassador to the Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce, and his great service earned him the Ambassador of the Year Award in 2011.

Mr. Napoli fully embodies the value of community service in all aspects of his life. Concerned with local high school graduation rates and skill level of recent graduates, Mr. Napoli with the Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce

partnered with the Santa Ana Unified School District to start the High School Incorporated Program, a unique collaboration that seeks to provide vocational training and career advice to high school students.

Passionate about investing in youth, Mr. Napoli chose to give even more of his free time to this program, especially the Automotive and Transportation division. Mr. Napoli also serves as a Business Advisor, advising the division on budget matters and providing valuable mentorship while also consistently visiting the inspirational students in class.

Mr. Napoli's dedication and service has helped raise the graduation rate for the program to 95 percent with many students already fully certified and well equipped for their bright futures.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Napoli is an example to us all of the incredible value found in community engagement. I am honored to recognize Mr. Napoli for doing his part in bridging the gap, and thank him for the positive impact he has made on the Santa Ana and Orange County community.

---

HONORING THE WESTERN  
HERITAGE OF COLORADO SPRINGS

**HON. DOUG LAMBORN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the proud and important Western Heritage of Colorado Springs.

Whether it is the 81st Western Street Breakfast, the 77th Annual Pikes Peak of Bust Rodeo, or the 68th Pikes Peak Range Ride, our Colorado Springs community has supported this heritage for many generations. I would also like to note that the proceeds from these events go to supporting our brave men and women in uniform at our five local military installations.

If you are one of the 10,000 people at the Street Breakfast, the many thousands at the Rodeo, or the two hundred plus Range Riders, you are taking part in a long and commendable tradition. And, with your continued enthusiastic support, it's one I know will last forever.

Thank you so much to the staffers, board members, and dedicated volunteers who make each of these events possible. Each June and July Colorado Springs shows the entire world what is so special about the heritage of the West.

---

IN HONOR OF THE ESTABLISHMENT  
OF A PERMANENT  
GEORGE MASON MAP CLINIC

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the award-winning Mason and Partners (MAP) health care clinic and to congratulate George Mason University School of Nursing and its partners on the establishment of a

permanent MAP Clinic in Manassas Park, Virginia. The clinic provides residents of medically underserved areas with a variety of health care services, including physicals, screenings, health care counseling, and acute primary care treatment while, at the same time, offering George Mason University nursing students and those in related studies the invaluable practical experience of treating and counseling patients who utilize the clinic.

George Mason launched its first MAP clinic in 2013, originally offering its services at the Manassas Park Community Center. Since then, the operation has expanded to three Northern Virginia sites while also broadening the services they provide. The clinic strives to serve as a bridge for patients with no access to healthcare until they are able to arrange for more formal healthcare coverage for themselves.

The MAP clinic program has also greatly benefitted our students at George Mason University. By offering an active learning lab, nursing and health and human services students are able to receive real-life experience working on interprofessional teams, a learning opportunity that is not available to many students across the nation. These clinical opportunities have been so well-received that the federal government's Health Resources Service Administration (HRSA) has awarded the school \$2 million to support the education of Mason School of Nursing students.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in celebrating with you and our colleagues the establishment of the first permanent structure of the MAP clinic in Manassas Park, Virginia. In addition, I ask that you join me in congratulating the George Mason University School of Nursing and its partners, Dr. Allison Ansher of the Prince William Health District, the Parks and Recreation and Education Departments of the City of Manassas Park, the city's Community Development Office and interim director Calvin O'Dell, the Potomac Health Foundation, and the students and faculty of George Mason's College of Health and Human Services, for the extraordinary success of this visionary, nurse-led program. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

---

HONORING MAYOR MATTHEW  
MARCHANT'S SERVICE TO THE  
CITY OF CARROLLTON, TEXAS

**HON. KENNY MARCHANT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my son, Matthew H. Marchant, for his public service as Mayor of the City of Carrollton, Texas.

Matthew finishes his six outstanding years in office as mayor of Carrollton later this evening, but that will not end his passionate commitment to serving his fellow citizens. Local leaders play a tremendous role in improving the quality of life on a daily basis for their residents and visitors—Matthew's constant stewardship on behalf of those who live and work in Carrollton is to be wholeheartedly congratulated. His leadership and service

have touched many, and many more will be able to enjoy the benefits for years to come.

Matthew was first elected mayor of Carrollton in 2011 and was re-elected in 2014. Prior to his election as mayor, Matthew served as councilmember for nine years from 2002 to 2011. In conjunction with Matthew's role as councilmember and mayor, he served in other leadership positions including Chairman of the Redevelopment Subcommittee, member of the Transit Oriented Development Subcommittee, member of the Carrollton Festival at the Switchyard Subcommittee, member of the Audit and Finance Committee, and member of the Judicial Committee. In addition, Matthew has served as Carrollton's voting member on the Regional Transportation Council.

Starting in 2011, Matthew led Carrollton through an economic development campaign to invest in the city's future. He championed an innovative project to revitalize Downtown Carrollton with new restaurants, retail, and greenspaces, while capturing the historic feel of Carrollton's past. In 2015, the City of Carrollton was awarded the "Best Public Improvement Project" by the Texas Downtown Association for its work in the downtown square. In 2010, striving to introduce new patrons to the Carrollton Square, Matthew worked with local and national musicians to host the Festival at the Switchyard concert series. Last year, more than 30,000 people were on hand to discover the unique stores, eclectic restaurants, and music all in the heart of Downtown Carrollton.

During Matthew's tenure as mayor, he has worked diligently with the Carrollton Police and Fire Departments to equip them with the tools needed to serve and protect the city's citizens. As a result, Carrollton now has one the lowest crime rates in its recent history. Matthew collaborated with neighboring cities to secure funding for the North Texas Emergency Communications Center which was launched in 2016 as a regional emergency dispatch command. Additionally, Matthew oversaw the construction of the new Carrollton Police Department Headquarters and Fire Station #8 which have helped lower the response time for medical emergencies by 12 percent across the city.

As Matthew leaves office, the property tax base of Carrollton is approximately \$13.3 billion, an impressive increase of 49 percent since his first election as mayor. In addition, Matthew has met his commitment to lowering the property tax rate for homeowners. During his 15 years serving in Carrollton city government, the population of the city expanded from around 115,000 to nearly 135,000, making it one of the top 25 most populous cities in Texas. Additionally, many small and large corporations such as AmeriSource Bergen, Inter-ceramic, CyrusOne, and others have also joined Carrollton's growing and diverse economic landscape.

In 1998, Matthew earned his Bachelor of Science degree from Southern Nazarene University in Bethany, Oklahoma. Matthew continued his studies at the University of Texas School of Law in Austin, Texas where he received his law degree in 2000. Outside of his duties as a public servant, Matthew works as legal counsel at Holly Frontier Corporation. He has been a lifetime resident of the Carrollton-

area where he lives with his wife, Lindsay, and two children, Kendall and Hayden.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing my son, Matthew Marchant, for his service to the people of Carrollton.

#### DE'VON REWERTS

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud De'Von Rewerts for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

De'Von Rewerts is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by De'Von Rewerts is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to De'Von Rewerts for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### CELEBRATING THE SERVICE OF THOMAS O'KEEFE

#### HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Thomas O'Keefe for his dedication to the safety of our nation and the well-being of his fellow citizens.

Mr. O'Keefe began his long career in government in 1984, working for the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. In 2003, he transferred to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, where he has served diligently for the past fourteen years. As a member of Customs and Border Protection, Mr. O'Keefe worked each day to protect the security of the United States and its citizens.

In addition to his work for the federal government, Mr. O'Keefe played an active role in the National Treasury Employees Union, serving as President of Northern New York's Chapter since 1995. The Chapter grew dramatically during his tenure, increasing both in membership and territorial reach. As Chapter President, Mr. O'Keefe fought for the rights of employees and sought to secure fair treatment for everyone he represented.

I want to thank Mr. O'Keefe for his years of work for the United States Government and the people of Upstate New York. His commitment to protecting our nation exhibits his strong character, and we commend his fine service.

#### HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT

#### HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the marking of a very special occasion—the 75th Anniversary of the Blue Grass Army Depot in Richmond, Kentucky. Since 1942, the Blue Grass Army Depot's dedicated civilian workforce has been called upon time after time to fulfill their critical role as key ammunition suppliers to our nation's joint warfighters by providing ready and reliable ammo at the right place and right time, every time.

Throughout the course of our nation's history, our great success in establishing our country as a beacon of hope to the world has been largely defined by the everyday bravery and dedication of individual citizens. The Blue Grass Army Depot has exemplified that bravery and dedication through direct civilian support of our warfighters.

From World War II to the Korean War, the War in Vietnam, the Gulf War, and through today's ongoing Global War on Terrorism, wherever and whenever our men and women are engaged in conflict and risking their lives fighting on the front lines, the Blue Grass Army Depot has been there.

The civilian employees of the Blue Grass Army Depot are amongst the thousands of often unsung heroes who have provided, and continue to provide, unwavering support for our nation's ongoing fight to defend and preserve democracy and freedom. Their work has ensured that our nation's joint war fighters are victorious, and sustains the reputation of the United States Armed Forces as the world's preeminent military.

The Blue Grass Army Depot and its workforce are to be commended for their service, dedication to duty, and loyalty to our nation. I join with a grateful nation in thanking them and wishing them the best in years to come.

It is my privilege to represent such an outstanding military installation and civilian workforce among my constituents in Kentucky's Sixth Congressional District, and to honor the Blue Grass Army Depot and its workforce before the United States House of Representatives.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BANNING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC CIGARETTES ON AIRPLANES ACT OF 2017

#### HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Banning the Use of Electronic Cigarettes on Airplanes Act of 2017. The bill prohibits the use of electronic cigarettes and vaping devices on commercial airplanes by including use of these devices within the definition of smoking. Smoking tobacco products on

commercial airplanes has been banned for years, but with the increase in use of electronic cigarettes and vaping devices in their place, it is necessary to update our laws to reflect this new nuisance and health risk on airplanes. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) issued a final rule in March 2016 banning the use of these devices on airplanes, but Congress should make a permanent, statutory change to include the use of these devices within the definition of "smoking." Last Congress, my bill received bipartisan support from the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and was added as an amendment to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reauthorization bill, the Aviation Innovation, Reform, and Reauthorization (AIRR) Act. The amendment was also included in the Senate's long-term FAA reauthorization bill.

Electronic cigarette use has increased over the last decade with the increased education of the general public about the dangers and public health threats caused by traditional cigarettes to smokers and nonsmokers alike. For example, between 2010 and 2011, e-cigarette use among adults doubled. Researchers and public health experts have voiced concerns over the use of electronic cigarettes because there are still so many unknowns about the chemicals these devices can produce. The American Lung Association (ALA) has cited many concerns about the lack of regulation of e-cigarettes because they are being marketed to the public while the potential harm from secondhand e-cigarette emissions is unknown. ALA has identified two studies that show formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, benzene, tobacco-specific nitrosamines, and other harmful irritants coming from e-cigarette emissions. In addition, the temperature of an e-cigarette can affect how harmful the chemicals are, but with no configuration standards, it is too difficult to uniformly assess the health effects of smoking e-cigarettes. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued a proposed rule in 2014 that would extend new regulatory authority to e-cigarettes by subjecting e-cigarettes to registration and product listing requirements, restrictions on marketing products prior to FDA review, and a prohibition on providing free samples as with traditional tobacco products.

It has been over 25 years since legislation was passed banning smoking on domestic flights in the United States. In the 1960s, the U.S. Surgeon General identified smoking as a cause of increased mortality and by 1986, the U.S. Surgeon General had named secondhand smoke a serious health risk. The National Academy of Sciences, in its report "The Airliner Cabin Environment: Air Quality and Safety," recommended a ban on smoking on all domestic commercial flights. The Association of Flight Attendants can be credited with urging the smoking ban due to the negative health impacts flights attendants suffered working in cramped, closed-off spaces when a third or more passengers smoked in-flight. Congress used this information to include an amendment authored by then-Representative DICK DURBIN (D-IL) in the Federal Aviation Act that made domestic flights of two hours or less smoke-free. By 1990, this smoking ban was extended to all domestic flights of six hours or less, and, in 2000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act made all flights to and from the United States smoke-free. All of this was done even in the face of the strong tobacco industry's opposition because of the undeniable health impacts of cigarettes and cigarette smoke. Many flyers do not remember a time without "No Smoking" signs located throughout a commercial airplane.

In 2016, DOT issued its final rule to prohibit the use of e-cigarettes on U.S. airplanes. Legislation is necessary to make this update applicable to all airlines, and permanent. Under current FAA policy, battery-powered electronic cigarettes, vaporizers, vape pens, atomizers, and electronic nicotine systems are prohibited in checked baggage, and the FAA recommends that such devices only be carried in the aircraft cabins because of safety issues.

The current statutory smoking ban applies to the smoking of tobacco products on all scheduled passenger flights and on scheduled passenger flight segments on foreign air carriers in the U.S. and between the U.S. and foreign countries, unless a waiver is granted based on bilateral negotiations. The Banning the Use of Electronic Cigarettes on Airplanes Act of 2017 will amend the statutory definition of smoking in 49 U.S.C. 41706 to include the use of electronic cigarettes, defined as "a device that delivers nicotine or other substances to a user of the device in the form of a vapor that is inhaled to simulate the experience of smoking."

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

#### THE CHARITY TRANSPARENCY ACT

**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 2001 the U.S. Government shut down the Texas-based Holy Land Foundation for its role in sending money to Hamas. But some of the Holy Land Foundation's employees are now working at 501(c)(3) "charities" that are leading the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement in the U.S. against Israel.

Charitable American donors have no way of knowing of the questionable histories of some of the employees of these charities before they donate. My bill, The Charity Transparency Act, will require organizations applying for 501(c)(3) status to disclose if any of their key employees once worked for such organizations.

It would require no new paperwork and give the IRS no new authorities. It would just require one more disclosure on the already existing IRS documents.

It would also not penalize any of these charities. It would simply protect charitable American citizens and arm them with the information they need to make better informed decisions regarding where they donate their hard earned money.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

And that's just the way it is.

DIANA ROGOZYAN

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Diana Rogozyan for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Diana Rogozyan is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Diana Rogozyan is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Diana Rogozyan for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### RECOGNIZING RAUL ORTIZ

**HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from my constituent Raul Ortiz, age 8, to President Trump on World Refugee Day.

DEAR PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP. Please receive a respectful greeting in my name and all the children and families that are part of LULAC's Child Refugees United for Freedom group. My name is Raul Ortiz and I come from Honduras. I want to express to you my fear for the situation of many refugees that have arrived to the United States of America seeking refuge. I must share with you our sad reality that we live in because our countries of origin are full of crime and violence. This is why our parents risked our lives to bring us to safety in the USA. Here we are safe and have hope to see another tomorrow.

Mr. President, we respectfully ask for your help, we ask you, a great man that is a responsible person dedicated to the USA, to please meet with us and listen to our stories and consider granting us protection.

Abraham Lincoln is my favorite president. He ran as president under the National Union Party which was the name used by the Republican party for the 1864 presidential election, during the Civil War. The Republican party at this time under President Lincoln was successful in abolishing slavery.

My favorite president Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves so I believe and have faith you President Trump can do the same thing with granting freedom to the Central American refugees just like me.

God Bless You President Trump and God Bless The USA!

Respectfully,

RAUL ORTIZ,  
8 yrs old.



# HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. JOHN A. SHANLEY

## HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. John Aloysius Shanley. John was a loving husband and father. He passed away peacefully on June 5, 2017, in the comfort of his home, surrounded by his family, after a hard fought battle against ALS.

John was known for his sense of humor, his youthful heart, and his successful business, P.G. Tire Inc. Known to his family as "PopPop," John is survived by his wife Marlene Shanley and four loving children Genevieve and Charles Hawk, Nicholle and Kenneth Simpson, Joseph and Natalie Shanley, and Marilyn Shanley, as well as his sister, Sharon Shanley of Las Vegas, NV. He has 7 grandchildren, Andrew Simpson, Ryleigh Simpson, Elizabeth Hawk, Colin Hawk, Maggie Shanley, Jack Shanley and Blaise Ingoglia.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Aloysius Shanley will be remembered as a humorous and humble man, beloved by his family and friends. I am very pleased to honor his life and legacy here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this most difficult time.

---

SAM KEATING

## HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sam Keating and his recent selection to the San Diego Padres in the 2017 MLB draft. Keating, a right-handed pitcher, was selected in the fourth round and has already signed with the organization.

Keating's high school career was one to be remembered as he led the Canterbury Cougars to back-to-back Class 3A championships. In his senior year, he went 11-1 on the mound with a 1.06 Earned Run Average and 93 strikeouts.

I would like to congratulate Keating for taking the first step into the professional realm. His hard-work and dedication are paying off, and I look forward to hearing about his successes in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING CAITLYN BAUDER, SADIE KRAUSE, MIGUEL ORTIZ, DEVAN RUDER, ASHTON SHOEMAKER, BRENNNA SYDOW, ATHENA TAYLOR, AND KYLE YAMADA

## HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize eight high school students who have been chosen to represent the state of Colorado as delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. The students are Caitlyn Bauder, Sadie Krause, Miguel Ortiz, Devan Ruder, Ashton Shoemaker, Brenna Sydow, Athena Taylor, and Kyle Yamada.

The Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders is an honors program that recognizes exceptional high school students who are pursuing careers as engineers, scientists, or technologists.

These students are the future leaders of the STEM fields and our country. Through their studies, they have embodied the meaning of hard work and perseverance to achieve their goals, and will advance science and technology for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize these students from the fourth district of Colorado for their hard work and service to our community. I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

---

## RECOGNIZING MR. ED WAITS

## HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a gentleman from my home state whose work in the area of respiratory care has undoubtedly saved countless lives.

Mr. Ed Waits spent four decades working many long hours every day to serve patients in North Central, Alabama.

Mr. Waits began his career in 1954 working in inhalation therapy at the Walker Oxygen Company. Waits would deliver oxygen tanks to local hospitals.

In 1958, one of the hospitals Waits delivered oxygen to, West End Baptist Hospital, offered him a fulltime position as an inhalation therapist. As part of this position, he also provided the same service for Highland Baptist Hospital.

Mr. Waits' workday began at 6:30 a.m. when most of us are just waking up. He would perform his duties at West End Hospital and then ride in a laundry truck to complete his days' work at Highland Baptist.

The job performed by Mr. Waits could at times be very grueling. If the elevator did not work, he would have to carry oxygen tanks, weighing between 75 and 100 pounds, up five flights of stairs slung over his shoulder. Mr. Waits also had to be on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week, as he was the only inhalation therapy employee. He performed this

non-stop service for four years before additional employees were hired.

In 1963, Mr. Waits became the first president of the Alabama Society of Inhalation Therapists. He has also received honorary doctorate degrees from Miles College and the American Pulmonary Medical Institute. He retired from Princeton Baptist Hospital in 1994.

Mr. Waits is also a veteran of our military. He served in the United States Navy from 1951 to 1955.

He is a true servant to his community, his state and to our country. This is why, for posterity's sake, his accomplishments should forever be enshrined.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Ed Waits for his sacrifice and hard work on behalf of so many Alabamians over the years and for being an example for younger generations to look up to.

---

ELIAS VIGIL

## HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Elias Vigil for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Elias Vigil is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Elias Vigil is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Elias Vigil for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

---

INTRODUCTION OF A BIPARTISAN RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR ADDRESSING THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT IN A CONCURRENT TRACK WITH THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN PEACE PROCESS AND COMMENDING ARAB AND MUSLIM-MAJORITY STATES THAT HAVE IMPROVED BILATERAL RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL

## HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bipartisan resolution supporting the concurrent-track approach to the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. I want to acknowledge and thank Representative ELIOT ENGEL, Ranking Member of the House Committee on

Foreign Affairs, and my friend and colleague across the aisle, Representative DAVID SCHWEIKERT, for introducing this resolution with me.

There is no reason to parse words: the Israeli-Palestinian conflict presents an immensely difficult challenge. There are no easy answers. Successive United States Presidential administrations have pursued peace agreements between the parties for over 30 years, from the 1982 Reagan Plan for Middle East Peace to the 1993 Oslo Accords, Camp David Summit, Clinton Parameters, Annapolis Conference, and efforts to restart the peace process under the Obama Administration. Today, it seems as if progress has ground to a halt.

The relationship between America and Israel is paramount. We stand with our ally and continue to support efforts to move the peace process forward, whenever and in any way possible. Despite lack of progress, Israel and some of her Arab neighbors have worked quietly and behind the scenes to improve bilateral relations in recent years. Common threats posed by Iran and the Islamic State have allowed for new limited dialogues to emerge. However limited they may be, these interactions present a new approach for improving the outlook of the Middle East.

The concurrent-track approach, sometimes referred to as the "outside-in" approach, encourages Arab and Muslim-majority states to improve bilateral relations with Israel, as Israel and the Palestinian Authority concurrently work to advance the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. Although there are rarely, if ever, easy solutions to challenges as complex as bringing lasting peace to the Middle East, Congress should encourage and support those states willing to engage in that endeavor.

The resolution expresses support for the concurrent track approach, and commends Arab and Muslim-majority states that have already taken steps to improve their bilateral relations with Israel. I, like nearly all of my colleagues in Congress, continue to support a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, negotiated between the State of Israel and the Palestinian Authority, and resulting in two states for two peoples, living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition. I believe this is the only way to ensure that both the Israeli people and the Palestinian people can have a sovereign homeland. The inability to achieve a two-state solution threatens the State of Israel's security and identity as the democratic homeland of the Jewish people, just as it impedes the well-being and self-determination of the Palestinian people.

Earlier this month, we marked the 50th Anniversary of Israel's Six-Day War and the anniversary of the re-unification of Jerusalem. For the 19 years Jerusalem was divided, Jews were forced from the Jewish Quarter and the Old City, barred from Holy sites, and Jewish cemeteries and synagogues were vandalized. In the days leading up to the six-day war, the armies of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria massed on Israel's borders, threatening the Jewish people with annihilation for the second time in just two decades. The Israeli people fought for their survival and achieved a miraculous victory. In reuniting the city, Jerusalem once

again became a place where people of all faiths can worship.

Despite this victory, the final status of Jerusalem and the safety of the State of Israel and its people, regardless of ethnicity or religion, will not be secured until peace is achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce this bipartisan resolution today, and urge its speedy consideration and passage by this body.

RECOGNIZING MASTER AT ARMS  
FIRST CLASS JOSEPH  
PELLICANO FROM PACE, FLORIDA

**HON. MATT GAETZ**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the incredibly heroic Master at Arms First Class Joseph Pellicano from Pace, Florida, who is stationed at Naval Air Station Whiting Field, for the role that he played in saving the life of young Kaysin Willis.

On January 16, 2017, MA1 Pellicano, while en route to work at NAS Whiting Field, drove upon a two-car accident and stopped to render aid. A small child had been injured in the incident and upon realization that the child was unresponsive and had no vital signs, MA1 Pellicano began CPR on the child.

He was able to successfully resuscitate the child, and then assisted the medical team as they prepared the child for transport to the local children's hospital. The child's injuries were extensive, yet Kaysin was able to make a full recovery and is now home with his family. This would not have been possible without the quick thinking and selfless initiative that MA1 Pellicano demonstrated on this day.

I would like to extend my gratitude to MA1 Pellicano for his valiant efforts that resulted in saving this young child's life. His exceptional character is evidenced by his courageous and extraordinary actions.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, and a grateful community, I am privileged to recognize Master at Arms First Class Joseph Pellicano for his bravery and thank him for his service.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS  
OF DANIELLE BERMUDEZ

**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Ms. Danielle Bermudez. Ms. Bermudez has been chosen as a Fulbright scholar, the first to ever be chosen from the University of California, Merced. Her accomplishment brings great pride to the Merced community and to all who have witnessed her hard work.

The idea behind the Fulbright Program began in 1945, when Senator J. William Fulbright introduced a bill to the United States Congress calling for the use of surplus war

property in order to fund the 'promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science.' President Harry S. Truman signed that bill into law in 1946 and Congress created the Fulbright Program. This international educational exchange program has fostered bilateral relationships, allowing both citizens and governments of other countries to work together with the United States and set joint priorities to shape the program's shared needs. Since the beginning of the program, there have been more than 360,000 Fulbright participants from the United States and other countries and Fulbright alumni from 14 countries have been awarded 57 Nobel prizes, 82 Pulitzer prizes, and 37 alumni have become heads of state or government.

The Fulbright program currently awards approximately 1,900 United States student grants annually in all fields of study. In March of 2017, Ms. Bermudez was selected as a Fulbright scholarship recipient. Ms. Bermudez is a fourth year doctoral student in the Interdisciplinary Humanities at the University of California, Merced. She was nominated for Outstanding Student Leadership in 2015, 2016, and 2017. She has also demonstrated an exceptional academic and professional record, outstanding personal qualifications, and language preparation among many other qualifications to receive this award. Additionally, she served as an intern for California Assemblymember Adam Gray in 2014. Ms. Bermudez shows her dedication and hard work as the first student from the University of California, Merced to ever receive a Fulbright scholarship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the achievements of Ms. Danielle Bermudez for receiving this prestigious award. I know she will continue to encourage the Fulbright program's goals of promoting mutual understanding among nations through her engagement in her host community and look forward to hear what else she will accomplish next.

IN HONOR OF FREEDOM HIGH  
SCHOOL'S ODYSSEY OF THE  
MIND WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP  
TEAM

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a group of students from Freedom High School, who recently won the Odyssey of the Mind World Championship on May 27, 2017. Leading up to this global competition in Michigan, the Freedom High School team won a Virginia Regional competition as well as the Virginia state championship, and these extraordinary achievements show how far dedication, hard work, and commitment to teamwork can take a group as they competed with some of the best student teams across the world.

The Odyssey of the Mind World Championship is a STEM-based scholastic competition in which students devise innovative solutions

to challenges, such as assembling vehicles and integrating them into timed skits. These problems and programs allow students to convert their ideas and knowledge into tangible results in a stimulating and competitive atmosphere. During the world championship, each team participated in three competitions, including a spontaneous problem solving challenge, a style competition, and finally a long term problem, which the team has worked on for 6 to 7 months.

Under the leadership of Coaches Bill and Judy Munley, Freedom High School's championship winning team consisted of seniors Michael Munley, Aditi Shukla, Manisha Kusuma, Apeksha Pradhan and juniors Virginia Campbell, Zander Rodriguez, and Sarana Adhikari. While the team has qualified for 5 world competitions in the past 10 years, this is the only Loudoun County team to ever win the championship at the global level.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Freedom High School's Odyssey of the Mind team for winning the Odyssey of the Mind World Championship and representing Virginia's 10th Congressional District with such distinction. I wish Bill, Judy, and the entire team the best in their future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF WE KAYAK  
GROSSE ILE ON THE DATE OF  
ITS SECOND ANNUAL BLESSING  
OF THE FLEET

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize WE Kayak Grosse Ile on the date of the organization's second annual Blessing of the Fleet. WE Kayak provides structured recreational activities accessible to all members of the Downriver community in the Grosse Ile's waterways.

Originally started in 2012, WE Kayak is a Grosse Ile-based organization that organizes weekly paddles available to the general public on the waterways in and around Grosse Ile, Michigan. The organization is active from Memorial Day through Labor Day, and has grown substantially from its initial group of six kayakers. Today, WE Kayak hosts several dozen members of the community each week to participate in exploring the waters while engaging with each other. The organization also hosts an annual Blessing of the Fleet, where WE Kayak, along with other members of the community, honor Kayakers who have passed and bless those who regularly go out on the water. This free community initiative has helped engage Grosse Ile residents while providing opportunities for physical recreation.

Initiatives like WE Kayak help bring the community together while allowing members to explore and appreciate the natural beauty around the Grosse Ile area. As the only organized public paddle on Grosse Ile, WE Kayak has played a key role in promoting physical activity and engagement while introducing new members of the organizations to a community of like-minded kayakers and nature enthusiasts. The group also serves as a forum for

individuals to exchange information about other water sports events in the area, and it is my hope that WE Kayak continues to provide access opportunities for recreation for all individuals in the Grosse Ile area in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring WE Kayak on the date of the organization's second annual Blessing of the Fleet. WE Kayak has helped individuals explore Grosse Ile's waterways and foster a strong community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE  
COALINGA POLICE DEPARTMENT

**HON. DAVID G. VALADAO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Coalinga Police Department, and honor the Ninetieth Anniversary of its founding.

In 1927, the Coalinga Police Department was established to serve and protect the City of Coalinga, California, located in the Pleasant Valley of Western Fresno County, and its 2,900 residents. At the time of its formation, the Department consisted of two officers and operated under Coalinga's first Police Chief, Walter Hayes. Since its humble beginnings, both the Police Department and the City of Coalinga have grown exponentially. Today, the Coalinga Police Department has a total of thirty-one sworn officers, a twenty-four hours a day dispatch center, and serves approximately 18,000 citizens.

While the Police Department has grown immensely in the last ninety years, its commitment to public safety has remained constant. The force has continued to provide a safe and peaceful environment in the city through effective and impartial law enforcement. From body camera implementation and advanced investigative techniques to cannabis regulation, the department strives to be on the cutting edge of law enforcement tactics and services. They are also committed to meeting the needs of residents and businesses through active participation and community partnerships. The Coalinga Police Department hosts annual community events including blood drives, animal vaccination clinics, and Christmas toy drives. The Department provides security detail services at Coalinga City and Chamber of Commerce events, such as the Coalinga Horned Toad Derby, an event that has brought visitors to the City for the past eighty-two years. This strategy encourages a stronger partnership between the community and the Police Department.

Additionally, the Coalinga Police Department prides itself on being the first Police Department in the State of California to have a female Police Chief. Chief Luella "Kay" Holloway was the first female law enforcement executive to be appointed by Governor Edmund G. Brown in 1975 to chair the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. In acknowledgement of the contributions made to ensure the safety and betterment of its local residents, the Coalinga Police Department

was presented with the Community Service Award from the Coalinga Chamber of Commerce. The Police Department has continued to exemplify extraordinary service to the People of Coalinga over the past nineteen years, and their bravery is worthy of recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Coalinga Police Department on their Ninetieth Anniversary and wish them another ninety years of success in serving the community.

CATHERINE WINCKLER

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Catherine Winckler for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Catherine Winckler is a student at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Catherine Winckler is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Catherine Winckler for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MINISTRY OF PASTOR ERASTUS AND ELECT LADY ANNIE PEARL GODFREY

**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2017*

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the 48th anniversary of Pastor Erastus Godfrey and his wife, Elect Lady Annie Pearl Godfrey, serving in the ministry.

Before his birth, Pastor Godfrey's mother received a prophetic work to name him Erastus, because she knew he would grow up to preach the gospel.

Pastor Godfrey was called into the ministry in 1969 at the Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church. After four years, he was called to be pastor at the Shiloh Baptist Church in Silverun, Alabama, for six years. He then became pastor of Union Baptist Church in Stewartville, Alabama, for 23 years.

On March 14, 2004, Pastor Godfrey founded the New Beginning Ministries in Sylacauga, Alabama, and still serves there today.

He received his biblical education at Shocco Springs in Talladega, Alabama and at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama.

*June 20, 2017*

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 163, Pt. 7

**9549**

Pastor Godfrey has been married to Elect Lady Annie Pearl Godfrey for over 50 years and is a second-generation minister.

He has three sons, one daughter and a daughter-in-law who have also been called

into the ministry. His wife is an inspiration to the church family at New Beginning Ministries.

Their children include: Kenneth Collins, Erastus Herbert Godfrey, Terry Fuller, Etta Taylor, Jeannette Godfrey, DeForest Godfrey and Mary Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Pastor Erastus and Elect Lady Annie Pearl Godfrey for their 48 years of service in the ministry.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 21, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 21, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### WORLD REFUGEE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was World Refugee Day, a day set aside by the United Nations to reflect upon those in crisis and dedicate ourselves to helping those we can help.

To mark this solemn occasion, today, the Judiciary Committee House Republicans will vote to slash refugee resettlement numbers, cut back aid to those fleeing violence and persecution for their religious or political beliefs, and make it harder for children fleeing violence, especially those from Central America, from receiving asylum from the richest, most powerful Nation in the world.

Tell me, how does that make America great again, Mr. Speaker?

According to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, there are more than 65 million people—a record number today—who have been forcibly displaced from their homes. More than 21 million are refugees. Eighty-six percent of the world's refugees are now finding refuge in the developing world,

with only 14 percent finding refuge in developed countries like the U.S. or European nations.

Worldwide, more than half of all refugees are children. So when anti-immigrant leaders, websites, and TV networks paint those fleeing the Middle East, Africa, and Asia as hardened jihadists, or those fleeing Central America as gangbangers and drug dealers, remember, most of them are just kids—little kids. That is what we are talking about, fleeing their country for their lives.

Mr. Speaker, America has, throughout our history, been a beacon of hope to refugees fleeing religious attacks, facing government intolerance and persecution, ethnic strife, or unsustainable poverty.

Beginning in the 1840s, when the potato crop disappeared because of a blight in Ireland, the Irish people were left starving. Over 8 million people in Ireland, 3 to 4 million of them faced starvation. About 1 million died mostly of starvation and disease.

Another 2 million came where?

To America.

According to a recent article in *The Irish Times*: “Panic had set in by the winter of 1846/47. People risked winter voyages across the Atlantic on unsanitary, unsafe ‘coffin ships.’”

The article continues: “People were placed in quarantine stations, or held onboard ships docked at ports.”

“Refugees experienced violent and racist reactions. Liverpool, Glasgow” . . . “Montreal, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia sought unsuccessfully to restrict entry” of the Irish.

A lot of this sounds familiar to me today when we discuss the Muslim ban that the courts have blocked and which motivated thousands of Americans to go to airports to demand that the United States honor its visas and honor its commitment to refugees, or as the House Judiciary Committee meets today, to punish children for fleeing for their lives.

Roughly 32 million Americans trace their roots to Ireland. That is about 10 percent of the U.S. population. And let's be clear, the British rulers over Ireland were not sending what they consider their best people. They were poor, they were uneducated, and U.S. politicians at the time said that they were sending rapists, murderers, and drunks, even as some, they assumed, were good people.

They were from a religion that threatened the United States. They were Catholics who were as foreign to

American Protestants, in some regards, as Muslims are today.

But who can imagine America without the Irish today?

You look down the list of generals, Presidents, Members of Congress, and every aspect of American society today, and we can all say, to some degree, we are Irish.

As House Republicans vote today to pass bills to keep out the wretched refuse of your teeming shores, as we pass laws to pull up the drawbridge and put a big “Do Not Enter” sign on the Statue of Liberty, I hope my Republican colleagues who can trace roots back to someone who came across the water and risked everything and bet their lives on the United States, I hope all of us will reflect on those ancestors as we deliberate laws and how we would have kept so many of them out.

His Holiness Pope Francis, who we all remember just spoke steps away from where I am at right now, reminded us to always follow the Golden Rule in all our deliberations. Pope Francis said just this past Sunday that the nations of the world should continue to welcome refugees; and each of us, as individuals, can learn a lot by meeting with, speaking with, and breaking bread with refugees.

His Holiness said: “. . . personal meetings with refugees can dissolve fears and distorted ideologies and become paths for growth in humanity.”

Mr. Speaker, I hope my Republican colleagues have been listening, as we have a Speaker who is both Catholic and Irish, but I fear they will not.

### OPIOID AND HEROIN ADDICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, prescription opioids and heroin addiction are ravaging our Nation, causing heartache and pain for millions of American families, and destroying our communities. This is no secret.

In my own home State of Illinois, opioids contribute to nearly 1,200 overdose deaths in 2016. Heroin played a role in those deaths of another 1,000 people, many of whom started with prescription drugs.

According to the Illinois Department of Public Health, more people die from opioid drug overdose than from homicide and motor vehicle accidents.

These aren't just numbers or statistics. The people battling addiction are moms and dads and neighbors and students. Addiction doesn't care about

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

your race, your gender, your income, your political leanings. It is an issue that affects everyone because it impacts every community and every person we love.

Congress took an important step last year in passing the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. This bipartisan legislation, which was signed into law, created a coordinated and balanced strategy for communities to tackle issues regarding prescription and opioid abuse in their communities.

Just last month, Congress voted to fund programs designed to prevent and treat opioid and heroin use. But the real leaders of this effort will be citizens in our local community. Many local police departments now offer drug drop boxes. Parents, especially, are on the front line of this issue and are responsible to educate our children about the dangers of prescription medication.

If you see someone struggling with addiction, please encourage them to speak to their local drug and alcohol commissioners.

Completely ending addiction nationwide may not be possible, but together we can save lives and begin to put hope back in our communities.

#### DO THE RIGHT THING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, when someone keeps something secret, it is often because it is embarrassing or negative or damaging or unsupportable.

Mr. Speaker, over in the Senate, Leader MCCONNELL and some of these Republican Senators are doing just that: crafting a healthcare repeal bill in secret because they know what it contains would deeply embarrass anyone who supports it openly.

They know it is going to be a hard sell to convince even their own Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to get behind a bill that even President Trump called mean. That was the House American Health Care Act to which he was referring. He called it mean for the harm it does to Americans.

They know it is going to be difficult in the Senate to convince Senators to support a bill that raises healthcare costs for working families and kicks millions of Americans off their coverage, including those who are covered by their employers; a bill that makes millions of individuals with preexisting conditions uninsurable and reinstitutes annual and lifetime limits; a bill that imposes an age tax on those between ages 50 and 64, increasing premium costs by as much as 800 percent; a bill that forces States to cut benefits and kick millions of people off Medicaid, whether it is next year, in 3 years, or in

7 years, those times that are to try to get by elections so that perhaps people will not be held accountable for voting for such draconian legislation.

Mr. Speaker, such a bill ought to be very embarrassing indeed, which is why Senator MCCONNELL, I believe, and his allies don't want anyone to see it until they are asked to vote on it.

We have a similar problem, of course, in the House.

Whatever happened to transparency, to openness, to reading the bills, to posting it for all to see in advance? Where are all those people who wanted everybody to read the bills and see the bills? Where are they today in demanding that bills be fully and thoroughly vetted, read, heard, and voted on?

It is no wonder even Republican Senators who haven't seen the bill are getting angry with their leader and those drafting it in secrecy.

Republican Senator RON JOHNSON said last week, Mr. Speaker: "I want to know exactly what is going to be in the Senate bill. I don't know it yet." And then he concluded: "It is not a good process."

And Senator MARCO RUBIO said: "The Senate is not a place where you can just cook up something behind closed doors and rush it for a vote."

But, Mr. Speaker, what we hear is exactly what is happening, cooking it up in secret and rushing it for a vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they are not the only ones who want to know what is in this bill. Millions of Americans are deeply worried about its contents.

Last week, I sat down with two courageous Americans who shared their personal healthcare stories with me. I want to thank them for doing so, and I want to share their stories today. Their names are Ola Ojewumi and Megan Foley.

Ola lives with a preexisting condition. As a young child, she received a heart and kidney transplant. She is also a cancer survivor. She is a young woman. She told me about how the Affordable Care Act saved her life. She was able to access affordable coverage because of the ban on denying coverage to those with preexisting conditions. Ola also told me how frightened she is that these protections could be taken away for her under the Senate's secret TrumpCare bill.

If it is enacted, Ola and others with preexisting conditions may not be able to access the coverage needed to keep them alive and healthy, or they may simply not be able to afford it.

When I spoke with Megan Foley, she shared her courageous story of struggling with mental illness and addiction. She told me how she overcame her addiction. Despite her recovery, before the Affordable Care Act came into effect, she was denied coverage again and again because her addiction was considered a preexisting condition. Those were difficult months, cutting

back on expenses and accruing debt just to pay for her medication until the Affordable Care Act kicked in and allowed for Megan to obtain coverage.

□ 1015

But she made it, and now, the law protects Megan and millions and millions of others like her struggling with addiction who were given a second chance.

At a time when this country is plagued, Mr. Speaker, with an unprecedented opioid addiction crisis, the Republican repeal bill is an insult to courageous Americans for whom recovery is a lifelong process and access to care is essential. They, and so many Americans, are now living with uncertainty and fear for their future.

Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my interviews with Ola and Megan on social media, and I encourage all Members of this House to sit down with their constituents and listen to their stories and hear about their concerns.

Americans deserve to know what is in the Senate's secret TrumpCare bill and how it would impact them and their loved ones. Americans deserve to know. Senators who represent those Americans need to know, and they have not seen it yet, yet there is some discussion that they may have to consider the bill as early as next week. Senators and Members of this House deserve to know.

End the secrecy. Pull back the curtain. Let us see what is in that bill that these Senators think is so embarrassing that it must be hidden from us all.

I will remind Republicans, both in the House and in the Senate, and the Republican President in the White House, that their party's control of our government is complete, and they will be held responsible for whatever happens to our healthcare system on their watch.

CBO tells us that 23 to 24 million people, as a result of the House bill, would lose their insurance; the preexisting conditions would be put at risk; and over \$800 billion would be cut from Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of us to listen to Americans, to hear how beneficial the Affordable Care Act has been. I hope they will listen to Ola. I hope they will listen to Megan and all those who are concerned for the future and not huddle in a secret backroom making decisions that will negatively impact millions and millions and millions of our fellow citizens.

Do the right thing. Do it for Ola. Do it for Megan. Do it for all of our citizens.

#### UNAUTHORIZED SPYING ON AMERICANS AND 702 REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, Americans' privacy is under attack, this time by the spying eyes of our own U.S. Government. And people across the U.S. are wondering what is this section 702 issue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, section 702 is a provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. We call it FISA. It permits government to monitor the communications of suspected foreign agents, including terrorists, and to find out, in that communication, if that foreign agent wants to hurt us.

However, sometimes these individuals under surveillance communicate with American citizens, and this surveillance allows the conversations of ordinary citizens to be recorded, and that includes text messages, emails, and the conversation itself.

But what many Americans don't realize is these secret communications are not destroyed by the intelligence agencies. They are kept and kept forever. In fact, the government stores this data, and often goes back into that data and searches it, without a warrant, in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution, for information on American citizens.

What we do with the foreign agents, hey, it is okay. But government then takes that information they have seized on Americans and then goes back and looks through it without a real warrant. That includes the IRS, the FBI. And they get the NSA to give those conversations on Americans, unrelated to the conversation with the terrorist, and they use that information to maybe prosecute them for some unrelated offense years later. Usually, this subsequent search is for reasons wholly unrelated to the original collection.

Essentially, the government uses this procedure to spy on Americans who may have done no wrong, and the search is not based on probable cause, not based on a real warrant from a real judge.

The National Security Agency is designed to keep a close watch on terrorists and foreign agents, not Americans. NSA surveillance is supposed to keep us safe from those foreign agents who wish to do us harm.

But before the Federal Government decides to invade the privacy of Americans, they should obtain a real warrant. Under current law, FISA courts, those are secret courts that operate in secret and issue secret warrants—I have got a whole issue problem with secret courts in this country anyway, based upon the history of the Star Chamber in England.

However, those secret courts allow government to search and collect that data, and the FISA courts almost always grant the requested warrant on the foreign agent.

Our Founders feared that a government powerful enough to commit un-

reasonable searches and seizures on Americans should be closely watched. That is why they crafted the Fourth Amendment, to protect our right to privacy. As a former judge, I heard issues on the Fourth Amendment every day. And let me read it again, especially for those folks in NSA.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, effects"—that would be conversations—"against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

That applies to the NSA. If they can get a warrant from a real judge based on probable cause to search that data on Americans, go for it. But they can't. They just seize the information and peruse it later and get information on Americans and then prosecute them.

This kind of reverse targeting on Americans is not what Congress intended under 702 of the FISA authorization bill. Technology may change, but our Constitution never changes, and spying on Americans just has to stop.

Americans should not be forced to sacrifice liberty and constitutional rights for security, especially for overreaching Federal bureaucrats.

Regardless of the result surrounding the alleged incidental capture of campaign officials' conversations, the American public must realize the implications of this little provision called 702. Reverse targeting of Americans without a search warrant based on the Fourth Amendment has got to stop. Can't do it.

But right now Congress has the ability to reform overreaching law as part of the larger FISA reauthorization process that will take place this year.

Opponents of 702, the concept that you can't spy on Americans, are wishing for what they call a pure reauthorization of FISA, without any new safeguards. They argue that these mass invasions of privacy will make us safer.

Those who preach we must sacrifice the Constitution on the altar of false security are wrong. We must never abdicate our rights because the national spy agency, NSA, demands it.

In fact, even a FISA court judge found that NSA analysts had been collecting searches that violate the procedures under FISA "with much greater frequency than had previously been disclosed to the court". The FISA court called this a very serious Fourth Amendment issue.

Well, no kidding. It is a violation of current law, but the NSA violates current law and spies on Americans.

After these findings were released and NSA was caught, the NSA pledged to stop the warrantless surveillance of Americans. But, Mr. Speaker, their promise is useless.

FISA and 702 must be fixed by inserting the specific language that prohibits reverse targeting on Americans without a valid search warrant. If government wants information on Americans, get a warrant.

Without clear and specific language, our intelligence agencies will continue these unconstitutional searches, even if they promise to end their procedure.

But we can't trust the NSA not to spy on Americans, so Congress needs to have an open debate on the spying of Americans and not reauthorize the FISA procedure unless we make sure that the American right of privacy is protected. Congressional action must be taken on this issue.

It is time to end spying on Americans. If you want to spy on an American, get a real warrant from the Fourth Amendment. Continue that surveillance of foreign nationals. That is a different issue. But you can't do both. You must protect the American right of privacy.

Congress has that obligation because that is our job to enforce the Fourth Amendment right of privacy.

And that is just the way it is.

#### CONTINUE PRAYING FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE SHOOTING IN ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, before I start, I just want to ask America to continue praying for our good friend, STEVE SCALISE, who was injured last week in the horrific targeting of Republican members of the congressional baseball team over in Alexandria. I had been there moments before the shooting started.

I want to ask America to continue praying for those in law enforcement that, every day, run toward the danger when we are fleeing the danger, to protect us, our families, and our property; two brave Capitol Hill police officers who helped stop an active assassin last week, Crystal Griner and David Bailey, wounded in the act of fulfilling their role; two congressional staffers, Matt Mika and Zack Barth, injured on that baseball field, just participating in America's pastime, the game of baseball, a charity game to raise money for inner city children.

It is tough. It is tough on Members of Congress. It is tough on our families and our staffs who are all questioning their security.

I just ask America to take a deep breath before you utter a word or write a Facebook post or send an email, make a phone call. Remember, Scripture says to take the log out of your own eye before you try to take the fleck out of someone else's, words that we should remember.



## THE LONGEST DAY

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the reason I came down to the well today is today is June 21. It is the summer solstice, the first day of summer. It is the longest day of the year, from sunup to sundown. And the Alzheimer's Association has picked today, the longest day of the year, to recognize and raise awareness toward and for Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month, the month of June.

I am wearing a purple tie today, and many are wearing purple in support of those impacted by Alzheimer's disease; more than five million people currently living with Alzheimer's disease in America, and it is the sixth leading cause of death in the U.S. These numbers are remarkable.

We passed recently, in the last Congress, the 21st Century Cures Act. It is now a law, and I pray that it will serve as a jump start on moving medical research and development closer to finding a cure for such a mysterious disease.

You know, this is a deeply personal issue with me. April of 2015, I lost my father to Alzheimer's. And as my family was going through struggling with my father's Alzheimer's and dementia, we found out that, in many cases, it is the caregivers who pass before the Alzheimer's patient because of the toll that Alzheimer's takes on the caregiver, hence, the name "the longest day." For many of those caregivers, dealing with an Alzheimer's loved one is a long day, a lot of repetition, a lot of forgetfulness. We see our Alzheimer's loved ones doing things, saying things that they never would have done or said in their right mind.

Alzheimer's is something that needs to be on our minds today, the longest day. The Alzheimer's Association needs to be supported. Alzheimer's research needs to be supported by Congress, by government at all levels so we can find a cure for this and end Alzheimer's.

Today, the longest day, I ask America to join me in thinking about those Alzheimer's patients, those families and caregivers, the Alzheimer's Association, and let's end Alzheimer's. We can do that. We can do that, America. The longest day.

□ 1030

## EXPAND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR THOSE EXPERIENCING EMOTIONAL TRAUMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week's shooting in Alexandria left our friend and colleague Mr. STEVE SCALISE badly wounded. Two brave U.S. Capitol Police officers and a young congressional staffer were also

injured. We continue to pray for their quick and their full recovery.

I know that other Members, other staff members, their friends, their families have been affected by this, too. Too often, after a shooting or some other traumatic event, we focus on those injuries that are physical, the ones we can see, while forgetting about those injuries we can't see.

I continue to practice psychology in the Navy at Walter Reed Hospital in Bethesda, where I work with veterans who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD, and traumatic brain injury. These veterans come back from witnessing traumatic events while in combat, and some have come close to committing suicide. These brave men and women fight every day against the horrific images that replay in their minds. The wound is invisible; the damage is often long term. They can and do recover with help.

Since last week, I have thought about other groups who witness trauma in their homes and in their neighborhoods. These are the forgotten ones: young kids in Chicago who have become desensitized to the sound of a gunshot or the sounds of police sirens throughout the night, victims of sexual assault on college campuses and elsewhere, children who witness domestic abuse, and youth in foster care.

Most youth in foster care have traumatic family histories and life experiences, including their removal from the birth family, resulting in an increased risk for mental health disorders. A recent study published in Pediatrics found that children placed in foster care were three to five times more likely to suffer from mental health problems such as depression and attention deficit disorder than children who were never in foster care.

Another study revealed that PTSD was diagnosed 60 percent of the time in sexually abused children and 42 percent of the time in physically abused children. A staggering 18 percent of foster children have never been the primary victim of abuse, yet they still suffer from PTSD probably because they witnessed domestic or community violence.

The American Academy of Pediatrics Healthy Foster Care America initiative identifies mental and behavioral health as the "greatest unmet health need for children and teens in foster care." And since most of these kids are not receiving mental health treatment, their problems carry on into adulthood.

Adults who formerly were placed in foster care, known as foster care alumni, have disproportionately high rates of emotional and behavioral disorders; 21.5 percent of foster care alumni suffer from PTSD compared to just 4.5 percent of the general population.

Each year more than 20,000 young people age out of foster care without being ready to live independently. Dis-

charged from care without social support or assistance, these youth are at higher risk for drug use and mental illness, depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress, and others. Too often they experience higher rates of unemployment, homelessness, and dependence on public assistance programs.

A lack of a comprehensive mental health screening of all children entering out-of-home care and the need for more thorough identification of youth with emotional and behavioral disorders contribute to these dismal statistics. As well, insufficient youth access to high-quality mental health services highlights our Nation's shortage of providers, in that half the counties in America have no psychologists, no psychiatrists, no clinical social workers, or workers who are licensed as substance abuse providers.

Given the evidence from studies indicating that children in care have significant developmental, behavioral, and emotional problems, quality services for these children are an essential societal investment.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the House yesterday took up legislation to address this important issue. H.R. 2847, the Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act, expands and improves the John H. Chafee Independence Program, which helps current and former foster care youth achieve self-sufficiency. Specifically, the bill will widen the age range of foster youth who can receive assistance under the program.

I am proud to support this bill and will continue to shed light on those who suffer from trauma, who, as a consequence, suffer from either PTSD, depression, or other emotional sequelae. These bills we voted on will continue to give our foster children both help and hope.

## PROMOTING TECHNICAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, while meeting with Kansas farmers during wheat harvest, I visited with a family where one spouse farmed full time and the other worked from home, an increasingly common arrangement, especially in the tough farm economy we have today. But at the moment, a reliable broadband connection is out of their reach.

To keep and grow these jobs in our rural areas, we must make smart infrastructure investments that connect our rural residents: investments that don't duplicate what private enterprise has done, and investments that will carry far into the future.

For most businesses, including agribusiness, broadband services allow companies to access the global electronic marketplace. For consumers,

broadband allows people to connect via social media, to download apps and stream videos, and to manage everything from a bank account to a college application. Beyond just access to resources, building out broadband in rural areas increases the quality of life for most citizens and promotes job creation and economic development.

As you think about infrastructure and technology, Mr. Speaker, and as the Small Business Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade hears testimony on the topic this week, I encourage my colleagues to keep in mind the value of our small rural telecom providers that connect rural Americans with the rest of the world and make every effort to connect rural consumers and businesses with a wide array of services.

Mr. Speaker, the House will take up the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. Education supported by career and technical education programs are vital to addressing gaps in workers' skills and employee needs. Employers across the Nation and in my district in Kansas continue to stress the need for well-trained workers, often citing the lack of workers as a key constraint for their own growth.

Luckily, there are great educational programs in my district. I am so proud that many community colleges and technical colleges offer 2-year degrees in technical education that lead to high-paying, steady jobs across Kansas.

About 30 FFA students recently visited me on Capitol Hill. They talked about their desire to enter a wide array of careers and trades. Their pride in the work they are pursuing is contagious. H.R. 2353 seeks to align CTE programs and in-demand industries, while allowing local programs more flexibility to address the needs of local labor markets.

The bill further highlights the importance of employability skills to student access. Career and technical education is foundationally important to economic growth and innovation. These are the jobs that sustain our economy. We must always keep this curriculum at the top of our minds as we look to preparing our students for success and our economy for stability.

I look forward to voting in favor of H.R. 2353 and ask my colleagues to do the same.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO PENNSBURY HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL TEAM ON WINNING STATE TITLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pennsbury High School baseball team

on winning their first State title on June 16, 2017.

After withstanding a rain delay of nearly 3½ hours, the Pennsbury Falcons triumphed over District 3 Dallastown in the PIAA Class 6A final at Penn State University. Thanks to Nick Price's single in the bottom of the seventh, the Falcons avoided extra innings and emerged on top, winning the game 1-0.

Pennsbury ended the season on 13 straight wins. Their pitching staff gave up one run in the playoffs, and zero runs in the last 30 innings. Billy Bethel was 4-0 with 0 earned runs in 27 innings in the district and State playoffs.

Mr. Speaker, it was Michael Jordan who said: "Talent wins games, but teamwork and intelligence win championships." The Pennsbury Falcons are something special, led by 13 seniors and Head Coach Joe Pesci. They should be extremely proud—not only for their accomplishments on the field, but also the pride that they brought to their families, to their school, and to the entire Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the individual names of the PIAA 6A Championship Pennsbury High School Falcon baseball team.

R.J. Huth, Jake Martell, Christian Buchler, Gary Minnes, Vaughn Ward, Alan Wolf, Josh Tesarek, Max Crown, Bryan Nagy, Justin Ward, Ryan McCarty, Josh Arruda, Alec Wilson, Nick Price, Tommy Erickson, Shane Ostrowsky, Nate Derry, Ben Spadea, Justin Massiello, Kyle Dear, Dave Murphy, Billy Bethel, Tyrone Hodges Jr, Alex Ritter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, these young men have shown us what success can look like on the baseball field, and I am confident that they will succeed in all of their future endeavors, continuing to make all of us in Bucks County proud.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM CHAD MULDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a friend and an American hero.

Chief Special Warfare Operator William Chad Mulder was a Navy SEAL and a highly decorated combat veteran receiving, among other honors, three Bronze Stars with Valor. He was a brother; he was a husband; he was a father; and he was a friend. William Chad Mulder, or "Bill," as his friends knew him, concluded his mission here on this Earth June 9, 2017.

If anybody was ever born for battle, it was Bill Mulder. He seemed to come hardwired with a soldier's spirit. All who knew him felt safer on account of his service to our country. Bill was the ultimate warrior.

Those of us who grew up with Bill in my hometown of Plainview, Texas, also

knew him as the epitome of a Plainview Bulldog. He was tenderhearted, but he was tough. He was as caring as he was courageous, and he was as fun-loving as he was fearless.

To his wife, Sydney: Thank you for loving Bill so well.

To his children: His tender heart and his warrior spirit will live on through each of you.

We are praying for all of you, and on behalf of Plainview High School, the class of 1989, and all of us who were fortunate enough to call Bill our friend, we are proud of you, Bill. You served with distinction and honor.

Thank you for dedicating your life to keeping us safe. We will miss you, buddy.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at noon.

#### PRAYER

Rabbi Hershel Lutch, MEOR Foundation, Baltimore, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray this day for wisdom, humility, courage, and Your beneficence.

We pray that You endow the distinguished Members of this House with the wisdom to develop legislation that advances the noble aims of our Nation and the honorable needs of her citizens.

Lord, we pray that You grant us humility to know that we are Your subjects and it is Your children for whom we toil.

We pray for steadfast courage to champion justice with fortitude and to battle tyranny with vigor.

O Lord, we pray this day that Your blessings of safety, success, and serenity rest on each Member, staff, and security officer of this House, and we pray that we might make continued room for Your presence in our hearts and in the soul of our great Nation.

Gracious God, we thank You today and every day for the profound gift that these United States represent in our lives. Both for those here at home and for people around the world, America stands as a beacon of hope and leadership in times of challenge and conflict.

May God bless this House of Representatives and may God bless the United States of America.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING RABBI HERSHEL LUTCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend, Rabbi Hershel Lutch, and to thank him for reading the opening prayer here on the House floor today.

Rabbi Lutch has devoted his life to working for the Jewish community in the United States and around the globe.

I met Rabbi Lutch on a trip to Israel that he and his organization, Aish HaTorah, helped to coordinate. That special trip showed me firsthand how our ally in Israel fights to survive and thrive every day.

In addition to his work for Aish HaTorah, Rabbi Lutch is the CEO of the MEOR Foundation, an organization that strives to inspire Jewish students on college campuses to learn more about their history and heritage.

In his personal life, Rabbi Lutch is a husband and a father and a son. He is an asset to his community and our country, and I am pleased we could hear from him on the floor today.

Thank you, Rabbi, for blessing us here today and for your continued dedication to the Jewish people and to people of all faiths. It is an honor to know you.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### HONORING ELSIE FIGUEROA JOHNSON

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Elsie Johnson, who passed away last week at her Raleigh home.

Elsie was born in Puerto Rico to Gilbert and Maria Figueroa, and it was there during World War II that she met her husband, Carl Johnson, a North Carolinian and a U.S. Navy sailor stationed at Roosevelt Roads Naval Base.

Elsie and Carl lived the American Dream. Together, they started a small business, a motor shop, which grew into a franchise automobile dealership in New Bern, North Carolina, and, under the leadership of their son, David, now spans dealerships from Maryland to Florida. David learned from his parents the value of hard work and excellent customer service.

Elsie was a woman of incredible faith in God. She was strong, wise, and honest. Mr. Speaker, she made a difference and she leaves a legacy.

May God bless her family.

#### NATIONAL ASKING SAVES KIDS DAY

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today, June 21, is National Asking Saves Kids Day, or ASK Day.

Every 6 days in our country, a child under the age of 15 dies from an accidental gunshot. Each year, more than 600 children sustain nonfatal injuries from an unintentional gunshot, and 80 percent of all unintentional firearm deaths of children under the age of 15 occur in a home. This is a national crisis, and we need to stop it.

Since 2000, the ASK Campaign has encouraged parents to ask before their child visits another home whether there is an unlocked gun in the House.

Today is the first day of summer, the season when kids spend more time at a friend's house, so later today I will be introducing a resolution to officially designate June 21 as National ASK Day, to promote children's health and gun safety.

This is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. This is an issue important to every family all across our country. Let's get the job done and do something that will save the lives of children all across our country. Just ask.

#### NATIONAL POLLINATOR WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Pollinator Week, and it is a time when we encourage the protection of pollinator

species, such as honeybees, native bees, birds, bats, and butterflies as essential partners of farmers and ranchers in producing food.

These pollinators are vital to keeping items like fruits, nuts, and vegetables in our diets.

As vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I know that healthy pollinator populations are critical to the continued economic well-being of rural America and our U.S. economy as a whole.

It is important to recognize how critical it is to protect the health of pollinators and celebrate the significance that they play in our everyday lives.

The number of honeybee hives has declined from 6 million in the 1940s to about 2.5 million today. We need to increase those habitats.

American farmers have no better friends than the honeybee. More than one-third of U.S. crops require pollination.

As someone who has a beehive in his backyard, I fully support efforts to raise awareness and keep our pollinators buzzing for generations to come.

#### SENATE REPUBLICANS ARE CRAFTING THEIR HEALTHCARE BILL IN SECRET

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Senate Republicans are continuing to craft their healthcare bill, TrumpCare, in complete secrecy, behind closed doors, no hearings, no bill text, no transparency whatsoever, and they expect to bring this bill to the floor next week.

The bill is secret, but it is pretty clear why they are keeping this legislation secret: because it is a lousy piece of legislation and the American people reject it because it takes away healthcare from 23 million Americans. For those who are fortunate enough to have healthcare, they will pay more for worse care. You will pay an age tax if you are an older American just to have access to healthcare.

Even President Donald Trump says this healthcare bill is mean. And let's just face the obvious. If Donald Trump says something is mean, you have got a real problem.

This legislation should go through the process of open debate and dialogue, not be crafted in secret because it is such a bad piece of legislation that the people offering it are embarrassed for the folks in America to know what it says. We have to shut this down.

#### HONORING SAILORS LOST AT SEA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the USS *Fitzgerald* collided with a cargo vessel in the Sea of Japan on Saturday, resulting in the loss of life of seven patriotic sailors. Each of the deceased sailors was dedicated in the service to their Nation and exemplified the U.S. Navy's motto, "Not for self but for country."

As the grateful father of an orthopedic surgeon currently serving in the United States Navy, the sailors and their families are in my thoughts and prayers.

May we never forget these sailors: Shingo Douglass, 25, of California; Noe Hernandez, 26, of Texas; Ngoc Huynh, 25, of Connecticut; Xavier Martin, 24, of Maryland; Gary Rehm, Jr., 37, of Ohio; Dakota Rigsby, 19, of Virginia; Carlos Sibayan, 23, of California.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of former State Representative Skipper Perry of Aiken, South Carolina, Aiken Chamber of Commerce "Man of the Year."

#### DO NOT REPEAL THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the last month, Republican Senators have worked in secrecy on a bill that will repeal the Affordable Care Act. Now they are preparing to vote on that bill next week without any public hearings, no debates, no open forums. Instead, the Senate Republican majority have failed to be transparent with their constituents and the American people. No one knows what is in the bill.

Based on the last CBO score, we know that TrumpCare will lead to 23 million more Americans uninsured and gut protections for Americans with preexisting conditions and force hard-working Americans to pay higher costs for less care.

Mr. Speaker, in the words of President Trump, this bill is a mean bill. Even our former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, has said to slow down.

Why must this bill be so secretive? Because our colleagues across the aisle know that the more light that is shed on their true intentions, the more people will realize this is not a healthcare bill at all, but a massive tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, and it will be paid for by our elderly and our poorest constituents.

Mr. Speaker, that bill is a bad bill.

#### REMOTE AREA MEDICAL

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this morning I met, once again, with representatives from Remote Area Medical, its founder and president, Stan Brock, and its leaders, Jeff Eastman and Anabel Evora.

Remote Area Medical, also known as RAM, is an organization that helps medical professionals volunteer their services to our Nation's neediest.

Over its 32 years, RAM has provided free healthcare to almost 1 million people over the course of 862 weekend events so far. Their largest clinic was in Los Angeles, where over 7,000 people showed up to receive free dental care, eyeglasses, women's health services, and other free medical services.

Unfortunately, only 12 States currently allow RAM to host these free clinics with volunteer medical professionals from all over the country. That is why I introduced H.R. 860, the HEALTHIER Act, so that people nationwide can have access to free healthcare clinics like RAM's.

RAM is willing to provide these free healthcare services to several million more people across the Nation if only we will allow them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Stan, Anabel, Jeff, and all the others who work with RAM for their great work, and I urge my colleagues to help to support my bill, the HEALTHIER Act, to help many more people receive free medical care.

#### HOW TRUMPCARE WILL AFFECT AMERICANS

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I worked in healthcare for a decade. I have seen up close how healthcare impacts families. That is why I began a short video series that we call "Hear from the Heartland". In this, I listen to families about how TrumpCare would affect them.

I have spoken most recently with a woman named Anastasia. She has a little boy named Gryphon. They are from a town called Elizabeth, Illinois, just a small town.

Gryphon was born with cerebral palsy, and because of TrumpCare, Gryphon's family might not have anywhere to turn for affordable coverage and would be at risk of reaching their lifetime limits on their insurance.

Anastasia said it best when she said that her son's preexisting condition was simply being born.

Whether it is at a grocery store or small business, I hear it: people talking about their grave concerns about TrumpCare and what it would do to them.

I want us to work together on healthcare and make sure that we focus on lowering the costs for American families, but, instead, take a look

at this. TrumpCare would raise costs, it would rip health insurance away from 23 million Americans, and it is so bad that, in the Senate, they are hiding their bill away. That is not what we were elected to do.

I want to work with my colleagues to improve the healthcare that we deliver to American families.

□ 1215

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD UNDERWOOD

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Richard Underwood, a veteran, a member of our Nation's Greatest Generation, an educator, and this is his 90th birthday.

Richard was born in Korea to his Presbyterian missionary parents and was a natural native speaker of the Korean language. After the attacks on Pearl Harbor, he was repatriated from Japanese-held Korea and attended high school in Brooklyn, New York, before enlisting in the U.S. Army and joining the Office of Strategic Services. In World War II, he served behind Soviet Russian lines in Korea and the liberation and division of Korea.

After his service in World War II, he returned to the United States, only to reenlist in the Army following North Korea's invasion of South Korea. As an interpreter in the Korean war, Richard and as his brother helped interpret peace talks at the end of the war.

After this military career, Richard returned to Korea in 1957 to head the America Korea Foundation; and in 1962, he joined the Korean mission of the Presbyterian Church and was assigned to the Seoul Foreign School as its principal and, later, headmaster.

Richard currently lives in Urbana, Illinois, with his wife of 65 years, Carol.

Richard, happy birthday, and thank you for your years of selfless service and sacrifice to this Nation.

#### SENATE VOTE ON HEALTHCARE

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, Republicans say they want a healthcare system that cuts costs and covers more Americans, yet this bill does no such thing.

Right now, Senate Republicans are having a backdoor meeting about this bill. I may be new to Congress, but I have been around politics long enough to know that you don't hide something that you are proud of.

Right now, they are keeping a bill that would impact the lives of millions a secret. They refuse to let those same

millions of people weigh in on the process.

What do we have to lose? In this equation, we have a lot to lose: 23 million Americans stand to lose their healthcare. I will say that again: 23 million stand to lose their healthcare. They are veterans, seniors, students, children, young and old. We all have a lot to lose.

I have said it before; I will say it again. There is a big difference between campaigning and governing. It is time to govern.

Philadelphians deserve a healthcare bill that guarantees quality, affordable care. Now is the time to resist. Together we will speak up and speak out to make our voices heard loud and clear. Philadelphians have not forgotten healthcare. We know we have a lot to lose.

The President talks about putting the country first, but this healthcare bill does no such thing. American people deserve better. Together we will fight back and build stronger neighbors block by block.

#### ALZHEIMER'S & BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of June as Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness Month and to highlight the need for continued investment, innovation, research, and lifesaving cures for diseases like Alzheimer's that affect every family and every neighborhood in America.

Right now, more than 5 million Americans are living with this terrible disease, with someone new developing symptoms every 66 seconds. Studies have shown that number could rise as high as 16 million people by 2020.

This year, the cost of treating Alzheimer's and other dementias will cost Americans nearly \$260 billion. By 2050, estimates are that those costs will rise to more than \$1.1 trillion. To put that in perspective, as a nation, we are only spending slightly more than \$30 billion, total, in researching cures for not only Alzheimer's, but cancer, heart disease, Parkinson's, diabetes—literally, all other diseases combined.

So this month serves not only to raise awareness about Alzheimer's, but also for us to renew our commitment to research. Mr. Speaker, we must find a cure for the millions of Americans struggling with Alzheimer's, and it is up to us to provide the resources to do it.

#### STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago, Puerto Rico held a vote on its future political status. Although the ballot was not preapproved by the U.S. Department of Justice as envisioned by a 2014 Federal law, the ballot was fair. It included Puerto Rico's three valid options: statehood, nationhood, and the current territory status. Each option was accurately described.

In our democracy, only those who cast ballots are counted, and those who voted in Puerto Rico overwhelmingly chose statehood. It is now up to Puerto Rico's elected officials, especially its Governor and Delegate in Congress, to determine how best to move forward. They can count on my full support.

As I see it, in the wake of this vote, the question is not whether but, rather, when Puerto Rico will become a State. After 119 years, it is well past time for the U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico to have the same rights and responsibilities as their fellow citizens living in Florida and in other States.

Puerto Rico has made countless contributions to this Nation for generations. It has earned its own star on the American flag.

#### CONGRATULATING CARLY CLAUCHERTY

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carly Claucherty for being named a Presidential Scholar in Career and Technical Education.

Carly recently graduated from Springport High School and was nominated for her outstanding work in their CTE agriscience program. She is one of just 20 students from around the country to receive this distinguished award.

In high school, Carly was active in Springport's Future Farmers of America chapter, served as president of the National Honor Society, and was involved in student council. This fall, Carly will be attending Michigan State University, where she tentatively plans to study crop and soil sciences.

Carly's selection as a CTE Presidential Scholar puts her in an elite group, but I suspect it is just a starting point for many more exceptional things to come.

Mr. Speaker, career and technical education provides valuable hands-on experience, and this week we will be voting for strengthening these important programs to help more students find their sweet spot, just like Carly did.

#### HONORING NAVY SEAMAN BOBBY TEMPLE

(Mr. BOST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Navy Seaman Bobby Temple, a 19-year-old who died during the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. He was one of 400 sailors who lost their lives aboard the USS *Oklahoma* and whose remains were buried in a mass grave.

In 2015, the Navy started a project to identify each of the remains and bring closure to the families after 75 years. Bobby's bravery was honored during a memorial service in O'Fallon, Illinois, last week before his remains were laid to rest in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Honolulu, Hawaii.

As a veteran myself, it is with heavy heart that I honor Bobby's heroic service and pray God's blessing for his peaceful rest.

#### REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL IS A DISASTER

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we hear the Senate is finally releasing a bill, a bill that would, sadly, take away healthcare from millions of Americans. Apparently, this bill will go straight to the Senate floor without a hearing, without a markup, without the opportunity for any public input.

This Republican healthcare bill is a disaster. It removes guarantees of coverage that the Affordable Care Act created, allowing States to determine health insurance options and discriminate against people with preexisting conditions.

Under the Republican plan to replace the Affordable Care Act, Colorado, alone, will lose billions of dollars of funding. Coloradans will no longer be covered by Medicaid, leaving many more people uninsured and a further burden on the rest of us, driving up our rates because we have to cover the uninsured. Even Colorado schools would be affected because many schools serve as Medicaid providers to students with disabilities, and they would lose that funding.

While the Affordable Care Act isn't perfect, I strongly oppose this Republican plan to take away insurance coverage and raise rates for Coloradans. Not only is the bill disastrous, the secretive process undermines the institution of Congress and the American people that have elected every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to oppose the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

#### SUPPORT DEFERMENT FOR ACTIVE CANCER TREATMENT ACT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Representative ED PERLMUTTER and I will be introducing the Deferment for Active Cancer Treatment Act.

In 2017, more than 1.6 million Americans will be diagnosed with cancer, and many of them are currently repaying their student loans. For these individuals, a cancer diagnosis goes beyond the exhaustive treatment and increased medical expenditures and often leads to unemployment or underemployment. As a response to this growing problem, I have introduced the Deferment for Active Cancer Treatment Act.

This commonsense bill will enable cancer patients to defer payments on their public student loans while actively receiving treatment without interest accruing during this difficult period, helping them, thusly, to avoid defaults. This measure will also help lenders by empowering borrowers to continue repaying their public loans after their treatment ends, leading to fewer defaults.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join Mr. PERLMUTTER and me in standing with cancer patients throughout our Nation and supporting the Deferment for Active Cancer Treatment Act.

#### DON'T DISMANTLE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the ACA and all it has done to protect the health of our country's young people.

As we gather today, everyone seems to be analyzing yesterday's elections results. Other folks have taken a deep dive to analyze whether or not Russia elected our President. And as all of this is happening, the Senate has been meeting in secrecy to dismantle the Affordable Care Act that, for millions of young people and millions of young Americans, has been a lifesaver. Since its enactment, the ACA has cut uninsured rates for Americans age 18 to 34 by more than 40 percent.

Guided by political expediency instead of principle, my Republican colleagues are jamming this bill through an approval process without hearings or input from healthcare professionals and with no regard to millions of Americans whose lives will be affected by it. This is a shocking breach of our constituents' trust.

The ACA lifted a heavy burden off the shoulders of millions of Americans, and now is not the time to kick these individuals to the curb. We are better than that, America.

#### COMMEMORATING AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am proud once again to rise and join in commemorating June 20, 2017, as American Eagle Day and to celebrate the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as the national symbol of the U.S. by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress. The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of freedom and the democracy of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the eagle have played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and culture of the United States.

The bald eagle's habitat exists only in North America. I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating June 20, 2017, as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1873, ELECTRICITY RELIABILITY AND FOREST PROTECTION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1654, WATER SUPPLY PERMITTING COORDINATION ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 392 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 392

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment

sources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment

the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin the rule on the two measures that are before us today, let me just make a couple of comments that have come to mind in light of the events over the last week.

Mr. Speaker, you may know that this is the first formal debate that we have had as a legislative body since last Wednesday morning's shooting. I think it is appropriate that we take a minute to reflect and remember those who were injured and are still struggling to recover from their injuries as well as those who did not receive physical injuries on last Wednesday morning but who are still recovering.

Let me also say, if I could be so presumptuous, Mr. Speaker, I believe that perhaps some people in the United States look to us here in Congress—their Representatives—and look and see how we act towards one another and how we conduct ourselves in our interaction with each other. Let me just say that if we are disrespectful to each other, others may see that and think that it is okay; that if Congress can be that way to themselves, maybe we can act that way, too. They may not even realize that. It may be just a subconscious thing.

I ask how can we expect others to have a high opinion of us if we don't even show each other the respect that we should and that we deserve?

I believe that we must all remember that we are—before we are Republicans, before we are Democrats or Independents—all Americans. We are all here trying to do what is right, what is right for our country, certainly

what is right for our constituents, and we shouldn't say that someone is not here for those purposes.

I don't know your district, Mr. Speaker, and I might say that you don't know mine. So let's argue, which is what we are here for. As ugly as sometimes it can be, that is our job, to debate on the merits of ideas. But it is not our job to win a debate by degrading the ones who are making the arguments against. I think we all have this obligation to win debates or to argue debates on the merits of the issue. Last Wednesday reminded me that it is up to us, if we want changes, to make them and to begin them here in this body.

I was heartened in our meeting as a Congress in the auditorium over at the Capitol Visitor Center that there were several Members asking for a change in tone—a change in tone in how we interact with each other. It is important that we act civilly, that we be polite, and that we be respectful—kind of like how we treat each other on the journey over here from our offices in the elevators and in the hallways.

I would assert that this is also something that is the responsibility of our President, our country's leader, someone who can set the tone for our country, someone who can describe our hopes and our dreams and help us aspire to reach those things. It is also the responsibility of our media and for those advocacy groups that we all have and that we all work with. It is up to our parties. I think it is up to every single American.

We need to rediscover the faith that we should have in each other, our respect for each other and those bonds that make us one nation under God.

Now, it is simple to state, but how do we accomplish this?

It can start right here on this floor. Say something positive. We all call each other lady and gentleman. We all start off that way, and then sometimes the gloves come off.

I can assert to you that not every idea that is presented here is all good or all bad.

What is the risk of acknowledging a good part of a larger idea even if you may disagree with that larger idea?

I believe we have some very articulate people in this body who can figure out quite easily how we can accomplish that.

We shouldn't impugn the motives of others. We don't assign blame. We don't get personal. In fact, if you look in the rules that were adopted by this Congress, in section 363 of Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice, it says: "The consequences of a measure may be reprobated in strong terms; but to arraign the motives of those who propose to advocate it is a personality, and against order."

So it says in no uncertain terms that we should not make this personal. We

can object without being objectionable, and maybe—just maybe—others will see this and discover a tone that we need and a change in America. I believe that we can start this right here, today, with our very first debate right now.

Will we agree on everything?

Absolutely not. In fact, this is where our disagreements should show the most. We are duty-bound to shape legislation by pointing out weaknesses but also by accentuating strengths. Mr. Speaker, every debate, every speech on the floor or in committee, our interactions with the media, in townhalls, or press releases, we are being listened to and being watched. I hope that we can change our tone and begin to change the tone in the United States of America.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 392, providing for consideration of two important bills: H.R. 1873, which is the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act; and H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act.

This combined rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1873 under a structured rule, making three amendments in order, all of which were submitted by Democratic Members of our Chamber. H.R. 1654 will also be considered under a structured rule, with one Democratic and one Republican amendment made in order.

H.R. 1873 will help ensure reliable electric service and reduced wildfire hazards, which can result from inadequate vegetation management near power line rights-of-way on Federally owned and operated lands.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several decades there have been numerous electricity outages as well as incidents of wildfires due to contact between power lines and trees on Federal lands.

In 1996, my home State of Washington was impacted when three power lines in the Pacific Northwest sagged onto overgrown trees, leading to a massive electricity blackout that impacted 7.5 million people across 14 Western States, two Canadian provinces, and even parts of Mexico. Then, in August of 2003, an outage left 50 million electricity customers without power when a falling tree came into contact with transmission lines.

These are not isolated incidents. According to the U.S. Forest Service, in 2012 and 2013, contact between power lines and trees on Forest Service lands led to the outbreak of 113 and 232 wildfires, respectively. This legislation would reduce such wildfires in part by promoting Federal consistency, accountability, and timely decision-making to protect electricity transmission, grid reliability, and distribution lines on Federal lands from overgrown and under-maintained trees and vegetation.



H.R. 1873 will cut red tape to create a streamlined and consistent process for removing hazardous trees and vegetation without wasting time and money before they cause a wildfire or an outage. Preventing forest fires and maintaining a reliable electrical grid for our communities is an obvious priority for all of us here in Congress, which is why I was pleased to see this bill pass through the House Natural Resources Committee with bipartisan support.

I have seen countless catastrophic wildfires devastate Western communities just in the past several years, which is why this issue must be addressed and resolved. However, due to existing regulations, it is extremely difficult for utility companies to remove hazardous vegetation or trees that have the potential of falling on these power lines.

The scope of this problem is evident when considering the U.S. Forest Service manages 155 national forests and 20 national grasslands—encompassing over 192 million acres—that include 2,700 authorized electric transmission and distribution facilities.

□ 1245

Similarly, the Bureau of Land Management administers 245 million acres, including over 71,000 miles of electrical transmission and distribution lines on its Federal lands.

In order to perform infrastructure inspections and operate and maintain power lines on these lands, electric utilities must seek permission and approval from the appropriate Federal land management agency, which typically use processes under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to assess whether the proposed vegetative management measures comply with Federal environmental laws.

This often leads to delays and cumbersome bureaucratic requirements, which often prevent utilities from carrying out important vegetative management activities on a consistent and timely basis. Yet the costs of operating, maintaining, and repairing these electric lines on Federal lands fall to the utility companies and their customers, which can lead to higher electricity costs for ratepayers.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act. This legislation will streamline the permitting process for new surface water storage projects, which is critically important for many Western and rural communities that have endured severe droughts in recent years.

Currently, the regulatory process for constructing new surface water storage projects often involves applying for a host of Federal, State, and local permits, as well as approvals from various agencies, which can be a very cumbersome, costly, and time-consuming undertaking.

Additionally, conflicting permit requirements and agency reviews can add time to the project, the planning, and implementation process while also increasing the potential for last-minute surprises that could endanger the success of a project or require significant additional work.

In order to address this problem, H.R. 1654 creates what is seen as a one-stop-shop permitting process to expedite construction of both new and expanded non-Federal surface water storage projects. The measure establishes the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for purposes of coordinating all reviews, analyses, permits, licenses, or other Federal approvals as required by law, which will streamline the current multiagency permitting process and eliminate unnecessary delays for job-creating construction projects that directly benefit local communities and economies.

As the lead agency, Reclamation will be required to coordinate and prepare the unified environmental documentation that will serve as the basis for Federal decisions authorizing the use of Federal lands, as well as to coordinate project development and the construction of qualifying projects.

Additionally, H.R. 1654 will allow the Secretary of the Interior to expedite the evaluation of permits for qualifying projects through the use of funds contributed by a non-Federal public entity.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we consider here today provides for the consideration of two bills that will have positive and lasting impacts for the American people, ratepayers, rural communities, and many Western States, as well as our entire country's economy.

H.R. 1654 will provide the type of coordination and streamlining that is essential to the development and construction of much-needed water storage projects, certainly benefiting my home State of Washington, as well as water-stricken communities across the country.

H.R. 1873 will create a framework for vegetation management near transmission and distribution lines on Federal lands while also providing electric companies with much-needed clarity and defined authority to remove hazardous trees that pose a risk of falling into power lines. Managing this vegetation is a critical component in ensuring the safety and reliability of the electrical grid, which will benefit all of our constituents.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule as well as the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

First, I want to rise in agreement with my friend from Washington's

statement about civility in this Chamber and beyond. I think that, while it is extremely important that those of us who are elected to represent 700,000 to 800,000 people reflect the passions that we bring to our service, at the same time, we need to make sure that nothing that we say in these walls or outside is used to incite those who hear those words in a different way than they are intended.

That is the fine line that we walk as elected Representatives who are passionate about our ideals and our values, and it is one that I encourage the President to walk, as well as other opinion leaders who we often see on the cable talk shows hurling inciteful phrases back and forth that could be used to further incite the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the two underlying bills: H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act; and H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act.

Frankly, both of these bills are trying to address real problems that have bipartisan solutions that I support, but neither of these bills solve the problems in a thoughtful, effective way without creating collateral damage that, in many ways, is as damaging as the problem that they are designed to solve.

The majority will claim that similar bills received hearings last Congress, but I want to point out from a procedural perspective that neither of these bills have had hearings. These bills have not gone through the committee process. But what they won't say is there are dozens of new Members of Congress. New members of the Natural Resources Committee didn't have hearings at all, but it was rushed through a markup in committee and to the floor without any hearings in this session, without the new members of the National Resources Committee having a chance to ask questions about these bills.

There is a reason we have regular order. It is so that we elected Representatives can use the passion we bring to service to ask the difficult questions to find out how to get at these very real problems that we are trying to solve.

Unfortunately, this secrecy, lack of hearings, and lack of participation appears to be the norm, and, in fact, the standard that Republicans are setting in both Chambers of Congress right now. It is how the Republicans handled the healthcare bill in the House. It is how the Republicans are handling the secret healthcare bill behind a closed door somewhere over in the Senate.

We know some things about the Republican healthcare bill. We know it will increase healthcare costs, throw people off their insurance, reduce access for the American people. We know

it will burden small businesses and the middle class. We know it will hand hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. But there is also a lot we don't know because the process has been closed. This type of secret backroom deal is, unfortunately, becoming the norm of the way Republicans are running their agenda in Washington.

The rule for this bill is another example. It blocked at least three amendments from being considered on the floor.

Why can't we discuss the ideas of all Members, especially since there was no hearing on this bill?

Representative MCEACHIN from Virginia, Representative SCHNEIDER from Illinois, and Representative TORRES from California all offered amendments, all had good ideas and were not even allowed to discuss those on the floor for 10 minutes, 5 minutes, not even for 1 minute, to offer or discuss any of those amendments.

If my colleagues on the Republican side don't think they are good ideas, let's at least have a vote. They can vote against them. If they defeat them, that is the process. But they are not even allowing a vote on these amendments.

Unfortunately, the process of this bill is typical of the Republican process on healthcare and the way they have approached so many other issues. Republicans are working in secret and limiting debates so the American people won't see the horrible things they are trying to do, like throwing tens of millions of Americans off of healthcare.

Now, getting to these bills.

First, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act has the goal of preventing forest fires and disruptions to power distribution; something that I strongly agree with.

I represent a district that has over 60 percent public land and a number of rural power districts. It is an admirable goal. We are a district that is at risk for forest fires. We had several devastating fires in the last several years alone. In fact, I am representing a State that is getting even more ravaged by fire, in light of the changing climate.

We need to take action to prevent them and allow additional work with regard to preventing the forest fire risk. Unfortunately, this bill is not a positive step, but I am glad to say there is an alternative out there.

Representative CRAMER from North Dakota and I, along with five of my Colorado delegation colleagues, recently introduced bipartisan legislation that will decrease these types of fires and protect power lines and transformers the right way—a way that Democrats and Republicans can agree on; a way that we can probably run the bill as a suspension and get 410 votes; a

way that the stakeholders are involved and utilities, fire prevention experts and firefighters, environmentalists all agree on.

My legislation, known as the National Forest System Vegetation Management Pilot Program Act of 2017, gives power and electricity companies the ability to remove dead trees, but without the recklessness included in the bill that we are considering today.

It is a stark contrast. We can actually solve this problem in a way that would bring the country together, or there can be a divisive bill—maybe against one Democrat, maybe against five; I don't know, but it is not a broadly bipartisan bill. It is not one that has the support of the communities that are most affected by forest fires in my district. It is not even a bill that has the support of our main utility company in Colorado that actually sought the ability to reduce forest fire risks, which is done by Representative CRAMER's and my bill.

This bill we are considering today simply lacks the protections that we need to have confidence. In this bill, the company can come up with a plan to remove vegetation, and then it can be accepted with no questions asked. They can't require them to fix obvious problems, like the power company cutting down trees for no reason other than to sell it for timber. They can't even deny an application.

Frankly, I think this legislation's real goal is to take a small step toward turning management of public lands over to private industry.

Once this plan that they would submit under this bill is approved—because the plans have to be approved—the utility companies would be able to do massive devegetation and clearing work without any reason related to fires and without any risk of liability.

On the other hand, the bipartisan legislation I introduced with Mr. CRAMER gives that liability waiver that the utility companies need to do the additional work, but only if there is no gross negligence by the utility company and has something to do with actually reducing the risk of fires, as well as putting reasonable limits on the distance that the work can be done from the power lines or transformers themselves.

Mr. CRAMER's and my bill has some of the most conservative and some of the most liberal Members of this body as cosponsors. So I just wonder and I ask the majority leader why we aren't bringing that bill to the floor—a bill that lacks controversy, that helps prevent forest fires, that saves American people time and money, a bill that this body could be proud of advancing with, if not all, almost near unanimity.

I would suggest that, instead of bringing the bill we are considering today to the floor, we should have been focused on fixing something that we

know needs to be fixed: the Forest Service's problem with fire borrowing.

Fire borrowing means the Forest Service has to spend all their money fighting fires and little money to reduce the risk of forest fires, deal with climate change, or clear the extensive backlog of maintenance. We can do that today by bringing to the floor the bipartisan Wildfire Disaster Funding Act that Representative SIMPSON and I introduced, along with my colleague, Mr. SCHRADER.

These are the types of commonsense measures that would actually reduce the risk of forest fires, put the right parameters around utility companies doing additional work, and free up additional resources to prevent forest fires from occurring, rather than simply doing the cleanup after they occur.

H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, also is an admirable and needed goal, one that there is potential for bipartisan cooperation to speed up the process of approval of water projects and hydro dams.

There truly is a problem with the speed of which some of these problems are approved. I represent a district and a State where we understand how difficult and important water is, and we also believe in the new renewable energy economy.

Unfortunately, this bill also does it the wrong way. It circumvents and undermines important input from experts and scientists that actually understand the reviews that are being made by the Clean Water Act. It even circumvents tribal sovereignty in the Native American Tribes and their sacred lands by overriding their input.

That is why a wide spectrum of organizations are opposed, from conservation groups like Oceana and League of Conservation Voters to sportsmen's groups like Trout Unlimited and The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations. Dozens are opposed to this reckless bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of opposition.

JULY 20, 2017.

PLEASE OPPOSE H.R. 1654

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to urge you to oppose H.R. 1654 (McClintock, R-CA), a bill that would significantly limit meaningful public and environmental review of new dams and other surface storage projects throughout the west. H.R. 1654 would likely reduce protections for fish and wildlife, and could lead to further damming and destruction of western waterways. Similar provisions were included in H.R. 2898 and H.R. 23—anti-environmental bills from 2015 and 2017, respectively—and the Department of Interior has previously expressed opposition to these efforts.

H.R. 1654 would undermine existing laws by making the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation ("Reclamation") the lead agency for all environmental reviews, including reviews under the Endangered Species Act. Giving Reclamation this unprecedented power over project permitting could undermine the ability of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and

N.O.A.A. Fisheries to share expertise and inform the development of major infrastructure investments, placing imperiled fish species at risk. H.R. 1654 also establishes strict project-review timelines, including provisions that could require expedited review under the National Environmental Policy Act. These fast-tracking provisions could make it difficult for responsible agencies to meaningfully analyze proposed projects, and could limit the public's ability to weigh in on infrastructure that could affect communities for decades. Further, the bill permits non-federal public entities to contribute funds to expedite project permitting, raising questions about the fairness of the federal review process.

This damaging bill would affect states throughout the west, and could even impact how state agencies are able review proposed projects within their jurisdictions. H.R. 1654 allows states to subject state agencies to the bill's procedures, thereby requiring those agencies to cede control to Reclamation and comply with Reclamation's timelines. Consolidating project review in this manner could weaken the essential role that states play in reviewing water infrastructure projects within their jurisdictions.

As we recently learned from the emergency at Oroville Dam in California, careful planning and design for major infrastructure projects is critical for ensuring public safety and protecting the environment. Environmental review of surface storage projects is also essential for protecting endangered and commercially important salmon runs and the thousands of jobs that depend on healthy salmon populations. With so much at stake, the streamlining provisions in H.R. 1654 are unwise and irresponsible. Instead of fast tracking dam projects in the West, we should be investing in fiscally sound, environmentally friendly water supply solutions like conservation, water use efficiency, wastewater recycling, and stormwater capture.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to vote no on H.R. 1654.

Sincerely,

American Rivers  
Audubon California  
California Trout  
Cascadia Wildlands  
Center for Biological Diversity  
Clean Water Action  
Defenders of Wildlife  
Earthjustice  
Endangered Species Coalition  
Environmental Protection Information Center  
Friends of the Earth  
Friends of the River  
Grand Canyon Trust  
Klamath Forest Alliance  
League of Conservation Voters  
Living With Wolves  
Native Plant Conservation Campaign  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
Oceana  
Sierra Club  
The Bay Institute  
Western Environmental Law Center  
Western Watersheds Project  
WildEarth Guardians  
Wilderness Workshop  
Wildlands Network.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the letter is signed by a number of sportsmen and environmental organizations, the very groups that we should seek to work with, the very groups that actually support, as I do, hydropower, facili-

tated permitting of hydropower, the right way.

We need to speed up the process. In Colorado, we have had water projects that have been waiting on a decision for far too long.

□ 1300

But instead of going around experts, rolling over tribal sovereignty, why don't we fund the agencies doing the reviews so that they have the manpower and time to look at an application, give feedback, and make a decision quickly?

Again and again we have underfunded the Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA, not acknowledging that that is what is causing and contributing to this very slowdown.

We can solve these issues that we are facing. We can expedite permitting for water projects and hydropower. We can allow utilities to do additional work to reduce the risk of forest fires.

I call upon this body, please, let's do it in a way that brings Democrats and Republicans together, proudly gets a bill to President Trump's desk in a fast and effective way involving input from Democrats and Republicans, not just Republicans.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the gentleman a couple questions to underline a couple of the really important points you made about the context in which this bill is considered, because while I think every Democrat agrees with our colleague from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) about the importance of civility and the importance of us each taking responsibility for the tone here and certainly condemning violence, condemning anyone who would suggest that if you come to the rally and you protest that you ought to be beaten up by the people that are there, the kind of thing that happened, unfortunately, last year, that we should condemn all of that. Does the gentleman agree that the House exercising vigorous oversight of the Administration when it breaks its promises, when it mixes personal business with public business, that this remains an important aspect of our job and no way suggests a breach of civility?

Mr. POLIS. Absolutely. I agree with the gentleman from Texas. This House and the institution of Congress, as a separate agency of government in Article I, section 1 of our Constitution has the responsibility to exercise oversight of the executive branch.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentleman would further yield, I heard a rather bizarre comment last week in the aftermath of these shootings suggesting that, in the aftermath of them, Democrats would be reaching out to Repub-

licans on healthcare, and I couldn't quite understand how that could occur. Indeed, your comments about this particular set of bills and the healthcare bill, isn't it a part of civility that we have respect for one another and don't try to force through a bill with an all-night, unnecessary session, not force through here a bill that Republican Members say they didn't have time to read but then leave it up there on the Speaker's desk for a month before even sending it to the Senate? And if you have a legislative process where the majority leader in the Senate says he won't even guarantee 10 hours to see a huge bill that affects this much of the economy and the lives and the livelihoods of millions of Americans, that that in itself is a breach of the respect and the civility that we need to have in this Congress?

Mr. POLIS. It absolutely is.

Sometimes the American people in the back-and-forth say: Hey, why aren't Democrats participating in the healthcare debate? And the reason, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) articulated, is we have never been invited into this room.

I would ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT): Have you seen the Republican healthcare bill in the Senate?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. No. I served on the Ways and Means Committee. We could not see the Republican House bill until hours before it came up.

Mr. POLIS. Isn't that too short a period of time to even come up with a thoughtful amendment?

Mr. DOGGETT. It was under police guard downstairs so that even Republicans, like Senator RAND PAUL, couldn't get in and see the bill.

Then we have an all-night session without a single member of the Trump Administration coming to respond to questions about it, while every healthcare professional group that I have heard of opposed the bill, not letting any of those people come to a hearing. I just suggest that this is a breach of civility. That is a breach of respect. It is a breach of the democratic process which we are all about. That needs to be on the table and is as important as whether someone uses strong language here in the House.

Mr. POLIS. I have one more question on that.

I am a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, one of the three committees that had original jurisdiction over the Affordable Care Act. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, one of the two committees with jurisdiction under the budget reconciliation for this healthcare bill. I want to ask: Have you ever been invited by President Trump to discuss your ideas for healthcare reform?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. No. I think he has only wanted to listen to one side, and I don't begin to think that even the Republican Members of this House can contain President Trump. They seem to have sealed their lips about it, and I wish they would speak out more.

But I think they can effect the processes in this House, and when they pass a bill that President Trump says is "mean, mean, mean," they need to go back and look at that process. And I see the same thing happening, from what you have told us, about the two bills that are up here.

Why is it that we have a process that is designed to exclude almost half of the people in this House, to exclude their amendments, to give them no opportunity to be heard at a markup, to bring in no witnesses to defend the bill or to allow discussion of that bill? That is not only not civil, not the democratic process, but it leads to worse public policy.

Even if they have a majority to pass it, their ideas need to be tested, and it allows them to perfect their legislation. That is the way the democratic process is supposed to work. But with all the secrecy, all the forced action, the tight timetables that are applying here, they thwart our democratic process in a way that hurts all sides and certainly impairs civility.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) and would just add, look, fire prevention, expediting water projects and hydropower, these are not partisan issues; and to prove that point, there are bipartisan bills sponsored by conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats that would solve these issues. Rather than moving either of those bills through the floor, they are moving a divisive ideological bill with unintended consequences—or, perhaps, intended consequences—that would devastate a lot of our natural resources that sportsmen and recreationists rely on for our quality of life in the mountain West and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, the beauty of having a diverse membership in this body is that we have people from all over the country who live and breathe the issues that are before us. We are privileged today to have the young lady from Wilson, Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) here to speak on these bills. I appreciate her offering to help in these arguments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my young colleague.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank very much my colleague from Washington particularly for calling me "young." I appreciate that always.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed listening to the colloquy taking place among my

colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We see this repeatedly now day in and day out as we work hard in the majority to continue the progress that we have made so far in this Congress, really record-breaking progress of passing legislation, putting bills on the President's desk, having those bills signed into law. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are now at the point where we have presented more bills to the President and had more bills signed than in any Congress in the first term of any Presidency since Harry Truman. It is a record we are very proud of over here.

It is clear that as we continue to put commonsense reform legislation forward that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would sometimes like to distract and talk about other things. In terms of the healthcare conversation that is going on and the talk of unintended consequences, I would just point out, Mr. Speaker, that we now know the consequences of ObamaCare. We have had to live under ObamaCare now for many years. We are in a situation where the system is absolutely failing the people of this country, and we have an obligation as a body, an obligation we take seriously here in the House, to make sure that we do what is right for the people of this country, that we provide them relief, that we provide them the kind of healthcare reform that is going to lower their costs, that is going to provide better access to care and put people back in charge.

We have tried the Democrats' way now for the last 7 years and fundamentally seen that the government cannot mandate effectively what people need. It doesn't have the consequences that many on the other side of the aisle thought it would, and the consequences have been devastating.

Mr. Speaker, the same is true in terms of the challenge that we are here dealing with today with these two bills. As my colleague from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) so eloquently put it, those of us across the West—and Mr. POLIS knows this well, too—have had to live under this situation of absolutely devastating forest fires, forest fires that have been caused in too many instances by mismanagement by the Forest Service, mismanagement by the Federal Government.

These bills—and in particular, H.R. 1873, which is a bill that I am honored to cosponsor with Representative LAMALFA—will begin to impose the kind of commonsense reforms that we need so that our power grid is no longer threatened by mismanagement of our Federal Forest Service, of our Federal forestlands.

On our federally managed forest in Wyoming, when we have overgrowth around a power line, it is a direct risk to the people, the property, and the power grid, as well as to the wildlife that those on the other side of the aisle claim to care so much about.

Our local leaders understand this. Our local leaders are in the very best position to do something about this and to do it quickly. That is why we put in place these provisions in these bills that will allow the local utilities, allow local officials, to make the kinds of decisions that have to be made quickly.

H.R. 1873 will allow our utilities to submit their own management facility inspection plans, their own operation and maintenance plans, and it will also ensure that our Federal land managers have consistent and accountable policies to reduce hazards in electricity rights-of-way, including they, themselves, will be held accountable for managing the land. The bill does adjust the liability framework for these rights-of-way to ensure that the utilities and the Federal Government have the incentive to respond quickly and effectively to these hazards.

Nobody in Wyoming or in any other State ought to feel that they have to go without affordable, reliable power, ought to feel that the power grid is threatened simply because the Federal Government fails to do its job. We have simply seen that too much. Our local co-ops are willing and able to step up to the plate.

Solving this problem is crucial to those who live in Wyoming, where bark beetle-killed trees and poorly managed overgrowth of Federal forests pose true threats to the safety and health of our communities and to our power reliability. Mr. Speaker, that is why H.R. 1873 is supported by the Wyoming Rural Electric Association, the Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Black Hills Energy, the Edison Electric Institute, the American Public Power Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Western Governors Association, and many others who care so much about our lands out West.

Wyoming supports this bill. Wyoming utility co-ops know best how to manage the provision of electricity and how to handle these rights-of-way and also how to provide healthy and sustainable forest management as they do so.

Mr. Speaker, I request immediate passage of this bill. It is hugely important that we get back on track, that we stop the kind of mismanagement from Washington that has been so damaging for so many years, and I urge my colleagues in Congress to act quickly on its passage.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, President Trump campaigned on a promise to bring, somehow, jobs back home. He said he was going to overhaul the Tax Code, introduce an infrastructure package, and remove barriers to job creation. Unfortunately, we have yet to hear specifics on any of the administration's plans to accomplish that.

My colleagues will be happy to hear that in my hand I have an amendment that will help to accomplish this goal by providing tax incentives to companies that bring overseas jobs back home. What a great idea.

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative PASCRELL's Bring Jobs Home Act, H.R. 685. This bill closes a tax loophole that actually rewards companies for moving jobs overseas while providing a tax credit to companies that move jobs back home to our country, the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Here we are again. We are debating a bill to roll back regulations that protect the public, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker. I think we are a little bit tone deaf.

Here is a news flash: The whole country is focused on defending blue-collar jobs, bolstering our industrial manufacturing base. Americans broadly agree that keeping United States jobs from moving overseas is a top priority. Yet despite campaign promises, the administration has awarded government contracts to companies that continue to offshore.

□ 1315

You can't make this up. So we say one thing and then we do another. Now, look, both parties do it. Neither party is privy to virtue. But let me tell you something, there is a plethora of these before us on saying one thing when you are campaigning and not following through. That is not good.

The flow of jobs overseas is not stopping. Just this week, it was announced that Ford is canceling plans to build the Ford Focus in Mexico, ending North American production entirely and making the model almost completely in China beginning next year, as soon as its output ends at a plant in Michigan.

Yet, right now, when companies move overseas, as the gentleman from Colorado just said, we actually give them a reward. We give them a tax break for the cost of moving. Do you think that is going to impede or help people deciding whether they should stay or go? A tax break for leaving. The average citizen never gets that kind of a break. I mean, that is the

law. I am not making it up. I will stand corrected, if need be, Mr. Speaker.

We need to stop offshoring these jobs. And this Congress should start by defeating the previous question and bringing up the Bring Jobs Home Act.

Around 5 million U.S. manufacturing jobs have been lost since 1994. Just ask folks in places like Ohio and Pennsylvania who have seen steel mills and rubber factories shipped overseas. Come to my hometown of Paterson, New Jersey, formerly the hub of the textile manufacturing industry.

My bill eliminates this tax deduction to those companies and those corporations who want to bring their jobs overseas, and it gives a tax credit of up to 20 percent of the cost to U.S. businesses that bring jobs back to the United States of America. The companies would have to add jobs to claim the tax benefit.

So let's stop subsidizing companies that ship jobs overseas and start bringing jobs back to our shores.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't get much simpler than that.

This is not a new idea. President Obama and Democrats in Congress have raised this bill for years, and the Republican Congress has blocked our bill at every turn. Senator STABENOW of Michigan leads this bill in the Senate, where it cleared a procedural vote 93-7 in 2014.

I challenge you, today, to take up and pass this bill to stand up for American manufacturing and the workers here at home. Talk only goes so far. Let's act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, isn't it good to hear good news? I just got this on my electronic device here.

The MedStar: "Congressman STEVE SCALISE continues to make good progress. He is now listed in fair condition and is beginning an extended period of healing and rehabilitation."

Isn't that good news?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that it is good news that our brother from Louisiana is in fair condition. I appreciate that news report.

And I also want to take up the previous speaker's offer to work with us on tax reform. We look forward to his assistance in moving that issue forward.

I might say that he is mistaken. The bill that we are talking about today is about protecting public interests. The last time I checked, people who I know like green trees, not black ones; they like their electricity to be there when they turn their light switch on; and

they like water. These are three issues that we are looking to protect and make sure that people in the United States can enjoy all of these attributes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) to talk about exactly that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my colleague on the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the West, water is life. Coloradans must wisely steward the precious water flowing through our lands. That is why we are so focused on water storage projects.

Unfortunately, many water storage projects in my State face significant setbacks in permitting due to a long list of regulatory checkboxes. Local, State, and Federal agencies all have their own requirements.

For the past several years, I have followed multiple important water storage projects on the front range of Colorado that deeply impact Coloradans. Year after year, the shovels remain untouched as the water projects inched their way through the regulatory permitting process. Water projects should not take over 10 years to permit and then only a few years to build.

Much of this delay occurs because each level of government—local, State, and Federal—requires their own studies and permitting checklists, even though many of those requirements are the same or only slightly different.

H.R. 1654 makes this process more efficient, allowing the Bureau of Reclamation to coordinate the Federal and State permitting processes, so that we can avoid unnecessary duplication and so that we can better unify the approval requirements.

H.R. 1654 offers a more streamlined approval process for our water projects but still empowers State and Federal governments to fulfill our duties to protect communities and the environment.

This is a good government bill. We are simply asking different levels of government to work together so that our water projects can earn the permits they rightfully qualify for.

No water project should take 10 years to gain approval, but too many have. H.R. 1654 ensures that projects on Federal lands will have a clear, more efficient permit application process.

We owe this bill to the people of Colorado; we owe this bill to the people of the West. We owe this bill to everyone in this country who relies on fresh, clean drinking water. We owe it to the farmers who need water for their crops, to the ranchers who need water for their livestock, to the anglers who need water for their recreation.

I am supporting H.R. 1654 for these people. I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation as well.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), my friend, that there is a problem here we are trying to solve. Unfortunately, these are not the bipartisan bills that Democrats and Republicans from both sides of the aisle have worked hard to put together to do.

Of course, Democrats, myself, and so many others want to expedite water projects permitting for hydro renewable energy projects. Of course, we want to free up utilities to do extra mitigation work around power lines to reduce the risk of fires. We have solid bipartisan bills that would do that. We could put them on the floor today or tomorrow, and they would have over 400 votes. There are liberal Democrats, conservative Republicans, and firefighters who support them. Utilities, Democrats, Republicans, and sportsmen support them.

That is a route we could go. We could get those bills to President Trump's desk by next week and actually start preventing forest fires and facilitate the permitting process around hydro projects. But, no, instead, we are doing a very divisive bill, one that has a lot of problems that it creates, in addition to solving some of the problems that it sets out to address.

I encourage my Republican friends—they are in charge; they control the agenda—to take a look at pragmatic, smart, and thoughtful ways to reduce forest fire risk, speed up water project approval, such as the bipartisan National Forest System Vegetation Management Pilot Program Act, which is a bipartisan bill.

Look, this bill around the expedited water projects would circumvent a lot of the public input process that is actually so important to the success of these projects. My colleague from Colorado was referring to several water projects. One that we both care deeply about, the Northern Integrated Supply Project, NISP, is currently with the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

I strongly supported extending the public comment period from 30 to 60 days—a very reasonable time to allow people more input, which actually changed how the project was done and planned. It was a very meaningful form of input to build additional public support for the project; and, when the project is completed, will lead to a better, more meaningful project, serving the water needs of our communities, as well as the impact on the lives of those who live in and near it.

So, look, whether it is fixing fire borrowing, giving utilities a liability waiver while not giving them a free pass, making sure that our agencies doing water project reviews have the men and women power they need to actually get them done quickly, these are reasonable, good ideas that I think we could pass with unanimity, or near unanimity.

I promise the Republicans, if you would just work with us and have an open process, we could find common ground. Let's start with these small things. Let's start with preventing forest fires around electrical fires. We will get to healthcare. We can find common ground with you on that, too.

But let's start on finding common ground around reducing forest fire risk around electrical wires, Mr. Speaker. There is a path to do that. Let's solve our small problems, and let's build a pathway to work together on the big problems our country faces.

I urge everyone to vote "no" on this restrictive rule, this rule that goes to the floor with no hearing, this rule that rules out Democratic amendments, doesn't even allow discussion of them, and has a controversial piece of underlying legislation, when there is no need for controversy around such an important aspect of life in the American West, and, nationally, reducing forest fire risk and facilitating water projects and hydroelectric projects. Please join me in voting "no," so we can get this House back to working on commonsense legislation that is bipartisan, with the full support of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the time of my colleagues, who have joined me on the floor today, to speak in support of these underlying bills, as well as for the hard work of the House Natural Resources Committee.

First of all, H.R. 1873 is a bipartisan bill by any measure—five Democratic cosponsors, passed bipartisanship through the committee.

This will reduce the threat of electricity outages caused by contact between overgrown trees and power lines. It is that simple.

Existing Federal regulations and red tape can make it extremely difficult for utilities to gain the access that they need to their rights of way in order to perform needed maintenance. Before taking this action, they must receive approval from Federal agencies. They have been criticized for not allowing these utilities to carry out vegetative management policies on a consistent and timely basis.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, just one down tree on a transmission line can have devastating impacts, causing blackouts for thousands or millions of homes as well as businesses, or it can ignite fires that consume entire forests. Yet it can take months to remove one single tree, due to our outdated Federal regulations and cumbersome bureaucracy.

H.R. 1654 streamlines the current multiagency permitting system, which creates significant delays for project construction and completion, by cre-

ating a one-stop shop, a permitting process at the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau was created to oversee water resource management in the West and to prevent water shortages by building dams and conveyance systems. Yet, over the past 40 years, Federal regulations and policies have slowly made it increasingly difficult to build dams and reservoirs throughout the Western United States. Presently, it is nearly impossible to even expand the storage capacity at existing facilities.

The Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act establishes a framework where the Federal agencies with jurisdiction over new surface water storage projects must work together, coordinate their schedules, share technical information and data, and publish their findings publicly. This important measure will allow water providers to better manage their systems to modernize and enhance their water storage infrastructure and optimize water resource management in preparation for future droughts and shortages, which we know will come.

□ 1330

The Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act will prevent wildfires and power outages while enabling utilities to safely supply electricity to rural and Western communities.

H.R. 1873 will ensure that practical measures are taken to protect power lines and conserve our public lands, which is especially important in Western States where overgrown Federal forests are too often the norm rather than the exception.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the rule provides for consideration of two commonsense measures that will implement much needed improvements to the Federal management of our water resources, our Federal lands and forests, and electricity infrastructure. I urge my colleagues to support this rule as well as the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 392 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 685) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order



against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 685.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule

[a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed, asking that it be read in full concerning President Trump's tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to the House of Representatives and the American people.

Whereas, President Nixon explained that "People have got to know whether or not their President is a crook" when he invited the Joint Committee on Taxation to audit his returns after the Internal Revenue Service gave him an unwarranted tax discount;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed his tax return information to the public;

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, Joint Committee on Taxation, and the Committee on Finance have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas, pursuant to Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, often referred to as the Origination Clause, the House of Representatives has the sole authority to initiate legislation that raises revenue for the national government, and the Committee on Ways and Means is considering a comprehensive reform of the Tax Code;

Whereas, according to media reports analyzing President Trump's leaked 2005 tax return, we know that had his own tax plan

been in place, he would have paid an estimated mere 3.48 percent rate instead of a 24 percent rate, saving him \$31.3 million;

Whereas, according to *The New York Times*, the President used a legally dubious tax maneuver in 1995 that could have allowed him to avoid paying any Federal taxes for 18 years;

Whereas, President Trump holds "interests as the sole or principal owner in approximately 500 separate entities," according to his attorneys, and the President's tax plan proposes to cut the tax rate on such "pass-through" entities from 39.6 percent to 15 percent;

Whereas, one analysis estimated that President Trump would personally save \$6.7 million from two tax breaks included in the Republicans' first tax cut, which they misleadingly call the American Health Care Act;

Whereas, without the President's tax returns, the American people cannot determine how much he will personally benefit from proposed changes to the Tax Code;

Whereas, an ABCNews/Washington Post poll found that 74 percent of Americans would like President Trump to disclose his tax returns and the most-signed petition on the White House website calls for the release of the President's tax return information to verify compliance with the Emoluments Clause, with more than 1,097,000 signatures as of date of this resolution;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election better understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation, Russian businesses, and Russian individuals;

Whereas, after breaking his pledge to make his tax returns available, President Trump instead presented a one-page letter from a law firm giving him a clean bill of health on any business dealings with Russians, but failed to note that the very same law firm boasted of the "prestigious honor" of being named "Russia Law Firm of the Year" for 2016;

Whereas, former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, before he was fired by President Trump, publicly confirmed that the Bureau has been investigating potential ties between President Trump's campaign and Russia since July and that the Russian President Vladimir Putin favored a Trump electoral victory;

Whereas, President Trump's son-in-law and senior advisor, Jared Kushner, met during the Presidential transition at the behest of the Russian Ambassador with Sergey N. Gorkov, a graduate of a school run by the successor to the KGB and who was appointed by Vladimir Putin to head a Russian state-owned bank that is on the U.S. sanctions list;

Whereas, Mr. Kushner proposed establishing a secret back channel of communications directly to Vladimir Putin, even considering the use of Russian embassy facilities to do so;

Whereas, Attorney General Jeff Sessions falsely stated during his Senate confirmation hearing that he "did not have communications with the Russians," when in fact he met at least twice during the campaign with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak;

Whereas, former Director Comey testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that President Trump had asked him in the Oval Office about "letting Flynn go," referring to the investigation into former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn's business ties to Russia;



Whereas, President Trump stated on May 11, 2017, that he had decided that he was going to fire Comey because of “this Russia thing”;

Whereas, former Director Comey, on June 8, 2017, testified that Special Counsel Robert Mueller could investigate whether President Trump’s actions with regard to Director Comey and the Flynn investigation constituted obstruction of justice;

Whereas, in 2013, President Trump said, “Well, I’ve done a lot of business with the Russians. They’re smart and they’re tough,” and President Trump’s son, Donald Trump, Jr., told a news outlet in 2008 that “Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets”;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses;

Whereas, the Director of the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics said that the President’s plan to transfer his business holdings to a trust managed by family members is “meaningless” and “does not meet the standards that . . . every President in the past four decades has met”;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the Constitution for the express purpose of preventing Federal officials from accepting any “present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state”;

Whereas, the Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C., has hired a “director of diplomatic sales” to generate high-priced business among foreign leaders and diplomatic delegations;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means used the authority under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means has now voted three times along party lines to continue to cover-up President Trump’s tax returns;

Whereas, the House of Representatives has now refused nine times to act on President Trump’s tax returns;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, Government contracts, or otherwise;

Whereas, the House of Representatives undermines its dignity and the integrity of its proceedings by continuing the cover-up of President Trump’s tax returns: Now, therefore, be it;

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return and return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as well as the tax return and return information with respect to the President’s businesses of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e, specifically each corporation and each partnership within the meaning of subchapter K of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 where he is listed as an officer, director, or equivalent, or exercises working control; and

2. Postpone consideration of tax reform legislation until the elected Representatives of the American people in this House have

obtained President Trump’s tax returns and return information to ascertain how any changes to the Tax Code might financially benefit the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to present argument on the parliamentary question whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I do wish to address the parliamentary question and would appreciate the opportunity to speak at this time about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, you can certainly observe, as all the Members can, the many troubling events that are reflected in the resolution we just had read and why they do arise to the privileges of the House.

Under clause 1 of rule IX, questions of the privileges of the House are: “those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.”

This resolution seeks to protect the integrity of the proceedings of the House, and I believe that it is therefore privileged. There is just not an issue that is more fundamental to the integrity of this House, the people’s House, than the faith the American people have in our democracy.

That sacred faith is being undermined. It is under assault right now by President Trump. This House must act to protect the integrity of its proceedings.

Now, I know that there are many Members here who are eager to avoid a direct up-and-down vote on the specific question of covering up the Trump tax returns, and that there have been nine previous times when Members have come to the floor and presented resolutions that were focused on trying to get those returns and to end the cover-up.

Recognizing the Speaker’s prior rulings nine times against considering this measure, I have, today, offered a different resolution, taking a new approach that I bring to the Speaker’s attention. Unlike the last nine resolutions, my resolution does not direct the Committee on Ways and Means to meet and consider action on these secreted tax returns.

I believe it should not be ruled out of order on the grounds that were used the previous nine times that this type of resolution was blocked. This coverup of the Trump returns must end, and that is why I have taken a different approach.

Pursuant to Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the United States Constitution, what we know as the Origination Clause, the House of Representatives has the sole authority to initiate legislation that raises revenue for the national government.

As the Speaker knows, that means the House Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, on which Mr. PASCRELL, who I know wants to comment on this point of order, is concerned, for this House to exercise with integrity its authority to originate tax legislation. This is authority that it solely possesses. The American people should know how the President and his family might personally benefit from the tax legislation, either in their direct personal income or through the many business intermediaries with which they work. I believe some 500-plus entities reported on their financial disclosure statement.

President Trump, we know, has bragged publicly about his ability to bend the Tax Code to his whim in the past. He has said only he can “fix it.”

And the question is: Will he fix it for himself, or fix it for working families? Will he enrich the middle class with jobs, or simply enrich himself and other billionaires like him?

While recently Mr. Trump has provided us a single page of clues concerning the contents of his tax plan that they now say will be provided fully in September, he has not given us much detail. But he does give us a few clues off that one page. One is his proposal to repeal the alternative minimum tax. We know if that had been the law, if that Trump proposal had been in effect for the one year, 2005, that we have his return, he would have paid about the amount that an employee does on their Social Security. It would have saved him \$30 million.

I understand that there are many here that simply don’t want to look under the rock to see what is contained in those returns. And there are many who believe that Mr. Trump is the golden ticket to more prized tax breaks, to more ending of consumer protection, and they have been rather quiet about the tax return issue, about the conflicts of interest, and about the potential foreign collusion.

But after all the resolutions presented here on the floor, nine, plus the amendments that I have offered in the Ways and Means Committee that have been rejected, I can say that, while there has not been progress yet on the House floor, there has been progress.

Mr. Trump has responded. He provided a one-page letter from a lawyer that reviewed his tax returns, and that lawyer gave a Good Housekeeping “seal of approval” to assure us—“to assure America he had no business dealings with the Russians as a result of reviewing the returns.”

What he did not say was that the same law firm had boasted of what they call the prestigious honor of being named the “Russia Law Firm of the Year.” I would just say today, in response specifically to the point of order, that it is not sufficient to preserve the integrity of this House to

rely on the "Russia Law Firm of the Year" to be the only entity that reviews these returns.

□ 1345

I believe that we can do better; that we must protect the dignity of the House.

According to Mr. Trump himself, he is already being investigated for obstruction of justice. It is important for us to have the tax returns on tax reform. It is important to have it on the Russia investigation.

And, you know, there is hardly an hour that goes by, certainly a day that goes by, that there is not some additional information. When I opened *The Washington Post* this morning, right there on the front page—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of privilege.

Mr. DOGGETT. Certainly.

And one of those aspects of the question of privilege is how conflicts of interest interface with what we are doing here in the House. I mentioned the tax returns and the Russia investigation, but there is a new one out today, and that is in the budget. I assume eventually we are going to have a budget resolution presented here, though it is very late this year. But when we take up that budget resolution and we take up the appropriation bills, *The Washington Post* reports that, while there have been significant cuts in the Housing and Urban Development budget, as many people cannot afford housing—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would do nothing else, Mr. Speaker.

And this particular example shows how the proceedings of the House would be impaired if the only aspect of the budget that increases HUD is one from which Mr. Trump personally benefits, which is what the *Post* is reporting, and so we need the returns in order to see that.

Like so many other broken promises, we will not get these returns voluntarily. I believe that the House needs to act. Unlike Sally Yates, unlike the U.S. attorney in New York, and unlike James Comey, he can't fire us, and we don't have to be accessories to a cover-up.

I call on this House to protect the integrity of its proceedings, including the integrity of our unique constitutional authority over tax legislation, by declaring that this resolution is in order. This resolution simply calls on the House to secure the tax return and return information on Mr. Trump and his businesses. It further declares that, in order to preserve the integrity of the House, we will not be taking up tax reform legislation, which we certainly need to take up, and we have ideas to

offer and to cooperate in trying to see reform of our taxes, but not do it until we have had an opportunity to review thoroughly Mr. Trump's tax returns and return information to ascertain how he may personally benefit.

I would hope that the Speaker, considering my comments, as well as those that I know Mr. PASCRELL wants to offer, would be ruling that we can have that straight up-and-down vote, no hiding behind a rock, let us look under the rock.

I appreciate the Speaker giving me this opportunity to emphasize the very significant importance of this question to the integrity of the House and to the future of the American people and our democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the question of order?

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, how are you today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey wish to be heard on the question of order?

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, I do, thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to define a few terms here what we are talking about. We are talking about tax returns. What does that mean? It doesn't mean the 1040. It doesn't mean the 278.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about close to 12,000 pages of tax returns; that is what we are talking about, the integrity of the House, the integrity of myself and you. I know you are a person of integrity. And I say it like it is, so I am not blowing smoke. That is why this is important.

So a 2-page, 3-page 1040 doesn't mean anything to what we are doing; 12,000 pages, just on this President's tax returns.

The stunning potential conflicts of interest are piling up. Every day, we all read about it. The President was told by the Ethics Commission, divest yourself of your holdings. That doesn't mean you give your money away, your assets away. It means what it says, you divest.

But I think that there is nothing more of a threat to the integrity of our House than ignoring our duties, to provide a check and a balance to the executive branch. To restore the dignity of the House, we must use our authority to request the President's tax returns. Give the American people the transparency that they deserve.

In addition, it is reported that the President's hotel in Washington received \$270,000 from Saudi Arabia when they were here to lobby against the bill allowing families of 9/11 victims to sue the Saudi Government.

Now, last week, the District of Columbia and Maryland filed a lawsuit

against the President, arguing that he is violating the anticorruption clauses in the Constitution by allowing his businesses to accept payments from foreign governments and other government entities. We have no way of knowing whether the President or his firms have received Russian income or loans or entered into Russian-linked partnerships. In fact, you are going to read a lot about that this week. There are hearings going on as we speak. A certified letter from paid attorneys does nothing to assuage these concerns.

Two weeks ago, we heard from the former Director of the FBI, James Comey, who confirmed that the President tried to influence him to stop the Russian investigation.

Isn't it great that we live in a body where they can't stop us? The President can't stop us. We can only stop ourselves.

The legislative branch has the responsibility and authority to check the executive branch, and section 6103, you have heard me say that number many times, section 6103 of the Tax Code, which allows for the examination of tax returns—that authority, put in place specifically so Congress could examine conflicts of interest following that scandal which we all know about in 1923.

Nothing could be more of a threat, to me, to the integrity of the House and our Members, than ignoring our duty to fully examine the personal financial entanglements of this President or any President, and particularly those, at this time, which we are reading about, that he may have with the Russian entities and individuals or whether he abused the tax laws of this country.

We have a right to know who our public officials are and what investments they have made, and every member of the executive branch of government—and this was made clear in the decision in 1924, particularly Interior Secretary Fall at that time, to examine his tax records, and that is how people were brought to justice in 1924.

It also protects the privacy of the very taxpayer. And we are having exceptions. We have exceptions to that. Three years ago, we had an exception in the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have any further argument on whether this resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, it does constitute a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the gentleman will confine his remarks to the question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, I can, Mr. Speaker. May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As long as the gentleman confines his remarks to the question of privilege.

Mr. PASCRELL. Very good. Thank you.

Just let me say this in conclusion: if and when, if and when such conflicts are revealed, I don't want to say to you, my constituents, that we had the power to review the conflicts, but we chose not to. I, for one, do not want my integrity or the integrity of my brothers and sisters on this floor to be demeaned by a shameful failure. To restore the dignity of the House is what this privilege is all about.

I have a question of the Speaker at this particular time, if I may.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. PASCRELL. I think that I would like to present today what Congress should do immediately about the question of privilege before us. May I proceed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As long as it pertains to the question of privilege.

Mr. PASCRELL. The Chair is good on that answer, Mr. Speaker.

I think that we should do this. I think we should require the President and the Vice President, whomever that will be in the future, for now, and their families, to resolve their conflicts of interest by selling their assets, using a truly independent asset manager.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's remarks are wandering from the question of privilege.

Mr. PASCRELL. I don't believe so, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You might not believe so, but the Chair does.

Mr. PASCRELL. But I am compelled to follow your direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman has no further argument on the question of privilege, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. PASCRELL. Well, my final comment is this: I know you don't take the question of integrity lightly. That is not a joking matter at all. Nor do I take the integrity of the President of the United States lightly. I have an obligation and a responsibility.

As I said on February 1, I will not yield. This is important to all of us, and it is not partisan. Read my letter of February 1.

I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas seeks to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

In evaluating the resolution under rule IX, the Chair must determine whether the resolution affects "the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings."

The first resolving clause of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas seeks tax returns and tax return information of the President and certain of his business entities.

Section 702 of the House Rules and Manual states that "rule IX is concerned not with the privileges of the Congress, as a legislative branch, but only with the privileges of the House, as a House."

As the Chair ruled on March 28, 2017, a resolution offered under rule IX seeking information from actors entirely extramural to the House, such as the President and certain business entities in which the President may be involved, is not uniquely concerned with the privileges of the House, as a House. Accordingly, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas does not constitute a question of privilege under rule IX.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I most reluctantly, after the Speaker's careful consideration of this, must appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

#### MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Newhouse moves that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 392; and on adoption of House Resolution 392, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 188, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—227

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham     | Brooks (IN)   | Davidson      |
| Allen       | Buchanan      | Davis, Rodney |
| Amash       | Buck          | Denham        |
| Amodei      | Bucshon       | Dent          |
| Arrington   | Budd          | DeSantis      |
| Babin       | Burgess       | DesJarlais    |
| Bacon       | Byrne         | Diaz-Balart   |
| Banks (IN)  | Calvert       | Donovan       |
| Barletta    | Carter (GA)   | Duffy         |
| Barr        | Carter (TX)   | Duncan (SC)   |
| Barton      | Chabot        | Duncan (TN)   |
| Bergman     | Cheney        | Dunn          |
| Biggs       | Coffman       | Emmer         |
| Bilirakis   | Cole          | Estes (KS)    |
| Bishop (MI) | Collins (GA)  | Farenthold    |
| Bishop (UT) | Collins (NY)  | Faso          |
| Black       | Comer         | Ferguson      |
| Blackburn   | Conaway       | Fitzpatrick   |
| Blum        | Cook          | Fleischmann   |
|             | Costello (PA) | Flores        |
|             | Cramer        | Fortenberry   |
|             | Crawford      | Fox           |
|             | Culberson     | Franks (AZ)   |
|             | Curbelo (FL)  | Frelinghuysen |

|                 |                 |               |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Gaetz           | Loudermilk      | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Gallagher       | Love            | Roskam        |
| Garrett         | Lucas           | Ross          |
| Gibbs           | Luetkemeyer     | Rothfus       |
| Gohmert         | MacArthur       | Rouzer        |
| Goodlatte       | Marchant        | Royce (CA)    |
| Gosar           | Marino          | Russell       |
| Gowdy           | Marshall        | Rutherford    |
| Granger         | Massie          | Schweikert    |
| Graves (GA)     | Mast            | Scott, Austin |
| Graves (LA)     | McCarthy        | Sensenbrenner |
| Graves (MO)     | McCaul          | Sessions      |
| Griffith        | McClintock      | Shimkus       |
| Grothman        | McHenry         | Shuster       |
| Guthrie         | McKinley        | Simpson       |
| Harper          | McMorris        | Smith (MO)    |
| Harris          | Rodgers         | Smith (NE)    |
| Hartzler        | McSally         | Smith (NJ)    |
| Hensarling      | Meadows         | Smith (TX)    |
| Herrera Beutler | Meehan          | Smucker       |
| Hice, Jody B.   | Messer          | Stefanik      |
| Higgins (LA)    | Mitchell        | Stivers       |
| Hill            | Moolenaar       | Taylor        |
| Holding         | Mooney (WV)     | Tenney        |
| Hollingsworth   | Mullin          | Thompson (PA) |
| Hudson          | Murphy (PA)     | Thornberry    |
| Huizenga        | Newhouse        | Tiberi        |
| Hultgren        | Noem            | Tipton        |
| Hunter          | Nunes           | Trott         |
| Hurd            | Olson           | Turner        |
| Issa            | Palazzo         | Upton         |
| Jenkins (KS)    | Palmer          | Valadao       |
| Jenkins (WV)    | Paulsen         | Wagner        |
| Johnson (LA)    | Pearce          | Walberg       |
| Johnson (OH)    | Perry           | Walden        |
| Jordan          | Pittenger       | Walker        |
| Joyce (OH)      | Poe (TX)        | Walorski      |
| Katko           | Poliquin        | Walters, Mimi |
| Kelly (MS)      | Posey           | Webster (FL)  |
| Kelly (PA)      | Ratcliffe       | Wenstrup      |
| King (IA)       | Reed            | Westerman     |
| King (NY)       | Reichert        | Williams      |
| Kinzinger       | Renacci         | Wilson (SC)   |
| Knight          | Rice (SC)       | Wittman       |
| Kustoff (TN)    | Roby            | Womack        |
| Labrador        | Roe (TN)        | Woodall       |
| LaHood          | Rogers (AL)     | Yoder         |
| LaMalfa         | Rogers (KY)     | Yoho          |
| Lamborn         | Rohrabacher     | Young (AK)    |
| Lance           | Rokita          | Young (IA)    |
| Latta           | Rooney, Francis | Zeldin        |
| Lewis (MN)      | Rooney, Thomas  |               |
| LoBiondo        | J.              |               |

#### NAYS—188

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Crowley        | Jayapal        |
| Aguilar         | Cuellar        | Jeffries       |
| Barragán        | Davis (CA)     | Johnson (GA)   |
| Bass            | Davis, Danny   | Johnson, E. B. |
| Beatty          | DeFazio        | Jones          |
| Bera            | DeGette        | Kaptur         |
| Beyer           | Delaney        | Keating        |
| Bishop (GA)     | DeLauro        | Kelly (IL)     |
| Blumenauer      | DelBene        | Kennedy        |
| Blunt Rochester | Demings        | Khanna         |
| Bonamici        | DeSaulnier     | Kihuen         |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Deutch         | Kildee         |
| F.              | Dingell        | Kilmer         |
| Brady (PA)      | Doggett        | Kind           |
| Brown (MD)      | Doyle, Michael | Krishnamoorthi |
| Brownley (CA)   | F.             | Kuster (NH)    |
| Bustos          | Ellison        | Langevin       |
| Butterfield     | Engel          | Larson (CT)    |
| Capuano         | Eshoo          | Lawrence       |
| Carbajal        | Españillat     | Lawson (FL)    |
| Cárdenas        | Esty (CT)      | Lee            |
| Carson (IN)     | Evans          | Levin          |
| Cartwright      | Foster         | Lewis (GA)     |
| Castor (FL)     | Frankel (FL)   | Lieu, Ted      |
| Castro (TX)     | Fudge          | Lipinski       |
| Chu, Judy       | Gallego        | Loebsack       |
| Cicilline       | Garamendi      | Loftgren       |
| Clark (MA)      | Gonzalez (TX)  | Lowenthal      |
| Clarke (NY)     | Gottheimer     | Lowe           |
| Clay            | Green, Al      | Lujan Grisham, |
| Cleaver         | Green, Gene    | M.             |
| Clyburn         | Grijalva       | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Cohen           | Gutiérrez      | Lynch          |
| Connolly        | Hanabusa       | Maloney,       |
| Conyers         | Hastings       | Carolyn B.     |
| Cooper          | Heck           | Maloney, Sean  |
| Correa          | Himes          | Matsui         |
| Costa           | Hoyer          | McCollum       |
| Courtney        | Huffman        | McEachin       |
| Crist           | Jackson Lee    | McGovern       |

|             |               |                |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| McNerney    | Raskin        | Soto           |
| Meeks       | Rice (NY)     | Speier         |
| Meng        | Richmond      | Suozi          |
| Moore       | Rosen         | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Moulton     | Roybal-Allard | Takano         |
| Murphy (FL) | Ruiz          | Thompson (CA)  |
| Nadler      | Ruppersberger | Thompson (MS)  |
| Neal        | Rush          | Titus          |
| Nolan       | Ryan (OH)     | Tonko          |
| Norcross    | Sánchez       | Torres         |
| O'Halleran  | Sarbanes      | Tsongas        |
| O'Rourke    | Schakowsky    | Vargas         |
| Pallone     | Schiff        | Veasey         |
| Panetta     | Schneider     | Vela           |
| Pascarell   | Schrader      | Velázquez      |
| Payne       | Scott (VA)    | Visclosky      |
| Pelosi      | Scott, David  | Walz           |
| Perlmutter  | Serrano       | Wasserman      |
| Peters      | Sewell (AL)   | Schultz        |
| Peterson    | Shea-Porter   | Waters, Maxine |
| Pingree     | Sherman       | Watson Coleman |
| Pocan       | Sinema        | Welch          |
| Polis       | Sires         | Yarmuth        |
| Price (NC)  | Slaughter     |                |
| Quigley     | Smith (WA)    |                |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—14

|          |              |             |
|----------|--------------|-------------|
| Aderholt | Higgins (NY) | Scalise     |
| Chaffetz | Johnson, Sam | Stewart     |
| Comstock | Larsen (WA)  | Weber (TX)  |
| Cummings | Long         | Wilson (FL) |
| Gabbard  | Napolitano   |             |

□ 1419

Mr. ESPAILLAT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 19, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Corey Stapleton, Secretary of State of Montana, indicating that, at the Special Election held on May 25, 2017, the Honorable Greg Gianforte was duly elected Representative in Congress for the At-Large Congressional District, State of Montana.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS, *Clerk.*

Enclosure.

#### THE STATE OF MONTANA CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, Steve Bullock, Governor of the State of Montana, hereby certify that at the Special Election held on the 25th day of May 2017, Greg Gianforte was elected to the office of United States Representative, to serve for the balance of an unexpired term that commenced on January 3, 2017. Said candidate received the highest number of votes cast, as appears from the official canvass of returns of the Special Election.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the Great Seal

of the State of Montana this 15th day of June, 2017.

STEVE BULLOCK,  
*Governor.*

[State Seal Affixed]

#### SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE GREG GIANFORTE, OF MONTANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect GIANFORTE present himself in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. GIANFORTE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 115th Congress.

#### WELCOMING THE HONORABLE GREG GIANFORTE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 1 minute. There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, GREG GIANFORTE is a family man and a businessman. He has been a husband for 29 years, and he is a father of four. He is a founder with his wife, Susan, of RightNow Technologies, which employs over 500 fellow Montanans.

It is good to have another businessowner in this House, somebody who knows the way the economy works, who has created jobs, and who cares about his local community.

Now, Montana may only send one Member to this body, but out West, it is not about how many of you there are, it is about how much you do.

GREG is a doer, and we are happy to have him here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), who is the dean of Montana.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and Majority Leader MCCARTHY.

I am humbled and honored to have been elected by the people of Montana to represent them here in this House.

I am joined today by my wife, Susan, who is in the gallery. We have been married 29 years. We have four grown children. Two of them are with us today, along with our daughter-in-law. We raised them hunting, fishing, and hiking on the great public lands in Montana.

I am a business guy and an electrical engineer. I am trained to solve hard problems, not to argue about them, just to get things done.

Susan and I did start a computer software company in our home over 20 years ago in Bozeman, Montana, and it grew to over 500 employees there and became one of the State's largest employers.

I am Montana's lone voice here in this House, sent by the people to do the work of the people. The MT comes before the R or the D after my name. I promised the people of Montana that I would come back and drain the swamp. That is why today three of my first actions are bills: no balanced budget, no pay; term limits; and a ban on lobbying by Members of Congress after being out of office.

We need to bring accountability to Washington, D.C.

I feel a deep sense of obligation to serve, and I look forward to being a strong voice for all of Montana.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Montana, the whole number of the House is 432.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1873, ELECTRICITY RELIABILITY AND FOREST PROTECTION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1654, WATER SUPPLY PERMITTING COORDINATION ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 392) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 186, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

YEAS—229

|               |                 |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham       | Goodlatte       | Olson           |
| Allen         | Gosar           | Palazzo         |
| Amash         | Gowdy           | Palmer          |
| Amodei        | Granger         | Paulsen         |
| Arrington     | Graves (GA)     | Pearce          |
| Babin         | Graves (LA)     | Perry           |
| Bacon         | Graves (MO)     | Pittenger       |
| Banks (IN)    | Griffith        | Poe (TX)        |
| Barletta      | Grothman        | Poliquin        |
| Barr          | Guthrie         | Posey           |
| Barton        | Harper          | Ratcliffe       |
| Bergman       | Harris          | Reed            |
| Biggs         | Hartzler        | Reichert        |
| Billirakis    | Hensarling      | Renacci         |
| Bishop (MI)   | Herrera Beutler | Rice (SC)       |
| Bishop (UT)   | Hice, Jody B.   | Roby            |
| Black         | Higgins (LA)    | Roe (TN)        |
| Blackburn     | Hill            | Rogers (AL)     |
| Bost          | Holding         | Rogers (KY)     |
| Brady (TX)    | Hollingsworth   | Rohrabacher     |
| Brat          | Hudson          | Rokita          |
| Bridenstine   | Huizenga        | Rooney, Francis |
| Brooks (AL)   | Hultgren        | Rooney, Thomas  |
| Brooks (IN)   | Hunter          | J.              |
| Buchanan      | Hurd            | Ros-Lehtinen    |
| Buck          | Issa            | Roskam          |
| Bucshon       | Jenkins (KS)    | Ross            |
| Budd          | Jenkins (WV)    | Rothfus         |
| Burgess       | Johnson (LA)    | Rouzer          |
| Byrne         | Johnson (OH)    | Royce (CA)      |
| Calvert       | Jordan          | Russell         |
| Carter (GA)   | Joyce (OH)      | Rutherford      |
| Carter (TX)   | Katko           | Sanford         |
| Chabot        | Kelly (MS)      | Schweikert      |
| Cheney        | Kelly (PA)      | Scott, Austin   |
| Coffman       | King (IA)       | Sensenbrenner   |
| Cole          | King (NY)       | Sessions        |
| Collins (GA)  | Kinzing         | Shimkus         |
| Collins (NY)  | Knight          | Shuster         |
| Comer         | Kustoff (TN)    | Simpson         |
| Conaway       | Labrador        | Smith (MO)      |
| Cook          | LaHood          | Smith (NE)      |
| Costello (PA) | LaMalfa         | Smith (NJ)      |
| Cramer        | Lamborn         | Smith (TX)      |
| Crawford      | Lance           | Smucker         |
| Culberson     | Latta           | Stefanik        |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Lewis (MN)      | Stewart         |
| Davidson      | LoBiondo        | Stivers         |
| Davis, Rodney | Loudermilk      | Taylor          |
| Denham        | Love            | Tenney          |
| Dent          | Lucas           | Thompson (PA)   |
| DeSantis      | Luetkemeyer     | Thornberry      |
| DesJarlais    | MacArthur       | Tiberi          |
| Diaz-Balart   | Marchant        | Tipton          |
| Donovan       | Marino          | Trott           |
| Duffy         | Marshall        | Turner          |
| Duncan (SC)   | Massie          | Upton           |
| Duncan (TN)   | Mast            | Valadao         |
| Dunn          | McCarthy        | Wagner          |
| Emmer         | McCauley        | Walberg         |
| Estes (KS)    | McClintock      | Walden          |
| Farenthold    | McHenry         | Walker          |
| Faso          | McKinley        | Walorski        |
| Ferguson      | McMorris        | Walters, Mimi   |
| Fitzpatrick   | Rodgers         | Webster (FL)    |
| Fleischmann   | McSally         | Wenstrup        |
| Flores        | Meadows         | Westerman       |
| Fortenberry   | Meehan          | Williams        |
| Fox           | Messer          | Wilson (SC)     |
| Franks (AZ)   | Mitchell        | Wittman         |
| Frelinghuysen | Moolenaar       | Womack          |
| Gaetz         | Mooney (WV)     | Woodall         |
| Gallagher     | Mullin          | Yoder           |
| Garrett       | Murphy (PA)     | Yoho            |
| Gianforte     | Newhouse        | Young (AK)      |
| Gibbs         | Noem            | Young (IA)      |
| Gohmert       | Nunes           | Zeldin          |

NAYS—186

|             |                 |             |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Adams       | Blumenauer      | Bustos      |
| Aguilar     | Blunt Rochester | Butterfield |
| Barragán    | Bonamici        | Capuano     |
| Bass        | Boyle, Brendan  | Carbajal    |
| Beatty      | F.              | Cárdenas    |
| Bera        | Brady (PA)      | Carson (IN) |
| Beyer       | Brown (MD)      | Cartwright  |
| Bishop (GA) | Brownley (CA)   | Castor (FL) |

|                |                |                |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Castro (TX)    | Jeffries       | Perlmutter     |
| Chu, Judy      | Johnson (GA)   | Peters         |
| Cicilline      | Johnson, E. B. | Peterson       |
| Clark (MA)     | Jones          | Pingree        |
| Clarke (NY)    | Kaptur         | Pocan          |
| Clay           | Keating        | Polis          |
| Cleaver        | Kelly (IL)     | Price (NC)     |
| Clyburn        | Kennedy        | Quigley        |
| Cohen          | Khanna         | Raskin         |
| Connolly       | Kihuen         | Rice (NY)      |
| Conyers        | Kildee         | Richmond       |
| Amash          | Kilmer         | Rosen          |
| Correa         | Kind           | Roybal-Allard  |
| Costa          | Krishnamoorthi | Ruiz           |
| Courtney       | Kuster (NH)    | Ruppersberger  |
| Crist          | Langevin       | Rush           |
| Crowley        | Larson (CT)    | Ryan (OH)      |
| Cuellar        | Lawrence       | Sánchez        |
| Davis (CA)     | Lawson (FL)    | Sarbanes       |
| Davis, Danny   | Lee            | Schakowsky     |
| DeFazio        | Levin          | Schiff         |
| DeGette        | Lewis (GA)     | Schneider      |
| Delaney        | Lieu, Ted      | Schrader       |
| Rice (SC)      | Lipinski       | Scott (VA)     |
| DelBene        | Loebbeck       | Serrano        |
| Demings        | Lofgren        | Sewell (AL)    |
| DeSaulnier     | Lowenthal      | Shea-Porter    |
| Deutsch        | Lowe           | Sherman        |
| Dingell        | Lujan Grisham, | Sinema         |
| Doggett        | M.             | Sires          |
| Doyle, Michael | Luján, Ben Ray | Slaughter      |
| F.             | Lynch          | Smith (WA)     |
| Ellison        | Maloney,       | Soto           |
| Engel          | Carolyn B.     | Speier         |
| Eshoo          | Maloney, Sean  | Suozi          |
| Española       | Matsui         | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Esty (CT)      | McCollum       | Takano         |
| Evans          | McEachin       | Thompson (CA)  |
| Foster         | McGovern       | Thompson (MS)  |
| Frankel (FL)   | McNerney       | Titus          |
| Fudge          | Meeks          | Tonko          |
| Galleo         | Meng           | Torres         |
| Garamendi      | Moore          | Tsongas        |
| Gonzalez (TX)  | Moulton        | Vargas         |
| Gottheimer     | Murphy (FL)    | Veasey         |
| Green, Al      | Nadler         | Vela           |
| Grijalva       | Neal           | Velázquez      |
| Gutiérrez      | Nolan          | Visclosky      |
| Hanabusa       | Norcross       | Walz           |
| Hastings       | O'Halleran     | Wasserman      |
| Heck           | O'Rourke       | Schultz        |
| Himes          | Pallone        | Waters, Maxine |
| Hoyer          | Panetta        | Watson Coleman |
| Huffman        | Pascarella     | Welch          |
| Jackson Lee    | Payne          | Yarmuth        |
| Jayapal        | Pelosi         |                |

NOT VOTING—16

|              |              |
|--------------|--------------|
| Green, Gene  | Scalise      |
| Higgins (NY) | Scott, David |
| Johnson, Sam | Weber (TX)   |
| Larsen (WA)  | Wilson (FL)  |
| Long         |              |
| Napolitano   |              |

□ 1434

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 185, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—230

|         |        |           |
|---------|--------|-----------|
| Abraham | Amash  | Arrington |
| Allen   | Amodei | Babin     |

|               |                 |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Bacon         | Graves (MO)     | Perry           |
| Banks (IN)    | Griffith        | Pittenger       |
| Barletta      | Grothman        | Poe (TX)        |
| Barr          | Guthrie         | Poliquin        |
| Barton        | Harper          | Posey           |
| Bergman       | Harris          | Ratcliffe       |
| Biggs         | Hartzler        | Reed            |
| Billirakis    | Hensarling      | Reichert        |
| Bishop (MI)   | Herrera Beutler | Renacci         |
| Bishop (UT)   | Hice, Jody B.   | Rice (SC)       |
| Black         | Higgins (LA)    | Roby            |
| Blackburn     | Hill            | Roe (TN)        |
| Bost          | Holding         | Rogers (AL)     |
| Brady (TX)    | Hollingsworth   | Rogers (KY)     |
| Brat          | Hudson          | Rohrabacher     |
| Bridenstine   | Huizenga        | Rokita          |
| Brooks (AL)   | Hultgren        | Rooney, Francis |
| Brooks (IN)   | Hunter          | Rooney, Thomas  |
| Buchanan      | Hurd            | J.              |
| Buck          | Issa            | Ros-Lehtinen    |
| Bucshon       | Jenkins (KS)    | Roskam          |
| Budd          | Jenkins (WV)    | Ross            |
| Burgess       | Johnson (LA)    | Rothfus         |
| Byrne         | Johnson (OH)    | Rouzer          |
| Calvert       | Jones           | Royce (CA)      |
| Carter (GA)   | Jordan          | Russell         |
| Carter (TX)   | Joyce (OH)      | Rutherford      |
| Chabot        | Katko           | Sanford         |
| Cheney        | Kelly (MS)      | Schrader        |
| Coffman       | Kelly (PA)      | Schweikert      |
| Cole          | King (IA)       | Scott, Austin   |
| Collins (GA)  | King (NY)       | Sensenbrenner   |
| Collins (NY)  | Kinzing         | Sessions        |
| Comer         | Knight          | Shimkus         |
| Conaway       | Kustoff (TN)    | Shuster         |
| Cook          | Labrador        | Simpson         |
| Costello (PA) | LaHood          | Sinema          |
| Cramer        | LaMalfa         | Smith (MO)      |
| Crawford      | Lamborn         | Smith (NE)      |
| Culberson     | Lance           | Smith (NJ)      |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Latta           | Smith (TX)      |
| Davidson      | Lewis (MN)      | Smucker         |
| Davis, Rodney | LoBiondo        | Stefanik        |
| Denham        | Loudermilk      | Stewart         |
| Dent          | Love            | Stivers         |
| DeSantis      | Lucas           | Taylor          |
| DesJarlais    | Luetkemeyer     | Tenney          |
| Diaz-Balart   | MacArthur       | Thompson (PA)   |
| Donovan       | Marchant        | Thornberry      |
| Duffy         | Marino          | Tiberi          |
| Duncan (SC)   | Marshall        | Tipton          |
| Duncan (TN)   | Massie          | Trott           |
| Dunn          | Mast            | Turner          |
| Emmer         | McCarthy        | Upton           |
| Estes (KS)    | McCauley        | Valadao         |
| Farenthold    | McClintock      | Wagner          |
| Faso          | McHenry         | Walberg         |
| Ferguson      | McKinley        | Walden          |
| Fitzpatrick   | McMorris        | Walker          |
| Fleischmann   | Rodgers         | Walorski        |
| Flores        | McSally         | Walters, Mimi   |
| Fortenberry   | Meadows         | Webster (FL)    |
| Fox           | Messer          | Wenstrup        |
| Franks (AZ)   | Mitchell        | Westerman       |
| Frelinghuysen | Moolenaar       | Williams        |
| Gaetz         | Mooney (WV)     | Wilson (SC)     |
| Gallagher     | Mullin          | Wittman         |
| Garrett       | Murphy (PA)     | Womack          |
| Gianforte     | Newhouse        | Woodall         |
| Gibbs         | Noem            | Yoder           |
| Gohmert       | Nunes           | Yoho            |
|               | Olson           | Young (AK)      |
|               | Palazzo         | Young (IA)      |
|               | Palmer          | Zeldin          |
|               | Paulsen         |                 |
|               | Pearce          |                 |

NOES—185

|                 |             |              |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Adams           | Butterfield | Conyers      |
| Aguilar         | Capuano     | Cooper       |
| Barragán        | Carbajal    | Correa       |
| Bass            | Cárdenas    | Costa        |
| Beatty          | Carson (IN) | Courtney     |
| Bera            | Cartwright  | Crist        |
| Beyer           | Castor (FL) | Crowley      |
| Bishop (GA)     | Castro (TX) | Cuellar      |
| Blumenauer      | Chu, Judy   | Davis (CA)   |
| Blunt Rochester | Cicilline   | Davis, Danny |
| Bonamici        | Clark (MA)  | DeFazio      |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Clarke (NY) | DeGette      |
| F.              | Clay        | Delaney      |
| Brady (PA)      | Cleaver     | DeLauro      |
| Brown (MD)      | Clyburn     | DelBene      |
| Brownley (CA)   | Cohen       | Demings      |
| Bustos          | Connolly    | DeSaulnier   |

|                   |                   |                |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Deutch            | Lawson (FL)       | Rice (NY)      |
| Dingell           | Lee               | Richmond       |
| Doggett           | Levin             | Rosen          |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Lewis (GA)        | Royal-Allard   |
| Ellison           | Lieu, Ted         | Ruiz           |
| Engel             | Lipinski          | Ruppersberger  |
| Eshoo             | Loeb              | Rush           |
| Espallat          | Loftgren          | Ryan (OH)      |
| Esty (CT)         | Lowenthal         | Sánchez        |
| Evans             | Lowe              | Sarbanes       |
| Foster            | Lujan Grisham, M. | Schakowsky     |
| Frankel (FL)      | Lujan, Ben Ray    | Schiff         |
| Fudge             | Lynch             | Schneider      |
| Galleo            | Maloney           | Scott (VA)     |
| Garamendi         | Carolyn B.        | Scott, David   |
| Gonzalez (TX)     | Maloney, Sean     | Serrano        |
| Gottheimer        | Matsui            | Sewell (AL)    |
| Green, Al         | McCollum          | Shea-Porter    |
| Green, Gene       | McEachin          | Sherman        |
| Grijalva          | McGovern          | Sires          |
| Gutiérrez         | McNerney          | Slaughter      |
| Hanabusa          | Meeks             | Smith (WA)     |
| Hastings          | Meng              | Soto           |
| Heck              | Moore             | Speier         |
| Himes             | Moulton           | Suozi          |
| Hoyer             | Murphy (FL)       | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Huffman           | Nadler            | Takano         |
| Jackson Lee       | Neal              | Thompson (CA)  |
| Jayapal           | Nolan             | Thompson (MS)  |
| Jeffries          | Norcross          | Titus          |
| Johnson (GA)      | O'Halleran        | Tonko          |
| Johnson, E. B.    | O'Rourke          | Torres         |
| Kaptur            | Pallone           | Tsongas        |
| Keating           | Panetta           | Vargas         |
| Kelly (IL)        | Pascrell          | Veasey         |
| Kennedy           | Payne             | Vela           |
| Khanna            | Pelosi            | Velázquez      |
| Kihuen            | Perlmutter        | Visclosky      |
| Kildee            | Peters            | Walz           |
| Kilmer            | Peterson          | Wasserman      |
| Kind              | Pingree           | Schultz        |
| Krishnamoorthi    | Pocan             | Waters, Maxine |
| Kuster (NH)       | Polis             | Watson Coleman |
| Langevin          | Price (NC)        | Welch          |
| Larson (CT)       | Quigley           | Yarmuth        |
| Lawrence          | Raskin            |                |

## NOT VOTING—16

|          |              |             |
|----------|--------------|-------------|
| Aderholt | Granger      | Napolitano  |
| Blum     | Higgins (NY) | Scalise     |
| Chaffetz | Johnson, Sam | Weber (TX)  |
| Comstock | Larsen (WA)  | Wilson (FL) |
| Cummins  | Long         |             |
| Gabbard  | Meehan       |             |

□ 1442

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 313. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes No. 311, No. 312, and No. 313 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair. I would have also voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 1873 and H.R. 1654. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 392—Rule providing for both H.R. 1873—Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act and H.R. 1654—Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

FIXING INTERNAL RESPONSE TO  
MISCONDUCT ACT

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2131) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to improve consistency regarding discipline and adverse actions in the Department's workforce, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2131

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fixing Internal Response to Misconduct Act" or the "DHS FIRM Act".

## SEC. 2. DHS POLICY ON DISCIPLINE AND ADVERSE ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 704 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (9), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(11) implement a Department-wide policy related to discipline and adverse actions described in subsection (e).";

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) POLICY ON DISCIPLINE AND ADVERSE ACTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Chief Human Capital Officer, in accordance with any established Department-wide policy that deals with discipline and adverse actions, shall provide—

"(A) guidance to the senior human resources official overseeing discipline and adverse actions for headquarters personnel and non-component entities, as identified by the Chief Human Capital Officer, and relevant component heads regarding informing the public about how to report employee misconduct;

"(B) guidance on how Department employees should report employee misconduct;

"(C) guidance on the type, quantity, and frequency of data regarding discipline and adverse actions to be submitted to the Chief Human Capital Officer by the senior human resources official overseeing discipline and adverse actions for headquarters personnel and non-component entities, as identified by the Chief Human Capital Officer and component heads for the purposes of paragraph (3)(C);

"(D) guidance on how to implement any such Department-wide policy in a manner

that promotes greater uniformity and transparency in the administration of such policy across the Department; and

"(E) guidance and appropriate training on prohibited personnel practices, employee rights, and procedures and processes related to such.

"(2) TABLE OF OFFENSES AND PENALTIES.—

"(A) PRE-EXISTING TABLES.—If a table of offenses and penalties exists for a component of the Department as of the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Chief Human Capital Officer shall review and, if appropriate, approve such table and any changes to such table made after such date of enactment. In cases in which such tables do not comply with Department policy, the Chief Human Capital Officer shall instruct component heads on corrective measures to be taken in order to achieve such compliance.

"(B) NEW COMPONENT TABLES.—If a table of offenses and penalties does not exist for a component of the Department as of the date of enactment of this subsection, a component head may, in coordination with the Chief Human Capital Officer, develop a table of offenses and penalties to be used by such component. The Chief Human Capital Officer shall review and, if appropriate, approve such table and any changes to such table made after such date of enactment. In cases in which such tables or changes do not comply with Department policy, the Chief Human Capital Officer shall instruct the component head on corrective measures to be taken in order to achieve such compliance.

"(3) COMPONENT RESPONSIBILITIES.—Component heads shall comply with Department-wide policy (including guidance relating to such) regarding discipline and adverse actions for the Department's workforce, including—

"(A) providing any current table of offenses and penalties or future changes to a component's table to the Chief Human Capital Officer for review in accordance with paragraph (2)(A);

"(B) providing any new table of offenses and penalties or future changes to a component's table to the Chief Human Capital Officer for review in accordance with paragraph (2)(B); and

"(C) providing to the Chief Human Capital Officer any data regarding discipline and adverse actions in accordance with paragraph (1)(C).

"(4) OVERSIGHT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Chief Human Capital Officer shall implement a process to oversee component compliance with any established Department-wide policy regarding discipline and adverse actions referred to in paragraph (1), including—

"(i) the degree to which components are complying with such policy; and

"(ii) at a minimum, each fiscal year, a review of component adjudication of misconduct data to—

"(I) ensure consistent adherence to such policy and any Department-wide table of offenses and penalties or any component-specific table of offenses and penalties approved by the Chief Human Capital Officer pursuant to paragraph (2); and

"(II) determine whether employee training regarding such misconduct policy or adjustment in such misconduct policy is appropriate.

"(B) WORKING GROUPS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Human Capital Officer may establish working groups, as

necessary, to address employee misconduct within the Department. If the Chief Human Capital Officer establishes such a working group, the Chief Human Capital Officer shall specify a timeframe for the completion of such group's work.

“(ii) FUNCTION.—A working group established pursuant to clause (i) shall seek to identify any trends in misconduct referred to in such subparagraph, review component processes for addressing misconduct, and, where appropriate, develop possible alternate strategies to address such misconduct.

“(iii) PARTICIPATION.—If a working group is established pursuant to clause (i), the relevant component head shall participate in such working group and shall consider implementing, as appropriate, any recommendations issued by such working group.

“(iv) FOLLOW-UP REVIEWS.—The Chief Human Capital Officer shall conduct annual, or on a more frequent basis as determined by the Chief Human Capital Officer, follow-up reviews of components regarding implementation of working group recommendations. In consultation with the Chief Human Capital Officer, the Secretary may request the Inspector General of the Department to investigate any concerns identified through the oversight process under this subsection that components have not addressed.”.

(b) REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the development of the oversight process required under subsection (e) of section 704 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 344) (as added by subsection (a) of this section), the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on such oversight process, including component compliance with any policy regarding discipline and adverse actions, data collection efforts, and information on the development of any working groups under such subsection (e).

(c) PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

□ 1445

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about my bill, H.R. 2131, the Fixing In-

ternal Response to Misconduct Act, or the Department of Homeland Security FIRM Act, for short.

Mr. Speaker, employee misconduct and unethical behavior at any Federal agency can disrupt the daily operations of our government; however, these activities can have greater national security implications at Federal agencies like the Department of Homeland Security due to its intrinsic mission. Incidents of employee misconduct within DHS do not only hinder the public's confidence in the Department, but also jeopardize the day-to-day working environment for Department of Homeland Security employees.

Since its inception, DHS has faced significant obstacles consolidating 22 preexisting component agencies, including instilling common, across-the-board policies. Time and again, the DHS Office of Inspector General has criticized the Department's lack of consistent policies.

Until recently, the Department was operating without an across-the-board overarching misconduct policy, and headquarters and a major component were operating without the assistance of a Table of Offenses and Penalties.

Issued in November 2016, the Department's discipline and adverse actions program directive put in place a Departmentwide policy to provide guidance in the adjudication and management of disciplinary matters.

My bill, H.R. 2131, will strengthen and support this policy by granting greater oversight to the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department, allowing the CHCO to identify trends and causes of persistent employee misconduct and to establish working groups to address such misconduct.

H.R. 2131 promotes greater consistency in the use of discipline and adverse actions and improves collaboration between the CHCO components and human resources officials regarding the improvement of employee conduct at the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill to help ensure any misconduct and unethical behavior at DHS is properly dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND  
GOVERNMENT REFORM,  
Washington, DC, June 21, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. McCaul,  
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in matters being considered in H.R. 2131, the DHS Fixing Internal Response to Misconduct (FIRM) Act.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 2131 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have identified matters of jurisdictional interest to the Oversight Committee in the

bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is currently investigating disciplinary processes and procedures, including disparate tables of penalties, across the federal government. Any government-wide table of penalties created by legislation stemming from the Oversight Committee shall supersede the tables established under this legislation. I look forward to working with you to ensure a uniform, consistent, and effective disciplinary process for federal employees across the civil service.

The Oversight Committee has historically been a strong defender of the Inspector General community. It is our understanding that nothing in this legislation creates a negative inference related to the authority of other Inspectors General under the Inspector General Act of 1978 at other departments and agencies within the federal government. I appreciate your willingness to work together to ensure that all Inspectors General are given the authority needed to accomplish their important mission.

I ask that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the committee report for H.R. 2131 and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,  
Washington, DC, June 21, 2017.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,  
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2131, the “Fixing Internal Response to Misconduct Act.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Oversight and Government will forego seeking a sequential referral of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration on this bill at this time, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform does not waive any jurisdiction it may have over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future.

Additionally, the Committee expects that any table of offenses or penalties created by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management for government-wide application shall supersede any table created at any component of the Department, including any Department-wide guidance on such tables, and shall be used at all entities of the Department, although the Department or its components may provide an additional table of offenses and penalties subject to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) entitled “Pre-Existing Tables” and “New Component Tables” respectively, for offenses not listed in the government-wide table.



Furthermore, this legislation authorizes the Inspector General of the Department, within their existing authorities under the Inspector General Act of 1978, to issue management alerts regarding misconduct to the Secretary. The Committee does not intend to create any negative inference related to the authority of other Inspector Generals with this provision. The Committee intends to reinforce authorities already existing in the Inspector General Act of 1978. The Committee strongly opposes the citation of this provision to cast any inference on Inspector Generals at other departments and agencies that would negatively impact their ability to accomplish their missions.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the report or in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2131, the DHS FIRM Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2131, or the DHS FIRM Act, seeks to ensure greater consistency and transparency in how discipline is administered across the Department of Homeland Security. Discipline administered in a fair and equitable manner has a huge implication on job satisfaction.

Since 2003, DHS, a diverse, multimission Federal Department, has struggled with low morale. At the end of the prior administration, there was evidence that the DHS workforce was starting to feel a more fair and cooperative and supportive DHS. In 2016, the Office of Personnel Management reported a 3 percent increase in the annual Employee Viewpoint Survey, which indicated that DHS supported fairness and protection of employees from arbitrary action.

While the OPM survey results are positive indicators, more must be done by the current DHS leadership. This bill seeks to give the Department's Chief Human Capital Officer a more prominent role in ensuring that discipline is handled in an equitable and fair manner. Specifically, this bill charges the Chief Human Capital Officer with oversight of how employee misconduct is managed across all components.

To ensure fairness and transparency, the bill requires each component to accomplish a matrix of offenses and penalties that is tailored to the needs of that organization, and upon approval by the Department's Chief Human Capital Officer, such information to be shared with the workforce.

While it is essential that senior-level human capital personnel at DHS have a structure to address discipline, it is equally important that such discipline be administered in a fair and equitable manner. This is what this bill actually does.

Mr. Speaker, the implementation of a Departmentwide discipline and ad-

verse action policy should improve employer and employee relations and communication. Enacting this legislation will send a message of support for the Department's workforce who, every day, do things big and small to guard our country against terrorists and other bad actors. These Department personnel are entrusted with the security of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 2131, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his wisdom and counsel.

I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2131, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2131, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DHS ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD ACT OF 2017

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1282) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish Acquisition Review Boards in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1282

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2017".

##### SEC. 2. ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### "SEC. 836. ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an Acquisition Review Board (in this section referred to as the 'Board') to—

"(1) strengthen accountability and uniformity within the Department acquisition review process;

"(2) review major acquisition programs; and

"(3) review the use of best practices.

"(b) COMPOSITION.—The Under Secretary for Management shall serve as chair of the Board. The Secretary shall also ensure participation by other relevant Department officials, including at least two component heads or their designees, as permanent members of the Board.

"(c) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet regularly for purposes of ensuring all acquisitions processes proceed in a timely fashion

to achieve mission readiness. The Board shall convene at the Secretary's discretion and at any time—

"(1) a major acquisition program—

"(A) requires authorization to proceed from one acquisition decision event to another throughout the acquisition life cycle;

"(B) is in breach of its approved requirements; or

"(C) requires additional review, as determined by the Under Secretary for Management; or

"(2) a non-major acquisition program requires review, as determined by the Under Secretary for Management.

"(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the Board are as follows:

"(1) Determine whether a proposed acquisition has met the requirements of key phases of the acquisition life cycle framework and is able to proceed to the next phase and eventual full production and deployment.

"(2) Oversee whether a proposed acquisition's business strategy, resources, management, and accountability is executable and is aligned to strategic initiatives.

"(3) Support the person with acquisition decision authority for an acquisition in determining the appropriate direction for such acquisition at key acquisition decision events.

"(4) Conduct systematic reviews of acquisitions to ensure that such acquisitions are progressing in compliance with the approved documents for their current acquisition phases.

"(5) Review the acquisition documents of each major acquisition program, including the acquisition program baseline and documentation reflecting consideration of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives, to ensure the reliability of underlying data.

"(6) Ensure that practices are adopted and implemented to require consideration of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives as part of the process for developing requirements for major acquisition programs prior to the initiation of the second acquisition decision event, including, at a minimum, the following practices:

"(A) Department officials responsible for acquisition, budget, and cost estimating functions are provided with the appropriate opportunity to develop estimates and raise cost and schedule matters before performance objectives are established for capabilities when feasible.

"(B) Full consideration is given to possible trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives for each alternative.

"(e) ACQUISITION PROGRAM BASELINE REPORT REQUIREMENT.—If the person exercising acquisition decision authority over a major acquisition program approves such program to proceed into the planning phase before such program has a Department-approved acquisition program baseline, the Under Secretary for Management shall create and approve an acquisition program baseline report regarding such approval, and the Secretary shall—

"(1) within seven days after an acquisition decision memorandum is signed, notify in writing the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of such decision; and

"(2) within 60 days after the acquisition decision memorandum is signed, submit to such committees a report stating the rationale for such decision and a plan of action to require an acquisition program baseline for such program.

“(f) REPORT.—The Under Secretary for Management shall provide information to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate on an annual basis through fiscal year 2022 on the activities of the Board for the prior fiscal year that includes information relating to the following:

“(1) For each meeting of the Board, any acquisition decision memoranda.

“(2) Results of the systematic reviews conducted pursuant to paragraph (4) of subsection (d).

“(3) Results of acquisition document reviews required pursuant to paragraph (5) of subsection (d).

“(4) Activities to ensure that practices are adopted and implemented throughout the Department pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (d).

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ACQUISITION.—The term ‘acquisition’ has the meaning given such term in section 131 of title 41, United States Code.

“(2) ACQUISITION DECISION AUTHORITY.—The term ‘acquisition decision authority’ means the authority, held by the Secretary acting through the Deputy Secretary or Under Secretary for Management to—

“(A) ensure compliance with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives;

“(B) review (including approving, pausing, modifying, or cancelling) an acquisition program through the life cycle of such program;

“(C) ensure that acquisition program managers have the resources necessary to successfully execute an approved acquisition program;

“(D) ensure good acquisition program management of cost, schedule, risk, and system performance of the acquisition program at issue, including assessing acquisition program baseline breaches and directing any corrective action for such breaches; and

“(E) ensure that acquisition program managers, on an ongoing basis, monitor cost, schedule, and performance against established baselines and use tools to assess risks to an acquisition program at all phases of the life cycle of such program to avoid and mitigate acquisition program baseline breaches.

“(3) ACQUISITION DECISION EVENT.—The term ‘acquisition decision event’, with respect to an acquisition program, means a predetermined point within each of the acquisition phases at which the acquisition decision authority determines whether such acquisition program shall proceed to the next acquisition phase.

“(4) ACQUISITION DECISION MEMORANDUM.—The term ‘acquisition decision memorandum’, with respect to an acquisition, means the official acquisition decision event record that includes a documented record of decisions, exit criteria, and assigned actions for such acquisition, as determined by the person exercising acquisition decision authority for such acquisition.

“(5) ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘acquisition program’ means the process by which the Department acquires, with any appropriated amounts, by contract for purchase or lease, property or services (including construction) that support the missions and goals of the Department.

“(6) ACQUISITION PROGRAM BASELINE.—The term ‘acquisition program baseline’, with respect to an acquisition program, means a summary of the cost, schedule, and performance parameters, expressed in standard,

measurable, quantitative terms, which must be met in order to accomplish the goals of such program.

“(7) BEST PRACTICES.—The term ‘best practices’, with respect to acquisition, means a knowledge-based approach to capability development that includes—

“(A) identifying and validating needs;

“(B) assessing alternatives to select the most appropriate solution;

“(C) clearly establishing well-defined requirements;

“(D) developing realistic cost assessments and schedules;

“(E) securing stable funding that matches resources to requirements;

“(F) demonstrating technology, design, and manufacturing maturity;

“(G) using milestones and exit criteria or specific accomplishments that demonstrate progress;

“(H) adopting and executing standardized processes with known success across programs;

“(I) establishing an adequate workforce that is qualified and sufficient to perform necessary functions; and

“(J) integrating the capabilities described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) into the Department’s mission and business operations.

“(8) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘major acquisition program’ means a Department acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of at least \$300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 2017 constant dollars) over its life cycle cost.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is further amended by adding after the item relating to section 835 the following new item:

“Sec. 836. Acquisition Review Board.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore my colleagues to join in supporting our bill, H.R. 1282, the DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2017. This legislation provides commonsense reform and saves the taxpayers’ dollars.

The Government Accountability Office and the DHS Office of Inspector General have reported the longstanding challenges the Department of Homeland Security faces in managing its major acquisition programs. These programs are those costing more than \$300 million, which cost the Department about \$7 billion in 2016 alone.

Since the Department’s creation, the GAO has placed DHS management

functions, including acquisition management, on its high-risk list of programs that are highly susceptible to fraud, waste, and abuse. Mismanagement is present or in need of transformation, and the DHS still struggles to ensure that major acquisition programs stay on budget, are delivered on schedule, and provide capabilities as originally intended.

Homeland Security is a unique committee insofar as it affords the opportunity for folks on both sides of the aisle to work in a bipartisan manner for things that we can all concede are in the best interest of our Nation.

A recent GAO report found that 9 of 26 major acquisition programs experienced cost growth or schedule slips. The amount of cost overruns totaled nearly \$1 billion and are scheduled to slip by an average of 6 months per program. The GAO also found that half of the major acquisition programs it reviewed deployed capabilities before meeting all key performance parameters, which are the most important requirements a system must meet in order to do the jobs that they are intended to do.

It is unacceptable for waste and dysfunction to continue, and it is imperative that the DHS take acquisition management seriously. This bill makes that the case.

We must provide strong accountability mechanisms to ensure major acquisition programs with challenges are caught up, found early, and that solutions are quickly implemented.

This bill ensures that DHS provides that accountability and consistency needed to manage major components, acquisition programs, et cetera, by authorizing the Secretary to establish an Acquisition Review Board. The Acquisition Review Board would then strengthen the accountability and uniformity in DHS’ acquisition process, review major programs, and evaluate the use of best practices.

This bill essentially codifies the already existing Acquisition Review Board to ensure that that board continues and has the oversight authority it needs under law to make sure that the dollars that we take from the taxpayers are sufficiently and adequately managed and not wasted.

The Acquisition Review Board would be chaired by the Under Secretary for Management and would require at least two component heads or their designees to be permanent members. This would ensure participation from all DHS components.

The Board would be required to meet regularly and would be responsible to determine if a proposed acquisition has met planning requirements needed to proceed to production and deployment, oversee major acquisitions as a business strategy, and review programs in a cost benefit analysis format to determine performance objectives and ensure that our dollars are well spent.

Mr. Speaker, a recent news story pointed out that nine individuals on the planet Earth control as much wealth as 50 percent of the population of the planet Earth. That means that these nine people control as much wealth as 3.5 billion people. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if you were to take the amalgamated wealth of those nine individuals and add it to those 3.5 billion and apply it to the United States' national debt, we could pay off a mere 9.4 percent.

Given that our national debt is almost \$20 trillion dollars and rising, it is imperative that we take this bipartisan step to ensure that our homeland is secured but that the dollars spent doing so are spent effectively, efficiently, and with good stewardship. This legislation helps to ensure that tax dollars are safeguarded, but it also helps to ensure that DHS personnel receive the tools they need to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, I implore and urge my colleagues on each side of the aisle to join in this bipartisan legislation to ensure that our tax dollars are well shepherded but that our Nation is as secure as can be possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1282, the DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2017, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the Department of Homeland Security has strengthened the management of its major acquisition programs, which historically has been weak.

H.R. 1282 authorizes the key mechanisms from the previous administration to ensure acquisitions valued at more than \$300 million, which account for over \$7 billion of DHS' annual budget, receive ongoing scrutiny—let me repeat, receive ongoing scrutiny.

Since 2008, the Acquisition Review Board has brought leaders together from across the Department to validate foundational acquisition documents such as cost and schedule estimates and performance requirements. The Department has had to learn the hard way about the importance of adhering to its acquisition best practices, including the establishment of realistic requirements in cost estimates that take into account the life cycle of costs.

An example is the SBInet program, started in 2006, that was supposed to bring together integration of systems of infrastructure and technology to secure the border. This program was terminated in 2011 only after \$1 billion had been spent. Let me repeat that. This program was terminated in 2011, but only after \$1 billion had been spent.

The acquisition went wrong because CBP bypassed required processes and awarded a multimillion-dollar contract

without having laid the foundation to oversee contractor performance, cost controls, and scheduling.

Just last week, the Department was forced to cancel its \$1.5 billion Agile Services contract, or the FLASH contract, due to significant errors and missteps in the procurement process.

Many of us are concerned that, in the Department's haste to deliver the President's campaign promise to build a wall, critical steps in the acquisition process will be short-circuited, leaving Americans with a bill for a bad investment.

□ 1500

At this time, a centralized oversight body for DHS major acquisitions is more important than ever.

This bill provides for the board to convene when a major acquisition program requires authorization to proceed from one decision event to another, or is in breach of its approved requirements, or requires additional review.

Efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition process is imperative for the DHS mission of procuring goods, services, and supplies in support of its national security efforts. The Committee on Homeland Security unanimously approved this measure earlier this Congress, and similar language was approved by the House in October 2015.

By establishing this board into law and laying out its responsibilities, Congress can ensure that this vital oversight will continue and that DHS will continue to show progress in its management of acquisitions.

I urge passage of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt thanks to my distinguished colleague from California. While we might not agree on all that is appropriate within the purview of the Department, we do agree on being effective stewards of tax dollars, and I am grateful for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my colleague from Virginia for bringing forth this most important accountability measure.

This bill enhances the Department's accountability and provides greater acquisition oversight to intercede before programs fail to meet important cost and schedule milestones.

Given DHS's limited budgetary resources and the importance of its mission, it is critical that DHS improves its management of major acquisition programs. Although the Department has made some progress in its major acquisition programs, DHS cannot afford to neglect the day-to-day management of the agency and how it procures essential goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, wish to extend my thanks to my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to support this commonsense, bipartisan measure, H.R. 1282, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1282, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ELECTRICITY RELIABILITY AND FOREST PROTECTION ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 392 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1873.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1504

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today marks the Committee on Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans' first step in advancing an infrastructure agenda that aims to improve our Nation's infrastructure and expedite the development of new infrastructure.

As vice chairman of the subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), I have already seen a number of bills advance through the committee that, like the bill in front of us today, employ simple, pragmatic solutions to improve our Nation's infrastructure and advance an all-of-the-above energy and water strategy.

The Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, a bipartisan bill offered by my colleagues, Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. SCHRADER, is about avoiding electricity blackouts, preventing forest fires, and promoting healthy habitat for wildlife on Federal lands.

This bill represents a simple, pragmatic solution to an issue that is born out of a lack of communication and consistency within a Federal agency.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for agreeing to help expedite consideration of this bill today.

I commend my colleagues, Mr. LAMALFA from California and Mr. SCHRADER from Oregon, for bringing up this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation.

I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, DC, May 19, 2017.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act. It is my understanding that, on April 27, 2017, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered the bill reported with amendments.

This legislation contains provisions within the Committee on Agriculture's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, May 22, 2017.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 27, 2017, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported as amended H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, by a bipartisan roll call vote of 24 to 14. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Agriculture to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and for the extraordinary cooperation shown by you and your staff over matters of shared jurisdiction. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Wildfires are a huge problem in our country. They are becoming more frequent and more intense, and they pose a growing threat to public safety and local economies.

But, instead of taking steps to reduce wildfire threats, this bill tries to scare us into weakening environmental safeguards and giving away public land management to States and localities.

I agree with the bill's sponsor that overgrown vegetation and falling trees can spark forest fires. However, government data shows that this accounts for less than one-third of 1 percent of fires in the past 5 years.

Why are we focusing on this minor problem when it is clear that real wildfire solutions require treating these fires like the disasters that they are under the law, and allowing the Forest Service to use its base budget for preventing wildfires, not just fighting them?

Given what we have seen from Republicans in the Natural Resources Committee, the answer is simple: to chip away at the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA; shut expert Federal agencies and concerned citizens out of the land management process; and allow Big Business to profit at the expense of taxpayers and our public lands.

The bill lets State and local electricity reliability standards trump public land management rules. There is not even any requirement that the

standards are based on sound science or principles of risk assessment.

If a county says it needs to clear-cut a half mile into a national forest to protect power lines, this bill would allow it, and the Forest Service could only watch. Further, there is no prohibition on selling timber harvested during these operations.

The bill also mandates the Forest Service and BLM use its NEPA categorical exclusion authority, even when vegetation management projects could cause environmental damage. This means that people who value public lands would be completely shut out from the management process. So much for transparency and public input.

Adding insult to injury, the bill waives liability for companies that start forest fires or cause other damage. This is nonsense and shifts an incredible burden and risk onto American taxpayers.

The bill also fails to deal with the root causes of our fire crisis, including the fact that the Forest Service cannot afford mitigation work to prevent wildfires because it spends half of its budget fighting them.

I support legislation making wildfire disasters eligible for disaster assistance under the Stafford Act, and I know many of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, do as well. I am disappointed that we are not passing a bill to do that today, and, instead, are here just pretending to do something about a very serious problem.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

In California, we know all too well the disastrous effects of wildfires. Reducing the threat of wildfires requires numerous proactive efforts, including the timely removal of fire hazards.

My colleague, Mr. LAMALFA, has identified a solution to help improve fire hazard removal on Federal lands and prevent electrical blackouts.

There are more than 18,000 miles of power lines on Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management land, and these transmission lines, running along electricity rights-of-way, are critical to the power distribution in the West.

The costs of operating and maintaining these transmission rights-of-way are borne by utility companies, but approval for companies to remove the fire hazards comes from the Forest Service. Currently, it takes the Forest Service months to grant approval to remove a dead tree.

H.R. 1873 addresses this issue by allowing utility companies to remove

fire risks in a timely manner and ensuring we are being responsible stewards of our Federal lands.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. Additionally, the bill allows utility companies to engage in responsible vegetation management along these rights-of-way, including language that I have added, which encourages the management practices for our pollinators, enhancing the habitat and forage for these pollinators, such as commercial and native bees that are so important to our trees and our community.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me repeat: We are talking about caution and what is causing fires; and 0.03 percent of fires caused by transmission lines is the data that is available to us. I know facts sometimes don't matter, but they should matter in something as important as this; and 0.03 percent is the cause by transmission lines of fires in the forest on public lands.

We are generalizing the huge wildfires that we have seen to make a case for this bill when the case is about transmission lines, rights-of-way; and it is 0.03 percent as the root cause of those fires over 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend my colleagues for this commonsense legislation. As a result of drought and the bark beetle, there are an estimated over 107 million dead trees in over 33 million acres of forests in California, and it is also throughout the West. Part of this is due to climate change, which is one of the most vexing challenges of our time.

This unprecedented tree mortality has created serious fire risk of wildfires throughout the West. Today, in California, in the Central Valley, we have record temperatures of 109 degrees and 112 degrees. Obviously, that adds to the concern.

One thing that can be done, though, to prevent wildfires is to manage and control the amount of vegetation, particularly in areas where we have increased fire risk. We just, bottom line, have to manage our forests a lot better than we are. We are putting way too much of our budget for managing our forests to putting out fires, and that must change.

But an example of a location with higher fire risk is a utility corridor with exposed electrical lines that we have throughout the West in forested areas.

In 2015, the Butte fire in northern California, which was the seventh most destructive in California's history, was sparked by a tree that came into contact with a power line. This is easily prevented by removing those trees that could damage lines, reducing fire risk and the cost of repairs to the utility ratepayers, plus the people in the surrounding area, which these fires are devastating, and sometimes lives are lost as well as property.

□ 1515

H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, if enacted, would create a process to expedite routine maintenance of vegetation along electric utilities in and near utility corridors and would help prevent future tragedies like the 2015 Butte fire in northern California that was devastating, once again.

The bottom line is that we must do more, and we can. I concur that we should utilize the Stafford Act for forest fires, and that would free up more money to manage the forests. But that is a separate piece of legislation that, hopefully, we will get a chance to act on.

This is a separate piece, and I urge support of this commonsense legislation, for my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1873, legislation sponsored by my colleagues from the Western Caucus, which improves the reliability of our electrical grid while, at the same time, protecting our Federal lands and forests from the ravages of wildfires.

This bipartisan legislation is common sense, plain and simple. This bill allows electric co-ops to prune or remove a tree that would fall on a power line in an electricity corridor if left unmanaged.

Maintaining healthy and well-managed rights-of-way is important for many reasons, not the least of which are the safety of our communities and reliable electricity delivery.

Now, if you knew that a tree was going to fall on a power line and potentially cause a massive blackout or spark a fire, you would probably want to cut it back or get rid of it, right? Of course you would. It is common sense.

Unfortunately, inconsistent and unpredictable viewpoints between Federal land managers at the Departments of Interior and Agriculture have prevented co-ops from ensuring safety along the corridors, putting many at risk.

Timely decisionmaking is crucial for these co-ops to protect the land, but for far too long, bureaucratic red tape has delayed the removal of hazardous

trees for weeks and, in some cases, months. Too many times, co-ops have notified the proper Department of a dangerous situation only to have the request to remove a hazardous tree either denied or bogged down by unnecessary and duplicative reviews. Not only that, but when the very tree they reported inevitably falls on a power line and sparks a fire, the co-op is left holding the bill for the damages.

Mr. Chairman, this is absurd, and I am pleased that this legislation shifts liability for a fire started under those circumstances back to the party responsible for inaction.

Rolling the dice on forest health is not just unwise, it is flat out irresponsible. I thank the gentlemen from California and Oregon for sponsoring this much-needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1873, the bipartisan Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for working with me on this important legislation that will bring much-needed consistency and accountability throughout the Federal land management agencies.

This bill is just common sense. Putting it quite simply, we are just helping our utilities better enhance safety and reliability of the grid and protecting against wildfires and blackouts.

Contrary to what some folks have asserted, this is actually a bipartisan bill supported by quite a few Democrats. This bill is especially vital for most of those in the West, where much of our land is federally owned.

Many of your utilities' and co-ops' service territory can be more than 50 percent federally managed. We have witnessed extreme variations and approaches not only between the Forest Service and the BLM, but within the management agency districts themselves.

Jim Pena, out in Oregon: "There is little consistency from agency to agency, district to district, or even within the same offices." This is the Forest Service talking.

We read and listened to the specter of big companies coming in and clear-cutting our Federal lands. I respectfully suggest that that is why we need these vegetative management plans. They are short, concise, deal with only the utility's right-of-way and the land adjacent to it that could cause problems.

I wonder sometimes what the heck folks are talking about. We have heard complaints about absolving companies from liability. That is not true. What we are saying is, if the Secretary fails

to allow the utility to manage the vegetation on Federal lands or adjacent right-of-way in a way that is consistent with their approved vegetative management plan that they have worked out with them or if the hazard tree or tree is in imminent danger of contacting an electricity line, the utility will not be held liable for wildfire damage or loss. It does not absolve a utility from liability if they are negligent or act in a way that is inconsistent with their vegetative management plan.

I give you a great example our colleague from Arizona talked about. In Oregon, a rural co-op requested trimming some dangerous trees along the rights-of-way by the Forest Service. The Forest Service denied the request. A tree fell on the power line, sparked a fire. The utility was held responsible for paying for that fire when they had actually brought the issue to them in the first place. That is ridiculous.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1873.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I also thank Mr. WEBSTER for managing this legislation for us here on the floor today. I appreciate it.

I rise today as a sponsor in strong support, of course, of H.R. 1873. It is indeed a commonsense vegetation management bill that reduces forest fire danger possibilities and electricity blackouts, while cutting through the bureaucratic red tape in the process.

I also want to thank my colleague Mr. SCHRADER from Oregon for his strong support in making this a true bipartisan effort for something that really should have no partisan roots at all.

As we have heard several of my colleagues speak earlier in testimony on the floor here today, there are gross inconsistencies and impediments in the way the Forest Service and BLM manage transmission lines, particularly in the West, where many of these lines run through difficult terrain and dense forest.

One electric utility in my district, the City of Redding Electric Utility, uses helicopters to engage in vegetation management along the rights-of-way on Federal lands. Such remote and forested areas make it especially difficult to effectively manage an area so large and dense.

Rapid agency response is needed to help electric utility requests to conduct routine and emergency vegetation maintenance along Federal rights-of-way. It is absolutely essential to avoid wildfires and blackouts.

Another benefit this bill brings to utility companies is much-needed safeguards in instances where the Secretary fails to allow them to trim or remove a hazardous tree. There was an

unfortunate incident in La Pine, Oregon, in which a rural electric utility company was unjustly billed for a \$300,000 fire suppression bill when its request to remove a tree in imminent danger of falling on a transmission line was denied by the Forest Service.

This bill would provide the electric utility companies the confidence and means to manage and maintain their own transmission lines from overgrown and unmanaged trees along rights-of-way, something the Federal Government should already be doing in the first place.

You see from the example here that electricity frequently is generated in rural parts of our country, and long, long transmission lines are needed to get to the urban parts of the country. So we are all in this: blackouts for the urban areas and, indeed, black skies in our rural areas where the forests are from unneeded wildfires.

The Forest Service's own document shows that, between 2012 and 2013, approximately 350 forest fires were caused by this interface of damaged trees, dying trees, falling trees falling into the different types of lines you would find in rural areas in order to move the power.

These changes to status quo are long overdue. This bill is an answer to many of the problems electricity companies are having with the management of electricity rights-of-way on Federal lands. Too many dying and dead trees have fallen unnecessarily on power lines, sparking devastating forest fires that could have been prevented had they had that ability to remove the tree in question.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LAMALFA. By providing the utilities with the tools they need to ensure the reliability and the longevity of our national forests, we can bolster investment in energy infrastructure and enhance the lives of all Americans and do much better to preserve the habitat of these areas that we treasure.

I urge swift passage of the bill today and favor in the Senate when it gets over there. Indeed, I thank my colleagues for helping this process along today.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

An example that supporters of this legislation use is from Oregon. It is from 1984. In the 33 years since then, I am aware of no example of a Federal agency refusing to allow a company to do vegetation management work and then holding the company liable for the damages.

In fact, as the committee report for this bill states, the issue of land managers allowing access to rights-of-way was largely resolved by language in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, stating:

Federal agencies responsible for approving access to electric transmission and distribution facilities located on lands within the United States shall, in accordance with applicable law, expedite any Federal agency approvals that are necessary to allow owners and operators of such facilities to comply with any reliability standard approved by the Commission under section 215 of the Federal Power Act that pertains to vegetation management, service restorations, or any situation that imminently endangers the reliability or safety of the facilities.

If the utility companies feel that BLM and the Forest Service are not complying with the law, they should seek resolution in the court. Instead, they are coming after a backdoor opportunity to affect our public lands.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, it really is amazing that the bureaucratic tangle that has been caused by our so-called environmental laws has now reached the point that even dead trees on public lands that threaten to fall on power lines and cause major forest fires cannot be removed without permission from Federal bureaucrats. And then to add insult to insanity, when the bureaucracy denies or delays permission and a fire results, the cost of the fire is paid by the utility's customers through higher household electricity bills.

Mr. LAMALFA mentioned a situation in La Pine, Oregon, where the Midstate Electric Cooperative begged the Forest Service for permission to trim trees that were threatening their power lines, and they were refused. Well, sure enough, when one of those trees fell on a power line and started a fire, the utility's customers were forced to pay the firefighting costs that resulted, a third of a million dollars.

Carbon Power & Light warned the Forest Service of trees threatening their lines. The Forest Service required them first to conduct \$1.6 million of environmental studies paid by the utility's customers. If there had been a fire in the meantime, they would have had to pay those costs as well.

Mr. LAMALFA's bill basically does two things:

First, it exempts such projects from time-consuming and costly environmental reviews. After all, there is nothing more devastating to the forest environment than a forest fire. Our environmental laws are now causing these fires.

Second, when a Federal agency delays or denies permission for a utility to remove or trim hazard trees and they end up causing a fire, the liability is placed where it belongs: on the agency and its bureaucrats, not on the utility and its customers; and it gives utilities permission to remove imminent threats to power lines before they can cause a fire.



Mr. Chair, you may have noticed, common sense is not exactly common to government. Let's change that today by adopting this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At a hearing on similar legislation in the Natural Resources Committee last Congress, both the Forest Service and BLM testified in opposition and explained how they work with utility companies to address vegetation management issues.

In addition to entering into voluntary vegetation management plans, the Forest Service testified that the agency's 2013 vegetation management guide specifies for field staffs the procedures and practices that should be included in operation and maintenance plans for power lines. This guide states that, where vegetation conditions inside or outside the authorized right-of-way pose an imminent threat to power line facilities, utility companies may remove those threats immediately, without prior approval from the Forest Service.

For its part, BLM testified that, under the terms and conditions typically included in a right-of-way grant, a utility company may conduct minor trimming, pruning, and weed management to maintain the right-of-way of a facility after simply notifying BLM. The utility company can often obtain BLM approval for removal of hazardous trees through a streamlined process. For an emergency situation causing an imminent hazard, no BLM preapproval would be necessary.

□ 1530

I understand that some of the companies believe they should be able to do whatever they want whenever they want, but the land does not belong to them. It belongs to the American people, and Federal agencies have a responsibility to all Americans to ensure that those lands are not abused.

Again, facts do matter, and 0.03 percent of fires in public lands were caused by trees falling on transmission lines in the last 5 years—0.03 percent. So we continue to exaggerate the common sense behind the facts that I just laid out.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, and I thank Mr. LAMALFA for his leadership on this issue.

I would also like to commend the nonpartisan support for this bill, and associate my remarks with the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

This bill is a commonsense piece of legislation that will reduce the risk of wildfires and improve the safety and reliability of our electrical grid.

How will this bill accomplish these objectives?

It is really quite simple. When we remove overgrown vegetation near our electric grid on Federal lands, we remove the fuel component of wildfires. By reducing the risk of wildfire, we reduce the risk of an interruption of our electrical grid.

Mr. Chairman, this is so much just plain common sense that it baffles me that we are having to debate it on the floor of the House of Representatives, but I think it is an example of how misguided some of our land management agencies have become, and the need for broader reforms.

This bill would streamline the Federal review process for removal of trees and vegetation that pose a risk to our power grid and promotes consistency among Federal agencies tasked with the decisions on removal.

If we want to move toward better protection of our forests on Federal lands and the electrical grid that moves through these locations, it is obvious that we should pass H.R. 1873.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague from California (Mr. COSTA) brought up one of the real causes of wildfire, and that was climate change, the lack of mitigation, and the situation within the Forest Service budget in which half of the revenue dedicated to that department is used to suppress wildfires.

This administration has denied the existence of climate change, scrubbed it from its vocabulary, from its science, from its study. If we are going to look at the causes of wildfires, if we are going to look at strategies and how we protect the urban and forest interface, if we are going to look at really addressing the subject, then the very salient point that Mr. COSTA brought up regarding climate change has to be part and parcel of the discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, management of the forests and forest fires is an important and significant topic, but it is not the issue that we are having here today. Climate change is an important significant topic, but it is not the issue that we are talking about today.

We are talking about how you transfer power from point A, where it is produced, to point B, where people live, and make sure that you can continue to have that power flowing there be-

cause it impacts the quality of life. This is about how we improve our lives. That is the key issue.

The examples have been given out here before of examples of where that has been interrupted simply because we failed to maintain transmission lines. A good example is down in New Mexico, where, once again, an ash tree—pun intended—actually fell on a forest, on the line, creating a 150,000-acre fire; and then the company that actually owned the line and wanted to maintain it but was not allowed to by the Forest Service was given a \$35 million bill. Unfortunately, the liability of that company was only \$20 million, so you can understand the difficulty that company is in right now.

That is the reality in which we are dealing, and we have to realize that this is a solution to that issue. It is about how we provide power to people.

The only chance I had of meeting President Obama was when he came to Utah and visited Hill Air Force Base, and he was there to talk about solar power that is being used on Hill Air Force Base.

Hill Air Force Base also has a great power source that comes from a neighboring trash dump, which provides steam and methane power that goes to the base itself. And I told the President, when he asked us questions about this, that it is very easy for Hill Air Force Base to have this power source because it is next door. But for most people, they live miles and miles away, and you have to have transmission lines that get the power from where it is produced to where they live, and often across Federal lands.

To his credit, President Obama lit up and said: Yes, not only is that an important issue, but it is also an issue dealing with our entire grid structure that needs to be worked on; another issue that is not today's discussion matter.

And to his credit, his office did contact our office, our committee, and started helping us work on some issues. Even though they did not stay with us to the final conclusion of the bill, the bill we have before us today is the result of those discussions, the result of that effort.

I try to emphasize how bipartisan this bill is; an effort to try and solve a real problem that helps real people with real circumstances that have caused problems in the past that need to be changed. That is what we are attempting to do here.

So I applaud the committee that came up with this bill. I applaud the chief sponsor of that bill. I urge my colleagues to please support this. This is the right thing to do if you really care about helping people.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, this legislation, with a few modifications, could help prevent



the 0.03 percent of wildfires that are caused by electricity infrastructure, but the majority refused to work with us on those modifications.

Most importantly, the failure to make vegetation management plans for utility rights-of-way mandatory negates any positive impact this bill might have had. As we have heard from Forest Service and industry at a hearing on similar legislation last Congress, voluntary vegetation management is already allowed and is quite common. This includes the ability for rights-of-way holders to access these areas and conduct vegetation management without notifying Federal land managers until after the fact. This is current law.

The majority claims we need this bill to address delays caused by the approval of unplanned work and delays associated with removing dead trees on public lands outside of rights-of-way.

Without an up-front planning requirement, I can see authorizing limited activity for utility companies to do targeted vegetation management adjacent to rights-of-way. But instead of offering the commonsense trade off, the bill before us today simply cuts Federal agencies out of the process of managing the American people's land by requiring the Forest Service and BLM to approve plans with no option to modify or reject them if the plans are inadequate.

So whatever the company turns in—the utility company turns in, that is the plan that will become the management plan for that vegetation, regardless of any opinion by Forest Service or BLM.

Further, the bill does not define “adjacent,” meaning that companies could cut trees that are well outside the rights-of-way on public lands. This makes public lands vulnerable to a level of abuse that no one who values them would be willing to support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers and I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say that this legislation is a solution without a problem. And as I mentioned earlier several times, facts do matter.

When we are doing a whole-scale change of how we manage rights-of-way on public lands because of 0.03 percent of the causation by utility lines of fires on public lands, that is a heavy-handed way to approach doing legislation. There have been opportunities and modifications, opportunities of expediting the process, but those were not allowed as part of this legislation.

If we, indeed, are going to look at both the wildfire situation, the budget

stress on Forest Service to suppress those fires, and this rights-of-way issue, which is miniscule compared to the bigger issues, then I think this legislation has to be rejected, and work on a piece of legislation that has consensus, that is bipartisan, and that addresses the real problems with wildfires in this country, not this utility giveaway that we are doing here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, again, I commend the bill's sponsors for bringing up this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation. I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 1873—the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

North Carolina is home to four national forests that offer visitors and residents access to incredible scenery, wildlife, and a wide variety of recreational activities.

In my district in Western North Carolina, American Forestry management has its roots in the Pisgah National Forest: The Cradle of Forestry, the very first forestry school in the country, is located there.

Proper forestry management is a part of North Carolina's history that we hope to pass on to for our future generations to come.

I commend my colleagues, Reps. DOUG LAMALFA and KURT SCHRADER, for identifying a problem and for providing a common-sense solution to make vegetation management in national forests easier.

Managing vegetation around power lines is important for ensuring electric grid reliability, and for keeping overgrown and falling trees from interfering with nearby power lines which can cause blackouts, wildfires, and other safety hazards.

This bill would ensure utility companies, who are responsible for vegetation management near power lines on federal lands, are no longer delayed by bureaucratic red tape and inconsistent federal standards between agencies.

With the passage of this bill, we will be a step closer to providing expedited forestry management plan approval, while also giving utility companies the authority to remove hazardous debris in emergency situations.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased we are advancing a bipartisan proposal today—I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act. This important legislation is meant to proactively prevent major utility reliability problems before they happen.

Currently, electric cooperatives in my district own transmission lines which cross lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to provide essential services to rural areas. I've heard from my electric coops that before addressing problems with these transmission lines, such as clearing downed trees or excess debris near utility poles, they must first be granted approval to do the work from these federal agen-

cies. Any delay in receiving approval costs time, money, and amplifies the impacts of major power outages to my constituents.

Currently, electric coops can be held responsible for damages if a tree falls on a power line and causes a fire, even if the coop is still awaiting approval to work on clearing the hazardous debris.

H.R. 1873 will save utilities unnecessary costs and improve electricity reliability for consumers by streamlining outdated federal land management policies. The language minimizes the need for case-by-case approvals and instead provides expedited review and approvals for routine vegetation management and maintenance activities. Cutting red tape will make it easier for electric utility companies to initiate preventative measures to manage vegetation and woody debris on right-of-way transmission lines. This proactive work will mitigate the effects of fires and storms by clearing hazardous material before the natural disaster hits.

Just two weeks ago, a major storm with winds up to seventy miles-per-hour blew through my district and left thousands of my constituents without power. The strong winds downed trees and took out power lines, severely damaged homes and businesses, and ripped the roofs off of barns. Lengthy power outages delay the repairs needed to get storm victims' lives back on track. So I am eager to support legislation which helps my communities recover from these painful storms as fast as possible.

Storms like these are commonplace in Minnesota. Our electric coops are ready to complete the work necessary to mitigate the effects of these disasters as much as possible so consumers can have better access to electricity, especially during natural disasters. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to be here today in strong support of H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

As we enter wildfire season, it is of the utmost importance that the federal government act to prevent these devastating disasters.

The Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act strengthens electric grid reliability while reducing the risk of fires and fire hazards caused by poor vegetation management in power line rights-of-way on federally managed public lands.

Currently, bureaucratic permitting delays impede electric utility companies from effectively managing overgrowth near electric infrastructure, which puts these areas at greater risk for a fire event. This common-sense, widely-supported, legislation would require an expedited federal review process for trees that are dangerously close to power lines.

The effective management of this unruly vegetation is especially important in my home state of California, where in 2016, an overwhelming 6,986 fires destroyed over 565,000 acres of land throughout the state.

I thank my Colleague from California, Mr. LAMALFA, for his leadership on this legislation and I look forward to supporting the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act later today.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1873

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the “Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act”.*

#### **SEC. 2. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ON FEDERAL LANDS CONTAINING ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### **“SEC. 512. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE RELATING TO ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**

“(a) *GENERAL DIRECTION.*—In order to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution rights-of-way and related facilities and adjacent property, the Secretary, with respect to public lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System lands, shall provide direction to ensure that all existing and future rights-of-way, however established (including by grant, special use authorization, and easement), for electrical transmission and distribution facilities on such lands include provisions for utility vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance activities that, while consistent with applicable law—

“(1) are developed in consultation with the holder of the right-of-way;

“(2) enable the owner or operator of a facility to operate and maintain the facility in good working order and to comply with Federal, State and local electric system reliability and fire safety requirements, including reliability standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a) and plans to meet such reliability standards;

“(3) minimize the need for case-by-case or annual approvals for—

“(A) routine vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance activities within existing electrical transmission and distribution rights-of-way; and

“(B) utility vegetation management activities that are necessary to control hazard trees within or adjacent to electrical transmission and distribution rights-of-way; and

“(4) when review is required, provide for expedited review and approval of utility vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance activities, especially activities requiring prompt action to avoid an adverse impact on human safety or electric reliability to avoid fire hazards.

“(b) *VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLANS.*—

“(1) *DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION.*—Consistent with subsection (a), the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide owners and operators of electric transmission and distribution facilities located on lands described in such subsection with the option to develop and submit a vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan, that at each transmission or distribution owner or operator’s discretion may cover some or all of the owner or operator’s transmission and distribution rights-of-way on Federal lands, for approval to the Secretary with jurisdiction over the lands. A plan under this paragraph shall enable the owner or operator of a facility, at a minimum, to comply with applicable Federal, State, and local electric system reliability and fire safety requirements, as provided in subsection (a)(2). The Secretaries shall not have the authority to modify those requirements.

“(2) *REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS.*—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly develop a consolidated and coordinated process for review and approval of—

“(A) vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plans submitted under paragraph (1) that—

“(i) assures prompt review and approval not to exceed 90 days;

“(ii) includes timelines and benchmarks for agency comments to submitted plans and final approval of such plans;

“(iii) is consistent with applicable law; and

“(iv) minimizes the costs of the process to the reviewing agency and the entity submitting the plans; and

“(B) amendments to the plans in a prompt manner if changed conditions necessitate a modification to a plan.

“(3) *NOTIFICATION.*—The review and approval process under paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) include notification by the agency of any changed conditions that warrant a modification to a plan;

“(B) provide an opportunity for the owner or operator to submit a proposed plan amendment to address directly the changed condition; and

“(C) allow the owner or operator to continue to implement those elements of the approved plan that do not directly and adversely affect the condition precipitating the need for modification.

“(4) *CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION PROCESS.*—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall apply his or her categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to plans developed under this subsection on existing transmission and distribution rights-of-way under this subsection.

“(5) *IMPLEMENTATION.*—A plan approved under this subsection shall become part of the authorization governing the covered right-of-way and hazard trees adjacent to the right-of-way. If a vegetation management plan is proposed for an existing transmission or distribution facility concurrent with the siting of a new transmission or distribution facility, necessary reviews shall be completed as part of the siting process or sooner. Once the plan is approved, the owner or operator shall provide the agency with only a notification of activities anticipated to be undertaken in the coming year, a description of those activities, and certification that the activities are in accordance with the plan.

“(6) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this subsection:

“(A) *VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLAN.*—The term ‘vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan’ means a plan that—

“(i) is prepared by the owner or operator of one or more electrical transmission or distribution facilities to cover one or more electric transmission and distribution rights-of-way; and

“(ii) provides for the long-term, cost-effective, efficient and timely management of facilities and vegetation within the width of the right-of-way and adjacent Federal lands to enhance electricity reliability, promote public safety, and avoid fire hazards.

“(B) *OWNER OR OPERATOR.*—The terms ‘owner’ and ‘operator’ include contractors or other agents engaged by the owner or operator of a facility.

“(C) *HAZARD TREE.*—The term ‘hazard tree’ means any tree inside the right-of-way or located outside the right-of-way that has been designated, prior to tree failure, by either the owner or operator of a transmission or distribution facility, or the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, to be likely to fail and cause a high risk of injury, damage, or disruption within 10 feet or less of an electric power line or related structure if it fell.

“(c) *RESPONSE TO EMERGENCY CONDITIONS.*—

If vegetation on Federal lands within, or hazard trees on Federal lands adjacent to, an electrical transmission or distribution right-of-way granted by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture has contacted or is in imminent danger of contacting one or more electric transmission or distribution lines, the owner or operator of the transmission or distribution lines—

“(1) may prune or remove the vegetation or hazard tree to avoid the disruption of electric service and risk of fire; and

“(2) shall notify the appropriate local agent of the relevant Secretary not later than 24 hours after such removal.

“(d) *COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE RELIABILITY AND SAFETY STANDARDS.*—If vegetation on Federal lands within or adjacent to an electrical transmission or distribution right-of-way under the jurisdiction of each Secretary does not meet clearance requirements under standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a), or by State and local authorities, and the Secretary having jurisdiction over the lands has failed to act to allow a transmission or distribution facility owner or operator to conduct vegetation management activities within 3 business days after receiving a request to allow such activities, the owner or operator may, after notifying the Secretary, conduct such vegetation management activities to meet those clearance requirements.

“(e) *REPORTING REQUIREMENT.*—The Secretary or Secretary of Agriculture shall report requests and actions made under subsections (c) and (d) annually on each Secretary’s website.

“(f) *LIABILITY.*—An owner or operator of a transmission or distribution facility shall not be held liable for wildfire damage, loss or injury, including the cost of fire suppression, if—

“(1) the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture fails to allow the owner or operator to operate consistently with an approved vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan on Federal lands under the relevant Secretary’s jurisdiction within or adjacent to a right-of-way to comply with Federal, State or local electric system reliability and fire safety standards, including standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a); or

“(2) the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture fails to allow the owner or operator of the transmission or distribution facility to perform appropriate vegetation management activities in response to a hazard tree as defined under subsection (b)(6), or a tree in imminent danger of contacting the owner’s or operator’s transmission or distribution facility.

“(g) **TRAINING AND GUIDANCE.**—*In consultation with the electric utility industry, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture are encouraged to develop a program to train personnel of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service involved in vegetation management decisions on rights-of-way relating to transmission and distribution facilities to ensure that such personnel—*

“(1) *understand electric system reliability and fire safety requirements, including reliability standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a);*

“(2) *assist owners and operators of transmission and distribution facilities to comply with applicable electric reliability and fire safety requirements; and*

“(3) *encourage and assist willing owners and operators of transmission and distribution facilities to incorporate on a voluntary basis vegetation management practices to enhance habitats and forage for pollinators and for other wildlife so long as the practices are compatible with the integrated vegetation management practices necessary for reliability and safety.*

“(h) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—*The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall—*

“(1) *not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, prescribe regulations, or amend existing regulations, to implement this section; and*

“(2) *not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this section, finalize regulations, or amend existing regulations, to implement this section.*

“(i) **EXISTING VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLANS.**—*Nothing in this section requires an owner or operator to develop and submit a vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan if one has already been approved by the Secretary or Secretary of Agriculture before the date of the enactment of this section.*”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—*The table of sections for the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 511 the following new item:*

“Sec. 512. *Vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance relating to electric transmission and distribution facility rights-of-way.*”

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 115-186. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 115-186.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, beginning on line 10, strike “the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide”.

Page 5, beginning on line 13, strike “with the option to” and insert “shall”.

Page 5, beginning on line 16, strike “plan, that at each transmission or distribution owner or operator’s discretion may cover some or all” and insert “plan covering all”.

Page 6, beginning on line 1, strike “The Secretaries shall not have the authority to modify those requirements.”.

Page 6, beginning on line 10, strike “and approval” and insert “, approval, denial, or modification”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 1873 ensures that we make up-front vegetation management planning a requirement for utilities that hold transmission rights-of-way on public lands.

I agree with Mr. LAMALFA’s intent to address the threats of wildfires. Coming from local government, as the former county supervisor for Santa Barbara, I have experienced firsthand the obstacles and challenges of balancing red tape and coordination among stakeholders.

Now, as the Representative for the Central Coast in California, I can tell you, we are no strangers to wildfires. Just last year, my district witnessed the devastating impacts of the Rey and Sherpa fires.

Unfortunately, the impacts of these wildfires are widespread. The Sherpa fire burned 7,474 acres in Santa Barbara County and the Los Padres National Forest for nearly a month last June. Then in January of this year, the heavy rains in the area triggered mudslides and flooding.

If we can take action to prevent wildfires, we should. We know it pays to be prepared. Congress needs to act to improve better coordination and clarity between Federal and land managers and utility companies that hold rights-of-way on public lands. In improving coordination, we can help utilities prevent fires due to overgrown vegetation or trees contacting power lines.

In turn, it would help the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management respond more quickly and consistently for requests to access and maintain rights-of-way on public lands. At the same time, the agencies can function as good stewards of our natural resources while enhancing their effectiveness in addressing fire hazard vegetation.

While well-intentioned, H.R. 1873 does not solve the problem of poor coordination.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill does not address the threats of wildfires because the rights-of-way maintenance plans described in the legislation are voluntary. Currently, owners of transmission lines can work with

the Federal land managers to develop these plans. This is no different than the status quo.

That is why I introduced my amendment to ensure that we make up-front planning a requirement for utilities.

□ 1545

I urge passage of my amendment to make sure that we are prepared and minimize the threats of wildfires.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, the goal of H.R. 1873 is to provide certainty to utilities, their line workers, and their consumers, not forcing unnecessary, one-size-fits-all regulations.

Each plan can be tailored by an individual utility based on the service territory, region, and other characteristics. Some utilities may not choose to submit plans because they are satisfied with their local Forest Service office. Others, especially those who have rights-of-ways that predate the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, may not want to trigger Federal paperwork costs that are ultimately passed on to their consumers.

This amendment, if adopted, would significantly burden Federal Land Management agencies by inundating them with all kinds of submittals. Additionally, if you want to increase the cost of this bill, then this amendment will do just that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I would inject additional bureaucracy into the bill that is unintended to do exactly the opposite of what this bill intended to do.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill is in search of a problem. Voluntary is the status quo. That is the case today, and we see the wildfires happen day in and day out. So, again, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115-186.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 9, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 12, line 16, strike the period and inserting “; and”.

Page 12, after line 16, insert the following: “(4) understand how existing and emerging unmanned technologies can help electric utilities, Federal, State, and local governments, and private landowners to more efficiently identify vegetation management needs, lower ratepayer energy costs, and reduce the risk of wildfires.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their leadership. I also thank Congressman LAMALFA, Congressman SCHRADER, and all of the other Members for their hard work on this issue. In particular, I thank Congressman GOSAR, who is here today, Congressman TIPTON, and Congressman O’HALLERAN for cosponsoring our bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Sinema amendment ensures the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior are educated on how unmanned technologies are transforming the energy industry to improve maintenance, lower costs, and reduce the risk of wildfires. Unmanned technology is changing the way Arizonans do business.

Currently, energy companies use manned helicopters to check transmission lines and direct repair and maintenance crews. This work ensures Arizona’s electric grid remains resilient, reliable, efficient, and that it works when Arizona families and businesses need it. But utilities and co-ops believe that unmanned technology can improve the way we manage our energy infrastructure. Unmanned technologies can monitor transmission lines quickly and safely in multiple locations, enabling more efficient operations and maintenance.

They provide better situational awareness to crews and managers, reducing accidents and workplace injuries. It also improves vegetation management, disaster prevention, and disaster response. These are critical issues in my home State of Arizona. In rural areas, our transmission and distribution lines run through Federal land that are prone to wildfires.

I am a cosponsor of the underlying bill because I recognize the importance of keeping these rights-of-way clear of dry brush and fallen trees. Streamlining the process that allows us to perform routine maintenance and prevent wildfires that too often endanger

our communities is just commonsense. Our bipartisan amendment improves the underlying bill by ensuring that unmanned technologies integrate appropriately, quickly, and effectively into broader vegetation management, disaster prevention, and disaster response strategies.

Unmanned technologies have the potential to improve efficiency, lower energy costs for Arizona families and businesses, and reduce the risk of dangerous wildfires by ensuring that rights-of-way are reliable and properly maintained. Federal agencies should be prepared to embrace these smart technologies.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Sinema amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to H.R. 1873. This bipartisan amendment would ensure that personnel involved in vegetation management decisions understand the benefit that unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs, or drones, can add to the maintenance and management of transmission lines.

In 2017, not only does this policy make sense, it is essential. Our electric grid and forests should be protected with this effective and cost-efficient technology, which has proven its worth in so many other areas, including national defense and private industry.

In my home State of Arizona, UAVs have proven to be highly valuable tools in forest management. Utilizing UAV expertise from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Prescott, Arizona, as well as Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, land managers have greatly improved their ability to monitor forest conditions both at scale and down to the detail of individual trees and branches.

Proper vegetation management around transmission lines is essential to preventing power outages and dangerous forest fires. UAV technology makes transmission line monitoring safer, cheaper, and more effective.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to our constituents to pursue smarter, safer, and cheaper approaches to public policy and resource management. This amendment and this bill allow us to do so in a bipartisan way. I am proud to partner with the gentlewoman from Arizona on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to extend my thanks to my friend and colleague, Mr. GOSAR from Arizona. I encourage my fellow Members to support the amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-186.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:  
**SEC. 3. NO LOSS OF FUNDS FOR WILD-FIRE SUPPRESSION.**

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall detract from the availability of funds or other resources for wild-fire suppression.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill before us today is a well-intentioned attempt to create a process which would minimize the risk of fire along electrical utilities’ rights-of-way. Yes, there are some problems with the bill, but my most significant objection is that this bill, our Natural Resources Committee, and this Congress refuse to act on the urgent need to address how our U.S. Forest Service deals with wildfires.

The Forest Service burned through more than half of its budget last year fighting wildfires. Yet our leadership won’t bring to the floor for a vote a bipartisan legislation that deals with the problem of “fire borrowing.”

In the 114th Congress, just such a bill, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act had 151 cosponsors—67 Republicans, 84 Democrats—but it never even got a committee hearing. So that is disappointing, and even irresponsible.

So, once again, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are going to go into this fire season knowing that they don’t have the resources to do the work necessary to mitigate wildfire damage on U.S. public lands.

In a recent report on fire suppression costs, the Forest Service reported that funding available for recreation, heritage, and wilderness had fallen 15 percent; funding for roads is down 46 percent; facility spending, off 68 percent; deferred maintenance outlays have been slashed by a disastrous 95 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in my two terms on the Natural Resources Committee, we

often debate and fret about how little money is available for maintenance of our public lands, the deferred maintenance. The diversion of these funds for wildfire suppression is among the many causes.

Non-fire-related staff has been cut by 39 percent since 1998, and over the last two decades, the cost of fire preparedness and suppression activities has grown from 62 percent of the Forest Service's total budget, to more than half—52 percent.

That shift has come at the expense of programs and staff that every American wants: staff on recreation, permits, timber sales, hunting, and fishing. Everything else is suffering because of our inability to deal in a constructive way with wildfire mitigation.

So now is the time that we address wildfires to be treated as the major disasters they are and for the efforts to put them out, to be eligible for disaster assistance, and not subtract it from funds that land managers need to do their daily jobs.

So my very simple one-sentence amendment simply says that no money in this bill—this bill will not divert legitimate wildfire mitigation money more to wildfires than is already there.

I urge you to vote “yes” on my amendment so, at the very least, we can prevent this bill from detracting from further Federal wildfire suppression efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment, but I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment prohibits any loss of funds for wildfire suppression activities. The bill also provides electric utilities with the certainty that they need to ensure that downed trees do not fall on power lines, which would prevent many of these wildfires from starting in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my friend from Florida for his support for this sensible amendment, and I hope that we can proceed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 243, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—171

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Gallego        | O'Rourke       |
| Aguilar         | Garamendi      | Pallone        |
| Barragán        | Gonzalez (TX)  | Panetta        |
| Bass            | Green, Al      | Pascarell      |
| Beatty          | Green, Gene    | Payne          |
| Bera            | Grijalva       | Pelosi         |
| Beyer           | Gutiérrez      | Perlmutter     |
| Blumenauer      | Hanabusa       | Pingree        |
| Blunt Rochester | Hastings       | Pocan          |
| Bonamici        | Heck           | Polis          |
| Brown (MD)      | Himes          | Price (NC)     |
| Brownley (CA)   | Hoyer          | Quigley        |
| Bustos          | Huffman        | Raskin         |
| Butterfield     | Jackson Lee    | Rice (NY)      |
| Capuano         | Jayapal        | Richmond       |
| Carbajal        | Jeffries       | Rosen          |
| Cárdenas        | Johnson (GA)   | Roybal-Allard  |
| Carson (IN)     | Johnson, E. B. | Ruiz           |
| Cartwright      | Kaptur         | Ruppersberger  |
| Castor (FL)     | Keating        | Rush           |
| Castro (TX)     | Kelly (IL)     | Sánchez        |
| Chu, Judy       | Kennedy        | Sarbanes       |
| Cicilline       | Khanna         | Schakowsky     |
| Clark (MA)      | Kihuen         | Schiff         |
| Clarke (NY)     | Kildee         | Scott (VA)     |
| Clay            | Krishnamoorthi | Scott, David   |
| Cleaver         | Kuster (NH)    | Serrano        |
| Clyburn         | Langevin       | Sewell (AL)    |
| Cohen           | Larson (CT)    | Shea-Porter    |
| Connolly        | Lawrence       | Sherman        |
| Conyers         | Lawson (FL)    | Sinema         |
| Cooper          | Lee            | Sires          |
| Correa          | Levin          | Slaughter      |
| Courtney        | Lewis (GA)     | Smith (WA)     |
| Crist           | Lieu, Ted      | Soto           |
| Crowley         | Lipinski       | Speier         |
| Cuellar         | Loeb           | Suozzi         |
| Davis (CA)      | Loeb           | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Davis, Danny    | Lofgren        | Takano         |
| DeGette         | Lowenthal      | Thompson (CA)  |
| Delaney         | Lowe           | Thompson (MS)  |
| DeLauro         | Lujan Grisham, | Titus          |
| DelBene         | M.             | Tonko          |
| Demings         | Luján, Ben Ray | Torres         |
| DeSaulnier      | Maloney,       | Tsongas        |
| Deutch          | Carolyn B.     | Vargas         |
| Dingell         | Maloney, Sean  | Veasey         |
| Doggett         | Matsui         | Vela           |
| Doyle, Michael  | McCollum       | Velázquez      |
| F.              | McEachin       | Visclosky      |
| Ellison         | McGovern       | Walz           |
| Engel           | McNeerney      | Wasserman      |
| Eshoo           | Meeks          | Schultz        |
| Españillat      | Meng           | Waters, Maxine |
| Esty (CT)       | Moore          | Watson Coleman |
| Evans           | Moulton        | Welch          |
| Foster          | Murphy (FL)    | Yarmuth        |
| Frankel (FL)    | Nadler         |                |
| Fudge           | Neal           |                |
|                 | Nolan          |                |

NOES—243

|             |                |               |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abraham     | Black          | Calvert       |
| Allen       | Blackburn      | Carter (GA)   |
| Amash       | Black          | Carter (TX)   |
| Amodei      | Boyle, Brendan | Chabot        |
| Arrington   | F.             | Chaffetz      |
| Babin       | Brady (PA)     | Cheney        |
| Bacon       | Brady (TX)     | Coffman       |
| Banks (IN)  | Brat           | Cole          |
| Barletta    | Bridenstine    | Collins (GA)  |
| Barr        | Brooks (AL)    | Collins (NY)  |
| Barton      | Brooks (IN)    | Comer         |
| Bergman     | Buchanan       | Conaway       |
| Biggs       | Buck           | Cook          |
| Bilirakis   | Bucshon        | Costa         |
| Bishop (GA) | Budd           | Costello (PA) |
| Bishop (MI) | Burgess        | Crawford      |
| Bishop (UT) | Byrne          | Culberson     |

|                 |              |                 |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Curbelo (FL)    | Joyce (OH)   | Rice (SC)       |
| Davidson        | Katko        | Roby            |
| Davis, Rodney   | Kelly (MS)   | Roe (TN)        |
| DeFazio         | Kelly (PA)   | Rogers (AL)     |
| Denham          | Kilmer       | Rogers (KY)     |
| Dent            | Kind         | Rohrabacher     |
| DeSantis        | King (IA)    | Rokita          |
| DesJarlais      | King (NY)    | Rooney, Francis |
| Diaz-Balart     | Kinzing      | Rooney, Thomas  |
| Donovan         | Knight       | J.              |
| Duffy           | Kustoff (TN) | Ros-Lehtinen    |
| Duncan (SC)     | Labrador     | Roskam          |
| Duncan (TN)     | LaHood       | Ross            |
| Dunn            | LaMalfa      | Rothfus         |
| Emmer           | Lamborn      | Rouzer          |
| Estes (KS)      | Lance        | Royce (CA)      |
| Farenthold      | Latta        | Russell         |
| Faso            | Lewis (MN)   | Rutherford      |
| Ferguson        | LoBiondo     | Sanford         |
| Fitzpatrick     | Loudermilk   | Schneider       |
| Fleischmann     | Love         | Schrader        |
| Flores          | Lucas        | Schweikert      |
| Fortenberry     | Luetkemeyer  | Scott, Austin   |
| Fox             | MacArthur    | Sensenbrenner   |
| Franks (AZ)     | Marchant     | Sessions        |
| Frelinghuysen   | Marino       | Shimkus         |
| Gaetz           | Marshall     | Shuster         |
| Gallagher       | Massie       | Simpson         |
| Garrett         | Mast         | Smith (MO)      |
| Gianforte       | McCarthy     | Smith (NE)      |
| Gibbs           | McCaul       | Smith (NJ)      |
| Gohmert         | McClintock   | Smith (TX)      |
| Goodlatte       | McHenry      | Smucker         |
| Gosar           | McKinley     | Stefanik        |
| Gottheimer      | McMorris     | Stewart         |
| Gowdy           | Rodgers      | Stivers         |
| Granger         | McSally      | Taylor          |
| Graves (GA)     | Meadows      | Tenney          |
| Graves (LA)     | Meehan       | Thompson (PA)   |
| Graves (MO)     | Messer       | Thornberry      |
| Griffith        | Mitchell     | Tiberi          |
| Grothman        | Moolenaar    | Tipton          |
| Guthrie         | Mooney (WV)  | Trott           |
| Harper          | Mullin       | Turner          |
| Harris          | Murphy (PA)  | Upton           |
| Hartzer         | Newhouse     | Valadao         |
| Hensarling      | Norcross     | Wagner          |
| Herrera Beutler | Nunes        | Walberg         |
| Hice, Jody B.   | O'Halleran   | Walden          |
| Higgins (LA)    | Olson        | Walker          |
| Hill            | Palazzo      | Walorski        |
| Holding         | Palmer       | Walters, Mimi   |
| Hollingsworth   | Paulsen      | Webster (FL)    |
| Hudson          | Pearce       | Wenstrup        |
| Huizenga        | Perry        | Westerman       |
| Hultgren        | Peters       | Williams        |
| Hunter          | Peterson     | Wilson (SC)     |
| Hurd            | Pittenger    | Wittman         |
| Issa            | Poe (TX)     | Womack          |
| Jenkins (KS)    | Poliquin     | Woodall         |
| Jenkins (WV)    | Posey        | Yoder           |
| Johnson (LA)    | Ratcliffe    | Yoho            |
| Johnson (OH)    | Reed         | Young (AK)      |
| Jones           | Reichert     | Young (IA)      |
| Jordan          | Renacci      | Zeldin          |

NOT VOTING—17

|          |              |             |
|----------|--------------|-------------|
| Aderholt | Higgins (NY) | Noem        |
| Blum     | Johnson, Sam | Ryan (OH)   |
| Comstock | Larsen (WA)  | Scalise     |
| Cramer   | Long         | Weber (TX)  |
| Cummings | Lynch        | Wilson (FL) |
| Gabbard  | Napolitano   |             |

□ 1622

Messrs. CHAFFETZ, FERGUSON, ROE of Tennessee, GARRETT, KNIGHT, ROSS, MOONEY of West Virginia, PETERS, BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, O'HALLERAN, KIND, and SCHNEIDER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, LIPINSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, and, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you with your congressional women's softball team, who are tanned, rested, and ready to beat the press tonight.

Our bipartisan team has been practicing for the last 3 months at 7 in the morning, two to three mornings a week, with batting practice at night at the cages at the Nationals training academy.

We have been singularly focused on two things—I know it doesn't make sense, because that would mean it wasn't singularly—making sure that we can continue to raise awareness about the risk that young women face of breast cancer and to make sure that we can shine a spotlight on the fact that young women can and do get breast cancer.

This is our ninth annual game. It is the eighth time that we are playing the common "enemy"—we say that affectionately—the female Capitol press corps. They have been incredible partners in helping this year cross the incredible milestone of raising more than \$1 million for the Young Survival Coalition. We are so proud of that.

We want to thank our coaches who have been remarkable through all these years. Of course, we have our head coach, Torie Barnes, Jo Ann Emerson's daughter, who was the co-founder of this game 9 years ago; our own House favorite, Natalie Buchanan, who is an amazing new mom who has been out there with us, in spite of just having a baby a few short months ago; Coach Jim, who has been amazing as well; and, of course, our very own colleague, Coach ED PERLMUTTER from the great State of Colorado.

Come on out tonight at 7 p.m. at Watkins Recreation Center, 420 12th Street, SE. Turn right at the CVS.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), my cocaptain, friend, and fellow appropriator.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone would agree with me when I say that, in the midst of the tragedy and horror last week, there are also special moments that brought us together and reminded us of what is really important. One was right here in this Chamber, where we heard touching speeches from PAUL RYAN and Leader PELOSI; another was at the baseball game when the entire Capitol Hill community gathered in an amazing show of support for our friend, STEVE SCALISE, our Capitol Police officers and their heroic acts; as well as Matt, Zack, David, and Crystal; and all of those who were involved.

That spirit of unity and togetherness is a big part of why we play this softball game. Our relationships as Members of Congress are stronger because of this game. I don't think we can have too many reminders about the importance of unity and friendship.

I encourage all Members and staff to come join us tonight and go to bat for this great cause. Unlike the baseball game, Republicans and Democrats don't compete against each other. We team up against one opponent we can all agree on: the press.

So, beat cancer, beat the press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 300, noes 118, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—300

Abraham  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington

Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton

Bera  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)

Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Cárdenas  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Eshoo  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al

Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kihuen  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawson (FL)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Loeb  
Lofgren  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
MacArthur  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke

Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rudolph  
Rosen  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shea-Porter  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Torres  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin



## NOES—118

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Gallego        | Pelosi         |
| Barragán        | Grijalva       | Perlmutter     |
| Bass            | Gutiérrez      | Pingree        |
| Beatty          | Hanabusa       | Pocan          |
| Beyer           | Hastings       | Polis          |
| Blumenauer      | Hoyer          | Price (NC)     |
| Blunt Rochester | Huffman        | Quigley        |
| Capuano         | Jackson Lee    | Raskin         |
| Carbajal        | Jayapal        | Rice (NY)      |
| Carson (IN)     | Jeffries       | Richmond       |
| Cartwright      | Johnson (GA)   | Roybal-Allard  |
| Castor (FL)     | Johnson, E. B. | Ruppersberger  |
| Castro (TX)     | Kaptur         | Rush           |
| Chu, Judy       | Keating        | Ryan (OH)      |
| Cicilline       | Kelly (IL)     | Sánchez        |
| Clark (MA)      | Kennedy        | Sarbanes       |
| Clarke (NY)     | Khanna         | Schakowsky     |
| Clay            | Kildee         | Schiff         |
| Cleaver         | Langevin       | Scott (VA)     |
| Clyburn         | Lawrence       | Serrano        |
| Cohen           | Lee            | Sewell (AL)    |
| Conyers         | Levin          | Sherman        |
| Crowley         | Lewis (GA)     | Slaughter      |
| Davis (CA)      | Lieu, Ted      | Smith (WA)     |
| Davis, Danny    | Lowenthal      | Speier         |
| DeGette         | Lowey          | Suozi          |
| DeLauro         | Lynch          | Takano         |
| DelBene         | Maloney        | Thompson (MS)  |
| Demings         | Carolyn B.     | Titus          |
| DeSaulnier      | McCollum       | Tonko          |
| Deutch          | McEachin       | Tsongas        |
| Dingell         | McGovern       | Veasey         |
| Doggett         | Meeks          | Velázquez      |
| Ellison         | Meng           | Visclosky      |
| Engel           | Moore          | Wasserman      |
| Espallat        | Nadler         | Schultz        |
| Evans           | Neal           | Waters, Maxine |
| Foster          | Pallone        | Watson Coleman |
| Frankel (FL)    | Pascrell       | Welch          |
| Fudge           | Payne          | Yarmuth        |

## NOT VOTING—13

|          |              |             |
|----------|--------------|-------------|
| Aderholt | Higgins (NY) | Scalise     |
| Blum     | Johnson, Sam | Weber (TX)  |
| Comstock | Larsen (WA)  | Wilson (FL) |
| Cummings | Long         |             |
| Gabbard  | Napolitano   |             |

□ 1639

Messrs. KEATING and PALLONE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 314 and 315 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the Carbajal Amendment. I would also have voted “nay” on H.R. 1873—Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was not present today, June 21, for rollcall votes. I was attending a memorial service in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 311, “yea” on rollcall No. 312, “yea” on rollcall No. 313, “nay” on rollcall No. 314, and “yea” on rollcall No. 315.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2842, ACCELERATING INDIVIDUALS INTO THE WORKFORCE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-187) on the resolution (H. Res. 396) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## CELEBRATING THE REMARKABLE CAREER OF TINA HERRING

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the remarkable career of Ms. Tina Herring, who retired as branch manager with the Georgia Department of Veterans Services on Thursday, June 1, 2017.

During her childhood, Ms. Herring often moved with her father, a Pearl Harbor survivor who frequently traveled on Air Force assignments. This instilled an appreciation for our Nation's Armed Forces.

She began her career with the Department of Veterans Services in 1985 as a benefits caseworker. In this position, she worked to ensure that Georgia's servicemen and -women received the crucial resources and benefits which they and their families deserve.

Ms. Herring was promoted to oversee multiple southeast branches of the Georgia Veterans Services Department in 2009 because of her exceptional dedication to Georgia's veterans and her 25 years of hard work.

Ms. Herring, thank you for your extraordinary effort in honoring our servicemen and -women. You have managed southeast Georgia's Veterans Department with exceptional precision. I wish you the best of luck in all your future endeavors.

## THE NRA AND PHILANDO CASTILE

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a simple question: Who is the National Rifle Association here to protect?

I ask this question because Philando Castile, exercising his constitutionally protected right to bear arms, was shot dead in front of his girlfriend and his young daughter.

At that time the NRA claimed that they were awaiting “more facts.” A year later, the investigation is over and the trial is complete. The facts are clear. Philando's killer remains free, but, Mr. Speaker, I and many Americans across this Nation remain confused and dissatisfied.

Mr. Speaker, dashcam video released yesterday confirmed that Second Amendment protections simply do not apply to Black, law-abiding, concealed carry permit-holding, compliant Philando Castile. And still the NRA has had nothing to say.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: If the NRA isn't here to protect law-abiding gun owners like Philando Castile, then just who are they here to protect?

□ 1645

## STOPPING THE SCOURGE OF SEX TRAFFICKING

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 15-year-old Bianca struggled with insecurities and depression, so she turned to social media for comfort and companionship. She met a person named Ariel, to her later displeasure, but after he brought her to a seedy motel room and forced her to watch as he raped two other girls, she knew she had walked right into the bonds of sex slavery.

Held captive, he put up advertisements about her on the notorious backpage.com, selling her to dozens of men a day. After 2 years of this hell, Bianca finally escaped, bolting from the motel room, and found safety, finding a police officer. Four days later, her trafficker was arrested and thrown behind bars.

Unlike Bianca, many victims don't escape this trafficking. That is why Senator JOHN CORNYN and I have introduced the Abolish Human Trafficking Act that increases funding for law enforcement to find and arrest traffickers like Ariel and helps restore and rescue victims.

We must use every tool in our resources we can find to help stop the scourge of human trafficking.

And that is just the way it is.

## HOUSE REPUBLICANS ARE FAILING TO DO THEIR JOBS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is not surprising that the House Republicans haven't put forward a budget, despite passing their deadline more than 2 months ago.

It has been nearly 800 days since the House Republicans agreed to a budget.



Hat-tip to the Huffington Post's Matt Fuller for that fun fact.

What we are seeing is an ongoing inability of House Republicans to do their job. Republicans have introduced no jobs bill, given no indication whether they will lift the debt ceiling to avoid default, and offered no responsible spending legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is dysfunction at its worst. The American people sent us here to deliver results on jobs, on healthcare, on security.

I urge my Republican colleagues to take that responsibility seriously and to work with Democrats to achieve progress. I know we can.

#### CONGRATULATING AYESHA AHSAN

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ayesha Ahsan, a resident of Arizona's Fifth Congressional District, who has earned a significant achievement: the Congressional Award Gold Medal. Ayesha has completed 400 hours of voluntary public service, 200 hours each of personal development and physical fitness, and a 5-day, 4-night expedition.

She is one of five Arizonans and only 373 Americans to win this prestigious award in 2017.

Ayesha volunteered at her local hospital in outpatient services, where she was responsible for registering patients who needed vital tests.

For her personal development requirement, Ms. Ahsan participated in weekly study groups with her friends to prepare for the SAT exam; and for physical fitness, she worked out at the local gym. For her expedition, she traveled to Sedona, Arizona, where she enjoyed hiking and exploration of that town.

Congratulations to Ayesha on these achievements. By completing the benchmarks for this award, Ayesha has learned perseverance and diligence, traits that will last her a lifetime.

I thank her for her example and service to our community, and I wish her well with her future endeavors.

#### COMMEMORATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SPENCERTOWN FIRE COMPANY

(Mr. FASO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the Spencertown Fire Company, which is celebrating 100 years of service to our communities in Columbia County, New York.

Twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year for the past century, this fire company has served with pride and courage. I express my gratitude for the

past and present volunteers of this organization, who have made great sacrifices and performed heroic acts to protect their neighbors.

Today, 35 individuals make up the team at Spencertown Fire Company. Two-thirds of this group are active, highly skilled volunteer firemen.

Their commitment to Spencertown and its neighboring communities does not stop at fire safety. Each year, since 1985, they have awarded a \$1,000 scholarship to a college-bound senior, chosen from within their service area.

I thank Spencertown Fire Company's President Alan Silvernale, Austerlitz Fire Chief Eric Pilkington, and the entire Spencertown Fire Company, which, in the great tradition of New York fire companies, continues to raise the standard in ensuring and furthering the well-being of our local communities.

#### CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-48)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with that provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2017.

The threat constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, has not been resolved. In addition, Executive Order 13219 was amended by Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, to take additional steps with respect to acts obstructing implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement of 2001 relating to Macedonia.

The acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in

these Executive Orders are hostile to United States interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 21, 2017.

#### CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-49)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with that provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to North Korea declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, addressed further in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2017.

The existence and risk of proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula; the actions and policies of the Government of North Korea that destabilize the Korean Peninsula and imperil United States Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region, including its pursuit of nuclear and missile programs; and other provocative, destabilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea, continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to North Korea.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 21, 2017.

**SURVIVORS OF BUS ACCIDENT IN TANZANIA AIDED BY SIOUXLAND TANZANIA EDUCATIONAL MEDICAL MINISTRIES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, this great deliberative body that we have and are, and this deliberative body that brings this Nation together to discuss our troubles, to discuss our triumphs, and sometimes intensively debate our disagreements here on the floor and in committee. We have seen a fair amount of that disagreement around the country.

There are a few things we see that brings this country together, and we join together in these efforts when we can be Americans, and reach out with the hand of the American heart and spirit and help others when they are in sometimes dire need and dire difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon to discuss one of these circumstances where Americans joined together and reached out their hands—not only of friendship but physically reached out their hands—to deliver the kind of medical care that saved three lives from a terrible accident that took place in Tanzania.

This terrible accident in Tanzania was worldwide news. There were 39 people on a bus in Tanzania, and all but three were students, children, 12 to 13 years old. There were two teachers and a bus driver on the bus.

From the reports that I got, the bus was going too fast. It went around a curve and reached the peak of a bump in the road, a rise in the road. The bus went airborne off the road into a ravine, and it crashed nose down in the same fashion that a plane might crash into the Earth.

Of the 39 people on the bus, 36 of them children, there were only three survivors. These three survivors were in the back of the bus, and all others in the front were thrown to the front, where the engine and the front part of the bus, all the way back to behind the driver, was jammed into the fuselage, I might call it, of the bus itself. And as that was jammed backwards, they were all thrown into that.

The three survivors were in the back, and the violence to them was cushioned, to a degree, by those who had perished in front of them. Everyone else was essentially instantly killed, and these three children by the name of Wilson and Sadia and Doreen were survivors. The bus was crushed together like a tin can.

Three vehicles behind the bus were some missionary workers who are asso-

ciated with STEMM, the Siouxland Tanzania Educational Medical Ministries, which was formed in Sioux City, Iowa, and it was formed by the inspiration of a long chain of, I will say, the Hand of Providence that arranges people together. They were there in Tanzania, following the bus three vehicles behind.

Mr. Speaker, the situation there was that, as they saw the bus go off the road and crash, the bus crashed down off into the ravine; they stopped. The three of them were trained medical personnel named Kevin Nygard and Jennifer Milby and Amanda Volkens. I believe there are also a couple that I don't happen to have their names in front of me this evening, and I don't want to leave them out, Mr. Speaker, but they raced down the bank to the ravine where the bus had crashed nose down. They knew it was a terrible accident.

I don't think they could have imagined how bad and how terrible it was, but the only way to get in that bus was through the windows in the sides, schoolbus-type windows, as we know. Most all of us are familiar with those, Mr. Speaker.

So they climbed into that bus and began to look for survivors and to try to pull the survivors out and then the bodies of those who didn't survive, and they worked frantically there with other volunteers, also, who happened to come along to the scene.

They were able to remove the three survivors that I had mentioned, Wilson and Sadia and Doreen, and lay them out on the bank. They were all medically trained, and so they were applying first aid.

These three kids, these three students, 12 to 13 years old, two girls and a boy, were then transported by ambulance into the city in Tanzania.

Now, I didn't know that this had happened, even though it was international news, but I was on an international trip as well into the Balkans. I happened to be in Bosnia at the moment in Sarajevo. I received a phone call from Dr. Steve Meyer. Steve Meyer is the founder of STEMM, the Siouxland Tanzania Educational Medical Ministries.

□ 1700

His heart has gone out to Tanzania nearly 20 years ago. He spends about half of each year there doing missionary work and providing and conducting orthopaedic surgery because he is an orthopaedic surgeon. He has taught them how to farm. He is drilling wells for irrigation. He also is running an educational system there that, at least the last report I had, it was the largest nonpublic school in Tanzania.

This is all done by the drive and the inspiration and the heart of Dr. Steve Meyer and his wife, Dana. And so the people that work with him had contrib-

uted to the survival of the three students that they had helped pulled out of that bus.

Yet I received a call from Steve Meyer. I was with the charge d'affaires in Sarajevo, Bosnia, and I stepped out of that reception to take a cell phone call. When I pick up my phone and it says, "Steve Meyer," I know I better answer the call. He is a friend. He is a pheasant hunting buddy. I guess he is a neighbor in the neighborhood, not technically a constituent, but we are brothers by faith, by head, by heart, and I know the level of conviction that Steve Meyer has.

So I took his call when I stepped out of the reception, and he said: "You have already seen this on the news. I need your help. There are three students that will . . ." He said: "One, probably two, of them will not survive if we cannot get them out of Tanzania. The third one likely will be handicapped for life, but is more likely to survive."

I know that he does orthopaedic surgery in Tanzania, and I said: "Can't you help them there? Can't you fix them there?"

And he said: "No, I can't. We don't have the equipment in Tanzania. We are not going to be able to save them unless we can get them out of Tanzania, get them back to Sioux City, where we can provide all the best medical care and perform the surgery necessary to put their bodies back together."

And that was his medical prognosis.

Now, I know from previous times that I have been around Steve Meyer, the level of conviction that he has and, of course, the depth of his heart. So I said: "I think I know what you need from me."

And he said: "Yes, their parents need to go along, too; and we want to send along a doctor and a nurse. I have only got just a little bit of time, and I am going to have to leave Tanzania, but we need to get them out of here while they are still alive."

So my job was to accelerate the visas, acquisition of visas for the three patients, the kid patients, for each one of their mothers, and for the doctor and for the nurse that needed to accompany them back to the United States, and to promote and accelerate the issuance of passports, which nobody had that needed to travel here either, and that would be a function of the Tanzanian Government and a function of something that we might be able to encourage.

So that was the easy part. It doesn't sound easy, Mr. Speaker, but it was the easy part compared to the second part of the assignment Dr. Meyer gave me. And he said: "I need a medevac plane, and we are going to have to fly them out of Tanzania in a medevac plane. I have got everything set up in Sioux City. It is at Mercy Hospital. All of us

are going to donate our time, our medical care, the devices that will be used to do the reconstructive surgery. All of that is going to be provided. It is going to be at no cost, but we need to get them there and get them there fast."

So this is a high emergency. I hung up the phone and I began to make phone calls. And the fortunate thing was I was leaving Bosnia shortly to go to Macedonia. Well, I would employ the staff at the Bosnian Embassy—the U.S. Embassy in Bosnia to pull some phone numbers together for me and start the outreach on this and to accelerate the effort to get the visas, promote the passports, and get the medevac plane. I want to thank the people there at the U.S. Embassy in Bosnia for their work and their cooperation.

I shortly arrived in Macedonia, where now I had a whole new embassy team to put to work; and they did. They pulled together phone numbers and made connections for me, too. I spoke—I believe it was from Macedonia—to the Tanzanian Embassy—the U.S. Embassy in Tanzania.

I want to thank Anthony Pagliai. Anthony Pagliai is the officer who issued the visas, and he was Johnny-on-the-spot. He couldn't have moved any more quickly or with any more conviction once I convinced him that this was for real.

And it was interesting how that happened, Mr. Speaker, that the—you know, when a congressman calls a staff person in an embassy in Tanzania, he doesn't have any way of knowing that it actually is a Member of Congress, for one thing, and what is the level of urgency and credibility of that call. But I told him I can vouch for Dr. Steve Meyer and I have known him for a long time, I know the level of his credibility and his conviction, his heart. I have spoken to that, Mr. Speaker.

I relayed that to Anthony Pagliai, and it seemed that the message wasn't clearly resonating because he didn't know of Dr. Steve Meyer. So I said to him that Steve Meyer is also working with Lazaro Nyalandu. Lazaro Nyalandu is an individual who ran for Prime Minister in Tanzania in the last election cycle—didn't win, but a fairly high name recognition within Tanzania. And when I gave Lazaro's name—you heard me hesitate already, Mr. Speaker. I have always had trouble remembering his name, but it is Nyalandu. And I hesitated on his name, but I said: "Lazaro, the Prime Minister candidate in Tanzania, is working with Dr. Meyer, and I can vouch for Dr. Meyer. I know Lazaro, and I know, if the two of them are working together, this is a credible endeavor, and you should help them in any way that you can."

And he finished up and he gave me Lazaro's last name. He volunteered it: Nyalandu. He said: "We know him. He was the only candidate for Prime Min-

ister that actually answered our phone calls."

So I knew that he had a good relationship with the U.S. Embassy and that they had all of the incentive to move forward to expedite the visas. And I asked Anthony: "Find me also a medevac plane."

Well, that was a very big request for somebody that is in the business of issuing visas for travel. And he said he would go to work on that, but I knew it was very difficult.

So with the confidence that the visas would be moved expeditiously and that the encouragement to deliver the passports would be supported out of the U.S. Embassy, I moved on to begin looking for a medevac plane while the course of his lifesaving techniques were going on in the hospital in Tanzania, trying to save the lives of these three badly broken bodies.

Mr. Speaker, as I move then from Macedonia to Albania, I have been continually making phone calls trying to find a medevac plane. I talked to the White House. I talked to the West Wing of the White House, and in particular, communicated with Steve Bannon and others who then did the outreach to the Department of Defense and went so far as to check with Stuttgart, where they command AFRICOMs out of Stuttgart, Germany. The assets to do this didn't really exist in an available way.

I reached even further into a security company that I worked with as head of my security in the Middle East, in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and they found a plane. This plane was sitting on the tarmac in the Middle East. It could have gone down. It was set up well enough to be a medevac plane, but the price, because it was a leased plane, was \$300,000.

So I told them: "I don't think I want to spend that amount of money out of my kids' inheritance. I am not sure we could raise it to replace it, but put that plane on hold because I want to make some more phone calls and see if there is a better alternative."

I kept making phone calls, and at about 4 o'clock in that afternoon, in a little back street in Albania, I had a phone call connection with Reverend Franklin Graham.

And I want to give credit in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Elizabeth Soderholm, who was a staff person out of our U.S. Embassy in Albania, who made sure that that phone call made connection as the cell signals were bad and the batteries were going down, nearly down on my phone. We made the connection with hers, so I dialed, and I got an answer from Reverend Franklin Graham.

And over the course of less than a 5-minute conversation altogether, over the course of about 3 minutes, I explained the situation to him. And Reverend Franklin Graham of Samaritan's

Purse said: "I have a DC-8 that I can fly and move them out of Tanzania to Sioux City, Iowa. I am willing to do that. I want to help."

And I said: "Reverend Graham, I don't know that I can raise the money for that."

And he said: "You don't have to. We will take care of it."

And at that moment I knew that we had the problem solved and we had a reasonable chance to save these three kids.

So, of course, I thanked him effusively. I texted Dr. Meyer's number to Franklin Graham, and Franklin Graham's number to Dr. Meyer. I said to each one of them: "Call each other right away so that you can make this connection and get this plane set up and dispatched to evacuate these three patients out of Tanzania."

And Dr. Meyer had no idea this was going on. He was 30 minutes from boarding his commercial flight out of Tanzania to come back to Iowa. Because of the obligations he had, he could not have stayed. And the phone rang, he answered it, and it was on the other end: "This is Franklin Graham, and I want to help."

And that is when Steve Meyer knew that the problems, the difficulties were going to be resolved. In any case, at that point they set up the logistics. The plane arrived in Tanzania, boarded these patients out of there, and flew them back to the United States—not without incident, but back to the United States.

Again, I am very grateful for all the people involved here. And I want to let this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD know, Mr. Speaker, that the driving force behind this was Dr. Steve Meyer. And it has been his heart to help the people of Tanzania for two decades, and anybody that has been around him like I have been, my pheasant hunting buddy, and the times that Marilyn and I have been involved in the fundraising efforts that go on with STEMM and Sioux City, you just know. You want to make sure that he is going to get it done. So why not make it as easy as possible on him and knowing that, when that calling comes from above, you answer that call?

So I wanted to point out some things here on the posters. This is how this came together. These pictures were taken, I believe, 2½ weeks ago, maybe 3½ weeks ago, but the accident took place May 6. So within a couple of weeks of the accident, they had finished the surgery of our three victims here.

Mr. Speaker, I will say, among these three, there were five broken arms and at least, I believe, three broken legs. There were two fractured spines. There were 17 broken bones altogether. There was a broken jaw over here in Doreen. And this is a fractured spine in her neck. And this is Sadia. And Wilson had a fractured femur.

And when you add this all up, it would have been—I guess I better not necessarily point out which one, but both of these girls were at great risk of death in Tanzania and likely would not have made it. Wilson here in the middle likely would have survived, but he had a fractured femur where, in Tanzania, would have required that they amputate his leg at the hip.

And now, as of a week ago Saturday, I went up to the Sioux City Bandits' football game—indoor football—and they were co-captains for the team, for the playoff game that took place that Saturday night. They wheeled all three of them out to the middle of the field for the coin toss. And after that, they came back, and we had a little stage on the end where we watched the game from the stage.

And they look a little fresher and more alert that night than they do in these pictures, Mr. Speaker, but they are now happy. Their parents are delighted and very grateful.

This is Dr. Steve Meyer here in the picture, and I just can't say enough about a man who inspires everyone around him and makes things happen by force of will and faith that would not and, we would think, could not happen otherwise.

And then of the patients here, Wilson is the one that cracks me up the most. On that Saturday night, this young fellow who would have, by now, lost his leg up at the hip, I leaned down and I said to him: "Wilson, is what I heard about you yesterday true?"

And he looked at me and smiled a little bit, and said: "Well, what?"

And I said: "Did you really kick a ball yesterday? Did you stand up and kick a ball?"

And he got this grin on his face and said: "Yes."

So that is how far this has come. This is a happy result, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to also show the picture. Here is Wilson and his mother. I will give you an example. He has got this ready smile. He is not the only one of the crew with a ready smile, but he has got a great ready smile. And part of it is he had got a big wound in his head that you don't see in the picture, too, but it doesn't suppress the grin on his face.

And we did a little press conference there. It was the first time he had been out of a hospital room. The only thing he had seen in America was the inside of a hospital room, and then wheeled down the hallway to the reception area of the hospital. And he is there with the two girls in their wheelchairs. That was also taken the same day.

□ 1715

And the press asked him: "What is it you like best about America?"

Well, the only thing he had seen of America was the inside of the hospital, and he smiled and he said: "Everything."

And they asked him: "What is your favorite food here?" And he said: "Everything."

And they asked him only one more question: "Is there anything else you would like to say, Wilson?" And he said: "Thank you."

And that is something that the parents have been saying ever since, the three mothers that are here and the doctor and the nurse that are here also to take care of them.

They are now out of the hospital. They are at Ronald McDonald House there in Sioux City. They have been taking them out on occasion to get some fresh air and see what normal life is in our part of the country. And you can just see the heart, and Steve Meyer here in this poster.

I would be remiss if I didn't have this poster up also tonight, Mr. Speaker. This is Samaritan's Purse. This is the DC-8 that Reverend Franklin Graham dispatched to fly our three patients out of Tanzania and into Sioux City, Iowa.

These are the people that have gathered at the departure wondering if they are ever going to see these three Tanzanian kids again. Many of these people would be people that were at the state funeral for the 36 who were killed in that bus accident. Tens of thousands came to the stadium as those 36 caskets were all lined up side by side, and the nation went into mourning in Tanzania because of that terrible loss that they had and the tragedy that was there, that was commemorated by the attendance of tens of thousands. Probably over 100,000 Tanzanians came to their soccer stadium for that huge funeral that they had. And now some of them come to the airstrip to see these three survivors, these miracle kids from Tanzania be flown off to the United States.

I can only imagine what it is like in their mind's eye, what they imagine is happening with their three children that have been flown over here to the United States.

And the father of one of these patients said to Dr. Meyer: "Why? Why? Why?" And Dr. Meyer said: "Well, what do you mean 'why'?"

"Why do you do this? Why are you willing to do this for our children?"

And his answer is: "We are Christians and we are Americans. That's why."

And so it is the head and the heart of our country, our people. It does come to us to reach out and lift others up and help them. We can't help them all. We can't save them all. But every once in a while, there is a cry out and a need for a chain of individual miracles linked together.

Without a connection, by the way, between Steve Meyer and Lazaro, who met years ago when Lazaro was going to college in Iowa, Lazaro Nyalandu—as he went to college in Iowa, he was brought together by Steve Meyer's pastor and then Steve Meyer, and they got

to know each other and they became friends. And because of that relationship, Steve Meyer went to Tanzania and became one of the lead people on mission to Tanzania. If it hadn't been for that, he never would have formed STEM.

The Siouxland Tanzania Educational Medical Ministry would have never been formed had it not been for that connection more than 20 years ago. And if it had never been formed, the workers wouldn't have been behind the bus when it went off the road, and, likely, everybody would have perished in that bus rather than all but three. If they hadn't been behind the bus, we would have not heard about the injuries that they had and wouldn't have had the connection to fly them back to the United States.

I don't know Lazaro myself. I don't have that to use to convince Anthony Pagilai that this is a credible act. Now, he might have done it anyway. His head and his heart sounds good to me, too, but it helped to have that series of networks already built.

I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, because I want people to know, the people that are listening here, and especially young people as they form and shape their lives, that networking is worth a lot. You can be the smartest person in the world with the best intentions in the world, but if you don't have relationships with people so that you can communicate, that you can share ideas, that you can connect and team up on projects, then you can't get a lot done.

The smartest person in the world in a phone book hasn't had much effect on our society. But people with good convictions and good relationships and positive attitudes and a good heart can get a lot done that is good if they are connected with the right people.

So I just encourage, especially, young people: Go out there and build those networks. Build them while you are young. Build them while you are in school, when you are in K-12, when you are in college, when you are after college, when you are building those networks of young people that are going into the profession together. And understand that 40 years later you are still going to have friends that you can call on to produce a good and positive result if you build those relationships and those networks, not be reclusive. Push yourself out there and build friendships with people. And that multiplied itself over and over again.

By the way, I am grateful that Franklin Graham took my call and I carried enough credibility that that actually worked that way, too. That is another piece of networking. But I can't thank Reverend Franklin Graham enough.

I remember sitting in my living room watching a black-and-white TV while Billy Graham was preaching and calling for an altar call, and that is a little

bit of how we grew up in our family, clear back then when TVs were black-and-white.

And now, his son, Reverend Franklin Graham, took a phone call from me from Albania that resulted in a DC-8 being dispatched to fly these three patients out of Tanzania to Sioux City, Iowa, where they received surgery that repaired 17 broken bones and, by the way, with all of the medical devices donated by the company that produced them as well.

When I look at this, Doreen was paralyzed, particularly in her right leg, and there was no confidence as to whether she would ever be able to have any feeling in that leg or ever be able to walk again. Today she has feeling in that leg. She has some movement in that leg, and my level of confidence that she will walk again is pretty high right now. All the other prayers have been answered; why not this one?

I think the day comes when these three arrive back in Tanzania, and I will predict the date. I think it will be the 18th or 19th of August that they will be flown back to Tanzania, and I believe that these three patients, with their mothers with them, will walk down the steps off that plane onto the soil of Tanzania; and I believe that there will be tens of thousands of Tanzanians there to welcome them back home again.

The completion of this series of miracles that came about because one person, Steve Meyer, had the right head and heart at all times, and he had the right networks, with people like Lazaro Nyalandu and people working in our U.S. Embassies like Anthony Pagiliai and Elizabeth Soderholm, who set up that call, and our Ambassadors within each of those places that promoted and allowed this to happen, including Ambassador Lu and also Ambassador Bailly, whom I worked with.

I got the good news when I was in Kosovo that it was going to be, it was likely to be completed then, that they had reached that transaction. I called it a transaction. They had put together the logistics so that the plane was going to go and pick them up.

I found myself then at the Vatican shortly after that, and kind of as maybe a little extra frosting on the cake, I was offered the opportunity to do the Bible reading at St. Peter's Basilica at the Vatican that Sunday. I don't know how that came to me unless it was just a little reward from God that said, "Well done, well done," by a lot of people.

These young people are now reconstructed. Their reconstructive surgery is completed, and they are on the mend. Two of the three are standing and walking and getting stronger, and each of them are taking physical therapy, and their attitudes are good. Their pain levels are down, and the projection is that, by mid to late August,

they will be ready to go back to Tanzania.

That is an American success story, Mr. Speaker, and it is one that I am happy to relay here on the floor of the House of Representatives and deliver the credit to so many people who did so much to make this work, particularly Dr. Steve Meyer, but all of that for three kids in Tanzania for whom it is a miracle that they survived the bus accident.

Now, for their futures, the three miracle kids of Tanzania have a legacy to live up to. I expect that in years going forward, 10 and 20 and 30 and 40 years from now, wherever they go in the world, especially in Tanzania, they will be known as the Tanzanian miracle kids, the ones who survived against such improbable odds.

Out of them should come the kind of ambassadorship that links together Tanzania and the United States, and who knows what gets built that helps them help themselves; who knows how much of their own agriculture will be expanded so they can raise their own food; who knows how much of their educational system will be built out because of the inspiration that can come from young people whose lives have been saved by the technology and education that we have here; who knows how much of their spirit of faith is going to be bolstered by the good hearts of people that only wanted to do something good, only wanted to reach out their hand and help.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and grateful that this story is on its way to a very happy conclusion, and I can't say enough about the children, about the mothers who expressed their gratitude at the game.

One of the mothers continued to always offer some little chicken strips for my granddaughter, my 10-year-old granddaughter, Rachel, to eat. Rachel couldn't quite understand why she was supposed to be eating all the time. And whenever Rachel would take a bite of it, then she would hear: "You like? You like?"

And I said: "Well, Rachel, it is because there are only a few words in English that this girl's mother knows, and she wants to open up a conversation with you, and so she's offering you food. That is a way of her expressing gratitude, not only to us, but to our country, and a way of having a conversation and communicating." And so it was a good experience for Rachel, too.

But I can't say enough about Reverend Franklin Graham, Samaritan's Purse, this effort that is global, that didn't hesitate. Again, it was not a 5-minute conversation between me and Reverend Franklin Graham that was able to set up this transportation; and the conversation with Franklin Graham and Dr. Steve Meyer, not very technical. It is: "Where are they?"

"What do we need to do?" "How are we going to figure out how to get there?" "Can we set the plane up to be a medevac plane?" He had expressed that also in the phone call with me.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a story that is on the way to a very, very happy conclusion, and I hope sometime, maybe in September, I can come back to the floor and report on the return of the Tanzanian miracle kids to Tanzania and, hopefully, I will have some pictures then of the crowd that is bound to be gathered together in a great celebratory event to counteract, or to be juxtaposed against the terrible, terrible tragedy of that bus accident that killed 36. It was 33 students and 2 of the teachers and the bus driver. Only these three children survived, and they survived because they were at the back of the bus when the bus landed on its nose.

So 17 broken bones, 2 broken spines, 5 or 6 fractured arms, and 3 or 4 of the legs were fractured in one bone or another.

Also, I should say that Dr. Quentin Durward was the neurosurgeon who did a lot of that technical work on the spines along with Dr. Steve Meyer, and he is one, also, who I know that his head and heart are in the right place.

I know that I have left off many, many of the medical providers at Mercy Hospital in Sioux City who donated their time and are so dedicated to this. I regret that I didn't have a list to read into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. But I also want to express my gratitude to those whom I left off the list.

With that, I believe that I should conclude my presentation here on the Tanzanian miracle kids and, again, thank all of those who are involved and transition my discussion over to a few other things that are part of the current concerns here in America.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to transition over to the shooting last Wednesday at the practice ball-field in Alexandria.

I want to thank everyone across this country who offered their prayers for the recovery of all of those who were injured in this shooting and especially our whip, our majority whip, STEVE SCALISE.

His nickname for me and mine for him for years has been "Scrapper." We just call each other "Scrapper."

Well, we know, STEVE SCALISE is a scrapper. He is a fighter. He took an awfully hard hit last Wednesday, and it did significant damage to him. All of the medical reports that we have been getting after the first 36 hours or so have been of improvement in his condition.

□ 1730

I don't suppose—and I say this for STEVE's benefit—I don't suppose LSU's loss in the College World Series the

other night by a score of 13-to-1 improved his condition that much, but he is a baseball player and a baseball fan, and he is a very dedicated LSU fan. They are still in the College World Series, as I understand it, and it is a double-elimination tournament. So they are the leaders in the loser's bracket, so to speak. So they have got a chance to battle back and still win.

But he is battling back, and he is a winner, and his strength is coming back. The day will come when he comes to this floor to cast a vote. I don't know how long that is going to be, Mr. Speaker, but I can only anticipate the cheers of joy that this House of Representatives will utter when the day comes that STEVE SCALISE comes back to this floor to vote, to count votes.

He is the vote counter for the majority in this House of Representatives. That is one of the most important jobs in this place. If you bring a bill to the floor and you can't produce the votes to get it to pass, it is a pretty heavy embarrassment, and STEVE SCALISE has gotten that art down pretty well.

I always want to make that job as easy for him as I can, provided I agree with him on the policy, of course. But STEVE SCALISE, whether you agree with him on the policy or whether you don't, he has the personal support and the prayers of a vast majority of the Members here on this floor, and across this country.

He is an individual who you have got to like him, you have got to like him personally. He is engaging. He is sociable. He makes sure that there is a meal back there for us on first votes of the week, and he is the host in the Lincoln room in front of the Lincoln fireplace where Lincoln used to sit back in the day as well.

His two kids and his wife are also certainly near him whenever they can be and by his bedside whenever they can be. It is a time when the family is going through a fair amount of grief and stress, too.

But STEVE SCALISE isn't the only story in this, and that would be that Matt Mika, the lobbyist for Tyson Foods, was the second-most seriously injured in the shootings last Wednesday. And without describing his wounds here in the RECORD, I just want to make sure the RECORD knows, Mr. Speaker, that it was a very serious wound that Matt Mika took, and his recovery looks positive at this point. It is also one of those things that, day by day, gets a little better.

But each one of these individuals, STEVE SCALISE and Matt Mika, had it been a different scenario, if it had been a more remote location, without an almost immediate medevac by helicopter out of there and to the hospital, I am going to say that if they had been in a remote location, we likely would have lost them both.

It is attempted murder by a fellow that we don't need to bring charges against now because he has gone to the morgue. And his death is as a result of the two officers who were there providing the security for STEVE SCALISE: Crystal Griner, I believe her name was, and also David Bailey.

One of the most uplifting things that I have seen was at the Congressional Baseball Game last Thursday night at the Nationals Park, when I saw Joe Torre come out to the mound, and I thought he was going to throw out the first pitch, and then they introduced—it was either Roberto Clemente's son or grandson, he was also at the mound—but then this fellow came out on crutches that had one leg up off the ground. And as he went out there, I realized who it was: David Bailey; the man who had actually taken the shooter out just the day before and took a wound himself in the leg came to the ball game on crutches and went out to the mound. He handed over one of those crutches, leaned on the other one, and threw out the first pitch.

It was a tremendous moment. It was the best moment of the evening, Mr. Speaker. It was the equivalent of Neil Diamond going back to the Red Sox stadium after the Boston bombing and singing "Sweet Caroline" at the seventh-inning stretch.

Those things, when we see that, have got a lot more meaning than just throwing a ball into home plate or singing a song at the seventh-inning stretch. It is something that uplifts and motivates all of us and should unify all of us together.

This ghastly attempted killing that took place by Hodgkinson was something that—we don't doubt that some of it was ginned up by the hatred and the vitriol that is part of the vernacular and part of the public arena today in politics. More examination of his Facebook page and his other communications and people who were around him will go on as we try to understand what motivated this man, but there is no question it was political.

I believe that he was radicalized by the political dialogue that has been taking place in this country. And that radicalization took place in a way, in his mind, that we won't understand. I remember Speaker PELOSI saying that everybody is not as stable as we are, and that words weigh a ton on people who aren't stable, and sometimes they are motivated into violence.

That doesn't mean we can prevent the violence by preventing the dialogue, but it does mean that when we clash, we should clash on policy. We should disagree on policy and the best method to bring this policy forward, but it should not be personal. We should not be demonizing the other side.

There is going to be a disagreement in ideology. Our Founding Fathers un-

derstood that. They set up this competition here in this Congress to drain the stress off of the streets of America. And one of the results here is that we come to this place, on the floor of this House, and when we disagree, we don't challenge the motive of the person we disagree with. We challenge the ideas, and we try to present better ideas. And the best ideas are to prevail in the mind of the public.

That is how it was designed to be. That is why every 2 years we have an election here, and why there are no appointments to the House of Representatives. Everybody that has a vote card in this place, all 435 of us, that is a vote card earned in an election; not one that has been handed by a Governor's appointment, for example, which is the case in the Senate, from time to time, when there is a vacancy.

But we are elected every 2 years, and our Founding Fathers looked at this and said: We are going to be the hot cup of coffee—or hot cup of tea, perhaps, is what they were referencing at the time—so we could react quickly to the will of the people.

But the saucer that it cools in is the Senate—6-year elections instead of 2—so that the hot ideas that come here to the House of Representatives can be tempered in the cooling saucer of the 6-year terms in the Senate.

But it was about bringing ideas here, bringing them here quickly with the elections every 2 years for every one of us, every 2 years, and then those fresh ideas then wash across over to the Senate, and the Senate is designed to step back and take a look, and a deep breath, and then, with the judgment of both bodies, come together and conference committee, and conference report, and send those results to the President of the United States—elected every 4 years—who is, of course, the Commander in Chief, commands our military, has a full authority to do all kinds of things, Mr. Speaker.

But the point I want to make is this: During the ObamaCare debate in 2010, in that March period of time, when this Capitol was surrounded by the American people, and encircled, and they were six to eight people deep in a human doughnut around the Capitol—not just a human chain where you touched people and reached out as far as you could—six or eight deep, packed together all the way around the Capitol.

By the way, there are no pictures of that human doughnut around the Capitol, because there was no airspace allowed for anything to fly up there and take pictures of us standing around in that fashion. But during that period of time, I had walked from the Judiciary Committee over here to the House of Representatives. And on the way, I came by a lady who I had seen in the gallery of the Judiciary Committee quite a number of times, and I had

never talked to her. But as I walked by her, I felt compelled to speak to her, Mr. Speaker.

And as I did, she said: You have got to stop arguing. You have got to stop debating. You have got to get to a compromise. You have got to get to a compromise and move on. We can't have these arguments in our country. We can't have this kind of stress, this kind of pressure.

And I hadn't answered a question of anybody the same as I did that day. I answered her differently, Mr. Speaker. And it just kind of clicked in my mind, and I said to her: Did you ever think that because we come to this city together, and we debate our disagreements here in open debate, and we air out our beliefs and our convictions, and we weigh our options, and we bring new ideas in, and we churn those ideas, did you ever think that because we do that this way in America, that it keeps us from being at each other's throats and fighting each other in the streets of America?

And I know that was how it was designed to be, to drain off that hot-bloodedness that comes through debate, and by public—not only by debate but by legitimate elections that reflect the voices and the will of the people. It is the biggest thing that keeps us from having revolutions in America. We have them. We have them every 2 years when we have an election. They are, in a way, a revolution.

New ideas come here. We weigh those ideas. We cast our votes. We change the policy. We adjust to the will of the American people, and that keeps us from having revolutions in the street of America.

But how long will that last, Mr. Speaker? How long can that last in a country where we had a legitimate election last November 8, and there is that ever-growing group of people who seem to be denying the very results of our legitimate election?

The constitutionally elected President of the United States is Donald J. Trump, and it is not an arguable or refutable point. You can say that Hillary Clinton won more popular vote than Donald Trump. Well, that is like saying, the Packers beat the Bears, but the Bears ran up more yards than the Packers, so they don't have a legitimate win. They are not playing by the rules on the football field of who runs up the most total yards. It is who has the most points on the scoreboard.

You can run the ball up and down the field, but if you can't get across the goal line, or kick it through the uprights, or if you can't score a safety, you don't score. And if you don't score and the other team does, you lose. If they score more than you do, you still lose. And that is how this constitutional election takes place, Mr. Speaker, is by the rules; the rules that are written into our Constitution and have

been barely altered over more than 200 years because they were so wisely put in place.

The electoral college decides the President of the United States, and the ballots are cast here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and that is the official tally that rings up who is the President of the United States.

There is no part of this process that is legitimately refuted by the other side. Yet, they say, we are the resistance. And the loser in the last Presidential election wants to be the leader of the resistance—the leader of the resistance, and one who has looked for a lot of reasons why she is not the President of the United States.

And I would quote CHUCK GRASSLEY on how you define that. In one of his elections years ago—this is a back-channel story about him, but he is a person I admire and have a great affection for, a senior Senator from Iowa, now the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee—they continually asked him when he was first elected to the Federal office here: "Why did you win? Why did you win?"

And he didn't want to say anything anymore. He was just happy enough with the victory. And finally, as he walked away from the press, they said: "But, Mr. Grassley, why did you win?"

And he turned, and he said: "I got more votes than the other guy." And he walked away.

Well, that is a pretty good point, CHUCK GRASSLEY. And in this case, Donald Trump got more electoral votes than his opponent. That is why he won. But he earned those legitimately by elections within the States that converted those electoral votes to his side. That is how it is supposed to be.

And to deny that then subverts the constitutional results of an elected President. It subverts the mandate that comes with the election of a President. It diminishes the credibility of our constitutionally structured government that is there, and it bogs down our process.

So when I see demonstrations in the streets, Mr. Speaker, that say "the resistance" in the front, and then there is another big banner up there that says, "be ungovernable," we don't want to be an ungovernable people, Mr. Speaker. We want to be a governable people. And when we elect a President, and when we elect Senators and House Members, and our offices in the States for our State representatives and our State senators, when we elect our Governors, when we elect our other constitutional officers who are there, we need to respect the results of that, and give them their respect, and let them do their jobs.

I especially want to encourage them, keep your campaign promises. Follow through on those campaign promises. But when we have masses of people in the streets who go out to demonstrate

against the results of a legitimate election, we start to look like the Third World.

Can't we have, on both sides of the aisle—can't we have Republicans over here and Democrats over here, and leftists over on the extreme there, and some Conservatives over here—that I think are as constitutional as myself—can't we have them respect the system enough to respect the duly elected Representatives who are there, including, and especially, the President of the United States so that there are not demonstrations in the streets?

In this city the next day, Mr. Speaker, 600,000 to 700,000 people swarmed the streets of this city in equal or greater numbers than those who came to witness the inauguration, to protest against the inauguration against the newly inaugurated President Trump.

□ 1745

Six to 700,000, the majority of them, were women wearing these knitted pink hats, carrying around some of the most vulgar signs I have seen anywhere—in fact, the most vulgar signs I have seen anywhere—protesting against the inauguration of the President of the United States.

Why?

I talked to a lot of them—more of them than it was probably wise, Mr. Speaker—but I did take them down to this: that you are obstructing and subverting the constitutional results of this election, and if you want to live in a free country, if you want to live in a constitutional Republic, and if you want to be able to receive and earn the benefits of the free enterprise system that we have, the rule of law that we have, the constitutional government that we have, this American spirit that is a can-do spirit that brings the vigor of the planet here to America and that employs their industriousness, grows our GDP, and contributes to the living standard in America, if you want all that to happen, then you can't be obstructing the results of elections because we will end up in the Third World.

If you destroy the rule of law in America by protesting in the streets and being ungovernable and if you are an ungovernable people, then we are not going to be a constitutional Republic forever.

Remember what Ben Franklin said when they came out of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia and a woman asked him: What have you given us?

His answer was: A Republic, Madam, if you can keep it.

Well, we have kept it for a long time, and we need to continue to keep it.

Ronald Reagan told us that freedom doesn't last more than a generation. It has to be fought for and it has to be defended.

We have fought for it and we have defended it. We also now have to defend it



in the minds and in the hearts of the American people. If we fail to teach our young people the value of this constitutional Republic, if we fail to teach them the continuation of the history of this great Nation that we are blessed to be part of, then eventually they will build a disrespect. They are already building it in many of the colleges and universities across the land. That disrespect turns into contempt, and that contempt turns into, sometimes, violence in the streets that shuts down freedom of speech in America.

Charles Murray got drummed off the stage, and he couldn't give a speech because they disagreed with what they think he is going to say. That happens also to others along the way who aren't able to deliver the speeches they want to deliver.

Brigitte Gabriel is a proud Americanized citizen who lived in a bunker in Lebanon while they were trying to kill her because she is a Christian. She had been bombed multiple times and she was wounded in that process. As a little girl, she watched television on battery-operated black-and-white TV. She saw "Bonanza" and "Dallas" and some of the other programs that showed about the quality and the character of American life. She understood that we are a people. And she said this just last Wednesday morning, right after we learned of the shooting: that she learned as a little girl, 8 to 10 years old, watching television that Americans are people that can disagree without having that break down into violence or without hurling accusations and insults at the person we disagree with, that we are a people that have a quality of our character that we can disagree with each other and do so and still be friends and respect the opinions of the other.

That is one of those things that keep this Republic going and keeps it successful. But I am watching it digress. I am watching as people more often hurl insults and throw a tantrum instead of listening to a position and then issuing the counterpoints. In fact, that happened today in the Judiciary Committee. I will let others look that up for now, Mr. Speaker, but when our emotions rule our intellect, then we start to devolve towards Third World. When our intellect controls our emotions, then the age of reason can continue to improve and achieve.

We are a country that has a foundation of blessings in it. Some of that foundation is the foundation of Western civilization itself. The dominant component of Western civilization is the United States of America. If we let the rest of the world be subsumed by other sets of values that don't respect the success of Western civilization, then eventually the part that we are able to hold together here will be less because we will have fewer allies around the world. Eventually we will

be surrounded by other ideologies that will want to consume or supplant us here in America.

So I want our children to know, Mr. Speaker, that this gift that is America is rooted in the pillars of American exceptionalism whose roots are in Western civilization and our rule of law. It is so essential that we restore that rule of law here in America.

You can trace the rule of law back to old England. One of the places that you can see that is just go down the road to Jamestown here in Virginia. Go there and look at the site where the Jamestown settlers landed. There, one of the first buildings they built was a church. But even before that, Mr. Speaker, they planted a cross there on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean where you can look across to the east to the old country, to England. There, they knelt and offered a prayer.

I think it would take me a little too long to call that up on my iPhone. I don't have it committed to memory. But they understood the destiny. They understood the gift of America. They understood the destiny to spread our freedom—freedom of religion—but spread also would be evangelism for the world. That prayer is so profound that I will grab that and put that into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a little bit later, Mr. Speaker. It is one of the first things they did at Jamestown.

Additionally, inside that church they built—and now there is a church that has been built just outside the old foundation that they laid at that time so you can walk inside of the church and stand there and see the old foundation of the church that was built maybe not in 1607, but very close to 1607—there is a poster, a sign inside. It is fitting that it is on the east wall of the inside of the church. It says: Here in this place, in 1607, English common law came to the New World.

It is a profound thing to stand there and read and understand that is what that meant to the earliest settlers in America: English common law arrived, the rule of law arrived with them.

That rule of law, what was it rooted in?

It is rooted in—once you go back to old England, you can trace the law to the Romans who occupied. And that Roman law can be traced all the way back to the birth of Christ and before. And that Roman law also can be traced back through Greece, who shared a fair amount of that respect and rule of law that they had to be successful nations, they had to have a rule of law.

It can be traced, then, from the Romans and the Greeks back to Moses himself. Mosaic law is the foundation for law in America, and it is traceable. The Greek philosophers and the leaders in Greece would talk about the rule of law. They would be sometimes teased and ridiculed by some of their competitors. They would say: "That is not

your thoughts. You borrowed that from Moses. That is Mosaic law. I can hear it in your voice. I know that is where it came from."

Mosaic law was traced to Greece and Rome, and from Rome then on to Western Europe where the Romans occupied much of that all the way to England and beyond. That is where the rule of law came from.

One of the pillars of American exceptionalism is the rule of law. If you would pull that out of the equation of the history of the United States of America, you would end up with an entirely different country, an entirely different culture, and an entirely different structure here.

We respect the law. We don't have police officers that pull us over because they need money for their children and accept a bribe because they said that you were speeding. If any of that happens, we look at their badge number, and that officer is soon out of a job. We clean our society up of those kinds of things. But that is not the case in Third World countries. They know what *mordida* means south of the border. That happens in country after country. But here, we respect the law.

We have open meetings laws where the function of government is out in the open so the public can be in and participate. That is rooted clear back in the Greek city-states.

I recall going into the National Archives to take a look and stand and gaze at the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, where you can get your hand within 8 inches of that parchment where they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. As I waited to step before the Declaration, there was a display of the artifacts from the Greek city-states where they would gather together all of the eligible-age men—at that time it was only men, but, of course, now, today, we fixed that—but as they would gather them together, they would all have a voice.

They had a situation where there would be what they would call demagogues. The Greek demagogues would be those who were so skillful in their oratorical skills that they could wind up the emotions of the other Greeks and sometimes get them to stampede in the wrong direction. If they consistently stampeded their fellow citizens in an ill-logical direction, eventually they would say—I don't know what the name would be of the Greek individual, but maybe it would be like: Demetrius is causing too much trouble for us, we are going to have to blackball him.

So if the demagogue was too effective and caused too much damage to the public policy, then they would go through, there would be one door there that you would vote in, and the next door would be the discard door. Each voter, each citizen, would get a white and a black marble. They would cast

their ballot, blackball that Greek demagogue and banish him from the city-state.

There is much that is rooted as part of this country that is rooted back in this era. We need to teach it and we need to have respect for each other.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

### THE TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, last week, as we are all too aware, a gunman opened fire on Members of Congress and staff assistants as they were practicing for the annual bipartisan baseball game to raise money for a Washington-based charity. Among those who were injured is my dear friend and colleague, Congressman STEVE SCALISE, the House majority whip.

As news of this event came in right before our weekly Nebraska breakfast, a 74-year tradition—by the way, a bipartisan tradition in which the entire Nebraska delegation gets together on a weekly basis and invites anyone from our home State to gather with us. As that was about to occur, I heard the news of the shootings. I felt bewildered, shocked, and numb.

As further reports came in from my colleagues throughout the morning, I heard that STEVE was playing second base at the time of his shooting. He crawled from the infield, leaving a trail of blood.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't a movie. These are not distant figures. These are our friends and our colleagues, people who work right here in this institution. Representative SCALISE and I frequently interact on the nuances of policy, and sometimes differences of policy. No matter what our disagreements—and believe me, there are hard differences even on one side of the political aisle. No matter what the differences might be, STEVE always has worked with me in a cordial, professional, constructive, and, perhaps most importantly, gentlemanly manner. That is just who he is. So regardless of what anyone may think of his policies, of his political point of view, Congress, or the GOP, he did not deserve to be shot.

As noted by Senator RAND PAUL, who was also at the practice, were it not for the courageous Capitol Hill Police officers who accompanied Representative SCALISE to events, this would have been a massacre. Were it not for the first responders from the Alexandria Police Department and Fire and Rescue, many of those injured, for them it could have been much, much worse.

My heart goes out to STEVE SCALISE and the others who were injured in this tragic event.

However, my words cannot stop here. For years now, across multiple administrations and across party lines, we have seen accelerating political rancor in our country that goes way beyond normal partisan politics. It is hard to get your mind around some of the stuff that people write. It is awful. It goes beyond just pointed language. It is now so frequent, so violent, and so directly threatening that security personnel are working overtime to keep up with it.

Madam Speaker, you know this. Many good men and women of differing political perspectives work in the United States Congress. These are people who have accomplished important things in their own home communities and decided that their heart was calling them to serve in a broader capacity.

□ 1800

I fully recognize that Washington, D.C., can seem elitist and aloof, but as you know, Madam Speaker, Members of Congress are real people, with real families, from real places across our land. Sure, there may be a disproportionate share of lawyers in the institution, but there are also nurses, social workers, doctors, teachers, and small-business owners.

In fact, one of the doctors, Representative BRAD WENSTRUP, a friend of mine, happened to be at the baseball practice. He is an Iraq veteran and surgeon. He attended to STEVE SCALISE's gunshot wound, thankfully.

Above all, all of these persons are Americans. Nevertheless, there is a limit to what the human person, even a paid public servant, can absorb. We can take the violent words, but when it spills into violent action, it is too much. This country cannot continue to rip itself apart like this.

Madam Speaker, there is one additional difficulty here that needs to be unpacked. There is a real risk and vulnerability in what I call regularizing this response, in making it like a "new normal."

In fact, within only a few hours of the shootings, certain national media had begun to routinize the tragedy, as they returned to obsessing on the latest crisis du jour in Washington, as if nothing fundamentally destructive to all that we hold dear as Americans had just occurred. And why not? As the media tells us, the assassin was a "troubled man," a "lone wolf," with a "history of violence" and "easy access to guns," who was likely "mentally ill." Nothing unique to see here.

Madam Speaker, these were not our thoughts after the assassination attempt on Ronald Reagan or the shooting of Democratic Arizona Congresswoman Gabby Giffords of Arizona. When President Kennedy was shot, I am told, it was as if the entire world came to a halt.

If we are now going to move beyond words and normalize the violent tar-

geting of people just because they choose public service, hold views that are different from our own, or speak in a style that is not to our liking, there is no country.

I find it particularly jarring that the widely praised theatrical assassination of President Trump at a rendition of Julius Caesar in New York City's Central Park—underwritten, by the way, by The New York Times—continues to go on.

Madam Speaker, violence is violence. When it is here and it is political, of course, it is particularly jarring.

Tragically, we also may be growing used to the idea of terror abroad. Although its root causes are different than those of domestic political attacks here on our own shores, the same thing is at stake: the very principles of civilization itself.

Madam Speaker, let me digress for a moment, because this is particularly notable.

After 9/11, crime all but vanished from the streets of New York City. In other words, the shock and the horror caused a community to rally together above any social discord in a spirit of true unity. We glimpsed that same spirit of solidarity as a nation when Osama bin Laden was finally confronted.

Just recently, a day after the terror attacks that rocked London a few weeks ago, Richard Angell, a patron in a restaurant that had been evacuated during the jihadist rampage, calmly returned to pay his bill. In explaining his generosity, Angell told a reporter, "These people shouldn't win."

The night before, several bartenders had risked their lives to defend patrons in that particular establishment with bottles, chairs, tables, anything they could find, as the terrorists tried to hack away their customers with large knives. More lives would have been lost were it not for their bravery.

Only a few weeks before that, at a concert attended mostly by young girls, a homeless man, Stephen Jones, who slept most nights near the stadium, helped several victims of that bombing to safety, even pulling nails from the faces of young children.

The resolve and courage in the face of barbaric violence harkens back to the passengers of United Flight 93 who sacrificed their own lives on 9/11 in order to take down a plane headed straight for Washington, D.C., probably for the White House.

While we appropriately recognize those who act with courage, the constant repetition of these scenes appear to be resulting, sadly, in what I call "terror fatigue." We go about the same tired ritual: the requisite shock and horror; the 24-hour media coverage of victims, heroes, and families; and the inevitable autopsy of what went wrong. By this exercise, I am afraid we further enable what Hannah Arendt once famously wrote, "the banality of evil."

Against this backdrop, I think it is important and useful to pull back and contemplate the fundamental error in our analysis and approach. In the West, we have a blind spot. We want to believe that if we can only understand how a disordered person was raised, how his parents treated him, if he was an orphan or poor or misunderstood or abandoned or a victim of some real or imagined prejudice, then we can understand what makes him kill. Armed with this soft understanding, perhaps we can prevent further tragedy by ameliorating the conditions that we think gave rise to barbaric deeds.

In many discussions of unpredictable and random attacks on bystanders in Europe and America, we find a perverse unwillingness to accurately identify the true motivations of the perpetrators, lest we close the space to “cure them” of their zealotry.

In the current, highly polarized, oversensitized, and extremely volatile climate, it is risky to call a thing for what it is. Instead, again and again, we hear that these were just a few misguided individuals—another mental health problem, another aberration, another police problem; nothing to do with dark theology to notice here. Carry on. We must just accept this as a new normal.

What makes these particular vicious actors different? In a study, the Gallup organization basically finds that most people in the world want similar things. Most people in the world want a good job: to be able to take care of themselves; to be able to take care of their family; to be able to use the creative talents of their personhood, whether it be their intellect or their hands to make things for the benefit of others and, in turn, receive an income that they can support themselves with.

However, as one of my Muslim friends has noted, Petro-Islam has enabled and unleashed a narrow sect of men and women who often want for nothing. Several of the terrorists on 9/11 were young men of both wealth and privilege, with world-class educations. They weren't motivated by the allures of Western secular materialism. They used those values to hide in plain sight. Rather, they were in the grip of a dark, violent theology. They were willing to die for its inherent irrationality.

This cannot continue. Even the Saudis, who have lived for too long with the hyper hypocrisy of buying off Wahhabists while shopping in Paris, recognize this is an unsustainable trend.

Madam Speaker, when I was in college, I remember the day when Egyptian President Anwar Sadat was assassinated. It was a hard day for me. Shortly before, I had lived in that country on an exchange program. I received the bountiful gift of hospitality and an invaluable source of deep and reach cultural understanding.

Sadat died. Sadat gave his life because he made a reasoned choice to reach across the divide to find peace. In another courageous move, just a few years ago, in a little-known speech, the current Egyptian President, Abdel Fattah el-Sisi, said: “Is it possible that 1.6 billion Muslims should want to kill the rest of the world's inhabitants—that is, 7 billion—so that they themselves may live? Impossible.”

Quite a courageous statement.

At this moment, Madam Speaker, we are on the verge of wiping out ISIS militarily. But it is only the latest brand. We will only fully resolve the thinking that leads to the embrace of dark theology through a rebirth in reason, modeled through courageous leadership.

As we see in our battle against ISIS, when you call for evil to happen on social media, in Main Street media and in art, eventually someone in the real world takes it to heart. We must stop creating the rhetorical conditions and the media cover for this politically motivated violence or the grotesque twisting of mediums to encourage terror. There is no rationalization that can justify it. This is not about freedom of speech. It is about freedom from violence.

Ask yourself a question: Where would you like to live? Where people lie, steal, and kill? Or where people are good, trustworthy, and free?

Madam Speaker, I will close with this because it is a hint of good news.

Last week, the House of Representatives, in a private session, Democrats and Republicans, had a family meeting and, with due candor, spoke about the effect of escalating rhetoric and the responsibility each of us must take in owning our share of it.

Importantly, the bipartisan Congressional Baseball Game went on as planned last Thursday night. I took my younger staff. The game was energetic and patriotically bipartisan. Madam Speaker, as you are aware, my side lost, but I believe America won.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, today a lot of people are looking at Washington more perplexed than ever, thinking that nothing is getting done here. It is easy for them to think that because, when they turn on their televisions or listen to their radios and listen to news commentators, all they seem to be talking about is some very obscure idea. But something that dominates all the communication, or a great deal of communication, is that

Russia in some way altered the outcome of the last election, perhaps—what they have been telling us—the Russians hacked into the system. This is the image we are being given.

□ 1815

All those emails that came out during the election from the Democratic National Committee and the Hillary campaign, those emails were, in some way, a product of a Russian conspiracy with the Trump campaign. Over and over and over again, even though all of the experts who we have seen from the intelligence communities on down the line have said that that is bogus; that did not happen; there is no proof that that happened. And many people who are looking into this don't think that the Russians were involved with that hacking at all, much less their involvement in our campaigns in a way that differentiated from every other government in the world, including our own, being involved in trying to impact other people's elections in a light-handed way.

In this situation, the Russian Government has not—again, has not—been proven or even the evidence seems to indicate that they were not involved in a way that actually affected the outcome of our last election. Yet that is all we hear about. That is the massive news coverage, and the American people's attention is being focused on that, or they are being told: Oh, but over in Washington, the Congress is so tied up because of this crisis. We have not been tied up. We have been doing great things here in the Nation's capital, and the Trump administration has been doing great things. We have not been frozen by this unrelenting attack trying to give the American people the idea that the last election was invalid.

This effort to distract us is a disgrace. And I do believe the American people see, when they hear this over and over repeated but there is no substance being told us that indicates the specific crime, the specific hacking incident that happened. No, we have no incidences where any type of Russian interference, in some way, determined the outcome of the last election.

But, of course, the distraction that is taking place is basically covering the fact that we have a group of people who lost the last election who have been disrupting, who have a plan, a program of resistance and disruption of those who did win the election. If there is anything more anti-American than that, I don't know what is. Talk about destroying democracy.

So with that said, what are we doing if we aren't tied up in this Russian problem? And let me note, there has been, even to the point after all the hearings that we had and there is no evidence of it, now some Republicans have gone along with this effort, and we have appointed what was called an

independent or a special prosecutor. And now what we can expect is another 3 or 4 months of the headlines on all of the news media except one or two trying to divert our attention. Well, I would ask that the independent counsel and the special prosecutor, they are going to look into Russia, let them not just look into, did our Attorney General have two conversations or three conversations with the Ambassador from Russia to the United States in passing meetings, I might add, other people engaged, instead of asking questions like that and trying to find some way to charge our Attorney General with some sort of crime that he would have committed and maybe perjury even because he forgot about one conversation with someone over a year's time period where there were thousands of conversations with thousands of people, nobody hope—if they can go into detail like that, let us hope that the Clinton Foundation becomes a target of that investigation.

They want to find out what effect the Russians had on our elections. Let's find out what the millions of dollars that went into the Clinton Foundation did that might have helped Hillary's chances of being elected. Let's find out that. And let's find out how much money was actually put into the Clinton family's pockets when former President Clinton, speaking again before Russian oligarchs, was able to receive certain payments, exorbitant payments, from what I understand, we need to know exactly what they were, into his own pocket at the same time Russian oligarchs were putting millions, maybe tens of millions, into the Clinton Foundation.

So, okay, that needs to be looked at. But I would suggest that the American people need to go beyond this made-up crisis. The American people need to take a look at what we have been accomplishing here, and we have been accomplishing. A healthcare bill passed. And, yes, it is not a perfect healthcare bill, but now we have actually got a bill that is in the system. The Senate is going to have their bill. The system is now working, and there is a healthcare bill going through the system to improve our situation now instead of being stuck with ObamaCare that was so poorly written that people were being priced out of the market of having insurance. And we end up with millions of people who can't afford the health insurance because ObamaCare did what? ObamaCare basically said anybody with a preexisting condition, that risk will be paid for by other health insurance policyholders. And, thus, everybody else's health insurance went way up, and the amount of coverage they got went way down. Surprise. Surprise. No, that was not a good way to go, and the Republicans are trying to find a better method.

Let me just note that I have personally been involved with promoting an

other concept of how we should be dealing with preexisting conditions, and there is a bill circulating now, and hopefully it will be seriously considered. And as the healthcare bill goes through the House and the Senate, maybe we can get this in there, and that is you look at preexisting conditions and you say: okay, that person has a preexisting condition, and right now that preexisting condition puts them into the mix with all the other policyholders. And then everybody else, including that person, picks up the cost of insuring for that preexisting condition, which then prices everybody out. More people end up without insurance, or insurance that they can't cover, or what they are getting for their money is decreased.

My daughter, for example, had leukemia a few years ago. She is 9 years old. And thank God that we got through that and she is now free of leukemia. But I am sure that somewhere along the line what we are going to have is an insurance company saying: Well, you had leukemia, you had a preexisting condition, thus we are going to charge you more money for health insurance. Maybe 10 years down the road this will happen to her, maybe 20. But the fact is that we don't need to have people around our country that are in that situation. My daughter is now cancer free. And if she has a preexisting condition, or anybody else in the country has a preexisting condition, what I am proposing—and there is a bill making its way around, people are considering this as an alternative, and I hope they take it seriously, but we will see, at least we are trying, and the idea is the Federal Government will document all preexisting conditions. My daughter's leukemia would be on that list. And at any time from then on that someone with a preexisting condition has that preexisting condition, if leukemia comes back to her or anyone else who has a preexisting condition that is documented, it will be paid for by Medicare. Just as simple as that. That condition only. All the rest of her health insurance, however, need not be covered by the Federal Government or anybody else.

Now that the preexisting conditions have not put their amount way up in the cost to buy an insurance, now they will be charged just the same as anybody else who is healthy. But if they break their arm, they are in a car accident, if they have another disease that comes on, they now are insured from that, but they are not having to pay extra insurance because of that preexisting condition, and you just leave that to Medicare. It is a simple answer. It is not going to cost the taxpayers any more money by doing it any other way. Just let the government take care of those preexisting conditions. All the rest of their healthcare, however, will have to be paid for by that individual.

Just the preexisting condition is covered.

So that is a type of reform that we can put into place, and people are talking about these ideas now here. That is why, when the Republican bill passed, it was launching a discussion, an honest discussion, of what we should do. The Senate is going to send us back something, and we will, this year, have a healthcare bill because we will have gone through all of these types of alternatives like the one I just suggested.

We also passed a financial reform bill. It was called the CHOICE Act. It was a financial reform bill that one of the main parts of it actually repealed the Dodd-Frank bill which was so dramatically hard for our economy and was basically making it very difficult for businesses to function in our country, was a terrible burden, and was actually bringing our economy down. So we passed the elimination of the Dodd-Frank Act, and we have reformed our financial community, and that has passed the House. It is now over to the Senate.

We have passed dozens of notable bills, yet the impression we are given, of course, is the only thing happening here is the Russians were, in some way, engaged in the last election, and we must focus totally on that, even though all the committees that investigated this, all the people who came from the various intelligence agencies, no one said, here is the proof that they were colluding with the Trump campaign to defeat the Democratic candidate in the last election.

So people are only getting that story, but there are all kinds of bills that are being passed, legislation being passed here. Like, for example, there was a weather bill that passed. I mean, this is one example. SUZANNE BONAMICI was someone who had a bill that was attached to the weather bill. It was aimed specifically at trying to have a warning system for tsunami waves that might be created and come not only towards the United States but towards Japan and any other coastal area. That bill passed, and, as I say, it is part of the weather bill now.

And SUZANNE BONAMICI, of course, is a Democrat, and I am a Republican.

The other lie is that Republicans and Democrats can't work together. Well, that is just wrong. People are creating a false image, and I am glad to see, by the elections last night, that the American people aren't falling for the baloney they are being fed.

So was that a good bill, the tsunami bill? I think it was, and it has made it through.

We have other environmentally aimed bills that are making up for the excesses of the last administration that was basically pushing a radical, environmental, globalist approach to environment issues. I think it is a

great thing that the President of the United States has withdrawn us from the Paris Agreement, which would have cost us billions of dollars that we would send to other countries and would put us under the jurisdiction of decisions made by international bodies, not by American-elected officials but by international bodies. That was a terrific move on the part of the President.

In fact, Trump has done a number of wonderful things that he is not getting credit for. Because all the media wants to talk about is how many conversations anybody associated with Trump had with any Russians in the last 2 years. Sorry. A lot of other things that are happening are important. Those people who are trying to distract us are not succeeding. The fact is that President Donald Trump had a triumphant trip overseas. His first visit was to the Middle East.

I am a former speech writer for President Reagan. I didn't write the speech, but I was there when he gave that speech in Berlin telling Gorbachev to "tear down this wall," a speech that made history, not just reflected it but is now seen as a pivotal moment in changing the direction of what was going on with the Cold War.

□ 1830

I might say, I didn't write it, but I did make sure that I was one of the people who smuggled that speech into the President's hands. After the President was given that speech and said he was going to say that, all of his senior advisers tried to convince him not to say, "tear down this wall." And "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," was a phrase in history that made history. And Ronald Reagan stood up against all of the people on the left who were attacking him and even all of his own advisers. That made a huge difference in the world that we live in.

Now, let me just note this. We have a President now, President Donald Trump, who went to Saudi Arabia and went to a meeting with the leaders of that part of the world. He talked to them—and these were Muslims, of course. And he said to the Muslim world that, if there is going to be peace with the United States, drive the terrorists out of your mosque; drive the terrorists out of your country.

I haven't been as proud of any President since I was with Ronald Reagan when he said "tear down this wall" than I was proud of our President, President Donald Trump, for telling the Islamic world that they have got to disassociate themselves, they have got to drive the terrorists out of their families and out of their relationships with good and decent Muslims, who are the vast majority of the Muslims in the world.

So, with that said, I think there is a lot going on that is good. There are

good things. This is a good report. I hope the American people pay attention.

There are a lot of creative ideas that are going on. These I just told you about, healthcare and finance reform, these are really important things. And the fact that we are not putting everything in the hands of the United Nations or some unelected government to tell us what we have to do in the name of the environment, that is good, too.

Well, I have got a few creative ideas that I have actually presented. I thought I would just let my colleagues know, let my constituents know, and let the rest of the country know, these are some issues on the table that I have personally put on.

I think I have a good chance, for example, of getting into the tax bill a provision that is now written out in H.R. 1792, the Expanding Employee Ownership Act.

What my bill suggests is that we should have more involvement by working people in their own companies. Let them own part of their companies so that the bosses and the laborers work together as a team rather than looking at each other as adversaries.

My bill, H.R. 1792, is being considered for the tax bill that we are putting together. What it says, very simply, is that, if an employer gives to his employees—it has to be a general distribution—stock in that company, the employees don't have to pay income tax on it. And if they keep that stock for 10 years, they don't have to pay capital gains tax.

So what we have now is a major boost of people keeping their good employees, a better working relationship, more productivity, and management more concerned about their laborers because now their laborers own stock in the company—maybe even 10 or 20 percent of the stock at some point. What we have is a bill that has a chance, and it is being considered. That is the type of thing that is going on here.

People are talking about new ideas. For example, I talked about the idea of a new healthcare reform bill and my approach and what I am doing to promote that price for people with pre-existing conditions. That is another example, ideas that are being discussed, legislation that is going through, and people are trying to mold it. That is part of the legislative process.

Also, when you talk about Republicans and Democrats working together, we are being told we don't work together. Well, we do. Republicans and Democrats work together, just like I did on the tsunami bill. We actually have a good relationship—many of us do.

Nowhere is that more evident than in my leadership of H.R. 975, which is a bill that is entitled, Respect State

Marijuana Laws. What this bill does is—over the years, in the last 6 years, I have been joined with a Democrat. It is Mr. BLUMENAUER now, and it used to be Congressman Farr when he was with us. We were able to put into the appropriations bill for the Department of Justice a provision, an amendment to the bill that said: No money in this bill can be used by the Department of Justice to supersede the State laws on medical marijuana in those States that have legalized the use of medical marijuana.

So, for the last 5 and 6 years, that has been a totally bipartisan effort. I am a Republican, obviously, and I have been joined by Mr. Farr and, now, Mr. BLUMENAUER. We have actually created a situation where we now have people who are getting involved in researching medical marijuana.

By the way, did you know that Israel now, finally, has stepped forward and has done research in the last 10 years? We haven't. The United States hasn't. In fact, for 100 years, when we should have been trying to find the medical uses of marijuana, it has been virtually outlawed. And now Israel has found wonderful applications for medical marijuana.

They also, by the way, when they were studying the effects of marijuana, have legalized it for personal use, for adult use of marijuana, as well as medical marijuana.

Well, what does that tell you? That tells you that some of the people who have been telling us, "oh, we can't do this because it is going to have a serious impact," Israel studies this closely, especially when it might have a military implication. This would not destroy their military; otherwise, they would not have passed this major reform in their country.

Now, why is it that marijuana is an important issue and it brings Republicans and Democrats together? We have limited resources here. The idea that we are going to spend billions of dollars not on protecting Americans from terrorists, not from trying to get bad guys—rapists and murderers—in our local area; no, we are going to spend billions of dollars on police, on jailers, on lawyers, on judges, and on prisons. And then we are going to take people out of the workforce. We are spending billions of dollars so somebody will not smoke a weed in their backyard.

And what is even worse, we are telling them we are going to spend billions of dollars to prevent you. If you find that there is a medical use for marijuana, like for senior citizens who have lost their appetites after a major operation—which happened to my mother, by the way. I did not give her marijuana, but I knew when I was feeding her that she had lost her appetite after a major operation. I said to myself: Why can't she have cannabis here? Well, now people know about that.

There is no reason for us to prevent our seniors from having some euphoria when they are 85 years old in a senior citizens home, especially if it brings back their appetite and they feel better because of it rather than drinking. Do they want to have them all drinking?

Well, this is not just for seniors. This is for people who have medical problems. It has been documented to have important uses. And again, no one has ever overdosed with marijuana, ever.

In terms of what we need to do and what we need to focus on are drugs that are harmful. We have an opioid addiction problem now. Doctors have been giving prescriptions for this. We need to confront that and confront other challenges in crime rather than billions of dollars to try to prevent someone from hurting themselves.

If an adult wants to consume cannabis—an adult—it is their business. For the government to intrude, especially the Federal Government, after a State has legalized it, this is tyranny. Our Founding Fathers did not believe that we should have police forces and criminal justice operating at the State—they believed it should happen at the State and local level, not the Federal level.

These current restrictions that we have, we have people, unfortunately, again, that are living in the past. All they can remember is the sixties when hippies were smoking dope, and it was just literally a counterculture—counter our culture. And I say “our culture” because I have more of a conservative family background.

Although I lived a life in my past and I had too much to drink at times, and maybe even when I was younger, maybe I tried cannabis a couple of times, but I have had an adulthood since I was 23 that I think meets the approval of my parents and, in particular, my dad, who was a lieutenant colonel in the Marines.

So with that said, had I been arrested, let's say, where some of my friends or something were consuming marijuana when I was around, what would have happened to my life? And what is happening to the lives of all of these people, especially in our less affluent areas, who can't afford the legal protections of hiring a lawyer right away?

It is destroying their ability to function in our society. We should not be taking people who are involved in an activity like consuming a weed. Adults should be able to make that decision for themselves. Sending police for someone like that or expending billions of dollars or ruining the life of that young person who can't afford, whether Black, Chicano, or Caucasian, who can't afford a lawyer to get them off and expunge their record, it is going to affect them the rest of their life. We can't be doing that. It is a waste of money.

We have a chance now, with bipartisan support, to pass this amendment again, perhaps. We are trying to get that onto the appropriations bill for the Department of Justice, which would then keep in place those restrictions on the Federal Government.

But I have a bill, again, with bipartisan support, that would make that across the board. It just says that every State that has legalized the use of marijuana, that none of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government should supersede. They should be treated just like someone selling alcohol or whatever. And, in fact, if they do, they will be asking for ID cards from people to make sure that they are not selling to juniors, to people who are minors, rather than to adults, just like beer.

Unfortunately, when it is illegal, it is easier to get marijuana than it is—for someone who is not 18 or 21, it is easier for them to get marijuana than beer because they don't have to show their ID card at the liquor store.

So with that said, there is bipartisan support for my bill. I am hoping that we can get it passed this year or next year, at least in this session of Congress.

And then, finally, we have lots of things going on here. I just discussed several creative things that are being discussed around town. And we have got a President of the United States who is opening the door which was guarded by basically a very far-left-wing philosophy for the last 8 years. The door of government in this country now is open to working people, where this President has committed himself to trade policies and others that are aimed at creating jobs for the American people, ordinary jobs.

One of the things that he has promised us to protect the American people and our American workers is to stop the massive flow of illegals into our country. The massive flow of illegals into our country is bringing down the standard of living of working people.

There is one idea that I have presented. When he wants to build a wall, we have the means to provide the resources to build that wall in a very creative way. It wouldn't cost the American people anything.

So I would hope that those who are listening who like some of these ideas don't get depressed about what they are hearing in the news. Good things are happening in Washington, and a lot of new creative ideas are being discussed.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family obligation.

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1094. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 22, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

“I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.”

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

GREG GIANFORTE, At-Large District of Montana.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1744. A letter from the Board Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's 103rd Annual Report covering operations for calendar year 2016, pursuant to Sec. 2B of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1745. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule —



Suspension of Community Eligibility, Washington County, IN, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8483] received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1746. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Formula Grant Program [Docket No.: OJP (OJJDP) 1737] (RIN: 1121-AA83) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1747. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Augusta, Georgia) [MB Docket No.: 11-54] (RM-11624) received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1748. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rural Health Care Support Mechanism [WC Docket No.: 02-60] received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1749. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1750. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's correcting amendments — Wassenaar Arrangement 2015 Plenary Agreements Implementation, Removal of Foreign National Review Requirements, and Information Security Updates; Corrections [Docket No.: 160217120-7396-02] (RIN: 0694-AG85) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1751. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to the Congress from the Office of Inspector General, for the 6-month period of October 1, 2016–March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1752. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis 2016 management report and financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1753. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, transmitting the 2016 Management Report of the

Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco including the 2016 Annual Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1754. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Policy, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustment for 2017 [Docket No.: OAG 156; AG Order No.: 3823-2017] received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1755. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7262; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-079-AD; Amendment 39-18912; AD 2017-11-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1756. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8182; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-18906; AD 2017-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1757. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0363; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-18887; AD 2017-10-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1758. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ZLIN AIRCRAFT a.s. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0156; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-003-AD; Amendment 39-18877; AD 2017-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1759. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6667; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-18882; AD 2017-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1760. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0501; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-053-AD; Amendment 39-18908; AD 2017-11-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Com-

mittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1761. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6666; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-18881; AD 2017-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1762. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0053; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-037-AD; Amendment 39-18888; AD 2017-10-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1763. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Stemme AG Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0451; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-18885; AD 2017-10-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 396. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules. (Rept. 115-187). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BARRAGAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr.



SOTO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2972. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support services for Alzheimer's patients and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2973. A bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an excise tax on certain prescription drugs which have been subject to a price spike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 2975. A bill to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security relating to public transportation security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 2976. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow for the deferment of certain student loans during a period in which a borrower is receiving treatment for cancer; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 2977. A bill to reduce a portion of the annual pay of Members of Congress for the failure to adopt a concurrent resolution on the budget which does not provide for a balanced budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PIN-

GREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 2978. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2979. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino, California, as the "Jack H. Brown Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. LATTI):

H.R. 2980. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2981. A bill to require all candidates for election for the office of Senator or Member of the House of Representatives to run in an open primary regardless of political party preference or lack thereof, to limit the ensuing general election for such office to the two candidates receiving the greatest number of votes in such open primary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2982. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of

Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. AMASH, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2983. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to release an interim report related to aquatic nuisance species control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2984. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to restrict Members of Congress who represent a State with a waiver approved under the amendments made by the American Health Care Act of 2017 to the same health insurance coverage as is available under such waiver to their constituents; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2985. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to restrict Members of Congress who represent a State with an essential health benefits (EHB) waiver, approved under the amendments made by the American Health Care Act of 2017, to the lowest actuarial value health insurance coverage that is available under the waiver; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2986. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to restrict Members of Congress who represent a State with a premium age band waiver, approved under the amendments made by the American Health Care Act of 2017, to the highest age band premium for health insurance coverage that is available under the waiver; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2987. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in national service positions to conserve, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Commit-

tees on Education and the Workforce, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2988. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to remove the requirement that residents of residential reentry facilities pay 25 percent of any gross income earned during work release to offset the cost of being housed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2989. A bill to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2990. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit inclusion of Social Security account numbers on Medicare cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 2991. A bill to establish the Susquehanna National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 2992. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to expand eligibility for public service student loan forgiveness to certain contractor employees of national laboratories; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2993. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to make available to Congress certain information relating to individuals formerly detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 2994. A bill to state the policy of the United States on the minimum number of available battle force ships; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ROYCE of California, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 397. A resolution solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H. Res. 398. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 21 as International Yoga Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H. Res. 399. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that welfare programs discourage marriage and hurt the institution of the family in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

69. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 7, requesting that the Congress of the United States of America authorize and appropriate adequate funding to the United States Coast Guard to maintain the United States Coast Guard's air facility in Newport, Oregon, in perpetuity; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 18.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 2977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the United States' Constitution.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 2978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2 Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

"The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators."

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 2982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (related to the general Welfare of the United States).

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 2991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 2992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sections 8 and 9

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence . . . to raise and support Armies . . . to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 36: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 40: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 66: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 91: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 93: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 173: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 350: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 365: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 367: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 392: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 432: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 468: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 508: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 535: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 572: Mr. COHEN and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 573: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 574: Mr. COHEN and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 632: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MAST, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 671: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 712: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 721: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 750: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 771: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 772: Mr. DUNN and Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 796: Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 830: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 846: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 849: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 911: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 948: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 960: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 975: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 976: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1034: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1057: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1090: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1110: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1116: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GOSAR, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1122: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1148: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1158: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1171: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 1225: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 1232: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1239: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1264: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 1265: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1318: Mr. KIND, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1341: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1360: Mr. BABIN and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1361: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1405: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1424: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1445: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1456: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1487: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. SOTO.

H. R. 1501: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1537: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1539: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1550: Mr. DENT and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1566: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1584: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1626: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1661: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1676: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1681: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1686: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1698: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1699: Mr. BARTON and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1724: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1733: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1736: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1823: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1825: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. FASO, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1838: Mr. COLE and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1861: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1865: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1896: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1897: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1911: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1928: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1939: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 1955: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

- H.R. 1969: Mr. MOULTON.  
H.R. 1995: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.  
H.R. 2012: Mr. MOULTON.  
H.R. 2013: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 2023: Mr. LONG.  
H.R. 2092: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 2105: Mr. TROTT.  
H.R. 2106: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 2142: Mr. KEATING.  
H.R. 2150: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 2172: Mr. BUDD.  
H.R. 2180: Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. VEASEY.  
H.R. 2205: Mr. BOST.  
H.R. 2215: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 2226: Mr. KING of Iowa.  
H.R. 2240: Mr. SCHNEIDER.  
H.R. 2258: Mr. KNIGHT.  
H.R. 2259: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. KEATING.  
H.R. 2301: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SCHRAEDER.  
H.R. 2366: Mr. MOULTON.  
H.R. 2408: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN.  
H.R. 2418: Mr. MOULTON.  
H.R. 2422: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 2434: Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 2435: Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 2451: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 2465: Mr. HARPER, Mr. KIND, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H.R. 2472: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 2476: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 2478: Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 2526: Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 2556: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 2610: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.  
H.R. 2611: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 2616: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 2625: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YARMUTH.  
H.R. 2641: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 2651: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2662: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.  
H.R. 2690: Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 2713: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 2723: Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 2740: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 2754: Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 2756: Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 2781: Mr. BOST.  
H.R. 2805: Mr. ROYCE of California.  
H.R. 2822: Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 2825: Mr. GARRETT.  
H.R. 2840: Mr. HECK and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 2853: Mr. WALZ, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. FASO.  
H.R. 2854: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 2856: Ms. MENG, Mr. DUNN, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. VELA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FASO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 2862: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 2870: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.  
H.R. 2871: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 2879: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.  
H.R. 2889: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 2901: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 2908: Mr. HECK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 2909: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 2913: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 2918: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 2919: Mr. POLIS and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2929: Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 2936: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 2937: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 2942: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 2943: Mr. KINZINGER.  
H.R. 2956: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. LATTA.  
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. GIANFORTE.  
H.J. Res. 6: Mr. GIANFORTE.  
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. MCEACHIN.  
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.J. Res. 102: Ms. MOORE.  
H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.  
H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. POE of Texas.  
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. ROYCE of California and Mr. VALADAO.  
H. Res. 31: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H. Res. 43: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. BRAT.  
H. Res. 185: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H. Res. 220: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H. Res. 257: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.  
H. Res. 271: Mr. ROUZER.  
H. Res. 285: Mr. EVANS.  
H. Res. 304: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
H. Res. 318: Mr. PAULSEN.  
H. Res. 332: Mr. LYNCH.  
H. Res. 359: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. POLIQUIN.  
H. Res. 363: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. MOORE.  
H. Res. 371: Mrs. DINGELL.  
H. Res. 395: Mr. ELLISON.

**SENATE—Wednesday, June 21, 2017**

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable JONI ERNST, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the center of our joy, You are our strength. Thank You for Your guidance and protection.

Lord, be a stronghold for our lawmakers, providing them with strength for today and hope for tomorrow. May they cast their cares on You, knowing that no one is more concerned about the things that threaten their peace. Show Yourself faithful to the faithful, rewarding integrity with Your bountiful blessings.

Lord, arm our Senators with courage for life's battles, keeping them humble and faithful in their work. Help us all to do the best we can each day and leave the results to You.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 21, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JONI ERNST, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mrs. ERNST thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, in the many years since ObamaCare was imposed on the American people, it has continued to hurt the people we represent over and over and over again with higher costs, fewer choices, pain and heartbreak for the middle class. We have watched ObamaCare unravel before our very eyes with each passing year. Now it teeters on the edge of collapse, and we face a choice: Allow the unsustainable ObamaCare status quo to continue hurting more Americans or take action to finally move forward.

Early on, Democrats made it clear they did not want to work with us toward that goal in a serious or bipartisan way. I regret that. But we have a responsibility to move forward, and we are.

As I have said, our entire conference has been active and engaged in moving beyond the failures of ObamaCare for quite some time now, and we are focused on the following: stabilizing insurance markets, which are collapsing under ObamaCare; improving the affordability of health insurance, which keeps getting more expensive under ObamaCare; freeing Americans from ObamaCare mandates, which force them to buy insurance they don't want; strengthening Medicaid for those who need it the most; and preserving access to care for patients with preexisting conditions. Those are the principles.

We believe we can do better than the ObamaCare status quo, and we fully intend to do so. We have all received the calls, letters, and emails from our constituents who have been hurt by this failed healthcare law. We all know the pain it has caused in our home States.

Take my home State of Kentucky, for example. Under ObamaCare, insurance markets are collapsing in Kentucky, just as we see them collapsing across the country. We want to stabilize them. Kentucky was once held up as an ObamaCare success story, but ObamaCare made a mess of healthcare markets in my home State, just as it has made a mess of markets all across the Nation. Too many families in Kentucky who liked their insurance plans or their doctors soon found they were unable to keep them. When families are kicked off their plan, they must find a new insurer, often at a higher price. When families must change doctors, they often lose a bond of trust they develop with a physician who is familiar with their medical history. When insurers flee the exchanges, it leaves families with fewer options for their healthcare. In fact, Kentuckians in nearly half of our counties now have

only one option on the ObamaCare exchanges, and as we all know, one option really isn't an option at all.

A woman from Lexington contacted my office about her difficulty finding a plan on the exchanges. Here is what she had to say: "I live in one of the three largest cities in our state, and I had two options for insurance this year." She wrote that the limited networks on both of those two plans "[eliminated] a huge number of providers in Fayette County," the second largest county in my State. In addition to the limited access to care on these plans, she said, "The lowest deductible option was \$10,000."

The lowest deductible option—\$10,000. For this Kentuckian and for so many others, ObamaCare has failed. We must do better, better for Kentuckians and better for families all across the country. That is why we have to act.

Under ObamaCare, healthcare costs are skyrocketing in Kentucky, just as they are skyrocketing across the country. We want to improve affordability. Too many Kentuckians have learned firsthand that the so-called Affordable Care Act has really been anything but affordable. Premiums and deductibles continue to climb higher as ObamaCare takes a larger bite out of Kentuckians' budgets.

A recent Health and Human Services report shows that ObamaCare premiums in Kentucky have spiked an average of 75 percent since 2013, when the law was fully implemented. This year alone, ObamaCare premiums have shot up by as much as 47 percent.

After years of being frustrated by ObamaCare, a small business owner from Lancaster, KY, said she had "decided it was utter nonsense to buy insurance that covered nothing." She said that it was utter nonsense to buy insurance that covered nothing.

Although she pays a large sum every month, her plan "covers no office visits, no prescription coverage, [and] has a \$6,000 deductible." In her estimate, "[i]t is useless."

The rising costs of ObamaCare add a burden that many in my State simply cannot bear. I have received heart-breaking letters from Kentuckians, such as one family faced with this dilemma: Pay for health insurance or put food on the table. As ObamaCare collapses, these families are stuck dealing with the consequences. Increasing costs have become the status quo under ObamaCare, and it is completely unsustainable—unsustainable for Kentuckians and unsustainable for families across the country. That is why we have to act.

Under ObamaCare, Kentuckians are being forced to buy insurance plans they don't want, just as Americans are being similarly forced to do so all across our country. We want to free them from those mandates. The American people have made clear that they don't like the mandate, which compels individuals to purchase unaffordable ObamaCare plans or pay a penalty. When you combine those who pay the fine and those who received a waiver, it adds up to millions of Americans who decided they didn't want or simply could not afford ObamaCare.

Listen to the story of a single mom from Berea, KY, who recently wrote my office. She is a full-time student trying to make ends meet. When she began searching for a plan on the ObamaCare exchanges, she saw a startling picture: high premiums and a staggering deductible. She wrote:

At this rate, I would honestly be better not to take health insurance at all and hope for the best.

Americans like myself need something better.

Some families, instead of bracing for another double-digit increase next year, are considering not buying health insurance at all. Because of the ObamaCare mandate, they are forced to buy insurance they just can't afford.

The elimination of the mandate will restore to Americans the freedom to choose the healthcare plans that are right for them, instead of being forced to purchase something that may not meet their needs. The American people, just like this Kentucky mom, deserve a better healthcare system than ObamaCare.

The Senate Republican conference is focused on addressing the issues I mentioned as we work toward strengthening Medicaid and preserving access to care for patients with preexisting conditions.

The Kentuckians' stories I have read this morning are just a sample of the pain felt by so many across my State, just as Americans from States across the country continue to share similar concerns with their Senators. ObamaCare's years-long legacy of soaring prices, shrinking choices, and total failure will continue to get worse unless we act.

The ObamaCare status quo is simply unsustainable. It is hurting Americans, and it will continue to do so unless we act. The American people are demanding relief, and we intend to deliver it to them. That is why Senate Republicans are continuing to work toward smarter healthcare solutions that will finally allow us to move beyond this failed law.

I want to repeat what I said yesterday. A discussion draft will be made public tomorrow. Every Member of the Senate will have it, and it will be posted online for everyone to review.

For the past 7 years, ObamaCare has continued to hurt the people we rep-

resent. For the past 7 years, Republicans have offered ideas for a better way forward. Soon we will finally have the chance to turn the page on this failing law.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time postcloture on the Mandelker nomination be considered expired at 4:15 p.m. today; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Billingslea nomination, it be as if cloture had been invoked at 6:30 p.m. tonight.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we are only a little more than a week away from having to vote on a secret Republican healthcare bill, according to the timelines given by the majority leader to the press—just 1 week away from voting on legislation that will reorder one-sixth of our economy and impact every single American in this country, and not a soul in America has seen it.

I have never seen a more radical or reckless legislative process in my time in politics—write the bill in secret; discuss it in secret; send it to the CBO in secret; then rush it to the floor with no committee hearings, no amendments, and just 10 hours of debate for the minority.

That is not how America ever got big things done. That is not how we do big things like healthcare in the Senate. That is hardly how we do small things, and my Republican friends know it.

Republican Senator BILL CASSIDY, of Louisiana, said: "I've always said I would have preferred a more open process."

Republican Senator MURKOWSKI, from Alaska, said: "If I'm not going to see a bill before we have a vote on it, that's just not a good way to handle something that is as significant and important as health care."

I couldn't have said it better myself.

Republican Senator MORAN said: "My hope is that we treat the bill seriously, that we have hearings, that we have witnesses. I want regular order to work."

In addition, Republican Senators RUBIO, CORKER, GARDNER, MCCAIN, COLLINS, PAUL, DAINES, FISCHER, JOHNSON, and LEE have all complained about the lack of transparency in the process.

Why did they flatly refuse to say to the majority leader: Let's have a hearing. Let's accept amendments in committee. Let's have regular order and real debate on this bill. It is too important.

If they do not want to say it to the majority leader directly, I hope they express their frustration with this process with their votes on the motion to proceed, which looks like we will have next week.

We Democrats had all of the things they had asked for. They did not vote for our bill, those who were here, but at least they had input. They could offer amendments on the floor or in the committees, if they were in the relevant committees. They could debate.

Not today. Not next week.

Now, why is it that my Republican friends have resorted to such secrecy?

There is only one reason: They are ashamed of their bill. They must think they are better off not talking about the bill publicly. We all know, if my Republican friends believed it was a good healthcare bill, one that actually lowered costs and improved care and helped more Americans afford insurance, they would be preaching it from the mountaintops. There would be a brass band down every Main Street in America that would be announcing this new legislation—but no. They are afraid to even whisper about their bill. They want it out in the open for as little time as possible in order for it to receive as little scrutiny as possible. They do not want the American people to see that their healthcare bill is little more than a vehicle to give another tax break to the wealthy, made possible by cutting care and raising costs on middle-class Americans and those who are struggling to get to the middle class.

They do not want the American people to know their healthcare bill is mean, like President Trump said it was, because they do not think it could survive an open process so they are keeping it secret and leaving almost no time for its review. If a bill cannot survive scrutiny or public debate, if a bill cannot survive a committee process or the threat of a single, open hearing, it should never become law—plain and simple.

Now, for months, we Democrats have tried to reach out to Republicans to bring an end to this dangerous game and move toward a bipartisan process. We want to improve our Nation's

healthcare system. If Republicans were serious about wanting to improve our healthcare system, too, they would get the President to guarantee the cost-sharing payments, stop sabotaging our healthcare system, and come talk with Democrats about bipartisan solutions. Instead, they are just sabotaging the bill.

As for the insurance companies which are pulling out of some exchanges and raising premiums, ask them; the No. 1 reason: no permanent cost sharing. Who is standing in the way of permanent cost sharing? The President and our Republican colleagues. They are the reason people are pulling out of exchanges and premiums are going up. They cannot escape that.

We Democrats were willing to try to work with our colleagues. We asked to have a bipartisan meeting in the Old Senate Chamber so we could discuss this—just the 100 Senators—among one another. We were rejected on that. We have been rebuffed overall, but the invitation and sentiment remains. I would remind my Republican colleagues that time is getting short for them to change their minds.

#### RUSSIA SANCTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now, on another matter, Russia sanctions.

Just last week, the Senate approved a package of Russia sanctions that would lock in existing sanctions, give Congress the ability to review any sanctions relief, and implement tough, new sanctions to punish Mr. Putin and his allies for meddling in our election.

The importance of this legislation is reflected in the overwhelming bipartisan vote of 98 to 2. Now we are hearing that the House of Representatives is under pressure from the White House, and they might blue-slip the bill, which could delay or prevent it from passing.

Never mind the fact that the Senate bill was written to avoid such a problem, as my friend, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER, said when he heard the news. Never mind that, and make no mistake about it, the blue-slip threat is nothing more than a procedural excuse by House Republicans who dredged it up to cover for a President who has been far too soft on Russia. This administration has been far too eager to put sanctions relief on the table. That is what this is about.

Many people, from one end of America to the other, are asking: Why? Why is he afraid of tough sanctions on Russia?

Just yesterday, the White House spokesperson said that he had never spoken to the President about Russia's interference in our election. What has Russia concluded from all of this? Putin now knows he will not suffer any

consequences for disinformation campaigns, for buzzing our ships and planes, for threatening our European allies, for cyber hacks, energy coercion, or his ongoing support for Russian separatists in Ukraine.

Now, in a short time, the Trump administration is sending one of our most senior diplomats to Russia to meet with his Russian counterpart.

Is the White House encouraging House Republicans to delay this bill so they can offer the Russians something in their upcoming talks? We do not know. It sure seems possible, even likely, and it is a flatout wrong approach, as Democrats and Republicans in this Chamber agree.

The United States should not be afraid to engage with Russia, but we cannot look the other way or, worse yet, reward Putin after he directed an assault on our democratic institutions. That is why the Senate passed this package of sanctions, sending a powerful message to President Trump that he should not lift sanctions on Russia.

Responding to Russia's assault on our democracy should be a bipartisan issue that unites both Democrats and Republicans in the House and in the Senate. The House Republicans need to pass this bill as quickly as possible. Their blue-slip excuse does not hold water.

#### CHINA AND NORTH KOREA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, a word on China and North Korea.

Yesterday, the President tweeted: "While I greatly appreciate the efforts of President Xi and China to help with North Korea, it has not worked out. At least I know China tried!"

We will wait to see if this tweet actually signals a shift in U.S. policy—you never know with these tweets—but no doubt it is a confession that the President's conciliatory approach toward China has failed.

Just months after he was elected, President Trump said he was willing to offer a better trade deal if China worked with us on North Korea—going back on years of campaign rhetoric about getting tough on trade with China, which is something I have fully supported and opposed, frankly, both President Bush and President Obama for being too weak on trade with China. When I heard that President Trump, during the campaign, was going to be tough on China, I was glad. I thought this was an area in which we could work together.

Yet the minute he sits down with Xi, Xi sort of wins him over, and he says: Well, we will get something out of North Korea.

I told the President on the telephone that China will not back off and help us with North Korea unless they feel the sting of economic sanctions for

their illicit, unfair trade practices which have robbed millions of American jobs.

The idea that China would suddenly start to cooperate with the United States after President Trump dropped his threats to get tough on China was always unrealistic and misguided. China has been unwilling to cooperate with the United States in the economic or foreign policy spheres for decades. China puts itself first. That is what it is doing now.

Let's not forget that millions of American workers have been hurt by China's rapacious trading practices over the decades. Selling out those American workers and simply hoping that China, out of its good graces, would start working with us on North Korea never made sense.

The best approach to dealing with China is to be clear and consistent and tough about America's foreign policy and economic interests. President Trump, rather than going soft on trade with China, should get tough on trade with China. That is the best way to get China to work with us on North Korea, and it is the right thing to do for the American worker.

I have some hope that President Trump's tweet yesterday means he has come to this realization and will work with us to get tough on China on trade.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Mandelker nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic whip.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it was about a month ago that the House of Representatives, by a narrow vote, voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act and to replace it with their own creation. That effort by the House of Representatives passed by, I believe, 2, 3,



or 4 votes. It was very close, and it was a partisan rollcall—all Republicans voting for it and no Democrats voting for it. So it came to the floor of the House without any bipartisan preparation. It was only after the vote that the Congressional Budget Office took a look at the measure and reported to the American people its impact.

Now, that is unusual because, when you take a big issue like the reform of America's healthcare system, historically, traditionally, Members of the Congress—the House and Senate—will send their versions of the bill to the Congressional Budget Office and ask for an analysis: Tell us how much this will cost. Tell us the impact on the deficit. Tell us what it will do in terms of healthcare coverage. But the House Republicans chose to vote before the analysis.

Well, the analysis still came out, and when it came out, the report was unsettling because it had a dramatic negative impact on healthcare in America. The House Republican repeal, according to the Congressional Budget Office, would mean that 23 million Americans would lose their health insurance.

Remember, we started this debate 6 or 7 years ago because we were concerned that too few Americans had health insurance and we wanted to expand the reach of health insurance and make sure that it was good health insurance, and that is why we passed the Affordable Care Act. We fell short in some respects, but we certainly achieved our goal of increasing the number of insured Americans with the Affordable Care Act. In my home State of Illinois, the percentage of those uninsured with health insurance was cut in half. In fact, it was even better than that. So more and more people ended up with coverage through Medicaid, as well as through private health insurance.

Now comes the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and the Republicans in the House decide to not only erase all of that progress in providing more health insurance for more families but to make it worse—to make the number of the uninsured even higher than it was. So if that is the starting point of healthcare reform, you ask yourself: Is that really a worthy goal? Why would you do that?

Well, they were forced to do it. They really were. The House Republicans really, in fairness to them, had no choice, because they made the initial decision that their highest priority was to give a tax break of about \$700 billion to the wealthiest people in America. So by creating this tax break—giving this money back to wealthy people—they took that same amount of money out of America's healthcare system. When you take \$700 billion out of America's healthcare system, here is what happens. People who are currently receiving their health insurance through

Medicaid, a government program, will have fewer and fewer opportunities to take advantage of Medicaid. In fact, they acknowledged that. The Republicans said in the House: We are just cutting back on Medicaid.

Secondly, you reduce or eliminate the helping hand we give to working families who can't afford to pay their hospitalization premiums. If you are in certain categories, we give you a subsidy to pay for your premiums. So follow the logic: If you cut the taxes by \$700 billion and take \$700 billion out of the healthcare system, you have less money to provide Medicaid health insurance for those in low-income categories, and you have less money to help working families pay for their health insurance premiums.

The Congressional Budget Office looked at that and said that the net result at the end of the day is that 23 million Americans will lose their health insurance because of this decision by the Republican House. In the State of Illinois, a State of about 12.5 million people, 1 million people would lose their health insurance because of this action taken by the Republican House of Representatives.

Well, from basic civics we know that here we are in the Senate and we get our chance once the House has acted. So we have been waiting—waiting for almost a month for the process to begin. The sad reality is it never even started—not the ordinary, open, public, transparent process of debating a change in America's public health system.

Instead, Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, said: What I am going to do is to take 13 of my male Republican Senators, put them in a room, and let them write an alternative to the House bill. Why he didn't initially include the women in his caucus, he can explain, but it was 13 of the male Republicans who would sit in a room to write, in secret, their alternative.

We think: Well, most legislative ideas start with that kind of a meeting—a closed-door meeting in the quiet of a room, basic negotiation. But it is the nature of a democracy and our form of government that at some point this becomes public. Shouldn't it? If we are going to change the laws about health insurance—basic fundamental coverage for American families—shouldn't we know it? Shouldn't we know what the changes will be before we vote on them?

Well, there is a pretty rampant rumor that tomorrow, for the first time, there will be a limited disclosure of this Republican effort over the last several weeks. We are told—and it is only a rumor—that the Senate Republican leadership will sit down with the Senate Republican caucus and show them for the first time what they want to propose that we vote on.

One might say: Well, that sounds like the beginning of a good, long process.

It is not. It is the beginning of a short process, because the Republican leader has said that this time next week we will be into debating that issue and voting on it to its conclusion—in 10 days. That is 10 days, start to finish, to rewrite the healthcare system of America, 10 days on a measure that has not been disclosed to the Republican Senators—not all of them—let alone the Democratic Senators and let alone the American people. That is what we are faced with.

When we wrote the Affordable Care Act, which was widely criticized by the Republicans, let me tell you the process we followed with the Affordable Care Act. In 2009, the Senate HELP Committee—or the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—held 13 public, bipartisan hearings, 20 walk-throughs of various proposals, and a markup in the committee that went on for 1 calendar month, and 160 amendments offered by the Republicans were adopted. That was in 2009 with the Affordable Care Act.

The Senate Finance Committee, which writes the tax laws, held 17 roundtables, summits, and hearings on the legislation, 13 Member meetings and walk-throughs, and 38 meetings and negotiations.

Keep in mind that we still haven't seen the Republican proposal we are supposed to vote on next week—this secret proposal.

The Senate Finance Committee on the Affordable Care Act held a 7-day markup and adopted 11 Republican amendments. At the end of the day, not a single Republican Senator voted for the measure, but they offered amendments, and those amendments were debated and many of them were adopted by the Democratic majority.

When the Affordable Care Act came to the floor of the Senate, we spent—and I remember this well—25 consecutive days in session considering that bill—25 days. As to what Senator MCCONNELL and the Republicans will offer to us in what we call reconciliation, we will be lucky to get 25 hours. We spent 25 days on the Affordable Care Act. In total, the Senate spent more than 160 hours on the Affordable Care Act and more than 150 Republican amendments were adopted, though not a single Republican Senator ended up voting for the bill. We opened it to their amendments and adopted their amendments. It was a bipartisan effort.

What has been the process this time around? No hearings, no markups, no public input, no support from the medical advocacy community at all. I don't have a single medical advocacy group in Illinois that supports what the Republicans did in the House of Representatives—not one. Hospitals, doctors, nurses, pediatricians, and disease advocacy groups, like cancer and heart, are all opposed to what was done in the House of Representatives, and we are

being told, when it comes to the Senate's turn: Get ready, it is going to be fast. Don't blink, you might miss it.

Let me tell my colleagues what else we have. We have a record of quotations from leaders on the Republican side who, even though the Affordable Care Act went through all of these hearings and all this deliberation, were very explicit in their criticism. Here is Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, a Republican of Kentucky, in December of 2009, on the Affordable Care Act. He said: "This massive piece of legislation that seeks to restructure one-sixth of our economy is being written behind closed doors, without input from anyone, in an effort to jam it past not only the Senate but the American people."

I might say to Senator MCCONNELL: How would you explain what you are doing now when it comes to rewriting the healthcare system behind closed doors without input from anyone? Is it an effort to "jam it past not only the Senate but the American people"?

Senator MARCO RUBIO last week was quoted as saying: "The Senate is not a place where you can just cook up something behind closed doors and rush it for a vote on the floor."

I agree with Senator RUBIO, but that is what they are trying to do.

Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, a Republican of Alaska, said: "If we had utilized the process that goes through a committee, I would be able to answer not only your questions but my constituents' questions."

Senator MURKOWSKI, a Republican of Alaska, expressed what most of us feel. How could we even answer an honest, legitimate question from someone we represent when we can't even see the measure that is being produced by the Republicans.

Senator JERRY MORAN, a Republican from Kansas, said last month:

I want the committees of jurisdiction to hold hearings, bring the experts who know about healthcare from across the country, bring the constituents to tell us their stories. Then I want every Senator, all 100 of us, to have the chance to offer amendments.

Thank you, Senator MORAN. I agree with you. That is how the Senate is supposed to work, but that is not how it is working now.

Let me tell my colleagues what some of the groups have said about this Republican effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. You expect: Oh, it is a partisan comment from a partisan Senator. These are nonpartisan groups.

The American Heart Association, what do they say? They say: "The House bill would seriously erode preexisting condition protections, including for patients suffering from cardiovascular disease."

About a third of us on Earth—or at least a third of us in America—have some preexisting condition. For the longest time, insurance companies said: If you are a woman, it is a preexisting condition.

Go figure. But now, at least a third of us have some condition which, in the old days, would disqualify us from insurance coverage or make it too expensive.

So now we put in the Affordable Care Act a prohibition against discriminating against any American because they have a preexisting medical condition. I think that is pretty important. My family has certainly had the same experience as other families when it comes to preexisting conditions.

Now the Republicans have said: We are going to take that out. We want to give you more choice. We want the insurance companies to give you more choice. Choice means another reason to say no. Choice means coverage that isn't there when you need it. Choice means restrictions on your health insurance policy. That may not bother you at all today, but tomorrow, when you go to that doctor for that diagnosis you will never forget as long as you live or get involved in an accident and finally take a close look at that health insurance policy, you want to make sure it is there if you need it, don't you?

The Republicans say we need more choice. The American Heart Association says that, when it comes to preexisting conditions, the House Republican repeal bill would seriously erode protection of Americans.

The American Medical Association, the largest group of physicians in America, said: "We cannot support [the bill] that passed the House as drafted because of the expected decline in health insurance coverage and the potential harm it would cause to vulnerable patient populations."

The American Diabetes Association said: "It would give insurers the ability to charge people with pre-existing conditions—such as diabetes—higher prices [for health insurance] . . . and would allow insurers to deny people with diabetes the care and services they need to treat their disease."

The American Association of Retired Persons has weighed in. Here is what they say: "This bill would weaken Medicare's fiscal sustainability, dramatically increase health care costs for Americans aged 50-64, and put at risk the health care of millions of children and adults with disabilities, and poor seniors who depend on the Medicaid program for long-term services and supports."

AARP is working overtime to notify Americans over the age of 50 and their kids that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act that passed the House of Representatives is a bad deal for seniors and their families.

There is something else going on, too. For more than 6 years, Republicans in Congress have been shouting "repeal and replace" from the rooftops, and they voted more than 60 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They

never liked it from the start. They put language into bills to make it more difficult for the Affordable Care Act to work, such as funding needed to make individual insurance markets work as intended. Then, on his first day in office, President Trump signed an Executive order directing Federal agencies not to enforce the Affordable Care Act.

The Trump administration cut the open enrollment timeframe in half, making it harder for people to sign up for insurance—meaning fewer people covered, fewer people in the insurance pools, and premiums going up as a result. The President, to this day, continues to make uncertainty in the insurance market. He refuses to say whether he will continue providing cost-sharing reduction payments to help 7 million Americans afford health insurance. Without the payments, insurers tell us premiums will skyrocket 20 percent next year.

Let me mention one other thing that has happened as part of this health insurance debate. We decided to make a historic change in healthcare in America. I have told the story repeatedly, and I will not tell it in detail, but it was Paul Wellstone, a progressive from Minnesota, who sat right there, and Pete Domenici, a conservative from New Mexico, who sat right there, who came together—these two unlikely partners—because they each had members of their families who suffered from mental illness. They said: Why is it that we don't treat mental illness like an illness? Why is it that health insurance just covers physical illness?

They were right. They fought the insurance companies for years, and they won. We put it in the Affordable Care Act. We said: If you offer health insurance, you have to cover mental illness. My friends, it is time for us to step out of the shadows, where mental illness was considered a curse and not an illness, and deal with it as something that can be successfully treated. We put it in the bill, and most Americans would agree that it was the right thing to do.

There was another part of it, though, that slipped my attention and now I know it is critically important. It wasn't just mental illness. It was coverage for mental illness and substance abuse treatment.

How important is substance abuse treatment in America today? Go to Maine, go to Iowa, go to Illinois, and ask the question: Are there any problems with opioids? Heroin? Overdosing? Death? Of course.

When you go to the rehab and addiction treatment centers and you ask people: How is your family paying for this care to try to rescue this young child in your family or someone dealing with addiction, they say they are either under Medicaid, the government insurance program, or their health insurance policy covers substance abuse

treatment. Why? Because Wellstone and Domenici effectively included that in the bill. Now, under the bill that passed in the House of Representatives, an estimated 1.3 million Americans with mental disorders and 2.8 million seeking help with substance abuse will lose their coverage for treatment. It is no longer a priority under the Republican idea of giving you choice with your health insurance.

Choice—when you are a father buying health insurance for your family and you are picking out a health insurance policy and you have a choice, could you anticipate the teenaged daughter you love with all your heart will one day face an addiction and desperately need substance abuse treatment to save her life? Did you think about that when you signed up for the right choice in a lower cost health insurance plan?

I feel, and many feel, that this is essential when it comes to services and health insurance. Republicans say: No, it is an option; take it or leave it. People who leave it and then need it find themselves in a terrible predicament. They can't provide the lifesaving treatment their kids and other members of the family they love desperately need.

I see my colleague on the floor, and I will not go any further other than to say this: Why are we in this position when, 10 days before the final vote on changing healthcare for 360 million Americans, it is in a proposal that no one has seen and no one has read and no one has analyzed? It is an embarrassment to this great institution, the Senate, that we are not deliberating on this measure—this lifesaving, life-and-death measure—with the kind of respect that it deserves, with the kind of expertise that it deserves.

My Republican Senate colleagues have said it well—Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator MORAN, and others: The Senate ought to do what the Senate was elected to do. Take up an important measure like this, read it carefully, debate it, amend it, bring in the experts, and don't move so quickly on it that you could jeopardize the healthcare of millions of Americans. I am sorry it has reached that point.

If 3 Republican Senators out of 52—if three of them—will step up and say: This is wrong; we need to do this the right way, a transparent way, a fair way, a bipartisan way. If three will step up and do that, then we can roll up our sleeves and do the right thing for America.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Just a moment, Madam President. I am looking for the healthcare bill. I know it is here somewhere. I haven't been able to find it and have been looking all morning. I suspect maybe we will find it in the next couple of days.

I wish to talk about Medicaid. Medicaid is often perceived as a welfare program, and it isn't. It is essential medical support.

Now, let's talk about who receives Medicaid. Seventy-two percent of the people who receive assistance from Medicaid are children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Indeed, 85 percent of the expenditures for Medicaid, as opposed to enrollees—85 percent of the expenditures—are for those same groups—the children, the disabled, and the elderly.

Particularly, what a lot of people don't realize is that Medicaid is one support—if not the principal support—for nursing home care throughout the country, and especially in my State of Maine. I suspect, if we surveyed people—perhaps some even in this body, but certainly in the general public: How are you going to cover Aunt Minnie's nursing home care when she has to have it later in her life, most people would say: Oh, we have Medicare. People I talk to at home say: Medicare is going to take care of me. No, except in very rare and limited circumstances, Medicare does not cover nursing home care. It doesn't cover long-term care. That is Medicaid.

Sixty-eight percent of all the Medicaid spending in Maine was for elderly or disabled people in 2014. About one in three people nationwide is going to require nursing home care—one in three. Nationally, over three-quarters of nursing home residents are covered by Medicaid. So if we are talking in this bill, wherever it is—if anybody finds it, let me know—about significant cuts to Medicaid, we are talking about people's ability to have long-term care in nursing homes. Make no mistake about it. You cannot cut Medicaid by over \$1 trillion in 10 years and not have it affect those people.

Now, some say we are giving the States flexibility. We are giving the States flexibility to make agonizing decisions between disabled people, children, and seniors. That is not flexibility. To quote the President, that is "mean." That is cruel. The States are only going to have two choices. They are either going to have to cut people off and limit services—and remember that three-quarters of the people are disabled, elderly, and children—or they are going to have to raise taxes on their own citizens.

Now, we are claiming we are going to help the Federal budget. We are going to reduce the deficit by \$800 billion over 10 years by passing this bill. But we are just shifting the bill to the States. That is nice work, if you can get it. Why don't we shift the cost of the Air Force to the States? That would make the Federal budget look better. But it is not a real savings to our citizens if they have to pay out of their pocket at their home State or in their city, or if they have to pay part

in their income taxes. That is no savings. That is a fake savings. That is a smokescreen to tell people: We are cutting government expenditures. No, we are not. We are just shifting them to another level of government where you are going to have to pay for them there as well.

But to get back to Medicaid. Seventy percent of the nursing home residents in Maine are covered by Medicaid. Who are they? They are people who can't be cared for at home any longer. They require nearly constant care and support. These aren't welfare recipients. These are our former teachers, police officers, the people who looked after us, the carpenters who built our houses, the nurses who cared for us in hospitals, the wait staff who served us meals, the veterans who served in times of trouble and fought for our freedom.

They and their families are simply part of our communities. They are not welfare recipients. They are people who have paid their fair share throughout their lives. They have worked hard. They have done all the things they were supposed to do, all the things that were expected of them. They stayed in their homes, by and large, as long as they possibly could. But at some point, after their assets and ability to pay were exhausted, they had Medicaid to help them in terms of long-term care.

I often say when I talk about this that it really frustrates me that we talk about this healthcare issue in terms of ideology and the free market and all of these kinds of things. No, this is about people.

This is about Jim and Cora Banks from Portland, ME. They lived in Portland. He was a State employee, and she was a beautician, who worked out of her home and most of her energy went into raising four boys. Cora was a den mother and Scout leader. They worked on projects and—can you believe it—all four of their boys were Eagle Scouts. That is an astonishing accomplishment, to have four sons as Eagle Scouts. They were active in the Kiwanis and taught Sunday school. One of their sons was involved in Little League. So Cora raised money to build a concession stand on the field, which is still used today.

At 55, tragically, Cora began to have memory issues. Because they had health insurance—because they had health insurance—she could get great care at a geriatric practice in Portland. Friends and family were helpful, and Jim was the principal caregiver for many years. But at 70, it became clear that Cora needed full-time care, and Jim could not provide that level of care. The doctors said she needed to be in a residential setting. Her assets were exhausted. She qualified for MaineCare, which is what we call Medicaid. Her nursing home care was covered, and she lived for a year in that nursing home.

Two-thirds of the income for all of our nursing homes in Maine come from Medicaid, from MaineCare. What happens to this resource of the nursing homes if suddenly their revenues are significantly cut? What happens? But, mostly, what happens to people like Cora?

There is also an idea—and I heard the head of the OMB talk about it: We are not really cutting; we are just cutting the rate of growth. Well, if the demand is growing, the cost is growing, and you cut the rate of growth, you are cutting. Less money will be available than is necessary to meet the need. That is a real cut.

All of us know we are facing a demographic bulge from the baby boom generation, who are aging and are going to require more and more medical treatment, and they are going to put a greater demand on our nursing homes.

In Maine, we are projecting a 105,000-person increase in the next 10 years of people over 65. One in four Maine people will be over 65 in the next two decades.

The Alzheimer's Association projects that 35,000 Maine seniors will be afflicted with the tragic disease of Alzheimer's within 10 years; 25,000 had the disease in 2014. People with dementia are 10 times more likely to live in a nursing home.

There is a lot in the bill, I am told. I don't know; I haven't seen it. I have been looking for it. But the central premise seems to be, if it is anything like the House bill, a massive cut in Medicaid and a massive tax cut to the people in our society who least need it. The tax cut is targeted at the very wealthiest Americans. Yet the results of that decision will be to cut essential medical support for elderly people, disabled people, and children. I don't understand that bargain. I don't understand that equation—a gigantic tax cut to the wealthiest and a substantial cut in support for those who most need it.

Maybe I will be pleasantly surprised when I see the bill, whenever that is. I hope it is more than a few hours before we are called upon to vote on it. Right now, what we are hearing and what we are learning and what the House bill looked like would be a tragedy for this country and a tragedy for real people.

I don't understand the impulse to give a tax cut and to hurt people when we know that is going to be the case. And again, these are not welfare recipients; these are your friends and neighbors.

In all of our States, almost two-thirds of the nursing home residents are on Medicaid. We are not going to be able to cut Medicaid in the dramatic way that has been proposed without affecting those people.

I hope this body will take the time necessary to analyze this issue, to openly debate it, to argue about it, and to find solutions that make sense and

will work for the people of America, not try to ram something through for the purpose of checking a box on a campaign promise made years ago.

The reality is, we have an obligation, in my view, not only to solve the problem in a compassionate and rational and efficient way but also to develop and run a process here that respects the institution and respects the American people.

This is not the way this place is supposed to run—to have a bill drafted in secret, brought to the floor within hours or a few days of voting, and then force a vote without the kind of consideration, hearings, input, argument, and debate that is supposed to be the hallmark of this institution.

This is a very important decision, I think one of the most important any of us will ever make. I, for one, am going to be able to tell my children and grandchildren that I stood for Maine, for our children, for our elderly, for our disabled people. And when the chips are down, the United States Senate is going to do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, no choice and a proposed 43-percent increase in premiums—that is what ObamaCare and its harmful impact will bring to Iowa in 2018. This year, it brought premium increases up to 42 percent. Last year, it brought increases up to 29 percent. ObamaCare is not sustainable and not affordable for Iowans.

To anybody who has studied healthcare reform, this should come as no surprise. In the past, many States have tried to reform their individual market. Twenty-seven years ago, Kentucky made an attempt and implemented the Kentucky Health Care Reform Act of 1994. This bill was similar to ObamaCare in many respects. It contained more taxes, more regulations, and more mandates. Within 3 years—3 years—insurers fled the individual market and the State was hit with skyrocketing premiums.

What happened in Kentucky then is eerily similar to what is happening in Iowa today as a result of ObamaCare. When it comes to affordability and choice, my home State of Iowa has been hit particularly hard.

While traveling across the State, I hear from Iowans who are looking for affordable coverage. Far too often, I hear that high monthly premiums are squeezing pocketbooks and that soaring out-of-pocket costs, such as deductibles and copays, make coverage unaffordable to use for those who do have it. That is not what ObamaCare promised, but that is what it has brought.

One Iowan who works at a small business in Hinton wrote to me and said:

Over the past seven years, prices have jumped considerably and the coverage em-

ployees are getting for the amount of money spent is substantially less! We have tried to help our employees by minimizing the changes in premiums, but these last two years we had to start passing on some of the increases in order to survive.

We can no longer absorb the constant rate increases, nor can we not offer a health plan to our employees. Therefore, we find ourselves between the proverbial rock and the hard place. We certainly are not the only small business facing the same dilemma.

Employees at this small business can breathe a small sigh of relief because their employer still has the ability to offer coverage, even if they are forced to pay more and more because of ObamaCare. Other Iowans are on the edge because their options for coverage are shrinking.

In 2016, UnitedHealthcare left the individual market in Iowa. A few months ago, Wellmark and Aetna both announced they would be leaving the individual market in 2018. Medica is the only remaining statewide carrier, and while they appear to be staying for the next year, it will take a massive rate increase on Iowans for them to do so.

The Iowa insurance commissioner said:

Iowa has hit a point within our market's collapse that a 43 percent rate increase will drive healthier, younger, and middle aged individuals out of the market. Iowa's individual market remains unsustainable.

If Medica leaves after next year, there is a very real possibility that tens of thousands of Iowans will have nothing to purchase on the individual market.

To put this issue into perspective and show why it matters so much, I want to share concerns I received from a constituent in Ames, IA. This constituent is the parent of a child with a rare disease. The family purchased a plan from Wellmark to cover the child for 2017, but now that Wellmark plans to leave, the parents are unsure whether they will be able to find a plan for their child. They find this whole experience “disruptive and anxiety provoking.”

Disruption and anxiety are not being felt just in Iowa; all across the country, premiums are skyrocketing and choices are limited and in some places, nonexistent. Recent data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services shows that 2.4 million people in 1,200 counties across the country will have one option for insurance in 2018. That is not an option at all. A recent report by HHS found that between 2013 and 2017, premiums more than doubled on the exchange—more than doubled on the exchange. In some States, premiums tripled.

Across the country and in my home State of Iowa, we don't have the option to continue with the status quo when it comes to our healthcare. The reality is, the status quo is truly unsustainable.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. As a proud resident of Rhode Island and proud resident of Providence Plantations, I thank the Chair for the recognition.

Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in expressing strong opposition to the Republican efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and to ask my Republican colleagues to abandon these efforts. They are crafted behind closed doors, and they embrace a huge tax cut for the wealthy at the expense of the most vulnerable among us.

Indeed, I implore Republicans to work with us on a bipartisan basis, in good faith, to make improvements to our healthcare system. We can make these improvements. I hope we can.

Just a couple of weeks ago, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office told us that 23 million Americans would lose health insurance under TrumpCare. Let me say that again: 23 million Americans will lose health insurance under the Republican bill. That is more people than live in Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming, the District of Columbia, and my home State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations combined—a huge portion of Americans. That is a shocking number.

What is worse is that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle plan to dismantle our healthcare system—one-sixth of the country's economy—without so much as a hearing to get input on the bill. Their bill is being written in secret, and from what we can glean of the process the Republicans are employing, we likely will not even see the text in the near future, although I am encouraged that there is some discussion of releasing the text tomorrow. Regardless of whether it is released tomorrow, there has been no deliberate consideration in a hearing. There has been no thoughtful interaction between Republicans and Democrats.

In sharp contrast, I was a member of the HELP Committee while we drafted the Affordable Care Act. The Senate spent 25 consecutive days in session on consideration of the Affordable Care Act, the second longest consecutive session in the history of the Senate. The Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, which I served on at the time, held more than 47 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs on health reform. In fact, the HELP Committee considered over 300 amendments over the course of

a month-long markup, one of the longest in the history of the Congress.

Over half of the accepted amendments were from Republicans. This bipartisan input, along with testimony and consultation from healthcare organizations representing hospitals, doctors, nurses, and patients, among others, over the course of a year led to a better, more informed bill.

We have a lengthy legislative process for a reason. Yet the Republican leadership—up until this moment at least—continues to write their bill in secret as they look for ways to convince their caucus to support a bill that nearly every major healthcare organization opposes, to say nothing of the 23 million Americans across all of our States who would lose their health coverage, and millions more would seek increased costs because of TrumpCare.

I would like to remind everyone that these are real people who will be hurt if we go forward as my Republican colleagues intend to. These 23 million people are all our constituents, our family members, our friends and neighbors. In fact, since the beginning of this year, I have heard from thousands of my constituents from all walks of life, through phone calls, letters, emails, appearances at townhall events, and even those I see out and about shopping around the State or on the airplane to Washington and back to Rhode Island. They have all indicated how they have benefited from the ACA and how TrumpCare could have a devastating impact on their families.

For example, David from Providence, RI, wrote to me to tell me how his life has been affected by the Affordable Care Act. He said:

I don't usually write Senators, actually I've never written a Senator. I have great concerns about my healthcare. I have a pre-existing condition, two heart attacks and open heart surgery, triple bypass. I had medical issues and needed to leave my position at a full-time job 3 years ago to get well. During that leave, the company went chapter 11. I lost my healthcare and had no income. I was able to acquire Medical Insurance through the Affordable Care Act. I started my own design business as a sole proprietor and worked a second job to make ends meet. My healthcare was subsidized for two years. I am now successful in my design business and will be paying back the subsidy for this year and no longer need the subsidy going forward. I am able to purchase affordable healthcare through the Health Connection in RI. Affordable healthcare and the subsidy were there when I needed it. This allowed me to start my business and become a successful business/sole proprietor in RI. It is critical for my continued success to have access to affordable healthcare and not be judged by preexisting conditions.

As David describes, the Affordable Care Act gave individuals and families control over their healthcare for the first time. He was able to get the care he needed, regardless of preexisting conditions, and able to start a new business. This is something I have heard a number of times from my constituents.

I have also heard from Andrew and his wife in Little Compton, RI, who decided to strike out on their own and open a dairy farm after the Affordable Care Act was implemented. Andrew said: "We took this plunge and started a business knowing that the stability of health care was there—we have a four year old daughter—and if it goes away, we are not sure what we will do."

Time and again, I hear from Rhode Islanders who are now free to take risks and start new businesses and other creative pursuits knowing that they will be able to access affordable healthcare. I ask my Republican colleagues: Do you want to go back to the days when people are locked into their jobs for health insurance? The only reason they are there is for health insurance. Their creativity, their ability to innovate and to invigorate our economy is stifled literally because they need the health insurance. Do you want to discourage your constituents from starting new businesses? Under TrumpCare, people like David, with preexisting conditions, would not have the option, and Andrew and his wife may not have been willing to take on the risk of leaving a job with health insurance to start a new business.

However, as we speak, my Republican colleagues are meeting in secret planning to take away these opportunities. I encourage my Republican colleagues to meet with their constituents, to hear their stories about the ACA. They are not unique to Rhode Island.

It is not enough to just ban insurance companies from denying coverage to people with preexisting conditions. The ACA eliminated annual and lifetime limits. In fact, yesterday I bumped into a family—two families—one with an adorable little girl who had a tracheotomy and who was being pushed around in a stroller. She is about 2 or 3 years old. And I met some other children, another young boy named Tim with a tracheotomy. Today I found out that their problem is lifetime limits. These are very young children, 2 years, 3 years old. Most insurance policies, except for the ACA, would have a lifetime limit. Now, you might be able to go buy it, but before these youngsters are 10, 12, or 13 years old, they will not have health insurance for the rest of their life.

So it is not just the preexisting conditions. The ACA eliminated annual and lifetime limits. When I saw those darling children yesterday, I just knew that has to be the law. Otherwise, it is just a matter of time. Maybe in 5 years, maybe in 6 years, but the kind of conditions they have, at some point, they will hit that limit and at some point the insurance company will say: No thanks.

We made those changes in the ACA. They are going to be disposed of in the proposals I have seen. The ACA requires coverage of basic healthcare

services like maternity care. That is not guaranteed.

Before the ACA, insurance companies would cut off coverage just when it was needed most and priced people with health conditions out of the market. These are not abstract concepts. I hear from constituents each and every day about the importance of the critical consumer protections under the ACA, and TrumpCare would undermine all of these.

Susan from Warwick wrote me to say:

ObamaCare saved my life. Please keep fighting to make affordable healthcare available to all Americans. I was diagnosed with Acute Myeloid Leukemia in 2012. I have my own business and pay for my own health insurance. We always purchased what we thought was adequate, but I'd reached the limit on my policy within just a few weeks of cancer treatment. That left me with huge bills, a need for more expensive coverage in order to obtain lifesaving treatment . . . and technically with a "preexisting condition—cancer."

Susan knows that insurance doesn't mean much if you are sick and have limits on your care. She goes on to say:

I am horrified by the Republican plan to replace Obamacare. Health care is not a luxury. It should be available to all. I never want anyone else to experience the fear I did when my insurance ran out and I realized the care that could save my life might not be available to me. Before we found additional insurance—and jumped through hoops to get it—we looked at selling the house, emptying our IRAs and savings account to pay for my care. It would not have been enough.

Cynthia from Woonsocket, RI, wrote to me to tell me about how TrumpCare would undermine care for people like herself with Parkinson's disease. Specifically, Cynthia wrote about how patients with Parkinson's rely on the essential healthcare benefits required under the Affordable Care Act, including rehabilitative services, mental healthcare, and access to prescription drugs. TrumpCare would do away with these benefits.

Cynthia also points out that the average age of diagnosis of Parkinson's is around 60 years old. However, TrumpCare creates an age tax, leading to skyrocketing costs for this very population. Cynthia also said in her letter that one-third of patients with Parkinson's access care through Medicaid. She says TrumpCare puts all of those patients at risk of losing care. As a patient, she knows better than most that without these existing protections, health insurance will not actually cover the care that is needed.

To add more detail on how critical Medicaid can be, especially to seniors, a constituent living in a nursing home in Pascoag wrote to me to say:

I am 101 years old and enjoy every day to the best of my ability. I am petrified that many of the programs that I rely on for my health and well-being, indeed my life, will be reduced or even eliminated. Please protect my access to Medicaid. DO NOT make Med-

icaid a block grant to the states. My daughter is helping me to send this communication to you. Please do not forsake me.

So I ask my colleagues: How do you intend to protect her access to nursing home care while cutting Medicaid by over \$800 billion? Block-granting Medicaid, as Republicans have proposed to do, will reduce Medicaid funding by at least 25 percent over the next decade and leave States unable to maintain current Medicaid programs, leaving behind our most vulnerable.

Indeed, the most significant costs for Medicaid in my State and every other State is nursing home care. It is exactly those men and women, like my constituent from Pascoag, a vigorous 101-year-old, who will be forced to pay more, who will be forced because of cutbacks in service at the facility not to have two or three people on duty but just one. All of that we can foresee, and we only can prevent it if we reject this attempt to replace, to repeal, to undercut affordable care.

Now, this Medicaid crisis is serious, and it is not just going to affect the healthcare sector because we know the pressure is on the States to make up some of this lost funding. It will not just be by transferring funds within healthcare efforts. They will have to go everywhere through their budgets: That is K through 12 education. That is infrastructure. That is law enforcement. That is all the things States and localities do but particularly States. They will try to plug the gap because they will have people, like I have described who have written me, coming and not just demanding but obviously in need of healthcare, and they will try to respond, but the response will affect our competitiveness, our education systems, our productivity, when you can't fix infrastructure, and it will be a profound impact.

In fact, a significant number of jobs in my State and a significant number of jobs projected for the future are in the healthcare industry. When this significant reduction of resources to the healthcare sector comes about, the jobs will go, too, because without the resources, you will not employ people—you can't employ people.

Let me share a letter from one of my constituents because it succinctly describes what TrumpCare will really mean for this country. Glenn and Paula from Wakefield, RI, shared a letter from their daughter, Gianna, who has type 1 diabetes, saying:

Let me offer you a translation of what your votes mean: I will die younger and sicker. Probably much sicker. My kids will have a mother for less of their lives. Your votes are what will cause this. Because no matter how consciously I care for myself, no matter how responsible I am, it won't matter if my insurance refuses to cover me. And it won't matter for you either, if you are one of the vast majority of Americans who will end up with a pre-existing condition over the course of your life. If you think you can simply pay

the costs yourself, you are in for a rude awakening.

These are only a few examples of the letters, calls, and emails I have received from constituents. The response in opposition to TrumpCare has been overwhelming by the very people whom it will impact the most. I hope my colleagues will listen to these concerns, not just the Rhode Island stories I am sharing today but also from their own constituents. People's lives are at stake.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to abandon this effort to pass TrumpCare and start working with us on bipartisan solutions to improve our healthcare system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, having returned from the weekend in Wyoming, talking to people as a physician, and talking to former patients of mine. What I see is that the pain of ObamaCare is continuing to worsen around the country for men, women, families, and people who have been living under the Obama healthcare law for a number of years now.

This is an important day, when insurance companies have to come up with the filings and the plans on what they plan to do for next year with regard to plans that meet the ObamaCare mandate. So very soon, millions of people will find out if they are going to be able to buy an insurance plan in their own communities, regardless of the cost. We have seen that the Blue Cross Blue Shield group in Maryland has proposed rate increases up to 58 percent for next year in the State of Maryland. This is after they went up 24 percent last year. How many families can afford such a thing? But that is what we are dealing with.

That is why it is so critical that we get involved in trying to provide relief for American families at this time, with the Obama healthcare insurance market, certainly, collapsing. The head of Blue Cross Blue Shield in Maryland, which is the largest insurer in the State, has said that they see their system is in the early throes of what is known as the insurance death spiral. Prices are continuing to go up, fewer people are signing up, and, as a result, prices are going to have to be raised even more. We saw last year that they went up 24 percent, and this year the proposal, going forward to next year, is 58 percent. This is a terrifying reality for people on ObamaCare today.



One of the big reasons we have been working so hard on healthcare reform is to improve access to healthcare—not empty coverage, but actual healthcare. So what we want to do as Republicans is get rid of some of the excessive mandates, the expensive mandates, things that are driving up the cost of care and certainly driving up the cost of coverage for that care.

When prices come down, people are able to afford insurance and companies are ready to sell that insurance. I know we have people in Wyoming who are ready to buy it. That is how you improve access to insurance. It is how you also improve access to care. You don't do it by forcing the prices up and then requiring people to buy coverage, which is what the Democrats who voted for ObamaCare did. They said: You have to buy it, it is a mandate, whether you like it or not. We know better than you do. That is what we heard from the Democrats during the debate on President Obama's healthcare law. That is what they passed. They passed it. They voted for it. They didn't know what was in it. Actually, it was the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, who said: First you have to pass it before you even get to find out what is in it.

President Obama gave a big speech to a joint session of Congress and said that if people like their plans, they can keep their plans. One of the newspapers called that the "Lie of the Year." So millions of Americans then got letters from insurance companies; over 5,000 in Wyoming got that letter. It said: Sorry, your insurance plan isn't good enough for government.

People ought to be able to make that decision for themselves. Families ought to make that decision, not Democrats in Washington who voted for the ObamaCare law. They shouldn't have the right to tell the people of my State or any State what is best for them and their family. It is interesting because the Democrats don't seem to want to remember that anymore. They have selective amnesia.

It turned out that if people liked their plan, they weren't really allowed to keep it. I heard about it again a week ago at a Wyoming stock growers meeting—farmers and ranchers from around the State of Wyoming who come together each year, an organization that has been in existence longer than the State has been a State. These are hard-working people who know what works best for them, what works best for their families. Some of these outfits have been in those families for 100 years. We have something called the Centennial Ranch program where they gather all the family members when an outfit has been in that family for 100 years, and they have been able really to survive so much over the years. Often they would say, you know, whether they deal with floods, whether

they deal with fire, the biggest problem they have is often dealing with the Federal Government. We have seen it all across the board, and healthcare is just one of the last things to add to a long litany of Federal Government involvement in the lives of the people of our State of Wyoming.

So here we are today with this incredible government overreach and the failure of that overreach, and even the insurance companies, some of whom supported the passage of the healthcare law, are saying that this is not working. How they reflect the fact that it is not working is they say: OK, we are not going to sell insurance anymore. You can't make them sell insurance. The prices have to go up too much, and it is just not worth the effort.

One of the big insurance companies, Humana, is dropping out of the ObamaCare exchange entirely next year. They made the announcement. Aetna said that it is quitting the internal markets in Delaware, Iowa, Nebraska, and Virginia. Anthem is pulling out of Ohio. The list goes on.

Now, so far, there are over 40 counties across the country that are expected to have no one selling insurance on the exchange—no one. In Wyoming, we are down to one company that sells it. We had two; one lost so much money, they were pulled off of the market. The second one, which does sell insurance in Wyoming, continues to lose money by selling on the exchange. They are committed to stay, but they just scratch their heads about what the potential future may hold. We are now seeing over 40 counties across the country where no one is selling insurance. That is the reality of ObamaCare.

Remember, President Obama said: If you pass this, there will be huge competition, big marketplaces. If there is only one selling insurance, it is not a marketplace; it is a monopoly.

Next year, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has said that about 40 percent of all the counties in America will have just one company selling on the exchange—just one—forty percent of the counties all across America. That is a monopoly. What happens when those companies decide to drop out?

Even for people who get an ObamaCare subsidy, if there is no one in that community, in that county selling ObamaCare insurance, the subsidy has no value whatsoever. It can't be used.

That is another part of the story that the Democrats refuse to talk about. In fact, Democrats say a lot of things about insurance coverage that aren't really telling the whole story. They have talked about the Congressional Budget Office report; they talk about a number of things. One of the interesting things about the Congressional Budget Office report—the CBO report, kind of the scorekeepers that take a

look at things—on the bill that passed the House said that there will be millions of people fewer who will have insurance if the Republican-passed bill becomes law. Well, the news headlines screamed that the House bill would mean millions of people lose their insurance. Well, that is wrong. That is not at all what will happen.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, when you look at it and see why is it that there will be fewer people with insurance under ObamaCare if you eliminate the individual mandate—the part of the law that says you must buy a government-approved program—the Congressional Budget Office says that if you don't mandate it, a lot of people don't want to buy it. They don't view it as a good benefit to them. They don't view it as worth their money.

If people aren't required to buy insurance, millions of them will choose not to purchase the insurance, especially when they believe it is not a good deal for them personally. I believe Americans have that right. Apparently, the Democrats don't believe that Americans have that right. They like the mandate. They like making people do things. That, to me, is the difference between a Republican approach, which provides for freedom, and a Democratic approach of government and mandates.

We want to give people the right to decide what is right for them and their families. That is what I hear in Wyoming at the Wyoming Stock Growers Association and as I travel around the State. People know what is best for them and their families. Then, when all of a sudden what they had is taken off the market because the government says that you can't sell it anymore, that is an affront to their ability to choose what works for them and their family, and it is things they have had in the past. Then they got stuck buying some very expensive plan that covered a lot of things they didn't need, didn't want, and couldn't afford, but the government said: We know better than you do, the people of Wyoming, the people of America.

So the Congressional Budget Office says that 8 million people who get coverage in the individual market will decide it is just not worth buying. They also said that there will be 4 million people on Medicaid next year, and if you eliminate the mandate, they aren't going to sign up for it, even when it is free, because they realize that, for many people, being on Medicaid—a failing system—isn't providing much for them at all.

So insurance isn't being taken from people; these are people who are making a decision as free individuals—Americans—of how they want to spend their money and what they want to sign up for, or not.



So the legislation that passed the House really makes no changes in Medicaid in 2018. Yet, the CBO says millions of people on Medicaid will drop it when the mandate goes away.

The Senate is coming up with its own solution. We are looking at ways to make sure that Americans have access to insurance that works for them, not just what works for Democrats in Washington. We roll back some of the worst parts of ObamaCare. Prices for health insurance will go down. People will have better options than the one-size-fits-all plans that Washington has forced on the American people. They will have other options that will work better for them and their families.

Our goal is to not do what the Democrats did. ObamaCare actually kicked people off insurance that worked for them, pulled the rug right out from under them; Republicans don't want to pull the rug out from anyone. Our goal is to reform the American healthcare system so that insurance costs less and it meets the needs of the people who buy it. Republicans' goal is to focus on care, not just useless coverage that ObamaCare had provided for many, with narrower networks so you can't keep your doctor, you can't go to the hospital in your community, you can't get the care you need, you can't see certain specialists, which is what we have seen with ObamaCare.

If Democrats want to talk about people losing their insurance, they need to look at what ObamaCare is doing to people right now. They need to look at people who are losing their insurance because their insurers are walking away from them. They need to look at people who are losing their insurance because of the premium increases we are seeing requested in Maryland; 24 percent is actually how much it went up last year and 58 percent in certain areas requested for this year.

Now I hear the Democrats say that they are worried about whether people with preexisting conditions get insurance. As a doctor, I will tell you, my wife is a breast cancer survivor; we are absolutely committed as Republicans to make sure that no one with a preexisting condition is left out. Democrats can't make that claim. They have made it over the years. But if there is no one selling insurance where you live, there is no exchange being offered, and you live in those 40 counties right now with no one selling—none—zero, and that number of counties is going to expand next year—if you have a preexisting condition and you are living under ObamaCare, you cannot get insurance no matter what any Democrat says, because no one is willing to sell it to you, even if you get a government subsidy—no one. You are left out. That is what the Democrats have given us in this country with their failed ObamaCare system.

So ObamaCare continues collapsing. It is going to harm more Americans who have preexisting conditions.

The other day, Senator SCHUMER admitted that ObamaCare isn't providing affordable access to care. I think it is an important admission from the minority leader. Now it is time for him and the Democrats to join with Republicans in the Senate—join us in providing Americans the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as the Senate knows—and I suspect a lot of people outside of the Chamber know—we will move forward on the healthcare reform effort to repeal and replace ObamaCare very soon. A bill will be released as early as tomorrow morning, representing a discussion draft.

I think it is important to remind all of our colleagues of the urgency that we face. We already know that insurance premiums have gone up since 2013 alone for those in the individual market—those would be individuals with small businesses—by 105 percent. This is 2013. Can you imagine in 2013 paying a premium only to realize that over the next 4 years, it would quadruple in just a short period of time?

Most Americans can't absorb that additional cost. We know that many people are struggling from the high cost and the lack of quality of care and the choices available to them.

Again, on the cost issue, when ObamaCare was being sold to the American people, I still remember President Obama saying that the average family of four would see a decrease in their premiums of \$2,500. I think the correct figure is based on experience. They have seen their premiums go up \$3,000.

I shared a story last week about a small business owner in Texas who had lost his healthcare. He lost his doctor, and yet he had to pay astronomically more for what ends up to be less coverage. I would say he is only one person who I have heard from. I have heard from many, many more under similar circumstances.

Even those who receive their healthcare from their employer are feeling trapped by ObamaCare. I had a constituent, for example, from Needville, TX, and his story, yet again, is all too familiar. After his employer renewed their healthcare plan, premiums rose 50 percent, and his current doctors refused to accept his plan from

the ObamaCare marketplace. While his healthcare costs rose, of course, his salary did not follow suit.

He has been forced to dramatically cut back on his standard of living and is living from paycheck to paycheck. In his letter, he said he is worried about being able to provide for his family. Can you imagine what that must be like? And not thinking of himself, but what this means for his coworkers, as well, and his community.

This is one of the endless stories that my constituents have sent me over the past few years, and I know Texas isn't alone, which causes me to wonder who our colleagues are listening to or not listening to in their States.

I mentioned yesterday that I had one colleague, whose name I won't mention out of respect for his confidential communication—this is a Democratic Senator—who has a son who has seen his insurance premiums go up to \$7,500. Sorry, that is the deductible. But his premium has gone up \$5,000. He told me that his son's out-of-pocket costs for healthcare was \$12,500 a year.

That is another casualty of ObamaCare. Yet, when we are looking around to see how many Democrats are willing to join us to come to the rescue of people who are being hurt by the destruction of the healthcare markets, we see no one raising their hand or coming forward.

For our Democratic friends to attack us for trying to fix the havoc that they wreaked in our healthcare system is really ridiculous. Our friends on the other side of the aisle had their chance. They passed ObamaCare by a party-line vote. In the interim, it demonstrated that this is an experiment in big government and massive spending that has simply failed.

Our friends on the other side know that. They also realize that, regardless of who won the election in November, we would be moving towards a new, better healthcare alternative, but they are simply unwilling to participate and are sitting on their hands and waiting. Indeed, they are hoping that we will fail in our efforts to save many Americans—millions of Americans—from a healthcare system they were promised but one that was not delivered.

Instead of working with us, they effectively are throwing what could only be called a temper tantrum. They are trying to shut down any productive activity in the Senate, including bipartisan committee work.

I was in three committee hearings this morning, one involving the Intelligence Committee and our investigation into Russian active measures involving the 2016 election. I was in another important Finance Committee hearing where we talked about the importance of modernizing the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, and then another one in the Judiciary Committee, where we talked

about the influx of dangerous gangs into the United States, including MS-13, from Central American countries. Yet our Democratic colleagues are so bent out of shape over the healthcare debate that they are willing to shut down legitimate bipartisan concerns for each of those issues by not letting our committees operate as they should.

Here is the rub. If they actually had a better plan, we would be more than happy to listen. We would be more than happy to work with them. But the only thing they have offered has been offered by the Senator from Vermont—one of their Presidential candidates—Mr. SANDERS, who said that what he wants is nothing less than a complete Federal Government takeover of healthcare, the so-called single-payer system. That would wipe out all private insurance, and you would be looking to the government for all of your healthcare.

We know that hasn't worked particularly well in places like Canada and England and elsewhere. We also know that it is completely unaffordable. The Urban Institute, which did a study of Senator SANDERS' single-payer healthcare system, said that just in 2017 alone, it would add more than a half trillion dollars to Federal spending, and it would add trillions and trillions of dollars more over ensuing years. This isn't a solution. This is creating a bigger problem.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues have let the far left faction of their own conference hold them hostage to pushing for a single-payer system that would make ObamaCare look like a wild and resounding success.

As I said, we need only look to our neighbors to the north, who under a single-payer system have their healthcare decisions decided for them by the government, while they see their taxes go up every single day.

Canada is marketed as an affordable outcome, but only if your procedure is deemed necessary by the government. In other words, if the government doesn't think the procedure you need is necessary, good luck with that.

Would you want somebody in the government making your medical decisions for you or your family without considering your individual medical history? I certainly wouldn't. Under a single-payer system, this could lead to many families having to buy supplemental health insurance on top of the taxes they have already paid or simply pay cash, rewarding high-income individuals with a better level of healthcare above that offered to the rank-and-file citizens under a government program.

Single-payer systems are not a solution, certainly not in this country. Not only is choice and cost threatened under a single-payer system, but so is quality of care.

Just last year in Canada, it took an average of 20 weeks for patients to re-

ceive medical care that was deemed necessary—the longest recorded wait time since wait times began to be tracked. One report estimated the Canadians are waiting for nearly 1 million healthcare procedures.

Can you imagine having to wait up to 38 weeks for some medical procedure, the whole time worrying about your health or the health of your loved one?

Single-payer is a costly, inefficient, and unfeasible option, and, perhaps because of that, we are not hearing many people on the floor stating what I believe to be the case, which is that it is the only choice being offered by our friends across the aisle. They are not willing to come here and debate the merits of what we are proposing, which is a market-driven, individual-choice system, which is designed to keep premiums down in a way that makes it more affordable. They are not willing to debate that and a government takeover known as a single-payer option with all of its assorted problems.

The reforms we are seeking are patient-centered and market-driven. These are the sorts of things that many of our colleagues across the aisle said they would like to see as well, but they have somehow fallen in line with part of their political base, which makes it impossible for them to have an open, rational discussion about the merits of each proposal.

We are left with no option but to finalize our discussion draft and introduce that tomorrow so that the world can see it and so it can be put on the internet, so we can have a fulsome debate and we can have unlimited amendments in the so-called vote-arama process, which I know is very popular around here. We will vote dozens of times or more on proposed amendments to the bill. That is the kind of transparency and openness that I think are important when you are dealing with something as important as healthcare.

Here are the goals of what we are going to propose tomorrow in this discussion draft.

First, we need to stabilize the markets that have left millions in the country with no choices when it comes to insurance providers. Under ObamaCare, insurance markets have collapsed. In Texas, one-third of Texas counties have only one option for health insurance, which is no choice whatsoever. Of course, in addition to threatening competition, it also lowers quality while doing nothing about rising costs.

Second, we have to address the ballooning price of ObamaCare premium increases. I mentioned, just in the ObamaCare exchanges since 2013, they have gone up 105 percent. If we do nothing about it, they are going to go up by double digits again next year, so doing nothing is not an option. Again, without competition, there is no room for

these prices to go anywhere but up, and we have to come to the rescue of the millions of Americans who are simply being priced out of the health insurance market.

Third, something our Democratic colleagues have repeatedly called for is that we have to protect people with preexisting conditions. If we want our healthcare system to work, we must be able to provide coverage, particularly for preexisting conditions, for all Americans. We will do that in the discussion draft proposed tomorrow.

Lastly, I believe we need to give the States greater flexibility when providing for the low-income safety net known as Medicaid, in a way that is more cost-efficient and effective. For example, in my State, we have asked for a waiver in order to provide managed care for people on Medicaid. More than 90 percent are on managed care, which means if you have a chronic illness—if you have a particularly complicated medical problem—you have a medical home and somebody keeping track of your treatment, making sure you get the treatment you need and are entitled to.

Now we have the opportunity to make Medicaid a sustainable program. We know that it is not, as currently written. What we are proposing is to spend more money each year on Medicaid but to do so at a cost-of-living index that will be affordable and sustainable by the American taxpayer. We have the opportunity to address the quality issues and redtape issues and provide this important entitlement to make sure that it remains on a stable path.

The American people have made clear, time and again, that the status quo of ObamaCare is not working. All you have to do is look around. There were 60 Democratic Senators in 2010 who voted for ObamaCare. They were in the majority—a big majority. How many are there today? Well, there are not 60 anymore. They have gone from the majority to the minority, I believe, in large part because of the unfulfilled promises of ObamaCare.

I encourage our colleagues across the aisle—indeed, I encourage all of us to listen to the stories from our constituents. There are too many families asking us to step up and come to their aid. We need to do more than just give floor speeches or loft impossible single-payer options, which simply won't work. We need to actually deliver on the promises we made to deliver healthcare reform and to do so to the best of our ability.

I am under no illusion that this will be perfect. Indeed, when you are operating under the constraints of the budget rules, with Democrats taking a walk and sitting on their hands, it is impossible for us to come up with the best possible product we could under the circumstances. But I dare say, it

will be better than the status quo, which is a meltdown in the insurance markets, and we will take large steps forward in not only stabilizing the markets but bringing premiums down, while assuring coverage for preexisting conditions and putting Medicaid on a sustainable path forward.

We invite our Democrat colleagues to join us, if they will. But under present circumstances, it doesn't look as though they plan to do so.

REQUESTS FOR AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. President, I have nine requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They do not have the approval of the Democratic leader; therefore, they will not be permitted to meet today beyond 2 p.m. But I ask unanimous consent that a list of the committees requesting authority to meet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Committee on Finance  
Committee on Foreign Relations  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
Committee on the Judiciary  
Committee on Intelligence  
Subcommittee on Seapower  
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I could take 30 seconds more—because my colleague from Louisiana is here—I, frankly, think the objection to nine committees meeting in the Senate is indefensible. I mentioned the three committee hearings we had this morning, but they are just an indicator of important issues, such as the investigation by the Intelligence Committee of Russian involvement in our election; the Judiciary Committee looking into the role of MS-13, one of the most dangerous and violent street gangs in America, with about 10,000 gang members present in the United States. We are looking at things like trade and the importance of modernizing NAFTA and the 5 million jobs that binational trade supports with Mexico or the 8 million jobs with Canada.

For our Democratic colleagues to object to our being able to meet in committees because of their pique over healthcare—which they have voluntarily taken themselves out of—is just beyond indefensible. I hope the American people realize exactly what they are doing. This is the temper tantrum I talked about a moment ago. This is not about having an open and honest debate and trying to solve a problem that, frankly, is not just our problem; it is a problem for all Americans. We ought to do better than that. We ought to hold ourselves to a higher standard than that. But this is the kind of temper tantrum, unfortunately, you get when a political party is not willing to

participate in the debate and where they have no ideas that are actually workable, other than a single-payer system that will bankrupt the country and will fail to deliver quality healthcare to all our citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am also here to comment, as Senator CORNYN has, on the state of play, if you will, and the repeal and replacement of ObamaCare. I think sometimes the American people feel like collateral damage as Republicans and Democrats go back and forth as to what is the best policy.

I am a physician, a doctor who worked in a public hospital for the uninsured for decades before I went into politics. I guess from my perspective, the primary thing is not Republican versus Democrat, but that patient who is struggling to pay her bills, her premiums, or the fellow who can't afford medicine. What are we doing for them?

There is a gentleman who went on my Facebook page—again, cutting through this kind of political noise. This is Brian from Covington, LA:

My family plan is \$1,700 a month, me, my wife and 2 children. The ACA has brought me to my knees. I hope we can get something done. The middle class is dwindling away. Can everyone just come together and figure this out?

If that is not a plaintive plea of someone who is drowning under the cost of premiums for insurance, which he knows he has and, as a responsible father and husband, he will work to pay for—nonetheless, he says that he is being crushed by these high premiums.

The American people need relief. We have to lower those premiums. I have always said, though, that whatever we do must pass the Jimmy Kimmel test; that is, to say that if Brian's wife or children or he himself has a terrible illness, there will be adequate coverage to pay for the care their family would need for that member of their family with that terrible disease. It kind of brings us to where we are now—two aspects to what we are considering.

By the way, when folks say that we are redoing one-sixth of the economy, that is not true. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, again, attempted to address one-sixth of the economy that is healthcare. We are focused on the individual market, which is about 4 percent of those insured, and Medicaid. We are not touching Medicare. We are not touching the employer-sponsored insurance market. It is important to realize that this is not as comprehensive as the Affordable Care Act. It is something far more focused.

Let's first talk about Medicaid. I am very concerned about what has been proposed for Medicaid, but also concerned about current law regarding

Medicaid. Under the Medicaid expansion in the Affordable Care Act, States got 100 percent of all the cost of the patients enrolled for the first 4 to 5 years. As you might expect, States were quite generous in their payments for these patients as they contracted with Medicaid-managed care companies to care for them, so much so that those folks enrolled in Medicaid expansion. Taxpayers are paying 50 percent more than taxpayers are paying for those in traditional Medicaid. And States enrolled roughly 20 million people in the Medicaid expansion program. The combination of enrolling so many people in the Medicaid expansion program and paying 50 percent more than for traditional Medicaid means that when States finally have to foot 10 percent of the bill, which they will by 2020—when States have to finally foot that 10 percent of the bill, they cannot afford that 10 percent.

Unfortunately, under the Affordable Care Act, State taxpayers will not be able to pay what in California is \$2.2 billion extra per year as the State's 10-percent share. Similarly in Louisiana, my State, our taxpayers—me, my colleagues, my friends, my neighbors—would be on the hook for \$310 million per year. Our State is having a budget crisis because we can't afford \$300 million. Now it is a \$310 million recurring bill every year.

One thing that is not said is that Medicaid expansion in its current format is not sustainable. We have to do something—again, to preserve benefits for that patient. We have to take care of that patient, but we have to make it sustainable, both for the Federal taxpayer and the State taxpayer. By the way, whoever is watching this is both a Federal and State taxpayer. You are getting caught both ways.

Let me speak a little bit about the process. If you want to speak about Medicaid, we just laid it out. Let's speak a little about the process, as much has been said about it. I don't care for how the process transpired, but I certainly understand Leader MCCONNELL's concerns that Democrats would not collaborate. I find that a sorry state of affairs.

What do I mean by that? SUSAN COLLINS and I, and four other Republican Senators, put forward a bill that would allow Democratic States to continue in the status quo—to get the money they would have ordinarily received under the Affordable Care Act and to continue a system—as much as they desire to have—for the whole Nation.

The minority leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, condemned our bill before we filed it, meaning before he had a chance to read it. Without reading our bill, he condemned it, even though his State of New York would have been allowed to continue in the program that they are currently in and receive the dollars to support that program. He condemned

the bill before he read it, even though it would have allowed his State to continue in the status quo.

Similarly, we approached other Senators—10, at least, on my part. None would help us with our bill, even though their State could have continued in its current status quo, receiving the income it currently receives. That tells me that even a good faith effort to reach across the aisle was not going to get cooperation. That is too bad, and that is why, I think, there is kind of a political back-and-forth in which the patient—the American like Brian, struggling to support and cover his family—gets lost in the crossfire. A goodwill bill, designed for States to do that which they wish to do, would not even be considered by the other side.

I have always pointed out that if even two Democrats had walked into MITCH MCCONNELL's office and said "We will work with you to pass a bill," they could have gotten far many more things for their State than saying "No, we have not been invited to the party; therefore, we will not participate." I say that as an observation, not as a criticism, but also as an explanation to the American people of how we have ended up in this position.

Now, as to the bill that will be before us, I have not seen the written language. I reserve judgment until I have seen that, but I will say that there are some things I like. If our desire, again, is to take that patient, the American citizen, and make sure his needs or her needs are met—a family such as Brian described here who cannot afford their current premiums—there are things in this bill which will lower those premiums. There is the so-called cost-sharing reduction payments for the next couple of years that would continue to provide certainty to the insurance companies so that when they market insurance on the individual market, there would be certainty. They would be able to know those dollars are coming from the Federal taxpayer to support folks for the next couple of years, and they could lower their premiums accordingly.

There will be a so-called State Stability Fund that going forward, States could use to create what was called the invisible high-risk pool—a reinsurance program, if you will—so that if you are a patient on dialysis, a patient with cancer, very expensive to care for, you would continue to get the care you require, but everyone else in that insurance market has their premiums lowered because there is a little bit of help for those folks with those higher cost conditions. By that, we lower premiums.

President Trump, when he was running for President, said he wanted to continue coverage, care for those with preexisting conditions, eliminate the ObamaCare mandates, and lower premiums. What I have seen or, at least,

heard is we are on the path to fulfilling President Trump's pledge. Now, again, reserving judgment until I have seen written language, I will say that what I have seen so far keeps the patient as the focus, would address someone like Brian, the needs of his family, the needs of their pocketbook as well as their health, and build a basis so that going forward, States would have the ability to innovate, to find a system that works best for them.

On behalf of those patients, I hope that we as a Senate—whatever our party—are successful. I hope going forward we, as a Senate, no matter what our party, put the patient as the focal point, hoping that our combined efforts—again, no matter what our party—will address her needs or his needs, both financially and particularly for their health.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, earlier this week, on Monday morning at 9 a.m., I held a last-minute emergency field hearing on healthcare. With our colleagues on the other side of the aisle refusing to hold any official hearing on the bill and refusing to even show us the bill—what almost certainly is almost bad policy that is contained in the bill—I wanted the people of Connecticut to know that their voices and their faces would be heard and seen here in Washington, DC, and their stories would be told with or without an official committee hearing.

When I say this emergency field hearing was last minute, it was truly last minute, with many people having not even days but hours of advance notice to come and speak and share with me and others what the Affordable Care Act has meant to them, to their families, to their communities, and what losing it would mean to them.

To say the room was full would be a gross understatement. Every seat was filled, and when those seats were gone, people lined the wall two or three deep and squeezed in through the door. They were so anxious to be heard, and they were loud and clear. They were heard by me, and now I want their voices to be heard here.

We are continuing this hearing. In fact, we are having a second hearing on Friday afternoon at 1:30 in New Haven. We are sending out notices, blasting them to the people of Connecticut. We will have a third, if appropriate and necessary.

The people who came to this emergency field hearing in Connecticut

were no different from millions of other people around the country, and they were speaking, in a sense, for all Americans. In my mind, they were speaking for parents who are suffering, providers who are healing, kids fighting back against dreaded diseases. They came because the closed-door discussions held in secret here by a small number of colleagues across the aisle will impact them every single day for the rest of their lives. My constituents and the people of Connecticut and the people of the country are unrepresented in those discussions. That is a travesty and a betrayal of our trust and our job.

So, on Friday, we are going to do the same thing. We are holding another emergency hearing in New Haven so people of my State can be heard, despite this disgraceful process that has left them and so many others on the outside looking in. They are excluded from democracy, and that is unconscionable.

If nothing else, I hope my colleagues will realize one thing. This is what democracy looks like. This is how we are meant to make decisions with many opinions—much debate, diversity of viewpoint, sometimes messy but always transparent, open, and clear to people whose lives are affected by it. That is what this emergency field hearing was designed to do.

Since it is becoming increasingly clear that this bedrock principle of our democracy—the right to open and honest debate—is being denied, I want to share some of the stories I heard on Monday, just some of them, and I will be sharing more of these stories over the coming days.

Justice Brianna Crutch was described by her mother as a beautiful free spirit, as you can see from this side of the photo. She was filled with compassion and at 21 years old had a beautiful and meaningful life ahead of her, all of her life ahead of her. She was a full-time student in a dental program, and she had a 4.0 average.

Justice, like far too many people, particularly young people in Connecticut and around the country, had a substance use disorder, and she needed effective, long-term treatment to begin that road to recovery. For Justice, this treatment came too late, and on August 23, 2015, she overdosed on heroin. It led to a brain injury. It is likely she will never recover from that injury.

"More likely than not," her mother said, "I will have to make the decision to bring my daughter home with hospice care. No parent should be faced with these decisions." That is what Jennifer Kelly said at the hearing on Monday.

That is a picture of Justice as she is today.

I want to read exactly what Jennifer Kelly said because her words are far more powerful and meaningful than mine could ever be.

The American Health Care Act—

The House version of the so-called replacement for the Affordable Care Act—

would reduce Medicaid funding by \$800 million, which provides coverage to an estimated 3 in 10 adults dealing with an opioid addiction. This will be so devastating to those seeking treatment for an opioid addiction. In a system where families are already seeking help, this will be a tremendous step backwards.

So here I am, almost two years later, pleading for life, fighting once again for families I have never met, because I believe that no one should have to fight to get help for addiction in this country like my daughter did. So my question is, Mr. President and the members of the Senate, what number of lives lost will be enough? What is the magic number of sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles that we as a nation will have to lose before you realize this country needs help?

I ask that same question of my colleagues today. I ask the question that Jennifer, a brokenhearted mother, asked. What number of lives will be enough? How many is enough? When will others in this body realize that gutting our healthcare system and stripping millions of care will simply make this opioid epidemic worse?

Jennifer was unfortunately not the only person who came to speak about the opioid epidemic. For me, the most moving and powerful among those moments came from Maria Skinner, who runs the McCall Center for Behavioral Health in Connecticut, who was there to give her thoughts and share the stories of two young people. I was actually lucky enough to meet both of them. Once again, I am going to share her words directly:

What I want to do is talk to you about two people and make that a real, personal, granular, human story. . . . And you know these two people very well; it's Frank and Sean.

She was speaking to me.

[You] have met Frank and Sean, who were able to access care and get clean and sober because of the Medicaid expansion, because they were able to have coverage.

And they've come here, to these rooms, to speak courageously and publicly about their struggle and about their recovery, and about how grateful they are to be able to be clean and sober because of the access of care afforded them through their insurance coverage.

We went to Sean's funeral on Saturday, and . . . Frank would be here today if he wasn't as brokenhearted as I am. Sean was 26 and had been doing really well, was on Naltrexone, was taking a Vivitrol shot, and he had to have surgery for a hernia, because he raced motorbikes professionally and the hernia hurt him. He wanted to go back and was doing so well, he was speaking publicly to youth and was anxious to go back into doing what he loved. So he had that surgery and had to come off of his medication to do that. He was very vulnerable after his surgery, and he slipped once, and he used.

I've been to too many funerals and seen too many mothers and fathers brokenhearted at the coffins of their sons and daughters. We can't make this any harder

than it already is. To me, it is unconscionable.

Maria is right, and so is Jennifer. Gutting Medicaid would be unconscionable. Weakening the protections afforded to those with mental health or substance use disorder would be truly unconscionable. Repealing the Affordable Care Act and the provisions within it that have meant more coverage, more healthcare, and more healing for those suffering from substance use disorder and struggling to break the grip of this opioid epidemic would be unconscionable and costly beyond words.

Alternative funds, as some reports say Republicans have considered, will never replace a permanent insurance program like Medicaid because Medicaid guarantees that coverage is there when families need it. No alternative can do that.

In Connecticut, nearly half of all medication-assisted treatment for people with substance use disorders is paid by Medicaid. My fear is that the Republican bill in place will mean that these people would have no place to go. They would have no support for medications, counseling, and help, no chance to get better, no place to go. I refuse to let us find out the answer to what would happen to them if Medicaid were gutted. I refuse to allow it to happen, if I have anything to do with it.

People with substance use disorder are not the only ones who will see their coverage threatened by a weakening of protections for those with preexisting conditions. In Connecticut on Monday, Shawn Lang of AIDS-Connecticut expanded on what this bill would mean for the people living with HIV in this country.

Some of us lived through the early days of the plague when we went to funeral after funeral, memorial service after memorial service, week after week, month after month, watching our friends wither away and die. The healthcare bill that is currently secretly weaving its way through Congress would bring us back to the early days of the plague.

HIV is a preexisting condition. Over half of the people living with HIV in the country and in this state are over the age of 50 and rely on Medicaid as their primary source of insurance. Most of those people also have other co-morbidities like substance abuse disorders and mental health disorders. What little we know about this bill would be devastating to people with HIV and AIDS, and it essentially would amount to a death sentence. Once again, having lived through those early days, we don't want to go back there.

Shawn's story is one of many I heard about the fear of losing coverage due to a preexisting condition.

Gay Hyre, a 60-year-old breast cancer survivor, has similar concerns about what gutting the Affordable Care Act would mean not just for her but for everyone around her. She said this about why she came to speak at the hearing:

I'm not just worried for me about my own care, although I will be on the receiving end of a lot of bad parts of this. I care passion-

ately about the other 23 million Americans who are my fellow citizens of every age, type, and need. It's about the future, it's about our kids, it's about our grandkids who won't have access to treatments, who won't have access to doctors.

I know my colleagues across the aisle don't want to hear these stories. If they wanted to hear these stories from people in Connecticut and around the country, millions of stories, we would have hearings—not just emergency field hearings; we would have hearings here in Washington before the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and before the Committee on Finance and other committees that have jurisdiction on the House side as well as in the Senate. We would be having a real debate, a robust discussion, and everyone of us here would have a chance to review this bill, if there is a bill, and comment on it and hear from the people we represent. But unfortunately my colleagues across the aisle don't want to hear about the details of repealing the Affordable Care Act.

One witness at my hearing, Ellen Andrews of the Connecticut Health Policy Project, really summed up the reason. Here is what she said:

We have been working on expanding health coverage, high-quality, affordable coverage to everyone in the state and now everyone in the nation. I looked back, actually, at 2010, how many people were uninsured in this state before the Affordable Care Act, it was 397,000 people, almost 400,000. Last year it was down by 262,000. That is 262,000 fewer people living in our state without insurance because of the Affordable Care Act.

I want to share one final story. It is about a little boy in Connecticut who has a lot to lose if the Affordable Care Act is secretly gutted behind closed doors, as is now happening in real time right before our eyes, in secret, invisibly, in this body. I want to tell you about Connor Curran.

Two years ago, when Connor was 5 years old, his parents noticed that he was lagging behind his twin brother. They brought him to a doctor. Rather than receiving a simple diagnosis, they learned that Connor has Duchenne muscular dystrophy, a degenerative terminal disease that has no cure. Most people with the disease don't survive past their midtwenties. Connor's family wrote that their sweet boy, who was just 5 and full of life, would slowly lose his ability to run, to walk, to lift his arms. Eventually, they said, he would lose the ability to hug them at all.

Connor needs complex care from multiple specialists, costing an estimated \$54,000 a year. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, he cannot be denied coverage and has the coverage he needs to receive care. His family also wrote that any elimination of lifetime caps or elimination of essential health benefits will hinder his family's ability to access the care that Connor needs.

This is Connor in a picture that has been provided by his family.

The ACA removed barriers to Conner's care, and they are concerned—and so am I—that this reckless, reprehensible bill will put them back to the place that they were when they first learned about Conner's diagnosis.

Should Conner's disease progress, he will very likely need access to Medicaid in order to offset the costs of living with a disability, but for his family, the question now is, Will Medicaid even be there? If that devastating day comes, will he continue to receive the care he needs?

Conner's family is not about to give up. They have come to my office annually since he was diagnosed in order to fight for a cure and to fight for the Affordable Care Act—sometimes with tears in their eyes. They raise awareness, and they fight for their little boy. I know they would do it a million times over again if it meant that Conner could get better and live a long and healthy life.

Conner and others like him are why I am here. Conner and others like him are why I will continue this fight against any attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and replace it with a shameful, disgraceful bill that has been written behind closed doors—destroying lives and degrading the quality of life for millions of Americans.

The people whom I have met in Connecticut who came to this hearing—and countless others who have talked to me about the Affordable Care Act—are fighting for their lives and their health and for others who need it as well.

Those people whom I met in Connecticut and the others who will come to our hearing on Friday and, perhaps, afterward are the reason I am fighting for better coverage for all of the people of Connecticut and our country.

Those people are the best of our country with their fighting spirit and dedication to the people they love, and they deserve to be heard. They are the voices and faces of the Affordable Care Act who have been turned away at the door of this Capitol. I refuse to allow them to be silenced.

As I have mentioned, we will be back at it again on Friday because hearing from our constituents is part of our job. It is the bedrock of democracy. It is the fundamental core of what we do—listening to the people whom we represent. Failing to do so is unconscionable just as destroying the Affordable Care Act would be unconscionable, just as denying Conner what he needs would be unconscionable, just as ignoring Justice and Sean and Frank would be unconscionable. I hope my colleagues will listen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the chairman of the committee. I am honored to take that 5 minutes.

#### VETERANS HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, a lot of us wake up in the morning with a plan for the day, and we know what we are going to do each hour—and every 5 minutes if you are a Member of the Senate. Some days surprise you. I went to breakfast this morning for Members of the Senate who are veterans of the U.S. military. There were three of us at that breakfast. There were supposed to be more, but some did not come at the last minute.

One of the people at the breakfast handed me a piece of paper—four pages as a matter of fact—and asked: Have you seen this?

I did not know what it was, but I turned and looked at it. It was a white paper on the impact of President Trump's proposed budget on the American veteran.

The guy said: You are the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I want you to explain why all of this is true.

I quickly turned through it, from one page to another, and looked at each of the headlines and subtitles. Every one of them was wrong. There was not a statement of fact in it, but there was a purpose to the paper.

So I thought all morning about what I would do today to try and get the word out about what is true without getting into a partisan or a bickering battle on the floor of the Senate about documents that have been sent out circuitously by one Member of the Senate or another. Facts are facts, and facts are stubborn things. It is very important for me as chairman of the committee to make sure that the Members of the Senate know what we are dealing with as we lead up to making important decisions.

This white paper alleges that President Trump's budget is a circuitous route to privatize VA health services for our veterans, which is patently untrue and wrong, and the authors of this in the Senate who have written it know it is untrue because they are on the committee. It further alleges that the funding of healthcare for veterans has been cannibalized by privatization programs in order to take healthcare out of the Veterans Health Administration and put it into the private sector.

I know, within a few weeks, that I am going to be coming to the floor with, hopefully, the entire Veterans' Affairs Committee and will be seeking additional funds for the Choice Program so as to continue to meet the demand for our veterans and their healthcare.

It was 2½ years ago that this Senate and this Congress and the former Presi-

dent passed and signed legislation that guaranteed that every veteran, no matter where he lived, could get services within the private sector in his community that were approved by the VA—services that he could not get from the VA anywhere. In other words, he got a choice. If he were denied an appointment within 30 days, he got a choice if he lived more than 40 miles from the service area. It became known as the Choice Program—popular but difficult to manage. It was popular in that 2.7 million appointments were held in the next 2 years over the previous 2 years because of the increased accessibility of healthcare for our veterans.

I come to the floor to say that the Veterans' Affairs Committee is working with the appropriators and the authorizers to see to it that the healthcare money that needs to be appropriated for our veterans is appropriately done in the budget proposal that we pass out of this body.

I want everybody on the floor to remember, every time you allege as a Member of the Senate that money for veterans is being cannibalized and that they are not going to get their health services, you are accusing the Congress and the Senate of not doing their constitutional duty of providing the funds we guarantee these men and these women when they voluntarily sign up to serve our country, serve for the eligible time necessary, and get VA status.

I am never going to forsake my obligation to the men and women who serve us today, have served us in the past, and will serve us in the future. I am never going to be one of those politicians who is not trustworthy in standing behind every promise that is made.

We have made a great promise to the veterans of America, and we are going to keep it because they made the greatest promise of all—that they would risk their lives for each of us.

So, if you get a document that reads "The Impact of President Trump's Proposed Budget on America's Veterans" and read it and it talks about the cannibalization of VA healthcare and its going to a privatized system of healthcare, put it in the trash can because that is where it belongs. It is full of quotes that have been taken out of context and that have been put together to tell a story to frighten folks.

Today and every day, we are in the process in the Veterans' Affairs Committee of working toward seeing to it that we meet the funding shortfalls that exist, to see to it that our veterans get the healthcare that they deserve and they come to our Veterans Health Administration for or that they have a choice, and we will continue to do so.

I have but one responsibility in the U.S. Senate, which is of paramount importance, and that is my chairmanship



on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am not going to let our veterans down, and I am not going to let somebody else allege that we on the committee are trying to do something that would not help the veterans or guarantee them their healthcare. On the contrary, we are going to see to it that nobody else takes it away. We are going to do for our veterans what they have done for us—pledge our sacred honor to see to it that they get the service they deserve, have fought for, and have risked their lives for.

I thank the Senator from Utah for yielding the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the last several weeks, I have been hearing quite a bit about process here in the Senate, particularly as it relates to the ongoing debate over the future of ObamaCare.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have, apparently, poll-tested the strategy of decrying the supposed secrecy surrounding the healthcare bill and the lack of regular order in its development. They have come to the floor, given interviews, and even hijacked committee meetings and hearings to express their supposedly righteous indignation about how Republicans are proceeding with the healthcare bill.

Of course, hearing Senate Democrats lecture about preserving the customs and traditions of the Senate is a bit ironic, but I will get back to that in a minute.

Last week, the Senate Finance Committee, which I chair, held a routine nominations markup to consider a slate of relatively uncontroversial nominees. On that same day, several of our colleagues and congressional staffers had been viciously attacked by an armed assailant, and a Member of the House of Representatives, of course, was in critical condition in the hospital.

I opened the meeting by respectfully asking my colleagues to allow the committee to use the markup as an opportunity to demonstrate unity in the face of a violent attack against Congress as an institution. Even then, my Democratic friends were, apparently, unable to pass up an opportunity to try to score partisan points and rack up video clips for social media by playing for the cameras as they lamented the committee's position in the healthcare debate.

Once again, the situation is dripping with irony. As I said, I will get to that in a minute.

If my Democratic colleagues are going to continue grandstanding over the healthcare debate, I have a few numbers I would like to cite for them.

Under ObamaCare, health insurance premiums in the State of Oregon have

gone up by an average of 110 percent. In Michigan, they have gone up by 90 percent. In Florida, they have gone up by 84 percent. In Delaware, they have gone up by 108 percent. In Ohio, they have gone up by 86 percent. In Pennsylvania, they have gone up by 120 percent. In Virginia, they have gone up by 77 percent. In Missouri, they have gone up by 145 percent.

I have not picked those States at random. Each of these States is currently represented by a Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee. Of course, those trends extend well beyond the committee.

In Illinois, where the Senate minority whip resides, premiums have gone up by 108 percent.

In West Virginia and Wisconsin, both of which are also represented by Democratic Senators, premiums have gone up by 169 percent and 93 percent, respectively.

Montana is in a similar situation with premiums rising by 133 percent under ObamaCare.

Now, just so people do not go thinking that I am picking on the Democrats, I will note that, in Utah, health insurance premiums have gone up by an average of 101 percent.

In Wyoming, they have gone up by 107 percent, and, in Nebraska, they have gone up by 153 percent.

I can go on, but I think my point is clear: Health insurance premiums have skyrocketed all over the country by an average of 105 percent. I will repeat that. Under ObamaCare, the average health insurance premiums in the United States have seen triple-digit increases.

These are the fruits of the so-called Affordable Care Act. This is the burden that ObamaCare has placed on patients and families throughout our country, and people are feeling that burden whether they vote for Democrats or Republicans.

The only difference is that, for 7½ years, my Republican colleagues and I have been talking about the failures of ObamaCare, and for 7½ years, Senate Democrats have done virtually nothing to address these problems.

For 7½ years, Republicans like myself have pleaded with our Democratic colleagues and with the previous administration to work with us to address the failures of ObamaCare, and for 7½ years, it has been virtually impossible to get any Democrat in Washington to even acknowledge that there have been any problems with ObamaCare to begin with.

As the cost of healthcare in this country has skyrocketed out of control and the system created by the so-called Affordable Care Act has been collapsing under its own weight, Democrats in the Senate have been cherry-picking what few positive data points they can find and telling the American people that everything is fine and that ObamaCare is working.

Give me a break.

By no honest or reasonable measure is ObamaCare living up to the promises that were made at the time it was passed. As a result, the American people are saddled with a healthcare system that has been poorly designed and recklessly implemented.

Sure, it has made for partisan political theater for my colleagues to express shock and dismay at the current state of the healthcare debate. I am quite certain the strategy has poll-tested very well among the Democratic base, and the Senate minority leader clearly has an elaborate media campaign in mind.

Before they begin berating Republicans, I hope my Democratic colleagues were able to come up with something to tell their constituents whose healthcare costs have exploded as a result of ObamaCare. I have just mentioned a few things.

I hope they have answers for their voters for wondering why they only have one insurance option available to them, if they even have that, and, most importantly, I hope they have an explanation as to why they have been more or less silent while the law they supported—and still support—has wreaked havoc on our Nation's healthcare system.

Until they can answer those questions and provide those explanations, my good friends should spare anyone within earshot their lectures about what is currently happening in the Senate.

Finally, let me address the irony of my Democratic colleagues' process complaints. Some of them have selective memories when it comes to the history of ObamaCare. We have heard our colleagues talk about the number of committee hearings held in advance of ObamaCare's passing. What we don't hear is that there was not a single hearing held in the Senate on the ObamaCare reconciliation bill, which was an essential element that ensured passage of the Affordable Care Act in the House.

We have heard our colleagues talk about the markup process in committee and the number of amendments that were filed and accepted. What we don't hear about is the fact that the bills reported by the Finance and HELP Committees were tossed aside so the healthcare bill could be rewritten behind closed doors in Senator Reid's office, who was then the majority leader. The final product was only made public a few days before the Senate voted on it.

The truth is this: Senate committees—including the Finance Committee—have had literally dozens of hearings wherein the failings of ObamaCare—both the structure of the law and its implementation—have been thoroughly examined. Between all the relevant committees, there have been



at least 66 healthcare hearings in the Senate since ObamaCare became the healthcare law of the land. More than half of those were in the Finance Committee.

Committees have conducted countless oversight investigations and inquiries into these matters over the years. Few matters in the history of our country have received as much of the Senate's attention as ObamaCare has received. Very few laws have been examined as extensively as the so-called Affordable Care Act, which is anything but affordable. ObamaCare is the very definition of well-covered territory.

The majority leader has made clear that Members will have an opportunity to examine the forthcoming healthcare bill, and I expect that to be the case. He has always made assurances that when the bill is debated on the floor, we will have a fair and open amendment process, as required under the rules. There is really no reason for anyone to expect otherwise.

Let's recall that when ObamaCare was passed, the Democratic Speaker of the House, with a plain face, stated that Congress had to pass the bill in order for people to see what was in it.

Let's also recall that a couple of years later, one of the chief architects of the so-called Affordable Care Act bragged about the lack of transparency that surrounded its passage and said it was necessary to, in his words, take advantage of the "stupidity of the American voter."

Any argument that the process that resulted in ObamaCare was a picture of transparency and deliberation is so off base that it would almost be humorous if the issue was something less important.

As I said in committee last week, I want to welcome my Democratic colleagues to the healthcare debate. Ever since ObamaCare was signed into law, Democrats have more or less assumed that the debate was over and that all they had to do was keep telling the American people that everything was just fine, as if repetition alone would make it come true.

Everyone is going to see the bill, and everyone is going to get their chance to say their piece about it.

For now, I simply hope my Democratic colleagues will spare us their lectures and maybe look in the mirror when they are ranting about the degradation of the process and traditions of the Senate.

I have been around healthcare for most of my 41 years in the Senate. A lot of the healthcare bills that work in this country have my name on them. This is one of the worst bills I have ever seen in all my time in the U.S. Senate. If I were a Democrat, I would not be claiming success because of that bill. It is a pathetic piece of legislation that is going to put this country down

and make healthcare not available for everybody but make everybody have the worst healthcare system they could possibly have.

Now, it is one thing to cherry-pick a few things that the healthcare bill can help with, but it would be a totally stupid bill if it didn't have something in it that was good. If you look at the overall bill and you look at the overall cost to America and you look at what it is doing to America and you look at how the medical profession is starting to really wonder if they want to be in the profession anymore—you can't do all of this and look at all of these things without asking, What in the heck have we done here? Are we so stupid that we believe the Federal Government is the last answer to everything?

Well, we will see, because I think some people are that stupid and, frankly—I don't want to name anybody, and I hope I am wrong, but I have been here 41 years and I have seen a lot of stupidity around this place and you have to really go a long way to find anything worse than the so-called "affordable" healthcare bill.

This is a pathetic piece of legislation that is going to wreck our country if we don't, as Democrats and Republicans, get together and reform it. This is an opportunity for my friends on the Democratic side as well as the Republican side to see what we can do about this and to get this thing straightened out.

This is the greatest country in the world. There is nobody in this country who should go without basic healthcare. When we have terrible cases like my distinguished friend and colleague from Connecticut has mentioned, yes, we want to make sure people who suffer like that are taken care of, and there are some on our side who could be a little more humane and compassionate, but there are some on the other side, too, who could be a little more humane and compassionate and maybe a little more honest when they talk about this bill.

We are a long way from solving the healthcare problems in this country, and if we go down this road any further, we will be an even longer way from solving these problems, and we may very well bankrupt the American economy, which will then really show us how bad we are with regard to healthcare in this country.

My friends on the other side never ask, Where is the money going to come from? Who is going to pay for this? Who is going to help us to get through this? We are just going to throw money at it, and we are \$100 trillion in unfunded liability in this country and \$20 trillion in national debt. It is astounding. Who is going to pay for it, especially when it doesn't work any better than that.

I spent some of my prior life in medical malpractice work defending doc-

tors and hospitals and healthcare providers, and some of that was really astounding to me because some of those cases were brought just to get the defense costs, which were always pretty high because those cases were very expensive to defend. Most of them were not good cases, but once they got in court, if they had any kind of basis at all—but even if they were dismissed, it still cost a lot of money.

All I can say is, there is a lot wrong with our healthcare system in this country, but it is still the best healthcare system in the world, and it is about to go down if we don't get together as Republicans and Democrats and straighten this mess out. We can make our political points all we want to. Both sides have been right in some cases and both sides have been wrong on some things, but we are wrong if we think that the current system is going to work, and we ought to be working together as Republicans and Democrats or Democrats and Republicans to straighten it out.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise with the understanding that the Senate will be voting on a Republican healthcare bill next week, a bill that has been written entirely behind closed doors.

The bill has been hidden from the American people, the press, and, as far as I can tell, almost every Senator. I have not been allowed to see it and neither have any of my Democratic colleagues.

I was elected to the Senate in 2014 during the same election that Republicans regained the majority, and I remember a pledge by their leadership that the Senate would return to regular order. Well, regular order means public hearings on legislation. Regular order means committees have a chance to gather input from expert witnesses, consider a policy's potential impact, and amend bills before they come to the floor.

Prior to enacting ObamaCare, the Senate Finance and HELP Committees held nearly 100 hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs on healthcare reform. In the House, where I served at the time, there were over 79 bipartisan hearings and markups that included an opportunity for our Republican colleagues to offer input and amendments in the bill. Dozens of Republican amendments were adopted during the House committee markups of the Affordable Care Act. That is an open process.

What we are seeing now is a bill drafted entirely in secrecy and hidden behind closed doors. But why? Is it because Republicans know that this bill is not a good deal for the American people? You could call the recent process a lot of things, but you can't call it

open, and you can't call it regular order.

Supposedly, the bill has been assembled by a working group of 13 of my Republican colleagues, but just yesterday—just yesterday—one of these Members complained that he had not yet seen a draft. In fact, he went on to say—this is a Republican colleague of mine in this working group:

It has become increasingly apparent in the last few days that even though we thought we were going to be in charge of writing a bill within this working group, it's not being written by us. It's apparently being written by a small handful of staffers for members of the Republican leadership in the Senate.

This quote makes it clear that this working group is—well, it is not working.

When Senators in the majority party are unable to tell you who is writing the bill, let alone what is in the bill, we have a problem. While we clearly have a problem with the secretive, rushed process, this process is a symptom, not the disease. The underlying disease is that this bill, which we reportedly will see tomorrow, is almost certainly terrible for the American people.

There are two explanations for keeping a product under wraps: Either you want to build excitement for it or you are worried about the weaknesses that would be exposed by the daylight. I don't believe for a moment that Republicans are trying to build excitement by hiding this bill. This bill is not next year's model of the Ford Mustang or Chevy Camaro waiting to be unveiled at the Detroit auto show to great fanfare. This bill is like a disaster that will negatively impact millions of Americans. This bill is the iceberg that sunk the *Titanic*, and Republican leadership has turned off the ship's radio and are furiously shoveling coal into the engines.

While the Senate moves full steam ahead to vote next week on a bill we haven't even seen yet, I am worried that my colleagues across the aisle, along with too many political commentators and pundits, are simply asking the wrong questions. They are asking: Will moderate Republicans vote for it? Will the tea party wing support it? Will it take sweetheart deals to get to 51 votes?

Well, folks, this is not a game. This is not about if and how the majority can count to 51 votes and solve their political problems with the far-right-wing base of their party. This is about people's lives.

There are serious policy questions we need to ask, and the American people deserve to have answers. There are questions like these: What are your policy goals here? How do you think this will help people afford quality insurance coverage? What will the bill do for tens of millions of Americans who have gained healthcare coverage in recent years? What will the bill do for pa-

tients with preexisting conditions? What will the bill do for the hundreds of thousands of Michiganders covered under the successful Healthy Michigan Program? What will the bill do for small business owners and employees? What will the bill do for seniors who need affordable, long-term care options? What will the bill do for individuals battling opioid addiction? These are questions I am asking, along with all of my Democratic colleagues.

I serve on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and just a few weeks ago we held a hearing on opioid abuse and how the epidemic is simply ravaging our Nation.

I had the opportunity to speak with a police chief from our southern border State of Ohio. He was very clear that if Medicaid expansion were to go away—as we saw in the House bill and expect to see in the Senate bill—it will make it much more difficult for local police departments to tackle this crisis because of dramatically scaled-back availability of addiction treatment. I spoke with a coroner, a medical doctor, and an addiction expert on the panel as well.

These are professionals dealing with a public health crisis each and every day—not people with political agendas. They all agreed that Medicaid expansion is critical to combating addiction, improving public health, and helping individuals suffering from addiction have an opportunity to be productive citizens and have a second chance at life.

The bottom line is that this bill—this secretive, rushed bill that we will supposedly see tomorrow—will move us backward and rip healthcare away from millions of Americans. When you take health coverage away from people, people will die.

As a Member of the House, I voted for the Affordable Care Act because I knew that, at the end of the day, it would save people's lives. As elected officials and public servants, there are only a handful of votes we cast that are literally about life and death. Next week, we will see one of those votes.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read the bill, whenever we get it, and then talk to doctors, patients, families, clinics, and hospitals in their State. I also urge my colleagues to vote no next week and to start a truly bipartisan process that keeps what works, fixes what doesn't, but, most importantly, helps all Americans afford quality healthcare in their communities.

I stand here ready and willing to be a partner in a bipartisan process and to work with my Republican colleagues to improve our healthcare system. Show us and the American people you are serious about health reform. Let's have an open and honest process and pass a bill that is genuinely in the best interest of the American people.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I come weekly to the Senate whenever we are in session to give my "Time to Wake Up" speech, talking about climate change and, quite often, talking about the climate denial campaign that prevents us from taking action and, quite often, talking about the campaign finance problems in our country that make climate denial effective. Here, in Congress, it is not hard to connect the dots from campaign finance to climate denial.

The Supreme Court's Republican majority's disastrous Citizens United decision was requested by the fossil fuel industry, and the fossil fuel industry took instant advantage of it—almost like they saw it coming. The industry and its front groups instantly used their new power conferred by Citizens United to come after politicians—Republicans in particular. Ask Bob Inglis, who backed responsible climate policies. Citizens United created new American dark-money emperors, and—no surprise—the new emperors love their new political power.

Their first payoff was that Republicans in Congress fled from any legislative action on climate change. Before Citizens United, there were multiple bipartisan climate bills. Year after year—when I was here in 2007, 2008, 2009—there were bipartisan climate bills to the left of you, bipartisan climate bills to the right of you, bipartisan climate bills cropping up all over. Today, we watch our Republican President trying to undo curbs on carbon emissions and, to the cheers of Republicans in Congress, withdrawing the United States from the historic Paris Agreement. We join Syria and Nicaragua as the only nations to reject this common cause. That, my friends, is the heavy hand of fossil fuel influence, driving us into isolation and abdication of American leadership.

Of course, right now, no Republican can safely sponsor any bill to limit carbon dioxide emissions, and so none do. Very different than before the Citizens United decision in January of 2010. That changed everything. When those five Republican justices opened up unlimited political spending to the big Republican special interests, that unlimited political spending was inevitably going to find dark-money channels. Dark-money channels hide the identity of the political donor, so that big special interests can pollute our politics with their money with seemingly clean hands.

The climate denial scheme of the fossil fuel cartel is powered politically by dark money. Whether through the lure of dark money coming in for you in a political race or the threat of dark money coming in against you in a political race, dark money powers climate denial. Well, we have just learned something new about dark money.

Chairman GRAHAM and I held hearings in our Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism to look at Russian interference in the recent 2016 election and what it portends for elections to come. Our witnesses warned us that Russia has strategically manipulated politics in Europe for decades. They started working in the former Soviet Union countries, and they expanded to where they are manipulating politics in France, Germany, Holland, England, and all over Europe. The witnesses warned us that we in America must be prepared for that. They jumped the Atlantic to manipulate the 2016 elections, and they are not going away.

One identified weakness of the United States against Russian influence was this dark money in our politics. Why is that? Well, it is obvious. Once you allow dark money in, dark is dark. Cash from Vladimir Putin is no more traceable than cash from Charles and David Koch. One witness, a former Republican national security official, told us: "It is critical that we effectively enforce the campaign finance laws that would prevent this type of financial influence by foreign actors."

"It is critical that we effectively enforce the campaign finance laws" against foreign influence by foreign actors.

The two best studies of Russian influence in Western Europe in their elections and in their politics are "The Kremlin Playbook," by CSIS, or the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and "The Kremlin's Trojan Horses," by the Atlantic Council. Both of them report that Russia takes advantage of nontransparency in campaign financing to build its shadowy webs of influence and control. If you leave dark-money channels lying around, it is likely that Vladimir Putin and his oligarchs will find them.

The "Trojan Horses" report warns this: "The Kremlin's blatant attempts to influence and disrupt the U.S. presidential election should serve as an inspiration for a democratic push back." That is a lower case "d" for "democratic push back," and it points to one key way we need to push back.

I will quote them again.

Electoral rules should be amended, so that publically funded political groups, primarily political parties, should at the very least be required to report their sources of funding.

That is, end dark money.

Likewise, the "Kremlin Playbook" report warns:

Enhancing transparency and the effectiveness of the Western democratic tools, instru-

ments, and institutions is critical to resilience against Russian influence.

Enhancing transparency means ending dark money.

Our hearing and these reports reveal another political influence tool used by the Kremlin: fake news. As we shore up our democracy to defend against Russia's fake news information warfare, we must remember this: Climate denial was the original fake news.

To give an example, here is a story that may sound familiar. An unknown hacker illegally breaks into and steals an organization's emails. The organization's emails are held until they can be released at a politically strategic moment. At the strategic moment, emails are leaked to a website with shady ties. The leaks are then amplified and spun by fake news, driven into the regular media, and have their desired political effect. Does any of that sound familiar? Of course, it is the methodology of the Russians' hack of the Democratic National Committee, right? Unknown hacker, stolen emails, strategic release, caching them until they can be used, shady website, fake news spin-up, regular media takes the bait, political damage.

If you step back and look at just the methodology, we have seen this pattern before—so-called climategate, the fake scandal years ago cooked up by the climate denial machine. It was 2009, not 2017. The organization hacked was not the DNC but the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom. The release was timed to the U.N. climate conference in Copenhagen, not the Presidential election. The documents went to climate skeptic blogs—with, interestingly, the first upload in Russia—instead of to WikiLeaks, but the mainstream media took the bait, and the political damage was done.

At the time, the New York Times wrote:

These revelations are bound to inflame the public debate as hundreds of negotiators prepare to negotiate an international climate accord at meetings in Copenhagen next month.

This climategate scheme worked so well that in November 2011, the climategate operation did it again just before the U.N. climate conference in Durban in what was dubbed climategate 2.0. Of course, the whipped-up climategate hysteria was all fake news.

As the Guardian wrote in February 2010:

Almost all the media and political discussion about the hacked climate emails has been based on soundbites publicised by professional [climate] sceptics and their blogs. In many cases, these have been taken out of context and twisted to mean something they were never intended to.

Eight times, everyone from the inspector general of the U.S. Department of Commerce, to the National Science Foundation, to the British Parliament

found no evidence of any misconduct by the scientists, but for the climate denier groups, the truth was never the point.

This climategate stunt was the product of a fake news infrastructure built by the fossil fuel industry to attack and undermine real climate science—disinformation campaigns, false-front organizations, stables of paid-for scientists, and propaganda honed by public relations experts. This denial operation aspires to mimic and rival real science, and it is an industrial-strength adversary with big advantages. It does not need to win its disputes with real science; it just needs to create the public illusion of a real dispute. It doesn't have to waste time in peer review, and it doesn't have to be true; it just has to sound like it might be. This industrial fake news operation isn't going anywhere. It is too valuable to the big polluters.

As we prepare to face down Russia's campaign of election interference, we will have to face up to these two hard facts:

If the Kremlin wants to deploy fake news information warfare in our country, the climate denial fake news infrastructure already exists. Remember, climate denial was the original fake news.

If the Kremlin wants to deploy a surreptitious financial influence campaign, the dark money infrastructure already exists. The fossil fuel industry's dark money election manipulation machinery is ready to go. Putin doesn't have to build a thing. The fossil fuel dark money and fake news infrastructure stands ready to go.

Unfortunately, we know it works because it has worked for years for the fossil fuel cartel, particularly since Citizens United allowed the fossil fuel industry to enforce silence on the Republican Party.

The dangers of fake news, dark money, climate denial, and foreign interference in our elections are all intermixed. They have brought us to the point where the President of the United States will leave the Paris Agreement, betraying the country's interests, in the service of the fossil fuel industry, the Koch brothers' climate denial operation, and Breitbart fake news.

This calls for an American response. Dark money and fake news are a sinister combination, whoever is behind them. America must address the twin threats of fake news and dark money. It is bad enough when these are the tools of the fossil fuel industry's climate denial operation, but we are on notice now. We are on notice from these reports and from multiple witnesses that the Kremlin can borrow these tools too.

I will close by asking that we clean up this mess. It may take citizen action, given the stranglehold dark

money and fake news have on Congress, but this is a fight worth having. There is no good that comes out of dark money and fake news, whoever is behind them. We should rid ourselves of this sinister combination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

REMEMBERING OTTO WARMBIER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a promising young man from Wyoming, OH—just outside of Cincinnati, my hometown—a young man whose life was drastically cut short at just 22 years of age. I rise to talk about Otto Warmbier.

Otto had all the smarts and talent you could ever ask for. He was a homecoming king and the salutatorian of the Wyoming High School class he graduated from a few years ago. He spent a summer at the London School of Economics. He was a smart kid. He won a prestigious scholarship to study at the University of Virginia. As everyone expected he would, he excelled at UVA. He got great grades. He had a thirst for learning. He loved meeting new people and hearing about their lives and their perspectives. His future was as bright as it could possibly be.

It was this smart, kindhearted young man—a college kid—who was taken prisoner by the North Korean regime for nearly 18 months. Otto's detainment and sentence were unnecessary and appalling. Neither one should have ever happened in the first place. At some point soon after being sentenced to 15 years of hard labor, from what we know, Otto suffered a severe brain injury—from what, we don't know, and we may never know.

Whom did the North Korean Government tell about this? No one. For the next 15 months or so, they kept this a secret. They denied him access to the best medical care he deserved, and they refused repeated requests for consular access that would normally be provided to those who have been detained—requests from our government, from the Obama administration, from the Trump administration, requests from the Red Cross, requests from the Swedish Government, which provides consular service for Americans in North Korea, requests from many of us here in the Capitol.

The regime unjustly imprisoned him and then lied about his severe medical condition. By the way, they continued to tell stories that make no sense. Doctors at the University of Cincinnati—some of the best doctors in the world and just the type of medical professionals Otto should have been able to see from the start—say that North Korea's claims as to what happened simply don't stand up to the evidence.

They called him a prisoner of war, but they also violated the Geneva Convention. For North Korea to imprison Otto Warmbier with no consular access

for more than a year with his medical condition and severe brain injury—it goes well beyond that. It demonstrates a complete failure to recognize fundamental human rights. Because of these actions by the North Koreans, Otto is dead. His promise has been cut short.

If there is ever any doubt about the nature of the North Korean regime—that pariah country—then Otto's case should erase all doubt. We know this regime has no regard for the rule of law or the freedoms we enjoy here, but they also have no regard for basic human rights and dignity. They have subjected hundreds of thousands of their own people to mistreatment, torture, and death for decades. They are now extending that treatment to innocent Americans. North Korea should be universally condemned for its abhorrent behavior and be held accountable for its actions.

Otto's family—God bless them—tried everything they could to bring Otto home. For 18 months—and for almost 16 months not knowing of his dire condition—they were steadfast and resilient, trying everything they could.

I was there with Fred and Cindy Warmbier when Otto finally returned from North Korea. He came home. It was incredibly emotional to watch Otto be reunited with his loving family. I believe he knew he was back home. I believe he knew he was among those who loved him.

I want to thank State Department Special Representative Joe Yun, Deputy Secretary Sullivan, and Secretary Tillerson for their work to help secure Otto's release last week and to bring him home.

There are still three Americans who are being detained by the North Koreans. They should be released immediately, and we should do everything we can do as a country to secure their release.

Otto's case is a reminder that we must, on the one hand, increase pressure on North Korea to force them to change. There will soon be more to discuss on that. At the same time, we have to maintain an open line of communication to deal with the deadly serious issues we face. Those are some of the lessons I have taken from the last 18 months.

Fred, Cindy, and the entire Warmbier family have been incredibly strong through this ordeal. No one should have to go through what that family has experienced. My wife Jane and I will continue to be at their side, including at the funeral service tomorrow in Wyoming, OH.

I urge my colleagues and everybody listening at home to continue to hold up this family in prayer, but also let's ensure that this tragedy is a wake-up call about the true nature of this brutal regime.

Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, President Trump said last week that the healthcare bill passed by the House was “mean,” and then he said the Senate should make the bill more “generous, kind [and] with heart.” It sounds like the President is having second thoughts about this Republican bill.

So now, Mr. President, you are waking up and noticing just how heartless this bill is; you know, the bill your Republican buddies in Congress slapped together in a back room; you know, the one you celebrated with a big press conference in the Rose Garden a few weeks ago; you know, the bill that you and House Republicans gave each other high fives over for taking away healthcare from millions of people, and now it sounds like you want a do-over.

Too bad no one explained to the President that mean is just part of the deal the Republicans have struck. Mean is baked into every sentence of this bill. When you set out to trade health insurance of millions of American families for massive tax cuts for the wealthy, things get real mean fast.

This mean bill does a lot of things, but some of the meanest things about it are how hard it will hit American women. To pay for the hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts for this bill, Republicans chose to make one of their classic moves—a sort of old reliable for Republican men: attack women's healthcare.

Let's run through just a few examples. Today, most people helped by Medicaid are women. The Republican bill cuts Medicaid by \$834 billion. Republicans say millions of women who lose healthcare will do just fine.

Today, plans on the individual market have to cover maternity care and treatment for postpartum depression. The Republican bill says: Forget it. Let the States drop those benefits. Women are the only ones using them anyway.

Today, the law says you can't charge women more by labeling things like pregnancy as preexisting conditions. The Republican bill says: Who cares? Go for it.

Today, women can choose healthcare providers they trust the most, but the Republicans want to eliminate that choice by cutting funding for Planned Parenthood. Republicans say women can do just fine without the care they need.

Frankly, I am sick of many coming down to the Senate floor to explain to Republicans what Planned Parenthood does. I am sick of explaining that it provides millions of women with birth control, cancer screenings, and STI tests every year. I am sick of pointing out, again and again, that Federal dollars do not fund abortion services at Planned Parenthood or anywhere else. Women come to the floor, we explain, we cite facts, but Republicans would rather base healthcare policy on politics than on facts.

Speaker RYAN called this mean bill pro-life, but this is just the biggest political play of all. Calling something pro-life will not keep women from dying in back-alley abortions. It will not help women pay for the cancer screenings that could save their lives. It will not help them take care of their families, have safe sex, or afford their medical bills. The pro-life label is the Republicans playing politics with women's lives.

Let's be blunt. The Republican bill will make it more likely—not less likely—that women and their children will die. Women aren't fools. We can feel the difference. We can tell the difference between reality and lies, and that is why we are here today. That is why we are fighting back on the Senate floor today.

Right now, 13 Senators—all men—are sitting in a room writing revisions to the secret Republican bill. These 13 men will not show us the bill and will not hold hearings on its contents. Just in case anyone missed the point, please note that all 13 of these men have already voted during their time in the Senate to reduce women's access to contraception and abortion. Republicans have told the press that Americans shouldn't worry about the fact that women are shut out because "reduc[ing]" the 13 men to their gender is a "game . . . of identity politics."

This is not identity politics, and it is certainly not a game. This bill will affect every woman in this country, and we know what is going on behind closed doors: 13 men are trading away women's healthcare for tax cuts for the rich.

American women deserve better than this mean Republican bill, and American women are here to fight back.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak 5 minutes before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOMINATION OF MARSHALL BILLINGSLEA

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in support of Mr. Marshall Billingslea, who has been nominated to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorist Financing.

Mr. Billingslea proved at his nomination hearing before the Banking Committee that he is exceptionally qualified for this job. As Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Mr. Billingslea would be in charge of coordinating Treasury's efforts on terrorist financing, anti-money laundering, and other illicit financial threats to the domestic and international financial system.

Mr. Billingslea would work with the entire national security and law enforcement communities, the private

sector, foreign governments, and other entities to carry out this mission.

As demonstrated at his confirmation hearing, his unique background includes 22 years of experience working with these entities to protect the Nation, and it also includes time in the legislative and executive branches, as well as the private sector. After 9/11, Mr. Billingslea served in senior positions in the Department of Defense and NATO. Prior to that, he worked on national security affairs at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where he drafted numerous pieces of sections of legislation intended to combat weapons of mass destruction and disrupt terrorist networks.

Mr. Billingslea's qualifications and capabilities were affirmed when he received bipartisan support from the Banking Committee in a 19-to-4 vote.

Before we proceed to the cloture vote on Mr. Billingslea, we will have a final vote on Ms. Sigal Mandelker's nomination to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, which I spoke about yesterday.

These two positions are critically important to defending our Nation from threats and securing our interests. As Assistant Secretary, Mr. Billingslea would work closely with Ms. Mandelker as head of the policy and outreach apparatus for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which Ms. Mandelker would lead.

As we saw with the Senate passage of the Iran sanctions bill and our Russia sanctions amendment last week, there is strong bipartisan support in Congress to remain strong against these Nations. As with the passage of that bill, I urge my colleagues to confirm Ms. Mandelker and to move forward with Mr. Billingslea's nomination so they can carry out the important work for which we have already shown such strong bipartisan support.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Mandelker nomination?

Mr. STRANGE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 150 Ex.]

#### YEAS—96

|            |          |              |
|------------|----------|--------------|
| Alexander  | Cantwell | Corker       |
| Baldwin    | Capito   | Cornyn       |
| Barrasso   | Cardin   | Cortez Masto |
| Bennet     | Carper   | Cotton       |
| Blumenthal | Casey    | Crapo        |
| Blunt      | Cassidy  | Cruz         |
| Boozman    | Cochran  | Daines       |
| Brown      | Collins  | Donnelly     |
| Burr       | Coons    | Duckworth    |

|           |           |            |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Durbin    | Klobuchar | Rounds     |
| Enzi      | Lankford  | Rubio      |
| Ernst     | Leahy     | Sanders    |
| Feinstein | Lee       | Sasse      |
| Fischer   | Manchin   | Schatz     |
| Flake     | Markey    | Schumer    |
| Franken   | McCain    | Scott      |
| Gardner   | McCaskill | Shaheen    |
| Graham    | McConnell | Shelby     |
| Grassley  | Menendez  | Stabenow   |
| Hassan    | Merkley   | Strange    |
| Hatch     | Moran     | Sullivan   |
| Heinrich  | Murkowski | Tester     |
| Heitkamp  | Murphy    | Thune      |
| Heller    | Murray    | Tillis     |
| Hirono    | Nelson    | Toomey     |
| Hoeven    | Paul      | Udall      |
| Inhofe    | Perdue    | Van Hollen |
| Isakson   | Peters    | Warner     |
| Johnson   | Portman   | Whitehouse |
| Kaine     | Reed      | Wicker     |
| Kennedy   | Risch     | Wyden      |
| King      | Roberts   | Young      |

#### NAYS—4

|            |        |
|------------|--------|
| Booker     | Harris |
| Gillibrand | Warren |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin Hatch, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Steve Daines, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Tom Cotton, Roger Wicker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 151 Ex.]

YEAS—65

|           |           |           |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Alexander | Ernst     | Murkowski |
| Baldwin   | Fischer   | Nelson    |
| Barrasso  | Flake     | Paul      |
| Bennet    | Gardner   | Perdue    |
| Blunt     | Graham    | Portman   |
| Boozman   | Grassley  | Risch     |
| Burr      | Hatch     | Roberts   |
| Capito    | Heitkamp  | Rounds    |
| Cardin    | Heller    | Rubio     |
| Cassidy   | Hoeven    | Sasse     |
| Cochran   | Inhofe    | Scott     |
| Collins   | Isakson   | Shelby    |
| Coons     | Johnson   | Strange   |
| Corker    | Kaine     | Sullivan  |
| Cornyn    | Kennedy   | Tester    |
| Cotton    | King      | Thune     |
| Crapo     | Lankford  | Tillis    |
| Cruz      | Lee       | Toomey    |
| Daines    | Manchin   | Warner    |
| Donnelly  | McCaskill | Wicker    |
| Duckworth | McConnell | Young     |
| Enzi      | Moran     |           |

NAYS—34

|              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Blumenthal   | Hassan    | Sanders    |
| Booker       | Heinrich  | Schatz     |
| Brown        | Hirono    | Schumer    |
| Cantwell     | Klobuchar | Shaheen    |
| Carper       | Markey    | Stabenow   |
| Casey        | McCain    | Udall      |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez  | Van Hollen |
| Durbin       | Merkley   | Warren     |
| Feinstein    | Murphy    | Whitehouse |
| Franken      | Murray    | Wyden      |
| Gillibrand   | Peters    |            |
| Harris       | Reed      |            |

NOT VOTING—1

Leahy

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 34.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

FREE SPEECH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to touch on a topic that, as I announced recently, I am going to continue to speak about in the coming weeks and months on the Senate floor; that is, the right of free speech.

This fundamental right is one of our most cherished. It forms the beating heart of our democracy. It sits at the core of our civic identity. Yet, these days, it seems to be coming under an increasing threat all across our country.

The challenges it faces are different from what we have seen in the recent past, but we must confront these, too, if we are to preserve this right for future generations. That is certainly what I intend to do. I know others share that commitment, and I hope more colleagues will join in this effort as well.

Our colleagues know this is a topic I have devoted a large part of my career

to. Throughout the Obama years, I warned that our ability to freely engage in civic life and organize in defense of our beliefs was under coordinated assault from an administration that appeared determined to shut up anyone—anyone—who challenged it. These efforts to suppress speech were well documented, they extended throughout the Federal Government, and they were often aided by the Obama administration's allies here in Congress.

There were threats before then as well. I know, because I took up the fight against many of them. Sometimes it was a lonely battle. Often it was an unpopular one, but, in my view, it was necessary because whether the threats to free speech came from the IRS or the Obama administration's SEC, they shared a similar goal: to shut down or scare off the stage those who chose to think differently.

Today, however, the threat to free speech is evolving. The speech suppression crowd may no longer control the levers of Federal power, but it hasn't given up its commitment to silencing those with an opposing view.

Yesterday, in the Judiciary Committee, Chairman GRASSLEY held a hearing to explore the worsening problem of a lack of tolerance on college campuses—imagine that, college campuses of all places—for the views of others—lack of tolerance on college campuses for the views of others. One of the witnesses at the hearing was Floyd Abrams, whom our former colleague Senator Moynihan rightly described as “the most significant First Amendment lawyer of our age.” Mr. Abrams noted that we are witnessing “an extraordinary perilous moment with respect to free speech on campuses” where “too many students . . . seem to want to see and hear only views they already hold. And to prevent others from hearing views with which they differ.”

So what could account for this?

A profound lack of information is one answer. For example, Mr. Abrams cites a study where “nearly a third of college students could not even identify the First Amendment as the one that deals with freedom of speech.”

The day before, across the street, the Supreme Court reminded us of the importance of a vibrant right to free speech, where its exercise does not depend upon the sufferance of the government.

In striking down the disparagement clause of Federal trademark law, the Court reminded us of what too many of those on college campuses appear not to have learned, and too many others seem to have forgotten: “Speech may not be banned on the ground that it expresses ideas that offend.” “Speech may not be banned on the ground that it expresses ideas that offend.”

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education estimates there were 43

reported instances of revoked speaking invitations or similar efforts to block speakers on campuses just last year. That is double the number recorded the previous year. It is more than 700 percent higher than the six incidents recorded back in 2000.

The trend is getting worse, not simply in terms of the overall number of incidents but—more worryingly—in terms of the growing aggressiveness of those efforts. This year alone, there have been multiple instances of intimidation, violence, and rioting at universities across the country.

There has been nasty and thuggish behavior aimed at suppressing speech. Sadly, it has often succeeded.

As USA TODAY put it in a recent editorial:

In just the place where the clash of ideas is most valuable, students are shutting themselves off to points of view they don't agree with. At the moment when young minds are supposed to assess the strengths and weaknesses of arguments, they are answering challenges to their beliefs with anger and violence instead of facts and reason.

This should worry all of us, regardless of party, regardless of ideology.

Hearing criticisms of one's beliefs and learning the beliefs of others is simply training for life in a democratic society. It doesn't mean one has to agree with those opinions, but no one is served by trapping oneself and others in cocoons of ignorance. That is hardly the recipe for a free and informed society.

To quote Frederick Douglass, “To suppress free speech is a double wrong [because] it violates the rights of the hearer as well as those of the speaker.”

Just as it was not right during the Obama years for Americans to endure harassment or incur crippling expenses because the government didn't like what they believed, it certainly is not right today for Americans to live in the shadow of fear simply because they dare to speak up or think differently or support a candidate or a cause that the speech suppression crowd may disagree with.

It really doesn't matter who you are or whether what you are saying is popular. These rights do not exist to protect what is popular; they exist precisely to protect what isn't.

That is one reason I have long opposed ideas like the flag-burning constitutional amendment. That doesn't mean I agree the flag should be burned. Of course, I don't. I disagree strongly, but it is the principle that matters because the moment we allow ourselves to believe that some people stand outside the free speech protections of the First Amendment, then we are all in trouble—all of us.

The growing trend of intolerance we are seeing has taken many forms lately, but the underlying hostility to free speech has not changed. As I noted earlier, in recent years, the threat had often come from the Federal Government. These days, the threat tends to

come from different quarters. There have been many high-profile incidents of speech suppression and violence at universities across the country, in particular, but it would be a mistake to think this problem is isolated to college campuses.

The bottom line, for me, is this: We simply cannot allow this trend of violence and intimidation to become the new normal in our country. This is a really serious problem that deserves serious attention. The solutions will not come simply. They will not be found in a single piece of legislation.

As President Reagan famously put it, “Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn’t pass it on to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on to them to do the same.”

That is what we are called upon to do again now—to inform, to engage, to empower; in the end, to inspire a new generation to defend a fundamental right for future generations, just as past generations did for us.

That is what I aim to do by continuing this dialogue on the Senate floor. From this platform, I will continue to raise the importance of free speech, outline the threats it faces, and do what I can to inform and encourage Americans to rally in its defense.

Others are using their platforms to advance similar goals, as Chairman GRASSLEY did yesterday. I hope more will join as this discussion continues because free speech is crucial to who we are as Americans, regardless of party, and we owe it to future generations to do what we can today to defend it.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### TRIBUTE TO RECIPIENTS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate this year’s winners of the Congressional Award. Established by Congress in 1979, the award recognizes the achievements of young Americans between the ages of 14 and 23 years old. It celebrates their accomplishment in four program areas: voluntary public service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration.

The Award challenges participants to set goals in an area that interests them. If they successfully achieve their

goals, they earn bronze, silver, and gold certificates and medals. Through the program, these young Americans gain new skills, earn greater confidence, and position themselves to be productive citizens.

Each year in June, these young people are presented their Congressional Awards at a ceremony here in our Nation’s Capital. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, I would like to congratulate all of the winners for their accomplishments and for the example they set for others. Among this impressive group, my State of Kentucky is home to five medalists. Through their efforts, the recipients of the 2017 Congressional Awards are strengthening their communities and our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of this year’s recipients of the Congressional Award be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama: Madison Haney.  
Arizona: Piyaporn Chivatanaporn, Ayesha Ahsan, Jacob Cryder, Emily Hartzler, Jacob Matsumoto.

California: Alannah Ruiz, Edward Jung, Nathaniel Chien, Katie Wong, Abhiraj Chowdhury, Hannah Lee, Conrad Chu, Riya Dholia, Ethan Teo, Kai Fisher, Megan Pollon, Minyoung Cho, Michael Ngan, Reed Fundter, Hee Won Jung, Suzie Kim, Yoojin Kim, Jonathan Liu, William Choi, Naomi Kim, Austin Noll, Daniel Hong, YuYing Dai, Steven Gi, Hyeun Lee, Kayla Samini, Alexander Kang, Tiffany Kim, Lina Kim, Pranit Kumaran, Danielle Lee, Jihyun Woo, Sung Ho Woo, Jung Hyo Baik, Snghyun Byon, Gordon Chan, David Huh, Jordan Jennison, Beom Kim, Katherine Kim, Ha Young Kong, Brandon Lee, Connie Lee, Eric Lee, Harris Liou, Hasan Liou, Jacob Nam, Daniel Jewon Choi, Dean Colarossi, Connor Fiddler, Emily Ha, Jeimin Ha, Sonia Kim, Yena Kim, Alice Lee, Tyler Nguyen, Peter Stewart, Jennifer Yi, Yan Zhang, Hee Won Jung, Jamie Ostmann, Janice Park, Katrina Chan, Jaeyub Chung, Alexander Scott, David Bao, Jake Leung, Lauren Rennecker, Naomi Kim.  
Colorado: Edwin Bodoni, Spencer Christensen.

Connecticut: Rachel Goldstein, Sydney Tabor, Ann Wechsler, Christian Yon.

Delaware: Kayleigh Barnes, Micah Petersen.

Florida: John Finelli, Jean-Paul Recht, Joshua Florkowski, Ronald Florkowski, Amir Kamrani, Alexis Behne Sharma, Julie Bicknell, Stephanie Brookshire, Christian Cropp, James Dowling, Nicole Ferruggia, Reece Haire, Caitlin Hiscock, Garrett Holmes, Aalisha Jaisinghani, Rachel Maunus, Jack McGinley, Ben Meyerson, Olivia Perez, Sofia Perez, Diana Pinkham, Cameron Pirozzi, Jonathan Prokos, Shelby Russo, Brianna Steidle, Sabrina Uvanile, Cali Vaughn, Jesse Katzeff, Brendan Shipley, Jillian Hanley, Srijith Nair, Colleen Murray, Sofia Santa-Cruz.

Georgia: Margaret Silliman, Rachael Liu, Cristina Dalton.

Idaho: Samuel Cuentas, Rebecca Levi, Christiana Stone, Jesse Cole, Annabelle Day, Solveig Norton.

Illinois: Natalia Czachorowski, Mary Kupianczyk, Samia Abdul-Qadir, Adam Koszyk, Jason Yang, Clayton Pope, DeAnna Pope.

Indiana: Lauren Ciulla, Matthew Frye, Emily Huff.

Iowa: Susan Alverio.

Kansas: Vasavi Garimella, Jared Gillen, Arjun Mahajan, Ryan Mohamadi, Katherine Walsworth, Irfan Ansari.

Kentucky: Katherine Speece, John Garland, Zachariah Kiser, Mackenzie Rigney, Kayla Sears.

Louisiana: Sean Thomas.

Maryland: Hansel Motiram, Ryan Briscoe, Madeline Carwile, Lucy Lee, WeiAnne Reidy, Alix MacKillop, Clara da Silva, Nikhil Swaminathan.

Massachusetts: Mikayla Steele, Alexandra Duplin, Ishan Shukla, Harrison Theodore, Maria Theodore.

Michigan: Emily Deese, Jeremy Tang, Emma Hicks, Sara Trojanowski, Emily Prokop, Thomas Libcke.

Minnesota: Emily Baer, Matthew Baer, Braden OConnor, Payton Puerzer.

Mississippi: Lane Mitchell, Abby Pitts, Mammie Albritton.

Missouri: Olivia Hoijarvi, Allison Licavoli, Natalie Dameron.

Nebraska: Luis Sanchez-Romo, John Paul Terneus, Terese Navarra, Ethan Nelson.

Nevada: David Tegtmeier, Sara Tegtmeier, Neha Zafar, Taimur Khalid.

New Jersey: Satchel Bell, Funda Akilli, David Crain III, Michael Doliszy, Madison Gandy, Marta Majewski, Amanda Olivio, Urvi Patel, Anthony Uzzolina, Andrew Laberee, Dominic Esposito, Christopher Lauria, Mitchell Lauria, Maya Ravichandran, Allison Wetherell, Erica Wu, Rahul Yerrabelli, Nicholas Coleburn, Ryan Robert Murphy, Vaed Prasad, Felicia Aschettino, Madilyn Somers, Lindsay Fogel, Maura Herbertson, Thiago Santos, Elena Boal, Priya Vulchi.

New York: Heejin Han, Christopher Kim, Naome Sajmani, Genevieve Bruen, Edward McCabe, Santo Tiralosi, Mahika Had, Fiona Dubrosa, William Gregson, Allison Herskovitz, Zachary Kunow, Kathleen Schofield, Lucas Zhao, Charles Siragusa, Gabriel Curcione.

North Carolina: Holly Hutcheson, Jacob Rowe, Emma Morris, Thomas Douglas, Capri D’Souza, Caroline Fitzgerald, Lauraleigh Guthrie, Jack Maginnes, Delaney Dunlap, Jenna Viveiros, Bennett David, Ashley Jamison, Kathryn Ellis, Jordan Feldman, Lawton Gresham.

Ohio: Natalie Carter, Ellen Haney, Pakrush Katragadda, Katherine Skelly, Max Lee, Hannah Addington, Arihant Chordia, Vidur Prasad, Sanjana Yerubandi, Laurel Grae, Jaidev Sharma, Alan Ai, Dusstyn Reynolds.

Oklahoma: Luisamaria Rubio.

Oregon: Kendall Fleshman, Megan Baumhardt.

Pennsylvania: Nisha Arya, Joshita Varshney, Elizabeth Belka, Victoria Belka, Noah Berkowitz, Seth Berkowitz, Lindsay Fullerton, Samantha Gable, Jasna Janikic, Erin Markham, Emily Matthews, Swathi Prakash, Anthony Radcliffe, Kristen Sparhawk, Stephanie Waldstein, Indra Alagar, Jaya Alagar, Krishnan Alagar, Rajan Alagar, Sarah Laible, Teja Polisetty.

Rhode Island: Aidan Sowa, Ryan Sowa.

South Carolina: Maggie Bowyer, Mary Grace Shannon, Jeremy Ward.

Tennessee: Evan Ladd, Carmen Ross, Grant Gammon.

Texas: Chelsea Parrott, Briana Gonzalez, Ruveyda Karaca, Almaas Khan, Gopal Raman, Monica Attaway, Edward Cen, Adam Hoffman, BJ Kim, Animate Mazurek, Miki Somosot, Srikar Anantha, Tejna Dasari,



Ashish Dave, Shrey Derasari, Siri Jois, Emily Jue, Eric Li, Rahul Popat, Charles Wang, Lauren Yang, Elizabeth Zhang, Darrel Dennis, James Hefner, Jarrod Clark, Shan Su, Joseph Nemec.

Utah: Hannah Brau, Mariah Pay, Payam Rasheed, Sofia Tiratto, Madison Arriaza, Saja Hassoun, McKenna O'Connor.

Virginia: Caroline Yi, Jordan Hibbs, Kimberly Laker, Lisa Huang, Pavan Krishnan.

Washington: Andrew Chin, David Singleton, Benjamin Stewart, John McManis, Rachel Demaree, Isabella Maehl, Katherine Chen, Nathan Chen, Nicholas Grosinger, Alexandra Marsh, Jessica Waller, William Waller.

West Virginia: Alonzo Webb.

Wyoming: Bailey Anderson, Grace Anderson, Lexi Bedard, Maxwell Bockmann, Sara Brennecke, Molly Burns, Tanner Laurence Christensen, Kaitlyn Erramouspe, Elexis Forgey, Benjamin Gallagher, Daniel Garcia, Liam Guille, Charlotte Hecht, Jarom Herring, Lily Joslin, Carli Knight, Konnar Knotwell, Cassidy Little, Thomas Lubnau III, Gregory Marchal, Patrick Marchal, Conner Martin, Luke McIlvain, Nicholas Nelson, Megan Pachniak, Giovanni Pizzato, McKenzie Powell, Devrae Russell, Karen Russell, Meagan Skolnick, Jaycie Wells, Ben Wetzell.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, on June 5, 2017, the Senate adopted S. Res. 176, a resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem. I am a cosponsor of this resolution. Unfortunately, I missed the vote due to a delayed flight. If I were in Washington, DC, during the time of this vote, I would have cast my vote in support of this resolution.

#### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, earlier this month, the Senate passed by voice vote the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017. I recognize this bill is the result of a bipartisan compromise, and I commend Senator TESTER, ranking member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, for his efforts to find agreement on this particularly challenging issue.

Everyone in a position of public trust, particularly those serving at the VA, must be held accountable for their actions. Whistleblowers must also be protected so that misconduct can be brought to light. This balance between accountability and transparency is essential to ensure that the services provided to the public—particularly to veterans—are of the highest quality and that we can attract the best and brightest to Federal service.

Unfortunately, while the bill passed by Congress seeks to strike the appropriate balance, I remain seriously concerned about some of the bill's provisions which would expedite the process

of terminating employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, by reducing current due process protections.

To ensure the integrity of the Federal civil service, it is essential that Federal employees have access to constitutionally protected due process rights. Specifically, the bill lowered the evidentiary standard for firing rank-and-file employees for misconduct from "preponderance" of the evidence, 50 percent or more, to substantial, 30 percent or more. Reducing due process protections for rank-and-file VA employees in this manner will make it harder for the Federal Government to attract the best and brightest to public service.

During the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee's consideration of the bill, I cosponsored an amendment offered by Senator BROWN to strike the section of the bill lowering the evidentiary standard. Unfortunately, the amendment was not adopted. Going forward, I intend to closely monitor the VA's implementation of the act to see that these new authorities are not abused in order to retaliate against VA workers. Not only would this be unfair, but it would also exacerbate the Department's challenging retention issues.

I am also disappointed that this bill does not address the longstanding recruitment and retention issues facing the VA. According to the VA, there are over 30,000 vacancies across the VA, including over 150 in Hawaii, for frontline medical personnel that this administration has not filled as of the end of January 2017.

The over 40,000 veterans in Hawaii who are enrolled in the VA healthcare system deserve the best healthcare and highest ethical and professional standards from those they depend on to provide that care. While we must ensure whistleblowers can come forward without fear of retaliation and those who violate the pub trust are held accountable, the VA cannot effectively carry out its mission without being fully staffed.

While this legislation was supported by VA Secretary Shulkin and makes some useful changes to improve accountability, we still have much work to do to ensure that veterans in Hawaii and across the country have access to the best healthcare we can provide.

Therefore, going forward, I will closely monitor the VA's implementation of this law to ensure that the changes made are not abused. I will also continue working to see that the staff vacancies in Hawaii and across the country are filled with qualified personnel.

#### MINORITY HEALTH

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed by the secrecy that has been employed by my colleagues in their reckless attempts to

gut the Affordable Care Act. It is clear to me that, in the absence of hearings, of public debate, and of any bill text at all, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will go to any length to suppress the undeniable successes associated with the Affordable Care Act.

Unfortunately, that now includes blocking a noncontroversial resolution to promote and bring awareness to National Minority Health Month simply because the text contains facts about the Affordable Care Act. They have decided that concealing the reality of what the Affordable Care Act has brought to minority communities is more important than promoting minority health.

I am proud to help lead this resolution with Senator CARDIN and my colleagues here this afternoon because raising awareness and finding ways to promote minority health is critically important to the future of our Nation and should be a shared priority amongst my colleagues. As of last year, over half of nonelderly Americans who lacked insurance were people of color and minorities face increased barriers when trying to access the care that is available to them.

In the past, our Republican colleagues worked with us on this resolution, which is why it has seen bipartisan and unanimous support. Now, however, like the secret healthcare bill they are drafting behind closed doors, they have turned an important and commonsense resolution into a political football, refusing to pass it unless it is stripped of any and all facts that don't fit their false narrative on the Affordable Care Act. The fact of the matter is that the Affordable Care Act has worked for minority communities. The Affordable Care Act has reduced the uninsured rate for minority communities by at least 35 percent.

It has led to a 7 percent drop in the uninsured rate amongst African Americans and has cut the uninsured rate for Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders in half. It has provided new protections for American Indians and Native Alaskans while cutting the uninsured rate amongst those communities by nearly 10 percent. The facts show that minorities have seen some of the largest gains in health insurance coverage under the Affordable Care Act and, despite the work we still have before us, have more access to affordable coverage than ever before.

Still, many in minority communities struggle to obtain coverage and receive quality care, despite chronic diseases disproportionately impacting many minority groups. That is why the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which was created to address and prevent chronic disease under the ACA, is so critical to minority health. That is also why these same communities will

yet again feel the brunt of these callous and misguided cuts should the prevention fund be eliminated along with the ACA.

African Americans are twice as likely to die from diabetes as White Americans. Thankfully, the prevention fund has invested \$291 million in diabetes prevention. Latino women are 44 percent more likely to be diagnosed with cervical cancer than White women. Therefore, the prevention fund has invested \$218 million in breast and cervical cancer prevention. Overall, the prevention fund has invested \$227 million to the Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health Program.

But eliminating the prevention fund wouldn't just negatively impact minority communities. In Connecticut, the Fund has invested over \$27 million in our communities since 2010, improving the lives and well-being of people there every day.

This strong investment has provided more Connecticut women with screenings for cancer. It has given our State health department the ability to better prevent diabetes, heart disease, and stroke and fight obesity through improved physical activity. It has allowed Connecticut to address school health more successfully, enriching our children's lives and inspiring a new generation of more healthy and happy citizens. It has provided the Connecticut Immunization Program with nearly half of its funding, with the program stating they "don't know how we could continue to exist without this funding."

Should the Affordable Care Act be repealed and the Prevention Fund eliminated, with TrumpCare cruelly and inadequately thrust upon our Nation in its place, the consequences would be devastating, not only for minority communities, but for the country as a whole. Bottom line: the Affordable Care Act has improved access to quality and affordable healthcare for all Americans and particularly for those that need it the most.

I sincerely hope that my Republican colleagues stop denying, ignoring, and concealing that the Affordable Care Act—and the minority communities that benefited from it—has helped our Nation's health. I stand ready to build upon the great strides made in improving minority health since the Affordable Care Act, and I hope my colleagues are ready to do the same. Thank you.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

#### RECOGNIZING THE LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate

the Little Rock Air Force Base, LRAFB, Community Council team on their recognition as the 2017 Association of Defense Communities Member of the Year. This prestigious honor is indicative of the community council's exceptional and unwavering commitment for the past 62 years to the Department of Defense, U.S. Air Force, U.S. Air Force Reserve, and Arkansas National Guard. These organizations, along with the LRAFB surrounding communities, form the celebrated Team Little Rock.

Since its founding in 1955, Little Rock Air Force Base has enjoyed a tremendous amount of support, respect, and appreciation from within the local community. The LRAFB Community Council, comprised of dedicated local civic leaders, has passionately championed the base's mission, while fostering partnership efforts between the military and civilian communities. Furthermore, as the Department of Defense and U.S. Air Force have faced an unprecedented 8 years of fiscal uncertainty, the community council has remained a steadfast leader and staunch advocate for the Team Little Rock mission, its airmen, and their families.

The LRAFB Community Council long ago established an enduring relationship with its Arkansas congressional delegation to ensure a sustained awareness of base needs, successes, and challenges. This outstanding example of leadership demonstrates the community council's commitment to building a dedicated and resilient community network around Little Rock's sole Air Force installation.

The level of collaboration between the community council and Team Little Rock is simply unprecedented. For example, Jacksonville and Little Rock have adopted ordinances and regulations preventing civilian encroachment that would impede aircraft operations, while many military-civilian initiatives have been formulated to offer mutual services, thus improving quality of life on both sides of the fence. Moreover, the Jacksonville fire department and emergency services team regularly participate in both exercises and real-world scenarios with their military counterparts. Finally, Arkansas Governor Asa Hutchinson appointed past community council president Brad Hegeman to chair the Governor's military affairs committee in order to address the assets, economic impact, benefits, and needs of military installations and military-related businesses throughout Arkansas.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have consistently witnessed the extraordinary and tireless support received by Team Little Rock on behalf of the Little Rock Air Force Base Community Council. The entire community council team is very deserving of this incredible honor, and I am thrilled to officially recognize them as the 2017

Association of Defense Communities Member of the Year. Congratulations, Team Little Rock.●

#### TRIBUTE TO WENDY NOREN

• Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, fair elections and voting rights for all Americans are integral to our way of life. Today I wish to honor a dedicated public servant and great Missourian who has spent her entire career ensuring these principals for Boone Countians, Missourians, and people of the United States, Ms. Wendy Noren. After 39 years in the Boone County clerk's office—35 as the Boone County clerk—Ms. Noren is resigning on June 23, 2017.

Wendy began her service to Boone County as deputy county clerk in 1972. She won her first election to county clerk in 1982 and won the next eight consecutive elections, only once having an opponent.

In addition to registering generations of Missourians to vote, Wendy has worked tirelessly during the last 35 years to ensure smooth, fair, and accurate elections and results. She is a leading election expert at local, State, Federal, and international levels. Some of her accomplishments include serving as an international elections monitor in Albania in 1997 and again in Bosnia in 2001; in 2008, she hosted international election experts studying methods for conducting elections. As the legislative chair of the Missouri County Clerks and Election Authorities, she helped draft several Missouri election law reforms, assisted in writing the Help America Vote Act, and was a part of the reformation of national election policies after the 2000 election. Ms. Noren has been reappointed to the US Election Assistance Commission every 2 years since first being appointed in 2004.

Closer to Missourians' hearts, Wendy is implicitly trusted for her fairness and accuracy and her tireless devotion to ensuring all Missourians have the opportunity to vote. Concerned that rural counties couldn't afford election expenses prompted by the Help America Vote Act, she advocated that the Federal Government assist local election authorities to implement the law. She has been an early adapter of technology to assist voters to register, to be informed about elections, and to securely cast their votes. For instance, rather than using the existing software to join a federally required voter registration database, she developed her own, saving taxpayers approximately \$125,000.

I ask today that my fellow Senators join me in recognizing Wendy Noren, Missouri's own "Empress of Elections," as a great Missourian, Boone Countian, and public servant dedicated to ensuring all Americans—and, indeed, citizens of the world—are able to participate in fair, free elections.●

# RECOGNIZING MONTPELIER SENIOR ACTIVITY CENTER

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this month we celebrate the Montpelier Senior Activity Center's 50th anniversary. For half a century, the center has provided opportunities for healthy aging and lifelong learning that enhance the quality of life for seniors. The Montpelier Senior Activity Center, established in 1967 and nestled in our State's capital, has the mission of enhancing the quality of life for the older adults in the Montpelier area by developing physical, mental, cultural, social, and economic well-being in a welcoming and flexible environment.

A Nation is judged by how it cares for its most vulnerable. It is undeniable that we are living in a time when many Vermonters and Americans are having to do more with less and the most vulnerable among us are making the unacceptable decisions like choosing between paying for healthcare, food on the table, or a roof over their head. In Vermont, more than 11,000 seniors are living in poverty.

At a time of massive political discontent, we need to focus on building up, not dismantling, our communities. In Montpelier, VT, just that is happening, as seniors are able to access services that help them live out their lives in dignity.

The center serves more than 1,000 seniors every year, including more than one of every five seniors in Montpelier. In 2016, the Montpelier Senior Activity Center provided more than 17,000 nutritious home-delivered and community meals for seniors. More than 80 percent of senior activity center participants report that their participation makes them feel healthier.

The Montpelier Senior Activity Center celebrated its 50-year anniversary on Saturday, June 10, 2017. To know that seniors have been able to access supportive care and resources for so long and have truly become a well-established part of the community is commendable. As Montpelier Senior Activity Center Day is commemorated, please understand that the center's work saves and empowers countless lives. I join the Montpelier community to celebrate this milestone anniversary.●

# 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SUMMIT, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Summit, SD. The town of Summit will be celebrating its quasiquicentennial on June 23 through 25, 2017. Summit will host quasiquicentennial events, which include school tours, alumni gatherings, a craft and flea market, competitions, tournaments, and a parade.

Summit is located in the Coteau des Prairies in Roberts County. The Summit area has long been known as a

community enriched with various outdoor activities, such as fishing, hunting, and camping. Since its founding 125 years ago, the community of Summit continues to serve as a strong example of South Dakota values and traditions. It is also known as the location of the annual Fog Fest.

I offer my congratulations to the citizens of Summit on their quasiquicentennial celebration and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

## PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

### REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DE- CLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13466 OF JUNE 26, 2008, WITH RE- SPECT TO NORTH KOREA—PM 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with that provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to North Korea declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, addressed further in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2017.

The existence and risk of proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula; the actions and policies of the Government of North Korea that destabilize the Korean Peninsula and imperil United States Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region, including its pursuit of nuclear and missile programs; and other provocative, desta-

bilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea, continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to North Korea.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 21, 2017.

### REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DE- CLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13219 OF JUNE 26, 2001, WITH RE- SPECT TO THE WESTERN BAL- KANS—PM 11

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with that provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 25, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond June 25, 2017.

The threat constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, has not been resolved. In addition, Executive Order 13219 was amended by Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, to take additional steps with respect to acts obstructing implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement of 2001 relating to Macedonia.

The acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in these Executive Orders are hostile to United States interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national

emergency with respect to the Western Balkans.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 21, 2017.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 625. An act to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1393. An act to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

H.R. 1551. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities.

H.R. 2132. An act to require the implementation of a redress process and review of the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules for aviation security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2190. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's real property portfolio, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2283. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2484. An act to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

H.R. 2742. An act to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to adopt an electronic system to help expedite the placement of children in foster care or guardianship, or for adoption, across State lines, and to provide funding to aid States in developing such a system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2834. An act to improve the well-being of, and improve permanency outcomes for, children and families affected by heroin, opioids, and other substance abuse.

H.R. 2847. An act to make improvements to the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and related provisions.

H.R. 2857. An act to support foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse.

H.R. 2866. An act to review and improve licensing standards for placement in a relative foster family home.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1238) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security

related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1094. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 625. An act to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1393. An act to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2132. An act to require the implementation of a redress process and review of the Transportation Security Administration's intelligence-based screening rules for aviation security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2190. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's real property portfolio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2283. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2834. An act to improve the well-being of, and improve permanency outcomes for, children and families affected by heroin, opioids, and other substance abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2847. An act to make improvements to the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and related provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2857. An act to support foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2866. An act to review and improve licensing standards for placement in a relative foster family home; to the Committee on Finance.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2484. An act to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participa-

tion of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1976. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2017 Operational Energy Budget Certification Report"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1977. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1978. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act; Further Delay of Effective Date" (FRL No. 9963-55-OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1979. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Infrastructure and Interstate Transport for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9958-61-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1980. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Regional Haze Progress Report State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9962-75-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1981. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District, and San Diego County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9960-40-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1982. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Nevada Air Plan Revisions, Clark County Department of Air Quality and Washoe County Health District" (FRL No. 9963-43-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1983. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 2017 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1984. A communication from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a corrected Semi-annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1985. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Policy, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustment" (OAG 156) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1986. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technology Innovation—Personnel Exchanges" (RIN0693-AB62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1987. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Proposed Amendment of Class D Airspace; Kingsville, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9511)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1988. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace, Grass Range, MT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0047)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1989. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kyle-Oakley Field Airport, Murray, KY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9443)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1990. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bar Harbor, ME" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9285)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1991. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 533" ((RIN2120-AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1992. A communication from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's 2016 Annual Report to the President and Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1993. A communication from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's 2016 Annual Report to the President and Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1994. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0363)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1995. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0114)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1996. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0186)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1997. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; NavWorx, Inc. Automatic Dependent Surveillance Broadcast Universal Access Transceiver Units" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9226)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1998. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Slingsby Aviation Ltd. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0048)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1999. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0124)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2000. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9438)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2001. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8849)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2002. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-8428)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2003. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9431)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2004. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-7262)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2005. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0123)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2006. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0084)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2007. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8182)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2008. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9524)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2009. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Seats California LLC Seating System" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-5595)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2010. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6667)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2011. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8179)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2012. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8848)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2013. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9075)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2014. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6666)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2015. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Learjet, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0501)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2016. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0506)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2017. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; ZLIN AIRCRAFT a.s. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0156)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2018. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9550)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2019. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9507)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2020. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0158)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2021. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness

Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0053)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2022. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Stemme AG Gliders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0451)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2023. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; Seafood Import Monitoring Program" (RIN0648-BF09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 97. A bill to enable civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies by private and public institutions, to expand theoretical and practical knowledge of nuclear physics, chemistry, and materials science, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-115).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

\*Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

\*Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1387. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to implement processes and procedures to provide expedited evaluation and treatment for prenatal surgery under the



TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1388. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for voting assistance officers for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KAINE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1389. A bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1390. A bill to strengthen the position of the United States as the world's leading innovator by amending title 35, United States Code, to protect the property rights of the inventors that grow the country's economy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1391. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1392. A bill to establish the Public-Private Partnership Advisory Council to End Human Trafficking to advise the Senior Policy Operating Group and the President's Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1393. A bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 1394. A bill to apply the medical certification standards of the Federal Aviation Administration to operators of air balloons; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1395. A bill to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in Delaware; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1396. A bill to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. STRANGE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1397. A bill to nullify any generalized, routine or ongoing reporting requirement imposed on a person licensed under section

923 of title 18, United States Code, that is based on the geographic location in which the licensee is located or on the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns, or any specific type of rifle or shotgun, to the same person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1398. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to release an interim report related to aquatic nuisance species control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1399. A bill to provide high-skilled non-immigrant visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1400. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1401. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to address lead contamination in school drinking water; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1402. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1403. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in national service positions to conserve, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 1404. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to provide for expanded natural gas exports; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 196. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the challenges the conflict in Syria poses to long-term stability and prosperity in Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Res. 197. A resolution to provide sufficient time for legislation to be read; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. Res. 198. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that any sweeping health

care legislation must be drafted in public under the watchful eye of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 198

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 340

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 340, a bill to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 515

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 515, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.



S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 717

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 717, a bill to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence.

S. 777

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow deductions and credits relating to expenditures in connection with marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law.

S. 823

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 823, a bill to ensure the digital contents of electronic equipment and on-line accounts belonging to or in the possession of United States persons entering or exiting the United States are adequately protected at the border, and for other purposes.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 856

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 856, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual assault, and for other purposes.

S. 905

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 905, a bill to require a report on, and to authorize technical assistance for, accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1013

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1013, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax

benefits for investments in gigabit opportunity zones.

S. 1020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of personal service income earned in pass-thru entities.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1256

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters, Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1311, a bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to reform appor-

tionments to general aviation airports under the airport improvement program, to improve project delivery at certain airports, and to designate certain airports as disaster relief airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1352

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1352, a bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes.

S. 1357

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1357, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic family care services in Medicaid.

S.J. RES. 8

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S.J. RES. 46

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 46, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. RES. 102

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 102, a resolution reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mexico, and recognizing bilateral cooperation that advances the national security and national interests of both countries.

S. RES. 195

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 195, a resolution recognizing June 20, 2017, as "World Refugee Day".

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KAINÉ, Ms.

DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1389. A bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with Senators BROWN, TESTER, BLUMENTHAL, KAINE, DUCKWORTH, WARREN, BALDWIN, FRANKEN, KLOBUCHAR, CORTEZ MASTO, VAN HOLLEN, and MENENDEZ, I am reintroducing the Military Consumer Enforcement Act to further strengthen consumer protections for service members.

Our Nation has a strong tradition of working to protect our service members while they sacrifice to keep our Nation, safe. Building on these efforts, Congress passed the Soldiers' and Sailor's Civil Relief Act in 1940 to provide essential financial protections for service members to "enable such persons to devote their entire energy to the defense needs of the Nation." Now called the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA), this law provides such protections as prohibiting the eviction of service members and their dependents from rental or mortgaged properties and capping the interest at 6% on debts incurred prior to an individual entering active duty military service.

Despite the importance of the SCRA's protections to our service members, enforcement of this critical law has been inconsistent and subject to the discretion of our financial regulators. For example, according to a July 2012 report from the Government Accountability Office, the estimated percentage of depository institutions that serviced mortgages that were examined for SCRA compliance varied by year between 2007 through 2011 at a rate of 4% in 2007, 17% in 2008, 18% in 2009, 26% in 2010, and 15% in 2011. Without a change in the law, SCRA enforcement will continue to be subject to the changing priorities of the financial regulators, which can also change with each newly elected President. Simply put, prioritizing the consumer protection of our service members should not be discretionary; it should be mandatory. Our legislation ensures that SCRA enforcement will be a permanent priority for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, which Congress created to enforce Federal consumer financial protection laws.

In 2010, as we debated the authorizing legislation for the CFPB, I led the bipartisan effort to ensure the CFPB would play a key role in protecting service members through the establishment of an Office of Servicemember Affairs, OSA. Since that time, the CFPB, through its enforcement actions, has helped service members recover ap-

proximately \$130 million in relief from unscrupulous actors in the financial marketplace and through the OSA's monitoring of complaints, the CFPB has helped other regulators provide more than \$60 million in relief for more than 78,000 service members harmed by SCRA violations. Imagine how much more the CFPB could do for our service members if it could do more than just refer potential SCRA violations to other regulators and educate service members about their SCRA rights. With this demonstrated record of success in protecting our service members, the CFPB should be empowered, as it would be under this legislation, to enforce certain key SCRA provisions, such as the protections against default judgments and being charged no more than the maximum rate of interest on debts incurred before military service.

We should do all we can to make sure there is a strong watchdog on the beat that can enforce the protections we have put in place. When it comes to the SCRA, that strong watchdog should be the CFPB. Our legislation is supported by more than thirty groups, including the National Military Family Association, the Military Officers Association of America, Veterans Education Success, Student Veterans of America, Consumer Federation of America, Americans for Financial Reform, Public Citizen, the Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, U.S. PIRG, Consumers Union, National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low income clients), National Community Reinvestment Coalition, Center for Popular Democracy, Alliance for Justice, American Association for Justice, and the Center for Responsible Lending. I urge our colleagues to help honor our commitment to our Nation's service members by joining us in this effort to improve the supervision and enforcement of the SCRA.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1393. A bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1393

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Jobs for Our Heroes Act".

#### SEC. 2. MEDICAL CERTIFICATE FOR VETERANS OPERATING COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) QUALIFIED EXAMINERS.—Section 5403(d)(2) of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149

note; 129 Stat. 1548) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) QUALIFIED EXAMINER.—The term 'qualified examiner' means an individual who—

"(A) is employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs as an advanced practice nurse, doctor of chiropractic, doctor of medicine, doctor of osteopathy, physician assistant, or other medical professional;

"(B) is licensed, certified, or registered in a State to perform physical examinations;

"(C) is familiar with the standards for, and physical requirements of, an operator required to be medically certified under section 31149 of title 49, United States Code; and

"(D) has never, with respect to such section, been found to have acted fraudulently, including by fraudulently awarding a medical certificate."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5403 of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "physician-approved veteran operator, the qualified physician" and inserting "veteran operator approved by a qualified examiner, the qualified examiner";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking "the physician" and inserting "the examiner"; and

(B) by striking "qualified physician" and inserting "qualified examiner";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "qualified physicians" and inserting "qualified examiners"; and

(B) by striking "such physicians" and inserting "such examiners"; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (3), (1), and (2), respectively, and by moving the text of paragraph (3), as redesignated, to appear after paragraph (2), as redesignated; and

(B) in paragraph (3), as redesignated—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking "PHYSICIAN-APPROVED VETERAN OPERATOR" and inserting "VETERAN OPERATOR APPROVED BY A QUALIFIED EXAMINER"; and

(ii) by striking "physician-approved veteran operator" and inserting "veteran operator approved by a qualified examiner".

(c) RULEMAKING.—The amendments made by this section shall be incorporated into any rulemaking proceeding related to section 5403 of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) that is being conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 3. COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE STANDARDS FOR CURRENT AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 31305(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "VETERAN OPERATORS" and inserting "OPERATORS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, RESERVISTS, OR VETERANS";

(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "subparagraph (A) during, at least," and inserting "subparagraph (A)—

"(i) while serving in the armed forces or reserve components; and

"(ii) during"; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by inserting "current or" before "former" each place the term appears; and

(B) by inserting "1 of" before "the reserve components".

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1395. A bill to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in

Delaware; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to adjust the boundary of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, CBRA, map unit for North Bethany Beach, Delaware. I am pleased to be working in this effort with the junior Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS, who joins me as an original cosponsor.

This map change implements a recommendation made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Service discovered during its recent digital mapping pilot project that a portion of the North Bethany Beach unit encompassing the South Shore Marina development was included by mistake when the map was created in 1990. The Fish and Wildlife released a report to Congress in November of 2016 on the results of the mapping pilot project required by the 2006 Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act (PL 109-226). Delaware was part of the pilot project, and the report contains the recommendation for this map change.

This map change can occur only through an act of Congress.

CBRA is a map-based law enacted in 1982 recognizing that certain actions and programs of the Federal Government subsidize and encourage development on coastal barriers. This coastal building contributes to the loss of natural resources and threatens human life, health and property. The CBRA system currently contains 859 geographic units in 23 States and territories along the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico coasts. The CBRA units are depicted on a set of maps that is maintained by the Secretary of the Interior through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

While CBRA does not prohibit or regulate development, it removes the Federal incentives to build on these undeveloped, unstable and environmentally sensitive areas. CBRA seeks to save taxpayers' money, keep people out of harm's way, and conserve natural resources by restricting most new Federal expenditures and financial assistance (e.g., beach nourishment, disaster assistance, and flood insurance) in areas designated within the CBRA system. That is why Mr. President, it is important to make sure these maps are accurate and that they do not include previously developed property. This bill will achieve that objective for the North Bethany Beach area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1395

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The map subtitled “Delaware Seashore Unit DE-07P, North Bethany Beach Unit H01” and dated December 6, 2013, that is included in the set of maps entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System” referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)) and relating to certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in the State of Delaware, is replaced by the map entitled “Delaware Seashore Unit DE-07/DE-07P, North Bethany Beach Unit H01” and dated March 16, 2016.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the replacement map referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1402. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP, in sponsoring the School Food Modernization Act to assist schools in providing healthier meals to students throughout the country.

School meals play a vital role in the lives of our young people. More than 30 million children participate in the National School Lunch Program every school day and more than 14 million eat school breakfasts, with participation rising steadily in Maine and nationwide. In Maine, 48 percent of children qualify for free or reduced-price meals based on household income.

Moreover, the food served at schools affects children's health and well-being. Many children consume up to half their daily caloric intake at school and some get their most nutritious meal of the day at school instead of at home. At the same time, too many of our children are at risk of serious disease, which may have a lifelong effect on their health as they grow to adulthood.

In response to these health concerns, our schools have stepped up. For example, in the New Sweden Consolidated School in Aroostook County, Maine, food service manager Melanie Lagasse prepares meals from scratch instead of opening cans or pushing a defrost button. The school's 64 students, aged preschool to 8th grade, have grown to relish the chicken stew, baked fish, and meatloaf that she makes fresh.

Many schools, however, lack the right tools for preparing meals rich in fresh ingredients. Schools built decades ago often lack the equipment and infrastructure necessary to do more than

reheat and serve one or two meal options each day.

To serve healthier meals, 99 percent of Maine school districts need to acquire at least one piece of equipment and almost 50 percent of districts need kitchen infrastructure upgrades. The median equipment need per school alone is \$45,000. Making the required changes to infrastructure is even more costly, with 41 percent of schools needing more physical space, 22 percent more electrical capacity, 21 percent more plumbing capacity, and 19 percent more ventilation.

It is estimated that \$58.8 million would be necessary just in Maine for the equipment and infrastructure upgrades needed to serve healthy meals to all of our students. That far exceeds the \$89,000 in grants that the U.S. Department of Agriculture awarded Maine last fiscal year. Maine is not alone. In a recent survey of school nutrition directors, the most frequently cited financial concern was equipment costs, ranking higher than even labor and food costs.

The School Food Modernization Act seeks to help food service personnel offer a wide variety of nutritious and appealing meals and snacks to all students. First, the bill would establish a loan guarantee assistance program within USDA to help schools acquire new equipment to prepare and serve healthier meals. Second, it would provide targeted grant assistance to provide the seed funding needed to upgrade kitchen infrastructure or to purchase high-quality equipment such as commercial ovens, steamers, and stoves. Finally, to aid school food service personnel in running successful, healthy programs, the legislation would authorize USDA to provide support on a competitive basis to highly qualified third-party trainers to develop and administer training and technical assistance, including online programs.

Senator HEITKAMP and I appreciate that provisions of this legislation were incorporated into the Child Nutrition Reauthorization legislation that was passed out of the Agriculture Committee last Congress. We encourage our colleagues to continue to support school kitchen equipment needs as the reauthorization process continues.

Mr. President, if our school children are going to be able to learn and compete, they need to be healthy and their minds and bodies fully nourished. This bill would help us achieve that goal.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

## SENATE RESOLUTION 196—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CHALLENGES THE CONFLICT IN SYRIA POSES TO LONG-TERM STABILITY AND PROSPERITY IN LEBANON

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 196

Whereas the stability of Lebanon, a pluralistic democracy in the Middle East, is in the interests of the United States and United States allies in the region;

Whereas the United States has provided more than \$2,000,000,000 in assistance to Lebanon in the past decade, including training and equipment for the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF);

Whereas the conflict in Syria threatens stability in Lebanon as a result of violent attacks against Lebanese citizens perpetrated by combatants active in Syria, as well as a massive influx of refugees fleeing the conflict;

Whereas the United States has contributed more than \$6,500,000,000 in humanitarian assistance for victims of the conflict in Syria, including for refugees in Lebanon;

Whereas the people of Lebanon have shown great generosity in welcoming more than 1,500,000 refugees from Syria, a refugee population equal to  $\frac{1}{4}$  of its native population;

Whereas Lebanon is hosting more refugees proportionally than any nation in the world;

Whereas the refugee crisis has challenged Lebanon's economy, which faces a national debt that is approximately 140 percent of gross domestic product and underperforming economic growth;

Whereas the LAF have been called into direct conflict with the Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS) as a result of attacks carried out by the terrorist group in Lebanon;

Whereas the Syrian conflict has placed additional strains on the Government of Lebanon as it continues to confront political deadlock that has kept the presidency vacant for more than two years;

Whereas the unique political constitution of Lebanon hinges on that nation's distinct demographic and social equilibrium;

Whereas the prolongation of the Syrian conflict has the potential to upset the precarious social and political balance in Lebanon;

Whereas the constitution of Lebanon is further undermined by undue foreign influence, particularly by the Islamic Republic of Iran through its terrorist proxy Hizbollah;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1701 in 2006, which calls for the disarmament of all armed groups in Lebanon and stresses the importance of full control over Lebanon by the Government of Lebanon; and

Whereas Hizbollah continues to violate United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701, including by replenishing its stock of rockets and missiles in South Lebanon: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of bilateral United States assistance to the Government of Lebanon in building its capacity to provide services and security for Lebanese citizens and curbing the influence of Hizbollah;

(2) encourages continued coordination between the Department of State, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and humanitarian organizations to ensure that refugees from the conflict in Syria, including those in Lebanon, are supported in such a way as to mitigate any potentially adverse effect on their host countries;

(3) recognizes that it is in the interests of the United States to seek a negotiated end to the conflict in Syria that includes the ultimate departure of Bashar al-Assad, which would allow for the eventual return of the millions of Syrian refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, and other countries around the world;

(4) supports full implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701; and

(5) recognizes the LAF as the sole institution entrusted with the defense of Lebanon's sovereignty and supports United States partnerships with the LAF, particularly through the global coalition to defeat the terrorist group ISIS.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 197—TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT TIME FOR LEGISLATION TO BE READ

Mr. PAUL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 197

*Resolved*, That (a) it shall not be in order for the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, message, conference report, amendment between the Houses, amendment, treaty, or any other measure or matter until 1 session day has passed since introduction for every 20 pages included in the measure or matter in the usual form plus 1 session day for any number of remaining pages less than 20 in the usual form.

(b)(1) Any Senator may raise a point of order that consideration of any bill, resolution, message, conference report, amendment, treaty, or any other measure or matter is not in order under subsection (a). No motion to table the point of order shall be in order.

(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. All motions to waive under this paragraph shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 3 hours equally divided between the Senator raising the point of order and the Senator moving to waive the point of order or their designees. A motion to waive the point of order shall not be amendable.

(3) This resolution is enacted pursuant to the power granted to each House of Congress to determine the Rules of its Proceedings in clause 2 of section 5 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 198—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT ANY SWEEPING HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION MUST BE DRAFTED IN PUBLIC UNDER THE WATCHFUL EYE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TESTER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 198

Whereas the people of the United States deserve and demand that legislation be created through a transparent, bipartisan process to ensure that they can hold their elected representatives accountable;

Whereas the proper functioning of representative democracy requires full transparency in the legislative process;

Whereas it has been widely reported that a group of Senators is working privately in a partisan fashion to craft national health care legislation in the Senate;

Whereas this group is secretly gathering in closed-door meetings that exclude the public and press;

Whereas Senate leadership has refused to commit to holding a single public hearing on this legislation before going directly to the Senate floor for a vote;

Whereas the draft health care legislation under consideration by a secretive group is one of the largest public policy reforms taken up by Congress in generations;

Whereas this legislation will affect the lives of all people in the United States;

Whereas health care constitutes  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the gross domestic product of the United States; and

Whereas Congress is elected by the people to serve the people: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the creation of any sweeping health care legislation must be done in a transparent, bipartisan manner in full view of the people of the United States and not behind closed doors.

## ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. on Thursday, June 22; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Billingslea nomination postcloture; finally, that all time during morning business, recess, adjournment, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Billingslea nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

## HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, since the first day of this administration, I

have heard from women in my home State and nationwide who are fearful of what President Trump will do to their health and rights—from appointing a Supreme Court Justice who has made clear that he opposes the historic ruling in *Roe v. Wade*, to trying at every turn to undermine women's access to safe, legal abortion here in the United States and abroad, to proposing a budget that would defund Planned Parenthood and devastate investments in women's health. I know from letters, calls, emails, tweets, rallies—you name it—that across the country women feel under attack because of this administration's policies and the willingness of Republicans in Congress to make sure they are carried out.

Women are worried and, unfortunately, they have a right to be, especially in this moment. In a matter of days, Senate Republicans could bring their version of TrumpCare to this floor. As many of us have said, this is the worst bill for women in a generation. It will cut off access to critical healthcare services at Planned Parenthood, our Nation's largest provider of women's healthcare. It will allow our insurance companies to go back to charging women more and interfere with women's constitutionally protected reproductive rights. In fact, at literally every stage of life, TrumpCare would stand in the way of women's access to the healthcare they need.

Under this bill, young girls nationwide would lose Medicaid coverage. College students across the country who go to Planned Parenthood for contraception would find the centers they rely on shuttered. Women would pay \$1,000 more a month for maternity care, and women battling cancer and women who are survivors would have to look ahead to being discriminated against for having a preexisting condition. Senior women would watch their premiums spike by as much as 850 percent because of the age tax Republicans have inexplicitly chosen to include in this bill.

I could go on, but let me just say that since President Trump and Republicans first began trying to jam this bill through, I have heard from countless women who would be impacted by the cruel policies I have just described.

One of them is Kelly. Her son has a developmental disability and he gets Medicaid coverage. There is Jennifer, who is fighting cancer tooth and nail and is now worrying about what is going to happen if the Medicaid expansion goes away. There is Tammy, whose congenital heart disease made pregnancy life threatening and who was able to afford safe and effective contraception because of her insurance coverage. Those are just a few examples. I am so grateful to them and to the many, many others who have spoken out and shared their stories.

We might think that with so many women thinking about how this bill

would impact them, with so much at stake for women's health, rights, and financial security should TrumpCare be signed into law, Senate Republicans would want to see what women thought of their version of TrumpCare. But they have made it abundantly and offensively clear that they do not.

They put together a working group of 13 men to draft their version. They negotiated in secret. They wrote this bill in back rooms. Now Senate Republicans are keeping it under lock and key until the very last minute so that women have as little time as possible to see just how badly this bill could harm them and their families. Women aren't going to put up with that, and Democrats aren't either.

I am proud to be here this evening with a number of my Democratic colleagues to call on Senate Republicans to stop hiding their bill from women and bring it out in the light for the scrutiny it deserves.

My Republican colleagues are right, I think, to be ashamed of this version of TrumpCare. But that doesn't mean it should be hidden from view, and we are not going to stop until women across the country get to read the fine print, instead of taking 13 male Republican Senators' word for it.

While this is a truly difficult and frightening time for anyone who believes that women should be able to make their own decisions about their own healthcare and who think politicians should not be able to interfere with those decisions, I have also been truly inspired by the response I have seen to the extreme agenda President Trump and Republicans are pursuing.

Since the first days of this administration, when I was so proud to march with millions of women across this country and the world to stand up for women's health and women's rights, women have continued to lead the fight against this administration's constant efforts to take our country backward. That is exactly what TrumpCare would do.

So let me be very clear. If Senate Republicans continue down this path, if they choose to jam a secret bill through Congress and get it signed into law instead of listening to people in this country and to us and working with us on real solutions to fix our healthcare system, you can be sure that women across the country—who will be forced to pay more for their care or lose it altogether—are going to be ready to make sure Republicans own every ounce of the harm they cause.

So I am here tonight to urge Republicans to make the right choice, and I will join women across the country in holding them fully accountable if they don't.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President I join my colleagues, Senator MURRAY and oth-

ers, and I thank Senator MURRAY for her leadership on this important issue.

Right now, 13 of our male colleagues are sequestered away somewhere, plotting—and I use that word, and that is an accurate word because that is what it feels like to those of us who are shut out of the process of putting together the Senate bill. These 13 men are plotting how to deprive millions of women across our country access to essential healthcare—women all over our country. That is half of our population. Frankly, it is sad that we are having this debate about the need for openness and transparency that impacts half of our population and that is one-sixth of our economy.

Sadly, it isn't surprising. Republicans in Congress have fought to deny women access to healthcare for decades. Now they have a willing and complicit ally in this crusade—Donald Trump. In their zeal to repeal the Affordable Care Act, the President and his allies in Congress don't appear to be concerned about the collateral damage they leave behind.

For women, this means facing a return to a time when our gender—our very gender—was considered a pre-existing condition. Before the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies could discriminate against women of child-bearing age. They could charge outrageous rates for birth control and contraceptives. Under the ACA, women have secure access to care before, during, and after their pregnancies. They can no longer be charged outrageous rates simply for having a child or be denied access to mental health services if they suffer from postpartum depression. Women can now receive free contraceptive care, like birth control pills and IUDs. But now the President and Republicans in Congress are determined to drag us backward, all in the name of giving the richest Americans a huge tax cut.

Let's be really clear on this. The poorest, oldest, and the most sick people in our country are going to suffer so that the richest people in our country can get a huge tax cut under this bill. We need to do everything we can to fight against all these misguided efforts.

Although we haven't seen the likely monstrosity currently being hatched in secret, we have a pretty good idea of what is going to be in this bill. In the House version of TrumpCare, States have the ability to opt out of the Affordable Care Act's essential health benefits, which include access to birth control, pregnancy, and mental health coverage.

One Republican Congressman even had the audacity to say he shouldn't have to subsidize pregnancy care because he can't get pregnant. How the heck do you think he even arrived on this Earth? I really think this is outrageous. This is an outrageous statement that speaks for itself.

The bill also makes good on a long-standing Republican promise to defund Planned Parenthood, regardless of the cost in lives. Over the past few years, Republicans in Congress have tried everything they could think of to defund Planned Parenthood—passing stand-alone bills, attaching poison pills to must-pass bills, threatening a government shutdown, and passing TrumpCare in the House. In March, the majority leader held the floor open for over an hour to allow the Vice President time to travel to the Capitol to break a tie to repeal a regulation on title X funding meant to preserve access to Federal family planning services.

I understand that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have strong feelings about abortion, but I have never been able to understand how this translates into attacking an organization that uses no Federal funds to provide abortions. In fact, Planned Parenthood uses its Federal funding to provide low-cost healthcare to the people in our country who need it most but who can't afford it.

In 2014 alone, Planned Parenthood provided over 600,000 cancer screenings and over 4 million tests and treatments for sexually transmitted infections. These are real facts, not alternative facts.

I have heard from hundreds of my constituents over the past 6 months about how important Planned Parenthood is to them, and I would like to share a few of their stories.

Tiffany from Honolulu made her first visit to Planned Parenthood when she was 21, under unexpected circumstances during a pregnancy scare. She felt that having a child at that time in her life would be extremely difficult and would have negatively impacted her ability to finish school. During her visit to the clinic, Tiffany took a pregnancy test and discovered she wasn't pregnant. Her caregivers were then able to counsel Tiffany about her sexual health without judgment. They walked her through the different options she had and administered an STD test. She left the clinic with a prescription for birth control.

Kim, a young attorney from my State, recently wrote to my office to tell her story about turning to Planned Parenthood when she faced an unexpected pregnancy. After having a safe and open conversation with the staff at her local Planned Parenthood, Kim decided she was not ready to have a baby and ended her pregnancy. Planned Parenthood gave her the space and opportunity to make the best decision for her. As she recounted to us, "You don't have to like someone's choice, but you don't get to take away their freedom to make it."

The fight against TrumpCare continues, but I am going to do everything I can to protect women's health and

their right to control their bodies—to control our bodies.

I urge my colleagues to oppose any measure in TrumpCare that takes women back to the days when our very gender was considered a preexisting condition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Hawaii for her words and Senator MURRAY for organizing this group of speakers.

I rise today to join my colleagues in making clear that TrumpCare would be a disaster for women in New Hampshire and across the Nation.

Right now Senate Republicans continue to meet behind closed doors on their TrumpCare bill, and the reason they have not been transparent is because they know they can't defend this dangerous bill to their constituents. Throughout the process in the Senate, it has been a group of 13 men—no women—writing a bill that will impact the healthcare of millions of American women. It is not just that a small group has been writing the bill behind closed doors. It is also that once we do eventually see the bill, it is going to be rushed to the floor without a hearing. So we will not have the benefit of feedback from our constituents, from stakeholders, from people who understand what the impact of this bill will be. This is simply unacceptable.

To compete economically on a level playing field, women must be able to make their own healthcare decisions. They shouldn't have to pay more than men do for their healthcare. They should be able to visit providers of their own choice who understand and have expertise in women's healthcare needs. The health insurance that is available to women should be equal to that of their male colleagues. That means it should cover their basic healthcare needs.

To fully participate not only in our economy but also in our democracy, women have to be recognized for their capacity to make their own healthcare decisions—just as men are.

I have heard from many constituents whose lives have been changed by being able to get the healthcare they need from the providers they trust. One of those people is Carla from Newfields, NH. As a college student, Carla suffered from significant pain. She needed immediate medical care, so she went to her local Planned Parenthood.

It turned out that her pain was caused by ovarian cysts, and the treatment for those cysts was birth control. As a college student on a limited budget, before the Affordable Care Act had passed, Carla couldn't afford birth control. Because she went to Planned Parenthood, though, she got the treatment she needed at a price she could afford. Her pain went away. She was able to

graduate college and eventually start a family—something she might not have been able to do if her underlying condition had not been treated, caught when it was. That was the power of access to appropriate and affordable health care in her life at the right time.

Carla's story is the story of the thousands of New Hampshire women who received primary and preventive healthcare services from Planned Parenthood.

TrumpCare is a disaster for women. TrumpCare defunds Planned Parenthood, which would take away a critical source of care for women. This care includes birth control and breast and cervical cancer screenings. Defunding Planned Parenthood would leave many women in the Granite State and throughout the country without access to care, plain and simple. There aren't enough other providers, as I heard from medical providers throughout my State when I was Governor there, to absorb all of the patients Planned Parenthood cares for now.

TrumpCare also includes harmful language that restricts women's constitutionally protected rights to access abortion services. Additionally, under TrumpCare, if you are a mother, giving birth could now be considered a preexisting condition that insurance companies could use to discriminate against you and charge you more.

TrumpCare would increase the cost to women from maternity care in two ways:

First, it would undermine the requirement that insurance companies must cover essential health benefits, including maternity care. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says that the House-passed TrumpCare bill would increase out-of-pocket spending for maternity care for women who have private insurance by thousands of dollars per year.

Second, TrumpCare slashes Medicaid funding. Medicaid pays for nearly one-half of all births in the United States, meaning, with the 25-percent cut in expenditures over the next decade that is called for in the TrumpCare bill, that at least some of this maternity coverage would also be cut.

Any cut to Medicaid would disproportionately affect Granite State women, as 62 percent of Medicaid recipients in New Hampshire are women. These cuts would also strain at-risk families because Medicaid covers nearly one in three children across our country and nearly 30 percent of the children in my State of New Hampshire.

It is clear that TrumpCare would continue efforts to play partisan games with a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions and control her own destiny.



It is critical that people in New Hampshire and across our Nation continue to speak out and share their stories about how TrumpCare would impact their lives, and I am going to continue to work with my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to follow my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator HASSAN. She said it very well. This is an extraordinarily important part of the debate.

A Senate vote on TrumpCare is now days away, and that is the case even though the bill remains hidden in the Senate shadows. I am here tonight with my colleagues to try to shine some light on the extraordinary harm TrumpCare is going to do to women's health across the country and also to call on the American people to stand up and say, and say loudly, that this is wrong—wrong because it would be a partisan process that takes away important healthcare rights from women across this country.

First, TrumpCare says that health insurance in America ought to be based on what men need and what women need ought to cost extra. You look back a few years to when the Affordable Care Act set in stone guaranteed insurance benefits to protect everybody who shops on the open market, the private open market, regardless of their gender, no price gouging women just because they are women. Now, however, the Republican plan lets States hack away at those essential health benefits, and it always seems that maternity care is the first benefit that then gets cut.

If TrumpCare goes through, what will happen in America is insurance companies will carve maternity care out of the plans they offer on the open market. It would, in effect, become an add-on—an add-on that would come with a higher price, as if a pregnant woman's healthcare is a luxury item like a sunroof on a new car.

Let's set aside the fact that every man in the country was born to a woman. My colleagues on the other side have spent 7 years telling Americans that they were laser-focused on bringing costs down for everybody. Apparently, that notion of "everybody" that we are hearing from Republican Senators doesn't include mothers because their costs are going to be going up in a number of instances.

Second, the public has heard time and time again that nobody would be hurt under TrumpCare and that repeal and replace is all about putting the patient at the center of care. Tell that to the hundreds of thousands of women who will lose their right to see the doctor of their choosing as a result of TrumpCare defunding Planned Parent-

hood. Just unpack that for a moment. I think one basic, almost sacred principle for women is that they ought to be able to make the choice of the physician they trust for their healthcare. Yet what we are talking about here—apparently tomorrow—is a real prospect that women will lose the right to see the doctor they trust.

This ideological campaign against Planned Parenthood ignores the fact that there are already laws on the books that prevent tax dollars from funding abortions. It ignores the fact that Planned Parenthood doesn't get a dime of taxpayer funding above what is available to other comparable healthcare providers. It ignores the fact that women rely on Planned Parenthood to get routine medical care from the doctors they know and trust—basic checkups, cancer screenings, preventive care, HIV tests.

It is long past time to end this crusade against Planned Parenthood, which is taking away from women in this country the ability to make their own judgments about whom they want to see and the doctors they trust.

Finally, the TrumpCare plan would significantly slash Medicaid, and this is a special threat to women. Medicaid is at the heart of women's healthcare in the country. Women live longer than men on average, and Medicaid helps pay for two out of three seniors living in nursing homes. Women are more likely than men to have a disability, and Medicaid is the key to helping millions of Americans with disabilities live successful, independent lives in their communities. The Republican healthcare plan would slash Medicaid so deeply year after year that States would be forced to cut benefits and access to care. Women would be hit the hardest by those cuts.

The public needs to know that right now, it is go time in America on healthcare. This vote is right around the corner. And because my colleagues on the other side have in effect locked into this "our way or the highway" approach—the Washington word for it is "reconciliation," and my guess is that in a lot of coffee shops in North Carolina and Oregon and points in between, people aren't that up on Washington lingo like reconciliation, but they really want Democrats and Republicans to work together. That has been the cornerstone of my work with respect to healthcare. That is what Chairman HATCH and I have done with respect to the transformation of Medicare, to update the Medicare guarantee. I have worked with my colleagues in a bipartisan way in terms of independence at home, more care for older people at home, and on a host of issues, particularly with respect to holding down pharmaceutical costs in a bipartisan way. The reality is, that is the only way you come up with approaches that are sustainable—build on principles

that both sides feel strongly about and lock it into a bipartisan agreement.

What we are looking at, again, not in 6 weeks but tomorrow, is the Senate Republicans saying: We are going to use this reconciliation—not the bipartisan approaches that I think yield the real dividends but a partisan approach. It is called reconciliation. It means "It is our way or the highway." And then what you are going to do is you are going to have one of the most consequential debates about domestic policy in decades. It is going to fly through the Senate with hardly any public input and debate.

A big part of what I wanted to do tonight is come to the floor of the Senate to say to Americans that this is the time to get loud, to get very loud and to tell your friends and your neighbors and your relatives to get out there and be loud with you. This isn't some mundane debate where the two sides couldn't square their differences, the kind most people choose to ignore; this is an out-and-out attack on the healthcare of millions of Americans and especially women.

I think that when the facts get out to women in this country, they are going to say this is wrong, and they are going to say this is personal. The people in Washington, DC, talk about lots of things and throw around lots of Washington lingo like "reconciliation," but I think they are going to see through exactly what these proposals mean for them. It is a significant rollback of their rights on matters like being able to choose the doctor they trust.

I will close with this, and I have felt this way since the days when I was co-director of the senior citizens at home in Oregon. Political change hardly ever is top-down—top being it comes from government buildings and then trickles down to people—it is almost always bottoms-up, where the voices of Americans are heard and they tell their elected officials when they are off base, when they are doing something that will hurt them rather than help them.

I close by way of saying that I hope this has provided at least some useful information so Americans—particularly women—can get engaged, get loud, and do it now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I note my colleague is prepared to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am proud and honored to follow my colleague from Oregon who has been such a steadfast leader when it comes to our Nation's healthcare and insurance and particularly when it comes to women's healthcare. I have been really proud to stand side by side with him, Senator MURRAY, and other colleagues who have been here today.

I must say, sometimes on the floor of the Senate, at this hour of the day or



night, we can feel alone, as though no one is listening, but I know millions of Americans are listening because of the voices like my colleague Senator WYDEN. I would join him in urging our fellow Americans to make their voices heard, to be loud, and we are going to be loud in Connecticut this Friday, at 1:30 in the afternoon, when I continue the emergency field hearing we began on Monday, giving the people of Connecticut an opportunity to make their voices and their faces known, seen, and heard because, unfortunately, that opportunity has been denied by a process that has been secretive and hasty. Secrecy and speed are a toxic recipe for any democracy. They can disguise deception and mistakes.

I am here to call attention to one of the profoundly mistaken courses that this new bill is expected to take. There is no doubt in my mind that the Republican bill will contain language to defund one of the most respected and accessible and significant of our healthcare providers in the United States; namely, Planned Parenthood.

I have been an advocate of women's healthcare and reproductive rights and choice since my days as a law clerk for Justice Blackmun in the 1970s. Our Nation has made progress—halting and sometimes it steps back—but Planned Parenthood has helped to improve, enduringly and profoundly, women's healthcare.

In my home State of Connecticut, Planned Parenthood has 17 sites and services for more than 60,000 women and men, and they have been covered by the Medicaid Program. That coverage will be decimated under the measure we expect to see. Defunding these clinics could do irreparable damage to the communities that Planned Parenthood clinics serve.

As a nurse practitioner at Planned Parenthood in Southern Connecticut told me, patients trust the services they receive at Planned Parenthood because they rely on them, and they know Planned Parenthood clinics have one interest and only one interest in mind, which is the well-being of their patients and clients. Planned Parenthood has, therefore, expanded into primary care. Not only does Amina provide family planning services and STI and cancer screenings, she now screens for and treats patients for chronic medical conditions that disproportionately impact low-income patients, such as depression, diabetes, asthma, and hypertension.

In her clinic, my friend who is a nurse practitioner there, Amina, has seen her primary care practice grow from 8 patients initially to 112 a few months later. Her clinic offers these services, in addition to the contraceptive services that are so important to many patients. Patients who will simply go unseen and uncared for have this care at Planned Parenthood, but they

will not have it if Planned Parenthood is defunded.

In Connecticut, other kinds of healthcare providers, like health centers and hospitals, would need to increase their capacity to provide contraceptive care, and they would have to increase it by 228 percent to overcome the care deficit left by defunding Planned Parenthood. With these craven attempts to immediately and completely defund Planned Parenthood as a part of TrumpCare—really TrumpCare 2.0—it will be even more challenging for so many women to get the healthcare they need and deserve.

Defunding of Planned Parenthood also jeopardizes gains our Nation made for women of color and patients who are served in areas where there are few, if any, other options.

Planned Parenthood centers and clinics are nothing short of a lifeline for quality healthcare in the underserved communities. The fact is, the Affordable Care Act has worked for women and particularly women of color. Planned Parenthood and other women's healthcare providers are an integral part of that success story, but it isn't only women of color, it isn't only women in underserved communities, and it isn't only women. It is families who have benefited—men, women, and children—because the quality of healthcare and preventive healthcare, particularly, has been raised immeasurably.

To decimate that network of care would be profoundly destructive to our Nation. I hope my colleagues will think again before they side with the forces of degrading and demeaning women who seek those protections. We need a national effort and appreciation to make sure our conscience prevails because the repeal of these provisions would mean they are gone, and all women—including healthy women—will see insurance costs rise. It is absolutely clear to me that the Affordable Care Act repeal would be cruel. It would be mean and most particularly to the women who depend on Planned Parenthood for so many of the services that help them and their families.

I hope my Republican colleagues will cease to ignore and deny these benefits. We stand ready to work with them to improve the Affordable Care Act, not to repeal it, not to decimate or destroy it, to improve it, to mend its defects, to preserve Planned Parenthood, to make sure the women of America and their families have the healthcare they need and deserve.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am joining my colleagues on the floor this afternoon because I share their concerns about what will happen to women's healthcare. I am concerned about what will happen to everyone's

healthcare, but particularly this afternoon we are talking about our concerns with respect to healthcare for women.

If the Senate passes legislation like the House passed recently—the American Health Care Act—that legislation has been widely described as cruel and poorly crafted. Just last week, President Trump described it simply as mean. Republican leaders in the Senate are now writing a companion bill that reportedly makes mostly cosmetic changes to the House bill. By some accounts, it would make the House bill even more extreme.

Obviously, any legislation that, by design, takes health insurance away from tens of millions of Americans, I believe, is deeply misguided. I am particularly concerned about the harmful effects this legislation would have on women's health. Indeed, I received countless emails and letters from women who are offended that, once again, powerful men are meeting behind closed doors to make critical decisions regarding women's health, and we have been excluded from the room.

This Republican bill would take us back to the days before the Affordable Care Act, when insurers could charge women more just for being women, with no other reason needed. It would take away the Federal protections against discrimination based on pre-existing conditions. Bear in mind, some of these conditions apply mostly or exclusively to women.

In the days before the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies treated pregnancies, sexual assault, domestic violence, and cesarean sections as pre-existing conditions. Insurers routinely charged higher premiums to women with these "preexisting conditions" or they denied coverage all together. For example, more than 30 percent of mothers have a cesarean section. Once again, if this House-passed bill passes, and if we see something out of the Senate that does the same, women would face discrimination, mothers would face discrimination from insurance companies.

The American Health Care Act would also harm women by allowing insurers to opt out of the 10 essential health benefits that all insurance plans must cover under the Affordable Care Act. These benefits are called essential because that is exactly what they are. They are essential, not only to good health but, in some cases, to actually staying alive. A number of these essential health benefits apply exclusively to women, including contraception, maternity and newborn care, mammograms, and cervical cancer screenings.

Several months ago on Facebook, I asked people across New Hampshire to tell me their stories—stories about how the Affordable Care Act has made life-saving difference or otherwise improved their lives. I heard from many women across New Hampshire who

have written about how the Affordable Care Act has ended discrimination against them by the health insurance industry because of their gender. In particular, they are grateful that the Affordable Care Act includes maternity care and contraception.

This is a picture of Maura Fay, of Exeter, NH. She writes:

My husband and I are self-employed. Before the ACA we were paying rates that were simply unsustainable for a middle-class family like ours. When I was pregnant in 2013, we were forced to pay a maternity rider of an additional \$822 a month.

That is in addition to her premium. She says:

I'm worried about the rollbacks in regulations around Essential Health Benefits, especially since so many of them impact women. Maternity coverage shouldn't come with an additional \$800 a month price tag.

Well, I appreciate that letter from Maura, but I am worried she may actually be underestimating the cost of maternity care coverage if the Affordable Care Act is repealed. According to one analysis, women who seek maternity care under the American Health Care Act—the legislation passed by the House—could pay up to \$17,000 in surcharges to their insurance company.

The American Health Care Act that the House passed also makes draconian cuts to Medicaid, and this will disproportionately harm women—nearly 40 million women—who make up the majority of Medicaid beneficiaries. Medicaid provides healthcare for nearly half of all pregnant women in the United States, supporting them through their pregnancies and ensuring that their babies get a healthy start in life. This coverage is directly threatened by the Republican legislation.

The American Health Care Act the House passed, if we combine that with the administration's budget proposal, it would cut Medicaid by a staggering \$1.4 trillion by the year 2027—so, in 10 years, a \$1.4 trillion cut. This would reduce Medicaid funding by nearly half and mean that tens of millions of people would lose coverage, including many women of reproductive age.

Let me also point out that both the American Health Care Act passed by the House and the President's budget

terminate all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, and we just heard Senator BLUMENTHAL speak eloquently about the importance of Planned Parenthood. This would leave millions of women and families with fewer healthcare options. In New Hampshire, it would mean that between 12,000 and 13,000 women and men would lose access to basic primary and preventive health services, including lifesaving cancer screenings and HIV testing.

According to poll after poll, the American people all across the political spectrum strongly support Planned Parenthood and oppose efforts to defund it. Despite efforts by Republican leaders in the House and Senate to misrepresent the facts, Planned Parenthood does not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. Indeed, Federal law expressly forbids the use of Federal funds to pay for abortions except under extremely narrow circumstances that have been agreed to by Congress, so the real issue here is not abortion. This is about ensuring that American women have access to the basic healthcare they need where they want to receive it. Remember that Planned Parenthood plays an especially important role in delivering essential health services to low-income, uninsured, and vulnerable individuals, including in rural areas.

Earlier this year I received a letter from Samantha Fox of Bow, NH, and she writes:

In 2007, I was a 19-year-old just barely starting out when I was denied health insurance due to a preexisting condition. Had I been able to access affordable coverage, my preexisting condition, a reproductive system disorder, would have been easily manageable. . . . [A]t that time, I was able to access care through Planned Parenthood which likely preserved my ability to conceive in the future. Flash forward 10 years: I am expecting my first child and I have coverage which, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, includes prenatal care.

Now, here in Washington, some people think that repealing the Affordable Care Act is all about politics and notching a win on their scoreboard. But for ordinary people in New Hampshire and across the country, including millions of women, repealing the Affordable Care Act isn't about politics,

it is about life and death. We need to listen to the women and men in each of our States whose lives and finances would be turned upside down if the Affordable Care Act is repealed.

Furthermore, it is just wrong to exclude women, to exclude their colleagues, to exclude Democrats, to exclude the public and to pursue a strictly partisan approach to healthcare—the same approach that produced a terrible bill in the House. And it is deeply misguided to bring legislation to the floor that we all know would hurt tens of millions of Americans and do particular harm to women.

There is a better way forward in the Senate. Let's put ideology and partisanship aside. Let's work together. Let's strengthen the elements of the Affordable Care Act that are working in the real world, including Medicaid expansion, and let's fix what is not working. It doesn't matter what we call this. It doesn't have to be called ObamaCare. We can call it whatever we want. The important thing is to have legislation that would provide access to healthcare for Americans, healthcare they can afford, that is quality, that is there when people need it. This is what the great majority of the American people want us to do. It is time now to respect their wishes. Let's strengthen the Affordable Care Act so that it works even better for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:49 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 22, 2017, at 11 a.m.

---

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Wednesday, June 21, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SIGAL MANDELKER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL CRIMES.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### CONGRATULATING THE SOUTH CALLAWAY BULLDOGS' BASEBALL TEAM

#### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the South Callaway Bulldogs' Baseball Team for their 2017 Missouri Class 3 Baseball State Championship.

This team includes Adam Albaugh, Austin Loucks, BJ Moffat, Braden Lallier, Caleb Hall, Clayton Knipfel, Cole Shoemaker, Devin Borghardt, Drake Davidson, Dustin Loucks, Dylan Lepper, Grayson Peneston, Jerod Mistler, Josh Johnson, Kaden Helsel, Landon Horstman, Nickalas Mealy, Nicolas Moffat, Peyton Leeper, Treysen Gray, Tyklen Salmons, Tyler Lepper, and their coach, Heath Lepper. They should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the South Callaway Bulldogs' Baseball Team for a job well done.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAMES W. HUGHES, PH.D.

#### HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize James W. Hughes, Ph.D. as he prepares to step down as Dean of the Edward J. Blaustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey on July 1, 2017. Although he is stepping down as Dean after over 20 years of leadership, Dr. Hughes will continue as a professor at the University. His long-standing dedication and remarkable achievements throughout his distinguished career are to be celebrated.

Dr. Hughes' tenure as Dean of the Edward J. Blaustein School of Planning and Public Policy began in 1995 and since that time, he has overseen the awarding of over 5,300 degrees to the school's graduates. Under his leadership, the Edward J. Blaustein School of Planning and Public Policy continues to be a preeminent institution for understanding and advancing the interconnectivity of urban planning and public health. Dr. Hughes has been a leading voice on sustainable development, demographics, housing and economics, advising lawmakers on policies that would improve the well-being of our communities.

Dr. Hughes holds a master's degree in city and regional planning and a doctorate in

urban planning and policy development. He began his professional career as an engineer and joined the Rutgers University faculty in 1971. His experience and expertise has earned him several appointments to various state boards and commissions including the Governor's Commission on Jobs, Growth and Economic Development and the Governor's World Class Economy Task Force, among others.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in thanking James Hughes for his ongoing service to Rutgers University and the state of New Jersey. Dr. Hughes' commitment to the betterment of our communities is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes because my flight was cancelled and the next one available arrived after votes. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on H.R. 2847, Roll Call No. 309, and Yea on H.R. 2866, Roll Call No. 310.

### CONGRATULATING HERMANN HIGH SCHOOL BEARCATS BOYS GOLF TEAM

#### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Hermann High School Bearcats Boys Golf Team on their first place win in the 2017 Class 2 Missouri State Golf Tournament.

This team includes Andrew Budnik, Justin Grosse, Matthew Heidger, Thomas Henson, Ross Henson, and their coach, Jeremy Hosick. They should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Hermann High School Bearcats Boys Golf Team on a job well done.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Roll Call No. 309 and No. 310. Had I been

present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 309 and Yea on Roll Call No. 310.

### RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY FIRST SERGEANT (1SG) NICHOLAS BARTON II

#### HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of First Sergeant (1SG) Nicholas Robert Barton II who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on June 7, 2010, during Operation Enduring Freedom. 1SG Barton was killed when his military vehicle was hit by an improvised explosive device in Konar, Afghanistan. Sergeant (SGT) Joshua A. Lukeala, Specialist (SPC) Matthew R. Catlett, Specialist (SPC) Charles S. Jirtle, and Specialist (SPC) Blaine E. Redding was also killed.

1SG Barton was assigned to the Company A, 2nd Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) of Fort Campbell, Kentucky. 1SG Barton gave 16 years of devoted service to the Army.

1SG Barton, a Roxie, Mississippi native, was 35 years old at the time of death. He graduated from Franklin High School in 1993, where he played center on the football team.

According to the McComb Enterprise-Journal, his grandmother, Jo Beth Coleman said, "He was a good student and a real likable person. Everybody loves him".

He was awarded three Bronze Star Medals; the Purple Heart Medal; the Meritorious Service Medal; three Army Commendation Medals; three Army Achievement Medals; the Meritorious Unit Commendation; two Army Superior Unit Awards; five Army Good Conduct Medals; two National Defense Service Medals; the Iraq Campaign Medal; the Afghanistan Campaign Medal; the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; two Armed Forces Service Medals; the Army Service Ribbon; three Overseas Ribbons; the NATO Medal; the Drill Sergeant Identification Badge; the Army Ranger Tab; the Combat Infantry Badge; the Expert Infantry Badge; the Parachutist Badge, the Pathfinder Badge; the Air Assault badge and the Weapons Qualification: M4, (expert).

1SG Barton is survived by his wife, Rebecca Barton, his stepson Jason Wells, his parents, SSG Robert N. Barton (retired) and Dona Lee Barton, his maternal grandmother, Patricia Paugh, and his paternal grandparents, Nathaniel and Jo Beth Coleman.

1SG Barton's sacrifice for our freedoms will always be remembered.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CONGRATULATING THE JEFFERSON CITY JAYS' BASEBALL TEAM

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Jefferson City Jays' Baseball Team for their 2017 Missouri Class 5 Baseball State Championship.

This team and their coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Jefferson City Jays' Baseball Team for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Tuesday, June 20, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 309 and 310.

HONORING ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL BILL ATHANAS AFTER 51 YEARS AS A NEW HAMPSHIRE

**HON. ANN M. KUSTER**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mr. Bill Athanas, who retires today after serving New Hampshire communities for 51 years, 21 years at Inter Lakes High school and 30 years at Franklin High School.

His commitment to students and the community goes beyond simply being a Vice Principal. Bill could be found every morning, rain, snow, or shine, outside Inter Lakes High School with a cup of coffee in hand greeting and welcoming students, as well as catching up with parents. Along with lifting spirits, through his genuine and sunny disposition, Bill attended every event in which his students participated in, always encouraging and cheering them on.

Bill's legacy will read that he tirelessly worked to give every single student the guidance and support needed to succeed, and a warm sincere smile when they most needed it. His plans for retirement include his passion for community service, he will be returning to Franklin High School as a volunteer. We thank Bill for his service to our students and to the community.

CONGRATULATING ANNA VOLLET OF THE HELIAS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL LADY CRUSADERS

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Anna Vollet of the Helias Catholic High School Lady Crusaders on her second place finish at the 2017 Class 4 Missouri Track and Field State Championship in the 200-meter sprint.

Anna and her coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for Anna's success at the State Championship.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Anna Vollet of the Helias Catholic High School Lady Crusaders for a job well done.

IN MEMORY OF DR. BILL BARTON

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 17, 2017, a funeral service was conducted at Saint Andrews Presbyterian Church (PCA) in Irmo, South Carolina, for Dr. Bill Barton, the church's founding pastor. The Church is an extraordinary institution of the dynamic community, one of the fastest growing in America.

The service was lovingly carried out by Senior Pastor Rev. Dr. Dale B. Welden, Director of Worship and Arts Rev. Marc Rattray, Rev. Dan Ratchford of Smyrna Presbyterian Church in Newberry, South Carolina, Organist Sharon Rattray, and Pianist Allison Hilbish. Pallbearers were members of the Irmo Police Department where Dr. Barton served as Chaplain.

The following thoughtful obituary was included in the service program:

Dr. Whaley Seignious Barton, Jr. (Bill), 76, passed away on June 12, 2017, at Richland Memorial Hospital in Columbia, South Carolina, surrounded by his family. He was born on May 5, 1941, in Miami, Florida, to Whaley Seignious Barton Sr., of Orangeburg, South Carolina, and Helen Monroe Barton of Houston, Texas.

Whaley (Bill) faithfully served the Lord as pastor of many churches and, for nineteen years, was the founding pastor of Saint Andrews Presbyterian Church in Irma, South Carolina. After retiring, he went on to begin Ministry Resources Team.

Whaley married Linda Lee Barnes of Miami, Florida, October 22, 1961. They were happily married for 55 years. He is survived by his daughter Kathryn and husband Ray of Texas, his son Steve and wife Mary of South Carolina, daughter-in-law Melissa Barton Prim of South Carolina, thirteen grandchildren, and eight great-grandchildren.

Whaley was preceded in death by his parents, brother George, and son, Whaley S. Barton III.

RECOGNIZING WORLD REFUGEE DAY

**HON. ADRIANO ESPAILLAT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Refugee Day and to stand in solidarity with refugees from around the world.

June 20th is an opportunity to recognize the millions of people from across the globe who have been forced to uproot their lives due to armed conflict and persecution. We honor their sacrifice and courage when displaced in seeking safety for themselves and their families.

In particular, I would like to recognize African Services Committee, Inc. an award-winning multiservice agency in Harlem that was founded by Ethiopian Refugees in 1981. Asfaha Hadera founded the agency in his basement in the Bronx after fleeing Ethiopia for refugee camps in Sudan and then emigrating to the U.S. He saw the need for refugee services from conflicted areas in Africa and established the organization, along with Kim Nichols.

Each year, the center assists 12,500 immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers from across the African Diaspora with health, housing, legal, educational, and social services. The staff comes from 20 countries and speaks over 25 languages, providing access to the ethnically diverse communities that live in Harlem and the Bronx. African Services Committee also works on HIV prevention and access to AIDS treatment in five HIV clinics across Ethiopia. I am proud of the work that this organization is doing to support refugees in New York's thirteenth district.

Contrary to these services, Trump issued a travel ban from six Muslim-majority countries as one of his first executive orders in March. This action was discriminatory and opposite of our American values.

On this World Refugee Day, let us remember the words on our dear Statue of Liberty, "give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses." That's who we are as Americans. We are a country that welcomes the poorest and most vulnerable among us, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

CONGRATULATING GANNON WITHERS OF THE NEW BLOOMFIELD WILDCATS

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Gannon Withers of the New Bloomfield Wildcats for his second place finish in the 2017 Missouri Class 1 Boys Individual Golf State Championship.

Gannon and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the team state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Gannon Withers of the New Bloomfield Wildcats for a job well done.

EMMA ALBERT

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emma Albert for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Emma Albert is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emma Albert is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emma Albert for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

JESSE KATZEFF

### HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jesse Katzeff of Naples, Florida, who has just recently earned the Congressional Gold Medal Award.

The Gold Medal award program presents an opportunity for young people to set and achieve challenging goals that build character and foster growth. It demands a significant time commitment of several hundred hours devoted to community service, personal development and physical fitness.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest honor Congress may bestow upon a young civilian. This year, Jesse Katzeff is one of just 373 young people from across 39 states to have earned it.

Jesse volunteered with Teen Court and the Sheriff's Department while also completing two summer internships at a local museum. This allowed him to learn more about his community while devoting his time for the benefit of others. Jesse learned to fly a plane while taking part in the Civil Air Program for nearly 5 years. Additionally, he competed on a local swim team while also improving his physical fitness with CrossFit. He chose to go hiking in the mountains of West Virginia, giving him the opportunity to learn more about himself while outside of his comfort zone.

The Congressional Gold Medal Award program has allowed Jesse to lay a foundation of engagement, determination and fortitude that

will serve him immensely well going forward. I congratulate Jesse on this truly extraordinary honor, and wish him the best of luck as he continues to grow and advance in life.

IN HONOR OF LUCY DIGGS SLOWE

### HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an extraordinary leader of women, Lucy Diggs Stowe, who has recently been honored by the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., an international sorority that she helped establish at Howard University in 1908. The ceremony took place in Berryville, the place of her birth, located in the 10th Congressional District of Virginia.

In the early part of the 20th Century, Lucy Diggs Stowe was an inspirational advocate for greater opportunity for African-American women, whose resourcefulness and resilience is reflective of the dynamic Josephine Street community where she spent her early childhood. The difficult loss of both of her parents in her youth and the obstacle of a segregated education in Virginia and Maryland did not stop Lucy Stowe from blossoming as a student and achieving greatness as an educator. Graduating second in her class from Baltimore Colored School in 1904, she was admitted to Howard University in Washington, D.C. and after graduating from Howard as class valedictorian in 1908, Lucy Diggs Stowe embarked on a stellar career as an educator, overcoming obstacles and breaking down barriers as she went. In chronological order, she taught high school English in Baltimore, studied at Columbia University during the summers and obtained a master's degree in 1915, was invited to create and lead the first junior high school for African-American students in the District of Columbia, was selected by Howard University as its first Dean of Women in 1922, and served in administrative positions at Howard for the next 15 years.

To ensure a prominent role for African-American women at traditionally black colleges, Lucy Diggs Stowe helped organize and served as the first president of the National Association of College Women, an organization dedicated to raising the standards in colleges for African-American women, developing women faculty, and securing scholarships. Stowe's passion for excellence extended beyond education to the sport of tennis, as well. In 1917, she became the first African-American woman to win a national title in any sport, when she claimed the first women's title at the American Tennis Association's national tournament in Baltimore.

While an undergraduate student at Howard, Lucy Diggs Stowe was one of nine founders of Alpha Kappa Alpha, the nation's first Greek-letter organization for African-American women and served as its first president. More than a century later, the international sorority has grown to more than 290,000 members in 997 chapters in 42 states, the District of Columbia and several U.S. territories and foreign countries. With the purpose of raising the sta-

tus of African-Americans, particularly girls and women, the sorority's corps of volunteers has championed life-long learning and instituted social action initiatives and social service programs that have transformed communities for the better.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in honoring the extraordinary life and contributions of Lucy Diggs Stowe, a favorite daughter of Berryville, Virginia and recognizing and thanking Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., for 109 years, of proudly and successfully working to raise the status of African-American girls and women

EMMA BUZBEE

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emma Buzbee for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Emma Buzbee is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emma Buzbee is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emma Buzbee for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MS.

LISA S. DISBROW

### HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Lisa Disbrow. Over the last 32 years, Ms. Disbrow has had a distinguished career in public and military service culminating with her recent assignment as Acting Secretary of the Air Force, where she was responsible for organizing, training, equipping and providing for the welfare of approximately 660,000 active duty, Guard, Reserve and civilian Airmen and their families, world-wide.

Ms. Disbrow has given much to this Nation through her dedicated and selfless service. After graduation from the University of Virginia she answered the calling to join the Air Force. She served on active duty until 1992 in a variety of positions to include intelligence alert officer, Africa/Middle East military political analyst, and chief of electronic intelligence analysis. She deployed in support of Operations Desert Storm and Southern Watch and was selected for the Defense Intelligence Agency's Advanced Language and Area Studies.

After Desert Storm, Ms. Disbrow transitioned to the Air Force Reserve, and accepted a civilian position as a senior systems engineer for the National Reconnaissance Office. In that capacity, she helped develop programs and requirements to improve national intelligence support to tactical users, including operational and analytical systems.

From 1995 to 2014, Ms. Disbrow held a variety of positions on the Joint Staff as a senior civilian, including the Joint Staff Vice Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment. She was responsible for developing joint warfighting requirements, advising on force assignments to combatant commanders, conducting force structure and warfighting studies, and evaluations defense plans, programs and strategies for the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

While assigned to the Joint Staff, Ms. Disbrow was detailed to the President's National Security Advisor as the Special Advisor for Policy Implementation and Execution at the White House. She assisted in planning and implementing the National Security Strategy and advised the White House on issues across the federal government.

Her twenty-three years of uniformed service culminated in 2008 when she retired as a Colonel from the Air Force Reserve while serving as Special Assistant to the Director of Programs, Headquarters Air Force.

In 2014, Ms. Disbrow was confirmed by the Senate as the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management and Comptroller, the principal senior official on all financial matters. She was responsible for financial policy, management, execution of an annual budget of over \$130 billion, workforce development for over 10,000 financial managers world-wide, and providing analytic support services. She directed the development of the five-year programming plan, prepared for the first congressionally-mandated audit, oversaw the Air Force Cost Analysis Agency and led accounting and financial operations.

Prior to assuming the duties of Acting Secretary of the Air Force, Ms. Disbrow served as the twenty-fifth Under Secretary of the Air Force. As Under Secretary, her leadership enabled the successful roll-out of the Long Range Strike Bomber program, helped develop the first-ever analytic framework for space resiliency, effecting \$10 billion in acquisition programs, facilitated operational energy efficiencies resulting in over \$1 billion in savings, and successfully gained authorization to add over 10,000 new Airmen to the active duty force.

At the same time, Lisa also led efforts to better support Airmen suffering from invisible wounds of war by improving processes from injury diagnosis through reintegration with appreciation of the member's experience and care.

Finally, I also commend Ms. Disbrow's family for their service and support. Her husband, Harry, served as an Air Force Colonel and as a senior civilian in the Pentagon. Her two children, Stefanie and Derrick have remained supportive through the family's decades of service. Stefanie's husband T.J. is an honored serviceman serving two tours in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I would also like to acknowledge their two children, Parker and Brody. Our na-

tion appreciates their unwavering support, service, and sacrifice throughout Ms. Disbrow's exemplary service.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. Disbrow and her family for their remarkable service to our nation. I wish Ms. Disbrow good luck and God-speed in her next chapter of life, and I look forward to their continued success.

#### RECOGNIZING ALBERT NAPOLI

#### HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2017

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize Mr. Albert Napoli's contributions to Orange County, California during his tenure as Chairman of the Greater Irvine Chamber of Commerce. Over the course of the last year, Albert successfully represented the 15,000 businesses and industries that call Irvine, California home.

Local Chambers of Commerce support small businesses and encourage economic growth and vitality. A thriving local economy helps companies of all sizes grow and invest in their operations, which strengthens our communities.

I thank Albert for his work to strengthen and expand Irvine's business community. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

#### GRACE HUSKINSON

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Grace Huskinson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Grace Huskinson is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Grace Huskinson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Grace Huskinson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF THE LATE HORACE NASH

#### HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Master Sergeant

(MSG) Horace Nash. MSG Nash died from injuries he sustained in a car accident on May 13, 2017. MSG Nash was well-known for his devotion to God, family and military service.

MSG Nash enjoyed playing sports growing up including football, baseball, and basketball. He excelled at all three. MSG Nash graduated from Carthage High School in 1996. The same year he enlisted in the Mississippi Army National Guard. During his 20 years of service, he deployed with Company A 150th Engineer Battalion, served as the Intelligence NCOIC for the 168th Engineer Brigade, and was a member of the 150th Brigade Engineer Battalion. He divided his time between the Mississippi Army National Guard and PECO Foods in Sebastopol where he was employed.

MSG Nash's sister, Paula Nash-Hogan, says her younger brother's dream was to be in the military and to also serve as a police officer. He achieved both of those goals.

"He wasn't my only military brother, but he was my favorite military brother," Paula said. "I was like his second mom. I am extremely proud. From the scale of 1-10, it would be 100. I love him."

Mississippi Army National Guard SGT Greg Wells, a childhood friend, served with MSG Nash during a deployment to Iraq from July 2004 until January 2006. He says if there was one word to describe MSG Nash, it would be "tenacious."

"He was one of those guys you knew would make a mark in this world," Wells said. "Horace did everything right."

MSG Nash is survived by his wife, Nilah Nash; his mother, Annie Bell Nash; his children, Charmecia Nash, Jawaunya Nash, Madison Nash, Colton Nash, and Katelyn Nash; four stepchildren, Armando, Aveon, Amarian, and Azavier Hayes; three sisters, Shelia Nash, Paula (Stacey) Nash-Hogan, Wanda Dortch; three brothers, Marvin (Jacqueta) Nash, Robert (Ruth Ann), and Deonday (April) Nash; best friends/brothers, Kendall Hall, Desmond Reed, Jr., and Mashawn Leflore.

MSG Nash's devotion to serving our nation will always be remembered.

#### HONORING BRENT "RUDY" EDWARDS

#### HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2017

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a brave young man from West Philadelphia, Brent "Rudy" Edwards, a sophomore at Overbrook High School.

On Saturday, May 27, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, a fire started inside of a toaster at a row home on the 1000 block of Flanders Road in the Overbrook section of Philadelphia. Eight family members were inside of the home at the time.

As the family escaped, they realized their 1-year-old relative, Bryce, was still inside as flames and smoke engulfed the home. That is when Edwards ran into the house, without hesitation, to rescue his 1-year-old nephew.

The house was overcome with smoke as Edwards ran in. He couldn't see anything but

the flames as he searched frantically for his nephew. He called out for Bryce twice and received no answer. Suddenly, he heard a sound—the baby's cough. Edwards reached out, grabbed a tiny arm, and scooped up his nephew. Holding him close to his chest, Edwards staggered back outside, where he gave the baby to his mother and collapsed on the landing.

Edwards was taken to Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and was treated for smoke inhalation. He was released the following day. As Edwards recovers, he is grateful that his baby nephew is alive and well.

The 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania extends best wishes to Edwards for his actions in the midst of a tragic event.

EMELIO MARQUEZ

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emelio Marquez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Emelio Marquez is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emelio Marquez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emelio Marquez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

### REMEMBERING JUNETEENTH

### HON. ADRIANO ESPAILLAT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1865, the Emancipation Proclamation was read by U.S. Army Major Gordon Granger in Galveston, Texas to slaves who were unaware of the original issuance and reading by President Abraham Lincoln nearly two and a half years prior.

This day, referred to as Juneteenth, is historic and significant in American history and marks the date of freedom for the millions of slaves who were liberated.

This nation was built on the backs of African-Americans. And this Capitol and our White House, were literally built by the hands of slaves. It was only 152 years ago that Blacks in America were considered property and three-fifths a human. Juneteenth serves as a reminder of the atrocities faced by the African-American community.

In 2017, African-Americans are still discriminated against on an institutional basis. Black women in New York State take home \$0.66 on the dollar compared to white men. And unarmed black people are killed by police at five times the rate of unarmed whites.

Despite being enslaved for 245 years and then freed to struggle, African-Americans have accomplished so much. It is our duty to acknowledge the ugliness of this nation's history and remain steadfast in our efforts to ensure equity and equality for all individuals. While our country has made great strides in race and freedom, there is still much work that remains to be done.

IN HONOR OF DENNIS PATRICK MULLINS

### HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to commemorate the life of Mr. Dennis Patrick "Pat" Mullins, who passed away on May 28, 2017, at the age of 79. Throughout his life, Mr. Mullins was an esteemed leader in our community and a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. Revered for his ability to bring people together and beloved for his vibrant personality, charm, and great sense of humor, Mr. Mullins embodied the essence of a true conservative and a Virginia gentleman. Under his extraordinary leadership, the Republican Party of Virginia experienced a period of expansion and tremendous success, unparalleled in recent years. His legacy endures and he will always be remembered and missed by many.

Originally from St. Albans, West Virginia, Mr. Mullins earned his bachelor's degree from Columbia University in 1959, where he served as sports editor of the college daily newspaper, the Spectator. Later, he earned his law degree from George Washington University. In 1963, Mr. Mullins married his wife, Jackie, with whom he raised four children.

Mr. Mullins's illustrious political career spanned multiple decades and commenced with his role as the Fairfax County Republican Committee Chairman from 1990 to 1996. After moving to Central Virginia, he served as the Chairman of Louisa County Republican Committee from 2008 to 2009. Subsequently, he was elected as Chairman of the Republican Party of Virginia in 2009 and served until his retirement in 2015.

In addition to his political activism, Mr. Mullins was known for his fervent passion for therapeutic horseback riding and his dedication to our community and his family. He served as a member of the American Paint Horse Foundation's Board of Directors and served as a Rotary District Governor. Mr. Mullins also always cherished his family and in his later years often regaled his grandchildren with vivacious stories. Mr. Mullins leaves behind a remarkable legacy and an extensive career of service to our Commonwealth. He will be greatly missed by the countless lives he has touched. He is survived by his four children, six grandchildren, and brother.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the life of, and bidding farewell to, Pat Mullins. May he rest in peace, and his family be comforted.

ELIJAH RAMOS

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Elijah Ramos for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Elijah Ramos is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Elijah Ramos is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Elijah Ramos for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

### SGT DON VOSS RETIREMENT

### HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a lifelong servant from Sarpy County, Nebraska, Sergeant Don Voss. As we see the end of one officer's historic career, we are reminded of the need for brave police officers from around our great nation to pick up this calling of service.

Sergeant Don Voss joined the police force in 1978 while still serving as a member of the United States Marine Corps Reserve. He received awards such as the Bellevue Jaycees Officer of the Year, the Knights of Aksarben Citizen Soldier Award, and the Michael J. Elman Officer of the Year Award. He received the Department Life Saving Award for quickly administering CPR to an infant, ultimately saving their life. He was a pioneer in community policing as a narcotics officer responsible for combating the growing opiate problem and providing care to Sarpy families whose children and loved ones were battling opiate addiction.

Don is a sterling example of someone who has put their life on the line, day in and day out, for nearly 40 years protecting the citizens of Nebraska. Sgt Don Voss, I wish you and your family the best in this next phase in your life. You and the entire police family will always have a friend in Washington, DC.



CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTHWEST ALABAMA COUNCIL OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (NACOLG)

**HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Northwest Alabama Council of Local Governments (NACOLG) which was created in 1967.

Then Alabama Governor Lurleen Wallace signed legislation in June of 1967 to establish NACOLG. Over the past five decades the organization has played a pivotal role in the economic opportunities of Northwest Alabama and has improved the daily lives of its citizens.

NACOLG is an association of 37 governmental units in the five county region of Colbert, Franklin, Lauderdale, Marion, and Winston Counties, along with the municipalities inside those counties. It is an association where local leaders can address issues of region-wide importance.

50 years after its creation, NACOLG continues to fulfill its original mission, which was to serve senior citizens in its five county region. NACOLG helps seniors in numerous ways, from getting medical care, to ensuring fair treatment, to finding jobs for area seniors.

In addition to serving senior citizens, NACOLG's role has expanded into economic and community development. NACOLG serves as a conduit for federal dollars to projects as diverse as water and sewer infrastructure to community tornado shelters.

Growing up in this area, I appreciate the significant role that NACOLG has also played in providing economic opportunities to people of Northwest Alabama. The Council's revolving loan program gives smaller municipalities access to capital to purchase land, and construct or renovate buildings to lure new business and jobs to the area.

Currently, NACOLG is led by Keith Jones, and has an excellent staff that makes sure the five county region is well served. On this 50th anniversary of NACOLG, I send my best wishes to all those who work directly and indirectly with NACOLG. I know NACOLG and its member partners will continue to use its strength to work for the people of Colbert, Franklin, Lauderdale, Marion, and Winston Counties.

EZEKIEL REYNA

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ezekiel Reyna for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ezekiel Reyna is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ezekiel Reyna is exemplary of the type of achieve-

ment that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ezekiel Reyna for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

**HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER THREE TYRONE PINKINS**

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Warrant Officer Three Tyrone Pinkins.

Chief Warrant Officer Three Tyrone Pinkins was born and raised in Rolling Fork, Mississippi. After graduating high school he attended Tougaloo College in Jackson, Mississippi before joining the Army in June 1996. He went on to earn his Bachelor's Degree in Political Science at the University of Maryland University College while serving on active duty.

Upon enlisting in the Army on June 24, 1996, Chief Warrant Officer Three Pinkins attended Basic Training at Fort Jackson, South Carolina followed by Advanced Individual Training at Fort Gordon, Georgia as a Signal Systems Support Specialist (31U). Prior to his appointment as a Warrant Officer, he completed the Primary Leadership Development Course, 7th Army Noncommissioned Officers Academy, Grafenwoehr, Germany; the Basic Noncommissioned Officer Course, Noncommissioned Officer Academy, Fort Gordon, Georgia; and the Advanced Noncommissioned Officer Course, Noncommissioned Officer Academy, Fort Gordon, Georgia. He received his appointment as a Warrant Officer in 2007 and has completed the Warrant Officer Basic Course, Warrant Officer Advanced Course and the Electronic Warfare Officer Course.

Throughout 21 years of service Chief Warrant Officer Three Pinkins has served in a variety of assignments to include major combat operations. His previous assignments include Signal Support Systems Specialist, 4th Battalion 1st Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Riley, Kansas; Squad Leader, 2nd Battalion 37th Armor, Friedberg, Germany; Section Chief, 2nd Battalion 69th Armor, Fort Benning, Georgia; Platoon Sergeant, 2nd Battalion 3rd Field Artillery Regiment, Giessen, Germany, and Battalion Communications Chief, 1st Battalion 214th Aviation Regiment, Mannheim, Germany. His assignments as a Warrant Officer include Network Security Technician, HQ 1st Armored Division, Wiesbaden, Germany; Brigade S-6 OIC, 10th Regional Support Group, Okinawa, Japan.

Chief Warrant Officer Three Pinkins' deployments include three tours in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom where he served in Baghdad, Tikrit and Najaf, Iraq respectively, as well as Operation New Dawn in Baghdad, Iraq.

Chief Warrant Officer Three Pinkins is a recipient of the Bronze Star Medal, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Army Meritorious Service Medal with One Oak Leaf Cluster, Army Commendation Medal with 4 Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Achievement Medal with 4 Oak Leaf Clusters, the Presidential Unit Citation Award, the Joint Meritorious Unit Award, the Meritorious Unit Citation, Army Good Conduct Medal third award, the National Defense Service Medal, the Iraqi Campaign Medal with service star, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, NCO Professional Development Ribbon with numeral three, the Army Achievement Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, and the Drivers/Mechanic Badge.

Chief Warrant Officer Three Pinkins is currently assigned as a Presidential Communications Aide at the White House directly responsible for communications and technical support to the President of the United States.

In addition to his role at the White House as Communications Aide and U.S. Army Chief, Warrant Officer Three, Tyrone Pinkins is also the founder of The Pyramid Project, an organization aimed at addressing the lack of business, government and public-sector exposure and development programs for youth at the base of the economic pyramid in the Mississippi Delta.

In an effort to combat these deficits, Warrant Officer Pinkins launched the youth development, mentorship and leadership programs: Cultural Exchange & Interaction Initiative (C.E.I.I), Youth Exposure Tour (Y.E.T), Ellevote Girl Initiative (E.G.I), E.G.I Forum, Ascend Forum and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Tour.

With only a shoestring organizational budget and invaluable volunteers, Pinkins simultaneously created unprecedented partnerships with government agencies, corporations, universities, museums and nonprofit networks and collaborated with middle and high school officials to encourage youth to enter into grade and writing contests as a way of earning opportunities to participate in his programs.

These efforts paved the way for The Pyramid Project to afford the selected students, grades 6-12, to learn firsthand about the government, corporate and community dynamics, history, historical sites and broaden their horizon during once-in-a-lifetime, weeklong tours of metropolitan cities like Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Chief Warrant Officer Three Tyrone Pinkins for his dedication to serving our great country and the growth and development of the youth in the Mississippi Delta.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE FREDERICK DOUGLASS BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT**

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill, along with Representative ANDY HARRIS of Maryland, that would establish a bicentennial commission to study ways that the federal government might honor and celebrate

the life of Frederick Douglass during the bicentennial anniversary of his birth, in 2018.

Frederick Douglass was born into slavery in 1818 on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He learned basic reading skills from his mistress and continued to teach himself and other slaves to read and write despite the risks he faced, including death. After two attempts, Douglass successfully escaped to New York and became an abolitionist and anti-slavery lecturer. He went on to serve in several administrations, including as a close advisor to President Abraham Lincoln, U.S. Marshal of the District of Columbia under President Rutherford B. Hayes, and District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds under President James Garfield. In 1889, President Benjamin Harrison appointed Frederick Douglass to be the U.S. minister to Haiti. He was later appointed by President Ulysses S. Grant to serve as secretary of the commission of Santo Domingo.

Douglass dedicated his life to achieving justice for all Americans. He lived in the District of Columbia for 23 of his 57 years as a free man and his home at Cedar Hill was established as a National Historic Site in Southeast Washington, D.C. The Frederick Douglass statue that stands in his honor in the United States Capitol is a gift from the nearly 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

My bill would establish a commission to examine ways the federal government can honor Douglass during the bicentennial anniversary of his birth, including the issuance of a Frederick Douglass bicentennial postage stamp, the convening of a joint meeting or joint session of Congress for ceremonies and activities relating to Frederick Douglass, a rededication of the Frederick Douglass National Historic Site, and the acquisition and preservation of artifacts associated with Frederick Douglass. The commission would report its findings and recommendations to Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

ESTRELLA ROBLES

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Estrella Robles for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Estrella Robles is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Estrella Robles is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Estrella Robles for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE WHITLAND AVENUE NEIGHBORS IN NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

**HON. JIM COOPER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Whitland Avenue neighbors. The Whitland area is one of the most historic—and beautiful—neighborhoods in Middle Tennessee.

Built in the earliest days of the 20th century, this relatively small neighborhood has more historical markers than any other in Davidson County.

In 1976, residents vowed to hold an annual party on the Fourth of July to celebrate our nation's birthday and keep our patriotic spirit alive. The celebration was conceived to include a number of timeless activities such as a bicycle parade for neighbors of all ages; performances of patriotic tunes by a band of local musicians; enthusiastic singing by all in attendance; a dramatic reading of the Declaration of Independence; recognition of veterans for their service; speeches by elected officials and other local dignitaries; and a covered dish picnic lunch.

The Whitland Avenue Fourth of July Celebration has become one of Nashville's most festive events. The neighborhood invites the entire city to join in a family-friendly parade and gathering to celebrate our great nation. The neighbors start planning months in advance, and each year's event is bigger and better than the last.

On July 4, 2017, the neighbors at Whitland Avenue will celebrate the 40th Anniversary of this beloved event. It is an honor to recognize the community, their spirit, and their patriotism. Whitland Avenue is the heart of Nashville, and I hope the community spirit lives on for generations to come.

NATIONAL SCLERODERMA AWARENESS MONTH

**HON. PETER T. KING**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Scleroderma Awareness Month.

Scleroderma is an autoimmune disease that not only affects thousands of individuals within my own constituency and the state of New York, but also thousands of individuals living in the United States.

Due to the lack of research on the unpredictable progression of Scleroderma, many physicians find it difficult to diagnose their patients and find it even more difficult to provide adequate treatment since a cure has not been discovered. As we recognize the need for awareness of this troublesome disease, we must do more for the thousands of Americans who are diagnosed with this condition each year.

In the past, I have championed legislation aimed toward galvanizing many federal agen-

cies to fund research for Scleroderma with former Congresswoman Lois Capps of California. As a representative, I consider myself responsible for the health and safety of my constituents. This is why I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting federal investment for research as well as recognizing June as Scleroderma Awareness Month.

ETHAN STRAUCH

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ethan Strauch for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ethan Strauch is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ethan Strauch is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ethan Strauch for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING ELEANORE DEVADETZSKY

**HON. DWIGHT EVANS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a noted centenarian of Philadelphia, Ms. Eleanore deVadetzsky.

Eleanore deVadetzsky was born in Pennsylvania Hospital on June 11, 1917, to Minna (nee Wolfsohn) and Teyve Rosenstein of Olney and Wynnefield. It was just months after the entry of the U.S. into WW I. Teyve had a trained voice, a choir leader, opera enthusiast, taught music and song and was a strong supporter of the founding of Israel.

Minna fled an unhappy family situation in Latvia, when a very young woman, making her way alone to the New World, with little more than a suitcase crammed with philosophy books, Spinoza and Maimonides. She was a homemaker, suffragette, and struggling businesswoman, who prized education and always had a book in her hands. She studied science, and upon graduating, became a chemist, first at Tastycake Bakery and later, at Whitman's Chocolates.

Along the way, Eleanore Rosenstein met the dashing Vladimir, aka Walter, deVadetzsky, who bore a striking resemblance to actor Richard Ney, and was on his way to the South Pacific to fight in World War II. They

wrote letters during his absence, and they were married on his return.

They managed to travel to far-flung places around the globe such as China, Japan, Australia for the '56 Olympics, pre-Castro Cuba, Central and South America, and almost every European country, making friends wherever they were. Both here and abroad, Eleanore & Walter enjoyed theater, ballet, music and art.

For many years, they both volunteered at Pennsylvania and Graduate hospitals. When Walter passed away in 2005, Eleanore continued volunteering at Pennsylvania Hospital and CHOP, until 2010, when she was sidelined with a broken ankle. She never touched alcohol, but always had a cocktail waiting for Walter at the end of the day, and was a connoisseur and devotee of dark chocolate, to which she attributed her longevity. Eleanore frequently visited with family and friends around the globe by telephone.

Sadly, Eleanore passed away on Tuesday, June 13, 2017 from complications of dementia. Her family and friends celebrated her 100th birthday and said goodbye on Sunday, June 11. She is survived by her cousins Rosenstein, Winitz, Wagner, Dichter, Kaplan & Vaughan.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during Roll Call vote No. 309 and No. 310 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on H.R. 2847—Improving Services for Older Youth in Foster Care Act, and yea on H.R. 2866—Reducing Barriers for Relative Foster Parents Act.

#### EVAN VIGIL

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Evan Vigil for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Evan Vigil is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Evan Vigil is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Evan Vigil for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE ENSURING SUCCESSFUL REENTRY ACT

### HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Ensuring Successful Reentry Act, a bill to eliminate so-called "subsistence fees." Federal law currently requires the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to impose a subsistence fee on the income of returning citizens living in residential reentry centers (RRCs), supposedly to promote financial responsibility by requiring RRC residents to pay a portion of their housing costs. The fee is currently 25 percent. However, many returning citizens living in these centers often work minimum wage jobs, so the loss of 25 percent of their paychecks is a significant hurdle to successful reentry, and it makes it extremely difficult for them to save money for rent, pay child support, or fines and fees associated with their conviction (such as restitution). Only last year, BOP eliminated the subsistence fee for returning citizens on home confinement, who cost BOP nothing for maintenance. Far from promoting financial responsibility, subsistence fees actually prevent returning citizens from meeting their financial obligations.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) has already recognized how "counterproductive" subsistence fees are, both for returning citizens and BOP. In a November 2016 memo, then-Deputy Attorney General Sally Q. Yates noted that BOP's "process for collecting these subsistence fees is costly and administratively burdensome for both RRC's and [BOP]," and called for DOJ to "develop a plan to limit the use of counterproductive 'subsistence' fees imposed on indigent residents." BOP can already waive subsistence fees in certain situations for residents of RRCs, but only a change in federal law can remove this unnecessary barrier to reentry.

We should not be imposing additional burdens on returning citizens, setting them up to fail, especially those who are employed and working toward independence from the criminal justice system. Jobs and affordable housing are crucial components in ensuring successful reentry—charging subsistence fees is antithetical to this goal. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

#### EZRA WRIGHT

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ezra Wright for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ezra Wright is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ezra Wright is exemplary of the type of achieve-

ment that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ezra Wright for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### HONORING THE WAUKEGAN TO COLLEGE (W2C) PROGRAM

### HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rafael Aguilera, Guadalupe Bueno, Ezau Calderon, Elisa Flores, Juan Carlos Flores, Elijah Glaze, Jared Herrera-Sanchez, Estrella Limon, Anjelica Linares, Ivan Martinez, Veronica Martinez, Sebastian Salgado-Gonzalez, Tamara Sanchez, and Emily Sostre for their admittance into the Waukegan to College (W2C) program.

A year-round college readiness service, W2C launched in 2009 and seeks to advance local students' intellectual and emotional development, cultivating a strong commitment to community and a profound belief that they can build a brighter future for themselves, their families and their communities. By establishing high academic expectations and counseling students and their families on the college application process, W2C helps students realize their full potential by making the dream of college a reality.

All of these students will be the first in their families to attend college, and were selected for the W2C program due to both their impressive academic achievements as well as their contributions to their communities. As leaders inside and outside the classroom, these students show tremendous dedication and potential.

Strengthening our communities requires rebuilding the ladders of opportunity so that all Americans have the opportunity to succeed and thrive. This begins with providing each and every child, regardless of zip code, access to a high quality, affordable education, continues by ensuring all families can afford to send their sons and daughters to college.

When our nation's talented young people pursue their passions and follow their dreams, they accomplish far more than personal growth. They serve as role models in their communities and their achievements inspire and motivate other young people to equally strive and achieve.

These students truly are Champions of Change. I wish them the very best of luck in their higher education and in all their future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF MATTHEW 'MATTY' FERRENTINO

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the active and impressive life of my friend Matthew 'Matty' Ferrentino as he celebrates his 90th birthday on June 21, 2017.

Matty Ferrentino is the son of Italian immigrants and was born and raised in Buffalo, NY. He and his wife Joan now live in West Seneca, NY.

Matty graduated from University at Buffalo in 1951 with a bachelor's degree in physical education. During his time at the University at Buffalo, Matty played football for the UB Bulls, starting all four years as offensive guard and defensive linebacker. In 1950, Matty earned Little All-American status and led the UB Bulls as co-captain in their fifth straight winning season.

After his time at UB, Matty began working at the Ford Stamping Plant as a guard and retired in 1994 as a Production Manager. Matty and his wife Joan raised three children: Dan, Judy, and Rob and now have five grandchildren: Dani, Baylea, Conner, Drew and Gracie. In September, Matty will become a great-grandfather for the first time.

Physical activity has long been a part of Matty's life. In addition to leading the UB Bulls during his time at school, Matty boxed in the U.S. Army and as an amateur outside of the army. Even today, Matty remains active working out at LA Fitness. I am honored to be among the many friendships that Matty has developed through the years at the gym. His discipline and perseverance is an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the accomplishments of my friend, Matty Ferrentino. I look forward to celebrating his 90 years of life with family and friends who have traveled from near and far on June 23, 2017. I wish Matty and his family health and happiness in all the days to come.

CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL SCARLET DRAGON BASEBALL TEAM OF MARTINSBURG, PA

**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements of the Central High School Varsity Baseball team of Martinsburg, Pennsylvania. The countless hours of commitment required by the players and coaches was rewarded by their PIAA, 3A State Championship win on Thursday, June 15th. The Scarlet Dragons defeated Holy Redeemer High School with a final score of 8-3 in the team's first-ever state championship.

The Dragons finished the season with a record of 24-3.

The team represented Pennsylvania's Blair County at Penn State's Medlar Field at Lubrano Park. The town of Martinsburg, PA is small but mighty, much like that of the 40 player team led by their head coach AJ Hoenstine. Coach Hoenstine has led the Dragons as a head coach for 10 years, and is a Central High School Baseball alum himself.

The 2017 varsity team was home to 11 seniors with a solidly backed line up of underclassmen. The game's star pitcher was a junior named Preston Karstetter. Karstetter took over for the team's ace Jarret Imler after the Dragons made it to the final game of the playoffs. The rest of the starting line-up from the Championship Game included Alex Hoenstine, Chase Smith, Josh McKnight, Michael Speck, Noah Muthler, Hunter Liebal, Larry Corle, Jacob Muthler, Brady Nicewonger, and Brice Brumbaugh.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to congratulate the players and coaches of the Central High School's Varsity Baseball team on their championship win. The type of dedication and hard work required to achieve this level of victory will surely follow these young men throughout the rest of their lives.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF WORLD WAR II VETERAN ALBERT CUMMINGS

**HON. TRENT KELLY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor World War II Veteran Albert Cummings who served our great nation from 1944 until 1946. Mr. Cummings answered the call to defend America and distinguished himself during some of the fiercest campaigns in Europe, including the D-Day Invasion of Normandy on the northern coast of France.

Mr. Cummings was raised on a farm in Carrollton, Alabama. He was one of 13 children. Mr. Cummings left the family farm to fight in World War II. He was 18 years old when he trained for the U.S. Army Infantry. Mr. Cummings excelled during his military service as a Squad Leader. He achieved the rank of Staff Sergeant (SSG).

Mr. Cummings was wounded as he made his way to Utah Beach during the invasion of Normandy. He was shot by a German soldier. Mr. Cummings was picked up by a MASH unit and strapped to the top of a field ambulance. He spent 17 days in a hospital in France. He was transferred to a hospital in England for five months. In January 1945, Mr. Cummings came back to the United States on a Liberty ship. Liberty ship was the name given to the EC2, the ship designed for emergency construction by the U.S. Maritime Commission. While sailing across the Atlantic Ocean, the ship split in half. These ships traveled in convoys, so he was able to be picked up. Mr. Cummings continued his recovery at the Augusta Army Hospital in Georgia. He spent a total of nine months in hospitals in Europe and

the U.S. After his recovery, Mr. Cummings continued to serve our nation guarding Prisoner of War (POW) camps from Mississippi to California. He was honorably discharged in January 1946.

When Mr. Cummings completed his military service, he took a job as a Trailways bus driver. In 1949, he met his future wife, Helen, who worked at a Columbus restaurant. They were married in 1950. They had two children, Cheryl and Tim. Mr. Cummings was later employed as a truck driver for Campbell 66 and worked there until he retired. Mr. Cummings enjoys spending the majority of his time with his five grandchildren and four great grandchildren.

In July, Mr. Cummings will be honored for his military service by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 4272. He will be honored for serving in WWII and for his service as a past Post 4272 Commander, VFW District Commander, and VFW State Commander.

Mr. Cummings has demonstrated what it is to be a patriotic American who is willing to fight for the freedoms we all enjoy. He has led a life of honor and honesty which is why we call Mr. Cummings and others like him "The Greatest Generation."

EXPO 2017

**HON. DANA ROHRABACHER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, over the 25 years of Kazakhstan's independence, that country has become a valued member of the international community. Its commitment to building a relationship with the United States has resulted in stronger ties and a strategic partnership rooted in shared interests.

After the Soviet Union dissolved, Kazakhstan inherited the fourth largest nuclear stockpile in the world. Through President Nursultan Nazarbayev's leadership, this nuclear arsenal was decommissioned and the steadfastness of their government in this matter has become a key part of our bilateral relations.

Today, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the international Expo 2017 which recently opened in the capital city of Astana. This unique event is focused on addressing the challenging issues of our time, especially the need for improved energy solutions. Expo 2017 is expected to draw nearly five million visitors over just a few months.

I congratulate the leaders and the people of Kazakhstan on the opening of Expo 2017 and wish them success as public audiences visit the exposition and the nation of Kazakhstan.

RECOGNIZING PRISCILLA KIRKPATRICK

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is truly remarkable and moving to witness a student

chosen among their generation to bring strong direction to their community. As a leader of leaders, this extraordinary individual contributes their time, energy, and wisdom to create opportunities for many to succeed. Priscilla Kirkpatrick, from Franklin, Tennessee, is one of these distinguished leaders. She was elected as governor of the American Legion Auxiliary's Volunteer Girls State and was chosen to be one of the 2017 Girls Nation Nominees.

For Priscilla, there is no limit nor bound of what could be attained. Her mindful service and vision for community has inspired many to go above and beyond themselves. Priscilla's success in the classroom, and involvement in several extracurricular activities has set her apart from the rest of her peers. These experiences have prepared her to perform the responsibilities that come along with this role. Franklin High School has been marked by her caring and serving nature. Leadership is not as it appears, but as it performs. I congratulate Priscilla for her new role as governor of the American Legion Auxiliary's Volunteer Girls State.

---

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY  
OF WALKER ALEXANDER WIL-  
LIAMS, JR.

---

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life and legacy of District of Columbia resident and my friend Walker Alexander Williams, Jr. Walker, who is 76, was honored this week at the Lincoln Theatre.

Born on November 7, 1940, Walker Alexander Williams, Jr., took on a selfless life of service to others. After attending Boston University and earning a degree in communications, he went on to attend Seton Hall and Rutgers University's Graduate Schools of Business Administration. From there, he built an impressive career working with an array of non-governmental organizations on issues ranging from education to economic development. During this time, he developed an expertise in the area of African and Caribbean development. He had a remarkable understanding of the African and Caribbean diaspora and politics, and realized the importance of elevating their voices in Washington, advocating for them and advising international and U.S. government agencies. He went on to found Leadership Africa USA in 2006 and served as President and Founder of Education Africa USA, focusing on educational challenges in South Africa.

Walker leaves behind his partner, Janice M. Smith; his brother, Kenneth Williams; his sisters Diane Harris and Elaine Bloom; children, Bryn Williams Meyer and Walker Williams III; and his grandchildren Max Meyer, Lashonna and Yahshua Williams.

I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Walker Alexander Williams, Jr., and remembering his selfless dedication to others.

IN RECOGNITION OF PATRICIA  
RICHARDS FOR HER CAREER AS  
A PUBLIC POLICY ADVOCATE  
WITH MARATHON PETROLEUM

---

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Patricia Richards upon the occasion of her retirement from Marathon Petroleum Corporation. Ms. Richards has been a strong advocate for energy policies that benefit working Americans throughout her career.

Ms. Richards began her career with Marathon as a state government affairs representative, serving in the states of Florida, Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio. In these roles, Ms. Richards distinguished herself as a knowledgeable representative with deep knowledge of the industry as well as the regulatory environment of the states in which she worked. As a result of her success in these roles, Ms. Richards was named director of Marathon Oil Corporation's Federal Government Affairs. In this position, Ms. Richards was responsible for helping formulate the company's policies addressing safety and environmental standards at the federal level. She was then promoted to head of office for Marathon Petroleum Corporation's Federal Government Affairs Office in Washington, D.C., where she utilized her public policy expertise to advocate for policies that help MPC serve its customers and the communities in which it operates.

Ms. Richards' work with Marathon has been critical to the growth and success of the organization. As a result of Ms. Richards' efforts, MPC has achieved distinction as a leading company that has created good-paying jobs throughout the Midwest while maintaining a focus on customer service and satisfaction. Additionally, Ms. Richards has been active in the Washington, D.C. community, working with various nonprofits and charitable organizations and remaining engaged with the community at large. Her advocacy, efforts, and deep knowledge of the industry have made her an effective public policy professional for over 30 years, and her expertise will be missed as she retires after a distinguished career.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Patricia Richards for her career with MPC. Ms. Richards has effectively served the company and the community through her leadership and hard work.

---

TRIBUTE TO MR. RICHARD S.  
MATLOCK

---

**HON. MO BROOKS**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 21, 2017*

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement from the Department of Defense, I raise tribute to Mr. Richard S. Matlock for a 40-year career as a civil servant and distinguished member of the Senior Executive Service of the United States. Mr. Matlock was one of the Department of De-

fense's top Science and Technology Executives. In his most recent position, Mr. Matlock served as the Program Executive for Advanced Technology for the Missile Defense Agency. In this position, he led the development of the next generation cutting-edge missile defense technology and proved the benefit to the warfighter through realistic experiments in relevant environments. Mr. Matlock developed new missile defense capabilities that outpaced threats from potential adversaries and enabled the Ballistic Missile Defense System to defend the Nation, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies against ballistic missile attack. Mr. Matlock's portfolio included high energy lasers, advanced sensors, and future anti-ballistic missile interceptors. Mr. Matlock simultaneously directed a Department-wide missile defeat special program for the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Mr. Matlock's previous Senior Executive assignments included the Program Director for Ballistic Missile Defense System Kill Vehicles, Program Director for Modeling and Simulation, and Technical Director for Kinetic Energy Interceptors.

Mr. Matlock's broad based career in government service included major acquisition and scientific positions with the Office of the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, the Missile Defense Agency, the United States Navy, the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, and the United States Air Force.

While serving at the Missile Defense Agency, Mr. Matlock led the world's first destruction of a ballistic missile during boost using an airborne high energy laser. His expert management skills enabled the program to overcome numerous technical hurdles to accomplish a feat many leading scientists declared outside the laws of physics. Mr. Matlock also initiated a joint experimental plan with the United States Air Force to prove the utility of unmanned aerial vehicle systems in a missile defense role. As the Senior Executive responsible for developing, integrating, testing, and procuring advanced kill vehicles for all exo-atmospheric interceptors, Mr. Matlock defined a modular kill vehicle concept that decreased the number of system developments which reduced cost and risk. Mr. Matlock also redirected the agency's modeling and simulation approach by using state of the art open architecture frameworks that allowed plug and play capability of a disparate set of models from a diverse contractor base thus eliminating intellectual property loss and reducing the time required for model code rewrite.

During his tenure with the Naval Sea Systems Command, Mr. Matlock led the development and implementation of a joint missile defense research program with the Japan Defense Agency which set in motion the joint deployment of the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System. Prior to employment with the Navy, Mr. Matlock was the Program Manager for Interceptor Technology Integration in the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (formerly the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization). Mr. Matlock developed the Lightweight Exo-Atmospheric Projectile, a primary building block for the Nation's missile defense programs. As Program Manager for this technology demonstration program, he established the experimental pathfinder for the Aegis Ballistic Missile

Defense Program. Mr. Matlock also built, launched, and operated several earth observing satellites, proving the value of low cost rapidly fieldable microsatellites for complex missile defense and space control missions.

Prior to joining the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, Mr. Matlock held several positions in the Department of the Air Force, both as an officer and civil servant including Chief of Integration and Analysis at the Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory and Technology Director, Space Based Interceptor System Program Office at Air Force Systems Command's Space Division.

Mr. Matlock's major awards include the Air Force Aerospace Primus Award, the Outstanding Technical Achievement Award for Missile Defense, the Navy Superior Civilian Service Award, the Missile Defense Agency's Star for Program Management, the inaugural Missile Defense Technology Pioneer Award, the Meritorious Presidential Rank Award, and the Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Civilian Service.

Mr. Matlock consistently exemplified a true dedication to our Nation and its ideals. His vision and drive enabled fielding of a truly worldwide ballistic missile defense capability that will be part of this Nation's defense for decades to come. The Ballistic Missile Defense System is one of mankind's greatest technical achievements. Mr. Matlock created programs that matured technology, strengthened the Nation's industrial base, leveraged the capabilities of laboratories and universities, and grew a science and technology workforce that will meet the needs of the next generation of missile defense systems. Our Nation owes Mr. Matlock and his family a debt of gratitude for his outstanding leadership and service.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 22, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

##### JUNE 26

4 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Airland  
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the sub-

committee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-232A

##### JUNE 27

9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-124

Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support  
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-232A

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard  
To hold hearings to examine marine sanctuaries, focusing on fisheries, access, the environment, and maritime heritage.

SR-253

Committee on the Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act Amendments Act, focusing on reauthorizing America's vital national security authority and protecting privacy and civil liberties.

SD-226

10 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Security Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SD-138

10:30 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor.

SD-192

11 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Cybersecurity  
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-232A

2 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Personnel  
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SD-G50

2:45 p.m.  
Committee on Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety  
To hold hearings to examine developing and deploying advanced clean energy technologies.

SD-406

3:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on SeaPower  
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-232A

4:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities  
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SD-G50

5:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-232A

##### JUNE 28

9 a.m.  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD-106

9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-222

Committee on the Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Timothy J. Kelly, and Trevor N. McFadden, of Virginia, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, and Jeffrey Bossert Clark, of Virginia, and Beth Ann Williams, of New Jersey, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

10 a.m.  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Claire M. Grady, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, and Henry Kerner, of California, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation.

SD-138

|                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                     |        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| JUNE 29                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                     | JUNE 30                                                                                                             |        |
| 9:30 a.m.                                                                                                                                | tives on the past and future direction<br>for the 2018 Farm Bill.                                                   | 9:30 a.m.                                                                                                           |        |
| Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry                                                                                        | SH-216                                                                                                              | Committee on Armed Services                                                                                         |        |
| To hold hearings to examine conservation and forestry, focusing on perspectives on the past and future direction for the 2018 Farm Bill. | Committee on Armed Services                                                                                         | Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018. |        |
|                                                                                                                                          | Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018. |                                                                                                                     | SR-222 |
|                                                                                                                                          | SR-222                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                     |        |



## SENATE—Thursday, June 22, 2017

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, Lord of the Universe, inspire our lawmakers today with the magnetism of Your presence. Give them a longing to know and do Your will, receiving Your guidance and following Your admonition. Lord, provide them with the liberating assurance that all things are possible for those who believe. Go before our Senators to guide, beside them to inspire, above them to bless, behind them to protect, and within them to transform. Fill their minds with Your Spirit and their hearts with Your joy, becoming their Providential Guide in all they think, say, and do.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. SULLIVAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 7 years ago, Democrats imposed ObamaCare on our country. They said it would lower costs. It didn't. From 2013 to 2017, premiums have on average doubled in the vast majority of States on the Federal exchange. Next year, ObamaCare premiums will go up across the country once again, potentially by as much as 43 percent in Iowa, 59 percent in Maryland, and even a staggering 80 percent in New Mexico. Does it sound as if ObamaCare is working?

They said it would increase choice. They said it would increase choice, but of course it didn't. This year, 70 percent of American counties have had little or no choice of insurers under ObamaCare. Next year, at least 44 counties are projected to have no choice at all, meaning, yet again, Americans could be thrown off their plans in States like Missouri and Ohio and Wisconsin. Does this sound as if ObamaCare is working?

Now Democrats tell us it would be wrong for the Senate to actually address these problems in a serious way while the law they have defended for 7 years teeters, literally teeters on the edge of total collapse. They were wrong before; they are wrong again now because ObamaCare isn't working. By nearly any measure it has failed, and no amount of eleventh-hour reality denying or buck-passing by Democrats is going to change the fact that more Americans are going to get hurt unless we do something.

I regret that our Democratic friends made clear early on that they did not want to work with us in a serious bipartisan way to address the ObamaCare status quo, but Republicans believe we have a responsibility to act, and we are—for our constituents, for our States, and for our country.

We have long called for a better way forward, and we have been engaged in intensive talks on how to get there. Through dozens of meetings, open to each and every member of the conference, we have had the opportunity to offer and consider many ideas for confronting the ObamaCare status quo.

We have debated many policy proposals, and we have considered many different viewpoints. In the end, we have found that we share many ideas about what needs to be achieved and how we can achieve it. These shared policy objectives and the solutions to help achieve them are what made up the healthcare discussion draft that we finished talking through this morning.

We agree on the need to free Americans from ObamaCare's mandates, and

policies contained in the discussion draft will repeal the individual mandate, so Americans are no longer forced to buy insurance they don't need or can't afford. We are repealing employer mandates, so Americans no longer see their hours and take-home pay cut by employers because of it. We agree on the need to improve the affordability of health insurance, and policies contained in the discussion draft will do that. It will eliminate costly ObamaCare taxes that are passed on to consumers, so we can put downward pressure on premiums; expand tax-free health savings accounts and deploy targeted tax credits, so we can help defray out-of-pocket costs; and shift power from Washington to the States, so they have more flexibility to provide more Americans with the kind of affordable insurance options they actually want.

We agree on the need to stabilize the insurance markets that are collapsing under ObamaCare as well, and policies contained in the discussion draft will implement stabilization policies, so we can bring financial certainty to insurance markets and hope to Americans who face the possibility of limited or zero options next year under ObamaCare and ultimately transition away from ObamaCare's collapsing system entirely, so more Americans will not be hurt.

We also agree on the need to strengthen Medicaid, preserve access to care for patients with preexisting conditions, and allow children to stay on their parents' health insurance through the age of 26.

I am pleased we were able to arrive at a draft that incorporates input from so many different Members, who represent so many different constituents who are facing so many different challenges.

The draft containing the solutions I mentioned, along with many others, is posted online, and I encourage everyone to carefully review it. There will be ample time to analyze, discuss, and provide thoughts before legislation comes to the floor. I hope every Senator takes that opportunity.

Next week we expect the Congressional Budget Office to release a score. After that, we will proceed with a robust debate and an open amendment process on the Senate floor—a process I would encourage each of our 100 Senators to participate in.

When legislation does come to the floor, it will present Senate Democrats with another opportunity to do what is right for the American people. They can choose to keep standing by as their

failing law continues to collapse and hurt more Americans, but I hope they will join us, instead, to bring relief to the families who have struggled under ObamaCare for far too long. Either way—either way, it is time to act because ObamaCare is a direct attack on the middle class, and American families deserve better than its failing status quo. They deserve better care, and that is just what we are going to continue to work to bring.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Billingslea nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are beginning to receive the first bits of information about the Senate Republican healthcare bill, which has until now been shrouded in absolute secrecy.

I can see why. Even as we continue to get more details, the broad outlines are clear. This is a bill designed to strip away healthcare benefits and protections from Americans who need it most in order to give a tax break to the folks who need it least.

This is a bill that would end Medicaid as we know it, rolling back Medicaid expansion, cutting Federal support for the program even more than the House bill, which cut Medicaid by \$800 billion.

Let me remind everyone in this Chamber, Medicaid is not just a health insurance program for Americans struggling in poverty, though that is an important and necessary part of it. Medicaid is increasingly a middle-class program. Medicaid is how many Americans are able to access opioid abuse treatment, Medicaid foots the bill for two-thirds of all Americans living in nursing homes, and Medicaid provides

the cushion, particularly in rural areas, so hospitals can survive and give topnotch healthcare to all of us.

From what is reported, in just 3 short years under the Senate bill, Republicans will take millions off their Medicaid coverage, and then, starting in 2025, the plan will institute even more Medicaid cuts, and each year those cuts get deeper than the year before. Within 10 years of this new funding system, the cuts to Medicaid could total hundreds of billions of dollars above the more than \$800 billion the House bill already cuts from the program.

Every senior in America should read the fine print of this bill. It looks as if American seniors could be paying way more. Why do this? Looking at the bill, the answer is, because the Republicans want to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans—those making over \$200,000 a year—and set themselves up to give these folks another, even larger tax cut in their tax bill.

Even though much of the early reporting says that the bill will keep certain protections for Americans with preexisting conditions, the truth is, it may well not guarantee them the coverage they need by allowing States to waive essential health benefits. What the bill is saying to those Americans is that insurance still has to cover you, but it doesn't have to cover what you may actually need. It doesn't have to cover all or even most of your costs.

If you need treatment for opioid addiction, your plan may no longer cover it. If you are pregnant and need maternity care, your plan may have decided that is too expensive. The coverage that Americans with preexisting conditions actually need may well become either unaffordable or even nonexistent under this bill.

Simply put, this bill will result—

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Democratic leader yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. Not right now—at the end of my remarks.

Simply put, this bill will result in higher costs, less care, and millions of Americans will lose their health insurance, particularly through Medicaid. It is every bit as bad as the House bill. In some ways, it is even worse.

The President said the Senate bill needed heart. The way this bill cuts healthcare is heartless. The President said the House bill was mean. The Senate bill may be meaner.

The Senate Republican healthcare bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing, but this wolf has even sharper teeth than the House bill.

It is clear that Republicans know that cutting Medicaid will hurt so many people in the middle class, so many in my home State of New York. Republicans know that people want essential health benefits, so they have created a disguise by saying that these changes will not occur for a year. But,

in reality, the Senate Republican bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing, only this wolf has even sharper teeth than the House bill.

We are potentially voting on it in a week—with no committee hearings, no amendments in committee, no debate on the floor, save for 10 measly hours, on one of the most important bills we are dealing with in decades. That brings shame on this body. We won't even know the full cost or consequence of the bill until CBO scores it, and that could take a few days more.

How can my friend the majority leader expect this body to fairly consider this legislation, prepare amendments, and debate it in 1 week with only 10 hours of debate? How can he expect his own Members to do the same? Many of them on the Republican side are learning the details of the bill the same way we Democrats are: They are reading it today.

Now, listen to what the majority leader had to say in 2009 when we were debating healthcare—his words:

This is a very important issue. . . . We shouldn't try to do it in the dark. And whatever final bill is produced should be available to the American public and to Members of the Senate, certainly, for enough time to come to grips with it. . . . And we are going to insist—and the American people are going to insist—that it be done in a transparent, fair, and open way.

Is 5 or 6 days enough time for the American people and the Members of the Senate to come to grips with a bill that affects one-sixth of the economy and the lives of every American in this country? I don't think so, neither do the American people and neither do a whole bunch of Republican Senators.

Senator CASSIDY: Would I have preferred a more open process? The answer is yes.

Senator COLLINS: I don't think it gives enough time to thoroughly analyze the bill, but we will see when it comes out.

Member after Member—RAND PAUL, LINDSEY GRAHAM, JERRY MORAN, MARCO RUBIO, BOB CORKER—has repeatedly said that this process—in their words and now in mine—is unfair, it is truncated, and it is rushed.

For my dear friend the majority leader to say we are going to have an open amendment process is turning truth upside down. I would ask our leader, rhetorically, because I know the answer: Can we allow at least 1 hour on each amendment, not 2 minutes? Will we have more time than 10 hours to debate the bill? I hope so. But, if not, please don't call this an open and fair process. If you want to rush it through, admit the consequences.

The debate over healthcare has been fierce. We know that Republicans and Democrats had differences when we debated the Affordable Care Act. At least we had a debate. At least we had committee hearings and a process. More broadly than that, at least we Democrats were trying to pass a healthcare

bill that helped more Americans afford insurance and tried to bring costs down and end some of the most egregious practices of the healthcare industry.

What is this bill—TrumpCare—trying to achieve? It seems designed to slash support for healthcare programs in order to give tax breaks to the very wealthy.

When the CBO score comes out, I believe it will verify that millions of Americans in this great country will be unable to afford insurance or the insurance they can afford won't cover the services they need.

Somewhere in America there is a family who takes a trip each Friday to visit grandma or grandpa at a nursing home, who sacrificed all of their savings to pay for their healthcare until they had no more savings and now rely on Medicaid to help pay the cost of long-term care in a nursing home.

Somewhere in America there is a father who is eaten up inside watching his son struggle with opioid addiction, who knows in his heart that his son will be able to go on and live a healthy and fulfilling life if he could only afford treatment to get him out from under this devastating addiction.

Somewhere in America there is a parent whose child has cancer, a mother and father who stay up late at night worried that their insurance will either not be available or run out when the family needs it most.

In the America that my Republican friends envision with this healthcare bill, those Americans, and many more besides, might not get the coverage and care they need.

We live in the wealthiest country on Earth. Surely, surely, we can do better than what the Republican healthcare bill promises.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.R. 1628

Now I have a unanimous consent request. I am going to have to delay my friend from asking questions until we finish our unanimous consent requests.

I ask unanimous consent that any substitute or perfecting amendment offered to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, not be in order if the text of the amendment has not been filed at the desk and made available on a public website for at least 72 hours, along with an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office of the bill's budgetary, coverage, and cost implications.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my colleague Senator CORNYN was going to ask a question, which I will answer, which was that the minority leader is referring to a bill that he hasn't seen a copy of because it hasn't yet been released. So the speech we just heard was about a bill that he hasn't seen.

With regard to his unanimous consent request, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, leader time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 142 pages thus far of this supposed bill have been printed online, and that is what I have used.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, several weeks ago the House of Representatives passed a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act and to replace it. It was passed without hearings. It was passed without an amendment process, and it was passed before the Congressional Budget Office provided the traditional analysis that we count on before we take up a measure of such magnitude.

The measure passed with a party-line vote—all Republicans. Had two Republicans voted the other way, it would not have moved forward.

After it passed, the President of the United States decided to have a celebration at the White House. We saw him on television, gathering the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and celebrating the fact that this measure had passed and that, finally, they were going to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

But then the American people took a close look and the Congressional Budget Office issued its analysis, and it turns out that 23 million Americans would lose their health insurance because of this Republican measure that passed the House of Representatives.

It turns out as well that there would be a dramatic increase in health insurance premiums for people between the ages of 50 and 64.

It turns out that in my State and many other States hospitals were in danger. The Illinois Health and Hospital Association says they would lose 60,000 jobs in Illinois with the dramatic cutbacks in Medicaid, endangering hospitals in rural areas and inner-city areas.

The facts started coming out about this repeal bill passed by the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States had a change of heart and announced to the American people that it was a mean bill—a mean bill. The President was right. It was mean legislation—mean to the millions who lost their healthcare, mean to seniors who would find their premiums going up dramatically, and mean to the people living in rural areas and small towns who count on those hospitals.

The President was right. It was mean.

Then, the responsibility shifts to the Senate. The majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and his Republican followers had a chance to do a bill that was not mean. They had a chance to sit down on a bipartisan basis and to have the same process we used to create the Affordable Care Act.

That would have involved public hearings. We had 50 public hearings on the Affordable Care Act. It would have involved a real amendment process. The Affordable Care Act had 300 amendments. How many were offered by the Republicans? There were over 150 offered and adopted in a bipartisan process when we passed the Affordable Care Act. The American people got a good look at the bill. The Congressional Budget Office issued their analysis before we voted on it. We passed it, and I am glad we did, and I am proud of that vote.

But what happened in the Senate when it came to the Republicans? They went into secrecy. Thirteen chosen Republican Senators all sat in a room and wrote the alternative, or so we are told. They met in secret and never once had a public hearing, never once disclosed to the American people what was being debated, never once gave an opportunity for real bipartisan cooperation to strengthen our existing healthcare system—not at all.

So all we have at this moment is truly press accounts of what has been announced to the Republican Senate caucus, what they are going to get a chance to read and see. But it is enough to see that when it comes down to the basics, there is not much of a change between the House of Representatives' effort and the Senate effort.

You can put a lace collar on a pit bull, and it is still a mean dog.

What we have here with the Republicans in the Senate is an attempt to dust off the edges of the House bill and say: This is not as mean. I will tell you, at the end of the day, from the reports we have, this is still a mean dog, and one the people of the United States don't want to see happen.

There isn't a single medical advocacy group—not one in my State, and I don't know of any nationwide—that endorses what the Republicans in the House have accomplished with the passage of their bill, and this bill mirrors it, as well, and we can expect the same result.

So the only thing we can offer the American people is a chance to be part of the conversation on a bill that will literally change healthcare for millions of Americans. If they are going to be part of the conversation, there has to be a chance for amendment and debate, at least, and a chance for the American people to see what is in the Senate Republican measure.

So I ask unanimous consent that any substitute or perfecting amendment offered to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, be subject to a point of order if the text of the amendment has not been filed at the desk and made available on a public website for at least 72 hours, along with an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office of the bill's budgetary, coverage, and cost implications; and

that a motion to waive the point of order be in order, and if a motion to waive is made, an affirmative three-fifths vote of those duly chosen and sworn is required to waive the point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to thank my friend the assistant Democratic leader for confirming that the majority leader's remarks obviously were made on the basis of news accounts. The bill has only been posted online for the last 20 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the majority leader yield?

I am the minority leader, at this point.

Mr. McCONNELL. I will yield for a question.

Mr. SCHUMER. The question is, Does the majority leader know that a half hour before we came to the floor were 142 pages of the bill listed online? That is what we used in our report.

I would ask the majority leader a further question: If there is anything I said—anything I said—that is not going to be in the bill, could he clarify?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, what we are seeing here today is just the latest broken promise from President Trump and his Republican Party. After weeks of secret negotiations, back-room deals, shutting out patients, families, and Democrats and even many Republicans from this process, Senate Republican leaders are now just days away from putting a bill on the floor that could not be more impactful or more devastating to families' bank accounts and their health. As even Republicans are pointing out, there has not been a single hearing, no robust debate, no opportunity for the people who will really suffer under this bill to see exactly how bad it would be.

This disastrous TrumpCare bill deserves full scrutiny under an open process, like the process that Democrats conducted when we passed the Affordable Care Act. We held hearings, we took amendments from both sides, and we certainly didn't leave the fate of women's healthcare up to a few Republican men.

Senate Republicans are right to be ashamed of this mean and heartless legislation. Just like the House TrumpCare bill, it will increase premiums, it will undermine protections for people with preexisting conditions, it will defund Planned Parenthood, and it will allow insurance companies—insurance companies—to charge women more. It is going to gut Medicaid. It will take away care for our seniors, pregnant women, people with disabilities, and it will take health insurance

coverage away from millions of people across the country—and for what? To give another massive tax cut to the wealthy and well-connected.

I would be ashamed, too, if I had to defend a bill that is cruel. I can certainly understand why Republican leaders do not want to give people time to see what is in this bill and why they don't even want to give their own Members time to see how much their constituents hate it, but that is the bed Senate Republicans have now made. If they are going to try to pass this disastrous version of TrumpCare, at the very least they shouldn't get to jam it through without the public knowing good and well what they are up to.

Mr. President, I ask a parliamentary inquiry: Is the Chair able to confirm that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions considered S. 1679, the Affordable Health Choices Act, which was ultimately incorporated into the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, in executive session on 13 calendar days prior to reporting the bill favorably?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary of the Senate's Office through the Senate Library can confirm that.

Mrs. MURRAY. That is confirmed.

So I ask unanimous consent today that any substitute or perfecting amendment offered to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, not be in order if the text of the amendment has not been the subject of a hearing, subject of executive session, during which amendments from both the majority and minority were considered and reported favorably by the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

None of these Senators have read the bill.

I have the floor.

The bill is 142 pages long compared to the 2,700-page ObamaCare bill. They can read the bill; if they have objections to the provisions, we can debate them, but what they are talking about is a bill that does not exist, which they have not read.

I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, would my dear colleague from Texas yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas does not have the floor. You have the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would like to just then tell my friend from Texas: This is the bill. It was posted online a half hour before we came in. I would ask a page to come over and bring it to my

dear friend and ask him if this is the bill which we have read.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, all Senators have a copy of the discussion draft bill. It is a discussion draft which will be open to an amendment process, with unlimited amendments which can be offered by both sides, before which we will have a fulsome debate.

Our colleagues here are complaining about secrecy that doesn't exist. This bill is online. The American people can read it. You can read it. I would suggest that they do read it before they start criticizing it.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would ask my friend from Texas to yield for another question.

Mr. CORNYN. I will.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will we get more than 2 minutes to debate each amendment we ask for or will we be under the reconciliation process, where we have 10 hours of debate and then every amendment only gets 2 minutes? Does he consider that—2 minutes, if that is the case—a full and fair debate on each amendment?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say, in response to my friend from New York, the fact that we are having to conduct this under the reconciliation rules is a result of their refusal to participate in the process, thus necessitating Republicans doing this under budget reconciliation rules.

If they would do this in a true bipartisan way, where we can get 60 votes to get on the bill and open to an amendment process, we could have a better bill, but given the refusal of our Democratic colleagues to participate in the process, this is the only way we can come to the rescue of the people who are being hurt by the meltdown of ObamaCare today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just to clarify, did the Senator from Texas object to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CORNYN. I do object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I heard the objection.

I just have to say, the exchange we just heard is exactly what we have been objecting to. We were told the bill would be online at 9:30 this morning. It was online at 11. I have a copy of it, but we are hearing from the other side now that this isn't the bill. This is a discussion draft. We aren't going to see the bill. We will not see the real bill, apparently, until next week, even though we were told we would see it this morning.

This has been the problem we have had since this discussion started. We started in January with a process which cut us out of this under reconciliation. Thirteen men in a private room wrote this "discussion draft,"

which is not a bill, that we are supposed to now look at and decide whether we like it—and the American public—a discussion draft, a bill even the other side doesn't know what we have. That is what we are objecting to.

We are asking that the American people—who have a right to know what is going to impact every one of their lives, every one of their families, every one of their communities, every one of their businesses—have more than a discussion draft, more than 10 hours of debate, time to look at it, and know how we are going to do an amendment process next week.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. I would be happy to.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from Washington if she is aware of the fact that under the budget reconciliation process, there will be an unlimited number of amendments that could be offered by either side to the bill which is ultimately filed?

Mrs. MURRAY. Oh, Mr. President, I am well aware of that; and I will remind our colleagues and everybody in this country what will happen: There will be 10 hours of debate, where we hopefully have more than a discussion draft that we will be allowed to offer amendments on, and there will be no debate on those amendments. No one will know what it is. It will be a chaotic process on this floor. The American public will not know. We will be able to tell them days later, after this gets undone.

That is not an amendment process. That is not what we went through when we passed the Affordable Care Act. The American public deserves better.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would ask my colleague a question.

What would be wrong with 1 hour of debate on every amendment to this bill? What is the objection to that, since the majority is proposing no debate on amendments, and then saying it is an open process? What is wrong with 1 hour of debate on every amendment offered to this bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say, in response to my friend the minority leader, that it is as a result of their refusal to participate in the usual process of passing legislation through the regular order—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CORNYN.—that we have to resort to the budget reconciliation process which has a set of statutory provisions and rules.

There will be a fulsome debate. There has already been a debate on a bill you haven't read. I suggest you take the

time to read it, and then we can talk about the details.

This bill—142 pages compared to 2,700 pages of ObamaCare—doesn't take that long to read. This is a start. This is not the finish. This is called the normal legislative process. I suggest colleagues, rather than criticize a bill they haven't read, they read it, and then let's have a credible debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would ask my friend, the majority whip from Texas, a series of questions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. What was the date that reconciliation was added to the budget resolution which said we don't need any Democratic votes? Was it May, was it April, was it March, or was it the very beginning of this session?

I would ask him another question. Where were the meetings held to discuss this bill, and were any Democrats invited?

I would ask him another question. Why did the majority leader not accept our offer to go into the Old Senate Chamber—100 Senators, no press, no anything else—and debate the bill?

How can my good friend—and he is a good friend; we are on the bikes in the morning together—my good friend from Texas say there was a bipartisan process when, at the outset—at the outset—our Republican colleagues said the only thing we will debate is repeal and then replace? There was no discussion of whether repeal was the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do. Now, overwhelmingly the American people prefer fixing ObamaCare—which we offered to do—than repeal and replace.

It is no wonder, I would say to my colleague as he answers these questions, that this bill is being brought in the dark of night. It is because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are ashamed of the bill—because, believe you me, if they liked this bill, they would have brass bands down every Main Street in America talking about it, but they are trying to sneak it through because mainly their goal is a tax cut for the rich.

I would ask my colleague to answer those three questions, and then he can respond to my rhetoric.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am really taken aback by the characterization of the minority leader here.

The minority has made it clear they don't want to participate in the process of rescuing the American people from the failures of ObamaCare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CORNYN. It has been made clear to us that you don't want to partici-

pate in the process, and you are turning a blind eye to the millions of people being hurt today by outrageous premiums, deductibles they can't afford, and a loss of choices because insurance companies have pulled out of the individual market. Your response to them is: We don't care.

We care, and we are doing our best to deal with this.

This is like going by a car accident with somebody seriously injured, and rather than stopping and rendering aid, just driving on by. That is what our colleagues on the other side are doing. They are turning a blind eye, driving right on by a seriously injured person in a car accident. We are coming to the rescue of the millions of people who are being hurt by ObamaCare today.

We would love to have our Democratic friends join us and do something truly sustainable, but you have to remember, my friends, how this started: Democrats jammed ObamaCare through on a party-line vote and Republicans weren't able to participate in that process.

What we are trying to do is we are trying to save the people who are currently being hurt and whose healthcare has become unaffordable. If you would like to join us in this process, we would love to have you, but failing that, we are going to get it done, and you can just drive by the car wreck.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, here is the correct analogy: Yes, there has been an accident. Yes, someone needs help. Someone who is not a doctor, not a physician, doesn't know how to help the patient—our Republicans friends go by the side of the road, but they don't know what to do.

So the Democrats come by. We are doctors. We say: We know how to fix this system. We know how to fix this patient, and the Republicans say: No, don't help with us. We will drive right by. Now the patient is ailing.

I would ask my colleagues, let's forget the past for the moment because we have a much better argument than you. We had hundreds of amendments offered by Republicans that became part of our bill. I doubt there will be a single Democratic amendment that will be—we had hours of hearings, hours of debate. You didn't. So you may not have thought the process was perfect, but it was a lot more open than yours.

I have a proposal to my friend. Let us forget this draft bill. Let us right now, Democrats and Republicans, sit down and try to come up with a bipartisan bill. We are willing to do it today, now, this minute. Will you accept that offer?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I thought that was a sincere offer, I would take it in a minute—in a New York minute, but it is not.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CORNYN. The fact is, insurance companies are having to go to the State regulators as we speak to get insurance rates approved for 2018. That is the urgency we are experiencing here.

Unless we act—and act in an expedited fashion—here, very soon, we will see millions of people have their insurance rates raised by another double digits. It has been 105 percent since 2013—105 percent. ObamaCare was sold under the premise that families of four would see a reduction of \$2,500. If you like your policy, you can keep your policy. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. All of that is false. False. This is a failed experiment.

They may not be willing to help, but we will, and we will get it done and help the American people who are being hurt by the failure of ObamaCare today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am struck by this conversation as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee. My colleague and distinguished Senator from Texas is on the Finance Committee. He knows I know something about writing bipartisan healthcare reform bills. I have written them. They have become law. I could tell my colleague, I have not once—not once—been asked to be part of any bipartisan effort with respect to this legislation.

I think, colleagues, it is real clear what is going on here. Senate Republicans are going to keep telling Americans they are fixing their healthcare right up until the second it gets taken away.

Now, as the ranking member of the Finance Committee, I find it bizarre that a health bill of this importance was hidden for so long behind closed doors, denying the American people the opportunity to see it in an open debate.

There have been no hearings on this dangerous, destructive proposal, not one hearing on whether Medicaid should be slashed to pay for tax cuts for the fortunate few, not one hearing on whether the bedrock protections for those with preexisting conditions ought to be shattered, not one hearing on whether Americans should face higher costs, along with annual and lifetime limits, on insurance coverage.

This secretive process of concealing and rushing this bill, which until today had been seen by nobody—nobody outside of the Republican leadership and their lobbyist allies who dwell on K Street—the secretive process stands in sharp contrast to the process that led to the Affordable Care Act.

I now put forward a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Chair able to confirm that the Committee on Finance considered S. 1796, the America's Healthy Future Act, which was ultimately incor-

porated into H.R. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, in executive session on 8 separate calendar days prior to reporting the bill favorably?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary of the Senate's office, through the Senate Library, confirms that.

Mr. WYDEN. I have information that indicates that 135 amendments were considered in the committee and that of those, 14 amendments offered by Republican members of the committee or offered in a bipartisan manner were adopted during the consideration of S. 1796. Is the Chair able to confirm that?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary of the Senate's office, through the Senate Library, confirms that.

Mr. WYDEN. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 1628, be in order until the bill has been the subject of executive session meetings in the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, during which amendments from the majority and the minority received votes and the bill has been favorably reported from those committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, our colleagues are coming here today and saying they want to participate in the process to fix what is broken in the Affordable Care Act. Yet I have in my hand a newspaper article about a letter that the Democratic leader and his colleagues sent saying they refused to participate in the process unless we drop all of our plans to repeal and replace ObamaCare. They refused to participate in the process.

I would point out that the failures of ObamaCare didn't just start today; it has been failing over 7 years. They did nothing—nothing—nothing to help the millions of people who are being hurt, who had to move from full-time work to part-time work because their employer didn't want to pay the employer penalty for not providing ObamaCare coverage. We know that many people have been hurt by it and not the least of whom are the people who are finding their premiums skyrocketing. They will do so again next year unless we come to their rescue. They have seen their deductibles so high, they effectively have been denied the value of their insurance.

I had a conversation a couple of days ago—I won't name the Democratic Senator because it was done in confidence. The Senator confided to me that his own son had effectively seen his premiums go up so high that he had—it cost roughly \$12,500 out-of-pocket to deal with his deductible and to pay his

premiums—\$12,500. That is not affordable to anybody, certainly in the middle class.

I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to indicate before the distinguished majority whip leaves that what is being talked about here is like having a hole in the roof of your house. Instead of patching it, they want to burn down the house. What we are not willing to participate in is burning down the house. We are more than happy and, in fact, have proposals and are anxious to work with the majority to improve healthcare—not rip it apart, not take tens of millions of people's healthcare away, but improve it.

Before asking a question of the majority whip, I also want to indicate for all those listening that we have the bill. We can actually read pretty quickly, and it has been out. Even though it is considered a discussion draft—we don't know what it is at this point—we have it. We are analyzing it.

What our leader, the Democratic leader, indicated is what we have been able to read in this discussion draft, which is not only more of the same but is worse for seniors, those in nursing homes, and children in Michigan and across the country. That is what is in this, which we now have, whatever it is called.

I would ask the majority whip, instead of burning down the house at this point in terms of ripping apart the healthcare system, would you join with us in putting forward a bill that would allow Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices for seniors, which my hospitals and insurance companies tell me are one of the driving forces that are raising the costs of healthcare? Would you be willing to work with us on a bill to lower prescription drug prices and allow Medicare to negotiate drug prices on behalf of America's seniors?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Michigan that we would be happy to work with you on high drug prices. That is a serious problem and one of the primary cost drivers of healthcare costs today. But this bill doesn't touch Medicare at all. We leave intact the healthcare for seniors, and it is not touched by this at all. When the time comes for us to deal with Medicare, I think that is a debate we should have and we would welcome.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, to the distinguished leader, I simply would say I am proposing that instead of this, which is essentially burning down the house in America in terms of healthcare, that you instead join with

us in what you have admitted is one of the top drivers of healthcare costs in this country, which is what we want to tackle. We want to bring down the costs. We want to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, the out-of-pocket costs for everyone whose copays and premiums are too high. That is what we want to do. Taking away nursing home care, taking away the ability for a parent to take their child to the doctor or someone with cancer to get the treatment they need or a small business owner being blocked from getting healthcare because of a preexisting condition—we consider that burning down the house. We are opposed to that.

Frankly, we would love to have a ceremony and light this on fire and come back together and work together on the No. 1 driver, which is the cost of prescription drugs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, maybe I misunderstood the question initially. I would suggest to the Senator from Michigan that it is the Democrats, under ObamaCare, who burned down the house because the individual market for healthcare has been decimated—decimated. And we are coming to the rescue of those millions of people who don't have employer-provided insurance. They don't get their coverage under Medicare or any other government program. They get it from the individual market. We are talking about individuals and small businesses. Right now people have almost no choices in many parts of the country, and for those who have choices, it is simply unaffordable.

It is an important conversation to have on drug prices and Medicare, and I am happy to do that. That would do nothing—zip, zero, nada—to help the people who are hurting now as a result of the failures of ObamaCare, and that is whom we are determined to help by passing this legislation after an open amendment process and fulsome debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to make one other comment, and that is, the people in Michigan who are purchasing on the private exchange—over half of whom are able to get a policy today for their families for less than \$100—I would say they would have a different perspective.

We need to fix those things that are not working, but for the 97 percent of the children in Michigan who can now see a doctor because of what has been done; for the hospitals that now see 50 percent fewer people walking into the emergency room without insurance, raising the costs for all policies; for the savings the State of Michigan is going to have in its budget next year of \$432

million in savings to taxpayers because they did the right thing by allowing children to go to a doctor instead of getting sick and going to the emergency room, I would suggest this is the wrong direction.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, last week, President Trump reportedly told several of our Republican colleagues that the House-passed version of TrumpCare's healthcare repeal of the Affordable Care Act was mean. This week, White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer said that the President would like to see a healthcare bill from the Senate that "has heart in it." What did we get? We got a bill from my Senate Republican colleagues that is identical to and in some cases even worse than the disastrous House-passed American Health Care Act that would rip coverage away from 23 million Americans and gut Medicaid by more than \$800 billion.

Nothing changes the fact that this undemocratic, secretive process has resulted in legislation that is so mean-spirited, it would make the Wicked Witch of the West cringe. The Senate Republican bill will rip away economic security from young families, make grandma and grandpa pay more for health insurance simply because they are old, tear away coverage for opioid addiction patients desperate for treatment, and punish Americans with pre-existing conditions such as cancer, diabetes, and Alzheimer's. For once, I agree with President Trump. This bill is mean.

Let's take a closer look about what is really inside of the Senate GOP's proposal on healthcare. Let's start by looking at the lower quality coverage. First, this bill will roll back the clock to the days before the Affordable Care Act, when an insurance card did not guarantee comprehensive coverage.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, there are certain things an insurance plan just has to cover—things like emergency services, maternity care, prescription drugs, mental health services. There is security in knowing that if you pay your premiums, this sort of basic minimum coverage is in place when you need it. But Republicans want to rip that away. They want to give States and insurance companies the option to not cover these things. This would make it so that a consumer could easily be faced with an unex-

pected medical bill for services they had assumed were covered with their healthcare plan.

Independent analysis from the Congressional Budget Office estimates that out-of-pocket costs for maternity care or mental health or substance abuse disorder services could increase by thousands of dollars in a given year under TrumpCare. That is not increasing quality, as President Trump promised; that is lower quality. And that just increases inequality between the healthy wealthy, who can pay out of pocket for their care, and providing lower quality coverage for everyone else. That is mean.

Second, an age tax. Since the Affordable Care Act became law, the uninsured rate for Americans ages 50 to 64 decreased by one-half. Those are the baby boomers, and it is estimated that more than 28 million of these baby boomers will develop Alzheimer's disease between now and the year 2050. This reduction in the uninsured rates came about because the Affordable Care Act expanded Medicaid and put protections in place to prevent insurers from charging exorbitant prices just because of age. But instead of caring for our family and friends as they age and ensuring they can afford quality coverage on what may be a dwindling income, TrumpCare punishes you for achieving your milestone 50th birthday.

Under the Republican healthcare proposal, insurance companies can charge older Americans five times more than younger Americans for the same coverage. That is unconscionable. It doesn't matter if you are a 50-year-old marathoner in the best shape of your life; you will still be paying at least five times more for your insurance than your 40-year-old neighbor who smokes. As a result, Americans over the age of 60 could see their premiums increase by an average of \$3,200 or 22 percent. That might not sound like a lot to some people, but for those with decreasing incomes and fewer job opportunities, it is the difference between being able to eat and being kicked out on the street.

To add insult to injury, the subsidies in TrumpCare to help individuals purchase insurance are far less generous than what is currently available under the Affordable Care Act. Because that will result in premiums that are higher, the tax credits will not keep pace to help pay for more expensive insurance, and, as a result, this age tax is going to be mean to those who are older in our country.

No. 3, Medicaid cuts. Medicaid is a lifeline for families across our country. More than 70 million Americans—nearly half of whom are children—depend upon it. But it is clear that with TrumpCare's cuts to the program, Republicans want Medicaid to flatline. For a program that covers more than



one-fifth of the Nation's population, including the sickest, the oldest, and the poorest amongst us, Medicaid is especially irreplaceable.

But Republicans harbor an ancient animosity toward Medicaid. Republicans say that we need to restructure Medicaid's financing to help control the program spending and make it more efficient. That is just another way of saying to America's most vulnerable that you are just not as important as those who donate to our campaigns.

Raiding the Medicaid coffers achieves two goals. First, it tears holes in a critical social safety net for more than 70 million low-income and working-class Americans. Second, it provides the GOP with an open checkbook to pay back their donors with huge tax breaks.

Republicans might want to refer to these changes as capping the Medicaid program, but don't be fooled. What capping really means is decapitating access to primary care, decapitating the ability of grandma and grandpa to secure a nursing home bed, and decapitating access to treatment for substance abuse and mental health conditions. Gutting the Medicaid program—that is mean.

Next, they are going to reduce access to care. This one is simple. Less insurance coverage equals less access to care. While it is possible to get a doctor's appointment and treatment without health insurance, it is usually at prices that are impossible to afford for a typical uninsured person. Most working Americans can't conceive of paying more than \$150 every time they want to visit a primary care doctor or footing the bill for a couple of thousand dollars in the event they need more specialized care. The best medicines and the most effective treatments are only as good as the insurance coverage people have to help them to access to it.

How will these 23 million Americans who lose insurance under TrumpCare get the care which they need? They will not get the care. Unfortunately, when patients do try to access care, it will be because their illness has progressed to the point where it can no longer be ignored. Instead of seeking care with a primary care doctor in a less expensive healthcare setting, most uninsured patients will end up going straight to the emergency room—the most expensive site for care. And the cost of that uninsured patient—well, that is just going to get absorbed by everyone else in our country, as our rates for treatment and insurance coverage increase to make up for this uncompensated care. So reduced access to care—that is mean.

Then we move on to higher premiums. Higher premiums are going to be the new rule in our country because that is going to be what happens if the Republicans are successful in repealing

the Affordable Care Act. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, TrumpCare would increase premiums by an average of 20 percent in 2018. In Massachusetts alone, premiums for next year could increase by \$600, threatening coverage for more than 180,000 of my constituents with private insurance. Because of everything else in TrumpCare, even though you are paying more, you will be getting less. It is like paying for a Cadillac, but only getting a tricycle. This will only prevent Americans from securing access to the care and the treatment they need and they deserve. Less care for more cost—that is going to be mean. Premiums are going to go up for everyone.

Finally, it threatens all of those in America who have preexisting conditions. For so many Americans, allowing insurance companies to refuse coverage or charge more because of a preexisting condition is inhumane, and it is immoral. Anyone who tried to buy individual health insurance before the Affordable Care Act remembers this problem. Before the healthcare act passed, in most States, if you had a preexisting condition, you could either be denied coverage, charged a much higher premium, or forced to wait potentially for years before receiving treatment for the condition to be covered. For many people, this meant they either had to go without needed care or spend their entire savings. For those with the most serious conditions, it was the difference between life and death.

The anxiety of suffering from an illness was only exacerbated by financial insecurity. It was a cruel and unusual form of punishment. Sadly, the Republicans want to take us back to this era. Threatening preexisting conditions—that might be the meanest of them all because protections for families who have preexisting conditions is something that goes right to the heart of what the Affordable Care Act provided as a protection.

Why would millions of Americans have to suffer these cruelties, these indignities, these punishments? That is the most outrageous part of all of this. President Trump and the congressional Republicans are proposing this healthcare heartlessness, all so they can give tax breaks to the wealthiest in our country.

We heard it from President Trump himself last night when he talked about the people he hired for his Cabinet. "I just don't want a poor person," he said. But who does he want running the government and our economy? He wants the wealthiest people in America. He wants people who are billionaires to be making the decisions as to how we run our economy. President Trump has in place a goal of turning over to the richest people in our country the responsibility for putting to-

gether the plan to cut the programs for the poor and the working families in our country.

The Republicans and their wealthy planners have put together a very simple one-step program: The rich get richer, and the rest get sicker in the United States. Make no mistake, this healthcare plan is of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich. It is giving billions in tax breaks to people who don't need or deserve them, paid for by people who can't handle or afford it. That is cruel, that is inhumane, that is immoral, that is just plain wrong, and my Democratic colleagues and I will not stand for it.

We are standing up to say no to ripping away coverage for millions of Americans. We are raising our voices to say no to increasing costs for middle-class families. We are saying here today that we are going to say no to this legislative malpractice. The health of the American public is too important for us to be so mean, so callous to the people we were elected to serve.

This Republican proposal has never been about policy. It has always been about politics, and it is time to stop playing political games with people's lives, with people's healthcare.

Healthcare is a right and not a privilege. That is the promise we made to the American people with the Affordable Care Act, and it is a promise we must keep.

The President is keeping his promise to the rich in our country. They have now written a healthcare plan for one-sixth of our economy that slashes \$800 billion that would be used for the poor, for the sick, for the working class, for senior citizens in nursing homes by \$800 billion in order to give an \$800 billion tax break to the wealthiest people in our country. That is wrong.

This is a critical moment in our country's history, and we, as Democrats, are going to battle every single day here on the Senate floor and across this country to make sure that every person understands what the consequences of this incredibly callous, mean bill will mean—lower quality coverage, an age tax on the elderly, Medicaid cuts that hurt families across our country, reduced access to care, threatening of the protections for preexisting conditions, and resulting in higher premiums for everyone. It will be a disgrace.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, first I want to thank Senator MARKEY for his comments. I share his concerns. I agree with what he has said about the risk factors of the bill that was announced this morning by the Republican leader and what it could do to millions of people around this country and what it will do to coverage for hundreds of thousands of people in my

State of Maryland who will lose coverage and just about every Marylander whose healthcare will be impacted if this bill were to become law.

I want to start by saying that I think this is a shameful moment for the Senate—the Senate, whose traditions have made it be known as the most deliberative body in the world; the Senate, which has been known as a body that allows for robust debate and benefits from the views of all 100 Members, where each of us has opportunities to get our voices heard. That tradition has been badly damaged by what the majority leader has done in bringing a bill that affects one-sixth of the economy of our country to the floor of the Senate without the deliberation by our committees and without transparency to the American people.

When I got to the Senate, I worked hard to get on the Senate Finance Committee. I did that because the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee contains areas that I have devoted a good part of my public career to, including issues of taxation and issues concerning social programs in our State. But it also included healthcare, an area that I worked on when I was first in the Maryland State legislature. I wanted to be on the committee that had a role in developing the health policy of this Nation. I thought I could add to that debate with my experience, and I wanted to make sure that the people of Maryland had a voice as we developed healthcare policy in America.

That role is being denied by what the Republican leader is doing in bringing this bill to the floor without the benefit of hearings. Let me just repeat that. There has not been one hearing held on the legislation being brought forward by the majority leader. There hasn't been one committee markup of the bill.

Now, let me explain to the general public what a markup is. It is when the committees that have expertise on a bill—in this case, it would be the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Senate Finance Committee—have had a chance to bring the public in to get their views on the legislation, have had the committee staff go through it and explain all of the aspects to the members of the committee, with an opportunity for us to offer amendments to improve the bill, and then, ultimately, taking a vote on the recommendation to the full Senate. That is the regular order, but it is particularly the regular order on complex pieces of legislation.

I don't think there is a Member of this body who would say that this is not a complex field when we are dealing with healthcare—one-sixth of our economy. But the process that was used denied the people of Maryland and the people of this Nation the opportunity to have their voices heard

through their elected representatives. It is a shameful moment.

Now, I know this has been done before on the floor, but I will just repeat it one more time. Compare this to how the Affordable Care Act was passed by the Senate. We had transparency, opportunities for the public to have input. We had hearings—many, many hearings that took place. My staff tells me there were 50 hearings or roundtable discussions or walk-throughs. We had 26 consecutive days of Senate debate. There were hundreds of amendments offered by both Democrats and Republicans that were adopted on the bill before the bill reached the floor of the Senate. That all took place before we started the debate on the bill.

You cannot justify this process. This is an abuse by the majority, and it will affect the functioning of the Senate.

There are concerns about what this bill will do. The process is terrible. The impact on the Senate is terrible. But the real tragedy here is the impact, if this bill were to become law, it would have on healthcare in America.

So let me talk a little bit about my State of Maryland. It has been projected under this bill that those who will not have insurance coverage will go back basically to what it was prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act; that is, a little over 400,000 Marylanders are at risk of losing basic health coverage. Now, it is going to affect everyone with insurance in Maryland, and I will get to that in a moment. But as many as 400,000 people are in jeopardy of losing their insurance because of what is done with regard to the alliances and the Medicaid Program itself. Many more will lose quality coverage.

Senator MARKEY talked about pre-existing conditions. You claim that there is protection for preexisting conditions, but it does not guarantee that the services will be provided because the States are given tremendous discretion as to what would be required as essential benefits within the healthcare plans. So if someone has a mental illness or someone has a drug addiction, is there a guaranteed coverage that that person would be able to get services? If that person has a pre-existing condition, it may very well not be covered because of the absence of essential health benefits.

Let me just give you another example of what could happen under this bill, and this is a real example on gender discrimination. Obstetrics coverage is critical for a childbearing woman. Now, if that becomes an optional coverage because of the State plans and discretion that it is given, obviously only those women who are planning to have children will take that coverage. Why would someone who doesn't need that coverage take the coverage? What are the consequences of allowing that type of choice? It is very clear.

Younger women are going to pay a lot more for their health insurance than they otherwise would. Is that fair? I think not. I think not. That is the consequence of the type of changes that are being made in the Affordable Care Act.

I was very instrumental in making sure that we had full coverage for pediatric dental. Why? Well, unfortunately, in my State in 2007—the year I first started in the Senate—we had a youngster, Deamonte Driver, who lived not far from here, who died because of an untreated tooth decay. It became abscessed and went into his brain. He had to go through a couple of surgeries, and he lost his life. What was needed was \$80 of dental care. He couldn't get access to it because there was no coverage for it. He had no access to that care. He lost his life and, of course, the healthcare system had to pay a lot of money when it only needed to spend \$80 to keep him healthy.

Well, we took care of that and fixed that with the essential benefits now, including pediatric dental. Is that protected under the Republican bill? The answer is unclear—probably not. It is up to the States. It may be different in one State versus another. We don't have the protection.

Then we get to the affordability issue for Marylanders to be able to afford to have health insurance. Under this bill, there will be discrimination on those that are older. They are going to have to pay more for their health insurance. Is that right? No, it is not right. I heard the majority leader this morning give examples of how the Affordable Care Act is in danger, and he cited high premium increases. One of the States he quoted was the State of Maryland, and it was very misleading the way he did that. He was talking about the individual marketplace, and he was talking about one segment of that. What he didn't tell you is that CareFirst, the insurance company that is proposing that rate increase, indicated that at least half of that increase is the result of action taken by the Trump administration, because the Trump administration has not made it clear whether they will fund the cost-sharing provisions, which keep the costs down and affordable in the individual marketplace. That is a self-inflicted increase in premiums by the Trump administration.

There is a second issue that CareFirst mentioned, and that is the President's insistence on not enforcing the individual mandate, and, by the way, that is in the Republican bill. It means that younger, healthier people will choose not to have health insurance. Now, if they happen to ride a motorcycle and wrap themselves around a tree and get flown to the Shock Trauma Center in Baltimore and we are going to treat him, guess who is going to pay the bill? All of us are going to

pay the bill through uncompensated care. It is going to raise my insurance policy and everybody's insurance policy. That person should have had insurance, but that person thought he or she didn't need that insurance. So they didn't take out the policy.

You find that those who will take out the insurance policies are the higher risks because they know they need the insurance. So those with high-risk issues will be in the pool raising the costs and that is why CareFirst has a higher ask, because they know it is less likely that healthier people will be in the pool than projected under the original Affordable Care Act. Why? Because of President Trump.

So when the leader says that the Affordable Care Act is falling apart, the Affordable Care Act is strong, but it has been made vulnerable by the actions of the Trump administration, and the provisions in this bill will make it even weaker.

Now, 1.2 million Marylanders are in our Maryland Medical Assistance Program, or Medicaid Program. Many of these people are working families. Many of these people are our seniors who need long-term care and are in the Medicaid Program because it pays for their long-term care expenses. Many of these people are veterans or returning warriors who are under the Medicaid Program.

Under the Republican-released bill, they may make it a gentler slope before we get to the full impact of the Medicaid reductions, but the Medicaid reductions, if I understand correctly, are even more severe than under the House-passed bill.

Now, I could speak for Maryland. I know our legislature. Our legislature is going to try to do what is right, but they have limited resources in order to try to meet the needs that are out there. It is just not right to say that we are passing these problems on to the States when the States don't have the fiscal capacity to deal with them. Who gets hurt? The 1.2 million Marylanders who rely upon the Medicaid Program and all Marylanders who don't want to see what we call cost shifting, when someone who doesn't have health insurance ends up in our emergency room and doesn't pay the bill and everyone else pays those bills.

So why are we doing this? What is the reason we have gone through this pain? I have heard my colleagues talk about it, and it is absolutely true. The Republicans need to make room for the tax cut. They are pretty clear about it. Close to \$1 trillion in tax cuts is what they need to do. Who benefits from tax cuts? The wealthy, those who have access to healthcare. Who pays for the tax cuts? Those who are the most vulnerable in our community. That is just wrong.

My staff has put together a lot of individual letters that have been sent to

us. I don't even need to go through them. I can tell the Presiding Officer just the experiences I have had walking on the streets to Baltimore or, quite frankly, walking anywhere, including here in Washington.

When people come up to me and say: Senator CARDIN, keep up the fight. Do you know what is going to happen if that healthcare bill becomes law? We have done some tests and we have certain genes, we are in a high-risk pool for cancer. We are not going to be able to get coverage if you let insurance companies go back to the practices they had before the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

People say that if they didn't have the insurance they now think they are going to lose, they would have to go through personal bankruptcy. That is not a hypothetical. Before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, unpaid medical bills was the leading cause of bankruptcy. Are we going to go back to those days?

I talked to a parent who has a child with a disability—and to think what the cost of that child is going to be in the healthcare system. They don't possibly have the means to be able to afford that if they didn't have access to healthcare coverage without discrimination. You leave these discretions to how the insurance companies will respond with their businesses, they are going to figure out a way so a family who has a disabled child will not have adequate coverage. That is what is at risk. Senator MARKEY is right—healthcare should be a right, not a privilege, and we are moving in the wrong direction.

In Maryland, we have hospitals that are located throughout our State to meet the needs of the people of Maryland. We have hospitals that are located in areas where they have a lot of elderly and a lot of poor people, but because of the way we deal with our hospital reimbursements, we don't have cost shifting. We can have what is known as an all-payer rate, where whoever goes into the hospital, they pay the same rate so a hospital can locate in an inner city or poorer neighborhood. If you increase the cost sharing for people who don't have insurance, hospital facilities will not locate in those communities, adding to the costs of everyone's healthcare.

One of the great benefits, one of the great achievements of the Affordable Care Act, is that we now have facilities that are more conveniently located to people in this country, whether they live in a rural area or urban setting. Some are healthcare centers and some are health clinics, but they are more conveniently located because more people have third-party coverage and have insurance in order to pay those bills.

So I read with interest that certain segments of the advocacy community

are going to be given certain concessions in this bill, and they think they are going to be OK. One is, I understand—and I am not sure what this term means, and maybe someone can explain it to me—medically complex children. These are children, I assume, who have special needs.

If I understand the bill correctly, there is going to be a carve-out in the Medicaid system so that these complex cases will be, at least for a period of time, reimbursed. Where are they going to get care?

Right now they are getting care, in many cases, in a school-based health clinic that is going to be closed under the Republican bill that is out here because it is not qualified to receive reimbursement. The expansion of our qualified health centers under the Affordable Care Act is going to be in deep jeopardy. I met with the CEOs of our qualified health centers where we have expanded to deal with pediatric care, dental care, and mental health. That is in jeopardy of being contracted if you don't have the reimbursements from the people who live in that community that we have under the Medicaid expansion. That is in jeopardy. So don't believe you are protecting any vulnerable population when you don't provide the structure in which you can have reasonable reimbursements so that doctors, hospitals, and clinics can locate in communities and be treated fairly under our reimbursement structure.

I am deeply disappointed. I am deeply disappointed with what we have done to this great institution on this, such an important subject. I am deeply concerned, about the impact this is going to have on the people of Maryland and our Nation, and I will join my colleagues in doing everything I possibly can, during the limited opportunities we have only on the floor of the Senate, not in our committees—to do everything I can to protect the interests of the people of Maryland and our Nation so healthcare can be a right and not a privilege.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Maryland for articulating the issues in this discussion draft that has been released this morning.

As I hear him talk about these complex kids, how the cap is going to work, and when people are going to be affected, it reminds me of the book, "The Smartest Guys in the Room." Right? Basically, people cook up schemes they think other people can't understand or the broader public will not catch on to in the hopes they can pass something. That is exactly what is going on here, a hoax and a scheme that is not cost-effective for the American taxpayer and will literally cut people off of access to healthcare, and literally, if the

House bill was mean, this is doubling down on mean.

So I thank my colleague from Maryland for articulating the complex kids issue because these are concepts. If this is a discussion draft, I would hope my colleagues would come to the floor and discuss it—discuss the concepts that are in this bill and debate them, but that is not what is happening. In fact, we know very little detail at this point in time because people are assessing the information and trying to read and assess in between the lines.

I can state what I know and have gleaned so far by the accounts, and that this is a continuation on the war on Medicaid. I say that because with regard to this war on Medicaid, we didn't know where the Senate would go in their proposal. We know what the House decided to do. The premise and structure of the House bill is to cut Medicaid by capping it and continually driving down the amount of Federal obligation to this program.

I will tell you, it is not even a smart idea. If you want to reform and deliver better healthcare at a lower cost, there are many ways to do that and save dollars and give better patient care, but that is not what the House proposal is. It was a budget mechanism. I am not just saying that. I am talking to my healthcare providers at home, I am talking to university professors, people who know and understand healthcare and have studied it for a long time. What the House did and now the Senate is doubling down on is nothing but a budget mechanism to cut people off of healthcare—as my colleague said, the most vulnerable of our population.

It is a wrong-headed idea. It is not going to help us control costs. Medicaid reduces bankruptcy rates, helps people stay employed, and boosts our GDP. Why would we want a draconian idea like cutting Medicaid as the centerpiece of a budget proposal by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle? As people have said, because they want to take that revenue and give it away in tax breaks for the wealthy. I guarantee you that is not what we should be doing.

The access to Medicaid is so important. Our veterans access the healthcare system through Medicaid. Many of them receive care through the VA, but also they receive services through Medicaid. Veterans would be impacted and would lose care. Our children who are seen at hospitals, such as the Children's Hospital in Seattle, are Medicaid populations, and they would not have the resources to get access to care. Our institutions that are covering individuals at Medicaid rates would take a hit.

All the Senate proposal does is basically move that cap, but it is a steeper cap at a point in time that makes and exacerbates this problem of cutting people off of access to care. So if the

House bill is mean, this is just doubling down on mean.

There is nothing about destructing this safety net that is so important to Americans that goes hand-in-hand with the philosophy about how to drive down costs to healthcare. If you think about it, if we came out here and had a discussion with 100 U.S. Senators and said a great way to drive down the cost of healthcare would be to cut people off of healthcare, most people would say that is not a smart idea because when people are cut off of healthcare, we know that uncompensated care exacerbates healthcare needs, challenges other parts of our system, and delivering care to them makes it more expensive. When we have had discussions and roundtables about the proposal that the House had put out, providers in my State told me point-blank, covering the Medicaid population has helped drive down and control the rate of insurance in the private markets. By saying we are going to cut Medicaid at a more drastic rate, we are going to just send a signal to the market that rates for the private insurers should go up.

I don't think that is what my constituents want. They want us to innovate. They want us to drive quality care and managed care into parts of the United States where it doesn't exist. They want us to take care of our most vulnerable population, and they want to make sure we are not delivering that off people who are going into the emergency room 50 times in a year because they don't have insurance.

We know the Medicaid rate is critically important. Medicaid costs up to one-quarter less than private insurance. It is a way to deliver care. We know measures we put into the Affordable Care Act, such as moving people off of nursing home care to community-based care, has saved Medicaid dollars. More States should do it.

We know plans such as bundling up the individual market into larger programs so they can have clout like others who work for a larger employer has also driven down costs. So those are the things we should be accelerating, not this notion that we move forward as a country by cutting the most vulnerable off of healthcare.

I ask my colleagues to come out and discuss this concept, discuss this idea, how it will affect the healthcare providers in their States. I plan to do that with my State. I hope they will come out here and tell us why it is a smart strategy to cut people off from Medicaid. I know no State that has the money to make up for the Federal share of Medicaid that is going to be doubled down in this bill.

I do not want to see a war on Medicaid. What I want to see is innovation. What I want to see is that covering people with some level of insurance basically helps save everybody on their

insurance bills as well. I hope my colleagues will take this discussion draft and be proud to come out here and discuss it, but we have heard very little of that thus far.

Let's look at the real numbers, and I guarantee that we will hear from Governors, we will hear from States, we will hear from providers, we will hear from businesses, and we will hear from people who do not think this is a good idea.

Already there are comments from the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging: "This strategy will also put . . . Medicaid [and] states [and consumers] on a fiscally precarious path."

We have heard from other people that the Medicaid cap is up to twice as bad for States, will cause problems, and also from children's healthcare groups: "Converting Medicaid into a per capita cap . . . would dismantle critical protections . . . to care for all enrollees."

These aren't just partisan comments. These are the facts. What my colleagues don't realize is that by taking a huge chunk out of Medicaid, you are taking a huge chunk out of the safety net so many Americans depend on. It will not help us lower costs. It will exacerbate an escalation of rates for everyone in the market.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time on the Billingslea nomination expire at 2 p.m. today and that if cloture is invoked on the Svinicki nomination, the postcloture time not expire until 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

#### RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in March, Mr. Comey briefed Ranking Member FEINSTEIN and this Senator on the Russia investigation. This included telling us who was and who was not under investigation.

After that meeting, I publicly called for Mr. Comey to tell the public what he had told us about whether President Trump was under investigation. I did this because the public had a right to know. Mr. Comey told me and other congressional leaders that the President was not under investigation. He even told the President himself, and I understand that he repeatedly told this to the President. But Mr. Comey didn't listen to my request for transparency. I think transparency in government is very important because transparency brings accountability, and government needs to be accountable. Mr. Comey didn't listen to the President's request. Only months later has the truth finally come out.

Well, it ought to raise the question with anybody: What happened in the meantime? What happened because Mr. Comey refused to tell the American people that the President wasn't under investigation? The short answer is something you see almost hourly, particularly in this city: media hysteria. Countless media articles falsely claimed the President was under investigation for colluding with Russia. Unfortunately, a number of our Democrat colleagues in the House and Senate played right along. Over and over again, the media published selective leaks. They published classified half-truths. All this was used to make false allegations of sinister conduct by the President. And, of course, there were a lot of people who believed it.

The intelligence community conducted an assessment of Russia's efforts to interfere in the election. That assessment said one of Russia's goals was to undermine public confidence in our democratic system.

Because Mr. Comey refused to tell the public that the FBI was not investigating the President, conspiracy theories and, of course, wild speculation have run rampant about the election, the President, and Russia. These conspiracy theories and wild speculation have played right into Russia's aim of undermining faith in our democratic system.

That doesn't come out very often in these stories, but we have to understand that Russia makes a career of not only undermining democratic systems in the United States, look at what they have done in Ukraine militarily, and look at what they have done in France with the elections and in the Netherlands with the elections. They are talking about upcoming elections in Germany, where the Russians will try to do the same thing because autocrats don't like democratic systems that work and whatever they can do to undermine those democratic systems is going to obviously make them look better in comparison.

Those national security concerns should have taken precedence. Mr. Comey said he was worried about a duty to correct the record if evidence of collusion involving the President came to light later on. But that concern was merely hypothetical—in other words, pure speculation. In the unlikely event that it came to pass, the public should know if the FBI is pursuing a criminal investigation against the President, just as the public should know if the FBI is pursuing a criminal investigation against a major party's nominee for President. But Mr. Comey agreed with Attorney General Lynch to shade the truth in favor of the Clinton campaign's rhetoric and call what was an investigation a "matter" instead of using the word "investigation." This came about because of an order by Attorney General Lynch.

After a year of the entire might of the U.S. intelligence community and the FBI looking for evidence of collusion with the Russians, where is that evidence? But after all of this chaos and mountains of innuendo about the President and collusion with Russia, the truth finally came out: The FBI was not investigating President Trump in the Russia probe. The media was wrong. The Democrats were wrong. The wild speculation and conspiracy theories ended up harming our country. They played right into Russia's hands.

How did we all learn the truth? In President Trump's letter removing Mr. Comey from office. At first, most didn't believe it. The media scoffed when they read what the President said in that letter. They insisted that Mr. Comey would never tell the President that he was not under investigation. We learned earlier this month from Mr. Comey himself that he had done exactly that. It wasn't a surprise to me because Mr. Comey had told me the same thing.

I have to note something else here. Mr. Comey didn't just tell the President, Senator FEINSTEIN, and me that the President was not under investigation. He had also told the Gang of 8. Of course, the Gang of 8 includes the Senate minority leader, Mr. SCHUMER. But even after Mr. Comey told the Gang of 8 that the President was not under investigation, the minority leader told the media that the President was under investigation, and, of course, that further helped feed media hysteria. The minority leader even tried to say that the Senate shouldn't vote on the Supreme Court nomination because the President was under investigation, and the whole time, he knew it wasn't true.

Media hysteria and baseless political attacks filled the vacuum left by Mr. Comey's failure to inform the public—to be transparent, to be accountable.

The odd thing about it is none of this fiasco had to happen. If Mr. Comey had just been transparent with the public, as I urged him to be, it could have been avoided.

Unfortunately, now it looks as if Mr. Comey and the media might be doing the same thing to Attorney General Sessions.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Comey said he didn't tell the Attorney General about the conversation he supposedly had with the President about General Flynn. Mr. Comey said this was because he believed the Attorney General was going to recuse himself from the Russia investigation.

Mr. Comey said the FBI was aware of the facts that he couldn't discuss in an open setting that could have made the Attorney General's continued engagement problematic. Well, that vague statement sounds very mysterious to people who don't know the whole truth. They will wonder: What were those secret facts? What did the FBI conclude

about those secret facts? Was the Attorney General under investigation? Did the Attorney General collude with Russia?

Once again, Mr. Comey is not being as transparent about senior government officials and the Russia investigation as he could or should be. Now the speculation is running rampant again, this time about the Attorney General instead of the President.

CNN reported that Mr. Comey told the Intelligence Committee behind closed doors that the issue was a possible additional meeting between Sessions and the Russian Ambassador. The media has begun to speculate all sorts of nefarious things. So here we go again. The rumor mill is back in business. It is insinuating improper ties with Russians and undermining people's faith in another senior government official, with the follow-up that it also undermines people's confidence in our institutions of government, and maybe even in our Constitution.

This is the same destructive pattern, and it plays right into the Russians' hands again. Well, this time around, we shouldn't put up with it. We ought to say enough is enough. There is no reason Mr. Comey couldn't have told the public the whole truth.

Once again, 3 months ago, Mr. Comey specifically told Members who was and who was not under investigation in the Russia probe. He should also tell the public whether the FBI ever had an open investigation on Attorney General Sessions. He should tell the public whether the FBI checked out the times Sessions met the Russian Ambassador. He should tell the public whether the FBI looked into the Mayflower Hotel event that went on. He should tell the public if the FBI found nothing improper about these meetings. If there was nothing to it, he should say so publicly. He should not be telling Senators one thing behind closed doors and then making public insinuations that are different. He is the person who can nip this ridiculous speculation in the bud.

Mr. Comey should have told the public earlier what he told Members about the President, and now he should tell the public what he told Members about the Attorney General. Enough of this nonsense.

The investigations of Russian interference and of circumstances surrounding Mr. Comey's firing will continue. I am confident that we will eventually get all the facts, one way or another, and we are going to go where the facts take us. In the meantime, it is time to stop the rumor-mongering. It is time to stop the innuendoes and half-truths. It is time to stop leaking national security information to score political points. And it is time to stop playing into Russia's hands by intentionally sowing false doubt about your political opponents. Instead, it is quite obvious that it is time to get back to doing the people's business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a relevant supplemental article from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 2017]

THE SESSIONS HEARING SHOWS WHO'S REALLY COLLUDING WITH RUSSIA

(By Marc A. Thiessen)

According to the U.S. intelligence community, Russia's objectives in meddling in the 2016 election included not only hurting Hillary Clinton's chances but also undermining "public faith in the U.S. democratic process," "impugning the fairness of the election" and calling into question "the U.S.-led liberal democratic order." If the spectacle of the past few months is any indication, Russian leader Vladimir Putin is certainly succeeding in these latter goals.

And here is the great irony: Those who are falsely claiming that Trump was under FBI investigation for collusion with Moscow are, in fact, the ones inadvertently colluding with Putin to undermine American democracy.

Case in point is the campaign of McCarthyite character assassination on display in the Senate Intelligence Committee hearing Tuesday. No doubt Putin was smiling as Attorney General Jeff Sessions was forced to rebut what he correctly called "appalling and detestable" accusations that he colluded with the Russians and lied to the Senate. Sessions testified that the much-vaunted "third meeting" between Sessions and the Russian ambassador at the Mayflower Hotel—which Sessions reportedly failed to disclose—did not happen, at least not beyond possible incidental contact that he doesn't even recall.

There was a time when airing unproven allegations of coordinating with the Kremlin was seen as bad form. Now it is common practice in Washington. These kinds of false charges and innuendo directly assist Russia in its efforts to undermine public confidence in our democratic institutions. Those raising such accusations without proof are, wittingly or unwittingly, doing the Kremlin's bidding.

For months, Democrats (a.k.a. "The Resistance") have been spinning the false narrative that President Trump was under FBI investigation to call into question the validity of his presidency. In March, Democrats used it as a pretext to argue that Trump did not have the legitimacy to fill a Supreme Court vacancy. Senate Democratic leader Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.) declared in a floor speech that the Senate should not vote on Neil Gorsuch's nomination because Republicans "stopped a president who wasn't under investigation" from filling the seat. Two days later, Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) said the same thing, declaring, "The FBI has revealed that the sitting president of the United States is under investigation. And it raises a really, I think, important question and that is whether or not a president who is under investigation by the FBI ought to be ramming through a Supreme Court nominee that would have a lifetime appointment."

The media gleefully echoed these false claims. The day before Comey testified, CNN blared: "In testimony, Comey will dispute President Trump's blanket claim that he was told he wasn't under investigation." In fact, Comey said precisely the opposite. When Sen. James Risch (R-Idaho) asked, "While you were director, the president of the

United States was not under investigation. Is that a fair statement?" Comey replied: "That's correct." Even then, CNN was not willing to concede its error, declaring in a so-called "correction" that "Comey does not directly dispute that Trump was told multiple times he was not under investigation" (emphasis added).

No, Comey did not fail to "directly dispute" it, he directly confirmed it. The CNN story—and its non-correction correction—was "fake news."

Not only that, Comey also testified that Trump never tried to get him to stop the probe into Russia's election meddling, which Comey explained was a separate matter from the FBI's investigation of disgraced former national security adviser Michael Flynn. Not only did Trump not ask Comey to stop the probe, the former FBI director told Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), "He went farther than that. He said, and if some of my satellites did something wrong, it'd be good to find that out." Rubio pressed Comey, asking whether he was testifying that Trump effectively said, "Do the Russia investigation. I hope it all comes out. I have nothing to do with anything Russia. It'd be great if it all came out, people around me were doing things that were wrong." Comey replied, "That was the sentiment he was expressing. Yes, sir."

Given these facts, Trump has legitimate reason to be frustrated. If you knew you were not under investigation by the FBI, but everyone was saying you were, you'd want the truth to get out. And you might be upset with an FBI director who refused to lift the "cloud" hanging over your administration by confirming that he was not investigating you.

That said, Trump has been fueling the liberal feeding frenzy with his tweetstorms taking his critics to task. If Trump knows he did nothing wrong—and if he really wants to find out whether any of his "satellites" did—he should stop talking and tweeting about the investigation, let special counsel Robert S. Mueller III do his work and focus on his job: governing. His daughter Ivanka Trump was recently asked how she dealt with the media frenzy over Russia. She replied, "I'm trying to keep my head down, not listen to the noise and just work really hard to make a positive impact in the lives of many people."

That's a good strategy—and one her father ought to emulate.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, today we finally got a look at the monstrosity of a bill that the Republicans have been hiding behind closed doors for weeks. Yes, it is finally clear how the Republicans were spending their time, locked in those back rooms.

Now we know the truth. Senate Republicans weren't making the House bill better—no, not one bit. Instead,

they were sitting around a conference room table, dreaming up even meaner ways to kick dirt in the face of American people and take away their health insurance.

Remember, the Senate Republicans worked for weeks on this new bill. They worked really, really hard on it. It is pretty clear now exactly who they were working for. This bill has one flashing neon sign after another telling us who the Republican Party cares about, and it is not American families.

The Senate bill is crammed full with just as many tax cuts as the House bill—tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, tax cuts for wealthy investors, and tax cuts for giant companies. All those tax cuts don't come cheap. They start to add up after a while.

Senate Republicans had to make a choice—how to pay for all those juicy tax cuts for their rich buddies. I will tell you how: blood money.

Senate Republicans wrung some extra dollars out of kicking people off the tax credits that help them afford health insurance. They raked in extra cash by letting States drop even more protections and benefits, like maternity care or prescription drug coverage or mental health treatment.

Then they got to the real piggy bank, Medicaid, and here they just went wild. Senate Republicans went after Medicaid with even deeper cuts than the House version—the Medicaid expansion gone, ripped up, and flushed down the toilet. The rest of the Medicaid Program? For Senate Republicans, it wasn't enough that the House bill was going to toss grandparents out of nursing homes or slash funding for people with disabilities or pull the plug on healthcare for babies born too soon. Senate Republicans wanted to go bigger.

The Republican bill claims to protect kids with disabilities by leaving them out of the calculations that decide how big the Medicaid cuts will be in each State. I don't know if the Republicans were expecting a round of applause for pitting kids with breathing tubes against vulnerable seniors or someone needing treatment for addiction, but I do know this so-called exemption will not do a thing to help these kids. The Republican cuts still slash hundreds of billions of dollars for Medicaid, leaving States with no choice—no choice but to cut services that kids with disabilities desperately need.

Medicaid is the program in this country that provides health insurance to 1 in 5 Americans, to 30 million kids, to nearly 2 out of every 3 people in a nursing home. These cuts are blood money. People will die. Let's be very clear: Senate Republicans are paying for tax cuts for the wealthy with American lives.

Think about what would happen if the Republican bill becomes law next week. Picture a woman in her eighties



who lives at home. She is shaky on her feet. She needs help preparing her meals or taking a bath, but her only income is her Social Security check. Right now, Medicaid helps pay for home and community-based services so she can stay in her home, someone who comes by to help for a few hours a week. Because of that help, she gets to stay home, to live independently. The Republicans are determined to cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires, so their healthcare plan cuts Medicaid money that helps millions of seniors stay in their homes.

Without these services, this elderly woman can't live alone. Where does she turn? The usual answer would be a nursing home. Wait. Medicaid pays for most nursing home care in this country. The Republicans are determined to cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires, so they have cut Medicaid funding so much that there is no help for this woman at home and no nursing home bed for her either.

What does she do? She stays home without help. She can't climb the stairs anymore. Her world shrinks. Eventually, most likely, she falls and ends up in the hospital. The care is expensive, and she is miserable.

Finally, let's say the hospital gets her back on her feet, but there is nowhere for her to go when she is discharged. She heads back home to wait for the next fall, maybe the one that will be fatal.

In their determination to cut taxes for the rich, is this what Republicans have planned for frail seniors in our country? Wait until they are all used up and then leave them out at the curb for the next trash pickup?

It isn't just seniors who will be hit hard. How about a premature baby born with lung defects? His parents both have full-time jobs, but no matter how hard they work, no matter how many hours they put in, they will never be able to pay for the millions of dollars in surgeries, equipment, medicine, and therapy that their child needs. Right now, Medicaid makes sure that kids with complex medical needs have coverage for feeding tubes and medication and surgery and physical therapy.

Senate Republicans were so determined to offer tax breaks for the rich that they have taken away this baby's Medicaid. What happens next? Maybe the parents try their best, but they can't pay. Maybe they try a Kickstarter campaign, but it is not going to bring in enough to cover the medical bills. They take out a second mortgage, and then they go bankrupt and lose their home.

Is that the Republican plan for this family—go live in a homeless shelter with your little baby, whose only crime was to be born 14 weeks early?

Senate Republicans can wave their hands and say that everyone will be

fine, but it is time for the rest of us to take a long, hard look at exactly what would happen to the people who have to live with the Republicans' reckless cuts.

Senate Republicans know exactly what they are doing with this healthcare bill. Their values are on full display. If they want to trade the health insurance of millions of Americans for tax cuts for the rich, they better be ready for a fight because now that this shameful bill is out in the open, that is exactly what they are going to get.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss, for just a couple of minutes this afternoon, the issue of healthcare and, in particular, the legislation that was unveiled today, what is referred to as a "discussion draft." It is legislative text, but it is not the final word on this issue. So we have to begin in earnest to engage in debate because we are going to be very limited in the time that we have.

I think the best way to describe this legislation can be very simple, actually, in terms of the impact on a lot of Americans. Unfortunately, I don't think this is really an effort to improve the healthcare system. I think it is a scheme. It is a scheme that sells out the middle class. It hurts seniors and children and devastates the protections and healthcare for individuals with disabilities over time, and all of that is done to finance tax breaks for the very rich. There are other ways, of course, to describe it, but I will focus mostly on Medicaid.

As it relates to Medicaid, this isn't a repeal and replace, or repeal and improve, or repeal and reform. This is repeal and decimate when it comes to Medicaid. The cuts may be stretched out, but they are, in fact, deeper over time.

So if you are one of the 1.1 million children in Pennsylvania who receives Medicaid or one of over 720,000 Pennsylvanians with a disability who benefits from Medicaid, your healthcare could be at risk. My test would be that if any of those individuals lose their Medicaid benefits, it is a bad bill. I would hope that would be the test for every Member of the Senate.

The other adverse consequence of this legislation is that it will cripple efforts to battle the opioid addiction in our country. We just had a great consensus at the end of last year where both parties came together on two pieces of legislation—one that dealt directly with the opioid epidemic, the so-called CARA bill, or the Comprehen-

sive Addiction and Recovery Act. Then later in the year, there was another bill that provided some additional funding. All of that would be compromised, undermined, or degraded, at least, if this legislation went through because the biggest payer—certainly, in the top two, in terms of our paying for opioid treatment and services—is, of course, the Medicaid Program.

So what we have here before us is a bill that is a tax giveaway to the wealthiest. The top one-tenth of 1 percent would receive thousands and thousands, if not tens of thousands, of dollars. One estimate of the earlier version of the House bill said, if you were in the top one-tenth of 1 percent, you would get \$197,000 each. Those people don't need \$197,000 from a tax break from a so-called healthcare bill. They would, I think, expect that we would take care of the people that need healthcare: Vulnerable children. Some 40 percent of the children in America get Medicaid. Almost half the births in the country are paid for by Medicaid. People with disabilities are disproportionately dependent upon Medicaid, and they should have a right to expect—and their families should have a right to expect—that, if you have a disability, you should get Medicaid today, tomorrow, years from now, decades from now, and as long as you need it. You should have that guarantee. This bill takes away that guarantee for those families with a loved one with a disability.

One of the many stories that we get from back home are from parents. Many of them are writing because their child has a disability or multiple disabilities, and they are dependent upon Medicaid. Here is just one:

My son, Anthony, was born at 25 weeks and he weighed one tiny pound. We were overcome with medical bills which Medicaid thankfully paid for us. Since his birth he has had multiple health crisis, seizures, sleep disorders just to name a few.

Most recently, Anthony was diagnosed with Autism spectrum disorder, Tourette's syndrome, severe obsessive compulsive disorder and Dyspraxia. He has suffered the most physically and mentally because of his Tourette's. It's severe and he is frequently unable to attend school due to his "tics." They are painful and debilitating. They make him unable to eat, breathe and see at their worst. Far from what is commonly depicted in the movies and on TV.

Then, this father goes on to say:

Two years ago I was forced to quit my job of twenty years as a therapist to stay at home and care for Anthony because of the amount of doctors' appointments he has and the number of days of school he misses every year. Luckily with medical assistance—

That is the Pennsylvania version of Medicaid—

covering his services I am still able to do so. If we lost coverage, we would not be able to provide the support he needs. We are sure of that.

I truly realize that unless you are actually living this kind of life, it's easy to turn a



blind eye. I can assure you that my story is much like thousands of others that DEPEND—

And he has that word “depend” in all capital letters—

on funds from medical assistance to cover doctors, medications, therapies and durable medical equipment that children with disabilities require. Families of children with disabilities are desperate to not lose those benefits.

My son Anthony is currently attending school almost regularly and functioning the best he has for a very long time thanks to the services he received from medical assistance.

That is otherwise known as Medicaid.

So that is the reality for a lot of families. Now, I can hear some folks in the Senate saying: Well, maybe Anthony will not be affected because the Medicaid provisions are going to be up to the States, and the States can handle that. We are just going to put a cap on the dollars, and we are going to wind down the Medicaid expansion that covered 11 million Americans at last count, and the States will handle it.

So we are sending back these challenges and the disproportionate burden that States will have to bear to make sure that Anthony—who has all those challenges in his life—has the coverage of Medicaid. The Federal Government will just wash its hands of that responsibility.

No, Medicaid is a guarantee now, based upon your eligibility. That guarantee should remain. We are a great country. We have the strongest economy and the strongest military in the world, and we have the Medicaid Program. We don't have to sacrifice those kids or sacrifice the healthcare for one child who depends on Medicaid. We don't have to sacrifice that child in order to have another part of our budget funded appropriately. That is an insult, and anyone who is going to choose to support legislation that would fund tax cuts for the wealthiest, while at the very same time and in the very same bill would result in others losing coverage—and I am not only talking about children with disabilities. I am talking about adults who have coverage—20 million people in the last couple of years. Any Member of the Senate who chooses tax cuts for the wealthy over those children and over those individuals, I think, should examine their conscience, to use an old expression, because this kind of policy that results in the most vulnerable among us losing their healthcare coverage is obscene. There are a lot of other words we could use—words we can't use here—because that is the definition of an insult to our values and to our country.

We are a better country than what we will become if this Chamber votes in favor of a bill that will decimate Medicaid, the way this bill will. I realize it might take a long time. I realize it might be another Presidency or

many Congresses from now, but the deed will be done here that will lead to that kind of misery. We have no sense of the misery that will be imposed upon those families because we have never had this before.

We had a program in place for 50 years, and it has helped a lot of kids with disabilities. It has helped a lot of families to be able to hold down a job while their child gets the benefit of Medicaid because of a disability. It has helped a lot of poor children rise up from poverty and overcome terrible poverty because when they were kids—when they were very, very young—they got early periodic screening diagnosis and testing—the kind of early intervention and good healthcare that children get on Medicaid.

A lot of seniors get into nursing homes. A lot of middle-class seniors from middle-class families get into nursing homes solely because they get the benefit of Medicaid, in addition to Medicare.

The last thing I would say is that I think Senators in this Chamber should think about the basic inequity when they have healthcare. Everyone here has healthcare. All the families here have healthcare. All of our loved ones who are dependent upon us have healthcare. Yet some will vote to take away healthcare from some, and, in the very same bill, vote for gross, obscene tax cuts for the wealthiest among us—most of whom, I would bet, don't want those tax cuts. They would rather see us take care of the vulnerable.

So it is a basic choice. This isn't complicated. This is a very simple choice. I hope that in the course of this debate, some will come forward with some courage, some guts, and some compassion and do the right thing and vote this bill down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, last month, Republicans in the House of Representatives passed a healthcare bill. They call it the American Health Care Act. It has been widely described as cruel and poorly crafted. Last week, President Trump described it as “mean.”

The House bill, by design, would take health coverage away from tens of millions of Americans. It ends the guarantee of affordable coverage for people with preexisting conditions. It cuts Medicaid, which is the principal program for ensuring children, people with disabilities, and seniors in nursing homes. It cuts Medicaid by more than \$800 billion, and to compound that cruelty, the same legislation gives an enormous tax cut—over \$30 billion—to those at the top of the income scale.

We just heard this morning some of what is in the Senate bill, the Senate version of the American Health Care Act. In fact, not only does it not do

what President Trump claims the Senate was working on—it doesn't address the mean aspect of it—but it actually makes it worse. In a State like New Hampshire, it provides for even deeper cuts to our expanded Medicaid Program, a bipartisan program that provides for treatment for substance use disorders for people dealing with the heroin and opioid epidemic. It would tax older Americans more than younger Americans for their health insurance and defund Planned Parenthood. There are all kinds of reasons. It would eliminate the requirement that people with preexisting conditions are able to have healthcare coverage. And all of this was done in secret behind closed doors.

My office has been deluged with messages from constituents who oppose the Republican leader's bill. This shows whom we have heard from in recent weeks. I have received more than 5,400 messages opposing the bill and 108 in support, so 5,461 are in opposition, and 108 are in support.

I am sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle must be receiving similar volumes of mail and phone calls from their constituents, and they are hearing what I am hearing from my constituents: that if we go forward with this legislation that the House passed and that the Senate is considering, we are going to have people lose their access to healthcare and many people will have to pay more.

So I appeal to Republican leaders. I urge you to stop and reconsider what you are doing. I want you to listen to some of the people we have heard from in New Hampshire, everyday Americans whose lives would be devastated by this legislation.

Several months ago, I asked people across the State of New Hampshire to tell me their stories about the Affordable Care Act, to tell me their concerns, to let me know how it has made a difference for them.

Here we see one of the people I heard from. This is Deodonne Bhattarai and her son Bodhi. They live in Concord, NH. As you see, Bodhi is in a special chair. Deodonne writes:

Our three-year-old son is a bright, curious, funny little boy who also has Spinal Muscular Atrophy.

That is a degenerative neuromuscular disease that causes his muscles to be very weak.

Our insurance initially denied coverage for his wheelchair, but because of the Affordable Care Act—

The ban on discrimination against those with preexisting conditions—my son is now able to explore his world independently.

She goes on to say:

I have [read news reports about the Republican legislation], and I fear for our ability to maintain not just insurance coverage but the type of quality coverage my son's life depends upon.

Next we have a picture of the McCabe family. They are from Kingston, NH, and this is their story:

Our daughter, Ellie, was born with a rare and serious heart defect called Hypoplastic Left Heart Syndrome.

You can see Ellie there. She looks like a healthy, inquisitive little girl, and she is looking healthy because she underwent her first surgery when she was just 3 days old.

The McCabes go on to say:

It terrifies us to think about what would have happened to our family if Ellie hadn't been protected by the pre-existing conditions protections in place thanks to the Affordable Care Act. Without those protections, either we would be in serious debt for the rest of our lives or Ellie would not have had her life-saving surgeries.

Next, this is Dr. Marie Ramas. She serves at the Lamprey Health Care Center in Nashua, NH. That is a clinic I recently visited. She wrote to me:

I have a 24-year-old patient who was born with a congenital condition that did not allow his leg bones to grow completely. This patient was unable to afford proper care and had been walking with an old prosthetic for the last 3 years.

Imagine not being able to get your prosthetic replaced for 3 years.

Thanks to expanded Medicaid and to the ACA protections for those with pre-existing conditions, he's now getting quality care and can afford a new prosthetic.

So his life has been changed by the Affordable Care Act.

I have also heard stories from scores of entrepreneurs and small business owners who have benefited from the Affordable Care Act.

This is Steve Roll of Keene, NH, and he wrote:

In late 2015, I left my job to start my own business. I've built a profitable business and expect to hire employees within a year or two. Before the ACA, I wouldn't have taken the risk to start a business because I have a pre-existing condition and I wouldn't have been able to get an individual health insurance policy. If the ACA is repealed, I'm concerned that I'll need to put my business on hold in order to go back to a corporate job just to get the healthcare benefits.

Well, the healthcare legislation that has been produced by the Republican leadership in the Senate would take away the requirement that people with preexisting conditions have to have access to healthcare.

We have another businessperson here, Dave Lucier. He is the owner of Claremont Spice & Dry Goods in western New Hampshire. Dave wrote this:

Before the Affordable Care Act, insurance costs were more than a third of my business expenses. Now they're less than an eighth. The ACA made it possible for me to go out on my own and realize my dream of starting a small business here in Claremont.

And his business is doing well.

Many women have written to me about how the Affordable Care Act has ended discrimination against them by the health insurance industry—discrimination because of their gender. In

particular, they are grateful that the Affordable Care Act includes maternity care and contraception among the law's essential health benefits.

This is Maura Fay of Exeter, NH. I talked about her last night when I was talking about the impact of this Republican bill on women's health. Maura wrote:

My husband and I are self-employed. Before the ACA, we were paying rates that were simply unsustainable for a middle-class family like ours. When I was pregnant in 2013, we were forced to pay a maternity rider of an additional \$822 a month. I'm worried about the rollbacks in regulations around essential health benefits, especially since so many of them impact women. Maternity coverage shouldn't come with an additional \$800 a month price tag.

Here in Washington, some folks seem to think that repealing the Affordable Care Act is all about politics, that it is about winning this debate. But for ordinary people in New Hampshire—people like Maura, like the McCabe family, like all the people I have shown pictures of this afternoon—for ordinary people in New Hampshire and across America, repealing the Affordable Care Act isn't about politics. For so many of them, it is about life-and-death. It is about the kind of lives they are going to lead. It is about whether they are going to be able to continue to afford healthcare, whether they are going to continue to pay their mortgage and buy prescription drugs. We need to listen to these ordinary people in each of our States whose lives and financial situations will be turned upside down if the Affordable Care Act is repealed.

This process has really not been in keeping with our democratic process in America. For the Republican leadership here in the Senate and before that in the House to pursue a partisan approach to healthcare, to deny Democrats and even deny many of my Republican colleagues the ability to engage in the writing of this bill—it is deeply misguided to deny the public access, to deny a hearing on this bill, legislation that we know is going to hurt tens of millions of Americans.

There really is a better way forward for both the Senate and for our country. If we put ideology and partisanship aside, if we work together, we can strengthen the parts of the Affordable Care Act that aren't working. We can continue Medicaid expansion so it can help people with substance use disorders, so it can help kids with disabilities, so it can help elderly people in nursing homes. We can fix what is not working, and we can improve on this law and make it better, but we can't do that if we continue to be divided up on our partisan sides, if we are not willing to talk about the issue, not willing to work together.

The American people want us to work together here in Washington to address their concerns. Well, it is time to respect their wishes. Let's strength-

en the Affordable Care Act so that it works even better for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### REQUESTS FOR AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They do not have the approval of the Democratic leader; therefore, they will not be permitted to meet, but I ask unanimous consent that a list of committees requesting authority to meet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Committee on the Judiciary

Committee on Intelligence

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

#### NOMINATION OF KRISTINE SVINICKI

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of President Trump's nomination of Kristine Svinicki to continue serving as a nuclear safety regulator.

Ms. Svinicki has served as a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for more than 9 years. In January, President Trump designated Ms. Svinicki as the Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. She is well qualified. In her time in office, she has proven to be knowledgeable, dedicated, and an outstanding public servant.

She also has been very responsive to Congress. Since becoming a Commissioner, she has testified 18 times before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Before becoming a member of the NRC, she served as staff in the U.S. Senate, as a nuclear engineer at the Department of Energy, and as an energy engineer for the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

She has already been confirmed twice to serve on the NRC. In both 2008 and 2012, her nomination was approved by the Environment and Public Works Committee and by the full Senate, each time by voice vote. Earlier this month, the Environment and Public Works Committee approved her nomination for a third time, again by voice vote.

Her nomination has garnered support from groups like Third Way, which is a think tank once labeled as "radical centrists" by the New York Times. Josh Freed, who is the vice president of the Clean Energy Program at Third Way, said this: "Svinicki's work at the NRC has resulted in improved readiness to regulate small modular and advanced reactors that could provide

enormous benefits for climate, American leadership, and domestic job creation." He went on to say that Chairman Svinicki's continued leadership at the NRC is needed now more than ever.

The Senate must act quickly to confirm Ms. Svinicki. Unless she is confirmed by June 30, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will no longer have a quorum of its members. We can't let that happen. The NRC has an important mission of regulating America's nuclear industry. The Commission serves to protect public health and the environment. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission needs a quorum of its members in office to meet its mission.

We need to confirm Kristine Svinicki, and I urge all Senators to vote yes on her nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired and the question occurs on the Billingslea nomination.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Billingslea nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 152 Ex.]

#### YEAS—65

|           |           |           |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Alexander | Fischer   | Murkowski |
| Baldwin   | Flake     | Nelson    |
| Barrasso  | Gardner   | Paul      |
| Bennet    | Graham    | Perdue    |
| Blunt     | Grassley  | Portman   |
| Boozman   | Hatch     | Risch     |
| Burr      | Heitkamp  | Roberts   |
| Capito    | Heller    | Rounds    |
| Cassidy   | Hoeven    | Rubio     |
| Cochran   | Inhofe    | Sasse     |
| Collins   | Isakson   | Scott     |
| Coons     | Johnson   | Shelby    |
| Corker    | Kaine     | Strange   |
| Cornyn    | Kennedy   | Sullivan  |
| Cotton    | King      | Tester    |
| Crapo     | Lankford  | Thune     |
| Cruz      | Lee       | Tillis    |
| Daines    | Manchin   | Toomey    |
| Donnelly  | McCaín    | Warner    |
| Duckworth | McCaskill | Wicker    |
| Enzi      | McConnell | Young     |
| Ernst     | Moran     |           |

#### NAYS—35

|              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Blumenthal   | Harris    | Reed       |
| Booker       | Hassan    | Sanders    |
| Brown        | Heinrich  | Schatz     |
| Cantwell     | Hirono    | Schumer    |
| Cardin       | Klobuchar | Shaheen    |
| Carper       | Leahy     | Stabenow   |
| Casey        | Markey    | Udall      |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez  | Van Hollen |
| Durbin       | Merkley   | Warren     |
| Feinstein    | Murphy    | Whitehouse |
| Franken      | Murray    | Wyden      |
| Gillibrand   | Peters    |            |

The nomination was confirmed.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2022.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 153 Ex.]

#### YEAS—89

|            |           |           |
|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Baldwin    | Cochran   | Feinstein |
| Barrasso   | Collins   | Fischer   |
| Bennet     | Coons     | Flake     |
| Blumenthal | Corker    | Franken   |
| Blunt      | Cornyn    | Gardner   |
| Boozman    | Cotton    | Graham    |
| Brown      | Crapo     | Grassley  |
| Burr       | Cruz      | Hassan    |
| Cantwell   | Daines    | Hatch     |
| Capito     | Donnelly  | Heinrich  |
| Cardin     | Duckworth | Heitkamp  |
| Carper     | Durbin    | Hirono    |
| Casey      | Enzi      | Hoeven    |
| Cassidy    | Ernst     | Inhofe    |

|           |         |            |
|-----------|---------|------------|
| Isakson   | Murphy  | Shaheen    |
| Johnson   | Murray  | Shelby     |
| Kaine     | Nelson  | Stabenow   |
| Kennedy   | Paul    | Strange    |
| King      | Perdue  | Sullivan   |
| Klobuchar | Peters  | Tester     |
| Lankford  | Portman | Thune      |
| Leahy     | Reed    | Tillis     |
| Lee       | Risch   | Toomey     |
| Manchin   | Roberts | Udall      |
| McCain    | Rounds  | Van Hollen |
| McCaskill | Rubio   | Warner     |
| McConnell | Sasse   | Whitehouse |
| Menendez  | Schatz  | Wicker     |
| Moran     | Schumer | Young      |
| Murkowski | Scott   |            |

#### NAYS—10

|              |         |        |
|--------------|---------|--------|
| Booker       | Heller  | Warren |
| Cortez Masto | Markey  | Wyden  |
| Gillibrand   | Merkley |        |
| Harris       | Sanders |        |

#### NOT VOTING—1

Alexander

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 89, the nays are 10.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NORTH KOREA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as we begin the markup—that is what we are going to be starting on right away. We have already had an initial meeting with the Senate Armed Services Committee on the National Defense Authorization Act. I want to express my deep concern over the continued malign behavior by the overtly hostile nation of North Korea.

I often talk to people, and they shake their heads in disbelief about a country that is run by a mentally deranged individual who is rapidly developing the capability of hitting the mainland United States with a missile. I think it is important that we immediately get to our Defense authorization bill, so we can start addressing this and many other problems that we have.

It is important to us in the Senate to communicate to the American people the incredibly grave situation we are facing right now in North Korea. The Kim Jong Un regime has expressed a desire to destroy the United States of America. Normally that wouldn't be a concern because he wouldn't have the credibility, but right now we are seeing progress being made in their technology and their ability to actually hit major areas.

In April, North Korea's official newspaper relayed the threat of a preemptive strike to "completely and immediately wipe out not only U.S. imperialists' invasion forces in South Korea and its surrounding areas but the U.S. mainland and reduce them to ashes."

That is a threat—a threat that has come directly from the leader of North Korea. This is the most recent in a long line of threats by that individual.

In addition, North Korean leaders constantly threaten our friends and allies in South Korea and Japan. These threats are not just hollow words any longer. North Korea's capabilities are rapidly improving to meet their long-stated intent.

We thought that Kim Jong Il was bad, but in 6 years, his son Kim Jong Un has conducted as many as 75 ballistic missile tests. In comparison, over a 17-year period, his father conducted about 30. In other words, he has done over twice as many in a fraction of the time.

Additionally, Kim Jong Un has sped up North Korea's nuclear program since taking power in 2011. North Korea's nuclear technology is advancing at an alarming rate. For example, the bomb North Korea tested in its most recent test last September was 10 times more powerful than what the regime could have produced in 2006—10 times more.

At the same time, North Korea has actively worked on miniaturizing nuclear weapons so that they can deliver by way of a ballistic missile. Earlier this year, analysts detected activity at a North Korean nuclear test site, indicating another nuclear test may be imminent.

Intelligence and military experts have repeatedly argued that it is prudent to assume that North Korea has successfully miniaturized their nuclear weapons. That means the only technology they need to conduct a nuclear strike on the U.S. mainland—that is us; that is right here—would be a functional intercontinental ballistic missile, or ICBM.

In January, Kim Jong Un said North Korea is in the "final stage in preparations."

Let's make sure we understand what we are talking about. We know that their capability is getting very close to it, and they have already said that they would send something over to the mainland United States.

Unfortunately, when you talk to people in the real world, they can't believe this could be true—that one guy who is mentally deranged could be heading up a country that has the capability of blowing up an American city. Yet we know this is going on right now.

Recently, in the Armed Services Committee—and I was in attendance at that time—the Defense Intelligence Agency Director, Lt. Gen. Vincent Stewart, told the Armed Services Com-

mittee: "If left on its current trajectory the [North Korean] regime will ultimately succeed in fielding a nuclear-armed missile capable of threatening the United States homeland."

That is a direct quote by the guy who knows more about this than anybody else. Lieutenant General Stewart added that "the North Korean regime is committed and is on a pathway where this capability is inevitable."

I will say that again. Our intelligence experts assessed that, unchecked, North Korea will inevitably achieve the capability to strike the U.S. homeland with a nuclear missile.

Even without the ICBM capability, the missiles we know they already have can range U.S.—that means it can reach the United States—military personnel and other citizens in South Korea, Japan, Guam, and many other areas.

North Korea's known missile inventory now includes a missile that North Korea successfully tested for the first time on May 14. That missile represented a major breakthrough in North Korean ballistic missile technology. The reports indicate the missile traveled over 1,300 miles at an altitude and successfully exited and then reentered the Earth's atmosphere—a key requirement for nuclear capable ICBMs.

If fired at its maximum range, the missile could reach Guam. Though the missile itself was not an ICBM, the technological breakthrough demonstrates a significant advancement that North Korea has made in their ballistic missile capability. This is actual. This is happening. This is today. This is reality.

Another significant advancement that occurs to me is the solid-fueled, road-mobile missiles the regime is developing. Kim Jong Un has successfully tested two such missiles already this year—one in February and another last month on May 21.

Solid-fueled missiles mounted on mobile launch vehicles can be prepared ahead of time. They can build up an inventory and come back and use that inventory whenever they desire to do so.

What can we do? It is clear that North Korea does not respond to international pressure. All of these ballistic missile tests violate multiple U.N. resolutions. Yet North Korea carries them out, despite sanctions and international condemnation. The normal type of negotiation doesn't work with those guys. Furthermore, conventional wisdom has led us to believe that China—North Korea's main trade partner in that region—holds significant sway over the regime. That conventional wisdom has been called into question recently. I commend the Trump administration for recognizing this and for working with China on this issue, but we can't assume that China will be able to help us close the deal in a diplomatic way.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to take all appropriate steps to defend ourselves from this threat that exists today. We have to keep in mind that as we formulate this year's National Defense Authorization Act—that is what I am talking about now—we have to do it. For 53 consecutive years, we have passed the Defense authorization bill, and right now there is some doubt as to whether we will get enough cooperation from those in this Chamber to make that happen again.

I remember 4 years ago, when I was ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, we didn't get this done until the latter part of December. If you wait around until the latter part of December and it passes midyear, we will have our soldiers over there not getting what they need to be getting in the way of hazard pay and other things. It would be an absolute disaster. Right now, they are watching us. Our kids are over there watching us now to see what we will do with the most important bill we pass every year.

We are going to get started. I applaud the President for the fiscal year 2018 budget request that calls for increases to defense spending and aims to fill critical readiness gaps. Right now, in Congress, we need to build on that even further.

First, we need to bolster our national ballistic defense capabilities to address the threats we face from North Korea. That is a no-brainer. We all understand that. Since 2006, the Missile Defense Agency budget has fallen 23 percent when adjusted for inflation. While we have taken positive steps in recent years, we need to ensure our last-resort defenses are airtight.

We should heed the recommendations of defense experts like Gen. Lori Robinson, commander of the U.S. Northern Command, who testified in April before our committee. I am quoting her now, Lori Robinson: "As adversaries continue to pursue credible and advanced capabilities, we, too, must evolve our missile defense capabilities to outpace increasingly complex threats." I think that is a recognition by her—the one who probably knows more about it than anyone else—that we are not keeping pace right now.

Simultaneously, we have to boost our military. Our forces are smaller than the days of the hollow force. I chaired a committee not too long ago that had the Vices of all four services. They all came in. The conclusion was—even though some of them were not old enough to remember, as I remember, the 1980s at the end of the Carter administration, but they made the statement that we are in a situation now that we have never been in before and that we are, in fact, a hollow force, just as hollow as we were back in 1989 after the Carter administration.

We really owe our brave service men and women better. We owe them an obligation. It is our obligation to let

them know what we are doing. Our forces are smaller than the days of the hollow force in the 1980s. Our equipment is aging, and our base infrastructure requires critical maintenance and upgrades. We went through 8 years of the Obama administration. We paid our price in not really giving our brave young warriors the equipment they needed. Through this year's NDAA, we ought to prioritize across the board end-strength increases and additional investments in maintenance to fill gaps in existing formations and to get our existing equipment back to par. The first thing that happens when you are on a starvation diet is you let your maintenance and modernization go. We have done that.

I hear people say defense spending is out of control. The truth is, defense spending, as a proportion of total government spending, has steadily decreased since World War II. How many people are aware that in 1964, we spent 52 percent of our total resources on defending America? Today, it is 15 percent. No one seems to care about it because they don't know about it. Nonetheless, that is where we are today.

In the recent years, despite waging multiple wars and facing unparalleled global threats, our spending has decreased to about 15 percent of our total spending. The Chief of Staff of the Army, General Milley, said it best when it comes to funding our military. This is really significant now when people are talking about spending too much. He said:

The only thing more expensive than deterrence, is actually fighting a war. And the only thing more expensive than fighting a war, is fighting one and losing one . . . We're expensive. We recognize that. But the bottom line is, it's an investment that is worth every nickel.

So we have to immediately make up for the damage done by the years of the dangerous defense cuts and recognize what the government is really supposed to be doing. I refer to that old document nobody reads anymore called the Constitution. You read that, and it tells us what we are supposed to be doing here; No. 1, defending America; No. 2, they called it post roads back then but infrastructure. That is what we are actually supposed to be doing.

The good news is, under the leadership of President Trump, we have already started that process working. The appropriations bill last month stopped the decline in Army strength. Instead of the planned 460,000 Active soldiers, we now have 475,000. We added 1,000 marines, a few hundred airmen. In total, we currently have 24,000 more servicemembers than we would have had under the previous administration.

More good news is that we have exceptional patriots like the airmen at Tinker, Vance, and Altus Air Force Bases and those who are protecting the skies with F-16s out of my city of

Tulsa. Soldiers like those in Fort Sill and in Oklahoma's 45th Infantry Brigade, who are right now in Ukraine training our allies there.

People don't know that the policy we are following under this new administration is, we are using our resources to help others train themselves. In the case of Ukraine—what happened in Ukraine should never have happened. Ukraine had this great parliamentary election. I happened to be there at the time, about 4 years ago. For the first time in 96 years, Ukraine doesn't have one Communist in its Parliament. They did that because they love us. They love the West. Consequently, when Putin came in right after that—this is back during the Obama administration—he started killing the Ukrainians, who were seeking their freedom—our best friends over there—and our administration refused to let us even send defensive weapons over there.

We are correcting that. In fact, the bill we are talking about right now, the Defense authorization bill, is one where we are going to be addressing that problem.

I am optimistic we will rise to the occasion and meet the challenge presented by the agnostic North Korean regime and confident President Trump has taken the appropriate steps to address this threat diplomatically. We, in Congress, need to follow his lead to ensure that our men and women in uniform have the resources required to answer the call quickly and effectively. We don't have the luxury of time. Just think of the statement I read a minute ago, where Gen. Vincent Stewart told the Armed Services Committee a week ago: "If left on its current trajectory the regime will ultimately succeed in fielding a nuclear-armed missile capable of threatening the United States homeland."

While we have a lot of problems right now on this floor—and we are trying to address these problems—the No. 1 problem is what is happening to our military and the absolute necessity of getting a defense authorization passed very rapidly. We are starting today.

#### CARBON TAX

Mr. President, let me just mention one more thing because I think I do have a little bit more time. Earlier this year, several major oil and gas companies announced their support for a carbon tax plan. This is kind of interesting because we have been fighting this battle for a long period of time. You have to keep in mind there are some very large corporations that would inure to benefit from a carbon tax.

The plan they are backing is one put forth by the Climate Leadership Council. This group's plan is labeled as a conservative climate solution that would tax greenhouse gas emissions and return money to the taxpayers as a climate dividend.

It ain't going to happen, folks. You pass a tax, and it is going to cost everyone—at least everyone who uses energy. I don't know of anyone right now in America who doesn't. The heart of the plan is to make energy from fossil fuels more expensive.

One of the things I do every week, I go back to my State of Oklahoma where there are logical people. I talk to them about things you don't hear in Washington; things, for example, back there in the Obama administration. It was in Chaddick, OK. A farmer came up to me and said: Explain this to me, Senator. If right now we have a President who is trying to do away with fossil fuels—that is coal, oil and gas—and he also wants to do away with nuclear, and while we are dependent—in order to run this machine called America, for 89 percent of the energy we use, we are dependent upon fossil fuels and nuclear, and if he is successful, how do you run the machine called America? The answer is, you can't. This fight has been going on for a long period of time. If you drive a car, you use electricity, or heat your home, you will see higher prices at the pump or if you pass one of these carbon taxes. While these are the obvious increases, higher energy costs would be felt across the economy as it becomes more expensive for all industries to operate and transport their wares, raising food prices and the price of consumer goods. In return for paying these higher prices, you get a check or what someone would call free money, but this money isn't really free. The higher costs of energy, food, and goods are paid by the consumer. That is by everyone in America, no exceptions, and then returned to the consumer. Why can't they just avoid the transition and just keep their money in the first place? Well, they can. That is the answer.

Furthermore, if every American gets the same amount of money as this money calls for, is that really equitable? A family who lives in a small apartment, who walks or takes the subway to work or to school and doesn't own a car in New York City would get the same amount of money as the independent long-haul trucker or a farmer in rural Oklahoma who spends a lot of time in his truck and running his tractor and using more energy to run his farm and his home. As unreasonable as it sounds, this is a reality. There are those out there.

The conservative climate solution sounds more like a redistribution from our rural citizens to more urban populations. Usually, we are talking about taxing the rich to pay to the poor. This is something new.

Furthermore, I always find it interesting that the Warren Buffett's of the world want more taxes. They feel comfortable enough in their wealth to ask for more of their money to be taken, knowing that raising taxes is a non-starter for many of us in Congress. As

I pointed out to him, and will point out to the companies that have joined the Climate Leadership Council, you are free to write your check, if you want to do it anyway. If you are so wrapped up in this idea, then you need either to go—or if, for some other reason, you want to pay money to the Treasury, they are open for business and would be glad to take your money. If you feel that strongly, why wait for legislation that would be a nonstarter? If you are a citizen and want to pay for your carbon footprint, the Treasury would be very glad to accept that.

Let's face it. I am not going to support a new tax—what could very well end up a tax, maybe even the largest tax we would have in this country that does not accomplish anything.

Let's keep in mind, if there is somebody out there who it inures to their corporate benefit, or otherwise, to increase their taxes, let them go ahead and send their check to the Treasury. They will be glad to get it.

#### BILLINGSLEA NOMINATION

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider with respect to the Billingslea nomination be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here to share the words, the stories, the fears, and some of the faces of people in Connecticut who will be impacted by the bill that was released this morning—the so-called discussion draft, if that is the right term for it. We learned this morning, I think, why that discussion draft has been shrouded in secrecy. The reason is very simply that my Republican colleagues are ashamed and embarrassed about it, and rightly, because it is not only mean, as the House bill was, but it is meaner. It is cruel and costly.

It will be cruel and costly to the people of Connecticut, in human suffering and illness and disease, and it will be costly in failing to prevent and treat disease before it becomes more expensive. That is one of the lessons of public health policy today: Treat earlier; prevent before diseases or illnesses or conditions become even more costly. It is not only a way to save lives; it is a way to save money.

The voices and faces of Connecticut have been heard nowhere in this process because of its secrecy, because it has denied anyone in America, in fact, the opportunity to be heard, to comment, to make their views known. Speed and secrecy have been the watchwords, and they are a toxic recipe, and they should mean this discussion draft is dead on delivery today.

My constituents have actually come in overwhelming numbers to an emergency field hearing on healthcare that I began in Hartford earlier this week, Monday morning at 9 a.m. They came for 2 hours. There were many more than we expected on very short notice, and they were there to make sure their voices and faces were heard and seen. That is what I did earlier in the week when I entered their testimony into the RECORD of the Senate. I was proud to do so.

We are continuing that emergency field hearing, in fact, tomorrow at 1:30 in New Haven at the Aldermanic Chambers, which have even greater capacity. We are expecting many more, judging by the response to the email blast and invitations that we have sent, because people care about healthcare.

They should care because it is the difference between life and death, and this bill will be the difference between life and death for so many people in Connecticut. It will be death. Even though that statement may sound like hyperbole or exaggeration, the public health experts, the docs, and the hospitals that deliver healthcare in Connecticut and around the country know that it is true, and so do the people of Connecticut and our country.

My colleagues have failed to hear those faces and voices because they have refused to have hearings, mark-ups, committee meetings, and robust full debate on the floor of this Chamber, as is the practice and should be in other pieces of legislation. Why is it not for one of historic and unprecedented importance for the future of our Nation?

Instead, they have met behind closed doors, a group of men who, maybe, coincidentally, produced a bill that defunds Planned Parenthood and, in effect, furthers a war on women's health—an assault on women's healthcare that will deny mammograms, screenings, preventive care—and on primary care for men, as well as women, in this country.

It will gut Medicare and Medicaid. It will rob millions of people of the healthcare they now have through Medicaid. It will mean higher costs and less care for America and especially for our seniors, who will be among the most victimized by these cuts.

For anyone who cares about opioid addiction and abuse—and everyone in this Chamber, by an overwhelming majority, during the last session voted for the 21st Century Cures Act and then for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, bipartisan, but it was nowhere nearly enough funded—this bill means, in fact, less funding than the House measure would have provided, from \$65 billion increased funding for opioid addiction and abuse treatment to \$2 billion.

When my colleagues characterize this bill as heartless, they underestimate its impact on people who suffer from

the disease—it is a disease, not a moral failing—of addiction and abuse.

Yesterday the voices and faces that I elicited on the floor of the Senate were three people who have struggled with substance use disorder and encountered different endings—Justice, Sean, and Frank. We lost Sean just a few weeks ago. Frank could not come to the hearing we conducted on Monday because he is recovering, as well, and the heartbreak of Sean's loss so affected him.

But Maria Skinner described their struggle to recover from that substance use disorder. Justice will likely never recover from the injuries she sustained when she overdosed. Although Frank is doing well, I am pleased to say he has access to Medicaid and the essential treatment services that he needs only because Medicaid exists in the present form. Denying him that kind of service and treatment means that he may be consigned to the risk that doomed Justice and Sean. The coldheartedness of the House bill was hard to match, but on Medicaid the Senate version has outdone even that coldheartedness—cutting the program even more drastically and costing our Nation, not just healthcare but also jobs.

When we say Medicaid, let's be very clear whom we are talking about, and let me introduce three of the people who are affected.

With me in this photograph are Evan, Amelie, and Amanda. They live with their mom in Ansonia, CT. Following their father's death 6 years ago, the entire family went on Medicaid so they could continue receiving the coverage they need and deserve and the healthcare they need and deserve.

Their mom reached out to my office to speak at the hearing that I am having tomorrow. She wrote to me:

I am very frightened that federal funding for state Medicaid programs will receive tremendous cuts with this potential repeal. I hope to advocate to all those in positions of power that will listen so they can see a face to this problem.

The face to this problem is before us in this Chamber. It is children and families that will see Medicaid decimated for them if the Affordable Care Act is repealed, as would be done by this so-called discussion draft from our Republican colleagues.

Today Evan, Amelie, and Amanda's mom is just learning how tremendous these cuts will be, and today she will fear even more for her children's health and well-being, because when we talk about cuts to Medicaid, we aren't talking about a line item on a budget. We aren't talking about a simple number or a statistic. We are talking about literally millions of children like Evan, Amelie, and Amanda, who have parents fearing what will happen if their reliance on Medicaid is betrayed ruthlessly, senselessly, and recklessly and if their dependence on this vital program for the basic healthcare they need is stripped away.

This bill would also jeopardize affordable access to people with preexisting conditions. At my hearing, a woman named Michelle Virshup told her story of how the Affordable Care Act was there for her to provide coverage as well as services when she was diagnosed with an autoimmune disease in her early twenties. Now, 3 years later, she is doing a lot better and is actually an attorney fighting to remove barriers to healthcare for others in her community. She will suffer under this bill because her access to essential services will be weakened. She will be stripped of coverage that is actually affordable. She will be effectively cut from healthcare once and for all.

When telling me about her illness, Michelle said:

The Affordable Care Act allowed me to see it through and the Affordable Care Act protects me now. Though my health is good, my experience is a preexisting condition that will follow me for the rest of my life.

That is the thing about a preexisting condition. It follows people for the rest of their lives. It is preexisting before they have insurance coverage, and so it is preexisting forever. This bill, in enabling States to eviscerate the safeguards against abuse of preexisting conditions, means their healthcare will be in jeopardy and their lives will be at risk and the abuses that I fought when I was attorney general—time after time, year after year—will come back again.

Among the most meaningful of the work I did as attorney general was to fight person by person when insurance companies said: No, we will not cover that preexisting condition. Their excuse proved to be a ruse, a charade, because they could abuse preexisting conditions, and they will do it again if this bill passes.

This bill's depravity unfortunately goes even further. It actually defunds Planned Parenthood, our Nation's largest women's healthcare provider, while eviscerating protections that guarantee women have access to maternal care throughout their pregnancy. It not only stops and undermines effective family planning, but it then denies effective healthcare when women become pregnant. So it is a kind of catch-22.

This action is cruelly ironic, turning women away from basic birth control services and then threatening their access to maternity care when they unavoidably become pregnant. It is really and simply devastatingly bad public policy, a foolish proposal that attacks women's healthcare and defunds Planned Parenthood, which is an overwhelmingly popular healthcare provider. The objective is to score cheap political points on the far right.

Tomorrow in Connecticut, when I hold another hearing—and we may have another afterward—many of my colleagues may wonder why. They may

well be scared of having that kind of hearing, where they have to listen to the voices and see the faces of the people who will suffer under this bill. They certainly have been too scared to have that kind of hearing in the U.S. Senate.

I will hear from the people this bill will hurt. I will hear from people whose lives will be put at risk as a result of this heartless, cruel, and costly measure. I will be inspired by these people, and I will fight as long and as hard as possible to be sure that this bill never becomes law.

Listening to our constituents is really the way democracy is supposed to work. We are proud of talking about democracy. We are approaching the Fourth of July. What better way to celebrate our democracy than to listen in this Chamber, in these halls, to the people who have expertise and experience that we need instead of the secrecy and speed that we are seeing now.

I am proud that we are having these hearings in Connecticut. I urge my colleagues to do the same. They are emergency hearings because we face the historic and unprecedented exigencies of a proposed bill that will rip away guarantees of effective insurance coverage that Americans need and deserve.

Healthcare is a right. Eventually we will have single-payer in this country. But for now, let's build on the Affordable Care Act, let's make it better, let's cure its defects, and let's work together across the aisle. We can do that if we have that resolve.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues to speak out and ask for a normal process, for hearings, and for debates.

The Presiding Officer and I have talked about this issue. I know the Presiding Officer has many good ideas to contribute, and I am hopeful that we can start over with a bill that would consist of a number of changes in our existing healthcare system. That is what I think we need to do, instead of this repeal bill that came to us without hearings. It is just not the right way to do this.

I have already gotten reactions from my State. Just to use some quotes from an article in the Minneapolis StarTribune that was just posted—we have our health plans saying that what matters is Medicaid, and they are the leaders in our healthcare community, calling this bill disappointing because of the continued insistence on significantly cutting Medicaid, the federally paid health insurance program for those who are the most vulnerable.

They have said things—the big story has been, What is it going to do to Medicaid? But, in fact, what our experts in our State are saying—our

health plans—is that this is really more of the same from what we have seen in the House bill, but over a different time period. There is an argument that in the end, it involves even deeper cuts.

The Minnesota Hospital Association came out and has already, in just the last few hours, said that the last of the guaranteed benefits discourages preventive care and that this proposal “creates a lot of chaos.”

One of the heads of one of our major hospitals said:

They are shortening up the money. But they're not giving us the ability to manage the care.

I have long advocated for changes to the Affordable Care Act—significant changes. I think seniors should be given the ability to harness their marketing power and negotiate for lower prices under Medicare for prescription drugs. They are currently prohibited from doing that. I think that is wrong. I said that when the Affordable Care Act passed.

I think there are many good things we could do to help with the exchanges and with small business rates, including doing something federally on reinsurance. My State legislature, which is a Republican State legislature, joined with our Democratic Governor and worked out an agreement on insurance. We are currently awaiting word from the administration on a waiver, but we think that is a good idea, and there are things we can do to bring that out nationally. I don't see that happening with this bill.

In the end, what matters to me is how this bill affects individual people in my State. Laura from North St. Paul wrote to me about her concerns about the very similar House bill. Laura recently retired, but she will not be eligible for Medicare until next year. She has a daughter with several chronic health conditions. She is concerned that if these proposals get passed, she will end up paying far more for her health insurance, and her daughter might lose her coverage altogether.

Take Mike from Grand Marais—that is in the far corner of Minnesota, right up at the tip. He has been self-employed his whole life and is now approaching retirement. He told me that just as he is about to retire, he will not be able to afford health insurance because of the way this proposal works. Like the House bill, it would increase premiums for older Minnesotans.

A woman from Andover, MN, wrote to me that she is worried about this slam dunk attempt to check off a box on a to-do list, when, in fact, she is squarely in the middle of that box. She asked me to put a face on the type of person who is affected by rushing through this checklist, and that would be her 28-year-old son. She said that Medicaid coverage has been a lifesaver



for her son because it helps him afford the treatment he needs to strive for an independent, productive life.

I have heard from so many people from all of the corners of my State, from the old, the young, the middle-aged. I have heard from many people from the rural parts of my State about the House bill, which, of course, is very similar to the Senate bill that has been proposed here. They were especially worried about the billions in cuts to Medicaid, which is the lead part of the concern from the Minnesota Council of Health Plans.

The Senate proposal, as I mentioned, would make even deeper cuts over the long term to Medicaid. Medicaid covers more than 1.2 million Minnesotans, including more than one-fifth of the people in the rural part of our State—20 percent of our rural population. This funding is vital to the ability of our rural hospitals and healthcare providers in those parts of our State to stay open and serve their patients. Many people who work in rural hospitals and who are served by rural hospitals have deep concerns.

Even after seeing the Senate proposal for just these few hours, it is clear that this healthcare legislation would have massive life-changing implications for families all over the country.

We know the President of the United States is not known for mincing words, but we also know he used very direct language when he talked about the House bill. The reports are that he called it mean, and there has been no denial that he said that. He didn't need a poll or focus group. He didn't need to know every detail of the bill. But when you hear that millions and millions of people could lose their health insurance, the wealthiest would get tax cuts, and then the people who need help the most would be forced to pay more, you can see why that would be a good word to describe a bill like this—"mean." What we don't want to have come out of the Senate is the "son of mean" or "mean 2."

Most of us agree that we must make changes to the Affordable Care Act, as I said at the beginning of my remarks. I would love to see those changes to prescription drug prices, not only with the Medicare negotiation I just mentioned, getting rid of that prohibition that stops 41 million seniors from negotiating for lower prices for prescription drugs by passing the bill that I have led for years to allow for that negotiation, but I would like to see more competition in two other ways. One is bringing in safe drugs from other countries like Canada. Senator MCCAIN and I have a bill that would allow that to happen.

The second is allowing for more generic competition and making it easier to have generic competition—again, not in the House or the Senate bill. Senator GRASSLEY and I have a bill

that would stop "pay for delay." That is where companies pay generics to keep their products off the market. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has assessed that we would not only save billions of dollars for the government but also for taxpayers if this passed. I would like to have that bill come up for a vote, maybe in the form of an amendment, because I believe it would pass.

We could make improvements in the exchanges with the idea of reinsurance. There are many ways we could come together to make sensible changes to the Affordable Care Act. We can never have a bill that big without making some changes, and I think the time has come.

Instead, we see a bill that was drafted behind closed doors. Yes, Democratic Senators were not a part of that; that is the way it is. But I don't think those doors should be closed to the American people.

Last week I attended the men's baseball game between Democrats and Republicans. It was an amazing event with over 25,000 people. At the end, when the Democratic team won, they took their trophy and gave it to the Republican team, and they asked them to put it in Representative SCALISE's office. We should take the spirit that we saw at that congressional baseball game. We should take that spirit, and we should bring it into this Chamber, and we should start working on a bill together—not this bill. We should start working on a bill that makes some major changes to the Affordable Care Act. We have ideas on both sides, and that is what I think we should do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to the comments of my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, and I would just say a couple of things. One is that if 10 or so Democrats would have the courage to work with us, we could pass a true bipartisan healthcare bill, but the message we received from Democratic Leader SCHUMER and others is that they don't want to get involved in the process. So it is a little hard to take seriously the statement that if we would just be willing to work with them, we could get this done, because we have asked, and they have refused.

But it is not too late. If we could get a bipartisan group of Senators to actually improve the status quo, which is a disaster under ObamaCare, then I think we could make progress. But that is not what I hear.

I hear Senators criticizing the House bill. I guess that is because they haven't read the Senate bill, and we have said all along that we want to improve on what the House did. I think the draft bill, which is just that—it is a draft; it is a work in progress—does

represent in many instances an improvement over the House bill.

I look forward to working with a coalition of the willing, whoever that might be. I hear some happy talk, but I don't see many people willing to cross over and actually work with us, roll up their sleeves, and do the hard work to actually pass a bipartisan bill.

I just have to say, I hear the criticism about cutting Medicaid. Well, the fact is, under the draft bill that was filed today, the essential safety net for low-income Americans is preserved. We actually will end up spending more money next year than this year and more money the following year because what we do is add a consumer price index increase.

As the Presiding Officer knows, being a practicing physician, this is a complex issue, but the fact is, it is absolutely critical to reforming Medicaid and making it work better. In addition to spending more money each year, which is not a cut in most of America—maybe it is in Washington, DC—as we all know, Medicaid is an open-ended entitlement, so if you qualify based on your income, then you get access to Medicaid. Medicaid continues to drive the budgets—not only the Federal Government but also the State government—and crowd out other priorities that are also important, such as law enforcement and education.

What we have decided we must do is to put Medicaid on a sustainable path by spending more money each year on low-income Americans. We still have some more work to do. But the idea that just because—compared to an uncapped entitlement with no limits on spending—we end up spending a set amount, as we spent this year or will spend next year and add more each year based on the cost-of-living index, that somehow is a cut, is just ludicrous. That is certainly not my understanding of what a cut is; it is a reduction in the rate of growth. So if you call that a cut, that assumes we are going to spend all of that uncapped amount of money, and we can't sustain the program if we do that.

This is one of the three major entitlement programs—Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security. I think it is our obligation, our duty, as we are saving the millions of people who are being hurt by the status quo and ObamaCare, to act responsibly to make sure this safety net program is available for low-income people going forward. We all should agree on that—that it is important and that we ought to put it on a sustainable, responsible fiscal path.

So this was kind of an interesting experience here this morning. We roll out the discussion draft of the ObamaCare repeal-and-replace bill, we put it on the internet, we make sure everybody has access to it, and we ask for their input, their advice, and their suggestions, and

we are starting to get suggestions. We welcome suggestions that people have to this initial discussion draft. But you have to start somewhere, and this is where we are going to start. Then we will have a process next week whereby any Senator who has an amendment to the bill has an absolute right to file that amendment and get a vote on it. I can't imagine a more transparent and open process than putting it on the internet, inviting people to comment and discuss, and then having an open amendment process following debate and then vote. That is what we are supposed to do—vote.

So I think today represents a big step forward in saving those Americans who are being punished by health insurance choices that limit their right to choose a product at a price they can afford that suits their family's needs.

We know what the promises were, and I guess I just have to repeat them again. President Obama said: If you like your policy, you can keep your policy. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. An average family of four will see a \$2,500 decrease in their insurance premiums.

What we have seen is a \$3,000 increase in insurance premiums for the average family of four—not a decrease of \$2,500, an increase of \$3,000. And people who buy their health coverage on the insurance exchanges in the individual market have experienced a 105-percent increase in their premiums. Now, I don't know about you, but there are not many things that come out of my paycheck on which I can sustain over a period of just a few years an increase like that of 105 percent. Imagine if you had a 105-percent increase in your rent payments for your apartment or your mortgage payments for your house or your car payments or anything else. That is harmful and damaging to hard-working Americans, and it really is a breach of faith with them, when they were told when ObamaCare passed that they would actually save \$2,500.

This discussion draft that was released today and put on the internet and is available to anybody who wants access to it is a product of years of debate on this floor and discussions among not just Republicans but the entire Senate and our constituents as well. We made our ideas public, and we sought feedback.

The Senate Finance Committee alone, on which the distinguished Presiding Officer and I serve, has had no fewer than 36 hearings on ObamaCare since 2011, ranging from the high cost of ObamaCare to transparency in the Medicaid system.

Just this year, there have been dozens of meetings throughout our conference. We would love to include Democrats, but they have chosen not to participate. Since May 4 alone, 18 of our conference lunches have been entirely dedicated to healthcare. There is

a practical reason for that too—because without Democrats participating in the process, we have 52 Republicans in order to get 51 votes to pass a bill. That means everybody is essential to a successful outcome in repealing and replacing ObamaCare.

So no one has been excluded. Everybody's ideas have been solicited. That doesn't even count individual meetings we have had with Senators and constituents.

Even after receiving this discussion draft, some of my colleagues across the aisle continue to refuse to enter into debate because they say it is not a final bill. Well, that is the point. We didn't present this as a fait accompli; we presented this as a place to start. And they don't even want to start. All they want to do is criticize. But they don't want to criticize an actual bill; they want to criticize the House bill, because they haven't even read the 142-page Senate bill. This is called a discussion draft for a reason: We are opening up a conversation and a discussion with the American people.

But we know Senate Democrats have chosen not to help to clean up the mess left by ObamaCare. I don't really understand how they can turn a blind eye or a deaf ear to their constituents. I am confident, with all of the people who are writing and calling me in Texas, that they have to have people in their States who are calling them and saying: My premiums are skyrocketing. My deductible is so high that I effectively don't have access to insurance.

By the way, the insurance companies are pulling out of my State as fast as they can because they are hemorrhaging money.

I don't know why they are not motivated to work with us, but apparently that is the decision they have made.

Unfortunately, I think it goes back to this: When President Obama visited Capitol Hill the last time, in January of 2017, he had one message to Senate Democrats; that is, don't work with Republicans on healthcare. The President of the United States said don't work with Republicans on healthcare. This flew in the face of three consecutive elections since ObamaCare had passed where the voters had clearly demonstrated their dissatisfaction with how ObamaCare actually worked. That shouldn't have been a surprise to anybody.

I remember being here on Christmas Eve 2009 when Democrats passed ObamaCare with only Democrat votes at 7:30 in the morning. No Republicans voted for the bill; only Democrats voted for the bill. Since that time, they have gone from 60 Democratic Senators down to 48. They went from the majority in the House to the minority in the House. They went from holding the White House to Republicans now holding the White House. To me, the mes-

sage isn't all that confusing, nor is it subtle. It is clear to me that the American people have rejected the failed promises of ObamaCare and have, frankly, punished our Democratic colleagues for passing it in the way they did and as a result of the failure to keep the promises that were made when it was sold.

I have heard these concerns from my constituents in Texas for the last 7 years. I have read their letters and their emails, sharing some of their stories here on the Senate floor.

This law has been expensive—about \$1 trillion in new taxes. People wonder why the economy hasn't grown during the Obama administration and since the great recession of 2008. One reason is because of the huge tax burden and because of the regulatory burdens it imposed on small businesses, which are the primary engine of job growth in the country, and ObamaCare has been part of the reason for that.

To my mind, this discussion draft does five things.

First, our legislation zeroes in on the unstable individual market.

Under ObamaCare, insurance markets across the country have languished under high costs and taxes, and the result has been that 70 percent of counties nationwide have fewer than two insurers to choose from. Less competition means higher prices because companies don't have to compete for the sale of a policy. In my State, one-third of Texas counties have only one insurance option. That is not exactly a choice; that is a monopoly.

Our legislation will help the collapsing insurance markets that have left millions of people with no options by creating a stabilization fund that will balance premium costs and address the lack of coverage that so many across the country have been experiencing.

I don't care what our critics say, we are not pulling the rug out from anyone. We will continue Federal assistance for healthcare markets through 2021 to make the transition smooth, much unlike our experience with ObamaCare. Ultimately, if we want to encourage a market to lower costs while providing better quality care, we have to get the government out of the way.

The only thing I hear from our Senate Democrats is that they want more government involvement in your healthcare. That seems to be their default position. Well, we know from the failed experiment of ObamaCare that it doesn't work, at least insofar as the promises that were made when it was sold. So why would they default to a position of more government as opposed to more freedom to let you choose instead of government choosing for you and to punish you with a penalty if you don't buy the product that government orders you to buy?

Our second goal is making healthcare coverage more affordable.

Under ObamaCare, taxes and mandates cost the American economy \$1 trillion—I mentioned that a moment ago—which, as our constituents felt firsthand, was ultimately paid by patients through higher healthcare cost.

Our friends across the aisle think we can raise taxes by \$1 trillion and it won't have any impact on the consumer. Well, that is just ridiculous. We all know that those expenses get passed on to the consumer and that they get passed on in the form of higher healthcare costs. So when you tax prescriptions, for example, well, it is going to cost more. When you tax health insurance plans, which ObamaCare did, premiums are going to go up. And guess what. Taxing medical devices increases the cost of those devices and leads to job losses because they leave the United States, and they make those lifesaving medical products offshore in order to avoid the medical device taxes.

These taxes and mandates have crippled our economy, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle recognize that as well. That is why our healthcare plan will improve affordability by addressing ObamaCare's taxes, which have hurt American families directly by making their healthcare less affordable. This framework provides a long-term State innovation fund that encourages States to assist high-cost and low-income individuals, making healthcare more affordable.

We are also encouraging tax credits to help defray the cost of purchasing insurance, adjusted for age, geographical location, and income, so that those who need financial assistance get the help they need.

Health savings accounts will also be expanded under our draft, giving Americans the choice of buying a hospitalization plan which covers major medical costs—not if they choose not to buy a comprehensive health insurance policy but, rather, to save money in a health savings account to be used for healthcare if they need it, and if they don't need it, they can use it for their savings. We give them that option, which they don't currently have under ObamaCare.

The third principle is something our Democratic colleagues can certainly agree with us on, I assume, unless their reflexive action is to disagree with us on everything regardless of the facts, which sometimes seems to be the case, and that is, we should protect those with preexisting conditions. No American should worry about their ability to be covered when they move from job to job.

Our draft legislation also allows children to stay on their parents' policies through age 26.

There are no changes to healthcare for veterans, for Medicare, or changes to Social Security.

Our fourth point of action is safeguarding Medicaid, which I addressed a little earlier, by giving States more flexibility. As we know, Medicaid is paid for by both a State and a Federal share, but the Federal Government sets the conditions by which that money can be spent on healthcare in the State as part of a low-income safety net. Bureaucrats in Washington, DC, shouldn't decide how Medicaid is applied in Texas. I don't know what rationale exists there. Why should the Federal Government tell a State how to spend its own money under Medicaid?

I believe States know how to handle this best because they are closest to the problem and they can design healthcare programs that meet the needs of those States. I dare say, the healthcare needs in Texas are much different from States like Vermont, Idaho, or other States—smaller States, certainly, with a more homogenous population. We have a very diverse State. We have a large number of non-citizens in my State. So why not send the money to the States and give them the flexibility to design programs to deal with the needs of their people? That is why our draft allows States to choose between a block grant and a per capita support for the Medicaid population starting in 2020.

We have done our dead-level best to make sure our draft doesn't leave anyone out, to ensure that the most vulnerable have protection—including children with medically complex disabilities.

Perhaps most importantly is the fundamental goal of this legislation to free the American family from ObamaCare mandates that have hit them where it hurts the most. We are giving Americans back their freedom of choice when it comes to healthcare, which has so long been denied them under the command-and-control regime of ObamaCare.

Our healthcare plan empowers families to make their own choices. It repeals the individual mandate which punishes you if you don't buy the government-approved policy and the employer mandate that has resulted from people going from full-time work to part-time work because employers have sought to avoid that penalty. Finally, no longer will folks be forced to buy plans they don't need at a price they can't afford.

I believe this is the framework for better care. But we are going to continue to discuss this plan and talk to anybody who is willing to talk to us and work with us. If there is a way the bill can be strengthened, I am open to it. But the status quo isn't working, and our Democratic colleagues know it.

This morning, I likened it as happening upon a terrible accident on the

highway. We know people have been injured, and we have two choices: We can either stop and render aid—which is what we are trying to do for people hurt by the failures of ObamaCare—or you can drive right on by.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues have simply chosen to look the other way and drive on by. But before them is a real solution, one that has a chance to change the lives of millions of Americans for the better. So we hope they will reconsider and join us.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the healthcare bill that is currently pending before us. Now that I have had a chance to look at it a little bit, I can see why there has been a lot of secrecy surrounding this process.

Before talking about how I think this bill would hurt Virginians, let me talk about the process itself and how flawed I think it is. But the good news is that it is a process that can be fixed.

This morning, when the bill was first described on the floor, I was interested when my friend the senior Senator from Texas, the majority whip, said we were doing it this way, through a budget reconciliation process, because Democrats didn't want to work together. I took offense at that comment.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I am a member with him on the committee. I was just added to the committee in January. I have been in the Senate for 4 years. I have had great committees, but this is the committee I always wanted to be on because, as a former mayor and Governor, the two biggest line items in the budget I have had to deal with have been education and health. So, finally, I am on the committee I most want to be on.

I believe this session of the Senate started on January 3. That was my first day on the committee. I have a letter I wrote on January 5. I had been a committee member for 2 days, and I wrote a letter to my chairman, whom I hold in the highest regard, Senator ALEXANDER; the Senate majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL; and the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, which has jurisdiction over Medicaid and Medicare issues. I wrote a letter on January 5, and I got 13 Democrats, including me, to sign this letter.

The gist of the letter is this: We would like to work with you. We would like to work with you to find solutions that would improve our healthcare system, whether that be within the Affordable Care Act or, more broadly,

Medicare, Medicaid, and Medicare Part D. We want to work together.

That was on January 5, 2 days after I had been added to the committee. As a member of the committee, I have been given no opportunity—not one—to work on this bill.

The committee we serve on works productively. We work productively on pharmaceutical issues. We work productively on educational issues. In the committee the Presiding Officer and I serve on, we have passed legislation through our committee and sent it to the floor. Some of the legislation we have sent has already gone off the floor to the House. This is a committee that has a great bipartisan track record, and I am convinced that bipartisan track record is going to continue. But there has been one topic which has been taboo, and that has been to allow meaningful bipartisan discussion about this healthcare bill.

When the House bill passed—now a number of weeks ago—it was our expectation that we would have hearings in the HELP Committee and in the Finance Committee about the bill. We haven't. The Democrats on the HELP Committee got a little riled up one day. We were having a hearing about something else, and a lot of us said: Wait a minute. We are not talking about the biggest topic in domestic politics in the country right now, which is this House health bill. We should be doing that in this committee. If we are not doing it in this committee, we are really not doing it.

Why does it matter to have hearings in the committee? It is the committee hearing process where you put witnesses at a table and ask them questions. We would have patients, we would have hospitals, we would have doctors, we would have nurses, and we would have pharmaceutical companies and insurance companies, and we would ask them: What is good and what is bad about this bill? What is good and what is bad, and what needs to be fixed about healthcare in this country? That is what you do in hearings, but we haven't had one hearing, and the Finance Committee hasn't had one hearing either.

We haven't had hearings in the committee on the House bill. We have had no willingness to hold hearings on the Senate substitute that was revealed today. The effort to draft the bill was closed-door. The notion that Democrats wouldn't participate—we weren't invited to the meetings. We didn't know where they were. We didn't know when they were. We had no chance to participate. Now we are being told that this bill described this morning—and we thought we were reading it online—no, that is a discussion draft, not the bill itself. So I don't know whether the bill is going to be different, or is it the same? The notion is to rush it to the floor and then essentially to close off

debate with a very meager amendment process.

The Presiding Officer knows this, but I just want to explain for the public. By not having committee hearings where you can talk to witnesses and hear from the public and then discuss and propose amendments, this is what it will be on the floor: 20 hours of debate about the most important topic in anybody's life—their health. Twenty hours and then you finish the debate.

Then, the majority leader indicates there is an unlimited amendment process, but the amendment process under budget reconciliation is as follows: An amendment will be considered, and there will be 1 minute of debate allowed for each side—1 minute.

We are talking about healthcare. We are talking about life and death. I have a number of bills I filed that I want to offer as amendments, but for us to truly debate it and for the American public to truly understand it, 1 minute is ridiculous. But that is apparently going to be the rule for us next week.

I think it is an outrage for a body that is known as the greatest deliberative body in the world to take up such an important topic and be told that it is in such a constrained way. So I just want to object to the characterization of the process this morning, that Democrats refuse to work together. I have evidence to the contrary. Within 48 hours of being put on this committee, I asked for an opportunity to participate in this debate. I think I am entitled to respect as an elected Member of this body and a member of the HELP Committee to be engaged on matters dealing with healthcare. But thus far, I have not had this opportunity, and that is so out of character for the HELP Committee, I might add.

I am going to be discussing this bill tomorrow with stakeholders in Richmond, where I live. Let me tell you what I see that really troubles me about the Senate bill. I think this bill hurts Virginians—especially seniors, children, people with disabilities, and working families—and it hurts them all to deliver giant tax breaks, largely to the wealthiest Americans. It also shifts costs from the Federal budget to the States, and as a former Governor, that worries me.

This bill would slash traditional Medicaid, which is a program that more than 1 million Virginians rely on. It is really important to point out that, when you are cutting Medicaid by potentially more than \$1.3 trillion over 10 years, that is what the House bill cut out in Medicaid—the House bill plus President Trump's proposed budget, \$1.3 trillion in cuts to Medicaid—and this bill could cut Medicaid even deeper by our reading of it.

You have to ask yourself, you cut Medicaid by that much—who are Medicaid recipients? In Virginia, nearly 60 percent of Medicaid recipients are chil-

dren. Kids who are in public schools receiving special education, many of their services are paid for by Medicaid. A youngster undergoing a cancer operation at Children's Hospital of King's Daughters in Norfolk, a lot of that is being paid for by Medicaid.

A kid who has autism and is getting a couple of hours of autism-related services to help them be successful in school is paid by Medicaid. A child in a dangerous household who might have to get institutionalized—not because the child is doing something wrong but because there aren't parents in the household who are helping the household stay together, they are in danger of being institutionalized—Medicaid can send services a few hours a week into the household to stabilize the family so the child doesn't have to be institutionalized, and that is being paid by Medicaid.

When you cut Medicaid, that is whom you are affecting; 60 percent are children, 15 to 20 percent are people with disabilities. That is who is on Medicaid in Virginia; 10 to 15 percent are parents and grandparents in nursing homes and pregnant women. That is who is on Medicaid in Virginia.

The Medicaid cuts in this bill are even steeper, even more significant than the cuts in the House bill. The bill would continue to allow something that I think is very challenging and that was a carryover from the House bill and may even be worse, which is the ability to charge older adults in the 55- to 64-year-old age range as much as five times higher than younger enrollees in the marketplace.

When most people are in the 55- to 64-year-old range, they are not necessarily at the peak of their earnings. Their earnings are often starting to come down a little bit. If you let their rates rise that dramatically, you are really hurting people who can't easily go back and reenter the marketplace and the workforce at the same level they could have when they were younger.

This is a bill that will hurt 22,000 Virginians who rely on Planned Parenthood for lifesaving healthcare. That is how many women in Virginia use Planned Parenthood as their primary doctor, as their primary physician—22,000, and this bill would hurt it.

This bill would weaken health benefits by reducing the essential health benefits contained in the Affordable Care Act, and that affects pregnancy, that affects mental health, that affects opioid treatment programs, and it would force States to make very difficult budget choices.

If you cut Medicaid by that much, you are going to make Governors and mayors decide: Wow. OK. Whom do I cut? Do I cut the kids? Do I cut the disabled? Do I cut the elderly? Do I cut all three or do I raise taxes? You are just pushing this off on the shoulders of States.

There is good news. I want to finish with good news. I always try to finish or find some good news. There is good news. We can do this right. We don't have to do this wrong. It is actually really simple. When the Senate bill is truly ready, and it is not just a discussion draft but a real bill and it is put on the floor, all we have to do is refer the bill to the two committees—the Finance Committee and the HELP Committee.

Let the committees hear from the public, from providers, patients, doctors and nurses, and hospitals. Let members of the committee—Republicans and Democrats—ask questions. Let us propose amendments. Let us improve it.

This doesn't have to be a complete up-or-down. Why can't we have a meaningful discussion and ask questions and propose amendments in a deliberative way and improve the bill? It is not as if the Democratic minority can just roll over you. We are the minority in this body, and we are the minority on both the HELP and Finance Committees. Unless I can put an amendment on the table and convince some Republicans it is a good idea, my amendment is going to be voted down. If I can't convince somebody around the table this is a good idea, I will take it, and my amendment will be voted down. At least, let's have a meaningful discussion about the most important expenditure anybody ever makes in their life and the largest sector of the American economy.

What would be wrong, what could be wrong in letting the HELP Committee take a look at the healthcare bill? What would be wrong, what could be wrong with letting the Finance Committee take a look at a bill that affects Medicaid and Medicare, which is in their jurisdiction?

What would be wrong, what could be wrong with allowing public witnesses to come to these committees and testify what they like and what they don't like? I may learn some things about the bill that I like after listening to some witnesses. What would be wrong, what could be wrong with allowing this to happen in this great deliberative body?

I guarantee it would improve the outcome. It would improve the product. More minds looking at this and debating and in dialogue will improve it, if what we want is an improved healthcare system. Maybe that is not what we want. Maybe doing our best job is not what we want. Maybe what we want is the ability to put something through only with votes from one party and with the other party completely shut out of it.

What I think we should want is to do the best job for the most people when it comes to the most important thing in their lives, their health.

I will conclude and say that we can get this right. We can take advantage

of the work product of the Republicans, who have been working on this draft by putting it in the HELP and Finance Committees and allowing the body to treat it as any other piece of legislation and improve it before we are forced to vote for it in a rush vote on the floor.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, there are two things Americans need to know about this Republican healthcare plan. The first is that it is going to make insurance more expensive, and the second is that it is going to make it harder to get healthcare in the first place. That is the bottom line of this bill: higher costs for less care—and all for a tax cut for the rich. That is what we are doing.

We are taking about \$800 billion worth of revenue, eviscerating it, eliminating it. Those tax revenues were basically tax increases passed under the Affordable Care Act. They were tax increases on the wealthiest among us. What we are doing is getting rid of all those tax increases in order to cut Medicaid. That is what this bill does. That is not what Americans had in mind when they said on a bipartisan basis, on a majority basis—when they asked Congress to fix healthcare. When you read the fine print, you see that it gets worse every moment, and you realize how bad this plan is.

The Senate version did something extraordinary: It actually moved to the right. And that is a real legislative achievement. Look at Medicaid. This is a program that helps one out of every five Americans, two out of every five children in the United States. It helps one out of every two families who have a newborn baby. And it covers three out of every four long-term nursing home residents.

This program literally saves lives—nursing home patients; people struggling with opioid addiction; people who are working two jobs but still don't make enough to cover their own healthcare insurance—but with this bill, Medicaid as we know it will be destroyed, all so that people at the top of the food chain can pay less in taxes.

This bill actually has a certain symmetry to it. There are at least \$800 billion worth of cuts to Medicaid—probably more but at least \$800 billion—and it just so happens that there are also around \$800 billion worth of tax cuts for the wealthy. So insurance executives will be OK. Don't worry about them. What we should worry about is women who need Medicaid for mater-

nal health services. We should worry about seniors and people with disabilities.

Activists for disability rights are appropriately freaked out about this bill. People in wheelchairs protested outside of a Senate office earlier today, and some of them said that they would literally die if this bill passes. It was an intense protest. And we hope everybody is OK, but it is intense because these are intense issues.

These are personal issues. These are healthcare issues. People are worried—not about some abstract public policy or political debate; they are worried about their own lives. And they are not wrong. Because of Medicaid, people now have access to physical therapy and immunizations. They can see a counselor for mental health problems and opioid addiction. They can afford the medication they need instead of relying on free samples from clinics. Medicaid has changed everything for them.

This is not just good for patients, it is also good for taxpayers. By giving preventive care, we save money. And if TrumpCare becomes law, those services will go away, thanks to \$800 billion in cuts.

This bill also lets insurance companies opt out of covering essential health benefits. I want to be very clear about this. This is a term of art. It is a piece of jargon. I am going to go slowly here and not assume that if you are not in politics, you would understand what an essential health benefit is.

Basically, if you are getting a healthcare plan, there are 10 things that, under Federal law, a healthcare plan has to cover. It just makes sense. I will list them. They are ambulatory patient services; emergency services, so ER visits; hospitalization—if you have to stay overnight in the hospital, it has to be covered in your healthcare plan; maternity and newborn care; mental health and substance abuse services, including behavioral health treatment; prescription drugs; rehab; laboratory services; preventive wellness and wellness services; chronic disease management; and pediatric services.

So I want you to imagine a world where you can get an insurance plan—a so-called insurance plan—but under the law, they can tell you: By the way, we don't cover hospitalization. By the way, we have this great insurance plan, but if you need any prescription drugs, those are out-of-pocket—not a copay; you have to pay all of it. By the way, we will give you an insurance plan, but if you have mental illness, you are on your own. By the way, if you get pregnant, we don't cover that.

It is a healthcare plan, which is why we have a statute, a Federal law, that says ambulatory patient services, emergency services, hospitalization,

maternity and newborn care, mental health and substance abuse services, prescription drugs, rehab, lab services, preventive and wellness services, and pediatric services have to be covered. Otherwise, it is not insurance. Every one of these benefits is covered full stop under the current law, but what the proposal does is it eviscerates essential health benefits.

I don't know what the CBO is going to say, because they got rid of the individual mandate, and it is going to be unclear. There is a real possibility that there will actually be an increase in the number of people who are covered, but that coverage is going to be nonsense. Can you imagine having a health insurance plan that doesn't cover maternity care? Can you imagine—especially nowadays, when half the time when you go to the doctor, they give you a prescription—so you go to the doctor, and they say you need this, and you say OK, and then you have to pay out-of-pocket? What is the point of insurance if none of the things you need are covered by the insurance? That is what this bill does.

I am also worried about the distractions in this bill. It defunds Planned Parenthood and doesn't provide nearly enough for opioid addiction programs. I want to be clear about what I mean by "distraction." It is my supposition—I don't know for sure that these things were intentionally either omitted from the bill or put in the bill to allow some of my Republican colleagues to get well legislatively. What do I mean by that? Opioid treatment was tens of billions of dollars in the House version. They brought it down to less than \$1 billion. That puts somebody on this side of the aisle in a position to say: Even though I am for \$800 billion of Medicaid cuts, which will eviscerate opioid treatment across the country, I am going to introduce an amendment and we are going to increase opioid treatment. Once we get a "yes" vote, well, you know, I was really concerned, but with my amendment, we have more money for opioid treatment.

Don't fall for that trick. It is a trick. The way to fund opioid treatment is to fund opioid treatment. Medicaid is both the best way to do it clinically and the best way to do it fiscally. So I am afraid they intentionally left that out so somebody can go in and be the hero on the other side, while not actually solving the problem—likewise with Planned Parenthood. The way you fund opioid treatment is through Medicaid.

We had 13 men working in secret without input from any women or Democrats or experts or advocates.

Part of the thing about healthcare, as the President says, is nobody knew it was so complicated. But you really need hearings. You really need to understand how all of the parts of a system interact with each other. Let me

give an example. You cut Medicaid, and somebody who is Medicaid-eligible but also a veteran—you don't know for sure whether, if Medicaid services are not available, they are going to go back into the VA system and cost the VA system more money. If you cut preventive treatment, you don't know if you are going to end up having to pay on the back end with more ER services. So the reason you have hearings is you have to have some rather technical expertise in the room to say: Hey, if you do this, this might happen. If you do that, this might happen. If you do this, we are not quite sure what might happen.

But the idea that 13 men with very little expertise in healthcare policy—they are not unintelligent, they are not unqualified to be public policy makers, but the whole thing about being in the Senate is that, for the most part, we are supposed to be, as they say—Jack or Jane—Jack of all trades, master of none. We are supposed to be pretty good at receiving information, kind of distilling it, asking the right kinds of questions, listening to our constituents, and then crystallizing all of that into a bill.

The problem with this process is they did about one-third of that. They talked to each other, and they talked to Republican lobbyists, but they didn't talk to the people back home. They didn't talk to people who run community health centers. They didn't talk to mental health advocates.

We have people who come from Hawaii and across the country who advocate for every specific disease treatment and disease research. These people usually are touched personally by their issues. They come in, and most of us receive them and talk to them and think about how to get them more funding or more reimbursements through NIH or CDC or the Department of Defense or wherever we can find resources for them.

That is the process of being in a legislative context if you are not personally an expert on healthcare policy. If you do it in the dark of night, if you do it literally without any women, if you do it literally without any people from the other party, you are going to get a bad product. They knew they were going to get a bad product, but they made a judgment. They made a judgment.

They decided that the longer this bill sees the light of day, the lower the chances it has of passing, and I think they are right. I mean, if this thing is subjected to real sunshine, it will just wither. That is just a fact. This is why they didn't have any hearings in the House, this is why they are not only not having any hearings in the Senate, but they are going to allow for I think it is 20 hours of debate under this silly vote-arama procedure.

What they will do is, I think, yield back a lot of their time. What does

that mean? That means 20 hours will become 10 hours because they don't want to defend their bill.

They are absolutely happy to trash the Affordable Care Act and say it has a series of problems and all the rest of it. You know what, the Affordable Care Act has a series of problems. No doubt about it. I will tell you it is way better than this. I will also tell you it is way better than the situation we had before the act was passed.

The No. 1 cause of bankruptcy in the United States was getting sick. Think about that. Before this act, people would not be just afraid for themselves when they got sick, when something catastrophic happened to them, either a chronic disease or something that imperiled their lives or an accident, but you would have dual anxieties, right? You wondered whether you were going to be OK, but you also wondered whether you were going to be able to make it financially.

So we are sort of beyond that, and now we have a law that has been on the books that does need fixing. I know the Presiding Officer and the Senator from Missouri, who is waiting to speak, would be pleased—really would be pleased to participate in a bipartisan process.

I think about the chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, one of the best statesmen in the U.S. Senate, LAMAR ALEXANDER, a Republican with whom I disagree on a lot, but he and PATTY MURRAY did a bill on public education that got—I don't know—84 votes or something. Liberal PATTY MURRAY and conservative LAMAR ALEXANDER did a deal. ORRIN HATCH, President pro tempore of the Senate, is someone who worked with my predecessor, who worked with Teddy Kennedy, who did bills and did deals.

So I understand we are kind of in this squabble about whether there is good faith or there was good faith. Our view of this is you went into the reconciliation process before even, in any serious way, pursuing bipartisan legislation. You decided you wanted 51 votes, not 60 votes, and that was sort of poisonous fruit from the tree. Fine. That is our view. Your view is that you serially tried to reach out to us, and we have rebuffed your overtures. I have my view; the Republicans have their view.

Right now, you are about to walk one-sixth of the American economy off a cliff, and you are also about to harm tens of millions of individuals in all of our home States—not Republicans or Democrats or Greens or Independents or Libertarians or people who don't vote or whoever it may be, but people are going to really be hurt by this bill. People are really going to be hurt by this bill.

Forgetting the politics, I think we have an opportunity to avert the harm.

If this bill does come crashing down, then I think we have an opportunity to work together on healthcare. I, for one, pledge that if we are in a position to sit down on a bipartisan basis and come up with improvements to the existing statute, I will be the first person to say yes to that kind of process. It is not too late. All we need are three Republicans to say: Let's slow down. Let's have a hearing. Let's work with Democrats. Let's do this the right way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, since the current healthcare bill—the bill usually called ObamaCare—passed, every year Missouri families have had to worry about whether their healthcare plans would be canceled, whether their options and access would be taken away, whether they could have the same doctors next year that they have this year, whether they could go to the same hospital next year that they could go to this year, whether their premiums would be going up, but if they were worried about whether their premiums were going to be going up, that was a worry that everybody else in every State had because premiums went up everywhere.

In fact, this situation has gotten so bad that in one-third of America's counties today, only one company in one-third of the counties today will even offer insurance. So the options are to buy from one company or to pay the penalty because your only choice is that one company. That one company gets to file a rate that the State regulator gets to agree to, if the one company is going to stay. In fact, I think this week the State of Iowa that has only one company providing individual insurance for the whole State, that one company said they would stay again next year, and then they filed an increase of over 40 percent on those policies for next year.

In Missouri, where I live, 25 counties will not have a provider next year, and it could be higher than that. One company has already said they will not be there next year. Twenty-five of the counties they sold policies in only had one company providing policies. We now know that at least 40 percent of all Missouri counties will not have—I mean, 40 percent of all U.S. counties will not have anybody even willing to offer these plans. This is a significant problem, and it just didn't occur when this President was sworn in or this Congress took over.

Premiums in your State, Mr. President, have gone up 123 percent since 2013. In my State, in Missouri, they have gone up 145 percent; in Alabama, 223 percent; in Alaska, 203 percent; in Oklahoma, 201 percent since this plan went into effect, and that was just 2013. This is not 30 years ago. This is 4 years ago.

The average increase for American individuals and families for getting policies under ObamaCare is 105 percent. Now, remember, this was the plan that was supposed to ensure that your costs would go down per family at least \$2,500. The “at least \$2,500 number” was close to right, but what was close to right about it is that your plan probably increased at least \$2,500 if you had that kind of plan. The status quo just simply will not work.

The draft legislation, as it stands right now, preserves access to care for people with preexisting conditions, it strengthens the future of Medicaid, it does not change Medicare in any way, and it gives people more health insurance choices than they otherwise have as States exercise their options under the law. It allows people to stay on their family insurance until they are 26. That, along with preexisting condition coverage, is usually seen as the two most popular things in the law as it stands now. They would still be in the law.

Now, Members of both parties—and the reason I say “as it stands today” is Members of both parties will have an opportunity to amend this bill. In fact, we will have a vote probably the night before we take the final vote on the bill, where every Member can make amendment after amendment after amendment on this bill. There will be plenty of chances to change this bill on a topic that the Members of the Senate probably know more about, and, by the way, because it is such a big Federal obligation and responsibility, should know more about than virtually anything else we deal with in a level of specificity that is higher than anything else we deal with.

Believe me, anybody who wants to read that bill—and I will, you will, and others will, some will not—anybody who wants to read that bill will have plenty of time to read it and plenty of opportunity to amend it, but it will be amended, so we need to be sure we understand the final product might not be exactly what we have before us today.

I am going to carefully look at the final legislation. I am going to carefully look at how this addresses problems of Missourians. I think one thing that is absolutely clear is that Missouri families need a more reliable and affordable healthcare system. This bill is an important first step in that direction. The status quo cannot continue to be the status quo.

By the way, there were plenty of opportunities over the last 7 years to make the kind of incremental changes that all of our friends on the other side said they would love to make, and they were in charge.

We had a bill over here that Senator COLLINS, I believe, was the principal sponsor of that said: Well, let's change that 30 hour requirement; that if you work 30 hours, you have to have insur-

ance to 40 hours. Now, that is not a very big change, but it is a very big change if you have a 28-hour-a-week job, and the reason that you have that 28-hour-a-week job is the law told your employer, if you hire somebody for 30 hours, you have to provide health insurance for that person.

Now, the employers by the way—nobody is better in America today than employers to provide health insurance and there is no better place to get your health insurance than at work, but we have almost forgotten the tragedy of the workplace where because of ObamaCare so many people worked two part-time jobs because the law said you don't have to pay health insurance if they work less than 30 hours.

Well, we tried to figure out a way to get more people to work at a full-time job, not a very big change. Our friends on the other side were in control for year after year after year after that bill was introduced. Nobody stepped up and said: Let's do that. Let's make that change. Let's get more people in full-time jobs.

These insurance markets were collapsing. I don't think there was any proposal on the other side to do anything about it. One of the difficulties we find ourselves in now is we are trying to save a critically important system—the American healthcare system—while that system is collapsing around us. That means it is not going to look as good as it would have looked if we could have gone back 7 years and done the things you and I wanted to do when we were House Members—giving more people more chances to buy more policies, having more transparency, being sure, if you didn't pay taxes on insurance you got at work, you also didn't pay taxes on money you spent for insurance if you had to buy it as an individual. There were lots of things that could have been done that were proposed. We can still go back and do that. This is clearly a first step.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services has over 1,400 places where that person's two predecessors defined what the law was supposed to mean. So earlier this week, Secretary Tom Price said he was going to look and his staff was going to look at every one of those 1,400-plus places and figure out if there is a way to define the law better so it doesn't have the impact on family economies or family access to healthcare that it currently has. That is an important step too.

This first step matters as well. I say to the Presiding Officer, nobody has been a more vigorous advocate of this debate than you have. We have an opportunity to continue this debate over the next several days. I look forward to it, and it will be interesting to try to remove the fact from the fiction when we talk about all the things that supposedly could have happened up until now. The fact is, they didn't happen.



I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you for the recognition.

All across my home State of New Mexico, thousands of hard-working people owe their healthcare and in some cases their lives to the Affordable Care Act. Since early January, I have received over 10,000 letters, emails, and calls from New Mexicans pleading with me to help save their access to healthcare. Over 96 percent of my constituents who have contacted me about healthcare oppose TrumpCare.

Let me say that again because I think it is a very important number. Over 96 percent of New Mexicans who have contacted me about healthcare over the past 6 months are opposed to TrumpCare, and they are opposed to the effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The TrumpCare bill is a disgrace and a disaster. It is a disgrace that Senate Republicans are trying to force an extremely unpopular bill on the country in 1 week, and they are doing this even though this bill affects one-sixth of our economy and even though it would cost hundreds of thousands of people in New Mexico and millions of Americans to lose access to healthcare, prescription drugs, drug addiction counseling, and other lifesaving services.

The Republican plan raids Medicaid, it strips away protections that prevent insurance companies from canceling your policy for getting sick, and it reduces the services your insurer has to provide. It does all this to pay for massive tax cuts for the wealthy.

This bill is a disaster because it would be devastating for older New Mexicans, families who are struggling to make ends meet, women, people with preexisting conditions, and New Mexicans in rural areas.

Our rural areas would be particularly hard hit. In some cases, it would do very severe damage to healthcare in rural areas. Hospital administrators in rural counties like Guadalupe County and Socorro County in my home State have told me that losing Medicaid reimbursements could break their budgets, and that could force the small, rural hospitals to limit services or even to close. You know, the last thing you want to have happen in a small, rural community is to have the hospital close. We all know what happens after that: The hospital closes, and then a diminution in services takes place, and

it is very hard for communities to stay alive in that situation.

It is no wonder the American people don't want this bill. They don't want TrumpCare.

I suppose it is no surprise that the Republicans have kept it hidden—without letting anyone see it. I want to talk about that for a moment. That is not just a talking point for Democrats. If this bill passes and becomes law, many people will suffer, and it has been kept a total secret.

I wish I could read on the Senate floor every story I have gotten from my constituents who are concerned. If I could, I could hold the record for the longest floor speech. I have shared several in the past, but today I would like to read just one, which is from Elena from Albuquerque.

This is a picture of Elena from Albuquerque, NM. She has a very moving story that she wrote me about. In this story, I think you see the story of the Affordable Care Act and the good it does.

Elena is 31 years old.

Earlier this week, I told some of Elena's story in a speech on the Senate floor, but today I want to tell Elena's full story.

Elena graduated last year from the University of New Mexico Law School—my alma mater—and she is quite determined and motivated, as you will hear. She wrote her story in a Facebook post to friends and gave me permission to share it with the American people and with my colleagues here in the Senate. Here is her story. This is Elena's story in Elena's words:

For the past 18 months, I have been carrying around a big secret. I felt really guilty for not sharing it, yet, try as I might, I could not work up the nerve to tell you all. Lucky for me, Senator Udall has helped me to rip off the Band-Aid.

In the spring of 2016, I found out that I have a BRCA-1 mutation, which puts me at a very high risk of developing breast and ovarian cancer. Women with a BRCA-1 mutation tend to get breast and/or ovarian cancer very young, sometimes even in their 20s or 30s.

When you have a BRCA-1 mutation, you have two options: One, you can get breast screenings every six months and yearly ovarian screenings and keep your fingers crossed that nothing pops up. Or two, you can get your breasts and ovaries removed and significantly decrease the odds of getting cancer.

Needless to say, there's not really a "right" decision. A woman's choice just comes down to what she feels is right for her body and life.

In the past 18 months, I've gotten to check a whole lot of things off my "absolutely not on my bucket list" bucket list.

In April 2016, I had my first breast MRI, which revealed a lump that my doctor thought might be breast cancer. I then had my first mammogram, my first breast ultrasound, and my first breast biopsy. These tests thankfully revealed that I didn't have breast cancer. They also helped me to make the difficult decision to have a prophylactic mastectomy and significantly reduce my chances of getting breast cancer.

In August 2016, I had a prophylactic mastectomy. And in October and February of this year, I had follow-up surgeries to have my breasts reconstructed.

Since February, I've been focusing on healing, and I feel great. Obviously, this isn't the end of the road. Doctors suggest that women with a BRCA-1 mutation get their ovaries removed around age 40. And of course screening will continue to be important. But for now, I feel at peace knowing that I'm doing what I can to protect myself.

As Senator UDALL mentioned, at the time that all of this health stuff came up, I had health insurance thanks to Medicaid Expansion through the ACA/ObamaCare.

I first enrolled in Medicaid about three years ago when I was a law student at UNM School of Law. UNM had just given qualifying students the opportunity to enroll in Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act. I was a healthy 29-year-old with no preexisting conditions, and doubted I would ever use my health insurance. Little did I know, completing the Medicaid application would be one of the most important decisions I ever made.

So, a truly genuine #thanksObama to President Obama, his staff and all our elected leaders who worked to make the ACA happen and are fighting to keep it alive.

I am so grateful that I qualified for Medicaid at a time in my life when I unexpectedly needed health insurance more than I could have ever anticipated. I am so thankful the drafters of the ACA understood that allowing me to get the preventive care I needed was better for my health, and also more financially sound. The ease with which I have received my medical coverage has allowed me to focus on my recovery.

While it has been a challenging year and a half, knowing that I could trust my health insurance made it so much easier than I'd imagined it would be.

I am so relieved that now I can focus on my future instead of figuring out how to pay off insurmountable medical debt.

I am fully recovered from my surgeries and am working on moving my life and career forward. I look forward to paying taxes (I swear, I really do) to support programs like Medicaid so that I can do my part to assist other Americans in staying healthy. If you had told me when I signed up for Medicaid that I would make such extensive use of it, I wouldn't have believed it. At times, I have felt guilty for having to utilize Medicaid at a time in my life that has proven to be so medically and financially complicated.

Friends and family have been good enough to remind me that this is what Medicaid is about: ensuring that Americans can afford to take care of their health, regardless of their financial state, when an issue strikes. The Affordable Care Act has made this a reality for more people than ever before; I am so grateful to be one of them.

I am very scared for what the future will bring for those many individuals who have received insurance thanks to the ACA. I worry that if the [Affordable Care Act] is destroyed, my preexisting condition will make it financially impossible for me and many others to get health insurance.

I worry for people who couldn't get insurance through their work and were finally able to get it through the Exchange. I worry that those who suffer from ailments that constantly affect their health won't be able to afford the care they need. I worry about the millions of Americans who are about to lose so much.

I understand that the ACA is not perfect. It needs some work, especially for people on

the exchange who are paying premiums that are way too high. But the replacement plan that is being proposed is going to make it incredibly difficult for all of us to get quality, affordable coverage.

There are no words to adequately express my gratitude to all those who worked so tirelessly to make the Affordable Care Act happen. I am so hopeful that instead of destroying the ACA, our leaders will work to make it stronger so that all Americans can get the healthcare that they deserve.

Those are the words Elena posted on her Facebook page, very, very moving words. Before her surgery, Elena had an 87-percent chance of developing breast cancer, and now it is less than 10 percent, less than that of the average woman.

I commit to Elena and to every New Mexican and American that I will work to make the ACA stronger so that all Americans will get the healthcare they rightly deserve. But the Senate Republicans cannot claim the same. Their bill, drafted in secret behind closed doors, hurts people like Elena who have preexisting conditions. It hurts people in her situation who have complicated healthcare needs with high medical costs and those who benefit from Medicaid, from the Medicaid expansion.

Americans support the Medicaid Program. They understand that even if they don't need Medicaid, neighbors, friends, family may need it. And they understand that they may need it unexpectedly in the future, as Elena did.

Medicaid expansion has meant that over 265,000 New Mexicans have healthcare coverage that they didn't have before. It is a pretty remarkable thing. In 6 short years in New Mexico, after the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we had people who didn't have any healthcare, and now 265,000 have Medicaid coverage. They could be in a situation just like Elena's. Many of these are hard-working families—families living in rural New Mexico and Native American families living in New Mexico.

The Senate Republican bill, like the House Republican bill, will end Medicaid expansion in New Mexico for people like Elena.

I want everyone listening to hear: This bill cuts Medicaid overall more deeply—more deeply—than the House version. And when President Trump said that the House version was a mean bill, this is a meaner bill. They are not necessary; these cuts are meaner, and they are not necessary to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They will hurt millions of Americans.

They are also devastating to our State economies. New Mexico can't afford to pick up the tab for those cuts, so the State will be forced to cut services and reduce payments to doctors. Hospitals might close, and that would mean healthcare jobs will dry up.

Elena's story is one of millions. Every Senator has hundreds of thou-

sands of constituents with these stories. We all need healthcare at some point in our lives.

I urge, I implore my fellow Senators across the aisle to reject the McConnell TrumpCare bill. Work with Democrats on a bipartisan basis to improve America's healthcare system so that every American has access to affordable healthcare.

Don't do this. Don't gut our healthcare system.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 120 through 152 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy, with the exception of COL Darius Gallegos in Calendar No. 140; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

##### IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army Medical Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

##### To be major general

Brig. Gen. Ronald J. Place

##### IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. William C. Greene

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. William S. Dillon

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Karl O. Thomas

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the

grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

##### To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jay B. Silveria

##### IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Samuel J. Paparo, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Gregory N. Harris

##### IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be brigadier general

Col. John P. Lawlor, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be brigadier general

Col. Dion B. Moten

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be brigadier general

Col. Bowlman T. Bowles, III

##### IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Daniel J. MacDonnell

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Daniel B. Hendrickson

Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas W. Marotta

Rear Adm. (lh) Matthew A. Zirkle

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Jacquelyn McClelland

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. James M. Butler

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Eugene A. Burcher

Capt. Rodney P. Dewalt

Capt. Joey B. Dodgen

Capt. Andrew J. Mueller

Capt. Richard A. Rodriguez

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

Rear Adm. (lh) Keith M. Jones

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

*To be rear admiral*

Rear Adm. (lh) Bret C. Batchelder

*IN THE AIR FORCE*

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

*To be brigadier general*

Col. DeAnna M. Burt

*IN THE ARMY*

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Stephen R. Hogan

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Janson D. Boyles

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Steven W. Ainsworth

Brig. Gen. Bruce E. Hackett

Brig. Gen. Michael C. O'Guinn

Brig. Gen. Miyako N. Schanely

*To be brigadier general*

Col. John W. Aarsen

Col. Kris A. Belanger

Col. Douglas A. Cherry

Col. Ellen S. Clark

Col. Robert S. Cooley, Jr.

Col. Dianne M. Del Rosso

Col. William B. Dyer, III

Col. Joseph A. Edwards, II

Col. Howard-Charles W. Geck

Col. Michael T. Harvey

Col. Martin F. Klein

Col. William S. Lynn

Col. Joseph A. Marsiglia

Col. Robert F. Pleczkowski

Col. Dustin A. Shultz

Col. Mark A. Towne

Col. Irene M. Zoppi

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Gregory L. Kennedy

Brig. Gen. Andrew P. Schafer, Jr.

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Christopher P. Callahan

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. James P. Begley, III

Brig. Gen. Sylvester Cannon  
Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Carden, Jr.  
Brig. Gen. Richard H. Dahlman  
Brig. Gen. Wendul G. Hagler, II  
Brig. Gen. Robert T. Herbert  
Brig. Gen. Jon A. Jensen  
Brig. Gen. John F. King  
Brig. Gen. Dirk R. Kloss  
Brig. Gen. Francis M. McGinn  
Brig. Gen. Walter L. Mercer  
Brig. Gen. Paul D. Rogers  
Brig. Gen. Sean A. Ryan  
Brig. Gen. Michael A. Stone  
Brig. Gen. Michael C. Thompson  
Brig. Gen. Giselle M. Wilz  
Brig. Gen. Gary S. Yaple

*IN THE NAVY*

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

*To be rear admiral*

Rear Adm. (lh) Ann M. Burkhardt

*IN THE AIR FORCE*

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. Scott A. Howell

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. James C. Vechery

*IN THE ARMY*

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Horlander

*IN THE NAVY*

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be vice admiral*

Rear Adm. Andrew L. Lewis

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be vice admiral*

Rear Adm. Matthew J. Kohler

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be vice admiral*

Vice Adm. Kevin M. Donegan

*IN THE MARINE CORPS*

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. Robert F. Hedelund

*IN THE NAVY*

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be admiral*

Vice Adm. James G. Foggo, III

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S  
DESK

*IN THE AIR FORCE*

PN496 AIR FORCE nomination of Jered N. Fry, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN497 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning CHRISTOPHER R. BONEY, and ending DANIEL D. REYES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN498 AIR FORCE nominations of Jeffrey A. Garrett, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN499 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning ROGER A. LEE, and ending JEFFREY R. ROSENBERRY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN500 AIR FORCE nomination of Theodore L. Wilson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN501 AIR FORCE nomination of Jason S. Cross, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN534 AIR FORCE nomination of Angela M. Mike, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN535 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning MATTHEW V. CHAUVIERE, and ending LAUREN A. MAY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN536 AIR FORCE nominations (13) beginning MICHAEL E. BRUHN, and ending VICTOR D. WEEDEN, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN537 AIR FORCE nominations (31) beginning JEFFREY W. DRAKE, and ending JACK VILARDI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN539 AIR FORCE nominations (36) beginning MEGAN E. ANDERSON, and ending RAJEEV S. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN544 AIR FORCE nomination of Jose G. Bal, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

*IN THE ARMY*

PN159 ARMY nominations (81) beginning JENNIFER M. BAGER, and ending RAMEY L. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2017.

PN160 ARMY nominations (12) beginning ALFRED C. ANDERSON, and ending KELLEY TOMSETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2017.

PN483 ARMY nomination of William F. McClintock, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2017.

PN484 ARMY nominations (9) beginning DAVID S. ALLEN, and ending BARRY K. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2017.

PN485 ARMY nomination of Jeffrey L. Washington, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2017.

PN545 ARMY nomination of Joseph B. Dore, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN546 ARMY nominations (2) beginning CHRISTOPHER M. CHUNG, and ending HEATH D. HOLT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN547 ARMY nominations (2) beginning DEVIN G. MCCANE, and ending SHARRI L. ORMSBEE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN548 ARMY nomination of Janna X. Gaddy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN549 ARMY nominations (2) beginning BRADLEY H. STEPHENS, and ending AMILYN M. TAPLIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN550 ARMY nomination of Terry Kim, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

PN551 ARMY nominations (16) beginning JEFF A. BURCHFIELD, and ending BRIAN D. WIECK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN488 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jason K. Pettig, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2017.

#### IN THE NAVY

PN395 NAVY nominations (6) beginning JUANITO F. BOYDON, JR., and ending SURESH K. THADHANI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN396 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ANTHONY L. BAYUNGAN, and ending MICHAEL A. LEACHMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN397 NAVY nominations (17) beginning TODD M. BOLAND, and ending KAIL C. SWINDLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN398 NAVY nominations (64) beginning JAMES G. ADAMS, and ending CHARLES C. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN399 NAVY nominations (2) beginning SHAWN G. DENIHAN, and ending CHAD A. RUNYON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN400 NAVY nominations (2) beginning KELVIN J. ASKEW, and ending ERIKA L. BERRY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN401 NAVY nominations (2) beginning KATHLEEN A. ALLEN, and ending CHRISTOPHER FRYE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN419 NAVY nomination of Bruce E. Osborne, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN420 NAVY nominations (2) beginning COLETTE M. MURPHY, and ending JOHN A.

ROBINSON, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN421 NAVY nominations (14) beginning NATHAN R. ANDERSON, and ending JODIE M.C. YIM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN422 NAVY nomination of Adria R. Schneck, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN423 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MARY A. PONCE, and ending BRIAN K. REED, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN424 NAVY nominations (2) beginning RYAN K. MAHELONA, and ending PHILIP L. NOTZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN425 NAVY nominations (14) beginning JOSEPH T. BAILEY, and ending JONPAUL STEFANI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN426 NAVY nomination of David W. Shaieb, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN427 NAVY nominations (15) beginning LEE A. AXTELL, and ending MARK S. WINWARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN428 NAVY nominations (13) beginning THOMAS M. BESTAFKA, and ending FRANCIS J. STAVISH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN429 NAVY nomination of Danny W. King, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN431 NAVY nominations (30) beginning BABAK A. BARAKAT, and ending STEPHEN M. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN432 NAVY nominations (26) beginning MICHAEL J. ALLANSON, and ending GERARD J. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN433 NAVY nominations (16) beginning MATTHEW L. BERAN, and ending IAN S. WEXLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN434 NAVY nominations (21) beginning GARLAND H. ANDREWS, and ending MEREDITH L. YEAGER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN435 NAVY nominations (50) beginning OLADAPO A. AKINTONDE, and ending SEAN R. WISE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN436 NAVY nominations (16) beginning JEFF A. BLEILE, and ending JEFFREY G. ZELLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN438 NAVY nominations (5) beginning GRADY G. DUFFEY, JR., and ending DAVID A. VONDRACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN439 NAVY nominations (4) beginning WILLIAM M. KAFKA, and ending WILLIAM R. URBAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN440 NAVY nominations (6) beginning DANIEL E. FILLION, and ending JASON D. WEDDLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN441 NAVY nominations (5) beginning DAMON B. DIXON, and ending JONATHAN J. VORRATH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN442 NAVY nominations (11) beginning JAMES W. ADKISSON, III, and ending SHERRI R. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN443 NAVY nominations (7) beginning CORY S. BRUMMETT, and ending DAVID J. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN444 NAVY nominations (18) beginning JULIE M. ALFIERI, and ending BRETT A. WISE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN445 NAVY nominations (9) beginning MATTHEW E. ARNOLD, and ending ANTHONY C. TARANTO, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN446 NAVY nominations (11) beginning PETER A. ARROBIO, and ending KEVIN J. WATKINS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN447 NAVY nominations (18) beginning JOHN A. ANDERSON, and ending JAY A. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN448 NAVY nominations (3) beginning LAWRENCE H. KENNEDY, and ending TRACIE A. SEVERSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN449 NAVY nominations (5) beginning JOSE G. HERNANDEZ, and ending DEREK A. VESTAL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN450 NAVY nominations (173) beginning DAVID A. ABERNATHY, and ending JESSE J. ZIMBAUER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN486 NAVY nomination of Kenneth M. King, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2017.

PN487 NAVY nomination of Garry P. Closas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2017.

PN502 NAVY nominations (2) beginning PAUL D. MELVEY and ending ALEXANDER WOLDEMARIAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN503 NAVY nominations (13) beginning WILLIAM J. BAILEY, JR., and ending CHRISTOPHER D. TUCKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN504 NAVY nominations (21) beginning GINA A. BUONO, and ending SANDRA F. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN505 NAVY nominations (6) beginning DAVID J. ALLEN, and ending TRACIE M. ZIELINSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN506 NAVY nominations (5) beginning DAVID M. BUZZETTI, and ending ERIC R. VETTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN507 NAVY nominations (11) beginning DAVID E. BAILEY, and ending CHRISTOPHER J. STEWART, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN508 NAVY nominations (8) beginning JOHN R. ADAMS, and ending MARY C. WISE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN509 NAVY nominations (7) beginning SEAN A. COX, and ending LUIS A. PEREZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN510 NAVY nominations (13) beginning ELIZABETH W. BUNDT, and ending MICHAEL G. WATSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 2017.

PN552 NAVY nomination of Miguel A. Santisteban, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2017.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO MAUREEN RILEY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a remarkable leader in the airport industry, Maureen Riley, who is retiring on June 30. Maureen is not only an accomplished businesswoman, but also a well-respected collaborator who had the vision and tenacity to get a \$3.1 billion airport redevelopment program off the ground at Salt Lake City International Airport.

For more than 30 years, Maureen's professional life has been marked by many significant achievements in the airport industry. She has distinguished herself as a trusted consultant for numerous airports across the country. She has also served as deputy executive director at Orlando International Airport and, most recently, as executive director for the Salt Lake City Department of Airports.

Maureen believes in collaboration and sharing information to create better operating results. She has served in top leadership positions for the Airports Council International-North America, ACI-NA, a trade association of airports around the globe. She also served as a member of the ACI World Board of Directors for 4 years.

I first met Maureen after she took over the helm at Salt Lake City's Department of Airports, a position she has served in for more than a decade. During this time, Maureen guided the airport through the planning, financing, and now construction of the \$3.1 billion airport redevelopment program.

Maureen is an exceptional manager who can be credited with gaining approval from the airlines to construct the new airport, which is paramount to the success of Utah's economy. She has the unique ability to bring people together and has been able to persuade the airlines, architects, financiers, and construction teams to get the construction program off the ground. Maureen never backs away from a challenge and does what is necessary to keep a project on track and on budget. She is well respected by her colleagues and is known as being a tough negotiator. As one airline executive once told Maureen, "It is hard to resist your reasonableness."

Maureen is passionate about providing excellent customer service to airport passengers. She is committed to seeing that a project is done right the first time and is not afraid of saying no when a project or proposal does not make sense. Maureen is also committed to promoting women in the workforce and encourages the use of gender-neutral language in meetings by contractors, consultants, and staff.

Maureen has been the driving force to ensure the airport redevelopment program leaves a positive lasting impression on passengers and meets Salt Lake City's passenger growth well into the future.

Maureen Riley is leaving a lasting legacy as she steps down from her position with the Salt Lake City Department of Airports. I want to wish Maureen well in her retirement and send my best wishes to her and her family on this momentous occasion.

#### VA ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, the Senate recently passed the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. This legislation is intended to improve the VA by strengthening the process of holding nonperforming VA employees accountable, but it does this by removing certain due process protections that are currently in place to protect VA employees from unlawful discrimination or retaliation. Dr. David Shulkin, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, asked for this authority to reform the personnel system, and the Senate obliged his request.

In Hawaii we have a much different and more pressing problem that this legislation does not address, and that is the challenge we face with recruitment and retention of VA leaders and filling vacant positions at the VA.

Nowhere is this challenge more evident than in the VA's yearlong search to recruit a new executive director for the Pacific Island Health Care System in Honolulu. During this time, six executive directors from six different VA healthcare systems on the mainland rotated through Hawaii on an interim basis. The VA said that its search dragged on for so long because it faced a shortage of individuals with the right skills to fill these medical director positions, but that is no excuse. The VA should have been doing more to develop a pool of qualified people to fill vacant medical director positions. Failure to find long-term, stable leadership undermines accountability not only at the highest level, but across the entire healthcare system.

I am also bothered by the decision to rotate medical directors in from other healthcare systems, even on an interim basis. This stopgap measure failed to ensure the proper leadership required to provide long-term direction for the Pacific Island Health Care System and to make sure that there was someone to hold accountable for the delivery of services to the more than 120,000 veterans that the VA is responsible for in the Pacific. Those veterans and their families deserve better.

Leadership recruitment is not the only staffing issue we face. In its September 2016 report on the Pacific Island Health Care System, the VA's Office of the Inspector General specifically noted that recruitment and retention of staff is an ongoing challenge across our neighbor islands, in large part due to cost of living, distance, and physical isolation. At the time of its report, the OIG noted that there were 75 unfilled positions at community-based outpatient clinics across Hawaii. These are vacant positions at clinics that directly affect veterans' access to healthcare.

I worry that removing important due process protections for VA employees will only make this problem worse, because, where there are already issues in physician recruitment and retention, the VA could compete through the promise of a stable job, in an environment free from unlawful discrimination or retaliation. Knowing that those protections are in place is not only helpful to attracting recruits, but it is helpful to promoting a culture free of inequity and intimidation because people know they will be held to account for their actions. That kind of culture is critical to recruitment and retention because the last thing the VA wants is hard-working employees to search for jobs that offer better working conditions elsewhere.

At our recent subcommittee hearing on military construction and veteran affairs appropriations, Secretary Shulkin acknowledged that the VA has seen cases of documented whistleblower retaliation, and that is important, because it means that Secretary

Shulkin is going to have to be vigilant so that this new legislation is not abused. In his mind, he is not seeking this legislation so that the VA can fire employees without any reason or to allow supervisors to abuse them, and I hope that is how this plays out in practice across the country, but there is going to be more risk for a workforce of 360,000 that is decentralized, where decisions are made locally, and so we will be vigilant with him and will hold Secretary Shulkin accountable for any wrongdoing.

We are still left grappling with the challenge of recruitment and retention, and unfortunately, this legislation does not address it, and it may make addressing it even harder. With nearly 50,000 vacant positions across the VA workforce, Congress needs to get a handle on this issue because these vacancies risk undermining the delivery of services and care to our veterans who rely on the VA. We can and need to do better by them.

Thank you.

#### CYSTINURIA AWARENESS DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize June 24 as Cystinuria Awareness Day and to offer my support to the International Cystinuria Foundation as the organization continues its excellent work promoting knowledge of this disease within the research and medical communities, as well as providing resources for those affected by cystinuria.

Cystinuria is an inherited disease characterized by high concentrations of the amino acid cysteine in the urine, leading to the formation of cysteine stones in the kidneys and urinary tract. It is a rare disease that affects roughly 1 in every 7,000 people, including an estimated 130 Granite Staters. Cystinuria is a painful and often debilitating condition. Those who suffer from it can experience kidney stones as frequently as daily, causing many to lose weeks of work each year. Many sufferers use prescription painkillers to cope with the disease, and tragically, some develop substance use disorders.

Cystinuria does not discriminate, affecting people of all genders, races, ethnicities, and ages. There is not yet a cure, and the disease is frequently misdiagnosed. I sincerely hope that this day of awareness will help in advancing research into the causes of the disease as well as possible therapies and cures. Because cystinuria is a rare disease, there is an acute need for more aggressive research, including at the National Institutes of Health. In addition to supporting important funding for research, we can also do our part by also advocating for awareness for the disease. Fortunately, the Affordable Care Act protects those with cystinuria and other preexisting conditions from discrimination by health insurance companies.

Cystinuria Awareness Day is a valuable opportunity for Americans to learn about this condition and offer support to those living with it. I am grateful to the International Cystinuria Foundation for its commitment to raising awareness of the disease, advocating for research, and providing support for those suffering from cystinuria.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY'S ADVANCED TEST REACTOR

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, my colleague Senator JIM RISCH joins me today in recognizing the Idaho National Laboratory's achievements in 50 years of operation of the advanced test reactor. The success of the scientific mission of the advanced test reactor is a pride of Idaho and of the entire American nuclear science community.

The advanced test reactor is a unique system designed to support multiple different experiments simultaneously. It can serve as a nuclear "time machine" by testing the stresses of nuclear power 20 times faster than conventional systems. It is currently involved in research to convert weapons-grade nuclear material to reactor fuel. This will strengthen American energy independence.

The U.S. Navy's nuclear propulsion program is a key customer of advanced test reactor research. It is one of many ways in which Idahoans contribute to our national security. The advanced test reactor is also the only American source for a particular isotope known as Cobalt-60. Cobalt-60 is vital for its use in modern brain cancer treatments and is saving the lives of Americans every day.

Beyond these good works, the advanced test reactor is available to our universities. Our next generation of scientists has access to this unique system on the condition that their research be published for the benefit of the American public. Through this and other efforts, the Idaho National Laboratory works to support current and future generations.

Congratulations to the dedicated men and women of the Idaho National Laboratory. They are the embodiment of American scientific achievement and leadership in nuclear research.●

##### RECOGNIZING TONGUE RIVER WINERY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing the team at the Tongue River Winery, in Custer County, for having the skill, patience, and dedication required to produce quality wines on the high plains of eastern Montana. De-

spite a difficult growing climate, this humble, family-run operation has successfully combined vineyard and winery functions and has received numerous awards and recognition for their efforts.

The married couple of Bob and Marilyn Thaden, along with their son Josh, are the team that makes the Tongue River Winery successful; 2017 marks the fifth consecutive year that the Tongue River Winery has won the Granite Peak Award. This award is presented to the top Montana winery at the Northwest Wine Summit.

For Bob, this year marks his 50th anniversary making wine. It has also been about 50 years since he met his wife, Marilyn, so it comes as no surprise that, when asked about winemaking, he compares the process of selecting good grapes to courtship. Bob reflected, "it's like courtship, plant the wrong one and you will regret it for a long time; take your time, choose carefully, so not to be disappointed later on." Bob has selected wisely in both endeavors. His advice on being thoughtful and patient can be applied to many other areas of life.

In the years ahead, I wish Bob, Marilyn, and Josh all the best as they continue to cultivate and create uniquely Montana wines. For their efforts, I raise my glass to the team at the Tongue River Winery.●

##### 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF BUCKSPORT, MAINE

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 225th anniversary of Bucksport, ME, an active town set along the banks of the Penobscot River. The town has a long and proud history dating back to the late 1700s, and I am pleased to join with Mayor David Keene, town officials, members of the Bucksport Historical Society, and residents as they gather for a founder's day celebration to honor the town's history.

First settled in 1763, Bucksport was incorporated in 1792 and named for its original surveyor, Colonel Jonathan Buck. However, Bucksport's history begins long before the 18th century. The town's first known inhabitants were the prehistoric "Red Paint People" who were discovered through an archaeological dig in the late 19th century. Originally known as the territory of the Penobscot Abenaki Native Peoples, the town of Bucksport today encompasses an area surveyed by Colonel Buck in 1762. After returning in 1763, Colonel Buck built the first sawmill, store, and home, and by 1775, there were a total of 21 families living there. During the Penobscot Expedition in 1779—notably one of the greatest defeats in American naval history—the British overtook and burned the town. As a result, in 1783, the town was resettled and named Buckstown Plantation,



later changed to Buckstown, and finally renamed Bucksport in 1817.

Bucksport's history is deeply engrained in the papermaking industry. In 1930, Bucksport's Maine Seaboard Paper Company opened its doors as the first paper mill on the Penobscot River. The mill and the town have experienced significant changes as the paper industry has declined, with the paper mill finally closing its doors in 2014. Despite these hardships, the town of Bucksport has opened new doors both through creative uses of the former mill site, as well as by capitalizing on the town's deepwater port, rail service, and location at the intersection of two loops of the "three Ring Binder" broadband network. The resiliency of the town is a testament to its residents' hard work, innovation, and commitment to Maine.

Bucksport is home to nearly 5,000 people and continues to grow. Bucksport is centrally located 18 miles from three major employment centers and is also home to numerous cultural and arts organizations like Northeast Historic Film, the Alamo Theater, and the Lighthouse Arts Studio. The town also features the Downeast Waterfront Walkway, a mile-long walkway along the Penobscot River with views of Fort Knox and informational panels that detail Bucksport's important past, as well as its potential for the future. I am proud to commemorate 225 years since the incorporation of Bucksport, a town that has greatly contributed to Maine's economic prosperity and a community known for providing the unique Maine experience.●

#### 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF UTICA, MICHIGAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 200th anniversary of the city of Utica, MI. The bicentennial celebration is a historical benchmark for Utica, as well as the State of Michigan.

Located in Macomb County and often referred to as a small town with city amenities, Utica residents have always prided themselves on their high level of community involvement, rich heritage, and family-oriented values. After 200 years of change and growth, the city remains embodied in that local spirit.

Founded by Canadian pioneer Thomas Squire in 1817 and formally incorporated in 1838, Utica has a rich history. In the early pioneer days, settlers and farmers from across the United States traveled to Utica due to its close proximity to the Clinton River. At the time, Utica was known by various names, including McDougalville, Hog Hollow, and Harlow. It was not until 1829 when Americans from New York State began moving to the area and changed the name to Utica, after their home city. Utica gained the status of village in 1838 and was among

one of the first towns in Michigan to do so.

The flourishing village experienced great economic growth from the agricultural industry, as well as the construction of the Detroit United Railway, Wildcat Bank of Utica, and Clinton-Kalamazoo Canal. Tragically, in both 1904 and 1905, fires erupted across the village and destroyed many businesses, residences, and the renowned Exchange Hotel. However, Utica residents demonstrated their love and commitment to the city by building waterworks in 1926, gas mains in 1930, and sewers in 1937. It was the same year, 1937, that Utica officially became a recognized city. It is testament to the longevity and vibrancy of the community that the Utica United Methodist Church, which was built in 1839 by two of the first settlers, Nathaniel and Jemima Squires, still stands today.

Today Utica is a vibrant community covering 1,114 acres of land, with affordable, safe housing, successful family-owned shops, and nationally recognized community schools. The city offers its residents a wide range of comprehensive and efficient services from festivals and 5K races, to senior nutrition programs and pinocle tournaments. Utica's fire and police department work hard to protect the city and its residents, as well as enhance the quality of life. In short, Utica is a great place to live, work, and play.

The city of Utica has a rich history, dynamic present, and bright future. As Utica celebrates this milestone, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating its residents, elected officials, and businesses as they celebrate their rich history. I wish the city continued growth and prosperity in the years ahead.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1282. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1873. An act to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands.

H.R. 2131. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to improve consistency regarding discipline and adverse actions in the Department's workforce, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, June 22, 2017, he has signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 1094. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1282. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1873. An act to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2131. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to improve consistency regarding discipline and adverse actions in the Department's workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 22, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1094. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2024. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant



to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2017; ordered to lie on the table.

EC-2025. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2009-2014 Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), funds, and was assigned case number 16-01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2026. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal year 2009 Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), funds, and was assigned case number 16-03; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2027. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John E. Wissler, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2028. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of International Affairs and Seafood Inspection, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Trade Monitoring Procedures for Fishery Products; International Trade in Seafood; Permit Requirements for Importers and Exporters" (RIN0648-AX63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2029. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Technical Information Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification Program for Access to the Death Master File" (RIN0692-AA21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2030. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (P.L. 102-1) for the February 7, 2017-April 8, 2017 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2031. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0100-2017-0112); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2032. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual reports of the Attorney General relative to enforcement actions taken by the Department of Justice under the Lobbying Disclosure Act for the period from January 1, 2016, through June 30, 2016, and July 1, 2016, through December 31, 2016; to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and the Judiciary.

EC-2033. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-70, "Early Learning Equity in Funding Amendment Act of 2017"; to the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2034. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-71, "Child Development Facilities Regulations Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2035. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-72, "Child Care Study Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2036. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2037. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary/Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2038. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Augusta, Georgia)" ((MB Docket No. 11-54) (DA 17-510)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2039. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rural Health Care Support Mechanism" ((WC Docket No. 02-60) (FCC 17-71)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 733. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-116).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 131. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain National Forest System land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-117).

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1405. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1406. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of Green Bonds and to establish the United States Green Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax incentives for manufacturing in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1408. A bill to enhance effective prosecution and defense in courts-martial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for residential energy efficient property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1410. A bill to further the development of unmanned aircraft system technology through investing in additional research, building a trained workforce, and establishing working groups to address near-term and long-term challenges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1411. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension of the payment of the special survivor indemnity allowance under the Survivor Benefit Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1412. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a percentage of student loan forgiveness for public service employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. REED):

S. 1413. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. STRANGE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1414. A bill to state the policy of the United States on the minimum number of available battle force ships; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1415. A bill to terminate the prohibitions on the exportation and importation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 1416. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1417. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop a categorical exclusion for covered vegetative management activities carried out to establish or improve habitat for greater sage-grouse and mule deer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1418. A bill to establish protections for passengers in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1419. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1420. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to review the termination characterization of former members of the Department of State who were fired by reason of the sexual orientation of the official, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1421. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year

property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1423. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1424. A bill to apply the provisions of title 5, United States Code, related to veterans' preference to the Federal Aviation Administration personnel management system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1425. A bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1426. A bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 199. A resolution designating June 2017 as "Great Outdoors Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. Res. 200. A resolution welcoming the President of the Republic of Korea on his official visit to the United States and celebrating the United States-Republic of Korea relationship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. Res. 201. A resolution affirming the importance of title IX, applauding the increase in educational opportunities available to women and girls, and recognizing the tremendous amount of work left to be done to further increase those opportunities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. KING):

S. Con. Res. 18. A concurrent resolution honoring David Americo Ortiz Arias, the 3-time World Series Champion Major League Baseball player who played for the Minnesota Twins and the Boston Red Sox for a combined 20 seasons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 256

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 584

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 584, a bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 804

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 856

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 856, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual assault, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1104

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1104, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a methodology for the collection by the Commission of information about commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service, and for other purposes.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1296

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

S. 1303

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1303, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1311, a bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1313

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1313, a bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1315

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1315, a bill to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to amend its regulations relating to qualified mortgages, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 1366

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1366, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1368

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an excise tax on certain prescription drugs which have been subject to a price spike, and for other purposes.

S. 1377

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1377, a bill to remove the limitation on certain amounts for which large non-rural hospitals may be reimbursed under the Healthcare Connect Fund of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1379

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1379, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit fellowship and stipend compensation to be saved in an individual retirement account.

S. 1389

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1389, a bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1393, a bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

S. RES. 102

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 102, a resolution reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mexico, and recognizing bilateral cooperation that advances the national security and national interests of both countries.

S. RES. 195

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 195, a resolution recognizing June 20, 2017, as "World Refugee Day".

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1419. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, four years ago, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court struck down the heart of the Voting Rights Act in *Shelby County v. Holder*. That 5 to 4 decision crippled the Federal government's ability to protect minority, elderly, and disadvantaged voters across the country. The impact of this disastrous ruling has been even worse than imagined.

Before the ink even dried on the Court's opinion, Republican officials in

several States rushed to enact laws making it harder for minorities to vote. Prior to *Shelby County*, the Federal government had the ability to prevent racial discriminatory voting changes from taking effect before those changes occur. Proposed laws and new voting procedures would first have been reviewed by the Federal courts or the Department of Justice to ensure that voting rights would not be harmed if the changes went into effect. But without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act after *Shelby County*, discriminatory laws quickly passed Republican legislatures in several States.

Chief Justice Roberts's majority opinion in *Shelby County* noted several times that the protections of the Voting Rights Act are no longer appropriate because our "Country has changed." It is true that our Nation has changed—we have made progress. But there is no question that the scourge of racial discrimination still exists. There are still those within our society intent on suppressing the right to vote and keeping minorities from exercising their constitutional right to participate in our democracy. Since the *Shelby County* ruling—and now emboldened by the Trump Administration—these forces are more concerning than they have been in decades.

Unfortunately, what has transpired in the aftermath of the *Shelby County* decision makes the need for the full protections of the Voting Rights Act unmistakably clear. Voter suppression efforts have found renewed life in numerous jurisdictions across the country. Thankfully, in some cases the courts have been able to provide a backstop. Based on strong evidence that hundreds of thousands of minority voters have been disproportionately prevented or discouraged from voting by Republican-enacted voting restrictions, Federal courts have blocked or rolled back many of these laws. Importantly, Federal courts have repeatedly found that these States enacted laws with the intention to discriminate.

Just last month, the Supreme Court left in place the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling that blocked North Carolina's harsh voting restrictions, including a strict photo identification law. The Fourth Circuit concluded that the Republican legislature had passed the law with the intent to racially discriminate against African Americans, and found that "the new provisions target African Americans with almost surgical precision."

In April of this year, Federal district court ruled for a second time that Texas's photo ID law was enacted with the intent to racially discriminate and had a racially discriminatory effect on Hispanic and Black voters. This ruling came after the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reaffirmed that the Texas law should be struck down because of its discriminatory effect on minority vot-

ers. But just weeks ago, the Republican-led Texas legislature and Governor enacted a new law in an attempt to escape the court's rulings.

Federal courts in Kansas and North Dakota have also acted as a bulwark against attempts by Republican officials to disenfranchise minority voters. In Kansas, courts have issued rulings rejecting repeated attempts by Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach from making voter registration more difficult. In North Dakota, a Federal district court held that the State's strict photo ID law disproportionately burdened Native Americans and blocked its implementation in the 2016 election.

These decisions are only the tip of the iceberg of what has transpired since *Shelby County*. While our courts are acting to guard against attempts to block minorities from accessing the ballot box, each of these cases requires years of litigation, money, and resources. And these are just the voting changes Republicans are enacting at the State level. Many of the efforts at the local level have gone unnoticed but have equally devastating effects on the voting rights of minorities.

The original Voting Rights Act would have prevented many of these discriminatory laws. But the Supreme Court's decision has taken this country back to an era before the Civil Rights movement—a bad time in our history where some states openly discriminated against minority voters. We are constantly reminded how costly the fight for voting and civil rights has been in this country. Just yesterday, we marked the 53rd anniversary of three civil rights activists who were killed in Mississippi for registering minorities to vote. James Chaney, Michael Schwerner, and Andrew Goodman gave their lives in 1964 when they were murdered while fighting in Mississippi for racial equality and free access to the ballot box. Their example, and the example of generations of civil rights activists who gave their sweat, blood, and sometimes their lives must inspire us and drive us to do more. It is now imperative for us to do everything in our power to correct the *Shelby County* decision and reinstate the full protections of the Voting Rights Act for the next generation.

The legislation I am introducing today would restore and update the Voting Rights Act. The Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2017 not only modernizes the Voting Rights Act in response to *Shelby County*, it also modernizes the law to provide tools to combat current forms of voter discrimination. This bill responds to calls from community leaders and grassroots activists working in communities whose voting rights have been threatened or suppressed. It responds to voting rights experts and civil rights leader who have called for strong legislation to counter the voter intimidation and

patently discriminatory efforts that were unleashed after the Shelby County ruling.

I am proud to introduce this bill with forty-six original cosponsors, nearly every single member of the Democratic caucus. I am also proud to be joined by Senator Durbin, who worked with me to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act in 2006. In addition, the House of Representatives is today introducing a companion bill led by Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, Congresswoman JUDY CHU, Congresswoman MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, my friend Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and over 175 members of the House Democratic caucus.

We are all joining together to introduce this bill today because we will not let systematic and persistent efforts to suppress Americans' right to vote go unchecked. We will not stand idly by while this country reverts to a bygone era where it was acceptable to disenfranchise our own citizens because they were Black, Hispanic, or disadvantaged. These unconstitutional and discriminatory efforts deserve a strong response.

Protecting Americans' constitutional right to vote is not a partisan exercise. The original enactment and every reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act has always been bipartisan. When we last reauthorized the Voting Rights Act in 2006, I worked closely with the Republican chairmen of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees—former Senator Arlen Specter and Representative Jim Sensenbrenner. And past reauthorizations of the Voting Rights Act have been signed into law by Republican presidents.

But now, the Republican majority—in both the House and the Senate—refuses to protect the right to vote, restore the Voting Rights Act, or address other critical civil rights issues. Since the Shelby County decision, Republicans at every level of our government have acted to make it harder to vote. This has become the legacy of today's Republican Party. They should think seriously about reversing course, rather than trying to reverse the gains we have made in history. One significant step would be to join with us to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act to restore the historic and critically-needed protections of this landmark civil rights law.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 199—DESIGNATING JUNE 2017 AS “GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH”

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### S. RES. 199

Whereas hundreds of millions of people in the United States participate in outdoor recreation annually;

Whereas Congress enacted the Outdoor Recreation Jobs and Economic Impact Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-249; 130 Stat. 999) to assess and analyze the outdoor recreation economy of the United States and the effects attributable to the outdoor recreation economy on the overall economy of the United States;

Whereas regular outdoor recreation is associated with positive health outcomes and better quality of life;

Whereas outdoor recreation is part of the national heritage of the United States; and

Whereas June 2017 is an appropriate month to designate as “Great Outdoors Month” to provide an opportunity to celebrate the importance of the great outdoors: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2017 as “Great Outdoors Month”; and

(2) encourages all people of the United States to recreate in the great outdoors in June 2017 and year-round.

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 200—WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA ON HIS OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES AND CELEBRATING THE UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA RELATIONSHIP, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. PERDUE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

##### S. RES. 200

Whereas the Government and people of the United States and of the Republic of Korea share a comprehensive alliance, a dynamic partnership, and a personal friendship rooted in the common values of freedom, democracy, and a free market economy;

Whereas the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea is a linchpin of regional stability in Asia, including against the threats posed by the regime in Pyongyang;

Whereas cooperation between our nations spans across the economic, energy, diplomatic, security, and cultural spheres;

Whereas the relationship between the people of the United States and of the Republic of Korea stretches back to Korea's Chosun Dynasty, when the United States and Korea established diplomatic relations under the 1882 Treaty of Peace, Amity, Commerce, and Navigation;

Whereas the United States-Republic of Korea alliance was forged in blood, with military casualties of the United States dur-

ing the Korean War of approximately 36,574 deaths and more than 103,284 wounded, and casualties of the Republic of Korea of more than 217,000 soldiers killed, more than 291,000 wounded, and over 1,000,000 civilians killed or missing;

Whereas the Korean War Veterans Recognition Act (Public Law 111-41) was enacted on July 27, 2009, and President Barack Obama issued a proclamation to designate the date as the National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day and called upon the people of the United States to display flags at half-staff in memory of the Korean War veterans;

Whereas the Republic of Korea and the United States have also stood alongside each other in the 4 major wars the United States has fought outside Korea since World War II—in Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq;

Whereas, since the 1953 Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Korea, done at Washington October 1, 1953, and ratified by the Senate on January 26, 1954, United States military personnel have maintained a continuous presence on the Korean Peninsula, and currently there are approximately 28,500 United States troops assigned in the Republic of Korea;

Whereas, in January 2014, the United States and the Republic of Korea agreed upon a new 5-year Special Measures Agreement (referred to in this preamble as “SMA”), establishing the framework for Republic of Korea contributions to offset the costs associated with the stationing of United States Forces Korea (referred to in this preamble as “USFK”) on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas the Democratic People's Republic of Korea continues its dangerous incitements, including political assassinations, conventional military provocations, ballistic missile tests and the advancement of its nuclear programs;

Whereas the United States continues to deploy advanced military capabilities to the land, air and waters of South Korea, including the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system (referred to in this preamble as “THAAD”) to defend against the growing threat from the ballistic missile and nuclear weapons programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and will continue to closely coordinate with the Government of the Republic of Korea when evaluating the full range of necessary defensive military policies;

Whereas the new Government of the Republic of Korea has announced that it has no intention to reverse commitments made in the spirit of the United States-Republic of Korea alliance, while it plans to implement the domestic procedures to uphold democratic, legal, and procedural legitimacy and transparency;

Whereas the People's Republic of China has engaged in an unprecedented campaign of economic pressure on the Republic of Korea in retaliation for the decision by the United States-Republic of Korea alliance to deploy THAAD, with the goal of undermining the United States-Republic of Korea alliance and causing significant damage to the South Korean economy and South Korean people;

Whereas the Government and people of the United States and of the Republic of Korea share a deep commitment to addressing the continued suffering of the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea due to the appalling human rights abuses and repression of the regime in Pyongyang;

Whereas, on March 15, 2012, the United States-Republic of Korea Free Trade Agreement entered into force, which both countries have committed to fully implement;

Whereas the Republic of Korea is the United States sixth-largest trade partner, with United States goods and exports to Korea reaching a level of \$63,800,000,000 in 2016;

Whereas United States foreign direct investment (referred to in this preamble as "FDI") in Korea (in stock) was \$34,600,000,000 in 2015, a 3.3 percent increase from 2014 and Korea's FDI in the United States (in stock) was \$40,100,000,000 in 2015, up 0.5 percent from 2014;

Whereas, the Republic of Korea spends 2.6 percent of its gross domestic product (referred to in this preamble as "GDP") on defense and carries a significant portion of United States operating costs for forces in South Korea;

Whereas President Moon Jae-in has expressed his desire to increase this spending to 3 percent of GDP during his tenure;

Whereas the United States, the Republic of Korea, and the Government of Japan have made great strides in promoting trilateral cooperation and defense partnership, including ministerial meetings, information sharing, and cooperation on ballistic missile defense exercises to counter North Korean provocations;

Whereas, on May 7, 2013, the United States and the Republic of Korea signed a Joint Declaration in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Alliance Between the Republic of Korea and the United States;

Whereas President Moon Jae-in stated during his inaugural address on May 10, 2017: "I will do everything in my power to bring peace to the peninsula";

Whereas there are deep cultural and personal ties between the people of the United States and of the Republic of Korea, as exemplified by the large flow of visitors and exchanges each year between the 2 countries, including Korean students studying in United States colleges and universities;

Whereas Korean-Americans have made invaluable contributions to the security, prosperity, and diversity of our Nation;

Whereas, from June 28, 2017, through July 1, 2017, President Moon Jae-in will visit Washington for his first official visit to the United States since his election as President; and

Whereas the United States Government looks forward to continuing to deepen our enduring partnership with the Republic of Korea on economic, security, and cultural issues, as well as embracing new opportunities for new partnership and cooperation on emerging regional and global challenges: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes His Excellency Moon Jae-in, the President of the Republic of Korea, on his first official visit to the United States;

(2) reaffirms the importance of—

(A) the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea, as enshrined in the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1953, which is vital to peace and security in Northeast Asia, and the entire Asia-Pacific region; and

(B) the commitment of the United States to defend the Republic of Korea under Article III of the Mutual Defense Treaty;

(3) reinforces longstanding United States commitments to provide extended deterrence, guaranteed by the full spectrum of United States defense capabilities, to the Republic of Korea;

(4) welcomes opportunities to strengthen security consultation, cooperation, and part-

nership between the United States and the Republic of Korea on matters such as space, cyber, and missile defense;

(5) supports ongoing efforts—

(A) to strengthen the United States-Republic of Korea alliance;

(B) to protect the approximately 28,500 members of the United States Armed Forces stationed on the Korean Peninsula; and

(C) to defend the alliance against any and all provocations committed by the regime of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(6) urges the United States and the Republic of Korea to work together with members of the United Nations Security Council and other Member States to fully and effectively enforce existing sanctions and consider the need to take immediate action to pass additional and meaningful new measures under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter;

(7) supports efforts by the United States and the Republic of Korea to peacefully achieve a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons through a diplomatic process;

(8) urges the United States and the Republic of Korea to work together to fully and fairly implement all aspects of the United States-Republic of Korea Free Trade Agreement; and

(9) encourages the United States Government and the Government of the Republic of Korea to continue to broaden and deepen the alliance by enhancing cooperation and building new partnerships in the security, economic, energy, scientific, health, education, and cultural spheres.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 201—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF TITLE IX, APPLAUDING THE INCREASE IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO WOMEN AND GIRLS, AND RECOGNIZING THE TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF WORK LEFT TO BE DONE TO FURTHER INCREASE THOSE OPPORTUNITIES

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 201

Whereas in 1972 President Richard M. Nixon signed into law title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as "title IX");

Whereas in 2002 Congress passed a joint resolution establishing that title IX may be cited as the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act";

Whereas title IX prohibits any institution that receives Federal education funding from discriminating against students or employees on the basis of sex;

Whereas sex discrimination includes—

- (1) gender-based violence;
- (2) sexual harassment and assault;
- (3) dating violence; and
- (4) domestic violence;

Whereas title IX guarantees—

(1) equal educational opportunities for all students, including pregnant or parenting students and gender non-conforming students; and

(2) protection for students from discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity;

Whereas, since 1972, the United States has made great progress in providing educational opportunities to women and girls, and in 2015 women earned the majority of doctoral, master's, baccalaureate, and associate degrees;

Whereas, since 1972, the participation of women and girls in sports has increased by 1000 percent in high school and greater than 500 percent in college, providing women and girls with the opportunity—

(1) to develop leadership and teamwork skills;

(2) to earn athletic scholarships to help finance a college degree; and

(3) to become successful professional athletes;

Whereas, despite the progress that has been made in higher education and athletics, women, girls, pregnant or parenting students, and gender non-conforming students in the United States are still frequently denied equal educational opportunities;

Whereas the number of baccalaureate degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math earned by women has decreased over the past decade, and women earn only—

- (1) 39 percent of physical science degrees;
- (2) 18 percent of computing degrees;
- (3) 19 percent of engineering degrees; and
- (4) 43 percent of mathematics degrees;

Whereas women of color earn only 6 percent of computing degrees and 3 percent of engineering degrees at the baccalaureate level;

Whereas, despite representing 56 percent of all those enrolled in colleges and universities in the United States, women hold almost ¾ of all outstanding student debt, and the average of student debt owed by women following the completion of a baccalaureate degree is \$1,500 more than the average of student debt owed by men;

Whereas there are approximately 64,000 fewer opportunities for women to participate in college sports compared to men, and in 2015, women made up only 37 of the 313 athletic directors in Division I sports;

Whereas multiple studies have confirmed that 1 in 5 women are sexually assaulted on college campuses and approximately 20 percent of girls have been the victims of sexual assault or attempted sexual assault while in high school;

Whereas more than 50 percent of girls in grades 7 through 12 experience sexual harassment and 10 percent of high school students experience dating violence each year, which can—

(1) lead to symptoms of depression and anxiety and unhealthy and antisocial behaviors; and

(2) negatively impact academic achievement;

Whereas men still hold the vast majority of school leadership positions, and women make up approximately—

(1) 35 percent of full professors at degree-granting postsecondary institutions;

(2) 26 percent of college and university presidents; and

(3) 27 percent of school district superintendents;



Whereas pregnant and parenting students are more likely to drop out of high school compared to other students, and only 51 percent of mothers under the age of 20 earn a high school diploma by the age of 22, leading to decreased opportunities for continuing education and employment;

Whereas students face pervasive discrimination and harassment in school, on college campuses, and in the workforce on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, which—

(1) impedes the ability of the students to fully access the educational opportunities to which the students are entitled; and

(2) constitutes sex discrimination; and

Whereas between 2011 and 2016, investigations by the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education into reports of sexual and dating violence and discrimination against transgender students have helped to identify and respond to systemic issues of discrimination against students that otherwise would have gone unrecognized, yet recent actions from the Office for Civil Rights indicate there will be fewer resources and less attention focused on these issues moving forward: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) applauds the tremendous increase in educational opportunities for women and girls, including in sports, since the passage of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.);

(2) encourages the Department of Education and the Department of Justice to protect the rights of students to have safe learning environments by working to ensure schools prevent and respond to discrimination and harassment on the basis of sex, including—

(A) sexual assault;

(B) harassment;

(C) domestic and dating violence;

(D) discrimination or harassment on the basis of pregnancy;

(E) sex stereotyping; and

(F) discrimination or harassment on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender identity; and

(3) recognizes the work that still remains to be done to secure the promise of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) that no federally funded educational institution shall discriminate against any person on the basis of sex.

# SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—HONORING DAVID AMÉRICO ORTIZ ARIAS, THE 3-TIME WORLD SERIES CHAMPION MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYER WHO PLAYED FOR THE MINNESOTA TWINS AND THE BOSTON RED SOX FOR A COMBINED 20 SEASONS

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. KING) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 18

Whereas David Américo Ortiz Arias, known to fans as “Big Papi”, was born in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, on November 18, 1975;

Whereas after graduating from Estudia Espailat High School in the Dominican Re-

public in 1992, David Ortiz was signed by the Seattle Mariners;

Whereas on September 2, 1997, David Ortiz made his Major League Baseball (in this preamble referred to as “MLB”) debut for the Minnesota Twins at age 21;

Whereas on January 22, 2003, David Ortiz signed a free-agent contract with the Boston Red Sox;

Whereas David Ortiz has created numerous iconic moments in Boston sports history, including—

(1) on October 18, 2004, hitting a walk-off home run in the 12th inning of Game 4 of the 2004 American League Championship Series against the New York Yankees to spark the Boston Red Sox’s improbable comeback from a 3 games-to-none series deficit, the only time in MLB history a team has ever made such a comeback;

(2) on October 19, 2004, hitting a walk-off single in the 14th inning of Game 5 of the 2004 American League Championship Series against the New York Yankees to continue the Boston Red Sox’s comeback; and

(3) on October 13, 2013, hitting a grand slam to right-center field to tie Game 2 of the 2013 American League Championship Series against the Detroit Tigers;

Whereas David Ortiz was instrumental in helping the Boston Red Sox snap an 86-year World Series drought;

Whereas David Ortiz played a crucial role in the Boston Red Sox winning the World Series in 2007 and 2013;

Whereas David Ortiz has won numerous awards for his baseball prowess, including—

(1) the Edgar Martinez Outstanding Designated Hitter Award from MLB in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2011, and 2013;

(2) the League Championship Series Most Valuable Player Award from MLB in 2004;

(3) the Thomas A. Yawkey Most Valuable Player Award from the Boston Red Sox in 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2013;

(4) the Silver Slugger Award as a designated hitter from MLB in 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2011, and 2013;

(5) the designation of “All-Star” from MLB in 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2016;

(6) the Hank Aaron Award from MLB in 2005;

(7) the Roberto Clemente Award from MLB in 2011;

(8) the Babe Ruth Award from MLB in 2013; and

(9) the World Series Most Valuable Player Award in 2013;

Whereas David Ortiz’s “Why not us?” attitude in 2004 transformed the baseball culture of the city of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and “Red Sox Nation” from one of near misses to one of champions;

Whereas David Ortiz founded the David Ortiz Children’s Fund in 2007;

Whereas the David Ortiz Children’s Fund has provided millions of dollars of financial assistance to more than 500 children for life-saving surgeries;

Whereas on June 11, 2008, David Ortiz was sworn in as a citizen of the United States along with 226 other immigrants at the John F. Kennedy Library in Dorchester, Massachusetts;

Whereas David Ortiz instilled hope and pride in the city of Boston in the days following the bombings at the Boston Marathon in 2013;

Whereas on April 20, 2013, David Ortiz gave a rousing and inspirational speech after the Boston Marathon bombings, reminding Boston and the country that “nobody is going to dictate our freedom”;

Whereas David Ortiz comforted the victims of the Boston Marathon bombings, visiting them in the hospital and giving them tickets to games throughout the 2013 MLB season;

Whereas the city of Boston has honored David Ortiz for his impact on the city by naming a bridge and a street after him;

Whereas the love and respect for David Ortiz felt by the city of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and Red Sox Nation is unparalleled; and

Whereas David Ortiz played his final MLB game on October 10, 2016: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That Congress—

(1) honors the legendary career of David Américo Ortiz Arias, whose character, leadership, and selflessness have helped define the identity of the city of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and all of Red Sox Nation; and

(2) wishes David Ortiz a fulfilling retirement as he bids farewell to the baseball diamond.

## PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Stephanie DeLuca of my staff and to her service dog Karra.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kimberly Koops-Wrabek, Alexander Floyd, Jeremy Jones, and Justin Abbasi be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 26, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, June 26; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Svinicki nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

## HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, it has been a rough day at the office for the



Senate Republican healthcare plan, and my take is that it is going to be even tougher over the next few days. There will be a lot of Senate Democrats home, meeting with folks in open meetings. We will see if any Senate Republicans have the courage to do that as well.

Earlier this morning, the whole Senate had its first opportunity to look at this bill in the light of day. The debate that unfolded on the floor made it clear that our colleagues are committed to a partisan scheme to jam this bill through at any cost. There isn't going to be a full debate. There isn't going to be any bipartisan input.

If you read through the fine print in this destructive proposal, as the American people have had the chance to do over the last several hours, it becomes clear why my colleagues on the other side have kept this bill hidden and want to jam it through as quickly as possible.

This proposal is stunning in its sameness to the cruel House bill that the American people have rejected outright—in fact, rejected, according to polls, by really eye-popping numbers. So I want to begin by warning against anybody's buying into the sales job that is inevitably going to unfold in the days ahead. This bill may change, but Senate Republicans will only be putting lipstick on a devastating blow to the healthcare of the American people.

This is a plan to raise costs, slash Medicaid, and cut millions of people off of their healthcare to pay for tax breaks for the fortunate few.

My colleagues on the other side have spent the last month telling every reporter and constituent who would listen that they were throwing out the House bill and they would be starting anew with a fresher and kinder bill. That has turned out to be fiction. Republicans are going to keep telling Americans that they are fixing their healthcare right up until the second it gets taken away.

This bill doubles down on the meanness that even the President described in the bill from the other body. The Senate Republican plan doesn't fix the problems with people's healthcare. It creates a bunch of new ones.

After a day of pouring over this bill—and the Finance Committee Democratic staff has been looking at this in detail—I would like to lay out, as we close up this afternoon, some of the most devastating effects this bill will have.

First, Senate Republicans are so committed to slashing Medicaid that their bill cuts it even deeper than the House. Today, Medicaid comes with a guarantee to the most vulnerable Americans and their families who walk an economic tightrope every day. Today, if you get sick or suffer an injury, you will get the care you need.

The Senate Republican plan ends that guarantee for good. It ends the Medicaid program as our country knows it for good.

People shouldn't be distracted by date changes or sweeteners for people already enrolled. This is a radical plan plucked from the wish list of the far right, and it is cloaked in the complicated language of inflation rates and dollar figures. When you talk about slashing Medicaid by hundreds of billions of dollars, you are not simply talking about the lingo of healthcare policymakers, like bending the cost curve. You are talking about people's lives.

Medicaid helps to pick up the bill for two out of three seniors in America's nursing homes. These are the people who have done everything right. They are our older parents, our grandmothers, our grandfathers. They scrimped, they saved, and they worked hard. But it is pretty clear: It is really expensive to grow old in America. So Medicaid is there to support them and cover the cost of nursing home care when savings run out.

The Senate Republican plan slashes Medicaid so deeply that States are going to be forced to cut benefits, and the guarantee of nursing home care will be in danger. This is one of the greatest threats seniors have ever faced, and it is being imposed on them by an act of Congress.

I don't make that statement lightly. My background is working with the older people of Oregon and our country. I was director of the Oregon Gray Panthers for 7 years and ran the legal aid office for the elderly before I was elected to Congress. I will say point-blank, having worked in this field now for more than three decades, that this is an extraordinary threat to the well-being of the Nation's older people, who shouldn't have to worry about winding up living in squalor or on the street.

Families shouldn't have to worry about where they will find the money to cover the cost of a nursing home. That is \$90,000 a year—\$90,000 a year, on average, for nursing home care. Independence, safety, and a reasonably comfortable old age should not become a privilege reserved just for the wealthy in our country.

Second, the age tax in the Senate Republican bill is going to hit older Americans between 55 and 64 like a wrecking ball. They are going to be forced to pay several times as much as a younger person for health insurance. You are going to see older people desperately hoping and praying that they can hold on to their health until they make it to 65 and enroll in Medicare. I would like to hear somebody try to explain what healthcare problem that is fixing or why it is a good approach to healthcare policy.

Third, Senate Republicans have now cooked up a scheme to decimate the

value of middle-class tax cuts for healthcare and send deductibles into the stratosphere. Here is how that is going to work. A whole lot of families in the middle class are going to lose their tax benefits outright.

As the ranking member on the Senate Finance Committee that has jurisdiction over tax policy, I have seen that. Then, as if that is not enough harm, this plan cheapens the value of the tax benefits that were created under the Affordable Care Act. It is a scheme to force people into bargain basement insurance plans with sky-high deductibles. It also risks kicking off a death spiral in States where the private insurance markets are stable and competitive today.

Fourth, Republicans have twisted a part of the Affordable Care Act I wrote to promote State innovation, and they are using it to give insurance companies the power to run roughshod over individual Americans. What we are talking about here is what are called section 1332 waivers. What was done in 2009, in the Senate Finance Committee—it came out of my original bipartisan bill, the Healthy Americans Act—we told States that the Affordable Care Act was going to set a new bar for insurance in terms of coverage and affordability. We said to the States—the laboratories of democracy—if you believe you can do even better, you can get a waiver so you can go test an innovative, new approach. We did build in protections, basic protections, so people would get decent coverage, and their lives would be protected.

The Republican plan wipes those protections out, wipes out the consumer protections. It tells States: OK. If you want to do worse, go right ahead. In fact, the Senate Republican plan offers States a bribe to end basic health protections and lower the bar for insurance. You will see insurance companies given a green light to cut essential benefits out of the plans they sell on the open market.

For example, take maternity care. The Affordable Care Act banned the practice of price-gouging women just because of their gender, but the Republican plan takes the side of the big insurance companies in this debate.

On a fundamental level, this plan says that health insurance in America ought to be based on what men need and what women need ought to cost extra. Services like maternity care would be an add-on item, and that means women are going to face higher costs just because they are women.

Fifth, this proposal attacks Planned Parenthood and deprives hundreds of thousands of women of the right to see the doctor of their choosing.

I want to come back to what that really means. Women in America ought to be able to see the doctor of their choice, the doctor they trust, the doctor, in their own judgment, is the best

doctor for them. This provision keeps them from doing that. Never mind that there is already an air-tight ban on taxpayer dollars funding abortions. Never mind that Planned Parenthood doesn't get a single dime of Federal funding above what is available to other Medicaid providers. Never mind that Planned Parenthood is where millions of women get routine medical care from doctors they know and trust—services such as basic checkups, cancer screenings, preventive care, HIV tests. The Senate Republican bill continues this ideological crusade against Planned Parenthood, and it is going to cost women across this country the right that I see as so fundamental—the right of women to be able to choose to go to the doctor they trust.

Sixth, at a time when the opioid epidemic is ripping apart communities from one corner of this Nation to another, this bill would be a devastating setback in the fight against opioid abuse. No community has been spared from this crisis, and I would wager that virtually every Senator has come to the floor at some point and spoken about the impact it has had on their State.

By the way, it would be hard to forget the parade of Presidential candidates in 2015 and 2016 that went through State after State claiming they had the very best plan to end the opioid crisis, but now the Senate Republican healthcare bill makes the crisis worse.

Medicaid is the only lifeline that thousands and thousands of people across America have in their struggle to try to put their lives back together after falling victim to opioids. For thousands and thousands of people, over the last few years, the treatment they have gotten through Medicaid has been their escape, their path out of a downward spiral that too often leads to heroin abuse and overdose deaths. The Republican plan takes this lifeline away.

Some on the other side have proposed creating a separate pool of money, a separate slush fund to replace the loss of treatment through Medicaid. In my view, this is a very serious mistake because it is based on a complete misunderstanding of the opioid crisis, and it is not going to work.

The opioid epidemic is a public health crisis, and fighting it means making sure people can get the healthcare they need. That means treating substance abuse disorders the same way you treat other diseases. Our country doesn't pay for heart surgery through grant programs. We don't pay for chemotherapy through congressional appropriations. If you are sick and you have healthcare coverage, you get the care you need. Anything less when it comes to opioid addiction treatment is going to fail.

Finally, when you listen to that parade of horrors—all the harm this bill

is going to do to generations of Americans across the country—you have to wonder why my colleagues on the other side would push this bill forward.

People have been asking me this all day. There is a simple answer for it. This bill takes healthcare away from millions of Americans and raises costs for millions more for one reason—to give tax breaks to the fortunate few in America. This isn't a debate about two competing visions of healthcare—one liberal and one conservative. One side in this debate wants to protect Americans' healthcare coverage, make sure they can go to the doctors they trust and afford the medical care they need. The other side in this debate has a plan to take away healthcare coverage and raise the cost of care for the vulnerable, the middle class, families struggling to get by—all to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest few. This is an out-and-out attack on millions of Americans' health and well-being.

In the debate that played out on the Senate floor this morning, it was suggested several times that Democrats turned down a chance to participate in the process. This is completely, entirely 100 percent false.

I am the ranking member of the committee that is responsible for healthcare. I have not once been asked by a single Republican to work on this bill or discuss fixes to the Affordable Care Act. I was stunned this morning when I heard the Democrats had been given an offer to work on these fixes; that Democrats aren't interested in being bipartisan.

I have made the center of my time in public service working in a bipartisan way on healthcare. I have written healthcare legislation that has been signed into law that has been bipartisan. It was based on principles that both sides of the aisle could agree on. Certainly, if there had been any interest in a process that would actually give both sides the opportunity to do the kind of give-and-take that you do with a bill—not through this partisan “my way or the highway” reconciliation—I would have been very interested in it, and I know Senate Finance Democrats would have been very interested in it. That wasn't on offer. The claim the Democrats have refused to work in a bipartisan way is fiction, a gross fiction.

It is clear now that the only way to bring this partisan process to a halt is for Americans to stand up and speak out. I am going to close with two points. Ever since those Gray Panther days, I have always thought healthcare was the most important issue because if Americans and their loved ones don't have their health, then pretty much everything goes by the board. You can't go to the game. You can't spend time with family. It is hard to do much of anything.

It is very clear that healthcare, as a result of this proposal for millions of

Americans and for our country, is going to be at risk. What is at risk is the prospect that the Senate will turn back the clock to those days when healthcare was basically for the healthy and wealthy. We shouldn't go there.

In the past, Democrats and Republicans have agreed we shouldn't go there. With the bill I wrote—seven Democratic Senators, seven Republican Senators—that was the centerpiece of it. By the way, several Senate Republicans who are here in this body were cosponsors of that legislation. We shouldn't go back to those days when healthcare was basically for the healthy and wealthy.

For all those who are paying attention to these proceedings, my view is, the only way you are going to end a partisan process and make policy the way it ought to be made is not through something Washington lingo calls reconciliation—it is just partisan—but through the give-and-take of Democrats and Republicans finding good ideas that the other side can agree on. The only way we are going to do that is for Americans to stand up and speak out.

Political change does not start in government buildings and then trickle down to the people. It is not trickle-down. It is almost always bottom-up, starting from communities where we are going to hear people speaking out over the next few days.

I am going to close by way of saying that over the next few days, this is one of the most important times for Americans to make their voices heard. As we wrap up the first day of actually seeing what the draft Republican proposal is all about, I hope Americans will weigh in, that we will see that grassroots juggernaut develop, and we will defeat a partisan plan and set about the task of doing healthcare policy again in a bipartisan way—where you find common ground that is sustainable rather than just a partisan approach, which continues the gridlock and the polarization on an issue that is the most important issue of our time.

I yield the floor. I believe there are no other speakers.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
JUNE 26, 2017, AT 4 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 26, 2017, at 4 p.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601 AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD D. CLARKE

## CONFIRMATIONS

### Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22, 2017:

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

MARSHALL BILLINGSLEA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TERRORIST FINANCING, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. RONALD J. PLACE

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. WILLIAM C. GREENE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. WILLIAM S. DILLON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. KARL O. THOMAS

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. JAY B. SILVERIA

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. SAMUEL J. PAPARO, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. GREGORY N. HARRIS

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. JOHN P. LAWLOR, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. DION B. MOTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. BOWLMAN T. BOWLES III

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) DANIEL J. MACDONNELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) DANIEL B. HENDRICKSON

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS W. MAROTTA

REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW A. ZIRKLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. JACQUELYN MCCLELLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. JAMES M. BUTLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. EUGENE A. BURCHER

CAPT. RODNEY P. DEWALT

CAPT. JOEY B. DODGEN

CAPT. ANDREW J. MUELLER

CAPT. RICHARD A. RODRIGUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) KEITH M. JONES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) BRET C. BATCHELDER

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. DEANNA M. BURT

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN R. HOGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. JANSON D. BOYLES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. STEVEN W. AINSWORTH

BRIG. GEN. BRUCE E. HACKETT

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL C. O'GUINN

BRIG. GEN. MIYAKO N. SCHANELY

*To be brigadier general*

COL. JOHN W. AARSEN

COL. KRIS A. BELANGER

COL. DOUGLAS A. CHERRY

COL. ELLEN S. CLARK

COL. ROBERT S. COOLEY, JR.

COL. DIANNE M. DEL ROSSO

COL. WILLIAM B. DYER III

COL. JOSEPH A. EDWARDS II

COL. HOWARD-CHARLES W. GECK

COL. MICHAEL T. HARVEY

COL. MARTIN F. KLEIN

COL. WILLIAM S. LYNN

COL. JOSEPH A. MARSIGLIA

COL. ROBERT F. PLECZKOWSKI

COL. DUSTIN A. SHULTZ

COL. MARK A. TOWNE

COL. IRENE M. ZOPPI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. GREGORY L. KENNEDY

BRIG. GEN. ANDREW P. SCHAFER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER P. CALLAHAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. JAMES P. BEGLEY III

BRIG. GEN. SYLVESTER CANNON

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS M. CARDEN, JR.

BRIG. GEN. RICHARD H. DAHLMAN

BRIG. GEN. WENDUL G. HAGLER II

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT T. HERBERT

BRIG. GEN. JON A. JENSEN

BRIG. GEN. JOHN F. KING

BRIG. GEN. DIRK R. KLOSS

BRIG. GEN. FRANCIS M. MCGINN

BRIG. GEN. WALTER L. MERCER

BRIG. GEN. PAUL D. ROGERS

BRIG. GEN. SEAN A. RYAN

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. STONE

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL C. THOMPSON

BRIG. GEN. GISELLE M. WILZ

BRIG. GEN. GARY S. YAPLE

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) ANN M. BURKHARDT

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. SCOTT A. HOWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. JAMES C. VECHERY

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS A. HORLANDER

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. ANDREW L. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. MATTHEW J. KOHLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be vice admiral*

VICE ADM. KEVIN M. DONEGAN

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT F. HEDELUND

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be admiral*

VICE ADM. JAMES G. FOGGO III

## IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JERED N. FRY, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. BONEY AND ENDING WITH DANIEL D. REYES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JEFFREY A. GARRETT, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROGER A. LEE AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY R. ROSENBERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF THEADORE L. WILSON, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JASON S. CROSS, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ANGELA M. MIKE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW V. CHAUVIERE AND ENDING WITH LAUREN A. MAY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. BRUHN AND ENDING WITH VICTOR D. WEEDEN, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY W. DRAKE AND ENDING WITH JACK VILARDI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MEGAN E. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH RAJEV S. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOSE G. BAL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

## IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER M. BAGER AND ENDING WITH RAMEY L. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 27, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALFRED C. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH KELLEY TOMSETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 27, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM F. MCCLINTOCK, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID S. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH BARRY K. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JEFFREY L. WASHINGTON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH B. DORE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER M. CHUNG AND ENDING WITH HEATH D. HOLT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEVIN G. MCCANE AND ENDING WITH SHARRI L. ORMSBEE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JANNA X. GADDY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADLEY H. STEPHENS AND ENDING WITH AMILYN M. TAPLIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TERRY KIM, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFF A. BURCHFIELD AND ENDING WITH BRIAN D. WIECK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2017.

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JASON K. FETTING, TO BE COLONEL.

## IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JUANITO F. BOYDON, JR. AND ENDING WITH SURESH K. THADHANI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 8, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY L. BAYUNGAN AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. LEACHMAN,

WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 8, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD M. BOLAND AND ENDING WITH KAIL C. SWINDLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 8, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH CHARLES C. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 8, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHAWN G. DENIHAN AND ENDING WITH CHAD A. RUNYON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 8, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KELVIN J. ASKEW AND ENDING WITH ERIKA L. BERRY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 8, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KATHLEEN A. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER FRYE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 8, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRUCE E. OSBORNE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COLETTE M. MURPHY AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. ROBINSON III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATHAN R. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JODIE M. C. YIM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ADRIA R. SCHNECK, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY A. PONCE AND ENDING WITH BRIAN K. REED, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RYAN K. MAHELONA AND ENDING WITH PHILIP L. NOTZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH T. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH JONPAUL STEFANI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DAVID W. SHAEIB, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LEE A. AXTELL AND ENDING WITH MARK S. WINWARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS M. BESTAFKA AND ENDING WITH FRANCIS J. STAVISH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DANNY W. KING, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BABAK A. BARAKAT AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN M. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. ALLANSON AND ENDING WITH GERARD J. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW L. BERAN AND ENDING WITH IAN S. WEXLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARLAND H. ANDREWS AND ENDING WITH MEREDITH L. YEAGER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH OLADAPO A. AKINTONDE AND ENDING WITH SEAN R. WISE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFF A. BLEILE AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY G. ZELLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GRADY G. DUFFEY, JR. AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. VONDRAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM M. KAFKA AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM R. URBAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL E. FILLION AND ENDING WITH JASON D. WEDDLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAMON B. DIXON AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN J. VORRATH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES W. ADKISSON III AND ENDING WITH SHERRI R. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CORY S. BRUMMETT AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE M. ALFIERI AND ENDING WITH BRETT A. WISE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW E. ARNOLD AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY C. TARANTO, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PETER A. ARROBIO AND ENDING WITH KEVIN J. WATKINS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN A. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JAY A. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAWRENCE H. KENNEDY AND ENDING WITH TRACIE A. SEVERSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSE G. HERMANDEZ AND ENDING WITH DEREK A. VESTAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. ABERNATHY AND ENDING WITH JESSE J. ZIMBAUER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KENNETH M. KING, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GARRY P. CLOSAS, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL D. MELVEY AND ENDING WITH ALEXANDER WOLDEMARIAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM J. BAILEY, JR. AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER D. TUCKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GINA A. BUONO AND ENDING WITH SANDRA F. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH TRACIE M. ZIELINSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID M. BUZZETTI AND ENDING WITH ERIC R. VETTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID E. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER J. STEWART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN R. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH MARY C. WISE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SEAN A. COX AND ENDING WITH LUIS A. PEREZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELIZABETH W. BUNDT AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL G. WATSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MIGUEL A. SANTIESTEBAN, TO BE COMMANDER.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 22, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 22, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### HIGHLIGHTING THE IMPORTANCE OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which will be considered on the floor this afternoon.

I proudly championed this bill, because I truly believe that passing it will be a win for the American worker and for American families.

Mr. Speaker, America is ready for a win.

First, I would like to thank the House Education and Workforce Committee Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX and Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT for their support in bringing this bill to the floor. I want to thank the Democratic lead, Representative RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY; and my colleague and CTE Caucus co-chair, JIM LANGEVIN.

I also want to thank House leadership, including Conference Chairwoman

CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Speaker PAUL RYAN, and Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, who remains in all of our prayers for a full recovery.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation aims to restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity, because all Americans deserve a good-paying, family-sustaining job.

One of the biggest challenges facing career and technical education is the stigma, or the bias, associated with it.

Through the years, we have seen wrong-headed claims that students involved in the trades lacked ambition. These misplaced assumptions are slowly subsiding, but not soon enough. We have also seen students pushed down the college-for-all pathway that just doesn't work for some students.

CTE, or skills-based education, has established itself as a path that many high-achieving students choose in pursuit of industry certifications and hands-on skills they can use right out of high school in skills-based education programs or in college.

By modernizing the Federal investment in CTE programs, we will be able to connect more educators with industry stakeholders and close the skills gap that exists in this country. There are good jobs out there, but people need to be qualified and trained to be able to get them.

Mr. Speaker, we have all met young people who haven't been inspired in a traditional classroom setting. We all know people who have lost jobs or are underemployed and are looking for good-paying, family-sustaining jobs. We all know people who are aspiring for a promotion, but keep falling short year after year. We all know people who are living in poverty. Maybe their families have been living in poverty for generations, for so long, they can't remember what put them there in the first place. This bill is for every one of these people.

We have heard the voices of those struggling to find the opportunities that they need to get ahead, the voices of those struggling to make ends meet. We have seen their frustration. Many are stuck in a job market that transformed quickly due to advancements in technology, and they have been left behind.

This bill will change that. It puts emphasis on advancing policies that promote good-paying jobs, and I look forward to the House passing it this afternoon. I urge my colleagues to support the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century

Act so everyone from all walks of life can have the opportunity to succeed. It is the American way.

### THE HYPE OF STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, so the ruling party in Puerto Rico staged an election, and they are very proud of the results. They say 97 percent of Puerto Ricans support statehood and that the United States should grant statehood right away because of it.

Yeah, they got 97 percent of the vote. That is pretty impressive; the kind of numbers that would make Putin jealous and Saddam Hussein green with envy if he weren't dead already.

The reason why the statehooders got 97 percent of the vote was pretty much the same reason those two guys got 97 percent of the vote: only one political party participated.

All the other parties thought the election was so rigged and so predetermined for the outcome the sponsors wanted that they didn't even think it was worth participating.

The vast majority of Puerto Ricans agree. Only 23 percent of the people voted. Seventy-seven percent boycotted the election because they didn't think it was worth their time; and they were absolutely right, but I guess in the era of alternative facts and made-up statistics about how many people attend your inauguration, you can try to make a one-party vote of 23 percent of the people look like a mandate for statehood. But I am here to warn my fellow Democrats not to believe the hype for one second.

Those who are peddling the fantasy of statehood sometimes call themselves Democrats, but we should be aware of an elephant in donkey's clothing.

Let's look at leaders of the statehood party here in Washington. Our colleague, the Resident Commissioner who ran on the statehood ticket, is a Republican who caucuses with the Republicans here in the House. She is a proud supporter of Donald Trump and pals around with STEVE KING and other Members who we might say aren't too friendly to Latinos and Latino causes, much less the Democratic Party line.

The Governor's Washington, D.C., office is headed by a Republican, Carlos Mercader, who was appointed to the position by Governor Rossello after serving as executive director of the right-wing political organization called

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, infamous for its constant bashing, yes, of President Obama.

That is who is pushing statehood in D.C., which makes me wonder why any Democrat would be embracing them, especially the chairman of the DNC, unless, of course, as the media reports, it is a payback for votes for DNC chairmanship.

And as for Governor Ricardo Rossello, leader of the statehood party, the "Democrat," his conservative record speaks for itself, even though he has only been in office for less than a year.

As a candidate, he sided with the bondholders and vulture capital funds and opposed any debt restructuring for Puerto Rico, saying that Puerto Rico should pay its debt in full to Wall Street speculators, in spite of massive cuts that that would entail for police, fire, health, pensions, roads, and schools.

He hosted, yes, a Democrat, the GOP Presidential candidate, Ben Carson; and the Governor opposes LGBT rights, including same-sex marriage, and opposes the teaching of gender equality in the schools.

Townhall, the uber conservative website, sees a kindred spirit in Governor Rossello, the Democrat, praising him for his conservative approach to helping bondholders over schoolchildren. And the Governor has withheld his criticism of President Trump, which few Democrats are able to resist, and for Latino Democrats is darn near impossible unless you are just playing the Democratic role to get ahead.

When confronted with the obvious, that Trump has denigrated Mexicans as rapists and murderers, promised to build a wall to keep Latinos out, and sneered at Puerto Rico's desire for what Donald Trump called a bailout, Rossello responded, saying of the President: "My view is I don't know that he is anti-Latino. Obviously, I have heard some derogatory remarks, but I don't know him personally, and it doesn't deter me."

So instead of spending money to help children whose schools are closing, to fix roads that are falling apart, or to pay doctors enough to prevent them from leaving Puerto Rico and going to Florida, it seems the entire Puerto Rican government is now dedicated to pursuing the unlikely chance of statehood.

It is certainly useful as a distraction from what the Governor and his D.C. operatives are actually doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this before: I hope to be buried one day on that beautiful island of Puerto Rico. But when I am buried, I hope it happens in a free, sovereign nation that has thrown off the yoke of colonialism and dependence on an overseas master, just as this country did, the United States of America, the country in which I was born.

I look forward to celebrating the Fourth of July. In the meantime, I think it is important to warn my fellow Democrats that they should get no more in bed with the statehooders than with any other group of rightwing conservatives with an agenda.

#### THE HOUSE SHOULD DEBATE THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am again on the floor to talk about a waste of life, a waste of money in Afghanistan. We have been there 16 years, and nothing has changed. Many of my colleagues agree with me that it is time to debate our country's longest war.

In response, I, along with JOHN GARAMENDI from California, have introduced H.R. 1666 in hopes of forcing that discussion. I am not asking for Members or leadership to agree with the bill itself or even vote for it, but I am asking that we be able to bring to the floor of the House the bill for the purpose of a debate.

We have not debated our role in Afghanistan since 2001. Members can either vote for or against the bill; just give the House a debate after 16 years.

Afghanistan is a failed policy. I would like to share a few sentences of an email I received this week from a great American, my friend and unofficial adviser, the 31st Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, General Chuck Krulak, regarding his thoughts on Afghanistan:

"Sixteen years we have been involved in Afghanistan . . . 16 years fighting in a country that has really never seen peace. Sixteen years with fluctuating troop strength—100,000 to 5,000—with no definition to who we are fighting—al-Qaida, Taliban or ISIS . . . you pick 'em—with no strategy, no strong reason for entering the fray, no real measure of effectiveness, no use of the five elements of national power, no support from the people themselves, a weak government, and no exit strategy, and fighting a war that is unwinnable in any real sense of the word."

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing when the President, the Commander in Chief, abdicates the responsibility of increasing the number of troops in Afghanistan to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Mattis.

There is more reason today than ever before to have a debate on the future of Afghanistan. That is the reason why Speaker RYAN should instruct committees in the House to come forward with a new Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Where is the Congress? Don't we have a congressional responsibility to debate war if we are going to send a parent's young man or woman to die for this country?

I think we do have that responsibility.

In closing, I am going to share another quote from General Krulak, the former Commandant of the Marine Corps:

"I go back to what I have always said . . . back years ago. Afghanistan cannot be viewed through the lens of a true nation-state or as a true country. It is fragmented . . . tribal . . . controlled by war lords, economically a basket case, no real government outside of Kabul, and that is questionable, a poorly organized and led Army who will shoot at Americans as well as the 'enemy,' and no sense of what the country wants to be. No one has ever conquered Afghanistan . . . and many have tried. We will join the list of nations that have tried and failed. Afghanistan is the origin of 'whack a mole,' whether it is al-Qaida, ISIS, or the Taliban. You can't beat them in a geographic area . . . they will just pop up someplace else."

Mr. Speaker, that is why many of us in this Congress, in both parties, feel that we have an obligation to our young men and women in uniform.

I have beside me a photo of a flag-draped coffin being taken off a plane at Dover. My question is this: How many more flag-draped coffins are we going to see when we increase the number of troops in Afghanistan without one word from Congress—not one word?

Mr. Speaker, we do owe it to the American people who pay their taxes, we do owe it to the parents whose young men and women will go and die for America. We do owe it to have a debate on the floor of the House. It has been 16 years since we have had a debate.

God help America and, please, God bless America.

#### AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, like in anyone's office, the photos and trinkets on display in mine tell a little bit about who I am: a wedding photo, a picture of me and my family on our swearing-in day, a copy of the first bill I had signed into law, the moments that I am proud of, the pieces of me that I want to share with the world.

In this body, the people's House is no different. We have always been proud of our democracy and even prouder to display it for all the world to see. That is why we keep these cameras on whenever we are in session. It is why every single word that is uttered on this floor is documented and preserved long after the day we draw our last breath. It is why we walk beside Americans of all backgrounds and beliefs through the rotunda with the same awe of our Nation's history embodied in bronze statues and bold paintings. It is why every

single night this building glows through the darkness; because the light of democracy not only lays bare our divisions and dissent, but it lights a path to our proudest moments.

In times of war and peace, fights over civil rights and equality, our debates in these halls have always been driven by a fierce conviction of our beliefs and a shared vision of a kinder, stronger country. Disagreements, yes, but enlightened by ideals, by vision, by a shared commitment to our American experiment.

And when you stand behind those principles and your policies, you welcome that spotlight; you engage in that debate; you are eager to answer questions; you are ready to be held accountable.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we should all be concerned by what has transpired in our Capitol over the course of the past few weeks. For if you are proud of your legislation, you don't lock it behind closed doors; you don't shield it from the very people that are going to be hurt most by it; you don't turn off the cameras and then call it mean; you don't sabotage a healthcare system and leave a wake of devastation and destruction to score political points.

Drafting TrumpCare under the cover of darkness is an admission that this bill cannot—cannot—withstand the sunlight of our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the America that I know would never turn its back on a friend or a stranger in need. TrumpCare does.

The America that I know doesn't tell the sick, the elderly, or the frail that you are on your own. TrumpCare does.

The America that I know doesn't tell the young woman struggling through an opioid recovery that your next relapse, well, that one was one too many. TrumpCare does.

The America that I know understands that our greatness comes from our goodness; that we lean into challenges, you don't yield to them; that the frustration that we see in our streets and our communities is a cry for our government to be as good and as decent as the people we aim to serve. They, we, deserve nothing less. TrumpCare is not that cure.

#### IN MEMORY OF A.A. "GUS" KARLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the remarkable life of Mr. "Gus" Karle of Waycross, Georgia, who passed away on Sunday, May 7, 2017.

From a young age, Mr. Karle was deeply interested in trains and railways. In 1939, he skipped school to visit his local train station, where he landed his first job at the young age of 12,

working as an assistant porter, responsible for loading and unloading train passengers.

After graduating from Wabash College in Indiana, he went on to start a career in railroad industry design and construction, working as an administrator for nearly 40 years.

Mr. Karle's career was extremely important to the economic development of the City of Waycross, Georgia, by way of his involvement in the design of Rice Yard, one of the busiest CSX rail crossroads in the Nation. Rice Yard serves as a daily transfer point for nearly 3,000 rail cars and remains one of the city's biggest employers, staffed by nearly 1,300 people from Ware and surrounding counties.

Mr. Karle retired from CSX Railroad in 2016. Last year, former CSX president, Clarence Gooden, whom Mr. Karle hired and trained in 1970, proclaimed every November 16 "A.A. 'Gus' Karle Day" in commemoration of Mr. Karle's hard work with the company.

Mr. Karle is a legend around Waycross. I want to thank him and his family for everything that he did to make Waycross and the First Congressional District of Georgia what it is today.

#### IN REMEMBRANCE OF MRS. NAN THOMPSON MILLER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mrs. Nan Thompson Miller, who passed away on Saturday, June 10, at the age of 89, and was laid to rest last week in Dublin, Georgia.

Mrs. Miller worked hard during her long life, selflessly serving others through a profession she loved.

At the age of 17, Mrs. Miller joined the United States Army Nurse Corps and attended the University of Georgia to study nursing, where she was a member of the last graduating class to receive their RN degrees.

Following the war, Mrs. Miller put her training to work with the Naval Hospital in Dublin, where she eventually rose to the position of head nurse before retiring in 1983.

As a young nurse, Mrs. Miller met the late George Anderson Miller, to whom she was married for 55 years. The Millers were active members of their community that helped form the Pine Forest United Methodist Church. Mrs. Miller was also a member of the Pilot Club of Dublin, the Order of the Blarney Stone, and the American Nurses Association.

Today, I have the pleasure of working with Mrs. Miller's granddaughter, Brooke. I can say from my own experience that Brooke's commitment to public service and dedication to our constituents is a wonderful testament to the legacy of her grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members will join me; my wife, Amy; and my staff in sending our thoughts and prayers to the Miller family as they remember

the life and legacy of Mrs. Nan Thompson Miller.

#### GEORGIA PRESS ASSOCIATION AWARD RECIPIENT, KATHLEEN RUSSELL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Kathleen Russell, from Darien, Georgia, who received the President's Award on behalf of the Georgia Press Association on Friday, June 2, 2017.

Ms. Russell's strong dedication to her role as longtime editor of The Darien News makes her worthy of such an honor. Each year, an individual who has exhibited outstanding leadership abilities and who serves as an innovator in Georgia's media industry is named a recipient of this prestigious award.

For generations, members of Ms. Russell's family have worked in the press, and it is only fitting that Ms. Russell would find herself working as a journalist.

Constituents remember Ms. Russell's beloved father, Mr. Charles Williamson, as a journalist who stood up to wrongdoers in McIntosh County, exposing corruption and theft by a multitude of former county officials.

As a child, Kathleen assisted her parents in the production of the weekly newspaper. During that time, her parents nurtured her love for the press.

After graduating from the University of Georgia in 1974, Ms. Russell began a career as an educator. She left education in pursuit of a career as a journalist and assumed the role of associate editor of The Darien News. In 2009, Ms. Russell was honored for her hard work when she was named publisher and editor of the newspaper.

Ms. Russell has remained an active member of McIntosh County, serving on several boards over the years, including the Division of Family and Children Services, Darien Downtown Development Authority, and the College of Coastal Georgia Foundation.

Ms. Russell, I applaud your efforts to keep the citizens of Georgia's First Congressional District in tune with current events throughout our State and country.

#### TRIBUTE TO COOK COUNTY COMMISSIONER ROBERT STEELE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, I was saddened to know of the passing of Cook County Commissioner and President Pro Tem Robert Steele, whom I have known since his childhood days. As a matter of fact, I lived in the same neighborhood with the Steele family from the year that Commissioner Robert Steele was born.

I count myself as a Steele family friend and have worked with Bob's



mother, Bobbie, since the late 1960s. His father, Robert, was a mentor to my son Stacey.

I had the pleasure of watching Commissioner Steele grow from a child into becoming an adult and an outstanding local and national leader.

Commissioner Steele was so much more than a man with a title. He was part of the glue which held his community together. He was a big brother to neighborhood boys whom he often took with him to events and activities. He was a mentor and an inspiration to those who came into contact with him. He was a great advocate for organ donation and transplantation. You see, he was a recipient from his sister, who gave him a kidney.

He was an Omega man, a great frat brother, and he was a leader of the West Side and countywide Black elected officials. He meant the world to his family and brought great pride and joy to his parents, Robert and former Cook County Board President Bobbie Steele.

Robert Steele was an absolute leader who provided leadership and guidance on a regular basis wherever he went. He was active in his church, in his community, in his neighborhood. He was intelligent, astute, and not afraid.

Of all the people that I have known who come from the West Side of Chicago as elected officials, none has brought more to the table than Bob, except, perhaps, his mother, Bobbie.

Our community will long remember the work of Cook County Commissioner Bobbie Steele. Perhaps the songwriter was correct when he said that "the good die young." Bob was indeed young, but he was a leader among leaders and a man among men.

I salute you, Commissioner Robert Steele, and long may your life, your work, and your legacy continue.

#### REMEMBERING FLOOD OF JUNE 23, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, on June 23, 2016, we experienced one of the darkest days in West Virginia's history.

Floodwaters raced through small towns without warning, washing away homes, washing away businesses, and, yes, washing away lives. Twenty-three souls were lost, while thousands were left without shelter and food.

Now as we approach the 1-year anniversary of this tragic event, we pause to remember those we lost and honor their lives. We reflect on how our communities changed over this past year. We pledge to continue rebuilding until our towns and our cities are better than they were before the rivers rose.

We have seen so many examples of strength, faith, and hope in this past

year, examples that carry us forward and inspire us all. More work remains to be done. We still have churches, schools, libraries, and other community centers that need to be rebuilt, replaced, and restocked. Many are still in temporary and rental housing. The scars still remain.

But the message that we should carry forward is the one that carried us through this terrible event: the knowledge that West Virginians will always have each other's backs. We are stronger when we stand united than when we stand alone.

Through everything that lies ahead, we will stay strong. We will thank those who put their lives on the line to help rescue others. We will remember and honor those whom we lost, and we will continue to offer our support to those who are rebuilding their lives. That is what we do as neighbors. That is what we do as friends. That is what we do as West Virginians.

□ 1030

#### NEW HEALTHCARE BILL IS ONLY GOOD FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, we watched President Donald Trump and Speaker PAUL RYAN ram their healthcare bill through the House of Representatives before it even had a cost analysis.

It didn't take long for us to learn why. It will strip over 20 million Americans of affordable healthcare. It will drive up premiums and out-of-pocket expenses for older Americans by as much as 25 percent. It will allow insurance companies to discriminate against pregnant women, children, and seniors. And this is all so Donald Trump can give a tax break to his wealthiest friends.

Mr. Speaker, this healthcare bill will literally be a death sentence to some Americans. House Republicans had years—let me say that again—had years to come up with ways to make healthcare more affordable. But instead, they would rather pull the plug out from millions of families who put their healthcare in the hands of the insurance companies.

Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, nearly 40,000 of my constituents have enrolled in Covered California, and nearly 200,000 in San Bernardino County, our residents, have been added to Medi-Cal following the ACA expansion. TrumpCare will end Medicaid and leave millions of Americans without coverage.

Children will be stripped of their coverage because their parents will fall into an income bracket that doesn't satisfy our President. This legislation isn't just bad, it is detestable. Accord-

ing to Donald Trump, it is even mean. Though, apparently, it doesn't matter how mean it is for middle class families as long as it gives tax breaks to his wealthy friends.

And now, Senate Republicans have taken a page out of the House Republican playbook and are writing their healthcare bill in secret. This is not how we govern. This is not what the American people expect.

#### SUPPORT CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my full support for H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

For more than 30 years, Federal funding, known as Perkins funding, has helped support career and technical education programs at the State and local level. This legislation reauthorizes that funding and makes needed improvements to ensure Perkins dollars are spent efficiently and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I am a big believer in career tech programs for three simple reasons: They help prepare students for rewarding careers; they ensure American workers have the tools necessary for skilled trades that are foundational to our society; and they boost our economy by providing a quality workforce.

When it comes to higher education, we all know that there has been a silent stigma attached to not completing an academic degree at a 4-year university. For years, we were afraid to say that college isn't for everybody, when the truth is, career tech programs can actually lead many Americans to better quality of life.

Thankfully, I believe those days are over. Efforts like Mike Rowe's "Go Build Alabama" campaign has been tremendously successful in raising awareness and dispelling myths about the jobs that exist in skilled trades. This rising generation is showing signs of being more entrepreneurial, with a willingness to work outside the box. Our programs have greatly improved over the years to offer training for careers our students are actually interested in.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Alabama is blessed with a strong network of community colleges offering a wide array of career training. Alabama Community College System has more than 79,000 students enrolled in CTE programs, and over 70 public high schools in Alabama are now offering CTE courses. They are working hand in glove with industry to make sure that the training matches the jobs that will be waiting for students when they complete their courses.

I visited one such program recently in Tallassee, a small town in central

Alabama. Tallassee High School administrators have worked tirelessly to build a program that serves the growing needs of local students. The city and county are working together to improve facilities and make sure students have access to transportation.

Up until now, students in Tallassee have had to take a bus 30 minutes away to Wetumpka, or even an hour away to Montgomery to Trenholm State, to access these career tech courses. Now, thanks to the hard work of Tallassee's leaders and educators, students are beginning to access these programs right in their own hometown.

I visited another thriving career-type program a few months ago in Geneva, a small town in Alabama's Wiregrass region. Geneva High School has partnered with the Alabama National Guard, whose local armory serves as a training site for high-demand skills, such as automotive technology, welding, aviation maintenance, and health science. Students from city and county schools can get ahead on their college coursework via dual enrollment with Lurleen B. Wallace Community College or Enterprise State.

Geneva and Tallassee are not alone in their commitment to our students. Dothan's Wallace Community College offers training in 16 high-demand career fields. Wallace takes their programs to the next level by combining traditional study with hands-on experience. Their criminal justice program, for example, utilizes a virtual law enforcement training simulator, the only of its kind on an Alabama college campus.

These programs serve as a model, not only for the State of Alabama but for the Nation as a whole. Their successes demonstrate the potential career-type programs hold.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is so much more than just funding. It makes important improvements to our career tech policy, including: simplifying the application process that community and State leaders have to navigate in order to receive Federal funds; providing more flexibility to administrators so they can adjust to the needs of the students and the industry; improving accountability and transparency to ensure that the programs that we are funding actually deliver results; and, lastly, ensuring a limited Federal role in education, just as we did in the new K-12 law.

Mr. Speaker, with the modern workplace changing at a rapid pace, it is imperative that educators and facilities keep up. With this bill, these programs can continue to successfully connect today's students with the careers of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to take the next step in career and technical education today. The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will

help equip our students with skills, knowledge, and experience they need to start their careers.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this legislation and support our future workforce.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF PHILANDO CASTILE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a public servant taken from us too soon; an individual who, through his life and example, inspired others, especially children, to be respectful and kind; a man who lived his life in service to others, Philando Castile.

In recent days, his name has been back in the headlines, but I want to talk about the person behind the stories. I want to talk about a man failed by our creed of liberty and justice for all. Philando Castile was the beloved nutrition services supervisor at J.J. Hill Montessori Magnet School, who was so invested in the young people he served, that he memorized the names and food allergies of more than 500 students.

One of his coworkers said: Kids loved him. He was quiet, respectful, and kind. I knew him as warm and funny.

Another said: He was as much a teacher as any teacher in that building.

His life was an example of living honorably for your community, for your family, and for the more than 500 students who loved him. Even in his final moments, he showed respect and dignity in what must have been a terrifying experience.

Mr. Castile's loss is our loss. He lived life as we all should: loving and respecting those around him. When he was told by an officer to get his ID, he complied and respectfully informed the officer that he was lawfully carrying a concealed firearm; that he had a valid permit. When he went to get his ID, as ordered, he was shot—not once, but seven times—not because of non-compliance, not because he was violent, not because he was a menacing threat. What killed him was his Blackness, or, more precisely, fear of his Blackness killed him.

Tragically, his story is not unique. This happens every day to Black men and women in America. Philando's story only made headlines because it was live-streamed on Facebook and showed a 4-year-old girl sitting behind him as seven rounds were emptied into his chest. A 4-year-old girl, that even Philando's murderer said "was in my line of fire."

Mr. Speaker, this murder was so downright outrageous that it led *The Federalist*, a publication that previously published an article on how

Black Lives Matter protests were destroying America, to call the not-guilty verdict an abomination.

Indeed, this is an abomination and a complete miscarriage of justice. The *Federalist* and I see eye to eye on this one thing. Groups in the center, on the right, on the left, have publicly and vocally condemned his murder, except for one: the National Rifle Association. The NRA's silence is sickening, deafening, and very hypocritical in this tragic American hour. For decades, the NRA has used fearmongering to claim that they are the sole organization fighting to protect the rights of every American to carry a firearm.

Where were they for Philando? Where is their outrage? Where is their stand for Philando's freedoms and rights? Where is their demand for better police training when dealing with citizens authorized to carry a firearm?

Shame, they have no outrage at this verdict. Shame for their double standard in supporting people with valid concealed-carry permits. They offer nothing but a tepid Facebook statement expressing concern.

Concern? The NRA has concern for Philando? Shame on the NRA. For them, it clearly isn't about rights for all. For NRA members who don't fit the right profile, they should give serious thought to even being members of the NRA.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Kevin Kitrell Ross, Unity of Sacramento, Sacramento, California, offered the following prayer:

May we turn within and look higher to the God of our understanding and pray.

Loving Presence, we invoke from the celestial balconies the witness of the pioneers of our progress whose bloodied journeys marshaled unprecedented faith and birthed a new nation of radical inclusion.

Bless these sons and daughters of promise gathered in this, the people's House. Let them reach higher for crowns of conscience to exemplify compassion and bring from their districts to their desks sharp pencils that carve

on their hearts the faces of freedom that they represent.

Let this House be an incubator for our best ideals, not a prison for our poorest politics.

Let these heroes and sheroes of the people's House summon the intellectual imagination and intuitive navigation to serve bolder together and break through the ideological gridlock that arrests the potential of our great Republic.

Let these innovators of cooperation and builders of the beloved community reunite these States of America and lead the way for a world that works for all.

This is enough. In the name of a love supreme we pray, and so it is.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TROTT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING REVEREND KEVIN KITRELL ROSS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the House to our guest chaplain, Reverend Kevin Kitrell Ross, Senior Minister of Unity of Sacramento.

Kevin is regarded as a respected interfaith social justice leader, committed to building bridges of understanding and cooperation across race, culture, class, and religious lines.

Whether in his role leading one of the Nation's most diverse and integrated congregations, conducting diversity and implicit bias trainings, or being an outspoken activist for healing the crisis between law enforcement and communities of color, Kevin is dedicated to strengthening communities through dialogue, direct encounter, and education.

A South Side of Chicago native, Kevin is a Morehouse College graduate, a senior fellow of the American Leadership Forum, a member of the Interfaith Council of Sacramento, and a three-

time delegate to the Parliament of the World's Religions.

Kevin and his wife, Anita, have three children and reside in Elk Grove, California. Anita is the founder of Women for Equality. They are both committed to building a world that works for all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Reverend Kevin Ross and thank him for offering today's opening prayer in the U.S. House of Representatives.

### RECOGNIZING THE NORA SANDIGO CHILDREN FOUNDATION

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Nora Sandigo Children Foundation, a non-profit organization in my home city of Miami, working around the clock to serve kids in our community who have been separated from their parents by deportation.

I have known Nora, the founder of this organization, for many years, and I have seen firsthand her true passion for ensuring the well-being of these children. Through the support of donors and volunteers, this organization is able to provide assistance in the form of food, clothing, educational programs, legal advice, and many other vital services.

This week, Nora will be visiting our Nation's Capital, with a delegation of 50 children from Florida, to advocate for the restructuring of our immigration policies so that the kids for whom she cares, who are as American as you and I, don't have to grow up apart from their parents.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation must do right for these children, and I urge my colleagues in Congress and the administration to work together so that we can have an immigration system that reflects our Nation's compassion and provides a solution that is fair and just to everyone.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### CONGRESS MUST RESTORE THE FULL PROTECTIONS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT NOW

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last year's Presidential election was

the first in 50 years without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. What was the result?

Fourteen States had new voting restrictions, including strict voter ID, cuts to same-day registration and early voting, and fewer polling places. This suppressed the vote, particularly among voters of color and in poor communities, and had a major impact in close races in North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida, according to the Brennan Center for Justice.

The Voting Rights Act once enjoyed bipartisan support, and Congress should, once again, come together to modernize the law and respond to the Supreme Court's objections. Yet despite calls to pass legislation for the past 4 years, nothing has happened.

Voting is a right, not a privilege, and there is no debating that point.

The Founders in Philadelphia, women at Seneca Falls, and marchers in Selma all recognized the power of the vote. When we protect the rights of voters to make their choices, whatever they may be, we do our part to build a more perfect union.

We can't wait for the next election. Congress must restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act now.

### TIME TO BAN TOURIST TRAVEL TO NORTH KOREA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Otto Warmbier was a shining example of what American families hope for sons and daughters: intellectually curious, interested in the world, and bright. Sadly, Otto was murdered by the North Korean dictatorship. By imprisoning him under sham charges, the Communist totalitarian North Korean regime is clearly responsible for his death.

Otto's story highlights the brutality of the North Korean murderers, one that wrongfully imprisons American citizens and uses them as bargaining chips in an effort to gain attention on the world stage. It is past time we strongly restrict tourist travel to this Potemkin atrocity.

I am grateful to have introduced bipartisan legislation, with Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, that would enable the Treasury Department to regulate travel to North Korea through licenses, and no licenses would be able to be granted for tourist travel. Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE has been instrumental for legislative success.

We will be most successful defeating brutality by denying the dictatorship any source of income and depriving it of the opportunity to use innocent Americans like UVA student Otto Warmbier as hostages.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

# WISHING LIEUTENANT JEFF NEVILLE A SPEEDY RECOVERY

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, there was a violent attack on a police officer at Flint Bishop International Airport. And like many in my community, I am shocked and horrified by this cowardly attack.

My thoughts are with injured officer, Lieutenant Jeff Neville, and his family; and I am relieved that he is in stable condition. He is expected to recover. I have known Jeff for decades, dating back to our service together in county government. He is a true public servant, and he is deeply committed to the community that he serves.

His actions to subdue the attacker, even while he was under attack, are truly heroic. He helped save others from potential harm.

I also want to thank those individuals who put themselves in harm's way to help Lieutenant Neville, including the Bishop chief of police, Chris Miller, and an airport maintenance worker who stepped in, Richard Cruell. Their actions saved lives.

I am thankful that the FBI, the Michigan State Police, the Flint Police, and other agencies are investigating this terrible attack as a potential incident of terror.

I just hope all my colleagues will join me in extending their prayers to Lieutenant Neville and his family in hopes for his speedy recovery.

# IN MEMORY OF PATRICIA LUCILLE MCKENZIE

(Mr. TROTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Patricia Lucille McKenzie, of Garden City, Michigan. Patricia passed away on May 31, 2017, and is dearly missed by her many family and friends, including her husband of 55 years, Doug McKenzie, and her children, Pamela, Barbara, Phil, and Marcia, as well as her 12 grandchildren.

In her 78 years, Patricia was devoted to her loving family, her faith, and to her strong belief in the principles of American democracy. She is also remembered for her love of her dog, Patty Lou, and, of course, for her passion for the Montreal Canadiens.

Patricia's story is the story of countless Americans: a hardworking person, a patriotic citizen, a loving wife, and a devoted mother.

To Patricia's many family and friends, I hope that during this difficult time you will find comfort in the knowledge that she has been called home in peace and harmony. Remember that Scripture tells us "the peace

of God, which transcends all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds."

Mr. Speaker, our friend, Patricia Lucille McKenzie, will be dearly missed, but we go on to remember and honor her legacy, just as she would want us to do.

# REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL IS A REPULSIVE SCAM

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill that was unveiled this morning, much like the House Republican healthcare bill, is a repulsive scam perpetrated against the American people.

On page 30 of the bill, section 120, under Executive Compensation Tax Cut, UnitedHealthcare will get a tax cut, under this bill, representing \$15.5 million. If that is not egregious enough, the fact is that UnitedHealthcare is under investigation today by the United States Department of Justice for defrauding the Medicare program of billions of dollars over the last 7 years.

This should be rejected today and, decisively, by all decent Members of this Congress who believe there is a moral responsibility to ensure that the legislation passed here is fair and just.

# CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION OF ROSE HISTORICAL CEMETERY IN TARPON SPRINGS, FLORIDA

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I had the honor of attending the centennial commemoration of Rose Historical Cemetery in Tarpon Springs, Florida.

Rose is the oldest African-American cemetery in Pinellas County and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. It was an especially meaningful ceremony because it was held on Juneteenth, the anniversary marking the end of slavery in the U.S.

Those who have been laid to rest at Rose represent a major part of Tarpon Springs history and culture. Civil rights pioneers, veterans, and many others, including friends I grew up with in Tarpon, are buried there.

I would like to especially thank Tarpon Springs Mayor Chris Alahouzos, Annie Dabbs, a member of the cemetery's board, and the dozens of volunteers who work tirelessly year-round to preserve the legacy of Rose Cemetery. Because of their dedication, Rose continues to be a beautiful, historical site for our community.

□ 1215

# CONGRATULATING BABCOCK & WILCOX ON THEIR 150TH ANNI- VERSARY

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of one of Charlotte's most exemplary businesses, Babcock & Wilcox, which today celebrates their 150th anniversary.

Boilers made by Babcock & Wilcox powered Thomas Edison's laboratories and New York's first subway.

During World War II, much of the U.S. Navy fleet was powered by Babcock & Wilcox boilers, and the company supplied components for the vital Manhattan Project. Later Babcock & Wilcox fabricated components for the USS *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear-powered submarine.

More recently, Babcock & Wilcox has become a leading innovator in emissions control technologies, helping to protect our air, water, and land by controlling emissions from hundreds of power plants and industrial facilities around the world.

In 2010, Babcock & Wilcox moved to Charlotte and became a vital part of the Charlotte region's growing cluster of industry-leading energy firms.

Congratulations today to Babcock & Wilcox's 5,000 employees on this 150th anniversary.

# CONGRATULATIONS TO ALZ- HEIMER'S DISEASE ADVOCATE JEANNIE CASTELLS

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the tireless dedication of one of New Jersey's greatest Alzheimer's awareness advocates, Jeannie Castells of Lambertville, Hunterdon County.

Jeannie has served as a congressional ambassador for the Alzheimer's Association since 2014, meeting with Members of Congress here on Capitol Hill, holding educational events in which I have participated in Congressional District Seven, and organizing fundraisers like the Walk to End Alzheimer's.

Unfortunately, Jeannie's advocacy does not come without tragedy because the disease has claimed the lives of both her mother and her husband.

And Jeannie's family is not alone, Mr. Speaker. Alzheimer's is the Nation's sixth leading cause of death. More than 5 million Americans are currently living with Alzheimer's, and as many as 16 million Americans are estimated to have Alzheimer's by 2050.

That is why in June, Alzheimer's Awareness Month, I urge advocates around the country, like Jeannie, to

continue to fight for Alzheimer's research funding. We are on the verge of a breakthrough, and with your help, we will certainly find one.

#### ROBERT MUELLER AS SPECIAL COUNSEL IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for 7½ years before coming to Congress, I was a judge in Tennessee trying felony criminal cases. I tried the attempted murder of James Earl Ray and many other high-profile cases.

Robert Mueller, with his close relationship with James Comey, should never have been appointed as special prosecutor in a case in which Mr. Comey is such a central player. Mr. Mueller should never have accepted such an appointment when offered. That would have been the honorable thing to do.

Then, to make matters much worse, he has hired several lawyers who are big contributors to and are active campaigners for Hillary Clinton and other Democrats.

Most people believe there are many conflicts of interest here. There are hundreds of thousands of lawyers who could have been hired who had not been involved in any way for either the President or Mrs. Clinton.

This investigation has been tainted, and any action now will look like a partisan witch hunt. Former Speaker Gingrich said what we now need is a special counsel to investigate the special counsel.

#### SUPPORT CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, legislation set to pass today to reauthorize and improve upon the Carl Perkins—a Member of this House in the past—Career and Technical Education program.

As a former teacher, it is my firm belief that school is not just and cannot be one size fits all. The Carl Perkins funding has allowed school districts and school boards from across the country to develop innovative programs to educate our Nation's youth.

I have always supported alternative forms of education. Education not only trains the mind, but trains our Nation's youth with valuable skills to succeed outside the classroom and in the workforce.

Many students in my State and across the Nation rely on nontraditional opportunities to achieve success, and Carl Perkins grants have done the job of providing additional opportunities for our youth.

In my State, these programs have led the way to providing our workforce with valuable certificates and credentials in Alaska's many industries. They include: qualification for Alaska's maritime and transportation industry; certifications in welding and carpentry; pre-apprenticeships for electricians, heavy equipment operators, and ironworkers; medical certifications, such as EMTs and certified nursing aides; certification of OSHA and HAZMAT agencies; and culinary arts and building maintenance repair.

These are all programs, Mr. Speaker, that help the working person and the young person to become prepared—just not going to college. They can become someone that can contribute to the good of our State and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation. I proudly stand here to support H.R. 2353.

#### HONORING THE LIVES OF CURTIS BILLUE AND CHRISTOPHER MONICA

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of two Georgia State corrections officers, Sergeants Curtis Billue and Christopher Monica, who were killed in the line of duty on June 13 in Putnam County, Georgia.

I share with their families the deep sorrow perpetrated by the violence of two rogue inmates, and I pray that God comforts the Billue and Monica families in their time of grief.

Described as hardworking, kind, and devoted, Sergeants Billue and Monica will be remembered for their service and sacrifice, for their loyalty as public servants, and for their love and dedication to their families.

I am grateful that the two perpetrators of this crime have been brought back into custody, and I am confident that justice will be served.

American law enforcement officers make a promise to keep our country and communities safe. In return, we must restore the tradition of respect and honor that is owed to all members of the law enforcement community who are on the front lines.

In gratitude to Sergeants Billue and Monica, Governor Nathan Deal ordered the flags of Georgia to fly at halfstaff on July 17 and 20.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing their lives and service and to say "thank you" to every brother and sister in uniform who stand on that thin blue line.

#### COMMENDING ARMY SPECIALIST MICHAEL MARTENEY FOR HIS HEROISM

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special recognition to Army Specialist Michael Marteney for an incredible act of heroism. While off duty, Specialist Marteney displayed remarkable selflessness and courage in the rescue and treatment of a fatally wounded civilian.

On May 27, 2017, a motor home traveling in Oak Grove, Kentucky, collided with a civilian building. With complete disregard for his own personal safety, Michael pulled his car over to the site of the accident and rushed to the scene. The front of the motor home was crushed, and Michael saw that the driver had life-threatening injuries to his head and leg.

With gasoline still rapidly spilling from the vehicle, Michael was able to gain access to the passenger side of the motor home and fashion a makeshift tourniquet. Oak Grove Police Officer Sergeant Havens arrived on scene and handed Michael a combat application tourniquet, which he swiftly applied.

Despite the imminence of fire or explosion, Michael went into the back of the motor home to locate a first-aid kit. Michael conveyed lifesaving information to EMS about the driver's disposition that prompted the call for immediate flight evacuation services.

If Specialist Michael Marteney had not taken control of the situation and implemented key medical assistance, the wounded driver would not have survived the trauma sustained.

I am honored to recognize Specialist Marteney's lifesaving actions, an inspiring illustration of the good will of others and the consequences of brave deeds. I thank Specialist Marteney for his bravery and all others in Oak Grove who were involved in the rescue.

#### RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY'S PIONEER CLASS

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 50th anniversary of Grand Valley State University's pioneer class.

In June of 1967, in a tent on its Allendale, Michigan campus, Grand Valley held its long dreamed of first commencement ceremony. On that day, 138 seniors, including 86 members of the pioneer class that started in 1963, received their diplomas from Michigan's newest college.

These first graduates laid the foundation of a university that would grow to offer 124 degrees, enroll students from 82 different countries, and boast a 94

percent employment rate for its graduates—always a good thing.

After that first graduation ceremony in 1967, GVSU had 138 alumni. Today, the university has over 110,000 proud alumni throughout Michigan and, frankly, around the globe.

Under the leadership of its first president, James Zumberge, followed by the continued guidance of Arend Lubbers, Mark Murray, and current president, Thomas Haas, Grand Valley has come to be a renowned institution and one of the 100 largest universities in this Nation.

During the very first commencement address, a speaker noted: “No one could ever possibly chart your course through these years.” And it is hard to imagine that the pioneer class could have dreamed of the role that they would be playing in helping Grand Valley State University achieve such great heights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Grand Valley State University’s pioneer class of 1967, the original “Lakers for a Lifetime.”

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2842, ACCELERATING INDIVIDUALS INTO THE WORKFORCE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 396 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 396

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-22. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the

order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of June 22, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 2353) to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of a very important measure. The resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 2842, Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

□ 1230

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2842 is a commonsense proposal to help transition welfare recipients into steady, paying jobs. Moving welfare recipients into work is a central goal of TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. This bipartisan bill would incentivize employers to hire TANF recipients and help subsidize these new employees’ salaries for up to a year to allow them to transition into the workforce.

The policy idea behind H.R. 2842 is simple: under this bill, States can es-

tablish partnerships with employers to hire recipients of TANF dollars. Through these partnerships, employers would receive a subsidy of up to 50 percent of the wage for a TANF recipient while the other 50 percent would be paid by the employer.

Beneficiaries would have to meet three requirements: they must be a TANF recipient, they must be unemployed, and they must have an income of 20 percent or less of the Federal poverty level. H.R. 2842 will direct our resources to the neediest individuals and families to help them accelerate these welfare recipients back into the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, President Ronald Reagan once noted: “We should measure welfare’s success by how many people leave welfare, not by how many people are added.”

The legislation under consideration in today’s rule is a fulfillment of that promise. Under H.R. 2842, State and local governments will be able to better utilize their TANF dollars to help move individuals into paying work and eventually help them transition out of the welfare system altogether.

Helping people get back to work is a great deal for the individuals who will be helped under this program, for the employers, for the economy, and for the American people. This bill is, at its core, about helping unemployed Americans get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation filled with hardworking people, and I have seen over and over again how badly many of the unemployed want to return to work. Many, if not most, recipients of TANF are in the program not because they want to be, but because they have been forced to be by circumstance. These unemployed Americans want nothing more than to return to the dignity of the workforce as quickly as they are able to do so. This bill will help remove barriers to employment and will incentivize employers to hire current TANF recipients.

Workers re-entering the workforce is a good thing for society. Not only will workers who receive jobs under this program be taken off of welfare rolls, thus ensuring the continued success of that program, but these new workers will be better able to contribute to better lives for themselves, for their families, and for their communities.

Here in Washington, we too often describe policy solutions as being “commonsense” or “win-win,” but in this case it is absolutely true. H.R. 2842 is a commonsense solution and is a win-win for everyone involved: the workers, the employers, the community, and the country.

That is why this legislation will receive a substantial bipartisan vote tomorrow. Whatever their differences, Republicans and Democrats alike want to put unemployed people back to

work. This bill will actually succeed in doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Oklahoma for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

This measure is a bipartisan bill that will help Americans receiving support from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families find good-paying jobs.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are more than 6 million job openings in our country. That is the highest level recorded since we started tracking this data, yet the share of Americans participating in the workforce is at a four-decade low. Clearly, there are underlying issues that need to be addressed to get more people plugged into the workforce.

For people looking for jobs, TANF serves as a lifeline. TANF is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services and is designed to help in-need families achieve self-sufficiency. Under the program, States receive block grants to design and operate their own programs to fulfill the goals of the TANF program.

It is important to note that States are at risk of financial penalty if TANF participants receive more than a year of education or if States have more than 30 percent of the State TANF caseload in education and training programs. Due to these limits, States have largely abandoned efforts to promote or support work in their TANF programs. This is important to understand because one of the most effective ways to get more people employed is through employer-driven on-the-job training.

Research has shown that, properly structured, these programs result in better and more stable employment, especially for individuals who are otherwise unlikely to find work.

Although the measure we are debating today does not address this issue, this bill will help tip the scale back toward job-training programs. H.R. 2842 establishes demonstration projects that combine work, training, and support for hard-to-employ TANF recipients.

This bill provides a onetime appropriation of \$100 million to subsidize these programs. After the 12-month period, States are going to be required to report to Congress on the effectiveness of subsidizing wages in moving individuals receiving TANF into full-time jobs.

Since we are talking about jobs, we need to recognize that we as an institution have not provided the necessary resources to get people back to work. If you were to ask any Member of this body to outline his or her top priorities, I guarantee you that job creation would be mentioned every single time.

We all agree on the need, but from there, the conversation stops. There are lots of proposals in Congress to create jobs, but we have been unable to pass a large-scale, bipartisan bill for quite some time. This really needs to change.

Given the legislation we are debating today, it is interesting to me that President Donald John Trump's budget proposal cut workforce training programs by 39 percent. Rather than present a jobs bill, he has presented a plan that would actually stop helping people looking for jobs. That, in my judgment, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. In bringing forward this legislation, I think it is being made clear that this body does not share that approach, but we need to do more than a single, targeted bill.

Five months into the Trump administration, Republican leadership still has not put forward a single large-scale piece of legislation to create good-paying jobs or raise the wages of hard-working Americans, but its leadership has rejected Democratic proposals out of hand.

We should be working every day on creating jobs and raising wages for everyone everywhere in America. But instead of focusing on job creation, Donald John Trump's budget request would destroy approximately 1.4 million jobs.

His budget would eviscerate billions of dollars from critical job-creating investments in infrastructure and innovation, dismantle skills training programs like the one we are discussing here today, ransack education benefits, and leave our country in a weakened state. Instead of bringing jobs back to communities that have fallen on hard times, the budget walks away from them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it at this. The underlying measure we are debating today is a good step forward. But one step is not nearly enough. We need to do more, not less, to strengthen our communities and help working families.

Just as I urge Donald John Trump to move past the campaign rhetoric and get serious, I also urge this body to lead with more bipartisan measures that will provide for necessary resources for those who need them most.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by agreeing with my good friend on many of the points that he made. I was particularly struck by the point he made about the low participation rate in the labor force. That has been a problem that has been with us, quite frankly, for, as he pointed out, several decades, and it is one that has gotten worse.

That is attributable in large part to another point that my friend made, effectively the thing around here we call

the skills gap. We have literally millions of jobs available in this country, and employers are ready to hire people but they simply don't have the training.

I couldn't agree more with my good friend that on-the-job training is sometimes the best training. You actually acquire the skill that you need to be successful, and the situation of this legislation will actually, again, offset the cost of that to the employer and, by the way, not add any cost to the taxpayer.

That is something we ought to talk about as well. We are just taking money that we would have been spending anyway, and we are spending it a lot more productively.

Now, my friend is right. This is a new program. This is a new approach. So trying it out for a year, spending \$100 million—a lot of money—but obviously we would spend more this way if we would know this would be successful. But I can't help but think it will be successful.

It is important to note that this bill is actually, again, exceptionally bipartisan. I was struck, as I hope my friend was, yesterday when we were in Rules Committee considering this legislation. We are used to seeing the members of the Ways and Means Committee come up and sort of fight in front of us. Instead, they actually came up arm in arm with a bipartisan proposal that they had agreed to that, again, is an excellent, excellent work.

It is exactly the way that Congress should work, quite frankly: find common ground and advance commonsense solutions that make life better for the American people. In this case, at least, I think we have succeeded in doing that.

It is also important to note that the rule authorizes the consideration of H.R. 2353, the so-called Perkins grant program. The Perkins grant is something we are pretty familiar with in Oklahoma. This is Federal money that moves into career tech systems that helps actually, again, workers acquire the necessary skills to be productive, quite often, again, working with the employer who has already got the jobs available. We then train the worker at a career tech system partly funded with Federal dollars, and that person is assured the job the day they walk out.

I suspect that bill, like this bill, when it finally reaches the floor will also have substantial bipartisan support. I want to pledge to my good friend that we are going to continue to work together on things like this. I don't think anybody disagrees about putting Americans back to work. Workers would rather be at work than, frankly, just receiving government assistance and not able to go work. So this bill does that.

I want to urge support of the rule and, again, the underlying legislation.



Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the underlying legislation, which includes my amendment expanding apprenticeships for American workers.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this important effort in the Ways and Means Committee, and I look forward to its passage.

We can all agree that helping people find long-term employment in a high-demand industry is one of the best ways to ensure that everyone has economic security. But technological advancements like automation and artificial intelligence are dramatically shifting the way our economy works, and these changes are only going to accelerate.

We cannot allow American workers to be left behind. Congress needs to be forward looking, not reactive, in crafting policies that help workers who are displaced from the workforce. I believe that means we need a national commitment to addressing the skills gap and mitigating disruption in an evolving 21st century economy.

Apprenticeships and on-the-job training are an important part of that equation. Apprenticeships can be an incredible opportunity for businesses and workers alike.

□ 1245

They allow employers to build a pipeline of qualified workers while equipping job seekers with the specific skills they need to find and keep good-paying jobs.

Oftentimes, they provide skills that are portable and meaningful anywhere in the country, giving workers more freedom to transfer between companies and industries.

In my home State of Washington, investments and apprenticeships have been shown to give a higher return on investment than any other job training program, returning \$23 for each dollar that is invested.

It is important to remember these investments not only have an incredible impact on our economy but also on people's lives by helping them become more self-sufficient through specialized training and increased earning potential.

I appreciate my colleague's bipartisan support for this amendment, and I urge its passage in the underlying legislation.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Decades of experience tell us that the most effective antipoverty program is a job, and this bill helps low-income

Americans earn success through the dignity of work.

States actually, as my good friends on the other side know, spend very little of their TANF funding on moving people into jobs. Today, half of all TANF recipients are neither working nor preparing for work. This bill ensures that money only goes to those who are working, providing individuals with paychecks in lieu of benefit checks, a key tenet in welfare reform.

This pilot only provides funding for one fiscal year, repurposing money that has already been appropriated and, frankly, using it in a better way than it was originally appropriated to achieve.

The bill requires that States report on outcome measures and provide high-quality evaluations so that Congress can make appropriate decisions after we have actually seen the results yielded by the program.

And finally, as we have been pointing out, but I think around here it is always worth pointing out multiple times, where actually CBO estimates the bill has no cost. So we are actually doing something good without increasing expenditures for the taxpayers, and, indeed, we are probably in the process of creating new taxpayers, people who can contribute to the wealth and the activity and the prosperity of the country; and people, honestly, who want to contribute to the wealth and the activity; and employers who want to provide people with an opportunity to improve themselves and become more productive.

So it is a good bill all the way around, and, again, I will be urging the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

President Donald Trump campaigned on the promise of job creation; however, his budget paints a very different picture. It cuts job training programs by 39 percent, and its radical spending cuts would lead to massive job losses.

In this body, we talk a lot about jobs, but we are 6 months into this Congress and have failed to pass any major job creation bills. While the bipartisan legislation before us today is, indeed, as my good friend points out, a step in the right direction, we can and we must do more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I have an amendment in my hand that will generate thousands of American jobs. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative DEFAZIO's bipartisan bill, H.R. 2510, the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act. This bill will create thousands of new American jobs through increased investment in our

Nation's wastewater infrastructure. Here is a chance to take today's momentum a step further and consider Mr. DEFAZIO's bill in addition to the bipartisan TANF bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my very good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who will discuss our proposal.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity. As he noted, the President has talked and tweeted incessantly about creating jobs and infrastructure investment, but, unfortunately, the only substantive proposal to come out of the White House that relates to infrastructure, infrastructure investment, and jobs is in his budget, and it actually reduces Federal investment in infrastructure, which would basically eliminate jobs.

So I mean, the bill before us today, bipartisan bill on apprenticeships is great, but you have got to apprentice for something that is real: a job in the end, construction.

America is falling apart, and, right now, we have nothing but rhetoric coming out of the White House, and now ideology. They are talking about privatizing all of the infrastructure in the United States so that you will pay tolls everywhere you go, and, you know, they call it asset recycling. They have come up with a catchy new name. That has been floated, but they haven't put any substance behind it.

So this amendment would allow the House to debate and pass H.R. 2510, Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. This bill would provide \$25 billion in direct infrastructure investment over the next 5 years to address America's crumbling wastewater infrastructure and local water quality challenges.

The state of our water infrastructure, according to the American Society of Engineers' report card of 2017, is a D-plus. Meanwhile, municipalities across the country have a backlog of more than \$40 billion—B, billion—in clean water infrastructure projects, and, according to the EPA, communities need close to \$300 billion over the next 20 years to bring their systems into a state of good repair.

It is clear that we cannot continue to neglect the serious needs of our aging water infrastructure. As these systems fail and degrade, they pose a risk to the health and safety of our citizens and obviously the environment.

I know the President promised, during his campaign, to make clean water a priority. I agree with that. He promised to triple funding for State revolving loan fund programs to help States and local governments upgrade critical drinking water and wastewater infrastructure.

Well, here is a chance to deliver on that promise. H.R. 2510 does exactly that. It triples investment in America's crumbling water infrastructure.

I was a county commissioner at a time when the Federal Government was a good partner, and, in those days, they put up 85 percent of the cost of our wastewater system. We put up the other 15. You know, this could—by renewing this legislation and a commitment to the State revolving loan fund programs and adding in a grant component for lower income areas, that could, you know, be a great step in terms of Federal partnership and creating actual jobs for the apprentices that this bill wants to create.

There is widespread support for this legislation. I include in the RECORD letters of endorsement from 30 separate groups.

OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL,  
Columbus, OH.

Hon. GARRET GRAVES,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAVES AND RANKING MEMBER NAPOLITANO: On behalf of the Ohio Environmental Council, I am writing to enthusiastically support the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. This bill bolsters the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) by authorizing \$20 billion over five years for loans to improve wastewater infrastructure in local communities. It also provides crucial additional funding to help states control water pollution and address challenges from outdated sewer systems.

The need for this bill has never been greater as the nation faces a \$40 billion backlog of clean water infrastructure projects, with cities and towns needing \$300 billion over 20 years to update their water systems. In Ohio, the American Society of Civil Engineers found our state needs a total \$14.58 billion for wastewater improvements. The Clean Water SRF is an essential resource to help meet this need.

The Water Pollution Control Loan Fund (WPCLF) program, Ohio's Clean Water SRF, continues to provide fundamental capacity to improve water quality for Ohio communities and residents. The program includes several different loan options that help both cities and rural communities prevent water pollution. This includes funding to upgrade and replace Home Sewage Treatment Systems (HSTS), as well as assistance for wastewater collection and treatment, stormwater activities, and efforts to reduce nonpoint source pollution. Interest from the WPCLF program funds the preservation and restoration of aquatic habitat to counter the loss of natural systems that helped maintain the health of Ohio's water resources.

Since its inception the Clean Water SRF has provided \$7.2 billion serving 621 villages,

cities, counties and sewer districts helping to curb pollution while providing quality jobs. To ensure this program's continuing success and help Ohio address our water infrastructure needs, I urge your support for the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017.

Sincerely,

HEATHER TAYLOR-MIESLE,  
Executive Director.

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF  
SANITATION AGENCIES,  
Sacramento, CA.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Public Works and Transportation, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBERS DEFAZIO AND NAPOLITANO: The California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) is pleased to support your efforts to address the water infrastructure funding gap and specifically the introduction of the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. For 60 years, CASA has been the leading voice for California's public wastewater agencies on regulatory, legislative and legal issues.

CASA agencies are faced with mounting challenges of aging infrastructure, growing demands from increasing population, and emerging challenges from changing climate conditions. Confronted with these realities, there is clear demand for increased infrastructure investment, including the need to invest in water recycling infrastructure and clean energy facilities derived from the wastewater treatment process.

Under your legislation, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) would be renewed at \$20 billion over five years. This authorization represents a critical down payment toward a robust federal commitment to the nation's water infrastructure needs. According to the report, the financial burden to simply meet water quality and water-related public health goals of the Clean Water Act (CWA) in California was in excess of \$26 billion in 2012. Due to drought conditions and other strains on our wastewater systems, that figure has only gone up over the last 5 years. Nationwide the demand for all clean and drinking water infrastructure needs has been estimated at more than \$300 billion over the next two decades. CASA also supports the bill's provisions to authorize grant assistance for water recycling as well as the programs to address stormwater flows and combined sewer overflows. In California, the ability to construct water-recycling projects is vital to a safe and reliable water supply and to ensure protection of our ecosystems.

As you and your colleagues work to develop a comprehensive water infrastructure policy for the nation, we look forward to working with you to advance meaningful federal assistance programs.

ADAM D. LINK,  
Director of Government Affairs.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,  
Washington, DC, May 2, 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) supports The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017 to provide needed

funds to fix the nation's wastewater treatment systems.

The nation's wastewater treatment systems are the most basic and critical infrastructure systems for protecting public health and the environment, but are badly underfunded. Nearly 240 million Americans—76% of the population—rely on the nation's 14,748 treatment plants for wastewater sanitation. By 2032 it is expected that 56 million more people will connect to centralized treatment plants, rather than private septic systems—a 23% increase in demand. In the U.S., there are over 800,000 miles of public sewers and 500,000 miles of private lateral sewers connecting private property to public sewer lines. Each of these conveyance systems is susceptible to structural failure, blockages, and overflows.

In March, ASCE released its 2017 Infrastructure Report Card, which graded our nation's wastewater systems a "D+." Many wastewater systems are aging and it's expected that over the next two decades, requiring at least \$271 billion to meet current and future demands.

This legislation is an important step towards meeting our country's wastewater investment needs and improving our wastewater systems.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PALLASCH,  
Managing Director, Government  
Relations & Infrastructure Initiatives.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK,  
May 2, 2017.

Re WIN's Strong Support for the Water Quality Improvement and Job Creation Act.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,  
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: The Water Infrastructure Network (WIN), a coalition of the nation's leading construction, engineering, municipal, conservation, public works, labor and manufacturing organizations, strongly supports the Water Quality Improvement and Job Creation Act. WIN also commends your continued work to reauthorize our nation's critical water infrastructure funding programs. The United States is facing a water infrastructure funding crisis as documented in recent reports by CBO, EPA and WIN pointing to a shortfall in funding for clean water infrastructure that exceeds \$300 Billion over the next two decades. The Clean Water Act was last reauthorized in 1987 and WIN believes that consideration and passage of legislation providing substantial increased investment in America's Water Infrastructure is long overdue.

WIN is encouraged by the growing bipartisan support in Congress for investing in our nation's clean water infrastructure. The FY '17 Appropriation Package released this week calls for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to be funded at \$1.39 Billion—a \$414 M increase over the original FY '17 funding request. The Trump Administration has also made investments in our nation's water infrastructure a top priority for the Environmental Protection Agency, requesting increases in funding for both the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act State Revolving Funds in their 2018 Budget.

WIN believes Congress must seize this unique opportunity make long overdue investments in our nation's critical water infrastructure. Investments in water infrastructure make eminent economic and environmental sense for our nation. WIN is committed to working with you and the bipartisan leadership of the Transportation and

Infrastructure Committee to advance water infrastructure funding legislation in the First Session of the 115th Congress.

Sincerely,

The WIN Executive Committee—American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC), American Public Works Association (APWA), American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Associated General Contractors of America (AGCA), International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE), Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA), National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA), National Rural Water Association (NRWA), United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters (The United), and the Vinyl Institute (VI).

OREGON WATER RESOURCES CONGRESS,

*Salem, Oregon, May 3, 2017.*

Re The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,  
*Washington, DC.*

REPRESENTATIVE DEFazio: On behalf of the Oregon Water Resources Congress (OWRC), I am writing to express our support of Congressman DeFazio's efforts to reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and tackle the water quality financing needs in the country under The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. The CWSRF is an effective program that addresses critical water infrastructure needs while benefitting the environment, local communities, and the economy.

OWRC was established in 1912 as a trade association to support the protection of water rights and promote the wise stewardship of water resources statewide. OWRC members are local governmental entities, which include irrigation districts, water control districts, drainage districts, water improvement districts, and other agricultural water suppliers that deliver water to roughly 1/3 of all irrigated land in Oregon. These water stewards operate complex water management systems, including water supply reservoirs, canals, pipelines, and hydropower facilities that serve a diverse set of farmers, ranchers, and other water users contributing to the local and global economy.

The CWSRF is a perfect example of the type of program that should be reauthorized because it creates jobs while benefitting the environment, and is an efficient return on taxpayer investment. CWSRF funded projects provide family wage jobs in construction and professional services industry that are a crucial component to economic recovery in Oregon and other states. Moreover, as a loan program, it is a wise investment that allows local communities to leverage their limited resources and address critical infrastructure needs that would otherwise be unmet.

OWRC was very pleased to see the passage of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN) by Congress in December last year. An integral piece of the funding puzzle for our member districts was reinstated by this act, irrigation district eligibility for principal forgiveness. The CWSRF is often an integral part of an overall package of state, federal and local funding that necessitates a stronger level of assurance that loan funds will be available for planned water infrastructure projects. Irrigation districts are often located in rural communities and have a small number of farmers with limited capacity to take on

loan debt. Even a small reduction in the principal repayment obligations can make the difference in whether or not a district can move forward with a project.

The CWSRF program is an important tool utilized by OWRC members across Oregon, and we applaud this effort by Congressman DeFazio to reauthorize this key program. OWRC looks forward to working with the Committee and this Congress as the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017 moves forward.

Sincerely,

APRIL SNELL,  
*Executive Director,  
Oregon Water Resources Congress.*

SOUTHERN ENVIRONMENTAL  
LAW CENTER,  
*Washington, DC, May 3, 2017.*

Hon. PETER DEFazio,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation  
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JIMMY DUNCAN,  
*House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,  
*Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DEFazio, NAPOLITANO AND DUNCAN: Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) writes in support of the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. At a time when much of our nation's infrastructure is at a breaking point, bolstering our national infrastructure funds is more critical than ever. Thank you for your leadership on clean water infrastructure investment.

This bill authorizes \$20 billion in Federal grants over five years to capitalize Clean Water State Revolving Funds (Clean Water SRF). Across the country, many communities are struggling with how to pay for needed investments and upgrades to infrastructure that protects clean water and public health. According to the 2012 Clean Watersheds Needs Survey, municipalities need close to \$300 billion in investment over the next 20 years to bring their wastewater and stormwater management infrastructure to a state of good repair.

The Clean Water SRF provides a critical source of funding to states to address water infrastructure needs and reduce pollution from stormwater and wastewater across the country. This legislation will help communities address the estimated \$40 billion backlog in clean water infrastructure projects. Additionally, this investment in our water infrastructure is good for the economy. The report Water Works: Rebuilding infrastructure, Creating Jobs and Greening the Environment shows that investments in our water infrastructure, including green infrastructure, would conservatively yield 1.9 million American jobs and add \$265 billion to the economy.

This legislation authorizes \$20 billion in Federal grants over five years for the Clean Water SRF to provide low-interest loans and additional loan subsidizations to communities for wastewater infrastructure. We are supportive of efforts to increase the resiliency of treatment works to natural or man-made disasters. In the face of a changing climate, resiliency of our nation's infrastructure is increasingly important.

Also, this legislation authorizes \$2.5 billion over five years for grants to address combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and sanitary

sewer overflows (SSOs) and recapture and reuse of municipal stormwater. CSOs and SSOs pose a significant health and safety risk to communities and can damage local economies that are dependent on clean water and tourism. We are supportive of funds to address this ongoing problem that can cost communities significant resources to address.

Economists estimate that between 20,000 and 26,600 construction, engineering, and manufacturing jobs are created for every billion dollars of federal investment in water infrastructure. Investments in the Clean Water SRFs are critical to protect public health, promote job creation, and restore clean water in our rivers, lakes, and streams.

SELC appreciates your leadership on clean water infrastructure investment and your continued work on reducing pollution related to aging and inadequately funded infrastructure.

Sincerely,

NAVIS A. BERMUDEZ,  
*Deputy Legislative Director,  
Southern Environmental Law Center.*

Mr. DEFazio. And according to the National Utility Contractors Association, every billion dollars invested in our Nation's water infrastructure creates or sustains 27,000 real jobs in the private sector. That means that the \$20 billion in Federal investment in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, including H.R. 2510, would create or sustain approximately 540,000 jobs.

This is real. It is real. Real jobs for real people and real improvements in the infrastructure of this country. This would be a great step forward, and I urge that my colleagues adopt the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have been having such a wonderful bipartisan moment here. My good friend from Oregon, and appropriately, wants to change the tenor a little bit.

Let me begin by actually congratulating my good friend from Oregon because he is a serious legislator and does serious things, and I am probably going to find myself on the same side with him on the issue of air traffic controllers where I think his points have been very well made.

On this particular piece of legislation, I must admit, I have not had the opportunity. I don't sit on my friend's committee to actually read it, but I suspect the committee hasn't picked it up and dealt with it either.

And just from a process standpoint, I think the appropriate thing to do would be for the committee to actually review it. It could be amended in committee, as indeed this bill was, and then we would have the opportunity to consider it on the floor. But to bring it to the floor immediately, to me, is premature, legislatively.

I also want to take issue, on the record, with my friends of the President of the United States in terms of job creation. I suspect President Trump, in his private life, has created more jobs than just about anybody in

the Congress of the United States, and I think he has laid forward some incredibly important proposals to continue and build on his personal record, now that he is President of the United States.

One of those proposals, as my friends are surely aware, because I think they largely agree with it, is to enhance the apprenticeship program announcement he made recently. Another one that my friends may not be quite so much in agreement with, he has laid out his principles for tax reform.

The greatest engine for job growth is never going to be the Federal Government. It is going to always be the private sector. And if we could, as the President has suggested, cut corporate tax rates, incentivize the return of profit, something where perhaps we can work together, that are stranded overseas, bring them back here and invest in America, I think we would create a lot more jobs a lot more quickly and in a lot more sustainable fashion than we would do through additional public spending.

Finally, I think we ought to give the President a little bit of credit for emphasizing and bringing home American jobs, something that actually began once he was President-elect. We saw it in Indiana with Carrier air-conditioning. We have seen it in other cases where he has promoted the sale of American arms in the Middle East where we have got substantial things.

So I think this is a President who actually gets up each and every day and thinks profoundly about what can we do to create an overall ecosystem, an environment, if you will, that will incentivize private investment, private employment, American jobs, and bringing American companies back to this country.

I think he is actually off to an exceptionally good start in those areas, and I look forward to working with him on that. I suspect we will see a tax proposal on this floor in the not-too-distant future—our friends on Ways and Means are working on it now—that will mirror many of the principles that the President laid out in his initial draft discussion of what he thinks we ought to do.

And that one change, changing the Tax Code, I think, will do more than all the programs that we would work on, many of them worthy programs, many of them things, I think, where the Federal Government does have a role.

I will agree with my friend from Florida, I am disturbed about some of the cuts in training programs. I have seen those programs work and work well, and I suspect the President will find out, as other Presidents have found out—we used to routinely praise President Obama's budget on the floor. It never got very many votes. I don't think it ever got any Democratic

votes—that, you know, Presidents propose, as they should, that is their prerogative, they run the executive branch, but, at the end of the day, it is Congress that makes the final funding decisions.

I happen to know a little bit about those programs because they come through my subcommittee on appropriations, and I want to assure my friends they are not going to disappear. And we may have to make some tough choices, as you always have to do, in appropriated dollars, but on many of the programs that I know my friend cares about and has championed in his distinguished career, they are going to be protected, and we are going to try and work in a bipartisan fashion in those areas and keep those things going.

But, at the end of the day, I think the President's record on job creation will be outstanding, and I think the actions that he has taken in the opening part of his administration are a testament to how seriously he takes the challenge of making sure that every American has a decent job, a job that pays a good wage, a job that will provide for his or her family, and a job that will give them an opportunity to live a life of dignity and prosperity, something we want every American to have a chance at.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I first want to address my good friend about the previous question and the fact that it has not gone through the process. I will just remind him that the chatter in Washington today is about a healthcare measure that hasn't gone through the process, at least to the extent that most of us would all want.

I also have great respect for my good friend from Oklahoma, and I know he will see and get a chance to talk with President Donald John Trump. I am not likely to.

□ 1300

But I would ask him to tell him when he sees him for me that I came here in 1993, and there were 14,000 bridges in need of repair in America, and last year the statistics from the society that does that analysis showed that there are 54,000 bridges in need of repair in this country. The point that I wish to make is that we need a serious substantial infrastructure measure.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about jobs in this Chamber. I was at a forum on Saturday, and someone mentioned: My governor's mantra is "jobs, jobs, jobs." And that person said: Well, he must mean that you have to have three jobs in order to get by.

I am glad that we are here today considering a bill that will help Americans in search of work to find a good-paying position that will help them support

themselves and their families. We have a lot of issues facing us, and this bipartisan legislation is just one tiny step forward in the right direction. I hope this measure translates into more bipartisan bills.

Too often, from healthcare reform, tax reform—footnote right there. My friend mentions that we will likely see a tax reform measure sometime soon. I hope that it doesn't revert to trickle down. We have seen trickle down. It did not work, and I hope we don't do that again.

We have an opportunity on other issues, and in many respects the majority has shut out the minority from the process, just like what has happened until today, at least, in the other body with reference to healthcare.

The bills we have debated and even passed are projected to eliminate millions of jobs. Even as we talk about job creation, my friends across the aisle too frequently turn around and champion measures that would do just the opposite. There is so much room for cooperation in this area, yet time and time again we are kept out of the process, and the results speak for themselves. For the sake of our country, this needs to change.

Even though this is a bipartisan bill, it also serves as an example of what I mean. I was disappointed that my Republican colleagues in the Rules Committee blocked yesterday six germane amendments to this bill. It is a symptom of the closed process. When we prevent germane amendments from even being debated by the House, it does us all a disservice, yet my friends across the aisle do it again and again.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this: President Obama is credited for creating 11.3 million jobs in our country. The economy added jobs for 75 straight months, and very fortunately that carryover for the last 5 months has continued.

While President Donald John Trump makes untenable pledge after pledge, I watched every word of his speech last night in Iowa, and all I heard was platitudes. I didn't hear anything about substance. And it seemed like a road test for some new ideas. He makes these untenable pledges, including a very humble promise to be—and I quote him—"the greatest jobs producer that God ever created."

The record is clear, the Democratic Party is, has been, and will be the party of job creation, and is ready to work with my Republican colleagues to continue significant job creation in this country.

So I will ask my friends across the aisle, let us continue the trend of the past few years and work together to produce bipartisan measures that will benefit the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by addressing a couple of points that my friend made. There will be places we agree; there will be places we disagree. I think too often around here we talk about how nothing gets done when this has actually been an extraordinarily productive period in terms of passing legislation. We are going to have differences on some of that legislation, there is no question. There is a reason why God created a Democratic Party and a Republican Party, and it probably wasn't to always agree all the time, but it was to challenge one another and try to work together when they could or define alternative paths when they felt they must, and let the American people make the decision.

Fortunately, we are blessed to live in a country where they get to make that decision on a regular basis like clockwork. They have been making some decisions recently. I think the President has had a pretty good run in special elections. We are pretty pleased with the decisions they have been making. But at some point they will change their mind—they always do—and they will decide somebody else has a better way.

I think in the interim we ought to stress occasionally so the American people know when we do work together. I actually was home after we managed to pass healthcare through this particular body, and that bill moved through multiple committees, had multiple amendments, lots of negotiation. Obviously it is in the Senate now. I think that process will start over there. But the day before we passed it, actually, we came together in a really quite remarkable way. We passed an omnibus spending bill of over \$1 trillion. That bill had worked through the Appropriations Committee of each House, 12 different bills put together to fund the Federal Government. That particular bill gave us the largest increase in defense spending in about a decade, the largest increase in border security money in about a decade. It gave us a substantial increase in money at the National Institutes of Health and at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, areas that Democrats and Republicans alike have been working together on and feel very strongly about.

That bill also broke the one-to-one relationship—pretty artificial relationship, in my view—that President Obama had laid down that, if you increase defense spending, you have to automatically increase domestic spending whether you need to or not or whether you can afford to or not. Frankly, that bill actually passed with a majority of my friends on the Democratic side in both the House and the Senate and a majority of Republicans in the House and the Senate voting for

the same bill and Donald Trump signing the bill.

Now, when I go home and I explain that to people, they look at me with a blank stare. It is like: What? That really happened? One trillion dollars with all those different elements in there and a majority of Democrats voted for it and a majority of Republicans voted for it and Donald Trump signed it?

I say: Yeah.

They are amazed. They have never heard about it. They have never seen it. I think that is because sometimes we present a false narrative of constant conflict. There is certainly plenty of conflict here. Look, I have some sympathy with the minority. Having been in the minority myself, you always feel shut out. But this is an occasion—this legislation, and, frankly, that spending bill—when my friends certainly weren't shut out. They participated, and they participated vigorously, and they contributed in the process.

I am with my friend. We need to do more of that. As a matter of fact, I think you will see it is happening right now. If you go to the Defense Committee, they are working on their authorization bill. That committee is the most bipartisan committee probably in Congress. Every time they report something out on an authorization—I think they have 63 or 64 members, something like that—the vote is always like 60 to 3. They have clearly put aside their partisan differences to work together.

In this bill, we have done exactly the same thing. So while we are going to have some points where we disagree, we are going to have some opportunities to agree and come together. And I pledge to my friend I will continue to work with him to try and see that we find more of them.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encourage all of the Members, obviously, to support the rule, but I am sure my good friends on the other side probably won't accept the invitation. That is okay. This is a process vote and they have got other matters they want on the floor, and I certainly understand that they will be opposing our rule and trying to offer an alternative.

But when the matter counts, when the actual legislation reaches the floor, I think H.R. 2842 will draw broad bipartisan support. This House is taking steps to help workers leave welfare rolls and return to the workforce. Under this bill, employers will be incentivized to hire TANF recipients and will help bring the unemployed up into the workforce and the economy.

This bill is a commonsense bipartisan solution that will benefit everyone: the workers, the employers, the community, the economy, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their work on this important piece of legislation. I think if we can get it

through this House and we get it through the Senate, I am sure that Mr. Trump will be more than happy to sign it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 396 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2510) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2510.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 184, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

YEAS—226

|           |             |              |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Abraham   | Bilirakis   | Bucshon      |
| Aderholt  | Bishop (MI) | Budd         |
| Allen     | Black       | Burgess      |
| Amash     | Blackburn   | Byrne        |
| Amodel    | Blum        | Calvert      |
| Arrington | Bost        | Carter (GA)  |
| Babin     | Brady (TX)  | Carter (TX)  |
| Bacon     | Brat        | Chabot       |
| Barletta  | Bridenstine | Chaffetz     |
| Barr      | Brooks (AL) | Cheney       |
| Barton    | Brooks (IN) | Choffman     |
| Bergman   | Buchanan    | Cole         |
| Biggs     | Buck        | Collins (GA) |

|                 |                 |                   |                   |                |                |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Collins (NY)    | Hunter          | Reichert          | Kilmer            | Neal           | Scott (VA)     |
| Comer           | Hurd            | Renacci           | Kind              | Nolan          | Scott, David   |
| Comstock        | Issa            | Rice (SC)         | Krishnamoorthi    | Norcross       | Serrano        |
| Conaway         | Jenkins (KS)    | Roby              | Kuster (NH)       | O’Halloran     | Sewell (AL)    |
| Cook            | Jenkins (WV)    | Roe (TN)          | Langevin          | O’Rourke       | Shea-Porter    |
| Costello (PA)   | Johnson (OH)    | Rogers (AL)       | Larson (CT)       | Pallone        | Sherman        |
| Cramer          | Jones           | Rogers (KY)       | Lawrence          | Panetta        | Sinema         |
| Crawford        | Jordan          | Rohrabacher       | Lawson (FL)       | Pascarell      | Sires          |
| Culberson       | Joyce (OH)      | Rokita            | Lee               | Payne          | Slaughter      |
| Curbelo (FL)    | Katko           | Rooney, Francis   | Levin             | Pelosi         | Smith (WA)     |
| Davidson        | Kelly (MS)      | Rooney, Thomas J. | Lewis (GA)        | Perlmutter     | Soto           |
| Davis, Rodney   | Kelly (PA)      | Ros-Lehtinen      | Lipinski          | Peters         | Speier         |
| Denham          | King (IA)       | Ross              | Loeb sack         | Peterson       | Suo zzi        |
| Dent            | King (NY)       | Rothfus           | Lofgren           | Pingree        | Swalwell (CA)  |
| DeSantis        | Kin zinger      | Rouzer            | Lowenthal         | Pocan          | Takano         |
| DesJarlais      | Knight          | Royce (CA)        | Lowe y            | Polis          | Thompson (CA)  |
| Diaz-Balart     | Kustoff (TN)    | Russell           | Lujan Grisham, M. | Price (NC)     | Thompson (MS)  |
| Donovan         | Labrador        | Rutherford        | Lujan, Ben Ray    | Quigley        | Titus          |
| Duffy           | LaHood          | Sanford           | Lynch             | Raskin         | Tonko          |
| Duncan (SC)     | LaMalfa         | Schweikert        | Maloney,          | Rice (NY)      | Torres         |
| Duncan (TN)     | Lamborn         | Scott, Austin     | Carolyn B.        | Richmond       | Tsongas        |
| Dunn            | Latta           | Sensenbrenner     | Maloney, Sean     | Rosen          | Vargas         |
| Emmer           | Lewis (MN)      | Sessions          | Ruiz              | Roybal-Allard  | Veasey         |
| Estes (KS)      | LoBiondo        | Shimkus           | McCollum          | Ruppertsberger | Vela           |
| Farenthold      | Love            | Shuster           | McEachin          | Rush           | Velázquez      |
| Faso            | Lucas           | Simpson           | McGovern          | Ryan (OH)      | Visclosky      |
| Ferguson        | Luetkemeyer     | Smith (MO)        | McNerney          | Sánchez        | Walz           |
| Fitzpatrick     | MacArthur       | Smith (NE)        | Meng              | Sarbanes       | Waters, Maxine |
| Fleischmann     | Marchant        | Smith (NJ)        | Moore             | Schakowsky     | Watson Coleman |
| Flores          | Marino          | Smith (TX)        | Moulton           | Schiff         | Welch          |
| Fortenberry     | Marshall        | Smucker           | Murphy (FL)       | Schneider      | Wilson (FL)    |
| Fox             | Massie          | Stefanik          | Nadler            | Schrader       | Yarmuth        |
| Franks (AZ)     | Mast            | Stewart           |                   |                |                |
| Frelinghuysen   | McCarthy        | Stivers           |                   |                |                |
| Gaetz           | McCaul          | Taylor            | Banks (IN)        | Lance          | Roskam         |
| Gallagher       | McClintock      | Tenney            | Bishop (UT)       | Larsen (WA)    | Scalise        |
| Garrett         | McHenry         | Thompson (PA)     | Cummings          | Lieu, Ted      | Tiberi         |
| Gianforte       | McKinley        | Thornberry        | DeLauro           | Long           | Wasserman      |
| Gibbs           | McMorris        | Tipton            | Gabbard           | Meeks          | Schultz        |
| Gohmert         | Rodgers         | Trott             | Johnson (LA)      | Messer         | Wenstrup       |
| Goodlatte       | McSally         | Turner            | Johnson, Sam      | Napolitano     |                |
| Gosar           | Meadows         | Upton             | Keating           | Perry          |                |
| Gowdy           | Granger         | Valadao           |                   |                |                |
| Granger         | Graves (GA)     | Wagner            |                   |                |                |
| Graves (LA)     | Graves (MO)     | Walberg           |                   |                |                |
| Griffith        | Grothman        | Walden            |                   |                |                |
| Guthrie         | Guthrie         | Walker            |                   |                |                |
| Harper          | Harper          | Walorski          |                   |                |                |
| Harris          | Harris          | Walters, Mimi     |                   |                |                |
| Hartzler        | Hartzler        | Weber (TX)        |                   |                |                |
| Hensarling      | Hensarling      | Webster (FL)      |                   |                |                |
| Herrera Beutler | Herrera Beutler | Westerman         |                   |                |                |
| Hice, Jody B.   | Hice, Jody B.   | Williams          |                   |                |                |
| Higgins (LA)    | Higgins (LA)    | Wilson (SC)       |                   |                |                |
| Hill            | Hill            | Wittman           |                   |                |                |
| Holding         | Holding         | Womack            |                   |                |                |
| Hollingsworth   | Hollingsworth   | Woodall           |                   |                |                |
| Hudson          | Hudson          | Yoder             |                   |                |                |
| Huizenga        | Huizenga        | Yoho              |                   |                |                |
| Hultgren        | Hultgren        | Posey             |                   |                |                |
|                 |                 | Young (AK)        |                   |                |                |
|                 |                 | Young (IA)        |                   |                |                |
|                 |                 | Zeldin            |                   |                |                |

NAYS—184

|                   |                   |                |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Adams             | Cleaver           | Evans          |
| Aguilar           | Clyburn           | Foster         |
| Barragán          | Cohen             | Frankel (FL)   |
| Bass              | Connolly          | Fudge          |
| Beatty            | Conyers           | Galleo         |
| Bera              | Cooper            | Garamendi      |
| Beyer             | Correa            | Gonzalez (TX)  |
| Bishop (GA)       | Costa             | Gottheimer     |
| Blumenauer        | Courtney          | Green, Al      |
| Blunt Rochester   | Crist             | Green, Gene    |
| Bonamici          | Crowley           | Grijalva       |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Cuellar           | Gutiérrez      |
| Brady (PA)        | Davis (CA)        | Hanabusa       |
| Brown (MD)        | Davis, Danny      | Hastings       |
| Brownley (CA)     | DeFazio           | Heck           |
| Bustos            | DeGette           | Higgins (NY)   |
| Butterfield       | Delaney           | Himes          |
| Capuano           | DelBene           | Hoyer          |
| Carbajal          | Demings           | Huffman        |
| Cardenas          | DeSaulnier        | Jackson Lee    |
| Carson (IN)       | Deutch            | Jayapal        |
| Cartwright        | Dingell           | Jeffries       |
| Castor (FL)       | Doggett           | Johnson (GA)   |
| Castro (TX)       | Doyle, Michael F. | Johnson, E. B. |
| Chu, Judy         | Ellison           | Kaptur         |
| Cicilline         | Engel             | Kelly (IL)     |
| Clark (MA)        | Eshoo             | Kennedy        |
| Clarke (NY)       | Espallat          | Khanna         |
| Clay              | Esty (CT)         | Kihuen         |
|                   |                   | Kildee         |

NOT VOTING—21

□ 1333

Ms. SINEMA and Mr. CRIST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING SERVICEMEMBERS KILLED ABOARD USS “FITZGERALD”

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the USS *Fitzgerald* collided with a container ship off the coast of Japan. Seven of our brave servicemembers were killed in the collision.

I ask my colleagues to join me in a moment of silence to honor the brave sailors who gave the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 179, not voting 19, as follows:



[Roll No. 317]

## AYES—233

Abraham  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gianforte

Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes

Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schneider  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—179

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)

Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen

Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Español  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating

Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loebbeck  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters

Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozy  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt  
Bishop (UT)  
Cummings  
Gabbard  
Hastings  
Johnson, Sam  
Lance

Larsen (WA)  
Lie, Ted  
Long  
Meeke  
Messer  
Napolitano  
Perry

□ 1342

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today for rollcall vote No. 317. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unexpectedly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 316, and "yea" on rollcall No. 317.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I missed two votes on June 22. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: Rollcall No. 316: On Ordering the Previous Question, "yea." Rollcall No. 317: On Passage of H. Res. 396, "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 316 and No. 317 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous

Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2842. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 396—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2842—Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

# REPORT ON H.R. 2998, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-188) on the bill (H.R. 2998) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules if a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on the postponed question at a later time.

## STRENGTHENING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2353) to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2353

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act".*

### SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

*The table of contents for this Act is as follows:*

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. References.
- Sec. 4. Effective date.
- Sec. 5. Table of contents of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

- Sec. 6. Purpose.
- Sec. 7. Definitions.
- Sec. 8. Transition provisions.
- Sec. 9. Prohibitions.
- Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.

### TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

#### PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

- Sec. 110. Reservations and State allotment.



Sec. 111. Within State allocation.  
 Sec. 112. Accountability.  
 Sec. 113. National activities.  
 Sec. 114. Assistance for the outlying areas.  
 Sec. 115. Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.  
 Sec. 116. Occupational and employment information.

#### PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

Sec. 121. State plan.  
 Sec. 122. Improvement plans.  
 Sec. 123. State leadership activities.

#### PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 131. Local application for career and technical education programs.  
 Sec. 132. Local uses of funds.

#### TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Federal and State administrative provisions.

#### TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSEYER ACT

Sec. 301. State responsibilities.

#### SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

#### SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect beginning on July 1, 2018.

#### SEC. 5. TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE CARL D. PERKINS CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 2006.

Section 1(b) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

“Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.  
 “Sec. 2. Purpose.  
 “Sec. 3. Definitions.  
 “Sec. 4. Transition provisions.  
 “Sec. 5. Privacy.  
 “Sec. 6. Limitation.  
 “Sec. 7. Special rule.  
 “Sec. 8. Prohibitions.  
 “Sec. 9. Authorization of appropriations.

#### “TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

##### “PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

“Sec. 111. Reservations and State allotment.  
 “Sec. 112. Within State allocation.  
 “Sec. 113. Accountability.  
 “Sec. 114. National activities.  
 “Sec. 115. Assistance for the outlying areas.  
 “Sec. 116. Native American programs.  
 “Sec. 117. Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.

##### “PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

“Sec. 121. State administration.  
 “Sec. 122. State plan.  
 “Sec. 123. Improvement plans.  
 “Sec. 124. State leadership activities.

##### “PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS

“Sec. 131. Distribution of funds to secondary education programs.  
 “Sec. 132. Distribution of funds for postsecondary education programs.  
 “Sec. 133. Special rules for career and technical education.  
 “Sec. 134. Local application for career and technical education programs.  
 “Sec. 135. Local uses of funds.

#### “TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### “PART A—FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

“Sec. 211. Fiscal requirements.

“Sec. 212. Authority to make payments.  
 “Sec. 213. Construction.  
 “Sec. 214. Voluntary selection and participation.  
 “Sec. 215. Limitation for certain students.  
 “Sec. 216. Federal laws guaranteeing civil rights.  
 “Sec. 217. Participation of private school personnel and children.  
 “Sec. 218. Limitation on Federal regulations.  
 “Sec. 219. Study on programs of study aligned to high-skill, high-wage occupations.  
 “PART B—STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS  
 “Sec. 221. Joint funding.  
 “Sec. 222. Prohibition on use of funds to induce out-of-State relocation of businesses.  
 “Sec. 223. State administrative costs.  
 “Sec. 224. Student assistance and other Federal programs.”

#### SEC. 6. PURPOSE.

Section 2 (20 U.S.C. 2301) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “academic and career and technical skills” and inserting “academic knowledge and technical and employability skills”; and

(B) by inserting “and programs of study” after “technical education programs”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “, including tech prep education”; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and programs of study” after “technical education programs”.

#### SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 (20 U.S.C. 2302) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (16), (23), (24), (25), (26), and (32);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), (27), (28), (29), (30), (31), (33), and (34) as paragraphs (9), (10), (13), (16), (17), (19), (20), (23), (25), (27), (28), (30), (32), (35), (39), (40), (41), (44), (45), (46), and (47), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “5 different occupational fields to individuals” and inserting “three different fields, especially in in-demand industry sectors or occupations, that are available to all students”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “not fewer than 5 different occupational fields” and inserting “not fewer than three different occupational fields”;

(4) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “coherent and rigorous content aligned with challenging academic standards” and inserting “content at the secondary level aligned with the challenging State academic standards adopted by a State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)), and at the postsecondary level with the rigorous academic content,”;

(II) by striking “and skills” and inserting “and skills,”; and

(III) by inserting “, including in in-demand industry sectors or occupations” before the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “, an industry-recognized credential, a certificate, or an associate degree” and inserting “or a recognized postsecondary credential, which may include an industry-recognized credential”; and

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting “, work-based, or other” after “competency-based”;

(ii) by striking “contributes to the” and inserting “supports the development of”;

(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by striking “general”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) to the extent practicable, coordinate between secondary and postsecondary education programs, which may include early college programs with articulation agreements, dual or concurrent enrollment program opportunities, or programs of study; and

“(D) may include career exploration at the high school level or as early as the middle grades (as such term is defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).”;

(5) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(and parents, as appropriate)” and inserting “(and, as appropriate, parents and out-of-school youth)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “financial aid,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “financial aid, job training, secondary and postsecondary options (including baccalaureate degree programs), dual or concurrent enrollment programs, work-based learning opportunities, and support services.”;

(6) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) CAREER PATHWAYS.—The term ‘career pathways’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(7) by inserting after paragraph (10) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(11) CTE CONCENTRATOR.—The term ‘CTE concentrator’ means—

“(A) at the secondary school level, a student served by an eligible recipient who has—

“(i) completed three or more career and technical education courses; or

“(ii) completed at least two courses in a single career and technical education program or program of study; or

“(B) at the postsecondary level, a student enrolled in an eligible recipient who has—

“(i) earned at least 12 cumulative credits within a career and technical education program or program of study; or

“(ii) completed such a program if the program encompasses fewer than 12 credits or the equivalent in total.

“(12) CTE PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘CTE participant’ means an individual who completes not less than one course or earns not less than one credit in a career and technical education program or program of study of an eligible recipient.”;

(8) by inserting after paragraph (13) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(14) DUAL OR CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT.—The term ‘dual or concurrent enrollment’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(15) EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL.—The term ‘early college high school’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).”;

(9) by inserting after paragraph (17) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(18) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means a consortium that—

“(A) shall include at least two of the following:

“(i) a local educational agency;

“(ii) an educational service agency;

“(iii) an eligible institution;

“(iv) an area career and technical education school;

“(v) a State educational agency; or

“(vi) the Bureau of Indian Education;

“(B) may include a regional, State, or local public or private organization, including a community-based organization, one or more employers, or a qualified intermediary; and

“(C) is led by an entity or partnership of entities described in subparagraph (A).”;

(10) by amending paragraph (19) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) to read as follows:

“(19) **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘eligible institution’ means—

“(A) a consortium of two or more of the entities described in subparagraphs (B) through (F);

“(B) a public or nonprofit private institution of higher education that offers and will use funds provided under this title in support of career and technical education courses that lead to technical skill proficiency, an industry-recognized credential, a certificate, or an associate degree;

“(C) a local educational agency providing education at the postsecondary level;

“(D) an area career and technical education school providing education at the postsecondary level;

“(E) a postsecondary educational institution controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or operated by or on behalf of any Indian tribe that is eligible to contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or the Act of April 16, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 452 et seq.); or

“(F) an educational service agency.”;

(11) by adding after paragraph (20) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(21) **ENGLISH LEARNER.**—The term ‘English learner’ means—

“(A) a secondary school student who is an English learner, as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801); or

“(B) an adult or an out-of-school youth who has limited ability in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language and—

“(i) whose native language is a language other than English; or

“(ii) who lives in a family environment in which a language other than English is the dominant language.

“(22) **EVIDENCE-BASED.**—The term ‘evidence-based’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101(21)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801(21)(A)).”;

(12) by inserting after paragraph (23) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(24) **IN-DEMAND INDUSTRY SECTOR OR OCCUPATION.**—The term ‘in-demand industry sector or occupation’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(13) by inserting after paragraph (25) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(26) **INDUSTRY OR SECTOR PARTNERSHIP.**—The term ‘industry or sector partnership’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(14) by inserting after paragraph (28) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(29) **LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD.**—The term ‘local workforce development board’ means a local workforce development board established under section 107 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.”;

(15) by inserting after paragraph (30) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(31) **OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.**—The term ‘out-of-school youth’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(16) by inserting after paragraph (32) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(33) **PARAPROFESSIONAL.**—The term ‘paraprofessional’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(34) **PAY FOR SUCCESS INITIATIVE.**—The term ‘pay for success initiative’ has the meaning

given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801), except that such term does not include an initiative that—

“(A) reduces the special education or related services that a student would otherwise receive under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.); or

“(B) otherwise reduces the rights of a student or the obligations of an entity under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), or any other law.”;

(17) by inserting after paragraph (35) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(36) **PROGRAM OF STUDY.**—The term ‘program of study’ means a coordinated, nonduplicative sequence of secondary and postsecondary academic and technical content that—

“(A) incorporates challenging State academic standards, including those adopted by a State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)), that—

“(i) address both academic and technical knowledge and skills, including employability skills; and

“(ii) are aligned with the needs of industries in the economy of the State, region, or local area;

“(B) progresses in specificity (beginning with all aspects of an industry or career cluster and leading to more occupational specific instruction);

“(C) has multiple entry and exit points that incorporate credentialing; and

“(D) culminates in the attainment of a recognized postsecondary credential.

“(37) **QUALIFIED INTERMEDIARY.**—The term ‘qualified intermediary’ means a non-profit entity that demonstrates expertise to build, connect, sustain, and measure partnerships with entities such as employers, schools, community-based organizations, postsecondary institutions, social service organizations, economic development organizations, and workforce systems to broker services, resources, and supports to youth and the organizations and systems that are designed to serve youth, including—

“(A) connecting employers to classrooms;

“(B) assisting in the design and implementation of career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(C) delivering professional development;

“(D) connecting students to internships and other work-based learning opportunities; and

“(E) developing personalized student supports.

“(38) **RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.**—The term ‘recognized postsecondary credential’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(18) in paragraph (41) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2))—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “foster children” and inserting “youth who are in or have aged out of the foster care system”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (F), by striking “individuals with limited English proficiency,” and inserting “English learners.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) homeless individuals described in section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a); and

“(H) youth with a parent who—

“(i) is a member of the armed forces (as such term is defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code); and

“(ii) is on active duty (as such term is defined in section 101(d)(1) of such title).”;

(19) by inserting after paragraph (41) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(42) **SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL.**—The term ‘specialized instructional support personnel’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(43) **SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES.**—The term ‘specialized instructional support services’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).”;

(20) in paragraph (45) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) by inserting “(including paraprofessionals and specialized instructional support personnel)” after “supportive personnel”; and

(21) by adding at the end the following:

“(48) **UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING.**—The term ‘universal design for learning’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(49) **WORK-BASED LEARNING.**—The term ‘work-based learning’ means sustained interactions with industry or community professionals in real workplace settings, to the extent practicable, or simulated environments at an educational institution that foster in-depth, first-hand engagement with the tasks required of a given career field, that are aligned to curriculum and instruction.”.

## SEC. 8. TRANSITION PROVISIONS.

Section 4 (20 U.S.C. 2303) is amended—

(1) by striking “the Secretary determines to be appropriate” and inserting “are necessary”;

(2) by striking “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006” each place it appears and inserting “Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act”; and

(3) by striking “1998” and inserting “2006”.

## SEC. 9. PROHIBITIONS.

Section 8 (20 U.S.C. 2306a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Federal Government to mandate,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “Federal Government—

“(1) to condition or incentivize the receipt of any grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, or the receipt of any priority or preference under such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, upon a State, local educational agency, eligible agency, eligible recipient, eligible entity, or school’s adoption or implementation of specific instructional content, academic standards and assessments, curricula, or program of instruction (including any condition, priority, or preference to adopt the Common Core State Standards developed under the Common Core State Standards Initiative, any other academic standards common to a significant number of States, or any assessment, instructional content, or curriculum aligned to such standards);

“(2) through grants, contracts, or other cooperative agreements, to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, eligible agency, eligible recipient, eligible entity, or school’s specific instructional content, academic standards and assessments, curricula, or program of instruction (including any requirement, direction, or mandate to adopt the Common Core State Standards developed under the Common Core State Standards Initiative, any other academic standards common to a significant number of States, or any assessment, instructional content, or curriculum aligned to such standards); and

“(3) except as required under sections 112(b), 211(b), and 223—

“(A) to mandate, direct, or control the allocation of State or local resources; or

“(B) to mandate that a State or a political subdivision of a State spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under this Act.”;

(2) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

#### SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 (20 U.S.C. 2307) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are to be authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act (other than sections 114 and 117)—

- “(1) \$1,133,002,074 for fiscal year 2018;
- “(2) \$1,148,618,465 for fiscal year 2019;
- “(3) \$1,164,450,099 for fiscal year 2020;
- “(4) \$1,180,499,945 for fiscal year 2021;
- “(5) \$1,196,771,008 for fiscal year 2022; and
- “(6) \$1,213,266,339 for fiscal year 2023.”.

### TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

#### SEC. 110. RESERVATIONS AND STATE ALLOTMENT.

Paragraph (5) of section 111(a) (20 U.S.C. 2321(a)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “No State” and inserting “For each of fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020, no State”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A), as amended by paragraph (1), the following:

“(B) FISCAL YEAR 2021 AND EACH SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEAR.—For fiscal year 2021 and each of the succeeding fiscal years, no State shall receive an allotment under this section for a fiscal year that is less than 90 percent of the allotment the State received under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(4) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B)”.

#### SEC. 111. WITHIN STATE ALLOCATION.

Section 112 (20 U.S.C. 2322) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “10 percent” and inserting “15 percent”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “1 percent” and inserting “2 percent”; and

(II) by striking “State correctional institutions and institutions” and inserting “State correctional institutions, juvenile justice facilities, and educational institutions”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “available for services” and inserting “available to assist eligible recipients in providing services”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “a local plan,” and inserting “local applications.”; and (2) in subsection (c), by striking “section 135” and all that follows through the end and inserting “section 135—

“(1) in—

“(A) rural areas;

“(B) areas with high percentages of CTE concentrators or CTE participants; and

“(C) areas with high numbers of CTE concentrators or CTE participants; and

“(2) in order to—

“(A) foster innovation through the identification and promotion of promising and proven career and technical education programs, practices, and strategies, which may include practices and strategies that prepare individuals for nontraditional fields; or

“(B) promote the development, implementation, and adoption of programs of study or career pathways aligned with State-identified in-demand occupations or industries.”.

#### SEC. 112. ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 113 (20 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “comprised of the activities” and inserting “comprising the activities”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), as so redesignated, by striking “, and State levels of performance described in paragraph (3)(B) for each additional indicator of performance”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(A) CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE FOR CTE CONCENTRATORS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL.—Each eligible agency shall identify in the State plan core indicators of performance for CTE concentrators at the secondary level that are valid and reliable, and that include, at a minimum, measures of each of the following:

“(i) The percentage of CTE concentrators who graduate high school, as measured by—

“(I) the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)); and

“(II) at the State’s discretion, the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate defined in such section 8101 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(ii) CTE concentrator attainment of challenging State academic standards adopted by the State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)), and measured by the academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(2) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)).

“(iii) The percentage of CTE concentrators who, in the second quarter following the program year after exiting from secondary education, are in postsecondary education or advanced training, military service, or unsubsidized employment.

“(iv) Not less than one indicator of career and technical education program quality that—

“(I) shall include, not less than one of the following—

“(aa) the percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), graduating from high school having attained recognized postsecondary credentials;

“(bb) the percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), graduating from high school having attained postsecondary credits in the relevant career and technical educational program or program of study earned through dual and concurrent enrollment or another credit transfer agreement; or

“(cc) the percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), graduating from high school having participated in work-based learning; and

“(II) may include any other measure of student success in career and technical education that is statewide, valid, and reliable.

“(v) The percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), in career and technical education programs and programs of study that lead to nontraditional fields.

“(B) CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE FOR CTE CONCENTRATORS AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL.—Each eligible agency shall identify in the State plan core indicators of performance for CTE concentrators at the postsecondary level that are valid and reliable, and that include, at a minimum, measures of each of the following:

“(i) The percentage of CTE concentrators, who, during the second quarter after program completion, are in education or training activities, advanced training, or unsubsidized employment.

“(ii) The median earnings of CTE concentrators in unsubsidized employment two quarters after program completion.

“(iii) The percentage of CTE concentrators who receive a recognized postsecondary credential during participation in or within 1 year of program completion.

“(iv) The percentage of CTE concentrators in career and technical education programs and programs of study that lead to nontraditional fields.

“(C) ALIGNMENT OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—In developing core indicators of performance under subparagraphs (A) and (B), an eligible agency shall, to the greatest extent possible, align the indicators so that substantially similar information gathered for other State and Federal programs, or for any other purpose, may be used to meet the requirements of this section.”;

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) STATE ADJUSTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE FOR CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible agency, with input from eligible recipients, shall establish and identify in the State plan submitted under section 122, for the first 2 program years covered by the State plan, State levels of performance for each of the core indicators of performance described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) for career and technical education activities authorized under this title. The levels of performance established under this subparagraph shall, at a minimum—

“(I) be expressed in a percentage or numerical form, so as to be objective, quantifiable, and measurable; and

“(II) be sufficiently ambitious to allow for meaningful evaluation of program quality.

“(ii) STATE ADJUSTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE FOR SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Prior to the third program year covered by the State plan, each eligible agency shall revise the State levels of performance for each of the core indicators of performance for the subsequent program years covered by the State plan, taking into account the extent to which such levels of performance promote meaningful program improvement on such indicators. The State adjusted levels of performance identified under this clause shall be considered to be the State adjusted levels of performance for the State for such years and shall be incorporated into the State plan.

“(iii) REPORTING.—The eligible agency shall, for each year described in clauses (i) and (iii), publicly report and widely disseminate the State levels of performance described in this subparagraph.

“(iv) REVISIONS.—If unanticipated circumstances arise in a State, the eligible agency may revise the State adjusted levels of performance required under this subparagraph, and submit such revised levels of performance with evidence supporting the revision and demonstrating public consultation, in a manner consistent with the procedure described in subsections (d) and (f) of section 122.”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) ACTUAL LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—At the end of each program year, the eligible agency shall determine actual levels of performance on each of the core indicators of performance and publicly report and widely disseminate the actual levels of performance described in this subparagraph.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—An eligible agency shall establish State levels of performance under subparagraph (A) in a manner consistent with the procedure adopted by the eligible agency under section 122(d)(9).”; and

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i)(I), by striking “consistent with the State levels of performance established under paragraph (3), so as” and inserting “consistent with the form expressed in the State levels, so as”;

(II) by striking clause (i)(II) and inserting the following:

“(II) be sufficiently ambitious to allow for meaningful evaluation of program quality.”;

(III) in clause (iv)—

(aa) by striking “third and fifth program years” and inserting “third program year”; and  
(bb) by striking “corresponding” before “subsequent program years”;

(IV) in clause (v)—

(aa) by striking “and” at the end of subclause (I);

(bb) by redesignating subclause (II) as subclause (III);

(cc) by inserting after subclause (I) the following:

“(II) local economic conditions.”;

(dd) in subclause (III), as so redesignated, by striking “promote continuous improvement on the core indicators of performance by the eligible recipient,” and inserting “advance the eligible recipient’s accomplishments of the goals set forth in the local application; and”;

(ee) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) the eligible recipient’s ability and capacity to collect and access valid, reliable, and cost effective data.”;

(V) in clause (vi), by inserting “or changes occur related to improvements in data or measurement approaches,” after “factors described in clause (v).”; and

(VI) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) REPORTING.—The eligible recipient shall, for each year described in clauses (iii) and (iv), publicly report the local levels of performance described in this subparagraph.”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in clause (ii)(I) of subparagraph (B), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i)” and inserting “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii)”;

(II) by striking “section 3(29)” and inserting “section 3(40)”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting “STATE” before “REPORT”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “information on the levels of performance achieved by the State with respect to the additional indicators of performance, including the” and inserting “the”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) by striking “categories” and inserting “subgroups”;

(ii) by striking “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i)” and inserting “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii)”;

(iii) by striking “section 3(29)” and inserting “section 3(40)”.

#### SEC. 113. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 114 (20 U.S.C. 2324) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary shall” the first place it appears and inserting “The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences.”;

(ii) by inserting “from eligible agencies under section 113(c)” after “pursuant to this title”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) REASONABLE COST.—The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to secure at reasonable cost the information required by this title. To ensure reasonable cost, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Center for Education Statistics and the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education shall determine the methodology to be used and the frequency with which such information is to be collected.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;

(ii) by striking “, directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements,” and inserting “directly or through grants”; and  
(iii) by striking “and assessment”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, acting through the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “describe how the Secretary”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “, in consultation with the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “the Secretary”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “, acting through the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “The Secretary”;

(II) by inserting “and the plan developed under subsection (c)” after “described in paragraph (2)”;

(III) by striking “assessment” each place such term appears and inserting “evaluation”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (v), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(II) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, which may include individuals with expertise in addressing inequities in access to, and in opportunities for academic and technical skill attainment; and”;

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) representatives of special populations.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “AND ASSESSMENT”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “, acting through the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “the Secretary”;

(II) by striking “an independent evaluation and assessment” and inserting “a series of research and evaluation initiatives for each year for which funds are appropriated to carry out this Act, which are aligned with the plan in subsection (c)(2).”; and

(III) by striking “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006” and inserting “Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act”;

(IV) by striking “, contracts, and cooperative agreements that are” and inserting “to institutions of higher education or a consortia of one or more institutions of higher education and one or more private nonprofit organizations or agencies”; and

(V) by adding at the end the following: “Such evaluation shall, whenever possible, use the most recent data available.”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) CONTENTS.—The evaluation required under subparagraph (A) shall include descriptions and evaluations of—

“(i) the extent and success of the integration of challenging State academic standards adopted under 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)) and career and technical education for students participating in career and technical education programs, including a review of the effect of such integration on the academic and technical proficiency achievement of such students (including the number of such students that receive a regular high school diploma, as such term is defined under section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or a State-defined alternative diploma described in section 8101(25)(A)(ii)(I)(bb) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7801(25)(A)(ii)(I)(bb)));

“(ii) the extent to which career and technical education programs and programs of study pre-

pare students, including special populations, for subsequent employment in high-skill, high-wage occupations (including those in which mathematics and science, which may include computer science, skills are critical), or for participation in postsecondary education;

“(iii) employer involvement in, benefit from, and satisfaction with, career and technical education programs and programs of study and career and technical education students’ preparation for employment;

“(iv) efforts to expand access to career and technical education programs of study for all students;

“(v) innovative approaches to work-based learning programs that increase participation and alignment with employment in high-growth industries, including in rural and low-income areas;

“(vi) the extent to which career and technical education programs supported by this Act are grounded on evidence-based research;

“(vii) the impact of the amendments to this Act made under the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, including comparisons, where appropriate, of—

“(I) the use of the comprehensive needs assessment under section 134(b);

“(II) the implementation of programs of study; and

“(III) coordination of planning and program delivery with other relevant laws, including the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.);

“(viii) changes in career and technical education program accountability as described in section 113 and any effects of such changes on program delivery and program quality; and

“(ix) changes in student enrollment patterns.”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting “, in consultation with the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “The Secretary”;

(bb) in subclause (I)—

(AA) by striking “assessment” and inserting “evaluation and summary of research activities carried out under this section”; and

(BB) by striking “2010” and inserting “2021”; and

(cc) in subclause (II)—

(AA) by striking “assessment” and inserting “evaluation and summary of research activities carried out under this section”; and

(BB) by striking “2011” and inserting “2023”; and

(II) by adding after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) DISSEMINATION.—In addition to submitting the reports required under clause (i), the Secretary shall disseminate the results of the evaluation widely and on a timely basis in order to increase the understanding among State and local officials and educators of the effectiveness of programs and activities supported under the Act and of the career and technical education programs that are most likely to produce positive educational and employment outcomes.”;

(C) by striking paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) and inserting the following:

“(3) INNOVATION.—

“(A) GRANT PROGRAM.—To identify and support evidence-based and innovative strategies and activities to improve career and technical education and align workforce skills with labor market needs as part of the plan developed under subsection (c) and the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary may award grants to eligible entities to—

“(i) create, develop, implement, or take to scale evidence-based, field initiated innovations,

including through a pay for success initiative, to improve student outcomes in career and technical education; and

“(ii) rigorously evaluate such innovations.

“(B) MATCHING FUNDS.—

“(i) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—Except as provided under clause (ii), to receive a grant under this paragraph, an eligible entity shall, through cash or in-kind contributions, provide matching funds from public or private sources in an amount equal to at least 50 percent of the funds provided under such grant.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may waive the matching fund requirement under clause (i) if the eligible entity demonstrates exceptional circumstances.

“(C) APPLICATION.—To receive a grant under this paragraph, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary at such a time as the Secretary may require, an application that—

“(i) identifies and designates the agency, institution, or school responsible for the administration and supervision of the program assisted under this paragraph;

“(ii) identifies the source and amount of the matching funds required under subparagraph (B)(i);

“(iii) describes how the eligible entity will use the grant funds, including how such funds will directly benefit students, including special populations, served by the eligible entity;

“(iv) describes how the program assisted under this paragraph will be coordinated with the activities carried out under section 124 or 135;

“(v) describes how the program assisted under this paragraph aligns with the single plan described in subsection (c); and

“(vi) describes how the program assisted under this paragraph will be evaluated and how that evaluation may inform the report described in subsection (d)(2)(C).

“(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to applications from eligible entities that will predominantly serve students from low-income families.

“(E) GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall award no less than 25 percent of the total available funds for any fiscal year to eligible entities proposing to fund career and technical education activities that serve—

“(I) a local educational agency with an urban-centric district locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the Secretary;

“(II) an institution of higher education primarily serving the one or more areas served by such a local educational agency;

“(III) a consortium of such local educational agencies or such institutions of higher education;

“(IV) a partnership between—

“(aa) an educational service agency or a non-profit organization; and

“(bb) such a local educational agency or such an institution of higher education; or

“(V) a partnership between—

“(aa) a grant recipient described in subclause (I) or (II); and

“(bb) a State educational agency.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), the Secretary shall reduce the amount of funds made available under such clause if the Secretary does not receive a sufficient number of applications of sufficient quality.

“(F) USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that is awarded a grant under this paragraph shall use the grant funds, in a manner consistent with subparagraph (A)(i), to—

“(i) improve career and technical education outcomes of students served by eligible entities under this title;

“(ii) improve career and technical education teacher effectiveness;

“(iii) improve the transition of students from secondary education to postsecondary education or employment;

“(iv) improve the incorporation of comprehensive work-based learning into career and technical education;

“(v) increase the effective use of technology within career and technical education programs;

“(vi) support new models for integrating academic content and career and technical education content in such programs;

“(vii) support the development and enhancement of innovative delivery models for career and technical education;

“(viii) work with industry to design and implement courses or programs of study aligned to labor market needs in new or emerging fields;

“(ix) integrate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, including computer science education, with career and technical education;

“(x) support innovative approaches to career and technical education by redesigning the high school experience for students, which may include evidence-based transitional support strategies for students who have not met postsecondary education eligibility requirements;

“(xi) improve CTE concentrator employment outcomes in nontraditional fields; or

“(xii) support the use of career and technical education programs and programs of study in a coordinated strategy to address identified employer needs and workforce shortages, such as shortages in the early childhood, elementary school, and secondary school education workforce.

“(G) EVALUATION.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this paragraph shall provide for an independent evaluation of the activities carried out using such grant and submit to the Secretary an annual report that includes—

“(i) a description of how funds received under this paragraph were used;

“(ii) the performance of the eligible entity with respect to, at a minimum, the performance indicators described under section 113, as applicable, and disaggregated by—

“(I) subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2)(B) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(c)(2)(B));

“(II) special populations; and

“(III) as appropriate, each career and technical education program and program of study; and

“(iii) a quantitative analysis of the effectiveness of the project carried out under this paragraph.”; and

(5) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

“(1) \$7,523,285 for fiscal year 2018;

“(2) \$7,626,980 for fiscal year 2019;

“(3) \$7,732,104 for fiscal year 2020;

“(4) \$7,838,677 for fiscal year 2021;

“(5) \$7,946,719 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(6) \$8,056,251 for fiscal year 2023.”.

#### SEC. 114. ASSISTANCE FOR THE OUTLYING AREAS.

Section 115 (20 U.S.C. 2325) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “subject to subsection (d)” and inserting “subject to subsection (b)”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

#### SEC. 115. TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY CAREER AND TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS.

Section 117(i) (20 U.S.C. 2327(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

“(1) \$8,400,208 for fiscal year 2018;

“(2) \$8,515,989 for fiscal year 2019;

“(3) \$8,633,367 for fiscal year 2020;

“(4) \$8,752,362 for fiscal year 2021;

“(5) \$8,872,998 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(6) \$8,995,296 for fiscal year 2023.”.

#### SEC. 116. OCCUPATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION.

Section 118 (20 U.S.C. 2328) is repealed.

#### PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

##### SEC. 121. STATE PLAN.

Section 122 (20 U.S.C. 2342) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “6-year period” and inserting “4-year period”; and

(ii) by striking “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006” and inserting “Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “6-year period” and inserting “4-year period”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “(including charter school)” and all that follows through “and community organizations)” and inserting “(including teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, school leaders, authorized public chartering agencies, and charter school leaders, consistent with State law, employers, labor organizations, parents, students, and community organizations)”;

(2) by amending subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) to read as follows:

“(b) OPTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF STATE PLAN.—

“(1) COMBINED PLAN.—The eligible agency may submit a combined plan that meets the requirements of this section and the requirements of section 103 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3113), unless the eligible agency opts to submit a single plan under paragraph (2) and informs the Secretary of such decision.

“(2) SINGLE PLAN.—If the eligible agency elects not to submit a combined plan as described in paragraph (1), such eligible agency shall submit a single State plan.

“(c) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The eligible agency shall—

“(A) develop the State plan in consultation with—

“(i) representatives of secondary and postsecondary career and technical education programs, including eligible recipients and representatives of 2-year Minority-Serving Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities in States where such institutions are in existence, and charter school representatives in States where such schools are in existence, which shall include teachers, faculty, school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel (including guidance counselors), and paraprofessionals;

“(ii) interested community representatives, including parents and students;

“(iii) the State workforce development board described in section 101 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3111);

“(iv) representatives of special populations;

“(v) representatives of business and industry (including representatives of small business), which shall include representatives of industry and sector partnerships in the State, as appropriate, and representatives of labor organizations in the State;

“(vi) representatives of agencies serving out-of-school youth, homeless children and youth, and at-risk youth; and

“(vii) representatives of Indian tribes located in the State; and

“(B) consult the Governor of the State, and the heads of other State agencies with authority for career and technical education programs that are not the eligible agency, with respect to the development of the State plan.

“(2) **ACTIVITIES AND PROCEDURES.**—The eligible agency shall develop effective activities and procedures, including access to information needed to use such procedures, to allow the individuals and entities described in paragraph (1) to participate in State and local decisions that relate to development of the State plan.

“(d) **PLAN CONTENTS.**—The State plan shall include—

“(1) a summary of State-supported workforce development activities (including education and training) in the State, including the degree to which the State’s career and technical education programs and programs of study are aligned with such activities;

“(2) the State’s strategic vision and set of goals for preparing an educated and skilled workforce (including special populations) and for meeting the skilled workforce needs of employers, including in-demand industry sectors and occupations as identified by the State, and how the State’s career and technical education programs will help to meet these goals;

“(3) a summary of the strategic planning elements of the unified State plan required under section 102(b)(1) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(1)), including the elements related to system alignment under section 102(b)(2)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(2)(B));

“(4) a description of the career and technical education programs or programs of study that will be supported, developed, or improved, including descriptions of—

“(A) the programs of study to be developed at the State level and made available for adoption by eligible recipients;

“(B) the process and criteria to be used for approving locally developed programs of study or career pathways, including how such programs address State workforce development and education needs; and

“(C) how the eligible agency will—

“(i) make information on approved programs of study and career pathways, including career exploration, work-based learning opportunities, dual and concurrent enrollment opportunities, and guidance and advisement resources, available to students and parents;

“(ii) ensure nonduplication of eligible recipients’ development of programs of study and career pathways;

“(iii) determine alignment of eligible recipients’ programs of study to the State, regional or local economy, including in-demand fields and occupations identified by the State workforce development board as appropriate;

“(iv) provide equal access to activities assisted under this Act for special populations;

“(v) coordinate with the State workforce board to support the local development of career pathways and articulate processes by which career pathways will be developed by local workforce development boards;

“(vi) use State, regional, or local labor market data to align career and technical education with State labor market needs;

“(vii) support effective and meaningful collaboration between secondary schools, postsecondary institutions, and employers, which may include the development of articulation agreements described in section 124(b)(3); and

“(viii) improve outcomes for CTE concentrators, including those who are members of special populations;

“(5) a description of the criteria and process for how the eligible agency will approve eligible recipients for funds under this Act, including how—

“(A) each eligible recipient will promote academic achievement;

“(B) each eligible recipient will promote skill attainment, including skill attainment that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential; and

“(C) each eligible recipient will ensure the local needs assessment under section 134 takes into consideration local economic and education needs, including where appropriate, in-demand industry sectors and occupations;

“(6) a description of how the eligible agency will support the recruitment and preparation of teachers, including special education teachers, faculty, administrators, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals to provide career and technical education instruction, leadership, and support;

“(7) a description of how the eligible agency will use State leadership funding to meet the requirements of section 124(b);

“(8) a description of how funds received by the eligible agency through the allotment made under section 111 will be distributed—

“(A) among career and technical education at the secondary level, or career and technical education at the postsecondary and adult level, or both, including how such distribution will most effectively provide students with the skills needed to succeed in the workplace; and

“(B) among any consortia that may be formed among secondary schools and eligible institutions, and how funds will be distributed among the members of the consortia, including the rationale for such distribution and how it will most effectively provide students with the skills needed to succeed in the workplace;

“(9) a description of the procedure the eligible agency will adopt for determining State adjusted levels of performance described in section 113, which at a minimum shall include—

“(A) consultation with stakeholders identified in paragraph (1);

“(B) opportunities for the public to comment in person and in writing on the State adjusted levels of performance included in the State plan; and

“(C) submission of public comment on State adjusted levels of performance as part of the State plan; and

“(10) assurances that—

“(A) the eligible agency will comply with the requirements of this Act and the provisions of the State plan, including the provision of a financial audit of funds received under this Act, which may be included as part of an audit of other Federal or State programs;

“(B) none of the funds expended under this Act will be used to acquire equipment (including computer software) in any instance in which such acquisition results in a direct financial benefit to any organization representing the interests of the acquiring entity or the employees of the acquiring entity, or any affiliate of such an organization;

“(C) the eligible agency will use the funds to promote preparation for high-skill, high-wage, or in-demand occupations and nontraditional fields, as identified by the State;

“(D) the eligible agency will use the funds provided under this Act to implement career and technical education programs and programs of study for individuals in State correctional institutions, including juvenile justice facilities; and

“(E) the eligible agency will provide local educational agencies, area career and technical education schools, and eligible institutions in the State with technical assistance, including technical assistance on how to close gaps in student participation and performance in career and technical education programs.

“(e) **CONSULTATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The eligible agency shall develop the portion of each State plan relating

to the amount and uses of any funds proposed to be reserved for adult career and technical education, postsecondary career and technical education, and secondary career and technical education after consultation with the—

“(A) State agency responsible for supervision of community colleges, technical institutes, or other 2-year postsecondary institutions primarily engaged in providing postsecondary career and technical education;

“(B) the State agency responsible for secondary education; and

“(C) the State agency responsible for adult education.

“(2) **OBJECTIONS OF STATE AGENCIES.**—If a State agency other than the eligible agency finds that a portion of the final State plan is objectionable, that objection shall be filed together with the State plan. The eligible agency shall respond to any objections of such State agency in the State plan submitted to the Secretary.

“(f) **PLAN APPROVAL.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall approve a State plan not later than 120 days after its submission to the Secretary unless the Secretary—

“(A) determines that the State plan does not meet the requirements of this Act, including the requirements described in section 113; and

“(B) meets the requirements of paragraph (2) with respect to such plan.

“(2) **DISAPPROVAL.**—The Secretary shall—

“(A) have the authority to disapprove a State plan only if the Secretary—

“(i) determines how the State plan fails to meet the requirements of this Act; and

“(ii) provides to the eligible agency, in writing, notice of such determination and the supporting information and rationale to substantiate such determination; and

“(B) not finally disapprove a State plan, except after making the determination and providing the information described in subparagraph (A), and giving the eligible agency notice and an opportunity for a hearing.”.

## SEC. 122. IMPROVEMENT PLANS.

Section 123 (20 U.S.C. 2343) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “percent of an agreed upon” and inserting “percent of the”; and

(ii) by striking “appropriate agencies,” and inserting “appropriate State agencies.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “purposes of this Act,” and inserting “purposes of this section, including after implementation of the improvement plan described in paragraph (1),” and

(ii) by striking “work with the eligible agency” and inserting “provide the eligible agency technical assistance”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the eligible agency fails to make any improvement in meeting any of the State adjusted levels of performance for any of the core indicators of performance identified under paragraph (1) during the first 2 years of implementation of the improvement plan required under paragraph (1), the eligible agency—

“(i) shall develop and implement, in consultation with the stakeholders described in section 122(c)(1)(A), a revised improvement plan (with special consideration of performance gaps identified under section 113(c)(2)(B)) to address the reasons for such failure; and

“(ii) shall continue to implement such improvement plan until the eligible agency meets at least 90 percent of the State adjusted level of performance for the same core indicators of performance for which the plan is revised.”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);



(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following:

“(B) REVISED PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to each eligible agency with a plan revised under subparagraph (A)(i) until such agency meets the requirements of subparagraph (A)(ii).”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking “sanction in” and inserting “requirements of”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “the eligible agency, appropriate agencies, individuals, and organizations” and inserting “local stakeholders included in section 134(d)(1)”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “shall work with the eligible recipient to implement improvement activities consistent with the requirements of this Act.” and inserting “shall provide technical assistance to assist the eligible recipient in meeting its responsibilities under section 134.”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the eligible recipient fails to make any improvement in meeting any of the local adjusted levels of performance for any of the core indicators of performance identified under paragraph (2) during a number of years determined by the eligible agency, the eligible recipient—

“(i) shall revise the improvement plan described in paragraph (2) to address the reasons for such failure; and

“(ii) shall continue to implement such improvement plan until such recipient meets at least 90 percent of an agreed upon local adjusted level of performance for the same core indicators of performance for which the plan is revised.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(aa) by striking “In determining whether to impose sanctions under subparagraph (A), the” and inserting “The”; and

(bb) by striking “waive imposing sanctions” and inserting “waive the requirements of subparagraph (A)”; and

(II) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) in response to a public request from an eligible recipient consistent with clauses (i) and (ii).”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (5); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—Except for consultation described in subsection (b)(2), the State and local improvement plans, and the elements of such plans, required under this section shall be developed solely by the eligible agency or the eligible recipient, respectively.”.

#### SEC. 123. STATE LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES.

Section 124 (20 U.S.C. 2344) is amended—

(I) in subsection (a), by striking “shall conduct State leadership activities.” and inserting “shall—

“(1) conduct State leadership activities directly; and

“(2) report on the effectiveness of such use of funds in achieving the goals described in section 122(d)(2) and the State adjusted levels of performance described in section 113(b)(3)(A).”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) through (4) and inserting the following:

“(1) developing statewide programs of study, which may include standards, curriculum, and course development, and career exploration, guidance, and advisement activities and resources;

“(2) approving locally developed programs of study that meet the requirements established in section 122(d)(4)(B);

“(3) establishing statewide articulation agreements aligned to approved programs of study;

“(4) establishing statewide partnerships among local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and employers, including small businesses, to develop and implement programs of study aligned to State and local economic and education needs, including as appropriate, in-demand industry sectors and occupations.”; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (6) through (9) and inserting the following:

“(6) support services for individuals in State institutions, such as State correctional institutions, including juvenile justice facilities, and educational institutions that serve individuals with disabilities;

“(7) for faculty and teachers providing career and technical education instruction, support services, and specialized instructional support services, high-quality comprehensive professional development that is, to the extent practicable, grounded in evidence-based research (to the extent a State determines that such evidence is reasonably available) that identifies the most effective educator professional development process and is coordinated and aligned with other professional development activities carried out by the State (including under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) and title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.)), including programming that—

“(A) promotes the integration of the challenging State academic standards adopted by the State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)) and relevant technical knowledge and skills;

“(B) prepares career and technical education teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals to provide appropriate accommodations for students who are members of special populations, including through the use of principles of universal design for learning; and

“(C) increases understanding of industry standards, as appropriate, for faculty providing career and technical education instruction; and

“(8) technical assistance for eligible recipients.”; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking paragraphs (1) through (17) and inserting the following:

“(1) awarding incentive grants to eligible recipients—

“(A) for exemplary performance in carrying out programs under this Act, which awards shall be based on—

“(i) eligible recipients exceeding the local adjusted level of performance established under section 113(b)(4)(A) in a manner that reflects sustained or significant improvement;

“(ii) eligible recipients effectively developing connections between secondary education and postsecondary education and training;

“(iii) the integration of academic and technical standards;

“(iv) eligible recipients’ progress in closing achievement gaps among subpopulations who participate in programs of study; or

“(v) other factors relating to the performance of eligible recipients under this Act as the eligible agency determines are appropriate; or

“(B) if an eligible recipient elects to use funds as permitted under section 135(c);

“(2) providing support for the adoption and integration of recognized postsecondary credentials or for consultation and coordination with other State agencies for the identification, consolidation, or elimination of licenses or certifications which pose an unnecessary barrier to

entry for aspiring workers and provide limited consumer protection;

“(3) the creation, implementation, and support of pay-for-success initiatives leading to recognized postsecondary credentials;

“(4) support for career and technical education programs for adults and out-of-school youth concurrent with their completion of their secondary school education in a school or other educational setting;

“(5) the creation, evaluation, and support of competency-based curricula;

“(6) support for the development, implementation, and expansion of programs of study or career pathways in areas declared to be in a state of emergency under section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5191);

“(7) providing support for dual or concurrent enrollment programs, such as early college high schools;

“(8) improvement of career guidance and academic counseling programs that assist students in making informed academic and career and technical education decisions, including academic and financial aid counseling;

“(9) support for the integration of employability skills into career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(10) support for programs and activities that increase access, student engagement, and success in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields (including computer science), particularly for students who are members of groups underrepresented in such subject fields, such as female students, minority students, and students who are members of special populations;

“(11) support for career and technical student organizations, especially with respect to efforts to increase the participation of students who are members of special populations;

“(12) support for establishing and expanding work-based learning opportunities;

“(13) support for preparing, retaining, and training of career and technical education teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, such as preservice, professional development, and leadership development programs;

“(14) integrating and aligning programs of study and career pathways;

“(15) supporting the use of career and technical education programs and programs of study aligned with State, regional, or local in-demand industry sectors or occupations identified by State or local workforce development boards;

“(16) making all forms of instructional content widely available, which may include use of open educational resources;

“(17) support for the integration of arts and design skills, when appropriate, into career and technical education programs and programs of study; and

“(18) support for accelerated learning programs (described in section 4104(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7114(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV)) when any such program is part of a program of study.”.

#### PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS

##### SEC. 131. LOCAL APPLICATION FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 134 (20 U.S.C. 2354) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “LOCAL PLAN” and inserting “LOCAL APPLICATION”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “LOCAL PLAN” and inserting “LOCAL APPLICATION”;

(B) by striking “submit a local plan” and inserting “submit a local application”; and

(C) by striking “Such local plan” and inserting “Such local application”; and

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:



“(b) CONTENTS.—The eligible agency shall determine the requirements for local applications, except that each local application shall contain—

“(1) a description of the results of the comprehensive needs assessment conducted under subsection (c);

“(2) information on the programs of study approved by a State under section 124(b)(2) supported by the eligible recipient with funds under this part, including—

“(A) how the results of the comprehensive needs assessment described in subsection (c) informed the selection of the specific career and technical education programs and activities selected to be funded; and

“(B) a description of any new programs of study the eligible recipient will develop and submit to the State for approval;

“(3) a description of how the eligible recipient will provide—

“(A) career exploration and career development coursework, activities, or services;

“(B) career information; and

“(C) an organized system of career guidance and academic counseling to students before enrolling and while participating in a career and technical education program; and

“(4) a description of how the eligible recipient will—

“(A) provide activities to prepare special populations for high-skill, high-wage, or in-demand occupations that will lead to self-sufficiency; and

“(B) prepare CTE participants for nontraditional fields.

“(c) COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive financial assistance under this part, an eligible recipient shall—

“(A) conduct a comprehensive local needs assessment related to career and technical education; and

“(B) not less than once every 2 years, update such comprehensive local needs assessment.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The comprehensive local needs assessment described under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) an evaluation of the performance of the students served by the eligible recipient with respect to State and local adjusted levels of performance established pursuant to section 113, including an evaluation of performance for special populations;

“(B) a description of how career and technical education programs offered by the eligible recipient are—

“(i) sufficient in size, scope, and quality to meet the needs of all students served by the eligible recipient; and

“(ii) (I) aligned to State, regional, or local in-demand industry sectors or occupations identified by the State or local workforce development board, including career pathways, where appropriate; or

“(II) designed to meet local education or economic needs not identified by State or local workforce development boards;

“(C) an evaluation of progress toward the implementation of career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(D) an evaluation of strategies needed to overcome barriers that result in lowering rates of access to, or lowering success in, career and technical education programs for special populations, which may include strategies to establish or utilize existing flexible learning and manufacturing facilities, such as makerspaces;

“(E) a description of how the eligible recipient will improve recruitment, retention, and training of career and technical education teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, and career, academic, and guidance counselors, including individuals

in groups underrepresented in such professions; and

“(F) a description of how the eligible recipient will support the transition to teaching from business and industry.

“(d) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the comprehensive needs assessment under subsection (c), an eligible recipient shall involve a diverse body of stakeholders, including, at a minimum—

“(1) representatives of career and technical education programs in a local educational agency or educational service agency, including teachers and administrators;

“(2) representatives of career and technical education programs at postsecondary educational institutions, including faculty and administrators;

“(3) representatives of State or local workforce development boards and a range of local or regional businesses or industries;

“(4) parents and students;

“(5) representatives of special populations; and

“(6) representatives of local agencies serving out-of-school youth, homeless children and youth, and at-risk youth (as defined in section 1432 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6472)).

“(e) CONTINUED CONSULTATION.—An eligible recipient receiving financial assistance under this part shall consult with the entities described in subsection (d) on an ongoing basis to—

“(1) provide input on annual updates to the comprehensive needs assessment required under subsection (c);

“(2) ensure programs of study are—

“(A) responsive to community employment needs;

“(B) aligned with employment priorities in the State, regional, or local economy identified by employers and the entities described in subsection (d), which may include in-demand industry sectors or occupations identified by the local workforce development board;

“(C) informed by labor market information, including information provided under section 15(e)(2)(C) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2(e)(2)(C));

“(D) designed to meet current, intermediate, or long-term labor market projections; and

“(E) allow employer input, including input from industry or sector partnerships in the local area, where applicable, into the development and implementation of programs of study to ensure programs align with skills required by local employment opportunities, including activities such as the identification of relevant standards, curriculum, industry-recognized credentials, and current technology and equipment;

“(3) identify and encourage opportunities for work-based learning; and

“(4) ensure funding under this part is used in a coordinated manner with other local resources.”.

#### SEC. 132. LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.

Section 135 (20 U.S.C. 2355) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 135. LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Each eligible recipient that receives funds under this part shall use such funds to develop, coordinate, implement, or improve career and technical education programs to meet the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment described in section 134(c).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR USES OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to eligible recipients under this part shall be used to support career and technical education programs that are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective and—

“(1) provide career exploration and career development activities through an organized, sys-

tematic framework designed to aid students, before enrolling and while participating in a career and technical education program, in making informed plans and decisions about future education and career opportunities and programs of study, which may include—

“(A) introductory courses or activities focused on career exploration and career awareness;

“(B) readily available career and labor market information, including information on—

“(i) occupational supply and demand;

“(ii) educational requirements;

“(iii) other information on careers aligned to State or local economic priorities; and

“(iv) employment sectors;

“(C) programs and activities related to the development of student graduation and career plans;

“(D) career guidance and academic counselors that provide information on postsecondary education and career options; or

“(E) any other activity that advances knowledge of career opportunities and assists students in making informed decisions about future education and employment goals;

“(2) provide professional development for teachers, principals, school leaders, administrators, faculty, and career and guidance counselors with respect to content and pedagogy that—

“(A) supports individualized academic and career and technical education instructional approaches, including the integration of academic and career and technical education standards and curriculum;

“(B) ensures labor market information is used to inform the programs, guidance, and advisement offered to students;

“(C) provides educators with opportunities to advance knowledge, skills, and understanding of all aspects of an industry, including the latest workplace equipment, technologies, standards, and credentials;

“(D) supports administrators in managing career and technical education programs in the schools, institutions, or local educational agencies of such administrators;

“(E) supports the implementation of strategies to improve student achievement and close gaps in student participation and performance in career and technical education programs; and

“(F) provides educators with opportunities to advance knowledge, skills, and understanding in pedagogical practices, including, to the extent the eligible recipient determines that such evidence is reasonably available, evidence-based pedagogical practices;

“(3) provide career and technical education students, including special populations, with the skills necessary to pursue high-skill, high-wage occupations;

“(4) support integration of academic skills into career and technical education programs and programs of study to support CTE participants at the secondary school level in meeting the challenging State academic standards adopted under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)) by the State in which the eligible recipient is located;

“(5) plan and carry out elements that support the implementation of career and technical education programs and programs of study and student achievement of the local adjusted levels of performance established under section 113, which may include—

“(A) curriculum aligned with the requirements for a program of study;

“(B) sustainable relationships among education, business and industry, and other community stakeholders, including industry or sector partnerships in the local area, where applicable, that are designed to facilitate the process of continuously updating and aligning programs

of study with skills in demand in the State, regional, or local economy;

“(C) dual or concurrent enrollment programs, including early college high schools, and the development or implementation of articulation agreements;

“(D) appropriate equipment, technology, and instructional materials (including support for library resources) aligned with business and industry needs, including machinery, testing equipment, tools, implements, hardware and software, and other new and emerging instructional materials;

“(E) a continuum of work-based learning opportunities;

“(F) industry-recognized certification exams or other assessments leading toward industry-recognized postsecondary credentials;

“(G) efforts to recruit and retain career and technical education program administrators and educators;

“(H) where applicable, coordination with other education and workforce development programs and initiatives, including career pathways and sector partnerships developed under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) and other Federal laws and initiatives that provide students with transition-related services, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.);

“(I) expanding opportunities for students to participate in distance career and technical education and blended-learning programs;

“(J) expanding opportunities for students to participate in competency-based education programs;

“(K) improving career guidance and academic counseling programs that assist students in making informed academic and career and technical education decisions, including academic and financial aid counseling;

“(L) supporting the integration of employability skills into career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(M) supporting programs and activities that increase access, student engagement, and success in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields (including computer science) for students who are members of groups underrepresented in such subject fields;

“(N) providing career and technical education, in a school or other educational setting, for adults or a school-aged individual who has dropped out of a secondary school to complete secondary school education or upgrade technical skills;

“(O) career and technical student organizations, including student preparation for and participation in technical skills competitions aligned with career and technical education program standards and curriculum;

“(P) making all forms of instructional content widely available, which may include use of open educational resources;

“(Q) supporting the integration of arts and design skills, when appropriate, into career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(R) where appropriate, expanding opportunities for CTE concentrators to participate in accelerated learning programs (described in section 4104(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7114(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV)) as part of a program of study; and

“(S) other activities to improve career and technical education programs; and

“(6) develop and implement evaluations of the activities carried out with funds under this part, including evaluations necessary to complete the comprehensive needs assessment required under section 134(c) and the local report required under section 113(b)(4)(C).

“(c) **POOLING FUNDS.**—An eligible recipient may pool a portion of funds received under this Act with a portion of funds received under this Act available to not less than one other eligible recipient to support implementation of programs of study through the activities described in subsection (b)(2).

“(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Each eligible recipient receiving funds under this part shall not use more than 5 percent of such funds for costs associated with the administration of activities under this section.”

## TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

### SEC. 201. FEDERAL AND STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The Act (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 311(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D), in order for a State to receive its full allotment of funds under this Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary must find that the State’s fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education for the preceding fiscal year was not less than the fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of such State, for the second preceding fiscal year.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “shall exclude capital expenditures, special 1-time project costs, and the cost of pilot programs.” and inserting “shall, at the request of the State, exclude competitive or incentive-based programs established by the State, capital expenditures, special one-time project costs, and the cost of pilot programs.”; and

(iii) by adding after subparagraph (C), the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **ESTABLISHING THE STATE BASELINE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the State may—

“(I) continue to use the State’s fiscal effort per student, or aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education, as was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act; or

“(II) establish a new level of fiscal effort per student, or aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education, which is not less than 90 percent of the State’s fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education for the preceding fiscal year.

“(ii) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of the new level described in clause (i)(II) shall be the State’s fiscal effort per student, or aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education, for the first full fiscal year following the enactment of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **FAILURE TO MEET.**—The Secretary shall reduce the amount of a State’s allotment of funds under this Act for any fiscal year in the exact proportion by which the State fails to meet the requirement of paragraph (1) by falling below the State’s fiscal effort per student or the State’s aggregate expenditures (using the measure most favorable to the State), if the State failed to meet such requirement (as determined using the measure most favorable to the State) for 1 or more of the 5 immediately preceding fiscal years.

“(3) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive paragraph (2) due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances affecting the ability of the State to meet the requirement of paragraph (1).”;

(2) in section 317(b)(1)—

(A) by striking “may, upon written request, use funds made available under this Act to” and inserting “may use funds made available under this Act to”; and

(B) by striking “who reside in the geographical area served by” and inserting “located in or near the geographical area served by”;

(3) by striking title II and redesignating title III as title II;

(4) by redesignating sections 311 through 318 as sections 211 through 218, respectively;

(5) by redesignating sections 321 through 324 as sections 221 through 224, respectively; and

(6) by inserting after section 218 (as so redesignated) the following:

### “SEC. 219. STUDY ON PROGRAMS OF STUDY ALIGNED TO HIGH-SKILL, HIGH-WAGE OCCUPATIONS.

“(a) **SCOPE OF STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate—

“(1) the strategies, components, policies, and practices used by eligible agencies or eligible recipients receiving funding under this Act to successfully assist—

“(A) all students in pursuing and completing programs of study aligned to high-skill, high-wage occupations; and

“(B) any specific subgroup of students identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(h)(1)(C)(ii)) in pursuing and completing programs of study aligned to high-skill, high-wage occupations in fields in which such subgroup is underrepresented; and

“(2) any challenges associated with replication of such strategies, components, policies, and practices.

“(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out the study conducted under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with a geographically diverse (including urban, suburban, and rural) representation of—

“(1) students and parents;

“(2) eligible agencies and eligible recipients;

“(3) teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, including those with expertise in preparing CTE students for nontraditional fields;

“(4) special populations; and

“(5) representatives of business and industry.

“(c) **SUBMISSION.**—Upon completion, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit the study conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.”

## TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSEY ACT

### SEC. 301. STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 15(e)(2) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491-2(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) consult with eligible agencies (defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)), State educational agencies, and local educational agencies concerning the provision of workforce and labor market information in order to—

“(i) meet the needs of secondary school and postsecondary school students who seek such information; and

“(ii) annually inform the development and implementation of programs of study defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302), and career pathways;”;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and  
(4) by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

“(I) provide, on an annual and timely basis to each eligible agency (defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)), the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Mr. Speaker, for years, Americans have urged Congress to work together and advance policies that promote good-paying jobs. We have heard the voices of those struggling to find the opportunities they need. They have been frustrated that the economy has taken so long to recover. Many feel stuck in a job market that has transformed dramatically due to advances in technology and an increasingly competitive global economy.

It is time to deliver the results hard-working men and women desperately need and restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity. That is exactly why we are here today.

This legislation is about jobs. I, along with my colleague Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, introduced H.R. 2353 to help prepare more Americans to succeed in the workforce by improving career and technical education.

Today, far too many Americans lack the skills and education they need to build a promising career, and many jobs are going unfilled as employers face a shortage of skilled workers.

Paul Tomczuk, president of R. H. Marcon and a constituent of mine, said: “Workforce development is one of the most pressing challenges facing roofing contractors today.” This is a problem we cannot afford to ignore.

As co-chair of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, I have worked hard to address this challenge by enhancing awareness of how CTE programs can lift people out of poverty and expand opportunity.

Too often, it is suggested that, in order to be successful in life, you have to get a bachelor's degree, but that is not the reality of today's diverse economy. In fact, I have met people who have gone into debt from attending a 4-year college or university only to enroll in a CTE program after graduation to get that good-paying job.

Attending a more traditional college or university simply isn't the right fit for everyone. There are countless individuals who learn best in innovative, work-based programming where they can acquire hands-on experience aimed at a certain career.

CTE programs are preparing students for the jobs of the future, including in technology, engineering, healthcare, agriculture, and more. However, there is more that can be done to ensure these programs are successful.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will rein in the Federal Government's role in CTE and empower State and local leaders to tailor programs to meet the unique needs of the students in their communities. It will give students and parents the tools they need to hold programs accountable.

Most importantly, this legislation encourages local education leaders to collaborate with local employers and improves alignment with CTE programs and in-demand jobs. This legislation is a win for American workers.

By working together, we have developed a set of bipartisan reforms that will help address our Nation's skills gap, break the cycle of poverty, and help more individuals climb the ladder of opportunity.

I want to thank Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for all the work that went into moving H.R. 2353 forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2353. H.R. 2353 is a bill introduced by my good friend Congressman THOMPSON and myself to modernize and take career and technical education into the 21st century.

A persistent complaint I hear from employers throughout the State of Illinois is that CTE programs have not kept pace with the changing demands of industry. This bill would address the skills gap by aligning CTE programs to meet the needs of the labor market, giving stakeholders more autonomy in developing curricula, while ensuring robust accountability standards. I hope everybody will support passage of H.R. 2353.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the

gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the distinguished chairwoman of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, who has had a commitment to skills-based education for many years.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, for his leadership on this issue. As he said, I have been a strong supporter of this for a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Mr. Speaker, when many Americans think of higher education, they think of a traditional college or university on a sprawling green campus. They think of students leaving colleges and universities with their degree in hand, ready for a career and set for life.

While many Americans choose this path, there is a misconception that this is the only pathway to success. For many hardworking Americans, the pathway to success does not require a baccalaureate degree. In fact, skills-focused education has helped countless Americans gain the specialized knowledge and skills they need to enter the workforce and build fulfilling lives.

So many men and women have found success through workforce development programs, however, we have come to a critical juncture with the future of these programs, and our educational institutions have not caught up. As a result, American businesses, large and small, are having a hard time finding enough workers with the skills and talent they need.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which unanimously passed the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, provides critical reforms to our Nation's education programs and prepares students to compete in our competitive global economy.

Mr. Speaker, all education is truly career education, and we must give our students every opportunity to attain the skills they need to succeed. When students, parents, employers, and, yes, lawmakers understand that, we will be on the right track to closing the skills gap that exists in our country.

I want to thank my colleagues, especially Representative THOMPSON, for his leadership on this issue. As the co-chair of the CTE Caucus, he has spent years championing this issue.

I also want to thank Ranking Member SCOTT and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, as well as all committee members, for the bipartisan work that is reflected in this bill.

Expanding opportunity through CTE is vital to closing the Nation's skills gap, ending the cycle of poverty, and creating a better tomorrow for hard-working Americans.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 2353.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, someone who has dedicated his career, in part, to this issue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership on this legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which will reauthorize the Perkins Career and Technical Education program. H.R. 2353 builds on the House's bipartisan efforts in the last Congress, when this Chamber passed CTE reauthorization by a vote of 405-5.

The research is clear: The United States workforce is suffering a skills gap. According to Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, by 2020, 65 percent of all jobs in the United States will require at least some postsecondary education or skills acquisition. Yet, if the current trend holds, by 2020, our Nation will have more than 5 million fewer skilled workers than necessary to fill the high-skilled jobs which will be available. In Virginia alone, that is 30,000 open jobs; 17,000 are in the area of cybersecurity, and those jobs have salaries starting at \$88,000.

This bipartisan, comprehensive reauthorization will improve program quality and services for students most in need of skills. It will also update the Federal investment in CTE to provide increased State and local flexibility, while ensuring greater accountability for program quality.

It ensures that there remains in place a Federal focus on equity of opportunity and the role of the U.S. Department of Education to protect and promote the civil rights of all students and compliance with Federal laws.

The bill also strengthens the Federal commitment to support delivery of high-quality CTE programs by retaining the Department of Education's full authority to approve or disapprove State and local plans.

The bill also requires Federal oversight, monitoring, and technical assistance to support program improvement and maintains full authority of the Secretary to enforce compliance with statutory program requirements and Federal civil rights laws.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for their bipartisan leadership, and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for his leadership as the chair of the CTE Caucus and for his dedication to realizing a comprehensive program reauthorization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported by the committee. It has nearly unanimous support from business groups, educators, and community stakeholders, so I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), the subcommittee chairman for the Workforce Protections Subcommittee of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I am proud to rise in support of this strong, bipartisan legislation.

Improving career and technical education programs is the most important thing Congress can do to help close the skills gap, combat poverty, and help put Americans back to work.

Studies clearly show that there are unfilled high-wage jobs out there that remain open because people lack the skills to fill the jobs. That is where CTE comes in.

When I was chancellor of Alabama's 2-year college system, I saw firsthand just how impressive these programs are. They really do work like magic by taking an untrained worker and giving him the skills he needs to fill an in-demand job. It is a win-win for everyone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor and supporter of this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this reform-oriented bill that helps build the 21st century workforce.

□ 1400

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), the chair of the CTE Caucus.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, I rise in strong support of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This bipartisan bill, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. The Carl D. Perkins CTE Act, the primary Federal investment in CTE, has not been reauthorized in over a decade.

I want to thank my colleagues, particularly Chairwoman FOXX, Ranking Member SCOTT, Representative THOMPSON, and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY for their leadership and collaboration on this important bill, and a particular thanks to my co-chair of the CTE Caucus, Mr. THOMPSON, for his outstanding leadership and partnership on this issue over the years.

Mr. Speaker, CTE provides students of all ages with the skills they need to succeed in high-demand, high-paying, high-skilled jobs. At a time right now when hundreds of thousands of jobs in manufacturing, IT, and other skilled

trades remain unfilled, Congress has a responsibility to empower workers with appropriate education and training. If we fail to modernize and invest in CTE, we will be unable to build a skilled workforce, and American businesses will pay the price.

H.R. 2353 aligns CTE programs with industry needs, promotes work-based learning, and supports career counselors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. H.R. 2353 aligns CTE programs with industry needs, promotes work-based learning, and supports career counselors while strengthening Federal investment in CTE.

I encourage my colleagues to support students, businesses, and their local economies by supporting this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this legislation.

I rise today to voice my strong support for the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, H.R. 2353. In today's economy, we know that not everyone follows the same path into the workforce. Whether a student wants to pursue a job in the auto industry, healthcare, energy, or IT, the reforms we are advancing will help aspiring workers get the hands-on experience they need to thrive in the 21st century workforce.

This bill is particularly important for my home State of Michigan, the heartland of American manufacturing, where high-skilled jobs are a vital component of our State's economy. I am also glad it includes my bipartisan provisions to address outdated and burdensome occupational licensing requirements.

As I meet with educators, workers, and manufacturers across my district, I consistently hear about the need to improve CTE programs and close the skills gap. Let's pass this bipartisan bill and help more men and women in Michigan and across the country secure fulfilling and good-paying jobs.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his leadership on this bill; and also to Congressman THOMPSON for all he has done to bring this to where it is today, because millions of students and workers are eager to advance into good-paying, high-skilled technical careers.

From childcare to manufacturing, to carpentry or computer science, jobs that require technical training are in high demand, and we want to make sure that students across the country have the skills they need to get hired and develop their careers.

With this bill, we will help strengthen the Perkins career and technical education program that reaches over 11 million students every year. This bill will help policymakers measure what does and does not work in career and technical education, allowing us to build on past successes. It will ensure our CTE programs are aligned with the needs of high-demand growth industries to make sure that America is competitive globally, and it will support work-based learning and apprenticeships, and our early education and childcare workforce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. This will bring the Perkins program into the modern, 21st century global economy. This has broad bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this act, and I urge them to fully fund the CTE programs and reject the proposed cuts of \$168 million.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GLENN THOMPSON for yielding. I appreciate his effective leadership on strengthening America's workforce to create jobs.

I am grateful to speak today on the importance of career and technical education, a critical tool in closing the skills gap and creating jobs.

South Carolina has been successful in promoting career and technical education programs, recruiting Michelin, BMW, Boeing, Bridgestone, MTU, and now Volvo. I hope all communities across America can experience the success we have achieved creating jobs, leading to the lowest unemployment rate in 16 years.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will reduce regulations and allow State and local leaders to create CTE programs that are best for their communities by providing greater flexibility of Federal resources, allowing States to respond to their unique educational and economic needs to create jobs for fulfilling lives.

I appreciate the opportunity to encourage my colleagues to pass this bipartisan legislation. These efforts, amplified by President Donald Trump's executive order last week expanding apprenticeship programs, will be an

important step forward in our educational system—closing the skills gap and training Americans for meaningful, skilled jobs.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

I would be remiss if I didn't compliment my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and all of their respective staffs who have worked so hard to bring this really good, strong bipartisan measure here before the Congress for the benefit of the American people.

I have got to tell you: everywhere I go back in Minnesota and around the country, I hear two things when I am talking to businesspeople. And they say, you know, the people who are trained under this career and technical education program are the best employees that we have. The other thing I hear is that we need more of them.

So, again, thanks to my colleagues for bringing this bill forward. There are some good, new provisions in it that gives States an opportunity to focus better on what the needs are in their particular region. There are some other tools to help communities, the program itself, and the businesses to form partnerships to expand the program.

At the end of the day, it is all about creating good, strong jobs with living wages and strong futures. It is about creating opportunities for the working men and women in this country and for the businesses that are at the heart of our economy. And is it about creating a dynamic economy where people can grow and prosper in the 21st century.

It is a good bill for workers. It is a good bill for business. It is a good bill for our economy. And it is a good bill for our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption in the strongest language possible.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my colleague from North Carolina, the chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee, to engage in a brief colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, Wyoming has used CTE funds to pioneer innovative ways of improving the college and career readiness of our students.

Protecting CTE funding in Wyoming for cutting-edge programs like the Pathway Innovation Center in Casper is crucial, in part, because the previous administration's harmful energy policies that devastated our economy, and we must now work to address a depressed labor market and hedge against future energy market downturns.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairwoman and her committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle for

their efforts to reform and reauthorize the CTE programs. However, I have concerns that the bill, as drafted in its current form, could negatively impact my State. Therefore, I can't support it.

Additionally, I know some Members from West Virginia and Louisiana share my concerns.

Therefore, I ask the gentlewoman, would she be willing to work with us as this process moves forward to help address these concerns so we can get a bill to the President's desk that we can all support?

Ms. FOXX. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CHENEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for sharing her perspective, and I look forward to working to address her concerns as we move forward in the legislative process.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support on reauthorizing the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, which really should be just called the JOBS Act. As we have heard from Members all across the country, Members are hearing the same thing from their employer community, which is jobs exist, but skills don't.

What this bill does is it connects people to that job market in response to the fact that the 21st century market is dynamic and changing, and this bill really gets it in terms of getting to that point.

In May, the U.S. Department of Labor reported that there are 5.9 million job openings in the U.S. economy; a record high since they even started collecting that data. So our job as Members of Congress is to update the law and update these programs to align it with the Workforce Investment Act, which was passed in 2014, and the Every Student Succeeds Act, which was passed again in the last Congress.

This will be the final piece of the puzzle, which will, again, make sure that millions of Americans will have the opportunity to have good-paying jobs that they can support themselves and their families. In sector after sector, whether it is IT, whether it is healthcare, whether it is advanced manufacturing, all are going to benefit from this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate both of the sponsors for their great work on this, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2353. This bill will reform our career and technical education system, and strengthen the programs in my district in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, there are jobs available in my district right now, but there aren't enough trained workers. This bill will help businesses and schools partner to prepare students for jobs in today's in-demand industries.

We need to accommodate the needs of many different types of students like Steve Nunemaker from Ephrata, Pennsylvania, who, at the age of 47, graduated from Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology with a degree in engineering computer-aided drafting.

CTE programs are vital to training workers for new careers. The jobs that are available are good, family-sustaining jobs. So many people in this country are ready to learn and eager to work.

I would like to thank again Representatives THOMPSON and KRISHNAMOORTHY for their leadership, and I rise to urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

I recently had the opportunity to visit our new Pathways in Technology Early College, or P-TECH, program at Skyline High School in Colorado.

P-TECH is a partnership between the St. Vrain Valley School District, Front Range Community College, and IBM. It allows students to earn a high school diploma and an associate's degree in 5 or 6 years through dual enrollment.

I spoke with a number of students participating in P-TECH and they shared with me how the program equips them with the skills they need to get a well-paying, reliable job after graduation. That is exactly the kind of innovation Congress should be supporting, and I am proud that the Perkins reauthorization bill does just that.

I urge this bill's final passage in the House, and I call on my colleagues in the Senate to take up this bipartisan legislation as soon as possible so more students can enjoy the kinds of opportunities that the students at the P-TECH High School and St. Vrain Valley School District do.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353.

Not only does this legislation authorize more available funding for CTE pro-

grams, it also gives States more freedom to support CTE activities in rural districts like mine.

□ 1415

This bill also gives authority back to the States to approve CTE plans rather than require Federal approval.

In the short time I have been in Congress, I have seen firsthand the unique differences across each of our States and districts. Increasing flexibility will enable States to have the flexibility to create and support programs that fit their unique workforce needs.

I am excited to be an original cosponsor of this legislation and look forward to its passage later today. Helping our young people transition from school into meaningful careers is one of the best ways we can move our Nation into a vibrant 21st century economy.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of career and technical education. While this bipartisan bill makes needed improvements to current law, during the committee markup I offered and later withdrew an amendment to provide more Federal support for skill development and training programs for ex-offenders who need a second chance and opportunity.

Ex-offenders, who are disproportionately young men of color due to the bias in the criminal justice system, face numerous hurdles when they try to reintegrate into society after serving their time. Finding a decent job is a necessary first step towards developing self-esteem and self-sufficiency. Unfortunately, and too often, a prior criminal history is a barrier to ex-offenders seeking employment.

I withdrew my amendment because of the important work. Nevertheless, it is my view that my amendment should be considered as this bill advances to future conference consideration. Let's help stop recidivism for this special population.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), who is a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Last week, President Trump laid out a plan to expand educational opportunities for American workers. President Trump's dedication to workforce development is admirable, and I am glad we have a President who has made this a priority.

As someone who has worked in the construction industry for my entire ca-

reer, I know firsthand how difficult it can be to find skilled workers. In fact, I spoke at the Associated Builders and Contractors breakfast this morning, and they reported that there will be over 1 million job openings in the construction industry in the next few years.

I have met with many industries in my district. The workforce is aging. There aren't enough people who currently have the skills to take over, and it can take nearly 2 years for people to be fully trained for these positions.

First and foremost, it is our responsibility to make sure that young people today are equipped for the job market of tomorrow. Getting an education is essential, but it is equally important that our education efforts are aligned with the in-demand jobs in our communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill will bridge the gap between the business community and education, which is critical to prepare America's future workforce.

I am happy to cosponsor this important bill, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting for H.R. 2353.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), who is the vice ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act is an important step in educating students and preparing them for the workforce. It increases opportunities for historically underserved students. It strengthens alignment between CTE programs and stakeholders. It includes the amendment I worked on with Representative STEFANIK to encourage CTE programs to integrate arts and design skills.

This bill will support more programs that respond to local workforce demands and teach advanced skills and creative thinking, like the one I just visited at Portland Community College. Employers, including Intel, support the school's new STEAM Lab, where students are pursuing certificates and degrees in fields like microelectronics technology.

The Federal Government does have an important enforcement role, and I am disappointed that the bill weakens the Department of Education's ability to hold States accountable for improving low-quality CTE programs. But despite that concern, this bill is worthy of support.

I thank Chairwoman FOXX, Ranking Member SCOTT, Representative THOMPSON, and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY for their bipartisan



work, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), an Education and the Workforce Committee member.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON for his leadership and hard work on this important legislation.

Too often, students across the country leave school without the necessary skills to compete in the modern economy. As the cost of a 4-year degree continues to soar higher and higher and students are taking on greater debt, employers across this country are struggling to find skilled workers to fill good, high-paying jobs. Career and technical education bridges the gap between the classroom and the workplace, offering students a clear pathway to a meaningful career.

I am pleased this legislation includes my amendment supporting dual and concurrent enrollment. By allowing high school students to begin earning postsecondary credit, dual enrollment can shorten the time to degree or credential completion, puts students on the fast track to a good job, and saves families a significant amount of money. Students who participate in dual enrollment are more likely to continue and pursue postsecondary education, less likely to need remediation, and more likely to complete a degree.

My district is lucky to be home to a great technical college that does its job. For example, in Rosemount, Minnesota, Dakota County Technical College partners with local employers to provide students customized training that fits employer-specific needs.

I am proud to support this important legislation that will increase opportunity and prepare students with the skills to succeed.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 8¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Since coming to Congress, I have visited with business leaders across my district, such as Cindy, the plant manager at Train in Charlotte, and educators at local colleges like Central Piedmont Community College. Each stressed the importance of educating our workforce to fill existing available jobs and to train for jobs of the future.

We must close the skills gap through innovation and work-based learning opportunities such as those provided through the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

CTE improves collaboration between secondary and postsecondary schools, employers, industry, and community partners, giving students, regardless of their background, access to quality job training and the opportunity to earn well-paying jobs without having to complete a 4-year degree. This training is critical to closing the opportunity gap that exists in communities like mine in Mecklenburg County.

IBM, which employs more than 1,300 people in the 12th District, wrote to me just last week to remind us that jobs in growing technology fields demand candidates with high-tech skills that don't always require a traditional degree.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in reauthorizing CTE to continue modernizing today's workforce training and securing America's future.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, one good thing about voting for this bill is the rhetoric we are hearing from this Chamber today. It sounds like the drumbeat from high school guidance counselors, college recruiters, and politicians kowtowing to the education lobby that everybody has to go to a 4-year college or that it is even wise for people to go to a 4-year college is beginning to come to an end.

I am glad, under this bill, we are going to make it easier for students to get a degree focused on skills. For some, that degree could be 1 year; for some, it could be 2 years. Frequently, these degrees lead to jobs that are higher paying than many jobs that you get after you have a 4-year degree.

Not only are they higher paying, but I think they result in more job security because you are not a generalist who will get laid off when you are 45 or 50 and not find a job. But if you have a skill, that skill is something in which you can still get a job when you are 50, 55, 60, or 65. Therefore, I am proud to announce for this bill today.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend from Illinois and also my friend Mr. THOMPSON for this bipartisan bill. I am happy to support it and hear all of my colleagues enthusiastically support it.

Career and technical education gives students the opportunity to get technical experience regardless of whether their next step out of high school is to immediately join the workforce or to go to college.

In my district, I have had the opportunity to visit many students in programs that benefit from the inclusions of career pathways in their high school curriculum. Mt. Diablo High School students, for example, create a farm-to-table restaurant experience, while

Pittsburg High Schoolers design computer animations as a part of the school's Green Engineering Academy. At De Anza High School in Richmond, California, they run an Information Technology Academy focusing on IT career skills, while providing their community IT services free of charge.

By enacting this bipartisan legislation, Congress will affirmatively take steps to update our Nation's educational vision and will propel today's students into tomorrow's workforce.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT), who is a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

The economy is not growing as it should be—about 0.7 percent last quarter—and according to many of the employers in my district, our workforce is not prepared to meet the needs of today, let alone the future.

This legislation is important because it recognizes that we need an education system that best prepares our kids for the future—a future in business—as soon as they hit K-12, and they should be ready to enter the job market or move on to additional training. Traditional 4-year colleges and universities cannot be the only pathway for the next generation of students.

In Virginia, there were nearly 110,000 postsecondary students enrolled in CTE courses in the 2014 year. Programs I am privileged to represent in Virginia's Seventh Congressional District include Amelia Nottoway Technical Center, the Chesterfield Governor's Career and Technical Academy, and Chesterfield County Public Schools Governor's Health Sciences Academy.

While these innovative programs in my district have excelled, technical skills and on-the-job training must be ingrained in the thinking of our entire K-12 educational system, across the curriculum, in every class. I believe this bill is a positive step in that direction.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding me the time.

Certainly, we are in the House today and sending a very clear message that career and technical skills matter, and I rise in support of this bill. For a 4-year college, that pathway is certainly great for some, but not all. Technical training helped shape my life from community college to the construction site and, yes, here to Congress.

Career and technical education, or CTE, is often overlooked, and it shouldn't be. We need electricians and



computer programmers just as much as we need doctors and engineers. In my State of New Jersey, 9 out of 10 of the fastest growing occupations don't require a 4-year degree, but they do require a certificate or on-the-job training.

This is an important reauthorization bill that will go a long way to providing students with opportunities to build skills that they need for those fast-growing, high-paying jobs.

I want to thank the sponsors for including my provision that will allow high schools to give more information on that career path in technical education.

Don Borden, who is the president of Camden County College in my State, says that we have an "understanding of the types of educational programs we need to provide for our students," and that "will lead to meaningful employment."

This is about employment and careers, to train the students on available curriculum, on available jobs. I urge support of this jobs bill.

□ 1430

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

I urge all Members to vote for this bipartisan bill that allows our educational institutions the ability to better adapt their programs to the specific needs of their students. This bill will give States and localities more flexibility in how to use Federal money for career and technical education programs, which will ultimately help Americans find the jobs they need.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This important legislation would allow more Americans to enter the workforce with the skills needed to compete for high-skilled, in-demand jobs.

Delaware employers tell me they need a skilled workforce. CTE support is a vital tool in addressing the skills gap in many industries in our country. Our support ensures that all students have access to high-quality CTE programs. It allows States to strengthen these programs, providing hands-on learning opportunities that lead to higher graduation rates as well as better postsecondary and career options.

In 2012, Delaware started Pathways to Prosperity to give high school stu-

dents an industry-recognized certificate, college credits, and relevant work experience, all before they graduate. In 2 years, it has grown from 30 students to over 6,000 students, who are now better suited to determine their next steps and build a career.

I thank Mr. THOMPSON and also Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY for their leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

As a former manufacturer, I have experienced firsthand the importance of career technical education in promoting meaningful work. It is especially helpful for helping people transition from a social safety net or a second-chance program, but I have seen it firsthand. For high school students and for adults who change careers, it can truly change lives.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. I am confident it can do for our country what it has done in the Eighth District of Ohio.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his great work on this bill that would reauthorize a program that is critical to both American workers and businesses, and the future of our American economy.

I am continuously hearing from family-owned manufactures across my district, such as Atlas Tool and Die and ODM, that they cannot find workers with the skills they need to fill good-paying jobs. I hear this from companies also like Boeing, Intel, and Abbott. At the same time, millions of Americans are struggling to find jobs, but they don't have the skills that they need.

This bill addresses this problem by supporting career and technical education programs that are matched to regional, State, and local labor markets. These applied science, technology, engineering and mathematics, or STEM education programs, are an important component of the innovation engine that drives our economy.

As we work to move innovative technologies into the marketplace, we need a skilled workforce to build and implement them. We also need to make sure that our innovation economy benefits all Americans, especially the middle class.

I thank my colleagues for this bill and urge all my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I want to thank Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY for all his work on

this bill, and I thank the Republicans for their work. It is a good, bipartisan bill. It is something that America needs to help strengthen our economy and help strengthen America's middle class.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would like to thank my staff and committee staff for all their work on this bill. I especially want to thank Alex Payne, the lead committee staffer on career and technical education from our side, who, unfortunately, couldn't be here with us today, due to the death of his father. I want to thank Congressman THOMPSON for his incredible leadership on this bill for all these years.

I also want to say that the main purpose of this bill is to coordinate what is taught in CTE classes with workforce demands. H.R. 2353 requires State plans to show how CTE curricula aligns with in-demand careers. School districts must consult business leaders, educators, parents, community leaders, representatives of special populations, and others to determine the most promising career fields. This bipartisan bill gives everyone a seat at the table and makes sure no one is left behind.

I also want to thank Chairwoman FOXX and Ranking Member SCOTT for their incredible leadership on this bill.

I want to take note of the fact that this is a bipartisan bill, at a time when bipartisanship is so needed in this town. I urge the Senate to take up our bill, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2353 has the power to improve the lives of countless Americans. By modernizing career and technical education, we can help prepare more men and women from all walks of life to succeed in the workforce.

I would like to note that it is important we continue to fund these programs at the authorized levels so the programs can adequately serve students of all ages. We really have an opportunity to make a positive difference today, and I couldn't be prouder of the bipartisan work that went into this.

Once again, I want to thank Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY as well as all the members of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. I would be remiss not to thank my education staff on my team, Katie Brown; Education and the Workforce staffers, James Redstone and Alex Payne; and all of our colleagues, for their diligent work on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 2353, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the

21st Century Act is a long overdue reform and reauthorization of the federal career and technical education (CTE) program. Unfortunately, I remain concerned that the bill included changes to the funding formula for states that would result in significant cuts to CTE funding for West Virginia and several other states beginning in 2021.

The removal of a hold harmless provision will result in a direct loss of \$4.07 million to West Virginia, a cut of nearly 20 percent over a three-year period. Given West Virginia's economic struggles in recent years, we can ill afford drastic cuts to workforce training programs. As the legislative process continues, I urge the U.S. Senate to find an equitable solution and consider states that will be disadvantaged by the removal of the hold harmless provision.

Without additional changes to the funding formula, in its current form I will oppose the bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

High school, community college, and trade school students in Houston and Harris County, Texas deserve the opportunity to receive a high-quality career and technical education (CTE). CTE education is the pathway for many in our community and throughout our great country to a good paying job and the middle class.

High-quality CTE programs are critical for our nation's economy. Nearly every sector of our economy, from refiners and shipbuilders along the Houston Ship Channel to medical device manufacturers and information technology firms, rely on skilled STEM-educated workers to innovate and compete in the global marketplace.

For over thirty years, the federal government has provided direct support to CTE programs nationwide through the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. Congress has not successfully reauthorized the Perkins Act in 11 years, delaying the needed reforms and additional resources our CTE students deserve.

Today's legislation delivers the reforms and resources that will help improve our local career and technical education programs. The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will provide states more flexibility in the use of federal resources in response to changes in education and the economy and reduce administrative burdens and simplify the process for states to apply for federal resources. This legislation will increase federal investment in CTE program by nine percent over the life of the authorization and reward success and innovation in CTE program practices that have been proven to best serve students and employers.

I ask all my colleagues to join in supporting this bipartisan legislation that is broadly supported by job creators and educators from across our great nation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Strengthening Career and Technical Education Act.

I devoted 35 years to workforce education so I know the career and economic opportunities possible through technical education. The

Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that there are 90 distinct career paths in my home state—Michigan—offering an average salary of \$50 thousand or more that do not require a 4 year college degree. That salary is well above the state median annual wage of \$45 thousand.

Yet we lack effective technical training opportunities to reach those paths. Too often young people are unaware of those opportunities and far too often access to career and technical education is lacking. CTE programs give students the opportunities to experience those careers and build skills needed for careers.

This bipartisan legislation updates federal law to support CTE programs and to improve access. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, it's estimated that the U.S. spends \$1.6 trillion dollars on human capital development each year. That includes spending on K–12 education, post-secondary education, and employer-based training. In spite of all that spending, fewer than half of Americans ages 25 to 64 have completed a credential beyond high school. All over my district I hear from employers about the need for workers with the right skills. Career and technical education is one way to do this.

I am pleased this legislation encourages states to utilize work-based learning, but I would also note that I think we can further strengthen it by encouraging apprenticeships, both registered and unregistered. As our nation continues to transition itself from analog to digital, so must our workforce. Apprenticeships are needed not only in traditional trades, but also in emerging fields like advanced manufacturing and the technology sector. President Trump demonstrated his commitment to this workforce development model in a speech last week, and I look forward to working on this model with the Chairwoman.

With these important reforms, we can help ensure the labor force of tomorrow has the skills it needs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concerns with H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for 21st Century Act, also referred to as the CTE Reauthorization Act. This bill reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins Act) to help more Americans enter the workforce with the skills necessary to compete for and succeed in high-skilled, in-demand careers. The bill also makes several other changes and funding modifications to the current program.

Louisiana highly values vocational and technical education and includes these skills in all public schools. These contributions are vital to Louisiana's Fourth Congressional District. With more than 25 schools in our district focused on careers in technical education, I am proud to represent many hardworking Louisianians who are skilled in hands-on labor. For these reasons, I cannot in good conscience support

this bill knowing it could result in Louisiana losing critical funding over the next several years.

As well-intended as this legislation may be, it will not benefit all states equally. A study conducted by the Congressional Research Service examined the bill's modified formula for allocating grants under the Perkins Basic State Grants Program, and found that Louisiana will lose money in nearly every scenario it calculated. In fact, according to this analysis, Louisiana would face some of the most significant decreases among all states in each scenario examined. Decreasing our state's funding level for technical career education would be a great detriment to our efforts and exactly the opposite of what H.R. 2353 is intended to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great concern that I oppose the current CTE Reauthorization Act. I believe we can do better by the constituents in Louisiana's highly-skilled workforce. Moving forward, I will do everything in my power to work for our students and teachers of the technical education field to ensure they are not left behind and are provided the resources they need to keep our communities strong and our economy growing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2353, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WATER SUPPLY PERMITTING COORDINATION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 392 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1654.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1440

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage

projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, the House meets for the second day in a row to consider another infrastructure bill that has come from the House Natural Resources Committee and its Subcommittee on Water, Power, and Oceans, of which I have the honor of chairing. My subcommittee has a strong infrastructure agenda, already hearing testimony on a number of bills aimed at improving our Nation's infrastructure and advancing an all-of-the-above energy and water strategy.

Many of our bills, including H.R. 1654, which we are considering today, apply simple solutions to expedite maintenance or construction of water and power infrastructure throughout the Nation. It is vital to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure, and one of the biggest roadblocks is the excess of regulatory red tape that applicants have to wade through before they can even move one shovel of dirt.

In Colorado, where I live, a water project was recently completed where water owned by the city of Colorado Springs was taken from a reservoir 60 miles to the south to the city of Colorado Springs for treatment and distribution. The project took 6 years to build. But before that could happen, there were over 200 permits and applications that had to be granted, any one of which could have stopped the whole thing, and that cost \$160 million in application fees, lawyers' time, and mitigation. That took 8 years. That took longer than the project itself.

Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK's Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act seeks to cut regulatory red tape by creating a one-stop-shop permitting process to the Bureau of Reclamation in order to streamline the current multiagency permitting processes for new or expanded non-Federal surface storage facilities.

However, this bill is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Mr. MCCLINTOCK's bill allows water storage project sponsors the flexibility to opt out of this process and, instead, choose the agency and process that works best for them.

While the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act will allow for much-

needed relief in the sponsor's State of California, this bill will benefit States throughout the West, including my own State of Colorado.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK's bill goes hand-in-hand with language in the WIIN Act, which was signed into law last year, that supports additional water storage capacity across the West.

I commend my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for bringing up this commonsense piece of legislation that simply looks to cut regulatory red tape for water storage projects that are essential to survival in the West.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my House colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are debating today what is being called an infrastructure bill. I wish that were actually the case. Our country certainly needs Congress to take action to address our country's infrastructure needs, yet this Congress is spending its time today debating another sham infrastructure bill that won't actually provide a single cent for real infrastructure.

Our Nation currently spends less on infrastructure as a percentage of our GDP than at any time during the past 20 years, and it shows. Far too many areas around the country have infrastructure that is crumbling before our eyes. We have seen this occur with the recent tragedy and the situation for water at the Oroville Dam in California, and this bill offers no solutions for these issues. In truth, this bill is simply an environmental deregulation bill disguised as an infrastructure bill.

Now, the bill's proponents have claimed that environmental laws, and specifically NEPA, are blocking new dam construction. This claim, Mr. Chairman, simply put, is bunk. According to the Bureau of Reclamation, not a single dam has been denied construction because of a lack of coordination between Reclamation and other agencies or because of delays associated with environmental review or permitting.

So why do we not see all sorts of new dams sprouting up around the West like we did for years and years in the previous century?

Because there is no new water to be captured, and because, frankly, all the best dam locations around the West were taken in the previous century when we had a heck of a dam-building spree.

New dams don't get built because they don't yield enough water to justify their multibillion-dollar price tags. You can ask the CRS if you don't believe other experts. In 2012, the Congressional Research Service found that the most likely causes of delay for

major infrastructure projects are a lack of funding and State permitting issues, not environmental laws.

Now, new surface storage may be appropriate in some cases. The fact is, however, that much of the United States is already saturated with dams because of that dam-building spree we had in the previous century. The United States built tens of thousands of dams in the 20th century. California alone built 1,400 major dams. The best dam sites are already taken. Other than extraordinarily wet years like this one, thankfully, in California we are having a hard time even filling up the reservoirs that we already built.

Despite these facts, my Republican colleagues continue to peddle this fiction that we have to gut our Nation's environmental laws to build new dams and other infrastructure. I guess we should not be surprised because this crusade against our Nation's environmental laws is being led by a President whose relationship with the truth is complicated at best.

A couple of weeks ago, President Trump claimed that projects like the Hoover Dam were built in 5 years because they didn't have to go through years of permitting and regulation that current infrastructure projects are subjected to.

Well, the independent fact checkers at The Washington Post evaluated this claim and they awarded the President's claim, as you can see to my right, three Pinocchios, which is the rating for statements that include "significant factual error and/or obvious contradictions."

Now, the fact checkers noted that, according to the U.S. GAO, 95 percent of public infrastructure projects are actually excluded from environmental reviews under current law. They further pointed out that the President ignored the many years of planning, permitting, negotiating, and preparing that was required to make sure that projects like the Hoover Dam were financially feasible and actually had public support.

In fact, dam planning on the Colorado River began in 1902, yet the Hoover Dam was not completed until 1937. Not completed, I might add, until the Roosevelt administration put actual public infrastructure dollars on the table to get that project financed and moving. The project took many years because, even despite the absence of modern environmental laws, big complicated projects take time to plan and finance, and they always have.

I am sorry that my Republican colleagues refuse to let such facts get in the way of their decades-long crusade against our country's bedrock environmental laws, but I hope we will eventually move on from this debate and get on to addressing real problems affecting our infrastructure, and that real problem is investment.

In terms of water infrastructure, our Nation is still not making necessary investments like water reuse projects and recycling projects. These are 21st century infrastructure projects that can provide us with water supplies that don't depend on the whims of an increasingly unpredictable hydrology. Given our changing climate, we can no longer rely exclusively on our 20th century infrastructure projects like dams.

Despite this, we have barely scratched the surface on building modern water infrastructure projects like reuse, recycling, desalination, groundwater storage, storm water capture, and water-use efficiency projects. Our country currently reuses less than 10 percent of our Nation's wastewater. Climate change will require us to do better. As George W. Bush's Reclamation Commissioner once said, the reuse of wastewater and recycled water could actually be the next river for the Western United States to tap for critical water supply.

This Congress should be working across the aisle to fully tap that next great river for the 21st century.

Reoperating existing facilities, modernizing those operations, is another example of something we should be working together on across the aisle.

All around the West we are dealing with dams and reservoirs that are being operated with the best technology from decades ago. The flood control manual at Oroville Dam, for example, hasn't been updated since 1970, which actually makes it cutting edge when compared to many of the reservoirs that are operating on 1950s flood control manuals. We are using slide rules instead of computers, with meteorological predictions that are based on historic data, backward-looking data, instead of looking up at the sky and using the data from modern satellite technology.

At Folsom Dam, we are watching a long overdue update to operations as part of a new auxiliary spillway. Forecast-informed operations, which is something that I have long advocated as part of comprehensive water legislation, is something we could work on together, and it would provide significant increases in water supply.

If my Republican friends are interested in expediting environmental reviews for infrastructure projects, then there is another thing that we can work on together, and that is we can end the slashing of budgets in Federal agencies that are in charge of environmental reviews for infrastructure projects. Budget cuts do nothing but hamper the ability of these agencies to participate in the review process and to protect our other Nation's fisheries and other natural resources.

This bill before us today compounds the problem by further undercutting the important role these agencies play to protect our natural resources. That

is why several conservation and fishing industry groups have warned that this Congress should reject this bill, that it threatens tens of thousands of jobs in the fishing industry across the Pacific Coast.

Many of our Nation's iconic fisheries are already on the brink of extinction. We have heard firsthand in our committee from the fishermen struggling to pay their mortgages, boats being scrapped because owners can't pay mooring fees, homes being repossessed, and restaurants, hotels, and other retail and service businesses struggling just to scrape by. Let's not add to these struggles by passing an ill-conceived bill that does nothing to actually improve our infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Members are advised and reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work on this.

Mr. Chairman, I always get excited when I hear people speak on the floor, especially when they come from California. Mr. Chairman, it is always interesting when people want to tell us what is the best way to make things happen.

It is interesting, in California, when the legislature was controlled by Democrats, they did waive CEQA, but it wasn't for a dam. It wasn't to prepare for a drought we were going through. But they waived it twice, all for sports. One was in San Francisco, and one was in L.A. It seems odd, but sometimes people have their priorities, I guess, not in the right place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, California and the West recently endured the worst drought in our century. Though it was the worst drought, this was not our first. We have faced droughts for generations, and each time the rain and snow came back and delivered the water that we needed to survive.

Just like previous years, this past winter was a godsend to Californians; the wettest on record. Living in the naturally dry region that we do, you would think it would be common practice to prepare for inevitable times of drought by capturing water when Mother Nature blesses us with the rain and snow. But the fact is that we aren't doing enough to store the water we do get for the times we don't get it.

So what can we do now? What would help the people in our district and across California and across the West to prepare for future droughts that we know are coming?

We should start by building more dams and reservoirs.

So what is stopping us?

Well, some is a ridiculous permitting process that forces us to wait and wait and wait when actually we should be acting.

Just look at history. Take the High Savery Dam in Wyoming. It took 14 years to permit the project but only 2 years to build it. It was finished in 2004. Think about how much the world has changed in those 14 years of time.

In 1990, somewhere around 5 million people had cell phones and only about 15 percent of Americans owned a computer. By 2004, when the dam was finished, about 180 million people had cell phones and 62 percent of Americans owned a computer. In 1990, the most popular movie was *Total Recall*. By 2004, we were already on *Shrek 2*.

Looking forward to my home State, we can't wait 14 years after starting the permitting process to finish our projects. The Temperance Flat Reservoir, once fully operational, can provide enough water to meet the needs of 172,000 households for an entire year. Finishing the Sites Reservoir proposal could provide 2 million California homes with enough water for a year. That is an astounding number. But, Mr. Chairman, I am sure on this floor we will hear those 2 million should actually wait. But I guess for a baseball stadium, no need to wait.

So fixing the process isn't just about saving some headaches or a few hours of time. This is about making sure millions of people in California and across America have the water they need and deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK for this legislation. Fixing this permitting process for water storage is more than just common sense. It is about making us a nation of doers again to get the American what they actually need.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK has worked. He has tried to work with both sides of the aisle. He has been through this process.

But you know what?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK has been home. He has been listening to his constituents on both sides of the aisle that don't have water. We have been through these droughts. We know these droughts will come again, and they have only been worse in the last couple of years.

Why?

Because of what has been imposed by the Federal Government. Even in the years where we have more than 170 percent of snowpack, we don't keep the guarantee of 100 percent of the water.

So as the environmental laws continue to take water away and put it out to the ocean instead of providing for the fruits to be grown and the fiber across our country and provide the water for the citizens of California, we should build more dams, and they should not have to wait 14 years with

only 2 years to build it. We can do better, we should do better, and we will do better when we pass this bill.

□ 1500

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I was in the California Legislature for at least one of the those environmental waiver bills that the majority leader referenced involving an NFL stadium, and I am glad to hear him criticize that because I, too, criticized it. It was a bipartisan mistake. I voted against it.

There was a bit of vindication because at least one of those stadiums ended up not getting built anyway, despite the environmental waiver, and it sort of exposed the fact that these environmental laws are often put forward as scapegoats. We are often told that if you just clear away the environmental permitting, we can do these things.

There were many other reasons why that stadium didn't get built, complicated issues involving NFL franchises and financing, which is usually the real scapegoat when these projects aren't moving forward. So it is a worthy example to talk about in the context of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on the Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, droughts are nature's fault; they happen. But water shortages are our fault. Water shortages are a choice that we made a generation ago when we stopped building new reservoirs to meet the needs of a growing population.

The unvarnished truth is we will not solve our water shortages until we build more reservoirs, and we cannot build new reservoirs until we overhaul the laws that have made their construction endlessly time-consuming and, ultimately, cost-prohibitive.

For years, the Natural Resources Committee has heard testimony from frustrated water districts unable to navigate the Byzantine maze of regulations and the phalanx of competing, overlapping, duplicative, and often contradictory Federal agencies.

After years spent trying to satisfy one agency, another suddenly pops up to claim jurisdiction with an entirely new set of demands in an often endless permitting process, despite the fact they are studying the same project in the same location with the same data. The burden this places on our ability to deliver water for the next generation is crushing.

The leader mentioned the High Savery Dam in Wyoming—14 years to permit, only 2 years to actually build.

The Federal Government has literally studied four storage projects in California nearly to death. One project, the Sites Reservoir, had over 50 alternative locations studied, and there is no end in sight for the feasibility process on that potential reservoir. Similar delays have prevented the expansion of the Shasta reservoir for 39 years.

Mr. HUFFMAN tells us that no dam permits have been denied because of this. The problem is very few dam permits have been approved because of this. And the costs are caused by cost-prohibitive delays in time that run up millions and millions of dollars in costs until the agencies simply throw up their hands and give up.

H.R. 1654 will bring order from this bureaucratic chaos. It establishes a framework in which Federal agencies with permitting responsibilities for the construction of new reservoirs must work together, coordinate their schedules, share data and technical materials, and make their findings publicly available. The end result will be fewer delays, more efficient use of taxpayer dollars, and, ultimately, more abundant water supplies.

It is modeled on the Obama administration's approach to constructing new electric transmission lines to accommodate its reliance on wind and solar generation. There is nothing new in this process. In October of 2009, the administration formed the Interagency Rapid Response Team for Transmission, a consortium of nine Federal agencies to coordinate a single unified environmental review document for each project analysis.

It is also modeled on provisions sponsored by House Democrats that expedited improvements on the Hetch Hetchy dam serving the San Francisco region. This bill simply says, if there is a potential project on Interior or Agriculture Department lands, then the Bureau of Reclamation will be the coordinating agency for the permits. That is a one-stop permitting agency.

It will call together all of the agencies, the local and State jurisdictions and tribal governments of our Indian nations, establish a timeframe for studying decisionmaking, and then coordinate all the reviews and analyses and opinions and statements and permits or licenses and other Federal approvals required under Federal law.

It also requires transparency, assuring that all data is available to the public online so the science guiding these decisions can be rigorously scrutinized by all interested parties.

It also allows water agencies to fund the review process if Federal funding isn't provided, removing one of the excuses that Federal agencies have made in slow-walking or stalling project reviews.

I want to make this very clear: It does not bypass or alter or waive any environmental or safety laws. It

doesn't waive CEQ or ESA or NEPA or any other law. It simply says the process needs to be more efficient, and the government agencies should coordinate and cooperate with each other rather than talking past each other as isolated and often inscrutable fiefdoms.

Five years of drought in California brought entire cities within months of exhausting their water supplies. The epic drought has now been followed with the wettest year on record, and we have helplessly watched our dams spilling millions of acre-feet of water to the ocean because we have no place to store the excess for the next drought.

Perhaps that is nature's way of reminding us that, if we didn't store water in wet years, we won't have it during dry ones, and the economic and social devastation have been immense.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, if you want to misuse our environmental laws to block any new water storage, well, then you should vote against this bill. We will continue to see increasingly severe water shortages and spiralling water and electricity bills.

But if you want to preserve our environmental laws, you ought to be supporting this bill because it places those laws back within a workable and practical framework, and it places our society back on the road to an era of abundance where our children can enjoy green lawns and gardens, brightly lit homes, and abundant and affordable groceries from America's agricultural cornucopia.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, the State of California is being mentioned quite a bit in this conversation.

It bears noting that the State of California is not asking for this legislation; and, in fact, the State of California has consistently opposed the rolling back of environmental standards and is busy passing bill after bill in this State legislative session to try to backfill for anticipated rollbacks in Federal environmental standards. So, certainly, if we are talking about the State of California and what it wants and it needs, its elected leaders are taking a very different direction than posing the false choice between environmental standards and infrastructure.

Again, the United States Bureau of Reclamation has emphasized that there are other factors, that it is not environmental review that has stopped any water projects in the West. The Congressional Research Service has reached the same conclusion.

And I just heard from my friend, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, that we can't build new reservoirs until we change these laws. Well, I have got to point out that California has built new reservoirs under

current law. You can ask the folks in Contra Costa County about Los Vaqueros Reservoir.

They didn't need any environmental waivers or special legislation. They built their dam. And in fact, they are getting ready to move forward with an expansion of that surface storage project. It should be broadly supported, and they are not asking for any special tweaks to the environmental laws. The same would apply to Diamond Valley Reservoir in southern California.

And, in fact, we have actually added nearly 6 million acre-feet of new surface and groundwater storage over the past few decades in California, all while honoring bedrock environmental protections like ESA and NEPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Centennial State of Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, Representative MCCLINTOCK, for putting forward a very sensible piece of legislation.

The Colorado Water Congress, who supports this bill, stated in their letter:

The economic viability of the State of Colorado is dependent on safe and reliable water supply. In recent years, the ability of water managers to meet growth demand and to create water storage has become more challenging.

In Colorado, the Windy Gap Project, whose formal environmental permitting process began in 2003, won't see construction start until at least 2019, with water storage ready by 2022—16 years to permit, 3 years to build.

For too long, Federal agencies have failed to properly coordinate and time their reviews of water supply project applications, resulting in missed opportunities for increased water storage during our wetter seasons.

Water is the lifeblood of Western communities. Without it, most communities in the Western United States could not survive, so it only makes sense to store as much of it as we reasonably can during those wetter years. Yet the Federal Government presents roadblock after roadblock that prevents a timely and cost-effective completion to many of these projects.

This legislation will streamline the permitting process and increase agency accountability by placing the Bureau of Reclamation at the center of the process and ensuring all other agencies are required to report to it in a timely fashion.

It is an effective piece of legislation, an effective approach to a problem that should not exist. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, this is an issue that is, I think, one of most im-

portant long-term issues that we deal with not only in California and Western States but, really, in the world, because the fact is that water is a crucial element of the sustainability of all of us, and it always has been.

With the planet clicking 7 billion people a couple of years ago, soon to be 9 billion people by the middle of this century, with climate change clearly impacting our ability to manage our water supplies, we must look at the long-term needs of using all the water tools in our water toolbox. And this is one effort to, in fact, look at how we can provide additional storage capacity not only in California, but elsewhere, so that when we have these periodic times—and we measure water on 10-year averages.

We have had near-record rainfall and snow in the snow-packed mountains of California, which we were blessed with the last 4 months. And after five of the most extremely dry periods of time, to have this rain and snow is wonderful.

But we know that you have got to plan for the future. And so in cases like California where it is either feast or famine, having an additional water reservoir supply is one of the important water management tools in our water toolbox, along with conservation, along with better irrigation technologies which we are implementing, along with conservation of all sorts of kinds, desalinization. All of these matter, as does storage.

This year, millions and millions of acre-feet of water have gone unused because of the lack of storage. This measure will help, but there are other things that we have to do to fix the broken water system in California, in the West, and, really, we can be a template if we better manage our water resources for the entire planet in the light of climate change.

I ask that we support this legislation. It is helpful, and we must do much more.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from California for supporting this very important legislation.

We all, all of us in California, have experienced what happens when you have radical environmentalist nonsense determining policy. We have just gone through one of the worst droughts in our history, yet during that drought, those wonderful California environmental planners saw to it that billions of gallons of freshwater were dumped into the ocean instead of being redirected towards producing food crops in our Central Valley area or providing water to drink or providing water so that people could afford to have water throughout our State. Instead, it was dumped into the ocean.

Now, what we needed and what we need now that the drought is over is

more water storage because we are in favor of people, not some grandiose concepts of what a better view counts—now, without people in it, that is, of course.

Now we need to think about what our policies will impact on average people. And what we have in this radical environmental approach is opposition to storing water, now that we have some extra water, right after a drought.

Now, whose side are you on?

You can't tell me you are on the side of ordinary people, because when water prices go up and there is not enough water for the crops, the price of food goes up and the price of water goes up.

Who is the worst hurt?

America's lowest income people are the ones who are hurt the most, the ones who can't afford to pay the little extra for food that it costs when it costs more money to grow crops in the middle of a drought.

□ 1515

So with that said, I dramatically support doing something for the people, not some environmental theory—nonsensical theories in most cases—that we are facing doom if we store water.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If we store water, that is going to be bad for the environment? I mean, I am sorry. That makes no sense to me.

And it doesn't make sense to ordinary people either that after a drought, that in some way it is against the environment to make it easier for us to store water so we don't have to have the same destruction and the same lowering of the standard of living of our poorer people when the next drought comes around.

This act by Mr. TOM MCCLINTOCK, H.R. 1654, will make it easier and quicker for us to build these dams. By the way, if we don't do this, many of those dams will probably be built, only we are talking about the evaporation not of water, but of money. After you have to go through years and years of paperwork, what evaporates is the money that should be going into education and transportation programs.

No. It is wrong all the way around not to permit people to go as fast as we can rationally and engineeringwise to build storage for our water supply today so when the next drought comes around, ordinary people won't be hurt.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Orange County for those comments. I have been to Orange County and I have seen the cutting-edge water management work taking place in Mr. ROHRABACHER's district. Among other

things, they are doing amazing ground-water recharge and water-use efficiency, water recycling. In fact, they have got one of the most cutting-edge potable reuse systems in the country. It is their reliance on those 21st century water management tools instead of large reservoirs—that, for the most part, were running dry during this drought we just went through—that enabled them to get through the most critical drought any of us have ever seen in much better shape than any communities around the State.

So kudos to the forward-looking water managers in Orange County. But if the gentleman is concerned about low-income people being impacted by water shortage and water management issues, I really hope he will pay a visit to my district, because on the north coast of California, you get the other end of this water management challenge.

The fishing communities of the north coast have been hammered by the fact that our iconic salmon runs are teetering on the brink of extinction. We have left very little flow in the rivers, and this drought only exacerbated the problem.

So I am representing people that are deeply impacted by water shortage and water management decisions that need to be part of this consideration instead of trivialized when we talk about water wasting out through the estuary. This is water that sustains these fishery runs that have been the lifeblood of the communities in my district for many years.

Now, just to inject a couple of facts into what has been called a radical environmental agenda that caused the waste of all of this water during the drought—in fact, that didn't happen. In 2014, the fact is only 4 percent of all the runoff in the entire Bay Delta Watershed flowed to San Francisco Bay solely for environmental protection. In 2015, it was even less. Two percent of the runoff for the entire watershed made it all the way out to San Francisco Bay solely for environmental purposes. The rest of that flow that made it through was to control salinity in the delta so that you could continue to serve municipal and industrial and other water-use needs. Most of that water was diverted and used.

We need to remember the facts in what can sometimes be a hyperbolic discussion of California water.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), who is also a subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1654, legislation sponsored by my good friend and colleague, TOM MCCLINTOCK.

For centuries, Western States have fought over scarce water supplies. We

even have an expression in the West that says whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting over.

The water scarcity in the West led our visionary forefathers to build Federal water storage projects throughout to provide water, hydropower, recreation, flood control, and environmental benefits while adhering to State water rights. These were nonpartisan endeavors, as evidenced by President John F. Kennedy dedicating the San Luis Dam in California.

Now, while the Central Arizona Project came after President Kennedy, it continues to bring prosperity to Arizona's cities, tribal communities, and ranches almost 50 years from its inception.

The Glen Canyon Dam and other projects affiliated with the Colorado River Storage Project provided the backbone of a regional economy that produced year-round water and emissions-free hydropower.

Lake Powell, the reservoir behind Glen Canyon, allows for millions of dollars' worth of recreational boating annually and even provided the scenery for the astronaut crash landing in the 1968 science fiction classic, "The Planet of the Apes."

For generations, these projects provided benefits to a growing society, but what the Federal Government helped give, it has been taking away.

The current regulatory process for constructing new surface water storage is a bureaucratic maze that requires numerous permits and approvals from a multitude of different Federal, State, and local agencies. Conflicting requirements continue to cause unnecessary delays, kill jobs, and result in us failing to capture precious water supplies. Ranchers, agricultural and municipal water providers and other stakeholders in the West need a clear process without the bureaucracy.

H.R. 1654 establishes such a process by creating a one-stop-shop permitting shop, with the Bureau of Reclamation in charge of the permitting process for these important water storage projects in 17 Western States. This makes a lot of sense, as the Bureau of Reclamation's multipurpose water projects made the West what it is today. Generations of our prior leaders focused on the need to capture water and deliver it to cities and fields.

Our communities always need water, and with the projected population increases, we are going to need a lot more of it in the near future.

Let's build on the good work of previous generations. Get the bureaucracy out of the way and pass H.R. 1654 so we have a clear process moving forward for preserving worthwhile water infrastructure projects.

There is an old adage: save for a rainy day. In this case, it should be: save on a rainy day.

This act facilitates that very concept.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for sponsoring such needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It has been a good conversation, but I hope one thing is clear: this is not an infrastructure bill. This is an environmental deregulation bill that is masquerading behind the issue of infrastructure.

Environmental laws, environmental reviews are not the reason new dams have not been built and it is not the reason new dams will not be built. All of the serious analyses point to other factors, the big one being they don't generate enough water to justify the huge price tags that go along with these projects. They are just rarely financeable, rarely do they make economic sense. So let's not scapegoat the environmental laws to try to address that problem.

Now, if my colleagues across the aisle are interested in an honest infrastructure bill, including a water infrastructure bill, they will find a lot of willing partners across the aisle, including myself. We have put forth all sorts of ideas. We want to see water infrastructure. Surface storage and new dams can be part of that, but we have got to put real dollars on the table. We have got to do what prior generations did when they got serious about building infrastructure, and not hide behind this ulterior agenda of gutting our environmental laws, repackaging that, and representing that as being responsive to our Nation's critical need for new infrastructure. This bill simply doesn't meet that test.

I request that my colleagues vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I close, I do want to point out a bit of circular reasoning that my friend from California is using. He says that it is not the environmental regulations or the red tape that slows down the construction of dams, it is the high cost. But what he doesn't recognize or is not willing to admit is that the high cost is caused by all the red tape and environmental regulations. So that is arguing in circles, and I don't accept that.

Again, I commend the bill's sponsor for this bill that looks to promote additional and much-needed water storage throughout the West.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the



amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BUREAU.**—The term "Bureau" means the Bureau of Reclamation.

(2) **COOPERATING AGENCIES.**—The term "cooperating agency" means a Federal agency with jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations, or a State agency subject to section 3(c).

(3) **QUALIFYING PROJECTS.**—The term "qualifying projects" means new surface water storage projects in the States covered under the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.) constructed on lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of any easement, right-of-way, lease, or any private holding, unless the project applicant elects not to participate in the process authorized by this Act.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

#### SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY AND COOPERATING AGENCIES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY.**—The Bureau is established as the lead agency for purposes of coordinating all reviews, analyses, opinions, statements, permits, licenses, or other approvals or decisions required under Federal law to construct qualifying projects.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COOPERATING AGENCIES.**—The Commissioner of the Bureau shall—

(1) identify, as early as practicable upon receipt of an application for a qualifying project, any Federal agency that may have jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, approval, or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations; and

(2) notify any such agency, within a reasonable timeframe, that the agency has been designated as a cooperating agency in regards to the qualifying project unless that agency responds to the Bureau in writing, within a timeframe set forth by the Bureau, notifying the Bureau that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the qualifying project;

(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the qualifying project or any review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision associated therewith; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments on the qualifying project or conduct any review of such a project or make any decision with respect to such project in a manner other than in cooperation with the Bureau.

(c) **STATE AUTHORITY.**—A State in which a qualifying project is being considered may choose, consistent with State law—

(1) to participate as a cooperating agency; and

(2) to make subject to the processes of this Act all State agencies that—

(A) have jurisdiction over the qualifying project;

(B) are required to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the qualifying project; or

(C) are required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the qualifying project.

#### SEC. 4. BUREAU RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The principal responsibilities of the Bureau under this Act are—

(1) to serve as the point of contact for applicants, State agencies, Indian tribes, and others regarding proposed qualifying projects;

(2) to coordinate preparation of unified environmental documentation that will serve as the basis for all Federal decisions necessary to authorize the use of Federal lands for qualifying projects; and

(3) to coordinate all Federal agency reviews necessary for project development and construction of qualifying projects.

(b) **COORDINATION PROCESS.**—The Bureau shall have the following coordination responsibilities:

(1) **PREAPPLICATION COORDINATION.**—Notify cooperating agencies of proposed qualifying projects not later than 30 days after receipt of a proposal and facilitate a preapplication meeting for prospective applicants, relevant Federal and State agencies, and Indian tribes—

(A) to explain applicable processes, data requirements, and applicant submissions necessary to complete the required Federal agency reviews within the timeframe established; and

(B) to establish the schedule for the qualifying project.

(2) **CONSULTATION WITH COOPERATING AGENCIES.**—Consult with the cooperating agencies throughout the Federal agency review process, identify and obtain relevant data in a timely manner, and set necessary deadlines for cooperating agencies.

(3) **SCHEDULE.**—Work with the qualifying project applicant and cooperating agencies to establish a project schedule. In establishing the schedule, the Bureau shall consider, among other factors—

(A) the responsibilities of cooperating agencies under applicable laws and regulations;

(B) the resources available to the cooperating agencies and the non-Federal qualifying project sponsor, as applicable;

(C) the overall size and complexity of the qualifying project;

(D) the overall schedule for and cost of the qualifying project; and

(E) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that may be affected by the qualifying project.

(4) **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.**—Prepare a unified environmental review document for each qualifying project application, incorporating a single environmental record on which all cooperating agencies with authority to issue approvals for a given qualifying project shall base project approval decisions. Help ensure that cooperating agencies make necessary decisions, within their respective authorities, regarding Federal approvals in accordance with the following timelines:

(A) Not later than 1 year after acceptance of a completed project application when an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact is determined to be the appropriate level of review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(B) Not later than 1 year and 30 days after the close of the public comment period for a draft environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42

U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), when an environmental impact statement is required under the same.

(5) **CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.**—Maintain a consolidated administrative record of the information assembled and used by the cooperating agencies as the basis for agency decisions.

(6) **PROJECT DATA RECORDS.**—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, ensure that all project data is submitted and maintained in generally accessible electronic format, compile, and where authorized under existing law, make available such project data to cooperating agencies, the qualifying project applicant, and to the public.

(7) **PROJECT MANAGER.**—Appoint a project manager for each qualifying project. The project manager shall have authority to oversee the project and to facilitate the issuance of the relevant final authorizing documents, and shall be responsible for ensuring fulfillment of all Bureau responsibilities set forth in this section and all cooperating agency responsibilities under section 5.

#### SEC. 5. COOPERATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **ADHERENCE TO BUREAU SCHEDULE.**—

(1) **TIMEFRAMES.**—On notification of an application for a qualifying project, the head of each cooperating agency shall submit to the Bureau a timeframe under which the cooperating agency reasonably will be able to complete the authorizing responsibilities of the cooperating agency.

(2) **SCHEDULE.**—

(A) **USE OF TIMEFRAMES.**—The Bureau shall use the timeframes submitted under this subsection to establish the project schedule under section 4.

(B) **ADHERENCE.**—Each cooperating agency shall adhere to the project schedule established by the Bureau under subparagraph (A).

(b) **ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD.**—The head of each cooperating agency shall submit to the Bureau all environmental review material produced or compiled in the course of carrying out activities required under Federal law, consistent with the project schedule established by the Bureau under subsection (a)(2).

(c) **DATA SUBMISSION.**—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, the head of each cooperating agency shall submit all relevant project data to the Bureau in a generally accessible electronic format, subject to the project schedule established by the Bureau under subsection (a)(2).

#### SEC. 6. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, after public notice in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Administrative Procedure Act"), may accept and expend funds contributed by a non-Federal public entity to expedite the evaluation of a permit of that entity related to a qualifying project.

(b) **EFFECT ON PERMITTING.**—

(1) **EVALUATION OF PERMITS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the evaluation of permits carried out using funds accepted under this section shall—

(A) be reviewed by the Regional Director of the Bureau of the region in which the qualifying project or activity is located (or a designee); and

(B) use the same procedures for decisions that would otherwise be required for the evaluation of permits for similar projects or activities not carried out using funds authorized under this section.

(2) **IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary and the head of each cooperating agency receiving funds under this section for a qualifying project shall ensure that the use of the funds accepted under this section for the qualifying project shall not—

(A) substantively or procedurally impact impartial decisionmaking with respect to the issuance of permits; or

(B) diminish, modify, or otherwise affect the statutory or regulatory authorities of the cooperating agency.

(C) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—None of the funds accepted under this section shall be used to carry out a review of the evaluation of permits required under subsection (b)(1)(A).

(d) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that all final permit decisions carried out using funds authorized under this section are made available to the public, including on the Internet.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-186. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-186.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 2, after the period insert “Such term shall also include State-led projects (as defined in section 4007(a)(2) of the WIIN Act) for new surface water storage projects in the States covered under the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.) constructed on lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of any easement, right-of-way, lease, or any private holding, unless the project applicant elects not to participate in the process authorized by this Act.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my subcommittee chairman, Mr. LAMBORN, for his leadership on this, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK for bringing the bill in chief forward here that I am asking to amend today.

This amendment ensures that State-led projects can also enjoy the coordination that the bill itself will do, State-led surface storage projects such as Sites Reservoir. These will be defined in the WIIN Act and they will be eligible under H.R. 1654's permitting.

Doing so enables States to direct their own resources towards infrastructure needs at lower cost and improves States' ability to partner with the Federal Government on projects that provide both State and Federal benefits.

Adopting this amendment to include State-led projects will allow the development of more water infrastructure more rapidly and at no additional cost to the Federal Government. For example, in my home State of California, the voters have approved billions of dollars toward infrastructure projects such as Sites Reservoir—not too far from my neighborhood—which will include enough water storage for millions more people in our State.

Now, if you know the saga of Sites Reservoir, the locals there will tell you they have been talking about it, studying it, poking it, prodding it for about 40 years. Bureaucracy plays a major role in that.

So the bill in chief is not looking to change environmental laws or get rid of environmental laws. Indeed, my colleague on the other side of the aisle talked about having an honest discussion in this area. Well, an honest discussion would show that the bill in chief is one that is merely coordinating. It is not changing the Water Quality Act. It is not changing NEPA, CEQA, or anything else, other than getting these people all in one room to coordinate at one time.

Yes, we, indeed, have costs involved, because people give up, whether it is private sector money or the people that pass bonds as State voters give up after a while because they don't think their dollars are actually getting to the projects, when they hear needless, endless delays, when we have this game of bureaucratic badminton being played by various agencies knocking one idea to another, taking years of time and additional costs, especially those surprise ones at the last minute.

Lake Oroville is in my own backyard. Now, what we have seen there since the crisis happened with the breakage of the spillway is that coordination under an emergency, where, even though there are some trying to throw roadblocks in there, people recognized coordination was needed, because when 188,000 people have to evacuate an area due to some unknown factors with how the infrastructure is holding up, then they saw the need to fix it.

□ 1530

And the spillway at Lake Oroville is going to be fixed pretty rapidly over a 2-year period and made usable in this short amount of time. So that is how coordination can work to get a needed project done when it can be an emergency.

What we need to quit doing is waiting for emergencies like this and on levee projects when we know for years and years that levee projects—highways, bridges, other infrastructure that have this bureaucratic badminton played when people are trying to get these projects done—need to be coordinated. That is what this bill does.

My amendment adds to it, again, an important ability for State dollars

under State-led infrastructure projects to be included in that. So I think it makes a heck of a lot of sense and will help our voters like in California and others around the country to be able to enjoy that coordination.

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. We support the amendment. It improves the bill by expanding opportunities for increased water storage across the West. I urge its adoption.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Marin for yielding me 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman LAMALFA. As I said earlier, we need to fix the broken water system in California because reliability is key.

We have a water system that was designed for 20 million people. Today, we have 40 million people living in California. By the year 2030, we are going to have 50 million people living in California.

The simple truth is that in the San Joaquin Valley, where I live, which has been ground zero for the impact of an unreliable water supply because of this broken system, we have felt the devastation of the drought. This lack of reliability is due to many factors that have intensified as a result of climate change, impact on regulations, and other factors.

Luckily this year, as I noted earlier, it has been a deluge of rain and snow, and for that we are thankful. But we know in California that it is either feast or famine, and so, sadly, we must plan for the future, and that means including surface storage and using subsurface replenishment of our ground water and all the other water tools that are part of this water toolbox that is critical for the long term.

We need more storage. We need the underlying legislation that this provides. While not completely fixing or resolving our challenges, it is a small step, and, as was noted before, this does not amend NEPA or CEQA, but it simply provides a timeline, and a timeline is a good thing.

This collaboration that this legislation envisions is not too different from the collaboration that the Governor is working with the Department of the Interior on, the proposal to fix the plumbing system in the delta. They

have a record of decision that has a timeline.

So if surface storage water is going to receive funding and support under the WIIN Act that we passed in December, matching State funds, along with this effort to provide the timeline, will be helpful.

Let me finally say that sustainability of our agricultural economy, sustainability of putting food and fiber on America's dinner table every night, and helping feed other parts of the world is really what we are talking about here. Reliability is key to making sure that we are sustainable under the adverse impacts of a lack of a fixed water system. We need to address this.

This legislation is a small step in providing timelines for certainty for this collaboration for this process to work better. I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague, Mr. COSTA, for his bipartisan support and effort in ensuring we have a proactive way of doing things in California on water infrastructure. I appreciate that a lot.

So for anybody to say that the amount of effort it takes to get past the bureaucratic process, to simply get the existing permits under existing laws, is not burdensome is naive. Indeed, whether we are talking highway projects, levee projects, bridge projects, and, more particularly, this bill, water storage projects, we need this coordination.

So the coordination will mean more for the American people, more for the people of my own State, with less dollars, less delay, and they can start enjoying the fruits of this project, the fruit of their tax dollars.

So my amendment simply adds to that, State-led efforts, whether it has been a bond passed by a State or other State funding in California and other States, that they, too, can enjoy that coordination that this bill would provide.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I, unfortunately, must oppose this amendment. I am not sure if it was the intent of my friend, Mr. LAMALFA, but it appears that this amendment would prioritize permitting surface storage projects under the WIIN Act and not groundwater storage WIIN Act projects.

The WIIN Act, of course, authorized money for both surface and groundwater storage projects. These projects are yet to be named and prioritized. That still needs to happen.

Yet this amendment applies this bill's streamlining provisions to WIIN's "State-led projects for new surface water storage projects."

Now, providing surface storage above all other types of water infrastructure

projects certainly is in keeping with some of the obsession with new dams that we have heard from my colleagues across the aisle. But the truth is, there are all sorts of other worthy projects that are needed if we are going to get serious about water infrastructure in California; and to put a thumb on the scale for one particular kind is not the right way to go.

So, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-186.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 7. CONDITION ON APPLICABILITY.**

This Act shall not apply to any project that the Secretary determines could cause harm to commercial fisheries.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I, like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, am concerned about the long-term prospects for water infrastructure and storage in the West.

As the western climate continues to get hotter, we are going to have more hot, dry, drought years. That is why many States and communities, including the cities that I represent, are doing all that they can to make their water infrastructure more resilient, to reduce unneeded runoff, to recycle water, and to store as much ground water as possible.

To support these critical activities, Congress needs to invest in our country's water infrastructure. The bill before us today does not do any of these things. It does not authorize new or additional funding for water projects. It is not an infrastructure bill.

Instead, the bill before us today makes many Americans nervous because it loosens key environmental safeguards and imposes arbitrary deadlines for the approval of dams on our rivers and streams. This bill threatens the health of our streams, our rivers, and coastlines, which could harm fish populations important to commercial fisheries.

Therefore, I am offering a straightforward amendment. It simply requires proposed new dams to go through the normal project review process if they are likely to harm commercial fisheries.

The construction of poorly permitted dams has been a major cause of mortality for California's fisheries. In California's Central Valley, they currently block Chinook salmon and steelhead from more than 90 percent of the historical spawning habitat.

My amendment will help protect my State's economically important fisheries from further harm. Commercial fisheries from my home State sustain thousands of jobs across California and the West Coast, and, currently, we have what can only be described as a fisheries crisis.

Many fisheries are at record-low population levels. According to some estimates, 78 percent of California's native salmon will be extinct or disappear within the next century if current trends continue.

Simply put, many West Coast fishermen and fisherwomen who depend on California's fish runs are hanging on by a thread. The thousands of fishermen and fisherwomen, and other employees of restaurants, hotels, and other businesses that depend on healthy fish runs, have been struggling mightily.

Even now, many fishermen and fisherwomen are still recovering from the total closure of the ocean salmon fishery along the West Coast in 2008 and 2009, because of poor California salmon returns. The closure devastated the Pacific Coast fishing industry and, ultimately, required millions of dollars in disaster aid from Congress.

In recent years, fishery managers have also had to severely restrict commercial fishing season because of low population levels. My amendment will help prevent future harm to people who are already struggling just to get by.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, first I would point out to my friend from California, if the climate continues to warm, we are not going to be able to store as much water in our mountains as snow, and we are going to need much more surface water storage reservoirs than the laws have allowed us to build because of the delays they have imposed in planning and construction.

The gentleman's amendment gives the Secretary of the Interior the ability to ignore this streamlining law if he determines it could "cause harm to commercial fisheries."

Well, now, remember, this bill makes no changes to any of our existing laws or regulations. It makes no changes to the licenses and permits required for a project or the criteria for obtaining those licenses and permits. It makes no changes to any law or regulation that

could affect commercial fisheries or, for that matter, anything else.

It simply says that the agencies and jurisdictions involved with these projects have to cooperate and coordinate and communicate with each other, and it requires the science guiding these decisions to be available to the public to review and scrutinize.

So why the amendment? Well, for one reason and one reason only, I think, because for the last 8 years, we have had an administration that was actively hostile to constructing new reservoirs. That administration has used the fragmented nature of the approval process as a way to delay projects indefinitely. That is what this proposal corrects.

Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment would allow any administration so inclined to make a specious finding as an excuse to ignore this law. Project applicants would not know from one election to the next whether their millions of dollars of studies and investments would suddenly come to naught, and projects already well along in the planning and approval process could find their efforts coming to a screeching halt.

For our laws to work, they must be predictable and fair. Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment is a poison pill to render this law unpredictable and capricious.

The irony is this: the gentleman's constituents in southern California have the most to lose from his amendment because southern California depends on surplus water from northern California. And let me make this very clear to the gentleman and his constituents: northern California has first claim on northern California water.

If we can't store the extra water in the north, there is no surplus for the south, and the gentleman's constituents can look forward to dead lawns and gardens, brown parks, empty swimming pools, astronomical water and electricity prices, spiraling grocery prices, and a future where they will have to ration and stretch every drop of water and every watt of electricity in their parched and sweltering homes. They might want to ask him about that some day.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from northern California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of this amendment. My colleague across the aisle just asked the rhetorical question: Why is this amendment needed?

It is needed because fishing jobs matter. The people whom I represent on

the north coast of California and also other fishing communities up and down the Pacific Coast, including Oregon and Washington, their jobs matter, and their limited opportunity to have their interests considered when a dam project is moving forward is what is shortened by the streamlining in this bill.

Their interests are already subordinated oftentimes, but they get subordinated even further by the streamlining in this case, which places the Bureau of Reclamation, the proponent of the new dam, in charge of the administrative record, which places the fish agencies—which often advance the interests of protecting fisheries—in a subordinate role to the Bureau of Reclamation that controls the administrative record, which imposes shortened timelines to make it even harder for their interests to be considered.

Fishing jobs matter. And the truth is, right now, in my district and in many other fishing communities, people are hurting because they have been damaged by poorly operated and poorly permitted dams.

Let's not make things worse. This amendment is absolutely necessary, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would first point out that commercial fisheries are controlled and regulated by the Secretary of Commerce, not the Secretary of the Interior, and yet it is the Secretary of the Interior to whom the gentleman would give the power to ignore this streamlining law and impose endless, repetitive, and duplicative delays in the consideration of these projects.

I would again point out that all of the considerations that are given to fisheries, that are given to environmental laws, that are given to engineering laws, everything that goes into the planning process in our dams under our laws and regulations is fully respected under this measure.

All that it does is say that the agency, that the Bureau of Reclamation, when an application is provided, will pull these agencies together, and all of the jurisdictions and all of the affected parties establish a timetable according to their best judgment of what is necessary, have them talk with each other, and then stick to that plan.

That is what the bill does, and that is why it is so desperately needed in a State that has not built a major reservoir of over a million acre-feet of storage since the New Melones was completed in 1979.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD three letters, including one from the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, which is the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the West Coast, collectively representing thousands of family-wage jobs and the West Coast commercial fishing indus-

try that contributes billions of dollars to the U.S. economy, strongly opposing this bill, H.R. 1654, and supporting the amendment.

PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION  
OF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS,

June 12, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA) is the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the West Coast, representing the interests of hundreds of family-owned commercial fishing operations who harvest and deliver fresh seafood to American consumers and for export. Collectively, we represent many thousands of family wage jobs and a West Coast commercial fishing industry that contributes billions of dollars to the U.S. economy.

On behalf of the hundreds of hard working commercial fishermen we represent, we are OPPOSED to H.R. 1654 for many reasons, among them the following:

While the concept of streamlining permitting for federal water projects is attractive on its face, our primary problem in the arid west is not a lack of water storage projects, but lack of funds for maintaining and repairing the many existing projects that are already in place. Hundreds of existing water projects are badly in need of repair, with many dangerously close to failing. And as we recently witnessed with the catastrophic failure of the Oroville Dam, an "expedited review process" like what is envisioned in H.R. 1654 could lead to poor or rushed impacts analyses potentially resulting in further catastrophe or economic disruption. It is now apparent that the Oroville Dam's 2017 emergency spillway failure was predicted—but the warning signs were ignored—in its expedited environmental impacts review process.

H.R. 1654 is simply the wrong approach. It would undermine existing laws protecting both the public and public resources by making the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) the lead agency for all environmental reviews, in effect leaving Reclamation in control of the entire environmental review process. However, Reclamation has neither the expertise nor the capacity of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service to inform the development of major infrastructure projects to reduce their impact on valuable wildlife and fisheries. Under H.R. 1654, these agencies would be stripped of their authority and duties to oversee and authorize water storage projects, to the detriment of the people of the West and the American taxpayer.

H.R. 1654 also implements overly restricted and burdensome project review timelines, including provisions that would require expedited review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)—timelines that may be inappropriate for very complex projects like the damming of streams and rivers. These fast-tracking provisions interfere with the ability of agencies and the public to meaningfully analyze proposed complex projects, and could also limit the public's ability to weigh in on infrastructure developments that could affect communities for decades. Further, the bill permits non-federal public entities to contribute funds to expedite project permitting, raising serious conflicts of interest questions about the fairness and impartiality of the federal review process.

H.R. 1654 also establishes perverse incentives for western states to cede their independent authority. Under the new regulatory scheme, state agencies could be compelled to

adhere to the bill's procedures, thereby requiring those state agencies to cede control to Reclamation and comply with its timelines. This weakens the essential and independent role that states play in reviewing proposed water infrastructure projects within their borders.

We sincerely request that you vote NO on H.R. 1654. This bill will not solve the problems it purports to address, and it would have widespread consequences far beyond water deliveries and water storage, including adverse effects to regional and local fishing industry economies and the jobs and communities those economies support.

Sincerely,

NOAH OPPENHEIM,  
*Executive Director.*

AMERICAN RIVERS,  
*Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.*

U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: I am writing on behalf of American Rivers and our 200,000 members to oppose H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, which is before the Committee on April 26, 2017. We understand that new surface storage projects are a consideration as part of a multi-faceted portfolio aimed at addressing long term drought in the Western United States. We also share Congress' view that long-term, balanced solutions to drought and water supply security that support and protect local economies, the viability of agriculture, municipal water supplies, recreation, and the riparian environment are critical to the future of Western communities. H.R. 1654, however, fails to provide a long-term, balanced solution, and goes far beyond the scope of authorities vested in the Bureau of Reclamation (the "Bureau") while undermining the critical role other federal agencies, tribes, and states play in the permitting of water supply projects in the West. We remain concerned about the potential harmful impacts to management authorities designed to protect streams and conserve watersheds. In light of these concerns, we ask you to oppose H.R. 1654.

This legislation amends the Reclamation Act, 43 U.S.C. 371, et seq., in a way that undermines the management authorities of other federal agencies, tribes, and states. H.R. 1654 allows the Bureau to preempt state laws and procedural requirements for agency decision-making by dictating unreasonable deadlines. It also weakens authorities under Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act, as well as other federal laws, by subordinating all other State and federal agencies to the Bureau's sense of how much time those administering agencies should have to do their jobs.

Specifically, H.R. 1654:

Designates the Bureau as the lead agency and allows the Bureau to set the schedule for all federal authorizations, including those issued pursuant to the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA), and other federal authorizations, even where those authorizations have been delegated or devolved to the states or Native American tribes.

Forces all other federal, state, and tribal agencies to comply with the Bureau's schedule and to defer to the Bureau's proposed scope of environmental review.

Effectively waives the Endangered Species Act or the Clean Water Act if a state, tribe, or federal agency cannot meet the Bureau's schedule or misses a deadline. The Bureau and the project applicant may simply proceed with the proposed action and the authorization is waived. There are no similar remedies or penalties if the Bureau or the project applicant fails to meet a deadline, or if delay caused by Bureau or the project applicant results in an agency missing a deadline. The end result of this and the following provisions could be that states and tribes may be forced to deny certification for new projects in order to avoid potential legal liability.

It is important that federal natural resource agencies retain the authority and responsibility to condition operations of surface storage projects so as to protect streams and other public resources. A key part of protecting watersheds, especially in the arid West, is maintaining healthy flows in streams. For years, American Rivers has worked with the federal land management agencies, tribes, states and other stakeholders to protect healthy river flows on public lands. Federal land managers, states, tribes and the public have an important role to play in protecting streams—based on the Property Clause of the Constitution, Section 505 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and other authorities—and they also have a responsibility to work with their stakeholders to do it right. Provisions of H.R. 1654 would harm the ability of federal land managers, states, and tribes to use these authorities to protect streams, rivers, and vital fisheries.

We oppose H.R. 1654, and urge Congress to carefully consider the impacts of the legislation on federal, tribal and state authority before proceeding further and determine if legislation is needed.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW NIEMERSKI,  
*Director, Federal Policy,*  
*American Rivers.*

GOLDEN GATE SALMON ASSOCIATION,  
*Petaluma, CA, June 12, 2017.*

Re H.R. 1654 (McClintock)—OPPOSE.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA: The Golden Gate Salmon Association is a coalition of salmon fishermen and women, both sport and commercial, and related businesses. As a business-oriented advocacy organization focused on conservation and restoration of Central Valley salmon stocks, with members throughout California, we write to offer our strong opposition to H.R. 1654 (McClintock), the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act." This legislation threatens tens of thousands of fishing related jobs and could result in severe impacts to a salmon fishing industry that is highly vulnerable today.

SURFACE STORAGE AND CALIFORNIA'S SALMON FISHING INDUSTRY

Surface storage projects have been the leading cause of the decline of California's historic salmon fishery. In the past decade, surface storage projects contributed to the first ever, historic closure of the California salmon fishery in 2008 and 2009. A fishery worth an estimated \$1.4 billion in annual economic activity to California in a normal season was shattered. This had devastating impacts on the 23,000 men and women whose livelihoods depend on the commercial and recreational salmon fishery.

In significant part as a result of dam projects, the health of our coastal fishing communities has decreased. We've seen a de-

cline in the number of commercial salmon boats registered to fish from almost 5,000 in the late 1980's to just over 1,000 today. Once bustling salmon ports, like Fort Bragg and Eureka are lined with crumbling docks and pier pilings. In some places there aren't enough fish crossing the docks to maintain basic infrastructure like boat repair yards, fuel docks and ice making machines. Where once proud freshly painted houses beamed pride of fisherman ownership, too many are sadly in need of repair. Go to any California harbor with commercial fishing activity and inspect the deck hardware and rigging on boats and you'll see what deferred maintenance looks like for people who struggle to keep a roof over their family's heads and pay the bills.

Because of low populations of adult salmon in 2017, salmon fishing for much of Northern California has been closed entirely this year. For the remainder of the California coast, the commercial fishing fleet has lost approximately two thirds of their traditional fishing season. These low population numbers are the result of the drought and the impacts of existing surface storage projects.

Decision-makers should respond to this crisis by strengthening efforts to restore salmon runs. However, H.R. 1654 could increase the impacts of dam projects on salmon, with potentially devastating consequences.

#### SPECIFIC CONCERNS

This legislation threatens to weaken analysis and permitting for surface storage projects, with significant potential impacts on salmon. GGSA offers the following specific concerns.

**Interfering With The Use of the Best Available Science:** The bill would allow the Bureau of Reclamation to control the administrative record used by all federal agencies in reviewing surface storage projects. At best, the Bureau lacks the environmental expertise of the regulatory agencies on a range of issues, including salmon. In addition, as a potential applicant for surface storage projects, the Bureau would have a clear conflict of interest, were they to be given control of the record used by all federal agencies. Further, the Bureau has a record of asserting dubious environmental benefits from surface storage projects and working to suppress analysis by federal agencies. As a result, it is highly inappropriate for the Bureau to be given control of a single administrative record to be used by all federal agencies.

**Interfering with Agency Review:** The bill would give the Bureau authority to establish a binding schedule for all federal agency environmental review and permitting. For the same reasons cited above, this is inappropriate. In addition, this requirement would produce unnecessary, costly and time consuming litigation, in the likely event that a schedule adopted by the Bureau does not allow adequate time for review by regulatory agencies.

**Undermining State Review of Projects:** In cases where states chose to opt in, the bill would give the Bureau control over the administrative record and schedule for state agencies. In such a case, the bill would allow the Bureau undue control over state analysis and permitting. This is highly inappropriate, given more than a century of traditional federal deference to state law.

**Surface Storage Bias:** Surface storage construction and operation is among the water management activities with the most severe impacts on salmon and salmon rivers. This legislation inappropriately restricts analysis

for the most environmentally destructive method of storing water and generating new water supplies, but not for less destructive activities.

For the above reasons, we urge you to oppose this damaging and unnecessary bill.

Thank you for considering our comments.  
Sincerely,

JOHN MCMANUS,  
*Executive Director.*

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, by that token, I will include in the RECORD the support of the United States Chamber of Commerce as well as the Family Farm Alliance and others in support of this bill and the jobs that will expand as a result of its adoption.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Washington, DC, June 20, 2017.*

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce urges you to approve H.R. 1654, the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act," which would streamline the permitting process for new surface water storage projects. The Chamber may consider including votes on, or in relation to, H.R. 1654 in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

H.R. 1654 would establish the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for coordinating environmental reviews and permitting new or expanded non-federal surface storage facilities. The bill also would allow the Secretary of the Interior to accept funds from non-federal public entities and to use those funds to expedite the permitting process for designated projects. This type of coordination and streamlining is essential to the development and construction of much-needed water storage projects.

The structure of H.R. 1654 tracks the permit streamlining provisions contained in Title 41 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, which was passed during the 114th Congress. The Chamber urges you to approve H.R. 1654.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY,  
*Senior Vice President & Chief Policy Officer.*

FAMILY FARM ALLIANCE,  
*Klamath Falls, OR, March 8, 2017.*

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: On behalf of the Family Farm Alliance (Alliance), we write to express our support for your "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act". This important legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes.

The Alliance is a grassroots organization of family farmers, ranchers, irrigation districts and allied industries in 16 Western states. Several of our members are mutual ditch and irrigation districts. The Alliance is focused on one mission: To ensure the availability of reliable, affordable irrigation water supplies to Western farmers and ranchers.

The "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act" provides a critical first step to-

wards addressing current regulatory and bureaucratic challenges that many times will delay or even halt the development of new water supply enhancement projects in the Western United States. The recent drought has ramped up much-needed Congressional interest to enact legislation that will allow Western water providers to better manage and prepare for future dry times. Now, the heaviest rain in a decade has overwhelmed parts of the West Coast, underscoring the critical importance of having modernized and enhanced water storage infrastructure in place to optimize water resources management for the future.

Family Farm Alliance members rely on the traditional water and power infrastructure built over the last century to deliver irrigation water supplies vital to their farming operations. Our membership has been advocating for new water storage facilities for over twenty years, and we have provided specific recommendations to Congress and the White House on how to streamline restrictive federal regulations to help make these projects happen.

As you are aware, developing new water storage projects is much easier said than done. For many reasons—political, economic and social—the construction of traditional surface water storage projects is undertaken on a much more limited basis than in decades past. Even if federal authorization and funding, or funding from non-federal sources, is secured for a new storage project, the existing procedures for permitting the development of additional water supplies can make project approval incredibly burdensome.

By the time project applicants approach federal agencies for permits to construct multimillion dollar projects they have already invested extensive resources toward analyzing project alternatives to determine which project is best suited to their budgetary constraints. However, current procedure dictates that federal agencies formulate another list of project alternatives which the applicant must assess, comparing potential impacts with the preferred alternative. These alternatives often conflict with state law or are simply not implementable in the first place yet valuable resources are required to be expended to further study these additional alternatives in the federal permitting process.

Thus, we strongly support your bill. We look forward to working with you, the 115th Congress and other interested parties to build a consensus for improving the federal regulatory and permitting process. If we don't find a way to restore water supply reliability for Western irrigated agriculture through a combination of new water supply and management infrastructure, other water supply enhancement efforts and demand management—our country's ability to feed and clothe itself and the world will be jeopardized.

This bill takes an important step towards addressing this critical need. I encourage you or your staff to contact Dan Keppen if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

PATRICK O'TOOLE,  
*President.*  
DAN KEPPEL,  
*Executive Director.*

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA  
WATER AGENCIES,  
*June 19, 2017.*

Re Support for H.R. 1654.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) is pleased to support H.R. 1654, the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act". ACWA's 450 public water agency members supply over 90 percent of the water delivered in California for residential, agricultural, and industrial uses.

As demonstrated by California's recent historic drought, it is important that Congress take actions now that help ensure California has sufficient water supplies for the future. Had the streamlining provisions contained in H.R. 1654 been in effect prior to the drought, California's water infrastructure and water supplies could have been improved to help mitigate much of the current personal and economic suffering that occurred.

Moreover, H.R. 1654 is consistent with policy principles ACWA has formally adopted embracing environmental and economic sustainability as co-equal priorities for water management in California.

Thank you for this opportunity to express ACWA's support for H.R. 1654.

Sincerely,

DAVID REYNOLDS,  
*Director of Federal Relations.*

VOITH HYDRO INC.  
*York, PA, June 20, 2017.*

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: On behalf of Voith Hydro, I am writing today to extend our strong support for H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act. Voith Hydro is a manufacturer of hydroelectric equipment and technology based in York, Pennsylvania. Additionally, we have Voith Hydro Services facilities located in Chattanooga, Tennessee and Springfield, Oregon. Voith Hydro currently employs approximately 680 workers across the United States. Water storage issues are critical to our ability to provide both the energy and jobs that sustain a nation.

As you are well aware, water provides multiple benefits to communities across the country. Without an abundant supply of water storage in the United States, hydropower production cannot reach its full potential. These same communities have been able to thrive in large part due to abundant water supplies and the production of renewable hydropower, especially in your home district in Northern California. Increasing water storage throughout the country will allow for better management during drought conditions, and thus prevent power outages to communities reliant on hydroelectricity.

Streamlining the permitting process to expand and develop new water storage throughout the United States is critical to increasing and upgrading our Country's infrastructure. I am pleased to see that Congress continues to consider bills targeted to improve the permitting processes and hope that other infrastructure permitting streamlining continues, especially as it concerns hydropower development.

I encourage the passage of the Water Supply Permitting Act this week in the House of



Representatives and look forward to working with you on similar issues in the future. Thank you for your leadership on water storage and other critical issues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. GALLO,  
*President and CEO.*

MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT  
OF ORANGE COUNTY,  
*Fountain Valley, CA, May 30, 2017.*

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,  
*House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: The Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC) is pleased to support your measure, H.R. 1654—"The Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act." We applaud your efforts to streamline the permitting process that relates to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands. This coordination is long overdue and will ultimately benefit the entire state.

The rains this past winter emphasized the critical need California has for surface water storage. We cannot let this resource slip out to the ocean due to lack of places to put it. Allowing the Bureau of Reclamation to be the coordinating agency for projects on Interior or Department of Agriculture lands will make the process more efficient and speed up the process for critical water infrastructure projects in our state.

The Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC), a water agency serving the needs of more than two million residents and 28 retail water agencies, voted unanimously to support your legislation and to assist with its passage.

On behalf of the MWDOC Board of Directors, we are pleased to support H.R. 1654 and sincerely thank you for your efforts to address the ongoing water infrastructure needs in California.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact either Jim Barker, our advocate in Washington, or MWDOC General Manager, Rob Hunter.

Sincerely,

WAYNE S. OSBORNE,  
*Board President.*

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 232, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

#### AYES—179

|                 |               |             |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|
| Adams           | Brady (PA)    | Clark (MA)  |
| Aguilar         | Brown (MD)    | Clarke (NY) |
| Barragán        | Brownley (CA) | Clay        |
| Bass            | Bustos        | Cleaver     |
| Beatty          | Butterfield   | Clyburn     |
| Bera            | Capuano       | Cohen       |
| Beyer           | Carbajal      | Connolly    |
| Bishop (GA)     | Cárdenas      | Conyers     |
| Blumenauer      | Carson (IN)   | Cooper      |
| Blunt Rochester | Cartwright    | Courtney    |
| Bonamici        | Castor (FL)   | Crist       |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Chu, Judy     | Crowley     |
| F.              | Cicilline     | Davis (CA)  |

|                |                |                |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Davis, Danny   | Kildee         | Price (NC)     |
| DeFazio        | Kilmer         | Quigley        |
| DeGette        | Kind           | Raskin         |
| Delaney        | Krishnamoorthi | Renacci        |
| DeLauro        | Kuster (NH)    | Rice (NY)      |
| DelBene        | Langevin       | Richmond       |
| Demings        | Larson (CT)    | Rosen          |
| DeSaulnier     | Lawrence       | Roybal-Allard  |
| Deutch         | Lawson (FL)    | Ruiz           |
| Dingell        | Lee            | Ruppersberger  |
| Doggett        | Levin          | Rush           |
| Doyle, Michael | Lewis (GA)     | Ryan (OH)      |
| F.             | Lipinski       | Sánchez        |
| Ellison        | Loeb           | Sarbanes       |
| Engel          | Loebsack       | Schakowsky     |
| Eshoo          | Lofgren        | Schiff         |
| Españalat      | Lowenthal      | Schneider      |
| Esty (CT)      | Lujan Grisham, | Schrader       |
| Evans          | M.             | Scott (VA)     |
| Fitzpatrick    | Luján, Ben Ray | Scott, David   |
| Foster         | Lynch          | Serrano        |
| Frankel (FL)   | Maloney,       | Sewell (AL)    |
| Fudge          | Carolyn B.     | Shea-Porter    |
| Galleo         | Maloney, Sean  | Sherman        |
| Garamendi      | Matsui         | Sinema         |
| Gonzalez (TX)  | McCollum       | Sires          |
| Gottheimer     | McEachin       | Slaughter      |
| Green, Al      | McGovern       | Smith (WA)     |
| Green, Gene    | McNerney       | Soto           |
| Grijalva       | Meng           | Speier         |
| Hanabusa       | Moore          | Suozzi         |
| Hastings       | Moulton        | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Heck           | Murphy (FL)    | Takano         |
| Higgins (NY)   | Nadler         | Thompson (CA)  |
| Himes          | Neal           | Titus          |
| Hoyer          | Nolan          | Tonko          |
| Huffman        | Norcross       | Torres         |
| Jackson Lee    | O'Halloran     | Tsongas        |
| Jayapal        | O'Rourke       | Vargas         |
| Jeffries       | Pallone        | Veasey         |
| Johnson (GA)   | Panetta        | Vela           |
| Johnson, E. B. | Pascarella     | Velázquez      |
| Kaptur         | Payne          | Visclosky      |
| Keating        | Perlmutter     | Walz           |
| Kelly (IL)     | Peters         | Watson Coleman |
| Kennedy        | Pingree        | Welch          |
| Khanna         | Pocan          | Wilson (FL)    |
| Kihuen         | Polis          | Yarmuth        |

#### NOES—232

|              |               |                 |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham      | Cook          | Guthrie         |
| Aderholt     | Correa        | Harper          |
| Allen        | Costa         | Harris          |
| Amash        | Costello (PA) | Hartzler        |
| Amodei       | Cramer        | Hensarling      |
| Arrington    | Crawford      | Herrera Beutler |
| Babin        | Cuellar       | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Bacon        | Culberson     | Higgins (LA)    |
| Banks (IN)   | Curbelo (FL)  | Hill            |
| Barletta     | Davidson      | Holding         |
| Barr         | Davis, Rodney | Hollingsworth   |
| Barton       | Denham        | Hudson          |
| Bergman      | Dent          | Huizenga        |
| Biggs        | DeSantis      | Hultgren        |
| Bilirakis    | DesJarlais    | Hunter          |
| Bishop (MI)  | Diaz-Balart   | Hurd            |
| Bishop (UT)  | Donovan       | Jenkins (KS)    |
| Black        | Duffy         | Jenkins (WV)    |
| Blackburn    | Duncan (SC)   | Johnson (LA)    |
| Blum         | Duncan (TN)   | Johnson (OH)    |
| Bost         | Dunn          | Jones           |
| Brady (TX)   | Emmer         | Jordan          |
| Brat         | Estes (KS)    | Joyce (OH)      |
| Bridenstine  | Farenthold    | Katko           |
| Brooks (AL)  | Faso          | Kelly (MS)      |
| Brooks (IN)  | Ferguson      | Kelly (PA)      |
| Buchanan     | Fleischmann   | King (IA)       |
| Buck         | Flores        | King (NY)       |
| Bucshon      | Fortenberry   | Kinzing         |
| Budd         | Fox           | Knight          |
| Burgess      | Franks (AZ)   | Kustoff (TN)    |
| Byrne        | Frelinghuysen | Labrador        |
| Calvert      | Gaetz         | LaHood          |
| Carter (GA)  | Gallagher     | LaMalfa         |
| Carter (TX)  | Garrett       | Lamborn         |
| Chabot       | Gianforte     | Lance           |
| Chaffetz     | Gibbs         | Latta           |
| Cheney       | Gohmert       | Lewis (MN)      |
| Coffman      | Goodlatte     | LoBiondo        |
| Cole         | Gowdy         | Loudermilk      |
| Collins (GA) | Graves (GA)   | Love            |
| Collins (NY) | Graves (LA)   | Lucas           |
| Comer        | Graves (MO)   | Luetkemeyer     |
| Comstock     | Griffith      | MacArthur       |
| Conaway      | Grothman      | Marchant        |

|             |                 |               |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Marino      | Posey           | Smucker       |
| Marshall    | Ratcliffe       | Stefanik      |
| Massie      | Reed            | Stewart       |
| Mast        | Reichert        | Stivers       |
| McCarthy    | Rice (SC)       | Taylor        |
| McCaul      | Roby            | Tenney        |
| McClintock  | Roe (TN)        | Thompson (PA) |
| McHenry     | Rogers (KY)     | Thornberry    |
| McKinley    | Rohrabacher     | Tipton        |
| McMorris    | Rokita          | Trott         |
| Rodgers     | Rooney, Francis | Turner        |
| McSally     | Rooney, Thomas  | Upton         |
| Meadows     | J.              | Valadao       |
| Meehan      | Ros-Lehtinen    | Wagner        |
| Messer      | Roskam          | Walberg       |
| Mitchell    | Ross            | Walden        |
| Moolenaar   | Rothfus         | Walker        |
| Mooney (WV) | Rouzer          | Walorski      |
| Mullin      | Royce (CA)      | Walters, Mimi |
| Murphy (PA) | Russell         | Weber (TX)    |
| Newhouse    | Rutherford      | Webster (FL)  |
| Noem        | Sanford         | Wenstrup      |
| Nunes       | Schweikert      | Westerman     |
| Olson       | Scott, Austin   | Williams      |
| Palazzo     | Sensenbrenner   | Wilson (SC)   |
| Palmer      | Sessions        | Wittman       |
| Paulsen     | Shimkus         | Womack        |
| Pearce      | Shuster         | Woodall       |
| Perry       | Simpson         | Yoder         |
| Peterson    | Smith (MO)      | Yoho          |
| Pittenger   | Smith (NE)      | Young (AK)    |
| Poe (TX)    | Smith (NJ)      | Young (IA)    |
| Poliquin    | Smith (TX)      | Zeldin        |

#### NOT VOTING—20

|             |              |                |
|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| Castro (TX) | Johnson, Sam | Rogers (AL)    |
| Cummings    | Larsen (WA)  | Scalise        |
| Gabbard     | Lieu, Ted    | Thompson (MS)  |
| Gosar       | Long         | Tiberi         |
| Granger     | Meeks        | Wasserman      |
| Gutiérrez   | Napolitano   | Schultz        |
| Issa        | Pelosi       | Waters, Maxine |

□ 1612

Messrs. YODER, REED, BUDD, CURBELO of Florida, CORREA, PITTENGER, MULLIN, WITTMAN, AND KATKO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ESPAILLAT, BLUMENAUER, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BYRNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, last Thursday evening, we played the annual Congressional Baseball Game for Charity. This is normally the time when the losing manager has to congratulate the winning manager. Over the last 10 years, I have become fairly proficient at congratulating Mr. DOYLE.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to tell a lot of jokes because, as we all know, at the Republican practice the Wednesday morning before, an individual opened fire on the Republican team and wounded the majority whip, Mr. SCALISE; both Capitol Police officers who were part of Mr. SCALISE's security detail; and two volunteers who were assisting us in our practice. So I don't have a lot of jokes today, Mr. Speaker.

I do want to congratulate Mr. DOYLE and his team. They played fair and square. They were extremely gracious before the game. We had a unity prayer. We had a unity introduction of the players. The night before, Mr. DOYLE and his team invited the Republican team, believe it or not, to the Democratic political headquarters. I went with my two sons. The food was great, and the fellowship was even better.

So I do sincerely want to congratulate him and his players for playing the best game. They deserved to win.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Republican team. We had approximately 25 of our Members at the practice. Every one of them exhibited courage and composure. They all looked out for their fellow teammates.

We had an equivalent number of staff and volunteers. We had two of the best Capitol Hill police officers it is possible to have. They risked their lives.

I want to say this, and then I will yield to my good friend, Mr. DOYLE.

The shooter that attacked the Republican baseball team, Mr. Speaker, was attacking democracy. When we are at full strength on this floor, there are 435 of us. Every one of us is a winner. We get here because we have won an election. We get here because we have got the faith of approximately 600,000 or 700,000 people who are depending on us to be their voice for democracy. We argue. We debate. But as I said in one of my interviews, before our names is United States Representative. United.

Last Thursday, at the baseball game, we were united. I could not be prouder of being a Member of this body, Mr. Speaker. I could not be prouder of the Republican team, including our MVP, RON DESANTIS; our honorary MVP, STEVE SCALISE; and every member of the Republican team.

Would the members of the Republican team stand and let's acknowledge their heroism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is different from the other years that we have stood up here. This trophy isn't for either team. This trophy is for STEVE.

I just want you all to know that when we got the news at our baseball practice about what was going on, the only thing we could think about is that we are a family. When we stood in the dugout and prayed that you were safe and that no one was hurt, we weren't thinking about Democrats and Republicans. We were thinking about our fellow Members.

I was thinking about your son, Jack, and all the fun times I have had kidding him. I was thinking about CEDRIC RICHMOND's 3-year-old son, who was with us, and what would have happened if that shooter had come over to our dugout.

If there is a silver lining to that terrible day, it was reflected in the outpouring of people who showed up at our game. We normally get a crowd of 9,000 to 10,000. We had 25,000 people come to that game.

We normally raise about \$500,000 for the three charities that the game supports. I have a check here that says we raised \$1.5 million, but that is not correct. It is \$1.7 million. Some worthwhile charities are going to get a check they weren't expecting.

I want to reiterate what you said about our Capitol Police. To have someone shooting bullets at you, that is terrifying enough. To make the decision to put yourself out there and charge at that shooter to make sure that there wasn't a massacre takes a special kind of person.

To see Crystal throw that ball out last night at the women's softball game brought a lot of joy to my heart. We owe a real debt of gratitude to the Capitol Police who protect us on these grounds.

I want JOE to know that we continue to think about all of you. You are in our prayers, you are in our thoughts. Something terrible happened. For many of you, it might take days before it hits you. I would encourage anyone who is feeling that to talk to someone. Don't be bashful about that. This was a traumatic experience for your team, especially, but I want you to know that you are in our hearts and in our prayers.

As we said before, JOE and I are going to walk this trophy over to STEVE's office. When the hospital gives us clearance, we are going to go over to the hospital and present it to STEVE personally. This is for him right now. We

want him to know that the entire Congress thinks about him every day, prays for him and his family, and we hope to get him back here on the House floor as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 180, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

#### AYES—233

|               |                 |               |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abraham       | Crawford        | Holding       |
| Aderholt      | Cuellar         | Hollingsworth |
| Allen         | Culberson       | Hudson        |
| Amodei        | Curbelo (FL)    | Huizenga      |
| Arrington     | Davidson        | Hultgren      |
| Babin         | Davis, Rodney   | Hunter        |
| Bacon         | Denham          | Hurd          |
| Banks (IN)    | Dent            | Jenkins (KS)  |
| Barletta      | DeSantis        | Jenkins (WV)  |
| Barr          | DesJarlais      | Johnson (LA)  |
| Barton        | Diaz-Balart     | Johnson (OH)  |
| Bergman       | Donovan         | Jones         |
| Biggs         | Duffy           | Jordan        |
| Bilirakis     | Duncan (SC)     | Joyce (OH)    |
| Bishop (GA)   | Duncan (TN)     | Kelly (MS)    |
| Bishop (MI)   | Dunn            | Kelly (PA)    |
| Bishop (UT)   | Emmer           | King (IA)     |
| Black         | Estes (KS)      | King (NY)     |
| Blackburn     | Farenthold      | Kinzinger     |
| Blum          | Faso            | Knight        |
| Bost          | Ferguson        | Kustoff (TN)  |
| Brady (TX)    | Fleischmann     | Labrador      |
| Brat          | Flores          | LaHood        |
| Bridenstine   | Fortenberry     | LaMalfa       |
| Brooks (AL)   | Fox             | Lamborn       |
| Brooks (IN)   | Franks (AZ)     | Lance         |
| Buchanan      | Frelinghuysen   | Latta         |
| Buck          | Gaetz           | Lewis (MN)    |
| Bucshon       | Gallagher       | Loudermilk    |
| Budd          | Garrett         | Love          |
| Burgess       | Gianforte       | Lucas         |
| Byrne         | Gibbs           | Luetkemeyer   |
| Calvert       | Gohmert         | MacArthur     |
| Carter (GA)   | Goodlatte       | Maloney, Sean |
| Carter (TX)   | Gottheimer      | Marchant      |
| Chabot        | Gowdy           | Marino        |
| Chaffetz      | Graves (GA)     | Marshall      |
| Cheney        | Graves (LA)     | Masie         |
| Coffman       | Graves (MO)     | Mast          |
| Cole          | Griffith        | McCarthy      |
| Collins (GA)  | Grothman        | McCauley      |
| Collins (NY)  | Guthrie         | McClintock    |
| Comer         | Harper          | McHenry       |
| Comstock      | Harris          | McKinley      |
| Conaway       | Hartzler        | McMorris      |
| Cook          | Hensarling      | Rodgers       |
| Correa        | Herrera Beutler | McSally       |
| Costa         | Hice, Jody B.   | Meadows       |
| Costello (PA) | Higgins (LA)    | Meehan        |
| Cramer        | Hill            | Messer        |

Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita

Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney

Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—180

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Fitzpatrick  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge

Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan

Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—18

Cummings  
Doggett  
Gabbard  
Gosar  
Granger  
Issa  
Johnson, Sam

Larsen (WA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Long  
Meeks  
Napolitano  
Pelosi  
Rogers (AL)

Scalise  
Tiberi  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine

□ 1632

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 319 (passage of H.R. 1654), I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this vote.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 318 and No. 319 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Lowenthal Amendment. I would have voted "nay" on the Final Passage of H.R. 1654—Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal conflict, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 318 and "yea" on rollcall No. 319.

## SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dutiful service of the United States Secret Service. The Secret Service protects the President and Vice President, their families, and foreign dignitaries, while also investigating cybercrimes and preventing fraud. These men and women place their lives on the line daily to protect some of the most highly targeted individuals in the world.

Further, they continue to conduct counterfeit interdiction operations despite the increasing need for protective details and low retention numbers.

While the Secret Service is often in the news for personal shortcomings, the organization has had a storied history in protecting the United States. It is a remarkable fact that, within the last year, they have successfully conducted security operations for multiple Presidential candidates, the U.N. General Assembly, a visit to New York City by Pope Francis, and countless foreign dignitary visits to our soil.

So from all of us here in Congress, I would like to thank the Secret Service for their service to our Nation and for their sacrifices. In the coming months, I plan to routinely honor this great example of American exceptionalism.

## THE BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION ACT

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the latest plan to gut the Affordable Care Act.

Senate Republicans, as has been reported, just unveiled their draft of their healthcare bill, the Better Care Reconciliation Act, which was developed entirely behind closed doors and will be rushed to a vote, from what I understand, without additional input or public debate.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this bill will not provide Americans access to better care and it will not create more affordable coverage.

Changes to Medicaid will mean Americans in the expansion population will eventually lose access to crucial services and supports, and shrinking the program will force States to cut services to the poor, the sick, and the elderly.

Like the House Republican version to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, the Senate's bill is an attack on the preservation of essential health benefits, and it will not ensure middle-income Americans can receive sufficient financial support to obtain coverage.

The Senate Republican Better Care Reconciliation Act does not deviate from the damage of the core policies found in the Republican House version of the American Health Care Act, and I just hope my Republican colleagues have a chance to realize this before they take a vote on a bill that will only undermine health coverage for the American people.

## INTRODUCING THE PUPPIES ASSISTING WOUNDED SERVICE-MEMBERS ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, according to recent VA analysis, an average of 20 veterans commit suicide per day. Additionally, 20 percent of those who have served in Iraq or Afghanistan suffer from PTSD or major depression.

Addressing the mental health of our veterans needs to be a top priority, which is why I am cosponsoring the Puppies Assisting Wounded Service-members Act, or the PAWS Act. It is an additional way to provide better treatment for our soldiers who are struggling with various forms of mental health following their service and deployment.

This initiative allows the VA to create a 5-year program to give organizations grants to pair veterans suffering with PTSD with service dogs to increase their recovery. Studies show

that service dogs contribute considerably to one's emotional and psychological well-being.

Mr. Speaker, the PAWS Act will help with the recovery of our veterans who have paid a great price in serving our country. It is imperative that our veterans' mental health remains a high priority and that they have access to as many options as possible.

#### JUNE IS NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize June as National Homeownership Month and to introduce three bills to protect homeowners: the Foreclosure Fairness Act, the National Homeowners Bill of Rights Act, and the Keeping Families Home Act.

In 2016, the homeownership rate in the U.S. fell to 62.9 percent, the lowest rate since 1967. Before the Great Recession, it peaked at about nearly 70 percent.

Unfortunately, in the past 8 years, New Mexico, my home State, has not seen economic recovery. In fact, as of April 2017, New Mexico's foreclosure rate is 40 percent higher than the national average.

Owning a home is not only the American Dream, it also increases economic activity as well as wealth for the owners. The average homeowner has a net worth that is 36 times that of the average renter—\$195,400 compared to \$5,400.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my bills, which will make the foreclosure process more transparent and fair, prohibit deficiency judgments, help non-English speakers communicate with mortgage servicers, and keep families in their home.

#### COMPENSATING VICTIMS WHO CONTRACTED FUNGAL MENINGITIS

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a national victim's compensation issue that must be treated with the urgency it deserves.

Nearly one year ago, because of the work of the Members of this body, \$40 million was made available to a victim's compensation program for people who had contracted fungal meningitis as a result of tainted NECC steroid injections distributed in 2012, which resulted in convictions with multiple people. That money was delivered to the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office 9 months ago, yet not a single claim has been paid.

Mr. Speaker, these victims, many of whom are from my district, need justice. We are nearing the 5-year mark of this terrible outbreak, and families across America need this Congress to continue to fight for them.

Against their own will, they became victims of this terrible tragedy, and they certainly do not need to also be victims of more bureaucratic red tape. Enough is enough. It is time to use these funds we secured and start compensating these victims.

I stand ready, willing, and able to help in any way I can, but I urge the officials in Massachusetts to treat this matter like the priority it truly is.

#### NEW JERSEY MAYORS UNDER- STAND COMBATING CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here proud to represent the New Jersey 12th Congressional District. I stand here proud that Mayor Eric Jackson of Trenton, Mayor Liz Lempert of Princeton, Mayor Francis Womack of North Brunswick, and Mayor Colleen Mahr of Fanwood led the charge in understanding that our global responsibility to combating climate change starts at home.

By passing resolutions that pledge their commitment to the Paris climate accord, these cities understand that American exceptionalism means we lead from the front, not from the back. I consider myself very fortunate to have lived my entire life in a State that has so many progressive nonprofit organizations and individuals that are working every day to protect public health, our environment, and our quality of life.

I commend these cities in my district and the elected officials, the business leaders, and the private citizens nationwide who have chosen to ensure the cultivation and preservation of this Earth for generations to come.

#### JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and it has reached crisis proportions.

There is no effective treatment, no means of prevention, and no method for slowing the progression of the disease. Sadly, one in three seniors will die with the disease.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 5 million

Americans were living with Alzheimer's disease in the year 2013. This number is expected to almost triple to 14 million by the year 2050.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. Alzheimer's also has a devastating impact on caregivers and loved ones of those diagnosed with the disease. More than 15 million Americans provide unpaid care to family and friends living with Alzheimer's and other dementias.

Compared with caregivers for people without dementia, twice as many caregivers for people with dementia indicate substantial emotional, financial, and physical stress.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. Let's join the fight. Let's take the pledge to raise awareness about Alzheimer's disease, and to never stop searching for a cure.

□ 1645

#### PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. PINGREE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, because June is PTSD Awareness Month, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary organization in my district that is making a huge impact on the lives of Maine veterans managing this challenging condition.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have paid close attention to effective alternative therapies for the symptoms of PTSD, from service dogs to equine therapy, from book and writing groups to yoga and acupuncture. A group in my home State of Maine, called K9s on The Front Line, has created an extraordinary model. At no cost to the veteran, volunteer police dog handlers teach participants to train their own dogs or dogs selected from shelters to be PTSD service dogs.

Many of these veterans have had years of therapy or drug treatment with limited success. Yet, in so many instances, the impact of these service dogs on both veterans and their families has been nothing short of miraculous.

I am proud to honor my constituents at K9s on The Front Line for improving the lives of Maine veterans with PTSD.

#### TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the importance of technical education.

Technical education allows Americans of nearly any age to gain practical skills for the modern economy. Students graduate with less debt and also great career prospects because growing

industries often partner with local education centers to find the best employees.

My home State of Tennessee, where global auto companies have created a network of high-tech manufacturers, is a prime example. This week, in Franklin County, we are celebrating the groundbreaking of another Tennessee College of Applied Technology campus. The program has been enormously successful across the State, helping Tennesseans who prefer to learn a trade to find meaningful work and helping employers to fill specialized jobs.

I applaud President Trump for his focus on apprenticeship and vocational programs to create jobs and economic growth. This week, I voted to simplify Federal funding for States, which administer a broad range of programs for everything from mechanics to coding. I have also voted to lift Federal restrictions on overdue energy and infrastructure projects requiring thousands of engineers and operators.

The United States must always be an industrial leader. That leadership starts with hardworking Americans pursuing their passions through technical education.

#### TAX REFORM

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against dark-of-night policymaking and extreme partisanship and turn to where we can work together with civility on our most pressing issues.

Instead of focusing on what we do not agree on, we must work together where we can find common ground on cutting taxes for hardworking Americans and businesses of all sizes and investing in the crumbling roads, tunnels, and bridges Americans drive over every day. In New Jersey, our roads are the eighth worst in the country, while our taxes are way too high.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, I have been working around the clock with both parties since I was sworn in to fix our roads, while lowering taxes and cutting unnecessary regulation and red tape. By doing so, we can increase economic growth in jobs, improve safety, fight terror, ensure clean drinking water, stand by our vets and first responders, and give our country a competitive advantage on the world stage.

We simply can't have a first-rate nation with second-class infrastructure and sky-high taxes. There is political will on both sides of the aisle on these issues, but we can't be spending our energy on rehashing the same tired partisan debates and jamming through partisan bills. We must work together to get things done for the American people.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF STAN McETCHIN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passing and celebrate the life of a good friend to many, Mr. Stan McEtchin. Hailing from Vancouver, British Columbia, Stan passed away on June 9, after 92 years of enriching the lives of those around him.

For the past few decades, the small town of Paradise, California, has known Stan as a pillar of the community, whose sculpted metal artwork decorated shops and houses all across Butte County. But before his creative artwork made him a local celebrity, Stan served his country in World War II.

In 1943, he volunteered for the First Special Service Force in the Canadian Army, an elite American and Canadian commando unit that preceded the modern Special Operations Forces we have today. In 2014, the man beloved for his artwork and for his charity was awarded a Congressional Gold Medal right here in Washington, D.C., for his unit's heroism in battle.

I consider myself fortunate to have known him just a little bit, and our country fortunate to have gained such a good man from our northern neighbors.

God bless his family and his memory.

#### TRUMPCARE, BUT AT WHAT COST?

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Senate Republicans have negotiated their TrumpCare bill in the dark, and that is just where it should have stayed. And just wait until the CBO score comes out next week.

Knowing that this bill will cause immeasurable harm to millions of American families who will lose their coverage and protections while facing higher costs, I do not understand how anyone could support it.

We constantly hear from our Republican colleagues that TrumpCare keeps their promise to repeal the Affordable Care Act. So you keep that misguided promise, but at what cost?

We are talking about the lives of real people, millions of real people. Aren't they worth more than just a tax cut for the rich?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to scrap this disastrous bill. Let's work together to improve the Affordable Care Act and not destroy it.

#### CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS PROVIDE STUDENTS OPPORTUNITIES FOR TODAY'S ECONOMY

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of today's legislation to advance our country's career and technical education programs. These programs help students learn the skills needed to be competitive and set our young people on the path to success.

I have visited with our manufacturers regularly, and they have repeatedly told me that more skilled workers are needed.

As a former vocational teacher, I have seen firsthand the fulfillment a student can find from getting real-world training in a useful skill, and I am encouraged by the positive steps this bill takes to address this skill shortfall.

There are many paths to success, and the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act helps us pave the way for a high-skilled workforce of Americans to have successful, fulfilling careers.

#### LGBT PRIDE MONTH

(Ms. JAYAPAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, all over the country, millions of Americans are celebrating Pride Month and our LGBTQIA communities across the country. In fact, this week I will join tens of thousands of Washingtonians at our annual Seattle pride events.

We will come together to support our family, friends, neighbors, and colleagues; we will come together to celebrate the advancement of LGBTQ rights in our country; and we will come together to celebrate the second anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision that reaffirmed our commitment to the principle of marriage equality in this country.

But this year, we also come together to acknowledge that we have seen a spike in hate crimes, an increasing coarseness of public discourse, and greater fear-mongering for political gain. We have a lot of work to do.

We intend to protect every advancement that has been made and continue demanding progress toward full protections in employment and housing, safety for our transgender brothers and sisters, and equitable access to healthcare and other services.

There is a lot to celebrate, but much more to do to ensure the promise of equality for all in our Nation. That is what this month has been about, and we celebrate it.

# LET'S WORK IN A BIPARTISAN WAY TO IMPROVE OUR HEALTHCARE SYSTEM FOR EVERY AMERICAN

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republicans' ongoing plans to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. Senate leadership unveiled their plan this morning and plans a vote as soon as next week.

This bill was drafted in secrecy and will have massive consequences for the healthcare of every American. It will affect more than one-sixth of our economy. Yet for all its impact, it was written behind closed doors, with absolutely zero bipartisan input.

I have heard from more constituents on this issue than any other—more than 5,000 letters, emails, and telephone calls: people like the cancer survivor in Lake Bluff who is worried whether she will be unable to find affordable insurance without the ACA's preexisting condition protections; or my constituent in Grayslake, who says he could only start his business because of the individual coverage he bought on the exchange.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the great majority of the American people. It is time to end this ill-considered charade to repeal ObamaCare and work together in a bipartisan way to improve our healthcare system for every American.

## SENATE VERSION OF AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT RELEASE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have a copy of the Senate bill to repeal ObamaCare, and it is no wonder they didn't want us to see it.

Like the mean-spirited bill passed by the House, it rips insurance away from millions of Americans, rolls back key protections to patients with pre-existing conditions, and allows insurers to charge older people five times more than others.

Despite the promises that the Senate bill will moderate the coverage cuts in the House-passed bill, the Senate is not only retaining the House bill's fundamental restructuring of the Medicaid program to a per capita cap on Federal funding, but it is deepening the cuts on Medicaid after a few years. This will inevitably lead to the rationing of healthcare for 70 million Americans who are beneficiaries of Medicaid: pregnant women, people in nursing homes, children, and people with disabilities.

It is not even clear what policy goal this bill is trying to solve, except for making insurance more expensive or

unavailable for people who really need it the most. It is almost hard to call this a healthcare bill at all.

There were no hearings, no public debate, and after weeks of backroom deals and operating in secrecy, we now have this terrible product that the Senate plans to vote on next week.

I think the American people deserve better.

## SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the healthcare bill that has emerged from secret Republican-only negotiations in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, 900,000 people—nearly 1 million—gained health insurance just in Ohio through the Affordable Care Act. But this lopsided Republican bill is even more cruel than their House version. It will rip away care from millions, including very sick people who are suffering from mental illness and opioid addiction.

We all know amazing families, many of whom have come to our offices telling their stories, families who care for the sick and for those who will never be able to realize the dreams due to illness and disability. To put them on the chopping block is un-American and it is anti-life.

The Republican bill slashes Medicaid, which is a lifeline to working people, and puts more crushing costs on millions of seniors dependent on Medicaid for nursing home care.

The Republican bill is anti-life. The Republican proposal makes healthcare unaffordable for many Americans, and basically gives a tax cut to those who make millions and billions of dollars. How cruel is that?

Caring for the most dependent and ill among us cannot be left to chance. Americans should rise up in protest from coast to coast and oppose this anti-life Republican bill.

## LET'S FIGHT TO SAVE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, healthcare should not be partisan.

I have on my jacket a sign that says "Restore the Vote" to give opportunities to Americans to vote because Republicans have decided that TrumpCare and healthcare is partisan. We need to be able to ensure that everyone has the right to vote.

Today, they issued a mean healthcare bill that is meaner than the House bill. Trillions of dollars are cut from Medicaid, from children and senior citizens. Subsidies are not given to

all of those given under the Affordable Care Act. Hospitals will crumble; federally qualified clinics will close; and emergency room doctors, of whom I had the chance to speak to just a few hours ago, indicated 140 million Americans go to emergency rooms, or have gone, for their healthcare. The Affordable Care Act eased that.

But, now with this monstrosity of a bill that undermines and throws Americans off healthcare—23 million and growing—then it really does say that elections do matter and that this is a sinister Republican plan to undermine the American people.

It is time for us to come together, not partisan, but nonpartisan, to fight for our lives and fight for our children and fight to save the Affordable Care Act.

Let's do it now.

□ 1700

## IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to represent the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, where a blend of cultures has shaped our community, from the food that we eat to the traditions that we celebrate. The north Texas area has benefited from immigrants that now call the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex home. In fact, over one-third of the district I serve was born outside of the United States.

It is the rich diversity found in Texas and across the country that have helped make our country great. Immigrants bring their skills and cultures and a belief in the American Dream that benefits each and every one of us. They work alongside us, teach our children, worship in parishes, and contribute to the innovation that has kept America on the cutting edge for decades.

In honor of Immigrant Heritage Month, I remind my colleagues of our country's legacy as a nation of immigrants. I urge each of you to keep these ideas in mind as the month ends and as we promote policies that directly impact our immigrant communities.

## URGING MEMBERS TO REMEMBER THE COMMITMENT THEY MADE TO ONE ANOTHER

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak after my friend from Texas. He is absolutely right. We have an incredibly vibrant fabric of folks across this country. My district looks very much like his district. I appreciate him recognizing those things that unite us and bring us together.

You know, it hasn't been much over a week, Mr. Speaker, since we committed ourselves to changing the discourse here, and just in the last 5 minutes of listening to speakers on this floor, I have heard sinister accusations of what our healthcare bill will do, of mean bills and meaner bills, of cruel bills.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in this Chamber who doesn't work every day to serve their constituents better than they did yesterday. There is not a man or woman in this Chamber who doesn't want to do better for America tomorrow than we did yesterday. And I promise you that that pathway is not paved with accusations of "sinister," "cruel," and "mean." It is paved with confessions of common ground, common goals, and common opportunity. I urge my colleagues to remember our commitment that we made to one another last week.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF SENATOR JIM BUNNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight to honor the memory of a legendary Kentucky statesman, a baseball Hall of Famer, a man of this House, and a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, Senator Jim Bunning, who recently passed away at the age of 85.

The Members who are joining us tonight, many of them who hail from Senator Bunning's home in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, extend our deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, Mary, who was his best friend for many years; his nine children; his 35 grandchildren; and his 21 great-grandchildren.

Those who met Senator Jim Bunning walked away with an impression, and that impression was: That has to be the most competitive person I have ever met.

In a recent op-ed in the Lexington Herald-Leader, providing a great tribute to Senator Jim Bunning, one of his very best friends, sports marketing executive Jim Host, wrote that Jim Bunning was "full of integrity" and, "the straightest arrow I ever met."

In that op-ed, he recounted a story where a reporter of the Louisville Cou-

rier-Journal wrote that former U.S. Senator Jim Bunning was "one of a kind," and Jim Host, in remembering his friend, said, "I agree, but more than that, he was an original. No one in politics in Kentucky or, for that matter, nationwide has been or ever will be like him."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman HAL ROGERS, the dean of the Kentucky delegation.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise, like most of the delegation here, in memory of our longtime friend and colleague, the late Jim Bunning, who was an indomitable force on the pitcher's mound, a stalwart champion for the Commonwealth, and the proud patriarch of a remarkable family.

Jim Bunning is the type of guy you always wanted in your starting lineup. With his multilayered talent, Jim valued strategic offense as much as staunch defense not only on the pitcher's mound, but in the Halls of Congress, where he fervently stood for conservative values.

Jim once said: "I have been booed by 60,000 fans at Yankee Stadium standing alone at the pitcher's mound, so I have never really cared if I stood alone here in Congress as long as I stood for my beliefs and my values."

Jim was bold and headstrong, but also fiercely loyal, a combination that made him effective in every endeavor he undertook. He lived a courageous life that was highlighted by his Hall of Fame record and commitment to public service. Jim left an indelible mark on our State, on our Nation, and his legacy will endure for generations.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mary and the entire Bunning family. We are forever grateful for Jim's courage of conviction to faithfully serve the people of the Commonwealth.

I had the pleasure of serving with Jim in the House before he was elected to the U.S. Senate, and many times we would be on this floor when Jim's indomitable spirit would surface. He held strong beliefs and he had strong opinions, but, as Jim Host has said, you have never met a straighter arrow than Jim Bunning.

We are going to miss you, Big Right-Hander.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to JOHN YARMUTH, my friend from Louisville in the Third Congressional District of Kentucky and a good Kentuckian who will demonstrate that Jim Bunning's appeal crossed party lines.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, my neighbor from just down I-64, for organizing this Special Order honoring the life of Senator Bunning this evening.

This is the first time in my 11 years serving in Congress that I have spoken from this side of the aisle, and it is a fitting occasion that I do that. I am

proud to join my Republican colleagues and friends this evening.

During his baseball career, Jim Bunning was once asked what his proudest accomplishment was, and he recalled the fact that he went nearly 11 years without ever missing a start. "They wrote my name down, and I went to the post," he said.

I can't help but think that is a fitting way of also describing his political career and his love of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Kentuckians wrote his name down time after time again, and he went to work for them, no questions asked.

Jim and I obviously didn't see eye to eye politically all the time, and as amazed as I was by the curve balls that he threw on the field, I sometimes found myself equally amazed by some of the curve balls he threw off the field, but that was Jim. When so much of what happens in Congress is political theater, you can't deny that he was always real and that every word he spoke, he genuinely believed.

I am sure Jim's family takes great pride in that fact. I join with my colleagues in offering them my thoughts and prayers as they continue to grieve their loss. I hope they find comfort in the lifetime of memories they share together.

It is reported that Daniel Boone once said: "Heaven must be a Kentucky kind of place."

I sure hope that is true.

As I said at the time of his passing, Jim Bunning can now throw no-hitters forever on his field of dreams.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman BRETT GUTHRIE, my friend from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk about my good friend, Senator Bunning, a mentor to me. I first came across Senator Bunning when I was a young boy watching baseball and watching him pitch for the Detroit Tigers and for the Philadelphia Phillies. But I really got to know them—and when I say "them," it is because most of us from Kentucky cannot talk about Jim Bunning without saying Jim and Mary. It is just Jim and Mary. They were grammar school sweethearts. I think the only people they ever dated were each other.

It was wonderful to see Mary the other day, unfortunately under these circumstances, but a wonderful lady.

I have a couple of stories. When I first thought I might run for public office for the State senate—and my now 23-year-old was 5, and I had a 3-year-old son—I went to Oldham County, Kentucky, to meet Jim Bunning. And, of course, you show up, there is Jim and Mary. And she said: "Are you going to be our candidate in the 32nd District?"

And I said: "Well, I just don't know. I am really concerned about it. I have got a young family."

And she looked at me and she said: "Young man, I have raised nine kids"—I think at that point 20-something grandkids—"we have done politics, we have done baseball, city council." She went through a whole list of things. And I will never forget she said: "You are worried about your family because of the experiences that you have had, and you want them to have the same kind of experiences, but you have got to take your family and make your family experiences. Our kids have gotten to do things no other kid has gotten to do because of the positions and the things that we have done as a family."

You know, when you start to run for office, you kind of want to talk yourself out of it. So I will never forget driving back home convinced that, yes, I am going to run for this office. I walked in, and the first thing my wife said is: "Guess what. We are going to have our third child."

I guarantee you, if I had not had that conversation with Mary Bunning, and after my wife telling me during the time of that decision we are going to have another one—now our 19-year-old—I wouldn't have moved forward.

My other story is Senator Bunning took me under his wing. I won my first race by 130 votes out of 27,000 cast. Jim Bunning was running in a fight for his life for the U.S. Senate. Bob Dole comes to Bowling Green, Kentucky, to have a rally for Senator Bunning, and he wanted me to speak. Well, then we see people around town like this that are operatives for our parties, and this one guy says: "No. No State, no local candidates. Only Federal candidates can speak."

I had to leave the podium because this young, 25-year-old guy said that. And Jim Bunning looks over—and they are all there for his rally—he says: "If he is not speaking, I am not speaking."

So the next thing I know, I got on the agenda. They said: "Yeah. Three minutes."

So I had my 3-minute talk.

The final thing I want to say is that one of my favorite Jim Bunning stories is he did not like to sign baseballs made in China. That was just his thing. He didn't want to sign a baseball made in China, which I didn't know that, but I had two major league baseballs for my two oldest kids to get them signed. He was going to be in Bowling Green, Kentucky. I show up there. And on the way, my youngest daughter, which we didn't think even cared, started crying. Well, to buy a real major league baseball in Bowling Green, Kentucky, at the last minute is not very easy to do. So we went by Walmart, picked up just a little official league ball. And I walked to the restaurant and I hand Jim the first ball. He signs it. The second one, he signs it. The third one—and it is in my office today, because I may have the only one—he picks it up and

he points to the "China" imprinted on the ball and just gives me this look like only he could give. And fortunately Mary was there, and she says: "Jim, you are signing that ball for that little girl." So I now have it in my office in the Rayburn building, a Jim Bunning baseball that says "Made in China" on it. It is something I cherish.

His granddaughter has interned in my office, and she is a chip off the old block, both her grandmother and grandfather. During the spring, we were getting a lot of phone calls in our office because of some of the actions here on the House floor. She was wonderful and mature beyond her years at 20 or 21 years old.

So the old right-hander, as Mr. HAL ROGERS said, is somebody we miss, is somebody that is important to me, somebody that leaves a fantastic legacy in Washington, in Major League Baseball. But far more important, if you had the opportunity to go to the funeral home, just looking at those nine children, and with over 30-something grandchildren and now into the great-grandchildren, that is his legacy. His legacy is his family, and there is no other way he would want it from that first few days in grammar school when he first met his wife, Mary, till today. It is just a legacy that all of us should strive to have.

We love him. We are going to miss him. And we certainly love his wife, Mary, and his family.

□ 1715

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from the First Congressional District of Kentucky, Congressman JAMES COMER.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Senator Jim Bunning. I met Senator Bunning in 1983, when I was 10 years old. He was running for Governor. At the time, he was a State senator in Kentucky, and my grandfather was chairman of the Republican Party of Monroe County.

So when he ran for Governor, my grandfather was the chairman of the county for his election. And I went up to him, a 10-year-old boy, and I had my baseball in my hand—because that is what you did when you saw Jim Bunning, you gave him a baseball to sign—and I said: "Mr. Bunning, I am like you. We have two things in common." I said: "I am a fan of sports and a fan of politics."

And he laughed and patted me on the head, and he said: "We are going to get along just fine." And he figured out who I was, who my grandfather was, and we stayed close through the years.

When I ran for State representative in 2000, he was one of the first people to call and encourage me and offer his support. I won that election. I served in the Kentucky General Assembly. He was always a supporter. He was always there for me.

I ran for commissioner of agriculture in another statewide office, and he was always there for me. I think the world of Jim Bunning just because I knew him and I knew that he cared and he remembered things.

In 2004, he was running for reelection for the U.S. Senate, and it was a tough election. It was a very close election. In fact, there were 120 counties in the State. With 118 counties in, he was behind in that election. And there were two counties left, Metcalfe County and Monroe County, two counties in my State House district. So he knew he was going to win because he won those counties by 4-to-1 margins.

So every time I would see him, he would remind me that he is in the Senate because of those counties in south central Kentucky. Most politicians probably wouldn't remember that, but he did.

So I am honored to stand here tonight with Representative BARR and show my support and appreciation for Jim Bunning. Kentucky is a better State because of the leadership of U.S. Senator Jim Bunning.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when you think about U.S. Senator Jim Bunning and when you think about his remarkable baseball career before politics, Jim Bunning could have gone anywhere and he could have done anything, but it is important to remember that those early days during his baseball career—and I will have to recount a story that was in that tribute that Jim Host wrote about the Hall of Famer Jim Bunning.

And he said that, after his career had ended, it had been about 15 years, and he had not yet been named to the Baseball Hall of Fame by the baseball writers, though when he retired, he was second in strikeouts to the famed Walter Johnson, he had won 100 games in both leagues, he had a perfect game in one of those leagues, and he had a no-hitter in the other league.

He had never pitched for a pennant winner.

A prominent sportswriter told me, quoting Jim Host, that the writers would have never elected him because he never developed relationships with most of them.

But this wrong was corrected the first year that the old-timers committee of the Hall could vote on him. Probably his greatest thrill, other than the birth of his nine children, was the call he got from Ted Williams and others saying they were correcting a tragic wrong by voting Jim Bunning into the Hall of Fame.

When he called Jim Host to tell him the news, his voice was filled with emotion unlike any that he had heard from him before.

And here is what Jim Bunning said to Jim Host:

I am glad those writers—he used another word—did not vote me in, being voted in by the players means more anyway.

In his acceptance speech, he attacked the ills in the game he loved so much that the commissioner and others were not addressing. The officials of Major League Baseball



sat on the stage quite uncomfortable. Vintage Bunning.

But you know, after that remarkable baseball career and after that wrong was corrected and he was ultimately voted into the Hall of Fame by the players, he chose to come home to Kentucky where he dedicated his life to his family and to public service.

He served on the Fort Thomas City Council and in the Kentucky State Senate before serving in this body, in the House of Representatives, as a Congressman from Kentucky's Fourth Congressional District, and he did so for six terms in a very distinct fashion.

And he capped off his remarkable career in public service by serving two terms and very consequential terms in the United States Senate. Throughout his entire career, he remained a principled conservative, and he was an unrelenting fighter for the causes he believed in and for the people of the commonwealth. Just as he was unafraid to face the boos and the jeers of tens of thousands of opposing fans in Major League Baseball stadiums around the country, Jim Bunning was unafraid to stand alone in Congress for the causes that he felt were right.

And a great example of this—and I like telling this story as the current chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee in this House. Jim Bunning was a fighter for accountability and transparency of the Federal Reserve. And when so many just took the Fed for their word, Jim Bunning stood up and he challenged then-Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan. And many of his colleagues looked at him in dismay because they believed that the Fed just deserved deference, and this great economist should always be taken as being right in what he was doing.

But Jim Bunning, in the end, was right, as Fed policies ended up being one of the causes of the Great Recession of 2008. Senator Bunning's legacy lives on in his amazing wife, Mary, and their many children and grandchildren, including his grandson Eric Bunning, who has been an important part of my team since I first took office.

And I just have to tell one story from the campaign trails. Many of my colleagues have told these stories, but I have got to tell one that is personal to me. Jim Bunning was a legend, and we all revered him. And when I made my first run for Congress, it was kind of coming down the home stretch, and we were the underdog, but I really respected Senator Bunning, and I wanted his political experience and his advice.

And as we were going down the home stretch of the campaign—it was a tight election—Jim Bunning approached me at an event, and he said: “Andy, how are you doing?”

And I said: “We are doing great. We have got the momentum. We are moving forward, and it is really tightening

up, and I really feel like we have got the momentum, and we are going to get over the top.”

And in his way that only Jim Bunning could be, as honest as he was, he said: “That is not what I hear. I hear you are down by 10 points, and you are going to lose in a landslide.”

Well, as it turned out, a few weeks later, it was a close election, and we only lost that campaign by a few hundred votes. But you know what? Just a few days after that concession speech that I had to give, you know who called? It was Senator Jim Bunning.

And even though he was certainly candid in that conversation a few weeks before election day, he said: “Andy, you ran a great campaign. You are a tenacious campaigner. Don't give up. Keep fighting. Be persistent. Do it again. The next time you are going to win.”

And you know, that embodies the character of Jim Bunning: tenacious, persistent, determined, principled, a man of integrity.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in praying for the extended Bunning family as we remember a respected former member of this House and a great Kentuckian.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to join many of my colleagues from Kentucky, and all of the other fellow members of this body, to celebrate the life and the legacy of Senator Jim Bunning.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members participating in this Special Order hour with the Progressive Caucus have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order, which is healthcare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here tonight on behalf of the Progressive Caucus to manage this Special Order hour along with my colleagues, who I will be introducing. Several of them will be joining me tonight to discuss what is going on in the Senate today with the GOP finally unveiling their closely guarded secret plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a plan they are unveiling that has had the legislative benefit of no hearings, no witnesses, no expert testimony, no tes-

timony by the public, and, again, no Congressional Budget Office score so far, which is the same way that the legislation passed out of the House side.

So does all of this sound familiar? It should, because this is the same clandestine, in-the-dark process that led to the plan which emerged here in the House of Representatives on the barest of margins with every manner of power play and power ploy engaged by leadership to produce the final result.

That bill, by the way, now stands at a whopping 9 percent in the polls, which means it is even more unpopular than Congress itself. And even though my friends across the aisle rented buses and vans to take them over to the White House to go and celebrate and exult in their dubious victory and uncork the champagne and drink beer with the President and his staff after they pushed the bill through the House, today, President Trump now calls the bill that he celebrated and he campaigned for mean. He says it is a mean bill today.

And there is no question he is right about that. We said that at the time, mean as a rattlesnake, that bill, which would have thrown 24 million people off their health insurance plans and destroyed preexisting health insurance coverage for people with preexisting health conditions.

The Senate version, though, is just as mean. It is downright mean. It may even be meaner than the House version. It not only strips health insurance coverage from tens of millions of our fellow American citizens; it not only forces American families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs, all to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest of our citizens; it forces Americans, ages 50 to 64, to pay premiums five times higher than everyone else, no matter how healthy you are.

That is right. If you are in the age bracket of 50 to 64, your premiums, under their bill, will be five times higher than everybody else in the population, no matter how healthy you are. It reduces the life of the Medicare trust fund and robs funds that seniors depend on to get the long-term care that they need. It blocked grants, Medicaid to the States, and then, astonishingly, for the first time ever, places a per capita cap on Medicaid payments for all recipients, including disabled Americans and senior citizens.

That is just unconscionable. Think about it. For the first time ever, under Medicaid, the Federal Government would not commit to pay for all of enrollees' health bills. So if your illness or your injuries are too severe or too complicated, your treatment too long, tough luck for you, buddy; you are on your own, Jack. That is the new proposal that is coming out from the Senate today.

The people that railed about death panels before passage of the Affordable Care Act, panels that never materialized and were proven to be an absolute fiction and fantasy, now seek to throw millions of people off of their health insurance, roll back the Medicaid expansion in the Affordable Care Act, which benefitted millions of our countrymen and -women, and then cut the heart out of the Medicaid guarantee by placing a per capita cap on payments to beneficiaries.

□ 1730

And this particular assault on the health and well-being of the American people doesn't even claim to be a response to any alleged problems with the Affordable Care Act, or with ObamaCare as they call it. It is, instead, a sweeping change to Medicaid that so-called free market conservatives have been trying to make for years.

This Senate legislation, cooked up in secret and seasoned with slashing cuts to Medicaid, is one fine mess. It does nothing but make our healthcare system more expensive, dangerously throws tens of millions of people off of their insurance, and eviscerates the core protections of Medicaid.

And why? What is the public policy being advanced here? All for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. It takes a special kind of single-minded focus to turn a healthcare bill into a massive tax cut for the people who need it the least in America.

Now, I heard some of my friends, my distinguished colleagues on the other side, say that other colleagues should not have been talking about how the bill was "mean," or "mean spirited," or "mean" because we have a renewed spirit of civility in this Chamber, which we do; and I praise it, and I celebrate it. Ever since the terrible attack on our colleague STEVE SCALISE and other colleagues and the Capitol Police officers who rose valiantly to defend them, we have really tried to put aside a lot of the partisan rancor. But my friends, we have got to talk honestly about legislation which is threatening the well-being of our own citizens.

The word "mean" comes not from my colleagues who were speaking before. The word "mean" comes from the President of the United States himself, who said that the legislation that passed out of the House, looking back on it, was "mean." Now, all of that was in order to say he likes the Senate version instead, but we think that the Senate version is even meaner than the bill that the President has already described as "mean" that came of the House.

So to describe more of the specific terms of this legislation and why it is a threat to our public health, why it is a threat to the basic values of solidarity and justice and community that

defines us as Americans, we have invited a number of our colleagues to come up and participate, beginning with the Congresswoman from Seattle, Washington, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, who used to co-chair the Progressive Caucus hour with me.

She has now been replaced by someone because she is moving on to an even bigger assignment right now, but please welcome a great Congresswoman, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, Representative RASKIN.

Mr. Speaker, it is great to have you presiding over the Chamber as well. It is all of our new Members here, and Representative KHANNA from California, who is going to be taking over as co-chair of this Special Order hour for the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure that the American people understand exactly what is going on. This is a bill that the Senate has been negotiating in private. It has been 13 men discussing healthcare for all Americans across this country in a secret room. That is really what has been happening.

Today we saw a draft of this bill, and the prevailing wisdom, when the bill passed the House, was that the Senate would completely revamp the bill. But according to *The New York Times*, it said: The Senate bill "once promised as a top-to-bottom revamp of the health bill passed by the House . . . instead maintains its structure, with modest adjustments."

It is the same bill. It is the same bill. And in fact, in some ways, it is a little bit worse because the cuts to Medicaid, while they don't take effect as quickly and they are more gradual, they are actually deeper than the House cuts to Medicaid.

There are other things in the bill that have been done, really, in part, to affect how the American people see the bill but don't change the basic provisions of this bill.

Part of the reason they delayed the cuts to Medicaid is so that they hope that they can get a better CBO score, Congressional Budget Office score, which the American people should know the last time around, the second time around after the first time the bill was about to come to the floor and then it got pulled from the floor because there weren't enough votes in the House, the second time when it did pass, it passed without a CBO score. It was not scored.

The reason it was not scored was because there was a belief that that very narrow passage in the House would not happen if Republicans and Democrats found out that the bill, as "revised," was actually just as bad.

So the bill that passed the House still took away health insurance from 23 million Americans. This is where we are today: a bill that has been crafted in secret but is essentially the same bill.

I have received more than 9,000 calls and letters from constituents who have been very clear that Congress needs to do all it can to protect our seniors, to expand Medicaid, and to defend the gains that have been made over the last 7 years.

And you know what is really ironic about this whole situation is that, if you think about some of the things that Republicans said about the Affordable Care Act when it was being passed—here is a quote.

In 2010, Speaker PAUL RYAN said: "After months of twisting arms, Democratic leaders convinced enough members of their own party to defy the will of the American people and support the Senate health bill which was crafted in secret, behind closed doors."

Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said: "When it comes to solving problems, Americans want us to listen first, and then, if necessary, offer targeted, step-by-step solutions. Above all, they're tired of a process that shuts them out. They're tired of giant bills negotiated in secret, then jammed through on a party-line vote in the middle of the night."

That is what Speaker RYAN said and Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said when the Affordable Care Act was being debated.

But here is the thing: When the Affordable Care Act was being debated, Democrats actually threw open the doors in Congress. They held over 100 Senate hearings. I wasn't here. This is based on actual reports and documents and files from Congress. There were over 100 Senate hearings, 25 consecutive days of consideration, and 161 amendments from Republicans. Many of those amendments were accepted into the bill.

This is a completely different process. We didn't have a single hearing on this bill. The bill came to the House floor, and there was some debate, but it certainly wasn't 100 hearings. It wasn't 25 days of consideration. There weren't 161 amendments. There weren't any amendments that were accepted from Democrats because there was no amendment process.

And now, in the Senate, we are going through the same process where a bill that is about the healthcare of hundreds of millions of Americans across this country is about to come to the floor, and they are not going to accept any amendments, certainly not from the Democratic side. Maybe they will take a few amendments from the Republicans before it comes to the floor. I don't know. We will have to see. But there is no debate on this.

How can we talk about the process of democracy and even of civility and the

ability to work together if we didn't offer the other side a chance to weigh in?

This bill will take away health insurance from millions of people, and it will make it less affordable for those who still have insurance because it is not very different from the House bill, and we already know that that is what the House bill does.

It would raise out-of-pocket costs for middle class families with higher deductibles and cost sharing. It would essentially defund Planned Parenthood by blocking people with Medicaid coverage from accessing preventive care at Planned Parenthood health centers for birth control, cancer screenings, and STD treatment and testing. And it would cut the essential health benefits protections.

Now, what are the essential health benefits protections? We talk about that phrase, but a lot of Americans don't know exactly what that means. So here is what it means.

It means that if you buy insurance, then you can be assured that that insurance is going to cover certain things. It will cover, for example, hospitalization. It will cover if you get cancer. It will cover some of your treatments that you need for cancer, certain things that are included in that. Mental healthcare is part of that essential health benefits coverage.

That is what it means. Otherwise, an insurance company can sell you something, and it can even say we cover, you know, X, Y, and Z, but when you get to the hospital because you are sick, you will find out that it doesn't actually cover hospitalization.

So this was an attempt to say, there is sort of an essential understanding, an essential set of things that would be covered. We will guarantee you that they will be covered if you buy insurance.

Now, I want to talk about Medicaid for a second, because this is one of the biggest travesties of the bill that is being proposed by the Republicans in the Senate.

This bill would literally decimate Medicaid. And between the Medicaid cut of over \$800 billion in the healthcare bill in the Senate and the budget cut that is proposed of over \$600 billion, let me be clear that we are talking about almost a \$1.5 trillion cut to Medicaid through these two mechanisms.

I want to talk about what Medicaid is because a lot of people might think that Medicaid just covers poor folks, which, frankly, I think we should cover poor folks. Let's be clear about that. But I want to tell you what Medicaid actually covers.

It covers half of all the births in the United States. It covers insurance for one in five Americans. It covers treatment for 220,000 recovering people with drug disorders, including those who

suffer from opioid abuse. It covers 1.6 million patients, mostly women, who get cancer screenings, and STD testing. It covers 64 percent of all nursing home residents. It covers 30 percent of all adults with disabilities. It covers 39 percent of all kids in this country and 60 percent of kids with disabilities.

So if you cut half of Medicaid, which is what a \$1.5 trillion cut to Medicaid would include—it would be half of what we spend on Medicaid today—a program that covers 74 million Americans across this country, 38 million Americans would lose their coverage.

No wonder, as Mr. RASKIN said, this healthcare bill has had such low approval ratings in the House, and now it is the same bill in the Senate.

Americans understand that whether you live in blue America or red America, whether you live in rural America or urban America, whether you are a man or a woman or a child, whether you are young or old, one of the great things about this country is that we are a country that believes in trying to provide for people when they get sick.

Now, we have been trying to do that for a long time, and until the Obama administration and the Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, we weren't doing that. But in Washington State, my home State, when we passed the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid expansion allowed us to cover an additional 600,000 people across our State. We cut the uninsured rate in half, and we created over 22,000 jobs across the State, including in rural areas.

So what we need to do now is to stop this bill from moving forward because it would be bad for the American people. It is that simple. It is going to kick Grandma out of her nursing home. It is going to stop a kid with asthma from getting an inhaler. It is going to put a premium on being an elder American. If you are an older American, you are going to pay four to five times as much as anybody else. Why? You just have to ask why.

So who benefits from this bill? This bill is a transfer of wealth from middle class Americans to the wealthiest Americans, corporations in this country. So this is about tax cuts for the richest. Sheldon Adelson, who is a Republican donor, casino magnate, he will get, if the Senate bill passes, he will get a \$44 million tax cut in 2017 alone.

How are they paying for that? By cutting Medicaid, taking away protections for preexisting conditions, for seniors, for average Americans.

Mr. Speaker, that is just not right. It is not right if you are a Democrat. It is not right if you are a Republican. It is not right if you are an Independent. It is just not right.

And, yes, the President is correct on this point: It is a mean bill. It is mean; it is cruel; it is unjust. And I hope we defeat it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1745

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman, Ms. JAYAPAL.

We have next with us Congressman RO KHANNA who is from California. He is an economist, and he is a lawyer. He has taught economics at Stanford, and he has taught law at Santa Clara. He was a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Commerce Department under President Obama. He is a well-known author who has written a very good book about manufacturing and economic competitiveness in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) who is going to be taking over for Congresswoman JAYAPAL as my co-convenor of this Special Order hour from here on in.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN. It is a real honor to be able to co-chair this Special Order hour with the gentleman. The gentleman is one of the most brilliant Members of our body on constitutional issues and constitutional law, really understanding our role in Congress as a check on the executive branch, and I look forward to working with the gentleman. I appreciate Liz Bartolomeo's and my staff's help in organizing this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what Congresswoman JAYAPAL said about this bill and the impact it is going to have on middle class families and on jobs, because here is one of the things that Congresswoman JAYAPAL said that folks don't understand: this bill is going to affect almost every family that has someone that goes for eldercare, to a nursing home.

The average cost at a nursing home is about \$80,000 a year. Most families can't afford that. Most middle class—most upper middle class families can't afford that.

So what do they do when their savings run out?

Medicare, by the way, doesn't cover nursing home costs. They rely on Medicaid.

What this bill does, in a shocking way, is say: we are going to cut Medicaid funding. Of course, we are going to conveniently cut it starting 7 years from now, coincidentally, after everyone has faced reelection, because we don't want people to know that we are going to cut these programs that they rely on. We are going to start these cuts 7 years from now, and we are going to make sure that people no longer have access to funding to be able to go for eldercare.

Now, here is what is so problematic about this from an economic perspective. One of the biggest job creators, according to McKinsey and according to every economic study, is in healthcare, is for eldercare. Medicaid creates more jobs for working class

families and middle class families at a time of globalization and automation than probably any other significant government program.

So not only are we hurting middle class families and the elderly, we are eliminating the very jobs that we ought to be creating at a time of automation. We are eliminating jobs of people who are going to take care of folks who are sick or folks who are elderly, service jobs, jobs that should be paying more.

At the same time, we are coupling this with drastic cuts in a budget for Alzheimer's research and for research on diseases that are affecting middle class families.

Congressman RASKIN said what the bill's motivation is. It is to really save money for tax cuts for the well-off—not for the well-off talking about people making 70 grand or 80 grand or \$100,000. Those are folks who are going to need Medicaid. We are talking about tax cuts for people who are making over \$1 million, over \$1.5 million.

Now, let's put aside the President that he said it is mean. Let's just see what is their philosophy. Give him the benefit of the doubt. Why do they want to do this? Because they think that giving these tax cuts to these multimillionaires is going to somehow fuel more entrepreneurship and more growth.

I ask people who are listening to this: Is that the problem in our country? Is that really the issue, that we think millionaires and corporations aren't making enough profits? Is that really what is the issue about why we aren't creating jobs? Or is the issue that, for half this country, their wages have stagnated for the past 30 years, and that people can't afford a decent place to live, college, and healthcare, and they are having trouble getting jobs?

If you believe that the problem is we need more corporate profits, we need more speculation on Wall Street, and we need more economic breaks for the investor class, that that is really what America needs at this moment in our economy, then I suppose you could look for the Republican bill. But if you believe that the real problem in our economy is that the middle class and the working class are getting squeezed by the economic concentration of power, by the excess on Wall Street, that ordinary folks are having a hard time getting jobs, and that what we really need to be doing is providing more jobs in healthcare for people so that they can have a decent middle class life, that what we really need to be doing is providing middle class families with basic economic security so they know that when they retire they will have some dignity for them, or their spouses when they fall sick, that they know that they won't be bankrupt because they have to bear the cost of the care for their parents; if you be-

lieve that we ought to be on the side of middle class families—working class families—then it is such a no-brainer that you would oppose this bill.

I will just end with this: People often say, Well, what can we do?

Well, I think you can speak out. I believe you should speak out and hold every Member in this body and in the Senate accountable because this bill is about our fundamental values. It is about what type of country we want to be. Are we going to be a country that gives power to the elite and believes that that is the ticket to American success? Or are we going to bet on middle class families and working class families like we have throughout our history?

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN, and I am looking forward to co-chairing this with the gentleman.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA for his very wise and insightful words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN for yielding to me.

I am very proud and excited to be here because we have so much at stake right now.

I wanted to point to this incredible photo that we blew up from today's news. Fifty people with disabilities were forcibly removed and arrested outside Senator MITCH MCCONNELL's office today. They were there to protest what could happen to them and the 10 million Americans who rely on Medicaid to live a life—often still struggling, but a life with more dignity because they have Medicaid.

I want to take some time to thank them for so passionately but peacefully resisting against the cruel Republican bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act. People were pulled out of their wheelchairs and ejected at the order. I presume, of the leader of the Senate to make space in front of his office. They were exercising their freedom to protest for themselves and for others in their situation. As I said, 10 million Americans with disabilities rely on Medicaid.

The Affordable Care Act incentivizes States to offer home and community-based care under Medicaid. The Republican bill would undo that. It would make it very likely that States would eliminate that home care and community-based care.

Now, I have worked for years with people with disabilities, and I know some of them have struggled to get out of nursing homes and to be able to live in the community which, by the way, is actually less expensive than taxpayers paying for people to be in nursing homes. This has been a tremendous battle for the disability community to be able to live independently.

That ability is threatened. By the way, even the amount of money that would go to nursing homes would be cut dramatically, or could be.

Right now, one-half of the cost of nursing homes and home care and community-based care is paid for by Medicaid, and \$800 billion was cut out of the House bill. I hear that the Senate bill is even worse. So this monstrosity of a bill would do a countless amount of harm to millions and millions of Americans. Just about everyone will be affected.

So, today, I want to focus on the damage it would do to two groups in particular: Americans age 50 to 64 and people with disabilities whom we saw represented by the courageous protesters today outside Senator MITCH MCCONNELL's office.

This bill would impose a crippling age tax on people 50 to 64 years old, which means that they will be either unable to afford insurance altogether or be forced to pay thousands more for it every year.

This is the same age tax that was in the House's version of the bill. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office gave this example: It estimated that a 64-year-old who makes \$26,000 a year could see his or her premiums rise by over 800 percent. That would be in the area of about \$14,000 a year. How does that work? There is simply no way she would be able to keep her insurance.

The Senate bill would allow individual States to undermine the essential health benefits package that is in the Affordable Care Act that ensures older Americans have insurance that actually covers the services they need. Without those essential benefits, insurance companies could end coverage for prescription drugs, for cancer care, for emergency care, and much more.

On top of those attacks on Americans age 50 and older, the bill also guts—as I pointed out—the Medicaid program which is absolutely essential for people with disabilities, both young and old.

Medicaid pays for nearly half of all long-term care in our country, and that includes, as I said, not just care provided by nursing homes, but home and community-based and personal care services that allow people with disabilities to live independently, sometimes to even travel to Washington, D.C.

We fought really hard to provide those home and community-based services. We expanded access to them in the Affordable Care Act. This mean bill not only undoes the progress, it moves us backwards by slashing Medicaid funds and turning it into a capped program, capping the amount of money that may go to every person. The Senate bill is even meaner than the House. Caps would rise more slowly and cause even more damage.

So it is no wonder that the AARP, the Alliance for Retired Americans, the

National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, the National Council on Independent Living, the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, the American Medical Association, and the American Nurses Association, really all the providers of healthcare, say no to this disastrous bill.

It spells disaster for anyone who depends on Medicaid. That includes pregnant women, infants, children, people with disabilities, and adults—including low-income seniors. The bill is also devastating for women's health. It defunds Planned Parenthood. Let's remember Planned Parenthood is often the only clinic within driving distance of people in rural areas.

□ 1800

Sometimes it is the only clinic available in medically underserved areas for things like cancer screening, primary care, birth control, testing men and women for HIV/AIDS, et cetera. It defunds Planned Parenthood and targets private insurance plans that would cover abortions.

So we really have to ask ourselves: Who benefits from this bill? Who wins if TrumpCare were to pass?

Well, there is an answer. The ultrawealthy individuals who get a massive tax break from this bill—that is why they want to cut all those hundreds of billions of dollars out of Medicaid—they are the winners.

Insurance, prescription drug, and medical device companies also get a huge tax break in this so-called healthcare bill.

Yes, they call it a healthcare bill that benefits only the healthy and the wealthy. I know which side and whose side I am on.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pause from our analysis of the specific terms of the bill that was unveiled today to ask the question: What is the value that is really at stake in healthcare policy in the United States?

When we were debating on the House side, I heard a colleague get up on the floor and say something to the effect of: Under ObamaCare, under the Affordable Care Act, healthy people are having to pay insurance to take care of sick people.

It took a second for that to register with me. Then I turned to the person I was sitting next to and said: Yes, that is what insurance is. The whole point of insurance is that all of us pay money in, knowing that people get sick in the course of life.

We hope that we are not going to be one of them. We hope we won't get injured. We hope we won't get sick or ill or come down with a terrible disease, God forbid, but we know it can happen, so we all pay in. When it does happen to some people, that is what insurance is for. So the value there is one of solidarity among everybody together.

In the richest country on Earth, at its richest moment in our history, there is another value at stake here, which is the value of justice.

Forgive me, but I want to speak personally for a moment here, because I have what we call a preexisting condition. So this issue of preexisting condition coverage is important to me and my family. I understand it is important for tens of millions of families across the country.

If you are having a great day, and you have got not one, but two jobs you love—I have been a professor of constitutional law at American University for 27 years now, and I was serving in the Maryland Senate. But if you wake up and it is a beautiful day and you have got two jobs you love, a family you love, great kids, and constituents you are committed to, and a doctor tells you that you have got stage III colon cancer, that is what I immediately took to be a misfortune.

It is a terrible misfortune, but we have to remember that it happens to people across the country, all over the world, every single day, where people get a diagnosis of colon cancer, lung cancer, Alzheimer's disease, autism, bipolar disorder, depression, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, you name it. It is a misfortune because it can happen to anybody.

But if you are told that you have colon cancer, for example, and if you can't get health insurance because, for example, before marriage equality, if you loved the wrong person and you couldn't get health insurance through your spouse, or if you can't get health insurance because you lost your job and you are without health insurance, or if you are too poor to afford it, that is not just a misfortune. That is an injustice.

We can do something about that. Life is hard enough with all of the illness, sickness, accidents, and injuries that people receive without government compounding all of the misfortune with injustice. Life is hard enough without government doing the wrong thing. So the Affordable Care Act added more than 20 million Americans to the rolls of people who have health insurance.

The bill that came out of the Senate today wants to strip health insurance from tens of millions of Americans and jack up everybody's premiums and make healthcare more inaccessible for people. They want to compound the normal difficulties and misfortunes of life with the injustice of distributing healthcare in a radically unequal and unjust way.

We can't go back. It is too late for that. The great Tom Payne once said that it is impossible to make people un-think their thoughts or un-know their knowledge. We have come too far as a country to turn the clock back.

I know there are people on the Senate side, like RAND PAUL, who I saw on

TV speaking about this, who think we should get rid of all forms of public attempts to get people health insurance. RAND PAUL takes a perfectly principled position. He says the government shouldn't be involved at all. I don't know how he feels about Medicare or Medicaid. He certainly hates the Affordable Care Act. He just wants to outright repeal it, which is what the GOP said they would do.

So he is going to vote against that bill because it keeps the remnants of the system that we voted in with the Affordable Care Act. I understand that. I understand his position. I disagree with it completely because I think, as Americans, we have got to have solidarity with each other and we have got to take care of each other through insurance because the misfortunes of life can happen to anybody. So we have got to stand together.

He says that is not part of the social contract. Okay. That is fine. I get it. But what I don't understand is people are saying: Well, we said we would just get rid of it, but we will get rid of some parts of it. We will throw millions of people off their health insurance. We will make insurance more expensive for everybody. We will cut the heart out of Medicaid.

Why? What is the public policy that is being advanced here?

It doesn't make any sense. Countries all over the world have arrived at the point of universal single-payer plans, like in France, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Canada. The countries that can afford it overwhelmingly have said: healthcare for everyone.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of a bill, which is proudly cosponsored by a majority of the people in the Democratic Caucus. It is Congressman CONYERS' Medicare for All bill.

I think that is where we need to go. I am convinced we are going to get there sooner rather than later. Winston Churchill once said: You can always count on the Americans to do the right thing, once they have tried everything else first.

We have tried some other stuff in between, but we are on the way to taking public responsibility for the healthcare of our people. My healthcare is connected to your healthcare because my health is connected to your health. We want the families whose kids go to school with our kids to be in a relationship with a primary care doctor. We want them to get their shots. We don't want them coming to school sick.

Public health dictates that everybody be in the system. A lot of young men, for example, think that they are too tough to go see doctors. That becomes a danger for everybody else. We need everybody to be in a relationship with a doctor. We owe that not just to ourselves and our families, but we owe it to everybody.

Everybody in the system, everybody covered. That is where America needs

to go. But understand that what is coming out of the Senate has nothing to do with that. The Senate plan is all about rolling back the progress that we made under the Affordable Care Act, like the ban on throwing people off of healthcare because they have a pre-existing condition or denying people insurance in the first place because they have a preexisting condition.

The fact that someone has got a pre-existing health condition is the reason that they need health insurance. It is not a reason to deny them health insurance. What they are doing is perfectly backwards.

The Affordable Care Act also said that young people could stay on their family's plan until age 26. Thank God we have had that provision. Even the GOP doesn't want to mess with that, at this point. We got millions of people into relationships with doctors. We could show you dozens of emails and letters and calls that we are getting from people who say: The Affordable Care Act saved my life. I would have had no access to healthcare without it.

The whole idea of turning the clock back and moving in the opposite direction is completely antithetical to the direction of American history. We are moving forward. We want universal coverage for everybody.

By the way, we spend more on healthcare than most of those countries that have single-payer healthcare. I think we may spend more than anybody else on Earth on healthcare, but we don't get the best results because we leave so many people out and we are spending lots of money on insurance. The last I looked, it was around 30 or 31 cents on the dollar we are spending on the insurance companies, on bureaucracy and red tape, instead of getting people healthcare.

That is the direction we need to be moving in, not dismantling and savaging the healthcare protections that we have in place right now.

I want to close with some thoughts just about the process that is going on. Back when the Affordable Care Act was being debated, my dear friends across the aisle complained about how fast things were going and how they thought the legislation was being rushed.

I don't want to embarrass anybody by calling out specific statements made, but we have got voluminous statements made by people on the other side of the aisle saying: This is too fast. You're trying to sneak it through. You're trying to ram it down the throats of the American people. All of this is happening too fast.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the debate over the Affordable Care Act spanned more than 12 months. It took more than a year. The Senate bill was unveiled today with no hearings, no witnesses, no professional testimony, no opportunity for the public to testify for

nurses or doctors or patient advocates or any of the groups that are interested; none of them.

In the Affordable Care Act, there were 79 hearings that I was able to find in Congress. That is 79 hearings. Not zero hearings, which is what they are proposing to do now. There were 79 hearings. There were 181 witnesses, both expert witnesses and ordinary citizens, who came to testify before Congress, in public. So far, there has been zero testimony on what the ramifications and consequences are of the bill that was unveiled in the Senate today.

We had multiple Congressional Budget Office scores that analyzed the costs and the impact of different proposals that were part of the ACA. By contrast, the House was forced to vote on the GOP healthcare repeal plan in this body with no CBO score at all, no estimate on how much the bill would cost the taxpayers, no estimate on how many Americans precisely would lose their health insurance. We have learned later the CBO estimate of \$23 million, but that was after we voted on it.

So the people who were saying that the debate moved too fast back then—a year of debate, with dozens of hearings and witnesses, and so on—now seem perfectly content with a process where a bill comes out on Thursday, and then they are going to vote on it next Thursday with no hearings, very little public debate, no opportunity for people to come and testify, and no real opportunity for the public to process what is going on.

What is the urgency?

If it is such a great bill, then we should be out trumpeting it and advertising it. And everybody should have at least one townhall meeting back in their congressional districts to explain how they feel about it so that everybody's constituents can ask us about the bill.

Is it going to improve America's healthcare? Is it going to improve the health and well-being of the people, or reduce the health and well-being of the American people? Is it going to drive our premiums, copays, and deductibles even more?

Those are questions we should have to face with our constituents.

Regardless of what your political party or ideology is, everybody should tell their Member of Congress: At the very least, let's have some public discussion about it. Let's have the opportunity for townhall meetings across the country before we completely rewrite the healthcare plan for the American people.

□ 1815

I urge my colleagues to slow down, take a step back, and work across the aisle for the best possible results. There are things we can do together to help.

For example, I heard the President of the United States come to our body and make a speech in which he said that prescription drug prices were out of control and we needed to give government the authority to negotiate lower drug prices. I agree 100 percent with the President of the United States about that.

There has been no action on that by my friends across the aisle in the House or in the Senate, and I beseech the President of the United States, before you advance 1 centimeter further on this extremely controversial bill, which I understand four Republican Senators have already announced their opposition to today, before you go any further on this, let's get to something we can agree on for once. Let's find the common ground. And the common ground has got to be prescription drug prices are out of control for Americans.

Let us give the government the authority to negotiate for lower drug prices in Medicare the way that we have got it for VA benefits or for Medicaid prescription drugs. We have got that authority, but there was a special interest provision slipped into Medicare part D, and the government doesn't have that authority. That is authority we should have.

Mr. President, we agree with you about that. Why don't you put a pause on trying to demolish the ACA and Medicaid, and let's see if we can get some prescription drug legislation that will bring prices down for all Americans. We are ready to work with you on that.

There are reports that there is some effort to come up with a phony plan on prescription drug prices that wouldn't actually give the government the authority to negotiate lower prices. I hope that is not true, but let's have a real plan to bring people's prescription drug prices down.

There are things we can do together across the aisle. In fact, the President of the United States said repeatedly during the campaign that his plan would be a magnificent plan that would cover everybody. He said everybody would be part of it. And a lot of people, including me, took him to be invoking the single-payer universal health plans that work all over the world, that work in Canada and that work throughout Europe and so on.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask, would it be possible for us to get together with the President in order to come up with a single-payer plan, the kind that he invoked over the course of the campaign? Let's seize upon the new spirit of civility and community in this body and in Congress to come up with plans that bring us together, that don't drive us apart.

The plan that passed out of the House of Representatives is standing at 9 percent in the public opinion polls. I can't imagine that the Senate plan is going

to be any more popular. If this was a mean plan, as the President said, the Senate plan looks meaner, or at least as mean as the House plan is.

But even if you doubled it and said 18 percent of the people would support it, that is still a tiny fraction of the American people. The overwhelming majority of Americans are not sold on this idea of turning the clock back and throwing millions of people off their health insurance plans.

Let us work together, and we can do it. In the societies that have universal health coverage, it is accepted now by people across the political spectrum. If you go to France or the United Kingdom or Canada, the conservatives are not agitating to throw people off of healthcare. The conservatives support a universal payer plan. And there are lots of conservative arguments for it.

For example, let's liberate our businesses, especially our small businesses, from the burden of having to figure out people's healthcare. Let's take that completely off of the business sector, and let's make that a public responsibility the way they have done in so many countries around the world. Wouldn't that be good for business? And doesn't it enhance feelings of community, solidarity, and patriotism for everybody to be covered by the healthcare system of the country that they live in?

We can do this as Americans. We are the wealthiest country that has ever existed. This is the wealthiest moment in our history. Let's come up with a real plan for health coverage that eliminates as much insurance bureaucracy and waste as possible and gets people the healthcare coverage that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to have this Special Order hour on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, which has advanced the Medicare for All plan, and I encourage everybody to check it out.

But in any event, we are not retreating 1 inch from defending the Affordable Care Act and the progress that has been made under it, and I hope that we will have maximum transparency and scrutiny of what came out of the Senate today, because we think that the only possible outcome is that bill will go down; then we can come together, find the commonsense solutions, find the common ground, and make progress for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill

of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1238. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 23, 2017, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1764. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2017-2018 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-16-0107; SC17-985-1 FR] received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1765. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of the interim rule as final rule — Changes to Reporting and Notification Requirements and Other Clarifying Changes for Imported Fruits, Vegetables, and Specialty Crops [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-16-0083; SC16-944/980/999-1 FIR] received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1766. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations [No.: AMS-LPS-15-0084] received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1767. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Pitahaya Fruit From Ecuador Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0004] (RIN: 0579-AE12) received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1768. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John E. Wissler, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec.

502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1769. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled "Revision of Armed Forces Retirement Home Leasing Authority"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1770. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled "Revision of Armed Forces Retirement Home Leasing Authority"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1771. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled "Revision of Armed Forces Retirement Home Leasing Authority"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1772. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Credit Union Occupancy, Planning, and Disposal of Acquired and Abandoned Premises; Incidental Powers (RIN: 3133-AE54) received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry: Alternative Monitoring Method [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0442; FRL-9964-14-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT57) received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1774. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; VT; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0604; FRL-9963-88-Region 1] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries Under CERCLA [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0786; FRL-9958-47-OLEM] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Mendocino County Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0726; FRL-9960-08-Region 9] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1777. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0760; FRL-9963-70-Region 5] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110



Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and the Town of Mammoth Lakes [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0409; FRL-9955-67-Region 9] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Western Mojave Desert, Rate of Progress Demonstration [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0028; FRL-9963-86-Region 9] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's technical amendment — Correction to Incorporations by Reference [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0292; FRL-9963-67-OAR] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1781. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report covering the period from February 7, 2017 to April 8, 2017 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1782. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-044, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1783. A letter from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including statistical tables on reports and actions as required by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1784. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1785. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Mill Creek, Hampton, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0075] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1786. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Chincoteague Channel, Chincoteague Islands, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0248] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENT, Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2998. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 2995. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of Green Bonds and to establish the United States Green Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2996. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to modify the work requirement applicable to able-bodied adults without dependents; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2997. A bill to transfer operation of air traffic services currently provided by the Federal Aviation Administration to a separate not-for-profit corporate entity, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2999. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to limit copayment, coinsurance, or other cost-sharing requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a specialty drug tier to the dollar

amount (or its equivalent) of such requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a non-preferred brand drug tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3000. A bill to terminate the designation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 3001. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a Multimodal Freight Funding Formula Program and a National Freight Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program to improve the efficiency and reliability of freight movement in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3002. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3003. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3004. A bill to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 3005. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3006. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3007. A bill to apply the provisions of title 5, United States Code, related to veterans' preference to the Federal Aviation Administration personnel management system,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3008. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the George W. Bush Childhood Home, located at 1412 West Ohio Avenue, Midland, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3009. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 3010. A bill to provide for the identification and documentation of best practices for cyber hygiene by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3011. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3012. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to increase the authorization of appropriations for youth workforce investment activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3013. A bill to provide funding for Violent Crime Reduction Partnerships in the most violent communities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3014. A bill to require servicers to establish a deed-for-lease program under which eligible mortgagors may remain in their homes as renters; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to provide protections to borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3016. A bill to allow homeowners facing foreclosure to avoid deficiency judgments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3017. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on En-

ergy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. HURD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BOST, Mr. BABIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HILL, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 3018. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that veterans may attend pre-apprenticeship programs using certain educational assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 3019. A bill to require executive agencies to avoid using lowest price technically acceptable source selection criteria in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3020. A bill to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within U.S. Customs and Border Protection, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 3021. A bill to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to stop a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa and to provide that any future increases in such minimum wage shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3022. A bill to prohibit the awarding of discretionary grants to institutions of higher education that will use the grant award for indirect costs; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3023. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay reporting fees to educational institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3024. A bill to require certain standards and enforcement provisions to prevent child abuse and neglect in residential programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 3025. A bill to strengthen security and deterrence in Europe and to hold the Russian Federation accountable for violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3026. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a percentage of student loan forgiveness for public service employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3027. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve recordkeeping and information sharing with States regarding military training performed by members of the Armed Forces and other skills developed through military service that translate to civilian occupations to expedite the transition of veterans to post-military employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3028. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide training for school certifying officials; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3029. A bill to prevent Federal funds from being used to carry out Executive Order 13799; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MESSER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3030. A bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama):

H.J. Res. 106. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the number of persons in each State who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself, Mr. JOHN-SON of Louisiana, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BACON, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASO, Mr.

FERGUSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota):

H. Res. 400. A resolution supporting the designation of a National Day of Civility; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H. Res. 401. A resolution urging China, South Korea, Vietnam, Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, India, and all nations to outlaw the dog and cat meat trade and to enforce existing laws against the trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 402. A resolution supporting the designation of July 2017 as Uterine Fibroids Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H. Res. 403. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2018 as Endometriosis Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

70. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 2995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 3001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Authorization

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform through the United States.

Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uni-

form Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (The Property Clause). The Property Clause states that Congress has the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. The Supreme Court in *Fort Leavenworth Railroad v. Lowe* (1885), reasoned that the authority of the federal government over federal lands is "necessarily paramount." The Court opinion went on to further reason that state governments also have rights though with regards to certain activities that take place on federal lands within state borders. The Act provides guidelines for controlling populations of bison in Grand Canyon National Park and requires the Secretary to coordinate with the appropriate State Wildlife Management Agency, thus making it constitutionally permissible.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1; and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 3008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 3010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes).

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies . . .

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a navy.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution provides Congress the power to "to make Rules for the Government".

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Con-

stitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 3021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authorities on which this bill rests are the powers of Congress to: "provide for the common Defence", "raise and support Armies", "provide and maintain a Navy" and "make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 3026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the constitution

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.J. Res. 106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3: "The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct."

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VELA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 95: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 112: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 203: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 299: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 380: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 392: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 400: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 435: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 459: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 490: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 504: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 535: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 548: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 608: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 632: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 676: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 681: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 747: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 792: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 795: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 799: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 820: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 821: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 831: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 849: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 881: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1035: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1045: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1057: Mr. THORNBERRY and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1094: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1098: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1116: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 1148: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 1149: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1164: Mr. TROTT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1231: Ms. MENG and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1243: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1284: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1315: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1316: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1317: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1361: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 1374: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1384: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1422: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1434: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1454: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1457: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1537: Mr. DUNN and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1552: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1606: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1626: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1648: Mr. HOLDING, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1651: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
 H.R. 1661: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. WALZ.  
 H.R. 1664: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H.R. 1676: Mr. FASO and Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 1686: Mr. THORNBERRY.  
 H.R. 1697: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H.R. 1719: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 1729: Mr. COSTA.  
 H.R. 1772: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. ROUZER.  
 H.R. 1779: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 1783: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.  
 H.R. 1810: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 1815: Mr. PETERS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 1928: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.  
 H.R. 1953: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 2040: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 2044: Mr. HECK, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H.R. 2077: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
 H.R. 2106: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
 H.R. 2121: Mr. LYNCH.  
 H.R. 2149: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 2152: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.  
 H.R. 2155: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 2181: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
 H.R. 2198: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 2215: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 2248: Mr. POLIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 2261: Mr. CRIST, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MAST, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.  
 H.R. 2286: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
 H.R. 2287: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
 H.R. 2315: Mr. OLSON, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 2319: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2341: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2418: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.  
 H.R. 2433: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 2478: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.  
 H.R. 2482: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. TENNEY, and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
 H.R. 2499: Ms. BASS.  
 H.R. 2522: Mr. RUSSELL.  
 H.R. 2544: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
 H.R. 2550: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
 H.R. 2578: Ms. NORTON and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
 H.R. 2643: Mr. ROKITA.  
 H.R. 2644: Mr. WALZ.  
 H.R. 2651: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. JEFFRIES.  
 H.R. 2663: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THORNBERRY.  
 H.R. 2669: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
 H.R. 2678: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 2683: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 2690: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 2694: Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 2715: Mrs. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 2733: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 2740: Mr. CRIST, Mr. BACON, and Mr. DESANTIS.  
 H.R. 2762: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 2788: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
 H.R. 2805: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
 H.R. 2822: Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
 H.R. 2823: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2829: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 2840: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. KHANNA.  
 H.R. 2845: Ms. SINEMA.  
 H.R. 2856: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
 H.R. 2862: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
 H.R. 2871: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. THORNBERRY.  
 H.R. 2879: Ms. TITUS.  
 H.R. 2884: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.  
 H.R. 2887: Mr. PETERSON.  
 H.R. 2890: Mr. MESSER.  
 H.R. 2895: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.  
 H.R. 2901: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 2902: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
 H.R. 2908: Mr. WALZ, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. DELANEY.  
 H.R. 2909: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. COMER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LONG, and Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 2910: Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 2917: Mr. KING of Iowa.  
 H.R. 2918: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 2919: Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
 H.R. 2940: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2942: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 2944: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
 H.R. 2951: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 2956: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 2958: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2970: Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 2976: Mr. SOTO.  
 H.R. 2978: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.  
 H.R. 2981: Mr. PETERS.  
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. TROTT, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.  
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.  
 H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MAST, and Mr. KILMER.  
 H. Res. 185: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
 H. Res. 351: Mr. KILMER and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H. Res. 359: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H. Res. 390: Mr. WALZ, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
 H. Res. 395: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KILMER.  
 H. Res. 398: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Akron, OH, relative to Resolution No. 184-2017, expressing opposition to the proposed federal budget put forth by President Trump; urging President Trump, members of Congress, and other policy makers in Washington to pass a fiscally responsible budget nation; and declaring an emergency; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget.

55. Also, a petition of the Town of Conway, MA, relative to a Resolution calling upon the Massachusetts Legislature and the United States Congress to implement Carbon Fee and Dividend (or "Rebate"), placing a steadily rising fee on carbon-based fuels, and returning all fees collected, minus administrative costs, to households; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

56. Also, a petition of City Council of Akron, OH, relative to Resolution No. 185-2017, expressing opposition to the United States' recent withdraw from the Paris Agreement on Climate Control (the "Paris Agreement"); offering support for the Paris Agreement and its goal of combating climate change on an international level; and declaring an emergency; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

57. Also, a petition of the City Commission of Miami, FL, relative to Resolution R-17-0208, urging President Donald J. Trump and the members of the United States Congress to grant temporary protective status to Haitians in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF LOUISA BRINSON

**HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Louisa Brinson, a federal employee who is retiring after more than thirty-seven years of service at the Social Security Administration (SSA).

Ms. Brinson began work at SSA in 1979 as a Summer Aide in the Las Vegas, Nevada, field office. Shortly thereafter, she was promoted to be a Claims Development Clerk. In 1985, she was detailed to Baltimore Headquarters where she joined the Operations team in the Modular District Office. After the detail, she joined the Alexandria, Virginia, field office complex where she received all of her promotions, beginning with Service Representative, Claims Representative, Management Support Specialist, Operations Supervisor, and since 2007, the District Manager of the Arlington, Virginia, field office.

With her high level of energy and enthusiasm, Ms. Brinson has made significant contributions to SSA during her career. Her ability to envision and adapt to change was evident in her leadership. She has shared her wisdom and knowledge of how important it is to have trust with the public SSA serves, as well as the employees she managed. Her devotion to the important mission of the Social Security Administration has been characterized by a commitment to excellence and to providing the highest level of support to her staff and management team.

Ms. Brinson is not only a dedicated federal employee who has helped untold numbers of my constituents in Virginia's 8th Congressional District; she also is one of my constituents. Today I salute Louisa Brinson for her leadership, her compassion, and her years of service to our country. We here in Northern Virginia are fortunate to have her as a public servant and as a friend and neighbor.

IZZABELLE ALLEN

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Izzabelle Allen for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Izzabelle Allen is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Izzabelle Allen is exemplary of the type of achievement

that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Izzabelle Allen for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

### RECOGNIZING THE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP CHRISTIAN BROTHERS ACADEMY LACROSSE TEAM

**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the Christian Brothers Academy Lacrosse Team in the New York State Public High School Association Class D Championship on June 10, 2017. The CBA Brothers defeated the Westlake Wildcats 12-5 to secure the Brothers' first state title in program history.

The Brothers, finishing the season 18-5, were determined to win the program's first state title. Senior Alex Calkins, the game MVP, scored five goals to lead the Brothers to victory. Other members of the state championship include Michael Adornato, Joey Akl, Wyatt Auyer, Augustus Bonacci, Sam Bonacci, Peyton Bowler, Matt Buck, Francis Cannizzo, Tommie Caputo, CJ Carbone, Michael Catalano, Doug DeMarche, Zach Eber, Will Fallon, Ian Henderson, Malcolm Jackson, Colin Kelly, Lewes Kunda, Sam Lubinga, Matt Luddington, Ryan MacKenzie, Joey Matheson, Michael Matheson, Ben McCreary, Patrick O'Brien, Dan Polhemus, Lynch Raby, ZJ Shahin, Preston Taylor, Matt Vavonese, Gabe Vinal, Eli Weiss, Gregory Wells, and Jace Whelan. The team is coached by Ric Beardsley.

I am honored to recognize the teamwork displayed by the CBA Brothers and to congratulate the members of the team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Christian Brothers Academy. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. CAROL SHEA-PORTER**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, due to a very long flight delay, I regret that I was un-

able to make votes on June 20, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 309 and Roll Call No. 310.

### COMMEMORATING CARIBBEAN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of Caribbean American Heritage Month, which celebrates and recognizes the significant contributions made by Caribbean Americans that have strengthened our country and made it better.

This month also marks the 55th anniversaries of independence for the Caribbean nations of Jamaica and of Trinidad and Tobago.

Although a half century has passed since they gained their independence, the struggle they waged to win their freedom still stands as a testament to the ideals of our own great nation.

I am privileged to represent a large segment of Houston, Texas, which is home to more than 300,000 Americans of Caribbean heritage, making it one of the largest, most diverse, and vibrant Caribbean-American communities in the nation.

Mr. Speaker, Americans of Caribbean heritage have made a positive impact on virtually every aspect of American life, including the arts, science, business, education, athletics, military, and government.

For example, in the area of government and public affairs America has benefitted from the contributions of Colin Powell, a former Secretary of State and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice; former Members of Congress Mervyn Dymally of California, and Shirley Chisholm of New York, and current Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE of New York; and KAMALA HARRIS, the Attorney General of California.

Caribbean Americans have enriched American art and culture with the legendary performances of Sidney Poitier, Harry Belafonte, Cicely Tyson, Nia Long, and Cuba Gooding, Jr.; the writings of authors W.E.B. DuBois and Malcolm Gladwell; the music of Beyonce Knowles, Lenny Kravitz, Rihanna, and Wyckle Jean; and the prowess of great athletes like Carl Lewis, Tim Duncan, Patrick Ewing, Sandra Richards-Ross, and Ndamukong Suh.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that in October, in the city of Houston, will be venue of the 6th annual Caribbean American Heritage Month Festival, which celebrates the rich culture of the Caribbean with a showcase of beautiful costumes, music, food, and enjoyment for all.

I also wish to recognize the leadership of the Caribbean American Heritage Foundation

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of Texas, which works to assist Texas Caribbean Organizations achieve their goals and to advocate on behalf of the peoples of Caribbean descent.

I congratulate the Caribbean American Heritage Foundation of Texas, the Caribbean Heritage Organization in my home city of Houston, and the many community organizations and volunteers across the nation for their efforts in making Caribbean American Heritage Month the success that it is.

During this month I hope all Americans will join with me in celebrating the remarkable history, culture, and contributions of Caribbean Americans to our nation's past and future.

IN RECOGNITION OF TOM  
PELLEGRINI, FOR FORTY YEARS  
OF SERVICE AT NEPA ALLIANCE

**HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tom Pellegrini on the occasion of his retirement from the Northeastern Pennsylvania Alliance after forty years of service. NEPA Alliance is a regional community and economic development agency that assists businesses and organizations with financial and non-financial resources and solutions to help them grow and succeed. NEPA Alliance's work in Northeastern Pennsylvania has been invaluable.

Tom is a graduate of King's College, holding a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Government and Politics, and he also completed additional coursework in Business Administration. He has been the driving force behind hundreds of grants during his time at the NEPA Alliance. Tom's work has aided numerous economic development agencies, non-profits, colleges, and universities.

Over his stellar career, Tom has been a member of the Luzerne County Business Incubator Center Advisory Board, the Scranton/Lackawanna Labor Management Council Board, and has served as the Campaign Coordinator for the United Way.

Tom resides in Exeter with his wife. He has three children and is also a grandfather. Tom is an avid sports fan and has enjoyed coaching in a number of student basketball leagues as well as the Exeter Lions Little League.

On behalf of the entire political leadership of Northeastern Pennsylvania, I recognize Tom for his years of service working with government agencies to secure funding for key projects in the region. Tom has been a great resource to the community; he will be missed in a well-deserved retirement, and we all wish him the best.

HALIMA BANGURA

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Halima

Bangura for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Halima Bangura is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Halima Bangura is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Halima Bangura for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. MAXINE WATERS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, due to a medical emergency involving another passenger, my flight from Los Angeles, California to Washington, D.C. was forced to land mid-flight in Kansas City, Missouri. The flight was grounded for an hour before we were able to continue on to our final destination. Unfortunately, we were unable to make up enough time and I missed the votes on the House Floor scheduled for June 20, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on H.R. 2847, and YES on H.R. 2866.

RECOGNIZING THE FAYETTEVILLE-MANLIUS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP RELAY TEAM

**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the Fayetteville-Manlius 3,200 Meter Relay Team in the New York State Public High School Association Class AA Championship on June 10, 2017.

Christy Berge, Palmer Madsen, Sophie Ryan, Rebecca Walters, Phoebe White, and Claire Walters of the Fayetteville-Manlius Hornets took home the state title in the 3,200 meter relay with a time of 8:56.41. The team is coached by Bill Aris.

I am honored to recognize the teamwork displayed by the Fayetteville-Manlius Hornets and to congratulate the members of the team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Fayetteville-Manlius High School. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

HONORING KATE CLINTON

**HON. JERROLD NADLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Kate Clinton, who has, for 36 years, offered unique and original insights as a political humorist and served as an important leader in the fight for justice and equality. She has made millions of people laugh and see truth in new ways, and in doing so, has changed hearts and minds so as to strongly impact America's long fight to secure equal rights for all of our citizens.

Kate Clinton's books, columns, essays, video blogs, and performances have affirmed the lives of LGBT people and all who have been marginalized, and her work has shed light on all manner of injustice. As she has invited people to see things differently, particularly through her special brand of gentle but pointed humor, she has provided joy and recognition to millions of people in her audience and beyond. Her commitment to equality and social justice is unwavering, not only as seen through her comedic craft, but also through her other important activist work as a feminist, lesbian, and American artist who understands that true equality can only exist when we all enjoy it.

For nearly four decades, Kate Clinton has built and used her unique platform to advance progressive causes—most notably women's rights and LGBT equality—and has used humor to build critical bridges of understanding between communities.

During this time when voices for progress are threatened, and when humor is sometimes the only salve for the weariness felt by so many Americans who are fighting a better future for our country and world, the work of artists like Kate Clinton is vital to building solidarity; providing inspiration, insight and levity; and generating courage to continue the arduous work of pursuing justice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Kate Clinton for her many accomplishments, and wishing her continued success in making us laugh, and sustaining our resolve, in the years to come.

HONORING YEOMAN 3RD CLASS  
SHINGO ALEXANDER DOUGLASS

**HON. DARRELL E. ISSA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Yeoman 3rd Class Shingo Alexander Douglass from Oceanside who died serving his country aboard the USS *Fitzgerald*. Shingo was a fine young sailor who proudly served his country. For such a young man he had accomplished so much. I know no words can describe the overwhelming grief of his family and friends at this time. The only consolation we here can offer is the thanks of the grateful nation he served and our pledge to support his and all other military families across our country. Shingo remains a hero whose memory will



continue to provide strength, courage and inspiration to the others. I thank him for the sacrifice he made to protect our country and to help those who long for peace and freedom. I would also like to commend the crew of the USS *Fitzgerald* for all their efforts to save lives and their ship. I would like to extend my deepest condolences to his loved ones and his fellow sailors. This unimaginable tragedy reminds us all to cherish those who serve.

JOHN MOORE

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud John Moore for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

John Moore is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by John Moore is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to John Moore for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

### RECOGNIZING THE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP LIVERPOOL BASEBALL TEAM

### HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the Liverpool Baseball Team in the New York State Public High School Association Class AA Championship on June 10, 2017. The Liverpool Warriors defeated the Massapequa Chiefs 4-1 to secure the Warriors' first title in program history.

The Warriors, finishing the season 23-3, were determined to win the program's first state title. Members of the championship team include Nick Antonello, Peter Belgrader, Thomas Bianchi, Jordan Brown, Joel Ciccarelli, Jeff Destefano, Jake Evans, Brandon Exner, Jonah Harder, Andre Leatherwood, Devan Mederios, Gerard Mouton, Zach Pieklik, Matt Rioux, Nikolas Saunders, Zach Scannell, Zach Scharett, Jacob Sisto, Owen Valentine, and Joe Zywicki. The team is coached by Fred Terzini.

I am honored to recognize the teamwork displayed by the Liverpool Warriors and to congratulate the members of the team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Liverpool High School. This is a historic win

for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

### IN RECOGNITION OF CLAGUE MIDDLE SCHOOL FOR BEING DESIGNATED A "SCHOOL TO WATCH"

### HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Clague Middle School for being designated a "School to Watch" by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform. This honor underscores the school's commitment academic excellence and the dedication of its students, educators and staff.

Originally founded in 1972, Clague Middle School serves over 700 students in the Ann Arbor area as part of the Ann Arbor Schools system. The school provides a culturally unique and diverse learning environment, with its students speaking over 25 different languages and coming from a variety of different backgrounds. In addition, the school hosts many enrichment and academic opportunities for its students, including a student-run newspaper, a nationally-ranked Academic Games team, as well as involvement in community events like an annual Week of Service to maintain the campus and surrounding area. Due to these efforts, Clague Middle School has been able to effectively meet the needs of each individual student in the school while serving the Ann Arbor community at large.

As a result of the school's superior record of achievement, Clague Middle School was named a "School to Watch" by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform, one of only 12 schools in Michigan to earn this designation. In order to earn this honor, schools must meet the criteria of academic excellence, individualized attention to students, social equity, and organizational resilience to maintain these high standards. This national recognition highlights the unique learning environment that exists at Clague as a result of the hard work of its educators and staff. The school's students are provided the resources and support they need to excel, and it is my hope that Clague Middle School is able to continue to build on its success in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the students and staff of Clague Middle School for earning the designation of "School to Watch" by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform. Clague provides high-quality education and enrichment opportunities.

### INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION URGING CHINA, SOUTH KOREA, VIETNAM, THAILAND, THE PHILIPPINES, INDONESIA, CAMBODIA, LAOS, INDIA, AND ALL NATIONS TO OUTLAW THE DOG AND CAT MEAT TRADE AND TO ENFORCE EXISTING LAWS AGAINST THE TRADE

### HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bipartisan resolution urging China, South Korea, Vietnam, Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, India, and all nations to outlaw the dog and cat meat trade and to enforce existing laws against the trade. It might surprise you to learn that an estimated 30,000,000 dogs and a great number of cats die annually across Asia for the dog and cat meat trade.

This resolution would urge nations that have a dog and cat meat trade to adopt and enforce anti-cruelty laws, urge those nations to increase efforts to prevent leather and fur by-products from entering international markets, and encourage those nations to enforce their food safety laws to crack down on the sale of dog and cat meat.

It is my sincere hope that this resolution will send a strong message to countries where the dog and cat meat trade still exist, and continue the animal protection movement that is already rapidly growing across Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this body will expeditiously pass this measure. Doing so will reaffirm America's commitment to the humane treatment of our most beloved companions.

### IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA REGION OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

### HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Eastern North Carolina Region of the American Red Cross and their commitment to aiding our communities for 100 years. The Eastern North Carolina Region is comprised of the Cape Fear, Central North Carolina, Northeastern North Carolina, Sandhills, and Triangle Area Chapters of the American Red Cross.

This particular region of the American Red Cross was founded in Raleigh, North Carolina back during World War I, when 28 women convened with the goal of determining how they could best assist the war effort. Following this historic meeting, this resourceful group formally established the Eastern North Carolina Chapter of the Red Cross. On March 12, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson officially granted the Charter to the Wake County Chapter of the American Red Cross. These

volunteers assisted wounded soldiers at near-by Camp Polk throughout World War I, in addition to running feeding stations and the soldiers' Bath House near the railroad station in Raleigh. From these small beginnings a century ago, the Eastern North Carolina Region now serves 53 counties and more than 4.6 million North Carolinians.

Established in our darkest hour, the Eastern North Carolina Region of the American Red Cross has stood the test of time—through two World Wars, the Great Depression and many other trials in our state's history. This incredible nonprofit organization has been a continued success story because of the strong men and women who have volunteered their time, energy, and efforts over the past century. I hope this organization thrives for yet another century of helping those in their greatest hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring the Eastern North Carolina Region of the American Red Cross on their monumental 100th Anniversary accomplishment.

JOSEPH NGUYEN

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Joseph Nguyen for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Joseph Nguyen is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Joseph Nguyen is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Joseph Nguyen for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING WILLIAM BRYAN FISH OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR EARNING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA WILLIAM T. HORNADAY SILVER MEDAL

### HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my sincere congratulations to my constituent, William Bryan Fish, on earning the Boy Scouts of America William T. Hornaday Silver Medal, its highest honor given for conservation work.

Described by the Boy Scouts as the "Olympic Medal Bestowed by the Earth," this award recognizes truly outstanding efforts by Scouts

that have contributed to environmental protection and conservation. Mr. Fish is one of only 1,200 Scouts to have earned this award since it was created in 1914.

To earn this award, Mr. Fish: installed hundreds of storm drain markers and information packets advising of the dangers of polluting waterways that connect to the Chesapeake Bay Watershed; organized an even-sided public debate on hydraulic fracking; cleaned up two miles of a local creek; and organized a battery recycling program for his local school district.

Mr. Fish's character, perseverance and leadership earned this Award and mark him as a future leader in our community and sets the standard for others to follow.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth-Congressional District, I congratulate William Bryan Fish on earning the Boy Scouts of America William T. Hornaday Silver Medal, and wish him continued great success in his future adventures.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOLY CROSS COLLEGE

### HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of Holy Cross College. This institution has been a pillar of the northern Indiana community for a half century, and I have no doubt the next 50 years will be just as meaningful for students, faculty, alumni, and the northern Indiana community.

Holy Cross College was founded in 1966 to advance the apostolic mission of the Brothers of Holy Cross. From the beginning, the college has been dedicated not only to fostering intellectual growth and discovery, but also to cultivating global citizens who are passionate, faithful, and courageous.

Today, with more than 500 students from over 30 states and 18 different countries, Holy Cross College is putting its values of global diversity and integration into action, no doubt enriching the lives of each and every student. The prestigious faculty and hardworking staff at Holy Cross are committed to providing an engaging and transformative college experience, offering enlightenment in numerous areas of study, and instilling the values of knowledge, faith, and personal growth.

Students at Holy Cross have vast opportunities to get involved on campus and in the community. The college has played a positive role in making northern Indiana a better place to live, learn, and grow. I applaud the selfless efforts students past and present have taken to give back to those in need.

It is a privilege to represent the Holy Cross community in Congress. I am grateful for the passion, integrity, and intellectual spirit that resonates both on and off campus. On behalf of 2nd District Hoosiers, I wish to extend my heartfelt congratulations on celebrating 50 years, and I am excited to learn of all the amazing things that are sure to come.

RECOGNIZING ALEXANDRIA  
PAYNE, STATE PENTATHLON  
CHAMPION

### HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alexandria Payne of the Jamesville-DeWitt Red Rams for taking home the state pentathlon title in the New York State Public High School Association Class A Championship on June 10, 2017.

Payne set a District III record for amassing 3,351 points during the two days of competition. She is coached by Jim Lawton.

I am honored to recognize the hard work displayed by Alexandria Payne and the rest of the team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Jamesville-DeWitt High School. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

A TRIBUTE TO RYAN COLLINS

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ryan Collins, a graduate of East Union High School in Afton, Iowa. Ryan was recently honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fifteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on April 30, 2017.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa high school was invited to select a senior with the highest academic achievement. Not only are recipients academically gifted, but the selected students are also those who have had success in extra-curricular activities and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Ryan in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize him for utilizing his talents to reach his goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating him on receiving this esteemed designation, and in wishing him nothing but the best.

ISAIH NGUYEN

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Isaih Nguyen for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Isaih Nguyen is a student at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Isaih Nguyen is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Isaih Nguyen for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HAMPTON JAZZ FESTIVAL

##### HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Hampton Jazz Festival on its 50th Anniversary.

The idea for a jazz festival emerged after a visit between friends—the President of Hampton Institute Jerome Holland and jazz entrepreneur and promoter George Wein, who was noted for his festivals in Newport, Rhode Island, New York, California, and New Orleans.

This first festival was in 1968 when Hampton Institute—present day Hampton University—celebrated its 100th birthday with a musical night filled with jazz. This celebration took place on Hampton's campus at Armstrong Field. Artists that performed at the original festival included Dizzy Gillespie, Ramsay Lewis, Herbie Mann Quintet, Nina Simone and her Trio, Muddy Waters and his Blues Band, and many more. It was supposed to be just a one-time event, but the attendees loved it and wanted more. In 1970, the City of Hampton became the third partner when the festival moved from Hampton Institute to the newly built Hampton Coliseum due to growing crowds; it went on for three days and has been a tradition in Hampton Roads ever since.

The Hampton Roads community welcomes fans who travel from all over for the weekend long Jazz Festival each year. Many think of it as more than just a few concerts. The festival is a celebration of jazz, pop, blues, soul, and R&B music and artists. It is a time for fans and artists to celebrate the culture and the life of jazz. It is a terrific opportunity for the community to come together for a great time listening to great music. As a result, many events surround the dates of the festival, including parties, family reunions, class reunions and other gatherings.

There are fans who have attended the festival since its beginnings, and enjoy it just as much as they did when they were younger. And I count myself as one of those fans, as I attended the very first festival at Armstrong Field and have attended virtually every festival since. Because jazz is such a unique genre of music that crosses so many ethnic and cul-

tural barriers, the festival is a way for different generations and diverse groups of people to come together and share in their love of jazz.

I commend Hampton University and the City of Hampton for their ongoing partnership to bring well-loved and critically acclaimed artists and musicians to Hampton Roads for this annual event. A record was set in 2011 for the festival when all three shows, featuring the artists Charlie Wilson, Kem, Jonathan Butler, Chaka Khan, Boyz II Men, and Maze featuring Frankie Beverly, sold out.

Last year's festival included Babyface, New Edition, Gladys Knight, and many more. Hampton strives to make the festival better and better each year with more artists and vendors, and I know this 50th Anniversary festival will be no different.

The remarkable success of the Jazz Festival has helped the City of Hampton build up the reputation of the Hampton Coliseum as a premier venue for the region. Thanks in part to the high profile acts that performed at the Jazz Festival, the Hampton Coliseum has been able to attract many popular artists and other events. As the Festival has grown in popularity, annual attendance is usually around 25,000 fans in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention a few names who have been instrumental to the success of the festival over the years—Dr. William Harvey, Joe Santangelo, John Scott, Joe Tsao, George Wallace, and Lucius Wyatt.

The 50th Anniversary of the Hampton Jazz Festival is to take place as it always does during the last full weekend in June and will include many fan favorites, including Jill Scott, Kem, Brian Culbertson, the O'Jays, Patti LaBelle, and Maze featuring Frankie Beverly.

Mr. Speaker, as a fan of jazz and a regular attendee, I congratulate Hampton University and the City of Hampton as the Hampton Jazz Festival celebrates its 50th Anniversary. I look forward to a great weekend listening to some of my favorite artists knowing that this Hampton Roads tradition will continue for many years to come.

#### IZABELLA SMITH

##### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Izabella Smith for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Izabella Smith is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Izabella Smith is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Izabella Smith for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedi-

cation and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### RECOGNIZING BROOKE RAUBER, THE STATE CHAMPION STEEPLECHASER

##### HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of Brooke Rauber of the Tully Black Knights for taking home the state steeplechase title in track and field in the New York State Public High School Association Class C-1 Championship on June 10, 2017.

With a time of 7:01.26, Brooke Rauber took home the state title in the steeplechase. She was coached by Michelle Franklin-Rauber.

I am honored to recognize the hard work displayed by Brooke Rauber and the rest of the team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Tully Junior-Senior High School. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SPENCERTOWN FIRE COMPANY

##### HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the Spencertown Fire Company, which is celebrating 100 years of service to our communities in Columbia County, New York. Twenty-four hours a day and 365 days a year for the past century, this fire company has served with pride and courage.

I express my gratitude for the past and present volunteers of this organization who have made great sacrifices and performed heroic acts to protect their neighbors.

Upon recognizing the need for organized fire protection, a group of 10 men came together and drew up the Articles of Incorporation for Spencertown Fire Company on November 6, 2017.

Their names were: John W. Hartmann, George S. Barden, George W. Demler, George Whiteman, Alfred Taylor, T. F. Niles, L. Harvey, Ray Barden, Erie Chace, and Elvin Barden.

Today, 38 individuals make up the team at Spencertown Fire Company. Two thirds of this group are active, highly skilled volunteer firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, the members of Spencertown Fire Company: Alan Silvernale, Jeffrey Prack, Steven Ulmer, Brian Geel Sr., Brian Collins, David Page, Daniel Howes, Mathew Verenazi, Henry Barens, Lorin Brink, John Daval, Mark Dempf, Joel Dyslin, Kendall Eckstrom, Jay Engel, Russell Gauthier, David Harrison, Jr., Robin Howes, Evan Kerr, Guy Madsen, Donald McComb, Paul Mesick, Rich Nesbitt, Jr.,

Timothy Newton, Stephen Oleynek, Eric Pilkington, Bill Rogers, Chrissy Rundell, Chris Rundell, Dan Rundell, Josh VanAlstyne, Greg Verenazi, Edward Walsh, Arthur Welch, George Wenk, Gary Williams, Shaun Williams, and Gary Wood.

Their commitment to Spencertown and its neighboring communities does not stop at fire safety: Every year since 1985 they have awarded a \$1,000 scholarship to a college-bound high school graduate chosen from within their service area.

I thank Spencertown Fire Company President Alan Silvernale; Austerlitz Fire Chief Eric Pilkington; and the entire Spencertown Fire Company which, in the great tradition of New York fire companies, continues to raise the standard in ensuring and furthering the well-being of our local communities.

#### HONORING TOM NUNES, SR.

### HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Nunes, Sr., this year's recipient of the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California's E.E. "Gene" Harden Award for Lifetime Achievement in Central Coast Agriculture. Tom has devoted his entire career to farming the fertile ground of the Salinas Valley, contributing to the economic lifeblood of this region known as the "Salad Bowl of the World." Tom was born and raised in the heart of the Valley by a farming family in Chualar, CA. After graduating from Salinas High School, Tom attended Saint Mary's College on a football scholarship and later transferred to Stanford University, where he graduated with a degree in Economics.

After college, Tom immediately went to work in the Salinas Valley agricultural industry. He started a farming venture with his father where he worked for several years before partners approached him with the idea to start a grower-shipper company in the mid-1950's, they named this venture Growers Exchange Inc. In 1966, Tom and his brother Bob decided to start their own venture, and founded Nunes Bros. of California Inc., a grower-shipper of iceberg lettuce. This venture achieved enormous success, and the Nunes brothers ultimately sold their company to United Brands/Chiquita. The brothers were also one of six western vegetable grower-shippers that formed Inter-Harvest, the largest vegetable grower-shipper organization in the country at the time. Tom and Bob Nunes briefly ran Inter-Harvest before retiring in 1970. In the fall of 1976, Tom and Bob came out of retirement to launch The Nunes Company, Inc., whose core values of honesty, integrity, trust, and attention to detail have fostered a culture that continues to this day.

Through his long and distinguished career, Tom has spanned the transition of harvests in the Salinas Valley from sugar beets and white beans to the modern specialty crop era. He has been an instrumental figure in the conversion how we farm, harvest, cool and market our fresh produce in the Salinas Valley that

feeds people all across this country, and around the world. What started as 400 acres of iceberg lettuce on the central coast of California in the 1950's has grown into more than 22,000 acres of vegetable crops spanning five states.

Aside from his business success, Tom is also an invaluable member of our community. Tom has served as the President and Chairman of the Board for the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California, worked with the Western Growers Board, was a charter member of the Palma High School Foundation, served on the Palma High School Board, and the National Steinbeck Center inducted him into the Valley of the World Hall of Fame. His friends and family know him as a passionate, powerful and intelligent man. In true farmer fashion, he is a man of action and few words. The Nunes Company has created opportunity for hundreds of residents, and three generations of the Nunes family continue to operate the company to this day. The strong work ethic that Tom has passed down to future generations is evident in the tradition of innovation and pride in stewardship of the land that his successors carry out at every level of this business to this day. I am proud to add my name to this chorus of thanks and congratulations to Mr. Tom Nunes, Sr. for his enormous contributions to our community, and our country.

#### JACOB TALLEY

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jacob Talley for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jacob Talley is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jacob Talley is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jacob Talley for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SAVANNA JOHNSON

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Savanna Johnson, a graduate of West Central Valley High in Stuart, Iowa. Savanna was recently

honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fifteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on April 30, 2017.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa high school was invited to select a senior with the highest academic achievement. Not only are recipients academically gifted, but the selected students are also those who have had success in extra-curricular activities and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Savanna in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her for utilizing her talents to reach her goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAMP SHELBY

### HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend one of the many fine military institutions in Mississippi that has had a profound impact on its history and continues to play a positive, vital role in its present and future, training the elite military men and women of the United States Armed Forces.

One hundred years ago, in 1917, the largest state owned training facility in the nation, Camp Shelby, was established in Mississippi on United States Highway 49. With its North Gate located at the southern boundary of Hattiesburg, Camp Shelby encompasses over 525 square kilometers and more than 134,000 acres of both Perry and Forrest Counties.

Camp Shelby was named for Governor Isaac Shelby, the first Governor of Kentucky and a renowned soldier who served as a Colonel in the Virginia militia during the Revolutionary War as a militiaman in the Kentucky and Indiana territories. As Governor and leader of the Kentucky militia during the War of 1812, Governor Shelby helped solidify victory for his American troops at the Battle of the Thames in Canada in 1813.

When Camp Shelby was established in 1917, the first commanding officer was Major General William Hamden Sage. Major General Sage was awarded the Medal of Honor for his valor, bravery and fortitude at the Battle of Zapote River during the Philippine Insurrection in 1899.

During wartime, Camp Shelby's mission is to serve as a major independent mobilization station of the United States Army Forces Command (FORSCOM). Camp Shelby's 134,000 acres allow for battalion-level maneuver training, Gunnery Table 8-12, field artillery firing points and a wide range of support facilities, while also being utilized by units across the country for its ability to support numerous different missions.

Camp Shelby serves as the training ground for the Abrams M1 and the Paladin Howitzer

Tanks. It is home to the 177th Training Support Brigade and is the annual training location for National Guard and Reserve units based in Mississippi, Alabama and Tennessee. Additionally, the 155th Armored Brigade Combat Team and the 278th Armored Cavalry Regiment conduct their gunnery training at Camp Shelby and store the bulk of their combat equipment in the Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site (MATES) on base.

During World War II, Camp Shelby was the training site for the famous Japanese-American 100th Battalion 442nd Regimental Combat Team and the Women's Army Corps. It even housed a prisoner of war camp for detained soldiers from the German Africa Corps from 1941–1943.

On June 6, 2004, Camp Shelby was federalized as a FORSCOM Mobilization Center, and since that time several Regimental and Brigade Combat Teams have mobilized through the camp, including the 278th Armored Cavalry Regiment (Tennessee Army National Guard); the 155th Heavy Brigade Combat Team (MS ARNG); the 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 28th Infantry Division (PA ARNG); the 56th Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 28th Infantry Division (PA ARNG); the 53rd Brigade Combat Team (FL ARNG); the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 34th Infantry Division (MN ARNG); the 41st Brigade Combat Team (OR ARNG); the 256th Infantry Brigade Combat Team (LA ARNG); the 116th Cavalry Brigade Combat Team (ID ARNG); the 27th Infantry Brigade Combat Team (NY ARNG); and the 48th Infantry Brigade Combat Team (GA ARNG).

In addition to fulfilling its obligations as a FORSCOM Mobilization Center, Camp Shelby is the field training exercise site for the United States Navy Seabees mobilized from the Naval Construction Battalion in Gulfport and is home to the Youth Challenge Academy, the only militarily-structured GED and high school diploma program in the state.

I have personally been deployed to Camp Shelby in support of the Global War on Terror and continue to drill there as part of my service in the Mississippi National Guard. I can attest that this is truly a national asset and a special part of the State of Mississippi.

I hereby recognize and honor the remarkable feats of Camp Shelby upon the auspicious occasion of its 100th Anniversary and express best wishes for its success and growth in the future.

#### RECOGNIZING THE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP SKANEATELES GIRLS LACROSSE TEAM

##### HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the Skaneateles Girls Lacrosse Team in the New York State Public High School Association Class D Championship on June 10, 2017. The Skaneateles Lakers defeated the Bronxville Broncos 12–11 in double overtime.

The Lakers, finishing the season 18–4, overcame a six goal deficit in the champion-

ship game to secure the program's second title in four years. Members of the championship team include Hope Allyn, Sarah Bailey, Emily Baldwin, Riley Brogan, Christiana Ciaccio, Olivia Dabrovsky, Grace Dower, Emma Goodell, Taylor Hill, Abby Kuhns, Grace Kush, Sophie Kush, Abby Logan, Mae McGlynn, Mary McNeil, Olivia Navaroli, Maggie Newton, Olivia Nye, Jessica Patalino, Rachel Pinney, Kyla Sears, Mikaela Terhune, and Gaby Welch. The team is coached by Bridget Marquardt.

I am honored to recognize the teamwork displayed by the Skaneateles Lakers and to congratulate the members of the team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Skaneateles High School. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

##### HARLEY THERIOT

##### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Harley Theriot for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Harley Theriot is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Harley Theriot is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Harley Theriot for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF MARK KEMMER FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED CAREER WITH GENERAL MOTORS

##### HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Mark Kemmer for his career and accomplishments with General Motors. Mr. Kemmer has been a steadfast public policy advocate for the automotive industry throughout his 36 years with the company.

Mr. Kemmer began his career with GM in Detroit in 1974, where he worked with GM's Energy Management division to serve the energy needs of the automaker's factories and manufacturing facilities. He then moved to GM's Washington, DC office after four years,

and served as a Washington Representative and Liaison Engineer for the organization's Industry-Government Relations staff until 2002. In this position, Mr. Kemmer worked with federal, state and local partners on behalf of GM and its customers. He was then named the Director of Federal Affairs for the GM Public Policy Center, where he was responsible for formulating the company's policies addressing a variety of issues, including energy and safety, fuel economy standards for research, and advanced technology. As a result of Mr. Kemmer's leadership, GM has achieved excellence in a variety of emerging technologies and is well-positioned for the future.

Mr. Kemmer's work with General Motors has been critical to the evolution of the company. Under Mr. Kemmer's leadership, GM has made advancements in sustainability, driven improvements in its manufacturing processes through public-private partnerships, and helped it earn a reputation as a world-class organization that both serves its customers and the communities in which it operates. Mr. Kemmer's decades of expertise, relationships with key stakeholders and knowledge of the automotive industry have been important in facilitating these improvements, and he will be missed as he moves on from his current position.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Mark Kemmer for his outstanding career with General Motors. Mr. Kemmer's impactful leadership has helped GM evolve to meet new challenges in a rapidly evolving industry.

#### HONORING PENNDEL POLICE DEPARTMENT

##### HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Pennndel Police Department upon the dedication of their new headquarters building, named in honor of the Department's first Chief, Fred C. Dunkley, who served in the position for more than thirty years. The members of this Department are uniformly loved and respected within the community in which they live and serve. Their mission, to affirmatively promote, preserve, and provide a feeling of security and safety among all persons within their jurisdiction, has brought the community together in a time when many communities grow further apart. They set an example from which all of us can learn, and we thank them for their incredible service. To the members of the Pennndel Police Department, past, present, and future, we say thank you.

#### RECOGNIZING THE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP SOLVAY SOFTBALL TEAM

##### HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the Solvay Softball

Team in the New York State Public High School Association Class B Championship on June 10, 2017. The Solvay Bearcats defeated the Depew Wildcats 1–0 to secure the Bearcats' first program title since 1986.

The Bearcats, finishing the season 23–2, were determined to win the state title. Members of the championship team include Jordan Bamba, Sidney Chaffee, Althea Davies, Nadea Davies, Sam Farruggio, Lauren Hurd, Izzy Lambert, Hannah Martineau, Caitlin McCann, Lauren Nichols, Gabriella Petralito, Hope Riviera, Delana Thomas, and Aleah Yaizzo. The team is coached by Phil Merrill.

I am honored to recognize the teamwork displayed by the Solvay Bearcats and to congratulate the members of the team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Solvay High School. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

IN HONOR OF LEXINGTON HIGH  
SCHOOL BOYS' 1600 METER  
RELAY TEAM

**HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Lexington High School boys track team for winning the 1600 meter event at the Ohio High School Division II State Track and Field Tournament.

An achievement such as this certainly deserves recognition. The Ohio High School Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn state titles since its founding in 1907. Throughout this time, the champions of OHSA state level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in Ohio. Each year these elite competitors join the long ranks of those who embody Ohio's proud history of athletic success.

The Lexington High School boys 1600 meter relay team's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. They have set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Lexington High School can be extremely proud of their performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Hunter Biddle, Tony Gerrell, Forest Volz and Mason Kearns on their state championship. I wish them continued success in both their athletic and academic endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO TAYLOR PASHEK

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Taylor

Pashek, a graduate of Winterset High School in Winterset, Iowa. Taylor was recently honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fifteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on April 30, 2017.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa high school was invited to select a senior with the highest academic achievement. Not only are recipients academically gifted, but the selected students are also those who have had success in extra-curricular activities and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Taylor in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her for utilizing her talents to reach her goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

JORGE TORRES-MARCHAND

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jorge Torres-Marchand for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jorge Torres-Marchand is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jorge Torres-Marchand is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jorge Torres-Marchand for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE SKANEATELES  
LAKERS STATE TRACK AND  
FIELD CHAMPIONS

**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mia Grasso, Kaitlyn Neal, Katherine Carlile, Maddie Peterson, Shannon Roberts, and Olivia Gage of the Skaneateles Lakers for taking home state titles in their respective events at the New York State Public High School Association Class B–1 Championship on June 10, 2017.

The Skaneateles Lakers' Mia Grasso placed first in the 400 low hurdles with a time of

1:07.72, Kaitlyn Neal placed first in the 3000 meters with a time of 10:37.26, Katherine Carlile in the discus throw with a distance of 83–10. Carlile and Grasso were also members of the 1600 meter relay team with Maddie Peterson and Olivia Gage with a time of 4:15.26. The team was coached by Rob Tuttle.

I am honored to recognize the hard work displayed by the Skaneateles Lakers, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers at Skaneateles High School. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

OPPOSING THE SENATE VERSION  
OF THE AMERICAN HEALTH  
CARE ACT

**HON. JOYCE BEATTY**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to Trumpcare and the shameful, secret process Senate Republicans are using to pass this destructive legislation.

Last month, I proudly voted against Trumpcare, a bill that guts the Affordable Care Act, raises costs while providing less coverage, and gives tax cuts to the 400 wealthiest American families.

Mr. Speaker, the version of Trumpcare that passed the House is so bad, the President himself called it "mean".

A bill so mean it raises healthcare costs for hard-working families.

A bill so mean it makes millions of Americans with pre-existing conditions uninsurable.

A bill so mean it forces states to cut benefits and kick millions of people off Medicaid.

The American people deserve better—they deserve transparency; they deserve openness; they deserve the chance to read the bill; and, Mr. Speaker, they deserve affordable healthcare.

SUPPORTING H.R. 1871

**HON. LEE M. ZELDIN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1871, the Property Tax Reduction Act, which is essential legislation to give our counties and taxpayers desperately needed fiscal relief and to help bring New York's Medicaid costs under control.

Under current federal law, states are allowed to impose a portion of their state Medicaid funding responsibility onto local municipalities. My state, New York, chose to take advantage of this in an extreme sense. In 2015, for example, New York transferred more than \$7.2 billion of its non-federal Medicaid burden to counties. The burden New York has placed on its counties is greater than any other state in our country. The other 49 states combined

only burden their counties with about \$2.3 billion in Medicaid costs. This means that New York counties pay three times more for Medicaid than all other counties in the country combined. My home county, Suffolk, pays, on average, approximately a quarter billion dollars per year to the state for Medicaid, with \$243,470,248, for example, being spent in 2015. Protecting our most vulnerable population is essential, and ensuring adequate funding for Medicaid programs is vital; however, New York's program has dangerously exploded.

Our county governments around New York are in dire need of the fiscal relief provided through this legislation. There is no reason New York State cannot identify and achieve the \$2.3 billion amount of efficiency necessary and available in the state Medicaid system, while at the same time making it clear that this can be achieved without harming any low income residents in need of coverage. If the state needs any advice on how to accomplish this, I am here to help. The state's conversion to Managed Long Term Care, gross overbilling of Medicaid into the hundreds of millions of dollars by some entities, eight and nine figure at a time handouts to 1199 SEIU to curry political favor, and many other issues result in a major problem that must be immediately confronted head on. Not only does New York State spend more money on Medicaid than Illinois, Texas and Florida combined, but it spends just about the same amount on Medicaid costs that Florida spends on its entire state budget despite having an almost identical sized population.

H.R. 1871 would single handedly flip Suffolk County's recurring massive nine-figure budget deficits into budget surpluses. For residents of my district, this is a dream scenario that lifts our county out of a very dire annual budget crisis. If this bill became law, you could eliminate Suffolk's \$50 million annual property tax levy completely, eliminate Suffolk's \$150 million structural deficit, and have \$50 million left over for combating the heroin and opioid epidemic, improving infrastructure, public works programs, environmental preservation and coastal erosion programs, upgraded and improved sewerage or for some other purpose that county residents deems necessary.

Passage of this bill is critical to providing necessary relief not only for Suffolk County, but many counties across New York. I urge all my colleagues to support this important measure, I thank Congressmen CHRIS COLLINS and JOHN FASO for this proposal, and I look forward to getting this bill across the finish line.

JIMMY TRAN

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jimmy Tran for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jimmy Tran is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jimmy Tran is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jimmy Tran for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

A TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH  
FULLER

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Elizabeth Fuller, a graduate of Southwest Valley High School in Corning, Iowa. Elizabeth was recently honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fifteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on April 30, 2017.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa high school was invited to select a senior with the highest academic achievement. Not only are recipients academically gifted, but the selected students are also those who have had success in extra-curricular activities and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Elizabeth in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her for utilizing her talents to reach her goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

RECOGNIZING BUTCH CORDA

**HON. JIMMY PANETTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Butch Corda for his work as Chair of the Board of the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California. In my home district on the central coast of California, agriculture is the engine that drives our local economy, and creates opportunity for the citizens who reside there. The Grower-Shipper Association plays a central role in bringing the region's vegetables and berries to tables around the world. Under Mr. Corda's leadership as Chair, the Grower-Shipper Association continued to expand upon its rich tradition of addressing the complex and evolving issues facing the agricultural industry, such as food safety, pest prevention, research and education, and much more.

A native son of the fertile Salinas Valley, Mr. Corda was born and raised in Gonzales. After

attending Gonzales High School, Hartnell College and San Jose State, he returned home and has been working in the agricultural industry for over 35 years. Most recently, he has served as the General Manager of Ippolito International, known for being North America's largest supplier of Brussels sprouts, among many other mixed and specialty vegetables. He has raised his family in Salinas, where his wife and daughter also work in the industry. His immense experience, ingenuity and creativity gained from a long and distinguished career served him well during his tenure as the chair of the Grower-Shipper Association.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly impressed by Mr. Corda's implementation of the Association's "Future Leaders Program." Through this program, the Board of Directors paid special attention to developing the next generation of leadership in the industry through mentorship, participation in board meetings, and many other educational events. This exposed a new generation of agriculture professionals to issues facing the industry as a whole, beyond what they manage in the day-to-day duties of their respective jobs, and empowered them to bring new and creative ideas to the table to solve these pressing concerns. Also during Mr. Corda's tenure, the Association premiered the documentary film "Historical Narratives of Salinas Valley Agriculture," a collaborative project that engaged and educated the public on the important and often overlooked stories of the people who have built Salinas Valley agriculture into what it is today. Under the leadership of Mr. Corda, the Association assisted in providing a place for industry leaders to come together to make progress on a number of important issues, particularly pesticide safety and water conservation.

While Mr. Corda's tenure as Chair of the Board has ended, I am certain his contribution to this vital industry in my home district will continue. It is my pleasure to add my name to the chorus of thanks and congratulations to the outgoing Chairman and look forward to continued collaboration to champion bold, productive, and creative solutions to address the needs of the industry, its workers, and the American families who enjoy the harvests that we produce here every day.

RECOGNIZING JEREMIAH WILLIS,  
THE LONG JUMP AND TRIPLE  
JUMP STATE CHAMPION

**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of Jeremiah Willis of the Cicero-North Syracuse Northstars Track & Field Team in two individual track and field events at the New York State Public High School Association Class AA Championship on June 10, 2017.

With a leap of 23 feet and one inch, Jeremiah Willis took first place in the federation long jump. Willis also took first place in the federation triple jump in 46-05.25. He was coached by Greg Boton.

I am honored to recognize the hard work displayed by Jeremiah Willis and his coaching



staff and teachers at Cicero-North Syracuse High School. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

RECOGNIZING IMMIGRANT  
HERITAGE MONTH IN JUNE

**HON. CHARLES W. DENT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the historical and cultural impact immigrants have had—and continue to have—on our great nation, as we recognize Immigrant Heritage Month this June.

Throughout its history, America has shone as a beacon of opportunity to millions of people seeking refuge from prejudice, political instability, or extreme hardship in their homeland. Our willingness to welcome those escaping persecution and seeking economic opportunity has only fortified our strength as a country, and it will continue to do so. The United States is ripe with opportunity for fiscal and personal prosperity, both of which have appealed to those who have arrived on our shores looking for a new life for themselves and their families. The resulting mixture of ethnicities and cultures has only served to embolden the unique American way of life and experience.

The foundation of our nation is built on immigrants, and as the descendant of German, English, and Irish immigrants, I am thankful for a chance to reflect on the importance of immigration to this country's historical narrative.

SUPPORTING THE VOTING RIGHTS  
ADVANCEMENT ACT

**HON. TERRI A. SEWELL**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of a critical piece of legislation, the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I am proud to sponsor this legislation and to be joined by my colleagues, Representatives JUDY CHU, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, and JOHN LEWIS.

In March of 2015, I, alongside former Presidents Barack Obama and George Bush, both Republican and Democrat Members of Congress, and thousands of people from across the world marched over Edmund Pettus Bridge to commemorate the 50th anniversary of "Bloody Sunday". We honored great Americans like Jimmie Lee Jackson, who was brutally murdered for attempting to vote, Ms. Amelia Boynton Robinson and our fellow Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who were both bludgeoned for marching for their right to vote. Their sacrifices and courage paved the path for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with overwhelming bipartisan support.

As we reach the fourth anniversary of Shelby v. Holder, the landmark case that over-

turned and gutted a vital part of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it is clear that Americans' right to vote is under attack now more than ever. While people of color are no longer subject to irrational literacy tests, arbitrary grandfather clauses, or high poll taxes, the reversal of Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act once again subjugates minorities to voter discrimination tactics. This section provided preclearance measures for states where voter discrimination has occurred. Section 4(b) required any changes of voting laws to first be cleared by the court in the determined states. Since Shelby v. Holder nullified this crucial part of the Voting Rights Act, 10 states have passed laws requiring photo identification to vote, and several more states now require government issued identification in order to cast a ballot. These identification laws have been proven to negatively affect minority and low-income voters disproportionately time and time again.

Moreover, instead of working to enhance the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and working to protect the voting rights of all Americans, the Trump Administration is wasting valuable time and resources creating a commission to investigate the groundless claim that millions of people voted illegally in the last election. The creation of this commission demonstrates a clear disregard for the millions of disenfranchised minorities across America.

My legislation, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, will effectively create a new coverage formula and provide updated preclearance procedures for states that have had 15 or more voting violations within the past 25 years. With the addition of this new formula, 13 states including Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, 9 of which have already passed discriminatory voter identification laws, would be subject to federal oversight. The Voting Rights Advancement Act presents a clear solution to the problem of voter discrimination and helps ensure Americans of all races and socioeconomic statuses are able to exercise their constitutionally protected right to vote.

Just as in 1965, we remain at a pivotal crossroads—the choice to give every American equal access to the ballot or to continue marginalizing and disenfranchising minorities and low-income communities. I urge my colleagues to take action and support the Voting Rights Advancement Act and not to let the bipartisan effort of previous Congresses be in vain. Congress must pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act and restore the right to vote to every American citizen.

IN HONOR OF SPECIAL AGENTS  
CRYSTAL GRINER AND DAVID  
BAILEY AND THEIR COURAGEOUS  
ACTS OF VALOR IN SAVING LIVES

**HON. PETE SESSIONS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the selfless acts of courage displayed

by Special Agents Crystal Griner and David Bailey of The United States Capitol Police saving the lives of numerous members of Congress and their staffs. Our thoughts and prayers go out to all of the wounded and Congressman Steve Scalise and Matt Mika and their families who are fighting for their lives. I include in the RECORD this poem penned by Albert Carey Caswell.

NOT ON MY WATCH

They awake on each new day  
With a hug and kiss  
saying goodbye to their loved ones out on their way  
As to themselves "Not on My Watch" they say  
No one is going to hurt you this day  
Putting on a bullet proof vest  
while strapping a holster and gun to their chest  
To watch over all of us to bless  
moving out to serve and protect  
Not knowing what evil to expect  
Or if this will be their last day, yet  
Who while all in the midst of hell  
must find the strength to make their souls swell  
Living by a noble code and creed  
to watch over us . . . you and me  
It's all in a Police Officer's day  
Saying, "Not on My Watch" all at speed  
To vanquish evil's darkest of all needs  
Ready to lay down their own lives if need be  
Standing on that thin blue line  
where death lies so close all the time  
When, who lives and dies  
And see's another sunrise  
So all depends on you  
relies  
And on that fateful morning in June  
When two Capitol Police Officers went deep  
stood true  
Who against all odds  
just like Gods kept their oath through and through  
Out gunned  
who from the face of death would not run  
All in their stride stood tall in the morning sun  
Until, they vanquished what this dark evil  
had begun  
Thank you  
Officers Griner and Bailey as you have  
blessed each and everyone  
But, "hate is hard . . . and it makes me cry"  
When, I see those tears in those wounded  
loved ones eyes  
But remember  
the darkness is no match for the light  
The kind that which on this day  
burned in Griner's and Bailey's hearts so bright  
Goodness  
Evil  
Darkness  
Light  
Those Brave Hearts Who Evil Must Fight  
Who Bring The Light  
Together Enjoined  
As We Battle On  
Into The Darkest of Nights  
"Not On My Watch"  
Those Brave Hearts Who Evil Must Fight  
You Bring The Light

IN HONOR OF JOE ELLIS

**HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Joe Ellis for winning the high jump event in the Ohio High School Division I State Track and Field Tournament.

An achievement such as this certainly deserves recognition. The Ohio High School Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn state titles since its founding in 1907. Throughout this time, the champions of OHSAA state level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in Ohio. Each year these elite competitors join the long ranks of those who embody Ohio's proud history of athletic success.

Joe Ellis' victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. You have set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Mansfield Senior High School can be extremely proud of your performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Joe Ellis on his state championship. I wish him continued success in both his athletic and academic endeavors.

TRUMPCARE WILL ABANDON  
AMERICANS SUFFERING FROM  
ADDICTION AND OVERDOSE

**HON. TERRI A. SEWELL**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our country is in the midst of a drug overdose epidemic that's devastating families and communities nationwide. Each day, 144 people die from drug overdose. Opioids kill more people than car accidents, and heroin kills more than all gun-related homicides.

Recently, President Trump stated the opioid crisis "is a crippling problem throughout the United States" and vowed to "expand treatment for those who have become so badly addicted." After promising the American people that he would take action to alleviate this suffering, he endorsed a GOP health reform bill that would decimate mental health and substance abuse treatment for those most in need.

Now, we all know about TrumpCare. We know the House version of the bill would cut more than \$800 billion to Medicaid, cause 23 million Americans to lose their health insurance, and disproportionately hurt the same low- and middle-class voters in rural areas who helped elect him in order to give a massive tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. And the Senate version, released today, is expected to have largely similar effects.

Today, I want to focus on one particularly harsh way TrumpCare harms Americans and their families: It severely reduces access to

critical mental health and substance abuse services for victims of this public health crisis, especially the 62 million Americans living in rural areas.

Folks living in rural areas, including many of my constituents in Alabama, are older and sicker than the average American and have higher rates of premature death, which is largely driven by drug overdoses. More than one third of Alabamians live in rural areas and report poor mental health. What's worse, for every 11,000 of my constituents living in Wilcox County, there is only one mental health provider. Wilcox County is only one example of the mental health provider shortage in rural America.

While the ACA didn't solve all of these problems, it made real progress towards increasing access to affordable and high-quality mental health and substance abuse services. It ensured that all individual and employer health plans covered therapist appointments, hospital visits, and medications. It banned lifetime and annual limits on the amount that health insurance companies would pay for critical mental health and substance abuse services. It capped out-of-pocket costs for these services, and finally, it ensured that no one would be discriminated against because they had pre-existing mental health or substance abuse conditions. Together, these reforms gave Americans suffering from this drug epidemic hope for lasting recovery.

TrumpCare, rather than building on the successes of the ACA and strengthening treatment for the 22 million Americans suffering from mental health and substance abuse disorders, wipe out access to life-saving health services for the families that need it most. The House version of the bill would allow states to eliminate requirements that health plans cover mental health and substance abuse services, and it would allow insurance companies to inflate prices for Americans who suffer from pre-existing conditions in certain states. As a result, the independent Congressional Budget Office has projected that individuals with a mental health or substance abuse history could be charged "thousands" more under TrumpCare than under the ACA. In addition to affecting the 175,000 Alabamians who purchased health insurance on the ACA marketplace, these cost hikes could extend to 1.6 million Alabamians with employer-sponsored health insurance.

Republican "solutions" to these problems are drastically underfunded, partly in an effort to reduce the total cost of TrumpCare in order to fund tax breaks for the wealthiest executives and heirs in our country. As a demonstration of my Republican colleagues' priorities, they vetoed an introduced TrumpCare amendment that would mandate coverage for mental health and substance abuse services.

To put it simply, more people will die from drug overdose if TrumpCare is passed. Instead of helping the rural voters who helped President Trump get into office, he betrayed them by supporting legislation that wipes out life-saving mental health and substance abuse treatments in order to cut taxes for Americans like him. TrumpCare will lead to more families torn apart by addiction, more out-of-home placements for children whose parents are suffering from this epidemic, and a larger bur-

den on child welfare and foster care systems already at capacity.

We have made real progress in combatting the opioid crisis in recent years, but our fight is not over. Regardless of partisan affiliation, we must ensure affordable and comprehensive mental health and substance abuse services for all Americans. Those who do not will have to answer to the grief-stricken families whose loved ones fall victim to this drug overdose epidemic.

HONORING THE TYLER JUNIOR  
COLLEGE APACHES, 2017 NJCAA  
DIVISION III WORLD BASEBALL  
CHAMPIONS

**HON. LOUIE GOHMERT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, residents of east Texas are no strangers to bringing home championship trophies. Yet it is still a thrilling moment to welcome home a team after winning a national championship title. Even more so when they bring home a second national title the following year, and rarer still when the team then wins a third national championship. But it is truly unprecedented in NJCAA history for a team to win four straight national titles in a row. What an exceptional privilege it is to stand today to congratulate the Tyler Junior College Apaches baseball team for its fourth straight 2017 NJCAA Division III World Series victory, the 56th national title in the history of TJC.

The Apaches finished 4-0 in the World Series held in Greeneville, Tennessee, securing an historic fourth consecutive championship with a 5-1 victory over the Niagara County (New York) Thunder Wolves. The team won their final eleven games of the 2017 season with an impressive overall record of 41-20.

This remarkable accomplishment cannot be possible without the determination and hard work of every team member, along with the skill and experience of a dedicated coaching staff led by Head Baseball Coach Doug Wren, who has escorted the Apaches to six World Series appearances in eight years as Head Coach. Assisting Coach Wren are Assistant Coaches Chad Sherman and Garrett McMullen; Student Managers Colter Dosch and Cody Jamison; Student Trainers Justin Smith and Chase Day; Assistant Athletic Trainer Travis Gray, and Head Athletic Trainer Eddy McGuire.

My most enthusiastic praise and congratulations goes to national champions Braden Wise, Jarrod Wells, Payton Adams, Matt Mikusek, Travis French, Justin Roach, Taylor Broadway, Corben Henry, Ryan Lawhon, Blaze Beason, James Kuykendall, Jarel McDade, Austin Cernosek, Tyler Abney, John Gillett, Chase Evans, Garin Shelton, Beau Buesing, Colton Whitehouse, AbeRee Hiebert, Blake Maddox, Cameron Carver, Mason Whitmarsh, Daniel Priddy, Luke Boyd, J.P. Gorby, Austin Tambellini, Marco Gutierrez, Daniel Bogue, Jordan Trahan, Trevor Parker, Andrew Nichols, and Eric Bullock.

Tyler Junior College has been a beacon of academic excellence for more than ninety

years. So it comes as no surprise the warrior spirit of pride and achievement extends to its athletic accomplishments under the leadership of TJC President Dr. Michael Metke, Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs Dr. Juan Mejia, Assistant VP/Athletics and Student Life Dr. Tim Drain, Assistant Director of Intercollegiate Athletics Kelsi Weeks, Associate Director of Intercollegiate Athletics Chuck Smith, and Administrative Assistant of Intercollegiate Athletics Sherry Harwood.

These exceptional student athletes have added a spectacular chapter to the legacy of Tyler Junior College. No matter how talented and committed the team, the path to a national championship would be much more challenging if not for the enthusiastic support of a fiercely loyal network of players' families, faculty, staff members, alumni, and community.

May God continue to bless these young people, along with their families, friends and neighbors in east Texas and beyond. It is a tremendous honor to recognize the 2017 NJCAA World Series Baseball Champions, the Tyler Junior College Apaches.

#### HONORING THE U.S.-INDIA RELATIONSHIP AND INDIAN AMERICANS

##### HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, as President Trump prepares to welcome Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi next week, there is much to celebrate in our country's relationship with India, the world's largest democracy, and in the enormous contributions that Indian Americans make in our country.

There are four million Indian-Americans in the U.S., according to the Census Bureau. In 2010, Pew reported that 87.2 percent of adult Indian Americans were foreign-born and that Indian Americans are highly educated and highly successful.

U.S. relations with India are critical to both countries. Our annual bilateral trade in goods and services could reach \$500 billion by 2024, a five-fold increase since 2013, according to the Congressional Research Service.

The role of Indian Americans in government is profound. In recent months, former Governor Nikki Haley was confirmed as Ambassador to the United Nations; Ajit Pai was made chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; Seema Verma was named Administrator of the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services; four Indian Americans took their seats in the U.S. House of Representatives and one in the Senate; and countless more serve in state legislatures, local governments, the judicial branch and beyond.

Indian Americans have deeply enriched our nation's arts and culture, and Indian media in the U.S. is surging to meet demand. Cable, satellite and radio offer a growing array of Hindu and Indian content. Global Hindi programmer ZEE TV's U.S. programming is viewed in nearly a million households.

Politically and militarily, our two countries are united in a commitment to fight terrorism

and promote world peace. Last year, the U.S. and India signed a historic defense agreement that paves the way for greater strategic and regional cooperation.

Please join me in acknowledging the immense contribution Indian Americans make to the United States, and in recognizing the importance of continuing to strengthen ties between our two nations.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SISTERS OF MERCY OF THE AMERICAS CONGREGATIONAL CHAPTER MEETING IN BUFFALO, NEW YORK JUNE 19-JUNE 29, 2017

##### HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas as they have gathered in my hometown of Buffalo, New York for their Congregational Chapter meeting from June 19-June 29. More than 300 Sisters of Mercy from various parts of the continental United States as well as from the Philippines, Guam and Latin America will elect an Institute president and leadership team, determine priorities, renew their vision and respond to the changing needs in their mission during this two-week summit.

Inspired by the life of Jesus and its founder Catherine McAuley, the Sisters of Mercy are women of faith who have committed their lives to God and use their resources to serve, advocate and pray for those in need throughout the world. Arriving from Ireland at the invitation of the Bishop of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1843, the women originally dedicated themselves to the service of people who were poor, sick, and uneducated. As membership grew throughout the United States, the organization's influence expanded to issues in education, health care, and social services.

The work of the Sisters of Mercy is inherently woven into the historic fabric of the growth of Buffalo and Western New York as these devoted women taught in numerous Catholic schools. They opened, led and cared for others in our Catholic hospitals as well as being highly engaged in numerous charitable organizations. The Sisters' profound influence on those they taught, those they tended to who were suffering physically, mentally, spiritually, those they helped bring into this world, and those they comforted as the end drew near has deepened across generations.

Today, the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas operate under the core values of Spirituality, Community, Service, and Social Justice focusing on the critical concerns of the earth, immigration, nonviolence, anti-racism, and women. They sponsor or co-sponsor 77 schools from early childhood education to the collegiate level and partnered with the Global Catholic Climate Movement to urge world leaders to commit to climate action.

This commitment to action on climate change is one I strongly share and support. For decades, the United States set the world's public policy standard on critical environmental

issues; a tradition that ended when this Administration backed away from the Paris Climate Accord—a pledge joined by more than 190 countries to reduce emissions toward the goal of cleaner air and a healthy planet. This reversal does not demonstrate the leadership that is characteristic of America, nor does it protect the health and safety of people today or those for generations to come.

In solidarity with the communities in which they minister, the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas' commitment to everyone's right to clean water will take another strong, steady and significant step forward; actually many hundreds of steps forward, as the Sisters will participate in a Contemplative Walk down Main Street to Canalside, the center of Buffalo's resurgent waterfront, where the Buffalo River flows into Lake Erie. The "Walk for Water" on Friday, June 23 will be led by representatives from the Native American community who will add their voices and vital historical perspective to the urgent need to protect and preserve our natural environment.

As the Congressional Representative who secured the funding for the infrastructure needed to make public access at our water's edge a reality, this ceremony is especially significant as we find ourselves, inexplicably, fighting to ensure the federal dollars used to restore our Great Lakes remains in place.

The Great Lakes contain 95 percent of America's fresh surface water and drinking water supply to more than 40 million people in North America. Currently under threat of drastic cuts, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) is a joint effort between the U.S. and Canada to restore the Great Lakes by cleaning up pollution, promoting shoreline health, combating invasive species and protecting fish and wildlife. Over the last decade the federal government has invested \$32.38 million in Great Lakes funding in and around the Buffalo River Area of Concern and is credited with the ecological and economic turnaround of the Buffalo River.

Now more than ever, we need to demonstrate the value both environmentally and economically of Great Lakes investments, and come together to fight for the continuation of this program and others that enhance the quality of life for this and future generations. And so, joined by the Interfaith Climate Justice Community, Climate Justice Coalition and like-minded public officials, the Sisters will add water from their regions to one container. This blended water will be sprinkled over the Sisters, over the land and then poured out into Lake Erie.

Once again, with humility and humanity, these valiant women are leading by example. This symbolic mixing of waters from lands served by the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas represents active and unified engagement in this crucial crusade to protect, promote and preserve our natural assets for all people. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas for adding another historic milestone to the legacy of the Buffalo waterfront. And to extend immeasurable gratitude for all they have sacrificed, shared and stood for in the past, and for all they will continue to stand up for today, tomorrow and for generations to come.

## A TRIBUTE TO TESSA SHIELDS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tessa Shields, a graduate of Mount Ayr High School in Mount Ayr, Iowa. Tessa was recently honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fifteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on April 30, 2017.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa high school was invited to select a senior with the highest academic achievement. Not only are recipients academically gifted, but the selected students are also those who have had success in extra-curricular activities and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Tessa in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her for utilizing her talents to reach her goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

## HONORING COLONEL JAMES C. BRENNAN III, USMC

**HON. WALTER B. JONES**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor Colonel James C. Brennan III, for his thirty-three years of selfless service to our nation in the United States Marine Corps.

Colonel Brennan's extensive career started in 1984 with the completion of entry level training at Parris Island, South Carolina. He received his commission through the Platoon Leaders Class in 1988 after graduating from Lynchburg College.

Colonel Brennan began as a field artillery officer serving with the 10th, 11th and 12th Marine Regiments. He held every major position from forward observer to battalion commander. His command of the 2nd Battalion, 10th Marine Regiment, however, is particularly noteworthy. During this time, he deployed his artillery battalion as a civil affairs group in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in al Anbar province, finally completing the efforts that Marines had started over five years earlier. His efforts resulted in the smooth transition of civil works projects, education projects and local governance over to the Iraqi people.

As a field grade officer, Colonel Brennan served in diverse ways, including multiple tours of duty outside his primary field. In 1998, he was assigned to Officer Candidate School, where his efforts resulted in the first complete revision of the school's curriculum in over a decade, as well as material changes, which reduced injuries significantly. In 2001, he first served outside of the Marine Corps as the

Deputy Liaison Officer to the U.S. House of Representatives during both the 107th and 108th Congresses. In 2004, he was assigned to Marine Forces Pacific where he served as a planner while simultaneously serving the U.S. Pacific Command as a crisis action planner. During this time, he was successful in planning operations in support of crises across the Pacific Rim from the Philippines to Indonesia, and all across the Indian Ocean. He was later deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom as a planner for Multi-National Force—West, where he was responsible for planning the first national election and constitutional referendum in Iraq's history. His efforts allowed every voter to cast their vote in a safe and secure environment.

In 2009, Colonel Brennan was promoted to Colonel, and served as the Commanding Officer of Headquarters and Service Battalion at Quantico, Virginia. This battalion has the distinction of being the largest battalion level formation in the Marine Corps with over 3,200 members. His efforts ensured that each of the 26 major commands he led received the same consistency of form and effort in managing their training, education, administration and legal matters to allow them to focus on their primary missions.

A few years later, in 2013, Colonel Brennan again moved outside the Marine Corps to support operations at the combatant command level. He was assigned to the U.S. Northern Command as its liaison to the U.S. Southern Command. During this period, he was assigned to support the training and execution of domestic disaster relief operations in the great states of Washington, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Mississippi and New York. His knowledge and expertise in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations assisted each state's joint task force in smoothly incorporating the active military forces within the legal constraints for operations on domestic soil.

During his decades of service, Colonel Brennan served with distinction in support of anti-terrorism operations, including Operation Provide Comfort, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation Freedom's Sentinel. He aided in support of crisis response missions around the globe including tsunami relief operations in Thailand, Indonesia and the Maldives, Haitian refugee operations, and multiple typhoon relief operations in the Philippines, as well as in the United States. He commanded at all levels, the battery, battalion and regimental, and has supported operations both domestically and overseas.

Colonel Brennan's career is distinguished by his willingness and desire to serve our nation, the Marine Corps, and the brave marines and sailors he has had the privilege to lead each and every day. He is a man who served faithfully and to the best of his abilities in all positions to which he was assigned, which has made him invaluable to the Marine Corps and to our nation. He successfully used his skills as a commander, leader and mentor, both in the field and in garrison. It is likely that much of Colonel Brennan's service will never fully be recognized, but his leadership will be remembered for years to come.

In addition, over the three and a half decades Colonel Brennan served our nation, Mrs. Laura Brennan, his wife, has been avidly dedi-

cated to serving the people of the United States. Noted as a counselor and leader, Mrs. Brennan serves as an assistant town attorney for the Town of Islip in New York, while maintaining a private practice. She is also active in the fight for autism awareness, both in her community and at the national level. Her greatest professional accomplishment has been helping advocate for military children on the spectrum to gain better access to appropriate care.

Mrs. Brennan continues to be involved in a multitude of organizations in West Islip, NY area while also raising their two school-aged children. I am fortunate to have known the Brennan family since 2001, and I am extraordinarily proud of the work they have done for our nation and will continue to do in the future.

On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I would like to recognize Colonel Brennan's outstanding accomplishments, courageous attitude, and his past and present devotion to our nation. I want to congratulate him, his wife Laura, and their children, Caroline and Charlotte on the completion of a long and highly distinguished career.

In closing, may God continue to bless the Brennans and may they have "fair winds and a following sea" as they embark on a new journey of service to our beloved nation.

Semper Fidelis.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 2017, I was not present for the recorded votes on Roll Call Nos. 311, 312, 313, 314, and 315. Had I been present, I would have voted: NAY on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair; NAY on the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule for providing consideration of both H.R. 1873 and H.R. 1654; NO on agreeing to the resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1873; AYE on agreeing to the Carbajal of California Part A Amendment and; NO on the passage of the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

## COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BABCOCK &amp; WILCOX

**HON. JAMES B. RENACCI**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Babcock & Wilcox, a power generation company which employs hundreds of Ohioans in Ohio's 16th District. B&W celebrates its 150th Anniversary on June 22, 2017, and since its founding, it has become a global leader in energy and environmental technologies, as well as services for power and industrial markets.

In its 150 years, B&W produced a number of historic firsts. It supplied energy for the first

electric street lights. It powered New York's first subway. It built components for the USS *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear-powered sub. It also pioneered emissions control technologies that allowed utilities to comply with the Clean Air Act.

As B&W celebrates 150 years in business, I would like to congratulate them on their storied achievements and wish them success in their next 150.

---

HONORING J. MICHAEL GILLILAND

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize J. Michael Gilliland. Michael is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Michael has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Michael has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Michael has led his troop as the Assistant Senior Patrol Leader, earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say, and become a member of the Order of the Arrow. Michael has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Michael constructed a round rail fence around an underground shelter at the Rotary Youth Camp in Lee's Summit, Missouri, making it safer for wheel-chair bound campers to access the shelter in an emergency situation.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending J. Michael Gilliland for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

---

HONORING MS. LYNN BUSH

**HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of a tireless public servant in Bucks County. Ms. Lynn Bush, the Executive Director of the Bucks County Planning Commission and Chief Clerk of the County, retired last week after more than eighteen years serving her friends and neighbors. The work Ms. Bush has done throughout her career has helped the businesses of Bucks County to flourish, and oversaw the preservation of Bucks County's 200th farm, as part of her passionate work protecting open space in the county. Her service stands as a reminder that we make a life by what we give others.

A TRIBUTE TO LIVY GREEN

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Livy Green, a graduate of Nodaway Valley High School in Greenfield, Iowa. Livy was recently honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fifteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on April 30, 2017.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa high school was invited to select a senior with the highest academic achievement. Not only are recipients academically gifted, but the selected students are also those who have had success in extra-curricular activities and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Livy in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her for utilizing her talents to reach her goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

---

HONORING CHIEF STEVE WESTERMANN

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the outstanding achievements of Chief Steve Westermann. Chief Westermann is one of the most respected fire district chiefs and is retiring from the Central Jackson County Fire Protection District. I join with his family, fellow firefighters, and the citizens of the central Jackson County in congratulating Chief Westermann on his many years of success, contributions to the community and retirement.

Chief Westermann started his career as a volunteer in 1972 while in high school. In 1977, he was hired as a Fire Inspector with CJC, creating the Fire Prevention Bureau and beginning the first in-school education programs. In 1979, he was promoted to assistant chief, and in 1981 left to take a position as the Assistant Chief / Fire Marshall in Chesterfield MO. In 1985 he returned to CJCFPD as a fire apparatus engineer and was soon promoted to deputy chief. In 1988, Chief Westermann was appointed Chief Fire Executive (CFE), the fourth in CJCFPD's history. Along the way, Chief Westermann has also been elected or appointed to serve in leadership and executive positions on countless local, state, and national organizations and committees, dedicated to making the communities we serve, and the fire service as a whole, stronger and safer.

While serving as CFE, Chief Westermann moved CJCFPD forward in all areas and cre-

ated an organization that is recognized and respected across the country. CJCFPD grew from 18 to 133 career staff, assumed complete responsibility for emergency medical services, achieved an Insurance Services Office rating of 2, significantly expanded fire and EMS training, added Station 5 and a state of the art training facility.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and the rest of the community, family and firefighters in applauding Chief Steve Westermann's outstanding achievements and contributions to the community, and the State of Missouri. We wish Chief Westermann and his family the very best in years to come.

---

HONORING THE CENTENNIAL OF  
THE AMERICAN RED CROSS OF  
THE CALIFORNIA NORTHWEST

**HON. JARED HUFFMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Congressman MIKE THOMPSON to recognize the 100th anniversary of the American Red Cross of the California Northwest (Northwest Chapter), as it celebrates the occasion on June 22, 2017.

Chartered in 1917, the American Red Cross of the California Northwest was originally comprised of eleven chapters from Sonoma to Del Norte Counties. These chapters provided necessary support and emergency services to United States Armed Forces and their families stationed in the area, as the country entered the First World War.

Throughout the years, the Northwest Chapter's purpose has evolved to meet the region's growing population and increasingly diverse needs. Now covering six counties with a combined population of 941,000 people, the Northwest Chapter has provided emergency services, training programs, and continued support to Military personnel and their families throughout the region.

This has led to critical emergency support during times of disaster both big and small. From the 1964 earthquake that devastated Crescent City to the Russian River Floods of 1955, 1982, 1995, and 2007, the Northwest Chapter has repeatedly answered the call for assistance with trained volunteers and broader emergency support. The Northwest Chapter responds to an average of 100 local disasters and assists an average 280 families each year through the efforts of its volunteer disaster workers.

Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross of the California Northwest has been a critical partner in providing local emergency support and preparation during times of crisis. It is, therefore, fitting to congratulate and thank the Northwest Chapter for a century of exceptional volunteer citizenship and community support.

HONORING GREENBRIER MIDDLE  
SCHOOL**HON. J. FRENCH HILL**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Greenbrier Middle School on being named one of 465 Schools to Watch by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform in 2017.

By establishing organizational norms, structures, and arrangements, Schools to Watch achieve academic excellence, developmental responsiveness, and social equity.

Those three characteristics are paramount to middle-grade success and young adolescent development.

I am encouraged to hear of Greenbrier Middle School's unyielding sense of purpose and dedication to the success of their students; and, I am excited to personally congratulate their outstanding efforts during their visit to Washington this month.

Our youth are our future, so I look forward to further Arkansas schools joining Greenbrier in the pursuit of excellence.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIRING  
TEACHERS AT INTER-LAKES  
HIGH SCHOOL IN MEREDITH,  
NEW HAMPSHIRE**HON. CAROL SHEA-PORTER**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, all teachers are special, but educators who stay way beyond normal retirement dates deserve extra credit. In my district, I have four educators from the same high school, Inter-Lakes High School in Meredith, NH, who are retiring after a combined 150 years in education. That is truly remarkable, and I join with their community to thank them for their service to the children and the community.

Vice Principal William Athans has been working in education for 51 years, which is simply incredible. Guidance counselor Christina Gribben has been assisting students and helping them reach their full potential for 43 years. World languages teacher Nancy Stetson has been teaching for 35 years, and science teacher Joyce Warburton has been expanding minds and preparing students for 21 years.

These educators have played a tremendous role in the lives of so many New Hampshire students. They have planted knowledge and wisdom in young minds and prepared their students for success. I hope our newly minted retirees enjoy a long and happy retirement. They certainly have earned it.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MARK  
SCOTT**HON. DARIN LAHOOD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Mark Scott, who passed away in May, 2017.

A native of Eureka, Illinois, Mark Scott attended Worsham College of Mortuary Science and later served as a funeral director for 20 years. As a servant of the community, he was found helping families in their greatest time of need at Otto-Argo Funeral Home in Eureka, Davis-Fulton in Peoria, and Irwin Chapel in Granite City. Later, Mark began his career as a financial agent, working for Country Companies in Eureka for the past fifteen years.

Mark continued his service and devotion in the community as an accomplished Eagle Scout with Masonic Lodge Triple 835 and as president of the Eureka Rotary Club. In addition, Mark was a member of the Eureka Business Association and served on the board at the Heart House. In his spare time, he was known as an avid outdoorsman who enjoyed outdoor projects and birdwatching, as well as a family man who was fond of vacations and game nights with his wonderful wife, Andrea, and children, Alyssa and Derek. Furthermore, Mark was a man of faith, serving as a deacon and President of the Board of Central Christian Church.

Mark Scott made his community a better place. He will always be in the hearts and minds of friends and family throughout the Eureka community. May he rest peacefully in heaven.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TOWN OF  
CONWAY, MASSACHUSETTS**HON. RICHARD E. NEAL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize the town of Conway, Massachusetts as they celebrate their 250th anniversary. Since its establishment in 1767, Conway has continued to flourish as a rich agricultural community located in the foothills of the Berkshire Mountains.

The town of Conway was first established as the southwest portion of the town of Deerfield, Massachusetts. After the end of the French and Indian Wars, the area was divided and the town Conway was official established in 1767. Named after General Henry Seymour Conway, a leader in the British House of Commons, the town was known for its sheep farming along with other agricultural pursuits. The first settlers of Conway were able to build gristmills and sawmills to harness the power of the many waterways that flowed through the town. As the Industrial Revolution began in the United States, Conway was no exception to the rise of the manufacturing industry. Factories began to emerge in Conway along the South River, where power could be readily ac-

cessible from the mills. Everything from textiles and hats, to washing machines and furniture were manufactured in these factories. As Conway transitioned into the 20th century, their manufacturing industry began to suffer as a result of the high cost of transporting goods from the town. The town has transitioned back to a farming community and the remnants of the old factory buildings serve as reminders of the town's history.

Today, Conway is a quiet, beautiful town with much to offer. Bardwell's Ferry Bridge still stands as a treasured historical landmark, stretching across the Deerfield River and connecting Conway to the nearby town of Shelburne Falls. Every fall, the annual Festival of the Hills serves as a way for the community to come together to celebrate the town's long and distinguished history. The events of the festival include a pancake breakfast, live music, as well as various family activities. All the proceeds raised from the festival go towards scholarships for local high school students, as a way for the town to continue its legacy as a hardworking community dedicated to supporting its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the town of Conway is an important piece in Massachusetts history and I am honored to represent it. I wish them all the best as the town continues to preserve their rich history and community involvement that has been the legacy of Conway for these past 250 years.

## RECOGNIZING STEVE KAWA

**HON. JACKIE SPEIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Steve Kawa for his 25 years of service to the city and county of San Francisco. Steve Kawa is no ordinary staff member. He is an exceptional public servant who has served three mayors of San Francisco in a wide variety of positions.

Most San Franciscans have never heard Kawa's name—and he prefers it that way—but they have certainly felt the impact of his work. He helped guide the City through the aftermath of 9/11 and the Great Recession. He played a key role in achieving marriage equality and universal health care access, and he oversaw unprecedented investments in affordable housing and infrastructure projects. His bosses have called him a cautious, shrewd negotiator, a driving force behind policy decisions and one of the best Chiefs of Staff a mayor could have. His effectiveness and style have also earned him nicknames such as the enforcer, the shadow mayor, the sphinx and the man behind the curtain.

Steve Kawa was born in Dracut, Massachusetts as the fifth son out of six children of Edward and Janet Kawa and grew up in a Polish-Irish American Catholic family. Mrs. Kawa was a school bus driver. Mr. Kawa was a construction worker. Steve credits his mother with his interest in politics. She loved the Kennedys and was fascinated with the Watergate hearings. Steve grew up watching the hearings on TV and says the inner workings of government mesmerized him.

Steve was the first member of his family to attend a four-year college and graduate from Merrimack College with a bachelor's degree in political science in 1983. To pay for school he worked four jobs as a bartender at the Polish American Veterans Club, as a dishwasher in a nursing home, as a florist's delivery man and as a security guard working the night shift. While attending law school at Suffolk University, he served as a legislative aide in Boston's State House at night. He graduated in 1989.

Two years later at the age of 30, Steve traveled to San Francisco for the first time and decided to make it his home. Within a month he found his first job working as a legislative aide to Supervisor Tom Hsieh. In November 1995, Willie Brown was elected Mayor and hired Steve as liaison to the Board of Supervisors. He promoted him to Director of Legislative Affairs and then Acting Director of the Mayor's Budget Office and then Deputy Chief of Staff. The next mayor, Gavin Newsom, hired Steve as his Chief of Staff in 2003. In 2011, Mayor Ed Lee did the same and Steve remained Chief of Staff until he recently decided to retire from his career at city hall.

Steve is the ultimate public servant. He is still mesmerized with the inner workings of government, just as he was when he was watching the Watergate hearings with his

mother. He recently told the San Francisco Chronicle, "There is so much cynicism about government and politics, and when I'm here I don't see the cynicism. I just see people working really hard for other people." There is no question that Steve is one of the hardest working people working for others.

Wherever his well-deserved retirement will take Steve Kawa, I am confident he will be effective and hope he will have more time to spend with his husband Dan Henkle and their two children Michael and Katherine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to recognize an exemplary public servant who would rather stay out of the limelight and get things done. Steve Kawa's absence at San Francisco City Hall will be deeply felt, but his contributions will remain part of the fabric of our beloved city by the bay.

---

A TRIBUTE TO JACOB HITZ

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jacob

Hitz, a graduate of Creston High School in Creston, Iowa. Jacob was recently honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fifteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on April 30, 2017.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa high school was invited to select a senior with the highest academic achievement. Not only are recipients academically gifted, but the selected students are also those who have had success in extra-curricular activities and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Jacob in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize him for utilizing his talents to reach his goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating him on receiving this esteemed designation, and in wishing him nothing but the best.



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, June 23, 2017*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of grace and goodness, thank You for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing of strength and perseverance that each Member might best serve their constituents and our entire Nation.

May it be their purpose to see to the hopes of so many Americans, that they authenticate the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our Republic with the work they do.

Grant that the men and women of the people's House find the courage and wisdom to work together to forge solutions to the many needs of our Nation and ease the anxieties of so many.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HECK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### RECOGNIZING KAYLA BARRON, NASA ASTRONAUT CANDIDATE

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Kayla Barron of Richland, Washington, who was recently selected for NASA's 2017 Astronaut Candidate Class. Kayla was cho-

sen 1 of 12 from over 18,000 applicants to join just 338 people who have held the prestigious title of American astronaut.

Before applying to the NASA program, Ms. Barron attended the U.S. Naval Academy, where she received several medals and unit commendations while earning a bachelor's degree in systems engineering. She went on to earn a master's degree in nuclear engineering from the University of Cambridge. She was a member of the first class of women commissioned into the submarine community as a submarine warfare officer.

Kayla is an exemplary role model for students interested in science and technology. I commend her for her hard work, and I wish her luck in her training and her future exploration endeavors.

### BRING BIPARTISANSHIP BACK TO BORING

(Mr. HECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to tell you about a time when bipartisanship was alive and when Congress was, well, boring for most Americans. In fact, it wasn't that long ago.

It was just in March of 2015 that Democrats and Republicans fixed the Medicare payment formula and funded the Children's Health Insurance Program. I was proud to be a Member of the body that day.

Did our bipartisanship dominate the headlines?

No.

Did it get a lot of attention at town-halls?

No, of course not. Because all of us getting along was, well, boring.

But these recent Republican healthcare proposals, they are not boring. They have been developed in secrecy, they are completely partisan, and they take us backward.

I challenge my friends across the aisle, the Republicans, to join us and fix the parts of the Affordable Care Act that need fixing because the Affordable Care Act has made a real difference for millions of Americans, a positive difference. So let's get back to bipartisanship, back to boring, back to basics because that is what our constituents want most of all.

### FOCUS ON THE FAMILY 40TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of Focus on the Family, a vital American institution dedicated to preserving one of the country's most foundational pillars: the family.

While I cannot attend today's celebration in person, I am grateful that my good friend, Vice President MIKE PENCE, is in Colorado Springs to mark this wonderful occasion.

It would be impossible to fully quantify the impact Focus on the Family has had in our own Nation and across the world. Thousands of marriages have been revived, children have been lovingly disciplined, and families have been reunited and strengthened.

Perhaps most important are the 382,000 lives saved through Focus on the Family's Option Ultrasound program, which helps mothers choose life when faced with unexpected pregnancies.

Those 382,000 lives and, indeed, our entire Nation owe you a debt of gratitude. So to founder Dr. James Dobson, Jim Daly, and the staff of Focus on the Family, I say, "Well, done," and offer you my sincere congratulations.

### HONORING LUKE NEWMAN

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the life and the legacy of an outstanding resident of my community who served in World War II, which is a long time ago, but he also became an outstanding citizen, steeped in the Lutheran church, provided resources to the community where he lived and worked, so I commend Mr. Luke Newman, and I just simply say that we have enjoyed knowing him.

### HONORING THE MEMORY OF FLORIDA HIGHWAY PATROL SERGEANT WILLIAM BISHOP

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Florida Highway Patrol Master Sergeant William Bishop of Lake City. Sergeant Bishop

was killed last Saturday while working a traffic accident on I-75 in Alachua County, Florida.

Sergeant Bishop is a 30-year veteran of the Florida Highway Patrol, and he dedicated his life to law enforcement. He truly loved his patrol family. He also served in the United States Army, serving on the front lines all his life. That is a calling, not a job.

Many of Bishop's colleagues remember him as someone who exhibited compassion, honesty, and faith. He loved watching football, but his greatest love of all was his family, especially his son, Trampas.

His service and sacrifice to the State of Florida is a debt we will never be able to repay.

Please join me in honoring Florida Highway Patrol Master Sergeant William Bishop and all of our fallen heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our safety.

#### RECOGNIZING MACKENZIE GORE AS 2016-17 GATORADE NORTH CAROLINA BASEBALL PLAYER OF THE YEAR

(Mr. ROUZER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that North Carolina is home to many great student athletes that serve as community role models.

One prime example is MacKenzie Gore, who graduated from Whiteville High School this month and has been named the 2017 Gatorade North Carolina Baseball Player of the Year. Not only that, he was just recently selected third overall in the Major League Baseball draft by the San Diego Padres.

MacKenzie not only demonstrates athletic excellence, but also exemplary character and work ethic—the two primary traits necessary for great success. Very few have achieved as much as early in life. It is a culmination of years of hard work and commitment.

As with all who are in success, MacKenzie is blessed to have a big decision to make: go pro and play for the Padres or head to East Carolina University to play for the Pirates. Whatever MacKenzie decides, we are all proud of him and wish him the very best.

#### EVAN'S LAW

(Mr. TURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes out of loss, a cause arises and the lives of others are saved. I rise today to ask for my colleagues' support of a bill I introduced today, Evan's Law.

My bill would require the Department of Defense to make windows in military residential housing safe for military families and their children by

equipping housing units with fall protection and prevention devices to protect against unintentional falls by young children.

We ask our servicemembers to go into harm's way to protect our Nation and our way of life. Our servicemembers deserve to live in residential housing properly equipped with window fall prevention devices to make sure their children are safe in their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, joining me today in the balcony is Commander Jason English; his wife, Ami; and their children, Jason, Luke, Lydia, and Joshua.

Commander English and his family have been tireless advocates for residential window safety requirements in the Department of Defense. They lost their son Evan. Commander English and his family have worked to raise awareness about the danger young children face in residential housing.

I thank the English family for their hard work. I am hopeful that Evan's Law will become a part of the National Defense Authorization Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in their support.

#### ACCELERATING INDIVIDUALS INTO THE WORKFORCE ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2842.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 396 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2842.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0911

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients, with Mr. DENHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support to talk about H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are more than 6 million job openings, the highest level since the government started tracking the data in the year 2000. At the same time, the share of Americans participating in the workforce is near a four-decade low.

Moving welfare recipients into employment is a central goal of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, or TANF. Yet only half of all TANF recipients receiving cash assistance are working or preparing for work.

Some TANF recipients have a difficult time transitioning from welfare into a job, so these types of on-the-job work experiences aid in the transition. The same goes for employers who may be reluctant to hire welfare recipients with limited work experience or other barriers to working.

So the question is: How can we bridge the gap? How do we connect out-of-work Americans with all of the employers who want and need to fill job openings?

H.R. 2842, sponsored by Congressman CURBELO of Florida and Congressman DAVIS of Illinois, encourages employers to work with State and local agencies to hire TANF recipients. States would only be able to use this money to provide benefits to those who are working, providing paychecks in lieu of benefit checks, a key tenet to welfare reform.

Employers would take the lead by partnering with State and local agencies to hire TANF recipients, providing recipients with highly valued work experience and on-the-job training, including apprenticeships.

Earn-and-learn models help people become familiar with the workplace, gain needed skills, and earn a wage.

The bill reserves up to \$100 million for 1 year from the TANF Contingency Fund, which has already been extended through the end of fiscal year 2018 to subsidize up to 50 percent of a TANF recipient's wage for no more than 12 months.

Fifteen percent of the funds would be set aside for career pathway programs, which combine work, training, and other supports to help individuals enter the workforce and move up the economic ladder.

Finally, high-quality evaluations would be used to determine whether these public-private partnerships were effective in helping welfare recipients move into jobs and retain work.

There is broad support from the employer community for helping low-skilled Americans gain on-the-job experience, and there is plenty of support here and across the country for tying government assistance to work or work preparation for those who are able-bodied.

Decades of experience tells us the most effective anti-poverty program is a job. It is helping low-income Americans earn success through the dignity of work.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to stand with Mr. CURBELO in supporting this bill today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0915

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, which is better known as TANF.

This important bill modernizes the TANF Contingency Fund to promote effective job training programs, such as subsidized jobs, career pathways, and apprenticeship programs. Research is clear. Subsidized employment, career pathways, and apprenticeship programs successfully engage people in employment, especially those who have been unsuccessful in finding paid employment through their efforts.

Further research on past TANF subsidized employment programs document that these initiatives increase employment and earnings both while individuals worked in a subsidized job as well as after the program ended. Also, studies show that States operated these programs that provided tremendous benefit at very reasonable cost.

Many States used the TANF Emergency Funds to establish effective subsidized employment programs. Using these TANF Emergency Funds in Illinois, former Governor Pat Quinn implemented the very successful Put Illinois to Work program that directly created over 26,000 jobs, helping close to 5,000 employees in Illinois. Nationally, the TANF Emergency Funds created 260,000 jobs.

Good subsidized employment programs have three characteristics that make them an attractive part of TANF: they are able to increase employment quickly; they help some of the individuals who face the greatest challenges enter the workforce and stay there; and, when funded on a large scale, they can help boost local economies. For these reasons, Democrats have proposed subsidized employment within TANF for years.

My friend and colleague from Wisconsin, GWEN MOORE, initially proposed allowing subsidized employment in TANF via her RISE Act many years ago. I embraced her idea in my Responsible Fatherhood bill, and I am pleased to join with Representative CURBELO on this effort.

If we are truly committed to helping families work their way out of poverty, we will need to do much more to strengthen TANF. We will need to ensure that States actually spend TANF money on TANF recipients. We need to

improve access to education and training, critical changes that both Republican and Democratic witnesses have emphasized over and over again. We need to improve childcare so parents can actually go to work.

This bill is a good bill. It makes a small, positive step forward on our path to more comprehensive improvements to TANF. I strongly support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), the lead sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

Here in the House, we have prioritized helping Americans escape poverty, and we are working to create policies that are focused on getting individuals into jobs so they can achieve self-sufficiency.

A job is something that dignifies the human condition. It is an opportunity for every individual to make a contribution to their family, their local community, and to our country.

This bill is an innovative solution that will give more people access to that opportunity. Through proposals like H.R. 2842, we can help struggling Americans find work and get on the path to success.

This bipartisan legislation connects Americans looking for work with employers looking to fill job openings, including through apprenticeships and other forms of on-the-job training. It uses \$100 million from the TANF Contingency Fund for grants so States can conduct demonstration projects intended to assist TANF recipients in entering the workforce and maintaining employment.

Importantly, this legislation requires that States meet certain criteria to ensure they achieve their intended goal. This includes a description of how local governments will coordinate these efforts with others that assist low-income individuals.

States must also report on the outcomes of the demonstration projects and provide evaluations to determine whether such employer-led partnerships were effective.

This bill empowers States, giving them the ability to take into account their own unique challenges and design programs that meet both their employers' and job seekers' needs, rather than a top-down Washington approach.

This legislation has support from our business leaders. I include this letter of support in the RECORD.

BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE,  
Washington, DC, June 20, 2017.

Hon. CARLOS CURBELO,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. DANNY K. DAVIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CURBELO AND REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Business Roundtable appreciates your bipartisan efforts to bring more people into the workforce who currently have few skills and lack job experience. Your bill, H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, is a thoughtful approach for encouraging companies to hire recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). We are pleased to support it.

Business Roundtable CEOs believe earn-and-learn programs help people become familiar with the workplace, gain needed skills, and earn a wage. In many inner cities, the unemployment rate for young people is distressingly high, but their prospects improve dramatically if they find a first-time job.

By supporting partnerships among business, government, and education to hire TANF recipients, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act will give the unemployed an opportunity to work and succeed.

Sincerely,

WES BUSH,  
Chair, Education and  
Workforce Com-  
mittee, Business  
Roundtable; Chair-  
man, Chief Execu-  
tive Officer and  
President, Northrop  
Grumman Corpora-  
tion.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I was happy to partner with Representative DANNY DAVIS on this effort to move individuals from welfare into long-term employment, and I am proud of the work we have done together.

I would also like to thank Chairman BRADY and Subcommittee Chairman ADRIAN SMITH for their leadership and hard work, as well as Rosemary Lahasky, Anne DeCesaro, and the rest of the House Committee on Ways and Means staff who have worked on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, if I may add one thing. Last week, in the wake of the tragic shooting against Members of Congress, we all vowed to come together, to find common ground. The Committee on Ways and Means answered that call, and I am very confident that this House will do the same later today.

The American people expect us to have our differences, our disagreements, but they also expect us to find common ground; and Republicans and Democrats have done this today in favor of those who need it most, welfare recipients, needy families in our country. I am very proud to sponsor this legislation, to support it, and I would ask all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who

has worked on these issues for many, many terms and many years.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and both my colleagues, though I respectfully disagree that this Congress has placed any priority on helping get people out of poverty. Indeed, when it comes to poverty in America, this Congress has largely been silent. I think the Congress itself is impoverished when it comes to ideas about how to lift people up into the middle class.

We talk here so much about the middle class, and appropriately so, but there are millions of people out there who are struggling to just climb up that first or second rung of the economic ladder and work themselves into the middle class, and this Congress is doing little, constructively, to assist them.

The need for real and meaningful change is particularly evident in my home State of Texas, where the State legislature has been so incredibly indifferent to this problem. There, one out of every four children is below the poverty level, and over one-third of all Texans live in the shadow of poverty, meaning that their income is less than twice the poverty threshold. The Corporation for Enterprise Development ranked Texas near the bottom among all States on key measures related to financial security.

Now, here is what today's bipartisan bill does to respond to that, and it is really a story of the number one.

Of the several Republican proposals that were originally advanced by now-Speaker PAUL RYAN two years ago, some introduced by Republican colleagues and some containing good ideas, this is the one last bill standing.

With the notable exception of a budget that is devastating to opportunities for poor Americans, this is the one and only bill on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, previously known as welfare, that Republicans will even permit us to discuss on the floor of this House.

This one very modest bill does not add one new dollar to address the challenges that those who want to rise from welfare to work need. It simply segregates \$100 million from an existing fund for one year.

Now, get this: the fund from which they are segregating the \$100 million from, Donald Trump is seeking to abolish the entire fund so that no moneys for this proposal will be available after one year.

This bill gives the States no new flexibility, and no new authority. It does not authorize them to do anything that they cannot do today. Indeed, some States—and I think my colleague from Illinois referenced one of these—are already finding ways to, in appropriate situations, subsidize employment.

What this bill does is to say that on this particular \$100 million fund, as

long as it lasts, until President Trump eliminates it entirely, that the States must use the money in a particular way. In other words, it seeks to restrict the States who receive these moneys to require them to use it for one particular way to assist those who are in poverty.

It is also significant that the Trump budget cuts are so far-reaching in trying to undermine efforts to raise people out of poverty, and for those who are not able-bodied, to provide them the support that they need. This bill deals with a little less than one-half of one percent of the Trump budget cuts.

I believe, sincerely, that we need a better approach, that we have ideas on both sides of the aisle that are being blocked by a determination to not address root causes of poverty.

First, we should support initiatives that strike at the early seeds of poverty, like the Home Visiting Program that will expire in a mere three months, which helps to improve opportunities for at-risk children and helps their parents be the parents they want to be; and certainly, early childhood education is a key part of that.

Second, we should increase efforts to help people gain the skills they need to secure jobs through which they can support their families at a living wage, and that is the challenge here. Sure, some employers will love to have taxpayers subsidize their workforce, pay part of the wages that they would otherwise have to pay, and sometimes this is a valuable support, particularly for people that are reentering our society after incarceration and other groups of particularly hard-to-place employees. But for many folks, the big question is, when the subsidy ends, when the taxpayer stops paying, will there be a job there? Is there a job ladder that will allow that person to work themselves up, or are they essentially participating in minimum wage employment that will not support their family and will not provide them a future?

There are in-demand skills-training programs that do work and do offer an alternative, but they are not free. They take an investment. An example is Project QUEST in San Antonio.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, Project QUEST has an 86 percent job placement rate for its graduates, who boost their incomes, on average, from \$10,000 a year before entering the program to \$40,000 a year.

I know there are similar programs in other parts of the country that do the same. They are not subsidized employment, but they are working with poor people to get the skills that they need for an in-demand job and working with local employers to find out what types

of jobs are most needed. In many parts of America, our economy is being held back by a lack of qualified workers.

Then, one of the areas that is so important to all parents, but particularly to single moms that are in poverty, is childcare. President Trump is proposing not one, but three cuts to childcare, cutting out hundreds of millions of dollars of support to childcare, which stands in the way of many individuals from working their way out of poverty.

I believe that we need to be working together to try to find genuine solutions and that working together is not just here in this House, in Congress, because the big problem here is that, when we voted in 1996—and I voted for it, for moving from welfare to work—we expected the States to be partners in that effort. Today, as much as we talk about work and getting from welfare to work, exactly 8 cents out of every dollar being spent on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program—8 cents—goes to work supports. And not very much more than that goes to childcare, and President Trump, of course, wants to reduce that.

It is only by having a comprehensive program that is really focused on the roots of poverty and assisting those who would help themselves that the promise of that welfare law can become effective.

Unfortunately, while we did change fundamentally and end welfare as we know it, it became welfare for Republican Governors who wanted to use these Federal moneys not to assist the poor, but to assist their States fill various budget gaps. We have a great example of where block grants fail. I hope we can find ways to succeed.

□ 0930

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efforts here today of my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) working together focusing on solutions.

Mr. Chairman, we know that, this day and age, it is very easy to identify the problems and the challenges that our country faces. It is a little more difficult to come up with the solutions and bring people together. I appreciate the efforts of both sides coming together today.

I truly believe that the solutions to our challenges are out in the communities where needy families live, and we know we have many needy families across our country for various reasons. America is a big country. And when you look at the challenges that individuals might face economically, I hope that we can come together as Americans to focus on growing our economy, growing opportunity, hoping

that we see, as our number one responsibility, the need to provide for opportunity in the future.

We can't set certain and determine certain outcomes, but we can certainly measure the outcomes from our efforts here in Washington. That is why this bill, very importantly, requires States to report on outcomes through this program. We know that we need to provide more flexibility for States. This does exactly that, and, even more so, with communities.

As we do get the feedback from the States, I hope that we will heed their advice because they are the folks who are more in touch with the needs of their various communities around their jurisdictions, all 50 States.

Mr. Chairman, they are experts, and I hope that we can work together with them here, on both sides of the aisle, in Washington, but also all across America with very diverse needs for needy families.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a fierce advocate for low-income people.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member DANNY DAVIS. I rise to express support for H.R. 2842, Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

I do, again, want to thank my dear friend, Representative DAVIS, for recognizing the importance of subsidizing jobs as something that was featured in my RISE Out of Poverty bill, and I applaud this bipartisan bill as a small step in the right direction.

Now, this bill calls for a demonstration project, which would show progress toward reducing poverty in our country through a 1-year test of subsidized employment programs. But I would note, Mr. Chairman, that it certainly does not tackle the larger shortcomings of TANF, which is in desperate need of reform.

If enacted, this bill would exhibit a great start at helping TANF recipients obtain short-term employment. However, methods to retain long-term employment through higher education and childcare options for TANF recipients are still needed.

I do want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that contrary to popular notions of welfare recipients—I have been a welfare recipient myself—people on public assistance do, in fact, want to work, but they want to work at a wage that is sustainable. They want to work at a job that includes training opportunities. They want to work at jobs that provide them with a career ladder, and they, certainly, want to work at a job that will bring them out of poverty—something that will help them work in a durable, lasting fashion.

Since I have a little bit more time than I thought I was going to have, I

just want to point out that it is a little-known fact that current law under TANF actually requires welfare recipients to do unwaged work. How absurd is that? Who in this body, Mr. Chairman, would work for absolutely nothing?

I want to note that the proposed funding mechanism in H.R. 2842 does not appear in my RISE Out of Poverty bill. TANF funds are woefully inadequate already. They are pegged to a 1994 appropriations, and, certainly, this flat funding would inure to the detriment of the entire TANF program.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close if there are no more speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to, first of all, commend Mr. CURBELO for his leadership on this issue, and I certainly agree with him that we have found enough common ground to be here this morning with a bill that we can pass, but I also agree with my friend from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), that there are many shortcomings to helping individuals actually realize the potential that they have to move beyond poverty to sustainable employment so that they can have a level of living and a level of expectation which gives them the energy that they need to keep moving forward.

There are some improvements that we certainly need to make. We can allow greater education and training. Every time witnesses come before us, they always tell us that, no matter whether they are billed as Republican or Democrat, or with no political stripe. We should improve TANF for kinship caregivers. We should remove the lifetime ban on felony drug convictions. Just imagine, that these individuals will never ever have the opportunity to experience the benefits of this program, or of this effort.

We should remove the 60-month time limit during recessions, and we should remove the ban to assist unwed teen parents and other youth who are displaced.

So clearly, we do have agreement this morning, and I am delighted to be a part of it, but I certainly hope that my colleagues will look at those unmet needs that the legislation does not cover.

I urge its support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Mr. CURBELO and Mr. DAVIS for their leadership on this issue, and then colleagues from both sides coming together in a bipartisan way so that we can help more Americans get back to work.

This bill requires high-quality evaluations to determine whether these public-private partnerships are effective in helping welfare recipients move into jobs. These evidence-based results will be used to inform future policy decisions to reform our welfare system, similar to the approach taken in the mid-1990s.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on these important issues so more Americans can earn a wage and feel the dignity of work.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-22. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2842

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act".*

#### SEC. 2. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO SUPPORT SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT FOR TANF RECIPIENTS TO ENTER THE WORKFORCE.

*Section 403 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*"(c) SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to States to conduct demonstration projects, at least one of which shall fund programs that offer apprenticeships registered under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the 'National Apprenticeship Act'; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.), designed to implement and evaluate strategies that provide wage subsidies to enable low-income individuals to enter into and retain employment.*

*"(2) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall require each State that applies for a grant under this subsection to do the following:*

*"(A) Describe how wage subsidies will be provided (such as whether paid directly to the employer or the individual), the duration of the subsidies, the amount of the subsidies, the structure of the subsidies, and how employers will be recruited to participate in the subsidized employment program.*

*"(B) Describe how the State expects those participating in subsidized employment to be able to retain employment after the subsidy ends.*

*"(C) Describe how the State will coordinate subsidized employment funded under this subsection with other efforts to help low-income individuals enter work as conducted by the State.*

*"(3) USE OF FUNDS.—*

*"(A) IN GENERAL.—A State to which a grant is made under this subsection may use the grant to*

subsidize the wages of an eligible recipient for a period not exceeding 12 months, and only to the extent that the total of the funds paid under this project and any other Federal funds so used with respect to the recipient does not exceed 50 percent of the amount of the wages received by the recipient during the period.

“(B) **ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an eligible recipient is—

“(i)(I) a recipient of assistance under the State program funded under this part or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)); or

“(II) a noncustodial parent of a minor child who is receiving assistance referred to in subclause (I);

“(ii) who, at the time the subsidy begins, is unemployed; and

“(iii) whose income, at that time, is less than 200 percent of the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))).

“(4) **LIMITATIONS.**—

“(A) **NONDISPLACEMENT.**—A State to which a grant is made under this subsection shall ensure that no participant in a subsidized job program funded in whole or in part under this subsection is employed or assigned to a job under the program—

“(i) when any other individual is on layoff from the same or any substantially equivalent job; or

“(ii) if the employer has terminated the employment of any regular employee or otherwise caused an involuntary reduction of its workforce in order to fill the vacancy so created with an adult described in paragraph (1).

“(B) **GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE.**—A State with a program funded under this subsection shall establish and maintain a grievance procedure for resolving complaints of alleged violations of subparagraph (A).

“(C) **NO PREEMPTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall preempt or supersede any provision of State or local law that provides greater protection for employees from displacement.

“(5) **REPORTS.**—As a condition of receiving funds under this subsection for a fiscal year, a State shall submit to the Secretary, within 6 months after the end of the fiscal year, a report that—

“(A) specifies, for each month of the fiscal year, the number of individuals whose employment is subsidized with these funds;

“(B) describes the structure of the State activities to use the funds to subsidize employment, including the amount and duration of the subsidies provided;

“(C) specifies the percentage of eligible recipients who received a subsidy who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the subsidy ended;

“(D) specifies the percentage of eligible recipients who received a subsidy who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after the subsidy ended; and

“(E) specifies the median earnings of eligible recipients who received a subsidy who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the subsidy ended.

“(6) **EVALUATION.**—The Secretary, in consultation with each State conducting a demonstration project, shall conduct a high-quality evaluation of the demonstration project, and may reserve funds made available under this subsection to conduct the evaluation in accordance with the following:

“(A) **EVALUATOR QUALIFICATIONS.**—The Secretary may not enter into a contract with an evaluator unless the evaluator has demonstrated experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of

program effectiveness including, where available and appropriate, well-implemented randomized controlled trials.

“(B) **METHODOLOGIES TO BE USED.**—The evaluation of a demonstration project shall use experimental designs using random assignment or other reliable, evidence-based research methodologies that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences when random assignment is not feasible.

“(C) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.**—The Secretary shall publish the results of the evaluation on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a location easily accessible by the public.

“(7) **RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall submit recommendations to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on how to increase the employment, retention, and advancement of individuals currently or formerly receiving assistance under a State program funded under this part or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)).

“(8) **FUNDING.**—Of the amounts made available to carry out subsection (b) for fiscal year 2018, the Secretary shall reserve \$100,000,000 to carry out this subsection.

“(9) **USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR CAREER PATHWAY PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary shall use 15 percent of the amounts reserved to carry out this subsection, to fund programs that offer career pathway (as defined in section 3(7) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) services.

“(10) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Funds provided to a State under this subsection in a fiscal year shall be expended by the State in the fiscal year or in the succeeding fiscal year.”.

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-187. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-187.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 2, before the period, insert the following: “in an in-demand industry sector or occupation identified by the appropriate State or local workforce development board”.

Page 5, after line 13, insert the following:

“(C) describes the State’s policies in effect during the fiscal year—

“(i) to ensure nondisplacement as required under paragraph (4)(A); and

“(ii) to implement grievance procedures as required in (4)(B), including information on the number of grievance claims filed in the

preceding fiscal year and the aggregate results of those claims;”.

Page 5, line 14, redesignate subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D).

Page 5, line 18, redesignate subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E).

Page 5, line 22, redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 396, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to H.R. 2842, Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, would make two changes to the bill. The first part of the amendment would encourage the demonstration projects created under this bill to direct beneficiaries toward jobs in an in-demand industry sector or occupation, as identified by workforce boards in their States and local communities.

Today, in this country, there are approximately 6 million jobs that remain unfilled because they require technical skills and knowledge related specifically to an industry or occupation. If we want to help participants move from government assistance and hold a job, then we must set them on a path toward jobs and industries that are currently, and will remain, competitive in the evolving 21st century economy.

The second part of my amendment would include in the reports from States that establish these demonstration projects information about their efforts to ensure nondisplacement of workers and to address grievance claims. Congress’ future decisions related to similar programs will be enhanced by having access to this information and data reported from the States.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would further strengthen the protections against displacement of current employees. I think it is a goal that we all share to make sure that this bill expands employment, rather than just changing who is employed.

I plan to support the gentlewoman’s amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, as our economy continues to recover and evolve, it is critical that job seekers have the resources needed to gain the skills they need to compete for in-demand jobs. That was the aim of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity



Act that we passed in 2014, and my amendment encourages State agencies to coordinate with their workforce boards to continue these efforts.

My amendment also would improve the information participating States submit about their demonstration projects, providing important data for decisionmakers in the future. I thank my colleagues for their consideration and ask for their support of this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOOX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BOST

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-187.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after "individuals", insert "  
", including individuals displaced or relocated from a public housing authority to an alternative public housing facility or placed on rental assistance."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 396, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 0945

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to provide relief to the people of Cairo, Illinois, and other communities across the country who have fallen victim to corruption in their local housing authorities.

Last year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development took control of Alexander County Housing Authority in my district after decades of fraud and mismanagement. Many of Cairo's public housing units were falling apart, rating somewhere between dangerous and unlivable. All the while, the housing authority's senior staff continued to cash in: excessive pay, great benefits, large pension payouts, and big consulting contracts for former executive directors. All of this was paid for with taxpayers' money.

An investigation by The Southern Illinoisan newspaper found local residents coping with leaking roofs, moldy living facilities, broken heating and air conditioning, rats, and cockroaches—unbelievable living conditions.

This didn't happen overnight. It happened after many years of neglect. The situation is so bad that the worst housing units in Cairo are being destroyed, and families are being required to move.

Sadly, Cairo's story is not unique. Similar stories of mismanagement and fraud have occurred in housing authorities across the country. While I continue to fight for families in Cairo, we must work to help those who have been relocated at no fault of their own.

My amendment would require the State applications include plans to help these families transition to their new communities and find work. This will be an important step forward for Americans already fighting to stay on their feet.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I want to say to everyone, if they can, to support this amendment.

I want everyone to know also that it is my hope that both State and Federal authorities pursue, in this particular case, those who have abused the system, that they prosecute them, and that they are put in situations where they are in prison, because there they will receive better housing conditions than what they left these people with.

Now, this amendment deals with the fact of allowing them the opportunity to work and to step them up into a better life. But I hope and I pray that the people who are responsible for Cairo and all these other facilities will be prosecuted to the full extent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-187.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert the following:

"(D) Describe how the State will coordinate subsidized employment funded under this subsection with the Federal Work-Study Program, career pathway (as defined in section 3(7) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) services, and other Federal programs to help low-income individuals complete education and training programs and enter the workforce."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 396, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering with my colleague, Representative SUSAN DAVIS, strengthens coordination between subsidized employment through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF, program, other Federal workforce development programs, and the Federal Work-Study program.

The goal of the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act is to help

low-income individuals gain the experience and skills necessary for long-term success in the workforce and access to family-sustaining wages. Yet studies of the long-term effects on unemployment from short-term, subsidized employment programs demonstrate differing outcomes, which is why I commend my colleagues for including robust reporting and evaluation requirements in the underlying bill.

We already know that other efforts have clear long-term benefits. Adults who attain postsecondary credentials and degrees are much more likely to be employed and much less likely to rely on public assistance. For example, about 90 percent of young adults who earn a bachelor's degree are employed. The employment rate for those who don't complete high school is just 48 percent. Not surprisingly, the vast majority—approximately 93 percent—of TANF recipients did not attain education beyond high school.

Helping more low-income adults complete postsecondary credential programs and degrees is a proven strategy for reducing reliance on public assistance and promoting self-sufficient households. This is a bipartisan goal.

Our amendment advances this goal by helping to give more low-income parents high-quality work opportunities while enrolled in postsecondary programs. Currently, the Federal Work-Study program provides part-time jobs to students. Studies show that those students who are lucky enough to get a Federal Work-Study job have higher completion rates and are more likely to work in a position that aligns with their program of study.

Unfortunately, Federal Work-Study alone cannot meet the demand for connecting low-income students with valuable, work-based learning opportunities. In fact, only about 2 percent of community college students participate in Federal Work-Study.

The subsidized employment program authorized in the bill we are debating today could help address this unmet need and target additional support to low-income student parents, helping them attain a credential or degree and vastly improving their long-term employment prospects.

Administering the subsidized employment program in conjunction with the Federal Work-Study program requires coordination among State agencies and higher education institutions. My amendment encourages this coordination, and I encourage Members to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.



There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. It requires States to coordinate efforts under this bill with other Federal programs designed to help low-income individuals obtain the necessary skills to enter employment and climb the economic ladder.

Our Federal welfare system is large, fragmented, and growing in cost. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service estimates that we currently operate over 80 programs that provide food, housing, healthcare, job training, education, energy assistance, and cash to low-income Americans. Reducing bureaucracy and streamlining a State's administration of employment and training services to low-income Americans is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well as supporting the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, a number of State programs leverage Federal Work-Study funds to help TANF recipients who are enrolled in community college programs meet work requirements and get real-world experience in jobs that reinforce what they are studying.

Additionally, the Government Accountability Office has recommended improving coordination between employment and training programs, and the Department of Health and Human Services guidelines on helping TANF recipients succeed in career pathways makes recommendations for using the Federal Work-Study program in conjunction with TANF to boost the attainment of industry-recognized credentials.

There is precedent and widespread support for improving the coordination of programs that help low-income individuals gain work experience to subsidize employment. Again, our amendment does not require States to devote funds from TANF-subsidized employment programs to low-income student parents, but it does ask States to consider how they are using subsidized employment—whether through TANF or Federal Work-Study—in concert to give more people the opportunity to earn a higher education degree or credential and, thereby, a significantly improved chance at finding a long-term, living-wage job.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chair, I am proud to support this amendment which would align the TANF program and the federal work study program.

TANF, or the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, was created to help struggling families become self sufficient.

We know that the best way to achieve this goal is to give people the resources they need to find quality jobs.

This amendment would allow states to align employment efforts by coordinating with schools to help more students access work-study opportunities.

And we know that these students are not the 18 year olds of decades past—they are older students with children, dependent parents, and more financial responsibilities.

Helping these students elevates entire families; helping these families elevates entire communities.

I hope we can come together to support this amendment and support more working Americans.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-187.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 9, before the semicolon, insert "and the percentage of such individuals whose employment is in an area that matches their previous training and work experience".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 396, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of my bipartisan amendment. I would like to thank my good friend, Congressman LLOYD SMUCKER of Pennsylvania, for helping me to introduce this amendment.

Right now what is being taught in classes doesn't necessarily align with what is needed to get a job. Yesterday, the House passed a bipartisan bill unanimously that would make sure that there is stronger alignment and collaboration between career and technical education programs and the employers that will be hiring.

Our amendment would require that States report the percentage of subsidized individuals whose jobs match their previous experience. Incentivizing States that opt into this pilot program expands on yesterday's bill to ensure that resources are being used as efficiently as possible by guiding students towards the jobs they were trained for.

Mr. Chairman, I hope everybody will support passage of our amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. This amendment provides further information to ensure we have high-quality evaluations requiring States to measure how many recipients entered employment in the same field they received on-the-job training. The more we know about how these programs work and their return on our investments is important when we make decisions down the road.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment as well as the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support.

I urge all Members to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-187.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 21, strike "and".

Page 5, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 5, after line 25, insert the following:

(F) specifies the number of eligible recipients who received a subsidy who concurrently received other Federal or State means-tested benefits during their subsidized employment.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 396, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that, if enacted, would provide additional data on the performance and effectiveness of the programs created under H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

In particular, my amendment would require States to include in their annual reports to the Health and Human

Services Department whether individuals who participated in this demonstration project still need additional forms of Federal or State assistance after the fact. The data point really shows whether they are truly independent of the safety net.

The most meaningful solution to poverty is a job. I believe the data point outlined in my amendment will further help Congress measure the performance of this program in the scope that should apply to all of our Nation's welfare programs: placing people into meaningful work and helping them and their families achieve self-sufficiency. We need this data to ensure the project is truly working.

When I worked in manufacturing, data was a vital component to solving problems. It showed me what worked best, what failed, and, most importantly, what needed to be changed and how to get to the root cause. The same science applies to solving problems here and to this program.

Too often we measure the success of our safety net programs based on dollars spent rather than effectiveness. Fixing our welfare system is a sentiment shared by both sides of the aisle. This is a bipartisan bill, and I believe this legislation is a great step forward.

Additionally, my office has been working on another bill, the Welfare BRAC Act, which would create a bipartisan commission to review the 90-plus means-tested programs that spent nearly \$850 billion a year. I hope one day to have a vote on that bill just as we are having one on this today.

We need more deeds and not just words. This bill is a great step forward to solving the problem. There is widespread agreement on both sides of the aisle that our safety net is not accomplishing all it needs to. If enacted, my amendment would help us here in Congress identify new methods to help our Nation's most vulnerable by getting them into the workplace.

□ 1000

It is crucial that everyone has an equal opportunity to engage in our communities and contribute by earning financial independence through the dignity of work.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require States to collect and report information on whether participants were receiving income-related assistance like health insurance; child care assistance; school lunch; or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, benefits; rental subsidies; or

perhaps even the earned income tax credit.

The information the amendment requests is not relevant to what we are trying to learn from these demonstration projects, which is whether different approaches improve earnings and employment. Asking for it is an invasion of the privacy of the individuals, with no research benefit.

Collecting this information also seems burdensome for States, and would likely require them to ask participating employers to ask their employees inappropriate personal questions that they would not ask of any other employee.

Most importantly, I am concerned that requiring States to collect information on these important work supports would make some States think that they are supposed to discourage participants from accessing these supports.

Both research and common sense clearly tell us that access to supports like child care assistance, healthcare, and wage supplements that pay for transportation and other work expenses make it more likely that individuals will succeed in work. We should do nothing that might discourage States from providing these supports to help workers succeed. We should do nothing that might cause individuals to not make use of what is available to them.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. DAVIDSON for his efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I hope that we can evaluate all of the programs that we have, coordinate among them, learn more about their effectiveness, and ultimately respect folks in need and do all we can that is appropriate to help lift themselves out of poverty.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this.

Sunlight brings truth. Truth will set you free. My hope is truth will set folks free from the trap that many people find in multigenerational poverty. We really, truly want to help solve the problem and get the information that will help us make our systems work effectively.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. KHANNA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-187.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 4, after "project," insert "including an analysis of the project's effect on eligible recipients who received additional credentialing and training during their subsidized employment or participation in an apprenticeship or career pathways program."

Page 7, line 10, insert at the end the following: "Such recommendations shall include recommendations on the effects of additional credentialing and training provided during subsidized employment or participation in an apprenticeship or career pathways program."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 396, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act. I would like to thank the sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

This bipartisan bill will assist low-income individuals by helping some of our most needy Americans to enter the workforce and maintain their employment. I believe one of the top priorities for Congress is to help our middle class by creating wealth in the middle class and to help the wages of the 50 percent of Americans who haven't had a wage raise since 1980.

For far too long, many Americans have seen falling incomes, which have left working families behind. My amendment is simple. It adds a requirements for the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to measure the effect that training and credentialing has on the recipients helped by this bill.

The public report and recommendations to Congress are already mandated by the original bill. This amendment will not affect the overall cost.

There is a body of research demonstrating that providing education and training to TANF recipients makes people more likely to obtain good jobs and increase their wages. They are more likely to stay employed.

The projects funded by this bill provide a great opportunity to add to this research so we can know how to better assist TANF recipients and other unemployed workers.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Washington, (Ms.

DELBENE), for her amendment to the bill during markup by the Committee on Ways and Means. That amendment requires that at least one of the employment demonstration projects must be an apprenticeship program.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment that seeks to add information that can be used to modernize our job training, credentialing, and apprenticeship program to match those seeking employment with our current job openings.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

This amendment simply requires that the high-quality evaluations include measurements or how many recipients participated in an apprentice or career pathway program, and any credentials earned along the way.

Earn-and-learn models—those where an individual is getting on-the-job experience, earning a wage, and learning new occupational skills—are one of the best types of workforce development models the government can support. Apprenticeships, in particular, provide a combination of occupational on-the-job training and related instruction, helping to improve worker training and address critical skill gaps that align with the needs of industry.

We know that the best way out of poverty is through work, and apprenticeships provide a pathway to obtaining a successful career.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well as the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-187.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 10, after the period, insert the following: "Such recommendations shall include recommendations on how to address employment-related challenges in rural areas and among members of federally recognized Indian tribes."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 396, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am here this morning to talk about the biggest thing on the minds of the folks that I represent: jobs.

I am glad that we are having a discussion today about how to help people land a job that they can be proud of.

Whether I am at a VFW or a county fair, in a lot of the parts of the region that I represent, this is the concern that I hear more than anything else.

Today's bill would help people who are looking for work acquire skills that help them land a bigger paycheck and a better career. I am glad to offer an amendment with a fellow member of the Bipartisan Working Group, Representative VALADAO, to make sure that the bill that is passed does some good for rural communities and for our tribal partners as well.

I know firsthand the challenges that small towns across America are facing. I grew up in a timber town in Washington State and watched some of the parents of my friends and some of my neighbors lose their jobs as mills shut down. These men and women are the hardworking Americans that want work, want training, and want careers. In short, they want a shot at a better life.

That is what this bill will do. I commend Mr. CURBELO and Mr. DAVIS for bringing it forward. With our amendment, we can make sure that shot is extended to all communities, no matter their ZIP Code.

Our amendment directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to take a look at how to address employment challenges in rural areas and those challenges facing members of federally recognized Native American Tribes. It directs the Secretary then to provide recommendations to Congress on what fixes actually work best.

When it comes to providing the training to get folks into quality jobs, we want to make sure that we are not flying blind. Our amendment makes sure that we have all the information we need to make the right decisions and give folks who want a quality job a shot at that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

The first hearing I held as chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources was on the geography of poverty. People often think of poverty only as they see it in cities, not realizing poverty today is more common than ever in suburban and even rural areas.

People also underestimate poverty in rural and remote areas, not knowing the rates of poverty in these areas have, for decades, been higher than in urban areas.

This amendment ensures the Secretary takes into account rural areas and Indian Tribes when making recommendations on how to address employment-related challenges.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well as support the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support. And, again, I thank Representatives CURBELO and DAVIS for their work on the underlying bill, and the cooperation of Mr. VALADAO for working to address this challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-187 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 380, noes 32, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—380

|          |           |          |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Abraham  | Allen     | Barletta |
| Adams    | Amodei    | Barragan |
| Aderholt | Arrington | Bass     |
| Aguilar  | Bacon     | Beatty   |

|                   |                 |                     |                                          |               |                |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Bera              | Eshoo           | Levin               | Royce (CA)                               | Slaughter     | Vargas         |
| Bergman           | Espallat        | Lewis (GA)          | Ruiz                                     | Smith (MO)    | Veasey         |
| Beyer             | Estes (KS)      | Lewis (MN)          | Ruppersberger                            | Smith (NE)    | Vela           |
| Bilirakis         | Esty (CT)       | Lipinski            | Rush                                     | Smith (NJ)    | Velázquez      |
| Bishop (GA)       | Evans           | LoBiondo            | Russell                                  | Smith (TX)    | Visclosky      |
| Bishop (MI)       | Faso            | Loebsack            | Rutherford                               | Smith (WA)    | Wagner         |
| Black             | Ferguson        | Lofgren             | Ryan (OH)                                | Smucker       | Walberg        |
| Blackburn         | Fitzpatrick     | Loudermilk          | Sánchez                                  | Soto          | Walden         |
| Blum              | Fleischmann     | Love                | Sanford                                  | Stefanik      | Walker         |
| Blumenauer        | Flores          | Lowenthal           | Sarbanes                                 | Stewart       | Walorski       |
| Blunt Rochester   | Fortenberry     | Lowe                | Schakowsky                               | Stivers       | Walters, Mimi  |
| Bonamici          | Foster          | Lucas               | Schiff                                   | Suozzi        | Walz           |
| Bost              | Fox             | Luetkemeyer         | Schneider                                | Swalwell (CA) | Waters, Maxine |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Frankel (FL)    | Lujan Grisham, M.   | Schrader                                 | Takano        | Watson Coleman |
| Brady (PA)        | Frelinghuysen   | Luján, Ben Ray      | Schweikert                               | Taylor        | Webster (FL)   |
| Brady (TX)        | Fudge           | Lynch               | Scott (VA)                               | Tenney        | Welch          |
| Brooks (IN)       | Gallago         | MacArthur           | Scott, Austin                            | Thompson (CA) | Wenstrup       |
| Brown (MD)        | Garamendi       | Maloney, Carolyn B. | Scott, David                             | Thompson (MS) | Westerman      |
| Brownley (CA)     | Gianforte       | Maloney, Sean       | Sensenbrenner                            | Thompson (PA) | Williams       |
| Buchanan          | Gibbs           | Malone, Sean        | Serrano                                  | Thornberry    | Wilson (FL)    |
| Buck              | Gonzalez (TX)   | Marino              | Sessions                                 | Tipton        | Wilson (SC)    |
| Bucshon           | Goodlatte       | Marshall            | Sewell (AL)                              | Titus         | Womack         |
| Budd              | Gottheimer      | Mast                | Shea-Porter                              | Tonko         | Woodall        |
| Bustos            | Gowdy           | Matsui              | Sherman                                  | Torres        | Yarmuth        |
| Butterfield       | Granger         | McCarthy            | Shimkus                                  | Trott         | Yoder          |
| Byrne             | Graves (LA)     | McCaull             | Shuster                                  | Tsongas       | Young (AK)     |
| Calvert           | Graves (MO)     | McClintock          | Simpson                                  | Turner        | Young (IA)     |
| Capuano           | Green, Al       | McCollum            | Sinema                                   | Upton         | Zeldin         |
| Carbajal          | Green, Gene     | McEachin            | Sires                                    | Valadao       |                |
| Cárdenas          | Griffith        | McGovern            |                                          | NOES—32       |                |
| Carson (IN)       | Grijalva        | McHenry             | Amash                                    | Duncan (SC)   | Messer         |
| Carter (GA)       | Grothman        | McKinley            | Babin                                    | Farenthold    | Olson          |
| Carter (TX)       | Guthrie         | McMorris            | Banks (IN)                               | Gaetz         | Palazzo        |
| Cartwright        | Gutiérrez       | Rodgers             | Barr                                     | Gallagher     | Pearce         |
| Castor (FL)       | Hanabusa        | McNerney            | Barton                                   | Gohmert       | Perry          |
| Castro (TX)       | Harper          | McSally             | Biggs                                    | Graves (GA)   | Poe (TX)       |
| Chabot            | Hartzler        | Meadows             | Bishop (UT)                              | Harris        | Posey          |
| Chaffetz          | Hastings        | Meehan              | Brat                                     | Jones         | Weber (TX)     |
| Cheney            | Heck            | Meeks               | Brooks (AL)                              | Kelly (MS)    | Wittman        |
| Chu, Judy         | Hensarling      | Meng                | Burgess                                  | Marchant      | Yoho           |
| Cicilline         | Herrera Beutler | Mitchell            | DesJarlais                               | Massie        |                |
| Clark (MA)        | Hice, Jody B.   | Mooleenaar          |                                          | NOT VOTING—19 |                |
| Clarke (NY)       | Higgins (LA)    | Mooney (WV)         |                                          |               |                |
| Clay              | Higgins (NY)    | Moore               | Bridenstine                              | LaMalfa       | Richmond       |
| Cleaver           | Hill            | Moulton             | Cummings                                 | Larsen (WA)   | Scalise        |
| Clyburn           | Himes           | Mullin              | Engel                                    | Lieu, Ted     | Speier         |
| Coffman           | Holding         | Murphy (FL)         | Gabbard                                  | Long          | Tiberi         |
| Cohen             | Hollingsworth   | Murphy (PA)         | Garrett                                  | Napolitano    | Wasserman      |
| Cole              | Hoyer           | Nadler              | Gosar                                    | Pelosi        | Schultz        |
| Collins (GA)      | Hudson          | Neal                | Johnson, Sam                             | Renacci       |                |
| Collins (NY)      | Huffman         | Newhouse            |                                          | □ 1042        |                |
| Comer             | Huizenga        | Noem                |                                          |               |                |
| Comstock          | Hultgren        | Nolan               | Messrs. BURGESS, WITTMAN,                |               |                |
| Conaway           | Hunter          | Norcross            | POSEY, and PERRY changed their           |               |                |
| Connolly          | Hurd            | Nunes               | vote from “aye” to “no.”                 |               |                |
| Conyers           | Issa            | O'Halleran          | Messrs. WOODALL, REED, ROKITA,           |               |                |
| Cook              | Jackson Lee     | O'Rourke            | and LAMBORN changed their vote           |               |                |
| Cooper            | Jayapal         | Pallone             | from “no” to “aye.”                      |               |                |
| Correa            | Jeffries        | Palmer              | So the amendment was agreed to.          |               |                |
| Costa             | Jenkins (KS)    | Panetta             | The result of the vote was announced     |               |                |
| Costello (PA)     | Jenkins (WV)    | Pascarell           | as above recorded.                       |               |                |
| Courtney          | Johnson (GA)    | Paulsen             | Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair-        |               |                |
| Cramer            | Johnson (LA)    | Payne               | man, I move that the Committee do        |               |                |
| Crawford          | Johnson (OH)    | Perlmutter          | now rise.                                |               |                |
| Crist             | Johnson, E. B.  | Peters              | The motion was agreed to.                |               |                |
| Crowley           | Jordan          | Peterson            | Accordingly, the Committee rose;         |               |                |
| Cuellar           | Joyce (OH)      | Pingree             | and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FER-    |               |                |
| Culberson         | Kaptur          | Pittenger           | GUSON) having assumed the chair, Mr.     |               |                |
| Curbelo (FL)      | Katko           | Pocan               | MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Com-       |               |                |
| Davidson          | Keating         | Poliquin            | mittee of the Whole House on the state   |               |                |
| Davis (CA)        | Kelly (IL)      | Polis               | of the Union, reported that that Com-    |               |                |
| Davis, Danny      | Kelly (PA)      | Price (NC)          | mittee, having had under consideration   |               |                |
| Davis, Rodney     | Kennedy         | Quigley             | the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the  |               |                |
| DeFazio           | Khanna          | Raskin              | conduct of demonstration projects to     |               |                |
| DeGette           | Kihuen          | Ratcliffe           | test the effectiveness of subsidized em- |               |                |
| Delaney           | Kildee          | Reed                | ployment for TANF recipients, had        |               |                |
| DeLauro           | Kilmer          | Reichert            | come to no resolution thereon.           |               |                |
| DeBene            | Kind            | Rice (NY)           |                                          |               |                |
| Demings           | King (IA)       | Rice (SC)           |                                          |               |                |
| Denham            | King (NY)       | Roby                |                                          |               |                |
| Dent              | Kinziger        | Roe (TN)            |                                          |               |                |
| DeSantis          | Knight          | Rogers (AL)         |                                          |               |                |
| DeSaulnier        | Krishnamoorthi  | Rogers (KY)         |                                          |               |                |
| Deutch            | Kuster (NH)     | Rohrabacher         |                                          |               |                |
| Diaz-Balart       | Kustoff (TN)    | Rokita              |                                          |               |                |
| Dingell           | Labrador        | Rooney, Francis     |                                          |               |                |
| Doggett           | LaHood          | Rooney, Thomas J.   |                                          |               |                |
| Donovan           | Lamborn         | Ros-Lehtinen        |                                          |               |                |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Lance           | Rosen               |                                          |               |                |
| Duffy             | Langevin        | Roskam              |                                          |               |                |
| Duncan (TN)       | Larson (CT)     | Ross                |                                          |               |                |
| Dunn              | Latta           | Rothfus             |                                          |               |                |
| Ellison           | Lawrence        | Rouzer              |                                          |               |                |
| Emmer             | Lawson (FL)     | Roybal-Allard       |                                          |               |                |
|                   | Lee             |                     |                                          |               |                |

of proper parliamentary practice that are so essential in maintaining order and deliberacy here in the House. The Chair wishes to emphasize these points:

Members should refrain from trafficking in the well when another, including the presiding officer, is addressing the House.

Members should wear appropriate business attire during all sittings of the House, however brief their appearance on the floor may be.

Members must refrain from engaging in still photography or audio or video recording or streaming in the Chamber. Members violating this rule may be subject to fine.

Members should address their remarks in debate to the presiding officer and not to others in the second person or to some perceived viewing audience.

The Chair wishes to stress efforts to reduce voting times.

As a reminder, Members should attempt to come to the floor within the 15-minute period as prescribed by the first ringing of the bells. As a point of courtesy to each of your colleagues, voting within the allotted time would help with the maintenance of this institution. Members are further reminded that the policy is to not terminate the vote when a Member is in the well attempting to cast a vote but that other efforts to hold the vote open are not similarly protected.

Following these basic standards of practice will foster an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect. It will ensure against personal confrontation among individual Members or between Members and the presiding officer. It will facilitate Members' comprehension of, and participation in, the business of the House. In sum, it will ensure the comity that elevates spirited deliberations above mere argument.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to these matters.

#### ACCELERATING INDIVIDUALS INTO THE WORKFORCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 396 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2842.

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1048

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients, with Mr. MITCHELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to reiterate the announcement of February 25, 2015, concerning floor practice.

Members should periodically rededicate themselves to the core principles

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 4 printed in the House Report 115-187 offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 147, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

#### AYES—264

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Abraham       | Curbelo (FL)    | Issa         |
| Aderholt      | Davidson        | Jenkins (KS) |
| Allen         | Davis, Rodney   | Jenkins (WV) |
| Amodei        | Denham          | Johnson (LA) |
| Arrington     | Dent            | Johnson (OH) |
| Babin         | DeSantis        | Jones        |
| Bacon         | DesJarlais      | Jordan       |
| Banks (IN)    | Diaz-Balart     | Joyce (OH)   |
| Barletta      | Donovan         | Katko        |
| Barr          | Duffy           | Kelly (MS)   |
| Barton        | Duncan (SC)     | Kelly (PA)   |
| Bera          | Duncan (TN)     | Kihuen       |
| Bergman       | Emmer           | Kilmer       |
| Beyer         | Estes (KS)      | Kind         |
| Biggs         | Esty (CT)       | King (IA)    |
| Bilirakis     | Evans           | King (NY)    |
| Bishop (MI)   | Farenthold      | Kinzinger    |
| Black         | Faso            | Knight       |
| Blackburn     | Ferguson        | Kuster (NH)  |
| Blum          | Flitzpatrick    | Kustoff (TN) |
| Bost          | Fleischmann     | Labrador     |
| Brady (TX)    | Flores          | LaHood       |
| Brat          | Fortenberry     | Lamborn      |
| Brooks (AL)   | Fox             | Lance        |
| Brooks (IN)   | Franks (AZ)     | Latta        |
| Brownley (CA) | Frelinghuysen   | Lawson (FL)  |
| Buchanan      | Gianforte       | Lewis (MN)   |
| Buck          | Gibbs           | Lipinski     |
| Bucshon       | Goodlatte       | LoBiondo     |
| Budd          | Gottheimer      | Loebsack     |
| Burgess       | Gowdy           | Loudermilk   |
| Bustos        | Granger         | Love         |
| Byrne         | Graves (GA)     | Lucas        |
| Calvert       | Graves (LA)     | Luetkemeyer  |
| Carter (GA)   | Graves (MO)     | MacArthur    |
| Carter (TX)   | Green, Gene     | Marchant     |
| Chabot        | Griffith        | Marino       |
| Chaffetz      | Grothman        | Marshall     |
| Cheney        | Guthrie         | Massie       |
| Coffman       | Harper          | Mast         |
| Cole          | Harris          | McCarthy     |
| Collins (GA)  | Hartzler        | McCaul       |
| Collins (NY)  | Hensarling      | McClintock   |
| Comer         | Herrera Beutler | McHenry      |
| Comstock      | Hice, Jody B.   | McKinley     |
| Conaway       | Higgins (LA)    | McMorris     |
| Cook          | Hill            | Rodgers      |
| Cooper        | Himes           | McNerney     |
| Costa         | Holding         | McSally      |
| Costello (PA) | Hollingsworth   | Meadows      |
| Cramer        | Hudson          | Meehan       |
| Crawford      | Huizenga        | Messer       |
| Crist         | Hultgren        | Mitchell     |
| Crowley       | Hunter          | Moolenaar    |
| Cuellar       | Hurd            | Mooney (WV)  |
| Culberson     |                 | Moulton      |

|                 |
|-----------------|
| Mullin          |
| Murphy (FL)     |
| Murphy (PA)     |
| Newhouse        |
| Noem            |
| Nunes           |
| O'Halleran      |
| O'Rourke        |
| Olson           |
| Palazzo         |
| Palmer          |
| Panetta         |
| Paulsen         |
| Pearce          |
| Perry           |
| Peters          |
| Peterson        |
| Pittenger       |
| Poe (TX)        |
| Poliquin        |
| Posey           |
| Ratcliffe       |
| Reed            |
| Reichert        |
| Rice (SC)       |
| Roby            |
| Roe (TN)        |
| Rogers (AL)     |
| Rogers (KY)     |
| Rohrabacher     |
| Rokita          |
| Rooney, Francis |

|                   |
|-------------------|
| Adams             |
| Aguilar           |
| Amash             |
| Barragán          |
| Bass              |
| Beatty            |
| Bishop (GA)       |
| Blumenauer        |
| Blunt Rochester   |
| Bonamici          |
| Boyle, Brendan F. |
| Brady (PA)        |
| Brown (MD)        |
| Butterfield       |
| Capuano           |
| Carbajal          |
| Cárdenas          |
| Carson (IN)       |
| Cartwright        |
| Castor (FL)       |
| Castro (TX)       |
| Chu, Judy         |
| Cicilline         |
| Clark (MA)        |
| Clarke (NY)       |
| Clay              |
| Cleaver           |
| Clyburn           |
| Cohen             |
| Connolly          |
| Conyers           |
| Correa            |
| Courtney          |
| Davis (CA)        |
| Davis, Danny      |
| DeFazio           |
| DeGette           |
| Delaney           |
| DeLauro           |
| DeBene            |
| Demings           |
| DeSaulnier        |
| Deutch            |
| Dingell           |
| Doggett           |
| Doyle, Michael F. |
| Ellison           |
| Eshoo             |
| Españolat         |

|             |
|-------------|
| Bishop (UT) |
| Bridenstine |
| Cummings    |
| Engel       |
| Gabbard     |
| Garrett     |
| Gosar       |

|                   |
|-------------------|
| Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Ros-Lehtinen      |
| Rosen             |
| Roskam            |
| Ross              |
| Rothfus           |
| Rouzer            |
| Royce (CA)        |
| Russell           |
| Rutherford        |
| Sanford           |
| Sarbanes          |
| Schneider         |
| Schrader          |
| Schweikert        |
| Scott, Austin     |
| Scott, David      |
| Sensenbrenner     |
| Sessions          |
| Shea-Porter       |
| Shimkus           |
| Shuster           |
| Simpson           |
| Sinema            |
| Smith (MO)        |
| Smith (NE)        |
| Smith (NJ)        |
| Smith (TX)        |
| Smucker           |
| Soto              |
| Stefanik          |
| Stewart           |

#### NOES—147

|                   |
|-------------------|
| Foster            |
| Frankel (FL)      |
| Fudge             |
| Gaetz             |
| Gallagher         |
| Galleo            |
| Garamendi         |
| Gohmert           |
| Gonzalez (TX)     |
| Green, Al         |
| Grijalva          |
| Gutiérrez         |
| Hanabusa          |
| Hastings          |
| Heck              |
| Higgins (NY)      |
| Hoyer             |
| Huffman           |
| Jackson Lee       |
| Jayapal           |
| Jeffries          |
| Johnson (GA)      |
| Johnson, E. B.    |
| Kaptur            |
| Keating           |
| Kelly (IL)        |
| Kennedy           |
| Khanna            |
| Kildee            |
| Krishnamoorthi    |
| Langevin          |
| Larson (CT)       |
| Lawrence          |
| Lee               |
| Levin             |
| Lewis (GA)        |
| Lofgren           |
| Lowenthal         |
| Lowe              |
| Lujan Grisham, M. |
| Luján, Ben Ray    |
| Lynch             |
| Maloney           |
| Carolyn B.        |
| Maloney, Sean     |
| Matsui            |
| McCollum          |
| McEachin          |
| McGovern          |
| Meeks             |

#### NOT VOTING—20

|              |
|--------------|
| Johnson, Sam |
| LaMalfa      |
| Larsen (WA)  |
| Lieu, Ted    |
| Long         |
| Napolitano   |
| Neal         |

|               |
|---------------|
| Stivers       |
| Suozzi        |
| Taylor        |
| Tenney        |
| Thompson (PA) |
| Thornberry    |
| Tipton        |
| Tonko         |
| Trott         |
| Turner        |
| Upton         |
| Valadao       |
| Vela          |
| Wagner        |
| Walberg       |
| Walden        |
| Walker        |
| Walorski      |
| Walters, Mimi |
| Weber (TX)    |
| Webster (FL)  |
| Wenstrup      |
| Westerman     |
| Williams      |
| Wilson (SC)   |
| Wittman       |
| Womack        |
| Woodall       |
| Yoder         |
| Yoho          |
| Young (AK)    |
| Young (IA)    |
| Zeldin        |

□ 1053

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients, and, pursuant to House Resolution 396, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 377, nays 34, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

#### YEAS—377

|            |                   |               |
|------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Abraham    | Beyer             | Brown (MD)    |
| Adams      | Bilirakis         | Brownley (CA) |
| Aderholt   | Bishop (GA)       | Buchanan      |
| Aguilar    | Bishop (MI)       | Buck          |
| Allen      | Bishop (UT)       | Bucshon       |
| Amodei     | Black             | Burgess       |
| Arrington  | Blackburn         | Bustos        |
| Bacon      | Blum              | Butterfield   |
| Banks (IN) | Blumenauer        | Byrne         |
| Barletta   | Blunt Rochester   | Calvert       |
| Barr       | Bonamici          | Capuano       |
| Barragán   | Bost              | Carbajal      |
| Barton     | Boyle, Brendan F. | Cárdenas      |
| Bass       | Brady (PA)        | Carson (IN)   |
| Beatty     | Brady (TX)        | Carter (GA)   |
| Bera       | Brooks (IN)       | Carter (TX)   |
| Bergman    |                   | Cartwright    |

Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Cheney  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Coffman  
 Cohen  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cook  
 Cooper  
 Correa  
 Costa  
 Costello (PA)  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crist  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davidson  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 Davis, Rodney  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 Demings  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DeSaulnier  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dingell  
 Donovan  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Dunn  
 Ellison  
 Emmer  
 Eshoo  
 Estes (KS)  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Farenthold  
 Faso  
 Ferguson  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Foxx  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Garamendi  
 Gianforte  
 Gibbs  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Goodlatte  
 Gottheimer  
 Gowdy  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffith  
 Grijalva  
 Grothman  
 Guthrie  
 Gutierrez

Hanabusa  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill  
 Himes  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hoyer  
 Hudson  
 Huffman  
 Huizenga  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd  
 Issa  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Kaptur  
 Katko  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kihuen  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger  
 Knight  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 LaHood  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latta  
 Lawrence  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (MN)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebach  
 Lofgren  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lowenthal  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham,  
 M.  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 MacArthur  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Marshall  
 Mast  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McEeachin  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNeerney  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan

Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 Nunes  
 O'Halleran  
 O'Rourke  
 Palazzo  
 Pallone  
 Palmer  
 Panetta  
 Pascarell  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pittenger  
 Pocan  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Polis  
 Posey  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Rice (SC)  
 Richmond  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney, Francis  
 Rooney, Thomas  
 J.  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rosen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce (CA)  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Russell  
 Rutherford  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Smucker  
 Soto  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Swalwell (CA)

Takano  
 Taylor  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tipton  
 Torres  
 Trott  
 Tsongas  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Vargas

Veasey  
 Vela  
 Visclosky  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Welch

## NAYS—34

Amash  
 Babin  
 Biggs  
 Brat  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Budd  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Crowley  
 Doggett  
 Engel  
 Espallat  
 Gallego

Gohmert  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Jeffries  
 Jones  
 Labrador  
 Lowey  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Massie  
 Meeks  
 Meng

Nadler  
 Perry  
 Rice (NY)  
 Sanford  
 Serrano  
 Slaughter  
 Suozzi  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Velázquez  
 Yoho

## NOT VOTING—20

Bridenstine  
 Cummings  
 Gabbard  
 Garrett  
 Gosar  
 Granger  
 Johnson, Sam

LaMalfa  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Long  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Olson

Pelosi  
 Renacci  
 Scalise  
 Speier  
 Tiberi  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz

□ 1101

Mr. BABIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 322 (passage of H.R. 2842), I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this vote.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 320, No. 321, and No. 322 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Krishnamoorthi Amendment. I would have also voted "nay" on the Davidson Amendment. I would have also voted "yea" on the Final Passage of H.R. 2842—Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 2017, TO MONDAY, JUNE 26, 2017

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, June 26, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

## NORTH KOREA MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS AGGRESSIONS

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, it has been a generation or two since the horrors of communism were routinely on the news and mentioned in our schools: people killed running for freedom from East to West Berlin, the Soviet Union's gulag archipelago designed to crush dissent and the human spirit, and Mao's brutal rule in Red China that killed millions.

This week, a new generation of Americans witnessed the barbarity of the evil of communism. I extend my condolences to the family and friends of Otto Warmbier, whose funeral was held yesterday.

Kim Jung Un and his North Korean thugs may believe Otto's torture and death somehow empowers them. They are wrong. President Reagan foretold that communism will end up on the ash heap of history, and that is where Kim is headed.

But Otto has a different legacy. One of Otto's friends told me his spirit could not be crushed and, unlike the communist thugs of North Korea, Otto's spirit will live on, especially in those who loved him.

Mr. Speaker, North Korea must be held accountable for Otto's death and other transgressions. Last month, the House passed the Korean Interdiction and Modernization of Sanctions Act. The Senate should pass this legislation and get it to the President quickly so we can begin to put maximum pressure on this outlaw regime.

## RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, which celebrated its 50th anniversary last week.

Built on the prairies of Illinois, under the leadership of its first director, Robert Wilson, this national lab performs cutting-edge research in physics to help us understand the fundamental properties of matter. It is also where I spent most of my career as a high energy particle physicist before I ran for Congress.

The discoveries made in Fermilab's first 50 years will remain in the science textbooks forever. Experiments at Fermilab discovered three of the fundamental components of matter: the bottom quark, the neutrino tau, and the top quark, the heaviest known form of matter.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget proposal of the Trump administration threatens the legacy of Fermilab and national labs and scientific facilities throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, scientific research is not like highway building that can turn on and off in any given fiscal year. Scientific teams and facilities that take generations to build can be wiped out in a single budget cycle by having their funding cut.

So, Mr. Speaker, I call upon you and your colleagues to show us a budget that will maintain our country's leadership in science and technology, because destroying our scientific facilities is no way to make America great again.

#### CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION COVERS MANY INDUSTRIES

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House unanimously approved the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, to give Americans who enter the workforce the skills they need to succeed.

I was proud to sponsor that bill with Congressman RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY. It will help all Americans across all sectors and industries because all education is career education.

As chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, I want to talk about food service careers.

Earlier this spring, I had the opportunity to visit the DC Central Kitchen right here in our Nation's Capital. DC Central Kitchen feeds the most vulnerable among us, but it fights hunger differently: it offers skills-based education, empowerment, and career opportunities that allow people to finally be free from hunger and poverty.

The CEO there said, "You can't feed your way out of poverty," and I wholeheartedly agree. DC Central Kitchen feeds the hungry, but also teaches people the skills needed to find employment in the hospitality industry. That is a CTE program: helping people find jobs that pay living wages and obtain lasting careers.

Now, that is something we can all get behind.

#### RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE REVEREND NATHANIEL DIXON

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Reverend Nathaniel Dixon. On Sunday, Reverend Dixon will be giving his last

sermon at St. Stephen's United Methodist Church.

While this Sunday may be his last sermon, I have no doubt that the lives he has touched, parishioners, colleagues, neighbors, all of us, will continue to uphold the lessons he taught us and will remember the action he has taken over a long and hard-fought career.

Reverend Dixon is a true renaissance man whose life has always been committed to New York City. For 27 years, he was a music teacher and, later, an administrator, and also an executive director of the Saxrack Learning Center.

Old Satchmo, the great Louie Armstrong, once said: "Musicians don't retire; they just stop when there's no more music in them."

Reverend Dixon never stopped teaching music, and he has inculcated this love and passion into the lives of students and parishioners. "Music helps," he said, "because there is awe in them."

Thank you, Reverend Dixon, for your commitment and willingness to become a leader and a role model for many years to come in New York's 13th Congressional District.

We love you and wish you the very best.

#### HONORING ROCKY CARROLL, TEXAS BOOTMAKER

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in Texas, whether you are two-stepping, herding cattle, or sitting in the summer heat enjoying some barbecue, you will rarely find Texans without their boots. And, Mr. Speaker, the finest boots in Texas were made by Houston legend, Rocky Carroll.

This week, after a long and colorful life, Rocky died.

The moment I met Rocky, I was immediately struck by his swagger. He looked like an outlaw out of an old western movie. He was proud of the fact that he worked 25 years with the Harris County Sheriff's Department.

Through the course of his life, Rocky also handcrafted boots for seven Presidents, celebrities, the Queen, the Pope, and many others.

I once performed a small wedding ceremony for Rocky and his new bride, Judge Denise Collins. And right before the wedding started, in walked Rocky's friend, President George H.W. Bush. Rocky knew everybody.

And while the walls of his shop, which really looked like an old barn, were adorned with photos of famous people, most of his customers were regular folks like me.

Rocky Carroll was larger than life and uniquely Texan to the core. We

will miss our dear friend, bootmaker for the Presidents, bootmaker for the stars, and bootmaker for regular folks.

And that is just the way it is.

#### HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF JEFFERY M. SANDERS

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes this well feels like the well of sorrow, and such is the case today.

I rise to honor a true and selfless public servant whose life was tragically taken before his time. Mr. Jeffery Sanders, a lifelong resident of Mayview, Missouri, and a firefighter, was killed in the line of duty on Monday, June 19, 2017. I have decided that I will be praying through the weekend and next week for his family.

Mr. Jacob Hayward was a man who gave a great deal to his community. He was seriously injured also in the same heartbreaking accident.

Jeff was well known in the close-knit community of 200 residents, having been a farmer in Mayview all of his life. He and his wife, Connie, raised two wonderful children, who continue to live in Lafayette County in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. Sanders dedicated much of his time to Mayview and its Fire Protection District. He could always be counted on to make a fire call and help someone in need.

In all of his activities, Mr. Sanders demonstrated dedication and commitment to the greater good of others. He was actively involved in the Mayview Lions Club, the Mayview Area 4-H Club, the Antique Tractor Club, and the Odessa FFA Advisory Board, along with his work as a volunteer firefighter with the Mayview Fire Protection District. He also spent time serving on the Mayview Special Road District.

Mr. Speaker, this family has given a great deal, and we owe a great deal to them.

#### CONGRATULATING THE DONEGAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL TEAM

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Donegal women's softball team on their PIAA State softball title. They beat Cedar Cliff 9-7, but it wasn't an easy victory.

Donegal trailed 7-3 heading into the bottom of the fifth inning, but never gave up. They scored six runs that inning to take a 9-7 lead, and they never gave that up the rest of the game.

This team has been to the State tournament the last 4 years, but, obviously, this one was special. Donegal head coach Wayne Emenheiser said of the



season: "This was our dream since we lost last year in the semifinals. We wanted to get back here. It was a magical season."

A victory like this is a display of years of dedication and hard work. So today I want to congratulate the Don-egal players, coaches, and staff on this remarkable achievement and let them know how proud we are of them.

I would also like to recognize the families, students, faculty, and fans that supported them along the way.

□ 1115

#### SENATE REPUBLICANS SHUT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE OUT OF AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

(Mr. CARBAJAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the recently unveiled Senate healthcare repeal legislation. The Republicans have shut the American public out of their debate and, with this bill, they aim to shut them out of affordable healthcare, too.

This bill sets us on a dangerous path backwards, back to a time when cancer patients could be kept out of coverage or kicked off of their insurance because the cost of their care was too high, and to a time where pregnancy could be considered a preexisting condition.

Congress must work collaboratively to bring down insurance premium costs and work together toward insuring every American, but denying millions of people access to insurance by repealing protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, gutting Medicaid, and threatening the solvency of the Medicare trust fund all in order to give the wealthiest Americans a tax cut is wrong.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to reject this misguided proposal.

#### UNSEAL RECORDS INTO AGENT BRIAN TERRY'S DEATH

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in December 2010, U.S. Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was killed with a gun that was traced back to the Department of Justice's Operation Fast and Furious. His family awaits answers.

Agent Terry's family recently testified before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee that the Obama administration continually denied all efforts to release any additional information about his death. They are now calling on President Trump to finally unseal the records and expose the dirty secrets behind this tragic scandal.

It is shameful that the Trump administration has been repeatedly accused of collusion and coverups based on unsourced rumors, while little attention was given to the Obama administration's blatant efforts to cover up the truth into Agent Terry's murder.

Under Operation Fast and Furious, roughly 2,000 firearms were purposely sold to criminals, which were later smuggled into Mexico, and have been linked to multiple homicides.

The Obama administration stonewalled Congress, investigators, and Americans for years and, to this day, refuse to take responsibility for their mistake.

It is time for the truth. We have an opportunity to return transparency and trust to our government, and I fully support the Terry family's request for the records to be unsealed.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN CHECHNYA

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, during this Pride Month, I rise today to speak out about the human rights violations occurring in the Russian republic of Chechnya.

It has been reported that in that country, men are kidnapped, detained, tortured, and even murdered just because of their sexual orientation. Families have been shamed by these kidnappings and have resorted to taking their own sons' lives.

In April, I, along with 48 other Members of Congress, signed and sent a letter to Secretary of State Tillerson asking him to raise the issue of this horrible violence against innocent men with the Russian officials, but to date, neither Secretary Tillerson or President Trump or anybody else in the administration have committed to taking action on this issue.

The United States must speak out about this atrocity, and Russia must investigate such human rights violations so that there is accountability for an end to these senseless crimes.

During this Pride Month, we here in the United States celebrate our equality. However, every month we must say and act for the men in Chechnya as we fight for equality across the globe.

#### THE CITIZENS OF PUERTO RICO HAVE EXPRESSED THEIR WILL TO JOIN OUR NATION

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, the American citizens of Puerto Rico overwhelmingly voted in favor of becoming the 51st State of our great Nation. This is the second time in the past 5 years where

my constituents have expressed their will to join our Nation.

Soon I will introduce legislation to set forth the terms of admission for the new State of Puerto Rico.

Our people have, in war and peace, made countless contributions to our Nation. They have fought in every conflict since the Great War. Many have made the ultimate sacrifice, and when they do, their casket is flown back to this country draped in an American flag bearing the 50 stars, but no star that represents them.

It takes a special kind of patriotism to fight for a nation that does not treat you equally, a nation that is a champion of democracy and self-determination, yet denies those same principles to 3.4 million of its own citizens in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents have spoken, and they deserve Congress' response.

#### IMMIGRATION HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, during Immigration Heritage Month, I want to recognize the great spirit and desire for a better life that lives within our Nation's immigrants today and those before them.

America's immigrants have started companies big and small, contributed to their local communities, and have been our friends, family, and neighbors. But our immigration system is broken. It is failing the many children who are brought to the United States outside of their own control.

That is why I have sponsored and cosponsored the BRIDGE Act and the Recognizing America's Children Act to protect these children who only want to live the American Dream.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have to work together, we must work together to pass a long-term immigration reform bill that secures our borders, yes, but just as importantly, protects our children, protects the families and the workers who want nothing more than to be a part of this great country and live the American Dream.

#### CANCEL THE AUGUST RECESS

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I stood before you in this very spot not long ago urging this Congress to do the work of the American people that the American people sent us here to do. Yet, 2 months later, not much has changed. Distrust in government is still at an all-time high, and it is not hard to see why. Our Federal debt continues to approach \$20 trillion. Our Tax

Code remains broken and burdensome. Threats continue to rise abroad. And here at home, by the way, our veterans are still not getting the care they deserve despite the progress that we have made this week on that issue. From my perspective, this is unacceptable.

Despite the fact that Congress, by any metric we devise, is not doing the basic job the American people sent us here to do, in 7 weeks, we are going to adjourn on a month-long vacation without reforming the Tax Code or getting our appropriations done. And just 30 days after returning from the August recess, if we don't make some hard choices, the government may shut down, cutting our constituents from access to the programs they depend on for their livelihoods.

My message is simple: let's work through the August recess because in what other job would you grant yourself a month off if you hadn't gotten your work done?

I know we need to get back home to meet with our constituents, but more than anything else, I believe our constituents sent us here to do our job, to work together to fix problems, rather than punt them to the next generation.

So, please, let's stay here and let's do the work for the American people.

#### WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

#### CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Not only is this bill critical to giving American workers the skills they need to lead in an increasingly competitive world, but also to making sure that our career and technical education is in stride with the major advancements that have been made over the last decade.

As I travel across northeast Wisconsin, businessowners routinely tell me they are hiring, but can't find workers with the knowledge and skills necessary to do the jobs they are hiring for.

Passage of this bill helps close the skills gap and boost economic growth by equipping students with the skills they need to fill the in-demand and high-skilled jobs in our local economies.

Schools in Wisconsin's Eighth District are prepared to lead the way when it comes to closing our country's growing skills gap, and it is time that we give them the tools that they desperately need to do exactly that.

I am proud to cosponsor this important piece of bipartisan legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, Solomon, who was often noted as the wisest man in the world, said: "A soft answer turns away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger."

If you were to ask the average American citizen would they like their elected officials to come to Washington and to work together, they would all say: Of course. They should. That is what we elect them for.

Yet, often in our history, we see emotions override the mouth and we raise our voices, distrust builds, isolation results, we don't get to know each other, we don't get to work with one another. As we isolate, then a distrust builds, and with distrust, then we don't want to hear what either side has to say. Ultimately, when we can no longer exchange ideas with a deliberateness, then we fall short.

Solomon also said in Ecclesiastes: "Two are better than one, for they have a good reward for their labor, for if the one fall, the other will lift up," and "A three-fold cord is not quickly broken."

As we look at our mottoes and our institutions, we have a phrase: "Out of many, one."

That phrase is not: Out of one idea, let's create many.

It is just the opposite.

One thing that I learned in my time as a soldier in negotiating and dealing with people groups that literally could not agree, to the point that they were shelling and killing each other and each other's women and children in their villages as they burned, that even in situations like that, they could find some overlapping circles and some common ground in between.

The events of the past week are a reminder not just to Members of Congress, who oftentimes we do know each other, we do work with one another, we do serve on committees with one another. We take great pride in developing those relationships despite our differences, but we have an obligation, because, as a constitutional representative republic, we are a reflection of the people that send us here.

It is important that the lawmakers that the American people send to Washington to do that work be those that are willing to accommodate, that are willing to assimilate the things that we agree on, because if we can't accommodate and we can't assimilate—as I have viewed in war-torn battlefields in several different places through a career as an infantry soldier, if you can no longer accommodate or be willing to assimilate certain agreed ideas, then you are left with the third choice, which is elimination.

The United States has never had that as its pretext. We got close once in a

period from about 1820 to 1860. We have faced tough times before and come together. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that not just our body, as we take and deem these responsibilities with a lot of conviction, but that the American people would take their responsibility to be mindful of the words of Solomon: "A soft answer turns away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger."

Our country is bigger than any of us. When we leave it, God willing, it will continue on. And the words that are said in this Chamber, although recorded, few read. As time passes and as we govern our lives and go about our business, we have to remember the very principles that brought us together as a nation and that I nearly gave my life for in defense.

So my hope is, as we move in the coming days and weeks, that we will work on the things where the circles overlap and we will not negotiate the nonnegotiables. If we just focus on those things, we will have more than enough work to do to actually get stuff done.

□ 1130

As a message to the American people: accommodate, listen, dialogue, be kind, and be patient. I have seen the worst thing that human beings can do to one another in my lifetime. I have watched friends die on a battlefield. I have had to take human life. I have seen horrible and horrific things that no human being should ever do. But we are not in that place. We live in freedom. We live in great enjoyment of prosperity where our ideas, our work—the sweat of our brow—can go, and we can put it to good use with great liberty. We have to tone it down.

We have to be willing to put others before ourselves and to listen. I pledge to do that as a Member, one of 435 here. I hope the American people will pledge to be as committed to the United States as we all must be if we are to secure the future for our children and grandchildren.

One of the things that we often all agree on is efficiency in government—to turn the tone and the topic of the conversation a little bit in a different direction. Efficiency in government—nothing makes us more sad and disappointed than to see hard-earned tax dollars wasted by inefficiency.

In my home State of Oklahoma, for every million dollars the government wastes, we have to have 96 Oklahomans work all year long to pay all of their taxes so that we can waste it. I have often highlighted these wasteful measures in a series called "Waste Watch." We just released "Waste Watch" number 7 where we, sadly, highlight over \$50 billion worth of waste in just one item and a total of \$70 billion worth of waste on a single topic. That is something that we all care about and that we all want to pay with our taxes. That is education.

For years, Americans have been paying more and getting less from our educational system. Over the past decade, national high school student proficiency test scores in math have consistently met the minimum or were below. Reading scores for high school students, over the past 20 years, have been consistently substandard with a continued downward trend.

As test scores remain low, available funding for education is often wasted. The solution is not simply to spend more on education without correcting the habits where the waste can occur. We need to spend our dollars wisely by eliminating educational waste, as well as many other forms of waste in government, and push those dollars where they actually count—to our teachers and to our classrooms.

Additionally, we have to change the perception that more money spent always equals a better outcome. If that were the case, we would be the most efficient government on the planet.

It is my hope to create motivation to protect taxpayers and assist in educating America's children with the resources available. It is not enough to point out the problems. That is easy. Anyone can be a cynic and a critic. But we must work together to fix them so that we can make our Nation stronger. Education is vital to our children and to our future.

What are some of these things that we are talking about? Well, how about this one: researchers at the esteemed Harvard University spent \$3 million to study if people were able to smell an unpleasant odor in their urine after eating asparagus, also known as asparagus pee, according to the research. The research was funded through a research grant from the National Institutes of Health with your tax dollars.

The NIH uses Federal tax dollars to fund its research and received \$30 billion in 2016. The NIH's mission statement is "to enhance health, extend healthy lives, and reduce the burdens of illness and disability."

We would all agree with that. It is good to try to fix problems with disease, fight the common cold, cure cancer, and cure Alzheimer's, all of those things.

However, the NIH has conducted lifesaving research in the past and has been given broad authority in deciding how to spend that \$30 billion, and now we see waste.

The NIH funds research grants to universities, and much of the NIH's funding is well justified and leads to lifesaving research. Funding a study that doesn't even explore the possible health benefits of eating asparagus but only if there is an odor after eating it does not fit into any mission of the NIH. It is akin to the taxpayers' money being flushed down the toilet.

This particular study was the result of a grant provided by the NIH to Har-

vard's T.H. Chan School of Public Health. Its purpose was to discover whether people could smell an asparagus effect. The researchers at Harvard received more than \$3 million in 2016, to survey 6,909 people of European-American descent to find if these people's urine smelled funny after eating asparagus, and the results were published in the British Medical Journal.

The results concluded that a "large proportion of individuals of European-American descent cannot smell" any effect. Sixty percent of the people surveyed, 58 percent of men and 62 percent of women, stated that they could not smell any urinary metabolites produced after asparagus consumption. However, Angus Chen, a reporter for the National Public Radio, stated in his report on this study that 4,161 people "were confused by the question." Do you think? We didn't need to waste \$3 million or have 260 Oklahomans work all year long to see if there was some effect in this madness.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to waste \$2 billion? Then give it to the Veterans Administration. In 2008, Congress passed the post-9/11 GI Bill updating the GI Bill from 1944, creating new benefits for servicemembers like myself, such as lengthening the expiration date following separation from the Armed Forces or retirement and offering living expenses as well as tuition. Another change made the benefits paid directly to the school of choice for the veteran—and here is where it began to go awry.

Initially, benefits from the GI Bill were paid directly to the servicemember for them to decide how and where to invest in their own education. This makes sense. They were responsible enough to defend our Republic; they can probably handle the funds—as they had for decades before. This change now comes with a litany of problems.

An audit conducted from 2013 to 2014, by the Office of Inspector General, for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs found that a 13 percent error rate in payments by the Veterans Benefits Administration to the schools of choice for servicemembers had occurred.

To conduct this audit, the OIG looked into 650 payments for 225 students to 50 schools. They found \$128,000 in improper payments; and eight students who withdrew from their classes still received \$2,400 in stipends, and this money was never recovered for the taxpayer. Extrapolating these numbers to the full class of students, the Office of Inspector General estimated that, over 5 years, the Veterans Benefits Administration would process about \$205 million in improper payments—and you see it continue to go on and waste \$2.2 billion.

We can do better. We must do better. We must do better by our veterans. We must do better so that we do not allow people's insatiable appetite for non-

existent government funds to continue to be consumed. We are a nation that is \$20 trillion in debt.

How many of you, if you came and I asked you: Hey, could I have \$100?

And you said: sure.

And I said: okay, but great, it is going to cost you \$105 because I am going to charge you \$5 to take your hundred.

Wouldn't that be pretty much absurd and in your face? Yet that is exactly what we do with a very popular program called the Pell Grant Program. The Pell grant was created in the 1970s and has since become the basic mechanism for the Federal Government to assist lower income families with higher education costs. The legislation mandates that students receiving the funds must be admitted and enrolled in an institution of higher learning. Fine.

While the Pell grant provides great opportunity for students who might not otherwise be able to attend college—something that we all think is good—the waste comes from a stipulation within the law that requires the Federal Government to pay a fee to give away their money. The \$5 payment goes directly to participating schools and is intended to help offset the cost of the Pell grant. So we let institutions of higher learning charge a fee to accept your money, the taxpayers.

While it is true that there are administrative costs involved with servicing Pell grants, schools should accept these costs as a part of doing business as they would if no Pell grant were provided and it was just your hard-earned money. If you were supporting one of your children in college, those fees would be incorporated within that same \$1,000.

For the 2015 and 2016 year, the maximum Pell grant available to an undergraduate student was roughly \$5,775. Based on the latest reports from the U.S. Department of Education for the same year or the year prior, the Nation's taxpayers provided \$30 billion to 8 million students. The average Pell grant received by students was roughly \$3,800. That all sounds good. While \$5 does not seem significant, when you put that \$5 towards 8 million students, you can see where the problem is.

It is an unnecessary and arbitrary fee that should be disallowed, and we need to restore it so that colleges and institutions do not scoop something off of the top. But people say: well, we have our administrative costs. We have overhead. We have our infrastructure. We have all of these things that we have to do.

Yes, and that is why we have allowed, for decades, the tax-exempt endowments so that as the endowments accrue wealth and they grow, they use those resources to sustain the infrastructure on the university.

We are \$20 trillion in debt. It would be great if we could not pay our bills to

go to our next-door neighbor and say: Hey, I am a little short on my electric bill, can you help me?

Or: I need help on my house payment this month. Let me just get it from you.

Our neighbors would not take kindly to that. Yet we are allowing these institutions that have the endowed wealth and that have all of the ability to do the infrastructure. Yet what happens? They continue to waste money with administrative fees that only have increased by 300 percent since 1976.

Here is another one for you: How many of you would donate to a charity that had a 52 percent administrative overhead? No takers? I didn't think so. Yet that is exactly what you do when you have the National Science Foundation put forth research grants that were designed to help people in their health and fighting disease and many other things. The average fee that universities and institutions charge back to the Federal Government for these research grants is 52 percent. That borders on the immoral.

A practice in higher education grant making that is not widely known or understood by the American public is this practice of charging indirect cost as a part of a grant. So, for example, \$1 million that is coming to a university for research—we are all excited about that, it helps our communities—did you know that that university, in turn, will scoop, on average, 52 percent off of the top?

The typical grant has direct costs, and we all understand that. As they put forth their budget, they will list it with such things as researchers' salaries—fine—travel associated with research—understood. But beyond that, universities are able to claim, under our insane laws, that additional funds in the form of indirect costs are needed for infrastructure of the institution, and it is our responsibility, as taxpayers, to support that. Never mind that tax-free endowments were designed specifically for that purpose and already exist that they could use. But they never touch that wealth. They never touch that accrued wealth. They never touch that accrued interest.

The Office of Management and Budget defines indirect costs as expenses an organization incurs indirectly—and they get to define what that is. What does it translate to? Well, rather than pick on Harvard, let's pick on the Big 12, a region I come from. We will start with the University of Oklahoma.

□ 1145

Charging the government for indirect costs is expensive and, unfortunately, a common practice among institutions of higher learning.

Here are the indirect costs for the schools in the Big 12. I am sure they are not the only ones. This is a nation-

wide epidemic, to the tune of \$55 billion. That is billion with a B. Even in Washington, D.C., that is real money.

The University of Oklahoma adds a 55 percent surcharge to its research on campus; Oklahoma State University adds 45 percent, and a 54 percent surcharge for instruction grant projects.

The University of Texas, 56 percent. We have a winner.

Texas Tech, 49 percent; Texas Christian, 54 percent; Baylor, 38 percent. They are a little more economical, but it is still nearly 40 percent of waste.

The University of Kansas charges a surcharge of 51.5 percent; Kansas State, 52 percent; West Virginia, 50 percent; Iowa State, 52 percent, meeting the median average.

Higher education officials rarely talk about it. When confronted with it, they will, with straight faces and degrees of education, argue that this waste is absolutely essential for them to continue.

A recent George Washington University student newspaper article revealed a higher education official's thoughts about indirect costs when he overtly referred to them as—you have got it—subsidies. He let it slip. Maybe Freudian, we don't know.

The George Washington Hatchet quoted Leo Chalupa, vice president for research, that "research is bringing in money to the university."

You think? It is \$55 billion worth.

However, Chalupa is not just referring to the direct dollars used to conduct research. We would all agree with needed research, but what we don't agree with is this indirect—more than half—plundering of what the dollars were designed and intended to do.

Let's switch to something that we should do to try to incentivize people to improve their educational experience. Sound confusing? It is—to the tune of \$7 billion was wasted.

Few Americans will argue that the Nation's schools do not need improvement. We would all say that they do. When one looks at test scores or compares American outcomes with other nations, it is easy to see that many of our K-12 schools are languishing.

One recent report evaluated testing outcomes against other industrialized nations, and America's students finished 17th out of 34—not something to be proud of. This led President Obama to direct more money at the issue, like so many previous Presidents before him, rather than looking at the underlying systemic concerns.

It is not the amount of money; it is the habit that is being created. While increasing funding can be a component of a solution, it is often not the most vital of the components. Without proper policy driving the expenditures, the money spent can become one more example of how inefficient Federal intervention in anything can be.

President Obama's Department of Education directed \$7 billion to a pro-

gram known as the School Improvement Grants program, to which the Department of Energy named the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. The funds were directed to States with instructions that the funds should be directed to the poorest performing schools.

It sounds agreeable.

The measures used to identify the underperforming schools were graduation rates and readiness scores in reading and mathematics. Then-Secretary of Education Arne Duncan said, in 2009: "We could really move the needle, lift the bottom, and change the lives of tens of millions of underserved children"—something that all of us would agree on.

The School Improvement Grant program built on the race to the top efforts undertaken during the Bush administration, and the Obama administration efforts doubled the funds for the program.

The Department of Education described the purpose of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers in the following way: "This program supports the creation of community learning centers that provide academic enrichment opportunities during non-school hours for children, particularly students who attend high-poverty and low-performing schools."

Again, all of these sound laudable. However, according to a report released by the Department of Energy just a few days before the end of President Obama's administration, test scores, graduation rates, and college enrollment were no different in schools that had received these funds from School Improvement Grants as those that did not—\$7 billion gone.

A Washington Post article detailing the report quoted Andy Smarick, a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute: "Think of what all that money could have been spent on instead." Mr. Smarick is correct: \$7 billion in taxpayer funds were spent without any oversight or careful oversight whatsoever.

Congress must reexamine the role of the Federal Government in education because what is being done now does not work—billions upon billions of dollars.

How about if we can't solve it through \$7 billion wasted in trying to make people feel good about education and then that will improve their schools, how about we get them moving so we can fight obesity and cut down on diabetes, disease, and other things. That sounds good. Let's talk about that.

In 2010, with the assistance of First Lady Michelle Obama, the Let's Move! project began, with the hope of reducing childhood obesity in America. This is a real problem in Oklahoma. We have one of the largest obesity rates of all the States.

The program, costing as much as \$1 billion per year, focused heavily on impressing upon children the need for proper exercise as well as bringing healthier food options into schools.

At first glance, it appears that the Let's Move! program produced results. In 2008, U.S. childhood obesity rates nationally were around 16.2 percent. During the next 3 years, 18 States saw those rates begin a modest decline, falling in some States by 5 percent.

This reduction could be attributed to the effectiveness of the program or a cultural change in how people view health choices and how they view their eating habits. But it should be noted, regardless, that this decline was already begun by the time the Let's Move! program was even enacted. Overall, and sadly, in the latest statistics, U.S. childhood obesity rates did not decline and, in fact, have risen to 17.2 percent in the last statistical year.

There are many, many things that we can continue to go on and talk about in waste. Let's end with this one.

Want people to eat healthy, something that sounds good? How many of you would be influenced by people dressing up like Fruit of the Loom, in outfits like green beans, grapes, tomatoes, and going to college campuses and then just seeing the sight of these people wearing these costumes say: You know, I think I need to eat some grapes or vegetables?

That is what this program did. It wasted \$14.7 million of your money. It is called the Get Fruved project.

I am not making it up.

Not only did this program waste \$14.7 million; it is still being funded by your tax dollars. The U.S. Department of Agriculture awarded \$4.9 million a year for this initiative, led by students and researchers at four American universities, which are the University of Tennessee, South Dakota, West Virginia, and the University of Florida.

The Fruved website reports that its goal is:

Our students are the best teachers. This is why Fruved has sophomores and juniors at each school peer-monitoring first-year students, helping them live a healthier life during their first year of college.

That includes dressing up in these outfits. That is \$14.7 million.

There are things that the Federal Government has a responsibility for and there are things that it does not. Abraham Lincoln said it best in a phrase where he said: The things that we can do ourselves, the government ought not to interfere. The things that we cannot do collectively, the government might have a role.

We know the government may have a role in education, certainly, with education funding and helping our facilities and our institutions. However, we do not need to waste \$70 billion. Imagine what that could do.

We will never change this idea if the American people do not demand of us

to stop such madness and waste. When people come with straight faces and Ph.D.s and argue for dressing up in outfits, we have to push back on that and say: \$20 trillion in debt, a weakened military, roads and bridges that are falling down and an infrastructure that needs improvement, modernization in our skies for the Federal Aviation Administration.

There are so many areas that the government truly does have a function and role. We will never get to it with asparagus urine studies and dressing up as fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that all of us as Americans can find those overlapping circles and fight this absolute absurdity of waste in government, be responsible with American tax dollars, and sustain our great Republic for the future of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PAKISTAN IS PLAYING THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when our forces invaded Afghanistan in 2001, the goal was simple: remove the terrorist group, the Taliban government that sheltered the plotters of the 9/11 attacks on America, and destroy al-Qaida, a terrorist group. This was a NATO operation.

A little history is in order.

The United States was attacked. The member nations of NATO agreed that this was an attack on one nation, and NATO agreed to retaliate to the terrorist attack under article 5 of the NATO agreement. Article 5 has been talked about recently in the press.

So these 28 nations, NATO, went into Afghanistan, a haven for terrorists who sought to attack and kill Americans. That was 16 years ago. This is the longest war in American history, and yet it is still going on.

Let's examine how all of this is taking place and center on one nation, Pakistan, and their role in all of this.

The Taliban, since that attack, has waged an insurgency in Afghanistan, a neighbor to Pakistan, and destabilized the country, creating a perfect condition for terrorists to exploit in Afghanistan and spread that terrorist activity to other parts of the world.

The Taliban and al-Qaida have launched many of their attacks in Afghanistan from their neighbor, Pakistan. Recently, a Taliban sneak attack killed more than 160 Afghan soldiers, prompting the defense minister and the army chief of staff to resign.

The Taliban, a terrorist group, doesn't just stage attacks. They seize territory. The Special Inspector Gen-

eral for Afghan Reconstruction said, in January, that 172 Afghan districts are controlled, influenced, and contested by the Taliban.

Al-Qaida has a long history and loyalty to the Taliban—two terrorist groups working together. Osama bin Laden swore his allegiance to the Taliban's leader, Mullah Omar, even before the 9/11 attack on the United States.

When bin Laden was killed in Pakistan, Ayman al-Zawahiri renewed that oath and cemented ties between al-Qaida and the Taliban. Wherever the Taliban is, you will see that al-Qaida is not far behind.

Since 2010, the United States incorrectly claimed that al-Qaida had just a little, small presence in the country, limited to only 50 or 100 fighters. Well, we know now that is absolutely incorrect.

Then, in 2015, the shocking U.S. raid in Afghanistan uncovered a massive al-Qaida training camp for terrorists, rounding up over 150 al-Qaida terrorist activity individuals. This was more fighters in one raid than the U.S. claimed existed in the entire country.

By the end of last year, U.S. officials announced that 250 al-Qaida terrorists were killed or captured in 2016.

The point here is that United States intelligence has been wrong about the activity of terrorists in Pakistan and in Afghanistan, but we are getting it right now.

Along with al-Qaida in Afghanistan, we have another terrorist group—I should have brought a chart to list all of these—the Haqqani Network.

Who are these folks?

It is another terrorist group linked to al-Qaida and the Taliban. The Haqqani Network is responsible for more American deaths in the region than any of the other terrorist groups that I have already mentioned.

□ 1200

The Haqqani Network attacks inside Afghanistan, and they have been directly traced back to Pakistan. All roads to terror lead to Pakistan.

In fact, in 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified to the Senate, "the Haqqani Network acts as a veritable arm of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency." What is that? That is the military arm of the Pakistan Government working with terrorist groups throughout the world.

The truth is, Pakistan has ties to about every terrorist group in Afghanistan, and we know that the Taliban terrorist group is based out of Pakistan.

It came as no surprise that when the U.S. drone strike killed the leader of the Taliban in 2016, guess where he was? He was in Pakistan hiding out.

There is a laundry list of evidence of Pakistan's support for terrorist groups,

and I think a little more history is in order because this activity by Pakistan has been going on for years and has been below the radar. So let's just list some of the counts of the indictment against Pakistan and their terrorist activity.

Let's go back to 1980. Pakistan actively assisted countries like North Korea, Iran, and Libya in their efforts to build a nuclear weapon.

Now, where are we today?

Iran, the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world, got some of its nuclear ability from Pakistan. North Korea, on the other side of the globe, guess what, they are developing nuclear capability, and we can trace some of their roots for their science back to Pakistan.

Since 1980, Pakistan has provided a safe haven and support, as I mentioned, for the Haqqani Network. The Haqqani Network operates many places in the world, including Lebanon, a threat to Israel.

Since the 1980s, Pakistan has hosted multiple madrassas that indoctrinate thousands of Pakistani young who join radical groups. That is a nice way of saying terrorist groups.

One Pakistan madrasa, which receives millions of dollars in state funding, has so many prominent terrorists in its alumni that it has the name of the University of Jihad.

I will continue. Since 1990, Pakistan has supported terrorist groups in Kashmir, like the Lashkar-e-Taiba, called the LeT, and other terrorist groups in its proxy war with India. These groups have carried out attacks inside India, such as the 2001 attack against the Indian Parliament.

Since the 1990s, Pakistan has allowed those terrorist groups like the LeT to openly fundraise in the country of Pakistan. Beginning in the 1990s, Pakistan provided training, advisers, intelligence, and material support for the Afghan Taliban, a specific terrorist group that operates in Afghanistan based in Pakistan.

Pakistan had forged the alliance between the al-Qaida and the Taliban before 9/11, and Hamid Gul, the former head of Pakistan's ISI, is called the father of the Taliban.

Pakistani nuclear scientists met with senior al-Qaida—this is a terrorist group—leadership in 1998, to discuss the terrorist group's desire to acquire nuclear technology.

In 1998, several Pakistani officers were killed in an al-Qaida training camp by the United States. Well, what were they doing there? They were training the al-Qaida in terrorist activities. This was a retaliation by the U.S. for the Africa Embassy bombings.

In 2001, Pakistan ISI helped revive the Afghan Taliban after it was defeated by the United States in the Northern Alliance. While Pakistan is fighting the Pakistani Taliban, it al-

lows the Afghan Taliban, or what it refers to as the good Taliban, to operate freely in its territory.

Let me try to explain this. There is the Pakistani Taliban. It operates in Pakistan. The Pakistan Government goes after those people because they are causing crimes in Pakistan. But there is the Afghan Taliban that operates out of Pakistan that is supported by ISI and works in Afghanistan to kill NATO forces, including Americans. Pakistan says: oh, we are after terrorists. We are going after them. They are only going after those terrorists that operate in their country against Pakistanis, not terrorist groups that operate in other parts of the world against Americans.

After the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, Osama bin Laden and many senior al-Qaida leaders fled to Pakistan. Many of them are still there. Pakistan facilitated arms purchases and foreign fighter flows for al-Qaida as the war continued.

Since 2004, eight major terrorist plots against Western countries were planned in Pakistan.

In 2008, the GAO—that is the folks who take care of our money, or at least try to track it—found that the Pakistan Government may have falsified claimed costs for providing support to the United States-led military operations. What does that mean?

We give to the Pakistan Government to help their military supposedly go after terrorists, and they give us back vouchers to say: well, this is what we did. Well, our government went through these vouchers and found out that Pakistan lied about this. They were asking for money for an activity that never occurred. So they tried to cheat the American public on these reimbursements. And there is more.

In November 2008, LeT conducted the Mumbai attack in India that killed more than 160 people with Pakistani assistance. Remember, LeT is a terrorist group.

In 2009, a Taliban leader, who had begun peace negotiations with the Afghan Government to stop the killing and the war, was arrested by Pakistan authorities for negotiating a peace talk because Pakistan did not want and does not want peace in Afghanistan.

In 2010, Pakistani intelligence is believed to have leaked the identity of an American CIA intelligence chief based in Pakistan. Of course, he had to flee the country.

In 2010, Pakistan closed the NATO supply route in Afghanistan for one week in response to NATO's helicopter strike that killed three Pakistani soldiers.

Documents leaked in 2010 revealed direct meetings between ISI and the Taliban to organize and orchestrate attacks on American soldiers in Afghanistan. That was in 2010.

I will continue. The terrorist perpetrator of the 2010 attempted car bomb-

ings in Times Square, that is in the United States, was known to have undergone weapons training in Pakistan.

In 2011, Osama bin Laden, we all know who he was, the number one terrorist in world history, well, he was found and killed in Abbottabad outside of Pakistan's version of West Point. In other words, you have a military installation, you have Osama bin Laden hiding in his big old home there, and the Pakistanis had been hiding him out. He was found there, Americans went and took him out, didn't tell the Pakistani Government because they would have moved him again.

We have evidence that Pakistan supports terrorism. What happened was, Pakistan scrambled American-made jets to go after the Americans who took out the Taliban. Fortunately, the Americans were able to get away and they were not attacked by the Pakistan Government.

To show how supportive Pakistan is, one of our helicopters, you may remember, had stealth on one of its rotors. Well, it crashed there, and they turned that evidence over to the Chinese and let them take whatever evidence they wanted to show the stealth in that helicopter.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 17 minutes remaining in his Special Order.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

In 2011, Pakistan jailed Dr. Afridi, who helped the United States track down Osama bin Laden, and he is still in jail.

So Pakistan claims that they are a help to the U.S. in tracking down terrorism in the world, but they are not. The evidence shows the difference. Whose side is Pakistan really on?

After the 2011 raid to kill Osama bin Laden, Pakistan, as I said, invited the Chinese to inspect the wreckage on the stealth helicopter that the U.S. forces left behind. If people are allies of the U.S., they don't turn over technology to China.

Once again in 2011, Pakistan ISI poisoned CIA Chief Mark Kelton following the Osama bin Laden raid.

In 2011, Pakistan shelling killed 42 Afghanistan civilians. Pakistan is notorious for its blasphemy laws which are used to persecute numerous minorities, including Christians. Asia Bibi, a Pakistan Christian mother of five, was sentenced to death for blasphemy in 2011.

Pakistan launched counterterrorism raids in 2014 into the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, yet turned a blind eye to the Haqqani Network and the Afghanistan Taliban operatives in the area.

In September of 2016, Pakistani terrorists attacked an Indian military base in Kashmir, killing 17 Indian soldiers. Indian officials say the terrorists

were from a group backed by the Pakistani ISI and were using weapons with Pakistani markings.

In 2017, Pakistani cross-border shellings forced hundreds of Afghanistan villagers to flee their homes and further strained relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Well, no kidding.

Let me give you some other evidence, Mr. Speaker, and let me make this clear. The issue here is not the people of Pakistan. The issue is not Americans of Pakistani descent. Our quarrel and our issue is not with those folks. I represent a lot of Pakistani Americans. Good folks. Hardworking individuals.

The issue is with the United States' relationship with the Government of Pakistan that is playing the United States. Recently, before the United Nations Security Council, H.E. Mahmoud Saikal, Ambassador, Permanent Representative from Afghanistan spoke to the U.N. He has an excellent speech. The speech is Afghanistan's relationship with Pakistan.

I am not going to read his entire speech, but I do want to make a couple of comments from his point of view about Pakistan and their terrorist activity.

He says: "In recent months, dozens of terrorist attacks across Afghanistan have claimed scores of innocent lives. In January, three simultaneous terrorist attacks in Kabul, Kandahar, and Helmand provinces killed and maimed over 160, including six UAE diplomats. In February, the Supreme Court, our symbol of justice, was attacked, causing numerous fatalities. Last week, two separate attacks in the heart of Kabul killed many civilians. Finally, just two days ago, Afghanistan's largest hospital was attacked, leaving over 140 killed and wounded, many of whom were doctors, nurses, and patients. The Taliban—terrorist group—have claimed responsibility for most of these attacks, but regardless of whose names are being labeled on these attacks, our own investigations have clearly established that they were generally plotted beyond our frontiers," namely, in Pakistan.

I include in the RECORD the entire speech of the Ambassador to the U.N.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL DEBATE  
ON THE SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN

H.E. Mahmoud Saikal, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to the United Nations, March 10, 2017, New York)

Thank you, Mr. President. Let me congratulate the United Kingdom on its leadership of the Council this month. I thank the Secretary General, Antonio Guterres, for presenting his first report on the situation in Afghanistan. Also, allow me to thank the SRSG, Ambassador Tadamichi Yamamoto, and Afghanistan's Independent Human Rights Commissioner, Dr. Sima Samar, for their briefings.

Given the severity of the situation in my country, I would like to dedicate my statement today to the challenging security situation, hidden agendas, the peace process and

the ever-increasing necessity for regional and global cooperation.

Mr. President, in recent months, dozens of terrorist attacks across Afghanistan have claimed scores of innocent lives. In January, three simultaneous terrorist attacks in Kabul, Kandahar, and Helmand provinces killed and maimed over 160, including six UAE diplomats. In February, the Supreme Court, our symbol of justice, was attacked, causing numerous fatalities. Last week, two separate attacks in the heart of Kabul killed many civilians. Finally, just two days ago Afghanistan's largest hospital was attacked, leaving over 140 killed and wounded, many of whom were doctors, nurses, and patients. The Taliban have claimed responsibility for most of these attacks, but regardless of whose names are being labeled on these attacks, our own investigations have clearly established that they were generally plotted beyond our frontiers, on the other side of the Durand Line. This, Mr. President, is the fundamental factor which needs to be addressed.

The UN Security Council issued prompt statements condemning these attacks in strongest terms, for which we are thankful. The statements underlined—and I quote: "the need to bring perpetrators, organizers, financiers and sponsors of these reprehensible acts of terrorism to justice". It also urged "all States, in accordance with their obligations under international law and relevant Security Council resolutions, to cooperate actively with the Afghan authorities in this regard." This is indeed what Afghanistan has been asking for many years. My Government and people would like to know why, after countless terrorist atrocities and specific Security Council statements condemning them, we are still witness to impunity for perpetrators and orchestrators of endless violence?

Mr. President, let me be very clear. The conflict in our country is not homegrown, as some desperately and deceptively try to portray. On the contrary, it is the nexus of illicit narcotics, violent extremism, and state sponsorship of terrorism with regional dimensions and global consequences. Tragically, it has morphed into an undeclared war by a neighboring state that has for many years, and still continues to coordinate, facilitate, and orchestrate violence through proxy forces and more than 20 terrorist networks. These groups benefit from a full-fledged external infrastructure to keep Afghanistan off-balance for motives that are inconsistent with our desire to live in a peaceful and prospering region.

In earlier statements to this Council, we have emphasized, time and again, on Pakistani actions that sustain terrorist activities in our country. Today, let me quote leading Pakistani officials themselves. General Pervez Musharraf, who led Pakistan for eight years as President, proudly commented in a 2015 interview with The Guardian newspaper that "Pakistan's Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) had given birth to the Taliban to counter Indian action against Pakistan". Last year, Mr. Sartaj Aziz, Pakistan Prime Minister's Adviser on Foreign Affairs, went on record to say that Taliban leaders reside in Pakistan and that they have influence over them. A couple of weeks ago, Mr. Ashraf Jehangir Qazi, former ambassador of Pakistan to the US, Russia, China, and India and UN SRSG to Iraq and Sudan, wrote in the Herald Magazine of Pakistan: "after the Soviet defeat and withdrawal, we (wittingly or unwittingly) unleashed a ruinous civil war and imposed a barbaric and medieval Taliban upon the hapless Afghan people." His words

are but confirmation of the truth that "Pakistan talks one policy, but walks the other".

Mr. Husain Haqqani, another former Ambassador of Pakistan to the US and Sri Lanka, categorizes in clear terms, in a NYT 2013 article, the links between Pakistan's state apparatus and the Taliban over time, and mentions in the context of peace talks that "the Taliban and their Pakistani mentors have hardly changed their arguments or their tendency to fudge facts". These quotes and admissions that I just read were not "rhetoric from Kabul" or "blame game" as often claimed by a known member state. This was Pakistan talking!

Mr. President, against this backdrop, in February, a series of unfortunate terrorist attacks in Pakistan killed dozens and wounded many more innocent men, women, and children. As is the case, Afghans always share the pain and anguish of our Pakistani brothers and sisters. However, the Government of Pakistan, immediately and without any regard for an investigative process or clear facts, blamed Afghanistan for the attacks and resorted to increased breaches of our territorial integrity, the closing of the main border crossings, blockading trade and transit, and harassing our nationals traveling to or living in their country. Such measures constitute a clear violation of principles of WTO and the rights of land locked countries, including their access to sea.

From January till today, we recorded at least 59 instances of violations of Afghan territory by Pakistan military forces, including three violations of our air space, over 1375 cross-frontier artillery shellings that caused dozens of casualties, displacement of 450 families in the middle of cold winter in our eastern provinces, burning of our forests, illegal construction of infrastructure near the frontier region, and hostile maneuvering of tanks and heavy weaponry.

Mr. POE of Texas. I will just make one more comment on the speech. The Ambassador says: "Pakistan talks one policy, but walks the other."

I will continue. The World Muhajir Congress has written a letter to the United States Congress. Who are these folks? Well, they represent the views and interests of the Muhajirs. They are descendants of Muslims who migrated from India to Pakistan at the time of the partition of India in 1947.

□ 1215

They write a letter, and the title of their letter is: "World Muhajir Congress request U.S. Congress to cut off military aid to Pakistan."

They go into detail talking about the terrorist activity of the Government of Pakistan, and not only in Pakistan, but in borders across the world. They "request Trump administration and the U.S. Congress to cut off military aid to Pakistan. Pakistan army and intelligence agency ISI is mainly using this military aid"—American military aid—"to kill innocent Muhajirs, Baloch, and Pashtoons. The double game of Pakistan's security establishment with U.S. administration must come to an end, which has put lives of U.S. and NATO soldiers in danger in Afghanistan."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter.



[From World Muhajir Congress, June 15, 2017]  
WORLD MUHAJIR CONGRESS REQUEST US CONGRESS TO CUT OFF MILITARY AID TO PAKISTAN

World Muhajir Congress represents the views and interests of Muhajirs—descendants of those Muslims who migrated from India to Pakistan at the time of the Partition of India in 1947 at appropriate international forums.

Indeed, our forefathers had created Pakistan as a homeland for Muslims in India primarily to safeguard their political and economic interests. However, their idea of Pakistan envisaged a secular state where other religious minorities would be guaranteed equal rights and complete religious freedom. The founder of Pakistan Mohammad Ali Jinnah—known as Quaid e Azam—left no doubts about his vision for Pakistan when he chose a number of non-Muslims in the first Cabinet for Pakistan. In his address to the First Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, Mr Jinnah made his views abundantly clear when he said, “in course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State.”

Unfortunately, the British Raj had left behind a huge Indian army at the time of Partition that was mainly comprised of Punjabi Muslims. This Punjabi Army soon took control of every major institution in Pakistan and never let the true democracy flourish. Protecting the interests of Punjabis has been the primary mission of this Army since the creation of Pakistan, even if it had to at the cost of national interests. Denial of basic constitutional rights to majority Bengali population and subsequent disintegration of Pakistan's Bengali-majority East Pakistan is just one example.

In the last few decades, Pakistan's Punjabi-dominated security establishment has blatantly used religion, Islam, as its major tool to perpetuate its domination over other ethnic groups in Pakistan, Muhajirs, Balochs and Pashtoons in particular. The Army itself has gradually become highly radicalized and seems obsessed with the idea of dominating the entire region. The most alarming trend in the last three decades, however, has been the creation and blatant use of ‘religious proxies’ by Pakistan Army to promote its sinister agenda of Punjabi dominance over Pakistan as well as the region.

Jihadi terrorist outfits created by Pakistan Army have caused havoc in the last three decades both inside and outside Pakistan. Even though hundreds of thousands of Pakistanis have died as a result of attacks carried out by these ruthless proxies of Pakistan's security establishment, the targets of these terrorist outfits have never been confined to Pakistan and pretty much every country in the region has suffered at the hands of these terror groups.

Whether it is the world's “most wanted” man Osama bin Laden or the chief of Taliban Mullah Omar; whether it is al-Qaeda's ideological founder Ayman al-Zawahiri or TTP Amir Mullah Mansoor Akhtar or 9/11 mastermind Khalid Shaikh Mohammad, they all have lived and freely operated from Pakistan. It is not even remotely possible that such notorious mass murderers could have lived and operated from Pakistani soil without the overt or covert support from ISI. In fact, thugs of every fanatic religious outfit are still freely operating in Pakistan, particularly in Karachi, very often under the

overt protection of Paramilitary Rangers. We have video evidence confirming that militants of banned extremist religious outfits are allowed to freely collect donations in Karachi to wage “Jihad against America.”

The region as well as the world has suffered enough due to the mindless policies and treachery of Pakistan's Punjabi-dominated security establishment. In fact, ethnic minorities of Pakistan have been the biggest victim of Pakistan Army and its intelligence agencies' ruthless pro-Punjabi policies. Over 20 thousand Muhajirs have been killed by Pakistan's state agencies since 1992 alone. Two federal governments in Pakistan were deposed on the charges of extrajudicial killings of Muhajirs in Karachi but none of the culprits was ever punished. Tens of thousands of Balochs have been killed by Pakistan's security agencies in the country's largest Balochistan province. Hundreds of ethnic Pashtoons too have either been killed and injured or made homeless by Pakistan Army in the last few years under the garb of security operations in the country's northern areas.

Pakistan Army and ISI are actively silencing every sane and secular voice in Pakistan and are supporting, arming and training every jihadi terrorist outfit under the sun. In recent days, General Janjua, the former Crops Commander of Balochistan, now the country's security czar, has facilitated legislation that now allows graduates of religious seminaries (Madrassahs) to receive Commission in Pakistan Army. The previous Director General of ISI (now the head of Pakistan's National Defense University) General Rizwan Akhtar has even proposed to ‘incorporate militants belonging to banned extremist religious outfits into paramilitary forces.’

The region is burning due to the highly unprofessional and irresponsible policies and acts of Pakistan's military establishment and ISI. The entire world is suffering. As the British Prime Minister Mrs. Theresa May said following the most recent terrorist attack in London “enough is enough.” It is about time for the world to act against this madness and put its foot down.

World Muhajir Congress sincerely request Trump Administration and US Congress to cut off military aid to Pakistan. Pakistan Army and intelligence agency ISI is mainly using this military aid to kill innocent Muhajirs, Baloch and Pashtoons. The double game of Pakistan's security establishment with US administration must come to an end which has put lives of US and NATO soldiers in danger in Afghanistan.

Mr. POE of Texas. So what does all this mean?

I have given 20 or 30 enumerated counts of an indictment against Pakistan, alleging them of supporting terrorism in the world.

What can we do about it?

Pakistan is not an ally of the United States. But the United States, every year, gives millions of dollars to Pakistan. Congress has even brought this up before, has tried to cut some of that money off. It has passed the House, but it has never passed and become law. And we continue to give them money.

The United States does not, and should not, continue to give Pakistan money because the money we give them goes to ISI, and that money goes to support terrorist activity in Afghanistan that kills Americans.

Why are we doing this?

But we continue to do it, for some reason that I think is absurd.

So the first thing we need to do is cut off the aid to Pakistan. We don't need to pay them to kill us; they will support killing Americans on their own. Cut off the aid.

The second thing we do is to label Pakistan a state sponsor of terrorism. That is what they are: a state sponsor of terrorism. Congress needs to label them and make that designation so they suffer the consequences for their terrorist mischief throughout the world.

And the third thing we do is we need to remove and revoke their major non-NATO ally status. That is a fancy word for: because Pakistan is a major non-NATO ally, they get certain benefits, militarily, that other countries don't get.

Revoke that. Quit giving them military aid. Quit giving them money. Designate them as a state sponsor of terrorism, and remove the major non-NATO ally status against Pakistan. There needs to be consequences for this long history, that most Americans are not aware of, where Pakistan says one thing and, like the ambassador said, does something else; and those consequences need to come down to get attention.

The longest war in American history continues today, and it is a war supposedly against terrorism. But Afghanistan still is a hotbed because of what takes place and supported from Pakistan. The Afghan Government knows it, we know it, and the Pakistan Government knows it.

So there must be consequences. I think Pakistan is found guilty of supporting terrorism, and there should be action by the United States immediately to do these three things.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is a privilege and it is good for the House and good for America when Judge TED POE is on the floor making a case. He was a great judge, a great prosecutor before that, and we will always need his voice making a case here on the floor, especially the kind of strong case he was just making. And I want to follow up with that.

There was a story yesterday, June 22, by Kristina Wong. It says:

“James Comey may have misled Senators on May 3, when he testified to the Senate Judiciary Committee that he had never been an anonymous

source in news reports related to the Russia investigation.

“By that time, he had already leaked several private conversations he had with President Trump to his friend Benjamin Wittes, editor-in-chief of the blog Lawfare and former editorial writer for *The Washington Post*.”

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recall, as we see every day, evidence that *The Washington Post* does not just despise Donald Trump, they are actually malicious in their reporting. President Trump, as a public figure, would normally have a tough time making a case as a public figure for libel or slander because you have to prove malice. The *Washington Post* has proved repeatedly they are not interested in fairness or anything resembling balance. They can't stand Donald J. Trump, and they are out to try to get him in a malicious fashion.

So when anybody, especially somebody with the FBI, leaks anything to people that may have it end up in *The Washington Post*, they, indeed, themselves become part of the malice for our President.

The article says:

“Wittes wrote in a piece on May 18, only 9 days after Comey was fired, that the former FBI Director had shared those conversations ‘over the previous few months.’ He wrote:

“Comey never told me the details of the dinner meeting; I don't think I even knew that there had been a meeting over dinner until I learned it from the *Times* story. But he did tell me in general terms that early on, Trump had ‘asked for loyalty’ and that Comey had promised him only honesty. He also told me that Trump was perceptibly uncomfortable with this answer.”

Now, let me insert here because obviously Mr. Comey does not understand what loyalty means and why a President of the United States would ask for loyalty from the Director of the FBI. But what loyalty means from a Director of the FBI is: Mr. President, I will be loyal to the administration. I will not go out and leak things to the media and I will not go out and stab you in the back every chance I have, even though I have these friends that hate your guts. And I know when I leak things or share things to people that can't stand the President, it is going to hurt him and it is going to be disloyal.

That is what loyalty is. It is outrageous for someone to try to make an obstruction case out of a President asking for loyalty.

Look at what the Obama administration did. They prosecuted more people that they alleged were leakers than all other administrations put together. They were aggressive in prosecuting disloyalty.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, as President of the United States, wasn't threatening to prosecute the way the Obama administration obviously had

done. And he didn't try to make an example of everybody by having them prosecuted if they leaked anything. Otherwise, Comey would be standing before a judge answering charges right now; and maybe that should come later.

All he was asking for is: I need you to promise me loyalty.

And the very question of a President just asking for loyalty ended up being a source of evidence that Mueller—not Mueller. That is another case altogether. There is plenty of evidence about him—that Comey is probably the most disloyal FBI Director since J. Edgar Hoover was taping Presidents himself and having them watched and spied on.

So it is amazing, as smart as James Comey is—I have questioned him a number of times, so I know how smart he is. But as smart as he is, he couldn't figure out that loyalty would mean you don't run—try to make your President look bad after a simple meeting where the President just asked: Would you be loyal? I am not asking for the Moon. I am not asking for anything outrageous. I am simply asking: Would you please be loyal?

And even as President Trump was, apparently, asking for loyalty, this disloyal, dishonest Director of the FBI was already turning wheels in his head: How can I hurt this President? I know a reporter that hates Trump, who worked for the Trump-hating *Washington Post*. Even though he is not there now, he will know how to help me hurt Trump.

I mean, even as the President is asking for loyalty, that is what he is getting in the mind of the FBI Director.

So is it any mystery when we look back at the case history we have talked about here on the floor about how Comey manipulated John Ashcroft into recusing himself so Comey could push his own dear friend and godfather of his child, Patrick Fitzgerald, into being special counsel to go after the Bush administration?

Clearly, Comey and Fitzgerald were hoping to nail Karl Rove's and Dick Cheney's hide to the wall. That is what they were after.

And how do we know?

Because on day one—well, of course, the fact that Comey would push the godfather of his child into that position tells you all you need to know, but there is plenty more.

They both knew that Richard Armitage had leaked Valerie Plame's identity as a CIA agent. And they knew that there was no need for a special counsel or a special investigation. Yet they spent millions of dollars and man-hours trying to get beyond that and find some way to nail somebody they didn't like.

You would call that dishonesty or disloyalty because honesty would have had Comey and his dear friend and god-

father of his child immediately going public on day one.

This would be honesty, to go forward and say: We know that the godfather of my child here, Patrick Fitzgerald, was appointed to find out who leaked information about Valerie Plame and her dishonest husband, Joseph Wilson, who lied to the CIA and lied to Congress, but we still need to know.

And guess what. We already know on day one who leaked it. It was Richard Armitage. There is no need to squander taxpayer dollars and there is no need for the government to pay massive amounts of money to Patrick Fitzgerald to do this investigation.

□ 1230

We are honest individuals. We are coming forward, and, yeah, maybe it wasn't all that honest for me to put my dear close friend, Fitzgerald, in this position, but I am going to be honest now. We don't need this investigation.

But that is not what they did. They were disloyal and dishonest to the American people, to the Bush administration, and to justice. They asked for expanded jurisdiction, made it seem like they were on the trail of something big.

No, they weren't on the trail of anything big. They had nothing. They wanted to try to get somebody prosecuted, and that way they could try to justify the massive amount of expenditures for nothing, for no good reason, that they were about to go through.

Eventually, they prosecuted Scooter Libby for allegedly being inconsistent with something he said—same thing they went after Martha Stewart for.

There was no insider trading that Martha Stewart engaged in. And I know she is not a fan of Republicans—seems like a very nice person when I talked to her—but she was treated grossly unfairly. There was no insider trading. So they keep talking to her until they find they think she said something inconsistent so they could get a conviction, get a scalp under their belt, figuratively speaking, and claim they had done some great good. Comey was underneath, behind the scenes in that as well.

So it is amazing to me how anybody could try to be accusatory of someone, a President that said: Can you please promise me you will be loyal?

He didn't ask for anything illegal, nothing unethical, but apparently—you know, I didn't know Donald Trump. I supported TED CRUZ for over a year for President. But I have come to understand, this man has amazing instincts with people, amazing business acumen, figures out when something makes sense and something doesn't make sense.

One of the other Members of Congress just this morning was saying: You know, I never realized until I had seen the President in person, the man really has a big heart.

Okay. It was kind of surprising to some folks. But you get the inkling of it the more you are around him. And you see the way he treats kids, and we saw the way he treats children. You know, we saw the way he was so good to all kids. It didn't matter—he didn't care if they were Democrats' kids or Republicans' kids.

But I do recall, 8 years ago, one of my friends from Texas had a daughter, had her little book and pen, saw kids lined up getting an autograph from President Obama. So she ran over to get an autograph, and she came back in tears because she said when he got to her, he said, "I am not signing yours," and walked away. Her parents assured her it was nothing personal. He just obviously had some kind of emergency.

But then later on, before the congressional picnic was over, she saw other children lined up getting an autograph. She ran, got to the end of the line, and once again, when President Obama got to her, he said, "I told you, I am not signing yours." It took a long time to get over that.

But a lot of the people that saw the way President Obama treated some kids—not all of them, but some—saw the way President Trump didn't care anything about their background, what party their parents supported. He was just a gracious guy, obviously showed a big heart for kids.

So it would be understandable that somebody in business, doing multi-million-dollar deals, would need to know people were going to be loyal. And I have come to know enough about Donald Trump and his intuition about people he is dealing with, if he asks someone to be loyal and that person hedges their bets, said, well, I will be honest—I haven't asked him, but I am willing to bet when James Comey refused to say he would be loyal but said he would be honest, I would be willing to bet you Donald Trump knew immediately this man is not going to be loyal or honest, and that is exactly what has happened.

James Comey has been both disloyal to his country, to the FBI, and to the President he was serving. He admitted leaking information. And some of us believe that if President Trump had not tweeted out, making reference to potential tapes of their conversations, that the disloyal, dishonest former Director of the FBI would probably not have been as honest as he was about some other things that were said.

But for anyone in the media to make some kind of big deal, potential obstruction of justice charge, just bringing up "I need you to be loyal; tell me you will be loyal" is absolutely outrageous.

I would expect every President, surely, if they were a good President, at one time or another needed to ask for a pledge of loyalty, not that you are going to lie, not that you are going to

commit a crime, but you are not going to run out and leak stuff more than once the way James Comey did. You are going to be loyal to me. And if there is a problem, you come to me. You don't go leak it to your leftwing friends.

And also being loyal, I would think, would include that, if you believe there is a need for an independent counsel, a special counsel, and that you are a critical witness, that being loyal and being honest would—and being ethical would require that you not look forward to having one of your best friends in the world, Bob Mueller, being the special counsel.

My friends, my very dear friends, JIM JORDAN, MARK MEADOWS, JODY HICE—I have an article from yesterday. I have been talking about this for a week or so with different people, but we do need an independent counsel. We need a special counsel. And courts have made clear, Congress cannot appoint an independent counsel. It is an executive branch function. It is a violation of the separation of powers.

It has been made very clear: Congress can appropriate for independent counsel, they can make laws that create an office of independent counsel or a special prosecutor, they can do all those things, but they cannot, Congress cannot appoint an independent prosecutor, a special counsel. That is an executive branch function, and everyone in the executive branch derives their power, any that they have, from and through the President of the United States.

We know, there is no question about it, President Barack Hussein Obama regularly and intentionally obstructed justice, but we know that for a President to obstruct justice the way President Obama did was legal. He has the power to legally obstruct justice a number of ways, whether it is at the very end, just an outright pardon, or whether it is a dictation of policies the way President Obama did: We are not going to go after and prosecute this group of people that have come in and committed crimes from other countries.

Some of us felt like it was terrible judgment, but President Obama had the legal authority to obstruct justice in directing the Justice Department not to pursue and prosecute certain groups of people or even individuals. He could pardon them outright before or after investigation. The President has that power. So does President Trump.

But as my friends point out in this article, Mr. Comey misled the American people in the early weeks of the Trump administration by furthering the perception that President Trump was under investigation when, in fact, he was not. He, again, did this willfully and intentionally, and, I would add, he did it disloyally and dishonestly.

They point out that Comey recently admitted that, after being fired from

the FBI, he had a friend leak an internal FBI document to The New York Times detailing a conversation Comey had with President Trump. Comey testified under oath that he had ordered the leak to help create public momentum for the appointment of a special counsel, which we now know is Comey's mentor, predecessor, dear friend, Robert Mueller.

Unless anyone be confused—and I have even heard our great Speaker of the House say: Yeah, well, you know, the fact is his credentials are impeccable. We trust him.

Well, anybody who looks into Mueller's situation deeply enough will not say that his credentials are impeccable. He served honorably, heroically in Vietnam, but as FBI Director, he set a policy in place that would run people out of the FBI that had years of service and experience as supervisors. One article pointed out, he had run off thousands and thousands of years of experience.

I would submit it is because his egotistical narcissism would not allow him to have anybody that knew more than he did so they could question or offer suggestions contrary to what Director Mueller wanted. That is why he cost the FBI millions of dollars. And because of his poor leadership, his purging of the FBI training materials so that all these new people, after he ran off the experienced people that knew what radical Islam was—they had been trained to recognize it—ran them off, had younger people in there who were not allowed to learn what radical Islam was, so when the Orlando shooter or Tsarnaev or any of these others that were on the radar were investigated by Mueller's trained FBI, they didn't know what they were looking for. Because of the poor training—it wasn't intentional by Mueller that they would end up costing people their lives, but that is what happened.

An article points out: "On May 7, 2014, the House of Representatives passed a resolution calling for a special counsel to investigate the IRS targeting of conservatives for their political beliefs. Comey and Attorney General Eric Holder blocked the appointment. This despite the fact that the lead investigator they assigned to the case, Barbara Bosserman, was a max-out contributor to President Obama's reelection campaign.

"This is the type of unequal justice the Americans despise. No special counsel in the IRS targeting investigation. No special counsel for the Clinton email investigation. But if it's about protecting Comey's reputation and hurting President Trump, then of course there has to be a special counsel.

"Throughout 2015 and 2016 there were calls from Congress for a special counsel in the Clinton email scandal."

I mean, for heaven's sakes, when you have someone go out and destroy

known evidence that has been subpoenaed with a hammer, now that is illegal obstruction of justice.

But, no, Comey didn't want that investigated. Oh, no, his dear friend Hillary Clinton, the dear couple that was so close to Loretta Lynch that she would order him to misrepresent what the FBI was doing, that she would get on a plane knowing he is the spouse of somebody they are supposed to be looking at prosecuting, that there is plenty of evidence to show she violated the law many times, criminal law many times, oh, no. But this Justice Department refused, even after it was revealed that Attorney General Loretta Lynch met privately with Bill Clinton less than a week before the FBI interviewed Hillary Clinton.

□ 1245

No special counsel was established, even allowed, or even recommended, even after some unusual Justice Department immunity deals, the deals the Justice Department made with Comey there as Director when he, apparently, was a big enough shot he could do his job and Loretta Lynch's; say, I'm not going to let anybody—what he said was no good prosecutor, in essence, would prosecute this case.

That was a lie, but he went before the public to say it to help his friends, the Clintons or, rather, better friends of Loretta Lynch and the President.

Boy, if President Trump had ever gotten the loyalty from James Comey that President Obama got, in numerous cases, undeservedly, people would be recognizing prior criminal activity for what it was and is.

Anyway, in one of the hearings, Mueller was asked about this incredible, horrendous activity of persecuting conservative organizations, refusing to allow them to form because they could go against President Obama in the next election. The Obama administration clearly used the IRS as one of its most effective campaign operative groups, and it worked. They were able, in 2012, to prevent conservative groups from forming and from coming after President Obama for problems he had created.

But with all the national furor over the IRS, Mr. Mueller was supposed to be so fair, so impartial. He is asked: Okay. Well, we're told we don't need a special counsel because you, the FBI, are all over this. You don't need any special prosecutor. You've got this under control. Who is the lead agent?

He couldn't answer the question.

He is asked: Okay. Well, how many agents have been assigned to the case?

Mueller could not answer that question.

He is asked: Have any victims been interviewed?

The answer again was: I don't know.

The reason was Mueller is not objective. He is not fair and balanced. He de-

spises this President, like his and Comey's friends at The Washington Post, The New York Times, and elite circles. They have shown they are and have been disloyal to the President. They have been unjust to this President.

And Mueller, I mean, going back to when William Jefferson was being investigated, I haven't seen the articles in many years, but I do recall, because we were paying attention, when Mueller had a congressional office searched without having—there are many times Members of Congress have potentially probable cause they committed a crime, and the way it was always handled, for over 200 years, you go to the Speaker of the House, because things in a Member of Congress' office—like, at that time, nobody should have come into my office, even with a warrant from the FBI, and been able to get material that said what FBI agents were giving me information about the terrible administration in the FBI.

The only way we can have a balance of power and the only way we can have oversight is if the FBI has no right to come in and find out who the whistleblowers are, because they do come after them. We have seen that over and over.

But Mueller was out for blood. They get a search warrant. Forget 200 years of law. We are not going through the Speaker so they can preserve things that are privileged that the FBI shouldn't get. Always in the past—there have been many people prosecuted with things that came from their office, as I understood it.

I was in on one of the meetings between the Attorney General's lawyers, the House lawyers, and the FBI. They said: You know, many times we have given you—when you show us what it is, we make sure what is privileged stays privileged and give you the evidence that lets you prosecute.

But Mueller went straight there, as a smack at Congress: You better not have oversight of me, or I will come after you.

And when he was questioned about this issue that Congress was raising, his response was: Maybe it's time I appointed 200 agents to investigate Congress.

He was threatening Congress.

This is mean-spirited. This is an unfair, unjust man. And there is only one answer because he leaked out, "I am investigating the President for obstruction of justice." Now if the President fires him, oh, it will be another Saturday night massacre.

So the answer is that the President has all the authority to appoint special counsel. He has got to appoint somebody to investigate Mueller, his chummy buddy Comey, their chummy buddy Loretta Lynch, and the Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton couple so we can fi-

nally find out truth, honesty, and loyalty in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 23, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to inform you that I hereby resign from the office of U.S. Representative, effective at 10:00 AM Eastern Time on June 30, 2017. It has been a tremendous honor and privilege to serve the people of Utah as a Member of Congress. I thank you for your leadership as Speaker and look forward to working with you in my capacity as a private citizen to continue to find ways to improve our great Nation.

Sincerely,

JASON E. CHAFFETZ,  
U.S. Representative,  
Utah Third Congressional District.

MAY 18, 2017.

Hon. GARY R. HERBERT,  
Governor, State of Utah,  
Salt Lake City, UT.

DEAR GOVERNOR HERBERT: I write to inform you in advance of my intent to resign from the office of U.S. Representative at the close of business on June 30, 2017. It has been a tremendous honor and privilege to serve the people of Utah as a Member of Congress. I look forward to working with you and others as a private citizen to continue to find ways to improve our remarkable State and Nation.

Sincerely,

JASON E. CHAFFETZ,  
U.S. Representative,  
Utah Third Congressional District.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LAMALFA (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a wedding.

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 26, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Greg Gianforte

# EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1787. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting reports entitled "2017 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 note; Public Law 107-314, 366(a)(5); (116 Stat. 2522); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1788. A letter from the Chairman, Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the 2016 Annual Report of the Appraisal Subcommittee, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3332(a)(5); Public Law 101-73, Sec. 1103 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1473(b)); (124 Stat. 2190); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1789. A letter from the Acting Comptroller of the Currency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting an annual report to Congress containing a description of actions taken to carry out Sec. 308 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1463 note; Public Law 101-73, Sec. 308(c) (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 367(4)(B)); (124 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1790. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received June 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1791. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1792. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the 2016 Management Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines including financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1793. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Agency Response for the period of October 1, 2016, to March 31, 2017, in accordance with Sec. 5 of Public Law 94-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1794. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs for FY 2015, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(i)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1893 (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 6402(j)(1)(B)); (124 Stat. 762) and 42 U.S.C.

1396u-6(e)(5); Public Law 109-171, Sec. 6034(a)(2); (120 Stat. 76); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1795. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018"; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2258. A bill to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves; with an amendment (Rept. 115-189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2547. A bill to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2548. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; with an amendment (Rept. 115-191, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1492. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice (Rept. 115-192, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

# DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1492 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Natural Resources and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2548 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

# PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself,  
Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BRADY

of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr.

VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 12. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 3031. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for flexibility in making withdrawals from a Thrift Savings Plan account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3032. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 3033. A bill to secure the technological edge of the United States in civil and military aviation; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TURNER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BOST, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 3034. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Justin Smith Morrill, United States Senator of the State of Vermont, in recognition of his lasting contributions to higher education opportunity for all Americans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RICE

of South Carolina, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 3035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt private foundations from the tax on excess business holdings in the case of certain philanthropic enterprises which are independently supervised, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BACON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 3036. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to modify the Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) to include a specific block explicitly identified as the location in which a member of the Armed Forces may provide one or more email addresses by which the member may be contacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3037. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limitation on employer-provided group term life insurance that can be excluded from the gross income of the employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 3038. A bill to provide employees with 2 hours of paid leave in order to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 3039. A bill to designate certain Federal lands in the State of California as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to designate portions of the San Gabriel River and Little Rock Creek in that State as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JUDY

CHU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 3040. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take certain actions related to pesticides that may affect pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 3041. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to provide an exception for a de minimus amount of fish or wildlife included in interstate commercial shipments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3042. A bill to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3043. A bill to modernize hydropower policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LANCE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 3044. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand supplemental benefits to meet the needs of chronically ill Medicare Advantage enrollees under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3045. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude employer contributions to 529 plans from gross income and employment taxes and to allow a deduction for individual contributions to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3047. A bill to correct the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Units P21, P21P, P22 in Florida; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER,



Ms. BORDALLO, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MENG, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 3048. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3049. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the windows in military family housing units to be equipped with fall prevention devices that protect against unintentional falls by young children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3050. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal financial assistance to States to implement, review, and revise State energy security plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3051. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require contractors to provide certain annual disclosures during a period of loan repayment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 3052. A bill to establish the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force, to expand the experimental sites initiative under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce college costs for students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEAL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution honoring David Américo Ortiz Arias, the three-time World Series Champion Major League Baseball player who played for the Minnesota Twins and the Boston Red Sox for a combined 20 seasons; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 404. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to create a small donor and public finance system for Congressional elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution (general welfare clause).

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article 1.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 3033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 3034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 3036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, clause 1 enumerates that, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . ." Further, Amendment XVI states that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 3039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Im-

posts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to waterways for the development of hydroelectric power and flood control.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 3044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to: Article I, Section 8, and Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, and Clause 3

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the "Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises."

By Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 3048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.



Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. JONES, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 24: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 38: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 113: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 468: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 490: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 502: Mr. COOPER and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 545: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 566: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 579: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILMER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 607: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 631: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 754: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 778: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 828: Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 860: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 873: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 911: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 959: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 997: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1044: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1045: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1057: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1118: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1223: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1247: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1322: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1368: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1406: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BACON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FASO, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1421: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1444: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1467: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1468: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1480: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1515: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1552: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 1563: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. FASO.

H.R. 1568: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1661: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1697: Mr. CORREA and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1698: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1699: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 1776: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1779: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1810: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1811: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1943: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2043: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2059: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2062: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2193: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HECK, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2230: Mr. ISSA, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2285: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2295: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2327: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2383: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BOST, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2392: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2401: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2404: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2418: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2431: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2452: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2550: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2635: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2711: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 2712: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 2723: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2746: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2756: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2823: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2825: Mr. PERRY, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 2832: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2862: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2879: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2902: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2909: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 2915: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2918: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 2921: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2924: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2943: Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2958: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2969: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2979: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. MCCARTHY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BERA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2982: Mr. SABLÁN and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2999: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3008: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 30: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H. Res. 199: Mr. KNIGHT.

H. Res. 259: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 267: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H. Res. 274: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. TROTT.

H. Res. 279: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 307: Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 317: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. ROYCE of California.

H. Res. 342: Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 395: Mr. KILDEE.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARCUS HOOK BOROUGH

**HON. PATRICK MEEHAN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th Anniversary of the founding of Marcus Hook Borough in Delaware County, Pennsylvania, and to honor the contributions of generations of Marcus Hook residents to our nation's development and prosperity.

Marcus Hook was founded during the boom years of the late 1800's, and its growth has been inextricably linked with the importance of the Delaware River to the commerce of America's east coast. Its key location and access to modern infrastructure made Marcus Hook a natural location for refining and for more than 100 years the industry has been the economic bedrock of the community.

Just a few years ago, the refining industry and the family-sustaining jobs it supports were at risk. Within a few short months, the operators of the refineries along the Delaware River announced their impending closure. But Marcus Hook didn't give up. Thanks to its legacy of excellence, the skills of its workforce and the grit of its residents, the community came together. Today, the refining sector is being revitalized, and another generation of Marcus Hook families benefits from the jobs it supports.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Marcus Hook, its leaders and its residents for 125 years as a family-friendly, close-knit community and I thank the families of Marcus Hook for the honor of representing them in the House of Representatives.

IN LOVING MEMORY OF DEVON PFEIFER

**HON. JAMES A. HIMES**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend and public servant, Devon Joan Pfeifer of Weston, Connecticut, who we lost far too soon. A dedicated and loving mother, beloved community leader, and passionate activist, Devon lived her life devoted to helping the lives of others, fighting for equal rights for all, and championing opportunities for the poor and working class.

The daughter of a carpenter and labor leader, Devon embraced the struggle she found in the labor movement: fair pay and a helping hand for the least fortunate. She brought this spirit of compassion to many volunteer causes

throughout Fairfield County, caring for those with disabilities and helping struggling schoolchildren learn to read. She cared deeply for the people she helped, and encouraged everyone to do as much good as they can, for all they can, as long as they can.

A lifelong Democrat and progressive, Devon served terms as Chair of the Weston and Fairfield Democratic Town Committees and as a member of the Weston Board of Education. She worked tirelessly behind the scenes to elect Democrats to local, state and federal offices. Her work embodied the very best of local political organizing; people coming together to support a shared vision for a brighter future. She drew people in to the hard work of creating change with powerful words, an infectious laugh, and seemingly endless energy. She inspired many young people in Fairfield County to pursue public service, mentoring and grooming them into leaders, and I know that today she is proud of their progress and the great work that they do. She always served as our collective conscience, willing us to do more and to do better.

Her activism lives on through her children—Conor and Maeve—whom she loved so dearly and within whom she instilled a rebel attitude and fierce sense of civic duty. Devon always strove for equal rights for all people, and her love for her children made her even more dedicated to the fight to make a more equal world for them.

Fairfield County and the State of Connecticut have lost a titan. We owe a debt of gratitude to Devon and I know I, and many others, will continue to be inspired and guided by her. Her legacy is and will continue to be one of service, love, and dedication.

2017 VETERAN'S ASSOCIATE PROGRAM (VAP)

**HON. BRIAN J. MAST**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the patriotic efforts of the Bank of America Merrill Lynch 2017 Veteran's Associate Program (VAP) and its Executive Sponsors Andrew Karp and Brian R. Carosielli, as well as William T. Golden, Co-Head of the NY Chapter of the Military Support and Assistance Group, for their steadfast and selfless commitment in helping members of the military transition into careers in the financial services industry.

Recognizing the unique experience and leadership of our servicemembers, Bank of America Merrill Lynch once again conducted a 10-week rotational program to provide on-the-job training and experience to assist veterans transitioning into the financial services industry. Ten veterans from the Army, Air Force,

Navy, and Marines participated in this year's VAP program; all were subsequently offered full-time placement in either the Office of the Chief Financial Officer or the Global Banking and Markets division.

Efforts like the VAP at Bank of America Merrill Lynch distinguish the service of the men and women in our military and make our country stronger.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STAN McETCHIN

**HON. DOUG LaMALFA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. LaMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the storied life of one of my constituents, Stanley David McEtchin, better known as Stan.

Hailing from Vancouver, British Columbia, Stan passed away on June 9th after 92 years of enriching the lives of those around him. For the past few decades, the small town of Paradise, CA has known Stan as a pillar of the community whose sculpted metal artwork decorated shops and houses all across Butte County. But before his creative artwork made him a local celebrity, Stan served in an even higher calling, volunteering in his country's military in World War II.

In 1943, Stan volunteered for the First Special Service Force in the Canadian Army and served as an ammunition supplier and medic. His unit, known as the Devil's Brigade, was an elite American and Canadian commando unit that preceded modern special operations forces that we have today.

In 2014, Stan and the rest of the Devil's Brigade travelled to Washington, D.C., where they were awarded with the Congressional Gold Medal for their heroism during the Second World War—the highest civilian award in the United States.

What makes Stan special is that he is known for his Congressional Gold Medal and for his distinguished military service, but also for his creativity and his artwork that help unite his community. Most people in Paradise, California would surely tell you that his metal artwork adds a distinct personality to his small town. I consider myself fortunate to have known him—and our country fortunate to have gained such a good man from our northern Canadian neighbors. He will be greatly missed.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING PAUL AND SHERY  
LOEWEN

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Paul and Shery Loewen, from Lakeport, California, upon their retirement from an exemplary career in the field of aviation.

Mr. Loewen was born in Amarillo, Texas, and moved to southern California with his family when he was five years old. He attended Glendale College where he earned his Airplane and Powerplant License, learned to fly and met Shery—whom he married in 1964. Mr. and Mrs. Loewen moved to our district in the early 1970s. In 1975, the Loewens established Lake Aero Styling and Repair, providing dozens of local men and women in our community with highly skilled jobs.

Mr. and Mrs. Loewen have sold Lake Aero Styling and Repair and are retiring after decades of developing and selling unique aircraft modifications. They are being honored by the Lake County Airmen's Association (LCAA) at Lampson Field this summer. Their products have a world-renowned reputation for quality and reliability. Thousands of Mooney Aircraft planes bear one or more of their modifications. These parts proved so successful that the manufacturer, Mooney International, later incorporated the modifications on its factory models. Additionally, Mooney Aircraft International awarded Mr. Loewen the Charles Taylor Award, which is an award given to senior mechanics who have led excellent careers.

Paul and Shery Loewen are also prominent members of our community. Mr. Loewen served as president of the Lake County Airmen's Association, and Mrs. Loewen held the role of secretary. While serving as president of the LCAA, Mr. Loewen organized and staged several successful Lampson Field Air Fairs. They have also produced several pilot-oriented travel videos entitled Flying the America's.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Loewen have created their own business and have contributed to our Lakeport community as industry leaders, job creators and community volunteers. It is with great pride that I honor Paul and Shery Loewen today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOEL GODDARD FOR HIS OUTSTANDING CAREER AND SERVICE WITH THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Joel Goddard for his career with the United Auto Workers and Ford Motor Company. Mr. Goddard has been an effective advocate for working Americans and labor, and his work has resulted in significant gains for our nation's autoworkers.

Mr. Goddard began his career with Ford Motor Company in 1972, when he joined the company to work at one of the company's Ohio engine plants. He then moved to Rawsonville, Michigan, where he began as a diecast diemaker. Mr. Goddard earned his first position with the UAW as an Alternate Skilled Trades Committeeman in 1985. As a result of his knowledge of the auto industry and effective advocacy on behalf of his fellow workers, Mr. Goddard moved up in the UAW and served in a variety of high-ranking positions. He was Chairman of the Local 898 UAW branch at Rawsonville and was reelected nine straight times due to his strong leadership. Additionally, Mr. Goddard served as the UAW National Negotiating Committee's Chairman from 2002 through 2015, where he represented autoworkers in multiple high-level negotiations and won them lasting improvements in pay and benefits.

Mr. Goddard has been an advocate and leader for the UAW throughout his career, and his deep knowledge of the automotive industry and tenacity have served the workers he represented well. As a result of Mr. Goddard's 25 years of work, the Rawsonville plant continues to provide good-paying jobs to Americans and produce high quality parts for Ford Motor Company. His commitment to a fair deal for UAW workers made him one of the longest serving Plant Chairmen in UAW history, and he continued to deliver wins for the workers he represented in negotiations. Mr. Goddard's leadership and expertise will be missed as he retires from his current position, and it is my hope that the Rawsonville plant and its workers continue to build on his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Joel Goddard. His career with the UAW and Ford has helped preserve American jobs and protect our country's workers.

HONORING KAYLA PIPPINS

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Cadet Col. Kayla Pippins of Callaway High School who was named the 2017 Jackson Public Schools JROTC Cadet of the Year.

Kayla Pippins serves as the Battalion Commander for Callaway's 4th Battalion Charging Chargers. She holds a 3.25 GPA and has earned a score of 24 on the ACT. She is a model cadet, not only for her battalion but for every cadet in the JROTC program. She has consistently demonstrated profound leadership throughout her four years as a JROTC cadet, earning her schools' top Leadership Education and Training award for her grade level in her 9th and 11th grade years.

Kayla Pippins also serves as President of Callaway's Jobs for Mississippi Graduates program, and in 2015, she was selected to represent that program in Washington, D.C., at the Jobs for America's Graduates National Conference. She is very active in her community and has assisted in several community service activities such as the New Hope Baptist Church Community Health Fair, Cottage Grove Nursing Home visits, Trendsetter Mentor program for North Jackson Elementary School and Callaway's Veterans Day program. She also serves as Sunday School Secretary and an usher at her church, Hope Spring Missionary Baptist Church.

Cadet Pippins has attended Girls State at the University of Southern Mississippi and the Junior ROTC Cadet Leadership Challenge at Camp Shelby in Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

After high school, Cadet Pippins plans to attend Tougaloo College and major in social work and to attain a Doctorate degree.

Kayla Pippins is the youngest child of Faylena Pippins.

The 13th Annual JROTC Cadet of the Year Awards Ceremony was held after a rigorous competition that culminated in an oral presentation before a panel of distinguished judges.

The Cadet of the Year was announced during this formal banquet. The school-level Cadets of the Year were also honored along with the top performing Leadership Education and Training cadets for each grade level.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Cadet Col. Kayla Pippins for her dedication to serving.

HONORING MR. JAY DAVID AGLI

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Jay Agli, who tragically passed away on June 13, 2017 at the age of 17. When his sister was in danger of drowning in the Connecticut River, Jay leapt to action to save her. Jay's example as a courageous and selfless brother is an inspiration to all of us.

Jay was a native of Meriden, Connecticut and an active young person in his community. He had just finished his junior year of high school at Orville H. Platt High, where he recently joined the wrestling team. He was also an enthusiastic volunteer with local groups, helping the Meriden Housing Authority Choice Neighborhood plan activities and joining the Meriden Youth Services teen group. Those close to Jay knew him for his kind and funny nature and his ability to make others laugh and feel welcome. He had a passion for cars and shared a love of art and drawing with his sister.

Mr. Speaker, Jay Agli was a bright young member of our community whom we lost too soon. His bravery and selflessness in acting to save his sister speak volumes about his character and willingness to help others. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor his life and memory here today. I extend my deepest condolences to Jay's family, friends, and all those who loved him. His laughter and love will be missed, but not forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILLIAM  
HENRY "DOC" LONG

**HON. MARK WALKER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of William Henry "Doc" Long, a veteran of World War II and liberator of France at Ancerviller on November 13, 1944. William Long was a member of the "Greatest Generation" and a true patriot. Mr. Long graduated from Summerfield High School just eight months before the attack at Pearl Harbor. Throughout his life, Mr. Long was active in his community, church and the trucking industry. To honor his more than 70 years of service to the transportation industry, the American Truck Historical Society recognized Mr. Long with the Golden Achievement Award. He served diligently at his church, Summerfield Peace United Methodist, and on the Summerfield School Committee. He was a 32nd degree Mason and Shriner, a lifetime member of the American Legion and the former Vice President of the 315th Regiment of the 79th Infantry Division Army Association. Mr. Long was inducted into the French Legion of Honor by a decree of former French President Sarkozy for his decisive role and personal contribution to the liberation of France during World War II. His name is on a monument in the village of Ancerviller, along with other men who fought so bravely to restore freedom. Mr. Long's numerous achievements and service to his country will not be forgotten. I join with his family, friends, community and the entire Sixth District in remembrance of William Henry "Doc" Long, a true American hero.

HONORING ISHA WILLIAMS

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student at Madison Shannon Palmer High School in Marks, Mississippi.

Isha Williams is the daughter of Jamesetta Strong. She is a senior at Madison Shannon Palmer High School. She participates in many activities such as basketball, volleyball, and cheerleading. In addition to her academic and athletic activities, she is a member of the Beta Club. She has received many awards for her outstanding academic performances such as an ACT Scholar (20 or above award for ACT), a Superintendent's List award, and an Outstanding Achievement award. Her goals and future plans consist of graduating from Basic Combat Training, AIT, and attending the University of Mississippi (Ole Miss University) to receive her master's degree.

Not only does she overachieve in school, but Isha also helps out in her community. She has tutored students in her Calculus class and other classmates as well. Isha has tutored elementary students after school on Mondays through Thursdays. She also has helped her

friend train and exercise so that she can join the Air Force. She attended a workshop at Mississippi Valley State University, and she helped the instructor by reviewing math problems and explaining each of them to other students. Isha is an overachiever who has made a difference in helping others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Isha Williams as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in her community.

IN HONOR OF MR. BERTOLINI

**HON. MIKE BISHOP**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Phil Bertolini of Oakland County, Michigan, for his induction into the prestigious National Chief Information Officer Hall of Fame.

Recognized for his outstanding contributions to his field, Mr. Bertolini was selected as one of only nineteen inductees for the Class of 2017. This award is a testament to Mr. Bertolini's unparalleled ingenuity, his unwavering commitment to excellence and innovation, and his dedication throughout twelve years of service to Oakland County.

Since becoming the head of Oakland County's IT department, Mr. Bertolini's application of new innovative technologies revolutionized the function of county government. Incorporating programs designed to increase government efficiency and communication, Mr. Bertolini and his team has received numerous honors and awards for their work. In 2012, he was recognized as a White House Champion of Change and has even had the opportunity to travel abroad as part of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Dedicated to the people of Oakland County, Mr. Bertolini has built his career on his devotion to serving others, and, understanding the responsibility and leadership required, he did not waiver in taking on this important Chief Information Officer role on behalf of his fellow citizens.

Mr. Bertolini's induction into the Chief Information Officer Hall of Fame is a great honor for not only him, but Oakland County and the great State of Michigan. He should be seen as an example of an ideal public servant, one who puts the needs of his community before his own.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my utmost gratitude and congratulations to Mr. Bertolini as his hard work, service, and outstanding performance receives the nationwide recognition that it deserves.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TRENTON  
TRIB FOR ITS SUCCESS ON THE  
DATE OF ITS NEW OFFICE OPEN-  
ING

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the writers and staff at the Trenton Trib for their work providing state and local news to the Downriver community. The newspaper provides important coverage of events and editorial perspectives to Trenton and residents in nearby areas.

Founded in 2010, the Trenton Trib is a monthly newspaper that covers current events and distributes information about the City of Trenton and the surrounding areas. The newspaper has grown and developed a loyal following since its establishment, and today boasts a monthly circulation of approximately 10,000 to residents and businesses throughout Trenton. The Trib covers local issues, including achievements by residents and events like the annual Trenton Summer Festival. The paper's columnists, Kathy Kane and Joe Hoshaw, also contribute original content and perspectives to provide context to issues facing the city. Additionally, the Trib issues an annual "Goodfellows" newspaper whose proceeds provide gifts and food to those in need during the holidays. Collectively, these efforts have helped inform the public while serving the community at large.

The Trenton Trib has filled a crucial need in Downriver by providing regular community-oriented news to area residents and businesses. The monthly publication both informs residents by providing unique local coverage and perspectives from Trenton residents and helps address issues in the community through its philanthropic initiatives. The growth and development of the Trenton Trib has enabled it to provide better coverage of area events while increasing circulation to better serve the city. The success of the publication is a credit to the hard work of the Trib's staff and underscores the continuing demand for high-quality local news, and it is my hope that the newspaper continues to effectively serve the area's residents in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Trenton Trib. The Trib's staff have served the community well through their coverage of local news and events.

HONORING THE LATE MR. L.  
PIERCE CARSON

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late L. Pierce Carson. He passed away on May 20, 2017 at the age of 76. He was an impressive journalist who had a remarkable career at the Napa Valley Register. He possessed a cheerful and energetic personality in the Napa community and was a champion for local food, wine and art.

Pierce was born in Trenton, New Jersey in 1940 and attended Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania before serving our country in Vietnam from 1965 to 1966. After returning home, he began his career with the Napa Valley Register, a position he held for nearly fifty years before his passing last month. He will be remembered as a mentor of young journalists and for his sponsorship of the Tri-High Gazette, a student run section of the Register. Mr. Carson wrote about and loved Napa. In recent years, he found a second home in Prague where he enjoyed living part of each year.

In his nearly fifty years of work as a journalist, Mr. Carson showed himself to be a friend and champion of Napa Valley food, wine and art. For many years, he served on the board of the Napa Valley Symphony and made it his priority to review their performances. Pierce could always be counted on to lend his writing talents to good causes. Over a twenty-five year period he volunteered for the Napa Valley Academy Awards party to raise funds and awareness for AIDS and HIV prevention and treatment.

Mr. Speaker, Pierce Carson was generous, kind and an excellent writer. He brought our Napa Valley community together. His newspaper stories taught us the value of friendship, culture, generosity and good wine. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor his life and legacy here today.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DEDICATION AND SERVICE OF ERNIE ANASTOS

**HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a widely respected public servant who is set to retire on June 30th. Through his inspirational leadership he has touched the lives of thousands of students in San Diego County.

It is fitting that at this time, as we celebrate the graduation of thousands of students across the nation, that I should rise to speak of Superintendent Ernest (Ernie) Anastos.

Ernie is a graduate of Brandeis University, and holds a master's degree in Special Education from Bridgewater State College. He has been a dedicated educator for over 45 years.

Ernie's life of public service began in 1972, as an elementary school teacher. His years of experience lent to a successful transition into school administration.

He served Sweetwater Union High School District for 20 years, working at Chula Vista High School, Hill Top High School, and Mar Vista High School. Ernie was named principal to National City Middle School in 1992, and to Rancho del Rey Middle School in 1997. Under his direction, both schools achieved the title of California Distinguished Schools.

His time at Sweetwater Union High School District also included a term as the Area Superintendent in charge of Instructional Support Services and Student Support Services from 2002 to 2005.

Ernie was named the Superintendent of Lemon Grove School District in 2005. On April 28th, 2017, the Association of California School Administrators named Ernie as Superintendent of the Year in the San Diego and Imperial Counties.

Under his leadership, Lemon Grove School District has created a number of highly successful, specialized schools including the Dual Immersion Academy at Mount Vernon Elementary, the San Miguel Arts Academy, and the Lemon Grove Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Ernie has been a stalwart in the push for quality public education.

The Lemon Grove Academy campus is an example of the success that arose as a result of Ernie's inventiveness. Ernie sought to create schools that could serve as community centers. Through a partnership with UC San Diego, and the Lemon Grove Library, a joint-use facility was created which featured medical and dental clinics to serve students and their families.

As I reflect on Ernie's career, I am inspired by his dedication to promoting student achievement. I am truly encouraged by his commitment to bettering the lives of those around him.

Ernie's dedication to students, commitment to excellence, and ingenuity truly made him a remarkable leader. Under his guidance, Lemon Grove School District has emerged as a mecca for innovative education. I wish him congratulations on his upcoming retirement.

HONORING ARMY SPECIALIST  
HOWARD HERMAN HARGROVE

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a remarkable person, U.S. Army Specialist 7 Retired Howard Herman Hargrove.

A native of Manson County, North Carolina, Spec 7 Hargrove moved to Mississippi in December 2005 to be near his only daughter, Gail Hargrove Marshall Brown. The late Spec 7 Retired Hargrove was a dedicated resident of the Second Congressional District in Clinton, Mississippi for five years.

Spec 7 Hargrove took great pride in exercising his right to vote and in serving his country. He served in the United States Army from January 14, 1948 to March 31, 1972 on several tours of duty. His military service included the Korean Conflict, from 1950 to 1951 with the 25th Infantry Division, U.S. Army Field Artillery Battalion and the Vietnam War where he served two tours in Vietnam and was proud to be honorably discharged without "a scratch or a wound".

Spec 7 Hargrove was among the thousands of Korean War Veterans who gathered in Washington, D.C. at the Pentagon on June 30, 2000. The ceremony was held at the Korean War Memorial on the National Mall to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of that war. The veterans were honored by President Bill Clinton who told them that this nation will never forget their bravery, service and sacrifice.

During his time as a Clinton, Mississippi resident, Spec 7 Hargrove actively attended Holy Temple Missionary Baptist Church in Jackson, Mississippi, pastored by the first female pastor of a Missionary Baptist Church in Jackson, Mississippi, Rev. Dr. Audrey Lynne Hall, who affectionately referred to him as "Papa Hargrove." During one of the church's Men's Day programs on Father's Day, Hargrove was recognized by the Pastor and the Church as its "Oldest Father".

As a member of Holy Temple, he contributed generously to the church financially. During a time when the small, but growing church's Kitchen Ministry was in need of a new stove, Spec 7 Hargrove found it in his heart to purchase a commercial stove for the church which is still being used by the Kitchen Ministry today. He also contributed financially to a Metro-Jackson Karate program at one of the local YMCA.

A quiet, friendly man, who believed heavily in the love and unity of family, Spec 7 Hargrove succumbed to complications due to Alzheimer's on June 27, 2010 at 2:30 a.m. in the VA Medical Center (Hospice Unit) in Jackson, MS. He had battled the horrific Alzheimer's disease for nearly half a decade.

His daughter, Gail, salutes his memory and legacy by being a strong advocate in the fight against Alzheimer's. She said, although he had forgotten who she was before he deceased, he never forgot the fact that he had proudly served his country in the military.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the late Specialist 7 Howard Herman Hargrove as a remarkable person who made a difference in his community and our country.

IN MEMORY OF HORACE SELLERS  
MERRILL

**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the life of Mr. Horace Sellers Merrill of Heflin, Alabama. Mr. Merrill passed away on February 17, 2017 at the age of 80.

Horace was born on October 15, 1936 in Micaville to Emory Joseph and Grace Allen Merrill. He graduated from Cleburne County High School in 1954 lettering in baseball and football. He attended Southern Union Junior College in Wadley, Alabama on an athletic scholarship until an automobile accident ended his athletic career in 1957.

Horace started work at Dixie Mines Mica Mining Company and married Mary Inez Thompson of Anniston, Alabama on June 1, 1963.

Mr. Merrill always held a strong interest in politics. In 1964, he was elected Circuit Clerk of Cleburne County and served for 12 years. During this time, he participated in the Lions Club, Jaycees and Athletic Boosters Club and was president of each. He also assisted in the organization of the first youth baseball program in Heflin, where he officiated and coached in the 1960s and 1970s and was the

public address announcer for Little League Football and junior high football games.

After completing two terms as Circuit Clerk, he was elected Probate Judge and Chairman of the Cleburne County Commission in 1976, a position he held for one six-year term. While serving as Probate Judge, he led the effort to purchase land and develop plans for the construction of the State of Alabama Welcome Center and Rest Area on I-20. He had a vision for a county-wide water system to service all citizens of Cleburne County through the Dyne Creek Watershed project that was supported by Congressman Bill Nichols and Senator Howell Heflin that he was not able to complete before the end of this term.

Mr. Merrill was an active participant in the Cleburne Baptist Association, and served as an officer and pastor of several churches. His pastorates included Happy Hill, Cedar Creek, Pinetucky (Interim), Chulafinnee and Edwardsville Baptist Churches. As a member of Heflin Baptist for over 50 years, Mr. Merrill served as a Deacon, Sunday School Superintendent, Sunday School Teacher, Church Training Director and Sanctuary Choir member.

Horace and Mary enjoyed 53 years of marriage and were blessed with two children and four grandchildren: Alabama Secretary of State John Harold Merrill (Cindy) and Audrey Merrill Gillis (Stephen), Pelham Brooks Merrill, Alexandra Grace Merrill, Mary Kathryn Gillis and Sarah Sellers Gillis.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the life of Horace Merrill. He will be greatly missed.

HONORING L. J. "JAY"  
TEMPLETON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. L. J. "Jay" Templeton upon the occasion of his retirement as the Executive Director of the Boys and Girls Club of St. Helena and Calistoga. Mr. Templeton has dedicated his career to serving young people, and has had a tremendous impact on our community.

A native of Washington State, Mr. Templeton graduated from Glacier High School and received his Bachelor of Arts in History from the University of Washington in 1973. Mr. Templeton began working for the Boys and Girls Clubs in 1969. He has held nearly every position in the organization, from a rank-and-file program assistant to the highest leadership roles. He became Executive Director of the St. Helena and Calistoga Clubs in 2012.

Mr. Templeton received the Masters and Mentors Award in 2013 based on his contribution to the Boys and Girls Clubs movement over a sustained period, successful mentoring of Academy members, and demonstrated excellence in the Boys & Girls Clubs profession.

Mr. Templeton is retiring not only as the Executive Director of the St. Helena and Calistoga Clubs, but from a 47-year career

with the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. He is a model professional and executive—always keeping his focus on planning, development, leadership, and programming. He has received numerous awards and accolades over the course of his career. He has influenced the lives of thousands of children who have grown to become productive members of their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, Jay Templeton has led a dedicated and distinguished career with the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. I am proud to have such a man working and living in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL  
DAVID E. WILMOT

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 2017

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the service of Major General David E. Wilmot of the United States Army for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to our Nation. General Wilmot distinguished himself through exceptionally meritorious service from October 24th, 1985 to July 30th, 2017, while serving as an Assistant Surgeon General and National Guard Bureau Surgeon, Headquarters Department of the Army.

His lasting contributions include an exemplary career as a family practice physician, flight surgeon, commander, and deputy headquarters surgeon, in numerous assignments across the Active and National Guard components of the U.S. Army. He quickly established himself as a unique combination of Soldier, leader, clinician, and key strategic thinker, culminating in service as the Assistant Surgeon General/Deputy Chief of Staff, Quality and Safety for U.S. Army Medical Command/Office of the Surgeon General, a position he was hand selected for.

His singular Warrior centered focus on reducing harm and enhancing the quality care through compassion, excellence, transparency and accountability resulted in better and safer care for Military Health System beneficiaries across the globe. He performed with consummate distinction in all of his assignments, the impact of which stems from his capacity as a proven senior healthcare executive, and dogged champion for quality care and patient safety. The distinguished accomplishments of General Wilmot culminate a long and distinguished career in the service of his country and reflect great credit upon him, the Army Medical Department, the United States Army and the Department of Defense.

General Wilmot is a native of Brownsburg, Indiana and married to Mrs. Lori Wilmot.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service of Major General David E. Wilmot as he and his family proceed to the next chapter in his remarkable career and continue to serve our great Nation.

HONORING MR. DAMIEN GREEN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable young man, Mr. Damien Green of Clinton, Mississippi.

Damien Green was born on October 15, 1999 to Ms. Jessica Green. He's currently a member of Jackson Revival Center Church, where he serves on the Media Team. He is a part-time employee at Metro 24 Bowling Center and MS Braves. During his spare time, Damien enjoys bowling and traveling.

Damien, a 2017 graduate of Clinton High School, was the Captain of the Bowling Team (Clinton Kingpins) and the Director of Football Operations of Clinton High School's 2016 to 2017 6A-State Championship.

With such honor, Damien has signed the first Bowling Scholarship ever given at Clinton High School (Clinton, MS). He will attend Blue Mountain College in Blue Mountain, MS, where he will major in Mathematics.

Damien learned the sport from his grandfather, Gregory Green. Greg, an accomplished bowler in his own right, is the Owner of Metro 24 Bowling Center (formerly the Cotton Bowl Lanes) on Lynch Street. Damien has been bowling seriously since he was 10 years old and has been on the Clinton Bowling Team since the 7th grade. Damien's bowling average is in the low 200, personal best is 277 and a perfect score is 300. Damien is ranked the No. 2 bowler in the district and the No. 6 bowler in the State of MS. With so many accomplishments over his years, he was awarded the Highest Average and Team Leader of Clinton High School's Bowling Team.

Damien's bowling Coach, Charlie Melton said, "Damien has been making a name for himself for the past couple of years". Coach Melton went on to say that the scholarship is a "huge incentive" for other members of the bowling team as it will make them work harder to achieve the same accomplishment. Of the scholarship, Damien said "It gives me an opportunity to do something that I love, and I am going to take advantage of that opportunity. It shows that my hard work did not go to waste."

With a cheering and supportive family, school district and church family, Damien is excited about doing his best. He tells his mom constantly that "The best is yet to come," and she is definitely his number one fan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Damien Green for all of his hard work, leadership, accomplishments and becoming a part of history, here in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF MR. JEFFERY M. SANDERS, A RESIDENT AND FIREFIGHTER IN MAYVIEW, MO

### HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true and selfless public servant whose life was tragically taken before his time. Mr. Jeffery Sanders, a lifelong Mayview, Missouri resident and Mayview firefighter was killed in the line of duty on Monday, June 19, 2017, following an on scene accident while wrapping up another call alongside a state highway. I will be praying throughout the coming days for his family, friends, and our community during this difficult time, as well as for Mr. Jacob Hayward, a fellow Mayview firefighter seriously injured in the same heartbreaking accident.

Jeff was well known in the close-knit community of two hundred residents, having been a farmer in Mayview all of his life. He and his wife, Connie, raised two wonderful children who continue to live in Lafayette County in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District. Although he was most proud of being a good husband, father, and grandfather, for more than thirty years, Mr. Sanders dedicated much of his time to the Mayview Fire Protection District. He could always be counted on to make a fire call and help someone in need.

In all of his activities, Mr. Sanders demonstrated his dedication and commitment to the greater good of others. He was actively involved with the Mayview Lions Club, the Mayview area 4H, the Antique Tractor Club, and the Odessa FFA Advisory Board. Along with his work as a volunteer firefighter with the Mayview Fire Protection District, he also spent time serving on the Mayview Special Road District.

While it is impossible for mere words to capture the essence of a person's life, for these reasons and many more, it is my privilege to honor and celebrate the life of Mr. Jeffery Sanders. Mr. Speaker, please join me and our colleagues in expressing our deepest and heartfelt sympathies to Connie, all of the Sanders family, the members of the Mayview Fire Protection District, and the community of Mayview for their loss. We join together to honor his professionalism and sacrifice and express our appreciation for his endless commitment to serving the residents of Mayview and the State of Missouri. He was an unparalleled role model to his family, peers and the entire Lafayette County community and we are better because of his life with us.

RECOGNIZING MASTER SERGEANT SCOTT FORBES

### HON. KATHERINE M. CLARK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Master Sergeant Scott Forbes from Melrose, Massachusetts.

On June 27, 2017, Master Sergeant Forbes will retire from the Air Force Reserve after 22 years of service to his country and his community.

During his service, Scott was deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. He most recently served with the 58th Aerial Port Squadron at Westover Air Base as an air transportation craftsman.

Scott, his wife Susan, and their children Abygail and Jackson are valued members of our Melrose community. Scott and Susan grew up in Melrose, where they both attended high school. As a young man, Scott decided he would continue the tradition of service passed on by his late father Bill Forbes, who fought for the U.S. Army during the Vietnam War. The Forbes family tradition of service extends beyond their military contributions. Today, just as his father before him, Scott continues to serve families in our community as an alderman in Melrose.

Scott, Susan, and the entire Forbes family exemplify the contributions of generations of service members and military families who have protected our country and continue to make our communities great places to live, work and raise a family.

### HONORING GREATER FAIRVIEW MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the congregation of the Fairview M.B. Church which was organized in 1918, under the leadership of the late Rev. Mark Burns; in an old store-front building on the corner of Amite and Jefferson Streets.

Following the lead of the Holy Spirit and with bare necessities such as wooden apple boxes and planks for seating, Rev. Burns moved forward with (2) deacons, Bro. Jeff Mason and Bro. John Camel; a church clerk, Sis. Ella Patton, and following her death Sis. Olive Patton. After 6 years of hard work and self-sacrifice by the faithful few, enough monies were raised to purchase a lot on Mississippi Street from M.A. Lewis. By 1924, the membership had grown to about 25 members and the church was officially built.

Rev. Burns was called to another assignment, and the late Rev. Willie Pickens, was called to carry on many unfinished task. He was a very good orator and the church grew mightily under his leadership. Following Rev. Pickens, the late Rev. N. Trouvillion, was called to service for a short time, and then came a Rev. Jackson. In 1930, the Rev. F. W. Coleman was called as pastor. He was a young dynamic man just beginning in the ministry. During his 14 years of service, much was accomplished; different auxiliaries were organized, and many more souls were added to the church. Directly following Rev. Coleman, the Rev. R. L. Varnado former pastor of Ridley Hill Baptist Church of Madison County was elected and served 8 years of which the church continued to grow in souls and finances.

In 1953, the Rev. R. H. Walls, former pastor of Pilgrim's Rest Baptist Church of Madison, succeeded Rev. Varnado. During his tenure, the church roofing was updated, the siding painted, a walk-way was installed, and an organ and piano were purchased. The Deacons Ministry grew under the beginning administration as followed: Brothers Jess Moss, John Camel, Sam Patton, Hemphill, Alforna Lewis, Charlie Spencer, Harvey Miles, Buster Jones, Joseph Walker, Vertis Kersh, Cleveland Jorner, and Albert Smith.

On April 27, 1962 by the Spirit of God leading, the Fairview church called Rev. S.L. Spann, Sr. as pastor. Through the mighty hand of God he led the church from the building on Mississippi Street to 2545 Newport Street. Just a little over a year later that building was upgraded and the original 65 members that came from Mississippi Street were now 300 strong.

After settlement on Newport Street, Fairview Church began to really grow and the name was changed to Greater Fairview Missionary Baptist Church. Through the leadership and teachings of Pastor Spann, the Word of God was being planted deeply in the hearts of men and they were being urged not to just congregate but to participate; to use the talents God had bestowed upon them in love and with purpose. Many new ministries were established to accommodate and involve everyone in this newly growing fellowship. The needs were met through the establishment of Matron's and Junior Matron's League, Juniors Usher Board, Laymen's and Jr. Laymen's Association, Missionary Society and the YWA Association, all training tools for the young people. The Sunday school grew to 10 individual teaching classrooms. Rev. Spann understood the importance of proper training and in order to reap a productive harvest someone had to plant the "Right(eous) Seeds".

To aid in priming the soil for planting of the Word, soul stirring music was needed, so several choirs were established: The Senior Choir, under the direction of the late Sis. Rebecca Jordan; the Youth and Junior Choirs were led by Sis. Lannie Spann; and Sis. Mary Davis was pianist for the Male Chorus and Chancel Choir, which later became the Inspirational Choir. The church also in-acted an After-School Tutorial Program, led by the late Bro. George Coleman, then by Sis. Velma Spann, and finally by Deacon Charles Smith. The students were not only taught the 3R's but also offered a holistic approach to their student studies.

Greater Fairview became a true source of spiritual revitalization for the Shady Oaks community and the people that were being drawn through her doors by the pure God-given preaching of Pastor Spann, and the strong spiritual messages through songs sung by the choirs, and all the teachings through love were aids in growing this congregation. The Young Adult Choir was a great draw to the community and church alike; recording its' first album in 1973 and touring the country representing Christ and the church respectively.

Greater Fairview continued to grow in leaps and bounds and the unadulterated word of God continued to come forth encouraging, admonishing, and changing the lives of many. Under Spann's leadership many Sons were



called, nurtured, and equipped for service using Godly precepts, fatherly teachings, and examples, they are as follows: the late Rev. Annia Collier, the late Rev. John Hunter, Rev. S.L. Jamison, Rev. Timothy Taylor, the late Rev. Ray Bowman, Rev. H. L. Sylvester, Rev. Robert Clark, Rev. Lonnie Wesley, the late Rev. Keith Brooks, Rev. Christopher Golden, Rev. Kenneth Whitten, Rev. Charlie Jackson, Rev. Johnny Smith, Rev. Bobby Burks, Rev. Willie McDowell, Rev. Dr. John McCarty, Rev. Larry Davidson, Rev. Matthew R. Spann, Rev. Charles Bell, Rev. Charles H. Spann, Rev. Fredrick Green, and Rev. Frederick Hanskins.

In 1992, Dr. Spann was led by the Holy Ghost to build a new sanctuary, and the project began with total support from the church and its leaders. The building was dedicated the 3rd Sunday in October 1995. Many said that Dr. Spann was too old for such a great undertaking, and that he probably wouldn't see it come to fruition. But, to the dismay of many he did see it and led the congregation into the new church on that rainy October day in 1995, and brought many stirring messages for another 4 years, until retirement in 1999.

During the period of Dr. Spann's; honorable position as Pastor Emeritus, Rev. Charles H. Spann served as Interim pastor of the church for approximately fifteen (15) months. Following the formation of a Search Committee by the church; who was charged with the responsibility of selecting a new pastor. Rev. Charles Bell and Rev. Bobby Burks served together as Pulpit Facilitators. Amazingly, these temporal positions for these three (3) Sons of the House provided them with leadership experience and ultimately prepared them; for they were soon called to serve at churches of their own. The words, "A Church Where Love Prevails over Hate," became more prevalent in the process to find a new leader.

As in life when assignments are complete they must all move on, and Pastor Spann's assignments were completed on November 9, 2001 after 38 years of service to Greater Fairview Church, the Shady Oaks Community, and the State of Mississippi. He was called home to a just reward, leaving the church sad- den yet rejoicing in the fact that they had been taught how to love each other to an un-meas- urable magnitude, and in the midst of sorrow his teachings could be accessed to help them through the dark hour. But feeling the dis- connect, just 9 months later in August 2002, God called Mother Spann home too, leaving the church with a legacy of memories of a hallmark of quiet, gracious, and humble char- acters in the midst of servitude.

After an arduous process of fasting, praying, and listening to several candidates for pastor, it was decided by a vote that Rev. Danny R. Hollins, a native of Pocahtontas, MS and the tenured pastor of Cedar Grove Baptist Church, become the next leader, the majority con- ceded and he was elected.

Rev. Danny R. Hollins preached his first sermon on the 5th Sunday of July 2001 and was installed as pastor on the third Sunday in October of that same year. Greater Fairview grew over the next few years as the word con- tinued to go forth. They never lost our vision and zeal for ministry and many other min- istries were added.

In 2004 the church purchased 34 acres of land on Boling Street for future development. During the 2005 Hurricane Katrina aftermath, the church became a refuge center, and pro- vided shelter for 60 members of one family from Slidell, La. and later to a Hispanic family, from Houston, Texas, when Hurricane Rita hit in September of that same year. The creed of "Meeting people where they are." was truly tested and taken to the limits while helping neighbors.

The Church adopted in 2006 Johnson Ele- mentary School, Morrison Academic Advance- ment Center in 2007, Dawson Elementary and Northwest Middle Schools in 2010, and also became a satellite program with the Con- tinuing Adult Education Program, of Jackson State University, where many of the members obtained a college degree. Finally, in October of 2010, ground was broken for the long an- ticipated development. The Fairview Learning Academy, along with the Recreational Out- reach Center, was built.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Greater Fairview Missionary Baptist Church.

---

#### CONGRATULATING QUALITY OF LIFE HEALTH SERVICES, INC. ON ITS FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY

---

**HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I re- cognize the Quality of Life Health Services (QOLHS) on the occasion of its 40th anniver- sary. This Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC), was founded by Dr. Roberta O. Watts to provide health care to the most vul- nerable populations.

QOLHS, based in Gadsden, Alabama, is the state's largest community health program. The organization's network extends from the north- ern area of Alabama in Geraldine to Phenix City in the southeastern corner of Alabama. QOLHS's network consists of 24 health cen- ters. Fifteen of those locations are in Ala- bama's Fourth Congressional District—which I am honored to represent.

I am proud to be a long-time supporter of QOLHS, helping to support numerous federal grants, attending the groundbreaking and grand opening of a school-based program in Gadsden, and joining in other events over the years.

Quality of Life serves over 55,000 patients each year and shows a profound commitment to the communities it serves. Let me end by congratulating Dr. Watts for her years of dedi- cation, and a very special congratulations to Wayne Rowe—who has served as CEO for the past 35 years. I look forward to continuing to work with QOLHS in the future.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE JUSTIN SMITH MORRILL CONGRES- SIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

**HON. DAN NEWHOUSE**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Justin Smith Morrill Congres- sional Gold Medal Act of 2016. This legislation would honor a true American hero by post- humously awarding the Honorable Justin Smith Morrill with the Congressional Gold Medal. Mr. Morrill was elected to six terms in the U.S. House of Representatives and six terms in the United States Senate, making him the longest serving Member of Congress in the 19th Century. During his tenure, he chaired the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Committee on Finance, and the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Buildings and Grounds, he served as the principle advocate for financing and constructing the Thomas Jefferson Build- ing of the Library of Congress and planned the location of the U.S. Supreme Court Building. He also raised funds to complete the then-un- finished Washington Monument and advo- cated for the Smithsonian Institution through- out his service in Congress.

His greatest achievement was authoring the Morrill Act of 1862, which created the land- grant university system. Today, land-grant col- leges and universities award nearly 1 million degrees annually and perform more than \$37 billion in research. Additionally, almost 30 years later, Senator Morrill authored the Morrill Act of 1890, which created the flourishing sys- tem of historically Black land-grant colleges and universities. I am proud to be a graduate of Washington State University, in my humble opinion, the premier land-grant university in Senator Morrill's system. I have seen first- hand how the system of colleges and univer- sities created by Senator Morrill has changed countless lives and shaped communities across the nation.

Justin Smith Morrill is a man who has pro- vided generations and millions of Americans— particularly those from working class families and rural communities—with access to higher education throughout the nation. His achieve- ments have inspired American history, values, and culture, and will be recognized and hon- ored by generations to come. For these rea- sons, and many others, I urge all members to join me in supporting this legislation to bestow Senator Justin Smith Morrill with a Congres- sional Gold Medal, a fitting honor for a great American hero.

---

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF RAYMOND V. WALENDZAK

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Raymond V. Walendzak,

who served for over 20 years as the Chief of the Oregon Fire Department. Ray passed away in his Oregon home surrounded by his family on June 7, 2017.

Ray was born in Toledo, Ohio on September 27, 1941 to Joan and Stanley Walendzak. He played football and wrestled for Clay High School, from which he graduated in 1959. Ray continued his education at Findlay College, and then joined the United States Air Force and served in West Germany.

In 1968, Ray became an Oregon firefighter, where he began his service in the department's maintenance division, became a fire prevention officer, a district chief, and the assistant chief. Ray's father also served as a firefighter, which helped Ray bridge the differences between the different generations who were serving as firefighters. He appreciated the traditions of fire service, and also the need to modernize fire service with technology.

Ray became Fire Chief in 1986 and retired in 2007 for a total of 39 years of fire service. While Fire Chief, Ray made sure his department was current in training and technology, and made sure that the department had the right equipment. Ray has said that his biggest achievement was getting a fire training facility built in Oregon.

His passion about the fire-fighting community led him to serve its various organizations which include serving as the past president of the Ohio Fire Chiefs Association, Lucas County Fire Chiefs Association, Oregon Fire Fighters Association, Ottawa County Fireman's Association, and, for over 26 years, as past president and secretary of the Northwest Ohio Volunteer Fire Association.

He had received the Ohio Fire Chiefs' Association's Distinguished Service Award, and was inducted into the Ohio Fire Service Hall of Fame. Ray served as a Governor appointee to the State of the Ohio Board of Emergency Medical Services for 12 years. He was inducted into the Clay High School Hall of Fame in 2014.

Ray's commitment to his community did not just stop with the fire department—it extended through his service to his church, St. Ignatius, and through many of the civic organizations he was a member of: the American Legion Christ Dunberger Post No. 537, Knights of Columbus, Swiss Club at the GAF, and the Clay Boosters.

Ray dedicated an enormous amount of time to the youth of his community, where he was a longtime coach of youth baseball through the Oregon Recreation Department. Ray also served as a football coach at Oregon Clay High School. His dedication to the young members of his community led him to run for four terms on the Oregon Board of Education where he also served as Board President.

Ray will be remembered for his dedication to his chosen profession of Fire Fighting and for his dedication to the Oregon community at large.

We offer Ray's children, Dean, Donald and Dennis, his six grandchildren, his family and friends, our prayers and hope that they find comfort in the wonderful memories of what Ray had meant to each of the institutions that he served.

# HONORING THE REMARKABLE MT. MORIAH BAPTIST UNION ASSOCIATION

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable historical Mt. Moriah Baptist Union Association.

The Mt. Moriah Baptist Union Association was organized in 1908, by Dr. C.P. Bohannon and he served as the first moderator for the Mt. Moriah MB Union Association for twenty-three years. Thirty congregations united themselves together in an effort to keep alive the hope of a people for the work of service to our Lord has been the strength of this body. Together, we can accomplish what one congregation may not achieve alone. Therefore, strength is generated through unity.

The association represented in the National Baptist Convention, USA, INC., the General Baptist State Convention and Moderator Bohannon Challenged the local churches of Mt. Moriah by say "our missionary activities in foreign land carried on." Moderator Bohannon passed in 1939 and vice moderator A.M. Robert completed his term. Other moderators followed; Rev. William H. Turner (upon his death, Rev. B.J. Edwards, as Vice-Moderator, carried out his term); Rev. J.C. Batteast, Rev. J.C. Hentz, Rev. Amos Sims and the newly elect, Rev. Larry Hervey. In May 1972, Sarah Kimble donated land to the Mt. Moriah District Baptist Association. In July 1982, Moderator Batteast led the association in the purchase of the Davidson Elementary School building in Water Valley to serve as a site for the work of the Association. The facility served the Association's for 18 years.

In March of 1999, the Association Board, under the leadership of Moderator J.C. Hentz, made the decision to build a new headquarters on the land donated by Mrs. Sarah Kimble. The vision of the forefathers has become a reality. The Mt. Moriah District Missionary Baptist Association headquarters was erected in 2000. On May 2008, the Association building was destroyed by fire. Mt. Moriah District Missionary headquarters was rebuilt in 2009 under the leadership of Moderator Sims, and stands today as a testimony of the power of vision among God's people.

In recognition of the challenging need of enlistment of ever growing constituency of the Baptist Churches affiliated with the General Missionary Baptist State Convention, USA, for the purpose of developing a strong and sound progressive denomination to fulfill the "Great Commission" enunciated by Jesus Christ, the head of the church. We, the messenger of the Mount Moriah District Missionary Baptist Association pledge its future to carrying forward of programs of religious educational training in church membership, evangelism and mission as sponsored by the General Missionary Baptist State Convention of Mississippi, through its several boards/committees.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Mt. Moriah Baptist Union Association for their dedication and outstanding service to their communities.

# IN RECOGNITION OF ST. LUKE'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN LANESBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS

**HON. RICHARD E. NEAL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Lanesborough, Massachusetts as they celebrate their 250th Anniversary on June 25th. The continued dedication of the congregation of St. Luke's was pivotal in the church becoming the oldest active Episcopal parish in Western Massachusetts.

The origins of St. Luke's Episcopal Church begin in 1767 when a small group of Church of England members would meet in a private home to worship together. From there they moved to a school house where they continued their worship until they were able to move their small congregation to a wooden church located in the center of town in 1769. During these early years, the church seldom had a pastor and was kept alive by the dedication of its lay members. In 1862, the parish built the "Old Stone Church," an impressive Gothic Revival structure that was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1972. Along with many of its original 19th century fixtures, the Old Stone Church also boasts a 450-pipe, hand-pumped organ that was crafted by William Johnson of Westfield, Massachusetts. The organ has gone through several restorations and is currently the fifth-oldest organ in use in Massachusetts.

In 1898, the congregation moved into a new structure called the Village Church and temporarily ceased operating out of the Old Stone Church. A major restoration effort in the 1980s, aided by the Massachusetts Historical Society, and returned the church to functional condition. Since then, the Old Stone Church serves as the parish's summer home as a place of worship for parishioners during the summer months, while a second building, the Village Church is the parish's winter home.

Mr. Speaker, St. Luke's Episcopal Church serves as a vital link to our region's history and still has much to offer to its parishioners even after all these years. As they celebrate their semiquincentennial, I wish them all the best in continuing to preserve their rich history and community involvement that has been the legacy of St. Luke's.

# IN MEMORY OF SKIPPER PERRY

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina lost a devoted public servant with the death of former State Representative Skipper Perry. He was a courageous early pioneer for the Republican Party, helping develop the two-party system in South Carolina. On June 21, 2017, a Service of Worship Celebrating the Life, Death, and Resurrection was

conducted at First Baptist Church in Aiken, South Carolina, by Reverend Dr. Fred Andrea, III, Instrumentalist Joyce M. English, and Soloist Vince Cloud.

The following thoughtful obituary was appropriately published in the Aiken Standard on June 20, 2017:

Robert Spence (Skipper) Perry, Jr. of Aiken died peacefully Father's Day, surrounded by his beloved wife and family.

A lifelong resident of Aiken, Skipper was the son of the late Robert Spence Perry, Sr. and May Seigler Perry. He is survived by his wife, Anne Straus.

In addition, Skipper is survived by his two sons, Stanley (Meg) of Charlotte, NC and Richard (Kristin) of Washington, DC. He leaves four grandchildren: Spence, Anne Healey, Liza May and Burke. He is also survived by his brother, William Perry (Rosaline) of Naples, FL, Mary Ann Gunneson (Dave) of Chattanooga, TN, Susan McCarty of Aiken, Jeannie (Earle) Robinson (Earle) of Augusta, GA, Addison deAurora (Eric) of Savannah, GA, and the late Otto McCarty, brother-in-law.

Skipper's life was remarkable for its deep devotion to family—enjoying contact with a brother or sister every day. His family was the warm embrace that sustained him every day of his life.

He repaid that gift by devoting himself to the public good—whether in elected office or in the service of those who were unable to help themselves. He ministered to the sick—most among us. He offered support for the mentally and emotionally disabled. What you know of his public deeds pales by what he did for countless individuals privately and unnoticed.

He redefined the role of grandfather as an active participant in their lives, interested in even the smallest details of their routine.

Skipper was honored recently as the Aiken Chamber "Man of the Year". He has also served in the South Carolina State Legislature, Mayor Pro Tempore City of Aiken, City Council of Aiken, President Aiken Center for the Arts, President Mended Hearts of Aiken, Founding member and Chairman of the Tri-Development Center, Chairman of the Adult Development Center, Founding member of the Historic Aiken Foundation, President of the United Way of Aiken, President Aiken Symphony Guild, Chairman of the Heart Walk, President of Pinecrest Elementary PTA, Chairman of Palmetto Amateur Golf Tournament, Sertoma of the Year, Order of the Palmetto, President Aiken Jaycees, President of the Aiken Sertoma Club, American Legion Post 26, and Announcer Aiken Polo Club.

Skipper was larger than life. He milked every ounce of living from life until the moment of death.

The family will receive friends from 5:00–8:00 PM Tuesday, June 20, 2017 at Shellhouse Funeral Home, Inc., 924 Hayne Ave., Aiken, SC.

Funeral services will be held 1:00 PM Wednesday, June 21, 2017 at Aiken First Baptist Church with The Rev. Dr. Fred Andrea, III officiating. Interment will be held immediately following at Historic Bethany Cemetery.

Honorary pallbearers will be Aiken Sertoma Club, American Legion Post 26, and the Mended Hearts of Aiken.

In lieu of flowers, the family is requesting donations to Aiken Center for the Arts, 122 Laurens St SW, Aiken, SC 29801, Mended Hearts of Aiken, PO Box 976, Aiken SC 29802 and the American Legion Post No. 26 (Boy's

State Program), 602 Hampton Ave NW, Aiken, SC 29801.

#### HONORING KENNEDY ALLYSA WRIGHT

#### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student at Madison Shannon Palmer High School in Marks, Mississippi.

Kennedy Allysa Wright is eighteen years old and a senior at Madison Shannon Palmer High School. She was born in Clarksdale, MS, but she grew up in Marks, MS. She has two siblings, Shadrick Wright, IV and Kaitlyn Wright. Her dad, Shadrick Wright, III works for a local factory and her mother, Cathy Wright, is an LPN II. When she graduates from high school, she plans to attend Mississippi State University and obtain a master's degree in Biological Sciences.

Throughout her tenure at Madison Shannon Palmer High School, she has participated in many organizations and a sport. She has held leadership positions such as President of the FCCLA, Vice President of the Student Council in her eleventh grade year, President of the Student Council in her twelfth grade year, and Treasurer of the Beta Club. She has also participated in other clubs and sport such as the Science Club and Powerlifting.

Along with her participation in various clubs and organizations, she has received many awards for her impressive academic standing and citizenship. She has received many academic awards, such as Highest Average, Superintendent's List, and Perfect Attendance. She has also placed second and third in many of the powerlifting competitions. For her Citizenship Award, she participated in many volunteer and community service projects. She has packed lunches for the needy, donated blood and clothing items, and helped the elderly. She has also been assisting her peers in applying for college.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Kennedy Allysa Wright as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in her community.

#### COMMENDING THE WORK OF GEORGE AND GLORIA SMITH

#### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend George and Gloria Smith for all of the great work they have done in our community to raise awareness and funds for mental health research.

After the tragic loss of their son, Adam, the Smiths established AdamFest in their son's honor—an annual event to raise awareness and resources for mental health research. The Smith's steadfast beliefs and courage in a

time of tragedy has inspired strength within our community, and for that I am very grateful. As a mother of three sons, my heart aches for the Smith's loss—and I deeply admire and share their resolve to ensure that no other family endure the pain they have felt. Their story is the reason awareness and research for mental illness is essential, and why events such as AdamFest are so important.

I am extremely grateful to be a part of such a strong community and I hope that we can continue to come together and share our support for one another. Mr. Speaker, again I want to formally thank George and Gloria Smith for all of the great work they have done for our community.

#### IN CELEBRATION OF MARY N. LONG'S 76TH BIRTHDAY

#### HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my sincerest congratulations and Happy Birthday wishes to an extraordinary nurse, activist, advocate, and pioneer, Ms. Mary N. Long, who is celebrating her 76th birthday on Monday, June 26, 2017. On this day, there will be a celebration at Paschal's Restaurant in Atlanta, Georgia.

Mary N. Long was born in Guthrie, Kentucky in 1941. She moved to Atlanta in 1960 to attend the Grady Memorial Hospital's School of Nursing and went on to graduate in 1963. Soon after, Mary embarked on what would become a distinguished career. Starting as an ambulatory care nurse at Grady, she gained extensive experience while volunteering at Atlanta's free clinics and assisting local health organizations. She soon became an influential figure at Grady, developing the hospital's satellite clinics while at the forefront of Grady's participation in Economic Opportunity Atlanta's health affairs to reach the greater Atlanta community.

In 1971, Mary developed and became the first Coordinator of the Central Referral Department at Grady. This program provided both information resources for those unfamiliar with the hospital system and advocacy within the community regarding policies and procedures so that proper treatment was readily available for patients. Her dedication and devotion built the program from the ground up and her work reflected such.

While working at Grady, she became involved with the Georgia Nurses Association (GNA), and its philanthropic organization, Georgia Nurses Foundation (GNF). As an active member and chairperson of GNA's Government Affairs Commission, Mary became the first minority woman to be their advocate at the Georgia legislature. In 1981, Mary was the first African American to be elected as the President of GNA where she served two terms. As a member of the City of Atlanta's Homeless Task Force, she was instrumental in the partnership between GNF and the city that led to the establishment of Atlanta's first clinic for homeless.

In 1985, Mary Long became the Vice President for Legislative Affairs for the Arthritis

Foundation and was later promoted to the Foundation's Group Vice President for Public Policy and Advocacy in 1996. In addition, she was elected to the American Nurses Association (ANA) Board of Directors and served as ANA's Second Vice President.

While Mary has made tremendous contributions to health care issues, she also made great strides in other areas. For example, she was active in the movement to pass the Equal Rights Amendment in Georgia. She has an extensive record of service at the local, regional, and national levels. Her work has transcended through organizations such as the YMCA, Atlanta Food Bank, Atlanta Habitat for Humanity, and the Atlanta Women's Foundation. She has received numerous awards for her groundbreaking innovation, actions, and creative thoughts. As an active member of her church, Trinity United Methodist in Atlanta, she has held onto her faith the entire journey.

As a friend of long standing, I have had the great privilege of witnessing Mary's work and the impact she has had on our state and nation. She has established a legacy of providing support for underrepresented groups on health care issues and I am very grateful for her tireless advocacy to improve the health care system in Georgia as well as her steadfast support for patients and their families. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise in her field are unparalleled.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me and my wife, Vivian, in honoring an outstanding citizen, advocate, and cherished friend, Ms. Mary N. Long, for the inspiring life that she leads. We extend our best wishes to her as she, her family, and friends celebrate her 75th birthday.

---

HONORING KAYLA MICHELLE  
RIGGS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 23, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a tenacious young woman, Kayla Michelle Riggs. Kayla has shown what can be done through hard work, setting goals, and aiming high.

Kayla Michelle Riggs was born on May 16, 1992 in Vicksburg, Mississippi to Jeffrey and Sherry Riggs. She attended her Elementary, Junior High School and High School in the Vicksburg/Warren School District.

Kayla graduated from Vicksburg High School in 2010 and went on to attend Northwest Community College in Oxford, MS for one year. She transferred to the University of

Mississippi in 2011 and Graduated with a Bachelor of Science in the field of Criminal Justice in 2014.

In 2014, Kayla started her criminal justice career with the Mississippi Gaming Commission and started to work on her Master's Degree from Delta State University. In April 2016 she resigned from the Mississippi Gaming Commission to work on her Master's Degree.

In July of 2016, Kayla join the United States Army in the military occupation skill of Infantry and was placed in the delayed entry program until the United States Army could set a date for the first integrated class of women in the infantry military occupational specialty. In December of 2016, she finished her Masters Work in the field of Criminology and Social Science.

On January 30, 2017, Kayla reported to the United States Army reception station on Sandhill at Fort Benning, Georgia. Then on February 2017, she started in the first enlisted integrated female infantry basic training and advanced individual training class. She received the Infantry Blue Cord on May 18 and graduated on May 19, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Kayla Michelle Riggs for being a part of a historic class, and her dedication to serving our great Country and strong desire to achieve.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 26, 2017

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 26, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PAUL MITCHELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL PATRICK D. FRANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brigadier General Patrick D. Frank, who is currently serving as the acting senior commander of the 1st Infantry Division in Fort Riley, but departing soon for a new post after serving in this capacity since October 2016.

Brigadier General Frank was the first to welcome me as a new Member of Congress, and he and his wife, Jennifer, have always served as great ambassadors for the Big Red One.

Thank you to the general and Jennifer for always making me, as well as my staff, feel so very welcome at Fort Riley.

Brigadier General Frank has received numerous awards and served in multiple theaters, some of which include Operation Desert Storm, Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti, and Operation Freedom's Sentinel.

We commend him for his service to our Nation and wish him and Jennifer

the best of luck and much success in his next post as deputy commander general of the Army Cadet Command at Fort Knox, Kentucky. He and Jennifer will certainly be missed at Fort Riley and in Kansas.

### ENFORCING TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Trump administration for their recent work on enforcement of trade agreements.

Kansas is an export-dependent State. We supply food, feed, aircraft, and parts to countries all over the world.

As I have traveled the State over the past 6 months, I have heard repeatedly that we must find ways to open new markets for United States producers, including Kansans.

The good news is that this administration is focused on doing just that: opening new markets. The announcement that U.S. beef will be allowed back in China is a tremendous example. China is a \$2.5 billion beef market, which the U.S. has been unfairly shut out of for 13 years. This bilateral success shows how serious the U.S. is about holding other countries accountable and that our negotiators are working on behalf of U.S. producers.

Recent confirmation that the U.S. is continuing World Trade Organization cases against China's import barriers for wheat, corn, and rice is also welcome news for United States farmers. China has flagrantly violated their WTO commitments, costing U.S. producers billions in lost farm income as China put up import barriers and stockpiled surplus grains that are weighing on world markets.

Our global rules-based trading system has brought tremendous benefits to American businesses, farmers, workers, and consumers. As global commerce has expanded, we have found that, when there is a free and level playing field, American producers can match any competitor.

### CONGRATULATING LAUREN EMERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Lauren Emerson from Rapides High School for being recognized as one of the top 20 ag teachers in the Nation by the National Association of Agricultural Educators.

Lauren's students come into her classroom with a strong background in

agriculture, and she provides hands-on lessons that provoke meaningful connections between the curriculum and their work at home to help take their learning to the next level.

Her students can earn industry certifications and dual credit by enrolling in her agricultural courses. She helps develop her students' leadership skills through the National FFA Organization, skills they need to move forward with higher levels of education, postgraduate education, and just for life.

To borrow from the FFA creed, I, too, believe in the future of agriculture because of educators like Lauren Emerson who are leading the next generation of agriculturalists. The Fifth District is proud to recognize Ms. Emerson for all she is doing for her ag students.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 2 p.m.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, thank You for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing of strength and perseverance that each Member might best serve their constituents and our entire Nation.

The debates and issues that dominate the legislative landscape, as always, are contentious and challenging. Many Americans are anxious to know what will come to pass.

Bless the Members of Congress with wisdom, equanimity, and good will as they struggle to find solutions that might unite rather than further divide our Nation. We know this is a lot to ask, but grant also to all Americans increased faith and hope, virtues most in need in these difficult days, that their Representatives might faithfully perform their appointed tasks.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### CELEBRATING NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June is National Homeownership Month, and it is a time when we celebrate and recognize the many benefits of owning a home.

For generations of Americans, owning a home has been an essential element in achieving the American Dream. But since the Great Recession, we have seen homeownership rates drop to historic lows.

Young families often find themselves unable to save for a downpayment or to gain access to adequate credit. This is especially true for those in rural areas.

The United States Department of Agriculture places emphasis on helping rural Americans buy homes. USDA provides mortgage loan guarantees through partnerships with private sector lenders to help low- to moderate-income rural home buyers.

In 2016 alone, USDA worked with nearly 1,500 lenders to help 116,000 rural individuals and families buy homes. USDA has helped more than 4.1 million rural residents buy a home since the National Housing Act was passed 68 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of homeownership have widespread benefits. Homeownership fortifies communities, creates jobs, and strengthens the local businesses that support our towns.

Thank you to USDA for your commitment to providing affordable housing for rural Americans. Happy National Homeownership Month.

### CELEBRATING LGBT EQUALITY DAY

(Ms. DELBENE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate LGBT Equality Day. Today, we mark the anniversary of landmark victories at the Supreme Court that moved our country toward one that is more fair, more equal, and more inclusive of all Americans, and we are a better, stronger Nation for it.

Each year, on June 26, we commemorate the decriminalization of loving LGBT couples, in overturning of the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act, and now marriage equality in all 50 States.

But even as we celebrate this incredible progress, we must never forget the work that remains.

The LGBT community continues to face staggering rates of harassment and discrimination for who they are and who they love. I invite all my colleagues to stand with me on the right side of history. America is ready to take the next step forward.

So today, let's recommit to breaking down the barriers that remain in fulfilling the American promise of liberty and justice for all.

### THE SUPREME COURT CAN SAVE US

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, why run for Congress when a single Federal judge can write a new law without having to get any votes for it?

Another Federal court recently decided that President Trump cannot set immigration policy, despite his having the clear authority to do so.

It is hard to believe this is happening in the United States of America where judges are supposed to interpret the law, not engage in partisan politics.

Our last hope now is with the Supreme Court. Surely they will remind other courts that their ruling should rest on the plain meaning of statutes, not on their personal views of the President.

That some judges ignore precedent and the Constitution is a clear and present danger to our democracy. If the Supreme Court does not strongly affirm that President Trump has the same rights as other Presidents, we will be witnessing the slow unraveling of our democratic form of government.

Based on their preliminary actions today, though, let us have confidence that the Supreme Court has the collective wisdom to guard and guide our great Nation.

### HONORING TEJ MAAN, YUBA CITY CITY COUNCIL

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tej Maan, an upstanding citizen and council member in my district. Mr. Maan has been the director of environmental health in Yuba County since 1998, where he has created vital safeguards to protect the environmental health and well-being of the Yuba County community.

Additionally, Mr. Maan is a member of the Punjabi American Heritage Society, the California Conference of Directors of Environmental Health, and the Yuba City Chamber of Commerce. He is the host of a local television show called "Punjabi Waves," which features discussions and in-depth interviews on current events and issues in the Punjabi community.

Mr. Maan is also the founder of the first Sikh school in the United States, which is located in Yuba City. Tej's love for America and his selfless dedication to his community have made him a well-respected and treasured member of the Yuba City region. I offer my utmost appreciation and gratitude for Tej Maan's many contributions to society.

### HIGHLIGHTING IMPORTANCE OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS PROGRAM

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the importance of the Secure Rural Schools program. In over 700 counties and 41 States, timber was once an economic engine, supporting tens of thousands of jobs while keeping critical government operations going strong in these communities that house tax-exempt Federal land.

However, in recent decades, restrictive forest management regulations, combined with devastating partisan environmental campaigns, has resulted in access to our Federal forests being cut off, blocking any economic activity opportunities.

Rural counties do not want to come to Congress every year to beg for money they should be getting to generate in their own backyards anyway. Money that should come from Federal and State land, though it may take up most of their county, now generates no economic value for them.

Reauthorizing Secure Rural Schools is very important and will provide, though not a permanent solution, at least a temporary one until we get back to the wise management of our Federal lands instead of watching them burn each fall, as we see in the news. We can't sit back and watch rural communities suffer until we wake up to that reality.

As Congress works to implement commonsense forest management policies, it is imperative we keep the Secure Rural Schools program in place so rural communities will have the funding for schools and roads that they need.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY) at 5 p.m.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

### VETERANS EXPANDED TRUCKING OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2547) to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2547

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Expanded Trucking Opportunities Act of 2017".*

#### SEC. 2. MEDICAL CERTIFICATE FOR VETERANS OPERATING COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) *QUALIFIED EXAMINERS.*—Section 5403(d)(2) of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) *QUALIFIED EXAMINER.*—The term ‘qualified examiner’ means an individual who—

“(A) is employed in the Department of Veterans Affairs as an advanced practice nurse, doctor of chiropractic, doctor of medicine, doctor of osteopathy, physician assistant, or other medical professional;

“(B) is licensed, certified, or registered in a State to perform physical examinations;

“(C) is familiar with the standards for, and physical requirements of, an operator required to be medically certified under section 31149 of title 49, United States Code; and

“(D) has never, with respect to such section, been found to have acted fraudulently, including by fraudulently awarding a medical certificate.”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—Section 5403 of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “physician-approved veteran operator,” and inserting “veteran operator approved by a qualified examiner.”; and

(B) by striking “qualified physician” and inserting “qualified examiner”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking “the physician” and inserting “the examiner”; and

(B) by striking “qualified physician” and inserting “qualified examiner”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “qualified physicians” and inserting “qualified examiners”; and

(B) by striking “such physicians” and inserting “such examiners”; and

(4) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking “PHYSICIAN-APPROVED VETERAN OPERATOR” and inserting “VETERAN OPERATOR APPROVED BY A QUALIFIED EXAMINER”; and

(B) by striking “physician-approved veteran operator” and inserting “veteran operator approved by a qualified examiner”.

(c) *RULEMAKING.*—The amendments made by this section shall be incorporated into any rulemaking proceeding related to section 5403 of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) that is being conducted as of the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2547, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Fixing of America's Surface Transportation Act, or the FAST Act, created a process only for doctors at the Department of Veterans Affairs to qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and then issue the medical certificates that are required in order to operate a commercial vehicle.

H.R. 2547 would expand who is eligible for the process to all VA medical professionals as long as they are authorized by the State in which they are licensed, certified, and registered to perform physical examinations and they meet other requirements.

H.R. 2547 would ensure that the list of eligible medical professionals within the VA matches the list of eligible medical professionals that can become certified under the traditional FMCSA process.

This is a bipartisan bill. It is going to ease the regulatory burdens that help create employment opportunities for our veterans.

Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2547, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2547. This bill is another of our efforts to help tackle the long-standing commercial driver shortage and support veterans at the same time as they transition from military to civilian life.

H.R. 2547 will ensure that all qualified medical professionals employed by the Veterans Administration can perform commercial driver physical examinations for their veteran patients.

The medical professionals that this bill addresses are already eligible to become certified medical examiners. This bill simply allows them to utilize the alternative certification process for VA-employed physicians that is currently being finalized by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Unfortunately, the most recent available data shows that, of the 54,000 medical professionals listed on FMCSA's national registry of certified medical examiners, only 25 are employed by the VA. The online training and testing system being developed by FMCSA and the VA should help remedy this situation. This bill will allow more caregivers to use this new resource.

This bill is consistent with the intent of the FAST Act, which was the product of a strong bipartisan process here in the House of Representatives. FMCSA, in consultation with the VA, has done a good job creating an alternative process that will eventually allow more VA doctors to become certified medical examiners, while maintaining the safety and integrity of the certification system. Allowing VA medical professionals to utilize online training and testing will make it easier for them to obtain certification, while ensuring they are familiar with the specific medical standards required for commercial drivers.

Though the FAST Act used the word “physicians,” the process that FMCSA has outlined should also be available for use by VA-employed nurse practitioners, chiropractors, physician assistants, and other qualified medical professionals. This bill ensures that they are eligible to use that process.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation and strongly urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding me the time, and I want to thank him for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, the amendment that you mentioned, the bill as amended, was actually an amendment from the chairman to perfect the bill. I want to thank the ranking member for her support on the committee, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for her work on the amendment.

Madam Speaker, I wish more high schoolers were in the Capitol today, I wish there were more American Government students in the Capitol today, because this amendment is exactly the way that the American people expect the process to work.

As the ranking member pointed out, we made a great step in the FAST Act to try to put more veterans to work, to try to fill more empty spots in commercial truck driving. We did a great job together in a bipartisan way.

A lot of folks do a job, and then they are embarrassed to admit that they didn't get it done 100 percent. We have had folks come into our offices who said: Listen, you have made a great step to help our veterans access these certifications, but you could do more, and let us tell you how.

As the ranking member pointed out, as the chairman pointed out, before the FMCSA has even finished the original regulations, we are back at work perfecting this, adding more healthcare providers to the rolls so that more veterans can get to work faster—not because we are particularly brilliant folks up here, but because folks who do this every single day as a job back home noticed it, told us how we could do it better, and then we created the partnerships up here to make it happen.

Madam Speaker, it makes me so proud to be associated with folks like the chairman, like the ranking member, the Transportation Committee in general, showing up every single day to see what we can do to make a difference. It is not a difference for 300 million Americans at the time, but if you were that one veteran who is trying to feed your family, who is trying to get your certification, who is trying to get yourself back to work, this bill could make all the difference; this amendment could make all the difference. I am grateful to the entire committee team of members and team of staff for making that possible.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Seldom do we get to do two good things at one time, and that is exactly what this bill does. Anything we can do for our veterans is not enough. This bill focuses on them.

Remember, they have been in the armed services driving trucks. When they come home, they probably have had the best training in the entire universe. Our country will gain much not only by putting them to work, but by using their training.

On our committee, we have long struggled with an issue that we still have not, indeed, conquered, and that is the difficulty of getting people to drive commercial trucks. This is one of the hardest jobs in America. You are spending time away from your family. You sometimes are gone not only overnight, but more than that.

It has been difficult to get people to do this indispensable job for our country and for the trucking industry. Madam Speaker, I am particularly pleased that Mr. GRAVES and I have been able to find this new way to both aid the industry and help out veterans.

Madam Speaker, I do not have any more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, with that, I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2547, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### DISASTER ASSISTANCE SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITIES AND HOMEOWNERS ACT OF 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1684) to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide technical assistance to common interest communities regarding eligibility for disaster assistance, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1684

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Disaster Assistance Support for Communities and Homeowners Act of 2017".*

#### SEC. 2. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management

Agency shall provide technical assistance to a common interest community that provides essential services of a governmental nature on actions that a common interest community may take in order to be eligible to receive reimbursement from a grantee that receives funds from the Agency for certain activities performed after an event that results in a disaster declaration.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a legislative proposal on how to provide eligibility for disaster assistance with respect to common areas of condominiums and housing cooperatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1684, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Disaster Assistance Support for Communities and Homeowners Act of 2017 would allow FEMA to provide technical assistance to some community associations regarding their application for disaster assistance. The bill also seeks recommendations from FEMA on how condos and co-ops may be eligible for disaster funds to repair common areas which are affected by these disasters.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for working with the committee on this issue. The House passed similar language last year as part of the FEMA Disaster Assistance Reform Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1684, the Disaster Assistance Support for Communities and Homeowners Act of 2017, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my good friend and colleague. This bill will assist common interest communities such as condos, co-ops, and community associations after disaster strikes.

Hurricane Sandy caused severe impacts to New York City and the surrounding areas, inflicting billions of dollars of damage.

While condominiums and cooperative associations are not common in large

parts of the country, they are common in dense areas such as New York City and Washington, D.C.

FEMA's Individual Assistance Program does not consider these types of housing units which share common areas such as entryways, stairwells, and elevators. As a result, FEMA determined that disaster damage to common areas is the responsibility of the condominium or cooperative association board and, therefore, not eligible for disaster assistance. That cannot be what Congress intended.

The bill also addresses another type of housing common in certain parts of the Nation: community associations. Community associations provide essential services of a governmental nature such as trash collection and maintaining roads and waterways. After disaster strikes, however, FEMA may deny reimbursement to community associations for performing the same types of essential services that FEMA reimburses local governments for performing.

□ 1715

In many cases, these common interest communities may have been eligible for FEMA assistance if they had entered into agreements with their local governments before the disaster occurred. Unfortunately, many common interest communities are not aware of these opportunities. This bill directs FEMA to provide technical assistance so that these common interest communities know what actions they can take before disaster strikes so that they may be eligible to receive reimbursement from FEMA after the fact.

I strongly support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the author of the bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

In the aftermath of Superstorm Sandy, thousands of New Yorkers and other Americans learned that they were ineligible for FEMA assistance because of the type of home in which they lived. Families who lived in condos were eligible for assistance for their individual units, but could not get any assistance to repair ground floor entryways, boilers, or other common areas. Those who lived in cooperative housing, or co-ops, were ineligible for any disaster assistance to repair the walls or floors of their units, let alone their common areas.

This was not a small problem for my constituents. In the storm surge area in New York, nearly 20 percent of hous-

ing units are in co-op buildings and an additional 8 percent are in condominiums.

Seniors in high-rise condo buildings were able to get assistance to repair their floors and repaint their floors, but nothing to fix the elevators they needed to reach their units. Families in co-ops could replace their furnishings and make some repairs, but the halls of the buildings remained covered with mold and uninhabitable. Almost every district in the country has condos, and homeowners in these condo communities will continue to face the same terrible realization that FEMA can give them no help in the wake of new disasters.

Community associations, or common interest communities, around the country have experienced similar roadblocks when they seek FEMA disaster assistance. Many of these associations own and operate their own roads, canals, bridges, and water systems. In the aftermath of a disaster, however, they are not eligible for FEMA assistance for basic essential government services, such as removing trees and debris from communal roads. Residents cannot get out of their neighborhoods and emergency vehicles cannot get in.

This bill would address these eligibility problems in two ways:

First, it would direct FEMA to provide common interest communities with technical assistance to identify options for public assistance eligibility. Many of these communities are unaware that they could already be eligible for assistance if, prior to a disaster, they entered into agreements with their local governments on issues like debris removal.

Second, my colleagues and I have communicated several times with FEMA about the issue of condo and co-op eligibility for disaster assistance. FEMA has studied this issue for several years, and this bill directs FEMA to take the next step in this process by providing the House and Senate committees legislative proposals to address these issues and to make condos and co-ops eligible for disaster assistance.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor today, and I thank Mr. SANFORD and Mr. ENGEL for cosponsoring it.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, my good friend is from New York, so it may be clear why he, with a city full of condominiums and co-ops, would want this bill. But I just want to alert Congress that increasingly what Mr. NADLER sees in

New York is what we are seeing all over the country.

After Hurricane Sandy, with climate change already here, we have to do all we can before the fact, having seen what that disaster did to New York City, New Jersey, and the surrounding community.

When people have gone through a disaster, they have suffered enough. So to find that your resident is covered, but your way to get in the residence or in the elevator is certainly not what Congress intended.

My own jurisdiction, the District of Columbia, was built with single family homes, but that is not what we are building in the District of Columbia and cities and counties throughout the United States now. In our own city, there is a limited area. There is no way to go but up.

Mr. NADLER speaks not only for New York City, but his bill speaks for what is happening in the United States of America. I think we may have caught this problem just in time. We do not know when the next disaster will occur. We don't want to be caught flat-footed on it.

I very much appreciate that my good friends have worked with us to bring this bill forward.

Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to please support H.R. 1684, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, after Hurricane Sandy, thousands of homeowners throughout the New York region learned that they were ineligible for federal disaster assistance because they lived in a co-op or a condo; not in a single family home.

According to the FEMA's policy, co-ops and condo associations are "business entities"—not eligible for federal assistance that can reach up to \$30,000 per household.

As a result, community associations are often faced with the daunting task of cleaning up and rebuilding after a major natural disaster—without the help or resources that other homeowners receive from the federal government.

To help bring fairness to the federal disaster relief process, my colleague JERRY NADLER and I introduced H.R. 1684, the Disaster Assistance Support for Communities and Homeowners Act.

Our bill directs FEMA to provide technical assistance to help community associations qualify for disaster assistance grants.

It also directs FEMA to provide recommendations to Congress, within 12 months, on additional ways that co-ops and condos can become eligible for assistance.

I encourage swift passage of H.R. 1684 to help ensure that all community association homeowners have access to federal disaster benefits.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1684, the Disaster Assistance Support for Communities and Homeowners Act of 2017.

This bill directs the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to provide technical assistance to Common Interest Communities to ensure they are eligible to apply for public assistance.

H.R. 1684 also instructs FEMA to provide legislative proposals to Congress in order to make condominiums and housing cooperatives eligible for disaster assistance in the future.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1684 addresses an outstanding issue many Americans face in the aftermath of natural disasters because they are ineligible for FEMA assistance based on the type of home they live in.

The glaring discrepancy and inequity in FEMA's policy were revealed as communities struggled to recover and rebuild from the ravaging effects of Hurricane Sandy in 2012.

In addition to causing the deaths of 72 U.S. citizens, Hurricane Sandy was the second-costliest hurricane in United States history, destroying 651,000 housing units in New York and New Jersey and exacting a staggering \$19 billion in damages for New York City alone.

However, due to FEMA's unfair policy towards community associations, thousands of New Yorkers found themselves ineligible for federal recovery assistance needed to repair their homes because under current federal law, condominiums, housing cooperatives, and homeowners associations are classified as businesses.

H.R. 1684 corrects this unfairness by authorizing FEMA to provide direct disaster relief to these communities in the form of technical assistance and monetary reimbursements.

Further, the legislation directs FEMA to submit to Congress within 90 days of enactment a plan to make common areas of condos and co-ops eligible for disaster assistance.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is particularly beneficial to my congressional district since Houston ranks among the most disaster-prone cities in the country.

Many of my constituents can recall with horror the devastating effects of Hurricane Ike in 2008, which killed 37 people and destroyed 100,000 homes in Texas.

Over the course of this massive natural disaster, FEMA played a vital role in responding to the needs of impacted areas and victims.

Unfortunately, FEMA's response to Hurricane Ike was also beset by a lack of clear communication between appointed officials and regional emergency managers on the ground.

Improving federal policy for disaster relief is a bipartisan issue and H.R. 1684 is endorsed by the Community Associations Institute, a leading membership organization with more than 34,000 members and 70 chapters nationwide.

Madam Speaker, legislation like H.R. 1684 is crucial to ensuring that all Americans receive the relief and assistance they deserve in the wake of natural disasters like Hurricane Sandy that destroy lives and leave local economies in tatters.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1684.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr.

GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1684, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ACTIVE DUTY VOLUNTARY ACQUISITION OF NECESSARY CREDENTIALS FOR EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2258) to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2258

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Active Duty Voluntary Acquisition of Necessary Credentials for Employment Act" or the "ADVANCE Act".*

#### SEC. 2. COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE STANDARDS FOR SERVICE MEMBERS AND VETERANS.

*Section 31305(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "VETERAN OPERATORS" and inserting "SERVICE MEMBERS, RESERVISTS, AND VETERANS";*

*(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "subparagraph (A) during" and inserting "subparagraph (A)—*

*"(i) while serving in the armed forces or reserve components; and*

*"(ii) during"; and*

*(3) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting "current or" before "former" each place the term appears.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2258.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, or FAST Act, authorized the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

to exempt veterans from certain requirements in order to obtain a commercial driver's license if they had qualified experience while serving in the armed services or Reserve components.

H.R. 2258 would extend this exemption to individuals who are currently serving in either the armed services or Reserve components.

This is a bipartisan bill that will help current members of the armed services or Reserve components find employment in the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2258, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2258, as amended, which will allow current servicemembers who have military experience operating commercial motor vehicles to more easily obtain a commercial driver's license.

In 2015, Congress included a provision in the FAST Act to allow States to waive the written CDL knowledge test for drivers with military commercial motor vehicle driving experience, but it restricts the waiver to former members of the military. There are a significant number of current reservists and members of the National Guard with military commercial motor vehicle experience who could benefit from the waiver. This legislation allows them to more easily use the skills they learned serving our country to earn a decent wage and feed their families.

These servicemen and servicewomen receive from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, or FMCSA, what they describe as thorough and comprehensive training, including many hours of behind-the-wheel training—something that we have long advocated for as a requirement for civilian drivers. There is a shortage of commercial truck drivers, and these well-trained military drivers are exactly the type of individuals that we would want to help enter the trucking profession.

Using its existing exemption authority, FMCSA has already taken action to make current servicemembers eligible for the knowledge test waiver on a temporary basis. Last October, FMCSA issued an exemption that allows States to waive the CDL knowledge test for trained military truck drivers, whether they are current members of the military or veterans.

FMCSA cited the fact that training these drivers receive in the military includes "many hours of classroom training, practical skills training, and on-the-road training that are essential for safe driving." However, FMCSA's temporary exemption expires in October 2018. This bill would make permanent the ability for current members of the military to utilize the FAST Act waiver.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR), my good friend.

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Active Duty Voluntary Acquisition of Necessary Credentials for Employment Act, or the ADVANCE Act.

The ADVANCE Act will allow Active Duty servicemembers, reservists, and National Guardsmen the same unique testing standards for commercial driver's licenses granted to veterans by the latest surface transportation bill, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, the FAST Act.

The FAST Act allows veterans with qualifying experience to be exempt from State knowledge-based tests when obtaining commercial driver's licenses. The ADVANCE Act would extend this exemption to Active Duty servicemembers, reservists, and National Guardsmen.

I introduced the ADVANCE Act to ensure that Active Duty servicemembers and reservists have access to the same benefits as veterans, helping to smooth their transition from military to civilian life. We owe it to our brave men and women to help them find work here at home.

This bipartisan bill is a commonsense measure that will create opportunities for servicemembers to find work in their communities by simplifying how they translate the driving skills they learned in the military to American jobs across this country. According to the Department of Transportation, the ADVANCE Act can help nearly 75,000 Active Duty, Reserves, and National Guardsmen throughout the United States.

This legislation comes at a critical time. According to the American Trucking Associations, there is an estimated 40,000 truck driver shortage nationally. The American Trucking Associations has endorsed the ADVANCE Act because it will help put servicemembers back to work here at home and it will allow us to close a troubling skills gap in our local communities.

The ADVANCE Act has also been endorsed by the Association of the United States Navy and The Retired Enlisted Association. It was unanimously passed out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and has strong bipartisan support.

Additionally, Senators Cornyn and Warren have introduced a bipartisan companion bill in the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to join me today and support this bill so we can

make this commonsense change to ensure that all current and former members of the military with specialized training can more easily access the licenses they need to get good-paying jobs as they transition to civilian life.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. AGUILAR, who is the author of this bill, for his work in filling this hole so that members of the National Guard and reservists, indeed, are more easily able to obtain a commercial driver's license based on exactly the kind of training that the armed services gives.

It is certainly true that we have had trouble in committee getting on-the-job training as a requirement.

□ 1730

Here, we have people who get on-the-job training, and on-the-job training of just the kind that our country needs, because of the shortage Mr. AGUILAR spoke of in commercial drivers, a very difficult job that necessitates long hours, often away from one's own home and family.

Madam Speaker, I regard this bill as a twin of the very first bill that we passed, the VA bill that allows the Veterans Administration to offer physical examinations, when we were alerted that there were only 25 physicians there who could do that.

So this is a good pairing of bills that our country needs because of the shortage of commercial drivers, and that we owe our veterans and those who serve, even now, in our services. I am particularly pleased that this is a jobs bill. It seems to me that it is clear that when we enable more and more people to drive commercial trucks, we are increasing the supply of jobs available in our country.

These are high-paying jobs for good reason, because they are difficult jobs, so I think this bill and our first bill are bills that the bipartisan House today can take special pride in.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, with that, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GRAVES of Missouri) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2258, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## COAST GUARD IMPROVEMENT AND REFORM ACT OF 2017

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1726) to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve the organization of such title and to incorporate certain transfers and modifications into such title, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1726

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Coast Guard Improvement and Reform Act of 2017”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

### TITLE I—REORGANIZATION OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

Sec. 101. Initial matter.  
Sec. 102. Subtitle I.  
Sec. 103. Chapter 1.  
Sec. 104. Chapter 3.  
Sec. 105. Chapter 5.  
Sec. 106. Chapter 7.  
Sec. 107. Chapter 9.  
Sec. 108. Chapter 11.  
Sec. 109. Subtitle II.  
Sec. 110. Chapter 19.  
Sec. 111. Part II.  
Sec. 112. Chapter 21.  
Sec. 113. Chapter 23.  
Sec. 114. Chapter 25.  
Sec. 115. Part III.  
Sec. 116. Chapter 27.  
Sec. 117. Chapter 29.  
Sec. 118. Subtitle III and chapter 37.  
Sec. 119. Chapter 39.  
Sec. 120. Chapter 41.  
Sec. 121. Subtitle IV and chapter 49.  
Sec. 122. Chapter 51.  
Sec. 123. References.  
Sec. 124. Rule of construction.

### TITLE II—TRANSFERS AND MODIFICATIONS

Sec. 201. Amendments to title 14, United States Code, as amended by title I of this Act.  
Sec. 202. Primary duties.  
Sec. 203. Regattas and marine parades.  
Sec. 204. Regulation of vessels in territorial waters of United States.  
Sec. 205. National maritime transportation advisory committees.  
Sec. 206. Clothing at time of discharge for good of service.

### TITLE I—REORGANIZATION OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

#### SEC. 101. INITIAL MATTER.

Title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the title designation, the title heading, and the table of parts at the beginning and inserting the following:

#### “TITLE 14—COAST GUARD

|                                                             |      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| “Subtitle                                                   | Sec. |
| “I. Establishment, Powers, Duties, and Administration ..... | 101  |

|                                                               |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| "II. Personnel .....                                          | 1901  |
| "III. Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary .....                 | 3701  |
| "IV. Coast Guard Authorizations and Reports to Congress ..... | 4901" |

## SEC. 102. SUBTITLE I.

Part I of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the part designation, the part heading, and the table of chapters at the beginning and inserting the following:

|                                                                      |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>"Subtitle I—Establishment, Powers, Duties, and Administration</b> |           |
| "Chap. ....                                                          | Sec. .... |
| "1. Establishment and Duties .....                                   | 101       |
| "3. Composition and Organization .....                               | 301       |
| "5. Functions and Powers .....                                       | 501       |
| "7. Cooperation .....                                                | 701       |
| "9. Administration .....                                             | 901       |
| "11. Acquisitions .....                                              | 1101"     |

## SEC. 103. CHAPTER 1.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 1 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

**"CHAPTER 1—ESTABLISHMENT AND DUTIES**

|                                                     |  |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--|
| "Sec. ....                                          |  |
| "101. Establishment of Coast Guard.                 |  |
| "102. Primary duties.                               |  |
| "103. Department in which the Coast Guard operates. |  |
| "104. Removing restrictions.                        |  |
| "105. Secretary defined."                           |  |

## (b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 1 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1                                            | Establishment of Coast Guard                                            | 101                                         |
| 2                                            | Primary duties                                                          | 102                                         |
| 3                                            | Department in which the Coast Guard operates                            | 103                                         |
| 652                                          | Removing restrictions                                                   | 104                                         |
| 4                                            | Secretary defined                                                       | 105                                         |

## SEC. 104. CHAPTER 3.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 3 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

**"CHAPTER 3—COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION**

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| "Sec. ....                          |  |
| "301. Grades and ratings.           |  |
| "302. Commandant; appointment.      |  |
| "303. Retirement of Commandant.     |  |
| "304. Vice Commandant; appointment. |  |

|                                                                     |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| "305. Vice admirals.                                                |  |
| "306. Retirement.                                                   |  |
| "307. Vice admirals and admiral, continuity of grade.               |  |
| "308. Chief Acquisition Officer.                                    |  |
| "309. Office of the Coast Guard Reserve; Director.                  |  |
| "310. Chief of Staff to President: appointment.                     |  |
| "311. Captains of the port.                                         |  |
| "312. Prevention and response workforces.                           |  |
| "313. Centers of expertise for Coast Guard prevention and response. |  |
| "314. Marine industry training program.                             |  |
| "315. Training course on workings of Congress.                      |  |
| "316. National Coast Guard Museum.                                  |  |
| "317. United States Coast Guard Band; composition; director.        |  |
| "318. Environmental Compliance and Restoration Program."            |  |

## (b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 3 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 41                                           | Grades and ratings                                                      | 301                                         |
| 44                                           | Commandant; appointment                                                 | 302                                         |
| 46                                           | Retirement of Commandant                                                | 303                                         |
| 47                                           | Vice Commandant; appointment                                            | 304                                         |
| 50                                           | Vice admirals                                                           | 305                                         |
| 51                                           | Retirement                                                              | 306                                         |
| 52                                           | Vice admirals and admiral, continuity of grade                          | 307                                         |
| 56                                           | Chief Acquisition Officer                                               | 308                                         |
| 53                                           | Office of the Coast Guard Reserve; Director                             | 309                                         |
| 54                                           | Chief of Staff to President: appointment                                | 310                                         |
| 57                                           | Prevention and response workforces                                      | 312                                         |
| 58                                           | Centers of expertise for Coast Guard prevention and response            | 313                                         |
| 59                                           | Marine industry training program                                        | 314                                         |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 60                                           | Training course on workings of Congress                                 | 315                                         |
| 98                                           | National Coast Guard Museum                                             | 316                                         |
| 336                                          | United States Coast Guard Band; composition; director                   | 317                                         |

## (c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(A) by inserting after section 310 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

**"§ 311. Captains of the port**

"Any officer, including any petty officer, may be designated by the Commandant as captain of the port or ports or adjacent high seas or waters over which the United States has jurisdiction, as the Commandant deems necessary to facilitate execution of Coast Guard duties."; and

(B) by inserting after section 317 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

**"§ 318. Environmental Compliance and Restoration Program**

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

"(1) 'environment', 'facility', 'person', 'release', 'removal', 'remedial', and 'response' have the same meaning they have in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601);

"(2) 'hazardous substance' has the same meaning it has in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601), except that it also includes the meaning given 'oil' in section 311 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321); and

"(3) 'pollutant' has the same meaning it has in section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362).

## (b) PROGRAM.—

"(1) The Secretary shall carry out a program of environmental compliance and restoration at current and former Coast Guard facilities.

## (2) Program goals include:

"(A) Identifying, investigating, and cleaning up contamination from hazardous substances and pollutants.

"(B) Correcting other environmental damage that poses an imminent and substantial danger to the public health or welfare or to the environment.

"(C) Demolishing and removing unsafe buildings and structures, including buildings and structures at former Coast Guard facilities.

"(D) Preventing contamination from hazardous substances and pollutants at current Coast Guard facilities.

"(3)(A) The Secretary shall respond to releases of hazardous substances and pollutants—

"(i) at each Coast Guard facility the United States owns, leases, or otherwise possesses;

"(ii) at each Coast Guard facility the United States owned, leased, or otherwise

possessed when the actions leading to contamination from hazardous substances or pollutants occurred; and

“(iii) on each vessel the Coast Guard owns or operates.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) of this paragraph does not apply to a removal or remedial action when a potentially responsible person responds under section 122 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9622).

“(C) The Secretary shall pay a fee or charge imposed by a State authority for permit services for disposing of hazardous substances or pollutants from Coast Guard facilities to the same extent that nongovernmental entities are required to pay for permit services. This subparagraph does not apply to a payment that is the responsibility of a lessee, contractor, or other private person.

“(4) The Secretary may agree with another Federal agency for that agency to assist in carrying out the Secretary’s responsibilities under this section. The Secretary may enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and grant agreements with State and local governments to assist in carrying out the Secretary’s responsibilities under this section. Services that may be obtained under this paragraph include identifying, investigating, and cleaning up off-site contamination that may have resulted from the release of a hazardous substance or pollutant at a Coast Guard facility.

“(5) Section 119 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9619) applies to response action contractors that carry out response actions under this section. The Coast Guard shall indemnify response action contractors to the extent that adequate insurance is not generally available at a fair price at the time the contractor enters into the contract to cover the contractor’s reasonable, potential, long-term liability.

“(c) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION ACCOUNT.—

“(1) There is established for the Coast Guard an account known as the Coast Guard Environmental Compliance and Restoration Account. All sums appropriated to carry out the Coast Guard’s environmental compliance and restoration functions under this section or another law shall be credited or transferred to the account and remain available until expended.

“(2) Funds may be obligated or expended from the account to carry out the Coast Guard’s environmental compliance and restoration functions under this section or another law.

“(3) In proposing the budget for any fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, the President shall set forth separately the amount requested for the Coast Guard’s environmental compliance and restoration activities under this section or another law.

“(4) Amounts recovered under section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9607) for the Secretary’s response actions at current and former Coast Guard facilities shall be credited to the account.

“(d) ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a prioritized list of projects eligible for environmental compliance and restoration funding for each fiscal year concurrent with the President’s budget submission for that fiscal year.”.

(2) CONFORMING REPEALS.—Sections 634, 690, 691, 692, and 693 of title 14, United States Code, are repealed.

#### SEC. 105. CHAPTER 5.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

#### “CHAPTER 5—FUNCTIONS AND POWERS

##### “SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL POWERS

“Sec.

“501. Secretary; general powers.

“502. Delegation of powers by the Secretary.

“503. Regulations.

“504. Commandant; general powers.

“505. Functions and powers vested in the Commandant.

“506. Prospective payment of funds necessary to provide medical care.

##### “SUBCHAPTER II—LIFE SAVING AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES

“521. Saving life and property.

“522. Law enforcement.

“523. Enforcement authority.

“524. Enforcement of coastwise trade laws.

“525. Special agents of the Coast Guard Investigative Service law enforcement authority.

“526. Stopping vessels; indemnity for firing at or into vessel.

“527. Safety of naval vessels.

##### “SUBCHAPTER III—AIDS TO NAVIGATION

“541. Aids to navigation authorized.

“542. Unauthorized aids to maritime navigation; penalty.

“543. Interference with aids to navigation; penalty.

“544. Aids to maritime navigation; penalty.

“545. Marking of obstructions.

“546. Deposit of damage payments.

“547. Rewards for apprehension of persons interfering with aids to navigation.

##### “SUBCHAPTER IV—MISCELLANEOUS

“561. Icebreaking in polar regions.

“562. Appeals and waivers.

“563. Notification of certain determinations.”.

#### (b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 5 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 92                                           | Secretary; general powers                                               | 501                                         |
| 631                                          | Delegation of powers by the Secretary                                   | 502                                         |
| 633                                          | Regulations                                                             | 503                                         |
| 93                                           | Commandant; general powers                                              | 504                                         |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)           | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 632                                          | Functions and powers vested in the Commandant                                     | 505                                         |
| 520                                          | Prospective payment of funds necessary to provide medical care                    | 506                                         |
| 88                                           | Saving life and property                                                          | 521                                         |
| 89                                           | Law enforcement                                                                   | 522                                         |
| 99                                           | Enforcement authority                                                             | 523                                         |
| 100                                          | Enforcement of coastwise trade laws                                               | 524                                         |
| 95                                           | Special agents of the Coast Guard Investigative Service law enforcement authority | 525                                         |
| 637                                          | Stopping vessels; indemnity for firing at or into vessel                          | 526                                         |
| 91                                           | Safety of naval vessels                                                           | 527                                         |
| 81                                           | Aids to navigation authorized                                                     | 541                                         |
| 83                                           | Unauthorized aids to maritime navigation; penalty                                 | 542                                         |
| 84                                           | Interference with aids to navigation; penalty                                     | 543                                         |
| 85                                           | Aids to maritime navigation; penalty                                              | 544                                         |
| 86                                           | Marking of obstructions                                                           | 545                                         |
| 642                                          | Deposit of damage payments                                                        | 546                                         |
| 643                                          | Rewards for apprehension of persons interfering with aids to navigation           | 547                                         |
| 87                                           | Icebreaking in polar regions                                                      | 561                                         |
| 101                                          | Appeals and waivers                                                               | 562                                         |
| 103                                          | Notification of certain determinations                                            | 563                                         |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting before section 501 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL POWERS”;

(2) by inserting before section 521 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—LIFE SAVING AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES”;

(3) by inserting before section 541 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER III—AIDS TO NAVIGATION”;

and

(4) by inserting before section 561 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER IV—MISCELLANEOUS”.

**SEC. 106. CHAPTER 7.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 7 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

“CHAPTER 7—COOPERATION

“Sec.

“701. Cooperation with other agencies, States, territories, and political subdivisions.

“702. State Department.

“703. Treasury Department.

“704. Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force.

“705. Navy Department.

“706. United States Postal Service.

“707. Department of Commerce.

“708. Department of Health and Human Services.

“709. Maritime instruction.

“710. Assistance to foreign governments and maritime authorities.

“711. Coast Guard officers as attachés to missions.

“712. Contracts with Government-owned establishments for work and material.

“713. Nonappropriated fund instrumentalities: contracts with other agencies and instrumentalities to provide or obtain goods and services.

“714. Appointment of judges.

“715. Arctic maritime domain awareness.

“716. Oceanographic research.

“717. Arctic maritime transportation.

“718. Agreements.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 7 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)          | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 141                                          | Cooperation with other agencies, States, territories, and political subdivisions | 701                                         |
| 142                                          | State Department                                                                 | 702                                         |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)                                                             | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 143                                          | Treasury Department                                                                                                                 | 703                                         |
| 144                                          | Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force                                                                              | 704                                         |
| 145                                          | Navy Department                                                                                                                     | 705                                         |
| 146                                          | United States Postal Service                                                                                                        | 706                                         |
| 147                                          | Department of Commerce                                                                                                              | 707                                         |
| 147a                                         | Department of Health and Human Services                                                                                             | 708                                         |
| 148                                          | Maritime instruction                                                                                                                | 709                                         |
| 149                                          | Assistance to foreign governments and maritime authorities                                                                          | 710                                         |
| 150                                          | Coast Guard officers as attachés to missions                                                                                        | 711                                         |
| 151                                          | Contracts with Government-owned establishments for work and material                                                                | 712                                         |
| 152                                          | Nonappropriated fund instrumentalities: contracts with other agencies and instrumentalities to provide or obtain goods and services | 713                                         |
| 153                                          | Appointment of judges                                                                                                               | 714                                         |
| 154                                          | Arctic maritime domain awareness                                                                                                    | 715                                         |
| 94                                           | Oceanographic research                                                                                                              | 716                                         |
| 90                                           | Arctic maritime transportation                                                                                                      | 717                                         |
| 102                                          | Agreements                                                                                                                          | 718                                         |

**SEC. 107. CHAPTER 9.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 9 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

“CHAPTER 9—ADMINISTRATION

“SUBCHAPTER I—REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY

“Sec.

“901. Disposal of certain material.

“902. Employment of draftsmen and engineers.

“903. Use of certain appropriated funds.

“904. Local hire.

“905. Procurement authority for family housing.

“906. Air Station Cape Cod Improvements.

“907. Long-term lease of special purpose facilities.

“908. Long-term lease authority for light-house property.

“909. Small boat station rescue capability.

“910. Small boat station closures.

“911. Search and rescue center standards.

“912. Air facility closures.

“913. Turnkey selection procedures.

“914. Disposition of infrastructure related to E-LORAN.

“SUBCHAPTER II—MISCELLANEOUS

“931. Oaths required for boards.

“932. Administration of oaths.

“933. Coast Guard ensigns and pennants.

“934. Penalty for unauthorized use of words ‘Coast Guard’.

“935. Coast Guard band recordings for commercial sale.

“936. Confidentiality of medical quality assurance records; qualified immunity for participants.

“937. Admiralty claims against the United States.

“938. Claims for damage to property of the United States.

“939. Accounting for industrial work.

“940. Supplies and equipment from stock.

“941. Coast Guard Supply Fund.

“942. Public and commercial vessels and other watercraft; sale of fuel, supplies, and services.

“943. Arms and ammunition; immunity from taxation.

“944. Confidential investigative expenses.

“945. Assistance to film producers.

“946. User fees.

“947. Vessel construction bonding requirements.

“948. Contracts for medical care for retirees, dependents, and survivors: alternative delivery of health care.

“949. Telephone installation and charges.

“950. Designation, powers, and accountability of deputy disbursing officials.

“951. Aircraft accident investigations.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 9 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 641                                          | Disposal of certain material                                            | 901                                         |
| 653                                          | Employment of draftsmen and engineers                                   | 902                                         |
| 656                                          | Use of certain appropriated funds                                       | 903                                         |
| 666                                          | Local hire                                                              | 904                                         |
| 670                                          | Procurement authority for family housing                                | 905                                         |



| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)                   | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 671                                          | Air Station Cape Cod Improvements                                                         | 906                                         |
| 672                                          | Long-term lease of special purpose facilities                                             | 907                                         |
| 672a                                         | Long-term lease authority for lighthouse property                                         | 908                                         |
| 674                                          | Small boat station rescue capability                                                      | 909                                         |
| 675                                          | Small boat station closures                                                               | 910                                         |
| 676                                          | Search and rescue center standards                                                        | 911                                         |
| 676a                                         | Air facility closures                                                                     | 912                                         |
| 677                                          | Turnkey selection procedures                                                              | 913                                         |
| 681                                          | Disposition of infrastructure related to E-LORAN                                          | 914                                         |
| 635                                          | Oaths required for boards                                                                 | 931                                         |
| 636                                          | Administration of oaths                                                                   | 932                                         |
| 638                                          | Coast Guard ensigns and pennants                                                          | 933                                         |
| 639                                          | Penalty for unauthorized use of words "Coast Guard"                                       | 934                                         |
| 640                                          | Coast Guard band recordings for commercial sale                                           | 935                                         |
| 645                                          | Confidentiality of medical quality assurance records; qualified immunity for participants | 936                                         |
| 646                                          | Admiralty claims against the United States                                                | 937                                         |
| 647                                          | Claims for damage to property of the United States                                        | 938                                         |
| 648                                          | Accounting for industrial work                                                            | 939                                         |
| 649                                          | Supplies and equipment from stock                                                         | 940                                         |
| 650                                          | Coast Guard Supply Fund                                                                   | 941                                         |
| 654                                          | Public and commercial vessels and other watercraft; sale of fuel, supplies, and services  | 942                                         |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)                                 | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 655                                          | Arms and ammunition; immunity from taxation                                                             | 943                                         |
| 658                                          | Confidential investigative expenses                                                                     | 944                                         |
| 659                                          | Assistance to film producers                                                                            | 945                                         |
| 664                                          | User fees                                                                                               | 946                                         |
| 667                                          | Vessel construction bonding requirements                                                                | 947                                         |
| 668                                          | Contracts for medical care for retirees, dependents, and survivors: alternative delivery of health care | 948                                         |
| 669                                          | Telephone installation and charges                                                                      | 949                                         |
| 673                                          | Designation, powers, and accountability of deputy disbursing officials                                  | 950                                         |
| 678                                          | Aircraft accident investigations                                                                        | 951                                         |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—Chapter 9 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting before section 901 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY”;

and

(2) by inserting before section 931 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—MISCELLANEOUS”.

#### SEC. 108. CHAPTER 11.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

#### “CHAPTER 11—ACQUISITIONS

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“Sec.

“1101. Acquisition directorate.

“1102. Improvements in Coast Guard acquisition management.

“1103. Role of Vice Commandant in major acquisition programs.

“1104. Recognition of Coast Guard personnel for excellence in acquisition.

“1105. Prohibition on use of lead systems integrators.

“1106. Required contract terms.

“1107. Extension of major acquisition program contracts.

“1108. Department of Defense consultation.

“1109. Undefined contractual actions.

“1110. Guidance on excessive pass-through charges.

“1111. Mission need statement.

“SUBCHAPTER II—IMPROVED ACQUISITION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

“1131. Identification of major system acquisitions.

“1132. Acquisition.

“1133. Preliminary development and demonstration.

“1134. Acquisition, production, deployment, and support.

“1135. Acquisition program baseline breach.

“1136. Acquisition approval authority.

“SUBCHAPTER III—PROCUREMENT

“1151. Restriction on construction of vessels in foreign shipyards.

“1152. Advance procurement funding.

“1153. Prohibition on overhaul, repair, and maintenance of Coast Guard vessels in foreign shipyards.

“1154. Procurement of buoy chain.

“SUBCHAPTER IV—DEFINITIONS

“1171. Definitions.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 11 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 561                                          | Acquisition directorate                                                 | 1101                                        |
| 562                                          | Improvements in Coast Guard acquisition management                      | 1102                                        |
| 578                                          | Role of Vice Commandant in major acquisition programs                   | 1103                                        |
| 563                                          | Recognition of Coast Guard personnel for excellence in acquisition      | 1104                                        |
| 564                                          | Prohibition on use of lead systems integrators                          | 1105                                        |
| 565                                          | Required contract terms                                                 | 1106                                        |
| 579                                          | Extension of major acquisition program contracts                        | 1107                                        |
| 566                                          | Department of Defense consultation                                      | 1108                                        |
| 567                                          | Undefined contractual actions                                           | 1109                                        |
| 568                                          | Guidance on excessive pass-through charges                              | 1110                                        |
| 569                                          | Mission need statement                                                  | 1111                                        |
| 571                                          | Identification of major system acquisitions                             | 1131                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)                      | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 572                                          | Acquisition                                                                                  | 1132                                        |
| 573                                          | Preliminary development and demonstration                                                    | 1133                                        |
| 574                                          | Acquisition, production, deployment, and support                                             | 1134                                        |
| 575                                          | Acquisition program baseline breach                                                          | 1135                                        |
| 576                                          | Acquisition approval authority                                                               | 1136                                        |
| 665                                          | Restriction on construction of vessels in foreign shipyards                                  | 1151                                        |
| 577                                          | Advance procurement funding                                                                  | 1152                                        |
| 96                                           | Prohibition on overhaul, repair, and maintenance of Coast Guard vessels in foreign shipyards | 1153                                        |
| 97                                           | Procurement of buoy chain                                                                    | 1154                                        |
| 581                                          | Definitions                                                                                  | 1171                                        |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—Chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by striking all subdivision designations and headings in such chapter, except for—

(A) the chapter designation and heading added by subsection (a);

(B) the subchapter designations and headings added by this subsection; and

(C) any designation or heading of a section or a subdivision of a section;

(2) by inserting before section 1101 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

**“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS”;**

(3) by inserting before section 1131 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

**“SUBCHAPTER II—IMPROVED ACQUISITION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES”;**

(4) by inserting before section 1151 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

**“SUBCHAPTER III—PROCUREMENT”;**

and

(5) by inserting before section 1171 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

**“SUBCHAPTER IV—DEFINITIONS”.**

**SEC. 109. SUBTITLE II.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after chapter 11 (as amended by section 108) the following:

**“Subtitle II—Personnel**

|                                               |             |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|
| “Chap.                                        | Sec.        |
| <b>“19. Coast Guard Academy .....</b>         | <b>1901</b> |
| <b>“21. Personnel; Officers .....</b>         | <b>2101</b> |
| <b>“23. Personnel; Enlisted .....</b>         | <b>2301</b> |
| <b>“25. Personnel; General Provisions ...</b> | <b>2501</b> |

**“27. Pay, Allowances, Awards, and Other Rights and Benefits .....**

**“29. Coast Guard Family Support, Child Care, and Housing .....**

**2901”.**

(b) RESERVED CHAPTER NUMBERS.—

(1) CHAPTER 13.—Chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning.

(2) CHAPTER 14.—Chapter 14 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning; and

(B) by striking the subchapter designation and the subchapter heading for each of the subchapters of such chapter.

(3) CHAPTER 15.—Chapter 15 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning; and

(B) by striking the subchapter designation and the subchapter heading for each of the subchapters of such chapter.

(4) CHAPTER 17.—Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning.

(5) CHAPTER 18.—Chapter 18 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning.

**SEC. 110. CHAPTER 19.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

**“CHAPTER 19—COAST GUARD ACADEMY**

**“SUBCHAPTER I—ADMINISTRATION**

**“Sec.**

**“1901. Administration of Academy.**

**“1902. Policy on sexual harassment and sexual violence.**

**“1903. Annual Board of Visitors.**

**“1904. Participation in Federal, State, or other educational research grants.**

**“SUBCHAPTER II—CADETS**

**“1921. Corps of Cadets authorized strength.**

**“1922. Appointments.**

**“1923. Admission of foreign nationals for instruction; restrictions; conditions.**

**“1924. Conduct.**

**“1925. Agreement.**

**“1926. Cadet applicants; preappointment travel to Academy.**

**“1927. Cadets; initial clothing allowance.**

**“1928. Cadets; degree of bachelor of science.**

**“1929. Cadets; appointment as ensign.**

**“1930. Cadets; charges and fees for attendance; limitation.**

**“SUBCHAPTER III—FACULTY**

**“1941. Civilian teaching staff.**

**“1942. Permanent commissioned teaching staff; composition.**

**“1943. Appointment of permanent commissioned teaching staff.**

**“1944. Grade of permanent commissioned teaching staff.**

**“1945. Retirement of permanent commissioned teaching staff.**

**“1946. Credit for service as member of civilian teaching staff.**

**“1947. Assignment of personnel as instructors.**

**“1948. Marine safety curriculum.”.**

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 19 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)  | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 181                                          | Administration of Academy                                                | 1901                                        |
| 200                                          | Policy on sexual harassment and sexual violence                          | 1902                                        |
| 194                                          | Annual Board of Visitors                                                 | 1903                                        |
| 196                                          | Participation in Federal, State, or other educational research grants    | 1904                                        |
| 195                                          | Admission of foreign nationals for instruction; restrictions; conditions | 1923                                        |
| 181a                                         | Cadet applicants; preappointment travel to Academy                       | 1926                                        |
| 183                                          | Cadets; initial clothing allowance                                       | 1927                                        |
| 184                                          | Cadets; degree of bachelor of science                                    | 1928                                        |
| 185                                          | Cadets; appointment as ensign                                            | 1929                                        |
| 197                                          | Cadets; charges and fees for attendance; limitation                      | 1930                                        |
| 186                                          | Civilian teaching staff                                                  | 1941                                        |
| 187                                          | Permanent commissioned teaching staff; composition                       | 1942                                        |
| 188                                          | Appointment of permanent commissioned teaching staff                     | 1943                                        |
| 189                                          | Grade of permanent commissioned teaching staff                           | 1944                                        |
| 190                                          | Retirement of permanent commissioned teaching staff                      | 1945                                        |
| 191                                          | Credit for service as member of civilian teaching staff                  | 1946                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 192                                          | Assignment of personnel as instructors                                  | 1947                                        |
| 199                                          | Marine safety curriculum                                                | 1948                                        |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(A) by inserting before section 1901 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—ADMINISTRATION”;

(B) by inserting before section 1923 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—CADETS

**“§ 1921. Corps of Cadets authorized strength**

“The number of cadets appointed annually to the Academy shall be as determined by the Secretary but the number appointed in any one year shall not exceed six hundred.

**“§ 1922. Appointments**

“Appointments to cadetships shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, who shall determine age limits, methods of selection of applicants, term of service as a cadet before graduation, and all other matters affecting such appointments. In the administration of this section, the Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to insure that female individuals shall be eligible for appointment and admission to the Coast Guard Academy, and that the relevant standards required for appointment, admission, training, graduation, and commissioning of female individuals shall be the same as those required for male individuals, except for those minimum essential adjustments in such standards required because of physiological differences between male and female individuals.”;

(C) by inserting before section 1926 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

**“§ 1924. Conduct**

“The Secretary may summarily dismiss from the Coast Guard any cadet who, during his cadetship, is found unsatisfactory in either studies or conduct, or may be deemed not adapted for a career in the Coast Guard. Cadets shall be subject to rules governing discipline prescribed by the Commandant.

**“§ 1925. Agreement**

“(a) Each cadet shall sign an agreement with respect to the cadet’s length of service in the Coast Guard. The agreement shall provide that the cadet agrees to the following:

“(1) That the cadet will complete the course of instruction at the Coast Guard Academy.

“(2) That upon graduation from the Coast Guard Academy the cadet—

“(A) will accept an appointment, if tendered, as a commissioned officer of the Coast Guard; and

“(B) will serve on active duty for at least five years immediately after such appointment.

“(3) That if an appointment described in paragraph (2) is not tendered or if the cadet is permitted to resign as a regular officer before the completion of the commissioned service obligation of the cadet, the cadet—

“(A) will accept an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Coast Guard Reserve; and

“(B) will remain in that reserve component until completion of the commissioned service obligation of the cadet.

“(b)(1) The Secretary may transfer to the Coast Guard Reserve, and may order to active duty for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes (but not to exceed four years), a cadet who breaches an agreement under subsection (a). The period of time for which a cadet is ordered to active duty under this paragraph may be determined without regard to section 651(a) of title 10.

“(2) A cadet who is transferred to the Coast Guard Reserve under paragraph (1) shall be transferred in an appropriate enlisted grade or rating, as determined by the Secretary.

“(3) For the purposes of paragraph (1), a cadet shall be considered to have breached an agreement under subsection (a) if the cadet is separated from the Coast Guard Academy under circumstances which the Secretary determines constitute a breach by the cadet of the cadet’s agreement to complete the course of instruction at the Coast Guard Academy and accept an appointment as a commissioned officer upon graduation from the Coast Guard Academy.

“(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Those regulations shall include—

“(1) standards for determining what constitutes, for the purpose of subsection (b), a breach of an agreement under subsection (a);

“(2) procedures for determining whether such a breach has occurred; and

“(3) standards for determining the period of time for which a person may be ordered to serve on active duty under subsection (b).

“(d) In this section, ‘commissioned service obligation’, with respect to an officer who is a graduate of the Academy, means the period beginning on the date of the officer’s appointment as a commissioned officer and ending on the sixth anniversary of such appointment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, any later date up to the eighth anniversary of such appointment.

“(e)(1) This section does not apply to a cadet who is not a citizen or national of the United States.

“(2) In the case of a cadet who is a minor and who has parents or a guardian, the cadet may sign the agreement required by subsection (a) only with the consent of the parent or guardian.

“(f) A cadet or former cadet who does not fulfill the terms of the obligation to serve as specified under section (a), or the alternative obligation imposed under subsection (b), shall be subject to the repayment provisions of section 303a(e) of title 37.”; and

(D) by inserting before section 1941 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER III—FACULTY”.

(2) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 182 of title 14, United States Code, is repealed.

**SEC. 111. PART II.**

Part II of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the part designation, the part heading, and the table of chapters at the beginning.

**SEC. 112. CHAPTER 21.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 21 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

**“CHAPTER 21—PERSONNEL; OFFICERS**

“SUBCHAPTER I—APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

“Sec.

“2101. Original appointment of permanent commissioned officers.

“2102. Active duty promotion list.

“2103. Number and distribution of commissioned officers on active duty promotion list.

“2104. Appointment of temporary officers.

“2105. Rank of warrant officers.

“2106. Selection boards; convening of boards.

“2107. Selection boards; composition of boards.

“2108. Selection boards; notice of convening; communication with board.

“2109. Selection boards; oath of members.

“2110. Number of officers to be selected for promotion.

“2111. Promotion zones.

“2112. Promotion year; defined.

“2113. Eligibility of officers for consideration for promotion.

“2114. United States Deputy Marshals in Alaska.

“2115. Selection boards; information to be furnished boards.

“2116. Officers to be recommended for promotion.

“2117. Selection boards; reports.

“2118. Selection boards; submission of reports.

“2119. Failure of selection for promotion.

“2120. Special selection boards; correction of errors.

“2121. Promotions; appointments.

“2122. Removal of officer from list of selectees for promotion.

“2123. Promotions; acceptance; oath of office.

“2124. Promotions; pay and allowances.

“2125. Wartime temporary service promotions.

“2126. Promotion of officers not included on active duty promotion list.

“2127. Recall to active duty during war or national emergency.

“2128. Recall to active duty with consent of officer.

“2129. Aviation cadets; appointment as Reserve officers.

“SUBCHAPTER II—DISCHARGES; RETIREMENTS; REVOCATION OF COMMISSIONS; SEPARATION FOR CAUSE

“2141. Revocation of commissions during first five years of commissioned service.

“2142. Regular lieutenants (junior grade); separation for failure of selection for promotion.

“2143. Regular lieutenants; separation for failure of selection for promotion; continuation.

“2144. Regular Coast Guard; officers serving under temporary appointments.

“2145. Regular lieutenant commanders and commanders; retirement for failure of selection for promotion.

“2146. Discharge in lieu of retirement; separation pay.

“2147. Regular warrant officers; separation pay.

“2148. Separation for failure of selection for promotion or continuation; time of.

“2149. Regular captains; retirement.

“2150. Captains; continuation on active duty; involuntary retirement.

“2151. Rear admirals and rear admirals (lower half); continuation on active duty; involuntary retirement.

“2152. Voluntary retirement after twenty years’ service.

“2153. Voluntary retirement after thirty years’ service.

“2154. Compulsory retirement.

“2155. Retirement for physical disability after selection for promotion; grade in which retired.

“2156. Deferment of retirement or separation for medical reasons.

“2157. Flag officers.

“2158. Review of records of officers.

“2159. Boards of inquiry.

“2160. Boards of review.

“2161. Composition of boards.

“2162. Rights and procedures.

“2163. Removal of officer from active duty; action by Secretary.

“2164. Officers considered for removal; retirement or discharge; separation benefits.

“2165. Relief of retired officer promoted while on active duty.

#### “SUBCHAPTER III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“2181. Physical fitness of officers.

“2182. Multirater assessment of certain personnel.”.

#### (b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 21 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)        | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 211                                          | Original appointment of permanent commissioned officers                        | 2101                                        |
| 41a                                          | Active duty promotion list                                                     | 2102                                        |
| 42                                           | Number and distribution of commissioned officers on active duty promotion list | 2103                                        |
| 214                                          | Appointment of temporary officers                                              | 2104                                        |
| 215                                          | Rank of warrant officers                                                       | 2105                                        |
| 251                                          | Selection boards; convening of boards                                          | 2106                                        |
| 252                                          | Selection boards; composition of boards                                        | 2107                                        |
| 253                                          | Selection boards; notice of convening; communication with board                | 2108                                        |
| 254                                          | Selection boards; oath of members                                              | 2109                                        |
| 255                                          | Number of officers to be selected for promotion                                | 2110                                        |
| 256                                          | Promotion zones                                                                | 2111                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)               | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 256a                                         | Promotion year; defined                                                               | 2112                                        |
| 257                                          | Eligibility of officers for consideration for promotion                               | 2113                                        |
| 258                                          | Selection boards; information to be furnished boards                                  | 2115                                        |
| 259                                          | Officers to be recommended for promotion                                              | 2116                                        |
| 260                                          | Selection boards; reports                                                             | 2117                                        |
| 261                                          | Selection boards; submission of reports                                               | 2118                                        |
| 262                                          | Failure of selection for promotion                                                    | 2119                                        |
| 263                                          | Special selection boards; correction of errors                                        | 2120                                        |
| 271                                          | Promotions; appointments                                                              | 2121                                        |
| 272                                          | Removal of officer from list of selectees for promotion                               | 2122                                        |
| 273                                          | Promotions; acceptance; oath of office                                                | 2123                                        |
| 274                                          | Promotions; pay and allowances                                                        | 2124                                        |
| 275                                          | Wartime temporary service promotions                                                  | 2125                                        |
| 276                                          | Promotion of officers not included on active duty promotion list                      | 2126                                        |
| 331                                          | Recall to active duty during war or national emergency                                | 2127                                        |
| 332                                          | Recall to active duty with consent of officer                                         | 2128                                        |
| 373                                          | Aviation cadets; appointment as Reserve officers                                      | 2129                                        |
| 281                                          | Revocation of commissions during first five years of commissioned service             | 2141                                        |
| 282                                          | Regular lieutenants (junior grade); separation for failure of selection for promotion | 2142                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)                           | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 283                                          | Regular lieutenants; separation for failure of selection for promotion; continuation              | 2143                                        |
| 284                                          | Regular Coast Guard; officers serving under temporary appointments                                | 2144                                        |
| 285                                          | Regular lieutenant commanders and commanders; retirement for failure of selection for promotion   | 2145                                        |
| 286                                          | Discharge in lieu of retirement; separation pay                                                   | 2146                                        |
| 286a                                         | Regular warrant officers; separation pay                                                          | 2147                                        |
| 287                                          | Separation for failure of selection for promotion or continuation; time of                        | 2148                                        |
| 288                                          | Regular captains; retirement                                                                      | 2149                                        |
| 289                                          | Captains; continuation on active duty; involuntary retirement                                     | 2150                                        |
| 290                                          | Rear admirals and rear admirals (lower half); continuation on active duty; involuntary retirement | 2151                                        |
| 291                                          | Voluntary retirement after twenty years' service                                                  | 2152                                        |
| 292                                          | Voluntary retirement after thirty years' service                                                  | 2153                                        |
| 293                                          | Compulsory retirement                                                                             | 2154                                        |
| 294                                          | Retirement for physical disability after selection for promotion; grade in which retired          | 2155                                        |
| 295                                          | Deferment of retirement or separation for medical reasons                                         | 2156                                        |
| 296                                          | Flag officers                                                                                     | 2157                                        |
| 321                                          | Review of records of officers                                                                     | 2158                                        |
| 322                                          | Boards of inquiry                                                                                 | 2159                                        |
| 323                                          | Boards of review                                                                                  | 2160                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)       | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 324                                          | Composition of boards                                                         | 2161                                        |
| 325                                          | Rights and procedures                                                         | 2162                                        |
| 326                                          | Removal of officer from active duty; action by Secretary                      | 2163                                        |
| 327                                          | Officers considered for removal; retirement or discharge; separation benefits | 2164                                        |
| 333                                          | Relief of retired officer promoted while on active duty                       | 2165                                        |
| 335                                          | Physical fitness of officers                                                  | 2181                                        |
| 429                                          | Multirater assessment of certain personnel                                    | 2182                                        |

(c) **ADDITIONAL CHANGES.**—Chapter 21 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by striking all subchapter designations and headings in such chapter, except for the subchapter designations and headings added by this subsection;

(2) by inserting before section 2101 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION”;

(3) by inserting before section 2115 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“§ 2114. **United States Deputy Marshals in Alaska**

“Commissioned officers may be appointed as United States Deputy Marshals in Alaska.”;

(4) by inserting before section 2141 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—DISCHARGES; RETIREMENTS; REVOCATION OF COMMISSIONS; SEPARATION FOR CAUSE”;

and

(5) by inserting before section 2181 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER III—GENERAL PROVISIONS”.

#### SEC. 113. CHAPTER 23.

(a) **INITIAL MATTER.**—Chapter 23 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

“CHAPTER 23—PERSONNEL; ENLISTED

“Sec.

“2301. Recruiting campaigns.

“2302. Enlistments; term, grade.

“2303. Promotion.

“2304. Compulsory retirement at age of sixty-two.

“2305. Voluntary retirement after thirty years’ service.

“2306. Voluntary retirement after twenty years’ service.

“2307. Retirement of enlisted members: increase in retired pay.

“2308. Recall to active duty during war or national emergency.

“2309. Recall to active duty with consent of member.

“2310. Relief of retired enlisted member promoted while on active duty.

“2311. Retirement in cases where higher grade or rating has been held.

“2312. Extension of enlistments.

“2313. Retention beyond term of enlistment in case of disability.

“2314. Detention beyond term of enlistment.

“2315. Inclusion of certain conditions in enlistment contract.

“2316. Discharge within three months before expiration of enlistment.

“2317. Aviation cadets; procurement; transfer.

“2318. Aviation cadets; benefits.

“2319. Critical skill training bonus.”.

(b) **REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 23 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 350                                          | Recruiting campaigns                                                    | 2301                                        |
| 351                                          | Enlistments; term, grade                                                | 2302                                        |
| 352                                          | Promotion                                                               | 2303                                        |
| 353                                          | Compulsory retirement at age of sixty-two                               | 2304                                        |
| 354                                          | Voluntary retirement after thirty years’ service                        | 2305                                        |
| 355                                          | Voluntary retirement after twenty years’ service                        | 2306                                        |
| 357                                          | Retirement of enlisted members: increase in retired pay                 | 2307                                        |
| 359                                          | Recall to active duty during war or national emergency                  | 2308                                        |
| 360                                          | Recall to active duty with consent of member                            | 2309                                        |
| 361                                          | Relief of retired enlisted member promoted while on active duty         | 2310                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 362                                          | Retirement in cases where higher grade or rating has been held          | 2311                                        |
| 365                                          | Extension of enlistments                                                | 2312                                        |
| 366                                          | Retention beyond term of enlistment in case of disability               | 2313                                        |
| 367                                          | Detention beyond term of enlistment                                     | 2314                                        |
| 369                                          | Inclusion of certain conditions in enlistment contract                  | 2315                                        |
| 370                                          | Discharge within three months before expiration of enlistment           | 2316                                        |
| 371                                          | Aviation cadets; procurement; transfer                                  | 2317                                        |
| 372                                          | Aviation cadets; benefits                                               | 2318                                        |
| 374                                          | Critical skill training bonus                                           | 2319                                        |

#### SEC. 114. CHAPTER 25.

(a) **INITIAL MATTER.**—Chapter 25 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

“CHAPTER 25—PERSONNEL; GENERAL PROVISIONS

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“Sec.

“2501. Grade on retirement.

“2502. Retirement.

“2503. Status of recalled personnel.

“2504. Computation of retired pay.

“2505. Limitations on retirement and retired pay.

“2506. Suspension of payment of retired pay of members who are absent from the United States to avoid prosecution.

“2507. Board for Correction of Military Records deadline.

“2508. Emergency leave retention authority.

“2509. Prohibition of certain involuntary administrative separations.

“2510. Sea service letters.

“2511. Investigations of flag officers and Senior Executive Service employees.

“2512. Leave policies for the Coast Guard.

“2513. Computation of length of service.

“SUBCHAPTER II—LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

“2531. Personnel of former Lighthouse Service.”.

(b) **REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 25 of such title

(as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)                                    | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 334                                          | Grade on retirement                                                                                        | 2501                                        |
| 421                                          | Retirement                                                                                                 | 2502                                        |
| 422                                          | Status of recalled personnel                                                                               | 2503                                        |
| 423                                          | Computation of retired pay                                                                                 | 2504                                        |
| 424                                          | Limitations on retirement and retired pay                                                                  | 2505                                        |
| 424a                                         | Suspension of payment of retired pay of members who are absent from the United States to avoid prosecution | 2506                                        |
| 425                                          | Board for Correction of Military Records deadline                                                          | 2507                                        |
| 426                                          | Emergency leave retention authority                                                                        | 2508                                        |
| 427                                          | Prohibition of certain involuntary administrative separations                                              | 2509                                        |
| 428                                          | Sea service letters                                                                                        | 2510                                        |
| 430                                          | Investigations of flag officers and Senior Executive Service employees                                     | 2511                                        |
| 431                                          | Leave policies for the Coast Guard                                                                         | 2512                                        |
| 467                                          | Computation of length of service                                                                           | 2513                                        |
| 432                                          | Personnel of former Lighthouse Service                                                                     | 2531                                        |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—Chapter 25 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting before section 2501 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS”;

and

(2) by inserting before section 2531 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE”.

**SEC. 115. PART III.**

Part III of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the part designation, the part heading, and the table of chapters at the beginning.

**SEC. 116. CHAPTER 27.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 27 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

“CHAPTER 27—PAY, ALLOWANCES, AWARDS, AND OTHER RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

“SUBCHAPTER I—PERSONNEL RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

“Sec.

“2701. Procurement of personnel.

“2702. Training.

“2703. Contingent expenses.

“2704. Equipment to prevent accidents.

“2705. Clothing at time of discharge for good of service.

“2706. Right to wear uniform.

“2707. Protection of uniform.

“2708. Clothing for officers and enlisted personnel.

“2709. Procurement and sale of stores to members and civilian employees.

“2710. Disposition of effects of decedents.

“2711. Deserters; payment of expenses incident to apprehension and delivery; penalties.

“2712. Payment for the apprehension of stragglers.

“SUBCHAPTER II—AWARDS

“2731. Delegation of powers to make awards; rules and regulations.

“2732. Medal of honor.

“2733. Medal of honor: duplicate medal.

“2734. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag.

“2735. Coast Guard cross.

“2736. Distinguished service medal.

“2737. Silver star medal.

“2738. Distinguished flying cross.

“2739. Coast Guard medal.

“2740. Insignia for additional awards.

“2741. Time limit on award; report concerning deed.

“2742. Honorable subsequent service as condition to award.

“2743. Posthumous awards.

“2744. Life-saving medals.

“2745. Replacement of medals.

“2746. Award of other medals.

“2747. Awards and insignia for excellence in service or conduct.

“2748. Presentation of United States flag upon retirement.

“SUBCHAPTER III—PAYMENTS

“2761. Persons discharged as result of court-martial; allowances to.

“2762. Shore patrol duty; payment of expenses.

“2763. Compensatory absence from duty for military personnel at isolated duty stations.

“2764. Monetary allowance for transportation of household effects.

“2765. Retroactive payment of pay and allowances delayed by administrative error or oversight.

“2766. Travel card management.

“2767. Reimbursement for medical-related travel expenses for certain persons residing on islands in the continental United States.

“2768. Annual audit of pay and allowances of members undergoing permanent change of station.

“2769. Remission of indebtedness.

“2770. Special instruction at universities.

“2771. Attendance at professional meetings.

“2772. Education loan repayment program.

“2773. Rations or commutation therefor in money.

“2774. Sales of ration supplies to messes.

“2775. Flight rations.

“2776. Payments at time of discharge for good of service.

“2777. Clothing for destitute shipwrecked persons.

“2778. Advancement of public funds to personnel.

“2779. Transportation to and from certain places of employment.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 27 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)         | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 468                                          | Procurement of personnel                                                        | 2701                                        |
| 469                                          | Training                                                                        | 2702                                        |
| 476                                          | Contingent expenses                                                             | 2703                                        |
| 477                                          | Equipment to prevent accidents                                                  | 2704                                        |
| 482                                          | Clothing at time of discharge for good of service                               | 2705                                        |
| 483                                          | Right to wear uniform                                                           | 2706                                        |
| 484                                          | Protection of uniform                                                           | 2707                                        |
| 485                                          | Clothing for officers and enlisted personnel                                    | 2708                                        |
| 487                                          | Procurement and sale of stores to members and civilian employees                | 2709                                        |
| 507                                          | Disposition of effects of decedents                                             | 2710                                        |
| 508                                          | Deserters; payment of expenses incident to apprehension and delivery; penalties | 2711                                        |
| 644                                          | Payment for the apprehension of stragglers                                      | 2712                                        |
| 499                                          | Delegation of powers to make awards; rules and regulations                      | 2731                                        |
| 491                                          | Medal of honor                                                                  | 2732                                        |
| 504                                          | Medal of honor: duplicate medal                                                 | 2733                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)                | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 505                                          | Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag                                    | 2734                                        |
| 491a                                         | Coast Guard cross                                                                      | 2735                                        |
| 492                                          | Distinguished service medal                                                            | 2736                                        |
| 492a                                         | Silver star medal                                                                      | 2737                                        |
| 492b                                         | Distinguished flying cross                                                             | 2738                                        |
| 493                                          | Coast Guard medal                                                                      | 2739                                        |
| 494                                          | Insignia for additional awards                                                         | 2740                                        |
| 496                                          | Time limit on award; report concerning deed                                            | 2741                                        |
| 497                                          | Honorable subsequent service as condition to award                                     | 2742                                        |
| 498                                          | Posthumous awards                                                                      | 2743                                        |
| 500                                          | Life-saving medals                                                                     | 2744                                        |
| 501                                          | Replacement of medals                                                                  | 2745                                        |
| 502                                          | Award of other medals                                                                  | 2746                                        |
| 503                                          | Awards and insignia for excellence in service or conduct                               | 2747                                        |
| 516                                          | Presentation of United States flag upon retirement                                     | 2748                                        |
| 509                                          | Persons discharged as result of court-martial; allowances to                           | 2761                                        |
| 510                                          | Shore patrol duty; payment of expenses                                                 | 2762                                        |
| 511                                          | Compensatory absence from duty for military personnel at isolated duty stations        | 2763                                        |
| 512                                          | Monetary allowance for transportation of household effects                             | 2764                                        |
| 513                                          | Retroactive payment of pay and allowances delayed by administrative error or oversight | 2765                                        |
| 517                                          | Travel card management                                                                 | 2766                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)                                                    | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 518                                          | Reimbursement for medical-related travel expenses for certain persons residing on islands in the continental United States | 2767                                        |
| 519                                          | Annual audit of pay and allowances of members undergoing permanent change of station                                       | 2768                                        |
| 461                                          | Remission of indebtedness                                                                                                  | 2769                                        |
| 470                                          | Special instruction at universities                                                                                        | 2770                                        |
| 471                                          | Attendance at professional meetings                                                                                        | 2771                                        |
| 472                                          | Education loan repayment program                                                                                           | 2772                                        |
| 478                                          | Rations or commutation therefor in money                                                                                   | 2773                                        |
| 479                                          | Sales of ration supplies to messes                                                                                         | 2774                                        |
| 480                                          | Flight rations                                                                                                             | 2775                                        |
| 481                                          | Payments at time of discharge for good of service                                                                          | 2776                                        |
| 486                                          | Clothing for destitute shipwrecked persons                                                                                 | 2777                                        |
| 488                                          | Advancement of public funds to personnel                                                                                   | 2778                                        |
| 660                                          | Transportation to and from certain places of employment                                                                    | 2779                                        |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—Chapter 27 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting before section 2701 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—PERSONNEL RIGHTS AND BENEFITS”;

(2) by inserting before section 2731 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—AWARDS”;

and

(3) by inserting before section 2761 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER III—PAYMENTS”.

#### SEC. 117. CHAPTER 29.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Chapter 29 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter designation, the chapter heading, and the table of sections at the beginning and inserting the following:

#### “CHAPTER 29—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT, CHILD CARE, AND HOUSING

##### “SUBCHAPTER I—COAST GUARD FAMILIES

“Sec.

“2901. Work-life policies and programs.

“2902. Surveys of Coast Guard families.

“2903. Reimbursement for adoption expenses.

“2904. Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses.

“2905. Youth sponsorship initiatives.

“2906. Dependent school children.

##### “SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE

“2921. Definitions.

“2922. Child development services.

“2923. Child development center standards and inspections.

“2924. Child development center employees.

“2925. Parent partnerships with child development centers.

##### “SUBCHAPTER III—HOUSING

“2941. Definitions.

“2942. General authority.

“2943. Leasing and hiring of quarters; rental of inadequate housing.

“2944. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees.

“2945. Conveyance of real property.

“2946. Coast Guard Housing Fund.

“2947. Reports.”.

##### (b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 29 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 531                                          | Work-life policies and programs                                         | 2901                                        |
| 532                                          | Surveys of Coast Guard families                                         | 2902                                        |
| 541                                          | Reimbursement for adoption expenses                                     | 2903                                        |
| 542                                          | Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses            | 2904                                        |
| 543                                          | Youth sponsorship initiatives                                           | 2905                                        |
| 544                                          | Dependent school children                                               | 2906                                        |
| 551                                          | Definitions                                                             | 2921                                        |
| 552                                          | Child development services                                              | 2922                                        |
| 553                                          | Child development center standards and inspections                      | 2923                                        |
| 554                                          | Child development center employees                                      | 2924                                        |



| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 555                                          | Parent partnerships with child development centers                      | 2925                                        |
| 680                                          | Definitions                                                             | 2941                                        |
| 681                                          | General authority                                                       | 2942                                        |
| 475                                          | Leasing and hiring of quarters; rental of inadequate housing            | 2943                                        |
| 680                                          | Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees   | 2944                                        |
| 685                                          | Conveyance of real property                                             | 2945                                        |
| 687                                          | Coast Guard Housing Fund                                                | 2946                                        |
| 688                                          | Reports                                                                 | 2947                                        |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—Chapter 29 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting before section 2901 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—COAST GUARD FAMILIES”;

(2) by inserting before section 2921 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE”;

and

(3) by inserting before section 2941 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER III—HOUSING”.

**SEC. 118. SUBTITLE III AND CHAPTER 37.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended by adding after chapter 29 (as amended by section 117) the following:

**“Subtitle III—Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary**

|                                                                     |      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| “Chap.                                                              | Sec. |
| “37. Coast Guard Reserve .....                                      | 3701 |
| “39. Coast Guard Auxiliary .....                                    | 3901 |
| “41. General Provisions for Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary ..... | 4101 |

**“CHAPTER 37—COAST GUARD RESERVE**

“SUBCHAPTER I—ADMINISTRATION

“Sec.

|                                                                                                      |  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| “3701. Organization.                                                                                 |  |
| “3702. Authorized strength.                                                                          |  |
| “3703. Coast Guard Reserve Boards.                                                                   |  |
| “3704. Grades and ratings; military authority.                                                       |  |
| “3705. Benefits.                                                                                     |  |
| “3706. Temporary members of the Reserve; eligibility and compensation.                               |  |
| “3707. Temporary members of the Reserve; disability or death benefits.                               |  |
| “3708. Temporary members of the Reserve; certificate of honorable service.                           |  |
| “3709. Reserve student aviation pilots; Reserve aviation pilots; appointments in commissioned grade. |  |

“3710. Reserve student pre-commissioning assistance program.

“3711. Appointment or wartime promotion; retention of grade upon release from active duty.

“3712. Exclusiveness of service.

“3713. Active duty for emergency augmentation of regular forces.

“3714. Enlistment of members engaged in schooling.

“SUBCHAPTER II—PERSONNEL

“3731. Definitions.

“3732. Applicability of this subchapter.

“3733. Suspension of this subchapter in time of war or national emergency.

“3734. Effect of this subchapter on retirement and retired pay.

“3735. Authorized number of officers.

“3736. Precedence.

“3737. Running mates.

“3738. Constructive credit upon initial appointment.

“3739. Promotion of Reserve officers on active duty.

“3740. Promotion; recommendations of selection boards.

“3741. Selection boards; appointment.

“3742. Establishment of promotion zones under running mate system.

“3743. Eligibility for promotion.

“3744. Recommendation for promotion of an officer previously removed from an active status.

“3745. Qualifications for promotion.

“3746. Promotion; acceptance; oath of office.

“3747. Date of rank upon promotion; entitlement to pay.

“3748. Type of promotion; temporary.

“3749. Effect of removal by the President or failure of consent of the Senate.

“3750. Failure of selection for promotion.

“3751. Failure of selection and removal from an active status.

“3752. Retention boards; removal from an active status to provide a flow of promotion.

“3753. Maximum ages for retention in an active status.

“3754. Rear admiral and rear admiral (lower half); maximum service in grade.

“3755. Appointment of a former Navy or Coast Guard officer.

“3756. Grade on entry upon active duty.

“3757. Recall of a retired officer; grade upon release.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 37 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 701                                          | Organization                                                            | 3701                                        |
| 702                                          | Authorized strength                                                     | 3702                                        |
| 703                                          | Coast Guard Reserve Boards                                              | 3703                                        |

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only—not amended)                      | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 704                                          | Grades and ratings; military authority                                                       | 3704                                        |
| 705                                          | Benefits                                                                                     | 3705                                        |
| 706                                          | Temporary members of the Reserve; eligibility and compensation                               | 3706                                        |
| 707                                          | Temporary members of the Reserve; disability or death benefits                               | 3707                                        |
| 708                                          | Temporary members of the Reserve; certificate of honorable service                           | 3708                                        |
| 709                                          | Reserve student aviation pilots; Reserve aviation pilots; appointments in commissioned grade | 3709                                        |
| 709a                                         | Reserve student pre-commissioning assistance program                                         | 3710                                        |
| 710                                          | Appointment or wartime promotion; retention of grade upon release from active duty           | 3711                                        |
| 711                                          | Exclusiveness of service                                                                     | 3712                                        |
| 712                                          | Active duty for emergency augmentation of regular forces                                     | 3713                                        |
| 713                                          | Enlistment of members engaged in schooling                                                   | 3714                                        |
| 720                                          | Definitions                                                                                  | 3731                                        |
| 721                                          | Applicability of this subchapter                                                             | 3732                                        |
| 722                                          | Suspension of this subchapter in time of war or national emergency                           | 3733                                        |
| 723                                          | Effect of this subchapter on retirement and retired pay                                      | 3734                                        |
| 724                                          | Authorized number of officers                                                                | 3735                                        |
| 725                                          | Precedence                                                                                   | 3736                                        |
| 726                                          | Running mates                                                                                | 3737                                        |
| 727                                          | Constructive credit upon initial appointment                                                 | 3738                                        |

| Title 14 section number before re-designation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)             | Title 14 section number after re-designation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 728                                           | Promotion of Reserve officers on active duty                                        | 3739                                         |
| 729                                           | Promotion; recommendations of selection boards                                      | 3740                                         |
| 730                                           | Selection boards; appointment                                                       | 3741                                         |
| 731                                           | Establishment of promotion zones under running mate system                          | 3742                                         |
| 732                                           | Eligibility for promotion                                                           | 3743                                         |
| 733                                           | Recommendation for promotion of an officer previously removed from an active status | 3744                                         |
| 734                                           | Qualifications for promotion                                                        | 3745                                         |
| 735                                           | Promotion; acceptance; oath of office                                               | 3746                                         |
| 736                                           | Date of rank upon promotion; entitlement to pay                                     | 3747                                         |
| 737                                           | Type of promotion; temporary                                                        | 3748                                         |
| 738                                           | Effect of removal by the President or failure of consent of the Senate              | 3749                                         |
| 739                                           | Failure of selection for promotion                                                  | 3750                                         |
| 740                                           | Failure of selection and removal from an active status                              | 3751                                         |
| 741                                           | Retention boards; removal from an active status to provide a flow of promotion      | 3752                                         |
| 742                                           | Maximum ages for retention in an active status                                      | 3753                                         |
| 743                                           | Rear admiral and rear admiral (lower half); maximum service in grade                | 3754                                         |
| 744                                           | Appointment of a former Navy or Coast Guard officer                                 | 3755                                         |
| 745                                           | Grade on entry upon active duty                                                     | 3756                                         |
| 746                                           | Recall of a retired officer; grade upon release                                     | 3757                                         |

(c) ADDITIONAL CHANGES.—Chapter 37 of title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting before section 3701 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—ADMINISTRATION”; and

(2) by inserting before section 3731 (as so redesignated and transferred under subsection (b)) the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—PERSONNEL”.

#### SEC. 119. CHAPTER 39.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended by adding after chapter 37 (as added by section 118) the following:

#### “CHAPTER 39—COAST GUARD AUXILIARY

“Sec.

“3901. Administration of the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

“3902. Purpose of the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

“3903. Eligibility; enrollments.

“3904. Members of the Auxiliary; status.

“3905. Disenrollment.

“3906. Membership in other organizations.

“3907. Use of member's facilities.

“3908. Vessel deemed public vessel.

“3909. Aircraft deemed public aircraft.

“3910. Radio station deemed government station.

“3911. Availability of appropriations.

“3912. Assignment and performance of duties.

“3913. Injury or death in line of duty.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 39 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before re-designation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended) | Title 14 section number after re-designation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 821                                           | Administration of the Coast Guard Auxiliary                             | 3901                                         |
| 822                                           | Purpose of the Coast Guard Auxiliary                                    | 3902                                         |
| 823                                           | Eligibility; enrollments                                                | 3903                                         |
| 823a                                          | Members of the Auxiliary; status                                        | 3904                                         |
| 824                                           | Disenrollment                                                           | 3905                                         |
| 825                                           | Membership in other organizations                                       | 3906                                         |
| 826                                           | Use of member's facilities                                              | 3907                                         |
| 827                                           | Vessel deemed public vessel                                             | 3908                                         |
| 828                                           | Aircraft deemed public aircraft                                         | 3909                                         |

| Title 14 section number before re-designation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended) | Title 14 section number after re-designation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 829                                           | Radio station deemed government station                                 | 3910                                         |
| 830                                           | Availability of appropriations                                          | 3911                                         |
| 831                                           | Assignment and performance of duties                                    | 3912                                         |
| 832                                           | Injury or death in line of duty                                         | 3913                                         |

#### SEC. 120. CHAPTER 41.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended by adding after chapter 39 (as added by section 119) the following:

#### “CHAPTER 41—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR COAST GUARD RESERVE AND AUXILIARY

“Sec.

“4101. Flags; pennants; uniforms and insignia.

“4102. Penalty.

“4103. Limitation on rights of members of the Auxiliary and temporary members of the Reserve.

“4104. Availability of facilities and appropriations.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 41 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before re-designation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended)               | Title 14 section number after re-designation |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 891                                           | Flags; pennants; uniforms and insignia                                                | 4101                                         |
| 892                                           | Penalty                                                                               | 4102                                         |
| 893                                           | Limitation on rights of members of the Auxiliary and temporary members of the Reserve | 4103                                         |
| 894                                           | Availability of facilities and appropriations                                         | 4104                                         |

#### SEC. 121. SUBTITLE IV AND CHAPTER 49.

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended by adding after chapter 41 (as added by section 120) the following:

#### “Subtitle IV—Coast Guard Authorizations and Reports to Congress

“Chap. “49. Authorizations ..... Sec. 4901

**“51. Reports ..... 5101****“CHAPTER 49—AUTHORIZATIONS**

“Sec.

“4901. Requirement for prior authorization of appropriations.

“4902. Authorization of appropriations.

“4903. Authorization of personnel end strengths.

“4904. Authorized levels of military strength and training.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 49 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 2701                                         | Requirement for prior authorization of appropriations                   | 4901                                        |
| 2702                                         | Authorization of appropriations                                         | 4902                                        |
| 2703                                         | Authorization of personnel end strengths                                | 4903                                        |
| 2704                                         | Authorized levels of military strength and training                     | 4904                                        |

**SEC. 122. CHAPTER 51.**

(a) INITIAL MATTER.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended by adding after chapter 49 (as added by section 121) the following:

**“CHAPTER 51—REPORTS**

“Sec.

“5101. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.

“5102. Capital investment plan.

“5103. Major acquisitions.

“5104. Manpower requirements plan.

“5105. Inventory of real property.”.

(b) REDESIGNATIONS AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The sections of title 14, United States Code, identified in the table provided in paragraph (2) are amended—

(A) by redesignating the sections as described in the table; and

(B) by transferring the sections, as necessary, so that the sections appear after the table of sections for chapter 51 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), in the order in which the sections are presented in the table.

(2) TABLE.—The table referred to in paragraph (1) is the following:

| Title 14 section number before redesignation | Section heading (provided for identification purposes only-not amended) | Title 14 section number after redesignation |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 2901                                         | Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request                | 5101                                        |
| 2902                                         | Capital investment plan                                                 | 5102                                        |
| 2903                                         | Major acquisitions                                                      | 5103                                        |
| 2904                                         | Manpower requirements plan                                              | 5104                                        |
| 679                                          | Inventory of real property                                              | 5105                                        |

**SEC. 123. REFERENCES.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) REDESIGNATED SECTION.—The term “redesignated section” means a section of title 14, United States Code, that is redesignated by this title, as that section is so redesignated.

(2) SOURCE SECTION.—The term “source section” means a section of title 14, United States Code, that is redesignated by this title, as that section was in effect before the redesignation.

(b) REFERENCE TO SOURCE SECTION.—

(1) TREATMENT OF REFERENCE.—A reference to a source section, including a reference in a regulation, order, or other law, is deemed to refer to the corresponding redesignated section.

(2) TITLE 14.—In title 14, United States Code, each reference in the text of such title to a source section is amended by striking such reference and inserting a reference to the appropriate, as determined using the tables located in this title, redesignated section.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REFERENCE TO SECTION 182.—Section 1923(c) of title 14, United States Code, as so redesignated by this title, is further amended by striking “section 182” and inserting “section 1922”.

(2) REFERENCES TO CHAPTER 11.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(A) in section 2146(d), as so redesignated by this title, by striking “chapter 11 of this title” and inserting “this chapter”; and

(B) in section 3739, as so redesignated by this title, by striking “chapter 11” each place that it appears and inserting “chapter 21”.

(3) REFERENCE TO CHAPTER 13.—Section 3705(b) of title 14, United States Code, as so redesignated by this title, is further amended by striking “chapter 13” and inserting “chapter 27”.

(4) REFERENCE TO CHAPTER 15.—Section 308(b)(3) of title 14, United States Code, as so redesignated by this title, is further amended by striking “chapter 15” and inserting “chapter 11”.

(5) REFERENCES TO CHAPTER 19.—Title 14, United States Code, is further amended—

(A) in section 4901(4), as so redesignated by this title, by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “section 318”; and

(B) in section 4902(4), as so redesignated by this title, by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “section 318”.

(6) REFERENCE TO CHAPTER 23.—Section 701(a) of title 14, United States Code, as so redesignated by this title, is further amend-

ed by striking “chapter 23” and inserting “chapter 39”.

**SEC. 124. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

This title, including the amendments made by this title, is intended only to reorganize title 14, United States Code, and may not be construed to alter—

(1) the effect of a provision of title 14, United States Code, including any authority or requirement therein;

(2) a department or agency interpretation with respect to title 14, United States Code; or

(3) a judicial interpretation with respect to title 14, United States Code.

**TITLE II—TRANSFERS AND MODIFICATIONS****SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED BY TITLE I OF THIS ACT.**

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision of title 14, United States Code, the reference shall be considered to be made to title 14, United States Code, as amended by title I of this Act.

**SEC. 202. PRIMARY DUTIES.**

Section 102(7) of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(7) maintain a state of readiness to assist in the defense of the United States, including when functioning as a specialized service in the Navy pursuant to section 103.”.

**SEC. 203. REGATTAS AND MARINE PARADES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 563 the following:

**“§ 564. Regattas and marine parades**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard may issue regulations to promote the safety of life on navigable waters during regattas or marine parades.

“(b) DETAIL AND USE OF VESSELS.—To enforce regulations issued under this section—

“(1) the Commandant may detail any public vessel in the service of the Coast Guard and make use of any private vessel tendered gratuitously for that purpose; and

“(2) upon the request of the Commandant, the head of any other Federal department or agency may enforce the regulations by means of any public vessel of such department and any private vessel tendered gratuitously for that purpose.

“(c) TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Commandant under this section may be transferred by the President for any special occasion to the head of another Federal department or agency whenever in the President’s judgment such transfer is desirable.

“(d) PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For any violation of regulations issued pursuant to this section the following penalties shall be incurred:

“(A) A licensed officer shall be liable to suspension or revocation of license in the manner prescribed by law for incompetency or misconduct.

“(B) Any person in charge of the navigation of a vessel other than a licensed officer shall be liable to a penalty of \$5,000.

“(C) The owner of a vessel (including any corporate officer of a corporation owning the vessel) actually on board shall be liable to a penalty of \$5,000, unless the violation of regulations occurred without the owner’s knowledge.

“(D) Any other person shall be liable to a penalty of \$2,500.

“(2) MITIGATION OR REMISSION.—The Commandant may mitigate or remit any penalty

provided for in this subsection in the manner prescribed by law for the mitigation or remission of penalties for violation of the navigation laws.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 563 the following:

“Sec. 564. Regattas and marine parades.”.

(c) REPEAL.—The Act of April 28, 1908 (35 Stat. 69, chapter 151; 33 U.S.C. 1233 et seq.), is repealed.

#### SEC. 204. REGULATION OF VESSELS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF UNITED STATES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCHAPTER V.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER V—REGULATION OF VESSELS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF UNITED STATES

##### “§ 584. Definitions

“In this subchapter:

“(1) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’ includes all territory and waters, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

“(2) TERRITORIAL WATERS.—The term ‘territorial waters of the United States’ includes all waters of the territorial sea of the United States as described in Presidential Proclamation 5928 of December 27, 1988.”.

(b) REGULATION OF ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS DURING NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—Section 1 of title II of the Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220, chapter 30; 50 U.S.C. 191), is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows before “by proclamation” and inserting the following:

“§ 581. Regulation of anchorage and movement of vessels during national emergency

“Whenever the President”;

(2) by striking “of the Treasury”;

(3) by striking “of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating”;

(4) by striking “this title” and inserting “this subchapter”;

(5) by transferring the section so that the section appears before section 584 of title 14, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section).

(c) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE OF VESSEL; FINE AND IMPRISONMENT.—Section 2 of title II of the Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220, chapter 30; 50 U.S.C. 192), is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows before “agent,” and inserting the following:

“§ 582. Seizure and forfeiture of vessel; fine and imprisonment

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If any owner,”;

(2) by striking “this title” each place it appears and inserting “this subchapter”;

(3) by transferring the section so that the section appears after section 581 of title 14, United States Code (as transferred by subsection (b) of this section).

(d) ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 4 of title II of the Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220, chapter 30; 50 U.S.C. 194), is amended—

(1) by striking all before “may employ” and inserting the following:

“§ 583. Enforcement provisions

“The President”;

(2) by striking “the purpose of this title” and inserting “this subchapter”;

(3) by transferring the section so that the section appears after section 582 of title 14, United States Code (as transferred by subsection (c) of this section).

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code,

is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER V—REGULATION OF VESSELS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF UNITED STATES

“581. Regulation of anchorage and movement of vessels during national emergency.

“582. Seizure and forfeiture of vessel; fine and imprisonment.

“583. Enforcement provisions.

“584. Definitions.”.

#### SEC. 205. NATIONAL MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 11 the following:

“CHAPTER 13—NATIONAL MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES

“Sec.

“1301. National Chemical Transportation Safety Advisory Committee.

“1302. National Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory Committee.

“1303. National Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee.

“1304. National Merchant Mariner Medical Advisory Committee.

“1305. National Boating Safety Advisory Committee.

“1306. National Offshore Safety Advisory Committee.

“1307. National Navigation Safety Advisory Committee.

“1308. National Towing Safety Advisory Committee.

“1309. Administration.

##### “§ 1301. National Chemical Transportation Safety Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Chemical Transportation Safety Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to the safe and secure marine transportation of hazardous materials.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of not more than 25 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Each member of the Committee shall represent 1 of the following:

“(A) Chemical manufacturing entities.

“(B) Entities related to marine handling or transportation of chemicals.

“(C) Vessel design and construction entities.

“(D) Marine safety or security entities.

“(E) Marine environmental protection entities.

“(4) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall, based on the needs of the Coast Guard, determine the number of members of the Committee who represent each entity specified in paragraph (3). Neither this paragraph nor any other provision of law shall be construed to require an equal distribution of members representing each entity specified in paragraph (3).

##### “§ 1302. National Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to the safe operation of vessels to which chapter 45 of title 46 applies, including the matters of—

“(1) navigation safety;

“(2) safety equipment and procedures;

“(3) marine insurance;

“(4) vessel design, construction, maintenance, and operation; and

“(5) personnel qualifications and training.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 18 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) 10 members shall represent the commercial fishing industry and—

“(i) as a group, shall together reflect a regional and representational balance; and

“(ii) as individuals, shall each have experience—

“(I) in the operation of vessels to which chapter 45 of title 46 applies; or

“(II) as a crew member or processing line worker on a fish processing vessel.

“(B) 1 member shall represent naval architects and marine engineers.

“(C) 1 member shall represent manufacturers of equipment for vessels to which chapter 45 of title 46 applies.

“(D) 1 member shall represent education and training professionals related to fishing vessel, fish processing vessel, and fish tender vessel safety and personnel qualifications.

“(E) 1 member shall represent underwriters that insure vessels to which chapter 45 of title 46 applies.

“(F) 1 member shall represent owners of vessels to which chapter 45 of title 46 applies.

“(G) 3 members shall represent the general public and, to the extent possible, shall include—

“(i) an independent expert or consultant in maritime safety;

“(ii) a marine surveyor who provides services to vessels to which chapter 45 of title 46 applies; and

“(iii) a person familiar with issues affecting fishing communities and the families of fishermen.

##### “§ 1303. National Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to personnel in the United States merchant marine, including the training, qualifications, certification, documentation, and fitness of mariners.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 19 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) 9 members shall represent mariners and, of the 9—

“(i) each shall—

“(I) be a citizen of the United States; and

“(II) hold an active license or certificate issued under chapter 71 of title 46 or a merchant mariner document issued under chapter 73 of title 46;

“(ii) 3 shall be deck officers who represent merchant marine deck officers and, of the 3—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed for oceans any gross tons;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed for inland river route with a limited or unlimited tonnage;

“(III) 2 shall have a master's license or a master of towing vessels license;

“(IV) 1 shall have significant tanker experience; and

“(V) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent labor; and

“(bb) 1 shall represent management;

“(iii) 3 shall be engineering officers who represent merchant marine engineering officers and, of the 3—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed as chief engineer any horsepower;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed as either a limited chief engineer or a designated duty engineer; and

“(III) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent labor; and

“(bb) 1 shall represent management;

“(iv) 2 shall be unlicensed seamen who represent merchant marine unlicensed seaman and, of the 2—

“(I) 1 shall represent able-bodied seamen; and

“(II) 1 shall represent qualified members of the engine department; and

“(v) 1 shall be a pilot who represents merchant marine pilots.

“(B) 6 members shall represent marine educators and, of the 6—

“(i) 3 shall be marine educators who represent maritime academies and, of the 3—

“(I) 2 shall represent State maritime academies (and are jointly recommended by such academies); and

“(II) 1 shall represent either State maritime academies or the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

“(ii) 3 shall be marine educators who represent other maritime training institutions and, of the 3, 1 shall represent the small vessel industry.

“(C) 2 members shall represent shipping companies employed in ship operation management.

“(D) 2 members shall represent the general public.

#### “§ 1304. National Merchant Mariner Medical Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Merchant Mariner Medical Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to—

“(1) medical certification determinations for the issuance of licenses, certification of registry, and merchant mariners’ documents with respect to merchant mariners;

“(2) medical standards and guidelines for the physical qualifications of operators of commercial vessels;

“(3) medical examiner education; and

“(4) medical research.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 14 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) 9 shall represent health-care professionals and have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience regarding the medical examinations of merchant mariners or occupational medicine.

“(B) 5 shall represent professional mariners and have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in occupational requirements for mariners.

#### “§ 1305. National Boating Safety Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Boating Safety Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to national boating safety.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 21 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) 7 members shall represent State officials responsible for State boating safety programs.

“(B) 7 members shall represent recreational vessel and associated equipment manufacturers.

“(C) 7 members shall represent the general public or national recreational boating organizations and, of the 7, at least 5 shall represent national recreational boating organizations.

#### “§ 1306. National Offshore Safety Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Offshore Safety Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to activities directly involved with, or in support of, the exploration of offshore mineral and energy resources, to the extent that such matters are within the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 15 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) 2 members shall represent entities engaged in the production of petroleum.

“(B) 2 members shall represent entities engaged in offshore drilling.

“(C) 2 members shall represent entities engaged in the support, by offshore supply vessels or other vessels, of offshore mineral and oil operations, including geophysical services.

“(D) 1 member shall represent entities engaged in the construction of offshore exploration and recovery facilities.

“(E) 1 member shall represent entities engaged in diving services related to offshore construction, inspection, and maintenance.

“(F) 1 member shall represent entities engaged in safety and training services related to offshore exploration and construction.

“(G) 1 member shall represent entities engaged in pipelaying services related to offshore construction.

“(H) 2 members shall represent individuals employed in offshore operations and, of the 2, 1 shall have recent practical experience on a vessel or offshore unit involved in the offshore mineral and energy industry.

“(I) 1 member shall represent national environmental entities.

“(J) 1 member shall represent deepwater ports.

“(K) 1 member shall represent the general public (but not a specific environmental group).

#### “§ 1307. National Navigation Safety Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Navigation Safety Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to maritime collisions, ramblings, and groundings, Inland Rules of the Road, International Rules of the Road, navigation regulations and equipment, routing measures, marine information, and aids to navigation systems.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of not more than 21 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Each member of the Committee shall represent 1 of the following:

“(A) Commercial vessel owners or operators.

“(B) Professional mariners.

“(C) Recreational boaters.

“(D) The recreational boating industry.

“(E) State agencies responsible for vessel or port safety.

“(F) The Maritime Law Association.

“(4) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall, based on the needs of the Coast Guard, determine the number of members of the Committee who represent each entity specified in paragraph (3). Neither this paragraph nor any other provision of law shall be construed to require an equal distribution of members representing each entity specified in paragraph (3).

#### “§ 1308. National Towing Safety Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Towing Safety Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to shallow-draft inland navigation, coastal waterway navigation, and towing safety.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 18 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 1309 of this chapter.

“(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

“(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) 7 members shall represent the barge and towing industry, reflecting a regional geographic balance.

“(B) 1 member shall represent the offshore mineral and oil supply vessel industry.

“(C) 1 member shall represent masters and pilots of towing vessels who hold active licenses and have experience on the Western Rivers and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

“(D) 1 member shall represent masters of towing vessels in offshore service who hold active licenses.

“(E) 1 member shall represent masters of active ship-docking or harbor towing vessels.

“(F) 1 member shall represent licensed and unlicensed towing vessel engineers with formal training and experience.

“(G) 2 members shall represent port districts, authorities, or terminal operators.

“(H) 2 members shall represent shippers and, of the 2, 1 shall be engaged in the shipment of oil or hazardous materials by barge.

“(I) 2 members shall represent the general public.

#### “§ 1309. Administration

“(a) MEETINGS.—Each committee established under this chapter shall, at least once each year, meet at the call of the Secretary or a majority of the members of the committee.

“(b) EMPLOYEE STATUS.—A member of a committee established under this chapter shall not be considered an employee of the Federal Government by reason of service on such committee, except for the purposes of the following:

“(1) Chapter 81 of title 5.

“(2) Chapter 171 of title 28 and any other Federal law relating to tort liability.

“(c) COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), a member of a committee established under this chapter, when actually engaged in the performance of the duties of such committee, may—

“(1) receive compensation at a rate established by the Secretary, not to exceed the maximum daily rate payable under section 5376 of title 5; or

“(2) if not compensated in accordance with paragraph (1)—

“(A) be reimbursed for actual and reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of such duties; or

“(B) be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5.

“(d) ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—A member of a committee established under this chapter may serve on such committee on a voluntary basis without pay without regard to section 1342 of title 31 or any other law.

“(e) STATUS OF MEMBERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), with respect to a member of a committee established under this chapter whom the Secretary appoints to represent an entity or group—

“(A) the member is authorized to represent the interests of the applicable entity or group; and

“(B) requirements under Federal law that would interfere with such representation and that apply to a special Government employee (as defined in section 202(a) of title 18), including requirements relating to employee conduct, political activities, ethics, conflicts of interest, and corruption, do not apply to the member.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), a member of a committee established under this chapter shall be treated as a special Government employee for purposes of the committee service of the member if—

“(A) the Secretary appointed the member to represent the general public; or

“(B) the member, without regard to service on the committee, is a special Government employee.

“(f) SERVICE ON COMMITTEE.—

“(1) SOLICITATION OF NOMINATIONS.—Before appointing an individual as a member of a committee established under this chapter, the Secretary shall publish, in the Federal Register, a timely notice soliciting nominations for membership on such committee.

“(2) APPOINTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After considering nominations received pursuant to a notice published under paragraph (1), the Secretary may, as necessary, appoint a member to the applicable committee established under this chapter.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary shall not seek, consider, or otherwise use information concerning the political affiliation of a nominee in making an appointment to any committee established under this chapter.

“(3) SERVICE AT PLEASURE OF THE SECRETARY.—Each member of a committee established under this chapter shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary.

“(4) SECURITY BACKGROUND EXAMINATIONS.—The Secretary may require an individual to have passed an appropriate security background examination before appointment to a committee established under this chapter.

“(5) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a Federal employee may not be appointed as a member of a committee established under this chapter.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR NATIONAL MERCHANT MARINE PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary may appoint a Federal employee to serve as a member of the National Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee to represent the interests of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and, notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), may do so without soliciting, receiving, or considering nominations for such appointment.

“(6) TERMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term of each member of a committee established under this chapter shall expire—

“(i) December 31 of the third full year after the effective date of the appointment; or

“(ii) in the case of a member filling a vacancy caused by another member not completing a full term, at the end of the unexpired term of the member succeeded.

“(B) TOTAL NUMBER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), members first appointed to a committee established under this chapter after January 1, 2018, may not serve more than 2 terms.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(I) VACANCIES.—A member appointed to a committee established under this chapter to fill a vacancy caused by another member not completing a full term may be appointed to 2 terms in addition to the unexpired term of the member succeeded.

“(II) CHAIRMEN.—A member elected Chairman of a committee established under this chapter may serve up to 3 terms.

“(C) CONTINUED SERVICE AFTER TERM.—When the term of a member of a committee established under this chapter ends, the member, for a period not to exceed 1 year, may continue to serve as a member until a successor is appointed.

“(7) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on a committee established under this chapter shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

“(8) SPECIAL RULE FOR REAPPOINTMENTS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the Secretary may reappoint a member of a committee established under this chapter for any

term, other than the first term of the member, without soliciting, receiving, or considering nominations for such appointment.

“(g) STAFF SERVICES.—The Secretary shall furnish to each committee established under this chapter any staff and services considered by the Secretary to be necessary for the conduct of the committee's functions.

“(h) CHAIRMAN; VICE CHAIRMAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each committee established under this chapter shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among the committee's members.

“(2) VICE CHAIRMAN ACTING AS CHAIRMAN.—The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or incapacity of, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of, the Chairman.

“(i) SUBCOMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of a committee established under this chapter may establish and disestablish subcommittees and working groups for any purpose consistent with the function of the committee.

“(2) PARTICIPANTS.—Subject to conditions imposed by the Chairman, members of a committee established under this chapter and additional persons drawn from entities or groups designated by this chapter to be represented on the committee or the general public may be assigned to subcommittees and working groups established under paragraph (1).

“(3) CHAIR.—Only committee members may chair subcommittees and working groups established under paragraph (1).

“(j) CONSULTATION.—Before taking any significant action, the Secretary shall consult with, and consider the information, advice, and recommendations of, a committee established under this chapter if the function of the committee is to advise the Secretary on matters related to the significant action.

“(k) TERMINATION.—Each committee established under this chapter shall terminate on September 30, 2027.

“(l) ADVICE, REPORTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each committee established under this chapter shall submit its advice, reports, and recommendations to the Secretary.

“(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit such advice, reports, and recommendations to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

“(m) OBSERVERS.—Any Federal agency with matters under such agency's administrative jurisdiction related to the function of a committee established under this chapter may designate a representative to—

“(1) attend any meeting of such committee; and

“(2) participate as an observer at meetings of such committee that relate to such a matter.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for subtitle I of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 11 the following:

#### “13. National Maritime Transportation Advisory Committees ..... 1301”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL FISHING SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 4508 of title 46, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the analysis for chapter 45 of that title, are repealed.

(2) MERCHANT MARINER MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 7115 of title 46, United States Code, and the item relating to that

section in the analysis for chapter 71 of that title, are repealed.

(3) **MERCHANT MARINE PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **REPEAL.**—Section 8108 of title 46, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the analysis for chapter 81 of that title, are repealed.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 7510(c)(1)(C) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting “National” before “Merchant Marine”.

(4) **NATIONAL BOATING SAFETY ADVISORY COUNCIL.**—

(A) **REPEAL.**—Section 13110 of title 46, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the analysis for chapter 131 of that title, are repealed.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(i) **REGULATIONS.**—Section 4302(c)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “Council established under section 13110 of this title” and inserting “Committee established under section 1305 of title 14”.

(ii) **REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF DEFECTS.**—Section 4310(f) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “Advisory Council” and inserting “Advisory Committee”.

(5) **NAVIGATION SAFETY ADVISORY COUNCIL.**—Section 5 of the Inland Navigational Rules Act of 1980 (33 U.S.C. 2073) is repealed.

(6) **TOWING SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **REPEAL.**—Public Law 96-380 (33 U.S.C. 1231a) is repealed.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(i) **REDUCTION OF OIL SPILLS FROM SINGLE HULL NON-SELF-PROPELLED TANK VESSELS.**—Section 3719 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting “National” before “Towing Safety”.

(ii) **SAFETY EQUIPMENT.**—Section 4102(f)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting “National” before “Towing Safety”.

(d) **TREATMENT OF EXISTING COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) an advisory council or committee substantially similar to an advisory committee established under chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, as added by this Act, and that was in force or in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this section, including a council or committee the authority for which was repealed under subsection (c), may remain in force or in effect for a period of 2 years from the date of enactment of this section, including that the charter, membership, and other aspects of the council or committee may remain in force or in effect; and

(2) during the 2-year period referenced in paragraph (1)—

(A) requirements relating to the applicable advisory committee established under chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, shall be treated as satisfied by the substantially similar advisory council or committee; and

(B) the enactment of this section, including the amendments made in this section, shall not be the basis—

(i) to deem, find, or declare such council or committee, including the charter, membership, and other aspects thereof, void, not in force, or not in effect;

(ii) to suspend the activities of such council or committee; or

(iii) to bar the members of such council or committee from meeting.

#### **SEC. 206. CLOTHING AT TIME OF DISCHARGE FOR GOOD OF SERVICE.**

Section 2705 of title 14, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the

analysis for chapter 27 of that title, are repealed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

#### **GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 1726.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

After 68 years, H.R. 1726, the Coast Guard Improvement and Reform Act will reorganize and modernize title 14, Coast Guard, United States Code. Title I of the bill reorganizes existing sections of the code within the title to provide a more uniformed, logical structure. It makes no substantive changes to the reorganized sections.

Title II includes amendments to title 14. The Coast Guard requested uniformity in how its advisory committees operate. Title II transfers the advisory committees to title 14 from title 46 and includes changes to ensure uniformity in committee operations.

Title II also transfers sections in title 33 and 50, dealing with port safety into title 14, to colocate them with similar authorities. In 2002, port security provisions were similarly reorganized, and this follows that pattern. No substantive changes were made to those sections either. The transfer allows for better organization of the code and makes it easier for the public and the Congress to find the governing laws of the Coast Guard.

Lastly, the title also amends the primary duties of the Coast Guard to clarify their defense readiness status, and it repeals an unused authority.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1726 is a noncontroversial bill to reorganize the Coast Guard's permanent authorities under title 14 of the U.S. Code in order to improve the clarity and the coherence of the title.

I would like to thank my assistant, and counsel, Dave Jansen, and John Rayfield, on the other side, for recognizing that there is confusion, and so this legislation, while it makes no substantive changes to the Coast Guard's existing authorities and policies under title 14, does save for some conforming

changes to create a new chapter for all of the Coast Guard national advisory councils and execute a handful of other minor transfers.

It just simply ends a lot of confusion as people try to figure out where it is in the code that they must look.

Accordingly, I am comfortable with supporting this legislation, although I do note that it will impose some additional administrative costs on the Coast Guard as they set about implementing it.

I want to commend the chairman, Mr. HUNTER, for the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, for his initiative and for his staff's initiative, in taking on this important little bit of housekeeping that is going to make all of our lives easier. I will certainly urge all of the Members to support it.

I also appreciate Chairman HUNTER's work with me in an effort to try to solve another problem. This is only one piece of our effort to try to improve the maritime industry. While we are trying to move H.R. 1726 today, we have more work to do.

And to that end, I look forward to working with Chairman HUNTER on bringing H.R. 2593 to the floor before the August recess, together with the full committee chairman, BILL SHUSTER; and ranking Democrat, PETER DEFazio. H.R. 2593 deals with the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 2017.

This legislation would update and strengthen the Shipping Act to address the current upheaval in the global shipping markets that affect U.S. foreign trade.

The formation of three large ocean carrier alliances has raised legitimate concerns among U.S. port service providers, maritime terminal operators, and tug operators. By virtue of the sheer size and volume of trade that these alliances carry, they will have a decided advantage in determining ports of call, negotiating contracts, and shifting costs, all at the expense, possibly, of our domestic port service providers.

I know Chairman HUNTER shares my concerns, and neither of us are indifferent. We are going to have to deal with this, and that will be our next piece of legislation on the floor. The chairman is on top of it with his staff, and we look forward to that bill, H.R. 2593, being reported out of the Transportation Committee as it clarifies the Federal Maritime Commission's authority to oversee and aggressively deal with competition.

So what we have today is one of two pieces of legislation that we intend to move forward dealing with the overall well-being of the maritime industry.

I highly recommend H.R. 1726 to the floor. It is noncontroversial and should pass. The other piece of legislation will be here shortly, and we will take that up at that time.



Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and thank him for all of his hard work, and especially Dave Jansen and John Rayfield, the two Coast Guard savants of the staff on the Transportation Committee. Those are the gentlemen who did this, who really understand this code, and who made it better for future Congress and future staff, so they can actually see what is going on with the Coast Guard, and maybe the Coast Guard might understand what is going on with the Coast Guard a little bit better.

I would like to reiterate that H.R. 1726 is a straightforward bill. It reorganizes title 14 and does not make any substantive changes.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1726.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2547, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 2258, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

## VETERANS EXPANDED TRUCKING OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the mo-

tion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2547) to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

YEAS—409

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barragán  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buck  
Budd  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen

Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Emmer  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Español  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge

Gabbard  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Hanabusa  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Khanna

Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Lofgren  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)

Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascarella  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano

Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swailwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—22

Brooks (AL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Butterfield  
Cummings  
Gutiérrez  
Labrador  
Long

Lucas  
Marchant  
Meng  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Pingree  
Richmond  
Rohrabacher

□ 1852

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 23, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from The Honorable Nathan Deal, Governor, the State of Georgia, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held June 20, 2017, the Honorable Karen Handel was elected Representative to Congress for the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

STATE OF GEORGIA,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Atlanta, GA, June 21, 2017.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, June 20, 2017, for Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia, show that Karen Handel received 134,595 or 51.87% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Karen Handel was elected as Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties/precincts involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

NATHAN DEAL,  
Governor.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Ms. Marci Andino, Executive Director, South Carolina Election Commission, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held June 20, 2017, the Honorable Ralph Norman was elected Representative to Congress for the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

SOUTH CAROLINA  
ELECTION COMMISSION,  
Columbia, SC, June 22, 2017.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, June 20, 2017, for Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina, show that Ralph Norman received 44,906 votes or 51.1% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Ralph Norman was elected as Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved and the State Board of Canvassers certifies the official results, a certification of the official results will be prepared and transmitted to the S.C. Secretary of State as required by law.

Sincerely,

MARCI ANDINO,  
Executive Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE  
KAREN C. HANDEL, OF GEORGIA,  
AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Georgia, the Honorable Karen C. Handel, be permitted to the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE  
RALPH NORMAN, OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA, AS A MEMBER OF  
THE HOUSE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable Ralph Norman, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect please present themselves in the well.

The Representatives-elect will please raise their right hand.

Mrs. HANDEL of Georgia, and Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 115th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE  
KAREN HANDEL TO THE HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome the newest member of the Georgia congressional delegation, Representative KAREN HANDEL, serving the Sixth Congressional District in our beautiful State.

I want to congratulate KAREN on becoming the first Republican woman ever elected to the House of Representatives from the State of Georgia. She was actually born in the District of Columbia, and was raised in Upper Marlboro, Maryland. So she is returning home.

She was president and CEO of the Greater Fulton County Georgia Chamber of Commerce, Deputy Chief of Staff to then-Governor and now Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue, chairman of the Fulton County Board of Commissioners, and Secretary of State of Georgia.

The Georgia delegation is Democrats and Republicans, but we are a family. We are trying to do our very best to serve the people in our district, in our State, and to work on behalf of the people of this great Nation.

I welcome KAREN and her husband, Steve.

If you should need my help, please feel free to call on me.

I wish her well, and I look forward to serving with her.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), my friend and brother.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my joy today to be able to introduce the newest voice of the Georgia delegation, Congresswoman KAREN HANDEL.

I have known KAREN for many years. She is a self-made woman with a very humble start, but a successful story. She and her husband, Steve, have a track record of service that is above none other. She has fought hard for the things that she believes in, much like us: balanced budgets, better jobs, and defending innocent lives. I know she will bring those same qualities that have made her such a great servant and leader here to Congress today.

Now, if I know anything about KAREN, she is going to hit the ground running. So get ready.

I am also glad to be able to join with Congressman LEWIS and to share with you that KAREN is making history tonight as being the first Republican Congresswoman to serve in either the House or the Senate from the State of Georgia. This is a proud moment for our State.

So, KAREN, you are an inspiration. You are an inspiration to all the young women throughout Georgia and throughout the country, including my two daughters.

I am pleased to welcome and to introduce to you Georgia's newest voice, a fighter for the State of Georgia, Congresswoman KAREN HANDEL.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL).

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LEWIS, Congressman GRAVES, the entire Georgia delegation, to all of you, my new colleagues and soon-to-be very good friends, and to my family and friends in the gallery, I thank you.

Now, I am not sure you have heard enough about this particular race. No, you really have. I am going to be very brief.

This is an extraordinary honor and the greatest privilege that I think I have ever had. I look forward to serving the people of the Sixth District, to serving the people of Georgia, and to being a good coworker and friend to each and every one of you.

Thank you for this opportunity. Thank you for welcoming me so graciously. God bless you, God bless the great State of Georgia, and God bless the great United States of America.

#### WELCOMING THE HONORABLE RALPH NORMAN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, as dean of the South Carolina delegation, to introduce to this Chamber Representative RALPH NORMAN.

Mr. NORMAN is from Rock Hill in York County, South Carolina. He is a real estate developer, a graduate of Presbyterian College, and previously served in the South Carolina Legislature. He and his wife, Elaine Rice Norman, have four children: Warren III, Caroline, Anne, and Mary Catherine.

Last Tuesday, June 20, Mr. NORMAN won the special election in South Carolina's Fifth District to fill the vacancy created when former Congressman Mick Mulvaney became Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Now it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), representing the Second Congressional District, for further introduction.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor tonight to be here with Congressman CLYBURN on a very extraordinary evening. To me, it is a dream come true.

Eleven days ago, I had the opportunity—my wife, Roxanne, and I—to campaign across the Fifth Congressional District by bus. As we traveled the district with RALPH and Elaine NORMAN, I found out that his business background gives him the basis to understand how to create jobs. I saw his affection for our veterans and his understanding of the importance of a strong national defense. In particular, with Shaw Air Force Base in the district, he understands a strong national defense.

It was so inspiring, also, to be with their four grown children who are each successful. And he has a real interest to be successful because he has 15 grandchildren. What an achievement. Members understand this is really important.

For the past 7 years, I am really grateful that he has been a floor leader for Governor Nikki Haley, now our Ambassador to the United Nations, where he has been a floor leader for limited government and expanded freedom.

It is with great honor I introduce to you Congressman RALPH NORMAN.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, members of my South Carolina Congressional delegation, it is an honor to be here. Let me have my family and friends stand. It is South Carolina's Brady Bunch. You all stand up there.

It is a tremendous honor to serve with such an esteemed group. I think it is a special time in history. As Congressman LEWIS said, we are family. With the shooting of STEVE SCALISE, we know that we are all Americans.

We have got such an opportunity, and I look forward to playing a part in working with Members to move this country forward.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentleman from South Carolina, the whole number of the House is 434.

#### ACTIVE DUTY VOLUNTARY ACQUISITION OF NECESSARY CREDENTIALS FOR EMPLOYMENT ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R.

2258) to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

YEAS—409

|                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham         | Comer          | Garrett         |
| Adams           | Comstock       | Gianforte       |
| Aderholt        | Conaway        | Gibbs           |
| Aguilar         | Connolly       | Gohmert         |
| Allen           | Conyers        | Gonzalez (TX)   |
| Amash           | Cook           | Goodlatte       |
| Amodei          | Cooper         | Gosar           |
| Arrington       | Correa         | Gotthelmer      |
| Babin           | Costa          | Gowdy           |
| Bacon           | Costello (PA)  | Granger         |
| Banks (IN)      | Courtney       | Graves (GA)     |
| Barletta        | Cramer         | Graves (LA)     |
| Barr            | Crawford       | Graves (MO)     |
| Barragán        | Crist          | Green, Al       |
| Barton          | Crowley        | Green, Gene     |
| Bass            | Cuellar        | Griffith        |
| Beatty          | Culberson      | Grijalva        |
| Bera            | Curbelo (FL)   | Grothman        |
| Bergman         | Davidson       | Guthrie         |
| Biggs           | Davis (CA)     | Hanabusa        |
| Bilirakis       | Davis, Danny   | Handel          |
| Bishop (GA)     | Davis, Rodney  | Harper          |
| Bishop (MI)     | DeFazio        | Harris          |
| Bishop (UT)     | DeGette        | Hartzler        |
| Black           | Delaney        | Hastings        |
| Blackburn       | DeLauro        | Heck            |
| Blum            | DelBene        | Hensarling      |
| Blumenauer      | Demings        | Herrera Beutler |
| Blunt Rochester | Denham         | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Bonamici        | Dent           | Higgins (LA)    |
| Bost            | DeSantis       | Higgins (NY)    |
| Boyle, Brendan  | DeSaulnier     | Hill            |
| F.              | DesJarlais     | Himes           |
| Brady (PA)      | Deutch         | Holding         |
| Brady (TX)      | Diaz-Balart    | Hollingsworth   |
| Brat            | Dingell        | Hoyer           |
| Bridenstine     | Doggett        | Huffman         |
| Brooks (IN)     | Donovan        | Huizenga        |
| Brown (MD)      | Doyle, Michael | Hultgren        |
| Brownley (CA)   | F.             | Hunter          |
| Buck            | Duffy          | Hurd            |
| Budd            | Duncan (SC)    | Issa            |
| Burgess         | Duncan (TN)    | Jackson Lee     |
| Bustos          | Dunn           | Jayapal         |
| Byrne           | Ellison        | Jeffries        |
| Calvert         | Emmer          | Jenkins (KS)    |
| Capuano         | Engel          | Jenkins (WV)    |
| Carbajal        | Eshoo          | Johnson (GA)    |
| Cárdenas        | Espallat       | Johnson (LA)    |
| Carson (IN)     | Estes (KS)     | Johnson (OH)    |
| Carter (GA)     | Esty (CT)      | Johnson, E. B.  |
| Carter (TX)     | Evans          | Johnson, Sam    |
| Cartwright      | Farenthold     | Jones           |
| Castor (FL)     | Faso           | Jordan          |
| Castro (TX)     | Ferguson       | Joyce (OH)      |
| Chabot          | Fitzpatrick    | Kaptur          |
| Chaffetz        | Fleischmann    | Katko           |
| Cheney          | Flores         | Keating         |
| Chu, Judy       | Fortenberry    | Kelly (IL)      |
| Cicilline       | Foster         | Kelly (MS)      |
| Clark (MA)      | Fox            | Kelly (PA)      |
| Clarke (NY)     | Frankel (FL)   | Kennedy         |
| Clay            | Franks (AZ)    | Khanna          |
| Cleaver         | Frelinghuysen  | Kihuen          |
| Clyburn         | Fudge          | Kildee          |
| Coffman         | Gabbard        | Kilmer          |
| Cohen           | Gaetz          | Kind            |
| Cole            | Gallagher      | King (IA)       |
| Collins (GA)    | Gallego        | King (NY)       |
| Collins (NY)    | Garamendi      | Knight          |

Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross

Norman  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)

Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Tanner  
Tenny  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—24

Beyer  
Brooks (AL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Butterfield  
Cummings  
Gutiérrez  
Hudson

Kinzinger  
Labrador  
Long  
Lucas  
Marchant  
Meng  
Napolitano  
Neal

Pingree  
Rohrabacher  
Ruiz  
Rush  
Scalise  
Turner  
Velázquez  
Walz

□ 1913

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

## WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON

(Mr. ROYCE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome President Moon of South Korea to the United States of America as he makes his inaugural visit here later this week. President Moon's trip comes at a critical time for America's strategic relationship with South Korea, and I look forward to welcoming him to Capitol Hill.

The friendship between our two nations, which was forged during the Korean war, has withstood the test of time and so many challenges. The people of South Korea have persevered in the face of incredible adversity and succeeded in building a modern, prosperous nation.

Today, we stand together in defense of democracy, freedom, and prosperity. And the strength of our friendship is now more important than ever as we face growing challenges in the Asia-Pacific region.

As the President begins his visit, let's also recognize the contributions of Korean Americans to the relationship between our two countries. The close bond that many Korean Americans have for South Korea, the country of their heritage, creates a strong sense of community that extends across the Pacific Ocean. This is the keystone in the bridge of our alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome President Moon, and I look forward to our meeting.

## CBO SCORE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as many families were making their way home or picking up children from either school or some daycare that they had to be in, the CBO report came out on the unfortunate representation of healthcare from the United States Senate. I think the most striking comment to be made is that, by 2026, with this healthcare bill of sorts, 49 million Americans will lose their insurance.

To add to the insult of those working families picking up children and trying to make ends meet with the dinners that they will be preparing, hoping that the Federal Government would take care of them, the President of the

United States indicated that he hopes that the Affordable Care Act that now has helped insure millions of Americans would crash and burn, crash and burn because he has strangled the subsidies. He has made sure that the insurance companies do not have stability, and he has decreased the amount of people who can get the expanded Medicaid.

I am sad when the President of the United States who should be the chief comforter, the person who takes care of Americans, takes great glee that 49 million people will be thrown off of insurance, without insurance by 2026 under TrumpCare in the House and TrumpCare in the Senate.

Democrats know how to fix this. I would hope that the Republicans and the President of the United States get off the special interests and stand with the American people.

Save our healthcare. Stop taking away our healthcare.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

## CELEBRATING CAMILLUS HOUSE

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the Camillus House, an organization in my home city of Miami that works tirelessly on behalf of the homeless and those in need in south Florida.

Since its creation in 1960, the Camillus House has operated with the belief that every person is precious and deserving of love, respect, and a chance to live a dignified life.

Camillus has grown into an indispensable lifeline for the most vulnerable in our community. Camillus provides housing options, free meals, drug treatment, and a full range of medical treatment to the homeless and those with disabilities.

For these individuals, the staff and the volunteers at Camillus House serve as a family, giving them the hope and support that they need in their difficult transition to a new self-sustaining life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Camillus' staff and volunteers for their devotion to the desperate and voiceless in our midst.

I encourage everyone in south Florida to visit [camillus.org](http://camillus.org) or to call 305-374-1065 to learn how you can empower this organization to continue serving those in need in our community.

# CELEBRATING GROWING BONDS OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN INDIA AND UNITED STATES

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Modi's visit this week serves as an occasion to celebrate the growing bonds of friendship between India and the United States.

India is a key partner for the United States and Asia. Both our economic and strategic posture in the region are strengthened by investing in the bilateral relationship between the world's two largest democracies.

India and the United States have pledged to collaborate on energy security, combating climate change, and growing the green economy—opportunities that will create jobs in both countries.

This visit is an opportunity to celebrate the work our countries have accomplished and all that we can do together in the future. I am happy that we are continuing to build on this nearly 70-year-old partnership and are laying the groundwork for an even stronger relationship in the decades to come.

# CONGRATULATING FOOD BANK OF SOUTHERN TIER, 2017'S FOOD BANK OF THE YEAR

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Food Bank of the Southern Tier in Broome County and Tioga County for being 2017's Food Bank of the Year, nationally. Out of 200 locations across the country, the Food Bank of the Southern Tier was ranked number one.

Last year, our food bank distributed more than 9 million meals throughout the southern tier. Over 40 percent of those meals were given to children and 14 percent to seniors.

Through their work with mobile food pantries and the Backpack Program, the food bank has increased access to healthy food for all, distributing 2.2 million pounds of fresh produce to southern tier families.

Today, I would like to thank President Natasha Thompson and the incredible volunteers who have worked tirelessly in their mission to build and sustain hunger-free communities. Your work has had a profound impact on ending hunger in our community. Thank you again for your dedicated service to the families of the southern tier.

# CBO SCORE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office has come out with their score—or, as we call it, cost—that was released today that further confirms the actions taken by the Senate Republicans are just as mean as the House Republicans.

Protections for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions will be undermined; hardworking families will be expected to pay more for less coverage; and \$772 billion will be cut from Medicaid, a safety net for millions of seniors in nursing homes, pregnant women, children, and people with disabilities.

The Senate Republicans can change the name of the bill, but, as we now know, it is not fundamentally different.

I hope this score raises a red flag for Republicans in both the House and the Senate. I urge that they reconsider in trying to cram their TrumpCare bill through the Senate.

Years ago Senator Dirksen said: "A billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon we are talking about real money."

Mr. Speaker, a million here, a million there, and pretty soon the Senate Republicans will be talking about denying coverage for 22 million people; 15 million will lose coverage next year alone.

How on Earth is this a debate? This is not healthcare. It is a tax cut for the wealthiest of Americans at the cost of low-income and middle class families.

Twenty-two million people will lose healthcare.

# LOOK OUT WORLD; MICHELLE COLLINS IS DANCING AGAIN ON CENTER STAGE

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 2008, at the home of Ricky and Victoria Collins, I met the most inspirational woman in Texas history: First Lady Laura Bush. Five years later, I learned there was one more woman who is more inspirational: Michelle Collins, the daughter of Ricky and Victoria.

In 2013, Michelle learned that she had acute childhood leukemia. Her dreams of being a professional dancer were fading. She endured 2 years of brutal chemotherapy, 44 straight days in the hospital after her diagnosis, 18 spinal taps, and fever after fever with her depleted immune system.

Michelle won her battle for life with family, faith, and art. As part of the children's art project at MDA Cancer Center, she designed Christmas ornaments that sold like "hotcakes."

Recovered, she graduated last month from St. Agnes Academy in Houston,

Texas. In 2 months, she will enroll at the University of Texas at Austin.

Look out world, Michelle Collins is dancing again on center stage.

# WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I join Chairman ROYCE and all of my colleagues in welcoming President Moon of the Republic of Korea as he travels to Washington this week.

Across 135 years of diplomatic ties, the United States and the Republic of Korea have forged a strong and unshakable relationship. Our countries have sacrificed together in war—from the Korean war to Vietnam, to the Persian Gulf, to Afghanistan—and we have prospered together in peace.

Our alliance, enshrined in the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1953, has been a pillar of stability and security for both of our countries. That alliance is especially important in light of the grave threat just 35 miles from Seoul: the dangerous regime controlled by dictator Kim Jung-un in North Korea.

America grieves with the Warmbier family over the tragic death of their young son, Otto. His unjust detention, abuse, and death haunts all of us. We must do all we can to secure the safe return of the three Americans still detained in North Korea.

I trust that President Moon's visit will deepen an understanding between Washington and Seoul in these trying times so that we may face this challenge as we have others: in lockstep, side by side.

□ 1930

# CONGRATULATING OUTSTANDING MUSIC PROGRAMS IN MINNESOTA

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to congratulate Chaska Middle School West, the Minnetonka School District, the Osseo Area School District, and Salem Lutheran School in Loretto on being named best communities for music education by the National Association of Music Merchants Foundation. They have all been recognized for outstanding commitment to their music programs.

Research has proven that music is vital to a student's education. Music education benefits language development, spatial-temporal skills, and can lead to a higher IQ and increased test scores. Music also brings students together and gives them incentives to practice and strive for more self-improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the administrators, the teachers, instructors, the parents, and the students in these schools and districts for their impressive dedication to music education. They put a lot of time and effort into their music programs, and all that hard work is really paying off.

#### WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in welcoming President Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea on the occasion of his visit to Washington this week. This visit is an important opportunity to further the strong bonds of cooperation and friendship between our two countries.

As North Korea continues to threaten our allies and pursue its destabilizing missile program, including tests of intercontinental ballistic missiles, this meeting comes at a pivotal time. The United States and the Republic of Korea must continue to stand together to contain this threat and ensure the security and safety of this strategically important region.

Earlier I sent a letter urging Speaker RYAN to invite President Moon Jae-in to speak before a joint meeting of Congress so all Members can hear firsthand his perspective of these shared challenges. If not possible during this brief visit, I hope he will address this body in the future.

Once again, I extend my heartfelt welcome to President Moon Jae-in, and I express my commitment to furthering the vital economic, security, and cultural relationships between our two countries.

#### WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN TO AMERICA

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in welcoming President Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea to the United States of America.

Next week will mark his first official visit to Washington, D.C., since he assumed the Presidency of his country. This represents a continuation of the friendship between our two nations.

This October will mark the 64th anniversary of the mutual defense treaty between our two countries. This landmark legislation continues to be a vital component to peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region.

Once again, I look forward to welcoming President Moon Jae-in to the United States, and I look forward to

continuing our partnership with the Republic of Korea.

#### REJECT SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, another Republican healthcare bill that the nonpartisan, bipartisan Congressional Budget Office tells us will rip away healthcare from 22 million Americans, raise premiums—especially on older Americans—and cut Medicaid by roughly \$800 billion.

The Senate Republican's plan is especially cruel for New York City. Not only will millions lose coverage, but sharp Medicaid cuts will cost hospitals over \$5 billion, and fewer seniors will be able to afford nursing homes and home care providers.

But the bill saves its worst for women. It cuts Federal funding for a year for Planned Parenthood clinics that provide essential healthcare to millions of American women. It allows States to easily waive guaranteed coverage for benefits like maternity. In short, women will have to pay more for essential healthcare because we are women, and women will have less access to healthcare because we are women.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to reject this cruel and merciless bill.

#### WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON

(Mr. MACARTHUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, the friendship between the United States and the Republic of Korea is based not only on shared, strategic, and economic interests, but also on shared values. We share a commitment to democracy and to political, religious, and economic liberty. It is a joy to welcome President Moon Jae-in to Washington, D.C. I congratulate him on his election, and I wish him a successful summit.

But, for me, the relationship with South Korea is also deeply personal. My wife and I adopted two of our three children, David and Isabella, from Korea. I am deeply grateful to the people of South Korea for my children and for giving me the family that I love so much.

But not every family on the Korean Peninsula is so fortunate. We remember those who live under the oppression of the North Korean regime that has no regard for the dignity of human persons. We condemn the horrifying crimes of that regime, and I express my hope for the reunification of Korea.

We express our firm commitment to the ongoing friendship with South

Korea, rooted in our shared values of freedom and democracy.

#### FREE DR. AFRIDI FROM PAKISTANI PRISON

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the day that Osama bin Laden, the world's number one terrorist, met his maker was a great day in the war on terror. But finding America's most wanted terrorist hiding in Pakistan was no easy feat.

Pakistani Dr. Afridi worked with our CIA to help determine and confirm Osama's hiding place in Pakistan by using DNA evidence. But after Osama bin Laden was killed, Pakistan threw Dr. Afridi in jail.

Why?

Because he helped the United States find Osama bin Laden.

Pakistan claims to be United States' number one counterterrorism ally, yet they hypocritically hold this hero in a Pakistani prison. Pakistan is no friend of the United States. They are on the wrong side on the war on terror. Pakistan hid Osama bin Laden from the world.

Dr. Afridi deserves a medal for aiding the elimination of Osama bin Laden, not life in prison. Pakistan should free him, and it is time to declare Pakistan a state sponsor of terrorism.

And that is just the way it is.

#### WEALTH CARE OVER HEALTHCARE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF CARIB- BEAN AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I rise to take this Special Order hour on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

It is with great honor that I rise as coanchor for the next 60 minutes. We have a chance to speak directly to the American people on the issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, and the constituents we represent, as well as all Americans.

This evening, myself and coanchor MARC VEASEY will discuss two topics: wealth care over healthcare and the contributions of Caribbean Americans.

On the matter of healthcare, Senate Republicans have finally released their draft version of the House-passed American Health Care Act, and it is clear why they kept it behind closed doors all this time. The bill is worse than the one that was passed in the House, with deeper cuts to Medicaid and a ban on Planned Parenthood funding for 1 year.

Just like the bill that passed the House, this proposal will likely strip coverage for millions of Americans and do nothing to address affordability. This bill is just as mean and heartless as the one the Republicans jammed through the House.

As bad as it already was, Senate Republicans have made TrumpCare even more devastating to Americans on Medicaid, and those include veterans, middle class seniors with long-term care needs, vulnerable children, and pregnant women. No, it is not just minority Black people who are on Medicaid.

TrumpCare's Medicaid cuts will have an especially severe impact in rural America, shutting rural hospitals, an important source of good-paying jobs. TrumpCare fundamentally means higher health costs, millions of hardworking Americans losing healthcare coverage, gutting key protections, a crushing age tax, and stealing from Medicare.

Republicans shut the American people out of writing TrumpCare. And if TrumpCare passes, the American people will be shut out of affordable healthcare, too. Now, after crafting this monstrosity in secret, the GOP wants to rush it to the floor before the American people see the damage it will do, abandoning any pretense of respect for the democratic process.

Democrats in Congress and across the country will continue to fight with all our strength to protect seniors and hardworking families from TrumpCare's assault on their healthcare.

June, as we know, is Caribbean American Heritage Month, and we will later hear from Members of Congress related to that.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Fort Worth, Texas (Mr. VEASEY), my co-chair, an advocate for his constituents and for all Americans. He sits on the Armed Services Committee and is here to discuss the effect that this bill will have not only on his constituents, but to the people that we care deeply about.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PLASKETT for yielding. I really do appreciate the gentlewoman heading up tonight and coanchoring and talking about the contributions of Caribbean Americans, and also talking about this health-scare bill that is going on right now, because it seems to be what everybody is talking about.

Of course, the CBO score came out today: 22 million Americans will lose their insurance, many of them that were able to get insurance for the first time under the ACA. So that should be very frightening and concerning to us.

The Senate is supposed to vote on this bill, Mr. Speaker, that will have a health-scare effect on so many millions of Americans. It is going to be much less affordable and it is going to be a

lower-quality healthcare. Unlike the Affordable Care Act, which boosted the African-American insured rate from 79 percent to 88 percent, the Senate Republican's healthcare plan will decimate the progress that we have made in the African-American community under the ACA.

Millions of Americans are at risks of losing their insurance, as the gentlewoman pointed out earlier when she said that it is not just people in the African-American community or the minority community that are on Medicaid.

It is something that affects all Americans and something that should be concerning to everyone, particularly when we talk about this opioid addiction that I know many people in many of these Republican areas, these conservative areas of the country, are hoping that they will be able to use Medicaid to be able to deal with that particular issue effectively. Because of this Senate Republican healthcare bill, they are going to be locked out. They are going to be trying to figure out how they are going to get themselves from under that addiction with absolutely no help from Medicaid. It is going to be a very sad day for them.

Many of these losses will come as States are forced to phase out Medicaid over the coming years. That will hurt the African-American population in particular.

Medicaid expansion under the ACA helped 15 million of the nearly 40 million African Americans in the U.S. gain healthcare insurance, and many of those were for the first time—many of those were for the very first time.

In addition to stripping our most vulnerable of healthcare, Senate Republicans want to defund Planned Parenthood and block lifesaving preventive care for hundreds of thousands of women in the district that I represent and nationwide.

Let me tell you something about Planned Parenthood. Oftentimes, when we start talking about Planned Parenthood, Representative PLASKETT, the issue revolves around abortion. But let me tell you something: you cannot have a serious discussion in this country. You absolutely cannot have a serious discussion about social service programs, about Medicaid, and trying to reduce those programs unless you have a serious discussion about family planning.

□ 1945

Family planning is something that people don't want to talk about. Maybe in some circles, particularly Republican circles, it is a very taboo subject, but it is something that needs to be discussed more often and we don't talk about enough. We don't talk about it enough with our kids, with our families.

When you do something like defund Planned Parenthood, it is going to

make that situation even worse. It is going to make people even more needy and more in a situation to where they cannot be self-dependent.

Instead of supporting smart public health initiatives, Republicans in the higher Chamber would rather repeal the ACA as another opportunity to demonize one of the country's leading reproductive health organizations, and that is Planned Parenthood that I talked about earlier.

We need to be doing everything that we can to make sure that Americans everywhere can lead a healthier life, but the Senate's cruel and heartless bill will cause unnecessary suffering.

The Affordable Care Act has been a lifeline for many in the Black community, and a full repeal will snatch that safety net out from under our community. The Black community has a lot to lose under the Republican healthcare plan, and we will not take an assault on healthcare lying down.

We have got to fight this thing. We need to fight for every grandmother out there. We need to fight for every aunt out there, every mother out there, all of our loved ones out there who may be forced to make the choice between whether or not they are going to have healthcare or whether or not they are going to be able to pay for groceries; and that is just not right.

We need to fight for all the single dads out there who are trying to make ends meet, the single moms out there who are trying to make ends meet, because we know that, if you take away Medicaid expansion, it is going to force individuals like that to have to make some really tough choices.

We need to make sure that we are doing everything we can to make sure that we have access to quality healthcare, and that it is not reserved for a few of the wealthy in our country. And when you look at the Republican bill, Representative PLASKETT, that is exactly what it does.

This is a vehicle that will deliver tax breaks to the very rich and will leave individuals like we have been talking about in the Black community, and not just in the African-American communities, but in all communities out there that are out there working hard, suffering, in a situation where they need Medicaid and they need insurance, it is going to leave them locked out.

It is going to be a sad day in America when people who thought that they were going to get insurance for the first time, or people who had insurance for the first time, they were going to get those wellness checkups, they were meeting with their family care physician on a regular basis, and they have that stolen from them because of this monstrous plan.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those words. We were discussing the Medicaid expansion and the fact that it is going to disappear after 2023.



The other thing that is going to be removed from this bill is the Prevention and Public Health Fund which presently has billions of dollars that are supportive to the CDC. What is this money used for?

This money is used for preventative block grants that go to all places, like my district, the Virgin Islands, that deal with chronic conditions such as heart disease and hypertension, provide maternal and child care, support public laboratories and research, and maintain vital statistics. Those moneys would be gone if this bill passes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. SCOTT, my esteemed colleague from Richmond and Hampton Roads in Virginia, who is the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, to talk about the issues and how he sees this is important, not only to his constituents, but to America as well.

I thank the gentleman for being here this evening and giving us his thoughts.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I have to point out that, after redistricting last year, I no longer represent the Richmond area.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is their loss.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And I certainly miss my friends from Richmond.

Ms. PLASKETT. I know the gentleman is still working for them though.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I certainly am.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding, and want to point out that, as we discuss healthcare, we have to notice that the Republicans are using a very flawed reasoning to try to sell TrumpCare to the American public.

They say: "We have a bill, and if you don't like the status quo, therefore, you have to support the bill."

And if you ask: "Well, what's in the bill?" They say: "Well, you have to do something."

"What's in your bill?"

"I don't like the Affordable Care Act."

"What's in your bill?"

"The present law is called ObamaCare."

There is no discussion about what the bill actually does or whether or not it improves the status quo and how the bill will affect American families every day.

But we do know something, based on the CBO report, and that is that TrumpCare is significantly worse than the current policy on every level.

They complain about costs. Costs will go up under this bill. And the only way anybody saves money on premiums is because the policies won't cover as much of the costs. That is because they will cover a lower percentage of the costs, and they will cover fewer benefits.

This was confirmed today by the CBO, which said that 22 million fewer people will have health and coverage under this plan; and the policies that people buy will cover a lot less than they cover now.

Mr. Speaker, at some point, we have to recognize fundamental principles of arithmetic. If you give massive tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations, as TrumpCare is proposing, you will have less money to help those who actually need money to afford insurance.

Less money means fewer people covered by Medicaid, fewer people receiving subsidies to help them buy their insurance, and policies that cover a smaller portion of the costs.

According to the CBO, TrumpCare will have a severe impact on rural America, threatening the services covered by rural hospitals which, in many areas, are the biggest employers in the area.

CBO also points out that the hardest hit will be those with preexisting conditions, low-income Americans, and seniors. But even those making \$100,000, around \$100,000, will also be hurt.

Mr. Speaker, why is the Senate even considering this bill? Who benefits? Maybe it is just those wealthy Americans who will get a huge tax cut as people lose their insurance.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for those thoughts and reflections that we should have about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE). She has been an advocate for Americans, has spoken, and done so eloquently, related to her work on the Judiciary Committee, as well as Homeland Security, and I am eager to hear what the gentlewoman has to say about healthcare. And as well, of course, as a fellow Caribbean American, I would wish her and her family a Happy Caribbean American Heritage Month, which was, of course, offered by our colleague, BARBARA LEE, in 2005.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman who represents the U.S. Virgin Islands for her constant leadership and consistently allowing us to come to the floor to speak to our colleagues and, hopefully, the American people on important topics.

I can't think of a topic more important than this one that really represents, when I say this one, the question of healthcare for Americans.

Might I say that the healthcare statement or framework was issued about 12 noon on Thursday. As you well know, we worked through Friday, and I left about 12 noon, landed in Houston, and went directly to the Legacy Community Health clinic on Lyons Avenue in Fifth Ward, Texas. That was a federally qualified health clinic that was able to be constructed in the neighbor-

hood of Barbara Jordan and Mickey Land by the Affordable Care Act and to bring healthcare to senior citizens living across the street access, easy access to healthcare.

There was 40, 50, 60, 70 people who came. We walked down the street to ask that this President and the Senators leave our healthcare alone. But more importantly, the disabled community came. I want to personally thank them.

There were children, there were pastors, there were doctors, there were good people there, but there was the blind, there was the deaf community, there were people in wheelchairs, and they cried. And one of them said: Please don't take my Medicaid healthcare away; and please allow me to continue to live independently, because I have at least the healthcare.

Of course, the Senate did not listen. The President today said that he hopes that the Affordable Care Act will crash and burn. And we know that polls are showing that they increasingly think their healthcare will get worse. But polls are showing that 51 percent of Americans believe and support the Affordable Care Act.

I want to spend the remaining moments of my life here on the floor—not my life, but my time on the floor. I hope to the Lord that it is not the remaining time of my life, but I am so overwhelmed by this bill, I know that some people will lose their lives.

So I am going to include in the RECORD an article entitled "Center for American Progress Coverage Losses Under the Senate Health Care Bill Could Result in 18,100 to 27,700 Additional Deaths in 2026."

[From the Center for American Progress, June 22, 2017]

COVERAGE LOSSES UNDER THE SENATE HEALTH CARE BILL COULD RESULT IN 18,100 TO 27,700 ADDITIONAL DEATHS IN 2026

(By Ann Crawford-Roberts)

One Republican member of Congress, defending the GOP health care plan—the American Health Care Act (AHCA)—suggested that concerns that the loss of health care coverage leads to death are overblown. However, the scientific literature on the effects of insurance coverage on mortality shows that the coverage losses from the AHCA would result in tens of thousands of deaths.

The secret Senate bill was finally released today, and it is broadly similar to what passed in the House: It ends Medicaid expansion and makes further deep cuts to the program; eliminates the individual mandate; and reduces funding that helps low-income Americans afford health coverage. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has not yet released its score of the Senate bill, although it is expected to do so early next week.

The CBO, however, has released a score of the House's version of the AHCA, which is largely similar to the Senate bill. The score projected that, by 2026, 23 million more Americans would be uninsured under the House bill compared to the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is what we are confronting. These

are not numbers that anyone would print just to create hysteria. These are truthful numbers.

Now, let me answer the question. The critics keep saying that we are crumbling. I said to you the President said: crash and burn. That is not the case, that insurers appear to be fleeing the Affordable Care Act's health insurance exchanges or State-based, online marketplaces where people can buy individual health insurance.

The fact that one-third of counties are projected to have just one insurer on their ObamaCare exchanges this year has been a popular talking point among Republicans, including President Trump, trying to gain or gin up support to replace the Affordable Care Act.

The stat was echoed in a recent editorial by Tom Price. Though some insurers are still deciding whether to participate in ObamaCare exchange, the complaint about lackluster insurer participation is valid.

In recent weeks alone, Aetna pulled out, leaving its participation in ObamaCare limited. But the real issue is that we have been strangling these insurance companies.

They leave out that the insurers might be less likely to exit if more States had expanded Medicaid under ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, I include this article in the RECORD, "Why So Many Insurers Are Leaving ObamaCare."

[From The Atlantic, May 11, 2017]

#### WHY SO MANY INSURERS ARE LEAVING OBAMACARE

HOW REJECTING MEDICAID AND OTHER GOVERNMENT DECISIONS HAVE HURT INSURANCE MARKETS

One of the most common reasons critics of Obamacare say the law is "collapsing" is that insurers appear to be fleeing the Affordable Care Act's health-insurance exchanges, or the state-based, online marketplaces where people can buy individual health-insurance policies.

The fact that one-third of counties are projected to have just one insurer on their Obamacare exchanges this year has been a popular talking point among Republicans—including President Trump—trying to gin up support for their replacement bill, the American Health Care Act.

The stat was echoed in a recent editorial by Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price, in which he portrayed Obamacare as a house that's on fire and "many of our fellow Americans are trapped inside."

Though some insurers are still deciding whether to participate in the Obamacare exchanges, the complaint about lackluster insurer participation is valid. In recent weeks alone, Aetna pulled out of Virginia's Obamacare exchange, leaving its participation in Obamacare this year limited to just four states. Medica, the last insurer remaining in most of Iowa, threatened to stop selling individual plans. And after Humana pulled out of Tennessee in February, leaving 40,000 people with no insurance option, BlueCross BlueShield reluctantly stepped in on Tuesday, but only if certain conditions are met. According to a Kaiser Family Foun-

dation analysis, 31 percent of counties will have just one insurer this year, up from just 7 percent last year.

There is one thing Republicans usually leave out of their indictment of Obamacare, though: Insurers might have been less likely to exit if more states had expanded Medicaid under Obamacare.

The Affordable Care Act was written with the idea that states would expand Medicaid, the insurance program for the poor, to cover people earning up to 138 percent of the federal poverty level, or \$16,400 for a single adult. But a 2012 Supreme Court case made that expansion optional, and so far 19 states have rejected the expansion. People earning below 100 percent of the federal poverty level, or about \$12,000 annually, in those states aren't eligible for subsidies to buy private insurance on the Obamacare exchanges or, in most cases, for Medicaid. They fall in an insurance no-man's land, the "coverage gap."

People earning between 100 and 138 percent of the poverty level in those Medicaid-rejection states, however, do qualify for subsidies to buy insurance on the Obamacare exchanges. Many of them enrolled in Obamacare, and they make up about 40 percent of the Obamacare enrollment population in the non-expansion states, compared to 6 percent in the expansion states.

The catch is, poor people tend to be sicker than rich people are. And having so many poor, sick people in their Obamacare marketplaces might have made it more expensive for insurers to operate in the non-expansion states.

In Alabama, for instance, BlueCross BlueShield is the only insurer participating in the exchange in 2017, and it's spending \$1.20 for every \$1 it collects in premiums—an unsustainable ratio, as insurance writer and analyst Louise Norris points out.

So, then, what happened in states that did expand Medicaid but nonetheless have very fragile insurance markets? Iowa, for example, expanded Medicaid, but it has had so many insurers pull out of its exchange that there might be no Obamacare plans on offer this year. In Iowa and several other Medicaid-expansion states, a different Obamacare-related choice might have contributed to the high cost of insuring their Obamacare enrollees.

Before Obamacare, insurers could reject customers they thought would be too sick and too expensive. After Obamacare was passed, about 35 states continued to allow the sale of non-Obamacare-compliant plans. (The states that didn't allow this tended to be more liberal—New York, Vermont, and the like.) Therefore, the people on these so-called "grandmothered" plans were likely to be healthier than average, since they had to pass the healthiness test that insurers were formerly allowed to use to screen their customers. These plans can also raise peoples' rates as they get sick—something that's not allowed under Obamacare. Many healthy people in the grandmother states were, in a sense, kept out of the Obamacare marketplaces, only joining Obamacare if and when they get sick. Thus, the grandmothered plans might have made the Obamacare pool sicker in those states.

According to a 2016 KFF analysis, states that both did not expand Medicaid and allowed the grandmothered plans had an average "risk score" that was 8 percent higher than those that did expand Medicaid and did not allow the grandmothered plans. The Kaiser researchers caution that there could be other hidden demographic factors at

play, but write that the study "does suggest that state policy decisions may have had a noticeable effect on risk pools."

Karen Pollitz, a KFF senior fellow, gave an example of how this worked in Iowa, via email:

In Iowa, most of the Wellmark (BCBS) market share continues to be in non-compliant plans (the grandmothers/grandfathered pre-ACA plans), so Wellmark cherry picks its own market share. Over three years, news reports show Wellmark lost \$90 million on ACA compliant plans, with one enrollee accounting for \$18 million in claims for one year alone. So for 2018 Wellmark will not only leave the marketplace, it will stop offering all ACA compliant plans, keeping in force just their pre-ACA policies.

Today, of course, insurers have even more to worry about, like whether the Trump administration will continue to make payments called cost-sharing reductions to defray medical costs for low-income people on Obamacare. House Republicans successfully sued the Obama administration in 2014 to stop the payments, and the Trump administration could simply drop the appeal. In that case, insurers participating in Obamacare would be on the hook for billions of dollars in medical expenses. (The House health-care bill would eliminate the payments as well.)

As Cori Uccello, senior health fellow at the American Academy of Actuaries, put it to NBC News, "Insurers need to know if they are going to get paid."

What's more, some insurers are skeptical that the Trump administration will enforce Obamacare's individual mandate, so they are raising their rates as a precaution.

And of course, with the Senate currently debating its own version of the Obamacare repeal bill, the entire future of Obamacare is uncertain. Indeed, "uncertainty" comes up a lot in stories about insurers leaving Obamacare.

At this rate, Republicans might live to see the Obamacare "death spiral" they have long been prophesying. But insurance markets don't just collapse on their own. Decisions by states, Congress, and the Trump administration can—and have—given them a hefty nudge.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And the answer, of course, is a litany of ways that the Republicans have extinguished the very essence of it.

But I just want to close by bringing to the attention of my colleagues Ryan Smith. He has a mental health generalized anxiety disorder. He has got a beautiful picture with, it looks like, his mom and him. And it says: Without the ACA, I would not have been able to move and find a new job.

He has generalized anxiety disorder. He is a young man with a job who worked for the Michigan House of Representatives, and he was diagnosed in 2013. Because of the Affordable Care Act, he keeps his job.

Then we have, how TrumpCare will kill me before cystic fibrosis. I am 34 years old. If I was a Canadian, there would be a good chance I would live for 17 more years, but, in the Americas of Donald Trump and PAUL RYAN, that is not going to happen.

At 2, I was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis. And this individual indicates: I got married. I hope one day to have children. But without the Affordable Care Act, they too may lose their lives.

ObamaCare saved my life. What now? This was a gentleman, lying in bed with my dog, recovering from the most recent surgery, when the news alert went off on my iPhone after midnight. Breaking news: the Senate has just taken a major step toward repealing the Affordable Care Act. Fear, that is what I and millions of Americans felt.

This is a breast cancer survivor, and she is worried about being able to survive.

So there are many stories like this, and there are stories of the disabled and senior citizens who may be thrown out of nursing homes and children who are very sick who may, because of a preexisting disease, not have insurance.

I am glad to be with you on the floor, and I think I will end by saying, my commitment is to see that this never happens to the American people; that whatever the shenanigans and negotiating that are going on in the Senate—and I respect the other body, but whatever is going on to pass a bill that may kill people, or cause people to lose their lives under the medical system, or, in fact, throw people off of insurance, I believe we have a moral obligation to stand in the gap and stand against this.

I really would lift up my hand to my friends, Senators and others, I lift my hand. Let us sit down to the negotiating table together, and let us save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague in strong opposition to the issue of repealing, revising, and replacing the Affordable Care Act presented by the Republicans.

Tonight, after seven years of claiming to have a workable replacement for the Affordable Care Act, the Senate, just as House Republicans before them, showed their hand; and it is empty.

Senate Republicans have finally released their draft version of the House-passed American Health Care Act and it is clear why they kept it behind closed doors all this time.

Today, the Congressional Budget Office and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) completed their estimate of the direct spending and revenue effects of the Better Care Reconciliation Act of 2017, which is the Senate amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1628.

The Senate bill would increase the number of people who are uninsured by 22 million in 2026 relative to the number under current law, slightly fewer than the increase in the number of uninsured estimated for the House-passed legislation.

By 2026, an estimated 49 million people would be uninsured, compared with 28 million who would lack insurance that year under current law.

Senate Trumpcare is yet another plan that promotes Wealth Care—if you are billionaire or a millionaire you will become wealthier.

If you are part of the middle class or the working poor your economic you will become less well-off due to higher health insurance cost or out of pocket health care expenses.

Earlier today, they were making changes to address the growing chorus of objections to their ill-conceived attempt to end Obamacare for more than 20 million Americans.

The change they proposed could be described as a post-script that people should try to keep health insurance coverage while they strip away the assistance that makes health insurance a right that is affordable and accessible to all Americans.

The reality of keeping health insurance under the Republican proposal would be nearly impossible for the very sick who are receiving coverage under Medicaid.

The added difficulty for the chronically ill is that their preexisting condition may mean higher premiums that the Republican plan will not help them cover through subsidies or the removal of prohibitions that insurance companies cannot discriminate against them.

If you or your loved one depends on Medicaid you will be worse off because the insurance market may allow you to purchase insurance, but there is no subsidies to help you purchase plans, and no control over how high a premium might become.

The Senate bill is worse than the one that passed the House, with deeper cuts to Medicaid and a ban on Planned Parenthood funding for one year.

Just like the bill that passed the House, this proposal would likely strip coverage from millions of Americans and do nothing to address affordability, all while providing a windfall to corporations and the richest of the rich.

Both healthcare bills are immoral bill and I call on Republicans to abandon their efforts to repeal and replace the law of the land at the expense of the most vulnerable Americans.

The President promised to a plan to provide health insurance for everybody.

But that promise has not been kept.

The legislation unveiled by House and Senate Republicans would kick millions of Americans off their health coverage and force millions to pay more for less.

This plan is a prescription for misery and spells disaster for hard-working families struggling to make ends meet in the face of spiraling health care costs.

The Affordable Care Act was always about real people who have real lives that are impacted by not having access to affordable and accessible health insurance.

Those caught up in the Opioid addiction rely on Medicaid for healthcare treatment for withdrawal special medical care centers.

The Senate and House Republican bills would eliminate Medicaid coverage for tens of thousands of Opioid addicts who are seeking help.

The Affordable Care Act has established healthcare as a right and not just something that the privileged can afford.

This repeal charade must end.

Republicans have had seven years to show they have a better way to cover millions of Americans but we have learned at last that they have none.

Republicans will be held accountable for whatever happens to our health care system under their watch, especially the destabilizing uncertainty their efforts have already engendered.

With America finally on the move thanks to the expansion of coverage through the Afford-

able Care Act, the Republican plan to repeal and replace the ACA threatens to turn the clock back by making America sick again.

Statistics Texas

Should the Republicans be successful in repealing the Affordable Care Act people living in the State of Texas will be harmed: 1,874,000 individuals in the state who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented could lose their coverage if the ACA is entirely or partially repealed.

1,092,650 individuals stand to lose their coverage if the Republican Congress dismantles the exchanges.

913,177 individuals who received financial assistance to purchase health insurance in 2016, received an average of \$271 per person, would be at risk of having coverage become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

1,107,000 individuals in the state could have insurance if the State of Texas would accept the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion. These individuals will not be able to gain coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the Medicaid expansion.

508,000 kids who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented are also at risk of having their coverage rolled back.

205,000 young adults in the state who are able to stay on a parent's health insurance plan thanks to the ACA now stand to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the requirement that insurers allow children to stay on their parents' plans until age 26.

646,415 individuals in the state who received cost-sharing reductions to lower out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, co-pays, and coinsurance are now at risk of having healthcare become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates cost-sharing reductions.

10,278,005 individuals in the state who now have private health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles stand to lose this avenue of access to affordable healthcare if the Republican Congress eliminates ACA provisions requiring health insurers to cover important preventive services without cost-sharing.

Women in the state who can now purchase insurance for the same price as men are at risk of being charged more for insurance if the Republican Congress eliminates the ACA's ban on gender rating in the individual and small group markets. Before the ACA, women paid up to 56% more than men for their health insurance.

Roughly 4,536,000 individuals in the state who have pre-existing health conditions are at risk of having their coverage rescinded, being denied coverage, or being charged significantly more for coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the ACA's ban on pre-existing conditions.

346,750 seniors who have saved an average of \$1,057 each as a result of closing the Medicare prescription drug "donut hole" gap in coverage stand to lose this critical help going forward.

1,746,043 seniors who have received free preventive care services thanks to ACA provisions requiring coverage of annual wellness visits and eliminating cost-sharing for many recommended preventive services covered by

Medicare Part B, such as cancer screenings, are at risk of losing access to these services if congressional Republicans go forward with their plan to repeal the ACA.

#### National Statistics 2013–2016

There were over 41 million uninsured persons in the United States in 2013, and by 2015 that number had declined to a little over 28 million because of the tremendous success of the Affordable Care Act.

In March 2016, HHS reported that due to the Affordable Care Act, 20 million Americans have gained health care coverage.

In 2016, Medicaid's share of total U.S. health care spending amounted to 17 percent. The program is funded by both federal and state government. In 2016, there were 72.2 million people enrolled in Medicaid.

Since 2012 the number of people receiving healthcare through Medicaid grow by 24.6 million.

The number of children enrolled in Medicaid coverage is 43%.

As more families were able to purchase health care insurance through exchanges the number of children receiving health insurance through Medicaid decreased from 50% in 2011 to 43% in 2016 because their families' health plan provided them with coverage.

The 2016 HHS report said that 6.1 million uninsured young adults ages 19 to 25 have gained health insurance coverage because they could remain on a parent's health plan due to the Affordable Care Act.

#### Black and Hispanic Insurance Rates

Gains in coverage because of the Affordable Care Act were strong across all racial and ethnic groups between October 2013 and early 2016.

The uninsured rate among Black non-Hispanics dropped by more than 50 percent (from 22.4 to 10 percent); corresponding to about 3 million adults gaining coverage.

The uninsured rate among Hispanics dropped by more than 25 percent (from 41.8 to 30.5 percent), corresponding to about 4 million Hispanic adults gaining coverage.

The greatest demographic that benefited from the Affordable Care Act were White non-Hispanics whose uninsurance rate declined by more than 50 percent (from 14.3 to 7.0 percent), corresponding to about 8.9 million adults gaining coverage.

#### History of Universal Healthcare in the United States

In 1949, Harry Truman became the first sitting President to propose universal healthcare for all Americans as part of the "Fair Deal."

On March 23, 2010, with the stroke of President Obama's pen, the American people received this part of the "Fair Deal."

The Affordable Care Act has been affirmed to be law by every means provided by our nation's constitution: On March 21, 2010, it passed the House and was sent to the President.

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law.

On June 28, 2012, the United States Supreme Court in *National Federation of Independent Businesses v. Sebelius* ruled that it was constitutional.

During the 2012 Presidential Election the Affordable Care Act was a central issue. President Obama was soundly reelected with 51.1

percent of the vote and 62% of the Electoral votes (332–206).

In 2014, the Affordable Care Act provisions banned insurance companies from:

Discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition.

Charging higher rates based on gender or health status.

Enforcing lifetime dollar limits.

Enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

The Affordable Care Act means:

Over 19 million Americans now have health insurance.

105 million Americans have no life time limits on health insurance

Nearly 134 million people with pre-existing conditions have coverage.

6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance plans.

5 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have saved billions on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 Small Businesses are using the Health Care Tax Credit to help them provide health insurance to their workers.

[Statistics on Texas and the Affordable Care Act]

1.7 million Texas have health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act.

7 million Texans no longer have lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance.

300,731 young adults can remain on their parents' health insurance until age 26.

10 million Texans have insurance although they have pre-existing conditions that would have prevented them from getting coverage before the Affordable Care Act became law.

346,750 seniors are no longer in the prescription drug donut hole, which means they are no sudden large out of pocket expenses to get the medicine they need.

□ 2000

Ms. PLASKETT. I thank the gentlewoman so much for that information, for much of the testimonies that you have given for the record.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it gives me great pleasure to yield to Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who not only represents California in the area of Berkeley as well as Oakland, but is also someone who is a real progressive fighter for the American people, cares passionately about healthcare.

But on this evening when we are also talking about Caribbean American Heritage Month, I have to tell you that, in June of 2005, the House unanimously adopted H. Con. Res. 71, which was

sponsored and ushered through by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE with other Members, which was recognizing the significance of Caribbean people and their descendants in the history and culture of the United States. On February 14, 2006, the resolution similarly passed the Senate, culminating a 2-year bipartisan, bicameral effort that was issued by President George Bush on June 6, 2006.

Since the declaration, the White House has issued annual proclamations recognizing June as Caribbean American Heritage Month, and it gives those of us of Caribbean-American heritage great honor and a real opportunity to extol and let other Americans know about the contributions, the issues that are important to us.

I thank Congresswoman LEE for bringing that forward and for ushering that through. It is really, I feel, quite often that we get subsumed, that the experiences of Caribbean Americans often get glossed over, and I want to thank her for affording us the opportunity to have this month to be able to talk among ourselves and among other Americans about the things that we have done.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California to discuss healthcare as well as Caribbean American Heritage Month.

Ms. LEE. I want to thank Congresswoman PLASKETT for hosting this Special Order and for her kind words, but also for her commitment to providing healthcare for all Americans, for her leadership in the Caribbean Caucus, for her dedicated constituent representation of her constituents in her district, and also being the epitome of why Caribbean American Heritage Month is so important. There are so many Caribbean Americans throughout our country who have contributed so much to the fabric of our society, and so I am really proud to be with her tonight.

And thank you for signing H. Con. Res. 71 because that was during the days of the bipartisanship spirit. If a BARBARA LEE and a George Bush could work together, then that says something.

Ms. PLASKETT. It says a lot for what we can accomplish.

Ms. LEE. What we can accomplish, but also about the brilliance and the importance of the Caribbean-American community.

Let me just mention Dr. Claire Nelson, who is the founder and president of the Institute of Caribbean Studies, because, for over a decade, just in terms of history, we worked closely together to recognize the many individual contributions of Caribbean Americans and to make Caribbean American Heritage Month a reality. So I must today salute her for her tremendous leadership.

Our Nation has been so fortunate to benefit from countless individuals of

Caribbean descent, including my personal mentor and friend, the late Honorable Shirley Chisholm, whose district now is so ably represented by our colleague of Jamaican descent, Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE.

Now, Shirley Chisholm was a woman of Bajan and Guyanese descent who never forgot her roots in the Caribbean. She was the first African-American woman elected to Congress, the first woman and the first African American to run for President. She was truly a trailblazer, and she convinced me that I needed to actually register to vote.

Throughout her career, Shirley was an advocate and a fighter. She fought for working families, the poor, and our most vulnerable: children and seniors. She believed that everyone should have the basics: food, housing, a decent job, good wages, and healthcare—again, regardless of their background. And let me tell you, I know that she would have been appalled by this Senate health bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed, and, to be quite honest, I am terrified about the Republican's heartless bill to rip healthcare away from 22 million Americans. Now, next year, 15 million Americans will lose their healthcare, and believe you me, these are not just Democrats, these are not only African Americans, but these are also Republicans and people who voted for Trump.

The bill, currently—this bill—was hatched by 13 male Republicans in back rooms and basements. They hid it for as long as they could because they knew if they held an honest debate, they would lose on the merits.

According to the Congressional Budget Office today, the Senate's bill would strip healthcare from 22 million Americans, devastate women's health, and weaken protections for those living with preexisting conditions, with disabilities. It will increase premiums and reduce benefits, and it would also make Americans pay more for less. It would end Medicaid as we know it, including long-term care for our seniors.

What is more, it will harm American families and really will present an environment now where it is a matter of life and death for so many who don't even need to worry about not having healthcare. They should have healthcare because, otherwise, many people who are going to be denied under this bill can lose their lives.

And for what? Why are we doing this, or why are they doing this? It is to pay for tax cuts for billionaires and for millionaires and for CEOs.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few months, like all of us, I received thousands of letters from constituents in the East Bay who are terrified of losing their healthcare. I have heard from people like Melissa, a mother in Oakland, whose son Sam was born premature with several preexisting conditions.

Her son received healthcare under the Affordable Care Act. Under the Senate healthcare bill, children like Sam will be locked out of the care that they desperately need. They are terrified. The bill would force American families like Melissa's to choose between groceries and healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is cruel and, yes, it is mean. It is a massive tax cut for billionaires at the expense of families and our most vulnerable.

Now, during the campaign, President Trump asked the question: What does the Black community have to lose? Well, for starters, Mr. President, I hope you hear us tonight, it is healthcare, given the number of African Americans, which Congressman VEASEY laid out, who, for the first time, now have healthcare.

In all my years in Congress, I have never seen such a morally bankrupt bill. And make no mistake, it is a matter of life and death, and the American people deserve better.

Finally, let me just say this bill is not a healthcare bill. It is a tax cut bill for millionaires and billionaires and is known as TrumpCare. I don't know how it got that title because it is more like—and what I call it—"Trump Don't Care" legislation, and it must be rejected.

Ms. PLASKETT. I thank the gentlewoman for that information and for her passionate words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), who is an advocate for people throughout this country, not just Wisconsin, and who is a poet along with being a great Congresswoman.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands so very, very much for yielding to me.

I rise today to speak with you, Mr. Speaker, because we have gotten so many complaints about the messaging that Democrats have around this bill, and I just want to keep the main thing the main thing, and I just want to talk to you, Mr. Speaker, very directly.

We talked a lot about the 22 million, 23 million people who will lose their healthcare if we were to repeal and replace so-called ObamaCare. But this goes deeper than that.

This undermines the Medicaid program, a program that will be 52 years old on July 30, if it survives. This takes away the eligibility, changes eligibility standards; and right now, Mr. Speaker, there are 70 million people who rely upon Medicaid. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow it could be you.

The average age of a Member of the House of Representatives is 57. The average age of a Senator is 61. So, I mean, Mr. Speaker, you are one stroke away, one heart attack away from becoming disabled. And after they wipe out your IRA and your pension and your Social Security so they can care for you, long-

term care, or allow you to stay home, you, too, Mr. Speaker, could end up relying on Medicaid to have a decent end-of-life experience or to be able to stay in your home.

You are one kidney failure away, one car accident away. Even though you make \$179,000 a year, you don't have enough money, Mr. Speaker, were you to have a disabled child that would need extensive care. You would depend on the Medicaid program.

You know, so many people don't care about what is going on here because they think it couldn't happen to them, that those 70 million people who rely on Medicaid is someone other than them. But, no, Mr. Speaker, it is you.

And even if you don't, God willing, have a stroke or a heart attack, you are someone who is going to suffer from the cost shifting so that, when 22 million people lose their healthcare, your premiums are going to go up. Your deductibles are going to go up. And God forbid that you have arthritis or some other preexisting condition, because under this bill you will be left at the tender mercies of our insurance companies where they can charge five times as much for someone who has aged or has a preexisting condition.

Hospitals in your nice suburban rural area may find themselves being shut down because they don't get Medicaid payments, and community health centers—not just Planned Parenthood, Mr. Speaker, that you are ideologically opposed to, but those community health centers that serve rural communities.

And how cruel could a bill be where 50 percent of the children born in this country rely on Medicaid? How cruel could a bill be when 7 million people with disabilities, represented, you know, by those folks who were tossed out of here in their wheelchairs the other day? And we will find that after we end the entitlement to Medicaid, we will have disabled people and children and people who need skilled nursing care fighting with each other because they will have to win the lottery in order to be able to access the crumbs that fall from the master's table of the States in which they live.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will have an impact on you. It is not just poor people. It is everybody. And I would urge the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, for us to be mindful of the fact that all Americans, every American relies on decent, good healthcare. This is the largest healthcare program in our country that is about to be dismantled, and I would urge caution and tell everyone, especially you, Mr. Speaker, to beware.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands has 25 minutes remaining.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with enormous, not just gratitude, but

great pride, actually, to yield to someone who, to me, is one of my big sisters here, who is the champion in the House, the foundation for those of us within the Caribbean Caucus who are Caribbean Americans here in the Congress. She represents probably one of the largest Caribbean constituencies in the United States, that being part of Brooklyn, New York, which I tell everybody is the largest Caribbean island in the world.

□ 2015

Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE is a great member on the Committee on Energy and Commerce. She is one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Caribbean Caucus, and she is a passionate progressive advocate for healthcare and for all care for Americans and for those who have been forgotten.

I am so glad and so grateful for the gentlewoman's continued efforts to raise the level of awareness on issues related to the Caribbean Basin, of Caribbean Americans here in the United States, and the African diaspora as a whole, that we are not a monolithic group, that we have a richness and a variety within even Americans who are of Caribbean descent here in America. And that needs to be celebrated and discussed, and the achievements and how we all, as a mosaic, make America great by being part of different cultures.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) this evening to discuss healthcare and Caribbean American Heritage Month.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the United States Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my Caribbean-American sisters and brothers across this country. For hundreds of years, Caribbean Americans have contributed to the artistic, legal, literary, diplomatic, business, athletic, and medical—you name it, there is not an endeavor where you won't find a Caribbean American who helped shape American society.

Alexander Hamilton grew up in the Leeward Islands of St. Kitts and Nevis and went on to found our economic system. Former Attorney General Eric Holder, whose family came from Barbados, served honorably as the first Black Attorney General. General Colin Powell, whose own parents immigrated from Jamaica, became our Nation's first Black chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the first Black Secretary of State.

Constance Baker Motley, whose parents were from Nevis, drafted the complaint in the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education* before serving as our Nation's first Black female Federal judge.

Shirley Chisholm, my predecessor and role model, served in Congress for

seven terms and became the first Black woman to seek a major party's nomination for President. Her family was from modern-day Guyana and Barbados.

Who can forget the unmatched contributions of such notable performers as Sidney Poitier, Harry Belafonte, Sammy Davis, Jr., and even Beyonce?

Let me add Rihanna. I could go on.

But by any measure, Caribbean Americans have enriched the United States beyond their numbers. They have made the United States better, stronger, and more vibrant while serving as a credit to the Caribbean region and the United States of America.

I, myself, am the proud daughter of Jamaican immigrants. My mother, Dr. Una Clarke, served as the first Caribbean-born female member of the New York City Council. In fact, she was the first foreign-born female to serve in the New York City Council.

For those reasons, I am proud to represent one of the largest Caribbean diaspora communities in the Nation and to serve as one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Caribbean Caucus.

However, unfortunately, the Caribbean region stands at a crossroads today. Many of the nations face high energy prices, environmental degradation, public health challenges, and economic challenges imposed by the correspondent banking crisis. Haiti, in particular, has been beset by numerous challenges over the past few years through no fault of its own.

I believe that the United States must not be silent in the face of those challenges. The Caribbean region is known favorably as the third border of the United States. Instead, it should aid our Caribbean neighbors to help ensure a vibrant future in the region.

Indeed, the State Department's recent report to Congress on the U.S.-Caribbean strategic partnership marked a step in the right direction. However, we must continue making strides on the road to full diplomatic engagement in accordance with our values and as befitting our friends and neighbors in the region.

I find it quite fascinating that so many other nations around the world have found this region in the Western Hemisphere to be partners with, and, we, right on its borders, have given it short shrift. When you look at the level of investment that China is making in the Caribbean region right now, it should give us all pause in the United States as we are concerned about the expansion of their influence into the Western Hemisphere.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I speak with pride today, I want to mention the name Susan Rice, former Ambassador to the U.N., another proud Caribbean American; and Patrick Ewing, formerly of the New York Knicks, another proud Caribbean American. The list goes on and on. We have deeply bene-

fited from their contributions to our life, enriching society here in the United States of America.

I would be remiss if I left the floor this evening without adding my voice to that of my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus in condemning this horrible healthcare bill that has been put forth in the United States Senate. It is a companion to the horrible bill that was put forth by United States House of Representatives.

I am a Christian and I practice my faith regularly. There is something said in the Bible about wickedness in high places. I have to speak to the wickedness within this bill that we, as a civil society, would remove the ability for people to just have human dignity, to have life, to be able to see their doctors, to be able to make sure that their children are well taken care of, that their parents can live out their days in dignity and in as best health as possible is really a blot on this Nation.

We have been through generations of challenges. We have reached a point where, in this Nation, we have made a lot of progress in really doing our best for our neighbors as we would do for ourselves. This is totally a step back.

Our children are going to ask us where we were when this vicious bill was proposed that Americans would be stripped of the ability to access healthcare in the United States of America in the 21st century.

I stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to say that we stood on the floor of the House and we fought. We fought for human dignity. We fought to make sure that this would not be something that would not rest on the mind and the conscious of our colleagues, that they would reflect on how they would feel if this bill were to impact them personally.

I find it really ironic that in many of the districts that this healthcare bill would impact, our colleagues are basically stripping away the well-being of their own constituents—people who voted and sent them here. It is truly unfortunate that we value wealth over human dignity; that we value giving money to people who haven't even asked for it over making sure that we can stop pandemics, that we can continue research into cures for those who may be ill, and that we can continue to move along the path of preventive health, which is, by far, the best way for us to conduct our lives in the United States of America. To see emergency rooms, if they remain open, filled with those who are uninsured in this day and age is not worthy of who we are as a nation.

So I stand with my colleagues to say that we will fight until the last person standing to bring dignity to our Nation—to all people—but we fight, in particular, as a Congressional Black Caucus for those who have been most



victimized and are the most vulnerable amongst us, and those are the people of the African-American communities here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for yielding.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting for myself that we have Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE and the next Member to come up is also from New York. Both of them have been Representatives of districts that I have lived in and that my family lives in. They represent what I think of when I think of my parents who live now in Congressman MEEKS' district, and my mother who was partly raised in Congresswoman CLARKE's district. My parents represent most Caribbean Americans who come to this country—people who come here with not much, who are willing to work hard, who believe that the sacrifice toward education and support of their families and helping others to come and find good, stable jobs and create middle class is what America is about.

We have contributed so much, and we can talk about so many of the Caribbean Americans who have done amazing things in this country. But it is those individuals who we do not talk about—our parents, our families—who come to this country, who provided the stability for others. It is why we are so concerned about the temporary protective status of Haitians—the 50,000 Haitians who are hardworking Haitians in this country, who are being sent back, who are now here working hard and sending so much money back that is the backbone of the economy of Haiti, who we cannot let go back because that country will collapse with them, leaving this country, and being good citizens—as much as they can be citizens—yearning for the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. MEEKS represents Queens, which is one of the backbones of Caribbean Americans. He is my parents' Congressman. The gentleman has been so good to the people that he represents as well as all the American people. The gentleman sits on the Committee on Financial Services. He also sits as a member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, where he advocates and speaks for those individuals who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PLASKETT for leading this Special Order on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

It is extremely important that we first thank our Caribbean brothers and sisters, as my sister YVETTE CLARKE so eloquently stated, the history of so many individuals that have made substantial contributions to make this a more perfect union, who, but for their labor and hard work, we would not be the country that we are.

But also as Representative PLASKETT has indicated, when I think about the average, everyday person who came across to America from the Caribbean Islands—the schoolteachers, the plumbers, the lawyers, the doctors, the sanitation workers, and the individuals that come even just to cut grass—when you think about the contributions, what they have committed is those individuals have raised children who become Members of Congress, like STACEY PLASKETT and YVETTE CLARKE, who continued that tradition of making this a much better place to live for all Americans, a shining example of what this great Nation is when it is so inclusive.

YVETTE CLARKE talked about Alexander Hamilton and the contributions that were made from the very beginning. But when you look at that and when you think of who we are and the hemisphere that we share—you see, the Caribbean Islands are the same hemisphere, and we have to make sure that we are together in lockstep. We can never forget that, when America catches a cold, many individuals in the Caribbean now get pneumonia.

So as a result of understanding the contributions that they have made in this country, and continue to make, we are really one on the same continent and we are only as strong as we are together.

□ 2030

And so we would have to stop and think of our brothers and sisters from the Caribbean and those who are still living there as just places that we go visit for tourism and vacation. Yes, we want to make sure that we do visit there to strengthen those economies, but we want to also make sure that, as a government, as a people, we are also doing the appropriate investments there in their infrastructure, because it only helps us here in the United States of America.

We are only as strong as we can be together. *E pluribus unum*, from many one, that is what this Nation is supposed to be, and I think that we have come a long way to accomplish it, which brings me to the second phase of what I want to talk about this evening, because this is not supposed to be a system of the haves versus the have-nots. It should not be where we have a reverse Robin Hood syndrome where you are taking from the poor to give to the rich. No, that is not the Nation that we want this country to be. In fact, people fled from a king who was wealthy and didn't care about the poor.

So here we are now as a nation, when the most important thing to anybody is health, because if you don't have health, you don't have anything. I don't care whether you are Black or White, whether you come from the East or the West or the North or the South—health. The one thing that we

have in common, everyone, is that we are human beings. And one thing that we know for sure, humans' bodies, at times, break down.

So, yes, if you are young and healthy, and, yes, if you are wealthy, then maybe this bill that they are looking at on the Senate side is for you. But if you are young and healthy today, believe me, tomorrow you won't be young if you are lucky.

And believe me, the human body gets sick. And when that happens, the question is: Will you have the ability to access the healthcare that you need to keep you healthy?

Well, under this bill, based upon the American Medical Association, hospitals, AARP, you can go to almost any health provider, they will tell you that, no. 22 million Americans, as the CBO score showed, would lose their access to healthcare, and many of those are in the middle, the middle class. They talk about healthcare. We are not just talking about healthcare; we are talking about adequate health coverage so that when you are sick, you can go to a doctor and receive the care that you need and know that you are covered, because my Republican colleagues have forgotten where we were before the Affordable Care Act.

You see, before the Affordable Care Act, more Americans were going bankrupt in trying to stay alive, for healthcare. These are middle class, hardworking, everyday individuals who thought they had coverage. But when they were sick, they went to the doctor, then they found out that what they thought they were covered for, they were not, and so they had to take out loans and re-mortgage and refinance their homes, give up everything that they had to try to stay healthy and alive. We don't want to go back there.

Before the Affordable Care Act, we were not talking about making sure that those individuals with preexisting diseases were covered.

If you listen to my Republican colleagues, they will tell you that the Affordable Care Act is the worst thing in the world. But before the Affordable Care Act, we weren't talking about children being able to stay on their parents' health insurance until they were 27 years old.

Yes, indeed, before the Affordable Care Act, many seniors saw their coverage capped, and, after a certain amount of payout, they had to come out of their pockets, which were not deep, and just hang in there with their families and suffer and go bankrupt.

So what we are talking about now is saving the lives of individuals.

I want to thank my friend and sister from the Virgin Islands for leading this for the Congressional Black Caucus, because the camera of history is rolling and it is recording, and it will record



her and the members of the Congressional Black Caucus standing on the right side of history.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PLASKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), and I will close out after that.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have said they want a healthcare system that cuts costs and covers more Americans, yet their bill does no such thing.

Last week, Republican leadership in the Senate unveiled their draft healthcare bill. Their bill makes extreme cuts to the Federal Medicaid program and doubles down on the President's vow to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The nonpartisan CBO came out and said that 22 million Americans stand to lose health coverage. Their bill does nothing but further harms the communities and threatens the livelihood of neighborhoods nationwide.

The healthcare debate in our country should be about increasing funding, promoting prevention, protecting and enhancing the quality of life for each and every person in Philadelphia, the Commonwealth, and our Nation.

What do we have to lose? We have a lot to lose. We are talking about the lives of 22 million Americans who stand to lose their healthcare. The numbers do not lie. These are our veterans, our seniors, our students, and our children.

We cannot turn a blind eye. The livelihood of our neighborhoods depends on our commitment to stop this disastrous bill from becoming law. There is a lot at stake, and our neighbors have too much to lose if we turn a blind eye.

We have heard from all of our colleagues tonight that clearly this is going in the wrong direction. And we, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, stand together to fight this horrible bill.

One last thing I want to say to my colleague on Caribbean Americans. June is Caribbean American Heritage Month, and I think the most of my colleague. I have learned a lot from watching her in action. She has that spirit and that drive as a Caribbean American. She has helped shape and strengthen the fabric of our communities.

I thank the congresswoman publicly for all that she has done as a great Caribbean American in this body.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of Caribbean American Heritage Month. In June 2005, the House of Representatives adopted H. Con. Res. 71, recognizing the significance of the Caribbean people. In February 2006, the reso-

lution passed in the Senate, and was signed by President George W. Bush in June 2006.

Since the declaration, the United States has celebrated June as Caribbean American heritage month every June, this year marks the twelfth anniversary. Approximately 3 million people in America can trace their ancestry to the Caribbean.

Historically, African-Caribbean migration to the United States can be traced back to the 17th century during British colonial slavery. While enslaved Africans imported from the Caribbean decreased after revolts in the 1700s, Caribbean immigration grew in the mid-1800s. After World War II, Caribbean immigration boomed during periods of economic growth. Between 1960 and 2009, the number of Caribbean immigrants grew from 190,000 to 2 million.

Caribbean Americans have contributed the fabric of our society, bringing a unique and vibrant culture to mesh with that of America's. Just to name a few, Colin Powell, Eric Holder, Cicely Tyson, and Lenny Kravitz are all Caribbean Americans.

I urge my fellow members of Congress to commemorate this month as National Caribbean American Heritage Month.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a medical procedure.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through June 29 on account of spouse health situation in California.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 27, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will

well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

KAREN C. HANDEL, Sixth District of Georgia.

RALPH NORMAN, Fifth District of South Carolina.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1796. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's Semi-Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to Sec. 1016 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1797. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia: Permit Exemptions and Definitions [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0113; FRL-9964-06-Region 4] received June 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1798. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0615; FRL-9963-41-Region 6] received June 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1799. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Redesignation of the Collin County Area to Attainment the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2009-0750 9963-47-Region 6] received June 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1800. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule and correction notice — Approval of Missouri's Air Quality Implementation Plans; Reporting Emission Data, Emission Fees and Process Information [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0790; FRL-9964-04-Region 7] received June 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1801. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA and SC: Changes to Ambient Air Standard Definitions [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0504; FRL-9964-09-Region 4] received June 23, 2017,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1802. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for Water Infrastructure Project Applications under WIFIA [EPA-HQ-OW-2016-0568; FRL-9964-19-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF64) received June 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1684. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide technical assistance to common interest communities regarding eligibility for disaster assistance, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2518. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3053. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 3054. A bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 3055. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to prohibit the preemption of State identity theft laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 3056. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to prohibit the preemption of State stalking laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 3057. A bill to establish the use of ranked choice voting in elections for Representatives in Congress, to require each State with more than one Representative to establish multi-member Congressional districts, to require States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 3058. A bill to redesignate the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in the State of Missouri as the "Gateway Arch National Park"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 3059. A bill to provide funding for Federally Qualified Health Centers, the National Health Service Corps, Teaching Health Centers, and the Nurse Practitioner Residency Training program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 3060. A bill to require that States and localities receiving grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program require law enforcement officers to undergo training on and thereafter employ de-escalation techniques to assist in reducing the need for the use of force by such officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 3061. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3062. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to consider the aircraft registry office in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as excepted during a Government shutdown or emergency (as it provides excepted services) to ensure that it remains open during any Government shutdown or emergency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY,

Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 3063. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation of June 21 as National ASK (Asking Saves Kids) Day to promote children's health and gun safety; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POSTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. HECK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KIND, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MENG, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SIREs, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mrs. TORRES):

H. Res. 405. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 26 as "LGBT Equality Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H. Res. 406. A resolution recognizing the importance of public park and recreation facilities and activities and expressing support for the designation of the month of July as "Park and Recreation Month"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. FASO, Mr. DUNN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H. Res. 407. A resolution condemning the persecution of Christians around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. COLE):

H. Res. 408. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 409. A resolution recognizing and commending Lunchtime Music on the Mall and its performers and partners for benefiting the District of Columbia and regional residents as well as visitors to the Nation's capital; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States Article I, Section 8 and Amendment II

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 3055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 3056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Con-

stitution in the government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 3057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 3058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 3059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 66: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 123: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 233: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 281: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 289: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 344: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 358; Mr. HARPER and Mr. LUETKE-MEYER.

H.R. 367: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 449: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 468: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 490: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 525: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 664: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 669: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 685: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 721: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. COMER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 731: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 747: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 750: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 754: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 807: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 816: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 828: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 846: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 873: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MAST, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 909: Mr. REED.

H.R. 927: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 930: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAST, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 947: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 986: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 995: Mr. ROYCE of California.

H.R. 997: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1017: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1057: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1059: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1090: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 1094: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1116: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1120: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1146: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1148: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1155: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1164: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1171: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1173: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1222: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1245: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1269: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1276: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1291: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1316: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1359: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1384: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1405: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1421: Mr. KIND and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1441: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1444: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 1447: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1456: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1491: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1494: Ms. MENG, Mr. OLSON, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BUDD, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1552: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1575: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1606: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1626: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1629: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1666: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1731: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1733: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1734: Mr. CICILLINE and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1757: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1759: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1777: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1828: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1841: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1847: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 1861: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1864: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1899: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1905: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1928: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WOMACK, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1953: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1955: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2013: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2054: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2059: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2061: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2149: Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 2225: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2240: Mr. COSTA.  
 H.R. 2273: Mr. BLUM.  
 H.R. 2315: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2345: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
 H.R. 2358: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 2366: Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 2379: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 2394: Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 2404: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
 H.R. 2428: Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 2435: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 2472: Mr. RASKIN.  
 H.R. 2478: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H.R. 2482: Mr. FASO and Mr. BARLETTA.  
 H.R. 2499: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 2501: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
 H.R. 2519: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.  
 H.R. 2544: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. BOST.  
 H.R. 2550: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 2556: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mr. ROKITA.  
 H.R. 2584: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. SOTO.  
 H.R. 2587: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 2589: Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 2598: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 2651: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2658: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. COFFMAN.  
 H.R. 2659: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H.R. 2664: Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 2690: Mr. VEASEY.  
 H.R. 2695: Ms. MENG, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 2696: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 2703: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2740: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. HANABUSA and Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 2790: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 2809: Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 2838: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2862: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. ROYCE of California.  
 H.R. 2870: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
 H.R. 2875: Mr. ZELDIN.  
 H.R. 2879: Mr. ROKITA.  
 H.R. 2902: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 2909: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. BACON.  
 H.R. 2913: Mr. HECK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 2918: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 2919: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RUSSELL.  
 H.R. 2944: Mr. RICHMOND.  
 H.R. 2946: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. GAETZ.  
 H.R. 2968: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 3003: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. BARLETTA.  
 H.R. 3004: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BACON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BARLETTA.  
 H.R. 3026: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 3033: Mr. TAYLOR.  
 H.J. Res. 6: Mr. ROKITA.  
 H.J. Res. 31: Mr. COHEN.  
 H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
 H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. DELAURO.  
 H. Con. Res. 64: Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H. Res. 185: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 218: Mr. ZELDIN.  
 H. Res. 257: Mr. KEATING and Mr. RASKIN.  
 H. Res. 274: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mrs. WAGNER.  
 H. Res. 279: Mr. DUFFY.  
 H. Res. 286: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
 H. Res. 307: Mr. BRAT.  
 H. Res. 317: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. ZELDIN.  
 H. Res. 351: Mr. FASO.  
 H. Res. 359: Mrs. LOWEY.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

##### OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3003 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

##### OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3004 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

**SENATE—Monday, June 26, 2017**

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, sovereign of nations, answer our lawmakers even before they call, and hear them even before they speak. Give them the wisdom today to commune with You. May this fellowship bring them Your gifts of knowledge, judgment, and wisdom for these turbulent times.

Lord, help them to yield their minds, hearts, and wills to the flow of Your Divine intelligence, using Your might to solve problems in our Nation and world. Give them the power to handle the pressures of legislative labor as they find fuel from a fresh flow of Your strength. May they think clearly, serve creatively, and endure consistently.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

**BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION BILL**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, 7 years ago, the Democrats forced an unfair healthcare system on our country that they called the Affordable Care Act. It turned out to be anything but that.

They told Americans that it would lower their premiums, but ObamaCare has increased premiums by an average of 105 percent in the vast majority of States on the Federal exchange since 2013. Unless we act, we can expect similar trends for years to come.

They told Americans that it would expand choice in the healthcare marketplace, but ObamaCare has left Americans in 70 percent of U.S. counties with little to no options for insurance this year. Unless we act, we can expect things to get worse.

They told Americans that it would allow them to keep their doctors, their

plans, and their ability to make the smartest healthcare decisions for their families. Instead, ObamaCare forced millions off the plans they liked and forced millions into plans they either did not want or could not afford. Unless we act, more Americans will be left trapped, forced by ObamaCare to buy insurance but left without the means to actually do so.

This is the ObamaCare status quo as millions of Americans have come to know it. It is unacceptable. It is unsustainable. The American people need better care, which is exactly what we are working to bring them.

Through dozens of meetings and through conversations with every Member of our conference, we have had the opportunity to discuss many different ideas and approaches for bringing relief from ObamaCare. Ultimately, we found there were a number of areas in which we all agreed when it comes to what the critical issues we need to address are and how we can do that. Those solutions are what make up the draft legislation that was released last week and that we will continue working to consider now.

Better Care will preserve access to care for patients with preexisting conditions, strengthen Medicaid, and allow children to remain on their parents' insurance through the age of 26.

Better Care will lower costs from where they are under ObamaCare by, among other things, eliminating taxes on the middle class, by giving Americans more power to control and reduce their medical costs and out-of-pocket expenses, and by giving States significant new tools to drive down premiums.

Better Care will free Americans from onerous mandates under ObamaCare by repealing the employer mandate that reduces hours and take-home pay for too many workers and by repealing the individual mandate that forces Americans to buy unaffordable ObamaCare insurance, freeing them to make the best healthcare decisions for their families on what types of plans they want and can afford.

Better Care will help stabilize insurance markets that are collapsing under ObamaCare by first implementing stabilization policies and then carefully transitioning away from ObamaCare completely so that more families are not harmed by its collapsing markets.

As one major insurer observed just today, this bill "will markedly improve the stability of the individual market and moderate premium increases." That is from a major insurer today.

We should keep working so that we can move forward with robust floor de-

bate and an open amendment process here on the Senate floor. I would encourage all 100 Senators to participate because the American people need better care right now, and this legislation includes the necessary tools to provide it.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION****EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2022.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this week, the eyes of the American people should be and are on the Senate. The Republican majority endeavors to pass a massive remake of our Nation's healthcare system with the votes of only one party and the ideas of only one wing of one party in just 4 short days.

The Republican majority kept their healthcare bill shrouded in darkness for as long as possible, only dragging it into the light last Thursday morning after it was forced to because there was so much outcry over the secrecy. That was only a week before it was set for a vote. There are still no hearings and no opportunity for a robust discussion of amendments. Just a few hours ago, they released a revised version, which, at the moment, is what we will apparently consider on the floor.

There is a reason my Republican colleagues labored in secret. There is a reason they forsook the committee process and regular order and open debate. There is a reason they want to jam this bill through in just 1 week. They are ashamed of their bill. Now that we have seen it, we finally know why.

The Republican healthcare bill—this new TrumpCare—unwinds the healthcare protections and programs that are designed to help the Americans who need it the most in order to give a tax break to the Americans who need it the least.

The bill would gut Medicaid, making it harder for families with a loved one in a nursing home or for families with a disabled child to afford his care, so that they can give a massive tax cut to the wealthy.

This bill would defund Planned Parenthood, making it harder for millions of women to obtain care, so that they can give people who make over \$1 million a \$57,000 tax cut, on average.

The bill would slash tax credits, which help families afford health insurance, in order to give a nearly \$1 trillion tax cut to the wealthiest Americans.

The bill would also punish any Americans who experience a gap in coverage, locking them out of health insurance for 6 months. Every year, tens of millions of Americans have a gap in coverage through no fault of their own. Some lose their jobs, and others have temporary financial problems. It is inhumane to say to those Americans: You now have to wait an additional 6 months without insurance.

Imagine someone who is struggling with cancer, and he has a lapse in coverage. The 6-month wait this Republican penalty imposes could well become a death sentence.

That is why Republicans are ashamed of this bill—it carries a staggering human cost. You do not have to take my word for it; the bipartisan National Association of Medicaid Directors came out today in opposition to the bill, saying it would “divert critical resources away from what we know is working today,” particularly for opioid treatment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Association of Medicaid Directors, June 26, 2017]

CONSENSUS STATEMENT FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MEDICAID DIRECTORS (NAMD) BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON THE BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2017

WASHINGTON, DC.—The following statement represents the unanimous views of the National Association of Medicaid Directors (NAMD) Board of Directors. NAMD is a bipartisan, nonprofit, professional organization representing leaders of state Medicaid agencies across the country.

Medicaid is a successful, efficient, and cost-effective federal-state partnership. It has a record of innovation and improvement of outcomes for the nation's most vulnerable citizens.

Medicaid plays a prominent role in the provision of long-term services and supports for the nation's elderly and disabled populations, as well as behavioral health services, including comprehensive and effective treatment for individuals struggling with opioid dependency.

Medicaid is complex and therefore demands thoughtful and deliberate discussion about how to improve it.

Medicaid Directors have long advocated for meaningful reform of the program. States continue to innovate with the tools they have, but federal changes are necessary to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the program. However, these changes must be made thoughtfully and deliberately to ensure the continued provision of quality, cost-effective care.

Medicaid Directors have asked for, and are appreciative of, improved working relationships with HHS and are working hard to streamline and improve the administration of the program. The Senate bill does formalize several critical administrative and regulatory improvements, such as giving Medicaid Directors a seat at the table in the development of regulations that impact how the program is run, and the pathway to permanency for certain waiver programs. However, no amount of administrative or regulatory flexibility can compensate for the federal spending reductions that would occur as a result of this bill.

Changes in the federal responsibility for financing the program must be accompanied by clearly articulated statutory changes to Medicaid to enable states to operate effectively under a cap. The Senate bill does not accomplish that. It would be a transfer of risk, responsibility, and cost to the states of historic proportions.

While NAMD does not have consensus on the mandatory conversion of Medicaid financing to a per capita cap or block grant, the per capita cap growth rates for Medicaid in the Senate bill are insufficient and unworkable.

Medicaid—or other forms of comprehensive, accessible and affordable health coverage—in coordination with public health and law enforcement entities, is the most comprehensive and effective way address the opioid epidemic in this country. Earmarking funding for grants for the exclusive purpose of treating addiction, in the absence of preventative medical and behavioral health coverage, is likely to be ineffective in solving the problem and would divert critical resources away from what we know is working today.

Medicaid Directors recommend prioritizing the stabilization of marketplace coverage. Medicaid reform should be undertaken when it can be accomplished thoughtfully and deliberately.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the nonpartisan American Medical Association—a conservative organization—came out today in opposition to the bill, saying it “will expose low and middle income patients to higher costs and greater difficulty in affording care.”

I ask unanimous consent that their letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,

Chicago, IL, June 26, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,  
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND LEADER SCHUMER: On behalf of the physician and medical student members of the American Medical Association (AMA), I am writing to express our opposition to the discussion draft of the “Better Care Reconciliation Act” released on June 22, 2017. Medicine has long operated under the precept of *Primum non nocere*, or “first, do no harm.” The draft legislation violates that standard on many levels.

In our January 3, 2017 letter to you, and in subsequent communications, we have consistently urged that the Senate, in developing proposals to replace portions of the current law, pay special attention to ensure that individuals currently covered do not lose access to affordable, quality health insurance coverage. In addition, we have advocated for the sufficient funding of Medicaid and other safety net programs and urged steps to promote stability in the individual market.

Though we await additional analysis of the proposal, it seems highly likely that a combination of smaller subsidies resulting from lower benchmarks and the increased likelihood of waivers of important protections such as required benefits, actuarial value standards, and out of pocket spending limits will expose low and middle income patients to higher costs and greater difficulty in affording care.

The AMA is particularly concerned with proposals to convert the Medicaid program into a system that limits the federal obligation to care for needy patients to a predetermined formula based on per-capita-caps. At the recently concluded Annual Meeting of the AMA House of Delegates, representatives of more than 190 state and national specialty medical associations spoke strongly in opposition to such proposals. Per-capita-caps fail to take into account unanticipated costs of new medical innovations or the fiscal impact of public health epidemics, such as the crisis of opioid abuse currently ravaging our nation. The Senate proposal to artificially limit the growth of Medicaid expenditures below even the rate of medical inflation threatens to limit states' ability to address the health care needs of their most vulnerable citizens. It would be a serious mistake to lock into place another arbitrary and unsustainable formula that will be extremely difficult and costly to fix.

We are also concerned with other provisions of the legislation beyond those directly affecting insurance coverage. The Affordable Care Act's Prevention and Public Health Fund was, according to the Department of Health and Human Services, established to “provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health, to improve health outcomes, and to enhance health care quality.” These activities are key to controlling health care costs and the elimination of support for them runs counter to the goal of improving the health care system. We also continue to oppose Congressionally-mandated restrictions on where lower income women (and men) may receive otherwise covered health care services—in this case the prohibition on individuals using their Medicaid coverage at clinics operated by Planned Parenthood. These provisions

violate longstanding AMA policy on patients' freedom to choose their providers and physicians' freedom to practice in the setting of their choice.

We do appreciate the inclusion of several provisions designed to bring short term stability to the individual market, including the extension of cost sharing reductions payments. We urge, however, that these provisions serve as the basis of Senate efforts to improve the ACA and ensure that quality, affordable health insurance coverage is within reach of all Americans.

We sincerely hope that the Senate will take this opportunity to change the course of the current debate and work to fix problems with the current system. We believe that Congress should be working to increase the number of Americans with access to quality, affordable health insurance instead of pursuing policies that have the opposite effect, and we renew our commitment to work with you in that endeavor.

Sincerely,

*James L. Madara, MD.*

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, even several Republican Senators are expressing concerns.

Republican Senator HELLER said: "The bill doesn't protect the most vulnerable Nevadans—the elderly, Nevadans struggling with mental health issues, substance abuse, and people with disabilities."

He continued: "The goal of healthcare reform should be to lower costs here in Nevada, and I'm not confident—not confident—it will achieve that goal."

Republican Senator SUSAN COLLINS said about the bill: "I'm very concerned about the cost of insurance for older people with serious chronic illnesses, and the impact of the Medicaid cuts on our state governments, the most vulnerable people in our society, and health care providers such as our rural hospitals and nursing homes."

Even my friend the junior Republican Senator from Texas said that under this bill, "premiums would continue to rise."

My Republican friends are right to have these concerns. The bill will not lower costs for working families. It will leave the most vulnerable Americans out in the cold, devastate rural areas, and set us even further back in combating the opioid epidemic.

This week, the Senate will witness a political exercise in that the majority leader will attempt to coerce the votes of these Senators and any other holdouts by adjusting the dials on the legislation a bit. There will be buyouts and bailouts and small tweaks that will be hailed as "fixes" by the other side.

The truth is that the Republicans cannot excise the rotten core at the center of their healthcare bill. No matter what tweaks they add, no matter how the bill changes around the edges, it is fundamentally flawed at the center. No matter what last-minute amendments are offered, this bill will force millions of Americans to spend more of their paychecks on healthcare in order to receive fewer benefits sim-

ply so that the wealthiest Americans can pay less in taxes. That is why our Republican colleagues are ashamed of this bill and are rushing it through in 4 short days.

Before we vote on the motion to proceed, I would ask my Republican friends to do one simple thing: Reflect on how this bill would impact your constituents. We are all sent here to serve the people of our States—to do right by them, to ease their burdens where possible and make sure our laws reflect a country that gives everyone an equal opportunity to succeed. The first rule of medicine is "do no harm." So it should be with government. So it should be with this healthcare bill.

But this bill will harm the middle-class family with a parent in a nursing home. It will harm the father whose son is struggling with opioid addiction and who is having trouble finding the money to put him through treatment. It will harm the child born with a pre-existing condition, who may hit the lifetime cap on healthcare coverage before he or she even enters kindergarten.

As the American Medical Association said today, this bill violates the "do no harm" standard on many levels. I believe my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle are men and women of good conscience. I would ask that they think with their conscience before they vote on the motion to proceed on Wednesday.

Any bill that does this much harm to the American people ought to receive a "no" vote.

#### RUSSIA SANCTIONS

Finally, Madam President, I have a word on Russia sanctions. President Trump has spent the last few days firing off tweets that point fingers at President Obama's handling of Russia's interference in our election. It is good that the President has finally acknowledged—albeit implicitly—that Russia interfered in our election, something that the intelligence community has long agreed upon.

Let me give the President some heartfelt advice. Mr. President, you have to stop the name-calling, finger-pointing, and deflection when it comes to something as serious as Russia's meddling in our democracy. This is very, very serious stuff.

Whatever President Trump thinks of President Obama's actions during the election is moot. Mr. Trump is now President, not Barack Obama, and the Russian threat is still there. If President Trump is concerned by Russian interference in our election, he can step up to the plate and try to stop it. Blaming Obama is not going to solve the problem, even though that blame may be wrongly placed.

The best thing President Trump can do is to support the Russia sanctions bill the Senate passed 2 weeks ago by an overwhelming, bipartisan, 98-to-2

vote—a bill that is currently languishing at the clerk's desk in the House, at what appears to be, at least, the request of the White House.

It would be unconscionable—unconscionable—to let sanctions stay where they are or, worse, to weaken them, when Russia has interfered with the wellsprings of our democracy and, if not punished, will likely do so again.

If President Trump doesn't support the bill and tries to block it or water it down, Americans are going to be asking: What is his motivation? What is the reason President Trump is afraid to sanction Russia after they interfered in our elections? The American people are going to ask a lot of questions.

I would advise the President to stop casting blame and step up to protect the vital interests of this country, to get tough on Russia, get serious about safeguarding our elections, and tell Speaker RYAN to pass our Russia sanctions bill so that President Trump can sign it.

Otherwise, President Trump is going to be in an even deeper hole with the public on the matter of Russia.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Democratic leader for his comments. I ascribe to them.

#### TRUMP ADMINISTRATION CUBA POLICY

Madam President, on June 16, in a campaign-style speech glorifying the failed Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961, President Trump spoke of freedom and democracy for the Cuban people.

Those are goals every one of us in this body shares, not only for the people of Cuba but for people everywhere. But the hypocrisy of the President's remarks in Miami, where he announced his decision to roll back engagement between the United States of America and Cuba, was glaring, if not surprising.

This is a President who has praised, feted, and offered aid and weapons to some of the world's most brutal despots. A President who, when he was in Saudi Arabia, never uttered the words "freedom" or "democracy" or "women's rights." In fact, he said he did not believe in lecturing other governments about such things. Freedom House ranks Saudi Arabia as less free than Cuba.

This is a President who welcomed at the White House President Erdogan, who has imprisoned tens of thousands of teachers, journalists, and civil servants as he dismantles the institutions of secular democracy in Turkey.

President Trump praised Philippine President Duterte, who brags of committing murder and who defends a policy of summarily executing, without any legal process, thousands of suspected petty drug users.



President Trump says he admires President Putin, and he acts like a soulmate to President El-Sisi, both of whom show no reluctance to order the imprisonment and, in Russia, even the assassination, of critics of their autocratic rule.

Despite all of this—praising these tyrants around the world—President Trump has decided to make a point of going after tiny Cuba, whose government, for all its faults, doesn't hold a candle to these other autocracies.

If the hypocrisy were not enough, it gets a whole lot worse, because in doing so he is trampling on the rights of Americans—of the Presiding Officer, of me, and of everybody else in this country.

I wonder how many, if any, Members of Congress have read the details of the President's announcement in Miami, other than the couple of Cuban-American Members of Congress—neither one of whom has ever set foot in Cuba—even though it is only a few miles off our coast. They publicly took credit for writing the new White House policy.

Now, that, in and of itself, speaks volumes about the administration's so-called policy review. That turned out to be largely a sham. Apparently, every Federal agency recommended continuing down the path of engagement begun by President Obama, as did the U.S. business community and the rapidly growing number of private Cuban entrepreneurs who are benefiting from U.S. engagement.

It is especially ironic that those hard-working Cubans and private American citizens are the ones who will be hurt by this change in policy. Instead, the President decided to toss a political favor to a tiny minority of the President's supporters in Miami.

Now, the President's party has long claimed to be a party devoted to individual freedom, as we all should be. But let me give my colleagues a few examples of what his policy means for the freedom of individual Americans.

First, remember that Americans can travel freely to any of the other countries I have mentioned, despite the repressive policies of their governments. Americans can travel to Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, Turkey, and Egypt, as well as to Iran, Vietnam, and China. We can go to any of those countries without restriction.

Of course, Americans can travel freely to Russia, Cuba's former patron. I would note that Russia is now investing heavily in Cuba's transport sector and, taking advantage of the fact that we are turning our back on Cuba, they are seeking a military base there. And Americans can travel freely to the dictatorship of Venezuela, Cuba's source of cheap oil. In fact, Americans can travel freely to any country they want, provided that country will let them in, no matter how undemocratic, no matter how tyrannical, no matter how re-

pressive. Apparently, President Trump could care less about that. But not to Cuba, whose people have far more in common with us than those of any of the other countries I named.

No, President Trump says you can go to Iran, you can go to Vietnam, you can go to Russia, you can go to Turkey, and you can go to Saudi Arabia. You can go anywhere you want, but you can only go to Cuba under conditions that the White House and bureaucrats in the Treasury Department, who have never been to Cuba, permit.

Rather than make your own decision about where to take your family for a vacation or to experience a foreign culture, the White House will make that decision for you.

You must be a part of an organized group, and the purpose of your trip must fit within 1 of 12 licensing categories determined by bureaucrats at the Treasury Department. I suspect they have never been to Cuba.

You must have a designated chap-erone to verify that, Heaven forbid, you do not stray from the program submitted to and approved—you hope—by the Treasury Department, whose employees and bureaucrats you have never met. If your application is interminably delayed or denied—for whatever reason—you are out of luck. There is no appeal.

Now, that is how the White House says that Cuba will become a democracy. By curtailing the freedom of Americans to travel and spend their hard earned money there. By behaving the way we would expect of a communist dictatorship—not of the world's oldest democracy, where the government's job is to protect individual freedom, not trample on it. The example we set for Cuba is by trampling on the rights of our own people.

How well did restricting travel by Americans to Cuba work from 1961 until 2014, when President Obama relaxed those Cold War restrictions, decades after the Russians had abandoned the island and Cuba no longer posed any threat to us? It failed miserably. At the same time, it treated the Cuban and American people as pawns in a political game.

Throughout those many years, the Castro government had a ready excuse for its own failings and repressive policies. They could blame it on the United States, and for many years, the Cuban people believed it because we, with our embargo, wouldn't let Americans travel to Cuba or do business there. But with the possible exception of the Pope, I don't think any foreigner has been received as warmly or engendered as much hope for the future as President Obama did when he and First Lady Michelle Obama visited Havana. It was amazing to watch the reaction of the people in Cuba.

President Trump claims President Obama got a bad deal when our flag

went up at the U.S. Embassy a little less than 2 years ago, after more than half a century. But President Trump has yet to say what the deal he believes he could obtain would look like. His so-called deal could be described in one word, "capitulation," which hasn't worked for over 50 years.

The White House decries the decrepit Cuban military's role in the economy, as if it poses a threat to us or is somehow an aberration. They should look at the role of Egypt's military and Russia's and Indonesia's and Pakistan's. They have their hands in all kinds of business and real estate ventures.

They point out the number of people arrested in Cuba has increased. I have condemned the arrests of peaceful protesters. These arrests are wrong, but they are also wrong in the countries whose repressive governments the President has praised, some of which he regards as close allies of the United States.

Now, like Americans, the Cuban people know that fundamental change will not happen quickly and that the revolutionaries who overthrew one dictator only to be replaced by another will hold on to power while they can. But they also know that their time is ending, that Cuba is changing, and that the American people can support them best by engaging with them.

Secretary of State Tillerson says the administration is "motivated by the conviction that the more we engage with other nations on issues of security and prosperity, the more we will have opportunities to shape the human rights conditions in those nations." Apparently, this administration should have added: "except for Cuba."

On May 25, Senator FLAKE and I, along with 53 Democratic and Republican cosponsors, introduced the Freedom for Americans to Travel to Cuba Act. It is, frankly, absurd that such legislation is even necessary to restore the American people's freedom to travel that the Federal Government should never have taken away.

Fifty-five Senators of both parties are on record in support of doing away with the restrictions in law that even President Obama could not fix; and, frankly, if there is a vote on this bill, it will pass overwhelmingly. I hope the majority leader will strike a blow for democracy and actually let us have that vote so we can show the Cuban people what real democracy looks like when people are allowed to vote.

We support freedom not only for the people of Cuba, we support it for the American people because we reject the idea that any government should deny its citizens the right to travel freely, least of all our own government. We actually believe Secretary Tillerson's rhetoric. We believe that restoring the punitive policy of the past is little

more than a misguided act of vengeance rooted in a half-century-old family feud that will do nothing to bring freedom to Cuba.

Who do we see now coming to Cuba to build a railroad? The Russians. Who do we see as we turn our back on Cuba planning to invest there? The Chinese. Let's not repeat the mistake we made for 50 years.

The Cuban people and the American people want closer relations. Every single poll shows that. I wish President Trump would listen to the American people rather than to a tiny minority who want to turn back the clock.

If we really care about freedom in Cuba, we should flood Cuba with American visitors and make it possible for American farmers and American companies to compete there as they would in any other country.

If we really care about freedom, our government should stop playing Big Brother with the lives of Americans. It doesn't work. It has never worked. Frankly, it is wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor, once again, to urge my colleagues to work in a bipartisan, transparent fashion to improve our healthcare system and help bring down costs.

Over the weekend, members of the American Medical Association—the Nation's largest organization of doctors—had a chance to finally read the proposed Republican bill and found it violates their “do no harm” principle. According to a letter they wrote to Leaders MCCONNELL and SCHUMER, “Medicine has long operated under the precept of *Primum non nocere*, or, ‘first do no harm.’ The draft legislation violates that standard on many levels.”

That is the conclusion of the American Medical Association, and they are correct. This bill will not lower costs, and it will not improve our healthcare system. Instead, it will remove health insurance coverage for millions of Americans. Indeed, the CBO has just released their estimate that 22 million Americans will lose their health insurance coverage. It will increase costs for everyone and decimate State budgets, creating a ripple effect throughout our economy.

The bill my colleagues worked in secret to craft is, in a sense, a sham. It will not lower costs, and it will not improve our healthcare system, as they insist. Instead, it will remove health insurance coverage for millions of Americans—22 million, according to the CBO—increase costs for everyone, as I said, and decimate State budgets. In fact, their bill essentially is a huge tax cut for the wealthiest 2 percent of

Americans at the expense of everyone else.

If you need any further proof of the real driver of this bill, one of its biggest giveaways is a retroactive tax break on investment income for people making at least a quarter of a million dollars. Dozens of leading economists, including six Nobel laureates, have criticized this plan as, in their words, a “giant step in the wrong direction” that prioritizes tax breaks averaging \$200,000 annually per household in the top 0.1 percent of Americans over the well-being of working families. In fact, President Trump himself will get an estimated \$2 million tax break each year from the giveaways in this bill. Let's call this bill what it is: a massive giveaway to the wealthiest Americans. Meanwhile, the rest of the country—all of our constituents—will be the ones paying the price for these tax breaks for those well-off. So much for the President's claim that he would end a rigged system.

Now, how do Republicans pay for these tax breaks? For starters, they are proposing to end the Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act, which is providing health insurance to nearly 15 million Americans, but then they go even further by effectively block-granting Medicaid, cutting hundreds of billions of dollars from the program over the next decade. These are not reforms designed to lower costs. This is a cut, pure and simple, which will sharply curtail and eliminate needed healthcare services to many across this country. In fact, the Center on Budget Policies and Priorities published data that shows a stark contrast of who gains and who loses under this bill. The 400 households in the country with the highest incomes will get tax breaks totaling \$33 billion because of the Senate TrumpCare bill. As a result, over 725,000 Americans will lose Medicaid coverage in just four States to equate to that \$33 billion: Alaska, Arkansas, Nevada, and West Virginia. That doesn't even scratch the surface as to who will lose access to care in the remaining 46 States.

Medicaid has played a critical role in ensuring access to care for millions of Americans, including children, seniors, and people with disabilities. In fact, across the country, and in my home State of Rhode Island, about half of all Medicaid funding is spent on nursing home care. Over 60 percent of nursing home residents access care through Medicaid. If you think nursing home care will be protected, you are in for a rude awakening because the math just doesn't work. It will be impossible to cut Federal funding for State Medicaid programs by hundreds of billions of dollars and not impact the most significant Medicaid expenditures, which are nursing homes.

I would also like to talk about the role Medicaid plays in emergencies like

a recession or public health crisis. We know all too well how an economic downturn impacts communities. With job loss, comes loss of health insurance, pensions, and other benefits. The tax base shrinks, and State budgets suffer. Medicaid, as currently structured, is able to adapt to this. As the need increases, the program grows to cover everyone who is eligible, including those who have just lost jobs. This saves families from having to choose whether to take their kids to the doctor or put food on the table.

Under the Senate TrumpCare bill, States will be hamstrung by arbitrary caps and limits on Medicaid. In fact, States will be unable to expand coverage during a recession to those in need, and they will likely have to make cuts across the board, from healthcare and education to transportation infrastructure, to make up for the lost tax revenues. This is not strictly going to be an issue of healthcare policy in States. The cuts are so dramatic that after they have taken all they can from other healthcare programs, they will inevitably go to education funding—the biggest expense most States have—and then to transportation and then to public safety. Even then, I don't think they can keep up with these cuts.

Like most of the country, Rhode Island was hard hit by the recession. It took many years for the economy to even begin to turn around in the right direction. It seemed my colleagues are forgetting how Medicaid has been a critical safety net through tough economic times.

I am also concerned that my colleagues are not aware of the impact Medicaid has on our Nation's veterans. The uninsured rate among veterans has dropped by 40 percent since implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Nationwide, nearly 1 in 10 veterans is covered by Medicaid, including approximately 8,000 veterans in my home State of Rhode Island. The cuts to Medicaid that have been proposed by my Republican colleagues put the care of our veterans at risk. We have all promised to provide the best care possible to our brave men and women when they leave the service, but the Senate TrumpCare bill would do the opposite.

That is not the only way this bill would damage veterans' care. Many veterans seek help for mental health care by going outside of the VA system. TrumpCare puts mental health and substance abuse treatment at risk by saying insurance companies no longer need to cover these services. For the over 15,000 veterans in Rhode Island who access mental and behavioral healthcare outside of the VA, they would be out of luck. For all the bipartisan work in this Chamber to increase veterans' access to these services, it would all be for naught if Senate Republicans pass their TrumpCare bill.

These are just some of the things Republicans are sacrificing in the name of tax breaks for the wealthy. It is, frankly, unconscionable. More importantly, this will not be lost on the American people. I have heard from thousands of my constituents since the beginning of this year, and if Senate Republicans press forward with this legislation, I think we will all hear from many more of these constituents for many years to come.

TrumpCare is fundamentally flawed and cannot be fixed. We would welcome the opportunity to work across the aisle on improvements to the Affordable Care Act, like those to lower costs, especially prescription drug costs, any time.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to drop their efforts and to work with us to instead make improvements to the ACA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, last week, I spoke with a very brave mother. She had endured what not one of us ever wants to have to endure while she watched her child go through cancer, over and over and over again. That mother is Elaine Geller from my State of Florida. I want to show you her daughter. This is her daughter Megan. She was working as a kindergarten teacher when she was diagnosed with leukemia in 2013 at the age of 26. At the time Megan was admitted to the hospital, her blood count was four. She had pneumonia, and she had water on her heart.

She ultimately checked into one of the very good cancer centers at the University of Miami, and she stayed there for 7 months. She went through the regimen of chemo. She spent months in the hospital, receiving multiple rounds of chemo, biopsies, and various other treatments. Eventually, Megan's doctor told her she had to have a transplant, which required a \$150,000 upfront payment. I think you see where I am going with this story. Very few families would be able to afford a 150-grand payment, especially a single mother.

I heard this story last week from Megan's mother. She said that thanks to the Affordable Care Act, she didn't have to write a check for the transplant. In fact, she didn't have that money. Because that transplant was provided for under the Affordable Care Act coverage, she knew that was one worry that could be taken off of her mind. She had enough to worry about as a mother, what she should be doing in such a situation, and of course she wanted to give all of her attention to her daughter.

The cancer went into remission after the transplant; however, after leaving the hospital, 63 days later, the cancer came back. This time, they went to MD

Anderson Cancer Center in Houston. I asked the mom why she wanted to do that. She said: "When your child is dying, there's nothing that you won't do." I think all of us as parents can identify with that, but we are so very fortunate that we haven't had to go through it.

Maybe, as we get ready to vote on this healthcare bill, on the Republican alternative—which, by the way, just came out of CBO today—the Congressional Budget Office—and they said that if the Senate bill were enacted, 22 million people would lose health insurance coverage. Remember, that is not too much different from what CBO said when the House bill was passed a couple of months ago, the bill to which there has been such a negative reaction. CBO said that 23 million people in this country would lose their coverage as a result of the House bill. We just got the score from CBO minutes ago. Twenty-two million people. Is that the direction we want to be going in?

Megan is still going through treatment, and the cancer was only in remission for 32 days before it came back again. Megan received multiple blood transfusions. Remember, this is a single mom trying to keep her daughter, a schoolteacher in her twenties, alive. This time, all of the blood transfusions started to take another toll on Megan. She became so weak. When trying to walk, she faltered, she fell, she hit her head, and at age 28, she passed away.

Let's get to the bottom line of this discussion, other than that our hearts go out to all the Megans all across America. The bottom line is, that whole treatment over 2 years cost \$8 million. There was not a cap on the total amount of money that could be paid under the existing law, the Affordable Care Act. An insurance company cannot put a cap on the amount of your medical bills that can be reimbursed. Suppose before the ACA that cap was \$50,000. This single mom could not even have come up with money for the initial transplant, which looked as though it worked and did work for several months. In fact, \$8 million over time—2 years—how in the world could any one of us afford that?

A lot of people say: Well, the ACA isn't doing it. Well, why don't we all get together in a bipartisan way and fix it? And one of the fixes would be, because certain healthcare problems, like Megan's, cause the insurance company to pay out a lot of money—do you know what we can do about it? We can create a reinsurance fund, which is a bill that I had filed, and it is to re-insure against that catastrophic healthcare problem like Megan's of \$8 million, to reinsure the insurance company. Do you know what that would do in the State of Florida, if we passed this as a fix to the ACA? It would lower the premiums in the ACA in Florida 13 percent. That is reinsurance.

It is not unlike what we have done for hurricanes. A catastrophic hurricane could cost so much more than the insurance company has assets for, and therefore they buy insurance from a company like Lloyd's of London or other reinsurance companies. They buy insurance in case of a catastrophe—the insurance company does that. If an insurance company did not have to pay out this \$8 million because it had insured against that kind of catastrophic loss, everybody else's premiums are going to come down. Otherwise, they have to make premiums actuarially sound, and they have to raise them in order to take care of the cases that are prohibitively expensive.

All of this sounds down in the weeds, but the bottom line is this: If we want to fix the ACA, we can fix it, but we can't do it one party against the other. We have to have the will to come together in a bipartisan agreement to fix it.

Of course, if the mom of this girl had been faced with this without insurance coverage, she would be bankrupt. She wouldn't have been able to even afford the first transplant, much less the 2 years of extra life her daughter had while fighting for her life. Anybody who goes through something like Elaine and her daughter Megan did knows that every second counts.

That is what this healthcare debate is about—giving people peace of mind, giving them that financial security, that certainty, putting people's health ahead of other things, such as company profits. You can do it all and solve everybody's problem, including the insurance company's, which obviously is in business to make a profit. You can do it.

Elaine said her daughter would be proud to know that we are telling that story today. It matters. It matters to her, albeit deceased. It certainly matters to her mom. It matters to their Senator. It matters to a lot of other people.

The ACA, the existing law—the one there was such a fractious fight over 5 to 7 years ago—is working. Here is a good example. Then we see that the aim of our friends on that side of the aisle is—they want to repeal it. They don't want anything that has the taint of ObamaCare, and so they concoct something in the House. You see what kind of greeting that has gotten in the country. I think it was in the upper teens—a poll that showed it was viewed favorably. In other words, it is viewed very unfavorably.

In order for the Senate majority leader to come up with something that he can repeal ObamaCare with, in the dead of night, in secret—even the Republican Senators didn't know what it was until they hatched it in the public last Friday. This bill is just as bad as the House bill.

They will claim, in trying to stand up this bill—by the way, it is going to

with, the more it is examined in the glare of the spotlight. They claim that it maintains the ACA's protections for those with preexisting conditions. Can anybody really say that with a straight face? It leaves it up to the States.

Before I came to Washington and the Senate service, I was the elected insurance commissioner, State treasurer of Florida. It was my job to regulate the insurance companies—all kinds of insurance companies, including health insurance companies. I can tell you that I have seen some insurance companies use asthma as a preexisting condition, and therefore that was the reason they would not allow the person who needed insurance to be covered. They said: If you have a preexisting condition, we are not going to insure you. I have even seen insurance companies use as an excuse a rash as a preexisting condition, and that means they are not going to insure you. Under the existing law, the ACA, they can't do that. You are going to have the security of knowing you are going to have coverage.

Do you know something else you are going to have the security of knowing? You are not going to deal with some of those insurance companies that I regulated. Of your premium dollar for health insurance, they would spend 40 percent of that dollar not on your healthcare, but they would take 40 cents of that premium dollar that you paid and that was going to executive salaries. It was going to administrative expenses. It was going to plush trips. Don't tell me that is not a true story. I saw it over and over in the 1990s as the elected insurance commissioner of Florida.

You know what the existing law says? It says that of every premium dollar you pay, 80 cents of that premium dollar has to go into healthcare. It can't be commissions. It can't be executive salaries. It can't be the executive jets for the corporate executives. Eighty cents of that premium dollar has to go into healthcare so you get what you pay for in that premium dollar. At some point there is going to be an attempt to undo that. If you start leaving things up to the States, watch out.

When Megan was in the ICU, she had a respiratory failure that cost thousands of dollars more, and thanks to the ACA, her insurance carrier covered it. But under the Republican bill that has been now released, States could let their insurance companies pocket more of those premium dollars to pay for those things I just shared, which I had seen back in the decade of the 1990s as the insurance commissioner. Well, we shouldn't be padding their pockets. The premium dollar for health insurance ought to go to healthcare.

The Senate bill cuts billions in Medicaid. We haven't even talked about that. Who gets Medicaid? Millions of

people in this country do. It is not only the poor. It is not only the disabled. It is 65 to 70 percent of all seniors in nursing homes who are on Medicaid, and it is also some children's programs. Let me just give you one example. I went to the neonatal unit at Shands Hospital in Jacksonville, a hospital affiliated with the University of Florida, but in Jacksonville. The doctors and nurses were showing me how miracles occur for premature babies; they keep them alive.

Then what they wanted to show me was—with the opioid epidemic, which has hit my State just like all the other States, they wanted me to see and understand that when a pregnant mom is addicted to opioids, she passes that on in her womb to her unborn child. When born, that baby is opioid-dependent. The doctors showed me the characteristics—that high, shrill cry, the constant scratching, the awkward movements. Do you know what they use to wean those little babies off opioids over the course of a month? They use doses of morphine.

Do you want to devastate Medicaid? Do you want to take over \$800 billion over 10 years out of Medicaid? What about those single moms? The only healthcare they get is Medicaid. And what about those babies I just described, who are also on Medicaid? If you start capping the amount of money that goes to the States on a Federal-State program for healthcare—Medicaid—you are going to throw a lot of people off any kind of healthcare, including senior citizens in nursing homes.

A Medicaid block grant, or a cap, would end the healthcare guarantee for millions of children, people with disabilities, pregnant women, and seniors on long-term care. There are 37 million children in this country who rely on Medicaid for care. The seniors, the poor, the disabled, the children—they are all vulnerable to the cuts that would occur.

If that is not enough to vote against this bill that is coming to the floor this week, the Senate bill actually imposes an age tax for older Americans, allowing insurance companies to charge older Americans up to five times more for coverage than a young person. You say: Well, older people have more illnesses and ailments; older people ought to cost more. If that is your argument, well, that is true.

The age rating in the existing law, the ACA, is three to one. This changes it to five to one, and five to one means one thing: higher premiums for senior citizens—I am talking about all insurance policies—until they reach that magic age of 65 and can be on Medicare. Do you want an age tax on older Americans as a result of this bill? I don't think so. But that is what is in there.

Fixing our Nation's healthcare system shouldn't be a partisan issue. That

is why I have joined—bipartisan—with colleagues to introduce a bill that I described a moment ago, which would lower healthcare premiums by 13 percent. That bill would stabilize the ACA's insurance marketplace through the creation of a permanent reinsurance fund. I have seen the policies work, as I described, with catastrophic hurricane insurance. There is nothing magic about my idea. It is just an obvious fix to the existing law, and ideas like that can bubble forth in a bipartisan way to make the existing law that we have sustainable.

What we ought to be doing is trying to look for ways to help people like that single mom Elaine and her daughter Megan. We should be working together to make the ACA work better. We shouldn't be plotting behind closed doors in the dead of night with a secret document—a secret document that we now know will make it worse.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, it is good to see you this afternoon.

I rise in support of the nomination of Kristine Svinicki to hold a third term as a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, known as the NRC. Many Senators heard from our chairman on the Environment and Public Works Committee in support of this nominee last week, just prior to our cloture vote. I want to add my voice in support of her nomination as well.

Since joining the Environment and Public Works Committee, I have worked closely with my colleagues to strengthen what we call the "culture of safety" within the U.S. nuclear energy industry. In part, due to our collective efforts and the NRC leadership and the Commission's dedicated staff, the NRC continues to be the world's gold standard for nuclear regulatory agencies. However, as I say time and again, that does not mean we can become complacent when it comes to nuclear safety and our NRC oversight responsibilities, a perspective that I am certain is shared by every Member of this body.

Ensuring that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission continues to have experienced and dedicated leadership is one of the most important things that our committee, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and the Senate can do to maintain a high level of safety and excellence in our Nation's nuclear facilities.

I am quite impressed with our NRC Commissioners, and I am encouraged with their ability to work cooperatively with each other. Each Commissioner, including our current chair,

Kristine Svinicki—let me say her name again: Svinicki. People have a hard time saying her name. It is Svinicki. She brings a unique set of skills to the table—something that has served the Commission and our country well.

I continue to have ongoing discussions with our friend, the chairman of the committee, Senator JOHN BARRASSO, about the strong interest I and our minority members of the committee have with ensuring parity, as the Senate looks to confirm other nominees to the NRC. This is in order to ensure that we have a balance of Democratic and Republican members on the Commission for years to come. It continues to be a priority for me and our Democratic colleagues.

At this time, I support moving Chairman Svinicki through the confirmation process. I do so out of respect for her long service to the NRC and for the need to ensure certainty and predictability within the NRC and its leadership. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting her nomination.

Mr. President, as to this particular nominee, not everybody on the committee or probably in the Senate will support the nomination of Kristine Svinicki. They could have held her up. No one has, and she has moved through our committee expeditiously. She, in my view, should have moved through expeditiously and will be coming before us for an up-or-down vote in a few minutes.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I want to suggest, as we approach our business later this week with respect to healthcare legislation, that maybe the way we have handled this nomination might be a little bit of a model for the way we can actually work together.

We need to. People in this country say to me all the time and people in my State say to me all the time: Just work together. Get something done.

I know the Presiding Officer and the Senator from West Virginia, who has just entered the Chamber, want to work that way, too, and so do I. What I think we ought to be doing on healthcare in this body is to look at the ACA and study it up and down. God knows we had enough hearings, roundtables, opportunities to debate it, vote for it, and amend it—over 80, I think, or maybe over 400 amendments, all told, and 80-some days of working on it in 2009.

Rather than have legislation that just Democrats or just Republicans vote to put on the table and to try to push through here on Thursday, my hope is that we will hit the pause button. My hope is that we will hit the pause button, and we will focus—Democrats and Republicans—on trying to figure out what in the Affordable Care Act needs to be fixed and fix it, and figure out what needs to be maintained and preserved and preserve it. That is what I think we should do.

Lo and behold, if we were to do those things, I think we would end up with a better healthcare system with better healthcare coverage and maybe actually make true of the word of the Presidential nominee, Donald Trump, who said he favored healthcare legislation that would actually cover everybody and get better results for less money. That is not a bad goal for us to shoot for. What I have laid out here just very briefly is this: Figure out what needs to be fixed in the Affordable Care Act and fix it, figure out what needs to be preserved and preserve it, and do it not just as Democrats or Republicans, but do it together. I think if we would do that, in the words of Mark Twain, we would confound our enemies and amaze our friends.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Svinicki nomination?

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Ex.]

#### YEAS—88

|            |           |           |
|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Alexander  | Enzi      | Menendez  |
| Baldwin    | Ernst     | Moran     |
| Barrasso   | Feinstein | Murkowski |
| Bennet     | Fischer   | Murphy    |
| Blumenthal | Franken   | Murray    |
| Blunt      | Gardner   | Nelson    |
| Boozman    | Graham    | Paul      |
| Brown      | Grassley  | Perdue    |
| Burr       | Hassan    | Peters    |
| Cantwell   | Hatch     | Portman   |
| Capito     | Heinrich  | Reed      |
| Cardin     | Heitkamp  | Risch     |
| Carper     | Hirono    | Roberts   |
| Casey      | Hoeven    | Rounds    |
| Cassidy    | Inhofe    | Rubio     |
| Cochran    | Johnson   | Sasse     |
| Collins    | Kaine     | Schatz    |
| Coons      | Kennedy   | Schumer   |
| Corker     | King      | Scott     |
| Cornyn     | Klobuchar | Shaheen   |
| Cotton     | Lankford  | Shelby    |
| Crapo      | Leahy     | Stabenow  |
| Cruz       | Lee       | Sullivan  |
| Daines     | Manchin   | Tester    |
| Donnelly   | McCain    | Thune     |
| Duckworth  | McCaskill | Tillis    |
| Durbin     | McConnell | Toomey    |

|            |            |       |
|------------|------------|-------|
| Udall      | Whitehouse | Young |
| Van Hollen | Wicker     |       |
| Warner     | Wyden      |       |

#### NAYS—9

|              |         |         |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| Booker       | Harris  | Merkley |
| Cortez Masto | Heller  | Sanders |
| Gillibrand   | Markley | Warren  |

#### NOT VOTING—3

|       |         |         |
|-------|---------|---------|
| Flake | Isakson | Strange |
|-------|---------|---------|

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider with respect to the Svinicki nomination be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only and with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Hawaii.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, we are all one diagnosis away from having a serious illness. Lots of us believe that getting a serious illness is something that happens to other people. I was one of them.

My moment of reckoning came 2 months ago. During a routine physical, my doctor told me I have kidney cancer. It is a moment everyone dreads. Thankfully, I had health insurance. I was able to sit down with my doctors and decide how I would fight my cancer, not how I would pay for treatment.

No one should have to worry about whether they can afford the healthcare that one day might save their life. Healthcare is personal, and it is a right, not a privilege reserved only for those who can afford it. It is why we are fighting so hard against TrumpCare.

Thirteen of our male colleagues spent weeks sequestered away, literally plotting how to deny millions of people in our country the healthcare they deserve. They spent these weeks figuring out how to squeeze as much as they could out of the poorest, sickest, and oldest members of our society so they could give the richest people in our country a huge tax cut. This is not a healthcare bill. This is a tax cut for the rich bill.

Last week, the majority whip looked the American people in the eye from

his desk and accused us of denouncing TrumpCare before we had a chance to read it. Well, read it we did, and it is as bad as we thought.

The Congressional Budget Office is estimating that 22 million people will lose their insurance under TrumpCare. Its draconian cuts to Medicaid would have a devastating impact on our seniors—our kupuna, as we refer to them in Hawaii—who depend on the program for long-term nursing care. It imposes an age tax on people 50 to 64 that allows insurance companies to charge them five times more for insurance. It fulfills the Republican Party's cherished goal of defunding Planned Parenthood. It undermines protections for Americans living with serious and chronic diseases who could face the reimposition of yearly and lifetime caps on their care.

For millions of people in our country, TrumpCare is not some abstract proposal that has no relevance to their lives. Last week, Senator MURRAY, Senator VAN HOLLEN, and I joined three advocates—Ian, Marques, and Jill—who told us their stories about how TrumpCare would impact them.

Ian grew up in Fond du Lac, WI. During his sophomore year in high school, Ian discovered he had bone cancer after suffering an injury playing football. He has been cancer-free for 6 years and is now pursuing a career in medical research, in large part, because of his experience in fighting this cancer. Although Ian has been cancer-free for some time now, he is very concerned about what TrumpCare could mean for him if his disease comes back. He has a preexisting condition.

Marques lives in Richmond, VA. He was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis when he was only 27 years old. He has three young daughters and faces a lifetime of extensive treatment for his disease. Because of the Affordable Care Act and the guarantee of coverage it affords every American, Marques did what he never thought he would be able to do with MS, he started his own business.

Jill is from Hillard, OH. Her daughter Alison was born with cystic fibrosis. Alison endured a lot at a very young age. When she was only 7, Alison had part of her lung removed because of the damage her disease caused. Because she has health insurance, which makes paying for expensive CF drugs more affordable, Alison is a happy teenager planning eagerly for her future. Jill made clear what would happen if TrumpCare passes: Alison's CF medication would become prohibitively expensive. Under TrumpCare, Jill would have to make decisions about which drugs she could afford for Alison, not which would work best to fight her disease.

Annual or lifetime limits on healthcare coverage will mean constant worry about paying for the life-saving care that Ian, Marques, Jill, and

their families need—not starting a business, not living like a normal teenager or young adult with dreams for the future. They will spend practically every waking moment just worrying about how they are going to pay for the care they need to live.

TrumpCare would be a disaster for the American people, and we are going to fight against it tooth and nail, but I also want to be clear about what we are fighting for. We are fighting for universal healthcare that is a right, and not a privilege, for every American.

Tomorrow, I am going in for surgery to remove the lesion I have on my rib, but I am going to be back as quickly as I can to keep up the fight against this mean, ugly bill. The stakes are too high to stay silent. We need everyone in this fight because we are all in it together.

Millions of people across the country are mobilizing against TrumpCare because healthcare is personal. I am encouraged that so many people have been calling all of us and making their voices heard. The majority leader and Donald Trump can try to jam this bill down our throats, but we aren't going to let them succeed, and we are going to hold them accountable.

The fight continues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

#### WISHING THE SENATOR FROM HAWAII WELL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I just want to salute, on behalf of all of us in the Senate, our great, great Senator from Hawaii. Her courage, her strength, her conviction to help people who need help is just inspiring—that is the only word I could think of, “inspiring”—to every one of us.

We love you, MAZIE. We wish you well, and we can't wait for you to come back and rejoin the fight doubly invigorated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I extend to my colleague from Hawaii every blessing for her successful health treatment. I know the thoughts and prayers of every Member of the Senate are with her tomorrow and beyond as she undertakes that healing path.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Hawaii tonight. They are certainly very relevant to the issue of healthcare here in America because each of us hopes that if a loved one gets ill, they will have the peace of mind that they know they will be able to get the healthcare they need and

they will not go bankrupt in the process. Yet here we are tonight debating a bill titled “Better Care Act.”

Better Care, has ever there been a bill in the history of the United States of America so more perversely named than this Better Care Act which strips care from 22 million Americans?

I was very struck by one equation of this bill; that is, that it provides to the richest 400 Americans \$33 billion over a 10-year period. That is enough to pay for healthcare under Medicaid for 700,000 individuals—700,000 individuals. It rips the healthcare away from them to give \$33 billion to the richest 400 families. That is obscene. That is certainly not better care.

It is hard for me to imagine that a single Member of this body would vote to proceed to this bill, but here we are. Until we get agreement that we are not going to proceed, we have to continue to carry on this fight.

We know that 15 million people, CBO estimates, will lose healthcare in the next 12 months. That is even worse than the House bill. Last week, I came to this floor to call the Senate draft mean and meaner. The House bill was mean. The Senate's is meaner. Now we have the CBO estimate that says, yes, it is worse. One million more people would lose healthcare in a short period of time.

Furthermore, the rate at which standard Medicaid is compressed—Medicaid, as it existed before ObamaCare, that rate has increased to further diminish healthcare, having nothing to do with ObamaCare, just to add to the cruelty of this bill. So millions lose, but we deliver billions of dollars to the richest Americans.

In my home State of Oregon, just the elimination of the expansion of Medicaid, the Oregon health plan—just that would eliminate 400,000 Oregonians off healthcare.

Imagine those individuals holding hands, 400,000 Oregonians, stretching from the Pacific Ocean to the State of Idaho. Anyone who has driven across Oregon would realize it is 400 miles across Oregon. If you are driving it, it is 7 hours of driving. For 7 hours, at 50 miles an hour, 60 miles an hour, you are passing a stream of people who would lose their healthcare just from the elimination of the expansion of Medicaid.

My colleagues across the aisle have crafted this so as to put it beyond the next Presidential election, beyond the 2018 election and beyond the 2020 election. Why? They are so terrified of the impact of this on the election they decided to postpone it until after 2018 and 2020, as if that makes it acceptable to rip healthcare from millions of people. That type of cynical, cynical act, purely political, is not going to be viewed well by the American public.

If you are so ashamed of this bill, if someone is so ashamed that they want

to postpone the effects beyond the next Presidential election 3½ years from now, then maybe you should be so ashamed as not to vote to move to the bill here in the short term.

One of our colleagues across the aisle noted today: I can't imagine—not quite the exact word-for-word, but it is close. I can't imagine that anyone in America would have a chance to review this bill and truly understand it in time to proceed to it this week, including myself.

Well, that is certainly true. Has there ever been a case where a bill profoundly affecting so many has not had the benefit of committee deliberation here in the Senate? Are we a legislative body or are we a dictatorship where everything is done behind closed doors and then rammed through? That is not the American way, and that is not the constitutional vision for how the Senate should work. There is supposed to be time to consult healthcare experts and time to go home to consult our constituents and find out how they feel.

If one is so terrified of this bill that you are afraid of your constituents, then you shouldn't vote to proceed to the bill. If one is so terrified you don't want to consult the experts, you shouldn't proceed to this bill. If you are so terrified that the reaction from the public will be so strong that it will put you in an awkward spot, then you shouldn't proceed to this bill—because you have the responsibility to consult with your folks back home, a responsibility to consult with healthcare experts, to understand every nuance of this bill.

One of those facts is going to have a devastating impact on those who would go to nursing homes. Folks who are under Medicaid and in a nursing home have given up their entire income and assets before they can get Medicaid support.

I was in Klamath Falls the weekend before this last weekend, went to a nursing home, and they said: Senator, almost 100 percent of the folks here on long-term care are paid for by Medicaid. I thought they were going to say 60 percent or two-thirds, because that is the national statistic. No, in rural Oregon, in Klamath Falls, almost 100 percent.

Then we had the CEO of the Oregon Health Association reach out and address this issue of how it is going to affect seniors. Here are his exact words:

I was on a call early today looking at some projections of how hard Oregon and Medicaid-funded long-term care service would be hit. If this bill passes, it literally could force the closure of the majority of nursing facilities in Oregon by 2025.

One thing I can't get out of my mind. At another nursing home I went to is a woman named Deborah. I explained I was coming by to talk to people because I wanted to understand better the impact of this bill on long-term care.

She said: Senator, I am paid for by Medicaid. If Medicaid disappears, I am on the street, and that is a problem because I can't walk.

That is exactly what Deborah said. And, of course, it is a problem, not only because she can't walk but because she needs extensive care, which is why she is in long-term care to begin with.

The anxiety was palpable among the nursing home residents, among the long-term care residents, because they have no backup plan, because they had to spend down their assets before they qualified for Medicare. Don't think of this just as ripping healthcare away from millions of working families, millions of struggling families, millions of children, but also from our seniors who are in long-term care, who need extensive care, and who have given up their assets in order to qualify for Medicaid. They used those assets to pay for it as long as they could, and now they are on Medicaid. We are prepared to take those folks, many of them in wheelchairs—like Deborah, unable to walk—and throw them into the street and say: too bad.

The President called the House bill mean and indicated he wanted a bill with more heart. This is not a bill with more heart. We should not move to proceed to this bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oregon for his words.

I rise today to give voice to the concerns I am hearing from so many people in my State and across the country about this repeal bill.

First, I want to recognize my colleague from Hawaii, Senator HIRONO, who spoke earlier tonight about her personal battle with kidney cancer, as she is an example to all of us of determination and grit when the going gets tough. She not only is going to the hospital for surgery tomorrow—which isn't an easy surgery—but she decided she wanted to spend the night before she went into the hospital here because she is so passionate about this issue.

I know she is going to fight this disease and win and come out stronger than ever. I have been so moved by how she has taken on her personal fight against cancer at the same time that she has kept this fight going in the Senate. She is doing it not just for herself or for her State but for people all over the country.

As Senator HIRONO has said, her experience shows how quickly a routine visit to the doctor can turn into a serious diagnosis—a diagnosis that becomes a preexisting condition.

Everyone who faces a serious illness, no matter who they are, should be able to focus all of their energy on getting better, not on how they are going to pay their medical bills. Unfortunately,

the bill we are considering doesn't allow everyone to do that.

As the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office noted earlier today, this bill could mean the return of annual or lifetime limits on what insurance would cover for people with expensive conditions like cancer or Alzheimer's, and some key healthcare benefits might be excluded from insurance coverage altogether.

It is no surprise that the Minnesota Hospital Association has said that this proposal "creates a lot of chaos."

I was just at Northfield Hospital this weekend. It is a college town, but it is in the middle of a very rural part of our State, with a lot of farms surrounding it. In fact, they call the town "Cows, Colleges, and Contentment." In that town and in that hospital, there wasn't a lot of contentment during my visit.

The CEO of the hospital told me that he was worried that this bill could drive more of his patients to bankruptcy. I met with a number of people who were on the board and work at the hospital, and they were all very concerned about what the bill would mean.

This did not mean that they didn't want to see changes to the Affordable Care Act. They do. They see the issues with premiums in our State. That is why our Republican legislature worked with our Democratic Governor to pass a bill for reinsurance, to try to use something to leverage the risk for the people in the exchange. We could do something similar on the Federal level, and we should, but that is not what this bill is about.

The head of another hospital in my State said: "They are shortening up the money, but they're not giving us the ability to manage the care."

A Minnesota seniors organization said that this bill "feels like we're pulling the rug out from underneath families and seniors." That is why AARP strongly opposes the bill as well.

According to the CBO report that we got today, this bill would cause 22 million people to lose their coverage over the next 10 years—22 million people. On Friday, my Republican colleague Senator HELLER said that he "cannot support a piece of legislation that takes insurance away from tens of millions of Americans." I agree.

I hope our Republican colleagues will come to the negotiating table in a bipartisan way. I hope this administration will not sabotage the bill that we have now and will work with States like mine that want a waiver to be able to do the kind of cost sharing and the reinsurance that I just described. During that time, we can work together to actually make healthcare in America better and more affordable.

We need to think about the real and devastating impacts on people's lives that this piece of legislation would have because that is what this debate



is about. It is not about all of us going back and forth and citing facts and figures. In the end, it is about how this will affect people.

It is about the lives of people like the mom in Minnesota who has a child with Down syndrome. She told me how she has seen Medicaid help parents of kids with disabilities avoid bankruptcy and how it helps school districts pay for the therapy children like hers need. She said that this bill is “unconscionable”—that is her word—because of what it would do to adults and kids who have disabilities.

We have more than half a million children in Minnesota who rely on Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program. This includes kids like the students of a retired teacher from Northwestern Minnesota, right across from the North Dakota border. The teacher wrote in, saying that the bill is “cruel and mean,” especially for the families of special needs students.

A lot of us have talked about how the President called the House bill mean and how we hoped to avoid a bill like this in the Senate. In fact, this last weekend, he did admit that he had called the House bill mean after he had celebrated its passage. That is behind us.

The President is the one who is known for speaking his mind and speaking directly. He didn’t need a poll or a focus group or an accountant to look at the House bill. He just called it what it was—mean.

In Minnesota, people don’t mince words either, and that is why that teacher told me exactly what the impact of this Senate bill would be. In fact, today the Congressional Budget Office—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—confirmed it earlier today with its estimate that millions of people, 22 million people, would lose their Medicaid coverage because of the bill.

Our debate today is about the lives of people like the retiree with Parkinson’s in Minneapolis, who told me she is “scared and worried.” She is not just worried about the cuts to Medicaid but also about depleting the Medicare trust fund to pay for tax cuts for the very wealthy. As she told me, the future of these vital programs that so many Americans depend on is on the line.

This healthcare bill is also about the people who are worried about taking care of their baby boomer parents at the same time that they are caring for their children. One woman told me about her mom, who died 2 years ago at 95 after suffering from dementia for more than 20 years. She had worked her whole life, but as she got older, she couldn’t afford the nursing care she needed so much. Luckily, she was able to rely on Medicaid to pay for it.

More than half—54 percent—of nursing facility residents in Minnesota rely on Medicaid. I think when this House

bill first came out, people thought, well, Medicaid—what does that have to do with my life? Then they started talking to their parents, their grandparents or they started talking to their neighbors, and that is when they realized, whoa, over 50 percent of people who go into assisted living and nursing homes end up relying on Medicaid.

This woman’s daughter told me she is worried that this bill’s cuts would put those vital services for seniors at risk for so many other parents and their kids. And even for older people who don’t use Medicare or Medicaid, this bill could put health coverage out of reach. That is because it has an age tax for seniors, allowing older people to be charged five times as much as younger people for insurance. As AARP has said, that is just not right.

These are the concerns I have heard from seniors and their families in Minnesota. They are shared by people across the country, especially by people in our rural areas, where they tend to have a little older population. One reason for that is because the Senate bill, actually more than the House bill when it comes to Medicaid, makes even deeper cuts over the long term that will hurt seniors and rural hospitals along with children, people with disabilities, and people suffering from opioid addiction.

We actually have a strong bipartisan group working on the opioid addiction problem. Four of us—two Democrats, two Republicans—were the chief authors of the bill that passed last year, which set the framework for the Nation. We then put billions of dollars into treatment last year, and we shouldn’t blow it up now by passing a bill that, because of the Medicaid cuts, would—in my State, one-third of the people who get opioid addiction treatment get it from Medicaid. Actually, it would be moving ourselves backward.

I know my colleagues Senator COLLINS and Senator MURKOWSKI have expressed real concerns about these kinds of Medicaid cuts in their States of Maine and Alaska, which also have big rural populations.

In my State, Medicaid covers one-fifth of our total rural population, about 20 percent of our rural population. These cuts could cause the rural hospitals that serve this population to close. This doesn’t just threaten healthcare coverage; it threatens the entire local economy. That is a big deal for rural hospitals, which often have operating margins of less than 1 percent. These rural hospitals are on the frontlines of the opioid epidemic that is hitting communities across the country.

In my State, deaths from prescription drugs now claim more lives than homicides. They claim more lives than car crashes. While there is more work to do to combat the epidemic, I want to recognize our progress. Yes, we passed

the blueprint bill, which I just mentioned, with the help of Senators PORTMAN, WHITEHOUSE, and Ayotte. Unfortunately, we are moving ourselves backward.

Medicaid expansion has helped 1.3 million people receive treatment for mental and substance abuse across the country. I know this bill’s cuts to these important services for people struggling with addiction have real concerns in States like West Virginia and States like Ohio.

The problems with this bill, of course, go beyond Medicaid cuts, as a mom from Belgrade, MN, told me when she wrote about her daughter who died way too young from cancer. She asked me to oppose this bill in honor of her daughter and the thousands of other children diagnosed with cancer each year. She is worried that the waivers in this legislation would undercut protections for people with preexisting conditions, threatening to make health insurance unaffordable for families like hers who have children or children with cancer.

One man from Minneapolis told me that what this does is “downright scary.” Those were his words. He is scared because he is self-employed. He has a preexisting condition, and he gets his insurance on the individual market. He is worried that under this bill, his costs—which are already high—would skyrocket.

I am the first to say that we need to fix the individual market. In fact, I started out by talking about the fact that we have done some work in our State, and I would like to bring that out nationally. This bill is not the way to do it because—as the CBO said earlier today—it would actually cut assistance and increase deductibles for many people on the individual market. Based on CBO’s projections, the Joint Economic Committee estimates that average premiums in Minnesota would go up substantially next year, even more than they have gone up already.

People across the country are making their voices heard about these types of problems. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation poll that came out just last week, only 30 percent of Americans had a favorable view of the House bill, and these concerns go across party lines. Only about half of Republicans—56 percent—supported the House bill.

I know this bill has some differences from the House version, but as Speaker RYAN said last week, the two are very similar. I hope that hearing from Americans on both sides of the aisle prompts my colleagues to start working together to make our system better in a bipartisan way.

Here are some ideas. I would love to include, if we worked on a bipartisan basis together, not only the work that needs to be done on the individual market, but on the exchanges, on the rates,

and for small businesses. But I would also like to work on prescription drugs. I have a bill that would harness the negotiating power of 41 million seniors on Medicare to bring drug prices down. We have a number of Senators on the bill. Right now, Medicare is absolutely banned from negotiating with 41 million seniors. That is just wrong. Our seniors should be able to use their market power to negotiate.

I would also love to see more competition in this market. There are several ways we can do it. One is by bringing in less expensive drugs from other countries when we have drug shortages now in this country. Senator COLLINS and I worked on this, and the bill passed this Senate and got signed into law. Now the Secretary of Human Services can actually bring in drugs that are safe from other countries when we have a drug shortage. We refined some of the language where the rules already allowed the Secretary to do that. They could do the same thing right now, but we can make it even more clear if this Congress got behind it.

Senator MCCAIN and I have a bill to bring in less expensive drugs from Canada, which is very similar to the American market. We have a provision in the bill so they would be safe. Many people in my State are doing this now. We once had bus rides of seniors going up there to get less expensive drugs. We could do it with other countries, as well, as long as they were certified as safe. For one of the ways you could do it, Senator LEE and I have a bill that looks at this. Again, this a bipartisan bill. If you have less competition in the market and you have less competitors, that would trigger the ability to bring in more drugs. You could do it based on the price. If it goes up high and the Secretary or someone else that we could put in that place finds that it is not because of input costs, you could allow this competition to come in from other countries. It would be a trigger. I would bet you right now that if you did that, it would create incentives on American drug companies not to jack up the prices like they have been doing.

The top 10 selling drugs in America have gone up over 100 percent. Things like insulin are up three times. Things like naloxone, which we rely on for overdoses from opiates, have gone up astronomically. It feels like when these drug companies get a monopoly in their lap, they go for it. That is what is happening.

A second way to bring in competition is by encouraging more generics. Senator GRASSLEY and I have a bill to stop something called “pay for delay.” This is unbelievable to me, when I describe this to people—that big pharmaceutical companies are actually paying generic companies to keep their products off the market. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has found

that this would save something like \$3 billion over a number of years if we passed our bill. That is for the government and taxpayers, but you could save an equal amount of money for consumers who are paying for this in premiums. How could you ever explain that pharmaceuticals are actually paying generics to keep their products off the market? That is a vote I would like this Senate to take. I would like to challenge anyone to explain why they would vote against that.

We also have another bill called the CREATES Act, with Senators GRASSLEY, LEAHY, LEE, and me, which makes it easier to get generics to market by sampling and other things.

These are just a few of the examples of bills that I think would be very good if we would consider them, but so far, we have done nothing. We banned seniors from negotiating. There is nothing in the House or the Senate repeal bills that does anything about these pharma issues. Again, that is one reason alone to be concerned about these bills.

I was at that baseball game a few weeks ago and saw firsthand that incredible bipartisan spirit, and at the women’s softball game, as well. At the men’s baseball game, the players played together, and, at the end of the game, when one team won—the Democratic team—they took their trophy and they gave it to the Republican team, and they asked them to put it in Representative SCALISE’s office. That is what we need to see more of—not just two teams but one team. Certainly, on an issue as complex as healthcare, we just can’t be playing in our separate ballparks. This is the time to come together. We have changes that we must make to the Affordable Care Act. I said that the day it passed—that it was a beginning and not an end.

I always thought it was unfortunate that it was more of a Democratic bill than it was a bipartisan bill. So we have an opportunity now to fix that, to make fixes to the bill, and to work together. But this bill is not the answer—this bill that we were not allowed to take part in, where the doors were closed, not only to Democratic Senators but to Americans themselves.

So I hope, as we go forward, that our colleagues on the other side will work with us on a truly bipartisan bill that would make some of the changes we need to bring down healthcare costs, instead of moving forward with this bill.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

MR. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to thank my friend and colleague Senator HIRONO for her words and her willingness to share how this bill could impact the millions of Americans with preexisting conditions. I, along with everyone else in this Chamber, wish

her the best and a speedy recovery so she can continue to fight for the people of Hawaii and the people of the United States.

After weeks of secret meetings, Senate Republicans released their healthcare legislation last week. In many ways, it is even worse than expected. It is no wonder that the Senate Republicans kept this legislative malpractice hidden behind closed doors. For working families and the elderly, for the disabled and for those suffering from opioid addiction, this legislation is a death sentence. This bill takes a machete to Medicaid. It abandons people with preexisting conditions. It punishes Grandma and Grandpa, who live in a nursing home, and 25,000 seniors in Massachusetts’ nursing homes who are on Medicaid.

It causes the single greatest rollback of civil rights for people with disabilities in a generation, by taking away the funding for those with disabilities. It creates an age tax for those over the age of 50. It shreds a critical healthcare program for the disabled, working families, and children just to bestow billions in tax breaks for the wealthiest in our country.

This is an amazing number. The richest 400 billionaires in the United States will get a tax break of more than \$33 billion, which is roughly equivalent to the cuts from ending Medicaid expansion in four States. That is more than 700,000 people in just those four States who could be kicked off of their health insurance coverage to benefit just 400 billionaires in America who do not have to worry about their healthcare or their family’s welfare. But for those who are going to lose the coverage—people with cancer, people with Alzheimer’s, people who need opioid addiction treatment, people with diabetes—they will have their healthcare coverage slashed so that 400 billionaires can get a tax break, which they don’t need and they don’t deserve. That is at the heart of this Republican healthcare bill. It is what it is all about. This legislation is of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich.

It is a “wealth care” bill for the upper 1 percent in our country, and it says to everyone else: Your healthcare is going to suffer in order to take care of that 1 percent with their tax breaks. It is a more than \$500 billion tax break to corporations and individuals making \$200,000 or more. It is no wonder that President Trump has kept his tax returns secret, because he knew he was about to get a massive tax break through this legislation from slashing healthcare for people with cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer’s, heart disease, and substance use disorders. This selfish Senate Republican legislation will increase premiums and out-of-pocket costs, while decreasing the quality of health insurance coverage for most Americans.

This bill would result in many Americans—especially those over the age of 50—paying thousands more in premiums for skimpier health plans. It will put insurance companies back in charge of our healthcare by allowing them to waive coverage of the essential health benefits like emergency care, prescription drugs, maternity care, or mental health treatment.

That means that someone with a pre-existing condition, like a cancer survivor or a child with asthma, might have insurance but not actually be covered for the treatment they need, because under this bill, the anxiety of suffering from an illness or the constant fear of relapse will once again be exacerbated by financial insecurity.

Yet some of the most damaging provisions of this legislation are the brutal cuts to Medicaid, which already serves more than 70 million Americans, including, very importantly, two-thirds of all seniors in nursing homes in America, who are on Medicaid. Let me say that again: Two-thirds of all seniors in America are on Medicaid. Half of all seniors over the age of 85 have Alzheimer's, and 15 million baby boomers are going to have Alzheimer's. They are going to need some help. People have a hard time paying \$60,000, \$80,000, \$100,000 a year for a nursing home bed. What are the Republicans planning on doing over the next 15 years? Slashing that funding in Medicaid for seniors in our country who will need that help just to stay in a nursing home, or else they are going to have to go home to their families who will be responsible for providing the care for them.

The Senate Republicans doubled down and opted for even steeper cuts in their bill than in the House version. In 3 years, the Senate bill will start the process of kicking millions off of their Medicaid coverage by ending Medicaid expansion in States around the country. It will mean 22 million Americans are kicked off of coverage.

Then, as if that wasn't enough, starting in 2025, the plan will institute even more drastic Medicaid cuts that every year become a deeper cut than the year before, and it will literally mean death by a billion cuts for millions of Americans who will lose their healthcare coverage, especially those suffering from substance use disorders. Medicaid covers about one-third of Americans with an opioid use disorder and pays for nearly half of the medication-assisted treatments in Massachusetts. Taking away this treatment would be a death sentence for thousands of Americans.

A vision without funding is a hallucination. The Republicans are saying: We will find the will to take care of these people with opioid treatments. Well, you can't will your way to dealing with an opioid crisis. It is a disease. You need funding. You need treatment. And right now, there are millions of Ameri-

cans who don't have the treatment they need. Medicaid is the way in which it will be provided, but the Republicans are just going to slash it, and the consequences are going to be catastrophic.

Now, here is what the Republicans are saying: To make up for the cuts to Medicaid, the Senate Republican healthcare legislation creates an opioid fund of \$2 billion for 2018. Compare that to the \$91 billion in funding for opioid use disorder treatment that would be provided by the Affordable Care Act over the next 10 years. A \$2 billion opioid fund is pocket change for a crisis that took 2,000 lives just last year in Massachusetts and 33,000 lives across the country. And if people were dying from opioid addiction at the rate they are dying in Massachusetts, that would be a 100,000 people a year—two Vietnam wars a year dying from opioid addiction. They are going to slash the funding for treatment for these families. It will be a death sentence for these individuals if they do not have access to the funding.

So the formula of this bill is simple: First, increase the cost of care, so working families pay more. Second, decrease the quality of care for seniors and the sick. Finally, hand over the hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country—billions in tax breaks to people who don't need them, who don't deserve them, paid for by people who can't afford it. It is healthcare heartlessness.

To add insult to injury, it will devastate the budgets of already strapped States, which may be forced to raise taxes or cut other benefits, such as education or housing assistance, to make up for the billions of dollars States will lose because of this bill.

It is cruel. It is inhumane. It is immoral. It is just plain wrong to cut healthcare benefits for those who need them to give tax breaks to those who do not need them. That is the Republican plan.

The Republican leadership is trying to catch a political unicorn with this bill—to make moderate Republicans happy while satisfying the most conservative elements of the Republican Party. But there is no treatment for TrumpCare. It is dangerous for healthcare, and there is no reviving Medicaid if this bill passes.

This Republican proposal has never been about policy. It isn't about covering more people or decreasing costs of healthcare or making it more patient-centered. The Republican proposal has always been about slashing healthcare for ordinary Americans to give a massive tax break to the wealthy in our country. That is the Republican policy agenda, not patient-centered care, because this will hand back over the power to insurance companies in our country, not to patients.

If Republicans were really concerned about reducing the deficit, then every single dollar in this bill would go to reducing the deficit—the crocodile tears which they shed about the deficit. No, ladies and gentlemen, they are shoving this money straight to the biggest number of billionaire beneficiaries than any tax bill in our country's history. They are, in fact, the party of the wealthy. They are the party trying to make sure that those who are in charge of funding the Republican Party now receive their pay back in the form of tax cuts at the expense of the healthcare of the ordinary people in our country. That is selfish, that is unconscionable, and that is why the Democrats are going to fight this every step of the way this week in order to protect healthcare for every American.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, today's Congressional Budget Office analysis of the Trump-McConnell healthcare bill gives us 22 million reasons why this legislation should not see the light of day. What CBO tells us in truth is that this bill really has nothing to do with healthcare; rather, it is an enormous transfer of wealth from the sick, the elderly, the children, the disabled, and the poor into the pockets of the wealthiest people in this country.

According to CBO—and that report came out just a few hours ago—this bill would throw 22 million Americans off of health insurance, cut Medicaid by over \$770 billion, defund Planned Parenthood, and substantially increase premiums for older Americans. Under this bill, a 64-year-old with an income of \$56,000 could see his or her premiums increase from \$4,400 under current law to \$16,000—an increase of nearly 850 percent. How are older workers in this country going to deal with an 850-percent increase in their premiums? Meanwhile, the Trump-McConnell bill would provide a \$231 billion tax break to the top 2 percent and hundreds of billions more in tax breaks to the big drug companies and insurance companies that are ripping off the American people every day.

At a time when the middle class of this country continues to shrink and when families all across America are struggling to make ends meet, to put food on the table, to pay their rent, to save a few bucks for retirement, we cannot take from working-class families and we cannot take from the sick and the elderly and the children in order to give even more to the very wealthiest people in this country—people who are at this moment doing phenomenally well.

Mr. President, this, in fact, is a barbaric and immoral piece of legislation. But let's be very clear. It is not just BERNIE SANDERS who opposes this bill.

It is not just every Member in the Democratic caucus who opposes this bill. It is not just that the overwhelming majority of the American people oppose this legislation. According to a recent NBC/Wall Street Journal poll, only 16 percent of the American people thought this bill was a good idea. This bill is opposed by virtually every major healthcare organization in this country—the people on the frontlines, the people who today, yesterday, and tomorrow are dealing with healthcare issues, dealing with the sick, working in hospitals, working in community health centers. Almost without exception, every major healthcare organization in this country opposes this bill.

Maybe my Republican friends might want to get beyond the politics, get beyond Republicans and Democrats, and ask the people who really know about healthcare in America and ask yourself, how does it happen that virtually every major healthcare organization in this country opposes this legislation?

The AARP opposes this legislation—the largest senior group in America, which knows what high premiums for healthcare will do to their membership. The American Hospital Association knows a little bit about hospitals and what will happen to rural hospitals if this legislation is passed. The American Medical Association is a conservative organization. This is the doctors organization all over this country. This is not any progressive radical group; these are our doctors, the doctors we go to. They oppose this legislation because they know what will happen if there are massive cuts to Medicaid, if 22 million people are thrown off of health insurance. The American Academy of Family Physicians knows what this legislation will mean to the children of our country. The American Psychiatric Association, the Federation of American Hospitals, the Catholic Health Association, the American Lung Association, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the March of Dimes, the National MS Society, the American Nurses Association—every one of these organizations opposes the Republican legislation; not BERNIE SANDERS but every major healthcare organization says do not go forward with this disastrous bill.

This is what the AARP, the largest senior group in America, said recently:

This new Senate bill was crafted in secrecy behind closed doors without a single hearing or open debate—and it shows. The Senate bill would hit millions of Americans with higher costs and result in less coverage for them.

AARP is adamantly opposed to the Age Tax, which would allow insurance companies to charge older Americans five times more for coverage than every one else while reducing tax credits that help make insurance more affordable.

I ask all of my Republican friends to think for a moment about the implica-

tions of this bill and what it will mean to your constituents when they lose the healthcare they currently have. Put yourself in their place. Today you have health insurance, but tomorrow, next year, you might not. What does that mean? Think about it.

What does it mean if you are an individual today—and, sadly, there are too many of them. If you are a person today suffering with cancer and you are fighting for your life—maybe you are on radiation treatment. Maybe you are on chemotherapy. You are scared to death. You don't have a lot of money. You have cancer. You are struggling. And now you are reading in the papers that this Republican bill may take your health insurance away from you? How do you think they feel? I suspect scared to death. It is the same with people who have heart disease, who have asthma, who have diabetes or any other life-threatening illness. What happens to those millions of people when they cannot afford to go to the doctor when they are sick, cannot afford to buy the medicine they desperately need?

Mr. President, I know this is a sensitive issue, but I am going to raise it, and that is that the horrible and unspeakable truth is that if this legislation were to pass, and I am going to do everything I can to see that it doesn't, but if it were to pass, many thousands of our fellow Americans every single year will die, and many more will suffer and become much sicker than they should. That is not, again, BERNIE SANDERS talking; that is exactly what a number of studies have shown. Study after study, including one from the American Journal of Public Health to the New England Journal of Medicine, to the Harvard School of Public Health have told us. Again, this is not BERNIE SANDERS engaging in a rhetorical debate; this is what scientists and doctors who have studied the issue are telling us.

In fact, just this afternoon, a few hours ago, the Annals of Internal Medicine, a prestigious medical journal, published an article from researchers at the City University of New York School of Urban Public Health at Hunter College and Harvard Medical School entitled: "The Relationship of Health Insurance and Mortality: Is Lack of Insurance Deadly?" That is the title of the article appearing today.

According to a summary of this article, "Insurance decreases the odds of dying among adults by at least 3 percent and as much as 29 percent and 'being uninsured substantially raises the risk of dying.'"

The coauthor of this article, Dr. David Himmelstein, commented:

According to the CBO, the Senate Republicans' plan would strip coverage from 22 million Americans. The best estimate based on scientific studies is that about 29,000 Americans would die each year as a result.

I know no Republican wants to see anybody die—none of us do—but that is the reality we are dealing with, and you cannot ignore it. If somebody has cancer, if somebody has heart disease and you take away their health insurance, I don't need studies from Harvard University to tell me and to tell you what you know to be the case. This is the United States of America, and we can do better than that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article that appeared today in the "Annals of Internal Medicine" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Annals of Internal Medicine, June 27, 2017]

THE RELATIONSHIP OF HEALTH INSURANCE AND MORTALITY: IS LACK OF INSURANCE DEADLY?

(By Steffie Woolhandler, MD, MPH, and David U. Himmelstein, MD)

(About 28 million Americans are currently uninsured, and millions more could lose coverage under policy reforms proposed in Congress. At the same time, a growing number of policy leaders have called for going beyond the Affordable Care Act to a single-payer national health insurance system that would cover every American. These policy debates lend particular salience to studies evaluating the health effects of insurance coverage. In 2002, an Institute of Medicine review concluded that lack of insurance increases mortality, but several relevant studies have appeared since that time. This article summarizes current evidence concerning the relationship of insurance and mortality. The evidence strengthens confidence in the Institute of Medicine's conclusion that health insurance saves lives: The odds of dying among the insured relative to the uninsured is 0.71 to 0.97.)

This article was published at Annals.org on 27 June 2017.

At present, about 28 million Americans are uninsured. Repeal of the Affordable Care Act would probably increase this number, while enactment of proposed single-payer legislation would reduce it. The public spotlight on how policy changes affect the number of uninsured reflects a widespread assumption that insurance improves health.

A landmark 2002 Institute of Medicine (IOM) report on the effects of insurance coverage on the health status of nonelderly adults buttressed this assumption. The IOM committee responsible for the report found consistent evidence from 130 (mostly observational) studies that "the uninsured have poorer health and shortened lives" and that gaining coverage would decrease their all-cause mortality.

The IOM committee also reviewed evidence on the effects of health insurance in specific circumstances and medical conditions. It concluded that uninsured patients, even when acutely ill or seriously injured, cannot always obtain needed care and that coverage improves the uptake of essential preventive services and chronic disease management. The report found that uninsured patients with cancer presented with more advanced disease and experienced worse outcomes, including mortality; that uninsured patients with diabetes, cardiovascular disease, end-stage renal disease, HIV infection, and mental illness (the five other conditions reviewed in depth) had worse outcomes than

did insured patients; and that uninsured in-patients received less and worse-quality care and had higher mortality both during their hospital stays and after discharge.

At the time of the IOM report, only one adequately controlled observational study had examined the effect of coverage on all-cause mortality. In this review, we summarize key evidence on this issue (Table 1), focusing on studies that have appeared since the IOM report and other previous reviews. Although not reviewed in detail here, more recent studies generally support the earlier reviews' conclusions that insurance coverage improves mortality in several specific conditions (such as trauma and breast cancer), augments the use of recommended care, and improves several measures of health status.

METHODS

We searched PubMed and Google Scholar on May 19, 2017, for English-language articles by using the following terms: “[(uninsured) or (health insurance) or (un-insurance) or (insurance)] and [(mortality) or (life expectancy) or (death rates)].” After identifying relevant articles, we searched their bibliographies and used Google Scholar’s “cited by” feature to identify additional relevant articles. We limited our scope to articles reporting data on the United States, quasi-experimental studies of insurance expansions in other wealthy nations, and recent cross-national studies. We contacted the authors of 4 studies to clarify their published reports on mortality outcomes.

We excluded most observational studies that compared uninsured persons with those insured by Medicaid, Medicare, or the Department of Veterans Affairs because pre-existing disability or illness can make an individual eligible for these programs. Hence, relative to those who are uninsured, publicly insured Americans have, on average, worse baseline health, thereby confounding comparisons. Conversely, comparisons of the uninsured to persons with private insurance (which is often obtained through employment) may be confounded by a “healthy worker” effect: that is, that persons may lose coverage because they are ill and cannot maintain employment. Nonetheless, most analysts of the relationship between uninsurance and mortality have viewed the privately insured as the best available comparator, with statistical controls for employ-

ment, income, health status, and other potential confounders.

Finally, we focus primarily on nonelderly adults because most studies have been limited to this group, and this group is likely to experience large gains or losses of coverage from health reforms. Since the advent of Medicare in 1966, almost all elderly Americans have been covered, precluding studies of uninsured seniors. Although Medicare’s implementation may not have accelerated the secular decline in seniors’ mortality, the relevance of this experience, which predates many modern-day therapies, is unclear.

Children have also been excluded from most recent analyses of the relationship of insurance to mortality. Deaths in this population beyond the neonatal period are so rare that studies would need to evaluate a huge number of uninsured children to reach firm conclusions, and high coverage rates make assembling such a cohort difficult. The few studies addressing the effect of insurance on child survival have found that coverage lowers mortality and few policy leaders contest the importance of covering children.

RANDOMIZED, CONTROLLED TRIALS

Only one well-conducted randomized, controlled trial (RCT)—the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment (OHIE)—has assessed the effect of uninsurance on health outcomes. In 2008, the state of Oregon opened a limited number of Medicaid slots to poor, able-bodied, uninsured adults aged 19 to 64 years. The state held a lottery among persons on a Medicaid waiting list, with winners allowed to apply for a slot. The OHIE researchers took advantage of this natural experiment to assess the effect of winning the lottery on the 74,922 lottery participants.

Many lottery winners did not enroll in Medicaid, and 14.1% of lottery losers obtained Medicaid through other routes (some also got private coverage). Hence, the difference in the “dose” of Medicaid coverage was modest, an absolute difference of about 25%; to adjust for this, the OHIE researchers multiplied outcome differences by about 4.

At 1 year of follow-up, the death rate among lottery losers was 0.8%, and the winners’ death rate was 0.032% lower, a “dose-adjusted” difference of 0.13 percentage points annually. This difference was not statistically significant, an unsurprising finding given the OHIE’s low power to detect mor-

tality effects because of the cohort’s low mortality rate, the low dose of insurance, and the short follow-up.

The findings on other health measures, obtained from in-person interviews and brief examinations on a subsample of 12,229 individuals in the Portland area, help inform the mortality results. Most physical health measures were similar among lottery winners and losers in the subsample. However, winners had better self-rated health, were more likely to have diabetes diagnosed and treated with medication, and were much less likely to screen positive for depression. Medicaid coverage was associated with a non-significant decrease of 0.52 (95% CI, 2.97 to –1.93) mm Hg in systolic blood pressure and 0.81 (95% CI, 2.65 to –1.04) mm Hg in diastolic blood pressure. In addition to the low dose of insurance, these wide CIs reflect the lack of baseline blood pressure data; this precludes analyses that take advantage of paired measures on each individual, which would reduce the variance of estimates.

In sum, the OHIE yields a (nonsignificant) point estimate that Medicaid coverage reduced mortality by 0.13 percentage points, equivalent to a (nonsignificant) odds ratio of 0.84.

Two older RCTs are also relevant to the effect of insurance and access to care on mortality, although neither directly compared insured and uninsured persons. In the RAND Health Insurance Experiment, random assignment to full (first-dollar) coverage reduced diastolic blood pressure by an average of 0.8 mm Hg ( $P < 0.05$ ) relative to persons randomly assigned to plans that required cost sharing, an effect size similar to the blood pressure findings in the OHIE. Unlike the OHIE, the RAND Health Insurance Experiment obtained baseline blood pressure readings, allowing researchers to determine that for participants with hypertension at baseline, full coverage reduced diastolic blood pressure by 1.9 mm Hg, mostly because of better hypertension detection; the effect was larger among low-income (3.5 mm Hg) than high-income (1.1 mm Hg) participants.

The Hypertension Detection and Follow-up Program also suggests that removing financial barriers to primary care in populations with high rates of uninsurance may reduce

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF STUDIES ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSURANCE COVERAGE AND ALL-CAUSE MORTALITY

| Study, Year (Reference)                                                                         | Participants                                                                                     | Information on Baseline Health                                                                                    | Estimated Mortality Effect of Coverage vs. Uninsured                                           | Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>RCTs</b>                                                                                     |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Oregon Health Insurance Experiment, 2013, 2011, 2012 .....                                      | 74,922 nondisabled adults on waiting list for Medicaid.                                          | Retrospective survey of a subsample; no baseline blood pressure or other measurements.                            | OR, 0.84 (NS) .....                                                                            | Study was underpowered because of crossovers between insured and uninsured groups, low mortality rate, short follow-up. Coverage was associated with nonsignificantly lower (0.91 mm Hg) average diastolic blood pressure |
| <b>Quasi-experimental studies, population-based</b>                                             |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Sommers et al., 2012, 2017 .....                                                                | Nonelderly adults in states expanding Medicaid (Arizona, New York, Maine) and comparison states. | None at individual level; compared trends in death rates in expansion with those in neighboring states.           | RR of death expansion/nonexpansion states, 0.939 ( $P = 0.001$ ).                              | Study examined Medicaid expansions that preceded the ACA’s expansions                                                                                                                                                     |
| Sommers et al., 2014 .....                                                                      | Nonelderly adults in Massachusetts and comparison counties.                                      | None at individual level; compared trends in death rates in Massachusetts with those in matched control counties. | RR for death in Massachusetts counties/matched counties, 0.971 ( $P = 0.003$ ).                | The 2006 reform expanded Medicaid and implemented subsidized coverage for low-income persons                                                                                                                              |
| Hanratty, 1996 .....                                                                            | Newborns in Canadian provinces expanding coverage at different times.                            | None at individual level; compared infant mortality trends pre- vs. postreform.                                   | RR for death, 0.95 or 0.96 ( $P < 0.05$ for both).                                             | Estimates varied slightly depending on how time trends were modeled                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Quasi-experimental studies, clinic cohorts</b>                                               |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Lurie et al., 1984, 1986 .....                                                                  | 186 clinic patients terminated from Medicaid vs. 109 who remained eligible.                      | Clinic-based data .....                                                                                           | OR at 1 y, 02.3 (NS) .....                                                                     | Large effect probably reflects very high baseline risk. Among terminated patients with hypertension, average diastolic blood pressure increased 10 mm Hg at 6 mo vs. decrease of 5 mm Hg among controls ( $P = 0.003$ )   |
| Fihn and Wicher, 1988 .....                                                                     | 157 patients terminated from outpatient VA care vs. 74 controls.                                 | Clinic-based data .....                                                                                           | OR not calculable from published data; per authors, “at least 6% of terminated patients died”. | Marked deterioration in blood pressure control among terminated patients                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Quasi-experimental studies using longitudinal data from the Health and Retirement Study.</b> |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|                                                                                                 | Several cohorts followed for varying time periods from age $\geq 51$ y.                          | Repeated questionnaires linked to Medicare records and National Death Index; no examination or laboratory data.   | Conflicting results; some found lower deaths among insured, and others were null.              | Studies compared mortality before age 65 y and relative changes in death rates after acquisition of Medicare eligibility. Different analytic strategies yielded different conclusions                                     |
| <b>Population-based cohort follow-up studies.</b>                                               |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF STUDIES ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSURANCE COVERAGE AND ALL-CAUSE MORTALITY—Continued

| Study, Year (Reference) | Participants                 | Information on Baseline Health                                   | Estimated Mortality Effect of Coverage vs. Uninsured                                                  | Comments                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sorlie et al., 1994     | CPS respondents 1982–1985    | None other than being employed                                   | HR for employed white women, 0.83 (NS); HR for employed white men, 0.77 (P = 0.05)                    | No data on smoking, health status or other non-demographic predictors of mortality at baseline           |
| Franks et al., 1993     | NHANES respondents 1971–1975 | Surveys, physical examinations, and lab test results.            | HR, 0.8 (P = 0.05)                                                                                    | Controls for baseline health status included physician-assessed morbidity                                |
| Kronick, 2009           | NHIS respondents 1986–2000   | Questionnaires only                                              | HR, 0.91 (P <0.05; without control for self-rated health) and 0.97 (NS; including self-rated health). | Control for self-rated health may bias findings because this variable is probably confounded by coverage |
| Wilper et al 2009       | NHANES respondents 1988–1994 | Surveys and physician-rated health after a physical examination. | HR, 0.71 (P <0.05)                                                                                    | Controls for baseline health status included physician-assessed health status                            |

mortality. That population-based RCT carried out in the 1970s screened almost all residents of 14 communities, with oversampling of predominantly black and poor locations. Persons with hypertension were randomly assigned to free stepped care in special clinics or referral to usual care. Although the clinics' staff treated only hypertension-related problems, they provided informal advice and "friendly referrals" for other medical issues. Strikingly, all-cause mortality was reduced by 17% in the intervention group, with similar reductions in deaths due to cardiovascular and noncardiovascular conditions.

Finally, a flawed RCT carried out by the Social Security Administration starting in 2006 bears brief mention. That study randomly assigned people who were receiving Social Security disability income and were in the waiting period for Medicare coverage to receive immediate or delayed coverage. Unfortunately, randomization apparently failed, with many more patients with cancer assigned to the immediate coverage than to the control group, precluding reliable interpretation of the mortality results. Interestingly, persons receiving immediate coverage had rapid and significant improvements in most measures of self-reported health.

MORTALITY FOLLOW-UP OF POPULATION-BASED HEALTH SURVEYS

Several routinely collected federal surveys that include information about health insurance coverage have been linked to the National Death Index, allowing researchers to compare the mortality rates over several years of respondents with and without coverage at the time of the initial survey. One weakness of these studies is their lack of information about the subsequent acquisition or loss of coverage, which many people cycle into and out of over time. This dilutes coverage differences and may lead to underestimation of the effects of insurance coverage.

Sorlie and colleagues analyzed mortality among respondents to the 1982–1985 Current Population Survey, with follow-up through 1987. In analyses limited to employed persons, the relative risk for death associated with being uninsured was 1.3 for white men and 1.2 for white women (neither overall figures nor those for minorities were reported). The study's lack of data on important determinants of health, such as smoking, and its reliance on employment status as the only proxy for baseline health status weaken confidence in its conclusions.

Kronick used data from the 1986–2000 National Health Interview Surveys, with mortality follow-up through 2002. The mortality hazard ratio for uninsured versus insured individuals was 1.10 (95% CI, 1.03 to 1.19) after adjustment for demographic variables, smoking, and body mass index. The hazard ratio fell to 1.03 (95% CI, 0.95 to 1.12) after additional adjustment for baseline health, defined by using self-reported disability and self-rated health. Although the self-rated health scale is known to be a valid predictor

of mortality, it may introduce inaccuracies in comparisons of uninsured versus insured persons. Recent data indicate that gaining coverage improves self-rated health, before improvements in objective measures of physical health are detectable (or plausible). This suggests that uninsurance may cause people to underrate their health, perhaps because of anxiety or the inability to gain reassurance about minor symptoms. Analyses, such as Kronick's, that rely on self-rated health for risk adjustment therefore may inadvertently compare relatively sick insured persons to relatively healthy uninsured persons, obscuring outcome differences caused by coverage. Studies that include more objective measures of baseline health should be less subject to any such bias.

MORTALITY FOLLOW-UP OF POPULATION-BASED HEALTH EXAMINATION SURVEYS

Two studies have analyzed the effect of uninsurance on mortality using data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), which obtains data from physical examination and laboratory tests among participants.

Franks and colleagues analyzed the 1971–1975 NHANES, with mortality follow-up through 1987. They compared mortality of uninsured and privately insured adults older than age 25 years, adjusted for demographic characteristics, self-rated health, smoking, obesity, leisure time exercise, and alcohol consumption. In addition, their models controlled for evidence of morbidity determined by laboratory testing and medical examinations performed by NHANES staff. By 1987, 9.6% of the insured and 18.4% of the uninsured had died. After adjustment for baseline characteristics and health status, the hazard ratio for uninsurance was 1.25 (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.55).

Wilper and colleagues' study (which we co-authored) used data from the 1988–1994 NHANES, with mortality follow-up through 2000. The study assessed mortality among uninsured and privately insured persons age 17 to 64 years, controlling for demographic characteristics, smoking, alcohol consumption, body mass index, leisure time activity, self-rated health, and physician-rated health after the NHANES physician completed the medical examination. The study also included sensitivity analyses adjusting for the number of hospitalizations and physician visits within the past year, limitations in work or activities, job or housework changes due to health problems, and number of self-reported chronic diseases, which yielded results similar to those of the main model. In the main model, being uninsured was associated with a mortality hazard ratio of 1.40 (95% CI, 1.06 to 1.84).

QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES OF STATE AND PROVINCIAL COVERAGE EXPANSIONS

In two similar studies, Sommers and colleagues compared mortality trends in states that expanded coverage to low-income residents (before implementation of the Affordable Care Act) with trends in similar states without coverage expansions.

Their analysis of Medicaid expansions in Maine, New York, and Arizona during the early 2000s found that adult mortality rates fell faster in those states than in neighboring ones (a relative reduction of 6.1%, or 19.6 deaths per 100,000), coincident with a decline in the uninsurance rate of 3.2 percentage points. Mortality reductions were largest among nonwhites, adults age 35 to 64 years, and poorer counties. Sommers and colleagues' subsequent reanalysis using data that allowed better matching to control counties yielded a slightly lower estimate of the mortality effect. As the authors note, the large mortality effect from a relatively modest coverage expansion may reflect the fact that Medicaid enrollment often occurred "at the point of care for patients with acute illnesses," leading to the selective enrollment of those most likely to benefit from coverage.

A study of the effect of Massachusetts' 2006 coverage expansion compared mortality trends in Massachusetts counties with those in propensity score-matched counties in other states. Mortality decreased by 2.9% in Massachusetts relative to the comparison counties, a difference of 8.2 deaths per 100,000 adults, with larger declines in poorer counties and those with lower coverage rates before the expansion.

OTHER QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES

Several researchers have used data from the Health and Retirement Study (HRS)—a longitudinal study that has followed cohorts enrolled at age 51 years or older—to assess the effect of insurance coverage on mortality. The HRS periodically surveys respondents and their families and has been linked to Medicare and National Death Index data.

McWilliams and colleagues found significantly higher mortality rates among uninsured compared with insured HRS respondents, even after propensity score adjustment for multiple predictors of insurance coverage. Baker and colleagues found that respondents who were uninsured (compared with those who had private insurance) had higher long-term but not short-term mortality. After adjustment for multiple baseline characteristics, including instrumental variables associated with coverage (such as a spouse's union membership), Hadley and Waidmann found a strong positive association between insurance coverage and survival before age 65 years. Black and colleagues suggested, on the basis of a "battery of causal inference methods," that others overestimated the survival benefits of insurance and that uninsured HRS respondents had only slightly higher (adjusted) mortality than those with private coverage. Finally, studies have reached conflicting conclusions as to whether the health of previously uninsured persons improves (relative to those who were previously insured) after they reach age 65 years and become eligible for

Medicare. Overall, the preponderance of evidence from the HRS suggests that being uninsured is associated with some increase in mortality.

Some studies using other data sources suggest that death rates drop at age 65 years, coincident with the acquisition of Medicare eligibility, whereas others do not.

Finally, several studies have assessed the relationship between insurance coverage and hypertension control, a likely mediator of any relationship between coverage and all-cause mortality. Lurie and colleagues followed a cohort of 186 patients who lost Medicaid coverage because of a statewide policy change and a control group of 109 patients who remained eligible. Among those who lost coverage, 5 died within 6 months (compared with none in the control group;  $P = .16$ ), and the average diastolic blood pressure of those with hypertension increased by 10 mm Hg (compared with a 5-mm Hg decrease in controls;  $P = 0.003$ ). At 1 year, 7 patients who had lost Medicaid and 1 control had died; blood pressure differences were slightly less

marked than seen at 6 months. A similar study of patients terminated from Veterans Affairs outpatient care because of a budget shortfall found marked deterioration in hypertension control among the terminated patients relative to controls who maintained access. These clinic-based findings accord with cross-sectional population-based analyses of data from NHANES, which have found worse blood pressure control among uninsured than insured patients with hypertension.

#### EVIDENCE FROM OTHER NATIONS AND FROM CROSS-NATIONAL STUDIES

The United States lags behind most other wealthy nations in life expectancy and is the only one with substantial numbers of uninsured residents. Although many factors confound cross-national comparisons, a recent study suggests that worse access to good-quality health care contributes to our nation's higher mortality from medically preventable causes (so-called amenable mortality). Similarly, a recent review of studies

from many nations concluded that "broader health coverage generally leads to better access to necessary care and improved population health".

Quasi-experimental studies assessing newly implemented universal coverage in wealthy nations have reached similar conclusions. For instance, Taiwan's rollout of a single-payer system in 1995 was associated with an accelerated decline in amenable mortality, particularly in townships where coverage gains were larger. In Canada, a study exploiting the different dates on which provinces implemented universal coverage estimated that coverage expansion reduced infant mortality by about 5% ( $P < 0.03$ ).

Finally, a recent study of cystic fibrosis cohorts also suggests that coverage improves mortality. Such patients live, on average, 10 years longer in Canada than in the United States. Among U.S. patients, those without known coverage have the shortest survival; among the privately insured, life expectancy is similar to that among patients in Canada.

TABLE 2.—WHY THE CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP OF HEALTH INSURANCE TO MORTALITY IS HARD TO STUDY

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Deaths, especially from causes amenable to medical treatment, are rare among nonelderly adults, who account for most of the uninsured.                                                                                                                                                             |
| Because insurance might prevent death by slowing the decline in health over several years, short-term studies may underestimate its effects.                                                                                                                                                       |
| Many people cycle in and out of insurance diluting differences between groups.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Randomly assigning participants to no coverage is unethical in most circumstances.                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Observational studies must address reverse causality. Illness sometimes causes people to acquire public insurance by qualifying them for Medicaid, Medicare, or Department of Veterans Affairs disability coverage. Conversely, illness may cause job loss and resultant loss of private coverage. |
| In cohort studies, adequate control for baseline health status is difficult, particularly in uninsured patients, whose lack of access lowers self-rated health and also causes less awareness of important risk factors, such as hypertension or hyperlipidemia.                                   |
| Quasi-experimental studies, which exploit factors associated with coverage (such as policy changes), rest on unverifiable assumptions (e.g., that without a coverage expansion, mortality trends in states expanding coverage would parallel those in comparator state).                           |

#### DISCUSSION

The evidence accumulated since the publication of the IOM's report in 2002 supports and strengthens its conclusion that health insurance reduces mortality. Several newer observational and quasi-experimental studies have found that uninsurance shortens survival, and a few with null results used confounded or questionable adjustments for baseline health. The results of the only recent RCT, although far from definitive, are consistent with the positive findings from cohort and quasi-experimental analyses.

Several factors complicate efforts to determine whether uninsurance increases mortality (Table 2). Randomly assigning people to uninsurance is usually unethical, and quasi-experimental analyses rest on unverifiable assumptions. Deaths are rare and mortality effects may be delayed, mandating large studies with long follow-up. Many people cycle into and out of coverage, diluting the effects of insurance. And statistical adjustments for baseline health usually rely on participants' self-reports, which may be influenced by coverage. Hence, such adjustments may under- or overadjust for differences between insured and uninsured persons.

Inferences about mechanisms through which insurance affects mortality are subject to even greater uncertainty. In some circumstances, coverage might raise mortality by increasing access to dangerous drugs (such as oral opioids) or procedures (such as morcellation hysterectomy). On the other hand, coverage clearly reduces mortality in several serious conditions, although few are common enough to have a detectable effect on population-level mortality. The exception is hypertension, which is prevalent among the uninsured and seems a likely contributor to their higher death rates. Although uncontrolled hyperlipidemia is also more common among the uninsured, the OHIE—the only RCT performed in the statin era—found no effect of coverage on cholesterol levels.

Finally, our focus on mortality should not obscure other well-established benefits of health insurance: improved self-rated health, financial protection, and reduced likelihood of depression. Insurance is the gateway to medical care, whose aim is not just saving lives but also relieving human suffering.

Overall, the case for coverage is strong. Even skeptics who suggest that insurance doesn't improve outcomes seem to vote differently with their feet. As one prominent economist recently asked, "How many of the people who write such things . . . choose to just not bother getting their healthcare?"

#### KEY SUMMARY POINTS

In several specific conditions, the uninsured have worse survival, and the lack of coverage is associated with lower use of recommended preventive services.

The Oregon Health Insurance Experiment, the only available randomized, controlled trial that has assessed the health effects of insurance, suggests that insurance may cause a clinically important decrease in mortality, but wide CIs preclude firm conclusions.

The 2 National Health and Nutrition Examination Study analyses that include physicians' assessments of baseline health show substantial mortality improvements associated with coverage. A cohort study that used only self-reported baseline health measures for risk adjustment found a nonsignificant coverage effect.

Most, but not all, analyses of data from the longitudinal Health and Retirement Study have found that coverage in the near-elderly slowed health decline and decreased mortality.

Two difference-in-difference studies in the United States and 1 in Canada compared mortality trends in matched locations with and without coverage expansions. All 3 found large reductions in mortality associated with increased coverage.

A mounting body of evidence indicates that lack of health insurance decreases sur-

vival, and it seems unlikely that definitive randomized, controlled trials can be done. Hence, policy debate must rely on the best evidence from observational and quasi-experimental studies.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this issue is really not just about healthcare. This is a profound moral debate defining who we are as a people today and whom we want to be as a people in the future.

A great nation is not simply one judged by how many millionaires and billionaires we have and by how many tax breaks we can give to billionaires. A great nation is judged by how we treat the weakest and the most vulnerable amongst us—those people who don't have fundraising dinners, those people who don't contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars into the political process. A great nation is judged by how we treat the children, the elderly, the sick, the poor, the people who have disabilities. This is what a great nation is. This legislation is not worthy of a great nation. This legislation must be defeated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to join my colleagues. We can see there are numerous colleagues on this side of the aisle who are speaking, just as my colleague from Vermont just did with great passion or my colleague from Massachusetts did with great passion and as I am sure my colleague from Minnesota will. We have all been home for the weekend talking to our constituents.



We are all back here now with the CBO news, and we are here because we are very concerned about the next steps the Senate might take in this healthcare debate.

When I was at home, I heard some unbelievably positive stories about healthcare. I was at a hospital in our State, Virginia Mason, which has been one of the leaders in reducing healthcare costs by utilizing new efficiencies. They have improved the return time of getting lab results to patients by 85 percent; they have increased productivity in some areas by 90 percent; they have reduced liability insurance premiums by 76 percent. They have innovated. They have innovated. They have innovated. They talked about the direction healthcare should go, and not once did they mention cutting or capping Medicaid as a solution.

I also talked to a community health center which, under the Affordable Care Act, was actually able to expand in a community. They literally cut in half the uninsured, and they are delivering great adult dental access to thousands of people in a county that didn't have good access to dental care. They are making great progress.

I talked to a veteran who served our country, who literally got out and is now going to school but without the help of Medicaid would not have been able to cover her healthcare expenses.

I met a woman on the street who told me her husband had lost his job. She never thought they would be on Medicaid, but when he lost his job, they went on Medicaid, and they depended on that to provide healthcare for themselves and their children.

I met a gentleman who also said he, too, lost his job, and after that came down with a serious, life-threatening illness, and it was only Medicaid that saved him.

So what do we know today that is different than last Friday? We now have some CBO numbers. We know the numbers. We know the numbers: that 22 more million Americans, as a result of this bill, if it is passed, would be uninsured; 15 million of them on Medicaid; and \$772 billion in Medicaid cuts. We know we thought it was heartless. Now we see the numbers that say cutting that many people off of Medicaid is, in my opinion, as my colleagues have also said, not something we should be pursuing as a nation. It leaves us to ask about not just the impact of this on individuals, as I just mentioned—because I believe there is a much better way to go with innovation—but what it also does for the individual market. A lot of this debate started because people thought the individual market hadn't seen some of the benefits of the employer-sponsored system. Well, why not talk about the individual market?

If 7 percent of the way people access health insurance, the individual mar-

ket, was having a problem, why not talk about ideas to improve the individual market? Instead, we have a bill from the House and the Senate that beats up on the Medicaid population as if they are the culprit. If you want to improve Medicaid and delivery services and help decrease costs, let's do that. There are so many innovative ideas, but just cutting people off Medicaid to solve the individual market problem doesn't even make sense to me.

We now have, as of last Friday, too, the Center on Budget Policy and Priorities' assessment, talking about how this would raise individual premiums in the individual market. They gave some examples. For example, in West Virginia and Nevada, a 60-year-old with an income of \$36,000 would pay respectively, \$5,000 and \$4,000 more than what they are paying now. In Alaska, a 60-year-old making \$45,000 would pay \$5,777 more than what they are paying now for premiums. So the notion that this bill is driving down costs is just a fallacy.

We have heard from Republican and Democratic Governors talking about this. They sent us a letter saying the first thing we should do is focus on improving our Nation's private health insurance system. Where did the Governors ask that you come and beat up on Medicaid? They didn't say that. They didn't say: Please beat up on Medicaid, have a big party covering people on Medicaid as a partner with us for 65 years and then leave us stuck with the bill. They didn't say that. They say:

Medicaid provisions included in this bill are problematic. Instead, we recommend Congress address factors we can all agree need fixing.

That is a pretty clear message, I believe, from Republican Governors who are saying this is not the way to fix healthcare.

Also, last week, a nonpartisan study by the George Washington University found that the House-passed bill would have a huge economic impact on our country. States' economies would shrink by \$93 billion, compared to what they would be without the bill. Business output would be cut \$148 billion. The study notes that the bill, combined with normal economic cycles "could contribute to a period of economic and medical hardship in the U.S."

That report also talks about job loss throughout the country, saying that individual states would see more than \$1 billion in lost gross State product, just because of the number of people who wouldn't be covered, the number of healthcare providers who would no longer be there, the loss of healthcare infrastructure and then the impact on the healthcare system overall for uncompensated care. These are costs we can't afford.

As my colleague Senator SANDERS mentioned, there are all these

healthcare organizations that have now come out saying they don't support this Senate-drafted bill. The Academy of Family Physicians knows about caring for the Medicaid population. They are seeing so many patients, and they know what this challenge is. The American Psychological Association doesn't support this bill. Other healthcare associations, such as the Catholic Health Association, do not support this bill. I have a long list.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of healthcare-related organizations and others that don't support this legislation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO SENATE HEALTH CARE BILL

Alliance for Retired Persons, America's Essential Hospitals, American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), American Association of People with Disabilities (AAPD), American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN), American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), American College of Physicians (ACP), American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), American Diabetes Association, American Federation of State, Country and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), American Health Care Association (AHCA), American Heart Association (AHA), American Hospital Association (AHA), American Lung Association, American Muslim Health Professionals, American Nurses Association (ANA), American Osteopathic Association, American Psychiatric Association (APA).

American Psychological Association, American Public Health Association (APHA), Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), Big Cities Health Coalition, Bread for the World, California Public Interest Research Group (CPIRG), Catholic Health Association (CHA), Cato Institute, Center for American Progress, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP), Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), Center for Reproductive Rights, Children's Hospital Association (CHA), The Chronic Illness & Disability Partnership, Coalition on Human Needs (CHN), Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, Community Catalyst, Consumers Union, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Ecumenical Poverty Initiative.

Environmental Organizations, Families USA, Federation of American Hospitals (FAH), First Focus, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Hispanic Federation, Human Rights Campaign (HRC), Indivisible, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Lutheran Services in America, Medicare Rights Center, MomsRising, MoveOn.org, NARAL Pro Choice America, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), National Breast Cancer Coalition, National Center for Lesbian Rights, National Center for Transgender Equality, National Committee to Preserve Social Security & Medicare (NCPSSM).

National Council on Aging (NCOA), National Council for Behavioral Health, National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), Planned Parenthood, Presbyterian Church

(U.S.A.), Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Trust for America's Health (TFAH), National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Organization for Rare Disorders, National Partnership for Women and Families, National Physicians Alliance, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, Pacific Institute for Community Organization (PICO) National Network, Physicians for Reproductive Health, Society of St. Vincent DePaul, Tennessee Justice Center, The Arc, Third Way, United Church of Christ Justice & Witness Ministries, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, U.S. Public Interest Research Group (US PIRG), Young Invincibles.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues understand that there are those here who are very willing to talk about how we can improve our healthcare system, but we are not going to make poor Americans the scapegoat of our healthcare challenges.

A gentleman named Joe Baker, president of the Medicare Rights Center, I think, said it best. He said:

You or someone you love is going to need Medicaid. You may not need the nursing home care . . . but you may rely on community-based services, like home care, that will allow you to stay in your home and out of a nursing facility. Medicaid is the lifeline that covers many of the benefits that Medicare does not provide.

Now why did I read that? Why did I pick a guy who is the head of a Medicare organization? Because he knows what his individual organization participants need in a healthcare delivery system. Everybody knows—everybody knows the people of America are living longer and as they age they need more healthcare. To our colleagues who want to reduce those costs, we are ready to come and talk about how we are going to reduce those costs.

I have talked about how I authored a community-based “rebalancing” program—the kind of rebalancing that helped our State save more than \$2 billion. If we did that in every State, we would be saving billions of dollars, but the notion that we are going to proceed in the next 24 hours or so on a motion, after we have a CBO report that says this would have a devastating impact on millions of people with Medicaid, is not the right way to go.

Taking this out on the poor people of America who need Medicaid will make it worse for us as well. It will raise our rates, return the costs to where they were, and not help us solve this problem for the future. I hope our colleagues will understand that so many people are raising so many concerns about this. Yes, it is about economics, but there are also personal stories of people, such as our colleague from Hawaii who said: You never know. You never know when an individual situation is going to affect you, and you want to make sure there is healthcare to help you get through that crisis.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to talk about the effort to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. Before I begin, I thank Senator HIRONO for sharing her story and for leading us all here in the discussion tonight.

I thank the Presiding Officer who has been listening, and I appreciate that. I really do.

In recent days, we have finally gotten to see the plan that 13 Republican Senators have been working on in secret and behind closed doors. I really thought the Senate bill would be better. I thought it would be better than the House version that was passed. Even Senator BURR said of the House bill that it was “dead on arrival” in the Senate, but, unfortunately, the Senate plan is just as bad.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office announced just today that, under the Senate plan, 22 million more Americans would be uninsured. That has consequences. Perhaps worst of all—and partly because this causes the reduction in the number of Americans who would be covered—the bill ends the Medicaid expansion and cuts the funding for the Medicaid Program by nearly \$800 billion—a program that has been a vital part of our social fabric since 1965.

This bill—and I do not like to say this—is mean. The President said that of the House bill. I do not like to characterize something that way, but it is mean and would have far-reaching effects for millions of Americans across the country.

This past weekend, I hosted a healthcare forum in Burnsville, MN. It is a suburb that is south of Minneapolis, of the Twin Cities. It was on the importance of Medicaid and how the Republican plan's devastating cuts would affect Minnesotans. Over 230 people showed up to share their stories about how Medicaid changed their lives, and it was very moving.

I think it is really important to tell this in terms of people, not in terms of numbers, although the numbers are pretty stark. Brandon and his mom spoke, Brandon and Sheri. They are both from Burnsville.

Brandon was born 15 weeks premature. He weighed just 1 pound 13½ ounces. He was so small that his parents' wedding rings could slide on his arm. He was also born with cerebral palsy and hydrocephalus, which is a condition that causes fluid to collect in Brandon's brain, which results in brain damage.

Brandon, who is now 17, got up with a walker at the event. He told me that he was taken immediately to the Mayo Clinic in Rochester. He was born in the Twin Cities, but Mayo said that his case was too complicated to handle, so they sent him back to the Twin Cities, to Gillette, which is a children's hospital. It is a great children's hospital, a great hospital. Within 24 hours of his

birth, the hospital told Brandon's parents that his costs were already over \$1 million—a terrifying addendum to what must have been a harrowing, harrowing experience.

Over the years, Brandon has needed 38 surgeries—surgery to reduce the fluid in his brain. He has a shunt. He has had surgeries to straighten out his legs. He has had eye surgeries and more. He has also needed extensive physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, and across his lifetime, he has needed other interventions to help him do basic tasks, like eat and now walk. He could not turn over. He could not do the things that babies do, that we parents and grandparents relish in every day.

But guess what. He is thriving. In fact, he just passed his first college course at Dakota County Technical College. He proudly told me and the rest of us that he received an A-minus, and he hopes someday to get a job at Gillette, the Gillette Children's Specialty Healthcare, which is the very place that provided him with the unique and high-quality care that he has needed over the years. All of this has been possible because Brandon and his family were able to get health insurance through Medicaid.

Sheri, Brandon's mom, said: “If we didn't have Medicaid, Brandon probably wouldn't be here”—meaning at our forum—“and he wouldn't be doing as well as he's doing.”

Brandon similarly noted:

Kids with special needs are referred to as “special needs,” and I like to think I'm pretty special. I also like to think our needs are also special depending on the kind of care we need and that's what Medicaid provides.

I really believe that all of us here tonight must do all we can to protect these kids and protect their families and everyone who relies on Medicaid, and I sincerely believe that means we have to defeat this bill.

My colleague Senator HIRONO stated last week: “We are all one diagnosis away from a serious illness.” That is the case. Do you know what else? We are also just one accident away from a life-changing injury.

Another Minnesotan, Deborah, shared her story with my office. She described for me a car crash and the subsequent traumatic brain injury that she survived in 2012.

She explained:

It was just another day. I was on my way to work. I lost control of my SUV after sliding on a patch of ice and slammed into a concrete median.

Her whole life changed at that moment. She had to relearn basic tasks—reading, walking, talking, and eating—but all of it was possible because of the home- and community-based services she was able to receive through Medicaid.

She said:

Without the services funded by Medicaid, my goal of returning to paid employment

would be impossible. I honestly worry that proposed changes to the Medicaid program could significantly diminish my overall health outcomes and even leave me facing long-term homelessness.

As my colleagues and people at home who are watching this debate well know, this week could prove to be an extremely consequential week in the history of this country. The decisions we make—the 100 of us—over the next few days could literally mean life or death for many Americans. Lives are on the line.

Tomorrow, I will give a speech that is more about the data, and we have heard about some of that, but there is a study in the New England Journal of Medicine that came out this week that reads that Medicaid—having the insurance—improves people's lives and that—this is not precise—for every 300 to 800 who will lose healthcare, who would lose Medicaid, there will be a premature death.

This is a study that is going to be summarized in the New Yorker, in an article by Atul Gawande, that the effect of having insurance is not about dramatic emergencies. This is especially about things like diabetes and heart illness and cancer—the day-to-day. It is about having access. Because you have insurance for care, it improves the health of people, and it extends mortality. This is real stuff. What we are doing is really serious.

I strongly urge my Republican colleagues to talk with their constituents about the bill that was drafted. Again, it was behind closed doors, and many of my Republican colleagues did not see it until last week. I urge them to talk to their constituents about the consequences this bill would have for seniors, for children, and parents who have Medicaid coverage.

Talk to the people who would see their healthcare costs rise. Talk to the families who may lose their health insurance. People are afraid.

I am a cochair of the World Health Caucus. I go all around my State. I talk to roundtables at rural hospitals and nursing homes. These are the parts of my State that voted for Donald Trump. During the campaign, Donald Trump said that he would not cut Medicaid. These are people who are scared, whose elderly parents stay home because Medicaid pays for their home healthcare, and they are afraid because that will go away. Both she and her husband work—this was a woman in Herman, MN—and they do not know what they will do.

Please, listen to your constituents. You need to do the right thing and vote no on this bill for their sake—for the sake of your constituents.

I yield the floor.

#### ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act

requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-12, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$1.3 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-12

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$0.04 billion.

Other \$1.26 billion.

Total \$1.30 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

The Government of Australia requested the sale of up to five (5) Gulfstream G-550 aircraft modified to integrate Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Electronic Warfare (AISREW) mission systems, Global Positioning System (GPS) capability, secure communications, aircraft defensive systems, and whole life costs of airborne and ground segments.

This proposed sale includes up to five (5) AN/AAQ-24 (V)N Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) systems, and additional sub-component spares. Each prime LAIRCM system will consist of: one (1) Guardian Laser Terminal Assemblies (GLTA), five (5) Infrared Missile Warning Sensors, (IRMWS), one (1) LAIRCM System Processor Replacements (LSPR) MDE items, one (1) LAIRCM System Processor Replacements (LSPR), one (1) Control Indicator Unit Replacement (CIUR), one (1) Smart Card Assembly (SCA), one (1) High Capacity Card (HCC), and one (1) User Data Memory (UDM) card. Also included are: MX-20 HD Electro-Optical and Infrared systems, Osprey 50

AESA Radars, AISREW equipment, secure communications equipment, and Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Systems. These systems will be installed on up to five (5) G-550 aircraft.

Major Defense Equipment (MDR):

Eight (8) GLTA AN/AAQ-24 (V)N (5 installed and 3 spares).

Twenty-nine (29) IRMWS (25 installed and 4 spares).

Six (6) LSPR AN/AAQ-24 (V)N (5 installed and 1 spare).

Six (6) Embedded/GPS/INS (EGI) with GPS Security Devices, Airborne (5 installed and 1 spare).

Seven (7) Multifunctional Information Distribution Systems—Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS JTRS) (5 installed and 2 spares).

Non-MDE includes: Also included in this sale are up to five (5) G-550 Aircraft, CIURs, SCAs, HCCs and UDM cards, AN/ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser Sets (CMDS), MX-20HD Electro-Optical and Infra-Red systems, Osprey 50 AESA Radars, AISREW ISR equipment, Secure Communications equipment, Identification Friend or Foe Systems, aircraft modification and integration, ground systems for data processing and crew training, ground support equipment, publications and technical data, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, flight test and certification, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QCS).

(v) Prior Related Cases if any: AT-D-SAA & AT-D-GCA.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc. Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex Attached.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 23, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Australia-Gulfstream-G550 Aircraft with Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Electronic Warfare (AISREW) Mission Systems

The Government of Australia requested the possible sale of up to five (5) Gulfstream G-550 aircraft modified to integrate Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Electronic Warfare (AISREW) mission systems, Global Positioning System (GPS) capability, secure communications, aircraft defensive systems; spares, including whole life costs of airborne and ground segments; aircraft modification and integration; ground systems for data processing and crew training; ground support equipment; publications and technical data; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; flight test and certification; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$1.3 billion.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major contributor to political stability, security, and economic development in the Western Pacific. Australia is an important Major non-NATO Ally and partner that contributes significantly to peacekeeping and humanitarian operations around the world. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist our ally in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale supports and complements the ongoing efforts of Australia to

modernize its Electronic Warfare capability and increases interoperability between the U.S. Air Force and the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF). Australia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment does not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be L3 of Greenville, TX. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale may require the assignment of up to six (6) U.S. contractor representatives to Australia.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-12

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. This sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to Australia. Sensitive and/or classified (up to SECRET) elements of the proposed sale include the AN/AAQ-24 (V)N Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) systems, Embedded/GPS/INS (EGI) with security devices, Airborne, Multifunctional Information Distribution Systems—Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS JTRS), AN/ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser Set (CMDS), MX-20HD Electro-Optical and Infra-Red systems, Osprey 50 AESA Radars, and Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance and Electronic (AISREW) mission system.

2. The AN/AAQ-24 (V)N LAIRCM is a self-contained, directed energy countermeasures system designed to protect aircraft from infrared (IR)-guided surface-to-air missiles. The system features digital technology and micro-miniature solid state electronics. The system operates in all conditions, detecting incoming missiles and jamming infrared-seeker equipped missiles with aimed bursts of laser energy. The LAIRCM system consists of multiple Infrared Missile Warning System (IRMWS) Sensors, Guardian Laser Turret Assembly (GLTA), LAIRCM System Processor Replacement (LSPR), Control Indicator Unit Replacement (CIUR), and a classified High Capacity Card (HCC), and User Data Memory (UDM) card. The HCC is loaded into the CIUR prior to flight. When the classified HCC is not in use, it is removed from the CIUR and placed in onboard secure storage. LAIRCM Line Replaceable Unit (LRU) hardware is classified SECRET when the HCC is inserted into the CIUR. LAIRCM system software, including Operational Flight Program is classified SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

The set of IRMWS Sensor units are mounted on the aircraft exterior to provide omnidirectional protection. The IRMWS Sensor warns of threat missile approach by detecting radiation associated with the rocket motor. The IRMWS is a small, lightweight, passive, electro-optic, threat warning device used to detect surface-to-air missiles fired at helicopters and low-flying fixed-wing aircraft and automatically provides countermeasures, as well as audio and visual warning messages to the aircrew. The basic system consists of multiple IRMWS Sensor units, one (1) GLTA, LSPR and CIUR. The set of IRMWS units (each A-330 MRTT has five (5)) mounted on the aircraft exterior

to provide omni-directional protection. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Software is SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

3. Multifunctional Information Distribution System—Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS JTRS) is an advanced Link-16 command, control, communications, and intelligence (C3I) system incorporating high-capacity, jam-resistant, digital communication links for exchange of near real-time tactical information, including both data and voice, among air, ground, and sea elements. The MIDS JTRS terminal hardware, publications, performance specifications, operational capability, parameters, vulnerabilities to countermeasures, and software documentation are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The classified information to be provided consists of that which is necessary for the operation, maintenance, and repair (through intermediate level) of the data link terminal, installed systems, and related software.

4. The AN/ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser Set (CMDS) provides an integrated threat-adaptive, computer controlled capability for dispensing chaff, flares, and active radio frequency expendables. The AN/ALE-47 system enhances aircraft survivability in sophisticated threat environments.

The threats countered by the CMDS include radar-directed anti-aircraft artillery (AAA), radar command-guided missiles, radar homing guided missiles, and infrared (IR) guided missiles. The system is internally mounted and may be operated as a stand-alone system or may be integrated with other on-board Electronic Warfare (EW) and avionics systems. The AN/ALE-47 uses threat data received over the aircraft interfaces to assess the threat situation and determine a response. Expendable routines tailored to the immediate aircraft and threat environment may be dispensed using one of four operational modes. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Software is SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided is UNCLASSIFIED.

5. The Embedded GPS-INS (EGI) LN-200 is a sensor that combines GPS and inertial sensor inputs to provide accurate location information for navigation and targeting. The EGI LN-200 is UNCLASSIFIED. The GPS crypto-variable keys needed for the highest GPS accuracy are classified up to SECRET.

6. Wescam MX-20HD is a gyro-stabilized, multi-spectral, multi-field of view Electro-Optical/Infrared (EO/IR) system. The systems provide surveillance laser illumination and laser designation through use of an externally mounted turret sensor unit and internally mounted master control. Sensor video imagery is displayed in the aircraft real time and may be recorded for subsequent ground analysis. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Technical data and documentation to be provided is UNCLASSIFIED.

7. The Osprey family of surveillance radars provides second generation Active Electronically Scanned Array (AFSA) surveillance capability as the primary sensor on airborne assets. The Osprey radars are at a high technology readiness level and are in production for fixed and rotary wing applications. This Osprey configuration employs a side-looking radar. Osprey radars provide a genuine multi-domain capability, with high performance sea surveillance, notably against "difficult" targets, land surveillance with wide swath, very high resolution ground mapping small and low speed ground target indication, high performance air to air surveillance, tracking and intercept.

8. The AISREW mission system provides near-real-time information to tactical forces, combatant commanders and national-level authorities across the spectrum of conflict. The mission system can forward gathered information in a variety of formats via secured communications systems. Most hardware used in this AISREW system is generic and commercially available. However, if any of the specialized hardware or publications are lost, the information could provide insight into many critical U.S. capabilities. Information gained could be used to develop countermeasures as well as offensive and defensive counter-tactics.

9. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent system which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

10. A determination has been made that Australia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

11. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Australia.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-33, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$366.2 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-33

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: The Government of India.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:  
Major Defense Equipment\* \$285.0 million.  
Other \$ 81.2 million.  
Total \$366.2 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One (1) C-17 Transport Aircraft.

Four (4) Engines, Turbofan F-117-PW-100.

Non-MDE includes: Also included in the proposed sale are one (1) AN/AAR-47 Missile Warning System, one (1) AN/ALE-47 Countermeasures Dispensing System (CMDS), one (1) AN/APX-119 Identification Friend or Foe (Lit) Transponder, precision navigation equipment, spare and repair parts, maintenance, support and test equipment, publications and technical documentation, warranty, quality assurance, ferry support, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-SAE).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: IN-D-SAC—\$4.12B, 29 Jun 2011.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 26, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of India—C-17 Transport Aircraft

The Government of India has requested the possible sale of one (1) C-17 transport aircraft with four (4) Turbofan F-117-PW-100 engines. The sale would also include one (1) AN/AAR-47 Missile Warning System, one (1) AN/ALE-47 Countermeasures Dispensing System (CMDS), one (1) AN/APX-119 Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Transponder, precision navigation equipment, spare and repair parts, maintenance, support and test equipment, publications and technical documentation, warranty, Quality Assurance, ferry support, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$366.2 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to strengthen the U.S.-India relationship and to improve the security of an important partner which has been, and continues to be, an important force for economic progress and stability in South Asia.

The proposed sale will improve India's capability to meet current and future strategic airlift requirements. India lies in a region prone to natural disasters and will use the additional capability for Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HA/DR). In addition, through this purchase India will be able to provide more rapid strategic combat airlift capabilities for its armed forces. India currently operates C-17 aircraft and will have no difficulty absorbing this aircraft into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be the Boeing Company, Chicago, IL. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel or contractor representatives to India.

There will be no adverse impact on S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-33

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology

1. The Boeing C-17A Globemaster III military airlift aircraft is the most flexible cargo aircraft to enter the U.S. Air Force fleet. The C-17 is capable of strategic delivery of up to 170,900 pounds of personnel and/or equipment to main operating bases or forward operating locations. The aircraft is also capable short field landings with a full cargo load. The aircraft can perform tactical airlift and airdrop missions as well as transport

litters and ambulatory patients during aeromedical evacuation when required. A fully integrated electronic cockpit and advanced cargo delivery system allow a crew of three: pilot, co-pilot, and loadmaster, to operate the aircraft on any type of mission.

2. The AN/AAR-47 is a small, lightweight, passive, electro-optic, threat warning device used to detect surface-to-air missiles fired at helicopters and low-flying fixed-wing aircraft and automatically provide countermeasures, as well as audio and visual-sector warning messages to the aircrew. The basic system consists of multiple Optical Sensor Converter (OSC) units, a Computer Processor (CP) and a Control Indicator (CI). The set of OSC units, which normally consists of four, is mounted on the aircraft exterior to provide omni-directional protection. The OSC detects the rocket plume of missiles and sends appropriate signals to the CP for processing. The CP analyzes the data from each OSC and automatically deploys the appropriate countermeasures. The CP also contains comprehensive Built-in-Test (BIT) circuitry. The CI displays the incoming direction of the threat, so that the pilot can take appropriate action. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Software is SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

3. The AN/ALE-47 Countermeasures Dispensing System (CMDS) is an integrated, threat-adaptive, software-programmable dispensing system capable of dispensing chaff, flares, and active radio frequency expendables. The threats countered by the CMDS include radar-directed anti-aircraft artillery (AAA), radar command-guided missiles, radar homing guided missiles, and infrared (IR) guided missiles. The system is internally mounted and may be operated as a standalone system or may be integrated with other on-board electronic warfare and avionics systems. The AN/ALE-47 uses threat data received over the aircraft interfaces to assess the threat situation and to determine a response. Expendable decoys tailored to the immediate aircraft and threat environment may be dispensed using one of four operational modes. The hardware, technical data, and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

4. The AN/APX-119 Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Digital Transponder is an identification system designed for command and control. It enables military and civilian air traffic control interrogation systems to identify aircraft. The hardware, technical data, and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

5. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

6. A determination has been made that the Government of India can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

7. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of India.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO DR. DEBORAH ZYCH

● Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I wish to honor the remarkable service of the Polytech School District superintendent, Dr. Deborah Zych, and to recognize her commitment and service to the district. Throughout her career, Debbie has been an outstanding leader and innovative thinker, serving in many positions throughout Delaware's school districts. Her hard work, perseverance, and dedication will truly be missed by students, parents, and Delawareans up and down our State.

Since 2011, Debbie has played an active and integral role within the Delaware Department of Education, the New Castle County School District, and the Polytech School District, serving as a teacher, administrator, director of curriculum, assistant superintendent, and superintendent. Throughout her time in Polytech School District, Debbie has been a major leader, instrumental in guiding POLYTECH through facility enhancements, the expansion of educational opportunities for students, as well as a marked growth in student certifications. She also played a significant role in establishing a more visible link between Polytech's highly recognized high school and adult education programs. I join the many Delawareans who have had the opportunity to work alongside Debbie, and we are truly grateful for all she has done to improve the lives of Delaware's youth and adults.

In addition to ensuring that Kent County students got quality education, I got to know Debbie through a lot of the work she and her staff did with manufacturers in Delaware and with their impressive apprenticeship programs they ran. She came down to a Democratic Steering and Outreach Committee meeting we hosted on workforce training, and last year, she hosted an event I helped organize on National Manufacturing Day. Debbie and her staff recognized that what manufacturers in Delaware needed was for the training to be done on the shop floor rather than in the school, and they have made dozens of companies stronger as a result. Under Debbie's leadership, Polytech School District also expanded the number of English language learners in Delaware.

Beginning her career in Maryland, Debbie has always been an advocate for students, teachers, and the local community. She was committed to ensuring that each student—no matter their age—was equipped with the tools and skills necessary to go out into the world and take advantage of each opportunity that came their way.

We cannot simply attribute Debbie's long service in Delaware's school systems to her hard work and advocacy,

but also to her genuine passion for seeing each student and program participant excel. Her forward-thinking ability and insight into the value of incorporating all district resources has undoubtedly laid the foundation for helping all students succeed.

Debbie's work has been nothing short of incredible, and I am sincerely grateful for all that she has done on behalf of the students and families across our State. It is my privilege to offer my sincerest congratulations on a job well done and wish her much success in her future endeavors at the University of Delaware where she will continue to serve Delaware in the UD Professional Development Center for Educators.●

#### REMEMBERING DAVID COLEMAN, JR.

● Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the great State of Indiana is proud of and ever thankful to those who defended our Nation's freedom, especially through military service. Today I wish to recognize the service and life of a member of the Greatest Generation, David Coleman, Jr., a veteran of World War II.

Mr. Coleman, born June 12, 1924, served in both the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force from 1943 to 1946 and then again from 1953 to 1960. During his military career, he earned the National Defense Service Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, and the EAME Theater Ribbon. As a veteran myself, I am proud to know of fellow Hoosier veterans such as Mr. Coleman. Mr. Coleman called Indiana home for 60 years, 56 of them with his beloved wife, the late Dorothy Coleman, by his side. Like many Hoosiers, Mr. Coleman enjoyed America's favorite pastime, baseball, and was an avid fan of the Indianapolis Indians. Mr. Coleman also had a strong Hoosier work ethic, working at both Bryant Heating & Cooling and Goodyear Tire Company until retirement.

Mr. Coleman loved his family, his God, and his country, and for these things, he will be remembered. Mr. Coleman passed away on June 18, 2017, just a few days after his 93rd birthday. My thoughts and prayers go out to the family he left behind, including his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. They should know that Mr. Coleman was an exemplary patriot, and I am proud to call him a fellow Hoosier.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages

from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

##### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 23, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1238. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2353. An act to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

H.R. 2842. An act to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients.

##### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, June 26, 2017, he has signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 1238. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water stor-

age projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2353. An act to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2842. An act to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients; to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 713. A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington (Rept. No. 115-118).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 459. A bill to designate the area between the intersections of Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Davis Street, Northwest and Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Edmunds Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Boris Nemtsov Plaza", and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-119).

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1427. A bill to provide States with the option of applying for and receiving temporary waivers for the States to experiment with new approaches that integrate Federal programs in order to provide more coordinated and holistic solutions to families in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1428. A bill to amend section 21 of the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1429. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1430. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. ROUNDS):



S. 1431. A bill to provide liability protection for volunteer pilots who fly for the public benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1432. A bill to prevent the Federal Aviation Administration's Aircraft Registry Office from closing during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1433. A bill to approve the 2010 Compact Review Agreement with Palau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1434. A bill to enhance the military childcare programs and activities of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1435. A bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearm Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1436. A bill to conserve fish and aquatic communities in the United States through partnerships that foster fish habitat conservation, improve the quality of life for the people of the United States, enhance fish and wildlife-dependent recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1437. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1438. A bill to redesignate the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in the State of Missouri as the "Gateway Arch National Park"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 1439. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to include gambling disorder in health assessments for members of the Armed Forces and related research efforts of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 1440. A bill to ensure the safety of workers of contractors that serve and supply the Armed Forces and the accountable use of taxpayer dollars; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1441. A bill to provide funding for Federally Qualified Health Centers, the National Health Service Corps, Teaching Health Centers, and the Nurse Practitioner Residency Training program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1442. A bill to establish United States policy for the Arctic region for the next 10

years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 202. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 26, 2017, as "LGBT Equality Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DAINES, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 203. A resolution designating the month of June 2017, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month" and June 27, 2017, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 480

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 480, a bill to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 765

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces.

S. 816

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rollovers from 529 programs to ABLE accounts.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend advanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.



S. 1238

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1238, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1286

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1286, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1311, a bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1330

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1330, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a dependent to transfer entitlement to Post-9/11 Education Assistance in cases in which the dependent received the transfer of such entitlement to assistance from an individual who subsequently died, and for other purposes.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 1354

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 1354, a bill to establish an Individual Market Reinsurance fund to provide funding for State individual market stabilization reinsurance programs.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to super-

vise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1393, a bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. 1414

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1414, a bill to state the policy of the United States on the minimum number of available battle force ships.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S.J. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

S.J. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 16, a joint resolution approving the discontinuation of the process for consideration and automatic implementation of the annual proposal of the Independent Medicare Advisory Board under section 1899A of the Social Security Act.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 202—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE 26, 2017, AS “LGBT EQUALITY DAY”

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr.

HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 202

Whereas the United States recognizes that all people should be treated equally;

Whereas Members of the 115th Congress support the rights and freedoms of individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (in this preamble referred to as “LGBT”);

Whereas, on June 26, 2003, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, that States could no longer criminalize the private conduct in which same-sex couples engage;

Whereas, on June 26, 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675, that section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (Public Law 104-199; 110 Stat. 2419) was unconstitutional and the Federal Government could no longer restrict married same-sex couples from receiving Federal benefits and protections;

Whereas, on June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 135 S. Ct. 2584, that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and States could no longer discriminate against same-sex couples when recognizing or licensing a marriage;

Whereas decisions handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 26 in 2003, 2013, and 2015 ended marriage discrimination and the criminalization of same-sex private intimate conduct under the law;

Whereas LGBT people and their allies have worked together for more than 60 years to make progress toward achieving full equality for all people in the United States, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity;

Whereas LGBT people in the United States continue to face many barriers that cannot be solved through courtroom litigation alone;

Whereas transgender people and LGBT people of color are disproportionately and uniquely burdened by such barriers, including violence, discrimination, poverty, and societal isolation;

Whereas, although victories at the Supreme Court of the United States have affirmed the dignity and equality of millions of same-sex couples, statutory reforms are needed to ensure that LGBT people in the United States are free from discrimination and have equal access to the American dream; and

Whereas June 26, 2017, would be an appropriate date to designate as “LGBT Equality Day”: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports equal rights and protections for all people, regardless of actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity;

(2) supports the designation of June 26, 2017, as “LGBT Equality Day”;

(3) encourages the celebration of “LGBT Equality Day” to—

(A) commemorate the significance of decisions handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 26 in 2003, 2013, and 2015; and

(B) continue educating all people about the forms of discrimination, harassment, and intolerance that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people continue to face; and

(4) acknowledges the need for further legislation to ensure that people in the United States are free from all forms of discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity, including in employment, housing, public accommodations, education, Federal funding, credit, and jury service.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 203—DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF JUNE 2017, AS “NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH” AND JUNE 27, 2017, AS “NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY”**

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DAINES, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 203

Whereas the brave men and women of the Armed Forces, who proudly serve the United States, risk their lives to protect the freedom of the people of the United States and deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas more than 2,000,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed overseas since the events of September 11, 2001, and have served in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the Armed Forces have sustained a historically high operational tempo since September 11, 2001, with many members of the Armed Forces deploying overseas multiple times, placing those members at high risk of experiencing combat stress;

Whereas, when left untreated, exposure to traumatic combat stress can lead to post-traumatic stress, sometimes referred to as post-traumatic stress disorder (in this preamble referred to as “PTSD”) or post-traumatic stress injury;

Whereas men and women of the Armed Forces and veterans who served before September 11, 2001, remain at risk for post-traumatic stress;

Whereas the Secretary of Veterans Affairs reports that about 11-20 percent of veterans who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom have PTSD in a given year, about 12 percent of Gulf War veterans have PTSD in a given year, and about 30 percent of Vietnam veterans have had PTSD in their lifetime;

Whereas many combat stress injuries remain unreported, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about post-traumatic stress and the persistent stigma associated with mental health conditions;

Whereas exposure to military trauma can lead to post-traumatic stress;

Whereas post-traumatic stress significantly increases the risk of anxiety, depression, suicide, homelessness, and drug- and alcohol-related disorders and deaths, especially if left untreated;

Whereas public perceptions of post-traumatic stress or other mental health conditions create unique challenges for veterans seeking employment;

Whereas the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, as well as the larger medical community, both private and public, have made significant advances in the identification, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of post-traumatic stress and the symptoms of post-traumatic stress, but many challenges remain;

Whereas increased understanding of post-traumatic stress can help eliminate the stigma attached to the issue;

Whereas additional efforts are needed to find further ways to eliminate the stigma associated with post-traumatic stress, including—

- (1) an examination of how post-traumatic stress is discussed in the United States; and
- (2) a recognition that post-traumatic stress is a common injury that is treatable and repairable;

Whereas post-traumatic stress can result from any number of stressors other than combat, including rape, sexual assault, battery, torture, confinement, child abuse, car accidents, train wrecks, plane crashes, bombings, or natural disasters, and affects approximately 8,000,000 adults in the United States annually;

Whereas the diagnosis now known as PTSD was first defined by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980 to commonly and more accurately understand and treat veterans who had endured severe traumatic combat stress;

Whereas combat stress had previously been viewed as a mental illness and the word “disorder” carries a stigma that perpetuates this misconception; and

Whereas the designation of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day will raise public awareness about issues related to post-traumatic stress, reduce the associated stigma, and help ensure that those individuals suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

- (1) designates June 2017, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month” and June 27, 2017, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day”;

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense, as well as the entire medical community, to educate members of the Armed Forces, veterans, the families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and the public about the causes, symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress;

(3) welcomes the efforts of the National Center for PTSD of the Department of Veterans Affairs and local Vet Centers (as defined in section 1712A(h) of title 38, United States Code) to provide assistance to veterans who are suffering from the effects of post-traumatic stress;

(4) encourages commanders of the Armed Forces to support appropriate treatment of men and women of the Armed Forces who suffer from post-traumatic stress; and

(5) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution

to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense.

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Christopher Friese, a congressional fellow on my staff, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the debate on the Better Care Reconciliation Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

**ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 2017**

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Tuesday, June 27; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am proud to be on the floor today, proud to stand with my colleagues, and I hope that at the end of this week, I will be proud of all of my colleagues when we vote to defeat this measure, or at least to delay it, because we owe the American people the right to be heard.

Our responsibility as elected representatives is at the very least to listen. I have been listening over the last week but really over the last year to constituents of mine in the State of Connecticut and over the last week at two emergency field hearings that I conducted because no hearings were held by the Senate and no markups and no votes in committee. What we saw here in Washington was complete secrecy, a bill produced behind closed doors, only seeing the light of day for the first time last Thursday.

Our Republican colleagues have gone from total secrecy to total chaos. The

reason for the chaos is the facts that were most dramatically revealed today—just hours ago—when the Congressional Budget Office told us, not surprisingly, that 22 million Americans would be thrown to the wolves as a result of this measure—thrown to the wolves of no healthcare coverage—and eventually 49 million Americans would be without healthcare insurance by 2026.

Next year alone, 15 million more people will be uninsured under the Republican plan, TrumpCare 2.0. Low-income Americans would be unable to afford any plan at all, and anybody who does would be paying higher costs for fewer services of lesser quality. Americans will pay a higher share of their income and receive less as a result. A 64-year-old making almost \$57,000 will go from paying \$6,800 under the Affordable Care Act to \$20,500 under the proposal before this body. This jump in cost is absolutely staggering.

It will destroy the financial well-being of middle-class Americans who also, when they need nursing home care, after they have exhausted their savings, will be thrown to the wolves. I visited one such facility just last Friday, where two-thirds of its 60 beds will be unaffordable when those middle-class families find their savings will no longer cover it.

These facts are the reason for the Republican chaos. One of our former colleagues, my mentor, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, famously said: "Everybody is entitled to his own opinion, but not to his own facts." The administration's statement that the CBO is not to be blindly trusted—nobody has to trust the CBO blindly. Those facts are driven by reality. Their report speaks truth to power and to the American people, and the American people get it.

None of us can look our constituents in the eye, look ourselves in the mirror, look inside ourselves, in our hearts, and justify a vote for this bill. The American people are angry, many of them because we are even considering it. It is not an anger that is kind of a shrug of the shoulders; it is a deep, vocal, vehement, vitriolic anger. I have seen it and heard it at those hearings, where I listened to people coming forward and talking about this bill, recognizing it for what it is. It is not a healthcare bill; it is a massive tax cut for the wealthy.

Just Friday afternoon, one of the folks who attended the hearing came to the microphone and said: Don't call it a healthcare bill; it is a wealth care bill. In fact, she is absolutely right. This bill cuts hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes for the richest so that they will do better, but it also cuts \$800 billion in Medicaid spending and investment to provide for that kind of tax cut. It is not a healthcare bill; it is a wealth care bill. And for most Americans, it is a catastrophic, cruel, and

costly insult to their intelligence, their health, and our American values. It is a sham and a charade, making possible those cuts for the rich—tax cuts for them—at the expense of our most vulnerable citizens. And it has been the result of a profoundly undemocratic process—secrecy and speed.

Despite the best efforts of our Republican colleagues to keep Americans in the dark about what this proposal would do, I have seen growing awareness, again, not only at these hearings but as I walk through the airport, as I march in parades—twice over this weekend—as I attend public gatherings. Whether it is Boys State, sponsored by the American Legion for 16- and 17-year-olds, or nursing facilities for elderly citizens, there is a growing awareness that this bill is bad—profoundly bad—for the American people.

The people I have heard from have prescriptions to fill, appointments to make, lives to live, but they have come to these hearings on very short notice in Hartford and in New Haven, literally filling rooms so that there was standing room only.

I challenge my colleagues to hold the same kinds of hearings, to delay this vote so that they can go home at the end of this week and hold hearings in their State and listen to their constituents about what they have to say and what the consequences will be.

Nearly 1 in 10 veterans has Medicaid coverage, meaning that a staggering 1.75 million veterans, including 18,000 veterans in Connecticut, would be impacted by these reckless cuts. Let me repeat that number for all of us who rejoiced in the recent Accountability and Whistleblowers Act. Some 1.75 million veterans—18,000 of them in Connecticut—will be harmed by this reckless and needless insult and injury.

Put simply, this bill would make it hard for veterans with mental health disorders like post-traumatic stress disorder to get care. Nearly a quarter of all veterans receive care for mental health disorders outside the VA system, meaning they rely on protections that guarantee their access to affordable care. Under this proposal, those protections would be severely threatened, and the veterans who need that care would see that care at risk.

Here we are talking about a choice program that enables veterans to seek care outside the VA system, privately, and we are endangering care for millions of Americans—veterans—who need and seek it by using Medicaid.

If my colleagues listen to their constituents, they will hear from many of the people who have come to my townhalls, like Christine Girassi. Christine has two beautiful 4-year-old twins named McKenzie and Cameron. McKenzie was born with Prader-Willi syndrome, a rare genetic disorder that her mom described as "including low muscle tone, seizures, temperature in-

stability, sleep apnea, infertility, OCD, intellectual disabilities, and developmental delay."

In the first few weeks of her life, McKenzie was in the hospital for 57 days, accounting for \$2 million in costs. Their family was spending \$30,000 a year to help their daughter thrive. So when Christine learned that her daughter had received a waiver to become a Medicaid beneficiary, she was overjoyed.

Christine told me:

When we received McKenzie's diagnosis, we were told that she wouldn't do a lot of things, and at only 4 years old she's already defying the odds. I have no doubt in my mind that if we are able to continue down our current path of the proper therapies and doctors, McKenzie will be able to have her fruitful life. I am terrified if the rug comes out beneath her that she will become just another statistic.

Another statistic? There are enough statistics in that CBO report. We will hear a plethora of statistics on the floor, but a picture is worth a thousand words and many more than a thousand statistics, and no one—no one should be consigned to being a statistic.

This family is one of the many faces and pictures and stories of Medicaid. They deserve to be heard. If we gut this program, if we strip away the important services it provides, we know all too well what will happen to McKenzie and her family as statistics. Like her mother said, Medicaid has been the path to success for them, and that rug will be pulled from that family, from beneath McKenzie.

At the hearing on Friday in New Haven, I heard from Kent O'Brien, who told me about the eight prescription medications he takes—four for psychiatric reasons and four for medical reasons.

Of course, mental health parity has been one of the crusades of my life. When I was State attorney general, I worked with Senator Ted Kennedy and Congressman Patrick Kennedy to help advocate for that bill. As a Senator, I advocated for the regulations that were necessary for its enforcement, and we finally got it done.

I want to quote what Kent said directly. He told me:

Hi, everybody, how are you today? I'm going to keep this brief, because I know the senators are on a very strict time constraint and I respect that. So I'm just going to talk very quickly about my prescription medications; there are eight of them. Four of them are for psychiatric reasons and four are medical. And if I lose my Medicare and Medicaid, I will be unable to pay for them obviously, which in turn I will end up in the hospital.

Kent went on:

Now, for the Republicans who are seeing this in Washington, can you please listen to me carefully?

I am speaking to an empty Chamber. Let nobody make any mistake that Republicans are hanging on Kent's words as I speak now, but every one of them

should go to the RECORD. Every one of them should be listening in their offices. Every one of them should go to the RECORD.

Kent goes on:

If I lose that medication, I will end up in the hospital, and it's going to cost the state and the federal government much more money than it would be to simply let me go to the pharmacy and pick up my medication.

If there were ever a message that Washington should hear, it is from Kent O'Brien, who closed by simply saying:

So I'm just going to close up with that, and don't hurt the American people. Help them!

If you met Kent, you would wonder how he was capable of that eloquence. He is an ordinary American, someone who looks like all the rest of us. He has said to this body what it means to hear: "Don't hurt the American people." He couldn't be more right. This proposal would cost our Nation so much, not just financially—Kent had it right—but morally. It will lead to a weakening of what makes our country strong and great in the first place: our ability to care about our neighbor, to fight for what is right, and to listen to the people who represent here in the Senate.

First, do no harm. That is what the ethos of the medical profession is. It ought to be our mantra as well. It ought to be what my colleagues, if nothing else, heed as we reach this decision to listen to people who sent us here and hear their stories. Listen to the anxieties and fears and value of America. They will tell you all you need to know about this bill. Kent told me. As he said, the cost will be staggering—not just in financial terms but in human terms.

This bill—written behind closed doors, away from the light of day, away from the realities of medical care in the United States of America, away from the voices and faces I have brought to the floor today, and which I will continue to bring to the floor—ignores the most important thing we can do this week. As Kent said, don't hurt the American people. As the doctors tell us: First, do no harm.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to start by thanking my colleague from the State of Connecticut for bringing those powerful testimonies to the floor of the Senate. It is really important that all of us—all 100 of us—spend time back home in our States listening to people who are telling us those kinds of stories.

I have received over 2,500 calls in my office just since Thursday, all of them strongly opposed to this so-called healthcare proposal.

Some things improve with time. Some things improve with age, like red wine. Some things get stinkier and

smellier the longer they sit out there, like rotten things. That is the case with the series of Republican so-called healthcare bills, TrumpCare 1, TrumpCare 2.0, and now, TrumpCare 3.0. They are all rotten to the core, and the more they sit out there, the stinkier they get, and the American people know it.

If you had any doubts, take a look at the most recent Congressional Budget Office report we got today. There is a pretty clear pattern between all of these Congressional Budget Office reports and the first bill we saw and the second bill and now on this latest version.

Here is the pattern. Tens of millions of Americans will lose access to affordable healthcare in the United States of America in order to provide tax breaks for powerful special interests and richer Americans. That is the pattern. In this most recent report, we are told by the nonpartisan professionals at the Congressional Budget Office that 22 million of our fellow Americans are going to lose access to affordable healthcare. For what? To give powerful special interests and wealthy Americans a tax break.

Insurance companies currently are not allowed to deduct the bonuses they pay to their CEOs. Now you are going to allow insurance companies to deduct the bonuses they pay to CEOs, and while tens of millions of Americans will lose access to affordable care, millionaires in America will get an average annual tax break of \$50,000 a year, every year.

So make no mistake. You can call this a healthcare bill, but it has nothing to do with healthcare and everything to do with wealth care and transferring wealth from more struggling vulnerable Americans to the very wealthy.

If this were about healthcare, why is it that we have all received in our offices long lists from patient advocacy organizations that are dead-set against this legislation? These are organizations that have been dedicated to trying to improve healthcare for people and patients in our country: the American Cancer Society, the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, National Alliance on Mental Illness, National Breast Cancer Coalition, and National Multiple Sclerosis Society. The list goes on and on from organizations that have dedicated themselves to advancing patient health.

On the other side, I haven't seen a single—not one—patient advocacy group that has come out to support this so-called healthcare bill. How can that be? If this is good for the health of our fellow citizens, why is it we have a long list of organizations dedicated to that cause against it and not one for it?

How about healthcare providers, the folks who help provide the care to our constituents? They are all dead-set against it: the nurses, the doctors, the hospitals, the people who have that network of care.

I was just out on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, a rural part of our State. The National Rural Health Association is opposed to this bill. They know the people they serve are going to be badly hurt, and, by the way, it is also going to hurt the economies in those parts of our State, especially the rural parts of the States, because those hospitals depend heavily on many of the people who get help through the Affordable Care Act, whether through the exchanges or through expanded Medicaid. As those patients come in the door and no longer can pay for their care, those hospitals said they may have to close down operations and lay people off. It is a double whammy—bad for patients and bad for those who provide the care to our patients.

That is why AARP has been all out against this, because they know that for Americans between the ages of 50 and 64, before you get on Medicare, this is a total disaster. As they have said, there is an age tax. If you are older, you are going to pay a whole lot more under this Republican bill than you pay today.

Many people are just realizing now as they follow this debate that two out of three Americans who are in nursing homes today are supported by Medicaid payments. So millions of our fellow Americans who now get their care in nursing homes, where Medicaid is providing support for two out of three, are going to be put at risk and made vulnerable because of this legislation.

Remember, Donald Trump said he wasn't going to cut Medicaid. This cuts it by over \$750 billion. Make no mistake, on this issue, this Senate bill is a lot meaner than the House bill. We all know that President Trump out in the Rose Garden celebrated the passage of the House bill. But behind closed doors, what did he call it? Mean. This Senate bill, as time goes on, will cut Medicaid far more deeply than the House bill. As we look at this Congressional Budget Office report, it talks about how you get to the end of year 8 and 9 and 10, and you go beyond that. You are going to have very deep cuts, much more painful, much meaner than in the Senate bill.

We have heard a lot about pre-existing conditions. The reality is that the Senate bill is very devious in this regard. It is a great sleight of hand. On the one hand, it creates the impression that if you have preexisting conditions, you are going to be all right. But what it pretends to give with one hand, it takes away with the other. It makes those Americans as vulnerable as they were before the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

I am not talking about those who are directly benefitting, like those on expanded Medicaid or those in the exchanges. I am talking about those who are benefiting from the patient protections in the Affordable Care Act.

I just got a note the other day from Mark in my State of Maryland saying:

My son was diagnosed with Crohn's disease in 2008, at age 18. He was repeatedly denied insurance and was only able to cover part of the cost of care through the Maryland high-risk pool. Obamacare made it possible for him to be insured and care for this lifelong disease.

It was ObamaCare that "will literally save his life." We have many stories like this one from others who were denied access to care because of pre-existing conditions before the Affordable Care Act.

There is another major sleight of hand in this Senate Republican proposal, and that relates to premiums. I have been listening. We have been hearing a lot from our Republican Senate colleagues about how this is going to bring down the price of premiums. We all know that what Americans care about is what they are having to put out in total for their healthcare. There are premiums. How much is the deductible? Great, I got a lower premium, but my deductible is now \$10,000. There are copays.

Here is the dirty little secret if you dig into the Congressional Budget Office report, after listening to many of our Republican colleagues talk about premiums. Now, you have to translate a little bit here because this is in the budgetese of the Congressional Budget Office. What they say on page 9 is this: Some people enrolled in nongroup insurance—in other words, in the individual market, the people who are currently in the Affordable Care Act exchanges—would experience substantial increases in what they would spend on healthcare even though benchmark premiums would decline on average in 2020 and years later.

So the translation is that in some cases the premium—that sticker price—may go down, but you are going to end up paying a whole lot more when it comes to your deductible and your copays.

It goes on to say that because nongroup insurance—in other words, the individual market—would pay for a smaller average share of benefits under this legislation, most people purchasing it would have higher out-of-pocket spending on healthcare than under current law. It goes on and on.

In other words, keep your eye on the ball, America, because when someone tells you your premiums are going to go down, watch what happens to all your other healthcare costs. The Congressional Budget Office, the non-partisan analysts, are telling you they are going up.

This brings me to my final point. I said at the beginning that some things

get better with time and some things get stinkier and smellier. We know that the more the American people get a look at this latest Senate Republican proposal—TrumpCare 3.0—the less they are going to like it. The more they see it, the more they will hate it. Just like something that is rotten gets stinkier with time, this will get worse and worse with time. That is why it is so important that we not try to jam this through the Senate.

I understand the Republican leader. He knows this is rotten to its core, and he knows the more it sits out there, the more people are going to see what it is all about and the more they are going to hate it.

Let's have a full debate, and let's make sure all of us go back to our States over the Fourth of July—to the parades, the barbecues, and the picnics—and look our constituents in the eye and tell them that we are going to take healthcare away from tens of millions of Americans, that we are going to open up the discrimination once again to preexisting conditions. We are going to increase their overall healthcare costs, even though we tell them we are going to be reducing them. Let's look them in the eye and tell them what this bill is all about rather than trying to push it through in 24 or 48 hours or later this week.

Our constituents deserve to know the facts, and we need to make sure we vote to protect the interests of the United States of America, not just provide another round of tax breaks to powerful special interests and millionaires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, you might think that for the last 7 years, the major complaint people had about the Affordable Care Act was that it hurt rich people, because they seem to be the only people who stand to gain with this Republican Senate healthcare plan. They get a giant tax break. The rest of America, on the other hand, is in trouble.

With TrumpCare, healthcare will cost more, and 22 million people are going to lose their healthcare altogether. Some healthcare bill. To put this in perspective, imagine if everyone lost their healthcare in Hawaii, Maine, Nevada, Alaska, West Virginia, Ohio, Idaho, and Wyoming. That is what TrumpCare does. That is 22 million Americans. It also devastates one of the best healthcare programs this country has.

With this bill, Medicaid is going to lose nearly \$800 billion. If your only worry is that your investment income gets taxed at 3.8 percent every year, you can breathe a sigh of relief. Let me drill down on that because one of the most egregious tax breaks in this bill—and this is mostly a tax cut bill and not a healthcare bill—is the following:

If you are making \$200,000 as an individual or \$250,000 as a couple, capital gains income is currently taxed at 3.8 percent. If you are making \$200,000 as an individual or \$250,000 as a couple and you have capital gains, not regular income, it is taxed at 3.8 percent. This bill zeros that tax out. This bill zeros that tax out. On top of that, it is retroactive. Think about the absurdity.

Here we are. I am looking at the Senator from Pennsylvania and how much he has advocated for children and especially for children with disabilities. I am looking at the Senator from Connecticut and the work he has done for people with chronic diseases and mental health challenges and the resources we need for that. And in the middle of a supposedly oriented toward healthcare piece of legislation, we are giving a retroactive capital gains tax cut to people who make over \$250,000 a year in combined income. It is absurd. It is not a healthcare bill.

If you have a loved one in a nursing home, if you are pregnant or thinking of having a baby, if your kid has a disability that requires costly care, if you work two jobs but your employer doesn't provide health insurance, then this bill does not take care of you. Instead of less taxes, you get less care, and you are going to pay more for it.

This is what happens when legislators don't have committee hearings or they refuse to meet with patients, doctors, nurses, advocates, their own constituents. There have been so few town-halls about healthcare. There have been so few real Senate debates about healthcare.

I have seen every single Democratic Member of the Senate come here and talk about this piece of legislation. I have seen every single Republican Member of the Senate talk about legislation that they are proud of. I have seen very few people on the Republican side of the aisle come down and talk about this bill because they know it is not a good piece of legislation.

At this point, we are not even debating healthcare policy. It is not a question of what is the best way to get people to sign up for insurance or how we can lower premiums and deductibles or how we can improve the delivery system; it is a question of how many people are going to lose their healthcare so that insurance company CEOs can continue to make millions of dollars a year. That is literally what is in this bill. Those are the conversations we are having—nothing related to reforming the healthcare system or getting people more coverage for less but, rather, tax cuts for people who are involved in the healthcare industry.

How many grandparents are going to get kicked out of nursing homes? It is not a rhetorical question. My wife's grandmother was in a nursing home 2 months ago. It was a beautiful facility. They took great care of her. They had

three beds, three nursing home beds. I think the normal reimbursement is about \$9,000 a month. They took wonderful care of my wife's grandmother. They won't exist. That nursing home and all the nursing homes like it won't exist if there is an \$800 billion cut to Medicaid. This is not a theoretical conversation. This isn't even a partisan conversation. Everybody has nursing home beds in all of their home States. Everybody at least ought to know some middle-class people who rely on Medicaid for nursing homes.

CBO gave us the answer today. Too many people are going to be locked out of the healthcare system if this bill goes forward, and all for giant tax cuts.

Look, our healthcare system is not perfect. Changes need to be made, but this bill is just not it. It has no clear guiding principle other than slashing Medicaid to pay for tax cuts. We have to start over.

I am looking at the Presiding Officer, who was a speaker of the house in North Carolina and understands how to do a bill on a bipartisan basis. I am thinking of the numerous Republicans who are capable of working on a bipartisan bill that can get 60 votes.

By the way, the politics would change because if we worked on a bill that could get 60 votes, we would be in a wonderful position—the Senate is set up to encourage us to work together—because if we abide by that 60-vote threshold and we come up with a bill together, we would own the American healthcare system together. We don't get to play this blame game about what is happening with premiums or what is happening with coverage numbers. We actually, on the level, collaborate.

When you think about a bill or an issue that used to be as partisan as public education, we had LAMAR ALEXANDER and PATTY MURRAY come together. Heck, in the last Congress, we had JIM INHOFE and Barbara Boxer do a bill together. It is possible for us to do a bipartisan piece of legislation.

The decision was made to go with reconciliation, and that is backfiring because the problem with not involving Democrats is that there are Democrats across the country. The problem with not involving experts is that you end up with a product you can't defend.

What we really need to do is take a breath, take the Fourth of July weekend, and reconvene as a Congress—not as Democrats and Republicans but as Americans who understand that our healthcare system is not perfect, that it is in need of improvement, but this bill doesn't get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to pick up where my colleague from Hawaii left off. There is a wonderful analogy that President Obama used

after the 2016 election. As you could imagine, Democrats were pretty dejected the day after, and President Obama put it pretty simply. He said: Listen, just remember, these elections are intramural scrimmages. We put on temporary pinnies, Republicans and Democrats, but in the end, we all belong to the same team. We are all Americans.

Elections and legislative fights are temporary skirmishes before we recognize and realize our greater identity, which is that we have this commonality. Clearly, that is not what the American people see here. They think our primary identity is our partisan identity, and there is a lot of days in which we give them fodder for that belief.

It really is amazing, when it comes down to it, that when you think about the healthcare system, we do have the same goals in mind. There are actually lots of other issues on which we don't have the same goal. Republicans want to go left, and we want to go right. Republicans want to go right, and we want to go left. On healthcare, we actually all want to get to the same place: More people have access to health insurance, the cost of that insurance is less than it is today, and the quality of the care people get is better. It is funny because underneath that, it is just mechanics. It is not actually ideology. It is a decision as to which lever you press and which you don't.

I get that a lot of my Republican colleagues don't think we are sincere when we say: If you put this monstrosity of a bill aside, we will work with you to do something better. But it is sincere. We don't want to blow up Medicaid. We are not with you on that. We don't want to pass along big tax breaks, only going to the very wealthy. But we get that you want some more flexibility for States. We get that you want maybe an additional plan offered on the exchanges that doesn't have all the bells and whistles the existing plans do. But you get that we want stability in the exchanges. We want some certainty in the markets going forward.

There is an important conversation to be had here. Our hope is that, with this CBO score, maybe it will be the straw that breaks the camel's back, that will cause our Republican colleagues to give up this nonsensical approach to healthcare reform and work with us.

I am going to repeat some of the ground that has already been covered here in the next few minutes, but I want to go over some of the highlights of this CBO report.

Senator SCHATZ previewed this, but it is hard to get your head wrapped around what it means for 22 million people to lose insurance.

This is an old chart from the CBO score on the House bill that held that

under their approach, 23 million people would lose insurance. I X'd that out. We now have 22 million people who would lose insurance under the Senate approach. That is the entire combined population of Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, West Virginia, and South Dakota. All that happened between the House Bill and the Senate bill is that the people of Rhode Island got saved. I X'd out Rhode Island because Rhode Island has about 1 million people. About 1 million more people will have insurance under the Senate bill, but that is humanitarian catastrophe. That is a big deal, to have that many people lose insurance.

I know that is not what you set out to do. I know the Republicans didn't set out to do this, in part because I listened to Senator CORNYN come down and complain on the Senate floor relentlessly that the Affordable Care Act still left a whole bunch of people without insurance. In fact, he sent out a tweet today highlighting that the CBO does confirm that if current law continues, there will still be a lot of people without insurance. He left out the fact that the CBO says that under the Republican bill, 22 million more people will lose insurance, but that is a whole lot of people.

By the way, in the first year, CBO says 15 million people will lose insurance. Fifteen million people is the entire population of 13 States. That happens next year. Emergency rooms in this country cannot in 12 months absorb 15 million people losing insurance.

For all the folks who say that the ACA is in a death spiral, CBO says you are wrong. Very flatly, CBO says that if existing law remains, even without any improvements, the number of people without insurance effectively remains static. Yes, at the end, if you make no improvements, you will go from 26 million people not having insurance to 28 million people not having insurance.

CBO says—I had to change this because it used to be 51 million under the House bill. CBO now says 49 million people will lose insurance if you actually pass the bill the Senate is going to consider this week. The death spiral happens if we pass the Republican healthcare proposal. That is not a death spiral; that is stability. It is not an optimal result, 28 million people not having insurance, but it is far preferable to 49 million people not having insurance. I understand that Republicans will quibble with CBO and say that maybe they didn't get it exactly right. Even if they were 50 percent wrong, that is still over 10 million people losing insurance. By the way, just for good measure, CBO was right in their estimates of the percentage of Americans who would have insurance under the Affordable Care Act. Inside



of their estimate—the details worked out differently—but they said that by 2016, 89 percent of Americans would have health insurance, up from 83 percent prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Guess how many people have health insurance today: 89 percent of Americans, 89 to 90 percent of Americans.

We all agree that premiums should go down. If we are going to pass something, the result should be that premiums go down. Here is what CBO says: Premiums go up and not by a little bit. They go up by 20 percent in the first year. Admittedly, I am painting a partial picture here. That is 2018. After that, CBO says for certain populations in this country, premiums will go down, but it is largely for the young, the healthy, and the wealthy.

CBO says that you will have massive premium increases for older Americans. For lower income Americans who are in that age bracket of 50 to 64, premium increases will go up by at least two times, up to four times.

CBO also says that if you are lower income, you are not going to buy insurance because you can't afford it. It doesn't even matter what your premiums are because they will be so high, you can't afford them. Premiums go up for everybody off the bat—and for lots of vulnerable people after that.

So who gets hurt? Everybody, except for the folks who are getting tax cuts. If you are an insurance company, a drug company, or you are super rich—maybe that is an unfair term—people making \$200,000 or more a year get tax cuts, but most of the tax cuts go to the super rich. People making over \$1 million a year will do fine. If you are an insurance company, a drug company, or you are very wealthy, you get a great deal out of this piece of legislation, but pretty much everybody else gets very badly hurt.

Today, one of our Republican colleagues said this to a reporter—I won't give you a name. One of our Republican Senate colleagues, when he was asked about the Republican healthcare proposal, said: "I am not sure what it does. I just know it's better than ObamaCare." That is about as perfect an encapsulation of the Republican positioning on this bill as I can imagine, because if you did know what it did—if my Republican colleagues did get deep into the CBO report, it doesn't solve a single problem in the American healthcare system. There are big problems, such as 26 million people still don't have insurance. This bill makes it worse.

People are paying too much for insurance, especially those folks who are making middle incomes who are just outside of qualifying for the Medicaid subsidies. This bill makes it worse. Almost every problem is made worse by this piece of legislation. I guess that is sort of what a lot of Americans won-

der—if our Republican colleagues do know what is in this bill. "I am not sure what it does. I just know that it's better than ObamaCare."

This solves one problem for Republicans. It is a political problem. Republicans have said for the last 8 years that they are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. My Republican friends promised it in every corner of this country, at every opportunity they had, and this does solve that political problem. If you pass this bill, you can successfully claim that you have repealed the Affordable Care Act, but that is the only problem it solves. It makes almost every other problem in this system worse.

The number of people without insurance goes up. Premiums, especially for the poor, the vulnerable, go up. There is nothing in this bill that addresses the cost of healthcare, of drugs, of devices, of procedures. There is nothing in this bill that talks about the quality of healthcare. Every problem—virtually every problem in the healthcare system gets worse.

I will just end by reiterating the offer that Senator SCHATZ made. I think you have a lot of people of very good will who want to work with Republicans and are sincere about it. I will be part of whatever group gets put together if this bill falls apart this week.

I held an emergency hearing in New Haven, CT, on Monday, just to try to explain to people what was in the Republican Senate proposal and to get people's feedback. It was hard to sit through. It was 2½ hours of some really scared folks.

I will be honest with the Presiding Officer. Most of the people who came had disabled kids. Most of the people who came had disabled kids who were on or relied on Medicaid, and they were just scared to death about what was going to happen to their children. But they also talked about the problems that still exist in the healthcare system—the fact that drugs are too expensive. Many of them pay too much for healthcare. They wanted those problems solved, and they wanted us to work with Republicans on it.

Senator SCHATZ was right. If we did it together, we would own it together. It would stop being a political football. While that would be a secondary benefit to the actual good that would come from a bipartisan piece of legislation that actually addresses the issues in the underlying healthcare system, it would be a pretty remarkable good that is possible because we have the same goals in mind. We both want the same things. It is just, in the end, putting aside this bill that makes all of those problems worse and, instead, sitting down together and deciding which levers we want to push to make things better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise, as well, to talk tonight about the issue of healthcare. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for looking down the road to when, maybe, we can actually work together on this issue. We are in conflict this week, and that is not a place any of us want to be.

We are in conflict because of the elements of this bill. I will make two basic points in my remarks tonight, one about Medicaid and then one point about another provision in the bill that I think is particularly insulting.

A lot of our discussions start with policy and data, and that is important. That is obviously part of the debate about the bill and what is in it and what impact it will have on programs and people over a long period of time, but part of this debate, of course, is about the people we represent. I know the Presiding Officer understands this, and I am heartened that he is paying attention to our arguments because sometimes—I have done it myself—when you preside, sometimes you are doing something else. So we are grateful for his attention.

I have talked on this floor a couple of times over the last couple of weeks—even months—and I will not repeat the stories because they have been told a number of times, but Rowan Simpson is a young man whom I recently just met. His mom had sent me a letter. Rowan is on the autism spectrum, and his mom is very worried about his future because of the potential impact on Medicaid and the benefits he is getting today from Medicaid.

I just referred the other day—I guess it was Thursday on the floor—to a letter from a dad about his son Anthony, who has a number of challenges, one of them being that he is on the autism spectrum. I have another letter, as well, which I will not go through tonight, but it is from a mom in Northeastern Pennsylvania, who wrote to me about two of her children—principally, her son who has Type 1 diabetes and what the loss of Medicaid coverage will mean for that child, who, in this case, is just 4 years old.

Everyone in this Chamber in both parties has stories like this to tell—stories about people who are, because of a disability, totally dependent upon Medicaid. That is not unique to one State, and, of course, it is not unique to one party.

One of the more egregious and objectionable parts of this 140-plus page bill is the impact it will have on Medicaid—the Medicaid expansion, which many people now know represents probably on the order of 11 million people who got healthcare coverage since 2010 and got that coverage because Medicaid was expanded. But the bill also speaks to the Medicaid Program itself by the so-called per capita cap, capping the dollars the Federal Government would provide in the future



with regard to the Federal-State partnership on Medicaid. These are big stakes when it comes to a program that has been with us for 50 years.

As everyone knows, Medicaid is principally about individuals with disabilities, and that is obviously those children I mentioned. It is about folks who need some help getting into a nursing home, senior citizens. Of course, it is about kids from low-income families who have no other healthcare, absent Medicaid. In our State, there happen to be 1.1 million kids on Medicaid who are from low-income families. The disability number in both children and adults is, by one estimate, more than 722,000 people. These are big stakes, even if it is just involving one of those individuals or hundreds or thousands. But as I will refer to later, some of the numbers are, of course, a lot higher than that. So those stories and those pleas for help from those families obviously do not just inform us, but they inspire us to keep working, to keep fighting. I will be fighting against this bill as long as it takes.

It is likely that we will have a vote this week. I am assuming we will, so we have only hours and a few days to fight and point out what we believe to be the defects. One of the things that is significant about this debate is that we have had people not just writing those stories and telling us their story but also telling us and giving us ideas about how to conduct the debate and how to fight and how to oppose it.

I have in my hand—I will describe it first before I offer a consent request. I have in my hand several pages that list almost 600 names from people in Pennsylvania who have written to me over the last number of weeks and months, actually. What they are urging me to do is to pursue a legislative strategy to protect their healthcare. Why are they doing that? It is not because they have nothing else to do. They are worried. These people are really worried. They are worried about those kids like Rowan and Anthony, whom I just mentioned, and a 4-year-old with Type 1 diabetes or a whole long list of other disabilities a lot of kids have. They are worried about their parents, who may not be able to get the long-term care they need if Medicaid is capped and cut and decimated. They are worried about their friends and their families. They are, in a word, as worried as anyone has ever been about the healthcare of those they love and the healthcare of those they care about. That is why they have been writing and going to meetings and making phone calls and engaging in such a robust way, all these weeks and months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list of almost 600 names from Pennsylvanians be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ashley De Padua, Carol Ribner, Lisa Brown, Adam Huard, Julie Strauss, Amy Reynolds, Dianne Spatafore, Pamela Nolan, Karin Fox, Claire Witzleben, Wendy Albertson, Laura Rose, John Mack Jr., Elizabeth Failor, Lisa Bargielski, Peg Welch, Jason Carnahan, Robert Perry, Morgan Vinokurovi, Melissa Byrne.

Patricia DeWald, Kristin Kondrlik, Michael Crane, Diane Smith-Hoban, Diane Sayre, Benjamin Andrew, Janice Diehl, Robert Bahn, John Bair, Angela McClain, David Cassiday, Dara Bortman, Judi Reiss, Nicholas Marritz, Amber Blaylock, Tina Nightlinger, Lisa Bradshaw, Kimber Schladweiler, Michael Dwyer, Vashti Bandy.

Christine Russell, Mary Farrington, Ralph Mcdermott, Anna Cunningham, Linette Schreiber, Barbara Powell, Shelley Francies, Joyce Pentross, Shannon Bearman, Jocie Dye, Ina Martin, Mary-jo Tucker, Bracken Babula, David Mosenkis, Martha Franklin, Nathaniel Missildine, Kristin Nielsen, Maria Duca, Erica Bartlett, Irina Pogrebivsky.

Stephanie Romano, David Hincer, Diane Holland, Tracy Krider, Michelle Nutini, Anne Martin, Tracey Miles, Alexis Lieberman, Dorothy Posh, Thomas Hennessey, Cynthia Mould, Jennifer Kunkle, Ann Calamia, Jennifer Zoga, Barbara Turk, Raymond Hopkins, Carol Proud, Alex Hesten, Kimberly Jones, Richard Pavonarius.

Robert Huff, Klvdia Vasylenko, Mike Kass, Bernadette Flinchbaugh, Jo Johnson, Carolyn L. Johnson, Abby Godfrey, Mark Herr, Jeri Sebastian, Lisa Hartjen, Anne Smith, Melissa Nurczynski, Christine Crooke, Ellen Garbuny, Harry Richards, Ruth Hetrick, Carolyn Rahe, Stephanie Moats, Sally McAfee, Abigail Gertner.

Stacey Smith, Davinica Nemptzow, TC DeAngelis, Shelley Schwartz, Lisa Keppeler, Katie B, Joseph Willard, Maryam Deloffre, Kathie Brown, Ellen Catanese, Cynthia Donahue, Porter Hedge, Gretchen Bond, Mary Dallas, Fae Ehsan, Kathy Goldberg, Jennifer Jarret, Dan Potter, David Dutkowski, Rich DeAngelis.

Patricia Kay, Sharon Doros, Stephanie Doyle, Lynn Loomis, Elizabeth Adams, Kathryn Petz, Agatha Andrews, Alex Lombardi, Erin Gautsche, Marie Turnbull, Carol Sinclair, Robert Turnbull, Elisa Bermudez, Marie Vincent, Florian Schwarz, Daniel Pencoske, Ina Shea, Beth Collins, Meenakshi Bewtra, Jillian Bosmann.

Mari Greipp, Michael DiEva, Andrea Epstein, Fredrica Friedman, Starla Crandall, Stanley G., Cindy Fogarty, Ron Ashworth, Trudy Watt, Kristen King, Kathleen Sheehan, Ryan Brown, Kevin Collins, Kelly Collister, Ambry Ward, Joseph Melchiorre, Catherine Abrams, Michael Bourg, Ed Gragert, Hien Lu.

Jo Johnson, Cody McFarland, Maggie Deptola, Sandra Blair, Zoe Soslow, Yoko Takahashi, Anna Drallios, William Dingfelder, Shawna Knipper, Cheryl Brandt, Larissa Mogano, Linda Bishop, Lital Levy, Laurie Pollack, Judith Navratil, Natalie Duvall, Richard Owens, Elaine Giarusso, David Thomas, Leslie Collier.

Nicole Seefeldt, Jonathan Lipman, Ellen Gallagher, MaryAnn Black, David Hughes, Michael Niemeyer, Pegene Watts, Kelly Sack, Glynnis Arnold, Ruth Lawson, Michelle LeMenager, Iris Valanti, Danielle Callahan, Frederick Ward, Martha Haines, Audrey Marsh, Lynn Campbell, Kristen Cochran, Judith Brennan, Michael McCabe.

Joshua Miner, Jaime Bassman, Rachel Murphy, Elena Knickman, Nelson Vecchione, Daniel Laurison, Karen Osilka, Roger Knisely, Theresa Baraldi, Holly Best, Thom-

as Baraldi, Patricia Walsh, Michelle Herr, Karen Heenan, James Paul Johnson, Alexander Kimball, Sigal Ben, Leah Durand, Ingrid Gustafsson, Mary Jo Maggio.

Ken Hardis, Lisa DeAngelis, Mary Jo Harris, Alice Ung, Lance Flowers, Deborah Hoelper, Joel Cardis, Georgine Dongillig, Renee Donahey, Anna Payne, Hallie Kushner, Linda Cortese, Mark Vecchione, Natalie Garner, Rachel Marx, Janet Cavallo, Adrienne Gunter, Heather Turnage, Kenneth Reisman, Flora McGettigan.

Tricia Connell, Nicole Conley, GiGi Malinchak, Ellen Toplin, Eileen Brumbaugh, Theodore Fallon, Elizabeth Dooley, Stacy Klein, Deena Thornton, Barbara Stephan, Cheryl Dungee, Louisa Alexander, Brett Krasnov, Mary Gallant, Kathy Gardian, Irene Lin, Colleen Dunn, Liane Norman, Susan Yerk, Ann Telford.

Leslie Elder, Sheri Utain, Christine Hooper, Teri Vanore, Paula Baxter, Mordecai Marl Mac Low, Nicolette Byer, Donna Vito, Michele Forbes, Rebecca Kane, Katherine Fein, Sue Meyers, Deb Yohman, Sherri Suppa, Jim Greipp, Jeffrey Bussmann, Rachel Smith, Eileen Reed, Louise Beer, Mary Reichart.

Tesia Barone, Nicole Gilchrist, Richard Greenstein, Amy Levengood, Judith Max, James Walton, Mary Widing, En B, Mary Jo Harris, E. E. Zachai, Tammy Harkness, Timothy McCormick, J Pensiero, Betty Fisher, Cindy Shannon, Elisabeth Whyte, Carmela Daniels, Amy Felton, Judith Gold, Jack Guida.

Sarah Gaffen, Linda Bullock, Pamela Woldow, Katherine Kurtz, Lisa Harrison, Esther Wyss-Flamm, Catherine Roundy, Jim Barlow, James Schreiber, Dave Carlton, Andrew Famiglietti, Maria Catrambone Rosen, Breanna Jay, Bethany Altieri, Alicia Oliviant Fisher, Chris Braak, Jessica Atchison, Elizabeth Dennis, Elizabeth Cates, Elizabeth Reilly.

James Berry, Marita Scheibe, Sheila Thomas, Randy Sarnier, Alyson D'Alessandro, Suann Snavelt, Chantal McKelton, Theresa Glennon, Josie Byzek, Marlene Katz, Deborah Grill, John Moffa, Anne Coles, Liane Norman, Chanda Lawrence, Norma Kline, Colleen Kessler, Maria Catrambone Rosen, Laurence Coles, Kate Wallis.

Carol Harris-Shapiro, Briana Latta, Melanie B, Charlotte Ridge, Nathan Krisanda, Meredith Sonnen, Margaret Walter, Hallam Carrie, Leslie Richards, Jenny Anne Horst-Martz, Karen Roberson, Richard Vanore, Susan Devenny, Rhana Cassidy, Maria Golden, Kathy O'Brien, Vanessa Baker, Robert Brucimann, Sarah Smith, Yuliya Benina.

John Ascenzi, Melanie Cichy, Paul Gottlieb, Shannon Browne, Jen Britton, Erin Dunke, Debi Seltzer, Anna Edling, Brianna Wronko, Francis Palombaro, Katie Morrison, Jennifer Hombach, Jessica Lennick, Ellen Toplin, Charlene Kurland, Joanne Mahoney, Sherry Greenawalt, Abigail Hyde, Sara Sierschula, Amy Leddy.

Emmy S, Renee Broxk, Kimberly Winnick, Melissa Reed, Lisa Jaremka, Karen Shelly-Genther, Melissa Welshko-Williams, Naomi Pliskow, Joan Susski, Rachael Pinsky, Lindsay Friedman, Shari Johnson, Melanie B, Keith Adams, Lynn Martin, Anastasia Frandsen, Brooke Petry, Tamara Davis, Martha Posnet, Phoebe Wood.

Lindee Fitting, Isabelle Mahoney, Tamar Granor, Nancy Berman, Karen Jensen, Katie Haurer, Beth Collins, Catherine Budd, Miriam Phillips, Christine Bradley, Michelle Gorski, Chris Gorski, Sophie Taylor, Catherine Borges, Mary Alice Clevenger, Nick

Ingram, Brenda Scholtz, Melissa Miller, Jeanne Burd, Nad Rosenberg.

Joanna Kempner, Maria Boyd, David Shen, Sara Sobel, Jessica White, Jennifer Pennington, Margot Keith, Catherine Sunnen, Naida Reed, Ashley Morgan, Beth Brindle, Amy Friedlander, Millicent Wilson, Richard Baron, Max Ray-Riek, Ruth Cary, Sandy Heisey, Sharon Furlong, Laura Tilger, Donkey Dover.

Lynn Jones, Kaytee Ray-Riek, Janice Test, Mary Terp, Faith Cotter, Sarah Campbell-Szymanski, Frank Wallace, Judie Howrylak, Minna Ltumey, Erin Hetrick, Melinda Kohn, Jenny Stephens, Susan Gambler, Olivia Landis, Terry Hirst-Hermans, Jill Hall, Roseanne Mulherin, Susan Miller, Julie Platt, Lori Spangler.

Hiro McNulty, Greg Carey, Amanda Fogarty, Sissy Gault, Mona Callahan, Meryl Mintzer Puller, John Hoetzel, Stacey Kallem, Thomas Paquette, Karen Clark, Paige Wolf, Patricia Scanlon, Ellen Reese, Rosalind Bloom, Gary Stein, Eric Berue, Jenn Hrehocik, Tamara Myers, Mara Kaplan, Amanda Cranney.

Deborah Miller, Debra Nathans, Paul Stockhausen, Johanna Hollway, Leah Holstein, Susan Robbins, Roger Latham, Alison Yazer, Melissa Marshall, Mary Lynn Colabrese, Harry McLaughlin, Samantha Payne, Elizabeth Hawkins, Julie Krug, Lisa Heinz, Shoshana Kaplan, Corrine Richter, Lee Baer, Eve Glazier, JoEllen Bitzer.

Judith Cardamone, Hilary Schenker, Faye Clawson, Caren Leonard, Carol Feldhaus, Judith Moyer, Sharyn Feldman, Jessica Martucci, Mike Kutik, Marylou Streznewski, Ann Baker, Abby Martucci, Dennis Cusin, Marie Norman, Debra Brokenshire, Martha Cornell, Maria Swarts, Sherell Chambers, Suzan Hirsch, Alison Wojtkowiak.

Patricia Carbone, Marcella Glass, Benjamin Mills, Peg Welch, Rita Shah, Marcia Gever, Karen Phoenix, Tabitha Felton, Carolyn Stillwell, Katherine Parys, Roxanne O'Toole, Harold Love, Nicole Jaffe, Steven Weitzman, Meredith Brown, Lauren Lewis, Sarah Wheeler, Maria Lauro, Jason Magidson, Lorette Lefebvre.

Denise Marcolina, Eric Krewson, Joseph Bosh, Joan Stein, Kami Schaal, Melissa Nerino, Dorothy McFadden, Heather Muntean, Donna Devonish, Gloria Rohlf, Terry McIntyre, Kaitlin Marks-Dubbs, Frederick Page, Douglas Graham, Sarah McKay, Zack Greenstein, Janice Nathan, Michel Wilcox, L Roulston, Laura Wukovitz.

Andrew Wilson, Amy Moulton, Christina VanSant, Donna Bullard, Nancy Entwisle, Tessa Lamont-Siegel, Ben Cocchiario, Yasmeen Ali Khan, Rachel Amdur, Amalia Shaltiel, Sara Stetler, Bruce McDowell, Pat Hanahoe-Dosch, Mara Rockliff, Tristan English, Ryan Bross, Lynn Rubenson, Elizabeth Cheney, Regina Vicoli, Vicki Hewitt.

Kelli Servello, Charles Ang, Kierstyn Piotrowski Zolfo, Leah Bailis, Tom Petersen, Pamela Magidson, Kathleen Morrison, Genevieve Coutroubis, Susan Rubinstein, Ruth Ann Davidson, Frances Winsor, Janis Rainer, Margaret Grubbs, Anna Kuhnreich, Melissa Melan, Wendy Forman, Kristina Witter, Joan Kwortnik.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I will make two final points about Medicaid and then juxtapose Medicaid with another part of the bill. If you look at the bill—it is about 140, I guess, 142 pages—more than 60 pages deal with Medicaid. So this is principally a bill about Medicaid. There are some other issues, obviously, addressed on the exchanges

and the fundamentals of healthcare. But it is mostly about Medicaid and tax cuts, unfortunately; and that is particularly objectionable to me that you have a small group of very wealthy people who are going to make out in ways we can't even imagine, like a big bonanza for the superrich.

Now, let me just talk about the Medicaid part of it first, and then I will refer to a chart. I am holding in my hand the Congressional Budget Office report from today, which came out. It, of course, is a document produced by the Congressional Budget Office as well as the Joint Committee on Taxation so it is a joint effort.

On the CBO—so-called CBO Congressional Budget Office report, recently—a couple weeks ago now—on page 17 of that document, there was an assessment made of the number of people who would lose Medicaid as a result of the House bill, and that number was 14 million Americans would lose Medicaid over the decade up until 2026.

Well, unfortunately, as of 4 p.m. or something this afternoon—I guess about 4 p.m., 4:30—we got the Congressional Budget Office assessment of the Senate bill, the Senate bill that was unveiled last week. Not on page 17 of this report but actually on page 16, here is what the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation says about enrollment in Medicaid. I am quoting from the bottom of page 16:

Enrollment in Medicaid would be lower throughout the coming decade, with 15 million fewer Medicaid enrollees by 2026 than projected under current law in CBO's March 2016 baseline.

Then, they refer to a figure in the report.

So the House bill CBO assessment says 14 million will lose Medicaid coverage. The Senate bill, analyzed by CBO, which is supposed to be a more moderate bill, a better bill in the eyes of some Republican Members of the House and the Senate, that was supposed to be better, but here is what we know now: 15 million people will lose Medicaid. That alone should cause any Senator to be very concerned about the impact of this legislation. That alone should, I hope, require some people to use an old expression: Examine your conscience about what will happen if you vote for this legislation.

Let's say someone says: Do you know what? I can put that into context, and I think actually that will not happen or I have another explanation or whatever justification or rationale you use for voting for a bill that will result in 15 million people losing Medicaid coverage. People are very vulnerable. Let's just say you can analyze that a different way and come to a different conclusion. We will see how people deal with that number this week when they go home and when they have to talk about this legislation over time.

Here is where it gets a lot worse. This is a chart that is rather simple. Even though it has a lot of data on it, it is rather simple. Here is what it says at the top. First of all, this isn't my chart; it is the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities' chart. You can go to cbpp.org to see it.

This is based upon the House bill, but I just told you that the Medicaid enrollment number is 1 million higher—or that the number losing Medicaid is 1 million higher under the Senate bill, and the tax cuts that are in the Senate bill are almost identical. You can just go down and count them. The House and Senate bill are virtually identical on tax cuts.

Here is what the headline is: Tax cuts for the top 400 roughly equal to Federal spending cuts from ending Medicaid expansion.

Now, remember, I said before that Medicaid expansion is one problem I see. The per capita cap is another. This chart just deals with one of the Medicaid problems—Medicaid expansion—so ending Medicaid expansion in Nevada, West Virginia, Arkansas, and Alaska, just four States, right? Alaska, they project, will lose \$2 billion worth of Medicaid over the decade, Arkansas would lose \$7 billion, West Virginia would lose \$12 billion, and Nevada would lose \$12 billion. That adds up to \$33 billion Federal Medicaid cuts from ending Medicaid expansion. So \$33 billion dollars just for States. By the way, these are not really high-population States. There is no California, New York, Texas or big States like that. So \$33 billion lost in Medicaid in just those four States.

What does this orange bar graph show? The same number, \$33 billion tax cut for the 400 highest income households in the country. It is the same number. So 400 households get a tax cut of \$33 billion, not in some other bill down the road, not in some other year, not in a budget bill or a tax bill. They get this massive tax cut in what is called a healthcare bill. At the same time, it is equivalent to the total Medicaid lost in just four States.

It gets worse if you add more States. Guess what. If you add up about 30 States in a different chart, it is about the same as all the tax cuts together, but here we are just talking about four States and 400 families.

I hope I am not offending anyone if they are in those top 400 households who are making either billions or, by one estimate, the average might be \$300 million. I know it has been difficult to make ends meet. You have been struggling and trying to pay the mortgage and the light bill when you are one of the top 400 richest households in the country.

But this chart, when you juxtapose this chart—and especially the orange part, the tax cut for 400 families, the giveaway to families who don't need it.

Frankly, they don't even want this tax cut. I haven't found one person who came up to me in the last couple of years and said: You know what, I wish my taxes didn't go up. I wish those taxes didn't go up while you were trying to help people on Medicaid. Not a single person said that.

Most people who will get this tax cut would rather that we make sure we take care of those children I mentioned with the disability or those families who need the protection of Medicaid.

When you put this chart next to the policy and those 60-plus pages of the decimation of Medicaid, there are a lot of words we could use that we are not allowed to use on this floor, but one of the words we should use is "obscene." That is an obscenity. When you match these cuts for 400 families next to the cuts to Medicaid, that is obscene, obnoxious, and bad policy.

If there was ever a reason to take this 142-page bill and throw it in the trash, throw it in a garbage pail as fast as we can, it would be this chart because that is not what the American people are asking for. They actually think some people in the Senate are actually working on a healthcare bill. That is what they believe. A lot of people don't know about this yet, but they are going to know. They are going to know by the end of the week, at least, if not sooner, that the 400 richest households in the country are getting that much money—\$33 billion. Maybe in the Senate bill it is only \$32 billion or \$31 billion, so we will stand corrected if it goes down, but that is really an abomination. That is an insult to the American people. People should be ashamed this is part of that bill.

I get it. We can have a debate about Medicaid. I get that, but when you are taking Medicaid dollars and transferring to wealthy people, no one should support that kind of a policy, but that is what we have. That is what we are up against.

If there was ever a reason to fight to the ends of the Earth against a piece of legislation, it is this. We are going to continue to fight this. We are going to continue to point out this basic inequity, this insult for the rest of this week.

We hope folks on both sides of the aisle will not only be listening, but we hope our Republican friends will take another look at this bill and understand how objectionable this is to so many American families. All of that worry I talked about before is made worse, is aggravated by this kind of result when it comes to tax cuts.

We can do all that as a great nation. We can make sure wealthy folks who need a break once in a while—they have gotten a lot of them in the last 25 years—that they can get a fair tax code. We could also make sure kids with disabilities, seniors, and kids in rural areas and big cities and small

towns can get the healthcare they need from Medicaid. We are a great country. We can do that. We can have a growing economy and still support a critically important program like Medicaid.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, we have just gotten the latest numbers on the Senate Republicans' reckless plan to take away health insurance from millions of American families, take it away from sick, little kids, take it away from seniors in nursing homes. These numbers are worse than anyone expected.

After weeks of secret work behind closed doors, the Republicans came up with a plan that will take away health insurance from 22 million people and slash the Medicaid Program by nearly \$800 billion, all in exchange for shoveling hundreds of billions of dollars of tax cuts to the richest families in this country.

You know, with results like these, Senate Republicans should not still be trying to figure out the best way to ram this bill through the Senate. They should just throw it in the trash.

We don't have a lot of time left, and I know it is easy to tune out these debates and to assume these are all just a bunch of partisan games. So if you aren't inclined to take my word for it, don't, and don't take the Republicans' word for it either. Take a look at what the experts are saying about the Republican bill because since this brutal bill was finally revealed on Thursday, it has been denounced by nonpartisan doctors groups, health policy experts, and patient organizations. The American Medical Association says the bill violates the fundamental principle of medicine: "First, do no harm." The Children's Hospital Association says it is "a major step backward for children and their health." The National Council for Behavioral Health says, "Instead of 'repeal and replace,' it is 'wreck and wreak havoc.'"

Lynn Nicholas, the head of the Massachusetts Health and Hospital Association, has actually come up with a pretty simple test for the Republican plan: "I challenge any Republican Senator to name one thing in this bill that will make healthcare in the U.S. better for patients or healthcare professionals who care for them."

Think about that. She says use that as the test, one thing. That is a pretty low bar—one thing. Yet the Republicans can't pass that test. They can't name one thing in this bill that will improve healthcare in America. That is because this bill is not supposed to improve healthcare in America. It is not a healthcare bill. It is a tax cut for the rich, paid for by gutting healthcare for millions of working Americans.

Doctors, patients, parents, families, experts, they are terrified by this bill

because they have read it, and they have concluded that nearly every line in this bill would make life worse for young people and for old people and for families across this country.

I want to focus on just one major part tonight, the part that rips away the Medicaid Program. Let's do some basic Medicaid facts. Who uses Medicaid? Thirty million kids. That is about 4 out of every 10 kids in this country count on Medicaid to help pay the medical bills. About 6 out of 10 children with complex medical needs—children who need breathing tubes, special therapies, and multiple surgeries, 6 out of 10 of those children count on Medicaid to help pay their medical bills. Nearly two out of three seniors in nursing homes count on Medicaid to help pay their bills, and one out of every three people dealing with addiction counts on Medicaid to help pay for treatment.

Who uses Medicaid? America uses Medicaid—children, the elderly, hard-working families, people with disabilities, and people struggling with addiction. At any given moment in this country, one in every five Americans is counting on Medicaid to help pay the bills. What are these people supposed to do when the Medicaid expansion goes away, when this bill's additional massive Medicaid cuts go into effect? What are they supposed to do? What are their families supposed to do?

Dig in on one issue around this. Dig in on opioid abuse. This is a problem that is growing around the country. Last year we lost 2,000 people in Massachusetts alone. I hear from parents who have lost children, from brothers and sisters who have watched a loved one disappear. I hear from people who are desperate because their child or sister or brother can't get into a treatment facility. I hear from dedicated doctors, nurses, and counselors who need more resources so they can expand treatment programs. Now the Republicans propose a bill that is like throwing gasoline on a bonfire. One in three people struggling with an addiction are counting on Medicaid, and the Republicans plan to cut nearly \$1 trillion from the program. I do not understand. I cannot understand how the Republicans could turn their backs on literally millions of people who need help.

The cuts to Medicaid are terrible, but there is more. The Republican bill also slashes the tax credits that people use to help pay for insurance. The budget nerds at the Congressional Budget Office say that "most people" would "have higher out of pocket spending on healthcare than under current law."

Think about that. Under the Republican plan, healthcare costs will go up for most people, and even if someone can manage, somehow, to afford coverage under the Republican bill, the Republicans are willing to let insurance companies drop expensive benefits

that the companies just don't want to cover, including—are you ready?—opioid treatment. If this bill passes, it will devastate our ability to fight opioid overdoses. This isn't a hypothetical. This isn't speculation. Before the Affordable Care Act became law, one-third of individual market health plans didn't cover substance use disorder services, and about one in five plans didn't cover mental health services. The insurance companies don't want to cover these services, but the ACA made coverage mandatory. That meant that no one in this country had to wonder when they showed up at a clinic whether or not their insurance would help them out, but the Republican bill opens the door to dropping those requirements. Millions more people could be left out in the cold at a time when they most need help. This is cruel. Our country is already struggling with a treatment gap, and far too many patients facing addiction can't get the care they need. The last thing we should be doing is kicking millions of these patients off of the coverage they already have.

Now, let's face it. The Republicans realized this, and they have a plan on this issue. They know that what they are doing is indefensible. So they have a plan. They propose to throw \$2 billion into a special fund for opioid treatment and say: Problem solved. This is political spin at its worst.

For every dollar the Republicans propose to put into opioid treatment, they are taking out more than \$100 from Medicaid, the rock on which our ability to provide opioid addiction treatment is built. Why? Why treat our brothers and sisters, our children, our elderly parents so shamefully? Why? So that Republicans can produce a giant tax cut for a handful of millionaires and billionaires. That is it. Our friends, our families, and our kids can struggle on their own. They can die on their own so that Republicans can cut taxes for the richest people in this country.

What the Republicans propose is morally wrong. It is not too late to do the right thing. It is not too late to reverse course. It is not too late to junk this bill and start over. I hope the Senate Republicans have the courage to do exactly that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Thank you, Mr. President.

I appreciate very much the comments from my colleague from Massachusetts and my colleague from Pennsylvania.

I notice my colleagues from the other side of the aisle are not here tonight to defend this piece of legislation. It doesn't surprise me, given what is in this legislation and given what we have heard over the last week.

The Senator from Massachusetts was explaining what it was we were trying

to do when we passed the Affordable Care Act, now years ago. Part of what we were trying to do was to extend coverage to a lot of Americans that didn't have it. In my State of Colorado that meant over 600,000 Coloradans who didn't have it before the Affordable Care Act was passed. Another thing we were trying to do was to say to insurance companies that it is not OK to have as your business practice that you take month after month after month of premiums from people and then when they call on the phone and say: My kid was sick; my kid got struck by lightning; my kid had an accident, to then hold them on the phone as long as possible just as a way of denying their claim. Most people in America are too busy trying to move their family ahead, trying to get by, to stay on the phone all day with an insurance company. While we were at that, we said: It is not fair to deny people insurance in the richest country in the world because they have preexisting conditions. It is not fair that it is a business plan in America to have lifetime caps on people in the richest country in the world who might hit those lifetime caps because they get cancer. It is not fair that in America, the richest country in the world, some seniors have to cut their medicines in half every month just to get through the month and to pay their bills. These were some of the issues that we were trying to address when we passed the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. President, I am from a Western State, like you. I was out all those months in Colorado, having town hall after town hall, not just in Democratic parts of the State but in Republican parts of the State, trying to explain what it was we were trying to do—both to give people better coverage, more predictable coverage, and less costly coverage and also to try to do something to bring down healthcare costs in this country. We succeeded at some of those things. We didn't succeed at others of those things. It was a legitimate attempt at trying to deliver something for the American people that people all over the industrialized world don't have to live with.

Only in this country do people have to make choices about feeding their family and taking care of their kids at the doctor. Only in this country do seniors have to make choices about cutting those pills in half. Only in this country do people have to make choices about paying their rent and taking care of their kids. It doesn't happen in the rest of the industrialized world. Before I hear it from the other side tonight, let me say: Our results are getting worse, not better. For populations across this country, longevity is actually getting shorter, not longer. This is a difficult, complex, but urgent question for our country.

That is what we were trying to do with the Affordable Care Act. Some of

it succeeded and some of it didn't. I will talk more about that in a minute.

For 8 years Republicans ran for election after election after election on ObamaCare: ObamaCare is socialism; ObamaCare is a Bolshevik plot to take over the United States; ObamaCare is destroying jobs—just at a time when we were coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. We saw uneven job growth in this country but undeniable job growth over the entire period of time they were saying ObamaCare was destroying the country and destroying our economy.

The recession was at the end of the last administration. The Obama administration saw the largest job increases we have seen in this country since World War II. I know it is inconvenient to believe that or to say that. I know that in corners of the internet where false news really does dominate, people don't believe it, but it is true. I am the first to say there are not enough good jobs, and I am the first to say there are not enough high-paying jobs, but compared to the record we inherited, it was a success, all while we had the Affordable Care Act being implemented, all while we were extending coverage to millions of people in America—many of them children who didn't have adequate coverage before we passed the Affordable Care Act.

It has been called every name in the book, just like President Obama was called every name in the book, and they linked those two things—healthcare reform, the Affordable Care Act, and ObamaCare. That became its name.

Every single attack under the sun was levied on that. Why? Because people really believed it was destroying the healthcare system? Maybe some people did. Because they believed that it was destroying businesses? Maybe some people did. I suspect there was a much more simple reason, and that was to try to win elections.

By the way, while we are on the subject, no matter whether you support the Affordable Care Act—and I support some things about it; there are other parts of it that have been disappointing to me—I think it is fundamentally important for people to understand that the Affordable Care Act is not our healthcare system. It is part of our healthcare system. The regulations that it has placed on insurance providers so that people with preexisting conditions couldn't be denied insurance is part of our system. The fact that it tried to create accountable care organizations so people got better primary care so we would reduce the amount of hospital readmissions from something like 18 percent or 19 percent, which wasted billions of dollars in this country, down to 2 percent or 3 percent, that is healthcare.

But there is a lot of healthcare that has nothing to do with ObamaCare or

that has something to do with it but it was not the creation of ObamaCare. There is Medicare and Medicaid. There are doctors. There are nurses. There are patients. There are drug companies. That is our healthcare system, and our healthcare system is a mess. It is a mess. It is a mess. We tried to take this thing and improve it when we passed the Affordable Care Act. Some of it worked; some of it didn't work. Some people would argue we went too far. Some people would say we didn't go enough.

But I can state this. I have been doing those town halls again in Colorado, and what I know is that people feel defeated not by ObamaCare but by the American healthcare system—by our healthcare system, which is less predictable and less affordable than in many countries around the world.

Now President Trump knew this. He is a smart politician. I never thought he was going to win. I never thought he was going to win on a campaign that on so many dimensions was out of step with conventional American political thought, and I was wrong. He won. I don't think he represents a traditional Republican view, and that may be one reason he won. In no sense do I think of Donald Trump as a conservative. I think of him as quite radical in his proposals. I think of him as a reactionary force on a political system that the American people, for whatever reason—some of them are probably good reasons—were losing their patience with.

You cannot deny that the guy, somehow, in the far reaches of Trump Tower, had his finger on the pulse of what was going on in some parts of this country. I don't know if it was because he was a reality TV star or what it was, but one of those things was healthcare. He understood the American people's dissatisfaction with our healthcare system, just as these 7 years and 8 years of Republican campaigns have understood it. Majority Leader MCCONNELL made it clear when we were passing the bill: You own it. You own it. He said in a book later that it was very important to him that the American people were able to demarcate between the Democrats' responsibility for the healthcare system as it was and the Republicans' willingness to take no responsibility for it.

Even though we had hundreds of hours of hearings that lasted more than a year and even though we had—they are not countless—well over 100 Republican amendments that were made in committee and on the floor that were incorporated in the legislation, in the end, not a single Republican voted for the bill.

Maybe that was a principled reason, not just a political reason, because maybe there are some people who have the view in the Republican Party that the Federal Government should not have any increased involvement in

their healthcare system. In fact, I have heard some people say the Federal Government should play no role in the healthcare system. Yet whatever the reason, not a single Republican voted for ObamaCare.

The rest of the history writes itself, which is that every premium increase in America, whether it was related to ObamaCare or not, becomes part of ObamaCare. Every drug that gets increased in price becomes ObamaCare, and for everybody who loses his insurance, that is ObamaCare when what is happening is really far more complex than that.

There are very legitimate critiques of ObamaCare, but it is not the same thing as our entire healthcare system. I think it is important to make that point because, whether we are considering the Republicans' proposed bill tonight or someone else's proposed bill tonight, we would have to understand it was not going to fix the whole problem all at once.

People in my State are deeply dissatisfied with our healthcare system. I say that as somebody who voted for the Affordable Care Act. I have said it before. People have tried to make a political issue out of it. They write ads about it: Look, Bennet said the healthcare system is not perfect.

I will go further than that. It is a crying shame that people in this country have to spend their lives wrestling with insurance companies, lying awake, wondering whether their kids are going to be able to get primary care or dental care or cancer care if they get sick. That keeps families up every night in my State, not so much the people who are on Medicare but a lot of other people.

So Candidate Trump saw this unease in the American people, this concern that the American people had with our healthcare system, which I share, and in his campaign—in his very populist campaign for President—he promised to provide “such great healthcare at a tiny fraction of the cost.” Those knuckleheads in Washington do not know what they are doing. I am going to deliver you “such great healthcare at a tiny fraction of the cost.” That was his promise to the American people. That is what he said he was going to deliver.

He differentiated himself from other Republicans by saying: “I will never cut Medicare.” “I will never cut Medicaid.” He said: Those other Republicans say they will. I am not going to do that, but I am going to supply better healthcare than you are getting now at a tiny fraction of the cost. He said: “Everybody is going to be taken care of much better than they're taken care of now” with no cuts to Medicare and no cuts to Medicaid.

We had our election, and people voted for this nominee who made not just these promises but many other prom-

ises about what he was going to do for our economy based on, I think, largely, a complete fiction about what is actually going on in our country—for that matter, in the world—with respect to our economy. So he won. He did not just win—the Senate is Republican, and the House of Representatives is Republican.

Now, after running elections for 8 years to get rid of that scourge on America, that stain on America, that legislation that has destroyed our economy and destroyed our healthcare system, they wrote a bill. It took them a long time, really, to get it through the House of Representatives, which was shocking, because they had 8 years to figure out what was wrong with the current system and how to address the current system. They tried it once, and they could not even bring it to a vote in the House. They could not even bring it to a vote.

Then, understandably, the people who sent those Republicans to office in the House said: What are you talking about? You said you were going to repeal ObamaCare. You told us all of these terrible things that ObamaCare had done. Your first order of business was to repeal ObamaCare. How dare you not have a vote?

I am glad they said that because people should keep their promises.

I have believed for a long time that people want consistency out of their politicians, that they will put up with inconsistency if you say to them that the facts are different than I thought they were and that is why I changed my view. Yet, in these times of fake news, of the media having the challenges it has, and the rest of the things that ail our system, consistency is not something that a lot of politicians pay attention to. I think they think that is because voters do not pay attention to it, but, in this case, they did. They said: You said you would repeal ObamaCare. You did not just say it once. You said it year, after year, after year, after year. Finally, they then passed a bill in the House. Not a single Democrat voted for it.

We learned from that process, which took place before the Congressional Budget Office had even scored the bill—imagine that. There were all of these people who criticized the Affordable Care Act, and proponents were rushing the bill through. As I said, I think there were 200 Republican amendments adopted. It was a bill that held almost countless committee hearings in the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate HELP Committee. It was a bill that consumed 25 days of legislative process on this floor, a modern record in terms of time. In fact, we had all of that process, and I will come back to this.

Here is what Senator MCCONNELL said about that. After all of that process, he said on this floor, I think, that

Americans were “tired of giant bills negotiated in secret and then rammed through on a party-line vote in the middle of the night.” Oh, that bill was negotiated completely in public, painfully in public. I used to go home, and people in my townhalls literally had copies of the bill. Do you remember the chant: “Read the bill. Read the bill”? That is because everybody had the bill.

On the House side, it is important for people to understand that they passed the bill without even getting a score from what is called the Congressional Budget Office. The head of the Congressional Budget Office is appointed by Republicans when the Republicans are in the majority, not by the Democrats. It did not even get a score. We had a score on the Affordable Care Act before we passed the bill. We had a score that every single American could see about what it would cost and what money it would spend, what money it would save, how many people would be added to the insurance rolls. We had that. They did not have the decency to do that in the House.

They should have because—guess what happened—when the score came out, it said that 24 million people would lose their health insurance after a candidate for President said that you are going to have “such great healthcare at a tiny fraction of the cost.” “Everybody is going to be taken care of much better than they’re taken care of now,” unless you are one of those 24 million and, I would argue, many of the rest as well. I will come to that.

So they passed that bill, a terrible bill. I think that bill has the lowest approval rating among the American people of any piece of legislation that has existed in the time I have been in the Senate. It is still not as low as the approval rating of this place, which used to be 9 percent, but it is low because people know it does not really address their healthcare problems. It is not a healthcare bill.

Then the President found out what was in the Congressional Budget Office’s score, and he had some Republican Senators over to the White House and said: I hope you will not pass a bill like that. That is a mean bill.

That is not my description. That is President Trump’s description of the House bill. That is a mean bill.

He said: I want a bill with a little more love in it than that bill out of the Senate.

He has to be disappointed tonight because the Congressional Budget Office’s score came back and said that under the Senate’s version of the bill—the less mean bill—only 22 million people will lose their health insurance and that far from having better insurance at a lower price, half of the country—literally half the country—is going to pay thousands more in out-of-pocket expenses because of what has become known as TrumpCare.

There are three principal parts to the bill in the Senate and in the bill that has passed the House. There are some differences, but I would say they are differences without a distinction. They are immaterial distinctions. There are three major components to these so-called healthcare bills.

The first is a massive tax cut for the wealthiest people in America. If you are making \$200,000 or less in Colorado or in any State in the country, you will not get a penny from this tax cut—not a penny. As my colleague from Pennsylvania said, if you are one of the top 400 taxpayers in America, together, you are going to get \$33 billion in tax cuts. That is an average tax cut for each of those 400 Americans of \$82.5 million. There is not a person in Colorado at any one of my townhalls who has said to me: MICHAEL, the key to doing a better job with our healthcare and the key to fixing ObamaCare—and I am talking about the critics of ObamaCare. There is not a one who has said to repeal those taxes on the top 1 percent of taxpayers in America at a time when our income inequality has not been greater than in 1928 and at a time when we are collecting in revenue only 18 percent of our gross domestic product and spending 21 percent. Not a single person has stood up in a townhall meeting and said the key to success here is in cutting those taxes. Just to be clear, I should mention that \$82.5 million is over a 10-year period. It is about \$8.25 million a year.

As Senator CASEY, from Pennsylvania, noted, that \$33 billion adds up to be the equivalent of what it would cost to pay for the Medicaid of 772,000 people who live in just four States—the entire Medicaid population of four States.

But what they would consume in healthcare to try to support themselves and their family is not \$8.5 million a year; it is not \$85 million over 10 years; it is, on average, \$4,500 a year on healthcare. That is the first part of this bill—a massive tax cut that is not going to benefit anybody in my State who earns below \$200,000.

The second element of this bill is a massive cut to Medicaid, which is one of the fundamental safety net programs in this country. The cut, whether you look at the House cut or the Senate cut, is massive. It is about a quarter of the program. It is about \$840 billion. And in the Senate bill, the cuts are even deeper than they were in the House bill. I wonder what the President would say about that. The House bill was mean. I bet he would say the Senate bill is cruel because it perpetuates those cuts.

I have heard the rhetoric from politicians in Washington about why it is so important to cut Medicaid. They need to cut Medicaid so they can pay for the tax cuts for people who are so wealthy, most of them probably don’t even need

to mess around with insurance to pay for their healthcare or their doctors. Now they are going to have another \$8.5 billion a year. Now they are going to have another \$85 million over 10 years if they want to spend it not on insurance but on whatever else they want to spend it.

So on the one hand, they had to find the money to pay for this tax cut. They found it from some of the poorest Americans there are. How do they justify that? They justify it by painting a picture that says that there are Medicaid recipients all over America who are receiving Medicaid but not working, and therefore we should cut the program because if we cut the program, they will know they have to get a job in order to buy health insurance, and they won’t be on the Federal Medicaid Program. They say to go to work, and that is why we can cut this program. Keep people out of that hammock they are lying in instead of working for their healthcare.

What an insult to the almost 50 percent of Medicaid beneficiaries in Colorado who are poor children. Are they supposed to go to work, or can they go to school? And while we are at it, maybe we should think about giving them better schools so they can actually compete in this economy. But are we really going to take away their healthcare?

Then there are a whole bunch of people who have spent down their life savings for the privilege of being in a nursing home paid for by Medicaid. There is not a townhall I have where there aren’t sons and daughters or grandsons and granddaughters of people who are in nursing homes paid for by Medicaid after they had to spend their whole life savings down to be there. What a terrible system it is that a family has to be near bankruptcy before we say: We will give you a helping hand. It is a terrible system, but it is what they have. And they can’t work. They are in a nursing home. They are in long-term care.

Then there are a whole bunch of people in my State and in other States—and this may be the greatest insult of all—who are working at one job or sometimes at two jobs, and in the richest country in the world, they are working and are getting paid and are not getting paid enough to be off the Medicaid rolls. They are working, and they are still on public assistance. And we are cutting a quarter of the Medicaid Program because people need to go to work.

I am not making this stuff up. I asked Secretary Price, who is the Secretary of HHS, Health and Human Services—he is in charge of the healthcare for this administration—I said: Mr. Secretary, let me take you through the faces of the people in my State who are on Medicaid. And not only did they confirm that that is who



is on Medicaid in my State, he said that is the way it looks all over the country.

What an insult to justify a massive tax cut for the richest Americans by taking away poor people's healthcare; by saying they are not working for it, when they are children, when they are in nursing homes, when they are working one and sometimes two jobs in the richest country on the world.

So that is the second part of this healthcare plan—tax cuts for wealthy people and cutting Medicaid for poor people. And in the middle of that is the only thing that could fairly be described as a healthcare plan; it is just a terrible plan.

Senator PAUL from Kentucky—one of the more principled people in this Chamber—said it very well when he called it, not politely, “ObamaCare lite.” He is absolutely right. If you hate ObamaCare, you are really going to hate ObamaCare lite. It is the same structure, which amazes me because all of the people who said we should repeal ObamaCare are now preserving the very basic structure of how the program worked, but the problem with it is that they have cut the subsidies. They have turned them into tax credits and cut the value of the subsidies. If you think insurance is expensive now in the individual market, wait until you meet ObamaCare lite, in the words of RAND PAUL.

So those are the three components of the bill. And it is not surprising to me that for those reasons, Senator MCCONNELL has written this bill in secret. It is not surprising to me that he hasn't wanted to have a committee hearing. It is not surprising to me that he brought the bill here on the floor last Thursday, then accused people on the other side of not having read the bill and still wants us to act on the bill this Thursday so he can go home before July 4th and say to the American people: We did it. We kept our promise. We repealed ObamaCare. We may have written a terrible piece of legislation that has nothing to do with improving your healthcare, but we repealed ObamaCare. And he is hoping the American people won't notice.

Let me tell you something. The American people are noticing. There is a reason why the House bill has the worst approval rating of any piece of legislation in modern American history. The American people are not stupid.

I was in Frisco, CO, not that long ago, which is a place that everybody should visit from all over the country. There is tremendous skiing, and there is tremendous hiking, wonderful people. And before I had the townhall meeting, I went and visited a healthcare center there that they are justifiably proud of. It turns no one away. It gives phenomenal primary care. It gives phenomenal dental care.

They have to figure out every week how to get through, but they always figure out how to get through so that people in Frisco and in the surrounding area have healthcare.

This is not a poor community by American standards. It is a resort community, but there are people who live there year-round. I asked the people who run the clinic: Who are the payers for healthcare in your clinic? Who are they? What pays for healthcare here? And she said: Well, MICHAEL, the Medicaid is 33 percent. That shocked me because if you are in rural Colorado, the Medicaid number is usually a lot higher than that because people don't have access to a lot of resources, and we all know they don't have access to a robust insurance market. Thirty-three percent was Medicaid, 53 percent was uncompensated care, and the rest was private insurance companies that pay for the insurance. That shocked me.

I said: Fifty-three percent is uncompensated care, people with no insurance? How can that be?

She said: These are people in our community who make too much money to be eligible for Medicaid, but they can't afford private insurance.

They are working full time; that is not the problem. They are not even—as I described before in a case where somebody is paying them too little, so they are eligible for Medicaid; their problem is that they are being paid too much, and they are not eligible for Medicaid as a result, but they can't afford private insurance. I think that is an indictment of the Affordable Care Act that I accept as somebody who voted for it. The idea that we would require people in America to buy health insurance and then not have a market that gave them quality health insurance at an affordable price is ridiculous.

I have had people in rural Colorado say to me: MICHAEL, look, why are you requiring me to buy something where there is not enough competition, so the premium is high and the deductible is ridiculous. So it is of no use to my family, and you are requiring me to buy something that is useless to me. We should have more competition to drive down price.

I say: You are 100 percent correct.

And if we had a functioning Congress that wanted to take a bipartisan approach to fixing that problem, we could fix it, and there are probably 15 or 20 other things along those lines. But the Republican healthcare bill—so-called healthcare bill—does none of that. It does none of that.

So to the extent that you don't like ObamaCare because you feel as though your premiums are going up and you are not getting enough for it, as opposed to the millions of people who have gotten insurance as a result of it, some for the first time—to the extent

you are worried about that, the House bill makes it worse and the Senate bill makes it worse.

There is a projection in the CBO report that says that at a certain point in time, your premiums might come down under the Republican bill, but the reason for that is because you will be buying lousy insurance. It is not because Donald Trump, as he said to the country, has provided such great healthcare at a tiny fraction of the cost. That is not the reason. It is because they provided terrible healthcare at a fraction of the cost. That is not a benefit to anybody. If an insurance company can put you on lifetime caps, of course they are going to charge you less.

I am all for working together in a bipartisan way to address the issues in our healthcare system that, frankly, go far beyond the Affordable Care Act to make sure people in America don't have to continue to make the choices people all over the world don't have to make about having to stay in a job they hate because they have to keep the insurance or being able to quit a job and do something else because they know the insurance will be there. Nobody else has to make those decisions. And nobody else in the world goes bankrupt because of healthcare, but that is still a problem in America.

I think fundamentally the problem we have here tonight is proponents of this legislation didn't set out to fix our healthcare system; they set out to repeal ObamaCare or the cartoon of ObamaCare they have been running on for the last 8 years. That is what they set out to do. Along the way, they obscured it all so they could have the opportunity to cut taxes on the wealthiest Americans—which, for some reason, is an obsession with some people around here—and dramatically cut access to healthcare by poor children.

I know there are people who are hearing this will not believe what I am saying is true. It is true. I hope you will familiarize yourself with the facts. I hope, in particular, people who feel the last bill we considered on this floor didn't get the process it deserved—people who quite rightly wanted to make sure Members of the Senate and the House had actually read the bill, people who wanted to know what it was like to live in a country where your health insurance is uncertain from month to month, where you have to decide between paying the rent, buying the food or being on health insurance; people who are dealing with and whose families are dealing with the effects of this terrible opioid crisis that wasn't even really a gleam in our eye when we passed the Affordable Care Act.

I especially say to people living in rural America how sorry I am that people aren't paying attention to your needs; that your hospitals may be cut because of an ill-considered piece of



legislation which has nothing to do with delivering healthcare in rural Colorado or rural America.

We can do so much better than this, but to get to a place, unfortunately, where Democrats and Republicans have the opportunity to work together, the first order of business has to be to defeat the bill on the floor. I hope people know this is the week when it is critical to call and let your voices be heard, let people know you expect something better than what we are getting, and that Americans ought to have a healthcare system that is affordable, that is predictable, and that actually creates stability instead of instability for their families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:55 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 27, 2017, at 2 p.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARK H. BUZZY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, VICE PAUL NATHAN JAENICHEN, SR.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARIA E. BREWER, OF INDIANA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SIERRA LEONE.

JOHN P. DESROCHER, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA.

KELLEY ECKELS CURRIE, OF GEORGIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

### UNITED NATIONS

KELLEY ECKELS CURRIE, OF GEORGIA, TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF

AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON IV, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

JAMIE MCCOURT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM.

CARL C. RISCH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONSULAR AFFAIRS), VICE MICHELE THOREN BOND.

### NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

KYLE FORTSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2019, VICE NICHOLAS CHRISTOPHER GEALE, TERM EXPIRED.

### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL RIGAS, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE CHRISTINE M. GRIFFIN.

### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CHRISTOPHER A. WRAY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS, VICE JAMES B. COMEY, JR.

### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

THOMAS G. BOWMAN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE SLOAN D. GIBSON.

JAMES BYRNE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE LEIGH A. BRADLEY, RESIGNED.

### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. FREDERICK J. ROEGGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DEWOLFE H. MILLER III

### IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DANIEL J. O'DONOHUE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL A. ROCCO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MARK A. BRILAKIS

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN

THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

#### To be major

MICHAEL J. SILVERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 9333(B) AND 9336(A):

#### To be colonel

MAIYA D. ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

#### To be major

KIMBERLY M. KITTLESON

KEVIN C. PETERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

CECILIA A. FLORIO

#### To be major

DEEPTHI V. BYREDDY

DIANE L. EVANS

JOHN M. FEJES

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be colonel

JOSEPH M. O'CALLAGHAN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

#### To be colonel

BRET P. VAN POPPEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

#### To be major

ALIYA I. WILSON

### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be captain

LINDA C. SEYMOUR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be commander

CHAD J. TRUBILLA

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, Monday, June 26, 2017:

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

KRISTINE L. SVINICKI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2022.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 GRADUATING CLASS OF THE DODIE LONDEN EXCELLENCE IN PUBLIC SERVICE SERIES

**HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the graduating class of the 2017 Dodie Londen Excellence in Public Service Series. Brandy Wells, Cindy Casaus, Debbie Vandenboom, Farhana Ahmed, Jeni White, Kristen Desmangles, Lauren Pemberton, Lisa Godzich, Dr. Shadow Asgari, Simone Hall, ViciLee Jacobs, and Yvonne Cahill have all distinguished themselves as impactful leaders in our community.

HONORING THE FIRST RESPONDERS OF THE JUNE 14, 2017 SHOOTING AT EUGENE SIMPSON PARK

**HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the City of Alexandria's First Responders on the scene of the shooting at Eugene Simpson Memorial Park in my district in Alexandria, Virginia.

On Wednesday, June 14, 2017 around 7:00 a.m., an individual at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in Alexandria, Virginia fired shots at Members of Congress who were practicing for the annual Congressional Baseball Game. The shooting wounded United States Representative Steve Scalise, Capitol Police Officers David Bailey and Crystal Griner, Congressional staffer Zack Barth, and former Congressional staffer Matt Mika.

The timely response of Alexandria's First Responders most certainly saved lives. Alexandria Police Officers Nicole Battaglia, Alexander Jensen and Kevin Jobe arrived within minutes of the 911 call. Officer Battaglia came under fire upon arriving at the scene and immediately engaged the shooter. In the opinion of Alexandria Police Chief Mike Brown, Officer Battaglia's actions diverted the shooter's attention, allowing the other responding officers to neutralize the shooter. Medical care provided at the scene by members of the Alexandria Fire Department, including paramedics Fiona Apple and Richard Krimmer, ensured this senseless act of violence did not become a casualty event.

I am honored to commend these valiant individuals for their selfless service; I thank them not only for their impact on the victims of this senseless act of violence, but for their daily positive impact in my district.

PASSING OF WALKER A. WILLIAMS

**HON. KAREN BASS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the life and memory of Walker Alexander Williams. Born in East Orange, New Jersey in 1940, Walker lifted his eyes well beyond our shores and developed an international reputation as a businessman and an advocate for the African and Caribbean diaspora communities. His passion for economic empowerment led him to create Alternative Marketing Access, Leadership Global (formerly Leadership Africa USA) and NiQuan Energy as platforms for development. Walker leaves behind a legacy of uplifting others and promoting the advancement of under-represented groups, especially those of African and African American descent.

Walker also recognized the importance of training people to fill leadership roles and developing talent to serve in African political and economic contexts. He had a vision for developing countries in which their diverse communities and nations overall could reach their full potential. His distinguished career included testifying in Congress on "The Future of Energy in Africa" where he urged this body to support and encourage partnerships to improve Africa's access to energy. He also provided vital leadership around the initial passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), arranging several Congressional briefings for African Ambassadors, key members of Congress, and Administration officials on AGOA and its potential effect on infrastructure, energy, agriculture, health, nutrition, and security.

During his long career as a businessman, advocate, and philanthropist, Walker remained committed to mentoring and empowering young people and professionals, and he always aimed to make those who worked with him feel valued. He worked with more than 100 non-governmental organizations over thirty-plus years, and he facilitated scholarship and educational opportunities in Africa and the Caribbean through the Education Africa Presidential and Premier Education Awards, Nelson Mandela Presidential Medallions, and the Walter Sisulu Scholarship and Training Fund. He encouraged Africans and Americans alike to envision and achieve personal power and a more prosperous future. Walker believed that a better Africa and Caribbean meant a better United States of America.

Walker is remembered by his partner, children, and grandchildren as a humble and dedicated man. I would like to celebrate a life of service while I offer condolences to those he has left behind.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF KENT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR/CONTROLLER DARYL DELABBIO

**HON. BILL HUIZENGA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a longtime public servant, Daryl Delabbio, on the occasion of his retirement.

Daryl has served as Kent County Administrator/Controller since 1998. Prior to his time with Kent County, he spent 11 years as Rockford city manager. In all, Daryl has dedicated four decades to the people of Kent County and the greater Grand Rapids area.

As Administrator/Controller, Daryl oversaw Kent County's daily activities, acted as its chief financial officer and headed project management. Under his leadership, Kent County maintained a balanced budget and saw the development of Millennium Park and the DeVos Place Convention Center. Most importantly, he has led the county in a non-partisan, fair, and fiscally responsible manner.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the career of Administrator/Controller Daryl Delabbio for his service to Kent County.

WELCOME PRESIDENT MOON  
JAE-IN

**HON. MIKE KELLY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and pleasure that we welcome President Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea to our nation's Capital on his first official overseas visit. The United States shares a special relationship with the Republic of Korea forged during the Korean War and solidified by the greater global struggle for freedom in the 20th century. The U.S.-Korea alliance is the cornerstone of U.S. leadership in the Asia-Pacific region. It is a special alliance built upon the sacrifice of brave individuals who stood strong against the adversaries of liberty and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as the co-chairman of the Congressional Caucus on Korea, I am proud to welcome President Moon Jae-in today. Our alliance will surely be tested, but our faith and determination will never falter or waiver. I thank him for his commitment to our common values, and I look forward to the work we will do together to strengthen the alliance even more in the future.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARCIA GREENBERGER FOR HER CAREER WITH THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Marcia Greenberger, cofounder and attorney with the National Women's Law Center. Ms. Greenberger has been a steadfast advocate for women and families during her career with the NWLC.

Ms. Greenberger began her career with the law firm Caplin and Drysdale, after which she founded the Women's Right Project of the Center for Law and Social Policy, where she served as the organization's Director. In 1981, she cofounded the National Women's Law Center with Nancy Campbell, which built on the success of her previous efforts. The NWLC provides legal aid and advocates for legislative initiatives to protect the rights of women and promote fair treatment of women and girls. The Center has been a key driver of advances in women's rights, having won victories in passing landmark legislation like the Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which codified protections against discrimination on the basis of sex, religion and national origin. Collectively, these have resulted in strong protections for women's rights.

As cofounder of the NWLC, Ms. Greenberger has played a critical role in the growth and success of the organization. Her legal expertise and deep understanding of women's rights issues has helped the NWLC win victories for women and children at the federal, state and local level. Ms. Greenberger has been widely recognized for her outstanding contributions as a women's rights legal advocate. She has been inducted in the National Women's Hall of Fame in Seneca Falls, NY and has also received the Woman Lawyer of the Year Award by the D.C. Women's Bar Association. Her career and efforts have established the NWLC as one of the nation's foremost advocacy groups, and it is my hope that the organization will continue to build on her legacy of excellence in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Marcia Greenberger for her advocacy with the NWLC. Ms. Greenberger's legal career has led to increased legal protections for the rights of women and children.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA ON THE OCCASION OF HIS FIRST OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Korea Caucus, I am honored

to rise today to welcome President Moon Jae-In of the Republic of Korea on his first official visit to the United States.

The Republic of Korea and the United States have been not only allies, but close friends, for nearly 70 years. This alliance and friendship was solidified in our 1953 Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of Korea, and it is this commitment which binds us together today as we confront the threat posed by a nuclear and ever bellicose North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing my work with my Korean friends as we work to make the peninsula, and broader region, safe and prosperous for all people dedicated to the rule of law and a democratic way of life. I wish President Moon a safe and productive visit to the United States.

**CAMP MIAKONDA HAS CREATED  
100 YEARS OF MEMORIES**

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th birthday of beautiful and legendary Camp Miakonda. Camp Miakonda is located in Toledo, Ohio, and is a bedrock for many Boy Scouts. I would like to include in the RECORD the words of its executive, Ed Caldwell:

On Saturday, the Erie Shores Council of the Boy Scouts of America will begin a year-long celebration of the 100th birthday of Camp Miakonda, an important community asset that deserves a grand celebration.

The festivities will commence with a hallmark event for the entire community to enjoy time at camp. Please join us to learn about the many Scouts who have camped at Miakonda over the decades and how our practices and equipment have changed.

Special ceremonies include the ribbon-cutting and grand opening of our new Wildlife Nature Center. Parking will be available at nearby schools with shuttle service from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. This event is free and open to the public.

I am proud to serve as the Scout executive and chief executive officer of the Erie Shores Council. Like many other people in our community, I am a product of the Boy Scout leadership program. I am, and always will be, an Eagle Scout.

I was taught the Boy Scout salute, and Scout handshake, the Scout motto ("Be prepared"), and the Scout slogan ("Do a good turn daily"). I memorized the Boy Scout Law ("A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent") and the Boy Scout Oath (with its pledge to "keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight").

Camp Miakonda, known as the "land of the crescent moon," is more than America's sixth-oldest Boy Scout camp and the oldest in the state of Ohio. It is a community asset.

From the first Scouts who camped at the 160-acre De Vilbiss Scout Reservation in 1917, to the many Scouts who travel from across the country each year to enjoy the camp's nationally recognized programs and facilities, Camp Miakonda has inspired tens of thousands of young men in its first 100 years. We are excited to serve the youth, and create a lifetime of memories for the next 100 years.

Today, Camp Miakonda is a multiuse facility, serving both the Boy Scouts and the community at large. For Scouts, the adventure starts at Camp Miakonda with Club Scout Day Camp during the summer months and many weekend Scouting programs throughout the spring, fall, and winter. For the general public, camp facilities are available for day, evening, or weekend use for special events, dinners, or training seminars.

In addition to our Saturday open house, we will be hosting other Camp Miakonda celebrations over the next few months. On Tuesday, the actual 100th birthday of Camp Miakonda, we will feature an all-day open house. On Oct. 5, we will host a "Special Evening under the Crescent Moon," a gala dinner to benefit Camp Miakonda's long-term operations.

I hope you will bring a friend and join us in our celebrations this year. This is your camp. The Camp Miakonda adventure starts here.

ED CALDWELL

(Scout Executive, Erie Shores Council).

RECOGNIZING ELLA MAY WINGER, THE RECIPIENT OF THE UAW LOCAL 865 WOMEN OF EXCELLENCE AWARD

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ella May Winger, an outstanding union woman who is being recognized by the UAW Local 865 Women of Excellence Award.

When I think of trailblazing women in our community, Ella May is at the top of my list. As a pillar in our community, she has tirelessly worked to better the lives of union workers and served as a role model in our community. She spent her career at John Deere Harvester Works where she helped start the first UAW Women's committee in Region 4. After being retired for more than 30 years, she continues to work every day at empowering her union brothers and sisters.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to honor Ella May Winger for her commitment to fighting for hardworking families and for all that she has done to strengthen our community. I congratulate her on the upcoming recognition she deserves.

HONORING MARCIA D. GREENBERGER, CO-FOUNDER OF THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today and join the many gathered this evening to pay tribute to an outstanding leader in the women's rights movement and my good friend, Marcia D. Greenberger, as she steps down as co-president of the National Women's Law Center.

Marcia has dedicated a lifetime to moving the agenda of women's rights forward and has

left an indelible mark on our nation. In 1972, at a time when the United States looked very different for women and women's issues were still considered "fringe issues," Marcia, along with the incomparable Nancy Duff Campbell, founded the National Women's Law Center, an organization that has become an invaluable resource in the fight for women's rights across the country. The NWLC is responsible for marking critical advances to improve the lives of women for more than 40 years, ensuring that the health and civil rights of women are kept at the forefront of public policy debate and lawmaking. Simply put, the strides we have made would not have been possible without the tireless advocacy of the National Women's Law Center.

In virtually every single battle for women's rights that we have fought over the last four decades, Marcia has led the fight to break down the economic, health, and social barriers facing women and girls. The impact of their work resonates across the country—it is felt in every state where the National Women's Law Center has advanced opportunities and improved the lives of women and girls. The New York Times said Marcia "guided the battles of the women's rights movement" and they were right. She was the first full-time women's rights legal advocate in Washington and her legacy includes the passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, and critical protection against sexual harassment on the job.

Marcia's leadership and contributions are reflected in the myriad of honors, accolades and commendations she has received and the numerous boards on which she has served throughout her career. She received a Presidential appointment to the National Skill Standards Board, and currently serves as a member of the Executive Committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. Marcia was named by Working Woman Magazine as one of the 25 heroines whose activities over 25 years have helped women in the workplace, by Washingtonian Magazine as one of Washington, D.C.'s most powerful women, and by Legal Times as a "Top Lawyer" and one of its "30 Champions." Marcia has been inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame, was the recipient of the American Bar Association Section of Civil Rights and Social Justice's 2016 Civil Rights Hero Award, the Trustees' Council of Penn Women "Beacon" Leadership Award, the American Bar Association Margaret Brent Award, and the National Association of Women Lawyers' Arabella Babb Mansfield Award just to name a few.

I consider myself fortunate to have had so many opportunities to work with and learn from Marcia and I am honored to call her my friend. Her unwavering commitment and personal passion will always serve as an inspiration, not only to myself but for countless others. While her stepping down as co-president is bittersweet, I have no doubt that Marcia will continue to find ways to make a difference.

Trailblazer, advocate, mentor, and friend—for all of her good work and invaluable contributions, I am pleased to rise today to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to Marcia D. Greenberger. I thank her for all she has done for women in this country. I wish her all

the best for health, happiness, and success in everything that comes next.

HONORING KARRIN TAYLOR  
ROBSON'S APPOINTMENT TO THE  
ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF RE-  
GENTS

**HON. PAUL A. GOSAR**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize Ms. Karrin Taylor Robson, of Arizona. Karrin is an invaluable member of the state community, and has contributed to its economic development in unfathomable ways. I want to first commend her on her service to the state, and her accomplishments with Arizona Strategies. Most importantly, however, I want to congratulate her on her new position on the Arizona State Board of Regents. I am confident she will excel in this position, undoubtedly championing our students.

Karrin currently serves diligently as the Founder and President of Arizona Strategies, an Arizona based land use and real estate development company. Here she has grown the business with integrity and professionalism. These qualities will serve her, the Board of Regents, and our students well. As a prominent business contributor to our state Karrin has served on numerous government and community organizations, leaving each one better than she found it. Governor Ducey could not have filled this seat with a better candidate.

Karrin's extraordinary career serves as an example for the students she has now been appointed to serve. I look forward to watching her drive Arizona's university system to new heights. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to recognize her today.

HONORING THE FREEDOM  
HAPPENS NOW 5K

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Polaris for hosting the Freedom Happens Now 5K on Saturday June 24, 2017. This important event accentuate the plight of the voiceless victims of human trafficking in an effort to both raise awareness on their behalf and eventually eliminate this modern day slavery.

Polaris was founded in 2002 by two seniors at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, Derek Ellerman and Katherine Chon, who were inspired to take action after learning about the horrifying account of six Korean women who were coerced into working at a brothel just a few blocks away from Brown University. This enlightened Ellerman and Chon as to how ubiquitous human trafficking really is and compelled them to take immediate action. They established Polaris, whose name derives from the North Star, which guid-

ed slaves toward freedom along the Underground Railroad. Since its inception, Polaris has remained firmly devoted to ending all forms of human trafficking and has always put an emphasis on directly supporting trafficking victims. Polaris has helped numerous victims escape from exploitation and worked to prevent more people from becoming ensnared by human trafficking. Over the past decade, Polaris has expanded their operations and today has evolved into one of the most preeminent global leaders in the fight against human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Polaris for their vigorous dedication and unwavering commitment to bring awareness to the suffering and horrors that confront the countless victims of human trafficking. I truly appreciate all their work and thank them for promoting awareness about this important issue through hosting numerous events, including Saturday's 5K, which not only united our community, but helped us all gain a greater understanding of the realities of human trafficking. I also want to express my sincere gratitude to all those who participated in Saturday's 5K in a collaborative and laudable effort to combat the scourge of human trafficking and provide assistance to its all too often unnoticed victims. I wish Polaris all the best as they continue their valiant crusade to eradicate human trafficking in the United States and worldwide.

SIXTEENTH DISTRICT LAW  
ENFORCEMENT AWARDS

**HON. VERN BUCHANAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to law enforcement men and women who have provided distinctive service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

Law enforcement is a demanding profession that requires sacrifice, courage and a dedication to serve others. Every day, brave men and women put themselves in harm's way to enforce the laws of our society and protect public safety. They deserve our gratitude and respect.

Six years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Law Enforcement Awards, CLEA, to give special recognition to law enforcement officers, departments, or units for exceptional achievement.

This year, I have presented the CLEA to the following winners chosen by an independent panel comprised of current and retired law enforcement personnel representing a cross-section of the district's law enforcement community:

Officer Jason Nuttall of the Bradenton Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Captain John Walsh, Captain Debra Kaspar, Lieutenant Jon Varley, Community Affairs Director Kaitlyn Perez, Deputy Phillip Mockler, Detective Tim Speth and Investigator Lynn Thomson of the Sarasota County Sheriff's will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Richard Wilson of the Palmetto Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Officer Alan Bores of the Holmes Beach Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Justin Warren of the Manatee County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Sergeant Robert Armstrong of the Sarasota Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Deputy Kevin Smetana of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Master Sergeant George Taunton of The Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Career Service Award.

Deputy Angel Buxeda and Deputy Grant Steube of the Manatee County Sheriff's Office along with Troopers Caleb Kerr and Trooper Brett Fitzpatrick of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Preservation of Life Award.

Sergeant Patrick Roberts of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Above and Beyond the Call of Duty Award.

Pastor Patrick Miller of the Bethlehem Baptist Church, Pastor Vincent Smith, Doctor Harriet Moore of the Trinity Youth and Family Services, Geoffrey Gilot and Al-Muta Hawks with the Boys and Girls Club of Sarasota will receive the Associate Service Award.

The Manatee County Special Investigations Division will receive the Unit Citation Award. The members of this unit are: Major William Jordan, Captain Todd Shear, Lieutenant Anthony Carr, Division Secretary Toni Burton, Administrative Assistant Cindy Hoffman, Sergeant Jason Powell, Detective James Parrish, Detective Kim Zink, Detective Greg Dunlap, Detective Mike Diaz, Bruce Benjamin (Crime Stoppers), Amber Hoffman (Manager), Erica Chenard (UCR Coordinator), Criminal Analyst Ashley Eannarino, Criminal Analyst Elicia Main, Intel Analyst Don Brown, Criminal Analyst John Ferrito, Intel Analyst Elizabeth Thomas, Sergeant Evelio Perez, Detective Joseph Petta, Detective Justin Warren, Detective Derek Pollock, Detective Eric Davis, Detective Ray Richter, Detective Patrick Thames, Detective Scott Williamson, Sergeant Gary Combee, Detective William Freel, Detective Maria Gillum, Detective Bryce Wilhelm, Detective Jonathan Kruse, Sergeant Steve Barron, Detective Randall Walker, Detective Brian Beck, Detective Shayne Rousseau, Detective Jeremy Martin, Detective Robert Brigham, Sergeant Isaac Redmond, Detective Rafael Ortegon, Detective Christopher Gallagher, Detective Joel Taylor, Detective David Bocchino, Detective Lourdes Santiago, Detective Aaron Bowling, Sergeant Brian Quiles and Detective Wendy Zarvis.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM DWIGHT TESTER, SR.

#### HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Sergeant William

Dwight Tester, Sr., father of Joyce Kraemer and William Dwight Tester, Jr., brother of Venora Hatley, grandfather of Lt. Commander Dustin Kraemer, Brandon Kraemer, and Brian Kraemer, great-grandfather of Max Kraemer, uncle of William C. Hatley, and husband of the late Josephine Tester. Sergeant Tester dedicated his life to serving his community and our nation, serving in the Korean War as a member of the 37th Infantry Division and later in the Ohio National Guard's Company B 137th Tank Battalion.

Sergeant Tester was born on February 3, 1933 in Butler, Tennessee to the late Roscoe and Roxie Tester and lived most of his life in Rittman, Ohio. Following his service to the country, he was employed as a tool and die maker at the former Packaging Corporation of America, retiring after 40 years of service. He was also an active member of his community, serving in the Doylestown American Legion post No. 407 and the Doylestown Lions Club. Sergeant Tester was an avid farmer and gardener, but above all else, he enjoyed spending time with his family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize a life so fully lived. William Dwight Tester, Sr. instilled the values of service, hard work and integrity into his children, grandchildren, employees, and mentees; values that we should all strive to uphold in our daily lives. I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in paying tribute to a valued soldier and citizen, Sergeant William Dwight Tester, Sr.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 2017, I voted Yes during Roll Call 321 on the Davidson of Ohio Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 2842; I intended to vote No.

#### HONORING TEJ MAAN, YUBA CITY CITY COUNCIL

#### HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tej Maan, an upstanding citizen and Councilmember in my district.

Mr. Maan has been the Director of Environmental Health in Yuba County since 1998, where he has created vital safeguards to protect the environmental health and wellbeing of the Yuba County community.

Additionally, Mr. Maan is a member of the Punjabi American Heritage Society, the California Conference of Directors of Environmental Health, and the Yuba City Chamber of Commerce. He is the host of a local television show called "Punjabi Waves," which features discussions and in-depth interviews on current events and issues in the Punjabi community.

Mr. Maan is also the founder of the first Sikh School in the United States, which is lo-

cated in Yuba City, California. Tej's love for America and selfless dedication to his community have made him a well-respected and treasured member of the Yuba City region. I offer my utmost appreciation and gratitude for Tej Maan's many contributions to society.

#### CONGRATULATING THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN FOR HOSTING EXPO 2017 AND ON THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF KAZAKHSTAN'S CAPITAL CITY, ASTANA

#### HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Republic of Kazakhstan on hosting the much anticipated EXPO 2017, and to congratulate them on the 20th anniversary of the founding of the capital city Astana, where the Expo is being held.

The theme for EXPO 2017 is "Future Energy," which is particularly fitting for Kazakhstan as the country has become a leader in renewable energy in Central Asia. Kazakhstan's efforts with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in the 1990's, as well as their ratification of the more recent Kyoto Protocol extension, clearly exhibit their commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and slowing global warming. Domestically, Kazakhstan continues to construct hydropower plants, providing jobs to local communities while meeting the increasing demands for energy in Eurasia. Additionally, the Kyzylorda and Aral regions have been proposed for the installation of solar power plants and solar stills in rivers to better provide clean drinking water to those areas in need of this life sustaining resource. Finally, Kazakhstan has provided robust funding for research dedicated to the advancement of wind energy efficiency.

I would like to also note the great work of our Kazakh friends in building Astana into one of the most industrialized cities in Central Asia over the past 20 years. This diligent work has resulted in Astana exhibiting remarkable growth in investment, industrial output, and small business development since its designation as capital in 1997. In addition, Astana's education and healthcare systems serve as a model for the programs of fellow recovering post-Soviet nations.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing to pursue a strong U.S.-Kazakh relationship as we work together to bring peace and security to Central Asia, and as we work together to decrease greenhouse gas emissions and invest in renewable energy.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO PRINCIPAL  
JOHN WILLIAMS ON THE OCCA-  
SION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM  
CARMEL HIGH SCHOOL

**HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Principal John Williams on the occasion of his retirement. For the past forty years, Principal Williams devoted his life to providing an exceptional educational experience to students. In his 14 years at Carmel High School, there has been tremendous growth and continued improvement under Principal Williams' guidance. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Principal Williams' commitment to educating the next generation of Indiana students to be knowledgeable, passionate, and active members of their community.

As a lifelong Hoosier, born and raised in Evansville, Indiana, Williams began his own education by attending Harrison High School. Williams never intended to pursue a career in education. However, during college, after working with his high school wrestling coach, he realized his passion for developing young minds. He changed his major and after graduation was hired to his first teaching position at Harrison High School. He taught social studies and coached young athletes. After a number of years teaching, Williams decided to pursue his administrator's license, which led to a position as assistant principal at Harrison High School where he served the community for seven years. When the principal of Harrison High School retired, Williams was tapped for the role and led the school as the principal for three years. Then came the opportunity to move to Carmel High School.

Principal Williams arrived at Carmel in 2003. During his time at Carmel High School, the student population grew from just under 4,000 to more than 5,000. Principal Williams was influential in quadrupling the number of students taking AP courses, more than doubling the number of dual credit courses offered and introducing the International Baccalaureate program to the school in 2006. In addition to the increasingly high caliber academics, extra-curricular activities such as sports and the arts have thrived as well, providing an excellent well-rounded education to students. Carmel High School's excellence did not go unrecognized. Under his tenure, Carmel High School accumulated among too many championships to name, including, sixty-seven athletic state championships, consistently finished in the top ten of the Bands of America competition and graduated hundreds of National Merit and National Achievement Scholars. Principal Williams' sincere interest in the education and well-being of his 5,000 students can be seen through his accomplishments as well as his morning ritual of shaking hands and giving high-fives in the hallways.

Principal Williams has made a remarkable impression on the lives of his students, faculty, and the Carmel community. He has truly left a legacy of success at Carmel High School that will be built upon for decades to come. On be-

half of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I'd like to congratulate Principal Williams on his extraordinary career and extend a huge thank you for all the wonderful contributions he has made to our Hoosier community. While I know Principal Williams will be missed, I wish the very best to him and his wife Paula, his son Jared, his two daughters Katie Niles and Jessica Dedmond, his stepchildren Brandon Gregory, Andrea Gregory, their spouses, and grandchildren as he enjoys a well-deserved retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF CLARENCE  
CAMPBELL'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO  
THE ANN ARBOR COMMUNITY

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the birthday of Clarence Campbell for his many years of service to the community of Ann Arbor as an entrepreneur and mentor. Mr. Campbell was one of the first African-American businessmen in the area and has made significant contributions to the growth and development of the Ann Arbor community.

Mr. Campbell moved to Ann Arbor in 1965 and has played an important role in the community through his business and philanthropic initiatives. In 1970, he started a full-service auto detail shop, Ann Arbor Auto-Glo, which initially provided auto repair services to city residents. Over the years, Mr. Campbell and his business partner, James Vann Jr., expanded their business to include car sales and commercial real estate development. The two remained business partners for over 30 years until their retirement in 2007, and their businesses provided important services and jobs to Ann Arbor residents. In addition to managing his auto detailing business, Mr. Campbell was involved in the arts community, supporting local musicians and also working to help finance several plays in the area. Collectively, these efforts have helped create robust business and cultural scenes in the Ann Arbor area.

Mr. Campbell's work with his businesses, as well as his involvement with music and theatre productions, has played a key role in the development of Ann Arbor. In addition to his work, Mr. Campbell also contributes to the community through his involvement with the Ann Arbor Boxing Club, where he serves as a mentor to area youth. In this capacity, Mr. Campbell works to train club members while teaching them the principles of discipline and mental toughness. This work helps inspire future youth and provide them with guidance and mentorship. Mr. Campbell's involvement in working with area youth underscores his commitment to the Ann Arbor community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mr. Clarence Campbell for his lifetime of service to Ann Arbor and its residents. His work in the business and community has impacted countless lives.

HONORING THE CENTRAL YORK  
HIGH SCHOOL BOYS  
VOLLEYBALL TEAM

**HON. SCOTT PERRY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly honor my constituents, the Central York High School Boys Volleyball Team, on earning the Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association (PIAA) Class AAA championship. These young men have brought home our seventh PIAA State Championship.

The State Championship capped a phenomenal year for the Panthers, which included a York-Adams League title, District 3 AAA crown and state gold medal.

The Panthers team has an army of loyal supporters. I extend my congratulations to head coach, Todd Goodling, and the school officials, family and friends that supported our young men on this incredible journey. On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I commend and congratulate the Central York High School Boys Volleyball Team on earning the 2017 State Championship. Their work ethic and commitment to excellence sets the standard for all others to follow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BILLY LONG**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 21, 2017, Thursday, June 22, 2017, and Friday, June 23, 2017, I was unable to vote on any legislative measures due to having surgery on my foot. Had I been present, I would have voted the following:

Roll Call No. 311, On motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 312, On ordering the previous question providing for consideration of H.R. 1873, the Electricity and Reliability and Forest Protection Act; and H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 313, On adoption of the combined rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1873, the Electricity and Reliability and Forest Protection Act; and H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 314, On agreeing to the amendment of Mr. CARBAJAL of California No. 1 to H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, I would have voted no;

Roll Call No. 315, On passage of H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 316, On ordering the previous question providing for consideration of H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 317, On adoption of the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 318, On agreeing to the amendment of Mr. LOWENTHAL of California No. 2 to H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, I would have voted no;

Roll Call No. 319, On passage of H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 320, On agreeing to the amendment of Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY of Illinois No. 4 to H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, I would have voted yes;

Roll Call No. 321, On agreeing to the amendment of Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio No. 5 to H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, I would have voted yes; and Roll Call No. 322, On passage of H.R. 2842, the Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act, I would have voted yes.

#### HONORING BETHEL COMMUNITY STOREHOUSE

#### HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of the Bethel Community Storehouse in Moriarty, New Mexico. Serving the impoverished and the homeless, the Bethel Community Storehouse has been a generous contributor to the Greater Estancia Valley and East Mountain area.

In 1987, a bus driver noticed students that were not dressed properly for the weather; she quickly began providing food and clothes to some of the children on her route. Eventually, there were so many people who needed help that she reached out to a local church. Shortly afterward, the Bethel United Methodist Church Missions Outreach established the Bethel Community Storehouse. In 1991, the storehouse was incorporated as a non-profit entity and moved into its own building.

The Bethel Community Storehouse has been a place of reassurance for struggling families and now employs 10 staff members.

In 2016, the storehouse helped nearly 8,000 families. It served approximately 440,824 meals and clothed 1,387 families. By the end of 2016, volunteers logged 18,600 hours, and 143 community partners helped the Bethel Community Storehouse. Each year, Bethel provides families in need with food, clothing, school supplies, and much more.

We look forward to many more years of service to the community from the Bethel Community Storehouse. This storehouse has been a lifeline to a community in need and showcases true New Mexican compassion. I am confident that the Bethel Community Storehouse will continue giving hope to the surrounding community for years to come.

#### HONORING NANCY DUFF CAMP- BELL, CO-FOUNDER OF THE NA- TIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER

#### HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the many who have gathered in paying tribute to an outstanding leader in the women's movement and my good friend, Nancy Duff Campbell as she steps down as co-president of the National Women's Law Center.

Duffy, as she is affectionately known, has dedicated a lifetime to moving the agenda of women's rights forward and has left an indelible mark on our nation. In 1972, at a time when the United States looked very different for women and women's issues were still considered "fringe issues," Duffy, along with the incomparable Marcia Greenberger, founded the National Women's Law Center, an organization that has become an invaluable resource in the fight for women's rights across the country. The NWLC is responsible for marking critical advances to improve the lives of women for more than 40 years, ensuring that the health and civil rights of women are kept at the forefront of public policy debate and lawmaking. Simply put, the strides we have made would not have been possible without the tireless advocacy of the National Women's Law Center.

A recognized expert on women's law and public policy issues for over forty-five years, Duffy has been a driving force in the development and implementation of key legislative initiatives and litigation protecting women's rights, particularly on issues affecting low-income women and their families. Her expertise on women's law and public policy issues knows no equal and her focus on issues affecting low-income women brought their stories into the public eye where they belonged. She was behind successful litigation protecting benefits for unemployed mothers, the right to child support, and the expansion of the rights of military women facing myriad issues from sexual harassment to the ability to serve in combat.

Duffy's leadership and vision have been recognized with a myriad of awards and accolades over the course of her career. She was named by Working Woman magazine as one of the top 25 heroines whose actions over the last 25 years have advanced Women in the workplace, a Woman of Genius by Trinity Washington University, and the 2010 Woman Lawyer of the Year by the District of Columbia Women's Bar Association. She received a Lifetime Achievement Award from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services for her "efforts on behalf of America's children," and was appointed by Congress to the U.S. Commission on Child and Family Welfare, to study and make recommendations on a range of issues. She was the sole North American representative to the 2009 United Nations Conference on the Implications for Women of the Global Financial Crisis and in 2010 was appointed by the Secretary of Defense to the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in

the Services. These are just a sample of the recognitions she has received—the legacy she leaves is extraordinary.

I consider myself fortunate to have had so many opportunities to work with and learn from Duffy and I am honored to call her my friend. Her unwavering commitment and personal passion will always serve as an inspiration, not only to myself but for countless others. While her stepping down as co-president is bittersweet, I have no doubt that Duffy will continue to find ways to make a difference.

Trailblazer, advocate, mentor, and friend—for all of her good work and invaluable contributions, I am pleased to rise today to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to Nancy Duff Campbell. I thank her for all she has done for women in this country. I wish her all the best for health, happiness, and success in everything that comes next.

#### CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF MARCIA D. GREENBERGER AND NANCY DUFF CAMPBELL

#### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bold and visionary leadership of Marcia D. Greenberger and Nancy Duff Campbell, co-founders and co-presidents of the National Women's Law Center (NWLC). Exceptional lawyers, shrewd strategists, and formidable coalition-builders, they retire after five decades on the frontlines of virtually every major advance for women and girls in this nation.

One of Marcia and Duffy's greatest legacies is the persistent leadership of the National Women's Law Center, the legal advocacy organization they co-founded and co-directed—pioneering progress for women and girls at a moment of landmark new legal and legislative victories for women's rights.

Under Marcia and Duffy's leadership, the NWLC grew into one of America's most formidable and effective organizations for advancing women's rights and opportunities.

Guided by their leadership, the NWLC will continue to honor their founders through strategic, effective and groundbreaking advocacy for a new generation of women and girls. Beyond the Center, the many female, and male, advocates who have been mentored and supported by Marcia and Duffy over the years continue to carry forward their vision.

Marcia's induction to the national Women's Hall of Fame at Seneca Falls, NY in 2015 was a fitting honor for an extraordinary person who has earned a place in the pantheon of champions for America's women. Duffy has been rightly honored with a Lifetime Achievement Award from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services for her "efforts on behalf of America's children." These awards are just two of the many recognitions they have received for their leadership.

It has been my honor to work with Marcia and Duffy for three decades and witness first hand their dedication and commitment. On behalf of their many friends in Congress, I commend Marcia D. Greenberger and Nancy Duff



Campbell for lifetimes of transformational service for the women of this country and wish them well in all their future endeavors.

THAT SPECIAL FORCE INSIDE: IN  
HONOR OF JARED BULLOCK'S  
COURAGE

**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of one of Illinois finest, SFC Jared Bullock of 3rd Battalion 7th Special Forces Group United States Army who grew up in Metropolis. After the 9/11 attacks, Jared and his twin brother Kyle enlisted in the Army to help protect our Nation. After serving two tours in Iraq, SFC Bullock later became a member of the 7th Special Forces Group. He was then almost mortally wounded in Afghanistan in an IED blast on November 13, 2013. The blast killed his friend Staff Sgt. Richard Vazquez and took Jared's arm and leg. It would take 30 surgeries in order to bring Jared back to where he is today. Jared has said, "he knew his life was not over and took the challenge to push on even harder." He has developed special training techniques which have advanced the ability for all others with similar injuries to gain strength and rebuild their lives. He is a fitness and exercise fanatic, pushing the limits of his body to gain strength and good health. He is the proud father of a son Aidan, and is supported by his lovely wife Jessica who is a nurse who adds new meaning to stand by your man. I include in the RECORD this poem penned in his honor by Albert Caswell.

All in the footsteps of our lives  
All in the paths that we so stride  
Which comes from so very deep down inside  
To reach our final destination, to arrive  
If we wish to reach for the sky  
Must come from that burning force from  
within which resides  
Is but that Special Force in our hearts which  
lies  
To help us climb the highest mountains in  
our time  
When, failure is not an option  
In what we decide  
To help us win all those wars with courage  
fine  
Will we give up or steadfastly go onward to  
rebuild our lives?  
Will we harness that great force from deep  
down inside?  
Or live in pity and cry?  
As on each new day a part of us begins to die  
When that magnificent force so decides  
So hold's the key to help us make our strides  
To from out of the ashes to begin to rise  
To new beginnings,  
To new heights realized  
Just when all our hopes and dreams so seem  
to be compromised  
All in these the darkest days of our lives  
But, comes that Special Force from deep  
down inside  
The kind of force which helps us go off to  
war  
And give up all we love and adore  
With the kind of light that helps us put it all  
on the line  
That even makes the angels up in heaven cry  
And makes us heaven bound when we die

Indeed it takes a special heart  
Who will don a uniform  
and so patriotically march onward to do  
their part  
But, for the greater good all in their hearts  
As did you Jared thou art  
And oh what a striking figure in uniform  
you'd so cast  
Like all of our great American Heroes into  
the future and from out of the past  
Who went off to war and did not ask  
And then that fateful day  
When, they took your strong arm and leg  
away  
And your brother Ssgt Vazquez's life,  
for whom you still weep for this day  
While, lying so close to death  
Would you fall or would you crest?  
As it looked as if you had none left  
As when you chose to fight your new fight,  
all in your quest  
As we stood back in awe,  
and watched what your heart of courage  
could so etched  
As this Special Force deep down inside of  
you would bless  
As your heart and soul began to flex  
Even Arnold, such dynamic gains could not  
expect!  
As always,  
To be the best  
No limits  
No limits,  
From you Jared is what we've all come to  
expect  
As we watched your magnificent heart so  
flex  
What will we do in the darkest days of our  
lives?  
When, all around us such heartache lies  
When, all the hope seems to die  
All in war's aftermath which lies  
Will we find the strength to climb  
Letting that Special Force in hearts help us  
to find  
The strength and courage and faith to all re-  
mind  
That there is no mountain high enough,  
No sorrow deep enough  
No valley steep enough  
Which can defeat that Special Force Inside.

IN RECOGNITION OF NANCY CAMP-  
BELL FOR HER CAREER WITH  
THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW  
CENTER

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Nancy Campbell for her work with the National Women's Law Center. As founder and co-president of the organization, Ms. Campbell has been an effective advocate for women throughout her career.

Ms. Campbell began her career as a law professor with appointments at the Georgetown University Law Center and Catholic University's School of Law in Washington, DC. She also served as an attorney with the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law, where she cofounded the National Women's Law Center with Marcia Greenberger in 1981 as an outgrowth of their work with the institution. The NWLC provides legal assistance for women and develops legislative initiatives to promote fair treatment for women and girls in the

United States. The center has been at the forefront of driving action to address these issues, and its advocacy has let to real improvements in protections for women, including stronger enforcement of Title IX, the federal law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex.

As cofounder of the NWLC, Ms. Campbell has played a pivotal role in shaping the organization and advancing priorities for women. She was a participant in a successful Supreme Court case that expanded AFDC eligibility to include two-parent families with unemployed mothers, and has strengthened the rights of military women who have faced sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace. As a result of these accomplishments, Ms. Campbell has received numerous accolades, including a Lifetime Achievement Award from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the District of Columbia Bar's William J. Brennan Award in recognition of her outstanding legal career serving the public. She has been a tireless advocate for women and families, and it is my hope that the NWLC continues to build on her legacy of excellence as she moves on from her current position with the organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Nancy Campbell for her career with the National Women's Law Center. Ms. Campbell's efforts have led to significant improvements in legal protections for women.

RECOGNIZING MR. BRIAN  
CURLLESS, FOR BEING NAMED  
THE 54TH ANNUAL WORLD LIVE-  
STOCK AUCTIONEER CHAMPION

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brian Curless of Pittsfield, Illinois, for being named the 54th annual World Livestock Auctioneer Champion by the Livestock Marketing Association.

Mr. Curless stood out amongst 30 other auctioneers in the World Livestock Auctioneer Championship, and was awarded this prestigious title after three rounds of competition. This event works to bring together North America's best livestock auctioneers, showcasing the skill and professionalism required in the livestock auction industry. As someone who has visited the LMA-member Fairview Sale Barn and learned how to be auctioneer from Mr. Curless during a "Cheri on Shift," I can undoubtedly speak to his passion and talent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again formally congratulate Mr. Curless on his title as the World Livestock Auctioneer Champion. I am proud to have Mr. Curless represent our strong agricultural community on the world's stage.

BICENTENNIAL OF  
McCONNELLSVILLE, OHIO**HON. STEVE STIVERS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Congressional District to recognize the bicentennial of McConnellsville, Ohio. Since the earliest settlers first made their homes in the village of Old Town, along the Muskingum River, McConnellsville has been the hub of Morgan County and serves as a reminder of much of our nation's early history.

As early as 1817, many recognized the advantages of the area, including the town's namesake, Roger McConnel. One of the community's earliest residents, he saw its potential and gifted four lots to the fledgling town. A tribute to his memory and the strength of this community, the town's Court House still stands resolute on two of those lots.

Fueled by Mr. McConnel's gift and its strategic location on the riverfront, the area grew rapidly in its earliest years—five churches, fifteen stores, two newspaper offices, and four factories had sprung up by 1846.

Today, it remains the county seat of Morgan County, and a wonderful place to work, live, and raise a family. I am grateful for the leadership of Mayor John Finley, the Members of the Village Council, and all of the neighbors and friends who have maintained McConnellsville's strong connection to tradition and history.

I am honored to represent this village, where the core values of our nation are exemplified. This is a place where community, faith, and freedom are celebrated not just in recognition of the 200th anniversary of its founding, but each and every day.

SOUTH KOREAN PRESIDENT MOON  
JAE-IN U.S. VISIT**HON. MIMI WALTERS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the South Korean President's upcoming trip to the United States. This marks the first official visit to the United States by President Moon Jae-in since his election on May 9, 2017.

The United States and the Republic of Korea share a close friendship based on shared values of freedom and democracy. Our Nations' cooperation has enriched our cultures, grown our economies, and strengthened our security against mutual threats.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my warmest welcome to President Moon Jae-in and hope that his visit is productive and serves to strengthen the important partnership between our Nations.

WELCOME TO SOUTH KOREAN  
PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN**HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 26, 2017*

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, thank you (Kam sa ham ne da).

I rise today as a co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Korea and member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to extend to President Moon Jae-In, the President of the Republic of Korea, a warm welcome from the House of Representatives on the occasion of his first visit to the United States.

The U.S. and R.O.K. share an alliance forged in blood. Yesterday, June 25 marked 67 years since the outbreak of conflict on the Korean Peninsula.

Out of the ashes of the Korean War emerged a partnership that endures to this day, and it is one of the true success stories of U.S. collaboration in the Asia-Pacific.

The R.O.K. is an economic juggernaut with a vibrant democracy, and the U.S. considers it the lynchpin of U.S. foreign policy in the region.

During his visit, I think he will be glad to find that Korean-Americans are as engaged as ever in community activism and civic leadership, and that Korean pop-culture, food, and entertainment are further enriching American culture.

Alliances are often defined by economic ties or military ties, but the U.S.-R.O.K. alliance runs even deeper . . .

We have family ties, and I and my fellow members of the Congressional Caucus on Korea are proud to contribute to that bond.

I wish President Moon well and look forward to a successful trip and working with him going forward.

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 27, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED  
June 28

Time to be announced

## Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Mark Andrew Green, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

S-216

## Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 1024, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

TBA

7 a.m.

## Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-222

8:30 a.m.

## Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of David James Glawe, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

SH-216

9:30 a.m.

## Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Timothy J. Kelly, and Trevor N. McFadden, of Virginia, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, and Jeffrey Bossert Clark, of Virginia, and Beth Ann Williams, of New Jersey, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

10 a.m.

## Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Steven Gill Bradbury, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, and Elizabeth Erin Walsh, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.

SR-253

## Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider S. 822, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, S. 1359, to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, S. 810, to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, S. 1395, to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in Delaware, an original bill entitled, "Diesel Emissions Reduction Act of 2017", General Services Administration resolutions,

and the nominations of Annie Caputo, of Virginia, and David Wright, of South Carolina, each to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Susan Parker Bodine, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

## Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed briefing on North Korea, focusing on recent developments.

SVC-217

## Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Claire M. Grady, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, and Henry Kerner, of California, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel.

SD-342

## Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine Russian intervention in European elections.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation.

SD-138

June 29

7 a.m.

## Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-222

9 a.m.

## Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 1405, to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration, S. 875, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs, S. 1426, to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, S. 1393, to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses, and the nominations of David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, and Derek Kan, of California, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

SD-106

9:30 a.m.

## Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine conservation and forestry, focusing on perspectives on the past and future direction for the 2018 Farm Bill.

SH-216

10 a.m.

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-192

## Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine principles of housing finance reform.

SD-538

## Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 1312, to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States, S. 1311, to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States, and the nominations of Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General, John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, and Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SD-226

## Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

10:15 a.m.

## Committee on Appropriations

## Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the Capitol Police; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SD-124

June 30

7 a.m.

## Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

SR-222

**SENATE—Tuesday, June 27, 2017**

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, Ruler of all nature, Your strong right hand continues to sustain us. The Earth belongs to You and everything in it.

Today, inspire our Senators to trust fervently in You. Lord, show them the path that leads to success in their many endeavors. Guide them with Your truth and plant Your secrets of joy in the soil of their hearts. May integrity and honesty protect them as they put their hope in You. Let Your wisdom sound a clarion call in their minds so they will glorify You with faithful service. Fill them with an attitude of gratitude.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The Senator from Utah, the President pro tempore.

**TAX REFORM**

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to discuss once again the ongoing effort to reform our Nation's Tax Code.

I have been coming to the floor regularly to talk about this subject for more than 6 years, and, during that time, more and more Americans have recognized the need to fix our broken and outdated tax system. Members of Congress from both parties have similarly acknowledged that, when it comes to our Tax Code, the status quo is untenable.

President Trump has made tax reform one of his top priorities, which is essential. Presidential leadership on tax reform has been sorely lacking in the past. Of course, for some the involvement of the President in this endeavor complicates matters. Indeed, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle are, by all appearances, bound and determined to block the passage of any part of President Trump's agenda even if, in terms of policy, there is common ground and it is good for all Americans. Still, I welcome the involvement of the President in this effort and hope that more and more of my colleagues will eventually do the same.

Today I want to take a few minutes to rebut the growing narrative in the media and elsewhere that tax reform is going to be a secretive exercise, involving the input of only a few key players.

True enough, there have been meetings involving the administration, House and Senate leaders, and tax writers in recent weeks, wherein we have been discussing tax reform at a high level in an effort to reach some agreement. However, while this process may result in an agreed upon framework, this will not be the be-all and end-all of tax reform. On the contrary, as chairman of the Senate's tax-writing committee, I am committed to ensuring a robust process in the Senate for developing, considering, and passing any tax reform package. That is how the Senate functions best, and that is what I intend to see happen.

Toward that end, I have been working to involve all of the Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee in this effort. We have a number of great Senators on the committee, many of whom have put in years of work on different areas of the tax system. I think it would be foolish to let that experience and expertise go to waste, especially at this time in our lives. Every Republican on the committee is involved in this process, and I have asked some Senators to focus on particular areas.

For example, I have asked Senators ENZI and PORTMAN to focus on the international tax system. This issue is essential. Our antiquated international tax system leaves American businesses at a decidedly competitive disadvantage, and it is one of the main drivers behind the stream of inversions and foreign takeovers we have seen in recent years. Both of these Senators have put in a lot of time and a lot of work on this issue in developing proposals for a better path forward, and some of that development in the past has oc-

curred with substantive input from our Democratic friends. With both Senators ENZI and PORTMAN working on this issue, I think we can and will see significant progress.

In addition, I have asked Senator GRASSLEY, a former Finance Committee chairman himself and currently chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to take a look at our individual tax system. I think most of us here in Congress—and not just on the Republican side—would like to see a tax reform bill that reduces the tax burden on middle-class individuals and families. I think Senator GRASSLEY and others will put their experience to good use.

Likewise, Senator THUNE has quite a bit of experience and expertise when it comes to the business tax system, and he has done a lot of work over the years to reform the estate tax. So I have asked him to provide his thoughts and advice as we work through these issues.

I have asked Senators HELLER and CASSIDY to work on solutions for energy tax policy. Similarly, I have asked Senator ROBERTS to find solutions to tax issues relating to agriculture.

There are other issues out there, as well, and over time I intend to enlist the help of other committee members to focus on particular tax issues and provide advice and assistance on crafting suitable reforms.

So, as you can see, the idea that tax reform is going to be a closed-door exercise is absurd, at least as things pertain to the Senate. Every Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee is involved in this effort.

Of course, we will need to go beyond the committee as well. There are Members throughout the conference with particular interests and expertise relating to tax policy. Many of my colleagues have introduced bills over the years and have become outspoken advocates on a number of key issues. I want those Members to be involved as well.

Just to be clear, I do not think this process should be limited to just Republican input. I want to see Democrats at the table. I want a bipartisan process that renders a bipartisan result. I think the relevant leaders from the administration have said much the same thing.

I have reached out to my Democratic colleagues on the Finance Committee and invited them to participate. Once again, I do not believe this process has to be limited to the committee. Any Member of the Senate, from either

party, should have an opportunity to express his or her views and ideas and have them considered as part of this process.

I am willing to sit down and work with anyone who wants to be a good-faith participant in this endeavor and who wants, ultimately, to see it succeed. After all, we have had years and years of bipartisan efforts, including working groups and reports, to find common ground. Recently, however, we have not been hearing much from our Democratic colleagues and friends when it comes to tax reform.

We have heard some of the usual accusations that Republicans are hell-bent on giving massive tax breaks to the super wealthy and inflicting some harm or another on the middle class—total bullcorn but, nevertheless, a constant theme by those on the other side. It is a constant, annoying theme by those on the other side.

We have also heard some process demands that some have set as preconditions for any real bipartisan tax reform discussions. All too often, those preconditions either reflect a lack of willingness to compromise or outright demands for things that are unrelated to tax reform.

In other words, we have heard our colleagues cite a number of reasons as to why they do not want to work with us on tax reform, and I suspect that, to some degree, this false narrative about secrecy and closed doors on tax reform will be added to the list. But I will say it again: I am willing to work with anyone—Republican or Democrat—in this effort. If anyone doubts my sincerity, I think my record for bipartisanship and compromise should speak for itself.

Long story short, my goal on tax reform is to draft and pass a bill with the broadest possible support and input from all who are interested in helping put our economy on a sustained, higher growth path. To do that, I think we need a vigorous and open debate in the Senate, which, in my view, should include a full process in committee and regular order on the Senate floor. At the end of this process, no one should be able to credibly claim that he was unable to participate or that he did not have enough information about the bill.

So I hope this puts to rest any claims or suppositions that the tax reform process is going to be secretive in nature, because, if I have my way, this process is going to be open, fair, and joint. It will be open, and it will be bipartisan.

The goal of everyone in this body, with respect to tax reform, ought to be to help the American people by providing tax relief to American families, simplifying the tax system, improving our business tax system to allow American businesses to compete in the global economy, and creating stronger

growth in the economy, wages, jobs, and opportunity.

I hope more of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important effort. It is important that we work our Tax Code out. It is a mess. It is not working. Too many people feel oppressed by it. A lot of our Members of the Senate do not feel very good about our current Tax Code. I do not feel good about it either. I think we need to get together as people who really want to help this country out and want to do the best for our constituents—whether they are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, or whatever—and do it the right way.

I just hope we can get enough interest on both sides of the floor to be able to do what really needs to be done in this very crucial area, and I intend to see that we do. As chairman of the tax-writing committee, we are going to do it. I just hope that I will have some support from the other side, as well, and that they will dig in and present their viewpoints and give us their ideas and help to mold and modify and work and improve and decide what is great in any tax approach that we take.

This is the greatest country in the world. We have the greatest economy in the world. We have the greatest opportunities in the world, but we can certainly hurt every one of those aspects of our lives if we do not handle the tax reform issue properly and if we do not handle taxes properly. I think it is important that we get together, work together, and get rid of some of the churlish stupidity that occasionally exists around this place and start doing what is best for the United States of America and best for all of our supporters, best for all of our constituents, and best for the world, really, because, if the United States is strong and powerful, the rest of the world will be better off.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION BILL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would like to read a few headlines from the past couple of weeks.

From the Detroit Free Press: “ObamaCare rates in Michigan could skyrocket as much as 31 percent in 2018.”

This is from the Associated Press: “New Mexico health insurer proposes 80 percent premium hike.”

From the Washington Examiner: “CMS: 47 counties won’t have ObamaCare coverage in 2018.”

From Bloomberg: “Anthem to Leave ObamaCare Markets in Indiana and Wisconsin.”

From the Washington Free Beacon: “Last Insurer in Delaware Requests Rate Hike of 33.6 Percent for 2018.”

These headlines should probably be shocking—an 80-percent premium increase; 47 counties without an insurer—but they are not. Insurers leaving the market, huge premium hikes, lack of coverage—that is par for the course for ObamaCare. Unfortunately, too many Americans have gotten used to those types of headlines. I have lost count how many times I have come down to the floor to read similar headlines.

While these headlines may not be shocking anymore, they are still disturbing. Behind these stories are tens of thousands of struggling Americans who can no longer afford the ObamaCare premiums, Americans who are losing their healthcare plan again, Americans who are worried they won’t have any coverage options at all for 2018. ObamaCare may have been well-intentioned, but good intentions are not enough.

ObamaCare was fatally flawed from the beginning, and it is rapidly imploding. We can do one of two things: We can just wait around for the exchanges to collapse completely, as our colleagues across the aisle seem inclined to do, or we can act. Sitting around waiting for the exchanges to collapse might be the easier path, but we can’t do much good for the American people if we are sitting on the bench and watching.

Republicans promised the American people that we would rescue them from the burdens of ObamaCare, and we intend to keep that promise. Last week, Senate Republicans released legislation to start undoing the damage caused by ObamaCare. It is called the Better Care Reconciliation Act.

To start with, our bill provides relief to individuals and families by repealing ObamaCare’s burdensome individual and employer mandates. Under our legislation, Americans will no longer be forced to buy insurance they don’t want or can’t afford. Employers will no longer be faced with the choice of reducing worker hours or not hiring more employees simply to avoid the Federal Government’s heavy hand.

Our bill also repeals the burdensome ObamaCare taxes. Taxes have consequences. When you raise taxes on everything from lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers, to health insurance itself, which ObamaCare did, it is no surprise that these things get less affordable. Our goal with this bill is to make healthcare more affordable and more accessible for all Americans. Repealing ObamaCare taxes is one part of that.

Stabilizing the rapidly collapsing ObamaCare markets is another part.

Premiums on the exchanges are spiraling out of control, and insurers are fleeing the marketplace. The Better Care Act will help stabilize the markets and check premium increases.

The Better Care Act provides funding to help States implement solutions to help make healthcare more affordable for their low-income and high-risk residents.

Giving States flexibility was an important priority for us in drafting the Better Care Act. ObamaCare, of course, took the opposite approach, attempting to impose a one-size-fits-all solution on every State in the Union. But the problem with that is that it is pretty much impossible for a massive Federal bureaucracy to hand down one comprehensive solution that will somehow meet the needs of everyone in this country, not to mention that top-down, one-size-fits-all solutions are seldom the most efficient or affordable. Bureaucracy costs money, after all.

Our goal in drafting the Better Care Act was to make sure the States had the flexibility to address the needs of their specific populations. So we provide a State innovation fund to help them meet the particular needs of their residents. We also empower States by simplifying the waiver process by which they can seek relief from some of ObamaCare's demands and by allowing them to encourage a greater variety of healthcare solutions. We give States more flexibility when it comes to meeting the needs of their residents who rely on Medicaid.

In addition to giving States the flexibility to design affordable healthcare solutions and to encourage innovation, our bill also provides help directly to Americans who are most in need. The Better Care Act provides advanceable and refundable tax credits to Americans making from zero to 350 percent of the Federal poverty level. The credits are adjusted to ensure that those in the most need get the most help.

Among other things, these credits will provide help to low-income Americans around the country who currently receive no healthcare assistance. In many States, thousands of Americans are unable to qualify for Medicaid but don't earn enough to get ObamaCare subsidies. That leaves these families with no assistance when it comes to purchasing health insurance. The Better Care Act fixes this.

The Wall Street Journal reports: "The Senate bill would extend eligibility for premium subsidies to about 2.6 million more adults with income below the federal poverty line, according to estimates from the Kaiser Family Foundation."

Since ObamaCare became law, I have heard from so many South Dakotans struggling under the law's mandates and the massive healthcare costs it has imposed. This bill is going to bring them relief. No more ObamaCare man-

dates, protection for those with pre-existing conditions, more affordable premiums, a more stable insurance market, assistance for low-income families, more flexibility to contribute to health savings accounts, increased flexibility for States to meet the needs of their Medicaid populations, more funding for hospitals that provide care to low-income South Dakotans, relief from ObamaCare taxes and, for the first time ever, 37,000 South Dakotans living below 100 percent of the poverty level will have assistance in getting health insurance on the individual market. This bill will give South Dakotans and all Americans access to better and more affordable healthcare.

The Better Care Act is the product of weeks of dialogue and collaboration among the Members of our conference, and I am particularly grateful to Senators ALEXANDER, ENZI, and HATCH, who have helped provide outstanding leadership throughout this process.

As I said earlier, Republicans made the American people a promise. We promised we would provide relief to the millions of Americans suffering under ObamaCare, and this bill delivers on that promise. I hope we will have the opportunity soon to vote for this legislation because it is time to give the American people access to real healthcare reform.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I just want to take a moment because we have all been so focused, and there has been so much concern about what is going to happen in terms of healthcare in this country. So many people have called me concerned about whether they are going to be able to continue their cancer treatments or whether their child is going to be able to get the operation they need or whether their mom with Alzheimer's is going to be able to continue to get nursing home care and so on, and I thank everyone who has told their story.

We have spent 6 months. This debate, this fight, isn't over yet, but it started the day after we were all sworn in, in this Chamber, in January, on January 4. A process was set up intentionally to be a partisan process that took just 51 votes, and instead of the regular committee process and working together, a path was initiated. Great concern went

out across the country about what would be happening in terms of healthcare.

People have spoken up. They have written letters, emails, and made phone calls, and marched and told their stories. Today, at least for a moment, this Senate will not proceed this week because there are not the votes to proceed to what I believe is a complete unraveling of our healthcare system. That may come. Certainly, I don't underestimate people's abilities to make deals and to create a way to have this happen when we get back from the Fourth of July, but at least, in the short run, I want to thank everybody who has been involved and spoken out about this critically important issue.

There are lots of things that have been said on this floor and have been said publicly about the healthcare system. We do have a situation of people buying insurance on the private exchanges where there is a combination of things that have been done to create the situation where people are paying more, but there are also situations where there are problems and not enough competition and areas where people are paying too much, and we need to address that.

One of the biggest cost drivers is the cost of prescription drugs, and we desperately need to address that. I hope, when we come back after this next week, the Fourth of July, that we will have a conversation about the real problems we need to address, to build on healthcare, not take away medical care from tens of millions of people but to build on successes and tackle the things that aren't working.

I am very concerned about small businesses. I have introduced a bill that would give a 50-percent tax credit for small businesses with 50 or fewer employees to help them cover the cost of their employees. We know most people who don't have insurance work for a small business or work for themselves as a single employer. Let's help them.

There are things I know we could work on together across the aisle that would lower costs and tackle the real problems.

This is what I also know; that is, when people talk to me about lowering cost and addressing healthcare, they are not talking about another tax cut for multimillionaires or billionaires. That is actually not on their list of healthcare reforms. It is in the bill that is in front of us, but it is not on the list when someone says to me: You know, I want to bring down out-of-pocket costs so I can afford insurance for my kids and, by the way, would you give another tax cut to multibillionaires. That is not on the list.

If we could come together and take the two things off the table, tax cuts funded by the second thing, which is cutting medical care for seniors, families, and children on Medicaid—if we

could take that off the table and focus on the real cost drivers, the real problems that need to be addressed so that healthcare is more affordable, then we would see enthusiasm on our side of the aisle and probably both sides of the aisle. I know we can come together; the Presiding Officer and I have worked together many, many times on issues. We can do this again, but we have a situation where somehow tax cuts get involved in every debate. Secondly, addressing Medicaid, which is actually saving money for taxpayers, States, and families, is part of this in a way that makes no sense.

I have said it before, but just to illustrate it one more time, our Governor and State legislature expanded Medicaid to working families, people making minimum wage, and what has happened as a result of that? Well, 97 percent of the children in Michigan can go to a doctor. What does that mean? That means they cut in half the number of people walking into the emergency room who don't have insurance and can't pay. Uncompensated care is down by 50 percent, and guess what happens. Magically, the State of Michigan is saving money. There is \$432 million more in the budget—taxpayers' money—and that savings can be used for something else important in the State, other than paying for people who don't have insurance, can't see a doctor, and have to use the emergency room.

For me, this debate gets all smooshed together with all kinds of things that aren't connected to each other. The truth is that Medicaid is saving money. More people can go to the doctor and get preventive care. Fewer people are walking into the emergency room, which is the most expensive way to get healthcare. This is working. For seniors, three out of five seniors in Michigan in nursing homes are there because of Medicaid healthcare.

I am not interested in cutting healthcare for seniors, children, and working families. I am not interested in a tax cut that is going to give the top 400 people in the United States a combined \$33 billion in tax cuts. But if we want to focus on small businesses, folks who are individually buying insurance and either can't find insurance or it is too high, count me in. Count me in. That needs to get fixed, and that involves making sure that the administration does not continue with actions that are raising people's costs on purpose. We need to fix the things in the system that aren't working.

I hope that for the rest of this week, next week, and beyond, we can have some real conversations about working together to solve the real problems that deal with costs, prescription drug costs, out-of-pocket costs for people, and we can do that in a bipartisan way if we are focusing on the real problems in healthcare and how we make

healthcare stronger, better, and more affordable for American families.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 4:20 p.m. today and that following the recess, Senator WYDEN or his designee be recognized for up to 60 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:36 p.m., recessed until 4:20 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUNT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the last few days have proven, once again, that political change in America doesn't start in Washington, DC, and then trickle down. It is from the bottom up.

Because millions of Americans called and texted and tweeted their opposition to an abomination of a health plan, that plan is not going to be on the Senate floor this week, thanks to grassroots America. It is so appropriate at this hour. I also want to make clear we have a bottom line for the next 2 weeks. We have an incredible amount of heavy lifting we have to do to make sure working families and seniors get a fair shake from the American healthcare system.

I say that because, as we speak, Senate Republicans are at the White House strategizing with the President. The horse-trading has already begun, and the Senate Republicans have a slush fund paid for by working families that contains hundreds of billions of dollars that can be used for sweetheart deals that would get them the 51 votes needed to pass this horrendous healthcare bill in the U.S. Senate.

Now I will turn to what we need to focus on in the next 2 weeks at town-hall meetings, civic group lunches, discussions with rural healthcare providers. That focus has to be to highlight what this flawed Republican bill really means and how it can't be fixed no matter how much money the Republican leadership throws at these problems. This bill is a healthcare smash-and-grab, designed to benefit the fortunate few, and is paid for by hundreds of billions of dollars in reductions from Medicaid—tax breaks for the wealthy that Senate Republicans are so anxious

to dole out, they are willing to make them retroactive. Contrary to what Senate Republicans say, their tax changes don't create jobs. They do create tax windfalls.

Exhibit A, under their bill, you have a \$1 million capital gain in February, and, if this bill passes, that lucky person would get a \$38,000 tax break. Many of these gains go directly into the pockets of America's 400 most affluent families, while disabled kids, those with opioid addictions, and families where a baby boomer has the misfortune of having a stroke and needs nursing home care face the prospect that the crucial health services they need—services that are life and death for them—will not be there because of this flawed healthcare bill.

Next, I want to point out that over the next 2 weeks, we are going to lay out how this legislation would send costs into the stratosphere for millions and millions of Americans. Start with older people who are about to get hit by what I call a double-age tax. If this bill goes through, insurance companies will have a green light to charge older Americans more than they charge younger people. As if that doesn't raise their costs enough, older Americans are also going to be forced to pay a higher share of their income on healthcare costs because the Senate Republican bill shrinks their tax benefits as they age. Older Americans need more healthcare. They can't afford to skimp out on bare-bones insurance. So many of our older people are going to see their premiums nearly quadruple.

It is not just older Americans who are going to see their costs jump. Right off the top, hundreds of thousands of middle-class families across the country are going to lose tax cuts for healthcare because the Republican bill snatches away their eligibility.

When it comes to the private insurance market, this bill is centered on a plan to push Americans into bargain-basement healthcare coverage. After all the talk about deductibles and out-of-pocket costs being unaffordable, this Republican proposal ties middle-class benefits to high-deductible, low-value insurance plans. It is a sleight of hand to make it look like consumers are getting a better deal and lower premiums.

Here is the reality. Of course you can make premiums go down if you force people into insurance that only covers band-aids and a bottle of aspirin. When people get sick or suffer an injury, they are going to read the fine print on their insurance. With this legislation, if it were to pass, they would see sky-high deductibles and cut-rate coverage. For working families, they would face the prospect they would get buried under medical debt because their insurance doesn't cover the care they actually need.

Finally, not even people who get their insurance at work—those folks



probably thought they were home free in this debate—not even folks who get their insurance at work are safe from the Senate Republican healthcare plan. Four million Americans are going to lose their employer-sponsored insurance coverage just next year if this bill goes through. Tens of millions of Americans could once again face some of the worst insurance company abuses—annual and lifetime limits on coverage. Those are limits the Affordable Care Act banned, but Republicans are proposing to bring them back.

Let's be real clear. If you bring them back and don't protect people from skyrocketing costs, it means that if they develop cancer, they could bust through their coverage limit, and, once again, we would go back to the days in America where those folks were forced into personal bankruptcy because millions of people without coverage will be unable to pay for the care they need. People with employer-based insurance are going to get hit with a hidden tax in the form of higher premiums.

So if an American listening to this is considering early retirement, think again. The cost could well be too high. If you were thinking of leaving your job, becoming an entrepreneur, and starting your own business, you can think again. Your costs could be higher under this plan, especially if you have specific medical needs.

Then there is the generation of adults in the workforce today—people who are middle class, who are doing everything they can to support their families and save whenever possible. They may not be thinking about the expense of long-term care, but the fact is, growing older in America really costs a lot.

Because of this bill, millions of people will no longer be able to count on Medicaid being there to cover their long-term care in a nursing home or at home where they are most comfortable later in life.

I want to close by way of saying that what we have to do now is make sure that—to beat this destructive Republican bill; this is the only way to do it—Americans keep tweeting, keep sending letters, keep finding rallies to attend, tell your stories about how you are going to do worse with this bill. And then tell your friends' stories and your family's stories. It is a virtual lock that this bill is going to come back around.

I close today by way of saying that grassroots America, by speaking out—the fact that they did that and did all that work I have described is why this flawed bill is not going to be voted on in the Senate this week. We need everybody over the next 2 weeks, seniors and working families and people all across this country—my message is that we need you to stay loud because that is the only way we will finally stop this bill in its tracks.

I yield to our friend from Maryland, Senator CARDIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator WYDEN for his leadership on this issue and so many issues, his position as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee. He serves this body very well, and he has done that today in outlining the flaw of the healthcare bill that was presented a week ago by the Republican leadership and what it would do to our healthcare system.

I want to acknowledge that I am very proud that I was in the Congress when we passed the Affordable Care Act. Today, millions of Americans have coverage who didn't have coverage prior to the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. I am also proud about the quality of that coverage. That coverage has guaranteed benefits so that individuals know they will be covered for their needs—no preexisting conditions, no caps. It is affordable, and we made sure it was affordable to the people of this Nation.

I have listened to the debate from some of my Republican colleagues about how the Affordable Care Act is collapsing under its own weight. Nothing could be further from the truth. The problems we are experiencing with high increases in the individual marketplace are caused in part by the actions of the Trump administration to try to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

Let me give an example in my own State of Maryland, where CareFirst—the largest carrier in the individual marketplace—sought about a 50-percent increase in individual rates, and they were very direct. At least half of that increase is as a result of the uncertainty of the Trump administration putting the cost-sharing payments into the budget. That raises the premiums for all of those individuals in the individual marketplace. There is also the uncertainty as to whether the Trump administration is going to enforce the requirement that people buy insurance, which means only the people who have higher risks are likely to buy the insurance, raising the price for those who want to buy insurance.

When we talk about the fact that there are increased costs beyond what we think are reasonable, recognize that it is the actions of the Trump administration that are causing a large part of that premium increase, which brings me to the bill that was unveiled last week by the Republican leadership. It moves us in the wrong direction in trying to fix the problems. It does that because it decimates the Medicaid Program. The largest expansion of coverage has been in the Medicaid Program.

This bill will significantly cut back—CBO has scored that a total of 22 million individuals who have insurance

today will lose their coverage, but it does more than that. It does that for what reason? Not to make healthcare more affordable—it does that in order to give tax cuts to the very wealthy.

I am glad that we now have a little cooling-off period. We are not going to come back to the bill for about another 10 days, it looks like.

I want my colleagues to know that as proud as I am of the Affordable Care Act, I acknowledge that we can make it better. I hope Democrats and Republicans will work together to move in the right direction on improving the Affordable Care Act. Let me give some examples.

We know there is a high cost on the premiums, a higher increase than we would like. Why don't we join together to make sure there is predictable cost sharing provided to the companies that are in the individual marketplace? That would remove the uncertainty and reduce the premiums significantly in the individual marketplace. Why don't we work together, Democrats and Republicans, to increase the subsidies we provide to low- and middle-income families so that the premiums will be more affordable? We intended to do that under the Affordable Care Act, but after we got the cost scoring, we had to trim that back. Let's work together, Democrats and Republicans. Those two changes alone would deal with the concern that in the individual marketplace, we are seeing large premium increases. Together, we can solve that problem.

Why don't we work for more competition? I have heard my colleagues talk about the fact that some of the insurance companies are leaving, and some are mainly because of the uncertainty as to whether they are going to get their rightful payments for cost sharing. We can do something about that.

Why don't we, Democrats and Republicans, come together and say that there should be a public option with no public subsidy, so it is a level playing field of competition? That way, we are guaranteeing to every market in the country that there will be coverage for the people in your community. That encourages more competition. That gives stability in the marketplace. We could do that together.

Then, Democrats and Republicans, let's work together to bring down the overall cost of healthcare in this country. We made proposals that—why are we paying more for prescription drugs, twice as much as our Canadian friends? Because they have an organized market, and they negotiate as an organized market. Why don't we come together and say: Let's take the entire market that we have for the government paying prescription drugs and have one negotiation? That would significantly bring down the cost of prescription medicine.

Why don't we build on efforts that we have done for collaborative healthcare,

for value-based reimbursement? That would significantly reduce the cost. We have seen that in mental health and addiction. We could see the same savings in kidney care and in diabetes and heart disease.

There are ways we can improve the Affordable Care Act. Democrats are ready to work with Republicans to get that done. What we will not do is make this current system worse. We are not going to cut the Medicaid Program in order to provide tax cuts to the wealthy. Join us in improving the law to make premiums more affordable in the individual marketplace, to bring more competition into the program, and to drive down the overall cost of healthcare in this country. That is what Democrats stand for, and we are ready to work with Republicans today in order to get that done. I would encourage our colleagues to work together, and let's improve the healthcare system.

Mr. WYDEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I know my friend from Maryland is a real expert on this whole matter of private insurance, going back to his days in the State legislature, and I was director of the Gray Panthers.

I think what you are saying is that it is critically important that we get more predictability and more certainty in the private insurance market. What I am struck by is, of course, this is the private sector. This is not the government. This is the private sector. The President has been basically pouring gasoline on the fires of uncertainty in the private insurance market because he is always in or out on this question of cost sharing, and the private insurers then say: We can't really predict what our rates are going to be, and maybe we have to pull out or we have to raise rates.

Could the Senator again highlight his thoughts with respect to more predictability and more certainty? It is such an important point.

After my good friend from Maryland has made that point, I know the Senator from Delaware is interested in the same subject.

Mr. CARDIN. Senator WYDEN is exactly right. I have met with the largest insurer in Maryland. I have gone over their rate requests for this year. They told me directly that the largest amount of their premium increase request is based upon the uncertainty.

They don't know whether the cost sharing is going to be put in the budget, and they have to make their decisions on rates now. Not knowing that, they have to cover themselves, and they are asking for a rate increase under the concern that the cost sharing may not be in the payment.

That was not only envisioned, we thought it was mandated in the Afford-

able Care Act. Now the President is talking about: Well, maybe I am not going to put it in. And we see some of his other activities. So if you are an insurance company and you are answerable to your board of directors and you know that this payment is how you are able to get low deductibles and copays, but you are not sure you are going to get the Federal payment, and you know that your customers are going to want the low cost sharing, you have to charge a higher premium just to cover yourself. That is exactly what was done in Maryland.

If the President of the United States had said that money is going to go into the program because that is what Congress intended, we would have had significantly lower rates in Maryland in the individual marketplace. Predictability is critically important.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Senator CARDIN and I serve together on the committee called Environment and Public Works in the Senate. One of the issues we deal with is clean air.

This conversation about predictability and uncertainty that businesses seek is not just in health insurance, it is in all kinds of businesses across the country.

I remember being in a conversation 8, 9 years ago with—I think Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee was with us. We met with the CEOs of a number of utilities across the country. Senator ALEXANDER and I were pushing legislation in response to President George Bush's proposal called Clear Skies. It was designed to reduce the emission of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury, and CO<sub>2</sub>, carbon dioxide. We talked with these CEOs from across the country for an hour in my office. We had been talking about reductions of X percent and Y percent and so forth in the emissions from these harmful pollutants from primarily coal-fired utilities. At the end of the conversation, this one older fellow who was representing a utility in the southern part of our country—he was sort of a curmudgeon-like person—he said: Senator, this is what you need to do with respect to the restraint on emissions, reduction in emissions. Here is what you need to do. You need to tell us what the rules are going to be. You need to provide us some certainty and predictability and give us a reasonable amount of time to comply and then get out of the way.

I will never forget that conversation. Tell us what the rules are going to be, provide us with some certainty and predictability, a reasonable amount of time, and get out of the way.

It is not just utilities that want certainty and predictability, so do others, and particularly, as utilities are a regulated industry, so is insurance. They

do like to have predictability and certainty.

We tend to focus just on the exchanges and the marketplaces in the 50 States, which provide health insurance for maybe 5, 6, 7 percent of Americans who get healthcare coverage. Most people get their healthcare coverage from employer-provided programs. Maybe 20, 25 percent get their coverage through Medicaid.

I used to think Medicaid was healthcare for poor women and children. When I was elected State treasurer, I used to think Medicaid was healthcare for poor women and children and not much else, and it turns out, it is a lot more than that today. Twenty, twenty-five percent of folks get their coverage there, another 15 percent or so in Medicare, and the rest are in the exchanges. Every State has an exchange. That is for folks who can't get coverage anywhere else. The idea is to have some opportunity to participate in a purchasing pool.

When we passed the Affordable Care Act, we made a promise that we would do the kinds of things that Senator CARDIN is talking about to provide certainty and predictability for the health insurance companies when they insure in these exchanges. The health insurance companies were reluctant to provide coverage to the folks who were going to get coverage through the exchanges. As my friend will recall, some of these people hadn't had healthcare for months, years, maybe even decades, and maybe some never had healthcare in their lives, so nobody really knew how much healthcare they would need, except we knew and the insurance companies knew that these people would need a lot. As my friend said, we provided some ways of reducing that lack of predictability. It is like the comic strip "Peanuts," with Lucy and Charlie Brown and the football. When she pulls the football away, she always fools him. He still kicks and misses every time. We sort of did that with the insurance companies. We assured them we would help provide stability, and we took away the very mechanisms designed to do that.

I think what my friend is saying, we need to come back and provide maybe three ways to do it; one, with respect to reinsurance; two, cover the risk costs; and the third is to do something—if we don't continue with the individual mandate, we need to come up with something like the individual mandate, which is not as harmful as Republicans are suggesting. I don't think the a 6-month lockout is humane.

Mr. WYDEN. Will my friend yield?

Mr. CARPER. I will be happy to.

Mr. WYDEN. The Senator, as a Governor, really has helped educate me over the years on this whole question of the States being "laboratories of democracy" and trying fresh approaches.

Delaware has done that and Oregon has done that.

I ask the Senator: As a former Governor, what would it mean to you if you are staring at a 20- or 25-percent reduction in Medicaid? Because as you know, that is what is contemplated with the Senate Republicans.

Mr. CARPER. I was Governor from 1993 to 2001. We started in a recession and ended up with 6, 7 really strong years, as you recall, during the Clinton administration. We were able to balance our budget 8 years in a row, cut taxes 7 out of 8, pay down some debts, and get good credit ratings across the board.

The person who was my secretary of finance the last 4 years is now our Governor, John Carney. Ben knows him pretty well. He was a wonderful member of Congress and a wonderful Lieutenant Governor before that. He is looking at a budget of less than \$4 billion. He is looking at a \$400 million hole to fill. What is being proposed by our Republican colleagues on Medicaid would not make that \$400 million hole any smaller. It would add anywhere from \$100 to \$200 million—increasing it anywhere from 25 percent to 50 percent. It is a killer. Our Governor and our legislature are struggling enough to try to fill a \$400 million hole rather than trying to figure out how to deal with something as vibrant as \$600 million. It would be a backbreaker. That is what we are looking at. I share that with everybody.

Going to my “laboratory of democracy,” some people would like to have Medicaid for all. Several of our colleagues are very much interested in a single-payer system. As an old Governor—someone who had the privilege leading the National Governors Association—I am a believer that States can be that laboratory of democracy. They can take ideas and show us it is a good idea for the country and other States or take ideas and prove they are bad ideas. We ought to enable them to do that.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my friend. Would my friend like to add anything else or should we yield to Senator CANTWELL?

Mr. CARPER. I want to say a kind word about our Presiding Officer. He heard me say this before. I will say it again. He may recall having cosponsored legislation in 1993, offered by John Chafee and cosponsored by ORRIN HATCH and others, that actually had a lot of good ideas in it. It had the idea of establishing exchanges in all 50 States. Having the sliding scale tax credit brought down the cost of healthcare insurance to lower income people in the exchanges with a bigger tax credit. It had the individual mandate in there to make sure young, healthy people got coverage too. We didn't leave health insurance coverages to a pool of unhealthy young people to try to insure.

We added employer mandates so a certain number of employers had to participate. There was prohibition against insurance companies denying coverage. I want to say, our Republican friends took that idea—and Mitt Romney used that idea to establish RomneyCare when he was Governor of Massachusetts. It worked there. It wasn't perfect. It took a while, but it worked. I would just say, we shouldn't give up on that idea. We should not give up on that idea. There are ways we can fix it. Senator CARDIN talked about some of those ways, and I am sure Senator WYDEN as well.

I just heard John Kasich on one of the shows on TV. He said he was with Governor Hickenlooper. We have to stop being Democrats on this or Republicans on this. Folks want us to be Americans on this and work together. That is what I would like to do. I think we can do that in a way that brings credit, not just to our party but really to our Country. It accomplishes the three things the President talked about for a while: coverage for everybody, better quality coverage for less money. There is no way Democrats by themselves or Republicans by themselves are going to do that. If we work together, all things are possible.

Mr. WYDEN. Before Senator CARDIN leaves the floor and we yield to our friend from Washington, who is also so knowledgeable about healthcare, on this point with the States being the laboratories of democracy, during the debate with my colleagues over the Affordable Care Act, we wrote a provision, 1332. It gives the States the authority to do better, to come up with, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, said—it is a chance to do better and try out those fresh ideas on my colleagues.

The problem is, with the Senate Republican bill, they are talking about giving the States the right to do worse, to waive out some of these essential protections. Again, I think this is natural for something that could be bipartisan, where Democrats and Republicans could work together to really encourage States to do better. Let's not go the other way and abuse that provision in the Affordable Care Act so States can work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleagues here from the Finance Committee. Although I don't want to admit it, it was 10 years ago that we had this discussion in the Finance Committee—my colleagues from Maryland, from Delaware, and from Oregon. What people don't realize—even the Presiding Officer knows we spent a lot of time talking about healthcare. This was not “let's have a few meetings and roll out a bill.” There was a very long period. In fact, the Chair knows that, in fact, our side got a lot

of heat for a lot of dialogue that happened with him and our colleague from Maine at the time—a lot of heat for dialogue with her. I think there was a period of time, about 6 or 7 months, where every single day I went to at least one thing in the discussion of the healthcare policy—at least one thing every day for like 6 months. That wasn't even the markup. Those weren't even the meetings. That was just the time period where the committee had designated various subgroups so we would talk about policy.

I don't know if the two of you remember that period, but my recollection is every single day I was going to something regarding the healthcare policy and listening to experts and recommendations, and then, of course, we had these—I call them more roundtables than hearings. We had a lot of roundtable discussions, and we obviously went through a very formal bill process.

There is a little bit of irony that we are the ones out here today still talking about this healthcare bill. I think it is because we knew what the challenges were, and we tried to address them and were not afraid to keep addressing them. We are not afraid to be out here today talking about solutions we want to see as well.

I thank my colleague from Delaware and my colleague from Oregon for both being part of that effort because it really was an unbelievable amount of time and energy and discussion and formulation. The notion that somehow now we would take something that is one-sixth of the economy and draft something up in a dark process, then throw it out here—I am not surprised today that there aren't the votes. The thing to do now is not try to just rack up some votes in the next few days and come back in July. The thing to do is to sit down and have a serious discussion.

I notice a couple of my colleagues are down at the White House. They are positioned right there next to the President. Maybe they are trying to put them on the hot seat. He is sitting there talking about the individual market. He is talking about the individual market in Alaska. All I am thinking is that the individual market in Alaska—we are sitting here, and the other side is proposing to cut 15 million people off of Medicaid. What does that have to do with the individual market? Nothing.

I don't know if people are ready to focus on this the way we focused on it in that time period for more than a year—more than a year, day after day, meeting after meeting, hearing after hearing. I hope what they will do is stop this proposal and sit down and have an open process and have a discussion on these policies because they are so important.

We have been having all this discussion, and a lot of the frustration people

have talked about is the individual market, where 7 percent of Americans get health insurance. There are ways to fix and improve the individual market. I feel like I was fortunate enough to put forward one of the better ideas that worked successfully, at least it is working successfully in the State of New York, the Basic Health Program. So 650,000 people are on the Basic Health Program as a proposal. I think they call it, in that State, the Essential Plan. Two adults in a family of four can buy a policy for about \$500 in premiums, on an annual basis, instead of about \$1,500 on the exchange for that population that is above the Medicaid rate that needed to have a solution in the marketplace. There are 13 different companies offering insurance to those 650,000 people, so that is obviously working.

Now, it got implemented late. New York did it in 2016 because they were off to the races, but other States should now consider this. What is so great about this and helping to address the individual market is because, where we are on this side, we are willing to allow individuals who don't work for a large company to get the same clout as if they worked for a large company. When you buy in bulk, you get a discount. Americans know that. That is why they shop at Costco. If you go there and buy in bulk, you get a discount. That is what they are doing in New York. So 650,000 people have been bundled up like they are a big company and saying to the marketplace: Who wants to bid on selling us insurance? The end result has been more affordable insurance in the individual market. That is what they should be discussing down at the White House today. That is what they should be discussing, not cutting 15 million people off Medicaid. That is not a smart idea.

I am sure my colleagues here have already gone over this notion that once you cut people off of care, they end up in the emergency rooms or have exacerbated healthcare needs. So there are longer periods of time to get access to healthcare, more complicated healthcare costs, rising premiums.

We have gone around our State and heard loud and clear from the provider community and the hospitals that they have seen downward pressure on the price of private insurance because we expanded Medicaid, and the economic numbers are out there now to show the same thing. Cutting people off of Medicaid is not the solution to the individual market. I hope somebody down there at the White House brings that up.

In 2020, when the Medicaid cap—if it did go into effect—the analysis is it would cost shift \$324 million per year to my State. They would be cutting people off of Medicaid, and then basically the cost would be \$324 million a

year to our State. You can imagine that our State doesn't have that money and isn't interested in picking up that tab. By 2028, when the Medicaid cuts start to kick in, we would be cost-shifting \$4.2 billion per year to the state of Washington. That is not smart economics for us.

Over the weekend, I visited Virginia Mason Hospital in the northwest—again, a great success in delivery system reform. They implemented the Toyota model of production. There is, literally, faster turnaround time on lab reports and better expedience of nursing care. I think there was something like a 72-percent reduction in insurance liability costs. I mean, there are huge successes by changing and improving the delivery system that helps put pressure down on price. This is what we need to be talking about.

There is much innovation that was in the Affordable Care Act. We need to now ask the question: What further things do we need to do to make sure we drive down costs in the individual market as well? But with this Senate bill, you are not going to drive down price. There are reports now out by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities last Friday that show the price will actually go up in the individual market if you cut people off of Medicaid. Basically, it will just increase by several thousand dollars the actual amount of money the people in the individual market will have to pay for insurance, so that clearly is not the solution.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—I hope they come back and say that it is time to work in a discussion about these ideas in a broad way, not just another Hail Mary pass. Just get rid of this notion that cutting poor people off of Medicaid is somehow going to magically fix the individual market. It is not. I thank my colleagues from the Finance Committee who went through all of that.

Believe me; I am telling you, these discussions went on for weeks and weeks and weeks. Some people here are trying to come up with a score and get an answer in a week on this entire package. I think we debated, I would say, probably 2 or 3 weeks just on the notion of reforming—getting off of fee-for-service and focusing on a value index and getting the priorities of the delivery system focused on better outcomes at lower costs. This is something that really should be a big priority in healthcare.

I remember we had private meetings. We had the head of CBO come down and talk to us. We had hearings. We probably spent 3 weeks just on one concept of how effective that would be in the healthcare delivery system.

I see we are still here. We are still talking. We are still willing to improve this delivery system and make sure people have better access to care, and I thank my colleagues for including me in this discussion today.

I want to again thank the Senator from Oregon, the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee. I know he knows exactly what I am talking about when we talk about innovation. There is so much innovation he put into the Affordable Care Act, giving states discretion. They already have all the discretion they need; they have all the discretion they need to keep innovating.

Hopefully we will get our colleagues to follow suit because this is where we are going to deliver better care at lower costs and help improve the access for everybody in America.

I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington State who was for care coordination, moving away from fee-for-service, using bargaining power, locally driven approaches long before it really became a buzzword in American healthcare. I thank her very much for this.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon to yield for about 30 seconds?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, of course.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, something the Senator from Washington said just reminded me—after we heard the news that Republicans are going to go back to the drawing board and see what they can come up with maybe during the Fourth of July recess, I did a radio interview with a station back in Delaware. One of the questions the interviewer asked me was: Well, the Republicans have a lot of money to play with; I hear a couple hundred billion dollars. Won't the Republican leaders just offer money to one Senator after the other after the other to find out what they need in order to get them to support this?

I said: I hope not. I hope that is not what happens. This is a time when we need to hit that pause button and, rather than dole out money to try to draw this Republican or that Republican to come into the fold, if you will, why don't we just spend some time in the rooms the Senator from Washington was talking about.

We spent all that time—a lot of time together, with Democrats and Republicans in hearings, public hearings, private meetings, roundtables, and so forth. That is the kind of thing we need to do over again. If we do that, we might be surprised. We might surprise the rest of the country about how well that would work out.

Thank you.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Senator WARNER.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me join my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee and not only express my concern about how we got here, but also acknowledge that an awful lot of folks in Virginia and a lot of decent

folks in North Carolina and folks across the country breathed a little bit of a sigh of relief today. But that sigh of relief was just the fact that we have a bit of a reprieve from a proposal that, in my years here, I don't think I have ever seen—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will suspend for a moment.

If the Senators are going to carry on a colloquy, the Senator from Oregon has to remain standing.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Presiding Officer. At this point, we are just going to hear from Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Again, I am here joining my Democratic colleagues from the Senate Finance Committee.

I believe that folks in Virginia and, for that matter, folks across the country got a reprieve today when the majority leader indicated that we were not going to vote on the piece of legislation that he brought forward, a piece of legislation which, as has been acknowledged by the CBO, would take 22 million Americans off of healthcare, would transfer close to \$800 billion of costs currently borne jointly by both the Federal and State partnership in Medicaid and then thrust that cost upon the Governor of North Carolina, the Governor of Virginia, and a host of others. I can't recall in my time here in the Senate where a proposal has been as universally panned by organizations from the left, right, center, and everywhere in between.

As perhaps the President is now acknowledging with the majority leader and a number of other Republican Senators, using his own quote, that "nobody knew healthcare [was] so complicated." The fact is, the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle have realized healthcare is extraordinarily complicated. It is why it took years to fashion the ACA and why there are many of us, again, on this side of the aisle who continue to say we acknowledge, years after implementation of the ACA, that there are many things that need to be fixed, but the only way they are going to be fixed is if we do it in a bipartisan fashion.

Instead, the legislation that we were going to vote on tomorrow would have actually made healthcare much more expensive, less affordable, and less accessible for a whole wide breadth of Americans. Don't take my word for it; don't take these other elected officials' word for it. Let's look at well-respected, bipartisan groups.

The American Cancer Society said that the bill the majority leader put forward "would be devastating for cancer patients and survivors." The American Medical Association said that the

majority leader's proposal violates the very first dictate of the Hippocratic oath, which says "do no harm." Obviously, this bill would have done a great deal of harm. The American Academy of Pediatrics says "The bill fails [our] children." The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse says the Republican proposal "will crush efforts to end the opioid epidemic." And the AARP says the proposal "would leave millions, including our most vulnerable seniors, at risk of losing the care they need."

But it is not just these leading healthcare organizations that have come out uniformly and virtually universally against what the majority leader had proposed. I am also hearing that from Virginians. On Monday of this week, I attended an opening of the new PACE Program in Fairfax, VA. The PACE Program—I know the ranking member on the Finance Committee has been a big advocate of the PACE Program—is a program that works in an extraordinary way at keeping seniors in their homes rather than having them migrate to nursing homes. Well, folks at the PACE Program in Fairfax were more than disturbed when they heard that the majority leader's proposal cuts Medicaid by \$772 billion. Medicaid allowed so many folks to get access to healthcare, particularly if they had individuals in their family who might have severe disabilities. The majority leader's proposal, the per capita caps would actually take away the amount of health insurance they could receive.

The truth is, Medicaid covers 28 percent of all Americans and covers about 40 percent of all poor adults and seniors. In my State of Virginia, for those folks in PACE or in nursing homes, literally two-thirds of seniors who receive any kind of care receive care through Medicaid.

The cuts in this proposed bill would devastate our seniors and their families, and the cuts will not save money because so much of this is just the old-fashioned trickle-down that trickles down this responsibility to States that, again, would have to either raise their own taxes to take care of their responsibilities or, frankly, put out seniors who receive this critical care.

Mr. President, I also want to share with you and my colleagues a meeting I had last week with a series of families who came in. They had children or adults who had devastating disabilities.

I heard in particular from Marlo Dean from Virginia Beach, who was there with her 15-year-old son Dante, who has extensive health needs because of a rare brain disorder. Dante had just received a Medicaid waiver after being on the waiting list for 10 years. Ms. Dean, Dante's mother, said:

Cutting Medicaid is not the right thing. It's not the humane thing.

There were other families. Angie Leonard, who traveled from the Roanoke Valley with her 22-year-old son Joshua, who has autism, said that this is not what America ought to be about.

Rebecca Wood, who brought her daughter Charlie from Charlottesville, said that she has private insurance, but she is wondering what would happen when that private insurance hits its cap, a cap that had been removed when we put in place the ACA. Again, Rebecca said: "Our country is better than this." Boy, oh, boy, is she right.

When our colleagues talk about cutting Medicaid, when they talk about cutting it at the numbers they are talking about or putting caps back in place, I hope they realize that this is more than about the numbers of a government program. This is about providing support and services to families facing the nightmare of chronic illness or crippling medical illness and bills, quite honestly, that they can't pay on their own. It is about peace of mind for these families.

I have said from the outset that there were mistakes made in the ACA, and I stand ready to work with any Member of either side of the aisle to make sure that we fix those mistakes. But this debate ought to be about healthcare reform, not about providing the wealthiest in our country a tax break they don't need or taking hundreds of billions of dollars out of Medicaid.

I look forward—I hope our colleagues who come back from this meeting with the President will come back with a renewed sense of cooperation and collaboration. I know there are other members of the committee who want to speak on this issue. I stand prepared to work with them and the ranking member from the Finance Committee to do this right, but it ought to be done in a way—whether it is Rebecca and her daughter Charlie, whether it is Ms. Dean and her son—that they get a chance to have their voices heard through a regular order process, where at the front end of the process we can hear the concerns, get those concerns vetted, and make sure legislation that gets brought to the floor is fully vetted and actually improves the quality of care for Virginians and Americans all across this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he yields the floor, I just want to thank Senator WARNER for his insightful comments. As a Governor, he really understands why a Medicaid cut of hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars is going to permanently damage the lives of so many people in Virginia. I thank him for his comments.

Let me yield now to Senator MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey seek recognition?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, call me old-fashioned, but as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I still believe the legislative process matters, especially when you are dealing with matters of life and death, like healthcare.

In 2009 and 2010, we had a painstakingly open, deliberative process while drafting our healthcare reform bill.

In the Senate Finance Committee alone, we held 53 hearings, roundtables, and meetings, consulting with patients, advocates, doctors, and industry leaders.

Only after months of bipartisan negotiations and marathon markups did we bring the healthcare bill to the floor, and when we did, we spent 25 days debating it in full view of the American people. That is how we passed a law that protected Americans with preexisting conditions. That is how we stopped health insurance companies from dropping consumers the moment they got sick. That is how we passed a law that delivered coverage to 9 out of 10 Americans for the first time in history.

Because when you have an open, deliberative, bipartisan process, you can deliver real progress to millions of Americans. But when you have an ugly, partisan, backroom process, you get an ugly, partisan bill. And that is what we have with the Senate Republican healthcare bill.

It is an ugly bill, born out of an ugly process with ugly consequences for the American people.

And you don't have to take my word for it. Just last night, the CBO confirmed that the Republican health bill will leave 15 million more Americans uninsured next year—and 22 million uninsured by 2026.

And mind you, this is the plan that Republicans promised would be so much better than the unpopular, disastrous legislation passed by House Republicans earlier this year.

Well, if Trump thought the House healthcare bill was mean, then the Senate Republican plan is downright nasty.

It is really quite simple. Republicans want to give the 400 wealthiest families in America—the Warren Buffets and Donald Trumps of our society—a huge tax cut they do not need, paid for by taking healthcare away from those who need it the most.

For years, Republicans railed against the Affordable Care Act, and pledged they would repeal and replace it with something better. But under the plan they put out last week, the only people who are better off are millionaires and health insurance company executives.

Across the board, Americans will pay the price. They will pay higher premiums, higher out-of-pocket cost, higher deductibles—all for less comprehensive coverage. That is because the GOP plan still rolls back key consumer safeguards, like protection from lifetime limits and coverage for pre-existing conditions.

It still ends the Affordable Care Act's Federal guarantee that every health plan cover essential health benefits, like prescription drugs, prenatal care, hospital stays, and more. It still defunds Planned Parenthood and saddles women with higher costs. It still imposes a crushing age tax on middle-aged Americans.

My Republican colleagues like to say that this bill gives Americans more choice over their healthcare. But I have heard from countless New Jerseyans in recent weeks who know that under the Republican health plan, they will have no choice but to go uninsured.

I have heard from older workers, like Howard in Park Ridge, NJ.

He writes: Without subsidies provided under the ACA, my 51-year-old wife and I would have no insurance. We could not afford premiums in excess of \$1100 a month. . . . Without these subsidies millions will go uninsured and many of these people, myself included, will die.

If all the choices Republicans provide workers like Howard are unaffordable, what good are they? That is not choice. That is a death sentence.

Or consider the half a million low-income New Jerseyans who secured coverage thanks to the ACA's Medicaid expansion.

My Republican colleagues call them "able-bodied adults." But they aren't able to even afford a trip to the doctor under this bill. Many of them have low-wage jobs that don't come with health benefits—dishwashers, cashiers, home health aides. These are the people I grew up with in Union City. These are the people abandoned by the Republicans' heartless healthcare plan—people like Alton Robinson of Morris County. He credits Medicaid expansion with saving his life.

Alton struggled with addiction for nearly two decades. Medicaid enabled him to get substance abuse treatment and the physical and mental healthcare.

Today, Alton is clean. His life is on track. And he spends his working days helping other New Jerseyans get on the path to recovery.

Republicans' cruel bill leaves millions of people who rely on Medicaid expansion with no options at all. And for what? To give health insurance executives, real estate moguls, and hedge fund managers a massive tax cut they don't need?

According to New Jersey Policy Perspective, a handful of New Jersey millionaires and corporations get a \$15 bil-

lion tax cut under this terrible Republican health plan, while over half a million people lose their coverage.

And, of course, this legislation goes far beyond ending Medicaid expansion. It ends Medicaid as we know it.

Their plan fulfills a decades-old right-wing mission to shred the social safety net—forcing the most vulnerable among us to pay for tax cuts for the richest among us.

It has nothing to do with giving States more choice over how to run Medicaid. Because when you slash Medicaid by nearly \$800 billion, you leave States with no choice but to provide less care. When you cut Medicaid funding by \$60 billion in New Jersey, you leave the State with no choice but to abandon the most vulnerable—people like Leandra, the 13-year-old girl I met last week in Newark. She suffers from a rare muscle disease that leaves her confined to a wheelchair, too weak to walk and in extraordinary pain. She takes 18 medications each day. She has survived 19 surgeries.

Leandra can't speak out against this horrible, cruel Republican healthcare bill that would jeopardize her life. But we can. And we must continue to be Leandra's voice until Republicans finally hear her.

That is the kind of process we need when we talk about healthcare—a process that gives voice to the voiceless.

So today I say to Americans everywhere: don't sit on the sidelines. Don't be silenced. Make your voices heard. Tell Republicans what this heartless healthcare plan means for your families and your future.

Mr. President, I have a group of Nordic Parliamentarians I am hosting in a few minutes. Let me say that I join my Senate Finance Committee colleagues in this effort because I still think the legislative process matters, especially when dealing with matters of life and death like healthcare.

To reiterate, in 2009 and 2010, we had a painstakingly open, deliberative process while drafting our healthcare reform bill. In the Senate Finance Committee alone, we held 53 hearings, roundtables, meetings, consulted with patients, advocates, doctors, industry leaders, and only after months of bipartisan negotiations and marathon markups did we bring the healthcare bill to the floor. And when we did, we spent 25 days debating it in full view of the American people. That is how we passed a law that protected Americans with preexisting conditions. That is how we stopped health insurance companies from dropping consumers the moment they got sick. That is how we passed the law that delivered coverage to 9 out of 10 Americans for the first time in history.

When you have an open, deliberative, bipartisan process, you can deliver real progress to millions of Americans, but when you have a backroom, partisan

process, you get an ugly, partisan bill, and that is what we have with the Senate Republican healthcare bill. It is an ugly bill in terms of what it does to people, it is born of an ugly process, and it has ugly consequences for the American people.

Just last night, as we all heard, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan scoring division for all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, said 22 million people will lose their health insurance and 15 million next year if the law were to pass.

Mind you, this was a law that was supposed to be better than the House Republican version. Well, that bill was mean, this bill is downright nasty. It takes healthcare away from those who most need it, only to give tax cuts to the Warren Buffetts and Donald Trumps of the world, who, fortunately for them, don't need it.

It is amazing to me that for years I have heard my Republican colleagues rail against the Affordable Care Act—or as they call it, ObamaCare—and pledge to repeal it and replace it with something better. They had 7 years to come together and decide what that would be, and then, on a plan that was put out only late last week, we see the consequences of something that was rushed together by 13 men, no women, and nobody creating the diversity of America that relates to their healthcare. That is fundamentally wrong, and I am not surprised that many of my Republican colleagues revolted against it—at least at this point. The question is whether they will continue to demand of their party and of all of us the type of healthcare that we want to see for each American, because under the plan as it was proposed, Americans will pay higher premiums, higher out-of-pocket costs, higher deductibles, all for less comprehensive coverage—pay more for less.

It rolls back key consumer safeguards. There is a difference between a guarantee—when we hear the word “entitlement,” we are really talking about a guarantee against lifetime limits. You have a serious disease, and you come up to that cap in your insurance. You still have the disease, you still have cancer, you are still treating it, you are still fighting it, you are trying to save your life, but you don't have any more money because there is no more insurance coverage. We eliminated that under the law. There is no guarantee of continuing that safety under the Republican bill.

There is no guarantee that when you give States waivers, the way in which they treat those waivers—that you truly have a guarantee against pre-existing conditions being a prohibition to getting healthcare.

Finally, if you are middle class and middle aged, this bill gives you nothing. Nothing. If you are an older American, it costs you enormously.

Let me make my final point about Medicaid. Look, I am tired of hearing about Medicaid being only about the poor, as if the poor don't deserve health insurance. They certainly do. But Medicaid is about a lot more than the poor. In my home State of New Jersey, 60 percent of recipients are either seniors or those who are disabled. They didn't choose to be disabled; they either were born with or developed a disability. They deserve the full potential of their God-given potential, as anybody else does. Medicaid provides them healthcare so they can be a successful part of our society. Medicaid provides seniors with dignity in the twilight of their lives. Medicaid provides for pregnant mothers who may not have insurance elsewhere. Medicaid takes care of special education children in our schools. And, yes, Medicaid takes care of the poor.

Medicaid expansion helps those who go to work in some of the toughest jobs in my State and in our country. They have the dignity of having healthcare and being able to stay healthy so they can work. We want them to work. Yet we take away the healthcare that is the very essence of what keeps them healthy so they can work. That is not the America I know. That is not the healthcare that was promised.

We can do better, and we can do better together. What we need to do is get over the mantra of, let's just repeal the Affordable Care Act instead of improve it. If you want to improve it and improve the healthcare of Americans, you are going to find a lot of Democrats ready to do that, myself included.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I believe we are very close to consuming the hour that the Finance Democrats have, so I ask unanimous consent that at this time Senator CASEY be recognized for his remarks and at the conclusion of his remarks, I be recognized for some final comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I seek recognition to continue this discussion on healthcare, and I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to talk about an issue that some of us have talked about, but I think it is an issue that is barely breaking through now. There has been a lot of discussion in the debate so far about various aspects of the bill. We know the bill in its current form is about 142 pages, I guess, and more than 60 of those pages deal with one topic—Medicaid. So this is basically a Med-

icaid bill and a tax cut bill, and the two are not just referred to on a regular basis in the text, but I would argue they are actually in conflict with one another.

I was on the floor last night showing a chart that indicated that the top 400 households in the country would get a tax cut of \$33 billion. Just imagine that. Four hundred families get \$33 billion out of the bill—the House bill, but it hasn't changed substantially at all when it comes to tax cuts—and then on top of that, the Medicaid cuts in just four States add up to the same number. So we have \$33 billion in cuts on Medicaid for 4 States and \$33 billion in tax cuts for 400 families.

If you are within the sound of my voice and you are one of those 400 families, sorry, but I don't think you deserve a tax cut.

Here is another way of looking at it. This is the same basic information, but now, instead of looking at four States, as we did last night—those four States were Alaska, Arkansas, Nevada, and West Virginia—where the total Medicaid cut was just below \$33 billion, here is just one State, the State I represent, Pennsylvania. The cuts over time come up to \$35 billion. The Senate bill might move that one way or the other by a little bit, but basically that is what it is. But we still have this number we just referred to—\$33 billion in tax cuts for the 400 highest income households in the country. Nothing about that is fair. In fact, I think that is obscene. There are other words we could use, but we shouldn't use those words on this floor. That is obscene.

In the same bill, they are ripping away Medicaid over time, and, as we know from the CBO report we saw last night, the House bill has a Medicaid cut of 14 million people losing their Medicaid coverage over the course of a decade. In the Senate bill, the number goes up to 15 million. So 15 million of the 22 million who lose their healthcare coverage are from Medicaid.

As my colleague from New Jersey just outlined, low-income folks, folks with disabilities, and folks who need to get into a nursing home—that is basically the Medicaid population. They are low-income children and adults, adults and children with disabilities, and, of course, seniors.

That is the basic inequity here. I don't think anyone around the country, if they were looking at that comparison, would really say that is fair. How could that be fair in a healthcare bill, that a small group of Americans gets a tax cut?

By the way, it doesn't end there. It is not just the top 400 Americans, it is a lot of other people as well. So if you are in any way wealthy, this bill is a bonanza for you. This is a once-in-a-lifetime injection of revenue that you are rarely, if ever, going to see. But why should a single family get millions



and millions of dollars—under this scenario, potentially tens of millions for one family—why should they get that kind of a break while others are losing their healthcare by way of the Medicaid cuts or otherwise?

So if we are going to have a real process here that leads to a bipartisan conclusion, we have to get serious about the issue of healthcare. This is not a serious attempt to change our healthcare system for the better. A third-grader could rip healthcare away from a lot of people and give away the store to very wealthy people. That is an exercise anyone could do. That is simple. But to fix problems in our healthcare system, to make sure that if you are living in a rural area and there is only one insurer, that we work to create some competition—to fix that requires some work. To fix that requires bipartisan support. It is not this exercise we have been going through so far.

I hope folks on the other side can defend this and go home and say: I voted for this bill—or the updated version of the bill in a couple of days or weeks—and I am here to tell you that I not only voted for the bill, but I am asserting that it is fair to give \$33 billion to 400 households and tear \$35 billion out of the Medicaid Program just for Pennsylvania—just for Pennsylvania, one State, and it gets worse when you add other States.

I know our time is short and others are waiting to speak, but we have a long way to go to make sure we are focused on some of the real challenges we have in our healthcare system, not just ripping coverage away from vulnerable Americans in order to enrich people who need no help, need no injection of a tax cut.

In fact, they don't even want the tax cut. I was at a townhall the other day, and a doctor stood up and said—if the House version of the healthcare bill went through, this one doctor in Pennsylvania would get \$20,000 in a tax cut. He said: I don't need that. I don't want it. We want to fix the system. We want to make sure the people on Medicaid still get coverage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. To wrap this up, Mr. President, I was struck when Senator MENENDEZ talked about the Senate Republican health bill being more for less. I think millions of Americans might say it is a classic bait-and-switch. After the horrible House bill was passed, Senate Republicans and the Trump administration promised something new. It would have more heart. It would be less mean. But essentially what they have done is doubled down on exactly what the American people rejected in the House bill—the secrecy, the fact that the breaks went to the fortunate few and the pain

went to millions of Americans who needed nursing home care, who have youngsters with special needs, or who are disabled.

The fact is that the process Senate Republicans have used on this health reconciliation bill hasn't gone well. That is why they can't go forward with consideration of their healthcare bill this week. And it looks as though—I heard remarks from one of our senior colleagues early this afternoon—it looks as though the same darn thing is going to be used for tax reform. Once again, a bill processed behind closed doors, without any input from the other party—it looks as if that is the route that is going to be taken on tax reform. I think that is unfortunate.

I have made it very clear—very clear—to the Trump administration that the history of successful tax reform is bringing both sides in early and finding ways to secure principles that each side feels strongly about that the other can live with. There has been no such consultation—zero—with respect to this administration and Democrats on the Finance Committee.

I am struck, because I wrote, over the last decade, what are the only two bipartisan Federal comprehensive tax reform bills—first with our former colleague, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Senator Gregg, and most recently with the new head of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Senator Coats, and we have had no consultation on the substance of tax reform. That is a prescription for trouble. It is, in effect, walking away from the history that the only way to get a sustainable, bipartisan tax reform plan is to get both sides together, not do what is being discussed now openly in the media: that the Republican leadership and the Trump administration are going to write a tax bill and then just pop it on the American people in the fall. And I anticipate it will be more of the same in terms of stacking the deck dramatically in favor of the fortunate few.

I say this because we heard again what appears to be the plan of the Senate Republicans to kind of double down on the flawed strategy of healthcare, which is just to do it in secret and then expect to see if maybe they can get a couple of Democrats to go along. Then they can say: Oh, that is a bipartisan bill.

That is not a bipartisan bill.

A bipartisan bill is the kind of work that was done in 1986 with my predecessor, Senator Packwood, and Bill Bradley of New Jersey, who was another tall Democrat on the Finance Committee. A big group got together and worked out a bill that made sense, broadened the tax base, and gave everybody in America the chance to get ahead.

My hope is that over the next 2 weeks, in terms of defeating a flawed

healthcare bill and showing that there needs to be a different path for tax reform, the American people will keep making those calls, keep tweeting, keep texting, keep going to rallies, keep going to meetings where healthcare providers get together and say: Look, this healthcare bill that Republicans are talking about does not work for us, and it does not work for our parents and our grandparents and youngsters and the disabled folks and those who need opioid services.

Again, I thank my colleagues from the Finance Committee. We have had something like eight colleagues participate in this over the last hour.

I would just say to the American people that the reason we have been able to hold off this horrendous Senate Republican healthcare bill is that grassroots America showed again that political change does not start at the top and trickle down but comes from the bottom-up. It was all of that citizen involvement that caused the Republican leadership to put this bill off, but it is a lock—an absolute lock—that it is going to come up again in a couple of weeks.

As I wrap up my remarks this afternoon, I hope that over the next 2 weeks, the American people will be loud, will come out to their elected officials' events, and will tell them what they are for and what they are against.

On behalf of the Senate Finance Democrats, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before I begin, I want to make something absolutely clear. This healthcare fight is anything but over. TrumpCare is not dead—not even close—and we cannot let up. It is no surprise that Senate Republicans needed another week to try to jam their TrumpCare bill through, given everything it would mean for families' health, their financial security, and their lives.

So, while we do not know what kind of backroom deals the Senate Republicans will cut or which Republicans will decide that they care more about toeing the party line than protecting the patients and families in their States, here is what we do know. The majority leader is not going to give up. He wants to get to yes, and so does President Trump, so the backroom deals and arm-twisting are going to go into overdrive starting now.

That is why my message is, to every patient and family, every mom and dad, adult caregiver, doctor, nurse, teacher, anyone who believes TrumpCare would be devastating for their communities: Do not let up the pressure. We saw what happened in the House. We need to keep fighting, and Democrats are going to keep fighting along with all of you.

One has to ask, given how mean this bill is and how clearly patients and

families are rejecting it, why are my Republican colleagues pushing ahead?

It is not like this is some kind of for-gone conclusion. At any moment, Republicans can drop this effort and work with Democrats on healthcare policies that will actually help patients and families and not hurt them. Yet it is clear right now that Republican leaders are not interested. In fact, they have done just about everything possible to prevent not just Democrats but anyone, including most of their own party, from being involved in this process.

As Democrats have made clear, this is unprecedented. I was here when the Affordable Care Act was debated and passed. We organized dozens of bipartisan meetings. We held hearings, and we took amendments from both sides. We certainly did not leave the fate of women's healthcare up to a few men.

Yet, with the Republican's TrumpCare plan, there have been no hearings, and there has been no scrutiny, no public input, no expert testimony. Why is that? It is that their bill is not actually about healthcare—far from it. Their bill is about giving a massive gift to the wealthy and the already well-connected on the backs of children, working families, the sick, and the elderly. It is an enormous broken promise, and yesterday's CBO report made that alarmingly clear.

Republican leaders promised to lower healthcare costs. This plan will actually raise them, especially for seniors. They promised not to pull the rug out from under patients, but this plan would take coverage from 24 million people and gut Medicaid with even deeper cuts, by the way, than would the House's version. Under their bill, they said no one would be worse off. Tell that to a woman who would have to pay as much as \$1,000 extra for maternity care or who would have to see her local Planned Parenthood center closed. They said their bill would protect patients who have preexisting conditions. Read the fine print. The fine print says, this plan is a backdoor way of putting those patients' fates in the hands of the insurance companies.

This is truly shameful.

Republican leaders promised they were committed to tackling our growing opioid epidemic, but with this plan, all of our efforts—all of the work left to be done by the States—would be at risk. That would be incredibly harmful.

Over the past year, I have met so many families in my home State of Washington who have lost a loved one to the opioid crisis—in Bellingham, in Spokane, in Yakima, in the Tri-Cities—in community after community. I know the same stories are actually being told in West Virginia, in Ohio, in Kentucky, and in Pennsylvania—in States all across our country. I have heard directly from people who are on the path to recovery who have told me

how their getting treatment and Medicaid coverage changed their lives for the better.

What will they do under TrumpCare?

I would be ashamed, too, if I had to defend this cruel bill over the upcoming recess. I would be ashamed if I had to explain this bill to constituents of mine like Jennifer England.

Jennifer is a woman from Kent, WA. She is a mom, a softball coach, and a cancer survivor. Because of coverage she had under the Medicaid expansion, she decided to play it safe and go to the doctor to get a lump checked out, something she told me she would not have done before. Jennifer was diagnosed with invasive ductal carcinoma. It was about to spread to her lungs and could have been deadly. Jennifer went through rounds of chemo and trip after trip to the doctor. On March 8—her daughter's 18th birthday—she was finally able to tell her daughter she was in the clear. Now Jennifer is terrified of what this bill would mean for her finances, for her family, and for her life if her Medicaid coverage goes away.

I would be ashamed if I had to defend this bill to Kelly Hill, from Seattle.

I met Kelly during a recent tour of Seattle's International Community Health Services clinic. Kelly shared with me that she has been living with HIV for 17 years and has a son with a severe developmental disability. Fortunately, Kelly told me she was able to get Medicaid when she needed it the most, in graduate school, when she was first diagnosed and when she was pregnant with her son.

Today, her son Avram is 15 years old and cannot be left unattended. He is going to need expensive care and support for the rest of his life. Medicaid plays a crucial role in keeping Avram active at home, in their community, and it allows Kelly the opportunity to have a full-time job so she can support her family. Kelly knows just how important access to healthcare is and the harm and uncertainty TrumpCare will cause.

I want to be very clear. If Republicans jam through TrumpCare this month, they will own the consequences. They will have to defend this bill to people like Jennifer and Kelly in their own States, and they will be responsible for increasing families' healthcare costs, undermining protections for people with preexisting conditions, defunding Planned Parenthood, and allowing insurance companies to charge women more. They will be responsible for taking away care for seniors, pregnant women, and people with disabilities.

Again, Republican leaders can still choose to drop TrumpCare once and for all. I am not going to take any chances, though, and neither should anyone who is listening who joins Democrats in opposing TrumpCare. I fully expect the backroom deals to con-

tinue and to get even worse now that Republican leaders have been forced to delay this week's vote. I just hope the Republicans who are rightly concerned about the impact of TrumpCare will take a close look at the facts on the table, will recognize it is time to change course, and will stand strong for their constituents.

That is what this debate should be about, making sure the people whom we represent can count on the security of healthcare when they get sick so they will not have to consider forgoing treatment for a sick child because they do not have the money and so they will be treated fairly and equally in our healthcare system.

That is what I have been thinking about these last several weeks. It is why Democrats have been holding the floor all of these nights, participating in rallies, and staying out on the Capitol steps. It is why my friend, the senior Senator from Hawaii, took to the floor yesterday and bravely talked about what this fight now means to her personally. As she said, everyone is only one diagnosis away from a serious illness, and no one should have to worry about what he will do if and when that moment comes.

In this country, healthcare should be a right, not a privilege reserved for the few. That is what Democrats are going to keep fighting for, and we will not let up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am deeply relieved that the majority leader has delayed a vote on the Republican's cruel bill to rip up healthcare for 22 million people. People in Massachusetts and across this country spoke out against this terrible bill, and today they proved they can make their voices heard. But let's be clear. The Republican's so-called healthcare bill has come back to life already more times than the scariest zombie in a horror movie. Despite how deeply unpopular this bill is and how hurtful it would be to families across the country, Senator MCCONNELL says he intends to vote as soon as the Senate returns in a little more than a week. That means that Senate Republicans still stand on the brink of passing legislation that will end health insurance coverage for 22 million people in America.

Make no mistake, if this plan passes, the rich will get richer and other people will die. I know that is a strong statement, and I know some people

don't want to hear it. I know some people will hear it, but they don't want to believe it. But facts matter, and here is the fact that Republicans simply want to ignore: People without healthcare coverage are more likely to die than people with healthcare coverage. For many Americans, health insurance is a matter of life and death. Decades of rigorous academic research back this up. The data show that people with no health insurance die earlier than those with coverage.

For example, a 2009 study published in the *American Journal of Public Health* found that uninsured people died at significantly faster rates than those with insurance. The authors claimed that lack of health insurance was associated with nearly 45,000 American lives lost in just 1 year. So 45,000 American lives were lost in 1 year. That is more people in this country dying for lack of health insurance than from breast cancer, and the impact isn't limited to adults. Johns Hopkins researchers found that sick kids without insurance who end up in the hospital are 60 percent more likely to die than the children down the hall who had health insurance.

In 2012, a study in the *New England Journal of Medicine* compared States that expanded Medicaid, which provided coverage to millions of low-income Americans, to those that didn't. They found that for every hundred thousand people in States that did not expand Medicaid, nearly 20 more people die every year than in the States that expanded Medicaid. That is right. More people died in States that refused to expand Medicaid.

Now, we know a lot about this in Massachusetts, which has been one of the best test cases for understanding how insurance affects death rates. We have been working for years—long before the Affordable Care Act—to expand health coverage. Today, with the help of the Affordable Care Act, more than 97 percent of people in Massachusetts have health insurance. That is the highest coverage rate in the entire country.

Researchers from Harvard and the Urban Institute studied our health reforms to figure out the impact of expanding coverage. Their results, a 2014 study published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine*, found that Massachusetts health reform was associated with a 4.5-percent drop in preventable deaths. These data suggest that, nationwide, the ACA's coverage expansions are already preventing 24,000 deaths a year, and it is in effect in only 31 of the 50 States.

I could keep going, but the consensus is clear. A new study, hot off the press, in the *Annals of Internal Medicine* put it bluntly: "The case for coverage is strong." The reasons are actually pretty straightforward. People who don't have access to high-quality, affordable

care—people who work as hard as they can but just don't have the money—can't go to the doctor when they need to; can't get preventive care, such as breast cancer screenings and vaccinations; and can't fill the prescriptions they need to stay healthy.

When someone doesn't have coverage, they typically wait to go to the doctor until things get really bad—when the cough turns into a rattle, when the lump gets too scary to ignore or the backache makes it impossible to even to walk. This is the reason why everyone who actually works in healthcare—doctors, nurses, hospitals, patient groups, researchers, experts—is coming out against the Republican bill.

The American Medical Association—the nation's largest association of doctors—says that the Republican bill violates the most basic principle of medicine: "First, do no harm."

The National Council for Behavioral Health, whose 2,900 member organizations provide mental healthcare and addiction treatment to 10 million Americans, said the bill would "cost hundreds of thousands of lives."

National Nurses United, representing 150,000 registered nurses across the country, said the bill would "prove to be deadly for our nation's seniors."

The President of a leading coalition of safety-net hospitals said about the Republican bill: "Let's not mince words. . . . People will die."

If the Republican bill passes, "people will die." That is what the healthcare professionals are telling us. The Republican plan is to kick 22 million people off their health insurance. They want to slash tax credits that help people afford their premiums. They want to open the door to insurance companies to offer plans with higher costs and less coverage.

And why? Nothing in this bill—not one thing—improves healthcare for anyone—not one thing. No, the only reason for this bill is to finance \$569 billion in tax cuts for a handful of millionaires and billionaires.

There has been a lot of concern about the discussion of healthcare getting overheated. The facts do not lie. The academic studies don't mince words. If the Republican healthcare bill passes, tens of thousands of people in this country will die every year.

Republicans can ignore these facts. They can turn away from these studies. They can pretend they don't know what is going on. But the people who lose their healthcare—the babies, the women, the seniors in nursing homes, the people with disabilities, the workers who get hurt on the job, the people who get hit by heart attacks and strokes and diabetes—will suffer all the same.

Yes, if the Republicans go forward with their bill, people will die. Those are the facts. We have less than 2 weeks to make sure the Republicans

hear from everyone in this country who wants them to abandon this terrible bill once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back for my weekly "Time to Wake Up" speech, which, given the theme of the week in Washington, it is going to focus on the health consequences of what is going on in climate change. It is timely to do so because just recently the National Weather Service issued an excessive heat warning for the Southwestern United States. In California, San Diego County set a record at—hang on—124 degrees.

As a result of this heat, the National Weather Service warned of "a major increase in the potential for heat-related illness and even death."

In Phoenix, AZ, it got up to around 120 degrees. It got so hot that flights had to be grounded at the Phoenix airport because the hot air was too thin for the jet engines to get enough bite on the air for the planes to fly safely. The emergency rooms saw patients coming in with burns caused by walking barefoot on hot pavement or touching their cars that had gotten so hot in the sun that they were burned. There were several heat-related deaths reported in the Las Vegas area and in California.

This heat wave problem is not going away. "Heat waves like the one we are seeing in the Southwest are becoming much more frequent," said Robert E. Kopp, director of the Coastal Climate Risk and Resilience Initiative at Rutgers University.

He went on to say: "Looking forward, we expect the amount of extreme heat on the planet to continue increasing even more" with obvious health effects.

It has gotten deadly serious in many places. In the 2003 European heat wave, there were more than 30,000 deaths across the continent, and the 3-day 1995 Chicago heat wave killed more than 700 people.

We need to pay attention. As Mr. Kopp concluded, "that calls for a major rethink of the systems that we rely upon." This is not normal any longer.

This week also saw the publication in the *Providence Business News* of an article by Nitin Damle called "Climate Change's Dire Health Consequences." Nitin Damle is a physician in Rhode Island. He is a leader of our medical profession in Rhode Island, and he just recently was the President nationwide of the American College of Physicians.

In the Providence Business News, he writes:

The medical community is witness to the health effects of climate change now and not in some distant future. There are five categories of health effects that will affect not thousands but millions of people in America and around the world.

First, as we just talked about what we saw in Arizona and in Southern California, he goes on to say:

An increase in global temperature and frequency of heat waves will expose people to a risk of heat exhaustion (dehydration, headaches, weakness, nausea and vomiting) and/or heat stroke (high fever, stroke, confusion and coma). The most vulnerable will include the elderly, with multiple heart, lung and kidney conditions, multiple medications and a poorer ability to regulate their body temperature.

But Dr. Damle went on to say:

Children will be at risk due to their inability to thermo regulate, as will laborers who work outdoors and the homeless. History tells us that there have been 7,400 annual deaths between 1999–2010 in the United States, 15,000 deaths in France in 2009, 70,000 deaths in Europe in 2003 and 15,000 deaths in Russia in 2010 from heat waves.

Respiratory effects are another health consequence that Dr. Damle elucidates here.

Respiratory effects from particulate matter and ozone result in exacerbation of asthma and other chronic lung conditions.

He continues:

Fifty-five percent of the U.S. population tests positive for allergens and 34 million people have asthma. The increased length of the pollen season and growth of allergen-producing weeds, grasses, mold and fungus will lead to more exacerbations of asthma and chronic lung conditions at an annual cost of \$56 billion per year with visits to the emergency room and hospital admissions.

I was at a conference recently and saw a presentation by Dr. Kari Nadeau, who is the director of the Sean N. Parker Center for Allergy & Asthma Research at Stanford University and the Naddisy Foundation Professor of Medicine and Pediatrics.

I am going to borrow a few of her slides that relate to the asthma and allergen concerns. Let me start with this graph, which shows asthma prevalence nationwide and asthma prevalence in Rhode Island.

In Rhode Island, we run a little bit higher for the experience of asthma than nationwide, and this is an issue that is important to us. It comes home to roost. Dr. Nadeau used this slide. This was exposure to extreme heat and precipitation events associated with increased risk of hospitalization for asthma. This was a study that was done in Maryland. As the temperature went up, and there was extreme heat or precipitation, and asthma hospitalizations went up as well.

She showed a graph from another study in New York that of the ED visits, or emergency department visits, related to ozone or related to smog, which is a well-known asthma trigger

and the estimated increase in ozone-related emergency department visits for children in New York from the 1990s to 2020s resulting from climate-change-related increases in ozone concentrations. As the ozone concentrations went up, up went the ozone-related emergency department visits.

The dark blue shows places where the emergency department visits went up 10 percent; the lighter blue, 7.8 to 9 percent; the even lighter blue, 6.6 to 7.7 percent; and in these counties, up 5.2 to 6.5 percent.

Globally, we see that pollen counts go up in conjunction with increasing carbon dioxide. In 1900, there were about 280 parts per million of pollen production, and we hit 370 parts per million in 2000. I take it back. At 280 parts per million of carbon dioxide, there were 5 grams per plant of pollen production. At 370 parts per million of carbon dioxide, pollen production increased to over 10 grams per plant. We are over 400 now. We are headed for 720 parts per million. At that point, we have more than quadrupled the pollen output.

We are seeing this happen not only in terms of the amount of pollen output that can trigger asthma but also the length of the pollen season. The months in which people who have asthma are vulnerable are extending themselves. Here, it is nearly 27 extra days. Here it is 24 extra days, 17 extra days, 19 extra days, 14 extra days, 13 extra days. We went through the middle of the country and saw over and over that the ragweed pollen season is getting long, and it is worse for asthma sufferers.

Another thing we have associated with climate change and with the dry drought spells has been wildfires. Wildfires, for obvious reasons, put a lot of stuff—ash and things—up into the air. In this monitoring map of California, when the wildfires were going on, you could see these spikes in asthma activity.

Here is before the fire. Here is during the fire activity, and here it falls back down afterward. The risks for asthma climbed dramatically during that period. The wildfires present yet another climate-related risk for people who have asthma. And here are the wildfires in California, shown to increase asthma, as determined by the emergency department visits. The emergency department visits climbed based on various risk factors. So when you are seeing folks having to go to the emergency department for asthma, that has gotten pretty serious. There is a lot of support for Dr. Damle's assertion that this is a concern we should pay attention to.

He goes on to list another category of concern: exposure to infectious disease from vectors such as mosquitos and ticks. He says it has and will continue to escalate.

There is a documented increase in cases of dengue, chikungunya, West Nile virus and Zika.

He goes on to say:

We will likely see a resurgence of malaria in certain areas of North America.

Other illnesses come from other consequences of climate change.

He goes on to report:

An increase in heavy downpours and flooding in America and the world will lead to an increase in waterborne diseases such as E. Coli and other bacteria (salmonella, typhoid and cholera), parasites (Giardia) and viruses (Hepatitis A and Norwalk) with an impact on millions of people around the world.

He goes on to cite extreme weather events, which create stress, anxiety, and depression. Hurricane Katrina, he reports, led to 32 percent of people affected by the hurricane suffering from post-traumatic stress.

He continues:

We know that there will need to be a global effort to reduce anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and the developed countries need to take a leading role developing/implementing and moderating the success of those mitigating measures.

He concludes:

We need to reenter the Paris agreement and move forward at the local and State levels for the benefit of our patients.

He is a respected doctor in Rhode Island. He is a clinical assistant professor of medicine at the Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University. Also, he was recently the president of the American College of Physicians.

I know my colleagues don't want to listen to any of this stuff about climate change because the fossil fuel industry controls them so much that they cannot even say the words, in many cases, "climate change" on the floor of the Senate, but for crying out loud, you have the former president of the American College of Physicians talking about the health effects; you have a prominent researcher at Stanford University talking about the health effects; and you have the National Weather Service warning about dangerous health effects from climate-related heat in the Southwest. When are we going to finally get around to having a serious discussion about this?

It is great that we had a little pause on this wretched healthcare bill. I couldn't be happier to be rid of it for a while, and I am hoping we can be rid of it for good, but it is probably going to come back. We will have to hammer a few more stakes into the heart of this zombie before we are rid of it, and then we can move on to a serious bipartisan healthcare bill.

There is good work to be done on healthcare. There is good work to be done on climate change. But we have to take the wretched special interest politics out so we can get to serious business.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

## HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor tonight to join my colleagues in opposing the Senate healthcare reform bill, what I will call the Senate TrumpCare bill. I am also here to thank the thousands of my constituents, the thousands of Delawareans who called and emailed my office to express their opposition to this bill that is about neither health nor care. It is because of your efforts, because of the efforts of thousands of Americans across the country who have made their voices heard, that today the Senate doesn't have enough votes to pass this TrumpCare bill.

I urge everyone watching and listening to remember that this fight is not over. The Senate will be back next month, and Republicans will be doing everything they can to make tweaks or shaves or changes or amendments to the bill to get it past this body. We need the engagement, the persistence, even the resistance of Delawareans and Americans to make sure the Senate TrumpCare bill never becomes law.

This is as urgent now as ever because of how fundamentally heartless this bill is. As many nonpartisan organizations, including the Congressional Budget Office, have pointed out, this bill is essentially a massive tax break for the wealthy paid for on the backs of some of America's most vulnerable citizens.

Many of my colleagues have already discussed the devastating impact this bill would have over time on millions of Americans. This Senate bill would make hundreds of billions of dollars in cuts to Medicaid, it would slash tax credits that help Americans buy health insurance, and it would force 22 million Americans off their health insurance and drive up costs for many millions more.

If that is not bad enough, the Senate TrumpCare bill does all of this slashing and cutting in large part to give another tax break to our wealthiest citizens. If this bill becomes law, the very richest Americans would get an extra \$700 billion in tax breaks over the next decade.

If it only affected the millions of Americans who depend on Medicaid or who purchase insurance on the individual market, it would be unconscionable, but it is even worse. Let me explain.

Many of our constituents don't realize that even Americans who get their health insurance through their employer—the 150 million Americans who get their health insurance through their employer—have benefited from the Affordable Care Act. In fact, I think that in some ways, the consumer protections put in place by the ACA are the most important accomplishment of that bill.

A core requirement of the ACA was that all health insurance plans cover

what are known as essential health benefits. These are basic services, such as emergency care, prescription drugs, pediatric services, maternity and newborn care, hospitalization, healthcare for the mentally ill, and substance abuse treatment for the addicted. To put it more succinctly, these are all the reasons many people want health insurance in the first place. Thanks to the ACA, almost every insurance plan in the country today has to carry these core services, and that includes the more than 150 million Americans and the half a million Delawareans who get their health insurance through their jobs.

The Senate TrumpCare bill would allow States, through waivers over time, to gut these essential health benefit requirements, gradually making many Americans' health insurance less and less valuable and less and less protective of their and their families' health.

That provision of the Senate TrumpCare bill would also allow States to waive the ban on insurers imposing annual and lifetime limits on essential healthcare coverage. Even if you get good insurance through your employer, if you have an unexpected development—let's say the premature birth of a child, who develops serious medical challenges, or a terrible diagnosis that requires expensive and repeated surgery—you either have to come up with that money on your own or you are forced into bankruptcy once you hit the lifetime cap.

Let me demonstrate with an all-too-real example. About 1 in 10 newborns has to spend time in the neonatal intensive care unit, or NICU, after they are born. According to the American Medical Association, in the NICU, "it is not unusual for costs to top \$1 million for an extended stay." That means even a baby born to parents with great insurance coverage through their employer hit their lifetime insurance cap before they even leave the hospital for the first time.

As Americans are scrambling to find ways to pay for their astronomical out-of-pocket costs under the so-called Senate TrumpCare bill, wealthier Americans and corporations will be given big tax breaks.

Moreover, while Senate Republicans may claim their bill still covers pre-existing conditions, insurance under this bill would be rendered meaningless if it doesn't cover what you need to treat your preexisting condition through these essential health benefits.

Let's briefly recap this Senate TrumpCare bill. Millions of Americans lose health insurance. Those who managed to keep it end up paying more but get less coverage. The wealthiest Americans get another big tax break. That is a painful, even cynical, political calculation.

Since I came to the Senate 7 years ago, I have said more times than I can

count that I want to work with Republicans to fix the parts of the Affordable Care Act that need fixing. Let's simplify the reporting requirements that burden small businesses and increase the tax credits that help small business employers offer insurance to their employees. Let's find ways together to increase competition and expand the tax credits to bring down premiums and deductibles on the individual market. Let's explore new mechanisms that control healthcare costs by incentivizing reforms and producing healthier outcomes, rather than more tests and services. Sadly, this Senate TrumpCare bill does none of these things.

It is my hope that after today's developments, that after the next few weeks, that after hearing from their constituents and returning in the next month, that my colleagues will recognize that if we work together, we can address the broken parts of the ACA and sustain the best of what it has done to expand insurance and healthcare for millions of Americans.

Let me close with a story I shared earlier today on the steps of the Capitol. This is Kerry Orr. Kerry is from my hometown of Wilmington, DE. Kerry is a massage therapist and self-employed yoga instructor. Like many Americans, she considers the Affordable Care Act "nothing short of miraculous."

Kerry signed up for health insurance in 2014, thanks to a subsidy that made it available to her through the ACA. She had some nagging abdominal and lower back pain for years but didn't think much of it, considering she had no family history of disease and had never even had stitches before. But that next year, in January of 2015, a routine procedure covered by her new insurance—which she told me she wouldn't have even gone for if it hadn't been covered by this new health insurance—revealed that Kerry, in fact, had stage III colon cancer. She had surgery a week later. She had 6 months of chemotherapy, and she ultimately faced no out-of-pocket expenses and is fully in remission. Kerry's cancer has now been in remission since September 2015.

She wrote to me earlier this year:

The ACA came along at the last possible moment to save my life. I am certain that without it, I would have continued to live with the discomfort and try to self-treat until the cancer was too advanced to be successfully treated.

I am opposing the Senate TrumpCare bill for Kerry and for the thousands of Delawareans and millions of Americans just like her. I have heard stories from Delawareans about things that need to be fixed in the Affordable Care Act, and I hope I get a chance to work across the aisle to do that, but I have also heard from hundreds of Delawareans whose lives have been improved or, in

cases just like Kerry's, saved by the Affordable Care Act. I will not yield on defending the best parts of the ACA that have saved the lives of Americans across this country.

In the days and the weeks to come, I hope all Americans will stay active, stay engaged, and stay the course so that we can push aside this cruel, cynical bill and find an opportunity to work together on a bill with real heart. That fight is not yet over, and I will not yet yield.

Thank you, Mr. President.  
I yield the floor.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 154, Neomi Rao to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### TRIBUTE TO ANNE ANDERSON

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Ireland's Ambassador to the United States, Anne Anderson, on the occasion of her retirement. Since 2013, Anne has served as Ireland's 17th Ambassador to the United States, the first woman to serve in this role. She has done much to further the close relationship long shared between the United States and Ireland. My great-grandparents were Irish immigrants, settling in Vermont, where I was born and raised. I have long been aware of the contributions Irish immigrants make to our Nation.

Ambassador Anderson first represented her Ireland's interests in the United States in 1983, when she became the Embassy of Ireland's economic attache and then press attache. After moving back to Ireland in 1987, she served as counsellor in the Anglo-Irish division of the Department of Foreign Affairs and then became Assistant Secretary General in Corporate Services. In this role, Ambassador Anderson greatly influenced the fight for equal treatment of women in the workplace and worked to pass fair employment legislation in the North of Ireland.

Ambassador Anderson assumed the role of diplomat again in 1995, when she became Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations in Geneva. During her time in Geneva, she acted as chair of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights and vice president of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. She then moved to Brussels to serve as the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the European Union in 2001.

After some time as Ambassador to France, she returned to the United States once more to become the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations in New York until 2013, when she was named the Ambassador of Ireland to the United States. Her focus in her time as ambassador has been in advocating on behalf of immigration issues and undocumented Irish immigrants in the United States, pursuing her passion for inclusivity and equality in human rights and women's rights, and fostering the cultural art connections between the two nations.

The foundations of our relationship with Ireland are built upon and solidified by the great work of diplomats and

public servants such as Ambassador Anderson, who seek to facilitate international relationships that rise above any national differences. While she may be retiring from her diplomatic roles, my friend Anne will forever be a diplomat in the truest sense of the word. Marcelle and I congratulate her on her retirement and thank her for her years of service and friendship and her dedicated efforts to strengthen the U.S. relationship with Ireland.

##### CBO ESTIMATE OF H.R. 1628

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, the Congressional Budget Office released its estimate of H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017, in May 2017. Information related to this House-passed bill can be found on the Congressional Budget Office's Website with the following link: <https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/115th-congress-2017-2018/costestimate/hr1628aspassed.pdf>.

##### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RECOGNIZING THE HUNTLEY PROJECT IRRIGATION DISTRICT

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Huntley Project Irrigation District for its 110th anniversary and for its impact on Montana. The district originated from an irrigation project in southern Montana that was completed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1907. The Huntley Project was one of the first Reclamation projects in Montana and led to the development and success of agricultural land in much of the surrounding area. As agriculture is Montana's No. 1 industry, it is critical that farmers and ranchers have irrigation projects set in place that are able to provide a reliable supply of water for their crops.

Leading by example is the way we do things in Montana, and this project shows how the dedication and ingenuity of our farmers and ranchers works. It has led to economic development for the area and beyond and transformed farming areas to be even more fruitful for our farmers and ranchers.

Our farmers and ranchers have made it through the tough times because of determination and have overcome many challenges. This anniversary celebrates more than an irrigation project but honors the determination and ambition of the Montana farmer and rancher. Congratulations again for the 110th anniversary of the Huntley Project, and thank you to everyone who has made it a success.●

##### SISSETON-WAHPETON SIOUX TRIBE'S SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

• Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary

of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe's treaty with the U.S. Government, which coincides with the Tribe's 150th annual Fourth of July celebration.

Beginning in 1867, the Sisseton-Wahpeton Dakota Nation's annual Fourth of July Wacipi is the oldest continual event in South Dakota and one of the oldest established celebrations in the Nation. The Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe is dedicated to maintaining their culture in the modern world through art, language, spirituality, and traditions, all of which is celebrated during its annual Fourth of July Wacipi. They also use the celebration to honor area veterans who bravely fought defending our freedoms.

The story of the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands is one of movement of the Native people that made their home on the Lake Traverse Reservation, where they still celebrate today. Here, Tribal members draw on their rich history, continue their traditions, and contribute to a vibrant, growing economy in the area.

On behalf of all South Dakotans, I wish to congratulate the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe on their sesquicentennial celebration. I thank them for their treaty, friendship, and alliance with the United States of America over the past 150 years and look forward to continuing our friendship in the 150 years to come.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1684. An act to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide technical assistance to common interest communities regarding eligibility for disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1726. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve the organization of such title and to incorporate certain transfers and modifications into such title, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2258. An act to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves.

H.R. 2547. An act to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1684. An act to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide technical assistance

to common interest communities regarding eligibility for disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1726. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve the organization of such title and to incorporate certain transfers and modifications into such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2258. An act to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2547. An act to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-43. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Louisiana to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to two hundred nautical miles off the coast of Louisiana; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 67

Whereas, in recent years, the Gulf of Mexico has contained the highest total allowable catch of red snapper in decades, but in 2016, anglers experienced the shortest recreational fishing season to date, lasting less than two weeks; and

Whereas, the federal government has overseen the Gulf recreational red snapper fishery for nearly four decades; today, federal management systems attempt to regulate red snapper fishing by the pound with tools specifically designed to manage the commercial sector, despite the fact that federal data collection systems are incapable of accounting to such a level of specificity for recreational harvests; and

Whereas, the federal government has, moreover, neglected to use recent data to provide meaningful guidelines and requirements for a systematic reallocation of federal fisheries; except for minor adjustments to account for errors in its own data collection system, the Gulf red snapper fishery allocation is based on highly suspect data from 1979-1986 and has remained unchanged since 1991; and

Whereas, the federal government is currently promoting a management strategy to privatize the Gulf red snapper fishery; approximately fifty percent of the fishery is already held by private businesses, while another twenty percent has been designated to be sold; shares of this public resource have also been given away for free, based on a commercial operator's past catch history; and

Whereas, because of extraordinarily remiss requirements in its conflict of interest guidelines, the federal fisheries management system allows commercial operators who already own red snapper shares or who may be

gifted shares to serve on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and to cast votes on issues that will result in direct financial benefit for themselves; and

Whereas, by creating a prohibitive environment for anglers and ethical issues among user groups and stakeholders, the federal government has proved itself incapable of properly managing the red snapper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico, and all five states along the Gulf Coast have increasingly implemented regulations and seasons that are not consistent with the federal management plan; and

Whereas, numerous studies, including some funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, indicate that the greatest economic engine in the Gulf reef fishery is the recreational angling sector, and federal control should be relinquished to the Gulf states, which depend most on this vital public resource. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Louisiana to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to two hundred nautical miles off the coast of Louisiana; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-44. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada supporting and encouraging the retention of federal public lands in the state; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 78th Legislative Session urged Congress to enact legislation to transfer title to certain federal public lands in this State to the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, The Federal Government manages and controls nearly 80 percent of the land in this State; and

Whereas, A significant portion of the federal public lands in this State consists of national forests, national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, conservation areas and wildlife refuges, all of which preserve the natural and scenic beauty of the federal public lands in this State and protect those lands from excessive human encroachment and exploitation; and

Whereas, The management and control of the federal public lands in this State by various federal agencies in this State confers an economic benefit upon the State of Nevada by saving the State of Nevada from incurring significant costs each year in managing those lands; and

Whereas, Some of the costs incurred each year by federal agencies include expenses for fighting fires, the management of wild horses and burros and the maintenance of national forests, parks and monuments; and

Whereas, The retention of federal management and control of the federal public lands in this State will ensure that access to and the use of those lands for recreational and other authorized purposes will remain available to all residents of this State; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly*, That Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 78th Legislative Session is hereby rescinded; and be it further



*Resolved*, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby support and encourage the retention of federal management and control of federal public lands in this State; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation and the Governor; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-45. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California relative to new Outer Continental Shelf Oil and gas leasing in federal waters offshore California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 35

Whereas, California's iconic coastal and marine waters are one of our state's most precious resources, and as elected officials, it is our duty to ensure the long-term viability of California's fish and wildlife resources, and thriving fishing, tourism, and recreation sectors; and

Whereas, Hundreds of millions of California residents and visitors, enjoy the state's ocean and coast for recreation, exploration, and relaxation; and tourism and recreation comprise the largest sector of the state's \$445 billion ocean economy; and

Whereas, There has been no new offshore oil and gas lease in California since the 1969 blowout of a well in federal waters; and

Whereas, Beginning in 1921, and many times since, the California Legislature has enacted laws that withdrew certain offshore areas from oil and gas leasing, and by 1989, the state's offshore oil and gas leasing moratorium was in place; and

Whereas, In 1994, the California Legislature made findings in Assembly Bill 2444, Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994, that offshore oil and gas production in certain areas of state waters poses an unacceptably high risk of damage and disruption to the marine environment; and

Whereas, In the same bill, the Legislature created the California Coastal Sanctuary Act, which included all of the state's unleased waters subject to tidal influence and prohibited new oil and gas leases in the sanctuary, unless the President of the United States has found a severe energy supply interruption and has ordered distribution of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Governor finds that the energy resources of the sanctuary will contribute significantly to alleviating that interruption, and the Legislature subsequently amends Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994 to allow that extraction; and

Whereas, Section 18 of the federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) requires the preparation of a nationwide offshore oil and gas leasing program setting a five-year schedule of lease sales implemented by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management within the United States Department of the Interior; and

Whereas, Consistent with the principles of Section 18 and the resulting regionally tailored leasing strategy, the current exclusion of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas development is consistent with the long-standing interests of Pacific Coast states, as framed in the 2006 Agreement on Ocean Health adopted by the Governors of California, Washington, and Oregon; and

Whereas, In November 2016, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management released a final 2017–2022 leasing program that continues the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the undeveloped areas of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf; and

Whereas, Governor Brown, in December 2016, requested that then President Obama permanently withdraw California's Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas leasing, and along with previous California governors, has united with the Governors of Oregon and Washington in an effort to commit to developing robust renewable energy sources to reduce our dependence on fossil fuel and help us reach our carbon emission goals; and

Whereas, The California Legislature has led the nation with its landmark climate change legislation, requiring ambitious greenhouse gas emission reductions of a 40 percent emissions reduction below 1990 levels by 2030, and achieving a renewables portfolio standard of 50 percent by 2030; California must lead the nation in fostering the transition away from offshore fossil fuel production to protect both our climate and oceans from the damaging impacts of climate change, which will affect all life on earth for generations to come; and

Whereas, There are renewed calls for opening offshore areas for drilling and for lifting moratoriums on energy production in federal areas, which could lead to more oil spills and increased dependence of fossil fuels; and

Whereas, The California Legislature considers new oil and gas development offshore of California to be a threat to the nation's economy, national security, and state's ambitious renewable energy goals; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the Senate strongly and unequivocally supports the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore California, opposes attempts to modify the prohibition, and will consider any appropriate actions to maintain the prohibition; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Governor of California, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, to the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and to each member of the California State Senate and Assembly.

POM-46. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing support for the determination of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish and Wildlife Resources to recommend that the United States Congress dedicate \$1.3 billion annually in existing revenue obtained from the development of energy and mineral resources on federal lands and waters for programs to diversify the funding for and management of all species of wildlife; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas, The State of Nevada is home to more than 890 species of animals, of which 65 of those species are found only in this State; and

Whereas, Congress has enacted legislation, commonly referred to as the Pittman-Rob-

ertson Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 669–669j, and the Dingell-Johnson Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 777–777k, both of which were assented to by this State pursuant to NRS 501.115 and 501.117, respectively, to provide federal aid for the support of conservation, restoration projects and science-based management of game and sport fish financed by hunters, recreational shooters, fishermen and boaters; and

Whereas, A similarly dedicated and sustainable method of funding is not available for many species of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians and reptiles which are not hunted or fished; and

Whereas, In 2012, the Board of Wildlife Commissioners approved a Wildlife Action Plan created by the Department of Wildlife; and

Whereas, The provisions of the Wildlife Action Plan prioritize 256 species of wildlife having the greatest need for conservation and 22 types of habitat that require prescriptive actions to ensure the maintenance of those species and types of habitat for current and future generations in this State; and

Whereas, There is a recognized need to expand funding for the conservation of wildlife in the United States; and

Whereas, The Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish and Wildlife Resources, consisting of 26 members who are leaders in business and conservation, was recently established; and

Whereas, The Blue Ribbon Panel was required to recommend alternative methods of funding to support fish and wildlife conservation in this State and to ensure the sustainability of all species of fish and wildlife for current and future generations in this State; and

Whereas, Securing a dedicated source of federal funding for the conservation of wildlife in this State will likely require this State to provide matching funds similar to the matching funds that are currently required under the Pittman-Robertson Act and the Dingell-Johnson Act; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly*, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature express their support for the determination of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish and Wildlife Resources to recommend that Congress dedicate \$1.3 billion dollars annually in existing revenue obtained from the development of energy and mineral resources on federal lands and waters for programs to diversify the funding for and management of all species of wildlife; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the members of the Nevada Congressional Delegation are encouraged to support the enactment of federal legislation to carry out the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Panel; and be it further

*Resolved*, That support is expressed for the development of policies and enactment of legislation that broaden dedicated methods of funding:

1. For the conservation of wildlife in this State;
2. For carrying out the Wildlife Action Plan of the Nevada Department of Wildlife; and
3. To provide state matching funds if a dedicated method of federal funding is obtained for the conservation of wildlife in this State; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States

Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-47. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security Benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; to the Committee on Finance.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 22

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit, payable to any person who also receives a public pension benefit earned in public employment not covered by Social Security; and

Whereas, the GPO can negatively affect a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit earned in public employment not covered by Social Security who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit even though the spouse paid Social Security taxes throughout the marriage; and

Whereas, according to recent Social Security Administration figures, more than half a million individuals nationally are affected by the GPO; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits in public employment not covered by Social Security, in addition to working in employment covered by Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, the WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in employment not covered by Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, according to recent Social Security Administration figures, more than one and a half million individuals nationally are affected by the WEP; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and the GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and, in combination, eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, because of the calculation characteristics of the WEP and the GPO, they have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like teachers, school workers, and state employees; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by the WEP and the GPO is growing as nearly

10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the WEP and the GPO may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the earnings accumulated during a return to work in the public sector may further reduce the Social Security benefits the individual is entitled to; and

Whereas, the WEP and the GPO are established in federal law, and repeal or reduction of the WEP and the GPO can only be enacted by Congress; Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-48. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the United States Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act; to the Committee on Finance.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, In the case of *National Bellas Hess, Inc. v. Department of Revenue*, 386 U.S. 753 (1967), the United States Supreme Court held, in relevant part, that Congress alone has the power to regulate and control the taxation of commerce that is conducted between a business that is located within one state and a customer who is located in another state and who communicates with and purchases from the business using only remote means; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court established in *Quill Corporation v. North Dakota*, 504 U.S. 298 (1992), that a state government cannot, of its own accord, require out-of-state retailers to collect sales tax on sales within the state; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court also announced in *Quill* that Congress could exercise its authority under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution to decide whether, when and to what extent the states may require the collection of sales tax on remote sales; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada and municipalities within this State receive significant operating revenue from sales taxes collected by brick-and-mortar businesses and online vendors with a nexus to the State and from use taxes on purchases made online through vendors without a brick-and-mortar location in the State; and

Whereas, Remittance of use taxes not collected by a vendor from online purchases imposes an undue burden and widely unknown obligation on consumers; and

Whereas, The unequal taxation schemes as between online and traditional retailers create a disadvantage for Nevada-based retailers, who are rooted and invested in the Nevada community and employ residents of this State; and

Whereas, The tax collection loophole for online retailers deprives local governments of revenue that could be used to fund necessities such as schools, police departments and fire departments, and other important infrastructure; and

Whereas, The Marketplace Fairness Act was introduced in the 112th Congress, again

in the 113th Congress and again in the 114th Congress, to provide states with the authority to require out-of-state retailers, such as online and catalog retailers, to collect and remit sales tax on purchases shipped into the state; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada has enacted the Simplified Sales and Use Tax Administration Act, chapter 360B of NRS, which is in compliance with the Marketplace Fairness Act; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly*, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature urge Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act without further delay; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation and the Executive Director of the Department of Taxation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-49. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the United States Congress not to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its most important provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, In 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), commonly known as the Affordable Care Act, was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Barack Obama; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act established a comprehensive series of health insurance reforms designed to make universal, affordable health insurance coverage available to all Americans, while also controlling rising health care costs and ending certain common industry practices that limited access to health insurance coverage; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act expanded access to health insurance coverage by creating health insurance marketplaces, allowing children to stay on a parent's health insurance plan until the age of 26 years, expanding Medicaid and establishing a system of tax credits to assist consumers in purchasing individual health insurance coverage and provide incentives to businesses to encourage them to provide health insurance coverage to employees; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act prohibits an insurer from denying health insurance coverage to a person on the basis of a preexisting condition, prohibits an insurer from rescinding coverage, eliminates lifetime and annual limits on coverage, requires all marketplace plans to provide coverage for 10 essential health benefits, including preventative care, establishes a mechanism for consumers to appeal determinations regarding coverage and establishes a system to assist consumers in navigating the health insurance marketplace; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act additionally requires health insurance coverage for annual well-woman visits, screenings for breast cancer and cervical cancer, screening for gestational diabetes, all approved contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures and patient education and counseling services often provided by nonprofit organizations such as Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; and

Whereas, In particular, since Nevada chose to participate in the expansion of Medicaid

in 2011, approximately 181,000 new enrollees obtained health insurance coverage in Nevada through the Medicaid expansion alone; and

Whereas, It has been estimated that 370,000 adults in this State stand to lose health insurance coverage if the Affordable Care Act is repealed; and

Whereas, It has been estimated that Nevada could lose an estimated \$1 billion in Medicaid funding if the Affordable Care Act is repealed; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act provides many other benefits and protections to ensure access to health care by all; and

Whereas, Congressional leaders have proposed repealing the Affordable Care Act during the 115th Congress without a plan to replace the Affordable Care Act which adequately protects the thousands of Nevadans who benefit from or may not have access to health insurance coverage without the Act; and

Whereas, The Congressional Budget Office reported that the congressional plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act will cost 24 million Americans their health insurance coverage by 2026; and

Whereas, Repealing the Affordable Care Act without establishing mechanisms to preserve the significant improvements and protections afforded by the law, and without adequately providing for those who stand to lose their health insurance coverage upon repeal, will have significant detrimental effects on individuals and their families, on the health care industry in general and on the overall economic well-being of both Nevada and the nation as a whole; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly,* That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge Congress to fully preserve the critical benefits afforded by the Affordable Care Act which many Nevadans have come to rely upon; and be it further

*Resolved,* That Congress should maintain federal funding for organizations, such as Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., that provide essential family planning, cancer screenings and other preventative health services to Nevadans; and be it further

*Resolved,* That Congress should not repeal the Affordable Care Act in a manner that would deny access to these essential programs and services to future generations of Nevadans; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-50. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to review federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures to ensure that veterans and their family members have convenient access to military service and medical records; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 136

Whereas, veterans of the United States armed forces have earned the respect, admiration, and gratitude of the state of Louisiana and its citizens; and

Whereas, the freedom and liberties we are blessed to enjoy today are a direct result of

the courage, devotion, and sacrifice of the members of our armed forces; and

Whereas, it is appropriate to recognize their unwavering selflessness and courage by giving due consideration to all laws meant to protect and assist those veterans and their families; and

Whereas, in order to apply for certain military benefits, veterans or family members need access to military service or medical records to fill out the application forms and to meet the requirements to apply for the benefits; and

Whereas, when these veterans or family members need our assistance in accessing their military service or medical records, federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures should be simple to navigate in order to obtain these records. Therefore, be it

*Resolved* that the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to review federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures to ensure that veterans and their family members have convenient access to military service and medical records. Be it further

*Resolved* that a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-51. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to increase funding for services for veterans who are returning from deployment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 65

Whereas, The freedom, peace and privileges that citizens of United States enjoy today are the direct results of the sacrifices of the veterans of the Armed Forces who have selflessly served to protect our nation; and

Whereas, The brave men and women veterans of the Armed Forces, who proudly served the nation and risked their lives to protect our freedom, deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being; and

Whereas, Investing in the well-being of veterans of the Armed Forces benefits not only those members, but also every citizen of the United States, as such an investment ensures that these individuals will thrive upon their transition into civilian life; and

Whereas, It is no secret that certain services provided by the government have failed to adequately serve our nation's veterans; therefore, increased funding may improve areas where service to veterans is not sufficiently addressing veterans' needs; and

Whereas, Veterans of the United States military have served this country with honor and dignity, putting their lives on the line for this country, and at a minimum, deserve quality care and services upon their return from deployment; and

Whereas, It is altogether fitting and proper for this House to urge Congress to increase funding for services for veterans returning from deployment; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:*

1. This House hereby urges Congress to increase funding for services provided to veterans upon their return from deployment.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States

House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, each Senator and Representative from New Jersey in the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.

POM-52. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 120

Whereas, the value of the domestic beef industry is a vital and integral part of the United States economy; and

Whereas, the 2016 economic impact was approximately sixty-seven billion dollars in farm cash receipts for cattle and calves; and

Whereas, there are over nine hundred thousand total cattle and calf operations in the United States of which ninety-one percent are family owned or individually operated, and eleven percent are operated by women; and

Whereas, domestic beef production in 2017 is estimated to be approximately twenty-five billion eight hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, the amount of beef consumed in the United States in 2016 was approximately twenty-five billion six hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, it is essential to the success of the domestic beef industry to increase international trade to key export markets; and

Whereas, the promotion of policies which highlight the quality, safety, sustainability, and nutritional value of domestic beef will drive growth in domestic beef exports; and

Whereas, it is in the nation's best interest to protect against legislative policies or agency regulations that have a negative impact on the economic health of the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, minor changes in future domestic beef import or export levels can significantly change the net beef supply and beef prices; and

Whereas, important steps to supporting the domestic beef industry include developing a comprehensive national strategy for including beef in future dietary guidelines and investing in necessary research to improve productivity and efficiency; and

Whereas, it is critical to the success of the domestic beef industry to identify barriers and develop strategies to attract and enable the next generation of farmers into the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, terrorist attacks have heightened the nation's awareness of agriterrorism and placed a renewed focus on ensuring the protection of the nation's critical infrastructures, including the domestic beef food supply; and

Whereas, an intentional contamination of the domestic beef food supply could harm millions of people and cripple our vast agriculture system; and

Whereas, it is critical to preserve the United States domestic beef supply and prevent reliance on foreign nations for food; and

Whereas, it will be necessary to develop a variety of federal actions to support the domestic beef industry including proposals which encourage domestic beef production, improve consumer demand, protect our nation's critical infrastructure, attract new farmers, improve the business climate, and increase trade to export markets; Therefore, be it

*Resolved* that the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States is strongly encouraged to adopt import and export policies that will protect the economic survival and prosperity of the domestic beef industry in Louisiana and America and the nation's food supply; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-53. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, supporting United States Senate Bill 928 and related House Bill 2119, creating the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act of 2017, which would impose a nationwide prohibition on commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy as an unfair or deceptive act or practice; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1443. A bill to improve Department of Defense software management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1445. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to ensure community accountability for areas repetitively damaged by floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1446. A bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1447. A bill to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1448. A bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1449. A bill to authorize payment by the Department of Veterans Affairs for the costs

associated with training and supervision of medical residents and interns at certain facilities that are not Department facilities, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to establish or affiliate with residency programs at facilities operated by Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and the Indian Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Con. Res. 19. A concurrent resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 59

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as long guns.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 220

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 220, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 360

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 360, a bill to

amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 667, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, 37, and 38, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304a or 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services and veterans for certain benefits and for calculating the deadlines for certain benefits.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to lower the mileage threshold for deduction in determining adjusted gross income of certain expenses of members of reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 822, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 844

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to consider certain time spent by members of reserve components of the Armed Forces while receiving medical care from the Secretary of Defense as active duty for purposes of eligibility for Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 947

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 947, a bill to protect passengers on flights in air transportation from being denied boarding involuntarily, and for other purposes.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 951, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, *supra*.

S. 1172

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to allow individuals living in areas without qualified health plans offered through an Exchange to have similar access to health insurance coverage as Members of Congress and congressional staff.

S. 1217

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1217, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for appropriate designation of collective bargaining units.

S. 1228

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to require a National Diplomacy and Development Strategy.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1393, a bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19—COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN FOLKLIFE FESTIVAL

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 19

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival, founded by the Smithsonian Institution on July 1, 1967, is commemorating 50 years of cultural exploration, exchange, and engagement on the National Mall of the United States this year;

Whereas the purposes of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival are to collaborate with individuals and communities throughout the United States and around the world to present diverse, community-based traditions in an engaging, accessible, and culturally appropriate way, to show the connections between traditional and emerging practices, skills, and knowledge through research, performance, demonstration, conversation, and documentation, and to support the efforts of individuals and communities working to promote the resilience, integrity, vitality, and sustainability of the cultural heritage of those individuals and communities;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival continues to collaborate with the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress, the Folk and Traditional Arts Program of the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Park Service, scholarly societies, and State and local arts agencies to deepen and advance public curiosity and appreciation of rich folk and traditional arts and

practices as vital and integral to the social fabric of families, communities, and other countries;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival has inspired similar cultural exhibitions and festivals across the United States and around the world;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival has generated educational curricula, scholarly publications, documentary films, and nongovernmental organizations committed to the documentation and presentation of folk and traditional arts;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival fosters intercultural dialogue, cross-generational learning, and cultural equity;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival celebrates the diversity of artistic expression and the dignity, delight, and innovation found in the creative process; and

Whereas the week of June 26, 2017 through June 30, 2017 is an appropriate week to designate as "Folk and Traditional Arts and Culture Week" in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress recognizes "Folk and Traditional Arts and Culture Week" in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival, to—*

(1) recognize practitioners of folk and traditional culture, and the institutions and organizations that support them;

(2) explore the creativity found within the families and communities of these practitioners; and

(3) congratulate the Smithsonian Folklife Festival for 50 years of outstanding efforts to champion creativity, cultural diversity and sustainability, cross-generational engagement, and intercultural communication through community-based research, public presentation, and archival documentation during the week.

## APPOINTMENT CORRECTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a correction to an appointment made on March 22, 2017, be printed in the RECORD. For the information of the Senate, this correction is clerical and does not change membership of the Service Academy Board made by the appointment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Section 1295b(h) of title 46 App., United States Code, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: the Honorable GARY C. PETERS of Michigan (Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation) and the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii (At Large).

## ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Wednesday, June 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time

for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Rao nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we have now reached a point where the Senate majority, the Republicans, and President Trump, have been unable to put together the package that allows them to take Medicaid and try to successfully turn it into a shadow of what it once was in our country, to turn it into a debt-soaked relic of what it is today by taking out \$770 billion that otherwise would have gone to the families of those in our country who need healthcare services, who need help in providing for those who need it the most within our country.

The same thing was true in the House of Representatives when they were moving through their bill over there. People said: Trump doesn't have the votes. The Republicans don't have the votes. They are not going to be able to be successful. However, this TrumpCare Hail Mary that they threw in the House, notwithstanding the remarkable defense put up by the American people—the millions of phone calls, protests, and rallies—they still were able to find the votes to ultimately pass this incredible attack upon the healthcare of tens of millions of Americans.

What they did in the House is what they are doing in the Senate. The GOP retreats; they wait for the defense to disperse, but then they plow through to get this bill over the finish line, hoping that a 2-week hiatus will be sufficient for the energy level of the defense against these cuts to so wane that then they can come back and finish off the job on their second try in the same way they did in the House of Representatives. Right now it is only halftime.

It is halftime. They are coming back. The ball is in their court. They will attempt again to destroy the healthcare system of our country as we know it today. We have not defeated this bill yet.

Now is the time for those who oppose this bill to redouble their energy, to

play even tougher defense against this Republican attempt to undermine Medicaid, to undermine access to care to everyone in our country. Their bill is now down, so let's keep it down for the count. Let's make sure this bill cannot get up and come back and haunt us in the middle of July.

The Senate proposal right now has \$188 billion, which is now going to be within the hands of the Trump administration, in the hands of the Republican leadership as a slush fund to be used to get the votes they need in order to pass their bill. That \$188 billion is right now being divided up in a way that will help them to get the votes.

What is the ultimate goal of the GOP? The ultimate goal is to take a machete to Medicaid because they harbor an ancient animosity toward Medicaid, and I will throw in Medicare and ObamaCare—all of it. They see this as the best opportunity they have had in two generations to be able to leave these programs as debt-soaked relics of what they are today. When they say: Well, we are going to cap the funding and send it back to the States with more flexibility—when they say “cap” the funding, they are talking about decapitating the funding, to cut it in half, send it back to the States, and then say to the States: You figure it out. You try to help those people who are poorest in your State whom you were never able to figure out how to help in the first place, which is why we put the Federal programs on the books in order to help those who are most in need in all of those States.

What is their real goal? It is pretty simple: Slash these programs and then turn them into one huge tax break for the richest people in America. That is what this program will do. One little example of that \$770 billion—let's take \$33 billion of it. That \$33 billion gets divided up by the 400 wealthiest families in America; 400 billionaires walk up and say: Can I please have my \$7 million that I get as part of taking away coverage for cancer, coverage for Alzheimer's, coverage for opioid treatment? Can I now get my payoff for the success in your wealth-income transfer program? Because that is what you have. You don't have a healthcare program; you have a wealth care program. The wealth of the wealthiest—please make them even wealthier; that is what their entire plan is about.

By the way, that \$33 billion would be enough to take care of the healthcare of 700,000 people in our country, but the Republican priority is to give all that money back to the wealthiest people in our country. That is immoral. That is inhumane. It is just plain wrong. The American public has to rise up and fight against the greatest legislative injustice that has been perpetrated or attempted to be perpetrated on the American people in more than a generation.

This bill is “the bill” of my entire career in the U.S. Congress, which is now 41 years. This is the worst bill. It is the greatest attack upon the well-being of our Nation. This program is of the rich, for the rich, by the rich, and where are they going to take the money from? From the poor, from the sick, from the elderly, from the disabled. It is selfishness on stilts.

To think that there is a plan to take healthcare away from the poorest and sickest and most disabled people in our country in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest is the most indecent action that may have ever been perpetrated on the floor of the U.S. Congress.

There are billions in tax breaks for those who don't need them or deserve them, paid for by people who cannot afford it. It is healthcare heartlessness; that is what it is. If you kicked these people in the heart, you would break your toe. There is no heart. There is no sense of decency toward those families who are going to see their loved ones' diseases get even worse or to see them ultimately die because of lack of coverage.

The Republicans say that their plan—at least they purport it as their plan—is to decrease the deficit by passing this bill, but what do they do with the money that they save? Ah, a tax break for the wealthy.

I thought that you were shedding tears about your concerns of subsequent generations having such huge deficits, but we know those are crocodile tears about future generations because you want to pay off this generation of billionaires and this generation of millionaires who need no additional wealth for their families today.

So there is no real concern about the deficit. This is, once again, just an attack on the programs that the Republicans have always opposed, and if they combine it as a tax break at the same time, all the better.

From my perspective, people are just going to wind up paying more for healthcare, and they are going to be getting less. They are going to be paying for a Cadillac but only getting a tricycle as the people go forward. For too many families, they will not be able to afford anything, and there will be no subsidy to help them get healthcare for their families. The anxiety of suffering from an illness will only be exacerbated by their families' understanding that they cannot even afford the care for their loved ones because of the financial insecurity in their own families.

This is going to be a historic 2 weeks in which we must raise our voices as they have never been raised before—in which we stand on the ramparts and let those Republicans know that they are

in for the fight of their lives. Cassandra-like, we must warn of the dangers of complacency, of the misunderstanding of what is happening right now.

The Republicans have removed the healthcare bill from the Senate floor for consideration. They are not defeated. They are just at halftime. They are now trying to construct a plan that will bring it back as soon as we return and with the votes now secured, from their perspective, in order to pass this bill and send it over to the House of Representatives and then down to President Trump for his signature.

These next 2 weeks will be the most important 2 weeks for the healthcare of our Nation in two generations. This battle is the battle to ensure that they are not successful. From my perspective, this is a fight that each and every American has to be a part of because it is your families who are going to be harmed.

If we just take opioid addiction coverage in Massachusetts, 2,000 people died from opioid overdoses last year. We are only 2 percent of America's population. If that number were to multiply across the whole country, that would be 100,000 people overdosing and dying. That would be two Vietnam wars of deaths in one year from one disease—a disease that we could begin to reverse if there were the treatment for families and if the prevention were put in place. Yet, if there is no treatment, if there is no prevention, if there is no access, then people, who otherwise would have been able to live normal lives with treatment, will now die.

If you have Alzheimer's, if you are in a nursing home, there is a very high probability—since two-thirds of all grandmas and grandpas in nursing homes are on Medicaid, if you slash Medicaid, the care that loved one is now receiving in a nursing home is going to be slashed. Grandma and Grandpa in that nursing home are going to see the services that they otherwise would have been provided not being available to them. That is what this Republican plan is going to do.

It says to a kid—a family member—with opioid addiction problems, it says to Grandma and Grandpa in a nursing home, it says to a woman who has cancer, it says to a man who has diabetes: I am sorry. We no longer can afford in America to help you get the healthcare you need.

We are better than that. We are a better country than that, and we are definitely a better country than our saying that we are going to take away that healthcare from all of those people and then give it as a tax break to billionaires. We are better than that. That is just wrong. So this is the battle, the most important battle.

In 1967, Martin Luther King said that the most important civil right was access to healthcare because health is the

first wealth. Without health, you have nothing. That is what we are fighting for right now. We are fighting for that fundamental civil right for everyone.

This slashes coverage for those who are disabled in our country. We have made progress over the last generation in reconfiguring how we view the disabled in our country. We have given them access to the help they need so that they can be fuller citizens in our society. This bill slashes the funding to help 20 million disabled in our country live fuller, more functioning lives in order to give a tax break to a billionaire.

It is wrong. It must be stopped. We must put up the defense against this bill's ever becoming law. For the next 2 weeks, while they sit and plot to try to find a way of camouflaging what they are doing, the American people must rise up and say: No, America is better than that. We will not allow this to happen. God help us in 2017 in the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, this is the beginning, not the end. Today, we claim an important victory because of thousands of people across the country. There are not enough Senators who support this Republican healthcare plan, so there will not be a vote this week. Because of all of the people who spoke up, the realities of this bill are delayed—the tens of millions of people without insurance, a decimated Medicaid Program, the closure of health clinics and hospitals. Yet that is the key word here—that this bill is delayed. This bill is not dead.

Everyone who spoke up about this bill should take a victory lap. Pat yourselves on the back tonight. It is an extraordinary moment in terms of what grassroots democracy can accomplish. You did what you had to do with what you could, and you succeeded but only for tonight. Tomorrow morning, we have to get ready because the minute that the Senate comes back from the July 4 recess, they will have 3 weeks to ram through a bill. They are not done.

I heard the Vice President say today that they are going to keep working until they get it done. They are not giving up, so we cannot rest either.

Most importantly, we cannot let them forget that we are watching, that we are waiting, and we will still be here when they try to come back and jam this bill through.

I really hope that the Republicans take another course. In setting aside the policy disagreements that we are having, there is really a better way. There is a way for the Senate to be a Senate, which is to empower two of the best Republican Senators whom we have seen in generations. They are LAMAR ALEXANDER and ORRIN HATCH—

two people whose conservative credentials nobody doubts. They are the chairmen of two of the biggest committees in the U.S. Senate—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Finance Committee. They have done bipartisan work—ORRIN HATCH for decades and LAMAR ALEXANDER for decades. Both of them, relatively recently, have done bipartisan work on tax extenders and on repealing No Child Left Behind. These are not easy issues. For these two chairmen, because they understand the committee hearing process and because they earned those gavels, I can only imagine their frustration.

Look, I am a Progressive, and I support the Affordable Care Act, but if I were sitting there as a Republican member of the HELP Committee or the Finance Committee and if these bills were going through and taking the country in a direction to which I objected and if I were the ranking member or were, maybe, a couple off from being the ranking member, I would be thinking to myself that I cannot wait until I get that gavel back.

I can tell you that I can have my own hearings, and I can listen to expert testimony, and I can craft a bill. That is what I want to do. The point of being a legislator is to actually work together on a bipartisan basis. Everybody knows that the chairman or the chairwoman has the lion's share of the authority, but it is still a collaborative process. It is politics. You try to accommodate people on both sides of the aisle, and you have quite an ideological spectrum, both on the D side and the R side, but that is the fun of it. That is the way the Senate is supposed to work.

You have a hearing, and the thing that we should remember about a hearing is that, generally speaking, if you have four testifiers—I do not know if it is a rule or just kind of an operating assumption—the majority party gets to pick three out of the four testifiers. So you are going to get three Republican witnesses and one Democratic witness if you have a normal hearing in HELP or Finance about the Affordable Care Act or what ought to happen with the American Health Care Act or whatever it may be. So it is not as if you cannot control the message, and it is not as if you cannot, in the end, do whatever bill you want to do. Isn't that the fun of being in the Senate?

Forget the Democrats for the moment. I mean, the Democrats were totally in the dark, and the public was totally in the dark. Even for the Republican Members, I mean, this has to irritate them that 13 people were sort of kept in the loop—some more than others, some less than others—but it was like these consecutive conversations: What will it take to get you to yes? OK. We will consider that. We will let you know what we are able to do.



Why not just have a public hearing?

That is, literally, what we do for everything—for the Defense authorization, for appropriations bills. Of the 12 subcommittees, we have several hearings. Whether it is telecommunications or railroads or education or even other healthcare issues, we have public hearings, and we do so on a bipartisan basis.

As tough as we are on each other in the election context and as tough as we are sometimes with each other on the floor, the committee hearing process is rarely as partisan. The committee hearing process allows you to kind of get to the work of legislating.

All I am suggesting is that I understand what Leader MCCONNELL is going to try to do. He is going to try to peel off votes. Senator MARKEY is exactly right in that he is going to try to peel off votes. Yet there is another way to go here, and that is to legislate. Let me just make the political argument for this on behalf of Republicans.

The problem with being the majority party and trashing the healthcare system by not properly funding the exchanges right now and by creating all of this uncertainty is that prices go up, and everybody understands this. Barack Obama is not the President. He was river rafting when all of this was happening, and he deserves it. I am happy for him. He is not the President. So the idea is that you are going to sort of say: Well, we are going to cut Medicaid, cut opioid funding, and we are going to turn this into a big tax cut for people who are already doing well financially because that last bill was called ObamaCare. It had the word "Obama" in it.

Listen, Republicans and Democrats across the country may not be politically sophisticated like we pretend to be, but they are smart. They are thinking to themselves, I am a Republican, I am a conservative, but I don't care about Barack Obama anymore. He is gone. He is not the President. So if you sit there and tell me we need to slash funding for mental health services or slash funding for my community health center in a rural neighborhood, I don't care—your argument cannot be: Because ObamaCare, right? You can't be: Because ObamaCare.

Now you have a majority in the House, a majority in the Senate, you have the Presidency. So now Republicans own the healthcare system. So

here we are trying to figure out a way where we can both own the healthcare system. We are acting like this is impossible to discover. We are acting like: Gosh, what way would we work where we can each sort of shoulder some of the political and policy responsibility, the personal responsibility for the American healthcare system?

There is a very simple answer to that. We just do this through the regular order. If you do this through the regular order—what that means is—it is interesting to me that the difference between now and, say, 6 months ago is people actually know what reconciliation is. They know there is a threshold for regular legislation of 60 votes to overcome a filibuster, but it is a really important point. The moment the Republicans decided to do this via reconciliation, that was tactical, and that was kind of technical, but what that meant was, they said: We have 52. We only need 51. We don't need to talk to you.

I understand that kind of rationale. You have 52 votes. You can give up actually two and have Vice President PENCE break the tie. That may be a judgment they made; I am not sure if they regret it or not.

So here we are. The way to take this off the table as a political liability for the Republicans is to get a bill that could get 60 votes because once it becomes a bipartisan enterprise, it cannot be a cudgel. We cannot beat each other up over it.

When the Affordable Care Act passed originally, one of the challenges we had as a political matter is that we had not a single, solitary Republican vote. I will take everybody at their word that they just couldn't vote for it because it was against their political ideology and their principles, but it also had the side benefit of, the moment a bill doesn't have the patina of bipartisanship—the moment only one party participates in a process—boy, do you own it.

So the question I have is, Do you really want to own the American healthcare system, whatever happens, good or bad? You become like the utility company. Nobody likes their utility company. The best thing that can happen, if you are a utility company, is the lights stay on and the rate of increase slightly slows. You are never going to have cheaper rates, right? And when you flip your light switch on and your lights go on, you don't say: Gosh,

I am so pleased with my utility company. You ignore it.

The best thing that can happen is, you come up with a brilliant bill, without any Democratic support, and then everybody shrugs their shoulders and moves on. More likely you are going to own all the problems you are creating, and you are creating myriad problems. I just want to say, there are a lot of Democrats who are on the level about wanting to legislate here, and we will do it the moment repeal is taken off the table, the moment there is a commitment to public hearings, the moment there is a commitment to doing things through the regular order.

Now, those were not my prepared remarks, but that really matters to me. I really believe in the Senate. For all of our flaws, we are still the place that has to solve the problems. We are still the world's greatest deliberative body because we must be, because these are Federal problems and we are the Federal legislature so we have to fix this ourselves. There are only two paths; one is the partisan path, which is great peril for people across the country and great political peril, and then there is the path of statesmanship and stateswomanship—the path of us working together and being a Senate again. We can do that, but we have to decide that is what we want to do.

I am hoping we go home, we participate in our parades, we hang out with our families, we cook some burgers, we cook some hot dogs, and we think: You know what, I want to legislate again. That was the battle, that was tough, I am angry, I am disappointed, I am relieved—it depends on who you are—but I would like to start legislating again, and I would like to do so in the regular order.

I am hoping that is what happens over the next week. If it doesn't, then we will be ready to fight again, and I know there are literally millions of Americans who are not going to let up until this bill is dead.

I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:20 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 28, 2017, at 12 noon.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 27, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 27, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### TRUMP PROMISE ON HEALTHCARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Senate is poised to completely break Donald Trump's promises on healthcare. Remember, he promised insurance for everyone, it would be less expensive, and it wouldn't touch Medicaid.

Well, the CBO report, out yesterday, makes it devastatingly clear that the Republicans are ready to repudiate all three of those promises. Next year alone, 15 million Americans will lose their healthcare coverage.

Over the course of the decade, that number will swell to 22 million Americans. And because they have disguised the impact to appear later in the next decade, we will watch those numbers skyrocket.

Less expensive?

Well, under their proposal, a 64-year-old with a \$56,800 income—not upper middle class by any stretch of the imagination—will, by 2026, face an annual insurance premium of \$20,000. Im-

pacts are most pronounced on low-income and older Americans.

Won't touch Medicaid?

Their proposal anticipates \$772 billion over the next decade to be slashed from that budget, a 26 percent cut for the health insurance provider that gives care to most Americans, 16 percent fewer people, people with higher costs, less coverage, and poorer insurance.

They take a stab at the concern about the destabilization of the insurance market, which their proposal will do, by taking away the mandate that people have coverage, allowing people to wait until they are sick but still requiring insurers to cover them.

There is an escape hatch. They don't have to provide that if there has been a break in coverage. Then there is 6 months' delay required before people can sign up. Think about what a 6-month delay could mean for somebody who is just diagnosed for cancer. It is the equivalent of a death sentence.

The people you trust for your healthcare do not support this bill. The American Medical Association, hospitals, people who deal with rheumatism, cerebral palsy, cancer advocates, across the board they express reservations or outright opposition.

Who do you trust with your medical care—who do you rely on who supports it?

No one you rely on supports this measure.

And make no mistake, healthcare in America will be worse. That is why the people you trust don't support it. Seniors in nursing homes and disabled children will suffer and, yes, we ought to admit it; people will die. There is very good research available that is logical, suggesting that for every 20 million people who do not have insurance coverage, an extra 24,000 people a year die year after year.

And why are we doing this?

To fulfill a campaign pledge and to be able to cut taxes for those who need it the least. This massive reduction in healthcare finances massive tax reductions. This is immoral.

There is a reason that it was hatched in secret, keeping it away even from Republican senators while it was being formulated, and why they are trying to jam this through in 1 week—a parody of Republican complaints about not enough process for ObamaCare. This is unprecedented and it is wrong.

It is our job, each and every one of us, to make sure the American public knows what is at stake before it is too late.

### SUPPORT FOR THE VENEZUELAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week's general assembly meeting of the Organization of American States, the OAS, in Cancun, was intended to get greater support from the region to hold Nicolas Maduro and his regime accountable for their horrific actions against the Venezuelan people.

However, we fell short of the 23 votes needed to fully enforce a resolution condemning Maduro for convening a fake constituent assembly with the purpose of undermining the democratically elected national assembly.

I commend the 20 nations. Thank you to the 20 nations that stood up to the Venezuelan tyrant; especially I want to single out Barbados, the Bahamas, St. Lucia, Jamaica, Guyana, and Belize.

To our allies in the Caribbean who voted with the people of Venezuela and not with the regime, I say: Thank you.

And to those who voted against the people of Venezuela and with the regime, my message to you is: Wake up.

The Maduro regime is a sinking ship and, as that economy continues to implode, it will take some of the Caribbean nations along with it.

It is in the best interest of the Caribbean nations to work with the United States, with Canada, with Mexico, and other regional allies to put an end to the abusive tactics of the Maduro regime once and for all.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, countries like Nicaragua, whose leader Ortega is a kindred spirit of Maduro, spoke out to oppose the meeting and criticized the OAS for what it called interference in Venezuelans' domestic issues.

Ortega condemned the OAS for taking its rightful action to apply the Inter-American Democratic Charter for Venezuela, yet Ortega wants us to believe that he is in favor of negotiating in good faith with the OAS to improve the electoral, the political, and the human rights situation in Nicaragua. What a farce.

Ortega has been doing Maduro's bidding at the OAS since day one, and we see right through him. Ortega has illustrated time and time again that he is not interested in any reforms, nor is he interested in restoring any democratic values back to the people of Nicaragua.

But Ortega was not the only one who abandoned the people of Venezuela. No.

El Salvador is another nation that has not once voted alongside the U.S. on issues related to Venezuela, even though we continue to provide funds for the Central American Alliance for Prosperity plan. They like our money. They just don't want to look at things our way at all.

Last week, I signed onto a letter led by my dear friend ALBIO SIREs from New Jersey. He wrote this letter to the Department of the Treasury, urging it to designate the El Salvadorian Foreign Deputy Minister Jose Luis Merino as a foreign narcotics kingpin for his ties to illicit activities to drug trafficking, to money laundering, for the FARC—the FARC that is a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization.

It is pathetic that the Venezuelan regime continues to use certain countries at the OAS as its puppets to shield itself from regional criticism.

In the last 2 months, Mr. Speaker, more than 70 people have been killed by Maduro's regime in Venezuela. Hundreds have been arrested. Hundreds have been injured by the violence, including a 17-year-old protester who was shot in pointblank range by pro-Maduro police thugs.

It is unacceptable for us to stand idly by as this cruelty continues to happen. It is a disgrace that the region could not come together in a united front to call out the Maduro regime for the violent thugs that they are, a disgrace to our democratic principles and values, and a disgrace to the Inter-American Democratic Charter for which the OAS stands.

The deteriorating situation in Venezuela is an important matter for the region, for our own interests, Mr. Speaker. Our message must be to those countries that continue to vote against the people of Venezuela: Stop being cowards. Be courageous. Stand up to those corrupt bullies in Venezuela. Do it for the people of Venezuela. How many more have to give their lives in Venezuela for you to wake up? And if you don't stop to reassess your support for the thug Maduro, and your willingness to turn a blind eye toward the suffering of the Venezuelan people, perhaps America will start to reassess its relationship with you.

#### AMERICAN GROWN FLOWER MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly introduce bipartisan legislation to recognize July as American Grown Flower Month. I have seen firsthand the value of the grown flower industry playing an important role in our economy and community during my visits with our Central Coast growers in my district.

California produces three-quarters of all cut flowers grown here in the United States. This generates thousands of jobs across our State and drives a staggering \$1.13 billion in the economic activity each year.

Whether it is celebrating Mother's Day, a birthday, or a graduation, flowers have been used to mark special occasions dating back thousands of years.

I am committed to recognizing this industry's remarkable contribution to our country by designating July as American Grown Flower Month. We officially celebrate the incomparable beauty flowers bring to our homes and to our celebrations year round.

I also want to urge the White House to consider having American flowers in the White House for all occasions.

#### 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF LEVITTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 65th anniversary of my hometown, Levittown, Pennsylvania.

On June 23, 1952, the first 20 families moved into Levittown, which is one of the first planned communities built in the U.S. With its partially framed housing, immature landscaping, and muddy streets, Levittown, in 1952, is a frontier outside of the city of Philadelphia.

Levittown's first official family, the Doughertys, moved into their home on Stonybrook Drive and embraced the American Dream of homeownership. And as Mrs. Dougherty told reporters in Levittown, she described Levittown as country living with city conveniences.

Between 1952 and 1958, Levitt & Sons built 17,311 single-family houses with lawns.

□ 1015

There were six models a family could choose from: the Levittowner, the Rancher, the Jubilee, the Pennsylvanian, the Colonial, and the Country Clubber. Levitt & Sons pushed the boundaries of housing construction by perfecting the homebuilding assembly line.

Levittown remains a special place in Bucks County. Originally designed as a completed community, Levittown grew into the model middle class community. In fact, it became a popular place for hundreds of returning World War II veterans who wanted to start families of their own. Now Levittown is home to over 50,000 residents with schools, churches, parks, and businesses that foster a sense of community for families to live and work.

Residents of Levittown have worked in our steel mills, built our infrastruc-

ture, and served in our military—all while raising their children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call Levittown my hometown, and I am grateful to represent this close-knit and hardworking community. Congratulations to all who have called Levittown home for the last 65 years.

Happy birthday, Levittown.

#### RECOGNIZING NETWORK OF VICTIM ASSISTANCE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Network of Victim Assistance, NOVA, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

NOVA seeks to support, counsel, and empower victims of sexual assault and abuse in our region through advocacy and community education. By utilizing individual and group counseling, victims of sexual assault and abuse can regain control of their lives, and through education programs, children and communities learn to be advocates for victims of abuse, as well as prevention and personal safety.

Additionally, NOVA Bucks County maintains a 24-hour hotline to be able to support all sexual assault victims to get the assistance that they need, as well as assistance in court and safety programs for those with disabilities. I was pleased to tour their facility earlier this year. I am thankful for the work of Penny Ettinger, Kathy Bennett, Steve Doerner, Keith Kirkner, Mandy Mundy, Bill Hoblin, and so many of the NOVA staff and volunteers serving Bucks County, including generous volunteers such as Tina Greenwood.

Through its programs and projects, NOVA empowers victims of sexual assault and abuse, providing them with the resources and security they need to live in spaces free from violence. I am proud to stand with them in their mission to stand with victims in the fight to end sexual assault.

#### SENATE HEALTHCARE REPEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, this week we expect that our colleagues in the Senate will vote on the latest version of TrumpCare. Recently, I voted against a very similar bill because it will be a disaster for Oregonians and Americans. Under the Senate bill, millions of people—up to 22 million people—will lose coverage.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are rightly worried. One of those is Kalpana. Kalpana is caring for loved ones with cancer. As she put it recently, she is sandwiched by cancer. She manages intravenous chemo treatments for her 7-year-old son who is fighting leukemia. Presently, he is winning that fight. Her father has been through countless therapies in his decade-long battle with prostate cancer, which has now spread to his lymph nodes.

Kalpna is amazing—our own local wonder woman. Fortunately, she can devote time and attention to her family's care without having to choose between paying for healthcare and paying for rent, food, and other basic necessities—for now. But after the House vote on TrumpCare, she said this: I feel like someone had punched me in the gut.

Before the Affordable Care Act, families lived in fear that a cancer diagnosis or a heart attack would leave them in economic ruin and make them ineligible for insurance in the future.

Early in my career, I worked at Legal Aid. I did financial counseling with clients who were struggling—often because they got sick with no insurance or because they had insurance that didn't cover them when they needed it.

We can't go back to the days when medical debt drove too many families into bankruptcy and financial ruin. Oregonians and Americans need the stability of knowing they will have affordable healthcare coverage when they get sick or when they are injured.

With the Affordable Care Act, families across the country have had that peace of mind and security that comes with having affordable health coverage. All of that is in jeopardy this week.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. Healthcare can and should be available for all, not just the healthy and the wealthy. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to reject TrumpCare, and let's all get back to the table and talk about how we can improve—not take away—access to affordable healthcare for our constituents.

#### IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, June is Immigrant Heritage Month, and as the son of parents who fled Castro's Cuba, like so many other residents of south Florida, I am especially proud of my district's rich immigrant history and culture. From small-business owners to law enforcement, hundreds of thousands of immigrants and their descendants across south Florida are contributing to our economy, culture, and local communities as living examples of American success.

I know from firsthand experience the great and generous spirit of the American people and the unimaginable opportunities our Nation provides to all who are willing to work for them.

Despite the longstanding tradition of welcoming immigrants to our shores, our Nation continues to have vigorous debate about immigration policy. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the current debate has left thousands of immigrant

children, who were brought to this country by their parents, in constant fear of deportation to countries of origin many of them don't even remember.

They have attended school with our own children, graduated high school, sometimes even serving in the military, and today are seeking to contribute to American society and help grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the President, the former President, and Members of Congress in both Chambers and from both parties agree that these young people, commonly referred to as DREAMers, should be treated with compassion.

I too agree, which is why I introduced legislation that would give these young people the certainty that they deserve. The Recognizing America's Children Act creates three pathways to legal status for them: academic, military service, or employment. All qualified applicants would be thoroughly vetted, and any individual who has been involved in serious criminal conduct will be disqualified.

Mr. Speaker, immigration reform means strengthening security at our border and modernizing our visa program to keep Americans safe, but it also means offering immigrants who love our country just as much as we do the opportunity to fully participate in the American experience. It is my hope that this Immigrant Heritage Month will lead us to act in this regard.

#### MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, neurological and psychiatric disorders have exacted a tremendous toll on our society. Despite the great scientific strides being made daily in neuroscience research, the underlying causes of conditions like Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, autism, epilepsy, schizophrenia, depression, and traumatic brain injury remain unsolved. For true breakthroughs to occur, researchers require additional data to better treat these conditions.

To address this, the previous administration announced the Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies Initiative in 2013. Known as the BRAIN Initiative, this collaborative public-private research will advance our understanding of how the brain functions as researchers work to map the brain and study how individual cells interact in both time and space.

The data generated from this research will help scientists fill in the gaps in our current understanding and provide unprecedented opportunities for exploring how the brain enables us to record, process, utilize, store, and retrieve vast quantities of information. This information will also provide researchers with a better understanding of mental illness and posttraumatic stress disorder in hopes of better treat-

ing these diseases and reducing the number of suicides each year.

I was pleased that the 21st Century Cures Act, which I supported here in the House and was signed into law, authorized \$1.51 billion for this important research.

Mr. Speaker, to help accelerate this project and raise public attention to this initiative, today I introduced the Mental Health Awareness Semipostal Stamp Act with Representative GRACE NAPOLITANO to raise awareness for this important cause. This would come at no cost to taxpayers.

Revenues generated from the sale of a specialized postage stamp would be directed to the National Institute of Mental Health to further this ambitious program that has the potential to revolutionize neurological and psychiatric care all around the world.

#### PHILANDO CASTILE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the death of my former constituent, Philando Castile, whose shocking and completely unnecessary death has now been seen by millions around the world via video.

I mourn not only his death but also the complete failure of local law enforcement and the criminal justice system to protect his most precious right, the right to life.

Philando, like so many other young African Americans before him, interacted with local law enforcement, responded peacefully, did exactly what he was supposed to do, yet he wound up dead, shot six times at pointblank range by an officer who saw him as something less than human.

He is dead for no good reason except for the color of his skin and the fact that his ethnicity fed into an implicit, sick, and deadly bias held by some police officers that Black people present an imminent threat simply by virtue of who we are. That bias is pervasive, not just among some police officers, but also throughout our criminal justice system.

Anyone who views the video of Philando's police shooting can see that he should not be dead and that the officer who killed him should have been held accountable. But as in far too many other cases, the justice system failed Philando and his family in the most outrageous way. The sad truth is that, in 2017, we continue to suffer under a justice system that provides justice for some but not for all.

As I join with Philando's family and millions of other Americans who were outraged by the complete lack of accountability for his death, I cannot but help remember another tragic case, the death of my 18-year-old constituent, Mike Brown, almost 3 years ago in Ferguson, Missouri. As I watched

Philando's family screaming out for justice, they reminded me of something that Mike Brown's mother, Lezley McSpadden, told me. She said: Congressman, I want them to know that he mattered to me.

Well, he mattered to me, too, as well as Philando. So did Tamir Rice, Eric Garner, Sandra Bland, Freddie Gray, and so many others who have died at the hands of local police for no good reason and without any consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported local law enforcement for over 30 years, and I continue to have no doubt that the vast majority of police officers perform a difficult, dangerous, and essential job with honor, bravery, and integrity. But I also know that too many other officers clearly lack the temperament and training to deescalate interactions before they become deadly, and that continues to cost many innocent lives.

That is why I have introduced, along with my good friends, Congressman STEVE COHEN of Tennessee and Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH of Illinois, the Police Training and Independent Review Act of 2017. This legislation has already earned almost 100 cosponsors.

My bill would protect both police officers and the citizens they serve. It would require sensitivity training in the areas of race, ethnic bias, disabilities, and interactions with new immigrants. It would also establish incentives to encourage States to adopt new laws to require an independent prosecutor in all cases when police use deadly force. This legislation deserves a fair hearing and an up-or-down vote in this House.

I will close with this: a brief teaching from the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on the occasion of another needless tragedy, the police killing of civil rights worker Jimmie Lee Jackson by an Alabama State trooper in 1965. In his eulogy, King said: "A State trooper pointed the gun, but he did not act alone. He was murdered by the brutality of every sheriff who practices lawlessness in the name of the law."

□ 1030

#### IT IS TIME TO GET OUT OF OUR 16-YEAR WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers today is this cartoon, a cartoon showing a general with several stars on his shoulder, saying: "Sixteen years of blood, bombs, bullets, and devastation, and no one's winning," talking about our 16-year war in Afghanistan. And then the cartoon shows a very greedy-looking man holding a briefcase called War Incorporated, with all kinds of cash sticking out of both sides and with this greedy smile say-

ing, "Oh, I wouldn't say that." And that is what this war is now all about, this 16-year war. It is being held up and continued only because so many people and companies are making money out of it.

Just yesterday, in *The Washington Times*, there was this story entitled, "War and Waste," and I would like to read some of that story.

"Those are the basics for outfitting an Afghan soldier. But in that simple uniform combination are the threads of two troubling stories—one about the waste of millions in American taxpayer dollars"—actually, it is many billions—"the other about the perils of propping up a partner army in a seemingly endless war."

"Together these tales help explain why some in Congress"—and it should be everyone in Congress—"why some in Congress question the wisdom of investing even more resources in Afghanistan, nearly 16 years after the United States invaded the Taliban-ruled country in response to the al-Qaida attacks of September 11, 2001. The Army general who runs the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan calls it a stalemate. Defense Secretary Jim Mattis says the U.S. is 'not winning.'"

And I will continue with this story: And, sadly, the only Americans who are being killed in recent weeks have been killed by the Afghan soldiers who we are paying and who we are there trying to help out.

Continuing this story: "The long war has generated repeated examples of wasted funds, which may be inevitable in a country such as Afghanistan, where the military has been built from scratch, is plagued with corruption and relies almost completely on U.S. money for even the most basic things, including salaries and uniforms. Among the costs rarely noted publicly: The Pentagon has spent \$1 billion over the past 3 years to help recruit and retain Afghan soldiers."

And then, I continue with the story: "The Pentagon has not disputed the gist of findings by its Special Inspector General for Afghanistan, John Sopko, that the U.S. spent as much as \$28 million more than necessary over 10 years on uniforms for Afghan soldiers with a camouflage 'forest' pattern that" is totally "inappropriate for the largely desert battlefield."

"In a report released this past week, Sopko's office said the Pentagon used to license a proprietary camouflage pattern even though it owns patterns it could have used for free."

The Pentagon spent \$28 million to get something that it could have gotten for free.

"The choice," it said, was based on the seemingly offhand fashion preference of a single Afghan official.

"This is not an isolated event," Sopko said in a telephone interview. The U.S., he said, has been "in a mad

rush to spend money like a drunken sailor on a weekend furlough.' It reflects a pattern, he said, of spending too much money, too quickly, with too little oversight and too little accountability."

And he continues, Mr. Sopko: "'This was more than just a bad fashion move,' he said. 'It cost the taxpayer millions of dollars' more than might have been necessary."

"Money is rarely part of the debate over what the United States should do differently or better in Afghanistan, and thus the accumulating costs are often overlooked."

"Since 2002, the U.S. has spent \$66 billion on Afghan security forces alone"—in addition to many, many billions more on other things in trying to do nation building in Afghanistan, which we never should have been doing in the first place.

"In recent years, this spending has grown"—listen to that. In recent years, this spending has grown over the \$66 billion.

"Stephen Biddle, a professor of political science and international affairs at George Washington University, said the money wasted on camouflage uniforms is symptomatic of a broader problem of official corruption that has sapped the strength and spirit of too many Afghan soldiers."

And he added this: "'The real problem in Afghanistan is not, 'Can we get a rational decision about which camouflage design it should be.' The real problem in Afghanistan is that cronyism and corruption'"—that word is in that story several times—"corruption in the government and the security forces saps the combat motivation of the soldiers."

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to end this very wasteful war and get out of Afghanistan.

#### TRUMPCARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about a young man by the name of Will, who is 34 years old and tells us a story that, if he was a Canadian, there would be a good chance that he could live 17 more years. He has cystic fibrosis, and I imagine there are many families with children who have that, but he is concerned about TrumpCare and the impact.

At age 2, he was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis, a hereditary disease impacting 30,000 Americans. He says:

Imagine being under water and coming up for air, but instead of breathing, you uncontrollably cough that air out. The harder you try to breathe, the more you cough. At its worst, this disease feels like a long, drawn-out panic attack set to the soundtrack of an endless hacking cough. At 34, statistically, I

have 7 more years left before my lungs cease to function.

He mentions that if he were in Canada, statistically, he would have 17 more years because of the healthcare, but he also says this is not an exaggeration:

The cold data from a recent study by the U.S. Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the conclusion is that Canada's nationalized single-payer healthcare system that guarantees health insurance for everyone is the primary reason why Canadians with my disease will live longer.

But look what happened to him:

For the past 4 years, however, my disease has gone into reverse. I have been gradually getting better. It is an extraordinary sensation. A new medication called Kalydeco made by a company in Boston has given me the promise of extending both the length and quality of my life. I have been healthy enough to work abroad as a freelance journalist.

A year and a half ago, Will got married.

My wife and I hope to one day have kids, but today is a sobering day. The House Republicans replaced the Affordable Care Act, and if the Senate bill goes through, a plan that likely won't allow me to remain on this drug, then my long-term plans go out the window. I have a preexisting condition. My outlook would likely regress back to the one of short-term survival and *carpe diem*. That is a very different future than the one I plan to have.

That is what TrumpCare represents to millions of Americans: higher costs; less coverage; not 22 million now, but in 2026, 49 million Americans will not be insured.

How can you? Where is the moral standing?

It guts protections for preexisting conditions no matter what kind of smoke and mirrors the Senate is trying to tell us. It does not exist.

It has got a crushing age tax. If you are over 50, more of your income will be used for your insurance premiums, up to \$12,000 to \$15,000.

And it steals from Medicare. It makes the Medicare trust fund insolvent.

In my own State of Texas, here is a long chart that talks to each Member, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how many people in their district will lose their health insurance.

I would ask the question: Is there any mercy? Is there anyone that understands?

In my district alone, almost 100,000—89,000—individuals will be losing their insurance; almost 20,000 of those will be children. And it goes on in other Members' districts, talks about children: 7,000, 9,000, 8,000, 15,000, 13,000, 12,000, 10,000, 14,000, 18,000, 16,000 children in different districts in the State of Texas will lose their insurance.

And then Will, who would have and has now, because of the Affordable Care Act, a decent life, with a preexisting condition that he described, how would

you like to come from under water and try to breathe and that breathing is undermined by the hacking of that cough?

I hope that this bill is derailed. I hope that TrumpCare in the House and the Senate never sees the light of day, not because I don't want to work with my colleagues, but because the chronically ill will suffer and many will die. The statistics show that in the State of Texas, Mr. Speaker.

I conclude with this one sentence, Mr. Speaker. I want to go back to Mr. CLAY, and I ask the Attorney General to investigate the shooting of Mr. Castile, and to do it now.

#### IMMIGRATION AND SANCTUARY CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the great State of Texas, I want to first acknowledge and preface my remarks with the fact that most people that are entering these United States illegally are doing so because they want a better life for their families. That said, it doesn't make it right. As has been said, and I have said it before, we are a nation of immigrants for sure, all of us, but we are also a nation of laws.

When the Federal Government abdicates its responsibility to secure our border and enforce our immigration laws, we not only fail in our sacred duty to uphold the Constitution and the rule of law, but we put American lives at risk. 121, that is the number of lives that have been lost from 2010 to 2014, lives that could have been saved if we had the political courage to enforce our immigration laws regarding criminal aliens.

Here is something even more outrageous. Of the over 36,000 criminal aliens released from Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody over the course of a year, 1,000 of them were reconvicted of another crime.

These avoidable, tragic deaths from violent crimes continue to happen across the country, and many of the criminal aliens who have committed them have found refuge in our Nation's sanctuary cities. These are lawless cities, let's be clear, cities whose actions undermine the basic American tenet that we are a nation of laws, not of men.

Fortunately, we have the opportunity to stop this madness and do the job the American people expect their government to do, their first job, and that is to keep Americans safe.

Passing the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act would impose significant penalties on States and cities that refuse to follow Federal immigration laws and cooperate with authorities. Additionally, it would allow the Secretary

of Homeland Security to prohibit law-breaking immigrants in DHS custody from being transferred to sanctuary cities.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act only addresses one part of the problem in this area, a problem that we all know will require further reform; but, nonetheless, this is a good, common-sense law, and it will move our country in the right direction towards safer, stronger communities.

In addition to supporting the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, I have co-sponsored the Davis-Oliver Act, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same. In addition to holding these cities accountable for harboring criminal aliens, we need to ensure that our State and local law enforcement officials have the authority to actually do their job, and that is enforce all of our Nation's laws.

Together, I believe the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act and the Davis-Oliver Act will have a major impact on stopping illegal immigration and deterring lawlessness at the hands of criminal aliens who have repeatedly proven that they will break our laws, harm our citizens, and disrespect this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let's empower the President and local law enforcement agencies to do their job. Let's honor the Constitution and respect the rule of law. Mr. Speaker, let's simply put America first.

□ 1045

#### BROKEN PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, as a candidate, Donald Trump made some very big promises on healthcare to the American people. GOP leadership in both the House and Senate have echoed those promises. But the Trump-Ryan healthcare bill and the Senate version of the GOP bill fail to deliver on those promises.

Donald Trump promised healthcare for all of the American people. Even though the ACA expanded health coverage to more than 20 million Americans, Donald Trump said he didn't think it provided enough people with coverage. He said: "We're going to have insurance for everybody," and, "I'm not going to leave the lower 20 percent that can't afford insurance."

The Congressional Budget Office says that 14 million people will immediately lose coverage under the Trump-Ryan plan, and 24 million people will lose coverage by 2027. The Senate version of the bill isn't much different.

Trump also promised that Americans would enjoy cheaper health insurance, with "much lower deductibles." His Health and Human Services Secretary,

Tom Price, said that “nobody will be worse off financially.” But the GOP healthcare plan would cause an increase in health premiums by 15 to 20 percent in the first 2 years alone, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

During the Republican Presidential primary, Donald Trump bragged that he was “the first and only potential GOP candidate to state that there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.” But the GOP health plan guts Medicaid more than ever before. It freezes enrollment and unravels the Medicaid expansion.

Donald Trump and the GOP leadership are breaking their promises to the American people. Their healthcare bills take away coverage from millions. Deductibles will go up. Copays will go up.

TrumpCare would gut essential health benefits, which would mean soaring costs for people with pre-existing conditions. It will provide worse coverage to those lucky enough to still be able to afford it. And to what end?

They are stripping healthcare from millions of people in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans who need it the least. They are lining the pockets of the rich while leaving our families out to dry.

The GOP wants to take away healthcare coverage from millions of hardworking Americans who just want to feel secure and know that they and their families will be able to see a doctor and get treated if they get sick, without putting themselves or their families in financial ruin. They are robbing Peter to give PAUL RYAN and his cronies a tax cut.

In Arizona, we have seen firsthand the damage that Medicaid cuts can wreak. In 2011, Arizona Governor Jan Brewer cut Arizona’s Medicaid funding and froze enrollment. Families who were on Medicaid at the time could only continue to receive benefits if their income remained below the Federal poverty level. A family who worked hard to raise their income even the tiniest amount above the poverty line would lose Medicaid coverage permanently, even if their income went down later.

About 150,000 adults in Arizona lost their Medicaid as a result of those changes. People would get sick and be unable to see a doctor just because they couldn’t afford it. In some cases, people were forced to decide between paying for lifesaving care or paying their rent.

If Medicaid expansion goes away under the GOP healthcare plan, around 400,000 Arizonans could lose coverage, according to AHCCCS in Arizona. That includes 26,700 cancer patients and about 47,000 who are working to overcome different levels of substance abuse, including opioid treatment. Peo-

ple in other States across the country would experience similar devastating outcomes.

Senators JOHN MCCAIN and JEFF FLAKE witnessed the disastrous effect of taking away healthcare coverage for people in Arizona. They know more than anyone else how many lives can be ruined.

Some Republicans have already voiced strong concerns about this bill’s impact on their constituents. If they are serious about these concerns, it will only take three Republican Senators to take a stand and grind this process to a halt. Unfortunately, so far, Senators MCCAIN and FLAKE are not among them.

Senators MCCAIN and FLAKE face a very stark choice: they can do the bidding of Donald Trump and deprive millions of healthcare coverage, or they can take steps to defend the health and financial security of the Arizonans they were elected to represent.

The people of Arizona haven’t been shy about letting our Senators know how they feel and why they feel it, but it is time to dial up the pressure. Senators MCCAIN and FLAKE must understand that they owe it to Arizona families to vote “no” on TrumpCare. If they don’t, Arizona will hold them accountable.

It is time for my colleagues in the House to put pressure on the Senators in their own States to do the right thing and vote “no” on this bill. We owe it to our constituents to stand up for them and make sure that this catastrophic plan never sees the light of day.

---

#### MONSIGNOR WILLIAM O’NEILL CELEBRATES 50 YEARS WITH SAVANNAH DIOCESE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Monsignor William O’Neill, who celebrated his Golden Jubilee of Ordination on June 4, 2017, marking his 50th year of service with the Catholic Diocese of Savannah.

Irish Catholics have been an important aspect of Savannah’s culture and history since their arrival during the mid-19th century. Today, Savannah maintains important aspects of Irish Catholic culture, and is now home to the third largest St. Patrick’s Day festival in the world.

A native of Ireland, a newly ordained O’Neill arrived in the heat of a Georgia summer in 1967. His first assignment was to St. Mary on the Hill in Augusta. Later, Father O’Neill would go on to manage the cathedral at Abercorn and Harris, which has become an architectural staple in the city of Savannah.

Father O’Neill’s graciousness and love for the Catholic faith and its Sa-

vannah followers led him to begin the renovation of the cathedral on Abercorn and Harris in 1998, which involved the removal and cleaning of over 50 stained glass windows, the replacement of the slate roof, and the restoration of the building’s interior.

On February 4, 2001, Father O’Neill was made the first priest of the Savannah Diocese in nearly 34 years to be invested with the title of Monsignor, which serves as a recognition of his commitment to the Diocese. Although he has since retired, Father O’Neill remains an active part of the Diocese.

I congratulate Father O’Neill and I thank him for his commitment to the First Congressional District of Georgia.

#### RETIREMENT OF FLETC DIRECTOR CONNIE L. PATRICK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Ms. Connie Patrick for her service to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, as she retires as its director this Friday, June 30, 2017.

Director Patrick began her career in law enforcement in 1976, when she was sworn in as a deputy with the Brevard County Sheriff’s Office in Titusville, Florida. Her hard work and determination gave her the opportunity for a promotion to serve as a special agent with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement.

After 20 years with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, she began her work with the FLETC. Director Patrick’s impeccable work ethic gained her a promotion to Director of the FLETC in 2002. She has since served in that capacity.

Under Director Patrick’s leadership, local, State and, Federal training facility growth has increased by an astonishing 22 percent. The FLETC has also trained more students during her tenure than it did in its first 36 years of existence.

As Director of this division of Homeland Security, Director Patrick oversaw training for a majority of Federal officers and agents from more than 90 Federal organizations on the local, State, and national levels. These facilities graduate approximately 63,000 law enforcement officers annually. To date, Director Patrick is the longest-serving head of any component of the Department of Homeland Security.

Director Patrick has also found the time to serve as a leader among members of the National Sheriffs’ Association Education and Awards Committee, as well as the executive committee of the National Law Enforcement Exploring Committee.

I thank Director Patrick for her invaluable dedication to ensuring that our law enforcement officers are properly trained to protect our loved ones.

#### ST. MARY MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the St.



Mary Missionary Baptist Church on its 87th anniversary this year.

In 1930, God gave a group of dynamic trailblazers, under the leadership of the church's first pastor, Reverend R.D. Cooper, a vision to help establish a permanent place of worship. They purchased land and built the first structure that would become St. Mary Missionary Baptist Church. On that location, the members of St. Mary embraced the church's unified goal of "Touching Lives for Christ."

As pastors came and went over the years, each had their own vision on how to improve and enrich the church and its congregation. The church's current leader, Minister Lawrence F. Baker, Sr., joined St. Mary as its pastor in 2005 and made many improvements and purchases that helped the church grow its membership while never losing sight of its vision.

St. Mary is a truly blessed congregation with its kind and charitable members serving the community any way they can. As the church continues to grow, the good people of St. Mary touch more lives every day. On June 11, communities and congregations from all over came together to celebrate St. Mary's history and future.

I congratulate Minister Baker on his impressive leadership of this dynamic organization.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Rabbi Gary Klein, Temple Ahavat Shalom, Palm Harbor, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Religious traditions teach that people and God are to work together to create a better world. Therefore, as we begin this day of work of the House of Representatives, we pray first, O God, that You join with medical professionals to help Congressman SCALISE and others injured with him experience complete recoveries.

We also pray that You bless the efforts of this legislative body so that the collective courage, dedication, compassion, and wisdom of its Members help this country maintain its position as "a light unto the nations."

You have also taught us through the Talmud, a work of Jewish religious lit-

erature, that trying to improve the world, even if you do not complete the task, is life's most sacred duty. Help us and our legislators to also understand the Talmudic concept that reinforces this when it states: If you save a single life, it is as if you saved the entire world.

O God, help each of us as Americans recognize the significance of the work done by our legislators, and help us to always be grateful to them. God, we also pray that You keep our legislators healthy and safe so that they may continue their work of improving the world.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIMES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING RABBI GARY KLEIN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome my great friend, Rabbi Gary Klein, who has led the Temple Ahavat Shalom of Palm Harbor, Florida, for the past 30 years.

Temple Ahavat Shalom is a congregation that serves nearly 500 households in my district. Since coming to Pinellas County in 1987, he served on the board of the St. Leo University Center for Catholic-Jewish studies and currently serves on the National Council of AIPAC.

Rabbi Klein is a long-time advocate on behalf of the U.S.-Israel alliance.

As co-chair of the Congressional Hellenic Israeli Alliance, I welcome his continued advice and counsel, especially as it relates to security in the Eastern Mediterranean.

For several years now, I have joined Rabbi Klein and the congregation for Passover Seder, and I very much look forward to continuing this tradition.

I am thankful for his friendship, and I wish him many more years of blessed leadership.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### BMW CREATES JOBS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, I was grateful to be with Governor Carroll Campbell, Senator John Russell, and Senator Verne Smith when BMW held the groundbreaking for their first American manufacturing facility in the upstate of South Carolina.

Today, with an investment of nearly \$8 billion by BMW, South Carolina is the leading exporter of cars of any State, and the Greer plant is the largest BMW manufacturing facility in the world, with \$9.5 billion worth of autos exported from the Port of Charleston last year. This fulfills the vision of the legendary industrialist, Roger Milliken.

BMW has excelled by being a leader of apprenticeship training programs, creating over 30,000 jobs with ontime delivery of suppliers, and a total of 120,000 jobs nationwide.

I was grateful to join Governor Henry McMaster; Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM; president of BMW, Knudt Flor; and chairman of the board, Harald Kruger, yesterday as BMW announced an additional expansion of \$800 million and 1,000 more jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations again yesterday on the swearing in of Congressman RALPH NORMAN, who is only the second Republican elected in 125 years from the Fifth District of South Carolina.

#### SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL DENIES COVERAGE

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning because yesterday the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan organization that we rely on in this Chamber for truth, told us that the Senate healthcare bill—so-called healthcare bill—will throw 22 million Americans off of their insurance. Two-thirds of those, 14 million, are Medicaid patients—the poorest people in America, elderly people in nursing homes.

I don't have a voice in the Senate, Mr. Speaker, but if I did, I would say: I understand how important it is to deliver on the promise you have been making for 7 years to repeal ObamaCare. The Republican base is demanding it, but it can't possibly be demanding the throwing off of their healthcare 22 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I also don't have a voice in the oval office, but if I did, I would ask this President, I would say: Sir, you promised to do three things: you promised to increase coverage, to lower deductibles, and to lower premiums for the American people.

I would say: Mr. President, this bill in the Senate does the exact opposite of all three of those things.

So I would say: Mr. President, if you keep your word, stop this Senate bill from passing.

#### HONORING JAMES WILDERMUTH

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Indiana's Rural Teacher of the Year, James Wildermuth of North Miami Community Schools.

Mr. Wildermuth is well deserving of this high honor awarded by the Indiana Small and Rural Schools Association. He is truly an exceptional Hoosier educator who has had a profound impact on student achievement and who exemplifies leadership in a way that should inspire all of us.

In addition to his 17 years as a teacher, Mr. Wildermuth also serves as a district adviser for the local Future Farmers of America program.

I am grateful that North Miami's students have Mr. Wildermuth as a role model and a mentor, always keeping them not only engaged in the lesson at hand but focused on using these lessons to succeed in life.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Second District Hoosiers, I want to thank Mr. Wildermuth for all he does to educate, support, and guide his students on the path to achievement and to make our community stronger.

#### POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about posttraumatic stress disorder, otherwise referred to as PTSD. Roughly, 5.2 million adults in the United States have been diagnosed in a given year with posttraumatic stress disorder.

Many of these individuals are men and women who have bravely served our Nation's military.

The Department of Veterans Affairs indicates that between 15 and 30 percent of Vietnam veterans have had PTSD in their lifetime; about 12 percent of Desert Storm veterans have been diagnosed with PTSD in a given year; and between 11 and 20 percent of those serving in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom have also been diagnosed with PTSD in a given year.

So today, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day, I call on all of us to do more to help our fellow Americans. We can do more, and we must do more.

We must be able to look at those Americans with PTSD in their eyes and say: You are not alone, and we are with you, and we are going to continue to give you the same service that you have given our country.

#### HONORING SERGEANT DILLON BALDRIDGE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Dillon Baldrige, who was killed in action on June 10, 2017, from wounds sustained in Nangarhar province, Afghanistan, while supporting Operation Freedom's Sentinel.

He was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, and the Army Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster. His prior awards and decorations included the Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal with three oak clusters, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, Military Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, and the Expert Infantry Badge.

Last week, hundreds of North Carolina residents gathered in Ashe County to pay tribute to Sergeant Baldrige as he was laid to rest. We should all take time to pause, reflect, and honor the sacrifices of those like this young man from Youngsville, North Carolina, who have given their lives in the pursuit of a more prosperous and free America. May we endeavor to live worthy of their legacy and guard vigilantly the history and stories of our fallen.

#### FLIGHT SAFETY LEGISLATION

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, Western New Yorkers witnessed tragedy due to inadequate pilot training. A poorly trained pilot crashed a commercial jet into a neighborhood in our community, ending the lives of those on board and one on the ground.

Since then, the victims' families of Flight 3407, who suffered unimaginable loss on that day, have turned their grief into a powerful citizens' fight to strengthen pilot training and flight safety rules.

The families of Flight 3407, who are here today, led the charge urging Congress to pass landmark flight safety legislation in 2010, including rules that could have prevented the tragedy that they all suffered. Since then, there have been 7 years of no fatal commercial crashes on domestic U.S. airlines.

Now the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization is nearing and some want to beat back this tremendous progress. Let's be clear, what is being proposed is a rule change that will allow less experienced pilots to fly commercial jets again.

The safety of the flying public should never be compromised again. I am prepared, along with the Western New York delegation and with the 3407 families, to protect these reforms once again, because we know the painful lessons of accepting anything less.

#### MAINTAINING GREAT LAKES' ECOSYSTEM

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are a national treasure, and nobody knows this better than the people in my home State of Michigan.

Our environment, economy, and quality of life depend upon maintaining a healthy Great Lakes ecosystem. One of the most harmful threats are invasive species like Asian carp that decimate every ecosystem in their path.

Last week, we learned some alarming news when a live Asian carp was found just nine miles from Lake Michigan beyond the electric barrier. If Asian carp are able to infiltrate the Great Lakes, it would be devastating for Michigan's fishing, boating, and tourism industries and all the jobs they support.

The Army Corps of Engineers has completed a report called the "Brandon Road Study" that provides a roadmap of how to best prevent Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes. They should release it immediately.

We must take bipartisan action before it is too late. We simply cannot allow, Mr. Speaker, Asian carp to wreak havoc on the Great Lakes.

□ 1215

## OPPOSING TRUMPCARE

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose TrumpCare, a bill that will cause at least 22 million Americans to lose healthcare.

Senate Republicans and House Republicans drafted their bill in secret, behind closed doors, and without a single hearing. But after seeing the bill, Mr. Speaker, I know why they kept it a secret.

TrumpCare will allow States to eliminate essential healthcare benefits like emergency room visits, preventative screenings, and prescription drug coverage. TrumpCare will gut Medicaid \$772 billion and allow insurers to charge hardworking Americans more money for less coverage.

It will cost the State of Ohio, my State, more than \$25 billion, giving 400 of the richest families a massive tax break.

Hardworking Americans should not have to choose between going to the doctor and putting food on their table. Republicans should work with Democrats to create a healthcare system that gives all Americans fair health coverage.

NATIONAL POSTTRAUMATIC  
STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS  
DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is National PTSD Awareness Day. Today and during the month of June, we raise awareness for those suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder.

After a trauma or life-threatening event, it is common to have reactions such as upsetting memories of the event, increased jumpiness, or trouble sleeping. If these reactions do not go away or if they get worse, you might suffer from PTSD.

There are organizations and resources that can help both individuals and professionals to discover ways to identify and manage PTSD symptoms and explore effective treatments.

PTSD is especially prevalent for those who have served in the military, though not all of our military servicemembers suffer from PTSD. A non-servicemember may be exposed to a single trauma—for example, a car accident—that can also cause the symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I worked as a rehabilitation therapist, and I have seen incredible strides that people with injuries can make with access to appropriate reha-

bilitation. There is help and support for those who have posttraumatic stress disorder. As a nation, we must stand ready to support them.

VOTER RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT  
ACT

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, with the Shelby County v. Holder decision, the Supreme Court effectively gutted the Voting Rights Act.

At the time, Chief Justice John Roberts said that the key protections the Court removed from the act were, as he put it: “extraordinary measures to address an extraordinary problem.”

Sadly and extraordinarily, many of those problems still exist. I would argue that the Voting Rights Act was extraordinarily successful.

Since that decision, the Federal Court commented that a voter ID law in North Carolina didn’t stop fraud. Instead, the provisions that were struck down “target African Americans with almost surgical precision.”

Courts found significant disenfranchisement caused by new laws in Wisconsin as well.

Mr. Speaker, every American has a right and the freedom to cast their vote without interference. People have fought and bled for that right. We are in danger of going back to a time when those rights were cast aside.

That is why it is time for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act to modernize the law, to put back in place provisions stripped from the Voting Rights Act, and to ensure that no State can discriminate by creating barriers to the ballot box.

If we want to remain a nation that empowers its citizens, we need swift action on this bill.

## PATRIOT WEEK

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we need to get back to the core values that our Nation embraced 241 years ago. That is why this year I have reintroduced my Patriot Week resolution, H. Con. Res. 12, which creates a national week of appreciation for the brave individuals, documents, and values that define our Nation’s history to be taught in schools and honored in workplaces across America.

Patriot Week would begin on the solemn anniversary of September 11 and end with Constitution Day on September 17.

Mr. Speaker, our founding principles have been ignored and eroded. Society has seemingly lost interest in the long-standing history that made our country great.

As we approach Independence Day, we must reflect on who we are as a nation and how we can improve what is good for generations to come. America has become too divided, and we must get back to the core values that make our country great.

Just as immigrants learn the history of our country, high school seniors should be able to pass, at minimum, the same citizenship exam upon graduation. Ronald Reagan once said that “freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction.” His words must serve as a wake-up call to every one of us today.

I urge my colleagues to support Patriot Week, and I would like to take this opportunity to wish our Nation a happy and safe Independence Day. We are grateful for all those who serve to keep us safe at home, in our Nation’s Capital, and all over the world.

## OPPOSING TRUMPCARE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirmed that the Senate version of the Republican healthcare bill, TrumpCare, is even meaner and more heartless than the House-passed version. It is so mean that already some Republican Senators have come out opposing even bringing this bill to the floor for debate. But, of course, that won’t be the end of it. We should beware of the backroom deals that will be attempted to get Republican Senators on board to move this terrible bill forward.

But any amount of window dressing or backroom deals won’t change the basics. This bill will require Americans to pay higher costs. Don’t just look at premiums. Look at the out-of-pocket expenses that Americans will have to pay. It will go up for worse care and for less coverage.

If you are age 50 to 65, get ready, because you will see an age tax. You will have to pay up to five times what younger, healthy Americans will pay.

Of course, this bill, because it rewards those at the very top, steals from Medicare. It makes Medicare less sustainable. We ought to reject this legislation. We ought to do it now, and we ought to send that message to every Member of the U.S. Senate.

RECOGNIZING LEXMARK’S EXCITING  
NEW PROGRAM TO TRAIN  
VETERANS

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly recognize Lexmark International, a global leader in printing solutions headquartered in Lexington,

Kentucky, for its development of an innovative program for training U.S. veterans and soon-to-be-separated Active Duty personnel with the goal that they can become certified service technicians of Lexmark printers.

The program, called the Lexmark Printer Service Training Partnership, is under the auspices of VALORR, the Veterans Association of Lexmark: Organized to Recognize and Respect.

We all recognize that our veterans bring with them tremendous know-how and a can-do attitude, the ability to step into new fields and master them quickly. By completing the printer service training program, these veterans will be certified to service Lexmark printers worldwide.

I am proud that my constituents at Lexmark have developed such a thoughtful program for veterans. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing those companies and organizations going the extra mile for those who have served our Nation in uniform.

#### MEDICAID CUTS

(Mr. O'HALLERAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep misgivings about the recent healthcare proposals put forth by the Senate. This bill, like the American Health Care Act, proposes drastic cuts to Medicaid and would saddle my constituents and Americans with skyrocketing premiums and deductibles.

We are placing our hardworking families and young children, our elderly, veterans, and Native Americans in harm's way by making coverage unaffordable and unattainable.

The cost of this legislation will be paid by those who can least afford it. Recent reports show that the cost of Medicaid cuts in this bill would cost Arizonans more than \$7 billion. This means hundreds of thousands of people, including nursing home patients who rely on affordable, lifesaving coverage, will be kicked off their Medicaid coverage.

From the beginning, these pieces of legislation have been crafted behind closed doors without input from doctors, nurses, and healthcare leaders.

While we play partisan games, the health and well-being of our families, friends, and neighbors are at risk. If we want to get serious about fixing our healthcare system and bringing down costs, we must work together on bipartisan legislation.

#### TRUMPCARE

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this week, Senate Republicans are very likely to vote on a bill that would take away health insurance from 22 million Americans, people like Marcia and Grace Kohler in Boulder, Colorado. The Kohlers, like many other families, were able to have access to healthcare through the Affordable Care Act.

At the age of 8½, Marcia's youngest daughter, Grace, was diagnosed with childhood leukemia. She endured 26 months of extensive treatments and several chemotherapy sessions per week. In Marcia's own words: "Going through this process without the assistance of healthcare is unimaginable. It brings tears back to my own eyes."

We are simply not a nation that turns its back on our most vulnerable citizens. 39 percent of all children in this country are supported on Medicaid, 64 percent of nursing home residents, and 30 percent of adults with disabilities.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate right now think of Grace and all those like her. I hope that they think about the millions of Americans that will have the rug pulled out from underneath them if they pass their cruel bill. For some it is a matter of debt or taxes, but for many it is simply a matter of life or death.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Respectfully, I write to tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

TOM MARINO,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of

the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. It has been an honor to serve on the Committee under the leadership of Chairman Smith.

Sincerely,

GARY PALMER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to inform you that I hereby resign my seats on the House Judiciary Committee and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform effective immediately.

Sincerely,

JASON E. CHAFFETZ,  
U.S. Representative,  
Utah Third Congressional District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write you today to respectfully resign my seat on the House Committee on Small Business, with the intention to join the House Committee on Homeland Security. It has been an honor to serve in this position.

Sincerely,

RON ESTES.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Respectfully, I write to tender my resignation as a member of the

House Committee on Natural Resources. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DAVID ROUZER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 410

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mrs. Handel.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Estes of Kansas.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mrs. Handel.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Gianforte.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Gianforte.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Norman.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Norman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1215, PROTECTING AC- CESS TO CARE ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 382

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in

the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

House Resolution 382 will ultimately drive down healthcare costs and make care more affordable to millions of Americans across the country.

In 2017, we have had a conversation in America about how health insurance costs have drastically increased in the past 7 years. We need to fix our health insurance market, a task that House Members and Senators have been working hard on for the past few months, but if we are truly going to address out-of-control health insurance costs, we need to start looking at the cost of supplying care itself. That is where H.R. 1215, the Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017, plays a vital role. H.R. 1215 focuses on lowering the cost of care by placing checks and balances on the excessive and frivolous lawsuits faced by doctors and other healthcare providers.

A GAO report found that rising litigation awards are responsible for skyrocketing medical professional liability premiums. Unfortunately, these premium costs are passed on to the patient and, in many cases, are passed on to American taxpayers. The reforms in H.R. 1215 will make care more affordable for patients and will improve access to care, especially for rural America.

Over time, unending and excessive lawsuits have limited the amount of doctors nationwide, particularly in States that have not instituted their own reforms. With a string of frivolous lawsuits levied against our medical community, many Americans who would become doctors and practice in certain parts of the Nation simply decided against it.

The reforms in H.R. 1215 will especially help rural and underserved urban communities, where quality healthcare can be difficult to access. Incentivizing medical professionals to serve in communities that might otherwise be overlooked should be one goal of our healthcare reform efforts.

I know the healthcare challenges faced by so many in eastern Colorado, where access to quality care is sometimes limited. We need doctors who are willing to invest in these communities, but we need to empower these doctors by freeing them of frivolous and excessive lawsuits.

Beyond just access to care, the growth of frivolous malpractice lawsuits has led to a change in the way care is provided. Many providers are forced to practice defensive medicine. In doing so, doctors order unnecessary, excessive diagnostics not because the patient needs them, but because the doctor attempts to avoid a frivolous lawsuit. The practice of defensive medicine increases costs for the patient without providing any discernible benefit.

The legislation we are considering is key to increasing the affordability of care and the access to care for all Americans.

This bill is supported by the American Hospital Association and the American Academy of Family Physicians. The American Medical Association has also voiced their support.

But let me be clear: The bill before the House today does not limit access to justice for legitimately wronged or injured patients. It does not hamper a wronged patient from recovering damages for their injuries.

The bill simply imposes a \$250,000 cap on noneconomic damages, a provision that has worked well in California, where this legislation has already been successfully implemented and modeled for decades. But there is no cap on economic damages that a patient may incur in a malpractice situation, and the bill's cap does not preempt any State law that otherwise caps any form

of damages at amounts either higher or lower than the cap in H.R. 1215.

The legislation also limits the contingency fees that lawyers can charge when bringing a malpractice case on behalf of a client. In other words, we don't want to incentivize lawyers to push forward with illegitimate cases. We want patients who have been wronged to have access to a fair trial, where they walk home with the winnings in their own pocket, not their lawyer's.

H.R. 1215 builds on the successes of medical malpractice reforms in States like California and Texas. In these States, similar laws have increased access to affordable medical care. They have created an environment where doctors can focus on helping patients rather than spending time in endless litigation and dealing with threats from the trial bar.

The legislation before us, while creating a uniform national playing field, protects State laws by allowing flexible reforms to be used at the discretion of States. State courts will still hear medical lawsuits as always.

The reforms at hand today deal with care that was provided or subsidized by the Federal Government, including through a tax benefit.

We must pass this legislation for the American taxpayer. The taxpayer doesn't deserve to have their hard-earned dollars simply end up in the pockets of trial lawyers due to frivolous lawsuits. That is why H.R. 1215 is a critically needed reform.

Unlimited and opportunistic lawsuits help no one except trial lawyers. Consequently, our doctors have to increase their costs and practice expensive defensive medicine, costing patients and taxpayers. And when our physicians are impacted, so are we.

Trial lawyers too often stand between patients and their doctors. With the looming threat of excessive, unending lawsuits, healthcare providers have to worry more about the trial lawyer at their door than the patient in their office. H.R. 1215 places important limits on these lawsuits so that the truly wronged are compensated without enriching trial lawyers at the same time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule today, one that provides for consideration of the Protecting Access to Care Act. This bill would significantly alter how families and patients that are injured as a result of medical error are able to hold healthcare providers, facilities, or device makers accountable to make sure that that same thing doesn't happen to other people.

This bill decreases patient safety. It undermines the ability of people who

are wrongfully injured by medical malpractice or faulty medical devices to be compensated for their injuries, and it violates the 10th Amendment to our Constitution, the rights reserved to the States.

Before I turn to the merits, or lack thereof, of this bill, I want to discuss the process under which this bill came to the floor.

The Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over this bill, had zero hearings on this legislation, heard from zero experts, and went straight to markup. Despite the overwhelming opposition to this legislation, the Judiciary Committee did not want to hear from groups like the American Bar Association, Patient Safety America, the National Disability Rights Network, or the National Protection Alliance.

When I see the American Bar Association, who the committee refused to hear from—I know my colleague from Colorado is an attorney. I just want to inquire of my colleague from Colorado if he is a member of the American Bar Association, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUCK. Proudly, no.

Mr. POLIS. Okay. Well, that is the association which many attorneys, excepting, of course, my friend from Colorado, are a member of.

The supporters of this bill point to its consideration in previous Congresses for hearings, but we have over 50 new Members who didn't hear a word about this bill from any experts before it was rushed to the floor.

We are considering this bill under a very restrictive rule. That means there were 24 amendments filed. This rule only allows the House to debate and vote on five of them. That means 19 of them, amendments offered by Democrats and Republicans, were simply just tossed out in the Rules Committee. That is what this rule does.

If this rule were to pass, it would mean that the efforts of 19 Members to offer ideas to improve healthcare wouldn't even be allowed to be debated or voted upon here on the floor of this House. It is no coincidence that eight amendments filed by Democrats, and not one Democratic amendment was made in order. Only 5 out of 24 ideas from Democrats and Republicans were made in order.

One amendment filed by my colleague, Representative JACKSON LEE, would have provided an exception to the bill for any medical-related injury to a child, which seems like common sense. At least have a debate about it. If people disagree, let them disagree. Let's have a vote.

This rule continues this very closed process, where Democrats and Republicans are shut out of participating in the bills that appear fully formed without the opportunity for us to represent our districts and offer amendments to improve and make these bills better, to

reduce costs, to improve the quality of care.

What I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is: Where is the open process promised by Speaker RYAN? This Congress hasn't even considered a single piece of legislation under an open rule, and we have had many, many bills brought to the floor under closed rules and without any committee hearings. But, you know, I am beginning to not be surprised so much anymore because secretiveness seems to be the standard that Republicans are setting in this Congress.

How the Republicans have handled their healthcare bill from start through now is a perfect example of the closed-door, secretive process that has become, tragically, the standard operating procedure for this Congress.

The Republican healthcare bill will increase healthcare costs, provide less coverage—22 million fewer people will be covered—increase costs for those who are lucky enough to keep their current coverage, and reduce access to healthcare for the American people. It puts a burden on small businesses, on the middle class, on rural healthcare providers, while handing hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to big corporations and special interests.

TrumpCare is a billionaire's tax cut disguised as a healthcare bill, and it will be one of the largest transfers of wealth from the middle class and the working families to the top 1 percent of Americans. Effectively, it is removing benefits from people in rural counties and cities across our country and giving those tax cuts mostly to people in New York and Hollywood. That is what Republicans are delivering with this bill.

When the American people were finally given the chance to see the Senate's healthcare legislation, the American people overwhelmingly rejected it. Only 16 percent of the American people approve of the plan. Democrats oppose it; Republicans oppose it; independents oppose it.

The Congressional Budget Office's recent score of the bill says that coverage will significantly decrease under this bill and that the costs of deductibles for patients will go up. Patients will have to spend more out of pocket, those that are lucky enough to even have insurance after this cruel bill.

But there is still time to stop it, and I call upon my colleagues to prevent this bill from moving forward.

The bill that Republicans are trying to ram through Congress is not truly meant to make improvements to our healthcare system but to take money away from the middle class and working families and put it into the pockets of a very few people who benefit from the tax cuts under this bill: for people making millions of dollars a year.

This bill makes it harder for middle-income families and for low-income

families to access quality, affordable healthcare, makes it harder for individuals who have preexisting conditions or have genetic disorders or long-term diseases from accessing lifesaving medical attention, and cuts critical healthcare services for disabled children in schools that many of our school districts rely on. And they want to do this all with a closed process.

I offered three amendments to improve healthcare in our Education and the Workforce Committee. All were defeated on a partisan vote.

□ 1245

Every Republican voted not to allow those. No Democrat, as far as I know—certainly not me—has been invited to present our ideas to Republican leadership or President Trump.

Democrats have lots of ideas to improve the Affordable Care Act. I am sure many Republicans do, too. Those ideas are not reflected whatsoever in this bill or in the closed process that prohibits Republicans and Democrats from even offering our suggestions to improve this bill.

So, here we are, debating another piece of healthcare legislation that did not go through an open process. Democrats were shut out of the amendment process completely.

This bill would make it more difficult for victims of medical malpractice to seek or receive compensation for their injuries. It is inconsistent with the 10th Amendment, which reserves these rights to the States that are not enumerated in the Constitution, and unlike the Democrats' approach to medical malpractice reform in the Affordable Care Act, which provided funding for pilot programs in the States to reduce the risk of medical malpractice liability consistent with the 10th Amendment. Many constitutional experts—I would add, many conservative constitutional experts—believe that this approach is unconstitutional because of the 10th Amendment.

We have learned that this bill does not actually protect access to healthcare but, instead, undermines a State-based tort system, making it more difficult for patients to be compensated from bad actors.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 60 national and State organizations opposed to H.R. 1215.

JUNE 12, 2017.

Re Groups Urge You to Vote NO on H.R. 1215.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned consumer, health, labor, legal and public interest groups strongly oppose H.R. 1215: The "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017." This bill would limit the

legal rights of injured patients and families of those killed by negligent health care. The bill's sweeping scope covers not only cases involving medical malpractice, but also cases involving unsafe drugs and nursing home abuse and neglect.

Even if H.R. 1215 applied only to doctors and hospitals, recent studies clearly establish that its provisions would lead to more deaths and injuries, and increased health care costs due to a "broad relaxation of care." Add to this nursing home and pharmaceutical industry liability limitations, significantly weakening incentives for these industries to act safely, and untold numbers of additional death, injuries and costs are inevitable, and unacceptable.

The latest statistics show that medical errors, most of which are preventable, are the third leading cause of death in America. This intolerable situation is perhaps all the more shocking because we already know about how to fix much of this problem. Congress should focus on improving patient safety and reducing deaths and injuries, not insulating negligent providers from accountability, harming patients and saddling taxpayers with the cost, as H.R. 1215 would do.

For example, this bill would establish a permanent across-the-board \$250,000 "cap" on compensation for "non-economic damages" in medical malpractice cases. Such caps are unfair and discriminatory. For example, University of Buffalo Law Professor Lucinda Finley has written, "certain injuries that happen primarily to women are compensated predominantly or almost exclusively through noneconomic loss damages. These injuries include sexual or reproductive harm, pregnancy loss, and sexual assault injuries." Also, "[J]uries consistently award women more in noneconomic loss damages than men . . . [A]ny cap on noneconomic loss damages will deprive women of a much greater proportion and amount of a jury award than men. Noneconomic loss damage caps therefore amount to a form of discrimination against women and contribute to unequal access to justice or fair compensation for women."

Other provisions in H.R. 1215 are just as problematic. The proposed federal statute of limitations, more restrictive than a majority of state laws, lacks complete logic from a deficit reduction angle since its only impact would be to cut off meritorious claims, forcing patients to turn to the government for care. The bill would repeal joint and several liability even though the Congressional Budget Office says this could increase, not lower, costs.

H.R. 1215 would overturn traditional state common law and would be an unprecedented interference with the work of state court judges and juries in civil cases. Its one-way preemption of state law provisions that protect patients (there are some exceptions) makes clear that the intent of this legislation is not to make laws uniform in the 50 states. Rather, it is a carefully crafted bill to provide relief and protections for the insurance, medical and drug industries, at the expense of patient safety. We urge you to oppose H.R. 1215: The "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017." Thank you.

Very sincerely,

NATIONAL GROUPS

AFL-CIO; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; Aging Life Care Association; Alliance for Justice; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Association for Justice; American Association of Directors of Nursing Services;

American Association of Nurse Assessment Coordination; Annie Appleseed Project; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Brain Injury Association of America; Center for Independence; Center for Justice & Democracy; Center for Medicare Advocacy; Christopher & Dana Reeve Foundation; Communication Workers of America; Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Watchdog.

Daily Kos; Families for Better Care; Gerontological Advanced Practice Nurses Association; Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing; Homeowners Against Deficient Dwellings; Justice in Aging; Leahslegacy.org; Long Term Care Community Coalition; Mothers Against Medical Error; NALLTCO, National Association of Local Long Term Care Ombudsman; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Association of Directors of Nursing Administration in Long Term Care; National Center for Health Research (NCHR); National Consumer Voice for Quality Long-Term Care; National Consumers League; National Disability Rights Network; National Education Association.

National Gerontological Nursing Association; National Medical Malpractice Advocacy Association; National Women's Health Network; Nursing Home Victim Coalition, Inc.; Our Mother's Voice; Patient Safety America; Public Citizen; Public Justice; Public Justice Center; Public Law Center; Quinolone Vigilance Foundation; The Empowered Patient Coalition; The Impact Fund; United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America International Union; United Spinal Association; Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement (WISER).

STATE GROUPS

Arkansas State Independent Living Council; California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform; Center for Advocacy for the Rights & Interests of the Elderly (PA); Chatham Advisory Committee for Long Term Care Adult Care Homes and Family Care Homes (NC); Citizen Action/Illinois; Connecticut Center for Patient Safety; Disability Rights Center of Kansas; Elder Justice Committee of Metro Justice of Rochester (NY); Friends of Residents in Long Term Care (NC); Greater Boston Legal Services, on behalf of our clients (MA); Idaho Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health; InterHab, Inc. (KS).

Iowa Statewide Independence Living Council (SILC); Kansas ADAPT; Kansas Advocates for Better Care; LTC Ombudsman Services of San Luis Obispo County (CA); Massachusetts Advocates for Nursing Home Reform; Michigan Long Term Care Ombudsman Program; Montana Independent Living Project, Inc.; NYPIRG; PULSE of Colorado; Residential Facilities Advisory Committee, State of Oregon; Rhode Island Long Term Care Ombudsman Office; Texas Watch; Voices for Quality Care (LTC) (MD & DC); Washington Advocates for Patient Safety; Washington Civil & Disability Advocate; WISE & Health Aging (CA).

Mr. POLIS. Some of the groups are the Gerontological Advanced Practice Nurses Association, Justice in Aging, Long Term Care Community Coalition, National Education Association, National Consumers League, National Disability Rights Network, Public Citizen, Public Justice, and many, many other great organizations.

I hope my friend from Colorado is a member of at least two or three of



these wonderful organizations. I will furnish the entire list to him.

This bill preempts State tort law that has been developed over the last 200 years and is contrary to the 10th Amendment of our Constitution. It imposes an arbitrary cap on the amount of noneconomic damages a victim can collect under a Federal law coopting the ability of States to do their own medical malpractice laws and hamstringing them with regard to the reforms that they can undertake.

In fact, capping damages also increases taxpayer spending. According to a joint study by Northwestern University and the University of Illinois, they found that capping economic damages actually increases Medicare part B spending.

I would point out another horrible feature of the cruel Republican healthcare bill is that it guts the Medicare trust fund and would lead to Medicare becoming insolvent sooner rather than later by draining the Medicare trust fund of over \$100 billion. That is another aspect of this bill.

No wonder they didn't want us to see it, Mr. Speaker. No wonder they kept it in a locked closet from even Republicans who were allegedly writing it, like KEN BUCK and my friend, Senator GARDNER, who was on the committee writing it and who later said he hadn't seen it. No wonder it was hidden, when you find out it actually leads to Medicare insolvency sooner, when you find that it throws 22 million people off the insurance that they already have, when you find out it raises rates for those who are lucky enough to maintain their insurance, when you find it takes money out of our schools, when you find that it risks throwing our elderly out of their nursing homes who rely on Medicaid.

This bill is a symptom of a problem. I am not a doctor; my friend from Colorado is not a doctor; but when I ask my doctor what you do when there are symptoms, it is treat the underlying cause.

Let's do that. This bill doesn't do that. This Republican Senate bill that throws people off insurance doesn't do that. Let's begin a process where we get ideas from Democrats and Republicans to work together to reduce costs in healthcare, to expand coverage in healthcare, and to improve the quality of healthcare for American families.

This bill is not focused on protecting patients. It increases the risk to patients. It drains Medicare of additional money. This bill will not reduce costs to patients. In fact, no healthcare bill being debated in Congress right now actually improves patient care or reduces costs to patients.

Those should be two pillars, two goals of healthcare reform: Can we reduce costs, and can we improve patient care?

This bill risks making patient care worse in an unconstitutional way. The

Senate bill actually will increase costs to patients, increase deductibles, make more people lose their insurance, make you pay more for insurance you already have if you are one of the people who is lucky enough not to lose it under the cruel Republican bill.

Instead of politicizing and polarizing access to healthcare—literally a life-and-death issue for American families—let's work together to find solutions that reduce costs, increase coverage, and improve care. The Senate Republican healthcare bill meets none of those three critical criteria that the American people demand in healthcare reform: reducing costs, increasing coverage, and improving the quality of care for ourselves and for our loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know my friend from Colorado did not mean to insult me when he referred to me as a lawyer, but I want to make a quick distinction.

I spent 25 years as a prosecutor, not a lawyer. Prosecutors put people in prison and make the world safe for all of us; lawyers get people out of prison and make the world less safe for all of us. I want to make that distinction.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Prosecutors are lawyers as well. So I just wanted to be clear that it is not an insult. Being an attorney is a fine profession. There are some attorneys on both sides, both defending as well prosecuting criminals, but they are both attorneys. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. BUCK. Reclaiming my time, do not tell prosecutors that they are merely lawyers. To be a prosecutor is a higher standard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not an attorney either, Mr. Speaker. I am a physician. As a matter of fact, I am an obstetrician. I think, of all the professions impacted by malpractice issues, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, obstetricians have been the most impacted.

I remember going back as a medical student and trying to figure out what type of doctor I wanted to become. My wife and I were blessed somewhere in there to have our first child. I remember when that little girl was given to me and I heard her cry, it was maybe the greatest single moment of my life.

As a young medical student, I was very impressed and said: That is what I want to do. I want to bring babies into the world and have that moment when I get to give a baby to a mom and

she looks at that baby and it is just a very special moment. It is just the most agape love I have ever seen, a mom with a perfect heart towards that little baby. I wanted to do that.

So I started telling my professors I wanted to be an obstetrician. Every professor I met said: Don't do it. You are going to get sued. Malpractice prices are screaming. You are not going to like that job anymore. No one wants to go into obstetrics.

Well, guess what? My professors were right. I did it anyway.

The average obstetrician gets sued between three and four times in their career. Malpractice remains the biggest deterrent of physicians choosing to go into obstetrics. The average obstetrician has to spend 2 to 3 months every year just to pay for their malpractice insurance.

I am very blessed. Over 20 years ago, Kansas undertook similar tort reform as this, and our malpractice costs have stabilized. My malpractice insurance was pretty much the same 20 years after we enacted the legislation to curb some of these costs.

I think it will be true for me to say that my friends that are obstetricians in other States without malpractice tort reform, their premiums are often three times higher than ours in Kansas. We have seen this work very, very well in Kansas. The good news is that this legislation will not impact any of that work as well.

I very much am in favor of this malpractice tort reform and how it is going to impact healthcare. I predict that this will help lower premium costs some 3 to 4 percent when enacted.

Malpractice is a huge cost of the current cost of healthcare. This is a first step of many that Republicans are encouraging or want to implement to start lowering those costs of premiums.

Small Business Association members were here in D.C. just 2 months ago. When they walked out of that meeting, I was expecting them to come back and tell me their concerns were mostly regulatory concerns, but their number one concern was the cost of healthcare premiums.

This is a small step. If we can lower their healthcare costs 3 to 4 percent, this is a great, great opportunity for us to help them out.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. I encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. It should be bipartisan support for this legislation that will help drive healthcare costs down.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think a couple of points, before I get to the main portion of my remarks, that the manager of the bill threw out need to be addressed.

First of all, my wife is a prosecutor. I like prosecutors, but they are lawyers. I was a trial lawyer until December 31 of last year. Guess what? We sue drunk drivers. We sue for people who get hurt when it is not their own fault. I come from a State where contributory negligence is the law. So I appreciate the reverence you hold prosecutors in—I do, as well—but we are all lawyers.

I also want to point out that, while there may be people on the floor who are not lawyers, you can't honestly believe this bill gives you equal access to justice, and here is why: You have a cap on noneconomic damages. So a person who is injured by a doctor and a person who receives the exact same injuries from some other tort have two different recoveries that they can reach. One is capped; one is not. That is not equal justice, in my judgment, under the law.

In addition, you all are the pro-business party, yet you all want to get into how people contract with one another. I would suggest that is inconsistent with your pro-business approach.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill really underlies is a fundamental mistrust for our constituents. Think about it. Juries are made up of our constituents. What you are really worried about is that your constituents are not going to get it right when they are sitting in that jury box and making decisions.

Your constituents are wise enough to send me and 435 of us here to the Congress to make decisions about trillion-dollar budgets, yet you don't trust them to sit in the jury box and make the very important decisions for their fellow citizens when they are injured.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that this bill clearly violates the spirit of the Seventh Amendment, the right to trial by jury, by putting these limitations on the jury, by putting limitations on access to justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded that Members are to direct all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was glad my colleague pointed out that it violates the Seventh Amendment. Now we add that to the 10th Amendment. So there are actually two Amendments. I am not even an attorney, but I know this violates two Amendments to our Constitution. That is pretty impressive for one bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1215.

My Republican colleagues seem to have a fixation with caps. In their healthcare bill, they slash Medicaid

and, for the first time in its history, cap Federal funding. The result: hospital closures, reimbursement and staffing cuts, reduced access, and lower quality. Now, in this bill, they want to impose another cap, a cap on noneconomic damages for injured healthcare consumers.

So who will be hurt?

It will be people like the 76-year-old woman whose tailbone had to be removed because her bed sores went untreated for 12 days or an 81-year-old resident who died because her ventilator was dislodged, alarms sounded, and no one responded.

How about the family of a 92-year-old man who died after suffering from malnutrition and dehydration and was found with live insects in his eyes and mouth?

How do we put a \$250,000 value on those injured?

Besides, this is a solution looking for a problem. There is no medical malpractice lawsuit crisis. Between 2000 and 2015, the number of claims dropped more than 40 percent and the amount paid fell 23 percent.

But we do face a medical crisis. Nearly half a million Americans die every year from preventable medical errors, and many more are permanently injured. This bill does nothing to solve that problem. Instead, it just takes away the right of the injured consumers.

□ 1300

And if you believe that average Americans should not be barred from the justice system as they seek to hold wrongdoers accountable, then you must oppose this bill.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point.

I have heard a number of times now that this bill is a solution searching for a problem or it does nothing to help our underlying cost.

The Congressional Budget Office, the very office that my friend relies on for the most recent estimate of those that will decide not to seek insurance under the Senate healthcare bill, has estimated that this bill will save taxpayers \$50 billion over 10 years and reduce medical malpractice insurance premiums by 25 percent to 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to inquire of my friend from Colorado whether recognizing those savings is in fact a Federal responsibility or a State responsibility.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I will remind my friend from Colorado that the very \$250,000 cap that we are talking about in this bill is the same cap that has been adopted by the Colorado State Legislature.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, exactly. What I would further add, then, is whose prerogative is it to institute this kind of cap: States like our own State of Colorado, which has that cap? Or Washington, D.C. insiders behind closed doors?

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friend again that the States that have adopted any cap—it could be \$250,000, it could be \$500,000, it could be \$1 million in non-economic damage caps—will not be affected by this bill. This bill only affects those States that have no caps, and it is Federal money that is being used to pay for these.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this effectively co-ops States and forces other States to do the same thing that my colleague's and my State of Colorado has already done. It goes beyond that as well. Under the 10th Amendment of the Constitution, this should be a power reserved for the States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to shed light on a serious issue facing millions of students nationally and in my home State of Colorado. Every day, 50 million students and 3 million teachers face significant health and safety threats due to inadequate school facilities. I have heard about many in Colorado, school gyms that are closed down because their roofs are falling in, staggering statistics that disproportionately affect high-poverty schools, particularly urban and rural schools, and many schools serving a high percentage of minority students.

Today we have a chance to address this rampant inequality throughout our school districts and to create jobs in the process.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative BOBBY SCOTT's Rebuild America's Schools Act, H.R. 2475, which I am also a proud co-sponsor of. Mr. SCOTT's legislation would invest \$100 billion in the physical and digital infrastructure needs of our schools, creating nearly 2 million jobs and creating the education infrastructure we need for the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for proposing this amendment.

The Rebuild America's Schools Act would help ensure that each of our Nation's 50 million public school students, taught by 3 million teachers, will have access to safe, healthy, and high-quality learning facilities and internet access sufficient for digital learning in the classroom.

This bold proposal would create nearly 2 million jobs, improve student learning, and revitalize under-resourced communities.

The Rebuild America's Schools Act is a win for students, families, workers, and the economy; and any responsible infrastructure proposal put forth by Congress should include a bold investment in our Nation's public schools.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on the 63rd anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education because, despite the promise of Brown, our public school facilities remain largely separate and woefully unequal.

Last year, on the 62nd anniversary of Brown, Ranking Member CONYERS and I unveiled the findings of a GAO report that found that more students are attending schools highly segregated by race and class.

Now, that most recent GAO report examining the state of our public schools' infrastructure saw that low-income and minority students are served by poor and inadequate school facilities.

If we are to fully achieve the promise of Brown, then no child should remain in a classroom with a leaking roof or a broken heating system. All students should have equitable access to science labs or spaces for high-quality career and technical educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, 12 States do not invest any money in capital construction projects in public schools, leaving responsibility of ensuring high-quality classrooms up to localities and local property taxes, which virtually guarantees inequitable funding between high- and low-income districts.

This bill targets Federal funding for school infrastructure to districts and school buildings with the greatest need for improvement to their physical and digital infrastructure, which would be an important step in fulfilling the promise of Brown.

All too often, when Congress talks about infrastructure investment, we speak only about investments in roads, bridges, and other public buildings. Public schools are often left out of the conversation, but schools must be part of that conversation on infrastructure.

The Rebuild America's Schools Act will ensure safe drinking water in schools, prevent instructional materials like textbooks from being ruined as a result of broken heating and air-conditioning systems, and improve air quality that students breathe in the schools. It will bring access to digital learning for more than 11 million students in nearly 20,000 schools who do

not already have it. Finally, the bill would mean high-quality jobs for nearly 2 million pipefitters, construction workers, and other hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass the Rebuild America's Schools Act. We owe it to America's students and hardworking families.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire of my friend from Colorado, he mentioned when he was introducing the gentleman from Virginia that there are schools that are closing because gym roofs are falling in. I know a number of very generous individuals that would like to contribute.

Does the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) have the names of any of those schools for us?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to supply those. To be clear, the entire school doesn't close, just the gym closes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do have further speakers.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN).

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Rebuilding America's Schools Act. Every day, students attend schools that put their health and safety at risk. The average school building is nearly 50 years old, and teachers and children struggle to learn in classrooms without heat, leaking ceilings, and no working internet.

Mr. Speaker, our children deserve better. Research shows that poor school facility conditions impact teaching and learning, and disproportionately plague schools that serve low-income and minority students all throughout America. Regardless of their ZIP Code, all children should have access to a quality education, and no child should have to learn in an unsafe or dilapidated environment.

The Rebuilding America's Schools Act would provide critically needed investments in Las Vegas and rural Nevada to improve our school infrastructure, helping teachers teach and children learn.

President Trump has repeatedly promised to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure. Passing the Rebuilding America's Schools Act would be the first step in making this happen. We must make an investment in our future generation to guarantee their shot at success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when we think about healthcare, we all think about, of course, first and foremost, ourselves and our loved ones and our families. As Representatives of 750,000 people, we also think about constituents that we know, that we have met, for whom healthcare is literally a life-and-death situation.

I think of my friend Debbie and her son Sam. Debbie's son Sam was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes when he was 4 years old. He is now 20 or 21 or so. He was a healthy kid, he ate healthy food, an active young child. As Debbie pointed out to me, it is not that anybody chooses an illness or a condition, the illness chooses you. Through the luck of the draw, her son Sam is afflicted with type 1 diabetes. Like many people with autoimmune diseases, it was not poor choices, it was not lifestyle decisions that gave him the disease or even increased his risk of the disease. He was dealt a bad hand with an autoimmune gene that his family didn't even know that they had.

Because of that, Sam has a costly disease. Thankfully, one that can be treated, if not cured, but he has a costly disease for the rest of his life. There is no cure, and the cost of insulin and other lifesaving technologies is very high.

Sam has what here in Washington people call a preexisting condition. That is what we are talking about. Without insurance, the cost per month would go from about \$400, which Debbie and her husband are able to afford and put together for Sam, to \$2,500 a month, which they could not possibly afford to do.

Sam is now 20, and because of the Affordable Care Act, he will be on the family's health insurance until he is 26. That is, if the family can keep their health insurance. The family worries, like so many others, that they might be one of those 22 million families that loses coverage under this Republican healthcare bill. It is a lot of families.

It is not going to be any of my colleagues' families. My colleagues have a government health insurance plan from serving in the House of Representatives. Their congressional staff has access to the exchanges, just like we do, to buy insurance. But 22 million people in each and every one of our districts, 435 districts in this country, in each and every one of our districts, not dozens of people, not hundreds of people, but thousands of real people like Deb and Sam, like a story I shared earlier of Marcia and Grace, will actually lose their healthcare. They will be forced to give up their home, become insolvent, go bankrupt, or die. A choice that no American should have to face.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration today is one of many that didn't go through regular order. There were no hearings. Closed process. They cut out all the Democratic amendments

that we had to improve the bill. That is how the Republicans have been handling healthcare legislation this Congress. That is why this approach isn't working. It is why this approach is so unpopular. No hearings, shut Members out of the legislative process, bring a bill to the floor that was hidden in some closet, written in secret, widely unpopular, throwing people off healthcare insurance, raising rates for those who are luckily enough to keep their insurance.

This bill is not aimed at protecting patients. This bill before us and the Senate Republican healthcare bill make it more difficult for Americans to deal with real-life healthcare issues that were dealt over the course of life for ourselves and our families.

We need a reset, Mr. Speaker. We need to reset and start real discussions about improving healthcare.

How could Democrats or Republicans work together to reduce costs?

Democrats and Republicans should work together to expand coverage. We shouldn't be talking about whether 22 million people lose coverage or 10 million people lose coverage or 5 million people lose coverage. Let's talk about 5 million people gaining coverage, 10 million people gaining coverage. Let's reset and frame the discussion about how more people can have access to healthcare.

The problem we are trying to solve is not how can we get less Americans to have access to healthcare. That is why this bill is so unpopular. If that is the problem Republicans are trying to solve, they solved it in this bill. Less Americans will have healthcare. But that is not the problem that the American people want us to address in Congress.

More people with healthcare, and people want to save money. They want their insurance rates to be lower, their deductibles to be lower. They want to save money. There are some low-hanging fruit in terms of costs in healthcare, administrative overhead, wasteful and duplicative spending, that we can go after together. These are good ideas, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican.

One of the amendments that I proposed was pricing transparency. One of the problems in the healthcare marketplace is nobody knows how much anybody charges. Different insurers and private payers pay widely different amounts for the exact same procedure. Let's at least disclose the pricing and have transparency so market mechanisms will work to pull down rates by promoting competition.

□ 1315

By not allowing the market into healthcare, we are creating inefficiencies and raising rates. Let's come together on that. Let's come together around a lot of good ideas that Demo-

crats and Republicans have bills on and have amendments on. But, no, they are not even allowed to be debated and not even allowed to be voted on either on this bill, in which every Democratic amendment was shut down, or in the Republican healthcare bill, in which no process was allowed for Democrats to improve the bill.

We have never even been invited into the secret backroom to figure out what was being debated. We didn't even see the bill until it was presented fully formed days before it had to be voted on, affecting the lives of 22 million Americans, one-eighth of our entire economy, without any hearings, without any expert testimony, and only days to digest this hundred-page bill.

So look, let's reset, let's work together to bring down costs, expanding coverage and improving quality, and create a work product in healthcare reform that we can be proud of as Republicans, as Democrats, and as Americans; one in which Debbie and her son, Sam, don't have to worry about giving up their home or facing death; or one in which Grace and her mother are able to live out their lives without worrying about their preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to reject this closed rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's newfound sense of bipartisanship. The Affordable Care Act was passed without a single Republican vote in the House, without a single Republican vote in the Senate, and without any concern of Republican thoughts about how healthcare should be run in this country. Now that the Affordable Care Act is, in fact, failing; now that we have over 90 counties in America that have zero health insurers to choose from in the individual market; and now that we see the Affordable Care Act in a death spiral, all of a sudden, we are concerned about the bipartisanship and how to fix the problem.

We have heard zero amendments in the past 6 years to the Affordable Care Act that would have, in fact, improved the Affordable Care Act from the other side of the aisle while they had the President in the White House, and now, all of a sudden, we are looking for bipartisanship and solutions. We will find that bipartisanship and those solutions in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly want affordable healthcare in this country, then we need to address the cost of supplying care. H.R. 1215 strikes at the heart of skyrocketing medical care. By limiting frivolous and unending lawsuits, doctors can focus less on the courtroom and more on the patient in the operating room.

The reforms made by H.R. 1215 will be especially important for rural America and underserved urban Amer-

ica. Doctors will be able to afford to live and practice in these communities, providing the attentive and responsive care that all Americans deserve, not just Americans who live a few miles from a major hospital.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation. I know Democrats and Republicans have different policy approaches to reforming our healthcare system, but this legislation has already been implemented by Democrats in the State of California, where it has proven successful. Now we have the chance to apply this approach more broadly, in a way that will help millions of Americans. This effort has been bipartisan in the past and should be bipartisan today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsor of this bill, Representative STEVE KING.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution, and I urge a "yes" vote on the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule governing debate of H.R. 1215, the "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017" and the underlying bill.

I oppose the rule for H.R. 1215, the "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017" for the following reasons:

There were twenty-five amendments proposed by colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

Only five of those amendments were made in order.

What did all five of those amendments have in common?

These amendments were all submitted by my Republican counterparts.

The rule for this bill incorporates none of the amendments offered by my Democratic colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, that exclusion is problematic.

The amendments not made in order reflect the crippling partisanship of the House majority.

I also oppose the underlying bill on the merits, because it limits noneconomic damages to a mere \$250,000, which if enacted, would have a disproportionately adverse impact on women, the poor, and other vulnerable groups.

When given the opportunity, members refused to incorporate an amendment that would increase that cap to reflect the cost of inflation and a concern for the humane treatment of those individuals affected by medical malpractice.

H.R. 1215 provides immunity for health care providers who dispense defective or dangerous pharmaceuticals or medical devices.

Finally, I oppose the bill, because it creates an excessively short statute of limitations period, makes it harder for victims to obtain adequate legal representation, and imposes the risk of loss on victims rather than wrongdoers.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous examples of people who have suffered at the hands of medical providers and whose lives will never be the same.

Consider the case of Olivia, an exceptionally bright high school senior from Santa Monica, California, who had gained early acceptance to Smith College in Massachusetts.

She never made it to Smith College, because after a medical procedure was completed and while Olivia was still under anesthesia, a fellow-in-training pulled the catheter causing Olivia's vital signs to plummet.

Hospital staff waited more than ten minutes to resuscitate her, but it was far too late for Olivia.

She passed away, and her promising future disappeared.

This tragedy never should have happened.

Mr. Speaker, instead of wasting time on this giveaway to special interests, we should be improving the Affordable Care Act, and opposing any bill that would leave over twenty million Americans uninsured, and investigating Russian involvement in our democratic processes.

For these reasons, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 382 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2475) to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2475.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject be-

fore the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

YEAS—234

|               |                 |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham       | Gohmert         | Norman          |
| Aderholt      | Goodlatte       | Nunes           |
| Allen         | Gosar           | Olson           |
| Amash         | Gowdy           | Palazzo         |
| Amodei        | Graves (GA)     | Palmer          |
| Arrington     | Graves (LA)     | Paulsen         |
| Babin         | Graves (MO)     | Pearce          |
| Bacon         | Griffith        | Perry           |
| Banks (IN)    | Grothman        | Pittenger       |
| Barletta      | Guthrie         | Poe (TX)        |
| Barr          | Handel          | Poliquin        |
| Barton        | Harper          | Posey           |
| Bergman       | Harris          | Ratcliffe       |
| Biggs         | Hartzler        | Reed            |
| Bilirakis     | Hensarling      | Reichert        |
| Bishop (MI)   | Herrera Beutler | Rice (SC)       |
| Bishop (UT)   | Hice, Jody B.   | Roby            |
| Black         | Higgins (LA)    | Roe (TN)        |
| Blackburn     | Hill            | Rogers (AL)     |
| Blum          | Holding         | Rogers (KY)     |
| Bost          | Hollingsworth   | Rohrabacher     |
| Brady (TX)    | Hudson          | Rokita          |
| Brat          | Huizenga        | Rooney, Francis |
| Bridenstine   | Hultgren        | Rooney, Thomas  |
| Brooks (AL)   | Hunter          | J.              |
| Brooks (IN)   | Hurd            | Ros-Lehtinen    |
| Buchanan      | Issa            | Roskam          |
| Buck          | Jenkins (KS)    | Ross            |
| Bucshon       | Jenkins (WV)    | Rothfus         |
| Budd          | Johnson (LA)    | Rouzer          |
| Burgess       | Johnson (OH)    | Royce (CA)      |
| Byrne         | Johnson, Sam    | Russell         |
| Calvert       | Jones           | Rutherford      |
| Carter (GA)   | Jordan          | Sanford         |
| Carter (TX)   | Joyce (OH)      | Schweikert      |
| Chabot        | Katko           | Scott, Austin   |
| Chaffetz      | Kelly (MS)      | Sensenbrenner   |
| Cheney        | Kelly (PA)      | Sessions        |
| Coffman       | King (IA)       | Shimkus         |
| Cole          | King (NY)       | Shuster         |
| Collins (GA)  | Kinzinger       | Simpson         |
| Collins (NY)  | Knight          | Smith (MO)      |
| Comer         | Kustoff (TN)    | Smith (NE)      |
| Comstock      | Labrador        | Smith (NJ)      |
| Conaway       | LaHood          | Smith (TX)      |
| Cook          | LaMalfa         | Smucker         |
| Costello (PA) | Lamborn         | Stefanik        |
| Cramer        | Lance           | Stewart         |
| Crawford      | Latta           | Taylor          |
| Culberson     | Lewis (MN)      | Tenney          |
| Curbelo (FL)  | LoBiondo        | Thompson (PA)   |
| Davidson      | Loudermilk      | Thornberry      |
| Davis, Rodney | Love            | Tiberi          |
| Denham        | Lucas           | Tipton          |
| Dent          | Luetkemeyer     | Trott           |
| DeSantis      | MacArthur       | Turner          |
| DesJarlais    | Marchant        | Upton           |
| Diaz-Balart   | Marino          | Valadao         |
| Donovan       | Marshall        | Wagner          |
| Duffy         | Massie          | Walberg         |
| Duncan (SC)   | Mast            | Walden          |
| Duncan (TN)   | McCarthy        | Walker          |
| Dunn          | McCaul          | Walorski        |
| Emmer         | McClintock      | Walters, Mimi   |
| Estes (KS)    | McHenry         | Weber (TX)      |
| Farenthold    | McKinley        | Webster (FL)    |
| Faso          | McMorris        | Wenstrup        |
| Ferguson      | Rodgers         | Westerman       |
| Fitzpatrick   | McSally         | Williams        |
| Fleischmann   | Meadows         | Wilson (SC)     |
| Fortenberry   | Meehan          | Wittman         |
| Fox           | Messer          | Womack          |
| Franks (AZ)   | Mitchell        | Woodall         |
| Frelinghuysen | Moolenaar       | Yoder           |
| Gaetz         | Mooney (WV)     | Yoho            |
| Gallagher     | Mullin          | Young (AK)      |
| Garrett       | Murphy (PA)     | Young (IA)      |
| Gianforte     | Newhouse        | Zeldin          |
| Gibbs         | Noem            |                 |

NAYS—184

|          |                 |                |
|----------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams    | Bera            | Bonamici       |
| Aguilar  | Beyer           | Boyle, Brendan |
| Barragan | Bishop (GA)     | F.             |
| Bass     | Blumenauer      | Brady (PA)     |
| Beatty   | Blunt Rochester | Brown (MD)     |

Brownley (CA) Hanabusa  
 Bustos Hastings  
 Butterfield Heck  
 Capuano Higgins (NY)  
 Carbajal Himes  
 Cárdenas Hoyer  
 Carson (IN) Huffman  
 Cartwright Jackson Lee  
 Castor (FL) Jeffries  
 Castro (TX) Johnson (GA)  
 Chu, Judy Johnson, E. B.  
 Cicilline Kaptur  
 Clark (MA) Keating  
 Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL)  
 Clay Kennedy  
 Cleaver Khanna  
 Clyburn Kihuen  
 Cohen Kildee  
 Connolly Kilmer  
 Conyers Kind  
 Cooper Krishnamoorthi  
 Correa Kuster (NH)  
 Costa Langevin  
 Courtney Larsen (WA)  
 Crist Larson (CT)  
 Crowley Lawrence  
 Cuellar Lawson (FL)  
 Davis (CA) Lee  
 Davis, Danny Levin  
 DeFazio Lewis (GA)  
 DeGette Lieu, Ted  
 Delaney Lipinski  
 DelBene Lofgren  
 Demings Lowenthal  
 DeSaulnier Lowey  
 Deutch Lujan Grisham,  
 Dingell M.  
 Doggett Luján, Ben Ray  
 Doyle, Michael Lynch  
 F. Maloney,  
 Ellison Carolyn B.  
 Engel Maloney, Sean  
 Eshoo Matsui  
 Espallat McCollum  
 Esty (CT) McEachin  
 Evans McGovern  
 Foster McNeerney  
 Frankel (FL) Meeks  
 Fudge Meng  
 Gabbard Moore  
 Gallego Moulton  
 Garamendi Murphy (FL)  
 Gonzalez (TX) Nadler  
 Gottheimer Nolan  
 Green, Al Norcross  
 Green, Gene O'Rourke  
 Grijalva Pallone  
 Gutiérrez Panetta

## NOT VOTING—15

Cummings Loeb sack  
 DeLauro Long  
 Flores Napolitano  
 Granger Neal  
 Jayapal O'Halleran

□ 1340

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Messrs. VELA, and BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 325.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 325.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 186, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

## AYES—235

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Arrington  
 Babin  
 Bacon  
 Banks (IN)  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Bergman  
 Biggs  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Buehson  
 Budd  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Cheney  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davidson  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Dunn  
 Emmer  
 Estes (KS)  
 Farenthold  
 Faso  
 Ferguson  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Garrett  
 Gianforte

## NOES—186

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Barragán  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capuano  
 Carbajal  
 Cárdenas  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Correa  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crist  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DelBene  
 Demings  
 DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Espallat  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Gottheimer  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez

## NOT VOTING—12

Cummings Long  
 DeLauro Napolitano  
 Hice, Jody B. Neal  
 Himes Pelosi

□ 1348

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 323, No. 324, No. 325, and No. 326 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on H.R. 2547—Veterans Expanded Trucking Opportunities Act of 2017. I would have also voted “yea” on H.R. 2258—ADVANCE Act. I would have also voted “nay” on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1215. I would have also voted “nay” on H. Res. 382—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1215—Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 178, answered “present” 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

## YEAS—238

|                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham         | Fortenberry    | McMorris        |
| Adams           | Foster         | Rodgers         |
| Aderholt        | Frankel (FL)   | McNerney        |
| Allen           | Frelinghuysen  | Meadows         |
| Amodei          | Gabbard        | Meehan          |
| Arrington       | Galleo         | Meeks           |
| Babin           | Garamendi      | Meng            |
| Bacon           | Gianforte      | Messer          |
| Banks (IN)      | Gonzalez (TX)  | Moolenaar       |
| Barletta        | Goodlatte      | Mooney (WV)     |
| Barton          | Gosar          | Moulton         |
| Bergman         | Gottheimer     | Mullin          |
| Bilirakis       | Govdy          | Murphy (FL)     |
| Bishop (UT)     | Granger        | Nadler          |
| Blumenauer      | Green, Al      | Newhouse        |
| Blunt Rochester | Griffith       | Noem            |
| Bonamici        | Grothman       | Norman          |
| Brady (TX)      | Guthrie        | Nunes           |
| Brat            | Hanabusa       | O'Rourke        |
| Bridenstine     | Handel         | Olson           |
| Brooks (AL)     | Harper         | Palazzo         |
| Brooks (IN)     | Harris         | Palmer          |
| Brown (MD)      | Hartzler       | Panetta         |
| Buchanan        | Heck           | Pascarell       |
| Bucshon         | Hensarling     | Perlmutter      |
| Budd            | Higgins (LA)   | Pingree         |
| Bustos          | Higgins (NY)   | Pocan           |
| Butterfield     | Hill           | Poliquin        |
| Byrne           | Himes          | Polis           |
| Calvert         | Hollingsworth  | Posey           |
| Carter (TX)     | Huffman        | Quigley         |
| Carterwright    | Hultgren       | Rice (SC)       |
| Castro (TX)     | Jeffries       | Roby            |
| Chabot          | Johnson (GA)   | Rogers (KY)     |
| Chaffetz        | Johnson (LA)   | Rohrabacher     |
| Cheney          | Johnson, E. B. | Rooney, Francis |
| Chu, Judy       | Johnson, Sam   | Rooney, Thomas  |
| Cicilline       | Jones          | J.              |
| Clark (MA)      | Kaptur         | Roskam          |
| Clay            | Kelly (MS)     | Ross            |
| Cleaver         | Kelly (PA)     | Rothfus         |
| Clyburn         | Kennedy        | Royce (CA)      |
| Cole            | Kildee         | Ruppersberger   |
| Collins (NY)    | King (IA)      | Rush            |
| Comstock        | King (NY)      | Russell         |
| Cook            | Knight         | Schneider       |
| Cooper          | Krishnamoorthi | Schweikert      |
| Courtney        | Kuster (NH)    | Scott (VA)      |
| Cramer          | Kustoff (TN)   | Scott, Austin   |
| Crawford        | Labrador       | Scott, David    |
| Cuellar         | LaMalfa        | Sensenbrenner   |
| Culberson       | Lamborn        | Serrano         |
| Davidson        | Larsen (WA)    | Shea-Porter     |
| Davis (CA)      | Larson (CT)    | Sherman         |
| Davis, Danny    | Latta          | Shimkus         |
| DeGette         | Lewis (MN)     | Shuster         |
| DelBene         | Lipinski       | Simpson         |
| Demings         | Loudermilk     | Sinema          |
| Dent            | Lucas          | Smith (NE)      |
| DeSaulnier      | Luetkemeyer    | Smith (NJ)      |
| DesJarlais      | Lujan Grisham, | Smith (TX)      |
| Deutch          | M.             | Smith (WA)      |
| Dingell         | Lujan, Ben Ray | Smucker         |
| Doggett         | Maloney,       | Soto            |
| Donovan         | Carolyn B.     | Speier          |
| Duffy           | Marino         | Stefanik        |
| Duncan (SC)     | Massie         | Stewart         |
| Duncan (TN)     | Mast           | Suozi           |
| Dunn            | McCarthy       | Takano          |
| Engel           | McCaul         | Taylor          |
| Eshoo           | McClintock     | Thornberry      |
| Estes (KS)      | McCollum       | Tiberi          |
| Farenthold      | McEachin       | Titus           |
| Ferguson        | McHenry        | Torres          |
| Fleischmann     |                | Trott           |

Tsongas  
Wagner  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams

Wilson (SC)  
Womack  
Yarmuth  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NAYS—178

Aguilar  
Amash  
Barr  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buck  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Castor (FL)  
Clarke (NY)  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Collins (GA)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Crist  
Crowley  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
Denham  
DeSantis  
Diaz-Balart  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Emmer  
Españat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Faso  
Fitzpatrick  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Fudge  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett

Gibbs  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hastings  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Holding  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
LaHood  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lofgren  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Matsui  
McGovern  
McKinley  
McSally  
Mitchell  
Moore  
Murphy (PA)  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halloran

Pallone  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Price (NC)  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rokita  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Sewell (AL)  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Swalwell (CA)  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Ellison

Tonko

## NOT VOTING—15

Black  
Burgess  
Cummings  
DeLauro  
Gohmert

Hunter  
Long  
Lowe  
Napolitano  
Neal

Pelosi  
Renacci  
Scalise  
Sessions  
Stivers

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1355

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 325 regarding “On Ordering the Previous

Question” (H. Res. 382). Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

I missed rollcall vote No. 326 regarding “Providing for consideration of H.R. 1215” (H. Res. 382). Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

I missed rollcall vote No. 327 “On Approving the Journal.” Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

## ADJUSTING THE AMOUNT OF THE MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCE

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 411

Whereas on June 14, 2017, an armed gunman opened fire at a practice for the annual Congressional Baseball Game for Charity, wounding five individuals;

Whereas Members of the House are understandably concerned about the security of their staff and the constituents they serve, as well as their personal security;

Whereas the Members' Representational Allowance (MRA) is available for ordinary and necessary expenses associated with security measures; and

Whereas heightened security concerns necessitate an adjustment in the MRA to provide Members with additional resources: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That pursuant to section 1(b) of House Resolution 1372, Ninety-fourth Congress, agreed to July 1, 1976, as enacted into permanent law by section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1977 (2 U.S.C. 4314), the Members' Representational Allowance applicable as of the date of the adoption of this resolution for each Member of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates and Resident Commissioner to the Congress) is increased by \$25,000, to be available through January 2, 2018.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 412

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Walz.

The resolution was agreed to.



A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### SANTA ANA RIVER WASH PLAN LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 497

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CONSERVATION DISTRICT.**—The term "Conservation District" means the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, a political subdivision of the State of California.

(2) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "non-Federal Land" means the approximately 310 acres of land owned by the Conservation District generally depicted as "SBVWCD to BLM" on the Map.

(3) **MAP.**—The term "Map" means the map titled "Santa Ana River Wash Land Exchange" and dated September 3, 2015.

(4) **NON-FEDERAL EXCHANGE PARCEL.**—The term "non-Federal exchange parcel" means the approximately 59 acres of land owned by the Conservation District generally depicted as "SBVWCD Equalization Land" on the Map and is to be conveyed to the United States if necessary to equalize the fair market values of the lands otherwise to be exchanged.

(5) **FEDERAL EXCHANGE PARCEL.**—The term "Federal exchange parcel" means the approximately 90 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management generally depicted as "BLM Equalization Land to SBVWCD" on the Map and is to be conveyed to the Conservation District if necessary to equalize the fair market values of the lands otherwise to be exchanged.

(6) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "Federal land" means the approximately 327 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management generally depicted as "BLM Land to SBVWCD" on the Map.

(7) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

#### SEC. 3. EXCHANGE OF LAND; EQUALIZATION OF VALUE.

(a) **EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.**—Notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections

202, 210, and 211 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1720–21), subject to valid existing rights, and conditioned upon any equalization payment necessary under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), and subsection (b) of this Act, as soon as practicable, but not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, if the Conservation District offers to convey the exchange land to the United States, the Secretary shall—

(1) convey to the Conservation District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land, and any such portion of the Federal exchange parcel as may be required to equalize the values of the lands exchanged; and

(2) accept from the Conservation District a conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the Conservation District in and to the non-Federal land, and any such portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel as may be required to equalize the values of the lands exchanged.

(b) **EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.**—To the extent an equalization payment is necessary under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716), the amount of such equalization payment shall first be made by way of in-kind transfer of such portion of the Federal exchange parcel to the Conservation District, or transfer of such portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel to the United States, as the case may be, as may be necessary to equalize the fair market values of the exchanged properties. The fair market value of the Federal exchange parcel or non-Federal exchange parcel, as the case may be, shall be credited against any required equalization payment. To the extent such credit is not sufficient to offset the entire amount of equalization payment so indicated, any remaining amount of equalization payment shall be treated as follows:

(1) If the equalization payment is to equalize values by which the Federal land exceeds the non-Federal land and the credited value of the non-Federal exchange parcel, Conservation District may make the equalization payment to the United States, notwithstanding any limitation regarding the amount of the equalization payment under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716). In the event Conservation District opts not to make the indicated equalization payment, the exchange shall not proceed.

(2) If the equalization payment is to equalize values by which the non-Federal land exceeds the Federal land and the credited value of the Federal exchange parcel, the Secretary shall order the exchange without requirement of any additional equalization payment by the United States to the Conservation District.

(c) **APPRAISALS.**—

(1) The value of the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be determined by appraisals conducted by 1 or more independent and qualified appraisers.

(2) The appraisals shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including, as appropriate, the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(d) **TITLE APPROVAL.**—Title to the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be in a format acceptable to the Secretary and the Conservation District

(e) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize a map and legal descriptions of all land to be conveyed under this Act. The Secretary may correct any minor errors in the map or in the legal descriptions. The map and legal descriptions shall be on file and available for public inspection in ap-

propriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(f) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—As a condition of conveyance, any costs related to the conveyance under this section shall be paid by the Conservation District.

#### SEC. 4. APPLICABLE LAW.

(a) **ACT OF FEBRUARY 20, 1909.**—

(1) The Act of February 20, 1909 (35 Stat. 641), shall not apply to the Federal land and any public exchange land transferred under this Act.

(2) The exchange of lands under this section shall be subject to continuing rights of the Conservation District under the Act of February 20, 1909 (35 Stat. 641), on the non-Federal land and any exchanged portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel for the continued use, maintenance, operation, construction, or relocation of, or expansion of, groundwater recharge facilities on the non-Federal land, to accommodate groundwater recharge of the Bunker Hill Basin to the extent that such activities are not in conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan or Habitat Management Plan under which such non-Federal land or non-Federal exchange parcel may be held or managed.

(b) **FLPMA.**—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701, et seq.), shall apply to the exchange of land under this Act.

#### SEC. 5. CANCELLATION OF SECRETARIAL ORDER 241.

Secretarial Order 241, dated November 11, 1929 (withdrawing a portion of the Federal land for an unconstructed transmission line), is terminated and the withdrawal thereby effected is revoked.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to sponsor this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation, the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act. This bill reflects a compromise negotiated at the grassroots level among the cities, county, mining companies, wildlife agencies, and water organizations for over two decades in the Upper Santa Ana Wash area.

The bill simply authorizes a land exchange of 327 acres of Bureau of Land Management land for 310 acres of land currently owned by the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District. This exchange facilitates the implementation of the broader Upper Santa Ana Wash Land Management and Habitat Conservation Plan, which identifies opportunities to expand existing aggregate mining operations to support new infrastructure developments; enhance

water storage for the surrounding communities; and establish protected habitat for certain threatened and endangered plants and species.

After the exchange, the Bureau of Land Management will use the land to protect critical habitat and will enhance the region's water conservation and storage efforts by recharging more than 77 water basins. The land acquired by the Water Conservation District, which is currently adjacent to two aggregate mines, will allow local mining companies to expand and create greater efficiency in their current mining operations.

The companies estimate that this small exchange will result in approximately \$8.5 million in new infrastructure projects and a \$36 million increase in annual payrolls from the new sites.

This bill is supported by a wide variety of stakeholders in my district, including the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino County, the city of Highland, California, the city of Redlands, California, CEMEX, the Endangered Habitats League, Robertson's Ready Mix, and Inland Action.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 497 authorizes a land exchange in California between the San Bernardino Valley Conservation District and the Bureau of Land Management. After 15 years, stakeholders have finalized the habitat conservation plan for the Santa Ana River Wash that balances the needs of endangered wildlife with regional economic development.

This is a stellar example of the Endangered Species Act at work, and I commend Representative COOK for his work on this bill.

This land exchange is a key component of the Habitat Conservation Plan and a win-win for all parties. It will help protect important wildlife habitat while allowing the conservation district to increase water storage capacity and direct mining activity into the appropriate areas.

So again, this is exactly how the Endangered Species Act should work. It is something we should all support. This is a good bill, and I urge swift adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act introduced by my Republican colleague and regional partner, Colonel PAUL COOK. The Santa

Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act is the final step, as he mentioned, to complete the transfer of land between the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District and the Bureau of Land Management, known as the BLM.

This legislation allows the BLM and the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District to trade parcels of land which will benefit both the BLM and the conservation district.

This land exchange will empower mining companies, Robertson's Ready Mix, and CEMEX, which sit on land managed by the BLM, to increase efficiency. And as the gentleman mentioned, by increasing that efficiency, these local mining companies will produce aggregate that will support numerous infrastructure projects and approximately \$36 million in annual payroll from this site alone.

Additionally, the land exchange creates 59 acres of land for the conservation district to use for conservation purposes to protect endangered plants and species and for recharging water in more than 70 basins.

The wash plan has been an ongoing project since the late 1980s, when it was a proposal from the cities of Highland and Redlands. As the former mayor of Redlands, I worked on this project at the local level. Years, and actually decades, of studies and committee reports have culminated in this final presentation of the Upper Santa Ana River Wash Plan.

The Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act moves this decades-long process forward, which will allow San Bernardino County to take advantage of critical economic and environmental benefits.

After years of working on this project at the local level and listening to constituents and local stakeholders' comments and questions, I can confidently say that this land exchange is widely supported.

I have received letters of support from two mining companies affected by the transfer, the County of San Bernardino, the city of Highland, the city of Redlands, the San Bernardino Valley Conservation District, a local chapter of the Habitat League, and Inland Action, which is an organization of regional stakeholders that promote economic growth in the Inland Empire.

This bill is a smart bipartisan plan that will help us support our local economy and protect the environment. It is a victory for all involved, and I offer my complete support and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act.

I want to commend Representative COOK again. He has been a regional leader on this issue. He has been a colleague. We have worked on many of these issues that border our two districts. He has been incredibly thought-

ful in his approach to this. He has done a yeoman's work with his staff in carrying forward this bill, and it is always a pleasure to work with my colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, obviously, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 497, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 220) to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 220

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.—The term “Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project” means the project identified in section 1325 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3212), and which is Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project number 2743.

(3) UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION EXPANSION.—The term “Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion” means the expansion of the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project as generally described in Exhibit E to the Upper Hidden Basin Grant Application dated July 2, 2014, and submitted to the Alaska Energy Authority Renewable Energy Fund Round VIII by Kodiak Electric Association, Inc.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The licensee for the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project may occupy not more than 20 acres of Federal land to construct, operate, and maintain the Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion without further authorization of the Secretary of the Interior or under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—The Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion shall be subject to appropriate terms and conditions included in an amendment to a license issued by the Commission pursuant to the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), including section 4(e) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 797(e)), following an environmental review by the Commission under the

*National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H.R. 220, allows for the expansion of the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project on Kodiak Island, Alaska—by the way, which is larger than New Jersey.

The Terror Lake Hydroelectric project provides 31 megawatts of hydropower capacity to the Island's approximately 13,789 residents and, of course, the largest Coast Guard station in the United States.

Kodiak Island is roughly the size, as I mentioned, of New Jersey. This means it is reliant upon the electric generation on the Island mostly by hydro at this time, some diesel.

With the growing electrical demands of the residents of Kodiak, the Kodiak Electric Association will not be able to meet their needs without requiring additional resources or will be forced back to increasing the use of diesel. There is no reason why a hydro-rich community like Kodiak should ever have to rely on diesel fuel for power generation. They wish to expand their operation by increasing their water resources, and I agree.

My legislation allows the Kodiak Electric Company to divert small flows of additional water from Upper Hidden Basin into Terror Lake by digging a 1.5 mile underground tunnel.

This diversion will increase the water resources at Terror Lake by 25 percent, resulting in an additional 33,000 megawatt-hours of generation each year and totalling an estimated output in the project of approximately 168 million megawatt-hours annually.

The issue at hand is the tunnel would need to go through Kodiak Island National Wildlife Refuge, which is Federal land, to the State land where the water diversion would be located.

My legislation authorizes the Kodiak Electric Association to occupy not more than 20 acres of Federal land to construct, operate, and maintain the Upper Hidden Basin Division expansion without further authorization of the

Secretary of the Interior under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

Alaska has tremendous hydroelectric potential, and I look forward to moving additional commonsense reforms to provide our rural and remote communities for new opportunities to obtain reliable and affordable hydropower.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports this, there is no objection to it, it is a solution waiting to happen, so we are going to dig a tunnel. This is really about a tunnel.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 220 would authorize an expansion of the existing Terror Lake Hydropower project in Alaska to meet increased powder demands from Kodiak Island.

The expansion would have to comply with environmental protections required under the Federal Power Act and National Environmental Policy Act.

This bill unanimously passed both the House Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

I want to thank Mr. YOUNG for his persuasive presentation both in committee and on the House floor. I fully support the sensible bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I was going to say a few words about this bill here, but I would be in fear of my life if I changed anything on Congressman YOUNG's statement.

So with that, I think he did an outstanding job presenting, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 220, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1415

#### ROBERT EMMET PARK ACT OF 2017

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1500) to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1500

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Robert Emmet Park Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Robert Emmet was one of Ireland's most prominent historical figures, having led an effort to secure Irish independence in 1803.

(2) Although Emmet's efforts initially failed, they succeeded in inspiring new generations of Irish men and women to struggle for independence.

(3) For his efforts to gain Irish independence, Emmet was found guilty of treason and sentenced to death by hanging.

(4) Robert Emmet's "Speech from the Dock" motivated many of the efforts that led to an independent Ireland following 1916's Easter Rising; (Emmet famously said that "To [Ireland] I sacrificed every selfish, every lasting sentiment . . . I wished to place her independence beyond the reach of any power of earth . . . to procure for my country the guarantee which Washington procured for America . . . to exalt her to that proud station in the world."). Emmet was strongly influenced by American democracy and the American Revolution.

(5) Emmet had family members similarly admiring of the United States and dedicated to the cause of Irish independence, including his brother Thomas Addis Emmet who went on to become a prominent Attorney General of New York.

(6) Emmet has been revered by generations of Irish-Americans for his leadership, courage, and sacrifice.

(7) Fifty years ago on April 22, 1966, the Robert Emmet Statue was dedicated on a small parcel of National Park Service land (reservation 302) at the corner of 24th Street NW and Massachusetts Avenue NW in Washington, DC.

(8) Robert Emmet's statue is the central feature of reservation 302.

(9) Many leading Members of Congress, including Speaker of the House John W. McCormack and Senators Everett Dirksen and Mike Mansfield served on the Robert Emmet Statue Dedication Committee.

(10) Other members of that committee and participants in the dedication ceremony included Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, Representative Michael Kirwan, Ambassador of Ireland William P. Fay, and Rector of St. Matthews Cathedral John K. Cartwright.

#### SEC. 3. REDESIGNATION OF ROBERT EMMET PARK.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The small triangular property designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302, shall be known as "Robert Emmet Park".

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, paper, or other record of the United States to the property referred to in subsection (a) is deemed to be a reference to "Robert Emmet Park".

(c) SIGNAGE.—The Secretary of the Interior may post signs on or near Robert Emmet Park that include one or more of the following:

(1) Information on Robert Emmet, his contribution to Irish Independence, and his respect for the United States and the American Revolution.

(2) Information on the history of the statue of Robert Emmet located in Robert Emmet Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1500, offered by our colleague, Representative JOSEPH CROWLEY of New York, renames a small triangular property owned by the National Park Service in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park.

Robert Emmet, sometimes referred to as the George Washington of Ireland, was a prominent historical figure known for his role in the Irish rebellion of 1803 and for his classic "Speech from the Dock" that inspired future efforts to gain Irish independence.

The small National Park Service reservation that is redesignated by this bill includes a statue of Robert Emmet, originally cast in 1916 by Irish-American artist Jerome Connor. In April of last year, the statue was rededicated at a ceremony that also jointly marked the centennial of the 1916 Easter Rising. The statue and park, located just a few blocks from the Irish Embassy, are a source of pride to the Irish community.

I wish to thank Representative CROWLEY for his sponsorship of this bill, and also Mr. Jack O'Brien of the Ancient Order of Hibernians for his tireless work in support of this legislation and his lifelong dedication to Irish cultural projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend, Mr. COOK, just pointed out, H.R. 1500 designates a small triangle of land in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park. The parcel is home to a statue of Robert Emmet, a seminal figure in Ireland's quest for independence. The bill also authorizes the National Park Service, which manages the area, to add interpretive displays and signage to the area.

Emmet admired the independence we achieved in this country and only wanted the same freedom and liberty for his compatriots in Ireland. Designating this small plot of land and the accompanying statue as Robert Emmet Park will stand as a constant reminder of the call to liberty and freedom that binds our Nation together.

I would like to thank my friend, Representative CROWLEY from New York City, who is also a proud son of St. Patrick, for his work on this bill, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time.

I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee here in the House of Representatives for moving this bill and helping to put this bill on the floor today in a bipartisan spirit. I would also like to acknowledge the majority and minority staff who have been very helpful to my office in this effort.

True, this is not the first time this measure has been considered. It passed the House during the last Congress, but the session ended before it could be moved forward in the Senate and into law. It was then, as it is now, a bipartisan bill. I would like to acknowledge all of the Members who are cosponsors. In substance, the bill would, as has been said, name a small parcel of the land in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park.

Emmet was honored by the United States over 100 years ago when a statue of his likeness was donated to the Smithsonian Institution. That statue was welcomed by no less than President Woodrow Wilson himself.

After 50 years, the museum moved the statue to the land where it rests now, an unnamed parcel of land. The rededication committee counted many key leaders, including then-Speaker of the House John McCormack, Senator Everett Dirksen, and Senator Mike Mansfield. Even President Lyndon Johnson conveyed his pride in Emmet, stating: "We Americans are proud to accord a place of honor here in the Nation's Capital to Robert Emmet, whose struggles and sacrifices bespeak the yearnings of mankind throughout the ages."

So it is clear that, on a bipartisan basis, Congress has long recognized the significance of this statue and its role in keeping alive not only the memory of Robert Emmet, but the ideals for which he stood.

At present, the statue of Emmet is the only statue on this small piece of land. This bill would take the next logical step by naming the land for Emmet. It is a fitting tribute since, for generations, many American schoolchildren learned the words of Emmet's famous speech, which became known as the "Speech from the Dock."

I often wonder what Abraham Lincoln was taught as a boy. We all

learned the Gettysburg Address, but, in fact, Abraham Lincoln could recite the "Speech from the Dock" by memory. It couldn't have been an easy speech for Emmet to give when one considers that he was expected to be executed after giving that speech.

Emmet had been an Irish independence leader who was deeply influenced by George Washington and the struggle for American independence. He was inspired by the American fight for democracy and self-determination. But after a failed effort to achieve independence, he was captured by the British, as were many others over centuries of struggle.

In his speech, Emmet said:

Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man who knows my motives dare now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them and me rest in obscurity and peace, and my tomb remain uninscribed, and my memory in oblivion, until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the Earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written.

Shortly after giving that speech on September 20, 1803, Robert Emmet was hanged, drawn, and quartered. But Emmet's words lived on. In fact, groups named the Emmet Monument Association were founded in the United States. Their stated purpose was to build a burial monument to Emmet, one that would, of course, include an epitaph.

But because Emmet called for Ireland to be free before his epitaph was written, these groups were actually Fenian freedom organizations. They and other American groups were quite active in the United States for many years all across our Nation. They came before subsequent American roles in the struggle for Irish independence, and their presence played a major role in American political life for many decades.

So I respectfully urge the passage of this bill. It does not require spending funds, and it does not alter the park or the park system. It would basically include the name Robert Emmet Park to a small piece of land where the Emmet statue rests.

Many Americans, as well as our government, have long recognized the significance of the park and statue in keeping alive not just the history of Robert Emmet, but what he stood for. I am glad that continues today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again thank the majority and the minority members of the Natural Resources Committee as well as their staffs. Their support made it possible for this measure to once again be on the floor today.

I would like to thank the hard-working staffs of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service who have taken care of the Emmet statue and park for these many, many years.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1500.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### ESTABLISHING A VISITOR SERVICES FACILITY ON THE ARLINGTON RIDGE TRACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1073) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1073

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DEFINITION.

In this Act, the term “Arlington Ridge tract” means the parcel of Federal land located in Arlington County, Virginia, known as the Nevius Tract and transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1953, that is bounded generally by—

- (1) Arlington Boulevard (United States Route 50) to the north;
- (2) Jefferson Davis Highway (Virginia Route 110) to the east;
- (3) Marshall Drive to the south; and
- (4) North Meade Street to the west.

#### SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF A VISITOR SERVICES FACILITY ON THE ARLINGTON RIDGE TRACT.

Notwithstanding section 2863(g) of Public Law 107–107, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct a structure for visitor services to include a public restroom facility on the Arlington Ridge tract in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1073, brought to us by our Natural Resources Committee colleague Congressman DON BEYER of Virginia, authorizes the National Park Service to construct a visitor services center at the United States Marine Corps Memorial in Arlington, Virginia.

The United States Marine Corps Memorial is one of the emblematic sites of our Nation’s Capital. As a marine, the memorial is especially near and dear to my heart. It represents our Nation’s gratitude and esteem for the Marines and those who have fought beside them.

While the statue depicts the flag raising on Iwo Jima—one of the most iconic events in World War II—the memorial is dedicated to all marines who have given their lives in defense of the United States since 1775.

Each year, the memorial attracts over 1 million visitors and hosts several popular events, including Summer Sunset Parades and the Marine Corps Marathon.

Despite this popularity, the memorial lacks basic visitor services such as permanent restroom facilities. The bill before us authorizes the construction of a visitor services center that includes permanent restroom facilities, thus allowing those visiting our Nation’s Capital to visit and appreciate this grand memorial with increased comfort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 1073, authorizes the National Park Service to construct a visitor services facility that includes a restroom at the U.S. Marine Corps Memorial, also known as the Iwo Jima Memorial. The memorial is located in Arlington, Virginia, adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery, and a short drive from the Pentagon and from here.

This iconic statue of marines raising the flag over Iwo Jima is one of the country’s most recognized memorials—the most recognized memorial in the whole world—and receives a tremendous amount of visitation. Unfortunately, there are no permanent restroom facilities at the site. It goes without saying that this is a major hurdle to visitor comfort, especially given that this is a popular destination of our veterans, not all of whom are able-bodied.

However, once this bill becomes law, the National Park Service will be able to construct a restroom with funds that have already been donated for this purpose. This is in keeping with a broad policy of improving accessibility of all the memorials on and around The National Mall.

This bill is a long time coming. I want to thank my bill cosponsors for their support, Mr. COOK of California and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

I understand that our good friends from the Park Service are watching with excitement and pleasure this afternoon as we take this up on the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1073.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REAUTHORIZING THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1135) to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1135

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM REAUTHORIZED.

Section 507(d)(2) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (54 U.S.C. 302101 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “and each of fiscal years 2018 through 2024.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1430

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 295, introduced by Congressman JAMES CLYBURN from South Carolina, reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

Since 1988, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program has awarded over \$60 million in grants to assist Historically Black Colleges and Universities with needed maintenance and rehabilitation of historic buildings on their campuses. These projects may include repairing damaged masonry, upgrading electrical and plumbing systems, or fixing leaking roofs.

Although the needs of our Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities exceed the amounts authorized by this legislation, future funding provided to this program will help to ensure that the rich history of these campuses remains preserved for future generations.

I urge adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1135 reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program. This program provides grants to revitalize and conserve historic structures at Historically Black Colleges and Universities in Virginia.

I am very proud and grateful of the five HBCUs we have in Virginia: Virginia State, Norfolk State, Hampton University, Virginia Union University, and Virginia University of Lynchburg.

I point out that the Nation's first elected African-American Governor, Douglas L. Wilder, was a graduate of Virginia Union University.

Since the program was first authorized in 1988, as Mr. COOK has said, there has been over \$60 million in grants to help restore iconic structures on many of these college campuses, and two-thirds of this money appropriated has been leveraged to generate matching funds to maximize the impacts of taxpayer dollars. But despite all the progress made with respect to revitalizing these campuses, there is still a lot of work that remains to be done in all 107 HBCUs.

Reauthorization and sustained support for this program is long overdue. So I would like to thank my esteemed colleague from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for all of his hard work and relentlessness to bring this bill to the attention of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as a student and former teacher of history, I have worked during my tenure in Congress to preserve

and protect our Nation's historic treasures.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities, commonly called HBCUs, are some of the most important historic educational institutions in our country. There are over 100 HBCUs in the country, and eight of them are in South Carolina. I proudly represent seven of them and I am a graduate of one.

Many of them have buildings and sites on their campuses that have existed for over a century and are of great historical significance. Unfortunately, many of the historic buildings and sites on these campuses have deteriorated over the years and are at risk of being lost if not preserved and protected.

In 1998, at the behest of the Congressional Black Caucus, the United States Government Accountability Office, the GAO, surveyed 103 HBCU campuses to identify the historically significant sites on these campuses and project the cost of restoring and preserving these properties. The GAO identified 712 historic buildings and sites, and projected a cost of \$755 million to restore and preserve them. Each of these sites has national significance to American history, and I believe we have an obligation to be stewards of these historic treasures.

In 2003, working with our former colleague Jim Hansen of Utah and our current colleague and my dear friend JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee, Congress expanded the program and authorized expenditures of \$10 million annually for 5 years. I have seen the results firsthand. Last year, Allen University rededicated the historic Chappelle Auditorium on its campus in Columbia, South Carolina, which was painstakingly restored thanks to funding from this program. Originally built in 1925, this building was central to the cultural life of African Americans in South Carolina for generations.

In 1947, Reverend Joseph A. DeLaine attended an NAACP event at Chappelle Auditorium that inspired him to organize Black families in Clarendon County to petition their school district to provide buses for Black students who, at the time, were forced to make a daily walk of 9.4 miles to school. That was 9.4 miles to school and 9.4 miles back home.

The legal case that grew from this petition, *Briggs v. Elliott*, precipitated the frontal attack on segregation in the country and was later combined with four other cases that became *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, at the Supreme Court. Overturning the separate-but-equal fallacy, *Brown* ended legal segregation throughout America.

This is just a singular example of the history living on HBCU campuses. Because of our past efforts, historic buildings and sites at 59 HBCUs in 20 States

have received funding from this program. However, many historic structures are still endangered.

Consequently, in the omnibus appropriations bill for 2017, which passed earlier this year, Congress included \$4 million for HBCU Historic Preservation so that we could continue this progress.

Last year, the House passed this bill unanimously, but it was not taken up by the Senate. I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for supporting it again today. This bill is supported by the United Negro College Fund, the Thurgood Marshall College Fund, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The HBCU Historic Preservation program serves as an essential purpose to HBCUs, which have a special place in the fabric of American history, culture, and education. Countless individuals have worked tirelessly to cultivate HBCUs, and their legacy is seen in graduates whose achievements adorn the pages of American history. From Booker T. Washington, to Mary McLeod Bethune, W.E.B. DuBois, to Martin Luther King, Jr., HBCU visionaries and graduates have set powerful examples of leadership.

The legacy of HBCUs is one of significant courage and steadfast determination. The structures on these campuses across the country are living testaments to African-American history, and they deserve to be stabilized and restored. HBCUs are among America's national treasures that must be preserved and protected for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this needed legislation.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a distinguished Member of Congress.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the HBCU Historic Preservation program. There are ten HBCUs in North Carolina. The Johnson C. Smith University is in my district.

I am pleased to see strong bipartisan support that recognizes how integral Historically Black Colleges and Universities are to our Nation.

I am a proud graduate twice of North Carolina A&T, a retired 40-year professor at Bennett College—both HBCUs in Greensboro.

Most of the structures that this program will help preserve date back to the founding of these schools, most founded in the 19th century. These structures teach us about the lengths that African Americans went through to be educated and to fight for their place in American society.



They also provide important lessons for today, reminding us of how far we have come as a society and how these structures were once built to cope with Jim Crow America but now are used to educate our future lawyers, doctors, and politicians.

They also remind us of how far we have to go, how we must continue to address the numerous inequities HBCUs face compared to other universities when it comes to educating the next generation.

Funding from this program finances repairs that schools with large endowments take for granted, repairs from water damage, asbestos, lead paint, improvements to heating and ventilation systems, and increased physical accessibility for the disabled.

The program helps modernize HBCU campuses, creating a suitable environment for learning and achievement, while allowing these institutions to attract prospective students who deserve an education.

W.E.B. DuBois reminded us: Of all of the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought for for 500 years, but the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this program is necessary to update HBCU infrastructure and maintain their competitive edge as institutions of higher learning supporting that fundamental right.

The President has said these schools are a priority for his administration. They are absolutely a priority for me as well as for my colleagues of the CBC and the bipartisan HBCU Caucus. So passing it proves that Congress can come together to achieve something substantial for these schools and continue the conversation surrounding HBCUs.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend Congressman JIM CLYBURN's bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

I have known JIM CLYBURN for more than 35 years, and this has been his passion ever since I first met him many years ago. I thank Mr. CLYBURN for his passion and his leadership on this issue.

Since 1988, the HBCU Historic Preservation program has provided more than \$60 million to HBCUs all across the country to support infrastructure and facilitate learning.

Both my undergraduate and law school alma mater, North Carolina Central University in Durham, an institution that I am now proud to represent in Congress, has greatly benefited from the program.

And I might say that my father graduated from Shaw University, which is an HBCU, and later from Meharry Medical College. My mother attended high school at Shaw University and graduated from college at Hampton Institute, now called Hampton University.

Mr. Speaker, HBCUs fill a unique and important role in our Nation's higher education system and in our country's narrative. Not only do HBCUs train our workforce of the future by producing the most African-American students who can earn science and engineering doctoral degrees, they are integral parts of our national identity.

The more than 100 HBCUs spread across the country house the books and the memorabilia from freedmen and former slaves dating back many years.

Many of the historic buildings on the campuses of HBCUs were used as meeting places during reconstruction and during the civil rights movement.

HBCUs represent the past, the here and the now, and the future of our country. By reauthorizing this important program through 2024, we can honor the many important faculty and students that have helped HBCUs endure, support people at those institutions today, and prepare our workforce for the future.

I strongly support this bill. I commend my dear colleague, Congressman JIM CLYBURN, for his enormous leadership on this important issue. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

□ 1445

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1135, to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

I am so grateful to Congressman CLYBURN for his leadership over the years to strengthen and protect the Historic Preservation program on behalf of our Nation's HBCUs. He has been a tireless advocate on behalf of historic preservation of HBCUs, and I am honored today to join him in this effort. Mr. CLYBURN has worked tirelessly during his time in Congress to preserve and protect our Nation's historic treasures and the legacies of those who came before us.

Many of us have HBCUs in our district. They represent a steep history of student activism in the civil rights movement. Many of the buildings, sites, and historic records that exist on these campuses have existed for over a century and a half. In 1998, as a matter of fact, the GAO found that there were

712 historic buildings and sites on HBCU campuses. If we do not do more to protect and preserve the vestiges that remain, we will surely lose this important history.

Tuskegee University is one university in my home State of Alabama, where Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, and the Tuskegee Airmen all made their place in our Nation's history.

Stillman College; Selma University; Concordia College; Miles College; Talladega College; Alabama A&M University; and Alabama State University, where my mother and father graduated, are Historically Black Colleges in the State of Alabama.

At Talladega College, these funds were used to restore Foster Hall, which was erected for girls and teachers in 1869, and is the oldest dorm on that campus. This program has helped so many HBCUs in my State. The buildings were nearly destroyed 5 years ago, but the funds from the historic program were used to restore the buildings on Talladega's campus.

When I think about my own district, the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, at Miles College in Birmingham, students were leaders in the civil rights movement and led a selective buying campaign at local department stores and major retailers in 1963.

Congress has recognized that we have a responsibility to be stewards of these great national resources since we first enacted grants to HBCUs for historic preservation in 1996. The program was then expanded in 2003, thanks to Mr. CLYBURN and others. Historical buildings and sites at more than 60 HBCUs have benefited.

If we continue making investments in this program, we can meet the dire historic preservation and restoration needs that remain at these threatened sites. We must not only know our history, but we must also protect our history.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to continue this important work by voting for this bill today to reauthorize the HBCU Historic Preservation program through 2024.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a graduate of the University of Virginia School of Law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager of this legislation, the cosponsors, Mr. CLYBURN, and so many others who have been part of this historic legislation for their leadership on it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the bipartisan Congressional HBCU Caucus and as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1135.

H.R. 1135 would authorize the appropriation of millions of dollars from 2018 through 2024 to the Historic Preservation Fund to provide assistance for the



restoration and preservation of historic structures at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Let me indicate that this has been a long journey. The reauthorization is very special and emotional to many of us. As many of us know, Historically Black Colleges and Universities came at the wake of the ending of slavery and were a place of refuge for so many students.

I am reminded of those individuals who, as freed slaves, told stories of walking miles to be able to get to a school like Fisk University or to a school for so many in North Carolina and South Carolina or all throughout the South. They were great refuges for individuals who wanted a better life.

It is important to note that in the 1980s, the National Park Service awarded more than \$65 million. These grants require you to cover 30 percent of the project. So it is not a handout. It is a hand-up. It is preserving the history of this great Nation.

I am very grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus. When the question is asked, "What is the Congressional Black Caucus and what do we do," I will say without shame that we are the conscience of this Nation and we recognize that we have a responsibility to protect the vulnerable things of this Nation, whether it be people or things.

So the idea was to make sure that not only students have a brilliant education, but those who would seek knowledge will be able to come to the campuses of these Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

I happen to represent two State schools: Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M. There are many HBCUs throughout the State of Texas. We are grateful for the leadership that they have given. They have history.

Soon I will be establishing what we call the Emancipation Trail, which chronicles the announcement of freedom in Texas. It was called Juneteenth. It was 2 years that some learned about their freedom after everyone else was free.

Those stories are being told at the HBCUs, but at the same time, STEM education is being taught. Oakwood College, a historically Black college of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, educates huge numbers of doctors. I am told it has the largest number of African Americans that go into medical school.

STEM is very important to our HBCUs. Texas Southern University has a renowned homeland security program.

This is a good bill, and I thank my colleagues for voting for this very right and positive bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Bipartisan Congressional HBCU Caucus and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1135, which reauthorizes the Historically Black

Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program.

H.R. 1135 would authorize the appropriation of \$10 million annually from 2018 through 2024 for the Historic Preservation Fund to provide assistance for the restoration and preservation of historic structures at Historical Black Colleges (HBCUs).

Specifically, H.R. 1135, reauthorizes \$10 million in annual appropriations for the National Park Service grant program supporting the preservation of historic buildings on the campuses of historically black colleges and universities.

Since the 1980s, the National Park Service (NPS) has awarded more than \$65 million to more than 80 HBCUs to repair historic buildings on their campuses.

To be eligible for grants under the program, recipients have to cover 30 percent of the cost of a project.

Eligible projects include stabilization, masonry repair, removing lead paint or other hazards, and the improvement of access for the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Preservation Program exists to preserve, and stabilize historic structures on HBCU campuses through projects such as structural stabilization, masonry repair, replacement of antiquated electrical and plumbing systems, abating environmental hazards such as asbestos, ameliorating termite damage, and replacing leaking roofs.

The HBCU preservation project is critically important because much of the history of African Americans has been lost due to it not being considered important enough by historians to study and the fact that many of the repositories of that history—black churches—have been destroyed by arson.

I thank and my colleague, Assistant Democratic Leader JAMES CLYBURN for his work in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that one of the greatest HBCUs in the country, Texas Southern University, is located in my congressional district.

Texas Southern University has a rich history with nine academic units, 1,000 dedicated staff members, and over 9,200 esteemed students.

Like most of my HBCU Caucus colleagues, I have worked closely with my local HBCU to provide funding and resources needed to enable them to fulfill their mission of educating the next generation of social engineers and conducting research programs addressing issues of major concern to the African American community.

I was proud to spearhead the initiative that brought more than \$13 million in financial aid relief for the students and campus of Texas Southern University.

I also worked with TSU administrators to initiate digital archive projects to preserve the records of two of its most distinguished alumni, the legendary Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland, both of whom preceded me as the Member of Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

I was pleased to facilitate a partnership between Comcast and TSU's School of Communication to provide scholarships and internships to TSU students and in-kind marketing services to the university.

I helped secure funding needed to establish the Center for Transportation, Training and Research in the TSU College of Science, Engineering, and Technology.

HBCU's have played a critical role in American history.

As the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. stated:

The function of education is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically. Intelligence plus character—that is the goal of true education.

HBCUs do not just educate—HBCUs have and will continue to fill an important role in education opportunity and engagement for millions of young people from diverse backgrounds.

I ask my colleagues to support reauthorization of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program by joining me in voting to pass H.R. 1135.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1135.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1967) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1967

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act".*

### SEC. 2. AUTHORITY FOR PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT UTILIZING MULTIPLE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION RESERVOIRS.

*Section 9(c)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)(1)) is amended by inserting "and pumped storage hydropower development exclusively utilizing Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs" after "including small conduit hydropower development".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), a valuable member of the Committee on Natural Resources, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to consider a bill that aims to remove barriers to improve our Nation's water and power infrastructure.

Just last Thursday, the House passed a bill designating the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency when it comes to permitting new and expanded water storage projects. Today, the bill before us seeks to clear up regulatory confusion over the development of new pumped storage hydropower.

Hydropower can and should be part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy now and well into the future. It is a reliable and emissions-free source of electricity that accounts for a majority of the Nation's total renewable electricity generation.

In my home State of Colorado, we have over 60 operating hydropower facilities that generate more than 1,100 megawatts, including new projects such as Carter Lake, South Canal, and Ridgway Reservoir. However, as is the case nationwide, there is potential for new hydropower generation in Colorado.

My bill, the Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act, H.R. 1967, looks to pave the way for additional clean hydropower generation by clearing up regulatory permitting confusion at existing Bureau of Reclamation facilities.

We worked with our colleague from central Washington State, Mr. NEWHOUSE, on this bill. His interest stems from a real-life example of where it is unclear whether the Bureau of Reclamation or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have permitting jurisdiction on pumped storage hydropower projects at the Columbia Basin Project.

The project's proponents want to build a project that pumps water to and from two of the project's reservoirs for hydroelectric generation. But because of potential dual permitting requirements, there have been serious delays in bringing this potential 500 megawatt project online.

Similar to a public law authored in 2013 by our committee colleague and fellow Coloradan, SCOTT TIPTON, that cleared up confusion on the Bureau of Reclamation's pipes and canals, my bill makes it clear that the Bureau of

Reclamation is the lead agency that will oversee pumped storage development for projects exclusively utilizing the agency's facilities.

The regulatory clarification in my bill will help pave the way for more pumped storage by incentivizing developers who will, in turn, pay the American taxpayers for the use of Federal facilities.

In a hearing earlier this spring of the Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee, which I chair, even our friends on the other side of the aisle agreed that we should be doing all we can to incentivize clean, renewable hydropower generation at existing Federal facilities. That is why this bill was passed by the House Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent in April.

I urge my House colleagues to join me in promoting clean, renewable hydropower generation as part of our Nation's all-of-the-above energy strategy by supporting this bill, the Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1967 would amend the permitting process for pumped storage hydropower projects utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs.

Currently, hydropower projects involving Reclamation facilities are subject to either the FERC permitting process or the Reclamation permitting process, based on whether a Reclamation facility was originally authorized for hydropower development.

The unique nature of pumped storage projects, which require the use of multiple separate reservoirs, can mean that a single proposed project can be subject to both Reclamation and FERC's permitting processes, since different reservoirs are under different agency jurisdiction.

If enacted, H.R. 1967 would subject pumped storage projects using multiple Reclamation reservoirs to just the Reclamation permitting process instead of the process for both Reclamation and FERC.

Like FERC, Reclamation's permitting project requires authorized pumped storage projects to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and other statutory requirements.

While I believe that H.R. 1967 is a commonsense bill and I support its passage, I also support ongoing efforts to incorporate feedback from the Colville Tribe in Washington State as this bill advances to the Senate and proceeds through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I had the remarkable opportunity to live in Switzerland for 4 years, and hiked and climbed many of the Alps. It was fascinating to see the high-altitude dams that made hydro-

power the dominant form of power in the country. Eighty percent of all electricity was hydropower or nuclear.

I thank my good friend, Congressman LAMBORN from Colorado Springs, for his leadership on this issue. I encourage unanimous passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as this Chamber considers H.R. 1967, the "Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act," I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in north central Washington. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project's potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, as this chamber considers H.R. 1967, the "Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act," I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related to a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in north central Washington. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project's potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1967, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

# REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION'S PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res 397) solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 397

Whereas more than 250,000 Americans died in the Second World War to liberate Europe from the scourge of genocidal fascism;

Whereas in the wake of the cataclysm of the Second World War, the United States, Canada, and European partners founded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Washington in 1949;

Whereas the foundation of NATO is collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty which states that, "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.";

Whereas NATO is one of the most successful military alliances in history, deterring the outbreak of another world war, protecting the territorial integrity of its members, and seeing the Cold War through to a peaceful conclusion;

Whereas Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty has only been invoked once in history when alliance members came to the aid of the United States following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas NATO allies and partners, including Canada and countries in Central, Eastern, and Northern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe;

Whereas NATO remains the foundation of United States foreign policy of promoting a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace;

Whereas at the Wales Summit in 2014, NATO leaders agreed that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation's gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

Whereas multiple Presidents have reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to the collective defense guarantees in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) solemnly reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty;

(2) strongly supports the decision at the NATO Wales Summit in 2014 that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation's gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

(3) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally; and

(4) welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO Alliance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Speaker RYAN and Minority Leader PELOSI. I want to thank Leader MCCARTHY and Minority Whip HOYER for their leadership on this important resolution and, of course, Ranking Member ENGEL, who has also been a strong supporter of the NATO alliance.

Mr. Speaker, in 1949, 12 free, democratic nations bound themselves together in an unprecedented defense alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These founding members acted in the aftermath of the Second World War to promote peace in Europe, to promote their freedom, and to face the threats they saw emerging on the horizon. Now, more than six decades later, this alliance has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security, and it has attracted other freedom-loving democratic nations to join its ranks.

Of course, article 5's principle of collective defense has been key to the success of the alliance, and we will not forget how the United States has benefited from that principle as NATO members unanimously elected to come to our support after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyber attacks, nonconventional attacks by terrorist groups against our people, these are threats that NATO's founders could not have anticipated, yet they are the challenges that we must act now to address. We are stronger, no question, when we act together.

Now, Moscow's strategic objective is to break apart the NATO alliance to boost Russian geopolitical influence in Western Europe. In light of this, it is even more important that NATO members meet the standard of investing 2 percent of their GDP on defense. We appreciate the few who already meet the minimum requirement: Estonia, Greece, Poland, and the U.K. At the administration's urging, others have stepped up their game, such as Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania, but others have further to go.

This resolution calls on NATO members to meet these commitments while also reaffirming our commitment to NATO and to the article 5 provision for collective defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure. Let me start by thanking the leaders on both sides of the aisle who worked to bring this measure forward: Speaker RYAN and Leader PELOSI; the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY; the minority whip, Mr. HOYER; and my friend from California (Mr. ROYCE), our chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, NATO has been the most effective alliance of the 20th and 21st centuries. It stood as a bulwark against communist aggression during the Cold War. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, it has played a critical role in building an integrated Europe that is whole, free, and at peace.

At the heart of the alliance is the value enshrined in article 5: An attack on any ally is an attack on all allies. That commitment has been so strong across the decades, that the alliance never once invoked article 5 during the long standoff between East and West during the Cold War.

In fact, article 5 has only been invoked one time in NATO's history, when the ruins of the World Trade Center were smoldering in New York City as the world rallied around the United States. After the attacks of September 11, 2001, NATO allies did what we always knew they would: they said the attack on us was an attack on all of them as well. Since then, for nearly 16 years, American troops have fought and shed blood and died alongside men and women serving in the uniforms of our NATO allies.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't a commitment we as Americans can take lightly. While I am glad President Trump finally affirmed the commitment of the United States to article 5, I think it is important for Congress to do it as well.

The administration's hot-and-cold approach to the alliance caused a lot of unneeded heartburn for our allies and caused even the best of friends to question our commitment.

NATO is not a thing that can just be thrown in with everything else. It is very important to us, and we should allow our allies to meet their commitments laid out at the NATO summit in Wales. It is very important that we do that.

Right now, especially, we need to be clear on our commitment to NATO. The danger that Russia poses to the alliance, to Western democracy and an integrated, unified Europe, is the greatest test in a generation. If there are cracks in the surface, you can bet that Vladimir Putin will do all he can to exploit them. Fracturing Western unity is his top goal, and the United States needs to be strong in our commitment to NATO.

Today, the House is saying we will not waver. We are sending a message to our allies and partners and to Moscow that a wager against NATO is a losing bet. I would like to see the House take an even tougher stance against Moscow and immediately pass the Senate's Russia sanctions bill. This legislation won overwhelmingly bipartisan support in the other body, and I am confident we could act on it swiftly in the House.

With this measure today, we are saying with one voice that article 5 is sacred, that NATO is strong, and the resolve of the United States and our allies won't be weakened by a bully sitting in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our esteemed chairman as well as the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Speaker RYAN's measure which reaffirms America's commitment to NATO, article 5 and the principle of collective defense.

Like my colleagues, I believe that NATO has been indispensable in deterring another world war and in protecting our values and ideals. It is our commitment to each other and to those ideals that have made our alliance so strong, so effective. It is that commitment to each other that has enhanced the territorial security and stability of each one of us.

Let us not forget that it was following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 that NATO invoked article 5 for the only time in its history, coming to the defense of us, the United States. This was a signal of unity, of strength, and that is what makes article 5 so special.

I also appreciate the pledges of our alliance members to share the burden of the cost of our mutual defense by aiming to spend at least 2 percent of their GDP on defense by the year 2024.

That is so important, Mr. Speaker, because NATO's role over the years has evolved. We are no longer facing just the threat of communist aggression; we are facing a multitude of threats against our mutual national security interests around the globe, and we need to be prepared for whatever comes our way.

I am pleased to reiterate my support for Speaker RYAN's resolution. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to NATO and to the principle of collective defense. It is ever so important in these dangerous times.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was in Brussels, and we met with NATO officials on a code led by the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on the committee, as well as the bipartisan nature of this legislation that Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL are bringing to the floor. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished former chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan resolution reassures our friends, it rebuffs our foes, and it reminds the world that America's commitment to NATO's common defense pledge is ironclad.

When President Truman signed the NATO Treaty nearly 70 years ago, he called the alliance, "a long step toward permanent peace in the whole world."

NATO has guaranteed the security of the American people and our allies for decades. Now some people don't remember what those decades were like, fighting the threat of communism. Article 5, the collective defense provision, is the core of that security guarantee.

Article 5, as the gentlewoman just mentioned, was invoked only once: when America's allies joined in the fight against al-Qaida after the September 11 terrorist attacks on our country.

I, like many of my colleagues, have traveled to Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places and seen that our NATO partners have shed blood in the name of article 5 in our common fight against terrorism.

Our commitment to article 5 is a commitment to brave men and women across the world who risk and give their lives for the NATO alliance. Previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have strongly and unambiguously stood by NATO and article 5.

I was very sad, I will be very honest with you, my colleagues, when meeting with NATO leaders at the alliance's headquarters in Brussels, a building dedicated to the victims of the 9/11 attacks, President Trump refused to

clearly and unequivocally reassure our NATO partners that he would honor article 5.

We in this Congress of the United States, acting in a bipartisan way, want to remove all doubt that the U.S. commitment to the principles of a mutual defense embodied by NATO are ironclad. I keep using that word. Every day, Putin searches for cracks in our NATO alliance. We must convey to him that this alliance is ironclad.

And now, just on another related subject, it is about our national security. While we are glad to be passing this resolution affirming America's commitment to article 5, the bipartisan bill sanctioning Russia languishes in the House. While the White House caters to Putin, Congress must hold Russia accountable for its actions by passing the Iran-Russia sanctions bill. It passed the Senate 98-2—98-2—strong bipartisan support for a bill that contained the Iran and Russia sanctions.

We can't go home for the Fourth of July without passing that legislation. It is my understanding it was just a blue slip problem that could be easily resolved. That is how it was characterized when the President of Ukraine said to us that they really need the Russian sanctions enforced and strengthened.

Let us have the courage to stand up to those who menace the free world and stand by our partners in support of a peaceful, democratic, and free future for all.

What we are doing today is very important. It is not just about a bill. It is not just about an agreement. It is about values. It is about security as a value, something we take an oath to protect and defend. This NATO agreement helps us do that, but we must also do what flows from it and say to the Russians, who are the point of NATO, you are going to have sanctions because of your aggression in Eastern Europe, and at the same time send that message to the Iranians.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a very strong unanimous vote for this. This is something so bipartisan, so wonderful. It is a good day. It is a good bill. It gives us all hope.

I urge our colleagues to vote "aye" and call upon the Speaker to bring the other bill to the floor. I hope our distinguished chair and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will be able to be part of bringing it to the floor very soon.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the distinguished ranking member, and I thank my friend Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the committee, for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 397, reaffirming the commitment of the United States to NATO's

principle of collective defense as enumerated in article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

□ 1515

As the head of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and as rapporteur for the Transatlantic Subcommittee, I can attest to the anxiety within NATO regarding the administration's commitment to the alliance.

Case in point, one cannot talk about the U.S. commitment to article 5 in 2017 without mentioning President Trump's failure to embrace it in full view of our NATO allies when he was in Brussels earlier this year. It has been widely reported that even the President's own national security team was blindsided by the omission.

I welcome this resolution, but it would have made a stronger statement to bring it to the floor immediately after the President's disconcerting speech in Brussels. This resolution maybe is less a profile in courage as it is a sigh of relief.

Since the House failed the leadership test on this account, let's redeem ourselves by taking up the Engel-Connolly bill on Russian's sanctions, and the Iran-Russia sanctions package recently passed in the Senate by 98-2, and send it to the President's desk for signature.

Any delay only furthers the trend of obsequiousness to the executive branch and enables this administration's disastrous retreat from global leadership.

I am proud to support this resolution, I am glad it is on the floor, and I hope it is an auger of things to come.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE for their leadership.

Like my colleague, who just spoke, over the last 4 years, I have been privileged to help represent the United States at the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow a line from a very well-known poet who said, "No man is an island," recognizing that human beings do not thrive when isolated from others, a concept that is recognized by all religions.

This is more true than ever as our world becomes increasingly dangerous. And, more than ever, the United States of America needs friends to stand strong and stand up for our mutual democratic values.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution, committing the United States to NATO article 5 collective defense.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, who is an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for their leadership. I also want to thank Mr. MCCARTHY, Speaker RYAN, and Leader PELOSI for their strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Brussels over the Memorial Day break. We met in Brussels with the NATO leaders. The Deputy Secretary General was there, and we spoke about the confidence that our European allies had, and needed, for the continuing viability of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and our commitment to the mutual defense of the members of NATO.

That has been for 70 years the critical—over 70 years, really—the critical stability that we have seen in the European Plain, and it needs to continue to be.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor this resolution, which reaffirms our Nation's commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's article 5 and the common defense among our NATO allies.

For 70 years, as I said, NATO has kept the peace in Europe and around the world. Now, that does not mean that we have had peace everywhere in the world, but it does mean that we have not had world conflagration, as we saw in the last century.

From the Cuban Missile Crisis to the fall of the Iron Curtain, NATO's unity in the face of common threats has helped prevent a direct Soviet attack against America and against our allies.

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has been adapting to meet threats new and old. Together, NATO members have served on the ground in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and enlargement has made the allegiance even stronger.

Now, with Russia once again putting forward an aggressive posture to its neighbors and the world—in addition to visiting Bosnia, we also went to Lithuania and to Estonia, and I visited Denmark, as well—there is no doubt that the neighbors of Russia feel a pressure that has, over the last 15 years, not been as present. NATO's common defense commitment is as vital to global security and America's security as it has ever been.

We know that Russia interfered with our elections and has used cyber attacks against our NATO allies to subvert their democratic institutions as well. Estonia, in particular, has developed, and is developing, defenses to cyber attacks.

We, the United States, the leader of the free world, must make it clear, unequivocally so, both to Vladimir Putin and to our NATO allies, that the United States stands firmly by its com-

mitment to the alliance and its collective defense.

It has only been once that article 5 has been implicated, and that was after 9/11, when all of our European allies in NATO said that an attack on the United States was perceived as an attack on them, and they pledged their unity and alliance and action. An attack on one is an attack on all—an attack on democracy, on freedom, on the values that this country and our NATO allies stand for.

It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues to join us in giving this resolution—it says here on this text—a strong vote of passage. More than that, I hope this is a unanimous vote of passage. This is the expression of the leader of the free world that we will not only lead, but we will act.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we should be clear that Vladimir Putin is testing us. He attacked our democracy in last year's election, he is working to create divisions among our allies, and he would love nothing more than to see NATO fail.

If the United States offers anything less than our full-throated support for the alliance, and our ironclad commitments to article 5, Moscow will see that as an invitation to undercut transatlantic unity and fracture our critical bond with Europe.

I am glad the House is coming together to ensure that it doesn't happen. I hope we can continue to work in a bipartisan way to shore up our alliances and push back on Russian aggression. This is a real threat. Russia is not our ally.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this measure, and I urge all Members to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of this resolution, I also want to thank the other coauthors, including STEVE COHEN of Tennessee, who has been a leader on NATO issues.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say, for the advancement of our own security, the promotion of our values, and a strong statement of support for our friends and allies, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 397, a resolution that reaffirms the United States' commitment to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and its principle of collective defense.

In the aftermath of World War II, the greatest conflict in human history, the United States, Canada, and their Western Europe allies founded the North American Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 in Washington.

Founded on the principle of collective defense, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that, "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

In the 68 years since the Treaty's ratification, Article 5 has only been invoked once, following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, when NATO members came to the aid of the United States.

NATO sent seven planes with 830 crewmen from 13 countries to protect American skies until May 2002, marking the first time in American history that the continental United States was protected by foreign forces.

NATO allies and partners have stood with the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the world.

Until this year, every American president since the treaty's signing in 1949—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama—has publicly reaffirmed the American commitment to Article 5.

American presidents have affirmed this nation's commitment to come to the aid of any NATO member that is under attack.

That is the symbolic meaning of the immortal words spoken by President Kennedy in West Berlin at the Brandenburg Gate in 1963: "Ich bin ein Berliner."

Mr. Speaker, the principle of collective defense is the core of NATO's founding treaty and the NATO alliance has been the backbone of American national security and foreign policy for nearly 70 years.

The strength and solidarity of this western alliance kept Western Europe whole, prosperous, and free and paved the way for the collapse of the Soviet Union and the liberation of the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, many of which have now been integrated into NATO.

The Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war, but Article 5 does not increase the chance of war.

Rather, NATO is a bulwark against the outbreak of war because it deters aggression by any adversary.

As a result, NATO is the most successful military alliance in world history, successfully deterring the outbreak of a third world war, seeing the Cold War to a victorious conclusion, and protecting the principle of territorial integrity.

This is why I strongly support H. Res. 397, which reaffirms the commitment of the People's House to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The resolution also expresses support for the agreement reached at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit calling upon each NATO member nation to allocate at least two percent of its gross domestic product to defense by 2024.

The resolution also condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally and welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO alliance.

I urge all Members to join me in affirming the commitment of the United States to Article

5 of the North Atlantic Treaty for this important resolution by voting for H. Res. 397.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND PERSECUTION IN CHECHNYA

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 351) condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 351

Whereas, on April 1, 2017, the Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta reported that authorities in Chechnya, a republic of the Russian Federation, had abducted, detained, and tortured over 100 men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas multiple independent and first-hand accounts have subsequently corroborated the Novaya Gazeta report, and describe a campaign of persecution by Chechen officials against men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas, as a result of this persecution, at least three deaths have been reported and many individuals have been forced to flee Chechnya;

Whereas Chechen officials have denied the existence of such persecution, including through a statement by the spokesman for Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov that "You cannot arrest or repress people who don't exist in the republic.;"

Whereas the same spokesman for Ramzan Kadyrov has also stated that "If such people existed in Chechnya, law enforcement would not have to worry about them, as their own relatives would have sent them to where they could never return," and credible reports indicate that Chechen authorities have encouraged families to carry out so-called "honor killings" of relatives due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas Chechnya is a constituent republic of the Russian Federation and subject to its laws, and Ramzan Kadyrov was installed as the leader of Chechnya by Russian President Vladimir Putin;

Whereas Chechen authorities have a long history of violating the fundamental human rights of their citizens, including through extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, and torture of government critics;

Whereas Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov dismissed reports of persecution in Chechnya and termed them "phantom complaints";

Whereas Russia's Human Rights Ombudsman, Tatyana Moskalkova, has also claimed

that such reports should not be believed because formal complaints have not been registered with the appropriate authorities;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and thus has agreed to guarantee the fundamental human rights of all of its citizens;

Whereas, on April 7, 2017, the United States Department of State issued a statement saying "We categorically condemn the persecution of individuals based on their sexual orientation" and urging the Government of the Russian Federation to take steps to ensure the release of all those wrongfully detained in Chechnya, and to conduct a credible investigation of the reports; and

Whereas, on April 17, 2017, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley issued a statement saying "Chechen authorities must immediately investigate these allegations, hold anyone involved accountable, and take steps to prevent future abuses. We are against all forms of discrimination, including against people based on sexual orientation. When left unchecked, discrimination and human rights abuses can lead to destabilization and conflict.": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violence and persecution in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease the abduction, detention, and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(3) calls on the United States Government to continue to condemn the violence and persecution in Chechnya, demand the release of individuals wrongfully detained, and identify those individuals whose involvement in this violence qualifies for the imposition of sanctions under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) or the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Public Law 114-328); and

(4) affirms that the rights to freedom of assembly, association, and expression and freedom from extrajudicial detention and violence are universal human rights that apply to all persons, and that countries that fail to respect these rights jeopardize the security and prosperity of all their citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.



Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the ruler of Chechnya, Ramzan Kadyrov, rules a dictatorship of medieval brutality. Those who challenge or simply displease him often disappear in that country, or they are murdered outright.

His latest campaign of persecution is aimed at gay men and women, and those perceived to be gay, who have been abducted, tortured, and even killed, with many others that are forced to flee the country. When the Russian newspaper, *Novaya Gazeta*, reported these atrocities, his spokesmen dismissed the accusations, saying that such people “don’t even exist in the republic,” and then threatened the journalists who brought the story to light.

Caught unaware by the unexpected publicity, Chechen authorities have choked off independent sources of information. We do not know the exact status of this campaign or its many victims, but there is no doubt that the situation there for sexual minorities in general has long been, and remains, oppressive.

Disturbing reports indicate that Kadyrov has now turned his focus from abducting and torturing gay men and women to pressuring their families to murder them through so-called honor killings of these men and women. This is despicable.

Vladimir Putin deserves some of the blame here. Chechnya is a constituent republic of the Russian Federation, of which he is the President. As such, he has a sworn responsibility to ensure that the Russian Constitution is fully implemented, which, at least on paper, professes to guarantee basic rights for all citizens. Russia is also a signatory to many international agreements that formally commit it to protecting a broad array of human rights.

Yet the Russian Government’s response has been largely dismissive, if not two-faced. Kremlin spokesmen have called the reports phantom complaints, yet also recommended that victims report grievances to the Chechen authorities accused of carrying out the attacks. And, of course, there has been no criticism of Kadyrov in the Russian state-controlled media—barely even a mention of the issue.

That is why this resolution is of such importance. By shining a light on these crimes in this dark corner, we seek to give hope to those who otherwise may have none at all. And we say unequivocally, to Kadyrov, and to Putin, that these atrocities are in plain view, and that their cowardly and evasive responses are not fooling anyone.

I want to thank Chairman Emeritus ROS-LEHTINEN, the author of this resolution, and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. Let me first thank my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, particularly Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida, and Mr. CICILLINE from Rhode Island, for their work on this measure, and for their leadership supporting LGBT communities around the world. I also thank Chairman ROYCE for support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, day after day, we hear new reports of abuse of LGBT individuals in Chechnya. This spring, authorities rounded up hundreds of gay men. Some were tortured, some were murdered. Reports from civil society and activists tell us that Chechen authorities have rounded up LGBT individuals, beaten them, tortured them with electric shocks, and outed them to their families in the perverse hope of provoking so-called “honor killings.” This is horrific.

Let’s not forget that Chechnya is part of Russia, as the chairman said. These crimes—this disregard for human rights and human dignity lie at the feet of Vladimir Putin and his crony in Chechnya, Ramzan Kadyrov.

No one anywhere should face violence, persecution, or death because of who they love. “Gay rights are human rights, and human rights are gay rights,” as Hillary Clinton said when she was Secretary of State. But under Putin’s rule, those rights are a myth.

So I was disappointed when Secretary Tillerson testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee about whether those atrocities were on the agenda with his Russian counterparts. “These are on the pending list,” he told us.

The United States should never put basic human rights on the “pending list.” Unless we shed a light on these abuses and demand that they be stopped, we are betraying our most fundamental values. So today I am glad the House, in a bipartisan way, is speaking out to condemn this violence and persecution, to stand up for the freedoms of assembly and expression, and to say that we believe that LGBT rights are human rights that must be protected around the world.

I am glad to support this measure. Again, I thank Chairman ED ROYCE, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and DAVID CICILLINE.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, of course, the author of this measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank, as always, our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE from California, as well as Mr. ENGEL from New York, who

really run our committee in the most fair, bipartisan way possible.

I think that our committee is an example for the rest of the House. But I am so grateful to have worked alongside my chairman and ranking member, and all of the colleagues in the House Foreign Affairs Committee in a bipartisan manner; particularly, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. LOWENTHAL, in introducing and bringing to the floor this important resolution, H. Res. 351, Condemning the Violence and Persecution in Chechnya.

Since early April, there have been credible reports that gay or perceived-to-be-gay men in the Russian republic of Chechnya have been rounded up, have been detained, have been put into prison camps by the authorities of Chechnya. And according to international human rights groups and activists on the ground, the situation has rapidly escalated. Despite the international attention and the rage, the beatings and torture did not stop. Men continued to be tortured on a daily basis, and, allegedly, at least 20 men have been killed.

The latest reports indicate that lesbians are also being targeted now. This government campaign targeting LGBT individuals is also inciting “honor killings.” Families are being threatened and act out of fear of also being persecuted. This is appalling.

Putin has given free rein to the Chechen leader and has significant influence over what goes on in Chechnya. Let’s not forget Russia’s deplorable human rights record of silencing religious minorities, of prohibiting freedom of expression, of restricting free association of LGBT individuals. This is Russia’s record. It is Chechnya’s as well.

Nothing has been done. No perpetrators have been brought to justice. This is why it is up to us in the United States to not sit idly by while this state-sponsored persecution is ongoing. This bipartisan resolution, Mr. Speaker, does not only shed light on this dreadful human rights disaster, but it also calls on the officials of Chechnya to immediately put an end to the abduction and violence of individuals based on their real or perceived sexual orientation.

It calls on Putin to uphold the international commitments and protect the human rights of all people upon which Russia has entered. They have signed these commitments, yet they don’t fulfill them. It holds accountable those individuals in the attacks who will also be sanctioned under two existing U.S. sanctions laws that we have passed: Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act and the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act.

Today, this body has the ability to once again be that strong voice for human rights of all individuals and to



send a clear message to any oppressor that the United States will not turn a blind eye against violence, harassment, and discrimination, no matter where it happens.

As a country, we have the responsibility to promote our deeply cherished American values and reaffirm our commitment to fundamental freedom, especially for those who live under the shadow of oppression and tyranny. We stand in solidarity with the persecuted, with the religious minorities, with the ethnic groups, with the suppressed women, and, in this case, with the LGBT community, because the respect of human rights of all people remains a U.S. foreign policy priority.

I thank my colleagues for their overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle who have supported this important resolution, which sends a unified message that the United States is committed to promoting human rights and that this crisis must end now because this matter is not just an LGBT issue—as important as it is—it is a human life matter and it deserves support from all of us.

Everyone deserves dignity. Everyone deserves respect in the place they call home, no matter where that is around the world. It is time to put an end to Chechnya's barbaric LGBT purge.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time and I thank the ranking member as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a coauthor of this resolution and someone who is fighting for human rights all the time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 351, which condemns the violence and persecution against LGBT or perceived-to-be LGBT individuals in Chechnya.

This resolution is an example of the strong bipartisanship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee under the leadership of Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL. I thank my good friend, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, who has long been a champion of the dignity of all people around the world, for introducing H. Res. 351. I also thank the chairman and ranking member for working with us to ensure this resolution was passed without delay and with the support of the full committee.

On April 1 of this year, the *Novaya Gazeta*, one of the few independent Russian newspapers, posted a chilling report detailing a concerted campaign by Chechen authorities to identify, round up, torture, and murder gay or perceived-to-be-gay men and women in the Chechen region of Russia.

Dozens of suspected LGBT men and some women have been rounded up with estimates of more than 100 people being detained, and at least three mur-

dered, maybe many more. Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov has denied the reports. When confronted with accusations, his spokesman denied there were any gay people in Chechnya, and explained that, "If there were such people in Chechnya, law enforcement agencies wouldn't need to have anything to do with them because their relatives would send them somewhere from which there is no returning."

In fact, there have been credible reports that Chechen authorities have forced family members of those detained or those suspected of being gay to commit "honor killings" or face violence and retaliation against their entire families.

Chechnya is a small, conservative region of Russia, and LGBT people there face a level of isolation and danger that is unthinkable to those of us living in the freedom of the United States. Even those who have managed to escape Chechnya continue to face danger from extended family members or Chechen authorities within Russia and even parts of Europe.

That is why it is so important that the United States work with our partners in Europe and assist in making sure that those fleeing the violence in Chechnya are relocated somewhere they can be safe. H. Res. 351 condemns the violence and persecution against LGBT individuals in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease the abduction, detention, and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses.

Furthermore, this resolution calls on the government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all of those involved in perpetrating such abuses.

We must remember that President Kadyrov is a close ally of President Putin, and that the Russian Government has essentially sanctioned the atrocities that are being carried out on its soil. That is why it is so important that representatives of the United States Government, at the highest levels, raise this issue with President Putin and other Russian officials.

I was extremely disappointed when Secretary of State Tillerson appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee earlier this month and admitted that neither he nor the President had raised this issue with anyone in the Russian Government. The United States must make it clear that human rights abuses will not be tolerated.

The President, the Secretary of State, and other senior officials must raise this issue consistently with the Russian Government and make it clear that they must protect the lives and safety of all Russian citizens.

Additionally, the Trump administration must take steps to ensure that any Russian officials involved in these atrocities are being sanctioned under the Sergei Magnitsky Act and the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, which we passed last year. Events like these are exactly why these bills were passed, to ensure that government officials involved in gross human rights abuses do not have the privilege of accessing American markets or traveling to the United States.

Furthermore, the administration should be working in concert with our European allies to ensure that Russia is being held to its international obligations and treaties. The lives of vulnerable men and women are at stake, and every day that we remain silent, we condemn more to a dark fate.

I am pleased that the House is considering this resolution tonight. I urge my colleagues to support it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

I rise to remind us that Martin Luther King once said: "Injustice anywhere threatens justice everywhere."

We are all in this together. The idea that we can cherry-pick whose rights we will proclaim and defend is a mistaken notion. It is also un-American. So the future rights of LGBT members in Chechnya are important to Americans, and we need to stand up for their security, their safety, and their fundamental human rights.

This resolution is important. I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for bringing it before us. I congratulate my good friend, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and DAVID CICILLINE for their leadership. I am proud to support this resolution today.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me, first of all, again thank Representative ROS-LEHTINEN, who is always working really hard and is on top of issues that are so important. We really appreciate her leadership and everything she does in the committee; Mr. CICILLINE, who has fought for LGBT rights; and, of course, my partner on the committee, Chairman ROYCE. Things like this show the bipartisanship of our committee, which I think is really important.

Occasionally we hear talk about Vladimir Putin that implies some sort of moral equivalency between the way he runs Russia and American policies. If you want to know how false that

comparison is, take a look at what is happening in Chechnya. Take a look at the violence that Putin's thugs are waging against innocent citizens. That is how Putin regards the rights of his own people. That is what we are here to condemn today.

The United States should continue to make advancing and protecting human rights a foreign policy priority, including the rights of LGBT communities.

I urge a "yes" vote on this measure. I thank Chairman ROYCE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this bill, I, again, thank Chairman Emeritus ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank Ranking Member ENGEL, as well as Representatives DARRELL ISSA, DAVID CICILLINE, CHRIS SMITH, and GERRY CONNOLLY for their important work on this resolution.

The abduction, torture, and targeted killings that we are seeing in Chechnya are an affront to the core universal values that all nation-states must strive to protect. The U.S. has a long history of speaking out on behalf of persecuted minorities, and that is what we are doing here today.

We cannot end injustice everywhere, but we can expose it. We can bring it to the world's attention and, in so doing, give hope to its innocent victims.

I ask all Members to speak clearly and to speak unanimously in condemning this violence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 351, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 397, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 497, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 220, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION'S PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 397) solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

YEAS—423

|                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham         | Chaffetz       | Eshoo           |
| Adams           | Cheney         | Espallat        |
| Aderholt        | Chu, Judy      | Estes (KS)      |
| Aguilar         | Cicilline      | Esty (CT)       |
| Allen           | Clark (MA)     | Evans           |
| Amash           | Clarke (NY)    | Farenthold      |
| Amodei          | Clay           | Faso            |
| Arrington       | Cleaver        | Ferguson        |
| Babin           | Clyburn        | Fitzpatrick     |
| Bacon           | Coffman        | Fleischmann     |
| Banks (IN)      | Cohen          | Flores          |
| Barletta        | Cole           | Fortenberry     |
| Barr            | Collins (GA)   | Foster          |
| Barragán        | Collins (NY)   | Fox             |
| Barton          | Comer          | Frankel (FL)    |
| Bass            | Comstock       | Franks (AZ)     |
| Beatty          | Conaway        | Frelinghuysen   |
| Bera            | Connolly       | Fudge           |
| Bergman         | Conyers        | Gabbard         |
| Beyer           | Cook           | Gaetz           |
| Bilirakis       | Cooper         | Gallagher       |
| Bishop (GA)     | Correa         | Gallego         |
| Bishop (MI)     | Costa          | Garamendi       |
| Bishop (UT)     | Costello (PA)  | Garrett         |
| Black           | Courtney       | Gianforte       |
| Blackburn       | Cramer         | Gibbs           |
| Blum            | Crawford       | Gohmert         |
| Blumenauer      | Crist          | Gonzalez (TX)   |
| Blunt Rochester | Crowley        | Goodlatte       |
| Bonamici        | Cuellar        | Gosar           |
| Bost            | Culberson      | Gottheimer      |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Curbelo (FL)   | Gowdy           |
| F.              | Davidson       | Granger         |
| Brady (PA)      | Davis (CA)     | Graves (GA)     |
| Brady (TX)      | Davis, Danny   | Graves (LA)     |
| Brat            | Davis, Rodney  | Graves (MO)     |
| Bridenstine     | DeFazio        | Green, Al       |
| Brooks (AL)     | DeGette        | Green, Gene     |
| Brooks (IN)     | Delaney        | Griffith        |
| Brown (MD)      | DeLauro        | Grijalva        |
| Brownley (CA)   | DelBene        | Grothman        |
| Buchanan        | Demings        | Guthrie         |
| Buck            | Denham         | Gutiérrez       |
| Bucshon         | Dent           | Hanabusa        |
| Budd            | DeSantis       | Handel          |
| Burgess         | DeSaulnier     | Harper          |
| Bustos          | DesJarlais     | Harris          |
| Butterfield     | Deutch         | Hartzler        |
| Byrne           | Diaz-Balart    | Hastings        |
| Calvert         | Dingell        | Heck            |
| Capuano         | Doggett        | Hensarling      |
| Carbajal        | Donovan        | Herrera Beutler |
| Cárdenas        | Doyle, Michael | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Carson (IN)     | F.             | Higgins (LA)    |
| Carter (GA)     | Duffy          | Higgins (NY)    |
| Carter (TX)     | Duncan (SC)    | Hill            |
| Cartwright      | Dunn           | Himes           |
| Castor (FL)     | Ellison        | Holding         |
| Castro (TX)     | Emmer          | Hollingsworth   |
| Chabot          | Engel          | Hoyer           |

|                |                 |                |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Hudson         | McKinley        | Schakowsky     |
| Huffman        | McMorris        | Schiff         |
| Huizenga       | Rodgers         | Schneider      |
| Hultgren       | McNerney        | Schrader       |
| Hunter         | McSally         | Schweikert     |
| Hurd           | Meadows         | Scott (VA)     |
| Issa           | Meehan          | Scott, Austin  |
| Jackson Lee    | Meeks           | Scott, David   |
| Jayapal        | Meng            | Sensenbrenner  |
| Jeffries       | Messer          | Serrano        |
| Jenkins (KS)   | Mitchell        | Sessions       |
| Jenkins (WV)   | Moolenaar       | Sewell (AL)    |
| Johnson (GA)   | Mooney (WV)     | Shea-Porter    |
| Johnson (LA)   | Moore           | Sherman        |
| Johnson (OH)   | Moulton         | Shimkus        |
| Johnson, E. B. | Mullin          | Shuster        |
| Johnson, Sam   | Murphy (FL)     | Simpson        |
| Jordan         | Murphy (PA)     | Sinema         |
| Joyce (OH)     | Nadler          | Sires          |
| Kaptur         | Neal            | Slaughter      |
| Katko          | Newhouse        | Smith (MO)     |
| Keating        | Noem            | Smith (NE)     |
| Kelly (IL)     | Nolan           | Smith (NJ)     |
| Kelly (MS)     | Norcross        | Smith (TX)     |
| Kelly (PA)     | Norman          | Smith (WA)     |
| Kennedy        | Nunes           | Smucker        |
| Khanna         | O'Halleran      | Soto           |
| Kihuen         | O'Rourke        | Speier         |
| Kildee         | Olson           | Stefanik       |
| Kilmer         | Palazzo         | Stewart        |
| Kind           | Pallone         | Suozi          |
| King (IA)      | Palmer          | Swalwell (CA)  |
| King (NY)      | Panetta         | Takano         |
| Kinzinger      | Pascarell       | Taylor         |
| Knight         | Paulsen         | Tenney         |
| Krishnamoorthi | Payne           | Thompson (CA)  |
| Kuster (NH)    | Pearce          | Thompson (MS)  |
| Kustoff (TN)   | Pelosi          | Thompson (PA)  |
| Labrador       | Perlmutter      | Thornberry     |
| LaHood         | Perry           | Tiberi         |
| LaMalfa        | Peters          | Tipton         |
| Lamborn        | Peterson        | Titus          |
| Lance          | Pingree         | Tonko          |
| Langevin       | Pittenger       | Torres         |
| Larsen (WA)    | Pocan           | Trott          |
| Larson (CT)    | Poe (TX)        | Tsongas        |
| Latta          | Poliquin        | Turner         |
| Lawrence       | Polis           | Upton          |
| Lawson (FL)    | Posey           | Valadao        |
| Lee            | Price (NC)      | Vargas         |
| Levin          | Quigley         | Veasey         |
| Lewis (GA)     | Raskin          | Vela           |
| Lewis (MN)     | Ratcliffe       | Velázquez      |
| Lieu, Ted      | Reed            | Visclosky      |
| Lipinski       | Reichert        | Wagner         |
| LoBiondo       | Rice (NY)       | Walberg        |
| Loebach        | Rice (SC)       | Walden         |
| Lofgren        | Richmond        | Walker         |
| Loudermilk     | Roby            | Walorski       |
| Love           | Roe (TN)        | Walters, Mimi  |
| Lowenthal      | Rogers (AL)     | Walz           |
| Lowey          | Rogers (KY)     | Wasserman      |
| Lucas          | Rohrabacher     | Schultz        |
| Luetkemeyer    | Rokita          | Waters, Maxine |
| Lujan Grisham, | Rooney, Francis | Watson Coleman |
| M.             | Rooney, Thomas  | Weber (TX)     |
| Luján, Ben Ray | J.              | Webster (FL)   |
| Lynch          | Ros-Lehtinen    | Welch          |
| MacArthur      | Rosen           | Wenstrup       |
| Maloney,       | Roskam          | Westerman      |
| Carolyn B.     | Ross            | Williams       |
| Maloney, Sean  | Rothfus         | Wilson (FL)    |
| Marchant       | Rouzer          | Wilson (SC)    |
| Marino         | Roybal-Allard   | Wittman        |
| Marshall       | Royce (CA)      | Womack         |
| Mast           | Ruiz            | Woodall        |
| Matsui         | Ruppersberger   | Yarmuth        |
| McCarthy       | Rush            | Yoder          |
| McCaul         | Russell         | Yoho           |
| McClintock     | Rutherford      | Young (AK)     |
| McCollum       | Ryan (OH)       | Young (IA)     |
| McEachin       | Sánchez         | Zeldin         |
| McGovern       | Sanford         |                |
| McHenry        | Sarbanes        |                |

NAYS—4

Biggs  
Duncan (TN)

Jones  
Massie

NOT VOTING—6

Cummings  
Long

Napolitano  
Renacci  
Scalise  
Stivers

□ 1614

Mr. BIGGS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WITTMAN and ELLISON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SANTA ANA RIVER WASH PLAN LAND EXCHANGE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cook) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—424

|                 |               |                |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abraham         | Brown (MD)    | Cook           |
| Adams           | Brownley (CA) | Cooper         |
| Aderholt        | Buchanan      | Correa         |
| Aguilar         | Buck          | Costa          |
| Allen           | Bucshon       | Costello (PA)  |
| Amash           | Budd          | Courtney       |
| Amodei          | Burgess       | Cramer         |
| Arrington       | Bustos        | Crawford       |
| Babin           | Butterfield   | Crist          |
| Bacon           | Byrne         | Crowley        |
| Banks (IN)      | Calvert       | Cuellar        |
| Barletta        | Capuano       | Culberson      |
| Barr            | Carbajal      | Curbelo (FL)   |
| Barragán        | Cárdenas      | Davidson       |
| Barton          | Carson (IN)   | Davis (CA)     |
| Bass            | Carter (GA)   | Davis, Danny   |
| Beatty          | Carter (TX)   | Davis, Rodney  |
| Bera            | Cartwright    | DeFazio        |
| Bergman         | Castor (FL)   | DeGette        |
| Beyer           | Castro (TX)   | Delaney        |
| Biggs           | Chabot        | DeLauro        |
| Bilirakis       | Chaffetz      | DeBene         |
| Bishop (GA)     | Cheney        | Demings        |
| Bishop (MI)     | Chu, Judy     | Denham         |
| Bishop (UT)     | Cicilline     | Dent           |
| Black           | Clark (MA)    | DeSantis       |
| Blackburn       | Clarke (NY)   | DeSaulnier     |
| Blum            | Clay          | DesJarlais     |
| Blumenauer      | Cleaver       | Deutch         |
| Blunt Rochester | Clyburn       | Diaz-Balart    |
| Bonamici        | Coffman       | Dingell        |
| Bost            | Cohen         | Doggett        |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Cole          | Donovan        |
| F.              | Collins (GA)  | Doyle, Michael |
| Brady (PA)      | Collins (NY)  | F.             |
| Brady (TX)      | Comer         | Duffy          |
| Brat            | Comstock      | Duncan (SC)    |
| Bridenstine     | Conaway       | Duncan (TN)    |
| Brooks (AL)     | Connolly      | Dunn           |
| Brooks (IN)     | Conyers       | Ellison        |

|                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Emmer           | Knight         | Poe (TX)        |
| Eshoo           | Krishnamoorthi | Poliquin        |
| Espallat        | Kuster (NH)    | Polis           |
| Estes (KS)      | Kustoff (TN)   | Posey           |
| Esty (CT)       | Labrador       | Price (NC)      |
| Evans           | LaHood         | Quigley         |
| Farenthold      | LaMalfa        | Ratcliffe       |
| Faso            | Lamborn        | Reed            |
| Ferguson        | Lance          | Reichert        |
| Fitzpatrick     | Langevin       | Rice (NY)       |
| Fleischmann     | Larsen (WA)    | Rice (SC)       |
| Flores          | Larson (CT)    | Richmond        |
| Fortenberry     | Latta          | Roby            |
| Foster          | Lawrence       | Roe (TN)        |
| Fox             | Lawson (FL)    | Rogers (AL)     |
| Frankel (FL)    | Lee            | Rogers (KY)     |
| Franks (AZ)     | Levin          | Rohrabacher     |
| Frelinghuysen   | Lewis (GA)     | Rokita          |
| Fudge           | Lewis (MN)     | Rooney, Francis |
| Gabbard         | Lieu, Ted      | Rooney, Thomas  |
| Gaetz           | Lipinski       | J.              |
| Gallagher       | LoBiondo       | Ros-Lehtinen    |
| Galleo          | Loeb           | Rosen           |
| Garamendi       | Lofgren        | Roskam          |
| Garrett         | Loudermilk     | Ross            |
| Gianforte       | Love           | Rothfus         |
| Gibbs           | Lowenthal      | Roybal-Allard   |
| Gohmert         | Lowey          | Royce (CA)      |
| Gonzalez (TX)   | Lucas          | Ruiz            |
| Goodlatte       | Luetkemeyer    | Ruppersberger   |
| Gosar           | Lujan Grisham, | Rush            |
| Gottheimer      | M.             | Russell         |
| Gowdy           | Luján, Ben Ray | Rutherford      |
| Granger         | Lynch          | Ryan (OH)       |
| Graves (GA)     | MacArthur      | Sánchez         |
| Graves (LA)     | Maloney,       | Sanford         |
| Graves (MO)     | Carolyn B.     | Sarbanes        |
| Green, Al       | Maloney, Sean  | Schakowsky      |
| Green, Gene     | Marchant       | Schiff          |
| Griffith        | Marino         | Schneider       |
| Grijalva        | Marshall       | Schrader        |
| Grothman        | Massie         | Schweikert      |
| Guthrie         | Mast           | Scott (VA)      |
| Gutiérrez       | Matsui         | Scott, Austin   |
| Hanabusa        | McCarthy       | Scott, David    |
| Handel          | McCaul         | Sensenbrenner   |
| Harper          | McClintock     | Serrano         |
| Harris          | McCollum       | Sessions        |
| Hartzler        | McEachin       | Sewell (AL)     |
| Hastings        | McGovern       | Shea-Porter     |
| Heck            | McHenry        | Sherman         |
| Hensarling      | McKinley       | Shimkus         |
| Herrera Beutler | McMorris       | Shuster         |
| Hice, Jody B.   | Rodgers        | Simpson         |
| Higgins (LA)    | McNerney       | Sinema          |
| Higgins (NY)    | McSally        | Sires           |
| Hill            | Meadows        | Slaughter       |
| Himes           | Meehan         | Smith (MO)      |
| Holding         | Meeks          | Smith (NE)      |
| Hollingsworth   | Meng           | Smith (NJ)      |
| Hoyer           | Messer         | Smith (TX)      |
| Hudson          | Mitchell       | Smith (WA)      |
| Huffman         | Moolenaar      | Smucker         |
| Huizenga        | Mooney (WV)    | Soto            |
| Hultgren        | Moore          | Speier          |
| Hunter          | Moulton        | Stefanik        |
| Hurd            | Mullin         | Stewart         |
| Issa            | Murphy (FL)    | Suozi           |
| Jackson Lee     | Murphy (PA)    | Swalwell (CA)   |
| Jayapal         | Nadler         | Takano          |
| Jeffries        | Neal           | Taylor          |
| Jenkins (KS)    | Newhouse       | Tenney          |
| Jenkins (WV)    | Noem           | Thompson (CA)   |
| Johnson (GA)    | Nolan          | Thompson (MS)   |
| Johnson (LA)    | Norcross       | Thompson (PA)   |
| Johnson (OH)    | Norman         | Thornberry      |
| Johnson, E. B.  | Nunes          | Tiberi          |
| Johnson, Sam    | O'Halleran     | Tipton          |
| Jones           | O'Rourke       | Titus           |
| Jordan          | Olson          | Tonko           |
| Joyce (OH)      | Palazzo        | Torres          |
| Kaptur          | Pallone        | Trott           |
| Katko           | Palmer         | Tsongas         |
| Keating         | Panetta        | Turner          |
| Kelly (IL)      | Pascrell       | Upton           |
| Kelly (MS)      | Paulsen        | Valadao         |
| Kelly (PA)      | Payne          | Vargas          |
| Kennedy         | Pearce         | Veasey          |
| Khanna          | Pelosi         | Vela            |
| Kihuen          | Perlmutter     | Velázquez       |
| Kildee          | Perry          | Visclosky       |
| Kilmer          | Peters         | Wagner          |
| Kind            | Peterson       | Walberg         |
| King (IA)       | Pingree        | Walden          |
| King (NY)       | Pittenger      | Walker          |
| Kinzinger       | Pocan          | Walorski        |

|                |             |            |
|----------------|-------------|------------|
| Walters, Mimi  | Welch       | Woodall    |
| Walz           | Wenstrup    | Yarmuth    |
| Wasserman      | Westerman   | Yoder      |
| Schultz        | Williams    | Yoho       |
| Waters, Maxine | Wilson (FL) | Young (AK) |
| Watson Coleman | Wilson (SC) | Young (IA) |
| Weber (TX)     | Wittman     | Zeldin     |
| Webster (FL)   | Womack      |            |

NOT VOTING—9

|          |            |         |
|----------|------------|---------|
| Cummings | Napolitano | Rouzer  |
| Engel    | Raskin     | Scalise |
| Long     | Renacci    | Stivers |

□ 1620

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 329.

#### TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 220) to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cook) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—424

|             |                 |             |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Abraham     | Bishop (MI)     | Budd        |
| Adams       | Bishop (UT)     | Burgess     |
| Aderholt    | Black           | Bustos      |
| Aguilar     | Blackburn       | Butterfield |
| Blum        | Blum            | Byrne       |
| Amodei      | Blumenauer      | Calvert     |
| Arrington   | Blunt Rochester | Capuano     |
| Babin       | Bonamici        | Carbajal    |
| Bacon       | Bost            | Cárdenas    |
| Banks (IN)  | Boyle, Brendan  | Carson (IN) |
| Barletta    | F.              | Carter (GA) |
| Barr        | Brady (PA)      | Carter (TX) |
| Barragán    | Brady (TX)      | Cartwright  |
| Barton      | Brat            | Castor (FL) |
| Bass        | Bridenstine     | Castro (TX) |
| Beatty      | Brooks (AL)     | Chabot      |
| Berra       | Brooks (IN)     | Chaffetz    |
| Bergman     | Brown (MD)      | Cheney      |
| Beyer       | Brownley (CA)   | Chu, Judy   |
| Biggs       | Buchanan        | Cicilline   |
| Bilirakis   | Buck            | Clark (MA)  |
| Bishop (GA) | Bucshon         | Clarke (NY) |

|                |                 |                 |               |               |                |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Clay           | Gutiérrez       | McCarthy        | Scott (VA)    | Swalwell (CA) | Walker         |
| Cleaver        | Hanabusa        | McClintock      | Scott, Austin | Takano        | Walorski       |
| Clyburn        | Handel          | McCollum        | Scott, David  | Taylor        | Walters, Mimi  |
| Coffman        | Harper          | McEachin        | Sensenbrenner | Tenney        | Walz           |
| Cohen          | Harris          | McGovern        | Serrano       | Thompson (CA) | Wasserman      |
| Cole           | Hartzler        | McHenry         | Sessions      | Thompson (MS) | Schultz        |
| Collins (GA)   | Hastings        | McKinley        | Sewell (AL)   | Thompson (PA) | Waters, Maxine |
| Collins (NY)   | Heck            | McMorris        | Shea-Porter   | Thornberry    | Watson Coleman |
| Comer          | Hensarling      | Rodgers         | Sherman       | Tiberi        | Weber (TX)     |
| Comstock       | Herrera Beutler | McNerney        | Shimkus       | Tipton        | Webster (FL)   |
| Conaway        | Hice, Jody B.   | McSally         | Shuster       | Titus         | Welch          |
| Connolly       | Higgins (LA)    | Meadows         | Simpson       | Tonko         | Wenstrup       |
| Conyers        | Higgins (NY)    | Meehan          | Sinema        | Torres        | Westerman      |
| Cook           | Hill            | Meeks           | Sires         | Trott         | Williams       |
| Cooper         | Holding         | Meng            | Slaughter     | Tsongas       | Wilson (FL)    |
| Correa         | Hollingsworth   | Messer          | Smith (MO)    | Turner        | Wilson (SC)    |
| Costa          | Hoyer           | Mitchell        | Smith (NE)    | Upton         | Wittman        |
| Costello (PA)  | Hudson          | Moolenaar       | Smith (NJ)    | Valadao       | Womack         |
| Courtney       | Huffman         | Mooney (WV)     | Smith (TX)    | Vargas        | Woodall        |
| Cramer         | Huizenga        | Moore           | Smith (WA)    | Veasey        | Yarmuth        |
| Crawford       | Hultgren        | Moulton         | Smucker       | Vela          | Yoder          |
| Crist          | Hunter          | Mullin          | Soto          | Velázquez     | Yoho           |
| Crowley        | Hurd            | Murphy (FL)     | Speier        | Visclosky     | Young (AK)     |
| Cuellar        | Issa            | Murphy (PA)     | Stefanik      | Wagner        | Young (IA)     |
| Culberson      | Jackson Lee     | Nadler          | Stewart       | Walberg       | Zeldin         |
| Curbelo (FL)   | Jayapal         | Neal            | Suozzi        | Walden        |                |
| Davidson       | Jeffries        | Newhouse        |               |               |                |
| Davis (CA)     | Jenkins (KS)    | Noem            |               |               |                |
| Davis, Danny   | Jenkins (WV)    | Nolan           |               |               |                |
| Davis, Rodney  | Johnson (GA)    | Norcross        |               |               |                |
| DeFazio        | Johnson (LA)    | Norman          |               |               |                |
| DeGette        | Johnson (OH)    | Nunes           |               |               |                |
| Delaney        | Johnson, E. B.  | O'Halleran      |               |               |                |
| DeLauro        | Johnson, Sam    | O'Rourke        |               |               |                |
| DelBene        | Jones           | Olson           |               |               |                |
| Demings        | Jordan          | Palazzo         |               |               |                |
| Denham         | Joyce (OH)      | Pallone         |               |               |                |
| Dent           | Kaptur          | Palmer          |               |               |                |
| DeSantis       | Katko           | Panetta         |               |               |                |
| DeSaulnier     | Keating         | Pascarell       |               |               |                |
| DesJarlais     | Kelly (IL)      | Paulsen         |               |               |                |
| Deutch         | Kelly (MS)      | Payne           |               |               |                |
| Diaz-Balart    | Kelly (PA)      | Pearce          |               |               |                |
| Dingell        | Kennedy         | Pelosi          |               |               |                |
| Doggett        | Khanna          | Perlmutter      |               |               |                |
| Donovan        | Kihuen          | Perry           |               |               |                |
| Doyle, Michael | Kildee          | Peters          |               |               |                |
| F.             | Kilmer          | Peterson        |               |               |                |
| Duffy          | Kind            | Pingree         |               |               |                |
| Duncan (SC)    | King (IA)       | Pittenger       |               |               |                |
| Duncan (TN)    | King (NY)       | Pocan           |               |               |                |
| Dunn           | Kinziger        | Poe (TX)        |               |               |                |
| Ellison        | Knight          | Poliquin        |               |               |                |
| Emmer          | Krishnamoorthi  | Polis           |               |               |                |
| Eshoo          | Kuster (NH)     | Posey           |               |               |                |
| Espallat       | Kustoff (TN)    | Price (NC)      |               |               |                |
| Estes (KS)     | Labrador        | Quigley         |               |               |                |
| Esty (CT)      | LaHood          | Raskin          |               |               |                |
| Evans          | LaMalfa         | Ratcliffe       |               |               |                |
| Farenthold     | Lamborn         | Reed            |               |               |                |
| Faso           | Lance           | Reichert        |               |               |                |
| Ferguson       | Langevin        | Rice (NY)       |               |               |                |
| Fitzpatrick    | Larsen (WA)     | Rice (SC)       |               |               |                |
| Fleischmann    | Larson (CT)     | Richmond        |               |               |                |
| Flores         | Latta           | Roby            |               |               |                |
| Fortenberry    | Lawrence        | Roe (TN)        |               |               |                |
| Foster         | Lawson (FL)     | Rogers (AL)     |               |               |                |
| Fox            | Lee             | Rogers (KY)     |               |               |                |
| Frankel (FL)   | Levin           | Rohrabacher     |               |               |                |
| Franks (AZ)    | Lewis (GA)      | Rokita          |               |               |                |
| Frelinghuysen  | Lewis (MN)      | Rooney, Francis |               |               |                |
| Fudge          | Lieu, Ted       | Rooney, Thomas  |               |               |                |
| Gabbard        | Lipinski        | J.              |               |               |                |
| Gaetz          | LoBiondo        | Ros-Lehtinen    |               |               |                |
| Gallagher      | Loebach         | Rosen           |               |               |                |
| Gallgo         | Lofgren         | Roskam          |               |               |                |
| Garamendi      | Loudermilk      | Ross            |               |               |                |
| Garrett        | Love            | Rothfus         |               |               |                |
| Gianforte      | Lowenthal       | Rouzer          |               |               |                |
| Gibbs          | Lowe            | Roybal-Allard   |               |               |                |
| Gohmert        | Lucas           | Royce (CA)      |               |               |                |
| Gonzalez (TX)  | Luetkemeyer     | Ruiz            |               |               |                |
| Goodlatte      | Lujan Grisham,  | Ruppersberger   |               |               |                |
| Gosar          | M.              | Rush            |               |               |                |
| Gottheimer     | Lujan, Ben Ray  | Russell         |               |               |                |
| Gowdy          | Lynch           | Rutherford      |               |               |                |
| Granger        | MacArthur       | Ryan (OH)       |               |               |                |
| Graves (GA)    | Maloney,        | Sánchez         |               |               |                |
| Graves (LA)    | Carolyn B.      | Sanford         |               |               |                |
| Graves (MO)    | Maloney, Sean   | Sarbanes        |               |               |                |
| Green, Al      | Marchant        | Schakowsky      |               |               |                |
| Green, Gene    | Marino          | Schiff          |               |               |                |
| Griffith       | Marshall        | Schneider       |               |               |                |
| Grijalva       | Massie          | Schrader        |               |               |                |
| Grothman       | Mast            | Schweikert      |               |               |                |
| Guthrie        | Matsui          |                 |               |               |                |

## NAYS—1

Amash

## NOT VOTING—8

Cummings  
Engel  
HimesLong  
Napolitano  
RenacciScalise  
Stivers

□ 1630

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 328, No. 329, and No. 330 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 397—Solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 497—Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act. I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 220—To authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor for H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

## HONORING FRANK KUSH

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a legendary Arizonan, Frank Kush, who passed away last week at age 88.

Frank is best known for his career as coach of the Arizona State University Sun Devils football program. He won 176 games over 21½ seasons, the most ever in Sun Devil history. He was named national Coach of the Year after the 1975 season and was elected to the College Football Hall of Fame in 1995.

Coach Frank Kush was not only concerned with wins and losses, he was a mentor for young men and ensured that their professional and academic development rose above their athletic prowess. Coach Kush influenced hundreds of young men during his career at Arizona State. His impact is ever-present in the lives of his former players, and his legacy will never be forgotten.

## TRUMPCARE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today a number of us were able to go to the children's hospital here in Washington, D.C., and met two miraculous families, children with complex, chronic diseases. With the love of their parents, one could not tell they were different from any other child, yet they had horrific and difficult medical conditions.

Those parents were middle class working families, and said that, without Medicaid, the half a million dollars of healthcare that keeps those beautiful children alive and leads them to a pathway of a life of love would not be possible.

I am glad that the Senate TrumpCare bill has been stopped in its tracks, the same bill that the CBO has said will cause 49 million Americans to lose their insurance in 2026.

There is no pathway to reform this bill. There is no White House meeting, no Presidential cajoling and shooting deals back and forth. These are lives of Americans, and as long as it takes, we will fight to the end to stop the demolition of the Affordable Care Act, which most Americans, over 50 percent, want the Affordable Care Act.

Stop the foolishness.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL  
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, also known as NATCA, on its 30th anniversary.

Since its foundation, NATCA has worked to guide aviation policies and improve working conditions for its members with one goal in mind: to ensure that passengers arrive safely to our destinations.

I would also like to recognize three remarkable individuals—Billy, Jim, and Mitch—whom I have met through NATCA's advocacy efforts. These men are committed to public service, first through their service in our Armed Forces, and then later as air traffic controllers ensuring that Miami's skies remain safe for all. Though Mitch has now retired, I know that his contributions to our Nation have not stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating NATCA and its members on 30 years of outstanding public service.

#### UKRAINE MILITARY OFFICIAL KILLED

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as co-chair of the Ukrainian Caucus, and I will include in the RECORD an article reporting on an act of violence that has taken place in Ukraine.

Yesterday, a bomb exploded in the car of a high-ranking Ukrainian special forces official, Colonel Maksim Shapoval, in Kiev, in what Ukrainian authorities are calling an act of terrorism.

Shapoval's heroic unit fought in eastern Ukraine, where a conflict between Ukraine and Russia has been raging since 2014, with mainly citizens being killed, over 10,000 innocents in that country.

Shapoval's death comes almost a year after prominent Ukraine journalist Pavel Sheremet was killed by a similar explosion in Kiev as he drove to work. No one has been brought to justice in that murder case.

A number of other public figures have also been killed under shady circumstances in and around Kiev in recent years.

Denis Voronerkov, a former Russian member of Parliament who fled to Ukraine, was shot dead in central Kiev in March 2017.

Lawyer Yuri Grabovsky, who had represented a Russian soldier captured in Ukraine, was found dead with a gunshot wound in 2016.

This has all the fingerprints of Putin's Russia, who will stop at nothing to blunt liberty. America must be a friend to liberty and an enemy to tyranny. I call on this administration to help Ukraine defend itself against these hostile acts of war against liberty.

[From theguardian, June 27, 2017]

UKRAINIAN MILITARY INTELLIGENCE OFFICER  
KILLED BY CAR BOMB IN KIEV

(By Alec Luhn)

A high-ranking Ukrainian military intelligence official has been killed by a car bomb in Kiev in what authorities are calling an act of terrorism.

An explosive device destroyed the Mercedes being driven by Col Maksim Shapoval at 8.15am local time, police said.

The car's bonnet was blown open and its roof and driver side door almost completely destroyed, video footage from the scene showed.

"The picture of the crime looks like it was a planned act of terrorism," interior ministry spokesman Artem Shevchenko told local media. The military prosecutor said his office would lead an investigation.

Police said a female passerby with shrapnel wounds to her legs received medical treatment after the explosion, as did an elderly man who suffered shrapnel wounds to his neck.

According to the defence ministry, Shapoval was a colonel in military intelligence. The Ukrainian Pravda newspaper quoted law enforcement sources saying he had headed a special forces unit.

Yury Butusov, editor of the Censor.net news website, said in a Facebook post that Shapoval's unit had fought in eastern Ukraine, where a conflict with Russia-backed separatists that broke out in 2014 has killed more than 10,000 people. He claimed Russian intelligence could have killed Shapoval.

Shapoval's death comes almost a year after prominent journalist Pavel Sheremet was killed by a similar explosion in Kiev as he drove to work. A documentary film released last month revealed evidence suggesting that Ukraine's spy agency may have witnessed the planting of the car bomb that killed Sheremet. No one has been brought to justice in the murder case.

A number of other public figures have also been assassinated in and around Kiev in recent years. Denis Voronenkov, a former Russian MP who fled to Ukraine, was shot dead in central Kiev in March. Pro-Russian journalist Oles Buzina was shot in a drive-by in 2015, and lawyer Yuri Grabovsky, who had represented a Russian soldier captured in Ukraine, was found dead with a gunshot wound in 2016.

#### CONGRATULATING THE EDEN PRAIRIE EAGLES

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Eden Prairie High School girls lacrosse team for recently winning their third consecutive State title.

The Eagles showed perseverance and grit by overcoming an early deficit to The Blake School in the championship game. It was the ninth meeting between these two schools in the State's final in a 10-year period. Eden Prairie rallied back to win 16-10, giving them the State title.

The girls' drive for another championship led them to have a 20-1 overall record, the number one ranking in the State, finishing 19th in the country.

Senior Naomi Rogge and sophomore Abby Johnson both carried the team by scoring four and six goals, respectively.

These student athletes work extremely hard, Mr. Speaker, not only on the lacrosse field, but also in the classroom. Our community is very proud of their hard work and dedication, and I am delighted to share that these young

women rose to the occasion and claimed yet another championship.

Congratulations to the Eden Prairie Eagles on their win.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HERKIMER COLLEGE

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Herkimer College. Established in 1966 as New York State's 29th community college, Herkimer College opened its doors for classes in 1967.

The inaugural class consisted of 221 freshmen, and for the first 4 years, Herkimer College held classes on the upper floors of the old Remington Arms factory in Ilion, New York. In 1971, the college moved to its present-day location in the Village of Herkimer.

Like the Village of Herkimer and Herkimer County, Herkimer College is proud to share its name with a Revolutionary War hero, General Nicholas Herkimer. As commander of the Tryon County Militia, General Herkimer valiantly fought at the Battle of Oriskany. To honor General Herkimer and Herkimer County's rich history, Herkimer College's athletic teams are nicknamed the Generals.

Today, Herkimer College currently enrolls over 3,000 students and boasts more than 20,000 graduates. The college offers over 40 degree programs and is consistently ranked as a top 100 community college in the Nation.

Over the course of five decades, Herkimer College's benefit to the local community is evidenced by over \$75 million in economic impact in Herkimer County, annually.

Today I recognize Herkimer College for an exceptional 50 years and offer my best wishes for many, many successful decades to come.

#### CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED FUNDING TO VETTED WATER RE- SOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about something called congressionally directed spending when it comes to Army Corps projects.

I have a bill, which is called the REPAIR Act, which would make a limited change to the House rules definition to allow Congress to direct funding to vetted water resource development projects of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The REPAIR Act does not authorize or appropriate any new funds for these projects, which comprises just one-half

of 1 percent of our overall annual discretionary spending, and stays exclusively within the budget cap set by Congress.

After several years of divided government, almost every Member of Congress here has experienced the direct correlation between our inability to provide for these projects over the executive agencies, especially as it pertains to these essential public works projects.

The REPAIR Act is a zero-cost solution to this problem that will simply allow Congress to respond to the water resource infrastructure needs of their communities rather than waiting for an unelected, faceless bureaucrat in the executive branch to move on these projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the REPAIR Act.

#### RECOGNIZING CONGREGATION MICKVE ISRAEL

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Congregation Mickve Israel in Savannah, Georgia, as it celebrates its incredible 284th anniversary on July 11, 2017.

Just 5 months after General James Oglethorpe settled the colony, Jewish settlers fleeing persecution in Europe arrived in Georgia. They sought refuge in Savannah, where they were free to practice their beliefs. This brave group soon founded the Congregation Mickve Israel.

Predating our country by several decades as the first congregation in the South, Mickve Israel set an important precedent for the Jewish people. As such, wars, plagues, and religious struggles each challenged the congregation over the years, yet Mickve Israel has withstood the test of time. It continues to be a beacon for the faithful and now welcomes 380 families inside its walls.

The story of Mickve Israel is special to the people and has been recognized for its achievement since its early years. President George Washington sent a personal letter to the congregation to honor its members and wish them well.

Since then, numerous Presidents over the years have made similar gestures, each one acknowledging the congregation's longevity and importance to the Jewish community.

I would also like to acknowledge the congregation's importance and congratulate Congregation Mickve Israel in reaching this impressive milestone. I know this religious community will continue to serve a caring, faithful, and integral role in Savannah, Georgia.

□ 1645

#### OPIOID ADDICTION CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am joined by a number of Members here to talk about one of the most insidious problems our Nation has faced in a long time. It is the problem of opioid abuse. We are in a crisis mode.

We have now reached a point where we will have more deaths from drug overdoses this year than there are names on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington. That is a frightening concept.

There is almost no county, no State in America, that is not affected by this. Some areas have much more. Places in eastern Kentucky, southern West Virginia and up the Ohio Valley, and places in New England and out West have seen this as a growing problem as death rates rise.

There are things we can do about this. But in order to have some discussion of what we can do about this, we are going to talk about how we got to this problem and then what we can do to go beyond that.

I want to start off by yielding to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, to talk about what this means in one State alone, the State of Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, who chairs our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee and is so passionate in not only finding a solution to the opioid epidemic, but also his great work on mental health reform as well, as was passed into law in the 21st Century Cures legislation.

As you know, the year before, the Energy and Commerce Committee also passed legislation to begin to address this issue. We will be doing a lot of work, going forward, to look at what is working on the ground and what is not.

Addiction, as you well know from your clinical experience, is an equal opportunity destroyer. It is a crisis that doesn't pick parties. It doesn't pick people because of their race, age, or socioeconomic status. We all know someone impacted by the opioid epidemic. It has literally touched every corner of our country and every community in our States.

The epidemic has hit close to home in my home State of Oregon, where more people now die from drug overdoses than from deaths in automobile accidents. I have met with community leaders, first responders, doctors, police officers, patients, and those on the front lines of this fight against opioid addiction.

At roundtables throughout the Second District of Oregon, I have heard firsthand accounts of the impact of the opioid epidemic. It didn't matter if I was in a rural eastern Oregon community or a more populated city in southern Oregon. The tragic stories were all too similar and all too familiar.

Medical professionals across Oregon told me about the rapid acceleration of the opioid epidemic over the last 20 years. They have witnessed patient after patient fall into the traps of addiction.

I heard from Oregonians who have struggled with the epidemic themselves. At our roundtable, a woman in Hermiston talked about how she became addicted to painkillers. After a minor foot injury, she got a prescription for an opioid-based painkiller. In her decades-long battle with this addiction—trying to get off of this addiction—she was forced to travel more than 5 hours into Washington State just to find a provider who could help her with Suboxone and get off of her addiction. There was nobody locally who could help her.

I heard from a father whose son was a high school athlete. He was prescribed opioids after a sports injury. Tragically, he became addicted. Soon, he transitioned to what we know as a cheaper and more deadly version of the drug known as heroin.

Sadly, this young man would not survive his addiction. He died from heroin. It devastated the family and stole another American in the prime of his life. This story is repeated all too often.

Combating the opioid epidemic in Oregon and every State of the union is going to require a real bipartisan team effort to continue, from elected officials with the input from healthcare experts and those on the front line of this fight in our local communities.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we stand shoulder-to-shoulder, all of us together, saying: What can we do more to help in this crisis; to seize the opportunity before us; to look at the legislation that was enacted in the last Congress to make sure that the grants are getting to the ground, as they are in my State; and that we are getting the help and that it is actually working?

It is one thing to pass a bill. It is another to make sure it is implemented correctly and that it actually works effectively.

I commend my colleague from Pennsylvania, Chairman MURPHY, for the work that he is doing on this and the compassion he has for those families who are tragically caught up in this addiction. Together, we are going to find our way through it.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his passion and hard work on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We know this is a life-and-death issue. This is

one of those things where Members are coming together from both sides of the aisle to deal with.

Let me lay out the background here. How did we get here?

About 80 percent of addictions begin with a prescription. When we see what has happened here on this chart of heroin increased use and prescription opioids, there is something that occurred at the beginning of this millennium where things really began to take off.

On this next poster, seeing here how this is increasing at such a rate—about 9 or 10 percent—it is understandable you are looking at some of these rates increasing severalfold just in the last decade, with increasing jumps. As fentanyl has gotten here, it is even worse.

Back in 1980, Dr. Hershel Jick, a Boston doctor, wrote a letter in *The New England Journal of Medicine*, and he said this: “Out of nearly 40,000 patients given powerful pain drugs in a Boston hospital, only four addictions were documented.” Since he published that letter, it has been cited again about 600 times. Doctors, academics, pharmaceutical companies, and others use it as evidence of the unlikelihood of developing addiction.

But it has been criticized soundly, saying that never should have been said. In fact, *The New England Journal of Medicine* took the unusual step of posting a one-sentence warning over the so-called Porter and Jick letter to the editor that the *Journal* published in 1980, and it says: “For reasons of public health, readers should be aware that this letter has been heavily and uncritically cited as evidence that addiction is rare with opioid therapy.”

Accompanying this note was an analysis from Canadian researchers exploring the frequency the letter had been cited, which was almost 600 times.

Here is the tragedy of this. Many physicians and many pharmaceutical companies said: See, prescribe these opioids; people will be okay. That was found not to be the case.

Jump ahead to 2001, when The Joint Commission released their pain management standards, and then shortly after that the American Medical Association said: let's make pain one of the vital signs. The other vital signs being blood pressure, heart rate, respiratory rate, and temperature. But when pain was also made one of those as well, doctors began asking questions about that, and basically screening people along the lines of: On a scale of 1 to 10, what is your pain level?

Everything else is measured with an instrument objectively, but pain is subjective. In fact, it is so subjective that it was found that 51 percent of people who are on an opioid have a mood disorder, such as depression or anxiety. There is a huge amount there.

The thing about this, if a person fails to screen for presence of a mood dis-

order, along with other aspects, you really increase their risk for addiction.

About 50 million Americans, for example, have low back pain. Twenty-five million of those are on an opioid. Of that group, about 40 percent have been found to have depression. If you combine depression and opioid use, you could triple or quadruple your risk for misuse, abuse, and addiction. It would make sense that before a doctor prescribes in these cases, concurrently they would also be screening for mood disorders. That does not appear to be the case.

Here is another part of the problem. Under the Affordable Care Act, hospital payments are tied to patient pain satisfaction surveys, which reward hospitals financially when patients give them a high rating for managing pain. In turn, the hospitals get less money if the patient says: my pain was not handled.

That is actually question 14 of the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems survey. It asks the question: How often did the hospital or provider do everything in their power to control your pain? Doctors feared negative responses, as did many hospitals, and it was found that probably had an impact on increasing prescriptions.

Another part of the problem is treatment access. Quite frankly, if you want to get help, you can't find it. Unfortunately, getting access to high-quality treatment is unlikely in the United States. Of the 27 million Americans suffering from addiction, less than 1 percent receive evidence-based treatment.

We have a shortage of trained providers, and half the counties in America have no psychologists, no psychiatrists, and no clinical social workers.

Let me add to this also that medication-assisted treatment is one of those things put up here as a treatment method. If I show you here, medication-assisted treatment is when a person is replacing their illegal drug with something like methadone or Suboxone, which Chairman WALDEN just referred to.

But here is part of the problem. It is supposed to be the doctor writing the prescription and then the patient is getting other treatment. But as is found with medication-assisted treatment, just in Pennsylvania alone, nearly 60 percent had no counseling in the year they received the buprenorphine. Forty percent were not drug-tested in the year they received the buprenorphine.

This is important because a person may receive a prescription but still remain on heroin or another drug. Thirty-three percent have between two to five different prescribers writing them a prescription for this. Where do all those prescriptions go?

This is one of the top diverted drugs. Many times, the patients simply take

those drugs, sell them, and buy the street drugs. Twenty-four percent of those buprenorphine prescriptions didn't see a physician in the prior 30 days.

In other words, with medication-assisted treatment, we simply have a failure to provide other treatment and a low expectation for improvement, in many cases thinking we will replace one addiction with another.

Another part is in the area of hospital care. When treating opioid and heroin addiction, inpatient and residential treatment is crucial for full recovery, but there are simply not enough treatment centers and beds. Today, our Nation suffers a shortage of 100,000 inpatient treatment beds.

Further, we don't have enough providers. When we do have providers, many times they end up overprescribing.

There was a law in the United States back in the Nixon era called 42 C.F.R., consolidated federal registry. Basically, it made it so that physicians could not find out in the record if a patient was on other opioids, in treatment for that, or taking buprenorphine or methadone.

So what happened? Someone shows up in the emergency room, they are in pain, perhaps a doctor looks in the record and doesn't see anything there, and writes a prescription. If that person was in treatment and was recovering from an addiction, and at that point not taking other drugs, look at what just happened. The doctor may prescribe some opioids for that patient who was used to taking quite a few at any given time to have an effect. Now they have this, and they are no longer thinking: I will take just one or two. They may take more. So you risk overdose.

The second thing you do is risk a relapse. That person was perhaps clean for months or years. Now they have OxyContin or some other opioid, they take it, and they have a relapse.

But there is a third problem that goes with that, and that is the person may be on other drugs, such as benzodiazepines or other respiratory suppressants, and that becomes a problem because then the doctor doesn't know about drug interactions.

So we have this law in place which prohibits sharing of information about substance abuse treatment between doctors. Doctors unknowingly prescribe these for people. It causes more problems. We need to deal with this.

Another level here is fentanyl. Fentanyl is a synthetic opioid which is a staggering 50 times more potent than heroin and 100 times more potent than morphine. It has a high potential for abuse. A mere 2 milligrams is fatal. A single packet of sweetener for your coffee is 1,000 milligrams. Take two of those and that is enough to kill you.

Since last 2013, fentanyl has contributed to at least 5,000 overdose deaths in



the U.S., and that is soaring. However, due to gaps in the data collections, it is likely the number of overdose deaths in the U.S. is actually much higher.

A low-cost, high-profit, hard-to-detect profile of fentanyl is increasingly more trafficked to traffickers and relatively easy to manufacture. China is a major part of this, in that the illegally manufactured fentanyl shipped to the U.S. via labs in Mexico, smuggled across the border, then hits our streets.

One other thing I want to point out here, in terms of this problem. If we look at what some have analyzed in terms of areas that are hotspots for substance abuse, you can see in here for persons on disability, look at the sections in Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, along the Mississippi Valley, up the Ohio Valley, and parts out West. This isn't the only causal factor. Many times you have people on disability and pain, and what happens is they may be prescribed opioids as part of that.

When you look here, where age-adjusted death rates occur for drug poisoning—those overdose deaths—look at the hotspots in America. It is just about the same out here in the Mississippi-Ohio Valley, portions out West, where you have these problems.

All of these come together in terms of crime, in terms of drug cartels, in terms of fentanyl, in terms of poor access to treatment.

I mentioned the hospital beds. By the way, over half the counties in America have no psychiatrist, no psychologist, no social worker, and no licensed drug treatment provider.

□ 1700

It is no wonder we are in this mess. We will talk more about some solutions here, but I wanted to recognize a number of Members who might want to talk about this.

Let me first go to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER). Representative CARTER is also a pharmacist. Let's hear some of his perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order.

This is certainly a very important subject, one that I am very familiar with. It is indeed an epidemic in our country. There is not a State nor a district that hasn't been touched by this problem. Countless people have succumbed to this issue. That issue is the use of opioids and the devastating impact on our communities.

Recent data showed that overdose deaths have jumped by over 50 percent in the decade leading up to 2015. In addition, nearly 1,300 people died in Georgia in 2015 from drug overdoses. These are statistics that need to be urgently addressed. We have made great progress with the passage of the Com-

prehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, but we have an opportunity to do more.

One staggering statistic is that last year it is estimated that roughly 60,000 people died from drug overdoses—a number that is far too high. Just earlier this month, four people in central Georgia died in a matter of 2 days due to opioid overdoses from falsely labeled drugs. That instance is not only troubling because it reflects growing painkiller use in the rural parts of my State, but because it also represents another problem: counterfeit and fake drugs.

An issue that I have been working on is the growing trend of drugs and drug ingredients being ordered abroad and delivered through the mail to addresses around the country.

A recent Wall Street Journal article mentioned the synthetic opioids that are being brought into this country and the methods by which they are doing it.

An example of one of those drugs is fentanyl, a synthetic opioid that is wreaking havoc across the country.

We must not only look at the types of drugs that are being used, but also how people are acquiring them and how to effectively limit that. Our enforcement personnel are working diligently with the Postal Service to find ways to curb this trend, such as using advanced data. But it is a topic that needs more work. By cutting off their ability to purchase these dangerous synthetic opioids, we can help to limit this epidemic.

As a lifelong pharmacist, I have seen firsthand the dangers and problems associated with opioid abuse and its impact on our communities. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to counter this trend in hopes of saving lives.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for hosting this tonight. It is so very vital to our country. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. As a pharmacist, when people come into the pharmacy, for example, if they want to get Sudafed, a cold medication, they have to go through some special process. It is behind counter. Is that right?

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Now, what if they wanted to pick up an opioid prescription? Do they have to show an ID? Are they required by law to have the same kind of restrictions?

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Yes, they are. They have to show an ID in order to pick it up. Now, the prescription itself is a C2 prescription, so if we don't recognize them at the pharmacy, we have to ask them for their ID to make sure that is indeed the person who is picking it up.

We also have a program in Georgia, in fact, a program that you are very fa-

miliar with, a prescription drug monitoring program, that allows us to go and check a database to see if that person has actually been doctor shopping or is pharmacy shopping and getting it at other places. That has helped us. It is a great tool in fighting this epidemic.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. But as the gentleman knows, that is data within the State, but across State lines, that data is still not populated.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. That is one of the major problems. For instance, in my practice, I practiced in Savannah, Georgia, which is on the South Carolina line, and only 2 hours from the Florida State line. That was a constant problem for us. I could look at my data all day long, but I wouldn't know whether they had gotten something filled in South Carolina or in Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I appreciate that. That is a problem we are going to have to fix in our committee.

I want to call up the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), eastern Ohio. Speaking of being able to jump across State lines and have prescriptions filled, minutes away from the Pennsylvania/West Virginia border, could travel down there, and also part of that deadly area along the Ohio Valley where so much of this is occurring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Representative MURPHY, for holding this Special Order on such a critically important topic.

And you mention that my district borders the State of Pennsylvania, and it does. And I have had so many incidents of engagement with my constituents on the opioid addiction issue. Several of them really stick out.

Representative MURPHY, one of those happened in Pennsylvania. Occasionally, because my district goes all the way up to the top into northeast Ohio, occasionally I fly in and out of Pennsylvania. I was there a couple of years ago, and I was sitting in the lounge waiting for a flight. I happened to be on a phone call, and I noticed that a gentleman began to look my direction. He very patiently waited until I got off the telephone, and then he came over, introduced himself. He recognized me, and he said: I am not one of your constituents, but I know that you represent a district just across the border in Ohio. He said: But I want to implore you, to beg you and your colleagues in Congress, please do something about the opioid addiction. He said: Our 21-year-old son died of an overdose in January. He had just gotten out of a rehab, was doing well, had gotten a job. He came home one Friday night, said he was going out with some friends. The next morning his mother and I found him dead in his room.

I hear stories like that all of the time.

I can tell you that the opioid addiction epidemic that is streaking across our country is not one that we are going to be able to arrest our way out of. It is not one that we are going to be able to incarcerate our way out of. It is an issue, my dear colleagues, that is going to take everybody from the top to the bottom, from the President of the United States all the way down to the family members. I am talking about local government officials, law enforcement, the judiciary, faith-based organizations, community organizations. This is something we are going to have to all be engaged in.

We have appropriated, as you know, Representative MURPHY, hundreds of millions of dollars, billions, in fact, to attack the opioid epidemic. More is needed. We are not going to be able to simply throw money at this problem. It is going to require a cultural change within our country.

I have so many other stories, but I don't want to take up more time because I know I have other colleagues here who want to testify on this very important issue.

Just know that I am with you. We take this issue very seriously in our district. Back in Ohio, we are constantly reaching out to law enforcement, mental health providers, healthcare providers, faith- and community-based organizations, and families on how to attack this problem.

I thank you for giving me a chance to speak on it.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I want to next recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON). Certainly he sees this issue, too. As I mentioned before, one of the problems physicians have, if they do not know what kind of prescriptions that person is on, for example, a medical record may show if a person has an allergy to penicillin or something, but you may have no idea that that patient may, for example, be taking buprenorphine or methadone unless they tell you or you test for it. And as a surgeon, what happens when they go to get anesthesia and the complications come from that, but it is part of the reasons why we have to make sure that you as a physician have access to these records, things we can clean up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order tonight to talk about this really important subject on behalf of the American people.

The opioid abuse disorder and drug addiction have impacted every community in our Nation. The epidemic knows no boundaries; does not discriminate based on age, gender, or socioeconomic status.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 91 American

lives are lost every day from an opioid abuse overdose. Unfortunately, drug overdoses in Indiana have increased fivefold over the past decade, and southern Indiana and the Wabash Valley, the area I represent, are bearing the brunt of this devastation.

This year in Vigo County, Indiana, population around 108,000 citizens, authorities have responded to over 16 opioid- or heroin-induced overdoses already this year.

Vanderburgh County, Indiana, 182,000 citizens, saw 29 deaths from overdose in 2016, which is a fourfold increase from the prior year. This year, the county has seen 25 confirmed heroin- or fentanyl-related overdoses already, but the coroner thinks it may be more.

Just this month, we have seen reports of instances of an opioid-based drug called gray death in Evansville, Indiana.

We are working here in Congress with our States and local communities to finally bring relief to these families, but a lot of work has to be done. While we still have much to do, over the past couple of years, we have actually made significant progress to bring hope to our communities and expand access to treatment for those who need it.

I was proud to be part of our efforts that we put into law, the landmark legislation, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, and I had the opportunity to author a portion of CARA that expanded access to medication-assisted opioid use disorder treatment, ensure patients have wider access to more comprehensive-based treatment options, and helped minimize the potential for diversion.

As Congressman MURPHY mentioned, the key here is ongoing therapy, counseling, and monitoring. Medication-assisted treatment is not a panacea, but it is a component of a more comprehensive treatment plan for each individual.

Through our work in implementing the 21st Century Cures Act, Congress has provided significant funding for the States. In fact, Indiana recently was granted nearly \$11 million from the Department of Health and Human Services to help us with this epidemic.

Again, most of us know someone, a family member, a friend, a neighbor, who has been impacted by this epidemic in some way. As a physician, I have seen the power of addiction up close and have focused on shaping real policy solutions here in Washington, D.C., to improve access to treatment for patients who are battling their problem every day. We all share in this fight, and we can't end this epidemic through policy changes alone. It is ongoing, and it is going to take all of us working together as a community to meet this challenge.

In that respect, I have met with and have been working with people who represent medical schools and resi-

dency programs in our country to help better educate the physician on prescribing habits as it relates to pain, whether that is surgical pain or chronic pain. It is a multifaceted approach, and I commend Congressman MURPHY for his dedication to helping end this crisis in our country, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his impassioned words and dedication here.

I want to refer back to my map here a moment. Dr. BUCSHON was referring to his district in southern Indiana here, which, on this 2014 map, was already showing high mortality rates for those who have drug overdoses.

Look here in the State of Washington, also an area that, on this 2014 map, showed a lot of problems, and now the problem is getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) to speak on this issue.

□ 1715

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this important issue and for the opportunity to address the House on this very important topic.

Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, our Nation is facing an epidemic. Over the past two decades, opioid overdoses have quadrupled. Think about that. They have quadrupled in the United States. My home State, as Dr. Murphy has just mentioned, has faced significant increases in drug overdose death rates, including a 70 percent increase in synthetic opioid overdose deaths in just the last 10 years. It is clear that this is a crisis, which is why we in Congress are committed to combating this growing epidemic.

Late last year, Congress passed sweeping legislation, called the 21st Century Cures Act. It was bipartisan legislation that authorized \$6.3 billion in funding to bring our healthcare innovation infrastructure into the 21st century. This legislation included \$1 billion for opioid intervention and prevention treatment programs throughout all 50 States. Earlier this spring, the Federal Government began awarding grants in order to confront this crisis, including \$11.7 million to the State of Washington.

While these funds will help expand treatment options, there is still much more work to be done at the Federal level, which is why I cosponsored legislation like H.R. 1057, the Synthetics Trafficking and Overdose Prevention, or STOP, Act. Designed to stop dangerous synthetic drugs like fentanyl, which you heard about, and carfentanyl from being shipped through our borders, this legislation will combat bad actors from China and India who have been taking advantage of weaknesses in international mail security standards to break U.S. customs laws and

really wreak havoc on our communities.

This is just one step of the opioid crisis that we must address. We need to combat the illicit drugs coming into this country as well as equip doctors, nurses, and first responders with the resources they need to treat pain appropriately.

We also need to support better access to care for individuals suffering from psychiatric and substance abuse disorders. And, most importantly, we must ensure these drugs are not falling into the hands of our Nation's children.

My colleagues in Congress and I are committed to combating this epidemic to keep it from causing further harm to our Nation's families and communities.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his dedication to helping his State of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), whose district is just north of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to talk about some of the problems, in his experience, and his thoughts about what we should be doing about substance abuse.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his long work in this field, not just the last 2 years but, really, a lifetime in this space. I commend him for that work. Also, with mental health issues, he has been helping educate Congress about moving toward solutions.

My colleague has outlined the scope of the national problem we have, and each of us can talk about our respective districts and what has been going on there.

In my district, just over the border from my colleague's, western Pennsylvania has been especially hard hit. In Beaver County, we saw 102 overdose deaths related to opioids in 2016, up from 30 in 2013. In Cambria County, we lost 94 people to overdose deaths in 2016, a startling 62 percent increase from 2015.

The stories just keep coming. A story of the mother who lost her 10th child, her youngest child, to this epidemic, who insisted that the words "damn heroin" be put in her son's obituary. Or the couple we learned about before Christmas, who overdosed, and 3 days later their infant died from neglect, all three being found 4 days after that.

Mr. Speaker, it is all hands on deck to address this crisis. We are coming together at the Federal, State, and community level to develop a comprehensive strategy to stop this epidemic and to share best practices at every level. That is what a big part of our Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, passed last year, was all about—an important first step.

Another asset we have, Mr. Speaker, is the Office of National Drug Control

Policy. This week, I led a bipartisan group of my colleagues, in a letter to President Trump requesting that the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy be re-elevated to a Cabinet-level position.

Since its inception, this Office has played a central and critical role in fighting drug trafficking and drug addiction. Both the Office of National Drug Control Policy and its Director have played, and should continue to play, a central role in this effort.

The Office was created in 1988 with the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. Its mission is to fight the Nation's drug problem through three areas: prevention, addiction recovery, and enforcement.

The Office's Director, commonly referred to as the "drug czar," was elevated to the Cabinet in 1993 by President Clinton, who wanted to raise the Office's profile in order to coordinate and emphasize legislative efforts on the Hill. More importantly, he wanted to focus and emphasize efforts within the administration for the antidrug efforts of the Department of Justice, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services. The Obama administration removed the Office from the position it had in the Cabinet.

When it comes to drug addiction as well as to the illicit drug trade occurring across our southern border, the challenges have never been greater. This is no time to retreat in our efforts, and it is time to restore the Office of National Drug Control Policy to the Cabinet.

The Office is a very important part of the fight against the opioid epidemic, particularly because it plays a crucial role in coordinating efforts at various levels of government. In addition to the legislation that we are passing here in Congress, the administration has a crucial role to play, as do leaders at the State and local level.

We all want to end this crisis, and this common cause unites us, perhaps more than any other issue, across party and partisan lines.

Again, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for giving me this opportunity, and I thank him for his work in this area.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for his dedication on this issue. And, yes, he is right: we have to cross party lines and work on this together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), another friend, who has seen these problems, as well, in his district and knows full well how these problems have merged well into the Ohio area, as it is an insidious problem.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in this most important area.

Mr. Speaker, the heroin and opioid scourge is running this country into

the ground, and, unfortunately, the problem appears to be getting worse, not better. That grim reality is particularly true in my district in Cincinnati, where, during a single week last summer, city health officials reported 174 overdoses in 1 week.

Deaths caused by opioids have doubled in my district, where, during the first 4 months in 2017, the Hamilton County Coroner's Office had already logged in hundreds and hundreds of opioid overdoses—heartbreaking numbers.

But numbers only tell part of the story. The circumstances surrounding the spike in overdoses can, at times, be horrifying.

A couple of months ago, in Cincinnati, Ohio, a 9-year-old girl called 911 about both of her parents, who overdosed on heroin in their SUV. She told the dispatcher she was scared and that her parents wouldn't wake up. The girl didn't know where she was or what was wrong with her parents, but she, fortunately, knew how to call 911. That call saved her parents' lives.

But no little girl—or little boy, for that matter—should ever be placed in that situation by their parents, or by anyone.

These types of stories are becoming all too common. Opioids don't discriminate based on age or race or socioeconomic class. Opioids can kill anyone, in any neighborhood. Every day, there are more headlines about how heroin and other opioids are basically taking over the country.

The simple fact is that nearly every Member of Congress could come to the floor today and share a similar story from their own district. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we work together to find new and more successful ways to combat the opioid epidemic. We need to put politics aside and help people in need.

Last year, we came together in a bipartisan manner to pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, and I think there is a good chance that the expanded treatment and recovery options that legislation created will help some of those suffering from addiction to turn their lives around.

While CARA will give local law enforcement and healthcare officials more resources to fight opioid addiction, we need additional legislation to help combat the importation into the United States of extremely dangerous synthetic drugs like fentanyl and carfentanil, which many have blamed for the spike of heroin overdoses. According to the DEA, much of the supply of these two dangerous drugs on our streets originates overseas, particularly from China and India.

Bipartisan legislation is being led by Representative TIBERI and Senator PORTMAN, the Synthetics Trafficking and Overdose Prevention, or STOP,

Act. It would update the customs process to require that advanced electronic notice of all packages, large or small, be provided to Customs officials. Providing this information to Customs before the packages arrive will help them, meaning the Customs agency, to intercept more illegal shipments and prevent these dangerous drugs from reaching drug traffickers within our borders.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be embraced with the same bipartisan enthusiasm that we saw with CARA because the heroin and opioid problem in this country is too serious, too significant, and too widespread for us not to work together at every level of government to find a solution to this epidemic. It is way overdue. We need to work together in a bipartisan manner about this.

I again want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in this area.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I point also on this map here to the Cincinnati area in southern Ohio, which is one of the hot spots in 2014 that has continued to grow as a problem. We recognize this is both a local problem and a nationwide problem.

I want to tell a story here.

Last December, when the President was signing into law the 21st Century Cures Act, which included my legislation, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, a former State Senator from West Virginia took the stage to introduce it. David Grubb talked about his daughter, Jessie, who, herself, had been in rehab, in treatment, something like three or four times, had had several drug overdose instances and had been revived. But what happened to her also is part of what they called the loaded gun that never should have happened.

She went into the hospital for some surgery, but the doctors and nurses never told her discharging doctor that she was in recovery for heroin addiction. The point we made before about the NASPA list, or the other lists there, or the 42 C.F.R., blocks information from going into the medical record. So while someone was out to protect her privacy, they didn't protect her from death.

She was given a prescription of 50 opioid painkillers. Remember, I said before that when a person is given this prescription, they run the risk of relapse, overdose, or bad drug interactions. In her case, it was an overdose that finally took her life—another important reason why we have to deal with this 42 C.F.R. and get rid of that arcane and, quite frankly, deadly law.

Let me talk about some other recommendations of what I believe Congress can do to help.

The references made before by Dr. BUCSHON and others about the prescrip-

tion drug monitoring program—and also BUDDY CARTER of Georgia mentioned this, too—where a pharmacist or a physician can say, “Is this person on other opioids? Have they jumped across the border? Have they seen four, five, or more physicians for some opiates?” by having a better PDMP, prescription drug monitoring program, or National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting program, we have to make sure that all States use the same system and that it collects data from across borders so doctors can easily see this.

But part of this, too, in dealing with the 42 C.F.R., is understanding Federal law prohibits including buprenorphine and methadone in the PDMP. How absurd and how cruel that is that a doctor would not even be able to know that a patient is taking one of those prescriptions.

Also, some of these drugs can end up being a respiratory suppressant, and when the patient takes another drug such as benzodiazapine, it can add to that effect and add to further complications.

Another aspect, too, which we must be further engaged with is vigorous public education programs across all age groups, beginning with early elementary school.

□ 1730

When schools have some of these programs—and we will bring forth some models that talk about these programs in a future hearing I will be holding in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee—these are very, very important to help students, early on, understand the dangers of this.

This is not just recreation, but it is so easy to slip into addiction. Given that 80 percent of drug abuse begins with a prescription, whether it is a student, athlete, perhaps a football player who injures a leg or something and he is given some of these drugs, it is essential the whole family be counseled from the onset, understanding the concerns and dangers of continuing to take these drugs.

We also have to have drug take-back programs and public education programs stressing the importance of proper disposal of unused opiates and pain prescriptions to prevent them from being stolen or misused. For example, if a family is selling their home and they are having an open house and strangers come into the house and while they are there they say, “Can I use your restroom?” and the family lets them do that, don't be surprised if that person has no intention of buying a house but does have an intention of going into the bathrooms and checking the medicine cabinets and finding any medication and taking it.

Also, when teens come over to the house for parties or socializing, don't be surprised if they also go into medi-

cine cabinets, look in drawers in the bathrooms or drawers in other places of the house looking for some of those drugs which they, themselves, will take or sell.

We have to make sure we have vigorous patient education programs about doctor-prescribed opioids to make sure people know about that before the addiction takes foot. And taking one of these prescriptions may only take 3 or 4 weeks before it begins to kick in and cause problems.

I know myself, back in 2005, I was in a rollover accident in Iraq with a couple of other Members of Congress. Our vehicle rolled, and as a result of that accident, I ended up having a mild concussion, snapping my neck, having some temporary paralysis, and a great deal of pain. Well, battlefield medicine is one that gets you out of the area, stops the bleeding, stops the pain, and ships you off to some other hospital, and that was the case for me.

But I know what happens. Everywhere I landed in a helicopter or an ambulance, appropriately so, the physicians would ask me a number of orienting questions, but also say: “Are you in pain? On a scale of 1 to 10, how much pain are you in?” And when I proceeded to say that number, immediately, as they would do for many other people in the battlefield, they would administer morphine or some other pain reliever and move you on from there.

What happened, though, returning to the United States, where pain continued for me, I was prescribed some pills for that pain, but I was also prescribed fentanyl. Never once was it ever described to me: “Be careful with this. This is highly addictive. This is a problem.”

Now, after a few weeks on this and recognizing it was hard to even do my job because I couldn't keep my head clear, I just said: “That it is. I am not taking this anymore.” But at that point, my body had already begun to develop some tolerance for this, and when I stopped taking it, I had some reaction.

Granted, it was not as severe as some of those who have been taking these drugs at a higher dosage and longer, but I could feel myself actually saying I understand what people mean when they say their skin feels like it is peeling off of them and they feel a sense of nausea and other problems as well.

Now, I can't even imagine what it is like for someone who is taking higher doses for longer periods of time. But it is extremely important that, every time a prescription is written, pharmacists have an opportunity to counsel patients and doctors are also doing more than simply passing out a prescription.

Pharmacists should do what BUDDY CARTER was saying before: make sure they have the person showing a photo

ID. Is this, indeed, a prescription they are picking up for themselves or claiming they have it for someone else? Perhaps that prescription was stolen from someone.

We have to make sure that we also understand, for those out there trying to legalize marijuana, I caution you, because the marijuana that is out there on the streets or presented in many areas can cause tremendous psychiatric problems for those who are already at risk. The longer you are on some of the types of marijuana, the greater risk you have for things like delusional behavior.

We have to make sure we also eliminate Medicaid payments for those question 14 responses I made reference to before when you are in the hospital to ask if the hospital adequately addressed your pain.

In the area of treatment and recovery, we have to expand the mental health workforce. As I said before, half the counties in America have no psychiatrists, no psychologists, no drug and alcohol counselors, and those who are out there likely have their schedule so filled, they don't even have room to treat someone. Not all of them even know how to treat addictive disorders.

The fact that a majority of people who may have an addiction disorder also have a concurrent mental health disorder is another reason why we have to increase this workforce by tens of thousands. Just for child and adolescent psychiatrists alone, we need another 21,000 of those.

We need tens of thousands more psychologists. It is important that the schools of medicine, schools of psychology, and schools of social work are graduating more people with these degrees and getting them into our workforce.

I have had legislation before, and we passed some things in the 21st Century Cures Act and in my Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, to provide more funding so that more of these folks can continue with their education. It is essential. It is like trying to fight a war without soldiers, trying to fight this war, which is killing more people every year than the entire war in Vietnam, but we do not have the soldiers to fight this.

We also have to make sure that, with regard to the government-sponsored medication-assisted treatment which I referred to before, we cannot simply rely on synthetic opioid maintenance alone. We have to make sure there are requirements to have that person in counseling and treatment.

I have heard from some persons that go to those treatment programs that they have no counseling at all, and some have great counseling. In some cases, sitting in the waiting room, perhaps a nurse or someone simply checks up on them: "What are you doing? How are you doing?" That is considered and

written down as group therapy. That is not acceptable in any way, shape, or form.

We need 100,000 more inpatient psychiatric beds, and we have to make sure insurance companies recognize that an addictive disorder is a chronic disorder. Simply giving someone a weekend or a few days for withdrawal and then putting them back on the street is not an answer.

That is why we have to encourage private insurance companies and Medicaid and Medicare. And I say Medicare because a large number of people who are having some of these problems are also the elderly.

We have to make sure that we increase the availability of fast-acting opiate blockers for first responders, such as Narcan. But let's keep this in mind: In some cases, we hear of some of those pushers of these drugs who also give an accompanying dosage of Narcan, recognizing that the drug will bring that person to a near-death experience.

We have heard from first responders and others, law enforcement, where someone may actually have a party where someone will remain there expecting that someone will actually have an overdose and die in order to bring them back to life. That is how some of these people are seeking some of those experiences.

We have to make sure that States review their laws, as some are doing, that if you take one of these opiates and you do have that near-death experience, perhaps that should be treated the same as a suicide attempt, that that person is in imminent danger of harming themselves or someone else and perhaps determine if they need an inpatient psychiatric stay.

We have to make sure we have support of employment for those in recovery to break the cycle of recovery and reexposure. Many times, persons who are trying to stay clean, they can't get a job because they can't pass the drug test, so they may be in a job and have exposure to other people who still end up with substance abuse.

We have to make sure they have higher standards and increased accountability for payment models that require evidence-based treatment in halfway houses, three-quarter houses, and residential treatment facilities.

We have to deploy certified addiction counselors to emergency rooms because we know that, when a person comes to an emergency room, if they see an addiction counselor there, they are not just simply given a business card and told, "Call someone next week and we hope you get treatment"; but if they see an addiction counselor in the emergency room, they increase their chances of follow-up by 50 percent, according to a Michigan study.

We must make sure the FDA is working with companies to find alternatives

to opioids and that, again, Medicaid and other physicians are educated on some of those aspects.

Physician training has to also be ramped up: require them to have training in opioid prescribing practices on risk for addiction and abuse and prescribing limited dosages. Instead of prescribing dosages for a month, perhaps just a couple of days. In many cases, they are not adequately trained in alternatives to opioids and the potential harm of overprescribing.

We have to increase training requirements for healthcare providers who deliver this medication-assisted treatment. Right now, in many cases, they only have a few hours of training, and then they can go and prescribe this and have very little, if any, training at all in drug addiction counseling. Before doctors write a prescription, we can make sure they are looking at the NASPER list or other lists as well.

In the area of law enforcement, it is critical that what is called the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program is made more available, with greater access around the country.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left in our segment here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. We have to make sure we have more border security so that we are intercepting these drugs as they come across the border.

We need funding for the post offices because, in many cases, unwittingly, the letter carriers are the ones who are delivering to people's homes fentanyl and other drugs.

In the incarceration system, we have to make sure we are testing inmates for the presence of drugs in their system during their incarceration. We can offer them medications which, upon discharge, actually block any effects of some of these drugs.

We need to also make sure that Medicaid and other insurance companies' payments resume immediately upon release from their incarceration to prevent them from relapsing or returning to the drug culture.

We also have to make sure we have solid data collection. In many cases, when we show the charts about death rates around the country, the charts may be grossly inaccurate. In many cases first responders, paramedics, and coroners do not keep accurate data on these rates. The persons themselves may not even be tested to see if they died from a drug overdose.

There are several items in here listing what we can be doing here as a nation, and there are many more. The point is we have fallen short and we have seen some problems with this. There is more that we can do and we must do in order to save lives.

I know I just have about 3 minutes left, Mr. Speaker, am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to talk about some of the issues dealing with substance abuse.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MURPHY for his incredible leadership on this important topic and for holding this Special Order this evening.

I can tell you, the citizens of the State of Ohio are paying attention. The opioid epidemic continues to intensify with over 2 million people addicted to prescription opioids and more than half a million addicted to heroin in 2015, alone.

According to an estimate from The New York Times, drug overdoses are now the leading cause of death for Americans under 50; and drug overdoses are the leading cause of accidental death in our country, with prescription opioids responsible for more than 20,000 deaths in the United States just in 2015, according to the American Society of Addiction Medicine.

I have to mention that Medicaid plays an important role in addressing this epidemic because it is a lifeline program, providing coverage to over 650,000 non-elderly adults with opioid addiction and covering a range of treatment services.

Ohio, tragically, leads the Nation in opioid overdoses in 2014. Sadly, deaths have continued to rise with increased use of heroin and fentanyl. Many States have expanded Medicaid, including Ohio, to cover adults who make a modest \$16,500 a year per individual. By broadening coverage of adults, the Medicaid expansion reaches many low-income adults with opioid addiction who were previously ineligible for coverage and facilitates access to treatment.

The opioid epidemic is so bad that even librarians are learning how to treat overdoses for individuals who come into libraries.

Mental health can be comorbid with opioid abuse, and those suffering from that duality are truly an American tragedy. For an addict to complete rehab and recovery successfully, they need to work in concert. And over half of uninsured non-elderly adults with an opioid addiction had a mental illness in the past year, with over one in five operating with a serious mental illness, such as depression, bipolar disorder, or schizophrenia.

To address the gravity of the challenge, I want to put on the RECORD the work that Lucas County, my home county, is doing with their DART program, which engages hospitals, mental health centers, and businesses in the community.

Believe it or not, according to Sheriff Tharp, the DART program has helped nearly 2,300 overdose victims and has a

74 percent success rate of getting people into detox and treatment programs at a total cost of about \$370 per individual. This is truly an amazing record, and I wish to include in the RECORD the information about other counties in the district that I represent.

The opioid epidemic does not just affect the addicted. Lucas County Children Services is struggling to help children displaced by the opioid epidemic.

The agency has been repeatedly forced to do the unimaginable tasks of comforting children as first responders work to save their parents from a heroin or fentanyl overdoses. On several occasions, it has had to break the terrible news to these children that their parents succumbed to their addiction.

LCCS is also coping with a dramatic increase in the number of children placed in protective custody because their families have been blinded by substance dependence. The State's current budget proposes no increase for this program, which is a shame. This is no time to short change children.

Finally, I submit for the RECORD a story of the Guest family of Lorain, Ohio, whose daughter Tera died of a heroin overdose at the age of 24.

According to the Cleveland Plain Dealer: "Tera Guest, 24, died Jan. 29, 2014, shortly after she and her sister used painkillers and a heroin-fentanyl mix. Her death marked the end of a two-year period that included stints in treatment and losing custody of her two children to her mother.

"Tera is among the hundreds who have died of overdoses within the last three years in Lorain County. The county coroner's office said a record 67 people died in 2013, followed by 60 in 2014 and 62 in 2015."

Lori took her tragedy and turned it into action and formed the Lorain Community Task Force, which is a group that raises awareness and provides assistance to addicts and their families.

Lori stepped up, and now Congress must do the same. We cannot turn our back on these people now. We must fight, we must work together, we must put politics aside. Only then can we begin to heal our Nation from this crisis.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this critical issue.

As was laid out, communities across this country, communities like mine in northeast Wisconsin, are in the midst of a public health crisis. It is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. It is an American issue, one that should bring us all together.

Opioid abuse is wreaking havoc on our homes, our schools, our churches. Its devastating effects are destroying our families and the lives of our loved ones.

As was pointed out, more Americans will have died from drug overdoses in 2017 than there are names on the Vietnam War Memorial. That is alarming. That should put it into sharp relief.

As a Marine veteran, I am acutely aware that servicemembers are more susceptible than the average person to addiction. In fact, veterans die from accidental drug overdoses at a 33 percent higher rate than the rest of the population, and something must be done to reverse this awful trend.

I commend our State lawmakers in Wisconsin who are doing aggressive work on this front, and I commend the gentleman and everyone who has spoken out for doing the same thing at the national level, and I look forward to working with him.

Because headline after headline reminds us of the tragic loss of life that has resulted from our Nation's opioid and addictions risk, we have to step up. We have to take action.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the gentleman convening this Special Order this evening. It has been fun working with him in the past on creative, bipartisan efforts to try and make sure the Federal Government is a better partner on this.

I look forward to working with him on legislation that will make it easier to be able to have the information available that people need for integrated treatment and his commitment to trying to bring people together to understand the problem and the fact that we are agreed more than we are divided on these things. I look forward to working with him on some progress in the months ahead.

□ 1745

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oregon, and I thank all the Members speaking here tonight. I want to say, as you saw, this was a bipartisan coalition of Members. We are much better off working hand in hand to pass legislation that changes issues than standing next to each other as pallbearers for another 59,000 people in our Nation next week.

Mr. Speaker, with that and with some hope that we can pass this legislation and save some lives, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3003, NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-195) on the resolution (H. Res. 414) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal



immigration laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3004, KATE'S LAW, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 3, 2017, THROUGH JULY 10, 2017**

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-196) on the resolution (H. Res. 415) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and providing for proceedings during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**ISSUES OF THE DAY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank all my fellow Members that are speaking up on this very important issue. I appreciate Dr. Murphy taking the lead. It is something that has not gotten enough attention. We continue to have people dying, and we need to deal with the issue.

It is interesting: some people find great hope in their religious beliefs. Throughout America's history, Christianity has been an important foundation. No, you didn't have to be a Christian to participate in government, to be a Founder, but, as Ben Franklin said, we know because he wrote out the speech in his own handwriting immediately afterwards, as requested.

So often, teachers teach that he is a Deist, as so many of the Founders, we are told, were Deists. Yet in his own words, in his own handwriting, at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, at 80 years old, 2 to 3 years away from meeting his Judge, his Maker—severe gout, arthritis, overweight, trouble getting up and down—he said these words:

"I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Franklin said, we have been—by the way, that is obviously a reference to Jesus' comment about the sparrow, and God seeing the sparrow, watching the sparrow.

But he goes on and he makes it very clear, as his own words indicate, that unless—he said: "We have been as-

sured, sir, in the Sacred Writing that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

Again, referencing Scripture.

Those are not the words—any of them—they are not the words of a Deist. So teachers that have been miseducating people for so long, I know they are just passing on what they were taught, but there has been so much miseducation for so long.

Regardless of what else, we don't try to force our religious beliefs on anyone. That is not what the House of Representatives is for. But since it formed such an important part of our founding and a part of the discussion for most of our Nation's history, it is important to point out that those Scriptures that Ben Franklin referenced at the Constitutional Convention, the Scriptures that have been quoted so often—

We know the Bible is the number one, far and away, most quoted book in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Nothing else anywhere even close. It has brought hope to people that had no hope.

So it is interesting that, as our Nation moves further and further away from the source of so much hope for so much of our Nation's history, and for those who lived through that part of our Nation's history, the hope that Franklin Roosevelt brought to the microphone when he read the famous prayer on D-Day as American soldiers were fighting, as he said, against those forces of evil, drawn from a country that was used to peace that were fighting forces of evil.

But they had hope. That hope and prayer that Franklin Roosevelt gave over the microphone for several minutes now is condemned by so many. That hope that served as the foundation, the building blocks for the beliefs of Sam Adams, that so many around in those days gave credit as being an important foundational building block for the revolution, for the new Nation.

We are arriving at a time when record numbers of people are dying. We heard today in our Judiciary hearing, I believe it was 144 Americans each day are dying of drug overdoses.

Who dies of a drug overdose?

People without hope, people who are drawn to drugs to provide a good, warm feeling.

We have more military members killing themselves than at any time probably in any nation's history. I don't know that for sure, but it is just hard to imagine a time in any nation's history when so many of its veterans are taking their own lives, a time when so many of our active military have taken their own lives.

Obviously, as people have said over the years, that is a permanent solution to a temporary problem, and it is the act of someone without hope.

So we know, regardless of whether people accepted Christian beliefs or

not, Christianity, throughout our Nation's founding, provided hope. The Bible provided hope for those who were slaves through the 1700s and 1800s. So many were Christians, and it was the Bible, it was those wonderful spirituals, it was Scripture that gave them hope to endure and get through the horrors of slavery.

Though Abraham Lincoln bragged in his early twenties about being an infidel and not believing in God, Steve Mansfield, in his book in the last 5 years or so about Lincoln's struggle with God, documents his going from being an infidel to a point where, as President, he read Scripture constantly.

Dr. Rufus Fears, a brilliant history professor at the University of Oklahoma, asked me once: You know why Lincoln's speeches are so good and touch our hearts?

And I said: I don't know. They are just really well-worded. They are great speeches.

He said: No. He was reading so much Scripture by that point in his life, like the Gettysburg Address, he wrote his speeches as if they were Scripture. His words provided hope because he referenced Scripture so much.

And whether atheist, agnostic, Muslim, Buddhist, whatever, so many have a general knowledge of what Christians believe, and it is very basic. God, according to Genesis, the Old Testament, He created the world, created the universe, created man and woman. Basically, we got the Bible as an owner's manual, giving us important history so that we could get a good look at what works and what doesn't, and what the owner expects, and how we can live the most joyous and hopeful life even through terrible, perilous times.

Christianity goes on and, in the New Testament, points to the belief that the Old Testament, as we refer to it, points to the Messiah coming to be born in Bethlehem. So many of the prophecies about the Messiah to come. Even if one believes Jesus was not the Messiah, incredible that He could fulfill those prophecies the way He did.

And Christians, as people of most religions understand, believe what John 3:16 says: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

So, clearly, Christian religion is based completely on love; that God so loved the world, that he gave His only Son, who was perfect, unblemished with sins of the Earth. And only something—someone unblemished could take away the sins of the world.

And the additional exclamation point that makes clear that Christianity is a religion based on love: it was made clear by Jesus himself when He was asked by the lawyer, naturally: What's the greatest commandment?



He said: love God, and the others like it. Love each other. And on those two commands hang all the law and the prophets.

If you were to go about outlining the Ten Commandments, they easily fall under those two headings: Love God, love each other.

But then Jesus also made clear: Greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

And Jesus knew, because whether you believe he was the fulfillment of all the prophecies from the Old Testament or not, He could have escaped. He made no effort. He gave himself out of love.

It is easy to say He is either a liar, or He is a lunatic, or He is exactly what He said. But his acts were based on love. He gave his life for a world that needed an unblemished lamb.

□ 1800

With that background, Mr. Speaker—and, of course, the Supreme Court outlined it much more thoroughly in the late 1800s as it came to the conclusion well after the horrid case of Dred Scott, when the court analyzed and made clear, determined, pronounced: Even though everyone in the United States is not a Christian, this is a Christian Nation.

And everything that the Court called into view in their decision testified to that fact, as the Court pronounced.

Now, so why am I going into this?

It is because we have hit what may be as low a point as we have ever hit in Congress. When Russell Vought was being questioned, on the same day, another person named Comey was testifying here on Capitol Hill. Russell Vought was being questioned by Senators so they could determine how they wanted to vote on whether or not he could fill a role in the administration. This low point in our Nation's history has to rank down there as one of our low points.

When so much throughout our history has testified to the fact that Christianity was such an important part of our foundation, of everything that has been good in America, the ending of slavery, driven and guided by churches. Sure, there were some atheists involved. The revolution following The Great Awakening, 1730s and 1740s, ended up yielding a revolution that produced the greatest country in the history of the world by virtue of the opportunities, by virtue of the protections for freedom-loving people around the world, by virtue of, you know, the opportunities and the assets, and that a country would ultimately arise where the number one health problem for the Nation's poor was obesity. With more opportunities, more assets, more freedoms, even then Solomon's Israel—incredible country with many religions—celebrated here in the United States.

But as General Jay Garner was told when he was in Iraq after Saddam Hussein was driven out—he has told me twice—actually, three times has said it when I heard him speaking back in 2004. I called him. He reiterated it. He told me again in last September. Yes, I remember it correctly. He talked to a direct descendant of Mohammed in Iraq about what kind of government the U.S. should help Iraq have. I will contend we shouldn't be about nation building, but that was his order and that is what he was doing.

And he said that this descendant of Mohammed with a black turban said he was going to explain in his native tongue, because they were recording it. And then after he finished, he said: Now, let me just give you, in a nutshell, what I told you we need here for a government in Iraq. We need a government formed by Iraqis, a government composed of Iraqis, and a government based on a constitution which is based on the teachings of Jesus.

A descendant of Mohammed told Jay Garner that the best hope for a country was a constitution based on the teachings of Jesus, because basically those teachings of Jesus are the only way in which a nation can allow freedom of religion.

No matter which religion or agnosticism, atheism, whatever religion, it is not going to be able to truly allow freedom of religion unless it is based on the teachings of Jesus. And that is what this insightful descendant of Mohammed in Iraq told retired General Jay Garner.

So we get to 2017, a hearing on the same day Comey testified, this appointee nominee by President Trump, Russell Vought, a great man, a fine man, had his Christian beliefs perverted, twisted into something that was represented to be hateful. It is a religion based on the love of God and the love of His Son that would give his life for others.

Senator SANDERS said: "Let me get to this issue that has bothered me and bothered many other people. And that is in the piece that I referred to that you wrote for the publication called 'Resurgent.' You wrote, 'Muslims do not simply have a deficient theology. They do not know God because they have rejected Jesus Christ, His Son, and they stand condemned.'"

Senator SANDERS then went on and said: "Do you believe that statement is Islamophobic?"

Mr. Vought replied: "Absolutely not, Senator. I am a Christian, and I believe in a Christian set of principles based on my faith. That post, as I stated in the questionnaire to this committee, was to defend my alma mater, Wheaton College, a Christian school that has a statement of faith that includes the centrality of Jesus Christ for salvation, and . . ."

Senator SANDERS interrupts: "I apologize. Forgive me, we just don't

have a lot of time. Do you believe people in the Muslim religion stand condemned? Is that your view?"

Mr. Vought replied: "Again, Senator, I am a Christian, and I wrote that piece in accordance with the statement of faith at Wheaton College."

Senator SANDERS said: "I understand that. I don't know how many Muslims there are in America. Maybe a couple million. Are you suggesting that all those people stand condemned? What about Jew? Do they stand condemned, too?"

Mr. Vought replied: "Senator, I'm a Christian . . ."

Senator SANDERS at this point is shouting: "I understand you are a Christian, but this country are made of people who are not just—I understand that Christianity is the majority religion, but there are other people of different religions in this country and around the world. In your judgment, do you think that people who are not Christians are going to be condemned?"

Mr. Vought replied: "Thank you for probing on that question. As a Christian, I believe that all individuals are made in the image of God and are worthy of dignity and respect regardless of their religious beliefs. I believe that, as a Christian, that is how I should treat all individuals . . ."

Senator SANDERS responded: "You think your statement that you put into that publication, they do not know God because they rejected Jesus Christ, His Son, and they stand condemned, do you think that is respectful of other religions?"

Mr. Vought said: "Senator, I wrote a post based on being a Christian and attending a Christian school that has a statement of faith that speaks clearly in regard to the centrality of Jesus Christ in salvation."

Senator SANDERS said: "I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, that this nominee is really not someone who this country is supposed to be about."

And that came from—the quotes came from an article in the National Review quoting from the hearing itself.

That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, this may be the low point for hope in America when a sitting Senator condemns someone who is simply quoting from the teachings of Jesus, teachings that even a descendant of Mohammed knew was helpful in creating a great nation.

We have come a long way from the hope that abounded within the founders of this country, within the hope of those who fought to bring about the end of the horrendous, hideous practice of slavery, where human beings treated brother and sister human beings with chains in bondage.

And now we come to a point that I feared—and I brought it up when hate crime legislation was discussed—that the day would come when the religion of the world based on the love of God

and the love of Jesus Christ would be twisted to the point that it would be called hateful.

Jesus said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me."

He is either a liar or a lunatic or he is exactly who he said he was. But that is not hateful. It is not hateful to believe in a religion where you want to share the joy and the hope that comes from it.

One of the results, maybe it is a—not a result, but more of an unfortunate situation that exists. When you take away the hope of the Christian religion, condemn people for believing Jesus is the hope, as he said he was, or as our friend, the late Chuck Colson, pointed out: "Our hope is not going to arrive on Air Force One."

He believed the hope was in Jesus.

And now we have someone who is declared totally inappropriate to be a government official because he believes the teachings of Jesus. It is not hateful to believe the teachings of Jesus. In fact, someone—I know I have Jewish friends who have said: I thought Christians blamed Jews for killing Jesus.

Well, the truth is that anyone who is a true Christian, if they blame Jews or anyone else for the death of Jesus, they are not a Christian. They don't understand the belief that Jesus died for me and for anyone who has done wrong in this life.

□ 1815

So it is a sad day, it is a sad week, and it is a sad month to look how far we have come from the hope that was once so prevalent. Now we are in a society where suicide is rampant—144 drug overdoses a day, and that doesn't count all of the suicides by veterans and Active Duty military.

Christianity is a religion of love. May God grant wisdom to any Senator who thinks otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Robert Reeves Deputy Clerk to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 115th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk of the House.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through June 29 on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 28, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1803. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Selected Acquisition Reports for the Chemical Demilitarization-Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives and Ballistic Missile Defense System programs, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432(b)(1); Public Law 97-252, Sec. 1107(a)(1); (96 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1804. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting an additional legislative proposal for the proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 414. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 415. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and providing for proceedings during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017 (Rept. 115-196). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 3064. A bill to develop an anticorruption strategy, establish Offices for Anticorruption in the Department of Defense, Department of State, and United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3065. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to Congress a report on the national security implications of the outsourcing of industrial and manufacturing capacities to locations outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3066. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to protect United States students against foreign agents; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish certain criminal violations for various aspects of harassment using the interstate telecommunications system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the research credit for domestic manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3069. A bill to provide for guidance relating to the management of Department of Defense arsenals to ensure affordability and competence in critical capabilities areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 3070. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to clarify the definition of a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 3071. A bill to require executive agencies to consider equipment rental in any cost-effectiveness analysis for equipment acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 3072. A bill to increase from \$10,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA,

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3073. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Mental Health Awareness Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3074. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinvest in our communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 3075. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase adjustments of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 3076. A bill to amend section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act) to require agencies to accept electronic release forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 3077. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the retirement earnings test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIHUEN (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 3078. A bill to extend quarterly reports on confirmed ballistic missile launches from Iran and imposition of sanctions in connection with those launches; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 3079. A bill to reduce by one-half of one percent the discretionary budget authority of the Department of Defense for a fiscal year if the financial statement of the Department of Defense for the previous fiscal

year does not receive a qualified or unqualified audit opinion by an external independent auditor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOEBACK (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3080. A bill to provide installation reutilization authority for arsenals, depots, and plants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3081. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3082. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to translate the FAFSA into foreign languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 3083. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the preparation of career and technical education teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3085. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to American military personnel who fought in defense of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippine Archipelago between December 7, 1941, and May 10, 1942, and who died or were imprisoned by the Japanese military in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, Wake Island, and Guam from April 9, 1942, until September 2, 1945, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to their country; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3086. A bill to improve understanding and forecasting of space weather events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Foreign Affairs, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 3087. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain Tibetans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 3088. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to require one-stop delivery systems under such Act to offer services through internet websites and to direct the Secretary of Labor to develop standards and best practices for such websites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. Res. 410. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Res. 411. A resolution adjusting the amount of the Members' Representational Allowance; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H. Res. 412. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Ms.

HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 413. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July as "American Grown Flower Month"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Ms.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 416. A resolution recognizing the Muslim holy month of Ramadan, commending a month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and extending best wishes to Muslims in the United States and across the globe for a joyous and meaningful observance of Eid al-Fitr; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 417. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of civic education and civic involvement programs in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

71. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13, affirming and supporting the designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument under the Antiquities Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

72. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, urging the Congress to fully preserve the critical benefits which many older Nevadans have come to rely upon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 3069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 3070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay Debts and provide for the common Defence . . . of the United States; but all Duties, Imports and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 which grants to the Congress power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department of officer thereof.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 3072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 3073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 3075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 3076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. KIHUEN:

H.R. 3078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 3079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 3080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." [Page H9375]

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, clause 8, section 6, Congress is empowered "to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard or Weights and Measures"

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 3086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 3088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 22: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 140: Mr. PERRY.  
H.R. 305: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 351: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 449: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 468: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 474: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
H.R. 486: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
H.R. 489: Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 490: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. COMER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 525: Mr. BACIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 535: Mrs. MIAMI WALTERS of California.  
H.R. 544: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 545: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 592: Mr. BACON, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 604: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
H.R. 632: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 703: Ms. HANABUSA.  
H.R. 747: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 767: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 799: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
H.R. 828: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 845: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 884: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 920: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 921: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 952: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 970: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 986: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1002: Mr. RICHMOND.  
H.R. 1016: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 1046: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1058: Mr. TURNER and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 1070: Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 1094: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1098: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 1116: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MARINO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1122: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 1124: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1143: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H.R. 1148: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1155: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1164: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1178: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
H.R. 1223: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1225: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 1243: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1253: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1281: Mrs. LOWEY.  
H.R. 1298: Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 1358: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H.R. 1398: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1409: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. HUDSON.  
H.R. 1441: Mr. DUNN.  
H.R. 1444: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1495: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 1537: Mr. BABIN.  
H.R. 1542: Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 1552: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. RATCLIFFE.  
H.R. 1555: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H.R. 1563: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 1575: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1599: Mr. BRAT and Mr. ARRINGTON.  
H.R. 1606: Mr. CORREA, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 1626: Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 1649: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 1659: Mr. MEEHAN.  
H.R. 1661: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1676: Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 1686: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
H.R. 1699: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. FLORES.  
H.R. 1777: Mr. YODER.  
H.R. 1793: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 1817: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
H.R. 1825: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. COFFMAN.  
H.R. 1828: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 1846: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1868: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1884: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 1905: Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
H.R. 1927: Mr. McEACHIN.  
H.R. 1928: Mr. SOTO and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 1953: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 1957: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 1991: Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
H.R. 2029: Mr. FLORES.  
H.R. 2036: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COLE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LoBIONDO, and Ms. TITUS.  
H.R. 2040: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2053: Mr. BOST.  
H.R. 2095: Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 2106: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. REED.  
H.R. 2108: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 2121: Mr. ZELDIN.  
H.R. 2128: Mr. EMMER.  
H.R. 2133: Mr. BUDD, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. CULBERSON.  
H.R. 2142: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 2152: Mr. BUDD and Mr. ZELDIN.  
H.R. 2158: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 2186: Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 2193: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2315: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 2319: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
H.R. 2328: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 2340: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 2386: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H.R. 2396: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. MESSER.  
H.R. 2408: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 2409: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2431: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. McClintock, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 2472: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 2480: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. NOEM, and Ms. JASON LEE.  
H.R. 2501: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2506: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 2519: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 2532: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2545: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2564: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 2569: Mrs. TORRES.  
H.R. 2589: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 2598: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 2628: Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 2695: Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 2696: Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 2706: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 2718: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. CROWLEY.  
H.R. 2723: Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 2732: Mr. HIMES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 2740: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 2790: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. JAYAPAL.  
H.R. 2797: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 2803: Mr. COSTA and Mr. BUCHANAN.  
H.R. 2807: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. ROSEN.  
H.R. 2823: Mr. BUDD and Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 2825: Mr. KATKO.  
H.R. 2832: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
H.R. 2851: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.  
H.R. 2856: Mr. BLUM, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HILL, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. McMORIS RODGERS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 2862: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 2871: Mr. BIGGS.  
H.R. 2886: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SABLON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2901: Ms. ROSEN, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H.R. 2902: Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 2908: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 2909: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.  
H.R. 2913: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2918: Mr. ROSKAM.  
H.R. 2938: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 2940: Mr. BABIN.  
H.R. 2945: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
H.R. 2946: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2956: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
H.R. 2957: Mr. PALAZZO.  
H.R. 2970: Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 2979: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BASS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NUNES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 2982: Mrs. TORRES.  
H.R. 2987: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 2999: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 3003: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BUCHANAN.  
H.R. 3004: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BUCHANAN.  
H.R. 3008: Mr. POE of Texas.  
H.R. 3018: Mr. TROTT.  
H.R. 3032: Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. KHANNA.  
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. CLYBURN.  
H.J. Res. 104: Mr. ELLISON.  
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. SCHNEIDER.  
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. PITTINGER.  
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. HARPER.  
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. POLIS and Mr. KILMER.  
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. NUNES.  
H. Res. 15: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H. Res. 31: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. DEMINGS.  
H. Res. 43: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
H. Res. 135: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H. Res. 161: Ms. BASS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. STIVERS.  
H. Res. 185: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. SUOZZI.  
H. Res. 218: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H. Res. 257: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. EVANS.  
H. Res. 265: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H. Res. 282: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H. Res. 307: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.  
H. Res. 313: Mr. ALLEN.  
H. Res. 318: Mr. TROTT.  
H. Res. 346: Mr. BOST.  
H. Res. 349: Mr. ELLISON.  
H. Res. 351: Mr. ZELDIN.  
H. Res. 359: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. COOK.  
H. Res. 397: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BACON.  
H. Res. 400: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H. Res. 405: Mr. COSTA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. EVANS.  
H. Res. 407: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. MEADOWS.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WAYNE SMITH

## HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Captain Wayne Smith of Naples in honor of his sacrifices to this country during his service in Vietnam.

As pilot, Wayne flew 90 missions over North Vietnam until he was shot down and taken prisoner in 1968. Wayne spent five years and two months as a POW, where he suffered continuous torture, isolation, and separation from his family.

In recognition of his service, Wayne was awarded the Legion of Merit, two Silver Stars, two Distinguished Flying Crosses, two Bronze Stars, seven Air Medals and the Purple Heart.

Since his time in the military, Wayne continued his career as a pilot in the private sector and he has remained an active member in our community. I would like to thank Wayne for his unwavering service to our country.

A TRIBUTE TO HONOR RAYMOND  
LAWRENCE SULLIVAN, JR., M.D.  
ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

## HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., was born in San Francisco on October 4, 1942. He was the second of six children and grew up in San Francisco and Hillsborough. He has three living siblings, Philip Sullivan, Mary Sullivan Ward, and Mother Agnes of the Cross, CJM, and his late sister, Sheila Sullivan Peterson. Larry was educated at St. Catherine's Grammar School in Burlingame, Bellarmine College Prep in San Jose, the University of San Francisco and the UCSF Medical School. He did his residency in Anesthesiology at Stanford, and served our country in the U.S. Navy Medical Corps from 1968 to 1970.

Larry married Victoria Grownay on August 13, 1966. Together they have five children: Larry Sullivan III; Kasey Sullivan Bradstreet, JD; Loretta Sullivan Chang, MD; Brian Sullivan; and Jason Lally, their foster child, who is part of their extended family. Their grandchildren, Liam, Andrew and Thomas Chang, Oscar Bradstreet and Harley, Riona and Raymond Lally bring them untold joy.

Dr. Sullivan joined the medical staff of O'Connor Hospital as an anesthesiologist in 1975 and has served there until his retirement. From 1982 to 1988 he served as Clinical As-

sistant Professor of Anesthesia at Stanford University School of Medicine. At O'Connor Hospital he was Anesthesia Department Chair, a member of the Critical Care Committee, President of the Medical Staff, Member of the Hospital's Board of Directors, and Chair of the Medical Staff Advisory Committee. He was honored in 2011 with the Vincentian Spirit Award given by O'Connor Hospital.

Dr. Sullivan has given generously of his time and talents to his professional community as a member of the Santa Clara County Medical Association, (CMA) the American Medical Association, the California Society of Anesthesiologists (CSA), the American Society of Anesthesiologists and the California Medical Association. He served as President of the CSA from 1999 to 2000, and from 1997 to 2006 he served on a Specialty Delegation to the CMA House of Delegates. He received the Distinguished Service Award from the CSA in 2009.

Larry also served as a referee and coach of the American Youth Soccer Association in Palo Alto, and was Scoutmaster of Troop 57, Stanford Area Council, where he guided 35 Scouts to the rank of Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring an extraordinary physician, a devoted son, husband, father, grandfather, a vital member of our community, and a treasured personal friend. Larry Sullivan is a man of integrity and he lives a life instructed by his faith. I have never met a finer human being and a finer family. How proud I am to call the Sullivan Family my friends and to have the privilege of representing them. I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in wishing my dear friend Larry, a great and good man, and his devoted wife Vicki, every blessing that retirement has to offer, and we thank him for all he has done to strengthen our community and our country.

COMMEMORATING THE OPENING  
OF THE MEMORIAL LANE IN  
GRANBURY

## HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the opening of the new and expanded Memorial Lane in Granbury, Texas on July 1, 2017.

Located along the Granbury Hike and Bike Trail, Memorial Lane pays homage to those who were lost in the line of duty and honors all those serving or who have served as a firefighter, police officer or armed service member. The memorial features moving art pieces that depict the sacrifices that these individuals and their families have made. In addition, Memorial Lane also includes a plaza completed with picnic tables and areas for the community

to enjoy the scenery and special atmosphere of the memorial.

Tributes such as these allow us to reflect on the remarkable lives of our fallen heroes and their families. We must continue to honor them every day and use these individuals as shining examples for generations to come. I look forward to seeing this memorial the next time I am in Granbury.

May God bless our first responders and armed service members serving today and in days past. May He comfort those who endure the pain of loss, and may He never cease to shed his grace on Texas and this great nation.

FOWL MATTERS AND THE  
POULTRY INDUSTRY

## HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I take the time to draw your attention to the important work of the Rachel Carson Council (RCC). Founded in 1965 and based in Bethesda, Maryland, the RCC honors the legacy and environmental ethic of Rachel Carson by linking environmental, health, and social policy solutions "with the goal of building a more just, sustainable, and peaceful future."

The RCC recently released a comprehensive report, "Fowl Matters," examining poultry production and its impact on public health and clean air and water. The report details the dramatic changes in the chicken industry over the past half-century, whereby the traditional practice of families raising chickens on small farms in open spaces for personal use has given way to modern-day Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs). As the RCC documents in its report, this new model has sweeping negative implications for the health and safety of people, animals, and the environment.

The report raises serious concerns regarding the enforcement of existing regulations under the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act related to CAFOs. For instance, it notes that industrial agriculture is one of the largest contributors of nutrient and sediment pollution to the Chesapeake Bay watershed, resulting in algal blooms that block sunlight from underwater grasses and suck up oxygen that fish populations need to survive. On Maryland's Eastern shore alone, CAFOs produce as much sewage as do 9.8 million humans, most of which goes untreated, threatening human health, fishing, and the public's ability to enjoy this indispensable natural resource. Additionally, the large fans used by CAFOs to aerate confined waste can cause nearby residents to be exposed to air polluted by ammonia and other dangerous particles. Breathing in this

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

polluted air can cause respiratory diseases, asthma, and lung cancer. The RCC report underlines these pollution concerns by highlighting that CAFOs are often located near vulnerable communities of lower socioeconomic status which tend to have fewer resources to engage in litigation asserting their environmental rights.

The report also argues that conditions in CAFO facilities can endanger the health of workers. Over the course of 12-hour shifts standing in production lines with temperatures up to 120 degrees Fahrenheit, workers breathe air contaminated by dust, ammonia, and feathers. These workers are vulnerable to all manner of health problems, including coughs, asthma, bronchitis, carpal tunnel syndrome, chemical burns, staph infections, and loss of limbs in dulled machinery.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to review the well-researched and documented Fowl Matters report by visiting the RCC website, at [www.rachelcarsoncouncil.org](http://www.rachelcarsoncouncil.org). We must keep these profound concerns in mind as we craft policies affecting the poultry industry and work to ensure strong enforcement of our environmental laws to protect the health and safety of communities nationwide.

#### FY18 TRUMP BUDGET CUTS EDUCATION

#### HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of President Trump's proposed budget for the fiscal year 2018, specifically those within K-12 education.

The President's budget proposal aims to cut education spending by 13.5 percent. \$9.2 billion dollars would be stripped from the federal education budget which would limit programs such as Title I, which provides targeted financial assistance to schools with high percentages of low-income students.

The President's budget is narrowly focused on 10 percent of students enrolled in private and charter schools, while neglecting the 90 percent enrolled in public schools. My job as a Member of Congress is to vote and be a voice for the constituents in my home state of Alabama. This budget will implement, and promote unproven programs such as charter schools and vouchers which will only benefit 10 percent of the student population and threaten public schools in my district.

This budget proposal will not only extract money from the public-school system, but will divert \$1.4 billion dollars from already struggling public schools to unaccountable charter schools. Due to the lack of transparency within the charter schools and voucher system, it would appear as though school choice is a program that allows people to contribute to a charitable act to improve student's education. However, research has shown that the "private" schools that students would be sent to are often not accredited and the children's performance does not improve in these settings.

Alabama has some of the lowest property taxes in the country and doesn't target any

state and local funding to schools with a high need. For schools in low-income, rural districts like mine these disinvestments result in a heavy reliance on federal education dollars. President Trump's plan not only redirects money to private schools, but will also allow states more flexibility to control how local educational dollars are spent. This could be fatal for public schools across rural Alabama.

The legacy I want to leave as Representative of the 7th Congressional District is to equip young people with the tools needed to succeed in the workforce. This is the chief reason I am concerned about the impact of the disinvestments in public schools and students proposed in President Trump's budget.

#### IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

#### HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Immigrant Heritage Month. America is a great nation of immigrants, and we should recognize the countless contributions and positive impact immigrants have made on our country.

We should take pride in the fact that most of us have passed down the stories of our families traveling from somewhere else in pursuit of the American Dream. I'm proud to be the descendant of Irish, Italian, and German immigrants who sought a better life in the United States.

Our country was built on the just belief that all men are created equal, and we have a proud history of advancing economic, educational, and personal opportunity.

It is my honor to take this opportunity to celebrate our country's traditions during Immigrant Heritage Month.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF FIRE CHIEF EDWARD SWITALSKI, JR.

#### HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to commemorate the life of a brave hero, Fire Chief Edward Switalski, Jr., who tragically lost his life in the line of duty. Chief Switalski died while serving others, just as he had selflessly done for over 35 years.

I want to begin by extending my heartfelt condolences to Chief Switalski's family, his wife Holly, two daughters Alison and Emily, his brother and sister and many nieces and nephews, and fellow members of the fire communities in which the Chief served. May you find comfort in the fond memories you share together.

Chief Switalski served the Pleasantview Fire Protection District in my district for over 34 years. Soon after he became a firefighter, he was quickly promoted to the rank of Lieutenant, then rose to be a Captain, and in 2013 he retired as the Battalion Chief. After retiring

from the Pleasantview Fire Protection District, Chief Switalski joined the Comstock Township Fire Department in Michigan where he served from 2013 until he died at the scene of an accident on June 14, 2017.

While serving the communities of the southwest suburbs of Chicago, Chief Switalski was awarded with the Medal of Valor for saving a fallen firefighter, and named the Pleasantview Firefighter of the Year. Chief Switalski was a dedicated and spiritual man. He knew at a very young age that he wanted to be a firefighter, just like his grandfather. He also served his community as a volunteer with numerous organizations and was chairman of his congregation at Peace Lutheran in Illinois before becoming an active member of the Zion Lutheran Church in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Following Hurricane Katrina, Chief Switalski was honored for his efforts in New Orleans in assisting those who lost everything. This experience awakened a renewed sense of giving back and the chief's love of mission work. It was through mission work where the chief embraced a strengthened bond with his daughters Alison and Emily.

Chief Switalski's death is a great loss for his family and for the communities he served. He was a generous and selfless man, who cared deeply for his wife, daughters, and all his loved ones, including the people he served. He enjoyed being outdoors fishing and boating and being with his family and friends. And like many of us, Chief Switalski was a huge Chicago Cubs fan and loved watching them finally win the World Series last November.

I ask my colleagues today in the House of Representatives to honor the life of Chief Edward Switalski, Jr. He gave so much to others and will be greatly missed.

#### JONATHAN ISAAC

#### HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Jonathan Isaac of Naples on being the sixth overall pick in the NBA draft to the Orlando Magic. Isaac spent part of his high school career playing for Baron Collier High School in Naples and he continued to amaze fans of the game during his time at Florida State University.

During his freshman year at Florida State, Isaac averaged 12 points and 7.8 rebounds per game. He also led the Seminoles to one of the most memorable seasons in program history with a 26-9 record, and an advancement to the second round of the NCAA tournament. I am look forward to seeing what Jonathan will accomplish as he continues to make his home of Naples and the entire state of Florida proud.



RECOGNIZING TREY MILLER FOR  
HIS STATE TITLE IN THE 100  
METER HURDLES

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Trey Miller, a senior from Lewistown High School, for earning the Class IA title for the Illinois State Championship in the 110 meter hurdles.

Trey Miller earned a time of 14.80 seconds in the 110 meter hurdles to claim his title as state champion, and I would like to recognize Trey for his tremendous accomplishment. Trey's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold, even after winning silver in last year's 110 high hurdles state championship. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Trey is an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Lewistown throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Trey Miller on his title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE GRAND OPEN-  
ING OF THE NEW HEAD-  
QUARTERS OF UNANET

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize a local business in Virginia's 10th Congressional District that will be significantly expanding its already extensive operations. On June 27, 2017, Unanet, a pre-eminent and innovative organization in the software industry, will open a new headquarters in Loudoun County, in the heart of my district. Unanet plans to make significant financial investment in this new operation as part of their expansion, which will result in a larger facility and will enable the organization to create new local jobs in the next few years.

Founded in 1998, by the present Chief Executive Officer, Fran Craig, Unanet has continued to prosper since its inception, as the organization has increased its revenue by about 20 percent per year over the past decade. Today, Unanet is one of our region's premier software companies and a leading provider of Cloud and On-Premise software for project-based organizations. Unanet currently serves over 1,000 organizations nationwide, including many government contractors located in the Washington D.C. metropolitan region.

While Unanet has been an economic catalyst for the Washington D.C. area as a whole, the organization, headquartered in Loudoun County since 2003, has deep roots in Loudoun County and has played an integral role in the development and success of the county's nascent

technology industry. In addition to their plethora of economic contributions, the organization has also done extensive philanthropic work in our community and been firmly committed to supporting local charities, including Loudoun Hunger Relief, Loudoun Education Foundation, Loudoun Laurels Foundation, and Loudoun Cares.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Unanet for their entrepreneurial achievements and for their numerous contributions to our local economy. I wish Unanet all the best as they celebrate this major expansion. I look forward to seeing their continued success and am thankful for the plethora of occupations and other opportunities they will provide my constituents.

RECOGNIZING EASTON BIANCHI  
FOR HIS STATE TITLES IN THE  
100 AND 200 METER DASH

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Easton Bianchi, a junior at Newman Central Catholic in Sterling, Illinois, for earning the Class IA title for the Illinois State Championship in both the 100 meter dash and the 200 meter dash.

Easton Bianchi earned a time of 10.86 seconds in the 100 meter dash, and earned a time of 21.78 seconds in the 200 meter dash to win him the title of state champion for both races. I would like to recognize Easton for his tremendous accomplishment. Easton's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold for not just one race, but two. With both of these wins, Easton is the first-ever individual track & field state champion in Newman Central Catholic School history. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Easton is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Sterling throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Easton Bianchi on his titles, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes Monday, June 26, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call votes 323 and 324.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 324.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. FRANK D. LUCAS**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote Monday June 26, 2017 due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 323, and YEA on Roll Call No. 324.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF BABCOCK &  
WILCOX

**HON. TIM RYAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of Babcock and Wilcox. While their headquarters are in Charlotte, North Carolina, I am proud to have one of their major operations located in my district in Barberton, Ohio. B&W's remarkable history began 150 years ago in 1867, when Stephen Wilcox and George Babcock established the company to manufacture and market their patented water tube boiler.

Since then, B&W has been at the forefront of energy innovation in the United States and around the world. In the 1880s, the company's boilers supplied energy for the first electric street lights in Philadelphia and the first central public utility, Pearl Street Station in New York City. B&W's boilers also powered Thomas Edison's laboratories and New York's first subway. In Barberton, B&W Power Generation Group designs and builds boiler and steam generators for industry.

As environmental issues moved to the forefront beginning in the 1970s, B&W became a leading innovator in emissions control technologies. B&W's environmental equipment protects the air we breathe, the water we drink and the land we use by controlling nitrogen, sulfur, heavy metals, ash, particulates and other emissions from hundreds of power plants and industrial facilities around the world.

Today, B&W employs 5,000 people on six continents and continues to be a global leader in commercial power and environmental technologies, renewable energy, and industrial power and emissions control. As the company celebrates its 150th anniversary, it's important for us to recognize and to be thankful for the hard work and outstanding contributions from the many thousands of employees who have

proudly served at B&W, our customers for their support and trust in our technologies and expertise, and for the communities and the leaders who have stood behind B&W all of these years.

Congratulations on 150 years of quality work and innovation.

RECOGNIZING GRACE McLAUGHLIN  
FOR HER STATE TITLES IN THE  
1600 AND 3200 RUN

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Grace McLaughlin, a junior at Rockford Boylan Catholic High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State championships in the 1600 meter run and the 3200 meter run.

Grace McLaughlin earned a time of 5:03.97 for the 1600 meter run, and earned a time of 10:40.45 for the 3200 meter run to win her the title of state champion for both races. I would like recognize Grace for her tremendous accomplishment. Grace's dedication and passion for her sport meant that she was determined to win gold for not just one race, but two. With both of these wins, Grace added two more state championships to her list of other championships. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Grace is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Rockford throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Grace McLaughlin for her titles, and I join the rest of the community in wishing her every success in the future

HONORING INDIANA'S RURAL  
TEACHER OF THE YEAR JAMES  
WILDERMUTH

**HON. JACKIE WALORSKI**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor North Miami Community Schools agriculture teacher James Wildermuth on being named Indiana's Rural Teacher of the Year.

Since 2004, the Indiana Small and Rural Schools Association has been recognizing exemplary teachers from small and rural towns across our state. Mr. Wildermuth is well deserving of this high honor. He truly embodies the characteristics of an exceptional Hoosier educator who has had a profound impact on student achievement, serves as a collaborating member of the greater rural community, fosters valuable learning among his students, and exemplifies leadership in a way that should inspire us all.

Mr. Wildermuth has taught for 17 years, including the last four at North Miami Community Schools. In addition to his remarkable ac-

complishments and sterling reputation as a teacher, Mr. Wildermuth serves as the district advisor for the local Future Farmers of America Program. Given his dedication to his students and the rural community as a whole, it is no surprise that he stood out among more than 6,000 Hoosier teachers in over 70 school districts considered for this prestigious award.

I am grateful that North Miami students have Mr. Wildermuth as a role model and mentor. With his kind spirit and innovative teaching style, he is sure to keep his students engaged and focused not only on the lesson at hand but also on how the knowledge and skills they learn each day will benefit them in their future. Mr. Wildermuth is a gifted educator in many ways, and his ability to connect with his students and enlighten them beyond the standard curriculum is where he truly makes a difference. He uplifts his students and teaches them how to grow as individuals with the confidence to succeed. He is a true inspiration to young Hoosiers and a truly valued leader in our community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 2nd District Hoosiers, I want to thank Mr. Wildermuth for all he has done to educate, support, and guide his students on the path to achievement. It is a privilege to represent teachers like Mr. Wildermuth who help make our communities vibrant and our children's futures bright

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL  
SUNGLASSES DAY

**HON. DORIS O. MATSUI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Sunglasses Day. When it comes to protecting the eyes from the sun's UV rays, sunglasses with lenses that offer UVA/UVB protection are so important. Individuals—regardless of age—should always wear sunglasses during daylight hours, as UV rays are present year-round, despite the season. Unprotected exposure to these UV rays may cause serious vision problems. In the short-term, individuals may experience sensitivity to light, trouble seeing, sunburnt eyes or eyelids, irritated eyes, and red or swollen eyes. While in the long-term, individuals may experience cataracts, macular degeneration, and even cancer on or around the eyes.

Today I want to honor the sunglass manufacturers and suppliers throughout my Sacramento Congressional District, the State of California and around the country. California accounted for nearly 14 percent of all Plano sunglass unit sales from March 2016 to March 2017, and is home to a variety of optical industry leaders. I commend the sunglass industry and their trade association, The Vision Council—which includes 92 members hailing from the state of California—for their ongoing research and outreach campaigns to educate consumers regarding the damaging effects of ultraviolet (UV) rays to the eyes, as well as the sunglass and lens solutions available to maintaining healthy vision.

Since UV damage cannot be reversed, prevention through protection is key. Schedule an

annual eye exam to talk to your eyecare provider about your UV eye health, and join The Vision Council, the greater optical industry and the National Sunglasses Day movement by donning sunglasses not just today on June 27th, but every time you go outside.

HONORING WESLEY JONES

**HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of Wesley Jones of Spokane, Washington.

The American Network of Community Options and Resources (ANCOR) recently selected Wesley Jones as a recipient of its 2017 Direct Support Professional (DSP) of the Year Award for the state of Washington. Founded in 1970, ANCOR is a national trade association of more than 1,200 private providers supporting over 600,000 people with disabilities.

The prestigious Direct Support Professional of the Year Award is given annually to outstanding individuals in each state to recognize the work of direct support professionals across our nation who support people with intellectual, developmental and other significant disabilities.

Mr. Jones has created inclusive and engaging environments for the residents of Spokane that have increased the ability for individuals with disabilities to pursue autonomy and self-determination. For one resident, Mr. Jones identified the triggers that led to self-injurious behaviors and helped calm the individual by painting his room a warmer color, changing the light bulbs, and purchasing new linens with warmer hues. For a resident who struggled to leave her home, Mr. Jones worked to build a trusting relationship and developed her coping skills, which ultimately enabled her to venture outside her home.

Direct support professionals, such as Wesley Jones, constitute the backbone of community supporters and services for American families and individuals across the country. I am proud to honor Mr. Jones for his valuable selfless contribution to the community of Spokane, and congratulate him again on receiving ANCOR's 2017 Direct Support Professional of the Year Award.

RECOGNIZING ERIKA FURBECK  
FOR HER STATE TITLE IN THE  
LONG JUMP

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Erika Furbeck, a junior at Geneseo High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the long jump.

Erika Furbeck jumped a distance of 19 feet, 5 inches in the long jump, and I would like to recognize her for this tremendous accomplishment. Her dedication and passion for her sport

meant that they were determined to win gold, even after winning silver in last year's state championship for the long jump. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Erika is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see them represent Geneseo throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Erika Furbeck for her title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing her every success in the future.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON  
JAE-IN

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, as co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Korea, I rise today to Congratulate President Moon Jae-in on his recent election victory and to warmly welcome him to Washington. His trip to our nation's capital comes at a pivotal time, and I look forward to working together to strengthen the important bond between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

Just last month, the Korean people went to the ballot box and elected President Moon Jae-in in free and fair elections—highlighting the strength and vibrancy of Korea's democracy. The R.O.K., a successful and stable democracy surrounded by autocrats and dictators, continues to serve as the lynchpin of U.S. foreign policy in the Asia Pacific region.

Tensions are rising on the Korean Peninsula, and President Moon Jae-in's visit to strengthen the U.S.-R.O.K alliance could not have arrived at a more pivotal time. North Korea continues to provoke the international community by conducting multiple missile tests and has yet to cease its unrelenting aggression against our democratic allies in the region. As his visit begins, I wish President Moon a successful summit with President Trump and look forward to working closely with the Trump Administration, and the Moon Administration to enhance the safety, security, stability, and success of the Korean Peninsula.

HONORING THE LIFE AND  
MEMORY OF L.A. TARONE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I honor the life and memory of my good friend, L.A. Tarone, and express my deepest condolences to his colleagues, family, and friends.

On June 25, 2017, L.A. lost his courageous battle with lung cancer. A well-known reporter, columnist, television host, and radio personality, L.A. was a larger-than-life figure in Hazleton. His loss creates a void that will never be filled.

During the span of his storied career, L.A. hosted numerous segments on WYLN-TV, wrote for the Standard Speaker newspaper, and was a popular host on WILK radio. His voice was unmistakable. There was never a time when I talked to L.A. that I did not learn something important. I never met anyone who knew as much about baseball, music, and politics as L.A. Yet, even with his unmatched intelligence and 70's-style attire, he was a humble man, and a true gentleman.

At 58, L.A. was taken from us much too soon. He was not only a pillar of news, but also a giant in the Hazleton community. His personality and presence were so big that it felt like he lived long before his time, and I have faith that his impact on those of us in Hazleton will certainly live on long after his death.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the life and memory of L.A. Tarone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, while I had been granted a leave of absence during the time these votes occurred on June 26, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 323 and YEA on Roll Call No. 324.

RECOGNIZING

VANDERHEYDEN, NATHAN  
SORIA, LUCAS HOFFER AND NICK  
SWARTZENDRUBER FOR THEIR  
STATE TITLE IN THE 4X400  
METER RELAY

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Reed Vanderheyden, Nathan Soria, Lucas Hofer and Nick Swartzendruber from Geneseo High School for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the 4x400 meter relay.

Reed, Nathan, Lucas and Nick Swartzendruber earned a time of 3:21.27a in the 4x400 meter relay, and I would like to recognize them for their tremendous accomplishment. Their dedication and passion for their sport meant that they were determined to win gold, winning Geneseo High School's first-ever relay state championship and breaking school records along the way. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Reed, Nathan, Lucas and Nick are examples of the importance of perseverance, teamwork and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see them represent Geneseo throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Reed Vanderheyden, Nathan Soria, Lucas Hofer and Nick Swartzendruber

for their titles, and I join the rest of the community in wishing them every success in the future.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON  
JAE-IN

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in welcoming President Moon Jae-in to the United States for his first State visit this week.

The United States and the Republic of Korea share a long history of friendship and cooperation based on shared values and interests. Our ties are based on common values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Our two countries work together to combat regional and global threats and to strengthen our economies. In fact, the Republic of Korea is the United States' sixth largest goods trading partner overall, and the 13th largest economy in the world.

President Moon's visit will reaffirm our strong bilateral relationship at an important time, as our countries work together to address mutual security threats and improve regional security. This is especially important now as the Democratic Republic of Korea's external aggression increases, and as the Republic of Korea's role as a regional and global leader continues to grow.

President Moon's visit will continue our partnership and I am sure his visit will lead to new areas of cooperation between our countries.

HONORING MARGUERITE AND H.F.  
"GERRY" LENFEST

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marguerite and H.F. "Gerry" Lenfest on being named the winners of this year's Carnegie Medal. The Lenfests are true philanthropists who have given an incredible amount to the city of Philadelphia.

The Lenfests first founded the Lenfest Foundation in 2000. However, unlike most foundations, the Lenfest Foundation was not meant to remain in perpetuity. Rather, its purpose is to give all of its funds to deserving causes and then dissolve. Their approach embodies the philosophy of Andrew Carnegie himself, who said that "the man who dies rich, dies disgraced."

The Lenfests' contributions to the City of Philadelphia and the surrounding areas have been innumerable. Their contributions helped build the five-story Lenfest Pavilion at Abington Memorial Hospital, they have left a lasting endowment to the Curtis Institute of Music, and they also sponsor the Lenfest College Prep Scholarship, which offers support to Pennsylvania students who would normally be unable to afford elite college preparatory private schools. Perhaps most importantly, The

Lenfests have done more than anyone else to ensure that Philadelphia's important cultural events live on. Through their unparalleled support of the Greater Philadelphia Traditions Fund, they kept events and organizations such as the St. Patrick's Day Parade, Steuben Parade, Puerto Rican Day Parade, Columbus Day Parade, Pulaski Day Parade, Greek Independence Day, Odunde, Pride Day, Mummers Parade, Chester Fine Arts Center, Philly Pops, and the Martin Luther King Day Celebration alive.

Their extraordinary philanthropic spirit has led them to give more than \$1.2 billion to deserving causes. Whether the beneficiaries are children at overnight camps, the Michener Art Museum, or the rowing team at Temple University, the Lenfests' generosity has touched countless Philadelphians. I cannot imagine more deserving recipients of this honor.

The City of Philadelphia would not be the same without the generosity of the Lenfest family. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring Mr. and Mrs. Lenfest on receiving this tremendous honor.

---

CELEBRATING THE SERVICE OF  
ERIN COE

**HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Erin Coe for her dedication to cultivating and promoting fine arts in New York's 21st District.

Throughout her career, Ms. Coe has worked in some of New York's most interesting artistic destinations, including the Shaker Museum and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In 1999, she began her time as chief curator of the Hyde Collection in Glens Falls; a role Ms. Coe served in for 15 years before becoming the museum's director in 2015.

Under Ms. Coe's supervision, the Hyde has transformed into a regional center for artistic discovery, strengthening its relationship with the local community and expanding its collections and exhibit space. As director, Ms. Coe more than doubled the museum's modern art collection, and worked to open the Feibes & Schmitt Gallery, which houses incredible works from some of the best-known artists of the 20th century.

In addition to her work at the Hyde, Ms. Coe has also contributed to our community through her work on the advisory board of American Women Artists, and as a member of the Forum for Executive Women of the Capital Region. As she begins a new chapter in her career with Penn State University's Palmer Museum of Art, I want to thank Ms. Coe for these efforts, and for sharing her love of art with us all.

In New York's 21st District, we appreciate Erin Coe and her years of service. Her legacy at the Hyde Collection will endure, and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING DEION MCSHANE  
FOR HIS STATE TITLE IN THE  
300 METER HURDLES

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Deion McShane, a junior at Freeport High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the 300 meter hurdles.

Deion McShane earned a time of 36.53 in the 300 meter hurdles to claim for himself the title of state champion, and I would like to recognize Deion for his tremendous accomplishment. Deion's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold, breaking the all-time state record in the process. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Deion is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Freeport throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Deion McShane on his title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

---

HONORING DANIEL AGAMI

**HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of United States Army Specialist Daniel J. Agami, who was killed in action in Baghdad on June 21, 2007. He was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Army Commendation Medal.

Daniel Agami's love of his country inspired him to enlist in the Army after high school. He answered the call to serve, and in doing so, made the greatest sacrifice of all. His tremendous bravery, selfless service, and enduring faith will never be forgotten.

The debt we owe the families of our fallen service members is immeasurable, and we must always strive to be a nation worthy of their sacrifice.

I am honored to join Daniel's parents, Beth and Yitzhak Agami, for a ten year memorial service this weekend. I am proud to honor the Agamis. May Daniel's memory continue to be a blessing.

---

AMERICANS STRUGGLING WITH  
OPIOID ADDICTION

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this country faces a terrible opioid epidemic that must be confronted head

on. In 2015 alone, 33,091 Americans died from opioid overdose. The use of illegal, destructive drugs like heroin and the abuse of prescription drugs like oxycodone and hydrocodone are keeping hardworking Americans out of commission.

As members of the United States House of Representatives, it is our duty to prevent such senseless tragedies from occurring. In 2015, a total of \$36 billion was spent on addiction treatment, and only a fraction of those needing treatment were able to receive it. However, the Better Care Reconciliation Act (BCRA) allocates only \$2 billion for opioid addiction treatment, falling remarkably short of what is needed. BCRA would cut Medicaid by \$772 billion, robbing those with the greatest need of aid.

This will have catastrophic repercussions for the millions of opioid addicts that rely on Medicaid for treatment. If enacted, this legislation will strip 22 million Americans of their health insurance and deprive many of the individuals battling opioid addiction of treatment. This Senate proposal will not solve the opioid crisis; it will do irrevocable harm to American families.

In my home state of Texas, there were 2,588 drug overdose deaths in 2015. This is inexcusable. In the future we must ensure that all individuals suffering from addiction and mental illness are given access to the proper resources and treatment. It is imperative that Congress provide sufficient relief for the millions of Americans struggling with opioid addiction, or thousands of more lives will be lost.

---

RECOGNIZING BRAYDEN HAMBLÉN  
FOR HIS STATE TITLE IN THE  
3200 METER RUN

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 27, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brayden Hamblén, a senior at Rock Falls High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the 3200 meter run.

Brayden Hamblén earned a time of 9:22.90a in the 3200 meter run to claim for himself the title of state champion, and I would like to recognize Brayden for his tremendous accomplishment. Brayden's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold, adding another state championship to his list of other state titles. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Brayden is an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Rock Falls throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Brayden Hamblén on his title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

**SENATE—Wednesday, June 28, 2017**

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, Ruler of all nature, Your strong right hand continues to sustain us.

Lord, remind our lawmakers of their accountability to You. Provide them with such a passion to please You that they will maintain a conscience void of offense toward You and humanity. In the flurry of legislative activities, may they not forget those on life's margins.

Lord, guide our Senators to perform those actions that bring the greatest glory to Your Name. Remind them of that Golden Rule, which states: What you don't want done to you don't do to someone else. May integrity and honesty protect them as they put their hope in You.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION****EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rao nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, Senate Republicans gathered down at the White House for another discussion on the way forward on healthcare. We had a productive conversation. I appreciate the administration's engagement, and I look forward to more discussions in the days that lie ahead.

We will continue working so that we can bring legislation to the floor for debate and, ultimately, a vote. We know that we cannot afford to delay on this issue. We have to get this done for the American people. That is a sentiment that is widely shared in our conference, and I think I speak for everyone in acknowledging, once again, that the ObamaCare status quo is unacceptable and that it simply cannot continue.

ObamaCare has caused premiums to increase by an average of 105 percent in the vast majority of States on the Federal exchange. Next year, premiums will again increase across the country—by as much as 43 percent in Iowa, 59 percent in Maryland, and 80 percent in New Mexico.

ObamaCare has led to 70 percent of our counties having little or no choice of insurance on the exchange this year. Next year, dozens of counties are projected to have no choice at all, which could leave thousands trapped, forced by law to purchase ObamaCare insurance but left without the means to do so. Seven years after Democrats forced ObamaCare on our country, these are the painful realities for countless families across our country.

It is unfortunate that our Democratic colleagues have refused to work with us in a serious way to comprehensively address ObamaCare's failures in the 7 years since they passed it. I regret that they continue to demonstrate an unserious attitude about all of this today, but it is increasingly clear that ObamaCare's negative trends will only get worse, hurting even more Americans all along the way, unless we act. This should not be acceptable to anyone.

Sitting on the sidelines and accepting the status quo will not bring help to anyone's constituents. We have the opportunity to provide relief to those struggling families, and we should take it. Senators will have more opportunities to offer their thoughts as we work toward an agreement, and every Member will have the ability to engage in a robust debate out here on the Senate floor.

But, if one thing is clear, it is this: ObamaCare is a direct assault on the

middle class. It is getting worse, and we have to act to finally move beyond its failures.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Senate will be going home this week for the Fourth of July recess, and most of us will be back in our homes with our families and in our hometowns and moving around. I still think the topic of conversation is going to be healthcare.

I think this conversation and debate in Washington has really touched a lot of families and businesses and individuals across this country. The reason I say that is because about 6 years ago, I voted for the Affordable Care Act, what is known as ObamaCare. For the longest time, I was sure it was the right vote, and I am still sure today, but I wondered why people didn't appreciate it because what we tried to do—and we achieved some success—was to provide health insurance for a lot of people in America who didn't have it. In my State of Illinois, we cut the percentage of uninsured people in half because of the Affordable Care Act. A large number of them are now covered by Medicaid, and a large number are able to buy health insurance through private insurance exchanges.

But for the longest time, when we asked people across America "What about ObamaCare? What about the Affordable Care Act?" we got mixed reviews. Less than a majority supported it.

Then we embarked on this conversation, this debate in Washington in the Senate over the last 6 months, and an interesting thing happened. When the Republicans, who are in the majority in the Senate and the House, who were determined to repeal ObamaCare, set out to do it, they found out it was a big, heavy lift.

So now, today, we have an interesting thing that has happened. For the first time in the last several weeks, a majority of the American people support the Affordable Care Act. All of those years after we passed it, when we were talking about the good things it did, people were skeptical, but when the notion of repealing it came up, people started saying: Well, what would I lose if you repealed it? And when they

thought about what they would lose, they decided those things were valuable to them personally and to their families. And what were those things? Some pretty basic things—first, that you would have access to health insurance.

I have repeatedly told the story of my friend Judy. Judy is in hospitality. She works in a motel down in Southern Illinois that I have stayed in from time to time. She is a sweetheart of a lady. She is 62 years old and has had jobs that don't pay a lot of money, but she goes to work every day—there is not a lazy bone in her body. She is 62 years old, and Judy had never had health insurance in her life until we passed the Affordable Care Act. Now she qualifies for Medicaid, and thank goodness she does because she has been diagnosed with diabetes, and she needs a good doctor she can count on, and she needs good medical advice.

So when we said that we were passing the Affordable Care Act so that more people would have access to health insurance, it happened.

We also said we were going to change the health insurance policies you buy so that you don't get tricked into buying something that is going to provide protection but only enough and not enough when you really need it.

For example, there used to be lifetime limits. People would buy health insurance and say: I am going to keep the premium low. I will sign up for a lifetime limit. How could I ever need health insurance for more than \$100,000 a year?

Well, it is an eye-opener, but there are many diagnoses or accidents that could happen to you next week that would cost more than \$100,000. So a lot of people found themselves facing personal bankruptcy because they had a limit on their health insurance policy and faced a cancer diagnosis and knew they would have to spend \$150,000 or \$200,000 for the most basic care.

We also said: When you sell health insurance, you can't discriminate against people because of a preexisting condition.

Well, it turned out that insurance companies defined "preexisting condition" to include everything, such as acne when you were a teenager or asthma—you name it. In fact, they went so far as to say that being a woman was a preexisting condition. Some of those things made no sense, so we said: That is over. We are not going to let that happen anymore.

One out of three Americans has a preexisting condition. You can't discriminate against a person because they are of a family with a child who has survived diabetes or is living with diabetes or a spouse who survived cancer surgery. So we said that from now on, under the Affordable Care Act, when you buy a health insurance policy, it is going to cover the basics.

We did something else that I want to mention because I don't want it overlooked. There used to be a Senator who sat back here in the last row, in the second seat, named Paul Wellstone of Minnesota. Paul Wellstone was a great guy. You couldn't help but love him whatever your politics. Over here was Pete Domenici, and he was a conservative Republican Senator from New Mexico. Wellstone from Minnesota, Domenici from New Mexico—what would those two have in common? What they had in common was that each of them had someone in their family with a mental illness, and they watched what happened to their loved one in their family. The two teamed up and said: From this point forward, when you buy health insurance in America, it is not going to be just physical health that it is going to cover, it is going to cover mental health as well.

So many families are touched by mental illness, some very serious forms, some not so serious but need medical help, and they all should be covered. So they put that provision in the Affordable Care Act so that now, when you buy a health insurance policy in America, it is not hit or miss; it covers mental illness, as it should.

Then they added a provision that most of us didn't pay attention to, and we should, and we do now: mental illness and substance abuse treatment. Think of this opioid and heroin epidemic and the people who are dying right and left. Think of families who are absolutely consumed by the addiction of a child, of a teenager, wondering if they can get them into treatment so they can save their lives. For many of them, that health insurance plan is paying for that treatment—treatment that otherwise would come out of their pocket if they could afford it.

So we put all of these things into the law, and the law took place, and when the Republicans said they were going to repeal it, people stood up and said: Wait a minute. I have to face lifetime limits again? I have to face preexisting condition prejudice again? I am not going to have mental illness covered automatically or maternity care covered automatically?

Well, when people reflected on this, they realized their vulnerability. So simple repeal was not enough; the Republicans needed to replace. If they were going to eliminate ObamaCare and all the people protected by it, they needed to replace, and that is when the process fell apart. In the House of Representatives, they went through a process of writing the replacement. When it was all over, they didn't wait for the Congressional Budget Office to analyze it because they knew what was coming. The Congressional Budget Office announced that some 23 or 24 million Americans would lose their health in-

surance because of the plan that passed the House of Representatives. They also knew that people could again face discrimination based on preexisting conditions. They knew basic health insurance didn't include the protections all of us really need to count on.

Do you remember the provision in the Affordable Care Act that said your son or daughter could stay on your family health insurance plan until you reached the age of 26? It is pretty valuable, isn't it? That son or daughter, whom you like a lot and helped get through college, doing internships and looking for a job—you wanted to make sure they have health insurance, didn't you? That was part of the Affordable Care Act, and we want to make sure the guarantee remains in any future change of the law too.

The House of Representatives passed their measure, and, unfortunately, it was a partisan roll call; only Republicans voted for it. It passed by four votes. If two Republican Congressmen had changed their votes, it would not have passed.

Then the measure came over to the Senate, as we remember from our civics lessons, and the Senate had its chance. So what happened? We had a chance to take this question to the committees of the U.S. Senate—Labor and the Health and Education Committee, which is chaired by Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, a friend of mine, Republican of Tennessee, and the ranking member, Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington. We had a chance to take the bill to the committee and to debate a better approach in the Senate, to have public hearings and witnesses. But we didn't do that.

Instead, the Republican majority said: We are going to do this on our own. We don't need any Democratic input. Thirteen Republican Senators will meet in a room and write the alternative to the House healthcare replacement bill, and they did. It went on for weeks, and no one saw it. There were no reports of what it included and what was inside of it. Then, 6 days ago—6 days ago—it was announced. We took a look at it, and it wasn't that much different from what the House had done.

The Congressional Budget Office released a report on Monday of this week and said that 22 million Americans would lose their health insurance under the Republican healthcare plan—22 million. And—this part was really troubling—there would be a dramatic increase in premium costs for people between the ages of 50 and 64. Some of them would see increases of up to \$8,400 a year in premium costs because of the Senate Republican plan.

What was the reaction of the medical professionals across my State to both the House Republican plan and the Senate Republican plan? It was the same reaction. They said: Senator, vote against it.

The Illinois Hospital Association said that if we cut back on Medicaid, hospitals—particularly rural hospitals and downstate hospitals—will have to cut back in services and may face closure.

The doctors in my State, the Illinois State Medical Society, came forward and said: Vote against the Senate Republican plan and the House Republican plan because we know what happens when people lose health insurance. They still get sick. They don't come to see us early on when we can prevent things from getting worse; they come to see us when things are pretty bad and pretty expensive and pretty dangerous.

So the doctors opposed it, the nurses opposed it, the pediatricians opposed it. Not one single medical advocacy group in Illinois supported the Republican bill, which was unveiled 6 days ago.

When it came to preexisting conditions, it wasn't just the medical groups that opposed the Senate bill. The cancer society, the heart association, the lung association—most of the major disease groups stepped up and said: The preexisting condition provisions in this bill are unacceptable, and, sadly, the policies that are going to be sold may not cover the basics that people absolutely need.

Then the other thing came out. What drove this whole debate, what started healthcare reform in the House of Representatives and in the Senate was not healthcare reform, but a tax cut. You see, the Affordable Care Act imposed new taxes, particularly on higher income individuals, and the money from those taxes went into sponsoring people into Medicaid and helping people pay their health insurance premiums. The Republicans in both the House and the Senate said: The first thing we will do is cut those taxes—about \$700 billion worth of taxes. Ultimately, they took \$1.1 trillion out of our healthcare system with this tax cut and other cuts. When you pull that kind of money out of healthcare in America, fewer people have health insurance, fewer people have a helping hand when it comes to paying their premiums.

The reaction to the Senate Republican bill over the last 6 days has been growing opposition—growing opposition, until yesterday. Senator McConnell announced: We are not going to vote on it this week. We were supposed to, but we are not going to vote on it this week. He said that he may return to it when we come back from the July 4th recess.

Here is the point I wanted to make on the floor today. I am glad we have reached the point that these proposals from the House and the Senate are not going to move forward quickly to become the law of the land. Too many people would be hurt—too many innocent people. Too many families would lose their health insurance. The cost of

health insurance would go up dramatically. The premiums would go up, particularly for people over the age of 50. We would see hospitals facing closure across our States. We would see cutbacks in treatment for mental illness and substance abuse. The list goes on and on. It would have been a terrible outcome, and certainly doing this in order to give a tax cut to the wealthy people of this country makes no sense.

Incidentally, how much is the tax cut? If your annual income is \$1 million a year, under the Republican plan, your tax cut is over \$50,000 a year. The people who are wealthy aren't asking me for that tax cut, and the people who will suffer because of it are folks who aren't making anywhere near \$1 million a year.

Here is what we need to acknowledge: The current healthcare system in America needs to be improved. There are things in the Affordable Care Act that need to be addressed, and we need to do it in an honest fashion, and we need to do it on a bipartisan basis.

I have talked to some Republican Senators. Senator McConnell has pulled this bill back, and they want to sit down and talk.

Senator McConnell said that there will be no conversations with Democrats; Republicans will do it by themselves. I hope over the Fourth of July he reflects on that because there are Democratic Senators who, in good faith, want to sit down and make a better healthcare system for America so that more people have the peace of mind and security of health insurance and so that it is more affordable for families all across the board.

The biggest, toughest part of healthcare today is the so-called individual health insurance market; 5 or 6 percent of people who need to buy health insurance plans don't have it where they work, and they don't qualify for Medicaid. Those are the ones who are seeing their premiums spike. Can't we take the collective wisdom of Senators—Democrats and Republicans—and sit down and address that problem effectively? Of course we can, but we need to have a starting point.

So my plea to the Republican leadership is to listen carefully, as our Democratic leader, Chuck Schumer, said yesterday. Once you take repeal off the table, once you take this massive tax cut for the wealthy off the table, we are ready to pull up a chair and sit down at the table.

Wouldn't it be a breath of fresh air in America in this day and age, in light of all that is going on, if Democrats and Republicans worked constructively together to make the healthcare system better, more affordable, and stronger for families and businesses across our Nation? I think that is why we were sent here. I think that is the reason we are supposed to be here, and I sincerely hope that happens next.

So we are ending the debate in the Senate this week, but we are not ending the debate in America. I urge those who think this is an important issue, and I am one of them, to speak up and to go home—I am going home soon—and to meet with people and have a conversation about where we go next as a nation. We can solve this problem, and I know we can do it in a constructive way.

If we show that kind of bipartisan leadership in the Senate, I think the House will join us. I think they will do the same thing. I think they can have a bipartisan approach too. What a relief it would be, with all of the breakdown in comity, all of the breakdown in communications politically, the warring camps that have become the American political scene. If we can show why there is a Senate and why there is a House and why people run for these offices—it is to solve problems, not to put out a press release, not to stake out a political position, but to solve a problem. This is a problem that needs solving.

I hope that over the next week, both parties will reflect on it, and when we return after the Fourth of July recess, we can roll up our sleeves and go to work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, my friend the Republican leader announced that the majority would delay the vote on the motion to proceed to this particular Senate Republican healthcare bill. We Democrats take no solace in that fact. Unfortunately, the majority seems intent on continuing their efforts to pass this healthcare bill.

Over the next few days and weeks, I expect to see buyouts and bailouts, backroom deals and kickbacks to individual Senators to try and buy their vote. What I don't expect to see yet is a dramatic rethink of the core of the Republican healthcare bill, but I am hopeful we can get to that point.

So far, every single version of the Republican TrumpCare bill in the House and the Senate has the same basic core to it. The details have changed a bit around the edges, but the core remains the same in each and every version: slash Medicaid to the bone in order to give a massive tax break to a very small number of wealthy Americans, cut support for Americans in nursing



homes, those suffering from opioid addiction, and those with a preexisting condition to pay for a tax break for the wealthiest few.

The basic premise of every Republican healthcare bill so far is to cut back on healthcare for Americans who need it most in order to give a tax break to the people who need it the least. There is just no moral calculus to justify it. It doesn't fix any of the problems in our current healthcare system like high premiums, high deductibles, counties where there are not enough insurance options, and it is not what the American people are for. The American people are not for tax breaks to the wealthiest of Americans, nor are they for cutting Medicaid.

A USA TODAY poll this morning showed only 12 percent of Americans support this bill. At a level of 12 percent, even huge numbers of Trump supporters are opposed to this bill. The level of popular support is not going to change one bit with a tweak that wins over this Senator or that. A bill with this twisted idea at its core will fail time and time again. That is why the vote had to be pulled yesterday. You can be sure, if it were popular with the American people, it wouldn't have had to be pulled.

I make my friends on the Republican side and President Trump an offer. Let's turn over a new leaf. Let's start over. Let's abandon more tax breaks for the rich. Let's abandon cuts to Medicaid, and discuss what the American people are really concerned about: premiums, deductibles, the cost and quality of healthcare.

President Obama invited both parties, Democrats and Republicans, to Blair House to discuss healthcare reform in front of the American people early in his first term as President. President Trump, I challenge you to invite us—all 100 of us, Republicans and Democrats—to Blair House to discuss a new bipartisan way forward on healthcare in front of all the American people. It would focus on what you, Mr. President, have talked about in your campaign: lower costs, better healthcare, covering everybody—not on tax cuts for the rich, not on slashing Medicaid. President Trump, you said you wouldn't cut Medicaid. We don't want to either.

We Democrats are genuinely interested in finding a place where our two parties can come together on healthcare. We want to bring down premiums. We want to bring down deductibles too. We want to stabilize the marketplace. We want to control the outrageous costs of prescription drugs—another thing the President talked about in his campaign.

There is plenty of common ground for us to come together around. We believe our healthcare system has made important progress over the past 8 years, but it still needs to be improved

in many ways. We admit the Affordable Care Act isn't perfect. There are ways we can improve on that law and on our entire healthcare system. So let's talk together about how we can achieve that in a bipartisan way.

If my Republican friends abandon cuts to Medicaid, highly unpopular with the American people; abandon tax breaks for the wealthiest few, highly unpopular with the American people, we Democrats are more than willing to meet with them and the White House to talk about how to improve healthcare for the American people, how to lower deductibles, how to provide better healthcare for more people at a lower cost because that is what we Democrats are fighting for: the average American family, not the wealthy few.

Today, we can turn over a new leaf and discuss healthcare legislation the way our Founders intended our government to discuss legislation: as a true debate between all of our country's representatives.

Yesterday, the majority leader reminded Republican Senators that if they failed on their partisan healthcare bill, they would have to negotiate with me, the minority leader, and by implication, our Democratic colleagues. When did the prospect of bipartisanship become a cudgel instead of an opportunity? When did bipartisanship become a threat? That is not how Congress is supposed to work. Negotiations with the minority to seek a compromise should be the first option, not the last resort.

Let's start over and get back to legislating in a way deserving of the grand tradition of the Senate as the world's greatest deliberative body. Providing affordable and quality healthcare is an issue we should grapple with, all of us together. It is one of the most important things we can do for our country. We can do it but only if we do it together and put the partisan ideology aside.

So I challenge the President, invite us all to Blair House. Let's see what we can come up with. Let's try. We Democrats have, on several occasions, sent letters to our Republican colleagues asking for bipartisan talks on healthcare. So far we have been rebuffed. Now, with the demise of this bill yesterday—its inability to get enough votes to proceed—we have an opportunity to go back to the drawing board.

We are willing to debate and compromise on healthcare, but we have to be included, and it has to be a discussion on how to actually improve our healthcare system for the American people, not slash Medicaid to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. We can meet, and we can try or the Republicans can stick to the same partisan approach on healthcare, which so hurts working families and so benefits millionaires.

President Trump, my Republican friends, the choice is yours.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, for all of the discussion about delays, politics, the process, vote counts, budget scores and analysis, it is critical we remember that this healthcare debate is first and foremost about people, our friends and neighbors, and their families. It is about moms and dads, sons and daughters, sisters and brothers, grandmas and grandpas.

We all agree everyone needs access to quality, affordable healthcare. Regardless of how healthy you are today, everyone needs the peace of mind that if they get sick, they will be able to get the care they need. We all know someone who has fought cancer, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, or has a child battling a chronic condition or disease.

In our shared experiences and relationships are shared values. Each of us wants our loved ones to be healthy and to live long, full, happy lives. We want what is in the best interests of our families, our friends, and our neighbors.

I have seen these values firsthand through the stories of Hoosiers who recently wrote to me out of desperate concern about the Senate healthcare bill. I have heard from everyone—from working parents to students, to seniors—that access to quality and affordable healthcare is critical to their ability to raise a healthy family, to contribute to our communities, and to live our final years in dignity.

Take Conor, who is a lawyer, and Sarah, a nurse practitioner, and their family in Fort Wayne, as an example. In 2015, Sarah was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis, an autoimmune disease that attacks the nerves in her brain and spinal cord. As Conor wrote me, "Like everyone else who suffers from MS, my wife didn't make this choice. She did not choose this disease . . . sometimes people get sick or are diagnosed with chronic conditions through no fault of their own."

If untreated, she would become severely disabled, and her condition would get progressively worse. The best possible outcome for Sarah is controlling the disease and limiting the spread of the symptoms because there currently is not any cure.

Conor and Sarah worry that under the Senate healthcare proposal, they would be subject to annual and lifetime caps, making Sarah's treatment unaffordable. Through the Senate healthcare bill, States could seek waivers that would allow them to get rid of essential health benefits and implement annual and lifetime caps, even for health insurance plans that people receive through their work, just like Sarah does. For Conor and Sarah and others who suffer from conditions like MS, the reforms that prohibit limits on

coverage allow them to have the peace of mind that they can live full lives, despite their disease and their diagnosis.

It is stories like Sarah's and Conor's that remind us why this is such an important debate. It is inherently personal. It is about the health, the well-being, and it is even about the life and death of our loved ones. It is about not going to the ER just to visit a doctor. It is about financial security. It is about financial security so our families aren't one illness or one sickness away from bankruptcy.

Take, for example, Beth and Brad from Plainfield, IN. They are the proud parents of Kyle. Kyle has special needs, and he relies on Medicaid, not only for his healthcare but literally to help keep the family together. Beth recently wrote me:

Kyle is on a home and community-based Medicaid waiver, which is not mandated. If Medicaid is cut, Kyle and others like him are in real danger of losing coverage for home nursing and nutrition among many other things. Without home nursing, Brad or I will also have to quit working. And without enough income to pay for it ourselves, we'll be placed in the horrific situation of either not being able to give our child what he needs at home, or institutionalizing our precious boy. We want to care for our son at home. We want to work and pay for his primary insurance that reduces the amount of Medicaid money needed. We want the independence, freedom and responsibility that the minimal supports through Medicaid allows.

And Lori from Kokomo, IN, wrote to me about her 3-year-old daughter Savannah:

She has a long list of medical issues. She has had 2 open-heart surgeries, 8 heart catheterizations, 1 pacemaker placement, and countless other procedures. Her medical bills, at 3 years old, are in the millions, and she still will need more cardiac surgery in the future. Her annual care—just her medications, appointments with specialists, therapies, etc.—are more than our annual income, despite my husband working 3 jobs. The Senate GOP bill puts her life in grave danger.

Lifetime limits and waiving of Essential Health Benefits means she will lose her private insurance. Allowing alteration or waiver of Essential Health Benefits will be catastrophic for Savannah and others with pre-existing or chronic conditions. I will be forced to look at my child and say, "I'm sorry honey, Mommy and Daddy don't have enough money for your surgery."

As a dad, the health and well-being of my family is on my mind every day, and I know that every mom and dad across our country feels the same way. My faith teaches me that we are all God's children, and every man, woman, and child should have a shot at being able to live up to their God-given potential. We will move Heaven and Earth to take care of our kids. These values are shared across Indiana and across our entire beloved country.

My faith also teaches me that we all deserve to live with dignity.

Claudia from Muncie wrote to me:

I am a 55-year-old, medically-retired flight paramedic and RN. My career was cut short when I was diagnosed with ALS—Lou Gehrig's Disease—in 2005. Without Medicaid and the waiver I would be institutionalized. Because of the things Medicaid covers, I am still able to be a mother.

For two decades, I was the person who came to the aid of others. Please, don't fail me or my family now.

This bill would fail Claudia and millions of others. It would force Claudia's family and families across the country to pay more, not less, or to even put critical healthcare out of reach. You don't have to take my word for it, though.

The American Heart Association calls this bill "heartless." The Catholic Health Association says the bill is "devastating." The American Academy of Pediatrics says it "fails children." The American Cancer Society says the bill could "greatly harm millions of cancer patients, survivors, and those at risk for the disease." AARP, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and Catholic Charities oppose this bill.

Here in the Senate, we have been hired by the people we represent to continue the proud American tradition of leaving our children a country that is even better than when it was given to us. We owe it to the people we serve to ensure they have healthcare that is affordable and accessible.

Ohio's Governor, John Kasich, recently said, when he talked about the challenges with our healthcare system, that this will never, ever be solved with a one-party approach. He is right.

In order to strengthen our healthcare system, we would be a lot better served by working together with a bipartisan effort and with input from those who provide healthcare every single day—the doctors, the nurses, the hospitals in urban communities and in rural communities all across our country. Most importantly, we need to remember the patients and the caregivers who rely on our healthcare system. We can do this together, and a big dose of Hoosier common sense would be a huge part of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I have always believed that elected officials should do more listening than talking.

The breadth of issues that we address here in the Senate is as vast and diverse as our Nation. We rely on input from experts, from stakeholders, and from constituents to craft responsible, meaningful policy. In the past month alone, I have had the opportunity to attend bipartisan hearings on cyber security, countering violent extremism, self-driving cars, rural broadband, nuclear defense policy, and the posture of our Armed Forces, just to name a few. These issues are vital to our economy and our national security, and they are

worthy of the time and effort that went into convening these very important hearings.

But over the same timespan, the Senate did not hold a single hearing on healthcare, while a handful of Republican Members drafted a flawed healthcare bill behind closed doors.

Healthcare policy is unique. It is very complex, while also being deeply personal. Throughout our lives, doctors and nurses are with us for some of our most significant moments. Whether it is responding to trauma in an emergency, helping us live with chronic conditions, devising treatment plans for an ailing parent, or delivering a newborn child, our medical professionals are there for us when we are at our most vulnerable.

We are all vulnerable. Life does not discriminate. Anyone can get in a car accident and need months of physical therapy. Anyone can be diagnosed with cancer and require surgery, radiation, or chemotherapy. Anyone can have a son or daughter born with cystic fibrosis. But in this great country, I believe no one should ever go bankrupt because they get sick, and no one should ever die because they cannot afford quality health insurance.

I believe healthcare policy is very complex, and we have to work very hard at it, but I am also guided by a very simple moral concept: No matter who you are and no matter where you live in this country, no citizen should ever be forced into bankruptcy because they are sick and no one should ever die because they can't afford quality insurance.

I urge my colleagues to use the coming days to think about their goals for healthcare in our Nation and be guided by their own moral conscience. Passing a politically expedient proposal that can get 51 Republican votes after significant arm-twisting so that the Senate can move on to tax reform is not in the best interest of the American people, and I believe it is simply irresponsible.

I believe that we should provide the best care possible to as many Americans as possible while making sure that it is affordable. Now, I honestly can't say whether my Republican colleagues share these goals, but I can say that the Senate healthcare bill that we saw this week does not hit the mark. I urge my colleagues to use the coming days to really think about what this bill will mean for the families in their State.

I feel fortunate that Michiganders have been willing to share their heartfelt stories with me in recent years. They are fearful that repealing the Affordable Care Act will not only put them in jeopardy but also their friends, family, and neighbors.

I have heard from Amy from Metro Detroit. She is 53 years old and has type 1 diabetes, also known as juvenile

diabetes. Amy is a self-employed small business owner. Before the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies viewed her diabetes diagnosis as a preexisting condition and were able to charge her more because of it. After the Affordable Care Act was implemented, Amy was able to shop around and find a much more affordable plan with the same level of benefits that she had before. While Amy does not qualify for subsidies to help purchase insurance, she was still able to cut her healthcare costs in half because of the Affordable Care Act. Amy fears—and rightfully so—that if the Republican healthcare bill passes, her costs may skyrocket, jeopardizing her business and everything she has worked her entire life for.

I have heard from Tammy, who lives in Marne, MI. Tammy's daughter Erin is 10 years old. Erin was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis at 18 months. She takes 23 pills and does 2 hours of breathing treatments each and every day. She is a fighter, and her whole family has pulled together to support her, but they are also very worried about her future. Erin's family has private insurance, but they supplement the high cost of her care through Medicaid. Tammy is afraid that the \$800 billion cut to Medicaid will jeopardize their ability to afford Erin's care and would cast an absolutely devastating blow to their family.

Finally, take Stefanie from Livonia, MI. Stefanie worked her entire life in the customer service industry, primarily in retail and in restaurants. She was never offered health insurance by her previous employers, and, until the Affordable Care Act, she never had health insurance as an adult. Then, in December 2015, Stephanie's third floor apartment caught fire, and she was left to make a horrific decision about whether to jump from her third floor apartment or die inside the burning building. Well, Stefanie jumped from the window to save her life, and she sustained serious injuries, including a broken back and a shattered foot. Because of the Affordable Care Act, she was able to receive treatment for her injuries, which included a month's stay in the hospital, multiple surgeries, and absolutely excruciating physical therapy to finally heal in the end. Stephanie's treatment came in close to \$700,000, an amount that would surely bankrupt nearly any American.

These stories and many more are what health insurance is truly about. For people like Stefanie, Amy, and Erin, we should do more listening than talking. We should listen to Stefanie, Amy, and Erin, and we should listen to the hundreds of healthcare experts who have expressed their strong opposition to this bill and the impact that it will have on the healthcare system in this country.

I would urge my colleagues to listen to the AARP, the American Academy

of Pediatrics, the American Diabetes Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, the Children's Hospital Association, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National Breast Cancer Coalition, and the National Council on Aging, just to name a few.

I am not just hearing from these national groups. I am also hearing from local healthcare professionals all across my State. Hospitals and community clinics in Michigan—particularly, the ones in the rural areas—are telling me this bill could cause them to close their doors. This will jeopardize access to care in communities that are already medically underserved. Costs will go up for seniors and individuals with preexisting conditions, like Amy.

No one chooses to get sick. But when we are confronting a disease or injury, health insurance is a lifeline. It allows us to get better, to get back on our feet, and it simply allows us to keep living.

In American society, healthcare coverage is our promise that if you work hard and you play by the rules, you will have the healthcare you need when you need it the most. As I have already said, no one in this great country should be forced into bankruptcy because they are sick, and no one—no one—should ever die because they can't afford quality insurance.

The Republican healthcare bill is irresponsible. This bill will strip away health insurance from 22 million Americans. This bill would put more and more Americans at risk of financial ruin from unpaid medical bills, and it would put more Americans at risk of dying because they can't afford the care they so desperately need.

This bill cannot and should not be salvaged with minor tweaks and arm-twisting to win a few votes.

I urge my colleagues to go back to the drawing board and begin an open, bipartisan process where we all listen to our constituents, hold hearings with experts, and work together to keep what works and to fix what doesn't. Let's let common sense rule the day and not partisan ideology. We should do what is best for our folks back home and ensure that everyone has access to quality, affordable healthcare. Michiganders and all Americans deserve nothing less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today as the pain of

ObamaCare around the country continues to worsen. Healthcare prices continue to rise. ObamaCare is collapsing, basically, more and more every day. People in every State of this Union have seen their healthcare costs skyrocket. It has happened everywhere around the country.

We must do something to help the American people who are suffering under the heavy weight that ObamaCare has placed on their lives.

I was at a hospital this past weekend in Casper, WY, my hometown, and I talked to doctors, nurses, and patients. What I hear at home in Wyoming is that there is an urgent need to do something about the high costs and the limited choices under the Obama healthcare law. We are having discussions right now about the very best way to do that. Whatever we come up with, it is going to be a fundamental change in a direction away from ObamaCare. That is what America wants. That is what America needs. It is what the American people are asking us to do.

One of the biggest steps we need to take is to get rid of the ObamaCare mandates and penalties. I hear about it day in and day out. I heard about it in my office yesterday from a woman who was in town visiting on another matter, but she talked about her experience with the ObamaCare situation where her premiums have gone way up, and the deductibles are up so high that even though they are counted under ObamaCare as having insurance, her husband would tell you that he will not go to a doctor because, with a \$6,500 deductible, he feels he cannot afford to. But he is counted under ObamaCare. He wants more choices. He wants more control of his own life. And he wants to eliminate the taxes and the mandates.

I am sure the Presiding Officer hears this at home: People hate the fact that there is a mandate that says they have to buy insurance that Washington says they have to buy—that the Democrats have said they have to buy—rather than what might work for them and their family and be cheaper and work better for them and be more tailored to their family's needs.

There are more than 19 million people across the country who have decided that they are going to pay a penalty to the IRS or they received a waiver so they didn't have to get ObamaCare insurance—either pay the penalty or get a waiver. These are people who made the fundamental decision that ObamaCare insurance was not a good deal for them.

The second thing we need to do, I believe, is to repeal the burdensome and expensive ObamaCare taxes. Healthcare costs have been soaring under ObamaCare. One of the reasons is because the healthcare law added almost \$1 trillion of additional taxes on

to the backs of hard-working Americans. These are the taxes that specifically raised the cost for people needing health insurance and healthcare. They put taxes on things needed by people who are in need of medical care. Somebody who needs a pacemaker, someone who needs a walker, a wheelchair, an artificial joint—additional taxes on all of these users of medical devices, medical supplies, of over-the-counter pain medicines, over-the-counter medicine for fever, sore throat, as well as prescription medications. The taxes are on just about everything, and then, of course, the tax on health insurance itself. So if you buy health insurance, you have to pay a tax on that. What is that going to do to the cost of health insurance? It is going to raise the cost for people who have health insurance.

When the Democrats were debating and voting in support of the ObamaCare law on this floor of the Senate, they conveniently failed to mention all of these new taxes to the American people.

The third important thing that Republicans are committed to doing is to give much more flexibility to the States when it comes to making and developing healthcare solutions for the future.

I served 5 years in the Wyoming State Senate. We always felt that we could do a lot better job if we just had a little more local control, a little less in terms of government mandates, and make that same amount of money work that much better and go that much further and take care of that many more people.

Medicaid is the prime example. I had a State legislator in from Wyoming today, and in the office we were talking about Medicaid and what role the States play and what role the Federal Government plays, how to make dollars go further at home. ObamaCare increased the amount of money that Washington sends to States that chose to expand their Medicaid Programs. Of course, that is taxpayer money. Then ObamaCare paid a bonus—a bonus—to States that decided to not focus on the area where Medicaid was intended originally to be focused, which was on poor women, children, and the disabled. They didn't get a bonus—not at all. No bonus money to help those people. The bonus money went to help able-bodied, working-age adults. That is not whom Medicaid was set up to help in the first place.

Why should Washington collect money from people at home and then send it back out to the States with all of these new Washington mandates and restrictions on how the money is spent? I have much more confidence in the people of my home State of Wyoming and in the people of the Presiding Officer's State of Arkansas than I do in any bureaucrat in Washington, DC. When it comes to developing good ideas

about improving America's healthcare, I always believe in more flexibility and local control and patient control. The more we are working with doctors and communities, working with State legislators, the better. We need more flexibility in every State; we don't need Washington telling all of us what to do. If we give people and States more options, there will be more affordable options for insurance as well as for care.

Democrats tried their goal of a one-size-fits-all, Washington-mandated approach. That is what ObamaCare was all about, and it did not work.

I want to talk about one other thing Republicans are committed to doing with our healthcare reform plan, and that is stabilizing insurance markets while other reforms can take effect.

The ObamaCare exchanges are completely falling apart. Week after week, there is another story, another headline about the disaster that is ObamaCare. We look at a headline in a Chicago paper: "Another Obamacare rate shock." "Another" and "shock" with rates—that is what people are seeing around the country.

Last week, we learned that another 77,000 people in Indiana will lose their ObamaCare plans. Two more insurance companies are leaving the market there. Across the country, there are more than 40 counties where no one will be selling ObamaCare insurance next year—no one.

Premiums have already doubled because of ObamaCare in the last 4 years. Next year, people's rates may go up another 40 percent, 50 percent—well above that in other places. We cannot allow this to continue. The American people cannot afford it, it is not good for our country, and it is not good for the people living in this country.

We need to make sure we help support people who do need help paying their premiums. We need to give insurance companies more flexibility to offer the kinds of plans that people actually want to buy. We need to give States the ability to support their markets in ways that make sense for people in that State.

The discussion draft of our plan includes ideas to help keep the individual market going in a much stronger way than it is under ObamaCare today. It stabilizes the markets.

The insurance company Anthem put out a statement on Monday. The company said that these kinds of ideas "will markedly improve the stability of the individual market and moderate premium increases."

Anthem has been dropping out of exchanges across the country because the markets are unsustainable under ObamaCare. That has to be one of our goals as we continue to discuss legislation—stabilizing the markets and reducing premiums. There are a lot of good ideas on ways to do it. We are

committed to exploring those ideas and putting together a plan that will help give people the care they need, from a doctor they choose, at lower costs. That is what the American people want us to do. That is what we are working on.

There are limits under the Senate rules that keep us from doing some things we would all like to do. If Democrats are ready to work with us and to be part of the conversation, I think we can do some things to make this bill even better. But the situation we have today in this country for healthcare is not working. ObamaCare has collapsed. Healthcare is in a state of crisis. Those who supported ObamaCare and voted for it have caused it. We are just trying to clean up the mess.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, after weeks of secrecy, after not engaging with the public, after an effort to prevent not only Democrats in this body but women in this body from participating in putting together a new healthcare bill, last week we saw Senate Republican leaders put forward their bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Like its companion bill in the House, this legislation imposes draconian cuts to Medicaid, our Nation's principal program for insuring children, people with disabilities, and seniors in nursing homes. It drives up costs for middle- and low-income Americans while delivering huge new tax cuts to the wealthiest in this country.

I start with the premise that you can't take health insurance away from 22 million Americans and call it reform or better care. I think President Trump was accurate when he described this approach simply as mean. The fact is, this legislation is a direct threat to the health and well-being of millions of Americans, including tens of thousands in New Hampshire.

The opioid epidemic in the country and in New Hampshire is the worst public health crisis in modern history. In New Hampshire, thanks to the expansion of Medicaid, done by a Republican legislature and a Democratic Governor, my colleague from New Hampshire who is now in the Senate, who is here with me today—thanks to their bipartisan work, nearly 11,000 Granite Staters have been able to access lifesaving treatment under the Medicaid Program for substance use disorders. By completely reversing the Medicaid expansion, the Senate bill released last week would cost who knows how many lives and would be a crippling setback in our fight against the opioid crisis.

Medicaid covers one out of three children in New Hampshire, as well as people with disabilities and seniors in nursing homes.

In concert with the President's budget, this bill being proposed by the Senate would cut Medicaid funding in half by the year 2027. Cuts of that magnitude simply cannot be done without having devastating effects on children and other vulnerable people across New Hampshire.

Then, of course, this legislation blocks all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood. We have more than 12,000 Granite State women and men who depend on Planned Parenthood for essential health services, including cancer screenings.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, nearly 45,500 Granite Staters would lose coverage under the Republican leader's bill. These are people who rely on that coverage for basic care, as well as for treatment of cancer, heart disease, diabetes, and other chronic illnesses, and they are deeply afraid that they will be among the 22 million Americans who will lose their health coverage if the Senate bill becomes law.

Last Friday, Senator HASSAN and I convened an emergency public field hearing in Concord. We wanted to hear directly from Granite Staters who would be affected by the Senate bill. I have to say—and I am sure my colleague agrees with me—it was an extraordinary event, with over 200 attendees. They overflowed the overflow room. This is a picture of the room where we held the hearing, and we can see people lined up on either side of the room, waiting to take their turn to testify.

Senator HASSAN and I heard firsthand from healthcare providers, from people in recovery from substance use disorders, from parents of children with chronic diseases and disabilities, and so many others who are concerned about this legislation. We listened to emotional, heartfelt statements about the uncertainty, anxiety, and anger this Senate bill has caused. I was especially moved by testimony from parents who are worried their children will lose access to the lifesaving treatment they need that for so many of these kids is the difference between life and death.

People like Paula Garvey, of Amherst, NH, who talked about her 19-year-old daughter Rosie, who was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis just 2 weeks after birth. Rosie also suffers from juvenile rheumatoid arthritis. Rosie must follow a strict regimen of medications to keep the cystic fibrosis under control. Paula fears that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and cuts to Medicaid will leave her daughter without coverage for her preexisting condition and that insurance companies will once again impose a lifetime dollar limit on benefits.

For Paula, and for any parent, the prospect of not being able to access lifesaving care for a child is profoundly upsetting. Paula said: I don't know

what I am going to do if the Affordable Care Act goes away. What will Rosie do when she is off of our insurance and she is not able to find insurance again?

Sarah Sadowski of Concord, NH, testified about her 9-year-old daughter who has cerebral palsy. She said:

The Affordable Care Act was a huge moment of hope. I cannot face what life would look like with pre-existing conditions, lifetime limits, and countless hours on the phone with insurance companies.

At the field hearing, we also heard important testimony about others who rely on Medicaid. For example, Medicaid provides coverage for more than 10 million Americans with disabilities and nearly 6 million seniors in nursing homes. In fact, these two groups alone account for nearly two-thirds of all Medicaid expenditures. Yet the Republican leader's plan to cut Medicaid funding in half over the next decade would have dire consequences for these Americans.

Brendan Williams, CEO of the New Hampshire Health Care Association, told our hearing that 63 percent of nursing home residents in New Hampshire rely on Medicaid. As was reported on Sunday in the New York Times, the deep cuts to Medicaid included in the Senate bill would force many retirees out of nursing homes or lead States to require residents' families to help pay for care. For many families, this is just not an option. They don't have the finances to be able to do that. So what happens? Their loved ones get kicked out of their residential care.

We also heard compelling testimony from healthcare providers who treat people with substance use disorders. Melissa Fernald is a private clinician in Wolfeboro, NH. She told us:

For the majority of [Medicaid expansion] patients, it is the first time they have had health insurance. It allowed me to assist them in properly diagnosing their mental health conditions . . . and securing primary care providers to treat their medical needs. It has been a powerful experience to watch them heal and grow as a result of receiving proper care. . . . My clients are more motivated and capable of getting a job and gaining financial independence.

Again, if your heart is not moved by the morality of these kinds of stories and by the values I think we should have in this country to help people who need help, we should be moved by the economics of this. It is going to cost a whole lot more when we kick people with substance use disorders off of their insurance, when they go to emergency rooms to get their care, or when they die than to make sure they get the help they need.

The Senate bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act and radically cut Medicaid is a threat to healthcare coverage for people in New Hampshire and in every other State in this country. I am so grateful to all of those Granite Staters who attended our field hearing on Friday. I know that in other States

across this country, large numbers of people are turning out to express overwhelming opposition to the Republican leader's bill. I heard this morning that polling shows that just 17 percent of Americans support this legislation. We need to listen. We need to stop this headlong rush to pass a cruel and heartless bill.

For ordinary people in New Hampshire—the people whom Senator HASSAN and I heard from on Friday—repealing the Affordable Care Act and gutting the Medicaid Program isn't about politics. It is a matter of life and death. We need to listen to the voices of ordinary people whose lives and finances would be turned upside down by this bill.

There is a better way forward for both the Senate and our country. It is time for Republicans and Democrats to put ideology and partisanship aside and come together to do what is right for ordinary working people in this country.

The majority leader's decision to delay a vote on the bill is an opportunity for all of us in the Senate. When we come back after next week's July 4th recess, let's come together in an open and inclusive process. The right way forward is for Republicans and Democrats to work together to strengthen the parts of the Affordable Care Act that are working, including Medicaid expansion, and to fix what is not working.

According to poll after poll, this is what the majority of the American people want us to do. It is time now to respect their wishes and to strengthen the Affordable Care Act so it works for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my friend and colleague, Senator SHAHEEN, to discuss the stories and concerns we heard from our constituents in New Hampshire about how they would be hurt if TrumpCare becomes law.

Even though Republican leadership has delayed a vote on TrumpCare this week, we know that the fundamentals of what is wrong with TrumpCare will not change.

TrumpCare would force Granite Staters to pay more for worse insurance, all to give billions of dollars in tax breaks to corporate special interests—including Big Pharma—at the expense of hard-working Americans and the programs they rely on. This is the basic principle of TrumpCare, and it is unacceptable.

TrumpCare would be a disaster for people in New Hampshire. Granite Staters know this, and they have been standing up and speaking out against this dangerous bill.

As Senator SHAHEEN discussed, we held an emergency hearing last week in

Concord to hear from our constituents about how TrumpCare would impact them. We held this emergency hearing at 2 p.m., on a Friday afternoon, in the summer, and with just a day's notice. Yet hundreds of people showed up.

Over 50 people shared their personal stories about the importance of healthcare, of how they have benefited from the important protections that are provided under current law—including maternity care, prescription drug coverage, and coverage for substance use disorder services—of the protections against insurance company abuses, of Medicaid expansion, and of traditional Medicaid. They told us what their lives were like and why TrumpCare would be devastating to them and their families. I wish to share some of those stories today.

We heard from Ariel, from Rochester, NH, a mother who is benefitting from substance use disorder services that are included in Medicaid expansion and would be taken away under TrumpCare. Ariel said:

I am a mother of 3 children and I have a substance abuse disorder. I come from a long line of women who never had much opportunity. With the opportunity to have Medicaid I have been given the chance of treatment.

Without the chance of treatment I wouldn't have been taught that there is a solution and a way to live a full, beautiful life as a woman in recovery . . . as a mother of 3 beautiful children. . . . As a woman of dignity and grace. . . .

If the opportunity of Medicaid is taken away, the chance of positive change in this world is going to drastically drop. . . . Women like me may never know a world outside of drug use and hopelessness.

She goes on to say:

Today because of the opportunity of change, I am able to be a positive role model to my children and most importantly our future.

When we met Ariel, she was pregnant with that third child, and she went into labor immediately following our field hearing. She told us over the weekend that she had a healthy baby boy. Because of the treatment Ariel received through Medicaid, she is in a better position to take care of that new baby boy.

Our Medicaid Program is not only critical to providing key support to combat the substance misuse crisis, but, as Senator SHAHEEN mentioned, it also helps seniors and those who experience disabilities get the care they need—services that would be taken away under TrumpCare.

This is something we heard from a Granite Stater named Jeff, who has a form of muscular dystrophy. Jeff said:

I am able to live a life that's independent in my own home, pursuing my own career, only by virtue of the fact that I am able to receive Medicaid services. Specifically, all this discussion about private insurance is well and good, but I think what some Senators aren't remembering or don't know is that private insurance doesn't cover many of

the types of services that Medicaid does. . . . Especially personal care services that allow us to live independently in our homes and communities, which is where all of us would like to be, if we're able to. So, I'm concerned about that.

He continued:

I'm concerned about the fact that my understanding is that this bill would allow states to opt out of providing optional Medicaid services, many of which are the waiver programs here in the state that frankly are so vital to folks with physical disabilities, developmental disabilities, acquired brain injuries, and all sorts of other conditions. So that part concerns me.

Medicaid coverage makes it possible for Jeff and so many others to work and participate in their communities. Jeff also said that he was concerned about the fact that TrumpCare cuts and caps Medicaid, which we know is really just code for massive cuts that would force States to choose between slashing benefits, reducing the number of people who can get care, or both.

Senator SHAHEEN and I also heard from several Granite Staters who have benefited from the Affordable Care Act and who are concerned that TrumpCare would reduce the care they receive while raising their costs. One of these people was Enna, from Exeter, NH. Enna said:

I am self-employed and purchase health insurance through the Marketplace here in New Hampshire. The ACA had given me the opportunity to purchase affordable health insurance for myself and my family of four.

She explained:

We were unable to maintain insurance consistently prior to the ACA, and even when we did have it, critical preventative care—for myself, as a woman—was not covered by our previous policy.

She said this about TrumpCare:

[It] would make our health coverage less comprehensive and less affordable. I am certain that our risk of financial and/or health catastrophe would be significantly greater [under TrumpCare].

There is no doubt that we should all be working together in order to improve the Affordable Care Act, build on the progress we have made, and lower healthcare costs for all of our citizens. I am willing to work with any of my colleagues on bipartisan solutions in order to make that happen, but we know that TrumpCare is not the answer. While my Republican colleagues have delayed a vote on this bill, no one believes that TrumpCare is dead yet.

I am going to continue to share the stories of Granite Staters who would have to pay more money for less care under TrumpCare. I will keep working to ensure that TrumpCare never becomes law. I urge my colleagues to take the time to listen to their constituents who would be hurt under TrumpCare.

The people of New Hampshire have been so brave. They have come forward, and they have talked about their most personal, difficult, and chal-

lenging experiences. They have laid themselves bare before the rest of us so we could understand what they have gone through and so we could understand that if we are not committed to a healthcare system in which every American—citizens in a democracy—have meaningful, truly affordable access to the type of care that each of us would want for our own family, then we are not doing our job as a democracy at all.

We need to protect and defend what we have, and, then, we need to improve what we have. We need to come together and make sure that healthcare is truly available to every one of us, so that we can be healthy and productive and so that we can lead together.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to talk about the healthcare bill, the healthcare issue, and talk a bit about how we can find a solution and then what the solution should look like.

For the last 2 days, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been in our markup. In that markup, we considered somewhere in the neighborhood of 250 to 300 amendments. Of those 250 amendments, approximately 210 of them were either compromised—an agreement was worked out between the proponents of the amendment and those who had reservations—and they were either withdrawn or became part of the bill by unanimous consent. Of the 25 or 30 that were left for votes, however, we had good debate. The members talked about their point of view. The people who opposed them gave their points of view. We had a vigorous discussion and debate and then we voted. The important thing to me—and I am pretty sure I am right about this, I kept a mental note as we went through the votes—I don't believe there was a single party-line vote in the Armed Services Committee on any amendment. The votes were sometimes more Republicans, more Democrats, but there wasn't a single party-line vote. In other words, the process worked as it was intended to work, as it should work, and as it can work.

So I have a radical suggestion for those who are seeking a solution to this healthcare issue; that is, submit a bill and put it before the requisite committees, have hearings, have debates, have information, get information from around the country, from experts, from people who know about the topic, and that is how we make good laws. A bill that doesn't go through any of that process, that is concocted in secret and



sprung on the Congress at the last minute, almost by definition will not be a good bill. Bad process—bad bill, and that is what we had happen in this case.

I think this is a time—we are going into a recess at the end of this week. Let's take a deep breath, and instead of trying to tinker around and attract a few extra votes and find something that will barely pass by the skin of its teeth, let's step back and submit this issue to the Finance Committee and the HELP Committee. Let's try to work through to find a real solution involving both parties, involving all of the wisdom that has been accumulated in this country on this incredibly complex and difficult and incredibly important issue. We don't have to try to do it in the dark. Let's do it in the light of day. Let's have open hearings and considerations, votes and amendments, discussion and debate, and then as our system is designed, we can come to a good result.

Let's talk about the bill that is currently before us. I guess it is before us. It hasn't really been submitted to any of the committees, but I am told it is coming to the floor. It was going to be this week. Now it is going to be the week, I guess, after the recess—at least that is what we were told yesterday.

Why is this a bad bill? I have been watching some of the commentary on this bill, and there is a lot of discussion about the Congressional Budget Office analysis: Is it correct, did they use the right baseline, are they good at projecting how many people are going to sign up for healthcare, and all of those kinds of questions. People are questioning the Congressional Budget Office. I happen to think they tend to be pretty nonpartisan, straightforward, good, scientific, and quantitative analysts of these kinds of issues. They issued their report saying 22 million people lose their healthcare. This is about people. It is not about ideology. It is about real people.

There is a really easy way to cut through all of the questions about whether they analyzed it properly and who is going to lose and who is going to win; that is, to look at a simple chart that is on, I think, the third page of the Congressional Budget Office analysis. This is really all you need to know about this bill: Medicaid loses \$772 billion over the next 10 years, and the tax credit and selective coverage provisions—that is the ACA—loses \$400 billion. It is \$1.1 trillion out of the healthcare system. You cannot take \$1.1 trillion out of the healthcare system and not hurt people. You can't do it. We don't have to argue about how many here, what age, and all of that kind of thing. We are talking about a massive cut to the support that is enabling American people to get healthcare.

In Maine, if you cut all these numbers back, as near as I can tell, it is

about \$400 to \$500 million a year. I was the Governor of Maine. I know that \$400 and \$500 million a year is huge. People talk about: Well, we are going to cut Medicaid back. We are going to trim the growth rate. We are going to lower the way it is calculated and make it a per capita cap, all of these things, and we are going to give the States flexibility. The magic word “flexibility”—as if the flexibility enables you to somehow conjure up \$1 trillion. What you are really giving the States is the flexibility to decide between the elderly and the disabled or children. That is what this is all about.

There is another option, by the way. The States can always raise taxes to make up for this difference, and that is one of the most frustrating things to me, again, as a former Governor. We are talking about this reduces the Federal deficit by \$330 billion over 10 years. Yes, because you shifted almost a trillion dollars to the States. That is nice work if you can get it. That is balancing the Federal books on the backs of the States. If we want to make the Federal budget look better, why don't we just let the States pay for the Air Force? That is a Federal expenditure. Shift that to the States. That will help us with our budget deficit, but it is a fake balancing of the budget because you are simply shifting the cost over to somebody else—another level of government.

The shorthand for that is shift and shaft. That is what we are talking about, either the State government is going to be shafted because they are going to have to raise taxes or the people who are going to lose the support are going to be shafted. We are talking about real people.

Let me talk about Medicaid for a minute. Medicaid is sometimes characterized—and I have even heard some of my colleagues use Medicaid and welfare in the same breath, as if Medicaid is a welfare program. It is not. It is a critically necessary support for healthcare for people who need it, many of whom are not welfare people—as we would denote them—not welfare recipients. They are getting a lifeline, a true lifeline that is actually keeping them alive.

In Maine, 70 percent of the people in nursing homes are on Medicaid. Nationwide, the number is 62 percent. So when you talk about Medicaid and cutting Medicaid, you are talking about Aunt Minnie in the nursing home. You are not talking about some welfare recipient who is ripping off the system. You are talking about your relatives who are in nursing homes, and 70 percent of the people in nursing homes are being supported by Medicaid. In Maine, we call it MaineCare.

So you can't shrink this amount of money and think it is not going to have impacts on people, and that is why this bill is so pernicious. Here is

what the bill is all about: a one-half trillion-dollar tax cut to the top 2 percent of wage earners in America. Let's be clear what is going on here. There is an equation of one-half trillion dollars of tax cuts and more than one-half trillion dollars of cuts to benefits—money to the wealthy; healthcare away from those who need it. That is the equation. That is what this bill is all about. This isn't a healthcare bill. This is a tax cut bill dressed up like a healthcare bill, and it is also an ideological bill because people don't like Medicaid.

Here is the problem: Our healthcare system is the most expensive in the world. We pay the most per capita for healthcare as anyone on the planet, by far—just about twice as much as most other countries. If you do the math and you take the annual healthcare bill and divide it by the number of people in America, you get about \$8,700 a year per person. That is what we spend on healthcare. So for a family of four, that is \$35,000 a year. That is what healthcare costs us. By the way, that is the real problem. When we are talking about Medicaid and Medicare, Anthem and private insurance, and all of those things, we are really talking about who pays. The deeper issue is how much we are paying. The problem is—and the reason we need Medicaid and the reason we need Medicare and the reason we need the Affordable Care Act—American people can't afford it without help. It is as simple as that. They can't afford it. The government has to provide some support. If it doesn't, it would break every family in America. We have to have the support. Right now, in the private sector, it is breaking our companies that are trying dutifully to keep up with the increase in costs of healthcare.

Don't fall for this idea that somehow the Affordable Care Act caused all the increases. I remember—again, harking back to when I was the Governor of Maine in the late 1990s, early 2000s—healthcare costs were going up 6 percent, 8 percent a year—10 years before the Affordable Care Act went into place. The private—the individual market for health insurance was already on a drastic upward climb. So to blame it somehow on the Affordable Care Act just doesn't wash in terms of the history.

The deep problem, as I say, is the overall cost of healthcare. We have to start talking about that issue. That is a separate issue from what we are talking about here as to who pays. We have to talk about different kinds of delivery systems. We have to talk about a huge increase in preventive care. We have to talk about helping people stay out of the hospital, stay out of the medical system. The cheapest medical procedure of all is the one you don't have to perform. So many of our diseases—our chronic diseases like diabetes—are based upon the choices people



are making and their lack of adequate care early in the disease. That is a separate discussion. I think that is one we really have to look at. However this debate is resolved in the next few weeks or few days, we have to talk about the deeper issue of the overall cost. If we don't get a handle on that, then all of this other stuff is going to be—it is not going to solve the problem because the deeper issue is the enormous cost we pay in this country, which is almost twice as much as anybody in the world per capita.

You could say: But we have the best healthcare in the world. Yes, we do, for the people who can afford it. But for millions of people who can't afford it, who have either no or skimpy care, it is not the best healthcare system in the world.

There are no statistical indicators that tell us we are doing very well. On things like longevity, prenatal care, infant mortality, we are way down. We are like 17th, 20th. You would think that if we are spending the most money in the world, we ought to have great results. We don't. So that is something we have to talk about.

The cost of pharmaceuticals, the cost of drugs is higher here than anywhere else in the world. Why is that? That is a problem we have to discuss.

I had a tele-townhall Monday night. It was sponsored by the AARP of Maine. At the peak, they tell me there were 10,000 people on that call. I took questions, and the questions from seniors in Maine were full of concern—"fear" may be too strong a word, although in several cases it wasn't, but very deep concern about what the effect of this will be on them, on their mothers, on people who are depending on Medicaid for their care.

One lady who called pays \$8,000 a month for her chemotherapy drugs. If it weren't for her support under the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid, she said on the phone, "I'd be dead." That is what we are talking about here. We are talking about real people.

The final sort of general point I want to make before I talk about some of the people who are going to be affected by this is that I hear sometimes the proponents saying: The free market is going to solve this problem. The free market is miraculous; it can solve all problems.

I am a huge believer in the free market. I am a thoroughgoing capitalist. I started a business. I ran a business. I understand the free market. The problem is that healthcare is not a free market. If you go to buy a car, that is a free market. You can go online and compare. You can test drive. You can find the prices at the four dealers that are in your neighborhood. You can do all of those things. That is a free market. You don't have that in healthcare.

No. 1, you don't know the price. You call your local hospital and say: What

will it cost me to get my knee replaced? Nobody can tell you. You don't know the price.

No. 2, it is very hard to compare products. You can do it if you can really dig and get word of mouth on who is a good doctor and who isn't.

No. 3, you don't say what you want; the provider tells you what you need. Imagine going into a car dealership and the car dealer saying: I am going to tell you I think you need this Mercedes over here. I think that is what you need, and by the way, you pay for it.

Our system is set up such that providers are paid for delivering a service, not keeping you well. They get paid by procedures, fee-for-service, not for keeping you well. There is no money in prevention. We have to change that. We have to change that.

Now let me talk about people. These are some people I have talked about before, and I just want to sort of go through them.

You know who this is. This is a Maine lobsterman. This is a guy; his name is David Osgood. The ACA gave them a chance to get insurance. It gave them an opportunity to get insurance where before it was practically impossible. He said it has given them some comfort, some reassurance. He said: "We'll be okay." That is the Maine way. "We'll be okay." This is one of the most independent, toughest professions there is in this country, but he is not part of a big corporation, and he doesn't have somebody to pay part of his healthcare. He has to make it work, and the ACA gave him an opportunity that he didn't have before to give some confidence to his family and to his life.

By the way, there are about 75,000 people in Maine just like him who got coverage under the ACA, many of them for the first time, and those are the calls we are getting in my office.

This is Jonathan Edwards and Jen Schroth. This is sort of a funny story; it tells you what Maine is like. I know Jen's mother. I worked with Jen's mother in the early eighties. Maine is a big small town with very long roads. We all know each other. And it just happens that here we are, 25 years later, and I have become acquainted with Jen.

She and her husband are farmers. They are small farmers in coastal Maine. She thinks it is irresponsible to go without health insurance, especially when you have a family, but it was so expensive, they couldn't get it. They couldn't acquire health insurance in the individual market because they are not a member of a big corporation. The ACA gave them access to insurance for the first time—real insurance that covers what they need, not skinny insurance that only covers certain things and doesn't cover other things and just gives you the illusion of coverage until you go to make a claim.

Jonathan Edwards and Jen Schroth are farmers in Brooklin, ME—that is

the real Brooklin, by the way, Brooklin, ME. Forget about that place in New York; this is Brooklin with an i-n. They are farmers in Maine to whom the ACA gave an opportunity to get insurance for the first time for their family.

Cora and Jim Banks from Portland raised four boys. This is amazing. They raised four boys, and every single one was an Eagle Scout. That is amazing. I mean, to be an Eagle Scout is a real achievement in this day and age. Cora worked at her home. She developed Alzheimer's in her late fifties. That is a tragic disease. When Jim could no longer care for her safely at home, she went to a nursing home, and Medicaid helped her be there. Medicaid helped her be there. If you start taking away Medicaid, what will become of Cora? What will become of Jim? He took care of her as long as he could. If she has to go home, if she has to leave that home, that will be a tragedy for her and for her family.

Again, as I mentioned before, 70 percent of the residents in nursing homes in Maine are on Medicaid. That is the kind of difference it makes in real life.

Here is Dan Humphrey. Dan Humphrey is a young man with autism who volunteers at local soup kitchens and delivers Meals on Wheels in Lewiston, ME. He depends on a Medicaid waiver to support his independent living. If it weren't for Medicaid, Daniel would be in an institution, or he would be with his parents. They wouldn't be able to work because he would need care 24 hours a day. He does need care and support 24 hours a day. Under Medicaid, he is able to lead a real life and feel good about it. You can tell he is a great guy; look at his smile. Medicaid is a lifeline.

I talked about Dan 2 or 3 weeks ago, and since then, I have had an outpouring from people across the country and especially in Maine, people who have children or relatives or friends with disabilities, on what this has meant for them and how terrifying it is that anybody wants to take three-quarters of a trillion dollars out of Medicaid, which is providing an opportunity for Daniel to lead a decent life. Why would anybody want to do that? I don't get it. I don't get it.

Of course it can be made more efficient. Of course the ACA can be made more efficient but not three-quarters of a trillion dollars more efficient. That is a huge amount—\$450 million a year in Maine.

Daniel waited 8 years, under the current program, for the services he gets now. And if we put in caps and block grants—that sounds good in Washington: We are going to put in caps. Caps mean Daniel may not get his services next year or the year after or another guy like Daniel in Peoria or Philadelphia or San Francisco. That is a tragedy. These are real people. We are not talking ideology; we are talking real people.

Here is Lydia Woofenden. She lives near where I live. She just graduated from Mount Ararat High School in Topsham. Two of my boys graduated from Mount Ararat. She even has a job she was offered after years of volunteering. Everything she has achieved has been accomplished with help from her family and dedicated teachers and therapists almost exclusively funded through special education in the public schools and Medicaid.

By the way, having a child with disabilities has nothing to do with your income. You could be high income, low income, middle income. It has to do with the luck of the draw. It has to do with bad fortune, and it could hit anybody. So, again, this idea that Medicaid is some kind of welfare program is just not true. It is not true.

So, Mr. President, the reason I am here is because of these people. The reason I am here is to stand up for these people because they can't be here to do it themselves.

We can do better. The failure to get the votes to vote on this bill this week gives us all a chance to take a deep breath, to step back and say: Sure, there are things wrong with the Affordable Care Act. There are things we can debate. There are things we can argue about. We can have amendments. We can do what we did in the Armed Services Committee over the last 2 days and have a real discussion and debate. I know it is possible because I sat there and saw it happen. It can be done, and we can do it here.

Let's take a week not to try to browbeat and push and make special deals to try to get 51 votes or 50 votes and then the Vice President breaks the tie. It goes to the House, and they don't even look at it—they will pass it. And then we will be embarked on a path that is really going to hurt the American people.

We have to have help. Healthcare is too expensive, and regular people in this country can't afford it. We have to have help, and this is the place where people are looking to find that help. Let's try to work together. I am certainly willing to work with anybody who will listen. But if they are starting from a premise of gutting Medicaid and giving somebody else a huge tax cut, that doesn't work. Let's talk about the real problem. You want to talk about healthcare, let's talk about it. Let's talk about how we can lower the cost of healthcare, how we can lower the cost of deductibles, how we can lower premiums, and how we can provide new options to people in the health insurance system. But let's not talk about what we are going to do that is going to have such tragic results on individuals and families and on the fabric of our society.

Mr. President, I believe we can do better. I believe we can do better, and we have an opportunity to do so. It sort

of dropped into our laps this week. We have 10 days to work on this, to think about it, to try to come up with a solution or at least begin the process of a solution. There is no deadline here next week, but let's begin the process.

As we begin, I have this radical idea of referring these bills to committees here in the Senate, having hearings, getting expert opinions, listening to the country, listening to the hospital association that says this is a terrible bill. The American Medical Association says this bill violates the basic principle of the medical profession: First, do no harm. This bill will do harm.

There is no group whom I have heard of who is for it—only people who have an agenda to cut Medicaid because they don't like Federal support or people who have an agenda to change the Affordable Care Act because it has Obama's name on it. That is not a good enough reason to strike at the heart of our people, our communities, and our society.

One final point. I have been talking about people; let me talk about jobs. In Maine, in 8 of our 16 counties, the hospital is the largest employer. I talked to a hospital director an hour ago. They are desperate about what is going on down here because it is going to make it difficult for them to survive and serve their communities—the rural hospitals especially. I have met with them across Maine—in Farmington, Bridgton, Skowhegan, Lincoln. Maybe you haven't heard of those towns because they are small towns in Maine, but they have a hospital that is the heart of the community and the biggest employer in the community. They all told me the same thing. This idea of this bill, this approach, is going to kill them. It is going to cause them to at least shrink their services or close. In Maine, because we are a rural State with far-flung communities, that means people are going to be a long way from available care—1 hour, 2 hours—and that is a tragedy for our communities in terms of economic development, in terms of jobs, but mostly, as I keep saying, because of people.

People say: Why are you so impassioned about this, ANGUS?

It is because this is what the people of Maine sent me to do. They sent me down here to help them, not hurt them. They sent me down here to speak for them, not stifle their voices. They sent me down here to do the right thing, to do the ethical thing, to protect them when nobody else will. That is why I am here, and I believe that this Senate, this Congress, this government, can do better, and I hope we will.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA WOMEN'S SOFTBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE 2017 WOMEN'S COLLEGE WORLD SERIES NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this is a little out of character. Confession is good for the soul. One of my very favorite—maybe my most favorite—of spectator sports is, of all things, girls' softball.

Now, a lot of people don't even know anything about the sport. It is pretty incredible. I am pleased to tell you that Oklahoma City is the home of a very famous ASA Hall of Fame stadium, which is the world's No. 1 softball field. This is where the Big 12 Softball Championship and the Women's College World Series are held.

This past May, the Sooners won the championship game at the Big 12 softball tournament between Oklahoma and Oklahoma State, which also has a great team, at this impressive stadium. The Sooners won.

Then, on June 6, they became the 2017 Women's College World Series national champions in Oklahoma City.

After facing diversity in the earlier game against North Dakota State in the NCAA regionals, the Sooners proceeded to win 11 consecutive games—think about that, 11 consecutive games—ultimately achieving a 5-to-4 victory over the University of Florida Gators.

In the first game of the championship series, Oklahoma outlasted Florida in a recordbreaking—I was here; we were actually in session at that time—17 innings. It went until 3 o'clock in the morning. Of course, we won. It was the longest game in the history of women's college series of all time.

This win is the women's softball team's second consecutive national championship and the third in the last 5 years. This is a big deal. These girls come from all over the country and end up playing softball there. It is something where they are clearly national champions. It makes me very proud to see that they are doing so well.

I would like to take a moment to congratulate all of the players. Their hard work clearly paid off. It is important to thank the coaches as well. Thank you for your skills, your tenacity, and your dedication, which helped lead these ladies to victory.

Their remarkable head coach, Patty Gasso, has been with OU since 1995, and was inducted into the National Fast Pitch Coaches Association Hall of Fame in 2012. I bet you didn't even know there was such a thing, but there is. She and her staff have worked together over the last few decades to build a legacy that has a strong community following. These women will

continue to make Oklahoma proud through their various roles as students, athletes, and leaders.

Just last week, junior pitcher Paige Parker was warming up before she threw the ceremonial first pitch of the game between the Kansas City Royals and the Boston Red Sox. It was during this warmup that the Royals players were able to see firsthand how impressive girls' softball pitchers are. The catcher even missed some of them and almost fell over.

I wish the best of luck to these players and the coaches for next year's softball season. Enjoy your success, and bring home another national championship next year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the team roster of all the players and coaches, who made this a great championship victory, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The players: Kelsey Arnold, Falepolima Aviu, Caleigh Clifton, Alissa Dalton, Macey Hatfield, Shay Knighten, Mariah Lopez, Paige Lowary, Kylie Lundberg, Nicole Mendes, Melanie Olmos, Paige Parker, Nicole Pendley, Raegan Rogers, Sydney Romero, Hannah Sparks, Vanessa Taukeiaho, and Lea Wodach.

The coaches: Patty Gasso, Melyssa Lombardi, JT Gasso, Jackie Bishop, Lacey Waldrop, Brittany Williams, and Andrea Gasso.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, over the last 10 days, I have conducted emergency field hearings, giving my constituents in Connecticut an opportunity to be heard, a chance for their voices and faces to be part of considering the Republican healthcare or really, more accurately, wealth care bill. Indeed, that label or characterization of the bill came from one my constituents who said: This plan is not healthcare, it is wealth care because it produces a massive transfer of wealth from the poor and middle-class Americans, whose healthcare would be deeply harmed, to the richest Americans, who would enjoy the benefits of hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts.

That kind of voice and criticism deserves to be heard here. Yet my Republican colleagues and their leadership have gone from total secrecy to total chaos. They are in chaos because they have refused to heed the voices and faces of ordinary, average working peo-

ple—middle-class people, the most vulnerable people—who would be deeply harmed by this proposal.

One woman at one of my hearings in Connecticut, knowing what would happen under this bill, said to me:

Do the right thing. Save the Affordable Care Act and save our lives.

She was not exaggerating when she said lives are at stake. She is right. This very eloquent woman, Amy Etkind, knows all too well what this bill means for Americans like her, and the man she described, literally, as the "love of her life." She told me about him during a hearing in New Haven Friday afternoon—about how he has struggled with addiction, mental health issues, and now diabetes. He is alive today because of Medicaid, and he has access to the services he needs. As she said, "If Medicaid were to go away, he would be literally dead in a very short period of time."

When we say the Republican plan would cost lives—it would kill people—it is no hyperbole, no exaggeration. It is plain, simple fact. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stubborn things." The fact is, this bill would cost the State of Connecticut nearly \$3 billion in Federal funding over the next 10 years. These cuts, mainly to Medicaid, cannot and will not be replaced, as the CBO has predicted. It would leave States like Connecticut in an impossible position: either raise taxes to pay the difference or cut Medicaid enrollment to insurers, putting people like Amy's husband at risk, literally, of death; putting out on the streets the senior citizens living in the Monsignor Bojnowski Manor in New Britain, where they are enjoying great care—a high-quality environment because of Medicaid. Many of them are middle-class folks who worked hard, played by the rules, and exhausted their savings. They are vulnerable now because of the cost of healthcare and their care, in particular. The focus ought to be on them, on the people who are affected, not so much the numbers, but we know from the numbers that the Republican plan would disastrously raise premiums by 20 percent and would cut enrollment impact on the individual market—premiums and enrollment, apart from Medicaid, on the individual market. These numbers are from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. They are fact. Facts are stubborn things.

We know also what the effects would be—what the numbers are for people who are middle income. The elimination of the tax credits for middle-income people paying their premiums would be nothing short of disastrous.

We focused on Medicaid. I talked to you about Amy and the love of her life and what the effects would be of the decimation of Medicaid, but here we are talking about the elimination of tax breaks that help middle-income

people. I don't need to explain this graph. For someone with \$26,500 in income, their premiums under the Senate plan would jump to \$6,500 from the present \$1,700. For somebody earning in the midfifties, the jump is even greater, and it is true even for people who are earning \$68,200. They will have to pay more, a larger share of their income, and receive less. It is not only that the Senate plan is disastrous because it is more costly, it is also going to impact the quality of care by reducing the standards; eliminating the strict requirements on preexisting conditions, the protections on annual and lifetime caps for coverage, defunding Planned Parenthood, continuing the war on women's healthcare. The long and short of it is that this measure is bad for America.

Tia spoke to me at these hearings about the opioid epidemic. If there is one example that breaks our hearts and wrenches our guts, it is the effect on people who are trying to recover from opioid addiction and abuse. Their recovery would be shredded—maybe stopped—by gutting Medicaid coverage.

Another woman who spoke at my hearing, Donna Sager, called herself "the perfect example as to why our healthcare plans must include preexisting conditions and not punish people like me with high premiums." Donna, as she told me, is 63 years old and not yet eligible for Medicare. When she was 36, she was diagnosed with a rare form of hereditary colon cancer. For 27 years she has been undergoing major surgeries, constant screening, doctor visits to make sure she can remain as healthy as possible. Then she told me about her husband, a man in his seventies, and she said this:

He would like to retire, but how can he with all my medical expenses? I am frightened what I will do if the Republican healthcare bill gets passed. Changes to preexisting coverage will be extremely damaging to me, how will I pay these costs and high premiums? The republican healthcare plan wants to punish me for having cancer.

She closed by saying:

It is as though Washington wants to punish me again for having cancer and being older. . . . I never would have expected that the greatest country in the world would treat me like this.

There is a path forward, and it requires our Republican colleagues very simply to start over, to work with Democrats, to abandon this misguided, myopic effort to repeal, repeal, repeal. That mantra simply is not a policy for American healthcare.

What is needed is to build on the Affordable Care Act, to improve it, to correct its defects. We can do it if we work together and if we focus on the rising costs of medical care and try to bring them down, if we focus on the regulatory barriers to entering insurance markets and seek to eliminate them, if we focus on the FDA drug approval process and seek to responsibly

and safely expedite new drugs coming to market, if we enable Medicare to negotiate drug prices as the VA does. Those examples of improving the present system are doable. They require leadership, which has been lacking and most particularly lacking at the White House.

Yesterday, we saw a picture that is worth a thousand words: the President of the United States sitting with Members of this body, but only Members of this body from the other side of the aisle—only Republican Senators. It was almost the entire membership on the Republican side. Not a single Democrat was invited, not a single Democrat consulted, not a single Democrat involved in the continuing process now of producing yet another plan behind closed doors in secrecy.

The majority leader announced it just today. The effort is to have another version to be submitted to the CBO by Friday, but that process simply continues the present fatal flaw in my Republican colleagues' thinking, which is that they can do it with only one party. I want to give credit to our Republican colleagues who had the courage and strength to say no because they saw it was bad for America.

In closing, I want to say that my Republican colleagues will be going home this weekend. They have been looking at themselves in the mirror, at their consciences, and they have been seeing something they don't like—a moral failing in this bill, not just a political failing or a policy defect but a real moral failing.

Healthcare is a right, and even if my Republican colleagues disagree on that point, they have to recognize that taking away healthcare, decimating Medicaid, waging war on women's health, depriving children of the preventive care they need so they can go to school and learn properly, evicting seniors from nursing homes, putting the burden of billions of dollars on my State of Connecticut and every State represented in this body, and other grotesque, cruel, costly impacts of this bill are the wrong ways to go. They know that when they look in the mirror, but they will know it even more powerfully when they look in the eyes of their constituents this week—if they have the guts and courage and heart to do so.

This wealth care plan is doomed to failure. Even if it passes, it is doomed to fail America. It is a moral failing, not just a policy failing. The health of our consciences, as well as our physical well-being, hangs in the balance.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise to defend the essential healthcare that 300,000 New Mexicans and millions of Americans depend on.

Leader MCCONNELL calls his TrumpCare bill the Better Care Reconciliation Act, but actually the bill will mean worse care for seniors, children, the disabled, rural communities, and working families all trying to make ends meet. It will mean no care for 22 million people, according to the latest Congressional Budget Office report. The bill cancels health insurance and slashes Medicaid funding, all so Republicans can give big tax breaks to the richest Americans.

President Trump called the original House bill mean. The Senate Republicans' healthcare bill isn't just mean; it is cruel. It is cruel to take away nursing home care that seniors depend on, cruel to take away necessary medical services from disabled children. Make no mistake, this bill will cost lives.

This version of TrumpCare is a massive redistribution of wealth from working families, seniors, and the disabled to the wealthy. But the Republicans' bill is not Robin Hood in reverse. TrumpCare doesn't just take money away from the poor to give to the rich; it takes away people's healthcare and robs families of their health and ability to work, care for their families, contribute to society, and lead happy and healthy lives.

This bill was drafted in secret. Only a handful of Republicans and their lobbyist friends got to see the bill. It is no wonder the American people hate what TrumpCare would do to them and to their families. TrumpCare is cruel; there is no doubt about it.

It is good that Leader MCCONNELL decided not to call a vote this week on this terrible bill, but I am by no means satisfied. We need to hear from the Republican leadership that they are ready to work with Democrats to improve the Affordable Care Act, not gut it, and to truly improve our healthcare system. This is what the American people are demanding, and this is what we in Congress should be working toward on a bipartisan basis.

We created Medicaid in 1965 to serve a critical need. Since then, Medicaid has become one of the most successful programs for making sure low-income people get the healthcare they need. People get treatment for illnesses that once were a death sentence.

The American people support a government that doesn't leave its most vulnerable to suffer and die, but the current Senate bill cuts Medicaid by more than \$770 billion. Let's be clear, these cuts have nothing to do with better healthcare. They are a ruthless tactic to fund tax cuts for the wealthy.

On the campaign trail, the President vowed not to cut Medicaid. He said it a

number of times. Last week, he tweeted that he is "very supportive" of the bill. Yesterday, he met with the Republican caucus and told them to pass the bill. By supporting this bill, the President breaks the promise he made during the campaign.

Medicaid expansion has allowed millions of Americans and over 265,000 people in my State to see a doctor. Many of these folks work but don't have health insurance through their jobs or can't afford private health insurance. Medicaid expansion is literally a lifeline, but TrumpCare wipes this out. I can't believe that our Republican friends are doing this to New Mexico children and families.

Take 1½ year old Rafe—this is Rafe. Rafe is here with his mom Jessica and his dad Sam, a veteran. They are from Albuquerque, NM. Rafe was born with cortical visual impairment—a kind of legal blindness—and significant developmental delays. He faced monumental medical challenges. But Jessica and Sam have been able to access the intensive medical care, early intervention services, medical equipment, and therapies he needs through a combination of their military insurance and Medicaid.

Now Rafe's parents are scared he will lose his Medicaid services. Their military insurance alone doesn't cover all the services and equipment Rafe needs. They need Medicaid. Without it, Rafe's chances for a better life are threatened. They worry about—and this is their quote—"dealing with insurance, finding healthcare, tracking down specialty doctors, keeping up with therapy appointments and doctor's appointments." They worry whether Rafe will be able to walk, feed himself, graduate from high school, and get a job. Now they must worry whether he will get the medical care he needs to give him the opportunity to do all of those things.

Let's talk about Carmen and her three children. Carmen is a single parent. She serves Native American students as a teacher, a coach, dorm parent, and higher education administrator. The small nonprofit organization Carmen works for doesn't offer health insurance. For the past 4 years, Medicaid has helped pay for the healthcare for her two sons.

Her kids are healthy, but two have nut allergies and need EpiPens at school and at home. According to Carmen, "When I renewed their EpiPen prescription for school this past fall, I was astounded that the price skyrocketed to \$741 to fill one prescription!"

Now Carmen is worried; she doesn't know whether her kids will lose Medicaid or how she will pay for prescriptions. She asked me: "Please continue to fight for the Affordable Care Act because you are fighting for me and my family's well-being."

It is cruel to threaten Rafe's chances for a healthier life, cruel that Carmen

might not be able to pay for EpiPens for her kids. TrumpCare threatens these two families and millions more.

TrumpCare will hurt seniors, so it is not surprising that AARP strongly opposes it. AARP opposes the TrumpCare age tax that allows insurance companies to charge seniors up to five times more for their premiums. The age tax, combined with reducing tax credits for premiums, will price seniors out of health insurance needed to supplement their Medicare. AARP is calling on every Senator to vote no on the Senate Republicans' bill.

Medicaid pays for an astounding 62 percent of all nursing home care. By cutting Medicaid, the Republicans threaten our mothers, our fathers, and our grandmothers and grandfathers in nursing homes. States can't bear the burden of these costs. Republicans want to shift them.

I know the State of New Mexico can't handle this. This cost-shift sets States up to cut reimbursement rates and reduce eligibility for services at nursing homes. Medicaid pays 64 percent of nursing home care in my State. New Mexico's 74 nursing homes will be impacted by these cuts.

Many of the folks in nursing homes are middle-class Americans who worked all their lives, paid taxes, and saved for retirement. They did everything right, but because skilled nursing care is so expensive, they have outlived their life savings, and now Medicaid pays the cost of care at the end of their lives, allowing them to live with dignity.

Senate Republicans may say that one improvement in their bill over the House bill is it protects people with preexisting conditions, but the American people shouldn't be fooled. People with preexisting conditions are not protected under the Senate bill the way they are now protected under the ACA.

The Senate Republican bill still allows States to waive the essential health benefits that all insurance companies must now provide under the ACA. These benefits include prescriptions, hospital stays, rehabilitative services, and laboratory services. If States waive these benefits, people with serious illnesses would have to pay out of pocket for these services or buy additional insurance, or if these services are covered but are not essential health benefits, insurance companies can put annual or lifetime limits on the services, and people with serious illnesses could end up with no coverage or be priced out of services.

All this sends us back to the time when people faced not getting care or going bankrupt if they got sick. We passed the ACA because the American people agreed no one should go broke to pay for lifesaving care and that insurance companies shouldn't be able to place limits on the care someone could

get in their lifetime. Why do Republicans want to take us back?

Finally, the steep cuts to Medicaid would devastate hospitals, especially rural hospitals. Make no mistake—rural hospitals are already struggling. Medicaid cuts will force some to close their doors if TrumpCare becomes law.

In New Mexico, our rural hospitals are often an economic anchor for the community. Hospital administrators in my State are very worried. Medicaid has helped the Guadalupe County Hospital cut its uninsured payer rate from 14 percent to 4 percent from 2014 to 2016. Its uncompensated care decreased 23 percent in the same period. The hospital's administrator, Christina Campos, fears what might happen if TrumpCare becomes law. She is urging me to protect access to care in rural areas.

I will fight hard to keep residents in our rural areas insured and to keep rural hospitals open in New Mexico and across the Nation.

The President and congressional Republicans want to take us back to the days when healthcare was a privilege for those who could afford it. The American people do not support the Republicans' cruel plans. Congress should listen to the pleas of our constituents. The American people reject the framework of TrumpCare. They reject gutting Medicaid and the Medicaid expansion. They reject making seniors pay more for healthcare. They reject making healthcare inaccessible for those with fewer resources.

The Republicans need to go back to the drawing board and begin to work with Democrats. I say to my colleagues across the aisle, do not take healthcare and the opportunity to lead a productive and happy life away from millions of Americans. Together, we can make affordable healthcare a reality for all.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, one of the things that the healthcare law changes here have demonstrated is that partisanship in Congress has reached a new high—or I would say a new low. I am tired of reading about who is to blame for what, and I know Americans and North Dakotans are too. Most importantly, it certainly doesn't do anything to help American families' healthcare get any better.

We should all want to improve our healthcare system so it works better for families and for businesses. It should be a bipartisan discussion, not a political exercise. I am here, as are many of my colleagues, because that is what we hope to accomplish.

For years, I have been offering reasonable reforms to make the current health reform law work better. I want such reforms to be bipartisan. I want to have a larger conversation about healthcare in this country. But the Re-

publican Senate bill, the Better Care Reconciliation Act, is simply not the way to have those discussions. Frankly, this bill is a nonstarter.

I have heard from so many North Dakota children with disabilities, seniors in nursing homes, men and women with preexisting conditions in my State, and hospitals, doctors, and nurses, especially in rural communities, who are deeply concerned—in fact, I can tell you, deeply panicked—about how this bill would make care less available and less affordable.

There are commonsense actions we can and should take right now to make sure American families aren't hurt in the near term. That is why we are here today.

Action and uncertainty caused by the administration, as well as House Republicans, exacerbated instability in the insurance markets, threatening significant cost increases for consumers in 2018. The administration has been unwilling to commit funding for cost-sharing reduction payments, and some Republicans have been working to dismantle the health reform law by not funding critical reinsurance programs. These actions make it extraordinarily difficult for insurers to plan and make business decisions for 2018—yes, 2018, the year we are talking about today. If insurers can't rely on these funds to support healthcare programs that make it possible for health insurance costs to remain affordable for families, the health insurance premium filings for the next term year will reflect that uncertainty. Health insurance rates for 2018 that have already been filed in some of our States demonstrate that fact.

Let's talk about the facts. Independent reports from the Congressional Budget Office and Standard & Poor's have said that the insurance markets were expected to stabilize this year and could stabilize this year unless the administration causes disruption. If you look at the numbers from last year, you will see that health plans were offered in every county in this country.

Today, we are here to offer a few bills that will make an immediate and real difference for families to address health insurance rate increases that we expect in 2018. These are commonsense bills that should be bipartisan.

We hope our colleagues across the aisle will work with us in a bipartisan way so we can provide immediate relief and guarantee stability for the individual market—stability that will enable individuals and families in all of our States to avoid serious increases in their health insurance rates.

No family should face bankruptcy to cover their healthcare costs because in Washington, DC, we can't implement the bill that we have and instead continue to stall and play the game of politics against the interests of the American people and, certainly in many

cases, some of the sickest among us and people who have a whole lot of healthcare insecurity. This is politics. We cannot continue to play politics with people's health.

Some of the issues we are working to address were included, interestingly enough, in the Senate healthcare bill—a clear acknowledgment from the Republicans that these changes are necessary for the health market to function in 2018.

Right now, we are standing here because time is of the essence. I hope our colleagues will join us in this effort. We want to work with them. We hope they will work with us. We hope we can at least at a minimum get together and solve the problem for 2018 while we are debating the future of healthcare delivery in this country.

I will call on my friend, the great Senator from New Hampshire, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, to offer what I think is a terrific idea and to talk about a bill on which I am a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1462

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP, and appreciate all of the efforts she is making to try to address the challenges we are facing in the healthcare markets across this country. Like her and like so many of my colleagues who are going to be here, I have come to the floor this afternoon because we want to take urgent steps and we can take steps today to address the uncertainty in our health insurance markets. We can take steps today that can hold down premiums.

I have heard Senators on both sides of the aisle who have expressed concern about looming premium increases in the Affordable Care Act marketplaces. We all need to understand, as Senator HEITKAMP pointed out, what some of the causes of these premium increases are.

Insurers regularly cite the Trump administration's refusal to commit to making cost-sharing reduction payments, also known as CSRs. These CSR payments were included in the Affordable Care Act in order to help Americans afford insurance once they had it. The ACA requires insurers to reduce deductibles and copayments for working families who are buying insurance in the marketplace. Because of the cost-sharing reduction payments, the CSRs, patients pay less for their care and the government reimburses the insurers.

These reductions and payments are built into the rates insurers are charging for 2017. Yet the Trump administration has refused to commit to paying these reimbursements because of a partisan lawsuit that has been brought by House Republican leaders.

Because of the radically uncertain landscape insurers are facing right

now, many of them are doing one of two things: Some are pulling out of the ACA marketplaces altogether, and others are dramatically increasing premiums. The end result is fewer choices and higher costs for American families.

Last year in my State of New Hampshire—and Senator HASSAN is here. We represent New Hampshire, and we have been very concerned about what is happening right now. Last year, the insurance markets were stable, and health insurance premiums increased an average of just 2 percent—the lowest annual increase in history. Today is a radically different story, in large part because of the uncertainty this administration is causing by refusing to guarantee insurers cost-sharing reduction payments. What we are seeing is that those insurance companies are protecting themselves by raising premiums on patients.

The same thing is happening in other States. In some cases, insurers are filing two different sets of rates—a set that is premised on the administration continuing to make cost-sharing reduction payments and an alternative set with higher premiums to account for continuing uncertainty and the possibility that this administration will stop making those payments.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration continues to send mixed signals to insurers, and of course it has threatened to stop paying cost-sharing reduction payments altogether. If this were to happen, insurers could immediately exit the markets for breach of contract.

So we are kind of in this perverse limbo situation. The administration creates uncertainty by refusing to commit to continuing the CSR payments, and the insurers protect themselves by exiting the markets or raising rates. And it is the premium holders, the families out there, who are hurt by this political football that the administration seems to be intent on continuing.

That is why I have introduced the Marketplace Certainty Act, which is a bill to appropriate funding for the cost-sharing reduction payments in order to make good on our commitment to help working families with their deductibles and cost sharing.

I believe that the House Republican leaders' lawsuit has no merit but that the chaos it has caused by allowing the Trump administration to waver on these promised payments requires that we act now.

I am pleased to be joined in this legislation by Senators BALDWIN, BLUMENTHAL, CARDIN, CARPER, COONS, KAINE, HASSAN, HEITKAMP, CORTEZ MASTO, KING, LEAHY, MARKEY, WYDEN, STABENOW, and I am sure that by tomorrow, we will have even more Senators on this bill.

We could pass it right now. Right now, we could end this manufactured

crisis. We could immediately restore certainty and stability to the health insurance markets for all of our constituents. That would be good for the Republicans, and it would be good for the Democrats. Mostly, it would be good for the families out there who are experiencing this uncertainty.

We could do this. It would give us the breathing space we need to come together on a bipartisan basis to improve the law, to strengthen what is working and to fix what is not. In poll after poll, that is what the American people want us to do. They want us to stop the partisan bickering. They want us to work together. They want us to make commonsense improvements so that this law works for every American.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1462, the Marketplace Certainty Act; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I just had an opportunity to read the legislation of the Senator from New Hampshire. It appears that the legislation was just filed today. Instead of giving the American people time to read the bill, the Senate is being asked to pass the legislation now. At a minimum, shouldn't the American people have at least a day to read the proposal?

Putting that aside, this bill seeks to address another major failure of ObamaCare. That is what they are trying to do here. As a doctor, I want insurance to be affordable for patients all across the country. This bill confirms what we all know—that ObamaCare is not affordable.

The Senator is well aware of the large premium increases in her own State. It is not just the premiums that are skyrocketing. This week, I spoke to a woman in Wyoming. She told me that the deductible under her ObamaCare plan is so high that her husband refuses to go visit the doctor. She said that it is \$6,500 for her and \$6,500 for him and that he will not go to a doctor with that kind of a deductible. According to supporters of ObamaCare, this person is actually covered under ObamaCare, but as a doctor, I see things differently in that healthcare must be more affordable for everyone.

The Senator's proposal seeks to throw more money at a systemic problem with ObamaCare. Instead, we should be passing bills that actually bring down the cost of care.

When the Senator mentions the CSRs, I will point out that absolutely every payment has been made—every one—all the way up until today.



People also talk about the sabotaging of the market. To me, the sabotaging of the insurance companies and the insurance market in this country has been because of ObamaCare's mandating that people buy insurance—buy more than they want, more than they need, and more than they can afford in so many cases, and it is insurance that provides very hollow opportunities to actually use the insurance.

Again, I appreciate the acknowledgment that ObamaCare is clearly not working; however, our focus should be on policies that make healthcare more affordable to all Americans.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we get our full amount of time and that the time my friend from Wyoming uses be from the Republicans' time at some point later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no order for divided time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Oh. So we have as much time as we need?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no order.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, while I am disappointed, I am not surprised that my colleague from Wyoming has objected to our effort to move forward. He is objecting to ending the uncertainty we have experienced, which is forcing insurers to raise rates because of the uncertainty with which this administration is administering the Affordable Care Act. They have been very clear that they want marketplaces to implode so that the act does not work for people. Senator BARRASSO is objecting to a commonsense step to stabilize the insurance marketplaces.

This is not going to be the last word because this is a commitment we made to American families. The instability here in Washington is what is causing the instability not only in insurance markets but in the country at large.

We are approaching the Fourth of July, which is next week. When our Founders declared independence on July 4, 1776, Benjamin Franklin warned that we must all hang together or we will all hang separately. It is no different today. We all need to come together. We need to work across the aisle. We need to improve the healthcare system so that it works for all Americans. That is our goal. That is why we are here on the floor today, and we need to start by making sure the insurers have some certainty so that they can keep rates low for American families. We will be back, have no doubts about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I have to say that there are a lot of things my friend from Wyoming could have said in his objection, but to lecture us about bringing out a bill that people have not had a chance to read or study is rather rich at this moment in our legislative journey on healthcare. I do not know if he thought that through before he said it, but I can assure you that when it came out of his mouth, all of us on this side were saying: You have got to be kidding me. Really? It was just a little much.

I know we are all talking around the obvious, and that is that we need to fix the healthcare system in America so that people do not have to go into their pockets as often, so that insurance is reliable, and so that the markets are more stable. We are going to have a lot of opportunity, I hope, to come together and do just that. I hope my friend from Wyoming and my other friends on the other side of the aisle will be part of that.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1201

We have a very simple solution to the bare counties, and I hope people will think this through before they just object. I am going to have 25 bare counties, mostly as a result of the sabotaging of the exchanges by this administration. People in those counties are looking to me for an answer, and I do not blame them for being worried. How can we solve that problem today? S. 1201, the Health Care Options for All Act, which I have introduced, will solve that problem today.

All we have to do is say to anyone who is in a county in America—and I know my colleague from Ohio, Senator BROWN, has some counties, and I know my colleague from Indiana has some counties—if you do not have an insurer in your county, you can come with your subsidy and buy insurance from the same places our staffs buy it and most Members of Congress buy it. Those are national plans. They are in every State in the Union because Members of Congress have staff members in every State in the Union. There is no need to attract more plans. There is no need to do anything complicated. You just take the subsidies that you are entitled to and you buy insurance at the same place Congress buys it.

We can do that today. If we do not do it today, do you know what we are saying to the people who live in Ohio and Indiana and Missouri? We are saying that we are entitled to something better than they have and that they should not be allowed to buy what we can buy. Now, that takes some nerve. If we are not willing to take this simple, basic step, people in these counties should be angry and take up pitchforks—metaphorically, of course.

The national plans that are out there that my staff uses that are in Springfield, Cape Girardeau, Columbia—and I am sure my colleagues could talk

about their staffs using these plans all over the country—I would like to make those available to regular folks in my State who want to be able to lay their heads on their pillows tonight and not worry about whether they are going to have insurance next year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1201, the Health Care Options for All Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, before coming to the Senate, I practiced medicine in Wyoming for over 20 years. That is why I am passionate about improving the quality of care and lowering the cost of healthcare. Unfortunately, we know healthcare is in a crisis. Premiums and deductibles are skyrocketing, and insurance is unaffordable.

It is interesting to hear the comments when we are talking about the sabotaging of the marketplace. It is ObamaCare that has sabotaged the marketplace. The Presiding Officer knows fully well, as do I, that when you look at the co-ops that were set up all around the country under ObamaCare, one after another went bankrupt—belly-up, shut down—and left people uncovered. That was before we even knew who the Republican nominee for President was going to be in 2016. That is ObamaCare. That was at a time when all there was out there was the Obama healthcare law. One co-op after another failed, and it cost the taxpayers billions of dollars—guaranteed loans that will never be paid back.

Just like the bill we just discussed, this proposal is an important acknowledgment by the Senator from Missouri. It is the acknowledgment that ObamaCare's collapsing insurance markets are affecting people all around the country. In Missouri, 18,000 people in 25 counties will have zero options on the ObamaCare exchanges—zero. They have been promised that their preexisting conditions will be covered, and no one is selling insurance in those counties in that State. They have basically been misled by ObamaCare that they will be covered for preexisting conditions. In the Republican plan, what we are doing is covering people who have preexisting conditions.

Let me say again that next year thousands of people in Missouri will have no insurance company that will be willing to sell insurance in the ObamaCare exchange. It is clear that



insurance markets in Missouri are collapsing, as they are all around the country.

This bill is not the solution. Instead of giving people more choices in Missouri, what does the bill do? It sends people to Washington, DC, to buy their health insurance—a typical solution from the other side of the aisle. Instead of empowering States with more flexibility and the authority at the State level, they think once again that Washington knows best. They think that the people they represent would rather call a bureaucrat who is hundreds of miles away than talk with local people who live and work in their communities.

The simple fact is that ObamaCare is not providing patients with the increased choices they were promised. We need to rescue people in Missouri and across the country from ObamaCare. This bill is the wrong approach.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming does not have the floor.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, the next time I will know, when he is giving a speech, before he objects, to start then.

I am pretty sure that his staff in Wyoming is not coming up to Washington to buy their insurance. I am pretty sure that all of our staffs—I am pretty sure the Presiding Officer's staff, those who work for him in Utah—are not coming to Washington to buy their insurance. I am pretty sure Senator MANCHIN's staff and Senator PATTY MURRAY's staff and all of our staffs who live all over this great country are not coming to Washington to buy their insurance. They are getting good health insurance plans.

I just think it takes incredible nerve to lecture me about people in Missouri having no insurance while the Senator from Wyoming is objecting to letting them get the same insurance he has. Really? That is what this has come to, this partisan exercise?

We don't have to fix this permanently this way, but we could do it just temporarily to give people peace of mind until we figure out the right way forward. But how dare Members of this Chamber tell people in my State they are not entitled to buy what we have, when they have no other options at this moment.

Let's move forward together and fix it—all of it. But to get a lecture that people in my State don't deserve what my staff has or what Senator BARASSO's staff has—no wonder people are upset with Washington.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for her good idea and for her passion for this issue and for her correct statement that when people sign up for these exchanges, they don't have to go by train, plane, or automobile to Washington, DC, to get their insurance.

I heard, when I was home this weekend, over and over, concern from people whom I was surprised to see come up to me. Several people in Winona, MN, came up to me and said: We are Republicans, but we don't think it is fair if seniors have to pay more when tax cuts are going to the wealthiest.

I heard from people in Lanesboro, MN, small business owners who were worried about what was happening with the proposal from the other side. In Northfield, MN, the town of "Cows, Colleges and Contentment," I can tell you that they were not very content at the Northfield Hospital as they saw the devastating impact this bill would have on rural hospitals.

So that is why I so appreciate my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP, bringing people together today to talk about the fact that there is another way forward.

There is another way forward, and the people in this Chamber have done this before. Senator MCCONNELL negotiated with Senator Boxer on a major transportation bill. The last time we had an issue with doctors' fees, we were able to get that done on a bipartisan basis. So what we are simply asking our colleagues to do is to start afresh and to look at what we could do together to help the people of this country without sabotaging the current healthcare delivery system and without taking this out on the most vulnerable through Medicaid cuts.

Here are some ideas. As to prescription drug prices, why would we not allow the 41 million seniors in this country to use their bargaining power—to harness their bargaining power—as my friend Senator NELSON from Florida understands because he knows there are a lot of seniors in Florida—to harness that bargaining power to negotiate for lower costs on prescription drugs. The current law bans us from doing that. So all we want to do is to lift that ban and let our seniors negotiate. That is not in this bill we are considering from the Republican side. This is something we can come together and work on.

We can get less expensive drugs in the form of generic drugs. Yet, right now, we have a situation where major prescription drug companies are paying generic companies to keep their products off the market. It is called pay for delay. Senator GRASSLEY and I have a bill to eliminate that. We can bring in less expensive drugs from other countries if, in fact, we have a situation where the prices have ballooned, as

they have for the top 10 selling drugs in America. Four of them have gone up over 100 percent.

The exchanges are another area where we have agreement. Senator COLLINS has been working on this. Senator KAINE and Senator CARPER have a bill on this, and Senator SHAHEEN is working on the cost-sharing issue. We can work together to make insurance more affordable for people who are in the exchange.

As to our small business rates, we must work on that.

I truly believe we can come together.

I will end with this. I got to be at that baseball game in the crowd with the 25,000 people who were watching the two teams play each other. Senator DONNELLY of Indiana was on the field. At the end of the game, after the Democratic team won, they didn't keep the trophy. They handed the trophy to the Republican team and asked them to place that trophy in Congressman SCALISE's office.

We are not two teams. We are one team, and that is for our country, for America. So let's work together on this bill.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I love what the Senator from Minnesota just said. I am a retired Navy captain. For years we had healthy competition among the different branches of our services. I salute the folks in the Army, the Marines, the Air Force, and Coast Guard. I always say: The Navy salutes you. Then I also say: a different uniform, the same team. To the extent that we wear different uniforms, we really are on the same team, and I think the American people are anxious for us to start acting that way.

What I hope we will do is to hit the pause button right now on the legislation that the Republicans have pulled off the floor and that we will use this time as an opportunity not to go to our separate corners and figure out how to do the other team in when we return here in 10 days. I hope we will, as some of our colleagues have suggested, explore some ideas where we can work together.

Some have talked about how to make the marketplaces work. It is not a Democratic idea. It is a Republican idea. There are the tax credits for the exchange, which is a Republican idea. The individual mandate and the idea that there cannot be prohibitions on insurers denying coverage are Republican ideas too. Those are all ideas from 1993, taken from Mitt Romney, who put them in RomneyCare in Massachusetts, and we put them in the Affordable Care Act.

We didn't just do this and shut out the Republicans. We had 80 days where we worked on the legislation. I was on

the Finance Committee with Senator SCHUMER and others, and we had, I think, a dozen or more hearings and dozens of amendments—over 300 amendments in all. Some 160 Republican amendments were included in the bill. To somehow say that they were being shut out is nonsense. That is a reinvention of history.

Let's do it the right way. At the end of the day, we will do what President Trump has been calling for, for the last 5, 6, 7, 8 months, as I recall. He said: Why don't we cover everybody, why don't we provide better coverage, and why don't we do it in a more affordable way.

Unfortunately, what Republicans have offered and what they pulled off the floor doesn't do that. It provides less coverage for more money. It says to people—the least well off in our society: We are going to provide you less coverage in order to give folks who make a lot of money, and really don't need a tax break, a tax break.

That is not consistent with the Golden Rule. The Presiding Officer knows it well. We are supposed to treat other people the way we want to be treated. That is an example of a failure with respect to the Golden Rule.

I didn't come here to waste my time and other people's time. I came here to get things done. We tried hard to involve the Republicans 8 years ago. They may not acknowledge that. The people in this country still want us to really bear down and work together, and we can do that. At the end of the day, we will be better as a party, we will be better as a body, and we will be better as a country.

I want to thank Senator WARNER for letting me speak before him. Thank you so much. I will say to Senator KAINE: Thank you for allowing me to be your partner on a great reinsurance plan that will help stabilize the exchanges. I am delighted to be your wingman. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I urge my friend, the Senator from Delaware, to get to the train station.

First of all, I wish to thank Senator HEITKAMP for bringing this group together. There has been a lot of talk about what ideas can fix the Affordable Care Act, and here we are hearing some of the ideas that we will offer.

Senator KAINE has had to hear this story before, but before I was in politics, I had a pretty long career in venture capital and invested in a lot of businesses. Some of those businesses managed to eke out a living, but the thing that was remarkable about the companies is that the companies that were the most successful weren't the ones that had the perfect business plan. They weren't the ones that had the newest ideas. The companies that were the most successful were the ones that

were able to adapt and change. I never, ever invested in a business that ever met its business plan. Every one had to change in some way—alter.

The truth of the matter is, as to the Affordable Care Act, for all its good things, there were things we got wrong. I will be the first to acknowledge that. There have been a lot of us in this body who over the last couple of years—again, I thank the Senator from North Dakota, who has been a part of these efforts—have said that maybe we need to do a little less bureaucracy in the ACA in terms of reporting requirements. Maybe we ought to have a cheaper option. We have gold and silver and bronze. I remember working with the former Senator from Alaska on this. Maybe we ought to have a copper plan, as well, to try to get those young people invested in buying that first plan.

We said that maybe we ought to take an idea that came from the other side of the aisle, and, as long as we have appropriate consumer protections, go ahead and let insurance products get sold across State lines so there is more competition. Then, we saw more problems arise. Unfortunately, problems arose with the ACA, as we have seen this administration and others try to knock out some of the building blocks that built up the ACA—risk corridors, cost sharing, or more recently the administration saying that we may just ignore part of the bill that says there is an individual mandate. Consequently, that means the insurance company had to charge a heck of a lot more money because they weren't sure whether the law was going to be in force.

We have had people like the Senator from New Hampshire say: Well, I had an idea on cost sharing that might fix it. My dear friends, the other Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Delaware said: Let's go out and do that reinsurance plan, so that if there are extraordinarily high-cost plans, maybe that will be a secondary backdrop so premiums will not have to be so high. I am proud to support and be a cosponsor on both of those pieces of legislation.

Then, as only the Senator from Missouri can do, she came up with the most obvious of, at least, a short-term solution that says: My gosh, if for some reason, because there have been efforts to sabotage the ACA, we don't have enough offerings for at least some stop-gap period, we ought to allow all the folks in our States, if they don't have any coverage, to at least get the same kind of coverage we get. That is kind of Harry Truman basic common sense—Missouri common sense.

So I hope our colleagues, after they get out of one more secret meeting in one more basement or secret location, will come back and start talking about these solutions—solutions that don't

start with the premise that we are going to give folks like me a tax cut or that we are going to take a meat ax to Medicaid or that we are going to come up with a proposal that will take 22 million Americans off of health insurance.

The ACA didn't get it entirely right. There is a lot of room for improvement. We have asked our friends on the other side to meet us halfway and to try to bring the kind of bipartisan spirit we all talk about on this issue that affects each and every American and one-sixth of our economy. We can do it. We can do it right, but it is going to take the kind of cooperation and the kinds of good ideas that are being offered by my colleagues on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, all of the Florida people walk up to me and say: BILL, what is going on? Why can't Congress get together? Why can't we work together? We do in our committees. We usually work together. We certainly do with Senator THUNE, who is the chairman of the Commerce Committee. This Senator is the ranking member. We get a lot of things out. We are going to mark up the FAA bill tomorrow. There are a lot of controversial issues. We are going to get that out. Why can't we do it with healthcare?

So, last night, I had a telephone townhall meeting in my State of Florida and 6,000 people joined. They asked questions for an hour. Often, they would get through asking their question and they would say: I wish you guys could work together. So that is what we have been hearing in all of these speeches.

Well, let me give one suggestion that would lower premiums in the existing law, the Affordable Care Act, 13 percent. I had it costed out in Florida. Every now and then, you are going to have a catastrophic loss. It is kind of like when I was the elected insurance commissioner of Florida, and I inherited the mess after the monster hurricane. Hurricane Andrew was such a monster hurricane that it took down a number of insurance companies because the losses were so big. So we had to try to get insurance companies to come back into Florida. We created a reinsurance fund. We called it the Florida Hurricane Catastrophic Fund, which would reinsure, or insure, the insurance companies against catastrophic loss.

That is what we can do right here. We could be like my poor constituent, Megan, who fought cancer for 2 years, with two transplants, and ultimately lost the battle, but the bill was \$8 million. That is hard for any insurance company to swallow, but those are going to be limited, isolated cases.

Why don't we create a reinsurance fund for the marketplace in the Affordable Care Act to help the insurance companies with catastrophic loss? I asked: If we did that in Florida, with the Florida marketplace, what would it mean? It would reduce the insurance premiums under the marketplace in Florida by 13 percent. That is just one suggestion.

Every one of us has a suggestion. Put all of these suggestions together, and we are talking about really fixing the current law, instead of this roadway we see our friends on the other side of the aisle going down—a solution that is going to take coverage away from 22 million people and is going to cut \$300 billion out of Medicaid and eviscerate Medicaid or that is going to charge older Americans over younger Americans five times as much as the younger. We don't have to do that. Let's come up with a creative idea to fix the existing law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise with my colleagues to speak in favor of commonsense solutions. I think the GOP leadership made a wise decision—and I thank them for it—to pull the vote on their healthcare bill this week when the CBO came out and said that 22 million people would lose health insurance, 15 million in the first year, and Medicaid cuts would be significant. Obviously, the public was very concerned, and I am glad the GOP has taken a step back. I think we now have a chance to get this right.

I want to tell a personal story about my own involvement in this in the last few months. The story, to me, exemplifies an important principle, and that is a bad process will produce a bad product. This bill was the subject of a very bad process.

The bill that was put on the floor was a bill that ignored and shut out all Democrats from participating. More importantly, it shut out the committees from participating. Most importantly, it shut out the public from participating. That led to a bill that was destined to be bad. So we ought to fix it.

Our Democratic leader is just exiting the Chamber. He asked me after I came back from the national ticket—as a consolation prize, I guess—can you be on the HELP Committee? This is the committee I have wanted to be on since I came to the Senate—Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

I have been a mayor, and I have been a Governor. I have been in local and State government for 60 years. Education is the biggest line item, and health is the second biggest line item. This is what I actually know something about. I was so thrilled to join the committee. But, boy, was I naive. I assumed that being on the HELP Com-

mittee meant we would get to have a hearing about a healthcare bill.

I got on the committee on the 3rd of January. On the 5th of January, with many of my colleagues, we wrote a letter to the Republican leader and to the Republican chair of Health and Finance—13 of us; we had been on the committee for 2 days—and said: If you want to talk about improving healthcare, we have ideas. We want to sit down with you right now and talk about improvements to healthcare.

I guess I am a naive 58-year-old. I thought, now I am on the committee. Now I am where things will happen, and we will get to actually fix healthcare. But instead, since I have been on the committee—and I have committee colleagues here who will attest to this—we have had hearings on higher ed, we have had hearings on Cabinet nominees, we have had hearings on FDA reform issues. But the one taboo topic on our committee is that we are not allowed to have a hearing about the healthcare bill.

We asked for one after the House passed their bill; we couldn't have a hearing. The Senate bill has been put on the floor; we haven't had a hearing, and as far as we know, there will be no hearing. So those of us who are focused on this issue have no opportunity, but, more important—it is not about committee Members. For those watching this and wondering what a hearing is about, a hearing is about hearing from the public. You have a witness table. You get a patient and a doctor and a nurse. You get an insurance executive and a pharmaceutical executive. You get a small business having a hard time buying health insurance. You get them all to sit there and tell you what they like, what they don't like, and what can be fixed. All of that—all of that—has been shunted aside in this process, so the public isn't heard and the committees can't do their work.

Our ranking member on this committee, the Senator from Washington—I had watched her as the Budget chair when I was a Budget Committee member work out a great bipartisan budget deal in December of 2013, with then-House Budget chair, now-House Speaker PAUL RYAN. We worked it out. It was bipartisan.

I watched our ranking Democrat on the HELP Committee work with the chair on the HELP Committee, LAMAR ALEXANDER, 2 years ago to do something most people thought was impossible: have hearings and rewrite No Child Left Behind into the Every Student Succeeds Act. It was 7 years past the reauthorization date because it was too controversial. But I watched them use the committee process, entertain ideas from both sides, hear from the public, rewrite the bill, then conference with the House, and then get it to the President for signature.

Why is healthcare taboo on the HELP Committee? Let the committees

do their work. Let the greatest deliberative body in the world deliberate. Let the Senate be the Senate, and let us work together.

My colleagues have mentioned that I put an idea on the table. It is not a fix-everything idea, but it is a particular idea with a lot of bipartisan cred, and it is the notion, as some of my colleagues have said, of reinsurance. Senator CARPER and I have introduced the Individual Health Insurance Marketplace Improvement Act, and it is going to a very particular problem that I think Democrats and Republicans recognize as a significant challenge in the current healthcare law.

President Trump, from the beginning of his administration, has injected uncertainty: We are not going to continue enrolling people—or we will reduce the market for enrollment. We are not sure we are going to pay the cost sharing. Maybe we should let ObamaCare crash and burn—a tweet that he did recently. Because this has happened, the individual market has become very unstable, and many insurers pulling out of the market are citing this unpredictability as contributing to an instability in the individual market.

Here is what Senator CARPER and I proposed, and we have numerous cosponsors: We take the tool that Senator NELSON was describing, reinsurance, a tool that provides a backstop against very high-cost claims, and we put it into the Affordable Care Act as it was for the first 3 years of the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act in its first 3 years had a reinsurance mechanism to backstop high-cost claims. If an insurance company knows there is a backstop, they can actually set premiums at a lower and more affordable level for everybody. Having that backstop also gives some certainty, so you can actually write a plan in a market where, if you don't have certainty, you might choose not to write it.

In the first 3 years of the Affordable Care Act, this reinsurance provision worked out very well, held premiums down, and kept insurers in the marketplace. It expired. But we actually know reinsurance works because it is part of a great bill that was passed during a Republican Presidency with overwhelming Republican support. Medicare Part D was passed during the administration of President George W. Bush. Reinsurance was made a permanent part of that bill to do exactly the same thing: to cover high-cost claims, seniors who had multiple high-cost medications. Because reinsurance was included in that bill—it was put in the original bill, authored by Republicans—it enables pricing to be more affordable for our seniors who are on Medicare, and it enables pricing actually to be more affordable for the public treasury.

Reinsurance is just one of a number of ideas that are out there, but it is an

idea that has bipartisan bona fides. It has been demonstrated to work. You are not going to put reinsurance in this bill and have an unintended consequence that you didn't think would happen. We know how reinsurance works, and we know how it will work here.

I would just conclude and say that I hope we will take a bad process, which produced a bad product, set that aside, and engage in a good process to find a good product on the most important expenditure anyone ever makes in their life—on their health—a good product in the largest sector of the American economy; one-sixth of our economy is health.

The right process is this: When the Republicans get to the point that they think this bill is all they would want it to be, why not just put it in the Finance Committee, put it in the HELP Committee, and let's be the U.S. Senate. Let those of us who are on the committees do what we want to do. We have good committee chairs in these committees: Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN, the chair and ranking on Finance; Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY on HELP. Put it in the committees; let's hear from the public about what works, what doesn't, and what can be fixed. Then let's dialogue and listen to one another and come up with solutions—just as in that budget deal, just as in the rewrite of No Child Left Behind.

The Presiding Officer knows the next thing I am going to say, I bet. I am in the minority on those committees. I have some amendments like reinsurance that I want to put up, but I can't get them accepted unless I can convince some in the Republican majority that it is a good idea. I have to convince Republicans it is a good idea for my amendment to be accepted. Shouldn't I have that opportunity? Why would anybody be afraid of being open to an idea that might actually improve the bill?

Just this morning, I came out of a markup that the Presiding Officer is very familiar with, the markup of the NDAA. We finished it this morning on Armed Services. We went back and forth across the table, 27 Democrats and Republicans. We traded amendments, we voted some up, and we voted some down. We had Senator MCCAIN and Senator REED leading us in that. We got to the end of the day, and we had a committee vote. After that discussion and listening to one another across the table, back and forth, the committee vote was 27 to 0—27 to 0. We got all the Dems on board.

I will not be naive enough to think healthcare is going to be simple and noncontroversial. I am sure we will have some tough discussions. I am sure I will offer an amendment that will be turned down. Maybe I will offer one that will be accepted. But we are much

more likely to produce a good product and help people's healthcare if we actually will sit down in the committees that have jurisdiction and dialogue and amend before we bring this thing to the floor. It is just not worth rushing, because it is life and death.

We have a chance to get it right. The step-back this week enables us to take that chance, and we should seize it and work together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I wish to make some concluding remarks.

No. 1, I share the concerns that Senator BARRASSO expressed. I hear from ranch families and I hear from farm families about the unaffordability of their healthcare premiums. I hear about high deductibles. I hear about how what has happened in the health insurance market has made it more difficult for them to cover their families. I hear that.

We have solutions we have been talking about that could lower those costs. I would include dealing with people with chronic conditions. Reports from the RAND Commission tell us that 12 percent of the people in this country who have five or more chronic conditions cost the healthcare system over 40 percent. Some of those people are on the exchanges, and when they are on the exchanges, that drives the healthcare costs up.

But I have a question. I have a question for people who are advancing the Republican healthcare bill: Why do you have to give the richest Americans in this country a tremendous tax break to solve that problem? How does giving the top 0.1 percent of taxpayers in this country over a \$250,000 a year tax break—how does that fix the problem for my ranchers? How does that fix the problem for my farm families? You know the honest answer: It doesn't.

I need to understand how taking billions of dollars out of the Medicaid system, driving sicker, older people who tend to be in the Medicaid population onto the exchanges into the individual marketplace—how does that help that farm family we talk about almost every week on the floor of the Senate, that farm family, that individual who is paying excess premiums? It does nothing for them.

This is all some smoke-and-mirrors deal. What we have done today—almost 15 of us have come to the floor, and what we are saying is: Let's fix the problems. We can all acknowledge that we have a healthcare system where really sick people have a hard time finding affordability. When you put really sick people into an insurance pool, it drives up the cost for everyone. How do we manage that? The insurance industry tells me the average time on the individual exchange is 10 months.

How do you take someone with five chronic conditions and manage them in a 10-month plan? You know what, you don't. So they hop from plan to plan, costing more and more.

If you want to reduce costs, you have to figure out how we can better treat the sickest among us. Until we do that, we will not achieve the common goal, which is reducing and bending the costs of healthcare in this country. We cannot achieve that goal. When all we are doing is saying: No, we don't want to pay, we are going to make the States pay or we are going to make people on the individual exchange pay or we are going to make people do what they have done before, which is not have coverage and put them into uncompensated care, that will not solve the problem.

We have some great examples here for the immediate concern that we have about the premiums that are going to be expressed. In some ways, this reflects concerns about the increased costs of healthcare and what is happening in that individual market, but it is being driven by the failure to fulfill the statutory obligation—reinsurance, cost sharing.

I do have to point out that I found it interesting that the objection to Senator SHAHEEN's bill was that, oh, we haven't had time to take a look at it, haven't had time to even considering this cost-sharing issue. Really?

This is the last page of the Republican bill, page 145, stating in section 208, "Funding for Cost-Sharing Payments." I will give you, it is a different schedule, different formula in the Shaheen bill, but this is not a new concept. If we wanted today to give the insurance industry the certainty they needed that would make sure that the premium increases reflected not uncertainty but reflected actual costs, we would do this: We would take up JEANNE's bill. The very bill that the Republicans have advanced says, "There is appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums that may be necessary for payments for cost-sharing reductions authorized by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including adjustments to any prior obligations)."

The same provision was in the House bill. How can it be objectionable to have a debate about a provision that has been advanced in both Republican bills? How can that be objectionable when so much is riding on that, when the healthcare and availability of insurance to our families is riding on making sure we at least have some kind of stopgap measures in the exchanges that will guarantee a stability that will make insurance available.

If we don't know what is going to happen with those counties—we know we have huge counties that don't even

have uninsured in them. Senator McCASKILL offered an opportunity. Guess what. How about they get their insurance where our staff get our insurance or some among us get our insurance? That is objected to because it is some kind of Washington solution.

What is ironic about that is that provision that made Senate staff in our home States get their health insurance on the DC exchange came from Senator GRASSLEY during the debate on the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, not a Democratic idea. It was a Republican idea and certainly something that bears at least a discussion, certainly something that ought to be talked about here.

Let's not pretend there has been an outreach to people on the Democratic side. Today the Democratic leader offered to go to Blair House, offered to bring people together at Blair House, have a sitdown on healthcare, offered to go to the Senate—the Old Senate Chamber, no cameras, let's talk about healthcare. What we get is: You are not serious.

I want you to know I am dead serious about sitting down and trying to fashion a healthcare plan that actually fixes the problems we have right now in affordability of health insurance.

When someone says, well, you have to accept tax breaks as part of that for the richest Americans, think about this: 400 Americans will get a tax break under the Republican bill—400. Just 400 Americans will get a tax break under the Republican bill, equal to what it would cost for Medicaid expansion in four States.

Make no mistake, this is not healthcare reform we are talking about. That bill is not healthcare reform. It is entitlement reform in Medicaid, shifting costs to States and patients. It is tax reform, making sure the wealthiest among us get a tax break.

If we want to talk about healthcare reform, if we want to talk about fixing the ACA, let's not throw out what is working. Let's make sure we are fixing and addressing the problems that we here express every day that come in our mail and that we know we have to address in order to make the system fair; that is, younger, healthier people need a break. They need to find an affordable product.

How are we going to do that? We have seen ideas here today, ideas that could take care of—even if we just made them temporary, even if we said this is only going to be there until 2019, we could stabilize all of this today and begin that today, but yet it is objected to.

I think the message we want to send is we stand ready to fix the healthcare system. We stand ready to work with the other side of the aisle. We stand ready to address the concerns we hear from our constituents about the healthcare system.

If we really want to respond to the concerns the American public has about the U.S. Congress, we better start working together. We better start finding a path forward to solve problems, real problems, not pretend problems but real problems in this country. That way we will, in fact, enrich and enhance our democracy. Until we do that, we continue to struggle to get credibility with the American public, and that is not, ladies and gentlemen and Members of the Senate, a formula for success for our democracy.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The majority leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 116, David Nye to be United States district judge for the District of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### TRIBUTE TO KENTUCKY'S AFRICAN-AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY WAR PATRIOTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as we prepare to celebrate our Independence Day, one of the most pivotal moments in the history of our Nation, I rise today to remember one group of Revolutionary War patriots who are too often overlooked. I am speaking of the African-American soldiers who served in the American Revolution. In particular, I would like to recognize the service of men who fought for our independence and who would later become Kentuckians.

In the 1770s and 1780s, African Americans throughout the young Nation joined the Revolutionary War effort. Like so many other patriots, they volunteered to fight for American independence. Many fought under the command of some of the most notable Revolutionary War heroes, including General George Washington.

I would like to focus on 11 soldiers who, after enduring the pains of war and traveling across much of the new Nation, decided to make a new home for themselves in the area that would later join the Union as the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

I would like to tell the stories of a few of these Kentuckians. I believe it is important to remember their service in the war.

Daniel Goff joined the Army in Chesterfield County, VA, in 1777. During his service, Goff marched from Virginia to New Jersey, where he fought in the Battle of Monmouth. He camped at Valley Forge under the command of General Washington and earned his discharge after 3 years in the Army.

In the years after the war, Goff chose to make a home in Boone County, KY. He worked for General James Taylor V, an American banker who was a quartermaster general during the Revolution. Taylor was a founder of Newport, KY, and he took a special interest in Goff. The two men knew each other for over 40 years and developed a close bond.

John Sidebottom, of Prince William County, VA, served for 1 year. In the course of his service, Sidebottom fought in the Battle of Trenton in December 1776, an historic battle in which General Washington led the crossing of the Delaware River on Christmas night to launch a surprise attack against a Hessian garrison.

Sidebottom settled in Clark County, KY. A man who knew him stated that during the Trenton battle, Sidebottom was one of the men who carried a wounded soldier from the battlefield to safety. That soldier was James Monroe, the future President of the United States, who survived the battle, in part, because of Sidebottom's actions.

George Burk enlisted in the Army in Shenandoah County, VA, in 1779. He served for 2 years, traveling around the region in several campaigns. During his time in the Army, he was tasked with guarding British prisoners at Albemarle Barracks and repelling the British and Native American attacks. Burk served under the command of General George Rogers Clark, who founded the city of Louisville, KY. At the end of his service, Burk was discharged in Louisville, and he spent the rest of his life in the area.

I would like to recognize the service and sacrifice of these Kentuckians in the cause of American independence. We owe a large debt to all of our Nation's veterans, and I am glad that we can remember these 11 patriots today.

#### REMEMBERING ALEX VILLAMAYOR

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to extend my deepest condolences to the family of Alex Villamayor, whose life was cut short 2 years ago in Paraguay. Alex was a son, brother, nephew, grandson, and friend. At just 16 years old, Alex taught us that we should not lead our lives with cynicism and hate, but with love and kindness. Even though Alex is no longer physically with us, he continues to shed light on the unjust and save lives through his story.

I call upon the Government of Paraguay to do everything in its power to guarantee an impartial, transparent, and expeditious trial so that justice is upheld for Alex and his family.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING JOSEPH CARTER CORBIN

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the life and legacy of Joseph Carter Corbin, a renowned African-American educator who left a legacy as a trailblazer and innovator that continues to open new doors for students to this day.

Joseph Carter Corbin was born in Chillicothe, OH, in 1833 to former slaves, who raised their family as free people in Chillicothe and later in Cincinnati. Corbin's family worked hard to make sure he and his siblings had access what had been denied to them—the right to an education along with the opportunities it provides.

Corbin studied at Ohio University, earning an undergraduate degree and

two graduate degrees at a time when African Americans had very limited access to higher education. Corbin started his family in Cincinnati, working as a clerk for a municipal bank and co-editing a regular newsletter for African Americans in the Midwest. However, he made it his life's mission to expand access to higher education to African Americans.

In 1871, Joseph Carter Corbin moved to Arkansas where he blazed new trails as the first African-American State superintendent of public instruction. He went on to found, in 1875, the Branch Normal College, which was the first institution of higher education for African-American students in the State. Corbin served as the school's principal and sole teacher for 7 years, before Branch Normal College was designated as an 1890 Land Grant Institution and later merged with the State university system to form University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff in 1972. University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff continues to educate students to this day.

We remember Joseph Carter Corbin for his lifetime of breaking down barriers and improving access to higher education for African Americans and others who are left behind by our educational system.

Today Joseph Carter Corbin will receive an Ohio historical marker on the campus of Ohio University Chillicothe, commemorating his impact on Ohio and his contribution to higher education of African Americans across the Nation. I know that my Senate colleagues will join me in celebrating his life and achievements, as well as applauding the actions by Ohio University to honor their distinguished alumnus, Joseph Carter Corbin.●

##### REMEMBERING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS MARVIN DALE HOLLINGSWORTH

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to SFC Marvin Dale Hollingsworth who passed away on June 16. Marvin was born January 9, 1925, in Cambridge, IA, and was raised in Cedar Rapids, IA. He enlisted in the Army in July 1943 and served nearly 20 years.

During his military service, Marvin Hollingsworth saw combat in World War II and during the Korean war. He served overseas in France, Northern Africa, Japan, Korea, Germany, and the Marshall Islands and Kwajalein Islands, as well as being stationed in many parts of the United States during his military career.

Marvin was on Active Duty at the Oklahoma Military Academy in Claremore as the top sergeant on the academy's command staff. After his third year, he was recognized with an officer's saber by the cadre, presented upon his retirement. In 1966, he began his 21-year civil service career in Cedar

Rapids with the 73rd Combat Field Hospital Unit where he trained new recruits, mentored staff, and worked in administration. A 10-foot portrait of him at that mobile medical Army unit is displayed at the National Guard—Army Reserve Center in Cedar Rapids. He received numerous accommodations for excellence in his career of service to his country, including the American Defense Service Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with three Stars, World War II Victory Medal, United Nations Service Medal, Korean Service Medal, and Good Conduct Medal with Four Knots.

As Americans, we owe our freedom to generations of selfless patriots like Marvin Hollingsworth who have been willing to risk life and limb in service to their country. The fact that he continued to serve his country throughout his life is inspirational. I am proud to be able to pay tribute to this son of Iowa and great American, Marvin Hollingsworth.●

#### TRIBUTE TO LILLI JASPER

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Lilli Jasper. Lilli hails from Sioux Falls, SD, and is a rising junior at South Dakota State University.

While interning on the Commerce Committee, Lilli assisted the Communication, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet Subcommittee. She is a dedicated worker who was committed to getting the most out of her internship. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lilli for all of the fine work she did for the committee and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 220. An act to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

H.R. 497. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1073. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1135. An act to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

H.R. 1967. An act to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 497. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1073. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1135. An act to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1967. An act to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 220. An act to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1460. A bill to provide for the modernization of the energy and natural resources policies of the United States, and for other purposes.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 577. A bill to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule (Rept. No. 115-120).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 579. A bill to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules (Rept. No. 115-121).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 381. A bill to repeal the Act entitled "An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation" (Rept. No. 115-122).

S. 691. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe (Rept. No. 115-123).

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

\*Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1450. A bill to prohibit cell phone voice communications during passenger flights; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1451. A bill to facilitate and promote innovative approaches to railroad safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1452. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish within the Office of the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs the position of Chief Information Officer of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1453. A bill to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to designate certain substance use disorder treatment facilities as eligible for National Health Service Corps service; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1454. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent the formation of corporations with hidden owners, stop the misuse of United States corporations by wrongdoers, and assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other criminal and civil misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1455. A bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish new goals for the Department of Energy relating to energy storage and to carry out certain demonstration projects relating to energy storage; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. STRANGE:

S. 1456. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to begin with fertilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1457. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out demonstration projects relating to advanced nuclear reactor technologies to support domestic energy needs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1458. A bill to establish a grant program to incentivize States to reduce prison populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1459. A bill to establish Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie National Park in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1460. A bill to provide for the modernization of the energy and natural resources policies of the United States, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mrs. ERNST:

S. 1461. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility of certain former members of the Armed Forces who are medically retired and who are entitled to hospital insurance benefits under Medicare part A by reason of previous entitlement to social security disability insurance benefits to enroll in the TRICARE program regardless of whether such members decline enrollment under Medicare part B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. CASEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1462. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to improve cost sharing subsidies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1463. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1464. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for energy conservation subsidies provided by public utilities to include subsidies provided by public utilities and State and local governments for water conservation and storm water management; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1465. A bill to terminate the prohibitions on the exportation and importation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1466. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to award grants to fund research on orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.



By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1467. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 1468. A bill to require reports on civilian casualties in connection with United States military operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend tax incentives to permanently extend the special expensing rules for certain film, television, and live theatrical productions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 1470. A bill to protect members of our Armed Forces from Russian and other foreign interference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 1471. A bill to ensure the compliance of Department of Defense regulations with Federal consumer protection laws on the collection of debt; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 204. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of Selfridge Air National Guard Base in Harrison Township, Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 205. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of Fort Custer in Augusta, Michigan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. Res. 206. A resolution urging the Secretary of the Interior to recognize the cultural significance of Rib Mountain by adding it to the National Register of Historic Places; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. Res. 207. A resolution designating the week of July 9 through July 15, 2017 as "Sarcoma Awareness Week" and designating July 15, 2017 as "Leiomyosarcoma Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 208. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that flowers grown in the United States support the farmers, small businesses, jobs, and economy of the United States, that flower farming is an honorable vocation, and designating July as "American Grown Flower Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 209. A resolution commemorating the 40th Anniversary of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, the preeminent public policy trade association in Silicon Valley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 256

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 528

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 528, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 705, a bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1152

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1152, a bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1158, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. 1197

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1197, a bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease.

S. 1201

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to allow individuals living in areas without qualified health plans offered through an Exchange to have similar access to health insurance coverage as Members of Congress and congressional staff.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1318

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to reform apportionments to general aviation airports under the airport improvement program, to improve project delivery at certain airports, and to designate certain airports as disaster relief airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1323

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1323, a bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1393, a bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. 1426

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1426, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, and for other purposes.

S. 1432

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1432, a bill to prevent the Federal Aviation Administration's Aircraft Registry Office from closing during a Government shutdown.

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to provide funding for Federally Qualified Health Centers, the National Health Service Corps, Teaching Health Centers, and the Nurse Practitioner Residency Training program.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 54, a resolution expressing the unwavering commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1464. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for energy conservation subsidies provided by public utilities to in-

clude subsidies provided by public utilities and State and local governments for water conservation and storm water management; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today Senators HELLER, BENNET, GARDNER, and I are introducing the Water Conservation Tax Parity Act. This bill would exempt the value of residential water conservation and storm water runoff management rebates from gross income calculations.

California and the western States have been facing a severe drought. Some public utilities, state and local governments, and water management providers offer programs to promote water conservation and storm water management by providing subsidies. These programs help stimulate responsible water use; however, residential participation is essential to their success.

For example, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California has offered a rebate program to encourage residents to replace turf with more water-responsible landscapes. More than 23,000 households have benefited from the turf removal rebates, and the average rebate per household covers 1,500 square feet or about \$3,000, which covers about half of the cost to the resident.

Section 136 of the Internal Revenue Code already exempts energy conservation rebates from inclusion in gross income. However, there is no Federal exemption for water conservation or storm water management measures, which may undermine incentives for participation in these programs. These programs are just as valuable as energy conservation programs and should be treated equally in the tax code. This bill would simply exempt water conservation and storm water management rebates from being included in gross income and would be retroactive to 2015. This would maintain the important incentives for resident participation in critical water conservation measures.

This bill is supported by a coalition of organizations and public utilities, including the Western Urban Water Coalition, Alliance for Water Efficiency, American Water Works Association, National Association of Water Companies, U.S. Water Alliance, Association of Water Agencies, WaterNow Alliance, Western Coalition of Arid States, and National Water Resources Association. This bill is crucial to ensuring residents continue participating in water conservation and storm water management programs.

Mr. President, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation and am hopeful that this Congress will move it forward.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1466. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to award grants to fund research on orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1466

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wounded Warrior Research Enhancement Act".

#### SEC. 2. ORTHOTIC AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the grants described in this section is to advance orthotic and prosthetic clinical care for members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and civilians who have undergone amputation, traumatic brain injury, and other serious physical injury as a result of combat or military experience.

(b) GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON PATIENT OUTCOMES.—The Secretary of Defense shall award grants to persons to carry out research on the following:

- (1) The actions that can be taken to prevent amputation of limbs.
- (2) The point in the course of patient treatment during which orthotic and prosthetic intervention is most effective.
- (3) The orthotic interventions that are most effective in treating the physical effects of traumatic brain injury.

(4) The patients that benefit most from particular orthotic and prosthetic technologies.

(5) The orthotic and prosthetic services that best facilitate the return to active duty of members of the Armed Forces.

(6) The effect of the aging process on the use of prosthetics, including—

- (A) increased skin breakdown;
- (B) loss of balance;
- (C) falls; and
- (D) other issues that arise during the aging process.

(c) GRANTS ON MATERIALS RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall award grants to persons to carry out research on the following:

(1) The improvement of existing materials used in orthotics and prosthetics for the purpose of improving quality of life and health outcomes for individuals with limb loss.

(2) The development of new materials used in orthotics and prosthetics for the purpose of improving quality of life and health outcomes for individuals with limb loss.

(d) GRANTS ON TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall award grants to persons to carry out research on the following:

(1) The improvement of existing orthotic and prosthetic technology and devices for the purpose of improving quality of life and health outcomes for individuals with limb loss.

(2) The development of new orthotic and prosthetic technology and devices for the purpose of improving quality of life and health outcomes for individuals with limb loss.

(e) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.—A person seeking the award of a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor in the form and accompanied by such information as the Secretary shall require.

## (f) AWARD REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) PEER-REVIEWED PROPOSALS.—Grants under this section may be awarded only for research that is peer-reviewed.

(2) COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES.—Grants under this section shall be awarded through competitive procedures.

(g) GRANT USE.—A person awarded a grant under subsection (b), (c), or (d) shall use the grant amount to carry out the research described in the applicable subsection.

(h) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, veterans, community-based clinicians, and expert researchers in the field of orthotics and prosthetics, submit to Congress a report setting forth the following:

(1) An agenda for orthotic and prosthetic research that identifies and prioritizes the most significant unanswered orthotic and prosthetic research questions pertinent to the provision of evidence-based clinical care to members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and civilians.

(2) For each report after the initial report under this subsection—

(A) a summary of how the grants awarded under subsection (b) are addressing the most significant orthotic and prosthetic needs; and

(B) the progress made towards resolving orthotic and prosthetic challenges facing members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(i) VETERAN DEFINED.—In this section, the term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense for the Defense Health Program, \$30,000,000 to carry out this section.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1467. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1467

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

# SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Wounded Warrior Workforce Enhancement Act”.

# SEC. 2. ORTHOTICS AND PROSTHETICS EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT.

## (a) GRANTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall award grants to eligible institutions to enable the eligible institutions—

(A) to establish a master's degree program in orthotics and prosthetics; or

(B) to expand upon an existing master's degree program in orthotics and prosthetics,

including by admitting more students, further training faculty, expanding facilities, or increasing cooperation with the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in the award of grants under this section to eligible institutions that have entered into a partnership with a medical center or clinic administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs or a facility administered by the Department of Defense, including by providing clinical rotations at such medical center, clinic, or facility.

(3) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be in amounts of not less than \$1,000,000 and not more than \$1,500,000.

## (b) REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter for two years, the Secretary shall issue a request for proposals from eligible institutions for grants under this section.

(2) PROPOSALS.—An eligible institution that seeks the award of a grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require, including—

(A) demonstration of a willingness and ability to participate in a partnership described in subsection (a)(2); and

(B) a commitment, and demonstration of an ability, to maintain an accredited orthotics and prosthetics education program after the end of the grant period.

## (c) GRANT USES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section shall use grant amounts to carry out any of the following:

(A) Building new or expanding existing orthotics and prosthetics master's degree programs.

(B) Training doctoral candidates in fields related to orthotics and prosthetics to prepare them to instruct in orthotics and prosthetics programs.

(C) Training faculty in orthotics and prosthetics education or related fields for the purpose of instruction in orthotics and prosthetics programs.

(D) Salary supplementation for faculty in orthotics and prosthetics education.

(E) Financial aid that allows eligible institutions to admit additional students to study orthotics and prosthetics.

(F) Funding faculty research projects or faculty time to undertake research in the areas of orthotics and prosthetics for the purpose of furthering their teaching abilities.

(G) Renovation of buildings or minor construction to house orthotics and prosthetics education programs.

(H) Purchasing equipment for orthotics and prosthetics education.

(2) LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section may use not more than 50 percent of the grant amount to carry out paragraph (1)(G).

(3) ADMISSIONS PREFERENCE.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section shall give preference in admission to the orthotics and prosthetics master's degree programs to veterans, to the extent practicable.

(4) PERIOD OF USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section may use the grant amount for a period of three years after the award of the grant.

## (d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “eligible institution” means an educational institution that offers an orthotics and prosthetics education program that—

(A) is accredited by the National Commission on Orthotic and Prosthetic Education in cooperation with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs; or

(B) demonstrates an ability to meet the accreditation requirements for orthotic and prosthetic education from the National Commission on Orthotic and Prosthetic Education in cooperation with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs if the institution receives a grant under this section.

(2) The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

## (e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, \$15,000,000 to carry out this section. The amount so authorized to be appropriated shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020.

(2) UNOBLIGATED AMOUNTS TO BE RETURNED TO THE TREASURY.—Any amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) that are not obligated by the Secretary as of September 30, 2020, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

# SEC. 3. CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN ORTHOTIC AND PROSTHETIC EDUCATION.

## (a) GRANT FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall award a grant to an eligible institution to enable the eligible institution—

(A) to establish the Center of Excellence in Orthotic and Prosthetic Education (in this section referred to as the “Center”); and

(B) to enable the eligible institution to improve orthotic and prosthetic outcomes for veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and civilians by conducting evidence-based research on—

(i) the knowledge, skills, and training most needed by clinical professionals in the field of orthotics and prosthetics; and

(ii) how to most effectively prepare clinical professionals to provide effective, high-quality orthotic and prosthetic care.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in the award of a grant under this section to an eligible institution that has in force, or demonstrates the willingness and ability to enter into, a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Defense, or other appropriate Federal agency, or a cooperative agreement with an appropriate private sector entity, which memorandum of understanding or cooperative agreement provides for either, or both, of the following:

(A) The provision of resources, whether in cash or in kind, to the Center.

(B) Assistance to the Center in conducting research and disseminating the results of such research.

(3) GRANT AMOUNT.—The grant awarded under this section shall be in the amount of \$5,000,000.

## (b) REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a request for proposals from eligible institutions for the grant under this section.

(2) PROPOSALS.—An eligible institution that seeks the award of the grant under this

section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

(c) GRANT USES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The eligible institution awarded the grant under this section shall use the grant amount as follows:

(A) To develop an agenda for orthotics and prosthetics education research.

(B) To fund research in the area of orthotics and prosthetics education.

(C) To publish or otherwise disseminate research findings relating to orthotics and prosthetics education.

(2) PERIOD OF USE OF FUNDS.—The eligible institution awarded the grant under this section may use the grant amount for a period of five years after the award of the grant.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “eligible institution” means an educational institution that—

(A) has a robust research program;

(B) offers an orthotics and prosthetics education program that is accredited by the National Commission on Orthotic and Prosthetic Education in cooperation with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs;

(C) is well recognized in the field of orthotics and prosthetics education; and

(D) has an established association with—

(i) a medical center or clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(ii) a local rehabilitation hospital.

(2) The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, \$5,000,000 to carry out this section.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 204—HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SELFRIDGE AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE IN HARRISON TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN

Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

#### S. RES. 204

Whereas 2017 marks the 100th anniversary of a military installation operating in Harrison Township, Michigan;

Whereas Selfridge Air National Guard Base is named after Army 1st Lieutenant Thomas E. Selfridge, who saw the potential of powered flight;

Whereas Lieutenant Selfridge became the first casualty of flight when he was killed during a demonstration flight with Orville Wright in 1908;

Whereas the Army commissioned Selfridge Field on July 1, 1917, and the first flight occurred on July 8, 1917;

Whereas, on June 27, 1919, Selfridge Field became the home of the 1st Pursuit Group, the oldest combat group in the Air Force;

Whereas, on October 14, 1922, 1st Lieutenant Russell Maughan flew the first aircraft to exceed 200 miles per hour at Selfridge Field;

Whereas the 332d Fighter Group of the Tuskegee Airmen moved to Selfridge Field on March 29, 1943, and Colonel Benjamin O.

Davis became its first African-American commander on October 8, 1943;

Whereas, on July 20, 1948, the first transatlantic flight by a fighter aircraft launched from Selfridge Field headed to Berlin during the Berlin Airlift;

Whereas, on July 1, 1971, Selfridge Field was transferred to the Michigan Air National Guard, becoming the first major active Air Force base to come under control of the Air National Guard;

Whereas, in 1991, Selfridge Air National Guard Base founded the first STARBASE program, a Department of Defense program for students in kindergarten through 12th grade that provides math and science education;

Whereas the 127th Wing of the Michigan Air National Guard was established at Selfridge Air National Guard Base on April 1, 1996;

Whereas Selfridge Air National Guard Base is the host to at least 40 tenant units representing every branch of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and representing members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty, in a reserve component, or in the National Guard;

Whereas Selfridge Air National Guard Base is the home to the KC-135 Stratotanker and the A-10 Thunderbolt II; and

Whereas, as of the date of agreement to this resolution, Selfridge Air National Guard Base is being considered to host the F-35 Lightning II, the Air Force's newest fifth-generation fighter; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) honors Selfridge Air National Guard Base in Harrison Township, Michigan, on its 100th anniversary; and

(2) commends the thousands of men and women who have worked and trained at Selfridge Air National Guard Base.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 205—HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FORT CUSTER IN AUGUSTA, MICHIGAN

Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

#### S. RES. 205

Whereas 2017 marks the 100th anniversary of a military installation operating in Augusta, Michigan;

Whereas Fort Custer is named after Major General George Armstrong Custer, a native of Monroe, Michigan, and a prominent Civil War cavalry commander;

Whereas the United States Army purchased 130 parcels of Michigan farmland to begin constructing Camp Custer in 1917;

Whereas more than 100,000 soldiers from Michigan and Wisconsin trained at Camp Custer before serving in Europe during World War I as part of the American Expeditionary Forces;

Whereas Camp Custer became the district headquarters of the Civilian Conservation Corps for Michigan's Lower Peninsula during the Great Depression;

Whereas Congress officially designated Camp Custer as Fort Custer on August 17, 1940, recognizing it as a permanent military training base;

Whereas, in preparation for World War II engagement, Fort Custer expanded to 16,000 acres with accommodations for nearly 1,300 officers and more than 27,500 troops;

Whereas more than 300,000 troops were trained at Fort Custer throughout World

War II, including the 5th Infantry “Red Diamond” Division that left for combat in Normandy, France, in June 1944;

Whereas Fort Custer served as a prisoner of war camp for approximately 5,000 German soldiers during World War II;

Whereas approximately 17,000 troops were trained at Fort Custer during the Korean War in the 1950s;

Whereas the United States Air Force established the Custer Air Force Station in 1956, which served as part of the North American Air Defense System for a decade beginning in 1959;

Whereas Fort Custer offered free education and vocational training to youth between the ages of 16 and 24 as a Jobs Corps Training Center from 1965 to 1967;

Whereas the 770-acre Fort Custer National Military Cemetery, established in 1981, honors thousands of the brave men and women who served the United States; and

Whereas Fort Custer continues to serve as a state-of-the-art training facility for the Michigan National Guard and other branches of the Armed Forces, including Reserve Officers' Training Corps students: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) honors Fort Custer in Augusta, Michigan, on its 100th anniversary;

(2) commends the thousands of men and women who have worked and trained at Fort Custer; and

(3) commemorates the tens of thousands of members of the Armed Forces and their families memorialized at Fort Custer National Cemetery.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 206—URGING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO RECOGNIZE THE CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF RIB MOUNTAIN BY ADDING IT TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Mr. JOHNSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

#### S. RES. 206

Whereas Paul Bunyan is a larger-than-life folk hero who embodies the frontier spirit, might, the willingness to work hard, and the resolve to overcome all obstacles;

Whereas reliable documentation establishes that the earliest story about Paul Bunyan was told north of Tomahawk, Wisconsin;

Whereas this evidence suggests that Wisconsin's claim that it is the birthplace of Paul Bunyan is superior to claims from other States;

Whereas Paul Bunyan has been the subject of countless literary compositions, musical pieces, commercial works, and theatrical productions;

Whereas local legend states that the “ribs” in Rib Mountain, Wisconsin, denote that the mountain is the burial site of Paul Bunyan;

Whereas Rib Mountain is nearly 4 miles long and peaks at 1,924 feet above sea level and 670 feet above the local terrain, making it the highest natural feature in North Central Wisconsin and one of the highest points in the entire State of Wisconsin;

Whereas Rib Mountain is home to the Granite Peak Ski Area, one of the first ski areas in North America, where thousands of visitors come annually to ski or snowboard;

Whereas Rib Mountain State Park, situated on Rib Mountain, is over 1,500 acres and

boasts a well-maintained network of hiking and nature trails with breathtaking views; and

Whereas Rib Mountain State Park attracts visitors from the local community as well as from across the State and the country: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) affirms the importance of Rib Mountain to the culture and economy of Wisconsin;

(2) recognizes the legend of Paul Bunyan as the embodiment of the frontier spirit; and

(3) requests that the Secretary of the Interior recognize the legendary burial site of Paul Bunyan by adding Rib Mountain to the National Register of Historic Places.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 207—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JULY 9 THROUGH JULY 15, 2017 AS “SARCOMA AWARENESS WEEK” AND DESIGNATING JULY 15, 2017 AS “LEIOMYOSARCOMA AWARENESS DAY”**

Ms. STABENOW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 207

Whereas a soft tissue sarcoma is a rare type of cancer, accounting for approximately 1 percent of all newly diagnosed cancers, that arises in the connective tissue of the body;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health designates sarcoma as a rare form of cancer, with sarcoma containing approximately 70 different subtypes;

Whereas sarcomas are largely resistant to current chemotherapy agents, immunotherapy agents, and radiation therapies, posing a formidable challenge for researchers and specialists;

Whereas sarcoma subtypes have largely not received benefit from immunotherapies due to the complexity of the DNA, genomes, and mutations associated with the many variations in the sarcoma subtype landscape;

Whereas leiomyosarcoma (referred to in this preamble as “LMS”) is a malignant, aggressive subtype of soft tissue sarcoma derived from smooth muscle cells typically of uterine, gastrointestinal or soft tissue origin, and can metastasize to the bone, spine, brain, and liver;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health classifies LMS as a rare disease, accounting for approximately 15 percent of all sarcomas, and LMS itself encompasses at least 4 different LMS subtypes;

Whereas LMS primarily affects adults without regard to gender;

Whereas research and clinical trials for LMS remain complicated and the prospects for long-term survival remain poor;

Whereas multidisciplinary care coordination teams, because of their expertise and experience, are critical to the health of sarcoma and LMS patients;

Whereas sarcoma and LMS research will allow medical professionals to improve the quality of care for affected patients, lead to better clinical outcomes, and promote longer survival for patients; and

Whereas increased education and awareness about sarcoma and LMS will contribute to the well-being of the communities of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of July 9 through July 15, 2017, as “Sarcoma Awareness Week”;

(2) designates July 15, 2017, as “Leiomyosarcoma Awareness Day”;

(3) recognizes the challenges faced by sarcoma and leiomyosarcoma patients; and

(4) commends the dedication of organizations, volunteers, researchers, and caregivers across the country working to improve the quality of life of sarcoma and leiomyosarcoma patients and their families.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 208—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT FLOWERS GROWN IN THE UNITED STATES SUPPORT THE FARMERS, SMALL BUSINESSES, JOBS, AND ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES, THAT FLOWER FARMING IS AN HONORABLE VOCATION, AND DESIGNATING JULY AS “AMERICAN GROWN FLOWER MONTH”**

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 208

Whereas cut flower growers in the United States are hard-working, dedicated individuals who bring beauty, economic stimulus, and pride to their communities and the nation;

Whereas the people of the United States have a long history of using flowers and greens grown in the United States to bring beauty to important events and express affection for loved ones;

Whereas consumers spend almost \$27,000,000,000 each year on floral products, including cut flowers, garden plants, bedding, and indoor plants;

Whereas nearly 30 percent of households in the United States purchase fresh cut flowers and greens from more than 16,000 florists and floral establishments each year;

Whereas the people of the United States increasingly want to support domestically produced foods and agricultural products and would prefer to buy locally grown flowers whenever possible, yet a majority of domestic consumers do not know where the flowers they purchase are grown;

Whereas in response to increased demand, the “Certified American Grown Flowers” logo was created in July 2014 in order to educate and empower consumers to purchase flowers from domestic producers;

Whereas as of April 2017, millions of stems of domestically grown flowers are now “Certified American Grown”;

Whereas domestic flower farmers produce thousands of varieties of flowers across the United States, such as peonies in Alaska, Gerbera daisies in California, lupines in Maine, tulips in Washington, lilies in Oregon, and larkspur in Texas;

Whereas the 5 flower varieties with the highest United States production are tulips, Gerbera daisies, lilies, gladiolas and irises;

Whereas people in every State have access to domestically grown flowers, yet only 1 of 5 flowers sold in the United States is domestically grown;

Whereas the domestic cut flower industry creates almost \$42,000,000 in economic impact daily and supports hundreds of growers, thousands of small businesses, and tens of thousands of jobs in the United States;

Whereas more people in the United States are expressing interest in growing flowers locally, which has resulted in an approximately 20 percent increase in the number of domestic cut flower farms between 2007 and 2012;

Whereas most domestic cut flowers and greens are sold in the United States within 24 to 48 hours after harvest and last longer than flowers shipped longer distances;

Whereas flowers grown domestically enhance the ability of the people of the United States to festively celebrate weddings and births, and honor those who have passed;

Whereas flower-giving has been a holiday tradition in the United States for generations;

Whereas flowers speak to the beauty of motherhood on Mother’s Day; and to the spirit of love on Valentine’s Day;

Whereas flowers are an essential part of other holidays such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Hanukkah, and Kwanzaa;

Whereas flowers help commemorate the service and sacrifice of our Armed Forces on Memorial Day and Veterans Day; and

Whereas the Senate encourages the cultivation of flowers in the United States by domestic flower farmers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 2017 as “American Grown Flower Month”;

(2) recognizes that purchasing flowers grown in the United States supports the farmers, small businesses, jobs, and economy of the United States;

(3) recognizes that growing flowers and greens in the United States is a vital part of the agricultural industry of the United States;

(4) recognizes that cultivating flowers domestically enhances the ability of the people of the United States to festively celebrate holidays and special occasions; and

(5) urges all people of the United States to proactively showcase flowers and greens grown in the United States in order to show support for our flower farmers, processors, and distributors as well as agriculture in the United States overall.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 209—COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SILICON VALLEY LEADERSHIP GROUP, THE PREEMINENT PUBLIC POLICY TRADE ASSOCIATION IN SILICON VALLEY**

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 209

Whereas the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (referred to in this preamble as the “Leadership Group”), founded by David Packard in 1978, advocates on behalf of Silicon Valley employers in the interest of improving the economic health of and quality of life in Silicon Valley;

Whereas the Leadership Group represents nearly 400 member companies that constitute 1 in 3 private sector jobs in Silicon Valley;

Whereas the Leadership Group was integral in establishing a permanent regional office of the United States Patent and Trademark Office in Silicon Valley, facilitating creativity, innovation, and efficiency for local companies and creating new economic and employment opportunities;

Whereas the Leadership Group was a crucial partner in promoting the restoration of the San Francisco Bay and restoring wildlife habitat by reducing toxins and pollutants, improving water quality, and protecting communities from floods;

Whereas the Leadership Group has been vital in the development of transportation improvements, including helping secure funding for the electrification of Caltrain, which will replace diesel trains with high-performance electric trains, nearly doubling ridership, reducing travel times, cutting emissions, and creating 9,600 additional employment opportunities across the United States; and

Whereas the Leadership Group has supported and contributed to organizations such as Second Harvest Food Bank, Housing Trust Silicon Valley, Healthier Kids Foundation Santa Clara County, Christmas in the Park in San Jose, and many other organizations that help improve the quality of life in the Silicon Valley region: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significant contributions of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group and the members of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group to the economic health of and quality of life in Silicon Valley; and

(2) commemorates the 40th anniversary of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

Founded by David Packard in 1978, the Leadership Group has worked tirelessly to improve the economic health and quality of life in Silicon Valley. I have had the pleasure of working closely with the Silicon Valley Leadership Group—and its Chief Executive Officer Carl Guardino—on many issues important to the San Francisco Bay Area.

For instance, the Leadership Group has been an indispensable partner in efforts to restore the San Francisco Bay and its critical wetlands. Just last year, they helped secure \$500 million for those restoration efforts. The Leadership Group was integral in establishing a permanent U.S. Patent and Trademark office in San Jose. That office now supports the creativity and innovation that made Silicon Valley the global leader of the digital revolution. Most recently, the Leadership Group was a driving force in developing transportation improvements in Silicon Valley—including the electrification of the Caltrain system that will cut travel times and improve air quality for countless Californians.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to recognize the Silicon Valley Leadership Group and its contributions to Silicon Valley, the state of California and our national economy.

Thank you.

#### REQUESTS FOR AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have nine requests for committees to

meet during today's session of the Senate. They do not have the approval of the Democratic leader for the seventh consecutive legislative day, therefore, they will not be permitted to meet after 2 p.m. I ask unanimous consent that the list of committees requesting authority to meet be printed in the RECORD for today's session and the previous 2 days.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monday, June 26, 2017.

Five requests for committees to meet for the following committees:

Subcommittee on Airlaid

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support

Subcommittee on Seapower

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

Tuesday, June 27, 2017.

Five requests for committees to meet for the following committees:

Committee on Armed Services

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Emerging Treaties and Capabilities

Subcommittee on Personnel

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

Wednesday, June 28, 2017.

Nine requests for committees to meet for the following committees:

Committee on Armed Services

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Committee on Foreign Relations

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Committee on the Judiciary

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Committee on Intelligence

#### APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Section 1295b(h) of title 46 App., United States Code, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: the Honorable JOHN THUNE of South Dakota (ex officio as Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation) and the Honorable DEB FISCHER of Nebraska (Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U. S. Military Academy: the Honorable JERRY MORAN of Kansas (Designated by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services).

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114-323, appoints the fol-

lowing individual to serve as a member of the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission: John Walters of the District of Columbia.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1460

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1460) to provide for the modernization of the energy and natural resources policies of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Thursday, June 29; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Rao nomination with the time until the cloture vote equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:43 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 29, 2017, at 11 a.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 28, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 28, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to hear that the Senate will not be able to take up the healthcare bill this week, but this is a tough issue. It is a tough issue because, at least on my side of the aisle, we want to do the right thing. We want to make sure that people can buy health insurance that is affordable and accessible, and not pull the rug out from under people who have issues.

In the House, we passed a bill, and one of the big issues was preexisting conditions. We made sure that people with preexisting conditions can buy health insurance that is reasonably priced, similar to people who have no preexisting conditions, but then we kicked in billions of dollars to subsidize those premiums to help those people be in the insurance market because I think it is important that those people are in the insurance market and have access to insurance that is affordable.

I think it is really un-American to pull the rug out from people because they got sick.

ObamaCare is imploding. In Ohio—and this is from the Health and Human Services Agency—ObamaCare in Ohio, since 2013, premiums have increased 86 percent. We had almost 236,000 families pay almost \$44 million in penalties because they couldn't afford their health insurance.

Then there is also a myth out there that the price is going through the roof, it is collapsing because of the current administration. Well, if you look at the facts, the average premium skyrocketed by nearly \$3,000 across the country during the previous administration's final term. Eighty-three insurers left the market, and the average exchange premium spiked 25 percent last year alone. Americans living in roughly one-third of our Nation's counties have only one option of healthcare coverage precisely because this law has continued to fail. All this has occurred prior to the current administration.

Mr. Speaker, I got a phone call last night from a lady whom I have known for over 30 years. She is self-employed, running a service-type business, and she was struggling to pay for her healthcare under the ObamaCare exchanges. She has prayed these last few years that she wouldn't get sick because she wouldn't be able to meet the deductible. She works 12-hour days. She is in one of those at least 20 counties in Ohio that will not have an insurer on the individual market for next year. She has no options to buy health insurance next year. She called me up and said: I don't know what I am going to do.

I didn't have a good answer for her. That is why we need to get this done.

Prior to ObamaCare—I don't know if a lot of people realize this—when I was a self-employed farmer, I bought my health insurance through association plans. ObamaCare did away with association plans and forced people onto the exchanges and mandated what kind of coverage you had to buy.

Ironically, as a Member of Congress, I am required to be on ObamaCare, and I am. But the ironic thing is, next year, if things don't change—and I was forced to be on the D.C. exchange, but if I was forced to be on my county exchange back where I live, my county does not have a health insurer in the individual market next year. I think it is ironic as a Member of Congress, if I wasn't on the D.C. exchange, I wouldn't be able to buy insurance through my exchange back home because it will not be available.

How do we fix this?

I think we have to incorporate free-market principles. We have to get the cost down, and then the market will work.

How do we get the cost down?

We have to have price discovery, and how you get that is through competition. I think health savings accounts is one way you will get competition and personal responsibility. People will shop around on a nonemergency-type basis, and it will help drive the cost down.

ObamaCare did away with health savings accounts.

Also, tort reform. We need to make sure that doctors practicing medicine don't have to worry about frivolous lawsuits and fight defensive medicine. That is really important.

We need to be able to buy insurance across State lines. We have it in property and casualty insurance. We have it in auto insurance. We ought to have it in health insurance. It ought to be portable, you take it with you. And you also have your health savings account that you can take with you and be portable.

These are some of the things that we can do, but we have to let the market work. That is my hope. And this is a tough issue. The Senate is working through it. They want to do the right thing. They want to make sure that Americans have affordable, high-quality health insurance coverage that they can buy. We need to work through that, and I think the Senate will get there. Hopefully, we will get a bill on the President's desk so my friend, whom I have known for over 30 years, can buy health insurance next year and not have to worry about the risk of what happens if she gets sick, or if she will have to go on Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, one out of four Americans today are on Medicaid. That is not really a good option. I am seeing some of our physicians are not treating Medicaid patients.

Do you know why that is?

Because they are a service business, and there are only so many hours in the day. So they have to have people with health insurance or self-payers, and they can't have too many people on their client portfolio that have Medicaid with reimbursements that are too low for the cost of service. That is what we have moved to.

### PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from



Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listen to my friend from Ohio, and I am just kind of wondering how he gets to his position.

The Affordable Care Act didn't do away with health savings accounts, and that is a fact that can be easily verified. Or the notion that somehow Medicaid is a negative because it was expanded, and the gentleman's own Governor has been arguing here against the Republican plan because it would eviscerate Medicaid. Medicaid provides more healthcare than any other program in America.

Sadly, what we have seen is that the proposals that have been coming forward are way off the mark, just like my friend from Ohio a moment ago. The claims that it would not cut Medicaid, claims to make the system better, and save the Affordable Care Act from collapse are mythology.

The Congressional Budget Office report—these are the independents scorekeepers, and, in fact, the head of the Congressional Budget Office was appointed by the Republicans, their 49-page report that is available online to any Member of Congress, to the public—pointed out that the health exchanges are not collapsing. They are actually in pretty good shape and they could be made stronger with relatively simple changes, because what we have seen for the last 7 years, the Republican plan has been to chip away at the Affordable Care Act, to make it worse, to create more uncertainty. Recently, the administration refused to advertise to help people join this year's enrollment period and eliminated enforcement of the mandate, making the market even more unstable.

How do we have such an alternative universe?

Well, I suggest that one of the problems is that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle who crafted the House bill and who are working in secret in the Senate crafting the Senate bill listen to the wrong people. They listen to a small group, some of whom benefit from the Republican approach because there are extra subsidies that go to them, or people who benefit from massive tax cuts that, frankly, they don't need. They listen to people who are all about political talking points and not about the facts of healthcare in America. Most of all, they don't talk to real people on the ground who would be affected.

In what universe is a \$773 billion cut over the next 10 years to Medicaid not a reduction?

Tell a 75-year-old widow who is looking at being in a nursing home for the rest of her life—6 percent of our Medicaid funding goes to people in nursing homes. It is almost half of the total funding. Tell them that that is not going to be a cut, that that is not going

to reduce services, maybe not make it available at all. Sixty-four percent of people in nursing homes rely on Medicaid.

There are 15 million people who are not going to have healthcare if the Republican proposal goes into effect, according to the objective independent scorekeepers. But you can look at the calculations yourself as a member of the public. The Kaiser organization has a calculator where you can figure out if people are better off under the existing plan or under the Republican alternative. A person in Utah making \$15,000 would pay \$400 after tax credits, but have a \$6,000 deductible. They are not talking to real people.

A situation in Baker City, Oregon, a 40-year-old is going to face a 128 percent increase if the Republican proposal goes into effect.

A 60-year-old woman in Strong, Maine, making almost \$40,000 a year is currently eligible for a credit of about \$7,000, which means she gets a comprehensive policy in 2020 for \$4,500. But the Republican Senate plan would result in her costs in 2020 being \$15,000 a year, one-third of her income.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the public to investigate for themselves and see who the Republicans aren't listening to.

#### TRIO PROGRAM ESSENTIAL FOR STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about TRIO programs, which, for more than 50 years, have helped millions of low-income students attend college. Often, these students are the first in their family to earn a college degree. TRIO programs have helped low-income and disabled students who want to pursue a higher education, but thought college was unaffordable and out of reach.

Children from disadvantaged families often struggle to access important mentoring, tutoring, and other hands-on services designed to help encourage high school completion and the pursuit of postsecondary education.

Sadly, these students are often unprepared for college academics and require remedial courses that add to the challenges of completing a program. Too many disadvantaged students simply give up on even applying to college because they are confused by the application process, overwhelmed by the cost, or are unaware of the available financial aid options, despite our best efforts to ensure the information is available and understandable.

Recognizing these challenges, the Federal Government has created several programs to help disadvantaged students access the support necessary

to realize the dream of a college degree. For example, college preparation and retention programs such as TRIO, Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Student Support Services provide a pipeline of support services that encourage low-income students to graduate high school and earn a postsecondary degree.

Mr. Speaker, just last week, the House unanimously approved the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Act and support skills-based career education. This bill will help close the skills gap that exists today and prepare students for in-demand jobs.

TRIO programs are just as important to help those who want to pursue a college degree have the resources necessary to do so.

As a senior member on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I am a strong supporter of TRIO. I am also a member of the House TRIO Caucus. I want all Americans to have higher education opportunities if that is the path that they choose.

The TRIO program dates back to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in response to the administration's War on Poverty. That is when Upward Bound was formed. In 1965, Talent Search, the second outreach program, was created as part of the Higher Education Act.

□ 1015

In 1968, Student Support Services, which was originally known as Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, was authorized by the Higher Education Amendments and became the third in a series of educational opportunity programs. By the late 1960s, the term TRIO was coined to describe these three Federal programs.

Over the years, the TRIO programs have been expanded and improved to provide a wider range of services and to reach more students who need assistance. In 1990, the Department created the Upward Bound Math and Science program to address the need for specific instruction in the fields of math and science.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, TRIO programs have a long history of helping low-income individuals, first-generation college students, and individuals with disabilities reach their full potential. I support these programs, and I want to see every American reach his or her educational goals.

#### IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, June is Immigrant Heritage Month in the United States, but to celebrate that, House Republicans have made this

anti-immigration week in the Congress.

The advocates against legal immigration have their annual talk radio festival here in D.C. this week to extol the virtues of cutting off legal immigration.

Dozens of conservative talk radio hosts set up remote broadcasts here to talk about why criminalizing immigrants and turning misdemeanors into felonies is a good thing for America. They may trade stories, while broadcasting on the air, about immigrants doing horribly bad things to people in America, as if we were in a national crime spree of Brown people killing White people.

The goal of talk radio hosts is to reinforce the anti-immigration fever that has gripped the Republican Party and allowed a tough-sounding game show host to take over their party.

The main organization behind the gathering of talk radio hosts is FAIR, the Federation Against American Immigration Reform, which we should note is designated as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center. That is the organization in Alabama most directly responsible for suing the KKK out of the mainstream.

It is like D. W. Griffith might rise up from his grave to film "Rebirth of a Nation—the Sequel" because FAIR and its allies want to take our immigration policies back to the 1920s when the Klan marched openly in Washington and legal immigration was reduced to almost zero. They want to get rid of anyone here who is deportable or could be deportable by passing new laws to criminalize them.

Now, to coincide with the talk radio anti-immigration week, Republicans are putting on a passion play of their own in the House of Representatives by bringing two anti-immigrant bills to the floor.

So we have a coordinated campaign from broadcasters, lawmakers, and the anti-immigration advocates to pressure Congress into passing bills to paint immigrants as a threat to our national and community safety—right out of the Trump playbook.

The question is not whether or not these bills will pass the House—they will pass—but whether Democrats will be tempted to vote for tough-sounding measures because they are afraid to be labeled by conservative talk radio hosts as weak on punishing the "murdering, rapist, drug-dealing Mexicans" they think are lurking in every alley.

Of course, that is not what these bills actually do at all. Truth and talk radio do not often go together—certainly not in the era of Trump.

Let's look at the two bills Republicans are bringing for a vote.

One bill is H.R. 3004, named for Kate Steinle, a young woman who was shot and killed by an immigrant nearly 2 years ago in San Francisco. It hap-

pened in July, and as you may remember, I was the first person to come to the floor and give a speech denouncing Kate's killer and calling for laws that keep people like him off the streets.

A week later, while talking about various immigration issues in Spanish with Telemundo, a quote was included in a story about Kate Steinle's killing. After it was aired, rightwing groups circulated it, alleging it was proof that I was insensitive to the Steinle family, when, in fact, I was not speaking about Kate Steinle at the time, and I had already spoken out specifically on Kate's death here on the floor.

But what is coming to the floor this week would not have kept Kate Steinle's killer off the streets. It would have had no impact on that case whatsoever. Instead, we are voting on a bill to put other people in different circumstances in jail for longer periods of time.

It is a bait-and-switch strategy: use a horrible tragedy to sell a policy that would not have prevented that death so that we put more immigrants in jail for longer periods of time and prevent them from ever living legally in the United States.

The other bill, H.R. 3003, is designed to take money away from America's largest cities and counties, specifically from efforts to fight crime—yes, take money away from them. Grants that would help local police fight crime would be eliminated under this bill from 600 of the country's largest jurisdictions. That doesn't sound like crime fighting, because it isn't.

So why are we doing this? Because Republicans in Washington think they have a better idea of how to fight crime than the county executives, State legislators, mayors, and local police chiefs. "Do what we say or we will take away your money" is what the Republicans are saying to big cities and counties.

That is the approach being taken by the conservatives who always talk about how State and local people should be trusted more and protected from Federal mandates. Well, I guess, not when it comes to immigrants. This is why these types of bills are opposed by the National Fraternal Order of Police and other police organizations.

So to all the talk radio hosts and advocacy groups: Why are you on the side opposing the National Fraternal Order of Police? And why would any Democrat want to cross that blue line to stand with you?

#### MEGAN'S STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell Megan's story from her point of view and her beliefs.

She was smart, kind, ambitious, and funny. She loved other people.

After attending high school in Austin, Texas, she enrolled in the University of Alabama. She had a beautiful life—that is, until she was sexually assaulted in January of 2015.

After a night of drinking with her friends, Megan was ready to go home and go to bed. However, a finely dressed young businessman who referred to himself as "Sweet T" offered to give her a ride.

You see, Mr. Speaker, "Sweet T" was from the richest family in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and just so happened to be a big financial backer of that university.

Megan didn't remember climbing into his sleek Mercedes, but she woke up at his Southern mansion and knew something was wrong. Megan said she resisted his initial advances and repeatedly told him she wanted to go home. He refused to do so. Instead, he sexually assaulted her, and then he fell off to sleep.

She tried to get out of the room, but the door was locked. Desperate to escape, Megan climbed out of the mansion's second-story bedroom window and went to his car looking for her keys. It was there that she discovered a handgun Sweet T had in the car all the time but took it for her safety on her walk home.

Doing everything a rape victim should do, she immediately called the police and went to the hospital. But it is here, Mr. Speaker, that the system, she says, started to fail her.

The hospital wasn't sufficiently trained in sexual assault procedure and botched the rape kit. Megan then went to the police station to give her statement about what happened to her. But it was there she was treated with disdain and disbelief by Tuscaloosa's police department. After all, Megan was claiming that the son of one of the wealthiest families in Tuscaloosa had raped her.

Despite her insistence that she said "no," the police did not believe her. She said they didn't want to believe her. An officer asked her why she didn't punch or kick the rapist. The police thought it must have been consensual since she did not violently resist the attacker, and they moved on.

But, Mr. Speaker, rape victims can never move on. It is something they carry with them for the rest of their lives. The scars left by the rape do not fade away for victims.

Mr. Speaker, I was a prosecutor and judge in Texas for over 30 years. I met a lot of rape victims, and I learned how these attacks sometimes devastate their lives forever.

Sexual assault is a very different type of crime. It rips the identity, the self-worth, and the very soul of the victim apart. It is the victim's belief, in some cases, that it is a fate worse than death.

It is easy to second-guess what someone should or should not have done

after emotional trauma of sexual assault, but Megan believed she did everything a rape victim is supposed to do:

She sought help, but she found none. The university failed her. The counselor assigned to her knew of the rapist's family name, so the university wouldn't give her any assistance and provided no other counselor. Megan was dismissed, ignored, blamed, and forgotten.

In the months following the sexual assault, she was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. She was so depressed, she left the school and returned to Texas. Still feeling like there was no way to escape her pain, Megan took her life.

Rape, Mr. Speaker, is never the fault of the victim. She deserved better.

Now, I don't know whether the perpetrator in this case is guilty or not. I am giving you Megan's point of view. But what Megan believed was that she was failed by the hospital, law enforcement, and the University of Alabama.

This past February before her death, Megan filled out a mental health clinic intake form at her new school, Southern Methodist University. One question asked if there had been any major losses, changes, or crises in her life. She wrote: "Raped, bullied by police, and I changed university."

Mr. Speaker, it is important and it is imperative that we understand victims of sexual assault. She got the death penalty for being the victim of sexual assault. She is not here to tell her story today, and I am telling it for her.

And that is just the way it is.

#### ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and that is Alzheimer's disease.

Since 2000, deaths from Alzheimer's disease have increased by 89 percent. Right now, there are more than 5 million Americans with Alzheimer's, and that number is expected to grow to 14 million—to almost triple—by the year 2050.

Alzheimer's and other dementias can be especially devastating both physically and emotionally for those who have these diseases and for their loved ones, your family and my family—for me, too many aunts and uncles, including my mother.

When Lena Costa was diagnosed with the disease, she took it on with the same strength and courage she had used to beat cancer and survive heart disease. She was in her late eighties. Upon hearing the diagnosis, she turned to my sister and to me and said calmly and bravely: "Jim, Bette, I will just do the best I can."

Today, there is no cure for Alzheimer's and there is no effective treatment for it. There is no proven way to prevent the disease or no method for slowing its progression.

Unlike my mother, we are not currently doing the best we can. We must come together to support additional Alzheimer's research—more funding. That is what we did in April when we in the House called for additional support for Alzheimer's research at the National Institutes of Health. But we must do more.

Alzheimer's is a devastating disease. We must stand together, calmly and bravely, like my mom and so many of our loved ones who have been affected by Alzheimer's throughout our country.

Just as importantly, we must fix America's healthcare system. Certainly, in the last week, we have proved that there is no Republican way or Democratic way, but there is an American way, and that is if we work together as Members of Congress to improve America's healthcare system for all.

#### EXECUTIVE ORDER 9066—JAPANESE INTERNMENT

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to speak also about Executive Order 9066, which was issued 75 years ago—75 years ago—by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The order authorized the evacuation and relocation of all persons deemed to be a threat to national security. What it did, however, was lead to one of the most shameful times in American history, and that was the internment of Japanese Americans. These were American citizens.

From 1942 until 1945, the U.S. Government detained over 120,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry and of resident immigrants forcing them to live in internment camps, taking them away from their homes, their farms, and their businesses, many in California, in the San Joaquin Valley.

As American citizens, the internment denied them their constitutional right of due process. These were U.S. citizens who were robbed of their rights and their freedoms. Yet, some of these Japanese Americans, while their families were forced to live in internment camps, never forgot their patriotism.

Many served in our Nation's military in World War II in the European theater. The 442nd Infantry Regiment Combat Team was made up of Japanese-American soldiers.

□ 1030

The 442nd is the U.S. Army's most decorated infantry regiment ever. We must remember this time in American history and not repeat it.

We had three assembly centers in the San Joaquin Valley under Executive Order No. 9066, locations where Japanese Americans were forced to relocate and stay for weeks before they were fi-

nally sent to the larger internment camps in other parts of the West.

The centers in my district were the Pinedale Assembly Center, the Fresno Assembly Center, and the Merced Assembly Center. They were fairgrounds. Today, we have three memorials on these sites to ensure that we will always remember and never again treat Americans in this reprehensible way.

As Americans, let us never again give into our fears and turn our backs on our fellow Americans. Let us never forget the sacrifice of American values in the name of protecting our great country. These are some of the lessons of American history that we should never, ever forget.

#### HONORING ELIE WIESEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act, which I had the privilege of introducing in the House last week, with 27 cosponsors.

Named after the courageous Nobel laureate, Elie Wiesel, this legislation honors the legacy of his life's work to expose evil around the world.

Mr. Wiesel was just 15 years old when the Nazis deported him and his family to Auschwitz. Rising from literal ashes, he became a writer and spent his life defending the persecuted across the globe. He died nearly 1 year ago, but his passion for victims of injustice lives on.

Elie Wiesel believed that from the Holocaust to South Sudan, from Burma to Syria, the world has witnessed far too many genocides and mass atrocity crimes. The true horror is that most of these devastating crises are, indeed, preventable.

My heart aches for those whose lives are being torn apart, and the fact that over 65 million people are currently fleeing preventable crises makes clear that the U.S. Government must improve its response to these conflicts.

Genocide and atrocity crimes, including war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing, include shocking acts of violence perpetrated by governments and nonstate actors, resulting in the murders of millions of civilians across the globe.

The Elie Wiesel Act establishes that the official policy of the United States is to regard the prevention of genocide and atrocity crimes as a core national security interest and moral responsibility. The legislation would establish an interagency mass atrocities task force to strengthen the U.S. Government's prevention and response efforts.

The legislation encourages the Director of National Intelligence to include a review of countries at risk of genocide and mass atrocity crimes in his or her annual report to Congress.

The bill also authorizes training for U.S. Foreign Service Officers on early signs of atrocities and transitional justice measures to ensure that America's diplomats know how to respond to conflict on the ground.

Lastly, the legislation authorizes the Complex Crisis Fund to support programs to prevent emerging or unforeseen crises overseas.

These tools will empower the United States to strengthen protection efforts and protect the innocent.

By supporting civil society, enhancing cooperation among ethnic and religious groups, promoting accountability, and holding murderers accountable, America can promote global stability and fundamental human rights. This time, when America says "never again," our actions will reinforce our platitudes.

#### CARIBBEAN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I only have 5 minutes to do justice to a great people, and it is with great honor that I rise today to speak on issues impacting the Caribbean and the contributions of the people of Caribbean heritage to the American fabric.

On June 6, 2006, President George Bush signed a proclamation that was ushered through this House by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, H. Con. Res. 71, naming June Caribbean American Heritage Month. June allows us to highlight the many contributions of Caribbean Americans to the United States.

The campaign to designate June as National Caribbean American Heritage Month was spearheaded by Dr. Claire Nelson, founder and president of the Institute of Caribbean Studies. Through the commemoration of this month, we hope to ensure that America is reminded that its greatness lies in its diversity, with Caribbean immigrants from Founding Father Alexander Hamilton, sports icon Tim Duncan, and journalist Malcolm Gladwell, who have and continue to shape the American Dream.

The Caribbean region was created through violence and trauma, from the exploration and annihilation by Columbus and his Spanish backers on the native people to the French, English, Dutch, Danish, and American use of African, Indian, and others to create income wealth in their nations.

The sweat, labor, and king sugar of the Caribbean people have shaped this and other nations. Our rebellion, innovation, and ingenuity, as well as our independent intellectual intensity, have benefited this and other countries.

As one of the pillars of American patriotism and democracy, Alexander Hamilton was born in Nevis, and raised and educated on the island of St. Croix, where he learned the theories and financial methods of the English, Danes, as well as the West African counting system that created not just the foundation of our financial system, but our Federalist ideas.

During that same time, Caribbean financiers assisted the American Revolution and gave courage through the example of the tremendous victory of the Haitian people over the French, British, and Spanish armies.

But the contributions of Caribbean Americans to the making of America didn't stop with those heroics. The massive migration of Caribbean people to the United States of America, during the early 20th century, gave us another opportunity to make our impact upon the liberation process that was taking place in this country through politics and the arts.

Who doesn't know Hubert Harrison and Edward Wilmot Blyden, intellectuals of the Harlem Renaissance? Marcus Garvey, Cicely Tyson, Malcolm X, and Harry Belafonte are all of Caribbean heritage and have personified the enormous dignity, revolutionary spirit, and unyielding intellectual gravitas and sense of self worth that hallmarks Caribbean people and has supported the African diaspora pride during times when those attributes would be desired to be denied by others in this country.

We continue to contribute to this country in many ways. Secretary of State Colin Powell is of Jamaican heritage; Attorney General Eric Holder, Barbados; Senator KAMALA HARRIS, Jamaica; and former Governor David Paterson's family is from Grenada.

We see many of them in great places. As a result, we all have families and friends who have emigrated to the north and contribute to the social, political, educational, and economic prosperity of the United States.

Who doesn't know Beyonce, who is of Bahamian background, who was named by Forbes as the most powerful celebrity? We have Gwen Ifill from Barbados; and Dr. Patricia Era Bath of Trinidad, who invented the Laserphaco Probe for cataract treatment. She is the first Black woman doctor to receive a medical patent.

We have Romany Malco of Trinidad, an actor and comedian; Dr. Marcia Royce, who has done research in HIV/AIDS and infectious diseases; as well as Camille Wardrop Alleyne of Trinidad, who works for NASA and the Department of Defense working on low Earth orbit.

This list does not scratch the surface of those making their mark in the United States. There are so many others that I cannot and do not have the time to highlight.

During this month, we have tried to make others aware of the contributions

that the Caribbean has. It is not just the contributions we have made, but the commitment that this country should have to its nearest neighbor, the Caribbean.

The Caribbean and the United States have shared a long and prolific history together. The United States is the largest economic partner of the Caribbean; and the Caribbean, that small region, accounts for the third largest receiver of American goods.

The United States needs to act as a buffer to the increased influence of China and Venezuela in the Caribbean through economic projects the U.S. can continue.

As a Delegate representing the only district in the English-speaking Caribbean, I am committed to working with the Caribbean community.

To those young Caribbean people, I see you. Be strong and of good courage. We are a small people, yet mighty in spirit.

#### WEALTHCARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I love my country and because I refuse to support the Senate "wealthcare" bill. It is not healthcare, but "wealthcare."

It is a "wealthcare" bill because it will cut more than a trillion dollars from healthcare. In so doing, it will transfer approximately \$238 billion to high-income earners.

It is a "wealthcare" bill. It will rob the poor, who need healthcare, to reward the rich with "wealthcare."

I refuse to support it. I refuse to participate in the concentration of wealth that has taken place.

Currently, according to Oxfam, eight people own as much wealth as half the world. This was as of January, 2017. There are eight people with as much wealth as half the world.

Mr. Speaker, Big Business and the super rich are fueling inequality not only in this country, but around the world. They do so by dodging taxes. They don't pay their fair share of taxes. They do so by driving down wages.

Many people assume that the country cannot afford healthcare because the people that we live in and around don't have what the super rich have. My friends, America is not a poor country. The wealth is just concentrated at the top. Those who are at the bottom and in between believe that the country can afford things that it can't. This is all about the concentration of wealth.

They are using their power to influence politics. You can't speak truth to power if you are afraid of the big banks. You can't speak truth to power if you are afraid of the Big Oil companies. You can't speak truth to power if

you are afraid of the big insurance companies and big pharmaceutical companies.

If you are going to speak truth to power, you have got to stand up to the people who are driving this country into a Third World position. I refuse to participate in it.

Mr. Speaker, currently, 1 in 10 on the planet are living off of \$2 a day. In this country, millions are going to go without proper healthcare, if the Senate "wealthcare" bill passes. They will go without proper healthcare, while millions in bonuses are going to be accorded those who are with insurance companies and receiving a part of the "wealthcare" transfer.

Mr. Speaker, in this country, the top 10 percent hold 76 percent of the wealth. In the United States of America, the top 10 percent hold 76 percent of the wealth. They are able to get away with it because they convinced all of us that one day we might hit the lottery and be in the same position as they are and control the world.

Well, my friends, if you don't hit the lottery and you have to continue your life, you ought to have decent healthcare in the richest country in the world.

□ 1045

You ought to have the best healthcare that we can provide, in the richest country in the world. We are not a Third World country, and I will not participate in this transfer of wealth that is taking place so that those who are wealthy can do more with more.

It seems that we believe that if you are poor, you can do more with less. But if you are wealthy, you need more to do more. This is a shameful, sinful circumstance that we find ourselves in.

As for the Senate "wealthcare" bill, it is a piece of trash, and it ought to be thrown on the ash heap of history.

No one who believes that people are equal and deserve good healthcare can, in good conscience, vote for that bill. I am glad they pulled it, but I hope that they will improve it to the extent that I will be able to vote for it. But if they do not, I say to you without question, reservation, hesitation, or equivocation, I will not support that transfer of wealth, that bill that would concentrate wealth, and I won't support the tax bill that will concentrate wealth, if there is one.

This has got to stop. This inequality of wealth has got to change. We have got to turn it around. Let's do so by providing good healthcare and not "wealthcare."

#### THE HEALTHCARE DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the healthcare

debate that we are having here in the United States.

We had a bill come out of the House of Representatives. We have a working bill that has just come out of the back room in the United States Senate. I think it is important for us, Mr. Speaker, to get some clarity on where each party stands on this issue.

When the Democrats passed the Affordable Care Act, we had some clear goals. We had some clear objectives, back in 2008, 2009, 2010. Our goal and goals as a party were simple: we wanted to expand access to healthcare. We wanted to make sure, in the wealthiest country that God has ever created, that every citizen, wherever you lived, urban, rural, suburban, you would have access to affordable healthcare.

We wanted to make sure that the insurance companies wouldn't knock you off the rolls or charge you a lot of money to get a plan, that when you got sick and you went in to cash in the plan and get some coverage, they said: Oh, we don't cover that. We wanted to make sure that didn't happen.

We wanted to make sure that if your kid had cancer or if you had cancer and the healthcare bills started ratcheting up pretty quickly, that the insurance company couldn't come in and say: Sorry. This is a tragic situation for you and your family, but you just hit your lifetime cap, so we can't cover anything else. You have to go to the Ronald McDonald House, and you have got to go do a fish fry at the local union hall to try to get enough money together to try to pay your healthcare bills, in the wealthiest country God has ever created. That is unacceptable here in the United States.

We were trying to cover more people. You know what? We paid the political price for it, but sign me up. I think of my friends John Boccieri and Steve Driehaus, former Members of Congress. They gave up their seats in this Chamber to make sure that American citizens had healthcare. The Democrats went into the minority since 2010, primarily because the Republican Party used this issue to bludgeon the Democrats. They demagogued the issue. Repeal and replace. Seven years, no plan. Nothing.

And now we have got two bills—one from the House, one from the Senate. Both bills, neutral analysts, the Congressional Budget Office says 22 million Americans will lose their healthcare. Fifteen million will lose it in the next year. If you are between 50 and 64 years old, you are probably going to lose your insurance. If you are a 60-year-old person in Ohio, you are going to pay \$4,000 more a year.

We get off this recent Presidential campaign where we heard a candidate: We are going to expand Medicare. We are going to expand Medicaid. It is going to be beautiful. Everyone is going to be able to afford insurance. I

am not inhumane, is what one person said, one candidate said.

But the realities, Mr. Speaker, are much different, because in the wealthiest country God has ever created, we have a political party that is trying to throw 22 million people off of their healthcare. We need to get some clarity. We are trying to cover people. I am not trying to be judgmental, but I am just saying the Congressional Budget Office is saying, in both bills, 22 million people are going to lose their healthcare.

Democrats, in order to implement our bill, we asked the wealthiest in the country to pay a little bit more. With that revenue, we expanded the Medicaid program for people who were working. If you made less than \$90,000 a year, they got a little bit of that money to help them pay for health insurance so they had more money in their pocket so they could go out and not only take care of their families, but be able to spend and help boost the economy. That is what we wanted to do. That is what we did.

Republicans cut taxes for the wealthy and cut the program by \$700 billion. Clear differences, Mr. Speaker. We need to knock down both of these bills and start all over. We need to fix the Affordable Care Act, not repeal it.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Howard Siplin, Beulah Missionary Baptist Church, Coconut Grove, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, almighty giver of all good gifts and authority, I stand humbly before You today to pray for the sins of this country, to ask for Your forgiveness, and to express our gratitude to You for this great country which we live in during these difficult times.

Father, I pray for the success and healing of all who labor here in the House of Representatives working together to use their influence and opportunities to change the world and make it better.

Heavenly Father, bless all our leaders of this great Nation as they face the ongoing challenges, give them the

right spirit to do the right thing for the needs of all the people.

Father, keep us all in the hollow of Your hand, we give You honor and glory now and forever.

In Jesus' name, we pray.  
Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. STEWART led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING REVEREND DR. HOWARD SIPLIN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to welcome the esteemed Reverend Dr. Howard Siplin to the House floor as our guest chaplain.

Reverend Dr. Siplin was my classmate from first grade to twelfth grade in Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

Reverend Siplin is the senior pastor of Beulah Missionary Baptist Church located in Coconut Grove, Florida.

Before joining the ministry, Reverend Siplin proudly served in law enforcement. He is a graduate of the Miami-Dade Police Academy who made history by earning the distinction of becoming the first African American to serve as president of the Fraternal Order of Police.

Three years ago, after joining Beulah Missionary Baptist Church, Reverend Siplin was ordained a deacon and later became chairman of the church's deacon ministry.

He was called to preach in the year 2000 and, in August 2003, was ordained and installed to serve as the church's pastor. Under his leadership, Beulah Missionary Baptist has helped the surrounding community confront and combat various challenges. He also has used his experience in law enforcement to help forge and strengthen bonds between residents and local police.

Reverend Siplin has dedicated himself to educating members of the Beulah Missionary Baptist Church community to live spiritual lives so that they can be productive citizens.

He holds a bachelor's and master's of ministry degree from the Jacksonville Baptist Theological Seminary. In 2014, the seminary awarded him an honorary doctorate degree.

Reverend Siplin is married to the former Zelma Ferguson who is with him here today. Her father, the late Reverend E. R. Ferguson, founded Beulah Missionary Baptist Church in 1954. They are the proud parents of 4 children, 11 grandchildren, and 2 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to join me in thanking Reverend Siplin for leading today's opening prayer and to thank him for his outstanding service to the south Florida community.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### CONGRATULATING PENNSYLVANIA STUDENTS AT CONGRESS OF FUTURE MEDICAL LEADERS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize five high school honors students from Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District chosen to represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as delegates at the Congress of Future Medical Leaders.

The following students were selected to attend the event which began Sunday and concluded yesterday in Lowell, Massachusetts:

Donovan Brubaker of Boalsburg;  
Catherine McQuitty of Rixford;  
Hannah Mull of Genesee;  
Mackenzie Wilcox of Duke Center;  
and  
Sarah Zakrzewski of Tyrone.

They were nominated by their teachers or The National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists based on their academic excellence and aspiration to join the medical field. Each of these dedicated students

achieved a minimum 3.5 GPA to be nominated for the honors-only program.

The event aims to encourage and guide the top students in our country who hope to become physicians or medical scientists. Chosen delegates at the Congress represent all 50 States including Puerto Rico.

I wish these students the best of luck in their future studies to lead our country's medical profession.

Congratulations.

#### THE SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL

(Ms. DELBENE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, Senate Republicans may have delayed the vote, but make no mistake, they are pushing ahead with a destructive, dangerous healthcare bill that is not just mean, it is immoral. The American people are right to be outraged. I am outraged.

We should be working together to give people better coverage at lower cost. Instead, Senate leaders crafted legislation that leads to lost coverage for 22 million Americans, skyrocketing deductibles, hospital closures in rural communities, and the return of annual and lifetime caps on care.

For families like Colton's in Mill Creek, Washington, who have watched as their 17-year-old son battled high-risk leukemia for 8 years, I can promise you, we are not backing down. Colton is in his fifth remission and still fighting—and so are we.

Healthcare is not a privilege reserved for those fortunate enough to be wealthy or healthy. It is a human right, and it is worth fighting for.

#### NORTH CAROLINA GROWTH AND FORTUNE BUSINESS RANKINGS

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the tremendous amount of growth in North Carolina, specifically in and around the Second Congressional District.

According to the Census Bureau, North Carolina's population has increased 6.4 percent since 2010. That number increases to over 16 percent for just Wake County which encompasses about half of the Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that North Carolina is a fantastic place to live and work, especially for young people wanting to raise a family. In fact, Fortune magazine recently surveyed tens of thousands of millennials nationally about the best places to work, and the results speak for themselves. Two of the top 10 businesses in

the United States call Wake County home.

SAS, a global analytics software firm, and Kimley-Horn, a provider of professional services, placed at number two and number eight on the list respectively.

That is great news for the future of North Carolina.

#### COMMENDING THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA'S FIRST RESPONDERS

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the city of Alexandria's first responders, the first to the scene of the shooting at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in my district in Alexandria, Virginia.

Two weeks ago today, Wednesday, June 14, at 7 a.m., a man fired scores of shots at the Members of Congress who were practicing for the annual Congressional Baseball Game. The shooting wounded U.S. Representative and House Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, Capitol Police Officers David Bailey and Crystal Griner, congressional staffer Zack Barth, and former congressional staffer Matt Mika.

The timely response of Alexandria's first responders almost certainly saved lives. Alexandria Police Officers Nicole Battaglia, Alexander Jensen, and Kevin Jobe arrived within minutes of the 9/11 call. Officer Battaglia came under fire upon arriving at the scene and immediately engaged the shooter. Her actions diverted the shooter's attention, allowing the other responding officers to neutralize him.

Medical care provided by the members of the Alexandria Fire Department, including Fiona Apple and Richard Krimmer, ensured these senseless acts of violence did not become a multiple-fatality event.

I am honored to commend these valiant individuals for their selfless service. I thank them for saving the lives of the victims and potential victims of this evil, mindless gun violence, and also for their daily positive impact on the extraordinary community of Del Ray and the exceptional city of Alexandria.

#### HONORING MISS NORTH CAROLINA

(Mr. ROUZER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Miss Greater Sampson County, Victoria Huggins, who won the 80th Miss North Carolina Scholarship Pageant this past weekend and will go on to represent our great State in the Miss America pageant this fall.

During the competition, Victoria also won first place in the Quality of Life Award which honors her dedica-

tion and work on her community service platforms.

A graduate of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke and a native of St. Pauls, Victoria is a member of the Carolina in the Morning team with the NBC affiliate WECT in Wilmington, North Carolina.

During her tenure as Miss North Carolina, Victoria will focus on her work advocating for Alzheimer's disease awareness.

On behalf of southeastern North Carolina, congratulations, Victoria. We wish you the best of luck as you represent our great State over the next year, compete in the Miss America pageant, and continue to enrich the lives of others.

#### THE REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the Congressional Budget Office reporting that 22 million people would lose healthcare coverage and premiums for those who keep their coverage increasing by more than 20 percent next year, it is not surprising that the Republican Senate bill was pulled due to a pervasive lack of interest and support.

Hit hardest under the pulled Senate bill were low- and middle-income Americans between the ages of 50 and 64 and people with preexisting diseases like cancer and diabetes.

The time has come for this Congress to use the leverage of a massive purchaser of healthcare—the Federal Government—and authorize a Medicare buy-in for Americans between the ages of 50 and 64.

With the leverage of 60 million-plus beneficiaries and low administrative costs, a Medicare buy-in option for the 50 to 64 population will drive down costs and drive up the quality of healthcare. We have an obligation to the American people.

#### HONORING REPRESENTATIVE CHAFFETZ

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor my good friend, JASON CHAFFETZ, as he prepares to leave the House tomorrow.

On the day that I was first elected, the very first phone call I got was a number I didn't recognize. I picked it up, and it was Jason. He was the first person to call and congratulate me. He has become a close friend ever since.

But he has become more than a friend. He is a person who I trust. I go to him often for advice. I think he has the best political mind in all of Utah, and I am going to miss that.

I also appreciate his honesty and his integrity. Leaders take hits—we understand that—and Jason has taken his share of arrows by those who may not agree with his positions. But no one has ever questioned his honesty or his integrity.

There is a great old movie called "Grumpy Old Men." Jason will never be a star in that movie because he is one of the most optimistic, friendly, and positive people that I know. He always has a smile on his face.

So for those reasons, Jason, we are going to miss you. On behalf of all Utahns, I thank him for his service. On behalf of millions of Americans throughout the country, we wish him Godspeed in his adventures ahead.

□ 1215

#### PULL THE PLUG ON TRUMPCARE

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the Senate has postponed a vote on their TrumpCare bill, which would have deprived 22 million Americans of health coverage. The truly vicious nature of this bill is most clear when it comes to Medicaid.

Are you a working family relying on Medicaid for long-term care of an aging grandparent? Well, with TrumpCare, you will pay more out of pocket.

For a low-income working mom who insures her kids through Medicaid, TrumpCare takes dead aim at you.

How about a person with a disability? TrumpCare means potentially losing coverage.

Why did the Republicans make these cuts? To give billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

The President says the House-passed bill is "mean." It is. So is the Senate cold-hearted proposal.

A delay on this vote is not enough. Congress needs to pull the plug on TrumpCare, not the American people. Then we can work together on real, bipartisan healthcare legislation aimed at strengthening the system, not harming the most vulnerable among us.

#### TRIBUTE TO FIRE CONTROLMAN 1ST CLASS GARY L. REHM, JR.

(Mr. JORDAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a courageous career Navy man, Fire Controlman 1st Class Gary L. Rehm, Jr., who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of his fellow Americans.

Gary was born and raised in Elyria, in the Fourth District of Ohio. He followed in his grandfather's footsteps, joining the Navy straight out of high



school and serving nearly 20 years, including a deployment to the Persian Gulf in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Gary was on the USS *Fitzgerald* when it was struck by a container ship off the coast of Japan on June 17. Amid the chaos, Gary jumped into action, battling the raging water that flooded one of the ship's berthing compartments, risking his own life to bring his shipmates to safety.

The sailors who admire him so much might use words like "valiant," "heroic," and "noble" to describe Gary's actions that day, but the words he would probably use to describe himself are found in the Navy's motto: "Not for Self but for Country."

Gary is survived by a loving family, including his wife, Erin; his sister, Jessica; his niece, Margaret Neal; and his parents, Gary and Anita.

For his profound sacrifice, this Nation owes Gary L. Rehm, Jr., and his family a tremendous debt of gratitude. He will be greatly missed, but the strength of his character, his selflessness, and the courage he demonstrated through his service will live on forever.

#### BILL THREATENS OHIOANS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, Vice President PENCE is expected to visit northeast Ohio for an appearance at a manufacturing firm. He will discuss the effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act and subsequently rip away healthcare for millions upon millions of Americans, as well as quadruple its cost to millions and millions more elderly.

Ohioans should know that the bill the GOP is trying to ramrod through Congress would threaten nearly 1 million Ohioans who gained coverage over the last few years through the Affordable Care Act. Further, seniors would see their insurance premiums rise by four to five times as much, with nothing being done to lower their cost of medicine.

Why is this administration making things worse for Ohio?

We need to maintain Medicaid for the treatment of those Americans who are sick, suffering, in nursing homes, those who are mentally ill, and those who are suffering from terminal illness. The Pence-Trump doctrine will hurt them all.

I hope the Vice President won't mislead our people about how many Ohioans will lose coverage.

In fact, is the Vice President aware healthcare jobs help drive our economy in Ohio. The TrumpCare bill, which is really a tax break for millionaires, will cause an Ohio job loss of over 80,000 healthcare workers over the next 5 years.

I urge the Vice President to meet with officials at Cleveland Clinic, MetroHealth, or the Sisters of Charity and hear what they have to say about the GOP's anti-life bill.

#### PROVIDENCE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH CELEBRATES 250TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Charlotte's Providence Presbyterian Church and in celebration of their 250th anniversary.

Founded by Ulster Scots in 1767, the church was named "Providence" to express the founders' firm trust in the faithfulness of God to work all things for His purpose.

Members of Providence Presbyterian were part of the combative North Carolina militia, the Hornet's Nest, which courageously opposed Lord Cornwallis during the Revolutionary War.

For over 140 years, the church sponsored all schools in the community and, in the late 1850s, established Providence Female Academy, which was one of the few schools for women in the South.

The church remains committed to service today. Part of the 250th anniversary celebration included making 250 dresses for young girls in Africa. Their motto is "Rooted in Christ, growing in the Spirit."

To Pastor Walt McCanless and the entire congregation, congratulations, and God bless this wonderful community of believers.

#### TORT REFORM

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today my colleagues will vote on H.R. 1215, the so-called Protecting Access to Care Act.

Disguised as a step toward healthcare affordability, in reality, this legislation tramples on the legal rights of Americans harmed in healthcare settings.

This bill would devastate the catastrophically injured by capping non-economic damages at \$250,000, a cap that applies even for loss of limb, permanent disability, or death of a child or spouse. These caps also apply to lawsuits that include accusations of reckless misconduct or violent crimes like assault or rape.

This bill further erodes the right to trial by jury by imposing a 3-year statute of limitations, which is shorter than most State laws.

Legal remedies often stand as the test of the last refuge of justice for the injured and aggrieved, regardless of

wealth or influence. Powerful interests have many tools at their disposal to stack the deck against vulnerable populations. But the goal of the American court system at its purest is to provide equal consideration in the eyes of the law. As a nation, our responsibility is to work towards that ideal, not undermine it.

H.R. 1215 is a direct affront to this idea, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

#### REMEMBERING GRANDMA EDNA

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, June 28, 1911, the day my dear grandmother, Edna Yoder, was born, has been a special day in my life. Each year, for the last 6 years, I have come to the floor to wish her a happy birthday. Last year, she celebrated her 105th birthday. Sadly, today would have been her 106th, but Grandma Edna passed away recently, and I miss her terribly.

She was a sweet, loving, and strong grandmother. She had an infectious laugh, an enormous love of family, and a deep belief in her faith. She was a symbol of everything that was great about America's Greatest Generation.

She was also a true example of what makes America a strong and vibrant nation: working tirelessly every day on the farm, milking cows at dawn, and bringing in the wheat harvest in the hot Kansas sun. I like to say she had a front row seat on the journey that was the great American century.

Mr. Speaker, today, I want Grandma to know that we love her, we miss her, and we know that she is at peace with the Lord in Heaven.

#### GOP HEALTHCARE BILL

(Miss RICE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, people in my district and in districts all across the country have been making it clear that they don't want millions of Americans to become uninsured just to cut taxes for the rich. They don't want Congress to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

What they want is for Democrats and Republicans to work together to make it better: to keep expanding coverage, reducing costs, and improving care. Now that the Senate has delayed a vote on the BCRA, we have yet another opportunity to do just that.

I urge my Republican colleagues to move past repeal and replace once and for all. Democrats are ready to work with you. So let's seize this opportunity and start solving problems for the people we serve.

STREAMLINING PERMITTING  
PROCESS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this week, in the Natural Resources Committee, we passed my bill, H.R. 289, the Guides and Outfitters Act, called the GO Act. It will help people be able to access public lands, national parks, U.S. Forest Service land, and BLM land for recreational activities without the litany and long wait of having to get permits. This will streamline that process.

A couple of aspects include getting all the different agencies to work together to have a one-stop permitting process and shorten the length of time it takes to get these permits so that people can have events that are compatible with the use of these public lands and enjoy them. Indeed, no one is trying to hurt the environment, and we don't need a 6-month study every time somebody wants to have a bikefest or a jog through their public lands.

We think the GO Act will be a very important, helpful tool, especially during the summertime, when people like to get outdoors and enjoy their public lands.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 3003, NO SANCTUARY FOR  
CRIMINALS ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 414 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 414

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all

time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 414, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from my fellow Judiciary Committee members Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Ms. LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 3003 received consideration by the Judiciary Committee as part of a larger bill, the Michael Davis, Jr. and Danny Oliver in Honor of State and Local Law Enforcement Act. That legislation was marked up and ordered reported by the Judiciary Committee on May 24.

As a cosponsor and strong advocate of the Davis-Oliver Act, I supported the passage of legislation before the full House. Today we have the opportunity to move an important piece of that bill forward and to strengthen our policies against jurisdictions that flout America's laws.

Mr. Speaker, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act is just simply common sense. John Adams said that we are a government of laws, not of men. As we approach the Fourth of July week, we recognize that America's foundation is that of the rule of law. Yet too often we have seen local jurisdictions ignore Federal immigration law and declare themselves sanctuary cities, as though their actions have no consequences for their law-abiding neighbors.

The reality, however, is that the localities that refuse to enforce Federal immigration law undermine public safety and break the democratic contract. Mr. Speaker, the sanctuary cities do not act in a vacuum. They endanger lives and set dangerous precedent.

□ 1230

To many people, it would seem obvious that local and State law enforcement should comply with Federal immigration laws and cooperate with its fair enforcement by communicating openly with Federal officials. It would also seem clear that jurisdictions that

ignore these laws should forfeit the Federal funds set aside to support compliance with those same laws.

Despite this, sanctuary cities oppose Federal immigration officials routinely. These men and women find themselves handicapped by local officials implementing obstructionist policies.

In light of this, Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to better protect our communities by ensuring our laws are followed. H.R. 3003 takes steps to do that.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Congressman KING, and Congressman BIGGS for their work on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. These Members are colleagues of mine on the Judiciary Committee, and they recognize the need to respond to the continuing problem of sanctuary cities with resolve, with confidence that Federal immigration laws safeguard every American community and apply equally to every American community.

The underlying bill provided for by this rule also includes legislation offered by Mr. KING—Sarah's and Grant's Law. Sarah's and Grant's Law is named after two individuals, Sarah Root and Grant Ronnebeck, who were tragically killed by unlawful immigrants. The unlawful immigrants were released and remain at large, and the Root and Ronnebeck families were left to grieve unspeakable losses while the lawlessness continues.

It is past time for us to take action to combat dangerous sanctuary policies. We are a nation of laws and we need to act like it.

While there is no uniform definition of sanctuary cities, and no comprehensive or official list of these jurisdictions, we have, regrettably, become all too familiar with them. So-called sanctuary cities are those jurisdictions that obstruct immigration enforcement through noncompliance with detainers. They construct unreasonable hurdles to compliance and create barriers to communication between Immigration and Customs Enforcement and local personnel.

We understand that ICE has a job to do and that its officers took oaths to uphold those duties. Opponents will claim that this bill is unnecessary because ICE has the jurisdiction it needs. The truth is, sanctuary policies make the ICE agents' jobs more difficult, more dangerous, and endanger communities.

While the previous administration frequently flouted immigration laws and, for far too long, took a rain check on holding sanctuary cities accountable, even former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson agreed that sanctuary cities shouldn't simply be allowed to decline to cooperate with Federal Government authorities. In fact, he said in 2015 that it is "not acceptable to have no policy of cooperation with immigration enforcement."

Mr. Speaker, faithfulness to the law isn't like being offered a cup of coffee. You can't look at the Federal statutes and say: You know, no thanks, but I appreciate you offering.

H.R. 3003 confirms that this option is not on the table.

While I agree with former Secretary Johnson that we must have a policy of cooperation, the policies of the former administration too frequently didn't indicate a commitment to that goal. In fact, State and local jurisdictions ignored more than 12,000 Federal detainer requests in 2014.

Now is the time for action.

Thankfully, President Trump issued an executive order directing the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, and ICE to ensure that sanctuary jurisdictions are ineligible for Federal grants and are subject to enforcement actions. The President also charged these agencies with reporting on jurisdictions that have refused to comply with detainers to hold criminal aliens.

The first week this report was issued, it showed 206 known instances in which local personnel declined ICE detainers and released criminal aliens. These aliens reentered the communities after they had committed crimes such as assault, aggravated assault or battery, driving under the influence, or domestic violence abuses.

The reports indicate that we have work to do, but it helps us by identifying jurisdictions where personnel are thwarting Federal law. It throws into relief the glaring problem of sanctuary cities and provides information that law enforcement and lawmakers can use as we assess the problem and develop meaningful solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the Georgia State House when we took action there to address the issue of sanctuary cities. In 2009, we in Georgia outlawed sanctuary cities in our State. Last year, the legislature went further by requiring local governments to certify their cooperation with immigration officials in order to receive State funds.

Today we have a chance to take a step in a positive direction on the Federal level.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act prohibits States and localities from implementing policies that restrict law enforcement agencies from cooperating with immigration laws and officials. It gives teeth to that restriction by tying eligibility for certain Department of Justice and Homeland Security grants to State and local compliance with existing immigration laws.

The bill requires that there will be probable cause before ICE can issue a detainer, and focuses on grant programs reasonably related to the scope of the bill.

Importantly, this bill also calls for aliens to be detained if the alien is engaged in a crime that caused death or

serious injury to another person. Had this provision been law at the time, it could have helped prevent what happened in the heartbreaking death of Sarah Root, where an alien who caused her death was freed on bond and remains at large.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act also takes the commonsense step of allowing DHS to withhold aliens rather than transferring them to sanctuary jurisdictions, even if the jurisdiction has a warrant. It simply doesn't make sense for DHS to transfer aliens who are removable under the law to jurisdictions that are looking for opportunities to let them go.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot talk about holding sanctuary cities accountable by strengthening our laws without mentioning the work of Chairman JOHN CULBERSON.

In 2016, Chairman CULBERSON successfully convinced the Department of Justice to update guidelines in order to disqualify sanctuary cities from receiving DOJ grant money should they be found in violation of title 8 U.S. Code, section 1373.

Attorney General Sessions has reiterated that Federal law enforcement grants are contingent on compliance with existing law, and that the DOJ will deny fiscal year 2017 grant funds to jurisdictions that have refused to share information regarding illegal aliens in their custody.

Chairman CULBERSON's efforts made clear that State and local law enforcement agencies are expected to work with Federal law enforcement agencies on immigration matters. Through his diligent work, meaningful steps have been taken to restore accountability.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act builds on these efforts and ensures that jurisdictions comply with the detainers while strengthening our law to ensure that aliens who have been committing crimes such as drunk driving are detained pending their removal.

H.R. 3003 permits the Secretary of DHS to issue a detainer for any individual arrested for violation of a criminal or motor vehicle law upon probable cause that an individual is an inadmissible or deportable alien.

In this critically important step, the bill grants immunity to State and local entities for compliance with any detainer.

Jurisdictions that want to act in good faith and follow the law should be able to cooperate without being held liable for their compliance. The protections provided in this bill are a major step forward to effective enforcement.

Finally, this bill gives victims and their families a private right of action against a State and local government whose noncompliance and release of an alien results in a murder, rape, or serious injury of the victim. This measure, were it law, would have allowed Kate Steinle's family to sue after her tragic

murder at the hands of a criminal and unlawful immigrant.

Sanctuary cities and jurisdictions ignore the law. They do it at the expense of the American people. Our citizens surely deserve better. They deserve to live in communities that don't let dangerous criminals back out into the streets. They deserve to see the law upheld rather than ignored. Law-abiding citizens deserve to see individuals who break our laws—not only by entering and residing in our country illegally, but by committing crimes once here—to be removed.

This rule provides for the consideration of legislation to strengthen the rule of law and to protect our neighbors and communities.

It demands that jurisdictions comply with our Nation's immigration laws and enforcement or face penalties.

Today we can take action to turn off the spigot of Federal funds to those jurisdictions that obstruct ICE efforts at the expense of Americans. We demonstrate that Members of this House will not sit idly by while sanctuary cities continue flouting the laws of our land with impunity. We strengthen our detainer policy, enable ICE to do its job, and, at the same time, help protect our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this closed rule, and in strong opposition to the underlying bill, H.R. 3003.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider its 37th closed rule for the year, and tomorrow it will take up number 38. My Republican friends are breaking all kinds of records here.

While I often wonder just why the Republican leadership is so afraid of open debate in the United States House of Representatives, I do recognize that it goes right along with the Republican majority's complete rejection of regular order.

The House of Representatives, I am sad to say, has ceased being a deliberative body where important issues are debated freely. The Republican leadership has shut this place down, and this is yet another example of it.

Look up the history of the bill the House will debate later today or tomorrow, H.R. 3003, the so-called No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. It was introduced on June 22. That was last Thursday. Like its 2015 predecessor, it has had no hearings, no markup, no input from local law enforcement, no regular order.

No one had a chance to testify about this bill. Not the U.S. Conference of Mayors that includes the mayors of over 1,000 cities and towns, Democrat

and Republican alike, who represent over 150 million people.

Not the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Catholic Charities, Church World Service, and religious and faith leaders from all across the land.

Not the National Fraternal Order of Police, the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, or the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence.

Not the NAACP, the Southern Poverty Law Center, the YWCA, or hundreds of national civil rights, human rights, labor, immigration, and humanitarian organizations.

Mr. Speaker, on a bill that would affect hundreds of cities and towns and counties across America, why wouldn't we want to hear the views of these important law enforcement, State and local government, religious, civil society, and victims' organizations?

The answer is simple, Mr. Speaker. Because they all oppose this legislation. All of them.

It is much easier for Republicans to close down the process and steamroll this terrible bill through Congress than to actually get feedback from the American people and the leaders charged with keeping them safe.

If you are going to pass a bill that has so much public opposition, I guess it makes sense to do it quickly and with as little debate as possible.

Welcome to the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, where the voices of the American people are shut out as Republicans continue to ram through their radical agenda.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3003 does nothing to advance cooperation between local law enforcement with the Federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Cooperation between local and Federal agencies to apprehend, try, and punish serious criminal offenders, and in the case of foreign nationals, to imprison and then deport them, has always been a high priority. These are matters of national security.

But instead of continuing to foster cooperation and strengthen this priority, this bill chooses to blackmail, coerce, and penalize local law enforcement agencies and demand that they potentially violate the Constitution of the United States, in particular the Fourth Amendment, the 10th Amendment, and the 14th amendment.

I wish my Republican friends were as faithful to the rights enshrined in these amendments of the Bill of Rights as they are to the Second Amendment, but then that is a whole other debate.

And let's think about this for a minute. What are they proposing to do?

For communities and local law enforcement that believe that doing what this bill asks them to do would make it more difficult for them to do local policing, and would make it more difficult for them to have the trust of members in their community to report

crimes. What my Republican friends propose to do is take away important Federal funding to help keep these communities safe.

What are we talking about here?

I think it is important for people to understand this. Programs like the COPS programs, the Community Oriented Policing Services; the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program; the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant program; and national security programs, those things would be taken away from local communities. It doesn't make any sense.

For example, the Byrne JAG is a major source of criminal justice funding for local law enforcement and provided \$275 million in fiscal year 2016 for prevention and education programs, drug treatment and enforcement, crime victim and witness initiatives, and other community-based programs.

Other funding programs and grants that are threatened under this bill are used to address sexual assault, gang violence, and trafficking such as the Sexual Assault Kit Initiative, the Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program, and the Reach and Evaluation on Trafficking in Persons program.

Maybe nobody read what this bill does before they brought it to the floor. I just don't understand the logic of basically trying to blackmail communities by taking away important funding that is designed to protect the citizens of various communities across this country.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called sanctuary cities bill, as I mentioned, threatens to strip local jurisdictions of Federal grants and funding. It specifically targets law enforcement, counterterrorism, and national security grants when they prioritize working with immigrant communities to keep our neighbors and cities and towns safe.

□ 1245

I don't think Washington knows best all the time, unlike my Republican colleagues. I trust my local police departments on this issue more than I trust my friends on the other side of the aisle. Republicans would rather demonize these cities, towns, and local police agencies and force them to squander scarce local resources on immigration enforcement instead of local policing, making our cities and our communities less safe, not more safe.

This is why law enforcement and city governments oppose this bill. It deliberately and cynically undermines their ability to protect their communities, nurture public trust in the police and our legal system, and strengthen public safety.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reeks of prejudice. It isn't meant to solve any problem. It is meant to punish cities that don't embrace the radical views of the anti-immigrant rightwing of the Republican Party. It is meant to demon-

ize all immigrants as criminals. It is meant to turn our local police into the lackeys of ICE.

Mr. Speaker, this House continues to wait and wait and wait for the Republican majority to show some leadership and bring up a comprehensive immigration reform bill. It has been more than 4 years since the Senate passed a strong, bipartisan immigration reform bill, and we are still waiting for House Republicans to step up and act, to actually try to solve a problem rather than continue to divide our country and continue to act in a way that is polarizing.

What we need is a way to bring 11 million of our neighbors, friends, colleagues, small-business owners, and hardworking residents out of the shadows. That is what makes America stronger. That is why 9 out of 10 Americans support immigration reform that creates a path to citizenship for the undocumented, according to a March 2017 poll by CNN/ORC.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article about the poll.

[From cnn.com, Mar. 17, 2017]

CNN/ORC POLL: AMERICANS BREAK WITH TRUMP ON IMMIGRATION POLICY

(By Tal Kopan and Jennifer Agiesta)

WASHINGTON (CNN).—Americans disagree with President Donald Trump's immigration priorities, according to a new CNN/ORC poll, with nearly two-thirds of Americans saying they'd like to see a path to legal status for undocumented immigrants rather than deportations.

Trump has made tough border security and strict enforcement of US immigration laws a focal point of his campaign and presidency—using some of his first executive orders to pave the way for far more deportations and detentions as well as ordering the construction of a Southern border wall.

But a CNN/ORC poll released Friday finds that the public is actually moving in the opposite direction since Trump has won election.

Americans are more likely to say that the nation's top immigration priority should be to allow those in the US illegally to gain legal status—and six in 10 say they are more concerned that deportation efforts will be overzealous than they are that dangerous criminals will be overlooked.

All told, 60% say the government's top priority in dealing with illegal immigration should be developing a plan to allow those in the US illegally who have jobs to become legal residents.

In contrast, 26% say developing a plan to stop illegal border crossings should be the top priority and 13% say deportation of those in the US illegally should be the first priority.

The number who prioritize legal status for those working in the US illegally is up from 51% who said so last fall. That shift comes across party lines, with Democrats and independents each 10 points more likely and Republicans 8 points more likely to choose a plan for legal status now compared with last fall.

While Trump campaigned heavily against “amnesty” for undocumented immigrants, he has avoided rescinding an Obama administration program offering protections and work permits to those who were brought to

the US as children, and in a recent meeting with reporters a senior administration official indicated Trump could be open to a compromise that included a path to legalization, if not citizenship, if it came to his desk.

Trump told Congress in his joint address last month that he supported the idea of an immigration reform compromise, but offered few details.

Offering citizenship to those immigrants who are living in the US illegally but hold a job, speak English and are willing to pay back taxes is immensely popular, with 90% behind such a plan. That's consistent across party lines, with 96% of Democrats, 89% of independents and 87% of Republicans behind it.

The President has described his immigration policies as focused on removing criminals, though critics of his administration say enforcement agencies' definition of criminal is too expansive and sweeps up people who only broke immigration laws.

He has also ordered the creation of offices and reports focused on publicizing victims of crimes committed by undocumented immigrants.

Americans say, however, they are more concerned about the effects of deportations than they are about immigrant crimes.

Overall, 58% say they're more concerned that deportation efforts will go too far and result in deportation of people who haven't committed serious crimes, while 40% say they're more concerned that those efforts will not go far enough and dangerous criminals will remain in the US. That number is largely driven by Democrats—more than two-thirds of Republicans say they are concerned efforts won't go far enough.

As for deportation priorities, seven in 10 say the government should not attempt to deport all immigrants living in the country illegally, up from 66% in the fall.

A wide majority, nearly eight in 10, support deporting undocumented immigrants who have committed other crimes, however, an area Trump says is his focus. There has been a small uptick, nevertheless, in the share who say the government shouldn't be deporting those living in the US illegally who have been convicted of other crimes, from 15% to 19%.

Opinions vary by party on both of these questions, though majorities across party lines are on the same side of both arguments. Among Republicans, 55% oppose attempts to deport all people living in the US illegally, below the 86% of Democrats and 71% of independents who feel that way. Considering deportation of those in the country illegally who have been convicted of other crimes, 64% of Democrats favor that, below the 79% of independents and 93% of Republicans who say the same.

CNN/ORC interviewed 1,025 American adults by phone from March 1 to 4 for the poll, which has a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points. Results by party have a margin of error of plus or minus 6 points.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, instead of working together to find commonsense solutions to immigration, the Republican leadership offers extreme, deportation-only bills that undermine public safety and hurt our communities. Let them register; let them pay a fine; let them be documented and not fear talking with the police; and let us recognize their many contributions to communities across America.

These are our friends, our colleagues, and our neighbors. Our kids go to school together. We shop at the same grocery stores and eat at the same restaurants. We serve together on the PTA and worship together at church. Our country is strongest when we lift up our neighbors. This bill will only drive us apart.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is just more of the same old divisive Republican anti-immigrant formula. It will sow fear among the immigrant community, regardless of their status; it will tear families apart; it will subvert public trust of local law enforcement and police; and it will undermine the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, America is better than this. I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule and to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I respect my friend from Massachusetts a great deal. I am not sure what is subversive to the Constitution in upholding the law.

When we deal with this issue, it is about a choice. We can talk about local law enforcement and we can talk about cities that do not want to do this, but they are making the choice here. It is time we hold people accountable for choices.

I think it is really interesting that we mentioned the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, which, by the way, was meant to reimburse localities for holding illegal immigrants. If they are not holding them, then why do they need the money to start with?

So let's at least put it in perspective here. I can talk about immigration reform. I believe there is a lot that we can do in that. I agree with the gentleman. However, I disagree in the part here, why don't we enforce the law that is here?

By the way, that is currently the law under both President Obama and President Trump. Under U.S. Code section 1373, in order to get Federal money, they have to comply with this section. This simply builds upon what we have already done.

So I think it is a choice here. I think making it out to be anything other than a choice that the localities have made is really trying to subvert the process and discuss another issue. We can do that all we want. That is what ended up, a lot of times, happening in this rule debate.

But at the end of the day, this is about simply enforcing the law. I think if you go to places all over the country and you begin to ask them just a simple question and start it off with this, "Don't you think we ought to enforce the law?" the answer you get over 90 percent of the time is yes.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is clear that the laws aren't working. That is why we need comprehensive immigration reform, and that is why it is so unfortunate that the Republicans in this House have stalled on that issue. We had bipartisan support a few years ago for comprehensive immigration reform, but people here, for some reason, would rather just demagogue the issue than do something about it.

As I said before, I actually trust my local officials, my local police, more than I do my Republican friends who are speaking here today and who spoke in the Rules Committee last night.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to all of us from the National Fraternal Order of Police, which is strongly opposed to this bill; a letter to all of us from The United States Conference of Mayors, which is strongly opposed to all of this; a letter to all of us from the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, which is strongly opposed to this bill; and a letter to all of us from Cities for Action, which is strongly opposed to this bill.

NATIONAL

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,  
*Majority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,  
*Minority Whip, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to reiterate the FOP's opposition to any amendment or piece of legislation that would penalize law enforcement agencies by withholding Federal funding or resources from law enforcement assistance programs in an effort to coerce a policy change at the local level. The House will consider H.R. 3003 on the floor this week and Section 2 of this bill would restrict the hiring program administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne-JAG) programs, as well as programs administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The FOP has been very clear on this issue: we strongly believe that local and State law enforcement agencies should cooperate with their Federal counterparts. That being said, withholding needed assistance to law enforcement agencies—which have no policy-making role—also hurts public safety efforts.

Local police departments answer to local civilian government and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances in their communities. Law enforcement officers have no more say in these matters than any other citizen and—with laws like the Hatch Act in place—it can be argued they have less. Law enforcement officers do

not get to pick and choose which laws to enforce, and must carry out lawful orders at the direction of their commanders and the civilian government that employs them. It is unjust to penalize law enforcement and the citizens they serve because Congress disagrees with their enforcement priorities with respect to our nation's immigration laws.

The FOP issued a statement in January of this year regarding the approach of the Administration on sanctuary cities as outlined in President Trump's Executive Order. The President recognized that it is unfair to penalize the law enforcement agencies serving these jurisdictions for the political decisions of local officials. It allows the U.S. Attorney General and Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to make an informed decision about the public safety impact without an automatic suspension from Federal grant programs. In Section 2 of H.R. 3003, there is no such discretion and it countermands the Administration's existing policy.

The FOP opposed several bills in the previous Congress, which were outlined in a letter to the Senate leadership, and we will continue to work against proposals that would reduce or withhold funding or resources from any Federal program for local and State law enforcement. If Congress wishes to effect policy changes in these sanctuary cities, it must find another way to do so.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to urge the House to reject H.R. 3003's punitive approach and work with law enforcement to find a better way to improve public safety in our communities. Please feel free to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my Washington office if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,  
*National President.*

—  
THE UNITED STATES  
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,  
*Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to register the strong opposition of the nation's mayors to H.R. 3003, a partisan bill that seeks to punish so-called "sanctuary cities," which is expected to be considered by the full House this week.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors represents well over a thousand mayors and nearly 150 million people. Today, we concluded the 85th Annual Meeting of The U.S. Conference of Mayors and adopted policy that reinforces and builds on previous positions we have taken which oppose provisions in this bill. Specifically, the nation's mayors:

- urge members of Congress to withdraw legislation that attempts to cut local law enforcement funding necessary to ensure the safety of our communities, indemnify conduct that violates the constitutional rights afforded to both United States citizens and immigrant populations, and further criminalizes immigration and infringes on the rights of immigrant;

- oppose punitive policies that limit local control and discretion, and urge instead that Congress and the Administration pursue immigration enforcement policies that recognize that local law enforcement has limited resources and community trust is critical to local law enforcement and the safety of our communities;

- oppose federal policies that commandeer local law enforcement or require local UN authorities to violate, or be placed at risk of violating, a person's Fourth Amendment

rights; expend limited resources to act as immigration agents; or otherwise assist federal immigration authorities beyond what is determined by local policy.

HR 3003 would do all of these things and more:

- It would jeopardize public safety by withholding critical public safety funding from jurisdictions that tell their police officers not to ask an individual their immigration status. Many departments have such policies to encourage crime victims and witnesses to report crimes and to build trust with immigrant communities.

- It would put jurisdictions at risk of violating an individual's Fourth Amendment rights by establishing probable cause standards for ICE's issuance of detainers that do not require a judicial determination of probable cause. Numerous federal courts have found that continued detention under an ICE detainer, absent probable cause, would state a claim for a violation of the Fourth Amendment and subject the detaining officer or jurisdiction to civil liability.

- While it says it would provide immunity to jurisdictions which comply with detainers and hold them harmless in any suits filed against them, they would still be subject to Fourth Amendment challenges.

- Further compelling and expanding compliance with certain enforcement provisions, such as immigration detainers, and cutting off federal funding to jurisdictions which do not comply with these provisions likely conflict with the Tenth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 is a bad bill for our cities and their residents and for our nation. It would jeopardize public safety, preempt local authority, and expose local governments to litigation and potential findings of damages. America's mayors call on you to do the right thing and vote against H.R. 3003 when it is considered on the floor.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors urges you instead to focus on positive legislation that will fix our broken immigration system and make our cities safer. The nation's mayors pledge to work with you on bipartisan immigration reform legislation that will fix our nation's broken immigration system. We need to move beyond punitive bills like H.R. 3003 and develop an immigration system that works for our nation, our cities and our people.

To make our cities safer we urge you to consider legislation that will help us to fight crime and prevent terrorism. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the Major Cities Chiefs Association agree that to make the streets of America safe, Congress must act to strengthen bonds between communities and police, expand homeland security grants, invest in mental health and substance abuse services, reduce gun violence, and reform the criminal justice system and strengthen re-entry services.

Sincerely,

MITCHELL J. LANDRIEU,  
*Mayor of New Orleans, President.*

—  
LAW ENFORCEMENT  
IMMIGRATION TASK FORCE,  
*June 28, 2017.*

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As law enforcement leaders dedicated to preserving the safety and security of our communities, we have concerns about legislative proposals that would attempt to impose punitive, "one-size-fits-all" policies on state and local law enforcement. Rather than strengthening state and local law enforcement by providing us with the tools to work with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in a man-

ner that is responsive to the needs of our communities, these proposals would represent a step backwards.

Attempts to defund so-called sanctuary cities regularly sweep too broadly, punishing jurisdictions that engage in well-established community policing practices or adhere to federal court decisions that have found federal immigration detainers to violate constitutional protections. We oppose these approaches and urge Congress to work to encourage—rather than compel—law enforcement agency cooperation within our federal system.

We believe that law enforcement should not cut corners. Multiple federal courts have questioned the legality and constitutionality of federal immigration detainers that are not accompanied by a criminal warrant signed by a judge. Even though the legality of such immigration holds is doubtful, some have proposed requiring states and localities to enforce them, shielding them from lawsuits. While this approach would reduce potential legal liability faced by some jurisdictions and departments, we are concerned these proposals would still require our agencies and officers carry out federal directives that could violate the U.S. Constitution, which we are sworn to follow.

Immigration enforcement is, first and foremost, a federal responsibility. Making our communities safer means better defining roles and improving relationships between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities. But in attempting to defund "sanctuary cities" and require state and local law enforcement to carry out the federal government's immigration enforcement responsibilities, the federal government would be substituting its judgment for the judgment of state and local law enforcement agencies. Local control has been a beneficial approach for law enforcement for decades—having the federal government compel state and local law enforcement to carry out new and sometimes problematic tasks undermines the delicate federal balance and will harm locally-based policing.

Rather than requiring state and local law enforcement agencies to engage in additional immigration enforcement activities, Congress should focus on overdue reforms of the broken immigration system to allow state and local law enforcement to focus their resources on true threats—dangerous criminals and criminal organizations. We believe that state and local law enforcement must work together with federal authorities to protect our communities and that we can best serve our communities by leaving the enforcement of immigration laws to the federal government. Threatening the removal of valuable grant funding that contributes to the health and well-being of communities across the nation would not make our communities safer and would not fix any part of our broken immigration system.

Our immigration problem is a national problem deserving of a national approach, and we continue to recognize that what our broken system truly needs is a permanent legislative solution—broad-based immigration reform.

Sincerely,

Chief Chris Magnus, Tucson, AZ; Chief Sylvia Moir, Tempe, AZ; Ret. Chief Roberto Villaseñor, Tucson, AZ; Chief Charlie Beck, Los Angeles, CA; Ret. Chief James Lopez, Los Angeles County, CA; Sheriff Margaret Mims, Fresno County, CA; Sheriff Mike Chitwood, Volusia County, FL; Sheriff Paul Fitzgerald, Story County, IA; Chief Wayne Jerman, Cedar Rapids, IA; Sheriff Bill



McCarthy, Polk County, IA; Public Safety Director, Mark Prosser, Storm Lake, IA; Sheriff Lonny Pulkrabek, Johnson County, IA.

Chief Mike Tupper, Marshalltown, IA; Chief William Bones, Boise, ID; Ret. Chief Ron Teachman, South Bend, IN; Ret. Chief James Hawkins, Garden City, KS; Commissioner William Evans, Boston, MA; Chief Ken Ferguson, Framingham, MA; Chief Brian Kyes, Chelsea, MA; Chief Tom Manger, Montgomery County, MD; Chief Todd Axtell, Saint Paul, MN; Sheriff Eli Rivera, Cheshire County, NH; Chief Cel Rivera, Lorain, OH; Public Safety Commissioner Steven Pare, Providence, RI.

Chief William Holbrook, Columbia, SC; Sheriff Leon Lott, Richland County, SC; Ret. Chief Fred Fletcher, Chattanooga, TN; Chief Art Acevedo, Houston, TX; Sheriff Edward Gonzalez, Harris County, TX; Sheriff Sally Hernandez, Travis County, TX; Sheriff Lupe Valdez, Dallas County, TX; Ret. Chief Chris Burbank, Salt Lake City, UT; Sheriff John Urquhart, King County, WA; Asst. Chief Randy Gaber, Madison, WI; Chief Michael Koval, Madison, WI; Chief Todd Thomas, Appleton, WI.

CITIES FOR ACTION,  
June 28, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Cities for Action (C4A) is a coalition of over 150 mayors and municipal leaders that advocates for policies and programs that promote inclusion of foreign-born residents. Our coalition has a deep commitment to promoting public safety and building trust between law enforcement and immigrant communities. We are writing to you today to urge that you oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003.

Cities and counties are united in our opposition to Representative Goodlatte's bill, which would undermine local public safety efforts. Nearly 600 jurisdictions have a variety of policies that would put them at risk of losing millions of dollars in federal funding for local law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives. These policies were adopted due to constitutional concerns and judgements made on the best use of limited resources. Rather than empowering localities to adopt measures designed to enhance the general welfare of their residents, H.R. 3003 would strip localities of the ability to enact common-sense crime prevention policies that ensure victims of crime will seek protection and report crimes.

Among the types of grants that would be at risk are: the Sexual Assault Kit Initiative, which addresses the growing number of unsubmitted sexual assault kits in law enforcement custody and aims to provide help for victims; the Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program, which is designed to create safer neighborhoods through a sustained reduction in gang violence and gun crime; and the Research and Evaluation on Trafficking of Persons, which helps support cities' efforts to respond to the challenges that human trafficking pose in their jurisdiction.

This bill also raises serious concerns by undermining local laws and criminal prosecutions. It would prevent states or localities from establishing laws or policies that

prohibit or "in any way" restrict compliance with or cooperation with federal immigration enforcement. This intrudes into local policies that help foster a relationship of trust between law enforcement officials and immigrants that will, in turn, promote public safety for all our residents.

This also raises serious constitutional concerns. The Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution limits the federal government's ability to mandate particular action by states and localities, including in the area of federal immigration law enforcement and investigations. The federal government cannot force states or localities to enact or administer a federal regulatory program, or compel state or local employees to participate in the administration of a federally enacted regulatory scheme.

In addition, this bill permits DHS to ignore validly issued state or local criminal warrants, which would prevent jurisdictions from completing their prosecution of criminals. The provisions of this bill undercut local law enforcement and will jeopardize public safety efforts.

Local governments have a strong interest in protecting all residents and maintaining public safety. Therefore, we urge you to oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, and ensure it never becomes law.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

CITIES FOR ACTION.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I know my friends think Washington knows best, but I trust my local police more.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, there is no debating that our immigration system is in need of reform. The system doesn't meet the needs of our Nation, its businesses, or its families. There are sensible steps we can take to ensure that it works better and that the rules are followed.

But rather than work in a bipartisan and top-to-bottom fashion to fix our broken laws, today we consider a one-sided and enforcement-only approach that is rejected by the majority of Americans.

This bill would drastically expand and, indeed, compel local involvement with Federal immigration enforcement. Even though the majority often professes its fondness for states' rights and local governance, the bill actually prohibits States and cities from policing themselves as they think best, including by having community trust policies that disentangle local policing from Federal immigration enforcement. These are policies that have proven to engender trust in law enforcement and drive down crime.

The bill prohibits jurisdictions from declining immigration detainer requests, even when compliance would violate binding court orders. In fact, a lot of Federal district courts have found that, when it is time to release an inmate because their sentence has been served, it violates the Fourth

Amendment to hold that individual upon a mere request by the Federal Government. If you want that person, the answer is simple: Get a warrant. It is the Fourth Amendment.

Indeed, the bill also likely violates the 10th Amendment by commanding States to engage in Federal enforcement.

The bill, as has been mentioned, cuts off critical law enforcement funding, and that is why the Fraternal Order of Police has written its letter in opposition to the bill.

Taken together, the provisions of this bill undermine law enforcement's ability to keep communities safe, hurt victims and witnesses of crimes, and likely violate the U.S. Constitution.

It is no surprise this bill is a priority for the Trump administration. Anti-immigrant sentiment may have become the hallmark of the Trump administration, but it does not represent the values of our Nation, and, indeed, the majority of Americans strongly oppose President Trump's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose the bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, just going on this, immigration is an interesting issue, and we can discuss this. There probably are not a lot of folks that I respect more than the gentlewoman from California, but this is a constitutional issue. Immigration is a national issue.

If we are willing to reverse this out and let the States and localities determine immigration, I think we settled that way over 200 years ago. This is where this belongs.

So, as we look at this, Washington is not saying it knows best. But on this issue, it is our domain; it is where we are supposed to be. This is our role.

We believe, simply, that enforcing the law is what we need here. If the gentleman believes that States ought to have more control in a lot of things that we do, then I think maybe I am getting him closer to agreeing with us on healthcare that we need to reform and replace ObamaCare and let States have a little bit more information in that.

But one of the things is that there is no affirmative action on the cities here. I think there is sort of a point to make here. There is no affirmative action on cities or localities to comply with this issue. They are simply, again, as I said earlier, making a choice.

If they choose not to work through it the current way, then they are giving up Federal funding. That is their choice. If they choose to do it, they are giving up Federal funding. They are not being forced and coerced. They are simply saying: You actually look at it; you make the choice in how you want to do it; then explain it to your population. If they are agreeing with that, that is your choice.



One of the things that often is said here is we trot out letters from associations. And I agree. I respect the National Fraternal Order of Police and mayors. They have a great thing. But they also represent members who are, right now, actually, not in compliance with this, who dislike this law. So, naturally, you would say part of their membership is going to be supportive of them.

But, also, growing up in the household of a Georgia State trooper, I also know a few things about law enforcement as well. Law enforcement wants to protect the communities they serve, and they want to enforce the law.

What is happening right now is that local law enforcement is deciding how they are going to do this. They are not cooperating with ICE to find a better way to work in their communities. They are simply saying: We made a political choice to do something.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think with the Constitution, this body has the political choice to say: That is your choice; just do it without Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman, my friend, says that this is a constitutional question. We agree that the Constitution is an important document, and it goes to the heart of why we are opposed to the bill that the gentleman is supporting here. The reason why we say that is because we have had Federal courts that have decided in ways in the past that cause great concern that much in this bill may be unconstitutional.

Now, that is why we should have had hearings, that radical idea that we keep on bringing up, like hearings where people come and testify. But I guess that is too much to ask.

One of the reasons why we are opposed to this is because we are concerned that it may undermine the Constitution, and that is a pretty big deal. I am happy to give the gentleman my copy of the Constitution and references to court cases if he would like to do a little research, but, boy, it would have been nice to have a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter on behalf of 407 local, State, and national immigrant, civil rights, faith-based, and labor organizations in strong opposition to H.R. 3003.

JUNE 28, 2017.

Re Vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 407 undersigned local, state, and national immigrant, civil rights, faith-based, and labor organizations, we urge you to oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, and any similar legislation that jeopardizes public safety, erodes the goodwill forged between local police and

its residents, and perpetuates the criminalization and incarceration of immigrants. H.R. 3003 would strip badly needed law enforcement funding for state and local jurisdictions, runs afoul of the Tenth and Fourth Amendment, and unnecessarily expands the government's detention apparatus. H.R. 3004 unwisely expands the federal government's ability to criminally prosecute immigrants for immigration-based offenses, excludes critical humanitarian protections for those fleeing violence, and doubles down on the failed experiment of incarceration for immigration violations.

Over 600 state and local jurisdictions have policies or ordinances that disentangle their state and local law enforcement agencies from enforcing federal immigration law. The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, seeks to attack so-called "sanctuary" jurisdictions (many of whom do not consider themselves as such) by penalizing state and local jurisdictions that follow the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by refusing to honor constitutionally infirm requests for detainees. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating various federal grants, including funding through the Cops on the Beat program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other federal grant related to law enforcement or immigration. Importantly, using the threat of withholding federal grants to coerce state and local jurisdictions likely runs afoul of the Tenth Amendment's prohibition on commandeering, a position supported by over 300 law professors.

"Sanctuary" policies are critical to promote public safety for local communities. Fearing referral to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, victims and witnesses of crime are significantly less likely to communicate with local law enforcement. Local law enforcement authorities have repeatedly echoed this sentiment, acknowledging that community policing policies are paramount to enhancing public safety. Indeed, "sanctuary" jurisdictions have less crime and more economic development than similarly situated non-"sanctuary" jurisdictions. Withholding critically-needed federal funding would, paradoxically, severely cripple the ability of state and local jurisdictions to satisfy the public safety needs of their communities.

Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, would further criminalize the immigrant community by drastically increasing penalties for immigrants convicted of unlawful reentry. Operation Streamline encapsulates our nation's failed experiment with employing criminal penalties to deter migration. Under Operation Streamline, the federal government prosecutes immigrants for reentry at significant rates. By all practical measures, Operation Streamline has failed to deter migration, wasted billions of taxpayer dollars, and unfairly punished thousands of immigrants who try to enter or reenter the United States to reunite with their children and loved ones. We fear that H.R. 3004's increased penalties for reentry would double down on this failed strategy, explode the prison population, and cost billions of dollars.

Instead of passing discredited enforcement-only legislation, Congress should move forward on enacting just immigration reform legislation that provides a roadmap to citizenship for the nation's eleven million aspiring Americans and eliminates mass detention and deportation programs that undermine fundamental human rights. Legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local democratic processes, and raises serious con-

stitutional concerns represents an abdication of the Congress' responsibility to enact fair, humane, and just immigration policy. In light of the above, we urge you to vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

America's Voice Education Fund; American Federation of Teachers; American Friends Service Committee (AFSC); American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; Americans Committed to Justice and Truth; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF); Asian Americans Advancing Justice—AAJC; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Asian Law Caucus; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO (APALA); Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; ASISTA; Bend the Arc/Jewish Action; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Casa de Esperanza; National Latin@ Network; Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.; Center for American Progress; Center for Employment Training; Center for Gender & Refugee Studies; Center for Law and Social Policy; Center for New Community.

Center for Popular Democracy (CPD); Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Refugee & Immigration Ministries; Christian Community Development Association; Church World Service; Coalition on Human Needs; CODEPINK; Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES); Community Initiatives for Visiting Immigrants in Confinement (CIVIC); Defending Rights & Dissent; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Disciples Home Missions; Dominican Sisters of Sparkill; Drug Policy Alliance; Easterseals Blake Foundation; Equal Rights Advocates; Farmworker Justice; Freedom Network USA; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Fuerza Mundial.

Futures Without Violence; Grassroots Leadership; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic National Bar Association; Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters—USA—JPIC; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Intercommunity Peace & Justice Center; Interfaith Worker Justice; Isaiah Wilson; Jewish Voice for Peace; Jewish Voice for Peace—Boston; Jewish Voice for Peace—Tacoma chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Western MA; Justice Strategies; Kids in Need of Defense (KIND); Lambda Legal; Laotian American National Alliance; Latin America Working Group; Latino Victory Fund; LatinoJustice PRLDEF.

League of United Latin American Citizens; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Mi Familia Vota; Milwaukee Chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace; NAACP; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA); National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON); National Education Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the NLG; National Iranian American Council (NIAC); National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC); National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Latina/o Psychological Association; National Lawyers Guild; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights;

National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; People's Action; PICO National Network; Queer Detainee Empowerment Project; Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services (RAICES); School Social Work Association of America; Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, New Windsor; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); Southern Border Communities Coalition; Southern Poverty Law Center; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank.

The National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health; The Queer Palestinian Empowerment Network; The Sentencing Project; The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants; UndocuBlack Network; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Legislative Ministry of New Jersey; Unitarian Universalist Service Committee; UNITE HERE; United Child Care, Inc.; United for a Fair Economy; UU College of Social Justice; UURISE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee & Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women's Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.

#### STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

(MILU) Mujeres Inmigrantes Luchando Unidas; #VigilantLOVE; 580 Cafe/Wesley Foundation Serving UCLA; Acting in Community Together in Organizing Northern Nevada (ACTIONN); Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Alianza; All for All; Alliance San Diego; Allies of Knoxville's Immigrant Neighbors (AKIN); American Gateways; Aquinas Center; Arkansas United Community Coalition; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Atlanta; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—LA; Asian Americans United; Asian Counseling and Referral Service; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center; Asylee Women Enterprise; Atlas: DIY.

Bear Creek United Methodist Church—Congregation Kol Ami Interfaith Partnership; Bethany Immigration Services; Brighton Park Neighborhood Council;

Cabrini Immigrant Services of NYC; Campaign for Hoosier Families; Canal Alliance; Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition; CASA; Casa Familiar, Inc.; Casa Latina; Casa San Jose; Catholic Charities; Catholic Charities San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin; Causa Oregon; CDWBA Legal Project, Inc.; Central American Legal Assistance; Central New Jersey Jewish Voice for Peace; Central Pacific Conference of the United Church of Christ; Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative (CVIIC); Centro Laboral de Graton.

Centro Latino Americano; Centro Legal de la Raza; Centro Romero; Chelsea Collaborative; Chicago Religious Leadership Network on Latin America; Church Council of Greater Seattle; Church of Our Saviour/La Iglesia de Nuestro Salvador Episcopal; Church Women United in New York State; Cleveland Jobs with Justice; Coalicion de Lideres Latinos-CLILA; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Coalition of African Communities; Coloradans For Immigrant Rights, a program of the American Friends Service Committee; Colorado People's Alliance (COPA); Columbia Legal Services; Comité Pro Uno; Comité VIDA; Committee for Justice in Palestine—Ithaca;

Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, Inc.; Community Legal Services and Counseling Center.

Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto; Community of Friends in Action, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.; CRLA Foundation; CT Working Families; DC-Maryland Justice for Our Neighbors; Delaware Civil Rights Coalition; Do the Most Good Montgomery County (MD); Dominican Sisters—Grand Rapids (MI); Dream Team Los Angeles DTLA; DRUM—Desis Rising Up & Moving; East Bay Sanctuary Covenant; Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon; El CENTRO de Igualdad y Derechos; El Monte Wesleyan Church; Emerald Isle Immigration Center; Employee Rights Center; Encuentro; End Domestic Abuse WI; English Ministry—Korean Presbyterian Church of St. Louis.

Episcopal Refugee & Immigrant Center Alliance; Equal Justice Center; Equality California; Erie Neighborhood House; First Congregational UCC of Portland; First Unitarian Universalist Church of Berks County; Florida Center for Fiscal and Economic Policy; Florida Immigrant Coalition, Inc. (FLIC); Franciscans for Justice; Frida Kahlo Community Organization; Friends of Broward Detainees; Friends of Miami-Dade Detainees; Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights; Gethsemane Lutheran Church; Grassroots Alliance for Immigrant Rights; Greater Lafayette Immigrant Allies; Greater New York Labor Religion Coalition; Greater Rochester COALITION for Immigration Justice; Grupo de Apoyo e Integración Hispanoamericano; HACES.

Hana Center; Harvard Islamic Society; Her Justice; HIAS Pennsylvania; Hispanic Interest Coalition of Alabama; Hispanic Legal Clinic; Hudson Valley Chapter of JVP; Human Rights Initiative of North Texas; ICE-Free Capital District; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immanuel Fellowship; a bilingual congregation; Immigrant Justice Advocacy Movement (IJAM); Immigrant Legal Advocacy Project; Immigration Action Group; Immigration Center for Women and Children; Inland Empire—Immigrant Youth Coalition (IEIYC); Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity; International Institute of Buffalo; Irish International Immigrant Center; IRTF—InterReligious Task Force on Central America and Colombia.

Japanese American Citizens League, San Jose Chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albany, NY chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albuquerque; Jewish Voice for Peace—Austin; Jewish Voice for Peace—Bay Area; Jewish Voice for Peace—Cleveland; Jewish Voice for Peace—DC Metro; Jewish Voice for Peace—Denver; Jewish Voice for Peace—Ithaca; Jewish Voice for Peace—Los Angeles; Jewish Voice for Peace—Madison; Jewish Voice for Peace—New Haven; Jewish Voice for Peace—Philadelphia; Jewish Voice for Peace—Pittsburgh; Jewish Voice for Peace—Portland; Jewish Voice for Peace—San Diego; Jewish Voice for Peace—South Florida; Jewish Voice for Peace—Syracuse, NY; Jewish Voice for Peace—Triangle NC; Jolt.

Justice for our Neighbors Houston; Justice for Our Neighbors Southeastern Michigan; Justice For Our Neighbors West Michigan; JVP-HV. Jewish Voice for Peace—Hudson Valley; Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Kids for College; Kino Border Initiative; Kitsap Immigrant Assistance Center; KIWA (Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance); Korean Resource Center; La Casa de Amistad; La Coalición de Derechos Humanos; La Comunidad, Inc.; La Raza Centro Legal; Lafayette Urban Min-

istry; Las Vegas Chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Latin American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Latino Racial Justice Circle; Latinx Alliance of Lane County; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County.

Legal Services for Children; Lemkin House inc; Long Island Wins; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Middle East Crisis Response (MECR); Migrant and Immigrant Community Action Project; Migrant Justice/Justicia Migrante; MinKwon Center for Community Action; Mission Asset Fund; Mississippi Immigrants Rights Alliance (MIRA); Mosaic Family Services; Movement of Immigrant Leaders in Pennsylvania (MILPA); Mujeres Unidas y Activas; Mundo Maya Foundation; National Lawyers Guild—Los Angeles Chapter; New Jersey Alliance for Immigrant Justice; New Mexico Dream Team; New Mexico Immigrant Law Center; New Mexico Voices for Children.

New Sanctuary Movement of Philadelphia; New York Immigration Coalition; NH Conference United Church of Christ Immigration Working Group; North Carolina Council of Churches; North County Immigration Task Force; North Jersey chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Northern Illinois Justice for Our Neighbors; Northern Manhattan Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project (NWIRP); OCCORD; Occupy Bergen County (New Jersey); OneAmerica; OneJustice; Oregon Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice—IMIRJ; Organized Communities Against Deportations; OutFront Minnesota; Pangea Legal Services; PASO—West Suburban Action Project; Pax Christi Florida; Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition.

Pilgrim United Church of Christ; Pilipino Workers Center; Polonians Organized to Minister to Our Community, Inc. (POMOC); Portland Central America Solidarity Committee; Progreso: Latino Progress; Progressive Jewish Voice of Central PA; Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; Project Hope—Proyecto Esperanza; Project IRENE; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Racial Justice Action Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; Refugees Helping Refugees; Refugio del Rio Grande; Resilience Orange County; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network (RMIAN); Rural and Migrant Ministry; Safe Passage; San Francisco CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates); Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN).

Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, Philadelphia/Delaware Valley Chapter; Sisters of St. Francis, St. Francis Province; Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester, Inc.; Skagit Immigrant Rights Council; Social Justice Collaborative; South Asian Fund For Education, Scholarship And Training (SAFEST); South Bay Jewish Voice for Peace; South Texas Immigration Council; Southeast Immigrant Rights Network; St John of God Church; Students United for Nonviolence; Tacoma Community House; Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition; Teresa Messer, Law Office of Teresa Messer; Thai Community Development Center; The Garden, Lutheran Ministry; The International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit; The Legal Project; Tompkins County Immigrant Rights Coalition; Transgender Resource Center of New Mexico.

Trinity Episcopal Church; U-Lead Athens; Unitarian Universalist Mass Action Network; Unitarian Universalist PA Legislative Advocacy Network (UPLAN); United African Organization; United Families; University Leadership Initiative; University of San

Francisco Immigration and Deportation Defense Clinic; UNO Immigration Ministry; UPLIFT; UpValley Family Centers; VietLead; Vital Immigrant Defense Advocacy & Services, Santa Rosa, CA; Volunteers of Legal Service; Washtenaw Interfaith Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Watertown Citizens for Peace, Justice, and the Environment; Wayne Action for Racial Equality; WeCount!; WESPAC Foundation; Wilco Justice Alliance (Williamson County, TX).

Women Watch Afrika, Inc.; Worksafe; Young Immigrants in Action; YWCA Alaska; YWCA Alliance; YWCA Berkeley/Oakland; YWCA Brooklyn; YWCA Clark County; YWCA Elgin; YWCA Greater Austin; YWCA Greater Pittsburgh; YWCA Greater Portland; YWCA Madison; YWCA Minneapolis; YWCA Mount Desert Island; YWCA NE KANSAS; YWCA of Metropolitan Detroit; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA Olympia; YWCA Pasadena—Foothill Valley; YWCA Rochester & Monroe County; YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts; YWCA Southern Arizona; YWCA Tulsa; YWCA Warren; YWCA Westmoreland County.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting issue with the canvas in the back of the entire immigration laws that need to be addressed.

This body—not the body at the other end of the building, this body—didn't have the guts to address it 4 years ago, 3 years ago, 2 years ago, nor this year. This is something that we need to address, even though it is not the bill itself.

I am a strong supporter of law enforcement. As co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I rise in total opposition to this bill and the rule. Here is what the misguided goal of this bill would do:

You are going to prove a point by penalizing law enforcement for immigration policies politicians in their city have to implement. That is what you want to do. So it absolves us down here in Washington.

This bill threatens the central Federal funding streams for law enforcement. You have heard all of those programs that are being endangered. Any grant administered by the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security that is substantially related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, or naturalization you are putting on the chopping block if this bill becomes law.

This bill would not make our communities safer. In fact, it undermines public safety.

The funding this bill puts at risk allows local police departments to purchase equipment and hire and provide training for officers. This actually jeopardizes the security—read my lips—of communities in order to perpetuate a false narrative about immigrants.

□ 1300

I just received a letter from the New Jersey State Policemen's Benevolent

Association. I think it says it better than anything I could say. It says: "Politics should not interfere with the safety of our members or our ability to do our job."

The police are telling us that, and you are asking them to go out and do the job of protecting our citizens day in and day out—which we all are, I hope—and then you are telling them: But I am sorry, because we have a disagreement on this issue, you are going to suffer the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the New Jersey State Policemen's Benevolent Association.

NEW JERSEY STATE POLICEMEN'S  
BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Woodbridge, NJ, June 28, 2017.

Re H.R. 3003.

HON. WILLIAM PASCARELL, JR.,  
Paterson, NJ.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCARELL: The New Jersey State Policemen's Benevolent Association (NJSPBA) represents over 33,000 law enforcement officers throughout our state. It is no secret that law enforcement officers risk their own safety every day to keep our communities safe. And as a strong supporter of law enforcement on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, we would like to thank you for all your efforts on behalf of the men and women that serve within the law enforcement community.

It is our understanding that this week the House is voting on H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," which adds additional obstacles to funding for the hiring of additional police officers in certain communities throughout our state. Specifically, the bill restricts municipalities from receiving grants administered by the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security if municipal officials fail to notify the federal government with regard to the presence of individuals as it relates to information regarding citizenship or immigration status.

While we strongly agree that state and local law enforcement should work closely with federal law enforcement, cutting off funding for law enforcement to already underfunded and understaffed police departments and law enforcement entities undermines our collective efforts to keep our members and the communities they serve safe. Politics should not interfere with the safety of our members or our ability to do our job.

On behalf of our membership, we appreciate your ongoing efforts and hope you will continue to work with your colleagues in Congress to assure funding for law enforcement and prevent our government from punishing our membership for something that is completely out of our control.

I am available to discuss our opposition to H.R. 3003 further, at your convenience. You can reach me at our NJSPBA offices, if you have any questions.

Thank you for all your efforts on behalf of the men and women of law enforcement.

Sincerely,

PATRICK COLLIGAN,  
State President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, congressional Republicans are doing that

right here. They are playing politics with our Nation's security.

To quote the New Jersey State Policemen's Benevolent Association again—these words are from the police, not me—"... punishing our membership for something that is completely out of our control."

Why are the police opposed to this legislation?

The Fraternal Order of Police you have heard about. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle like to talk the talk when it comes to supporting law enforcement until it either costs money or we are going to have to deal with the bigger factors. That is a fact.

You may laugh all you want, but that is a fact. I can cite you chapter and verse if you want. This is no laughing matter. This is business. This is the lives of the police.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will address my remarks to the Chair, but I also will not stand here and let it be said from some political angle that the son of a Georgia State trooper has anything less than respect for law enforcement or wants anything more than to have law enforcement agencies do their job. And this is exactly what we are talking about. Do your job.

If you want to make a political statement, then work it out politically. But this is: Do your job, keep the law.

I mean, what else—are we going to get another letter from another police association saying: Well, we decided we are not going to enforce Federal whatever else?

This is an issue that needs to be discussed, and I will just simply say, from this perspective, of one who has lived it for 50 years and who lived it under the same house for 21 years, no, there is no one that respects law enforcement and their role more than this Member. And this Member is simply reflecting a lot of views of law enforcement.

This says: Let us do our job. We will work on these issues, but you are making a choice. If you don't want to enforce it, then don't take the money. Do what you want to do. Just don't take the money.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) in order to respond.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very pathetic way to look at our police officers in this country. "If you don't like it, don't take the money."

You must be kidding me. I urge my colleagues to find a different tactic to

penalize political decisions that you don't like.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are, again, reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to individuals on the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we do defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule to bring up Representative BOBBY SCOTT's Raise the Wage Act, H.R. 15, which would finally give workers the raise they deserve, and increase the Federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, America needs a raise. We have not raised the minimum wage in 10 years, and people who work hard every single day have seen their pay erode again and again.

Mr. Speaker, people who are working full time at \$7.25 an hour can't make it. And if we can defeat this previous question, we can actually bring up something that the American people really need, which is to get a raise.

Mr. Speaker, this is not something we are going to dump on top of business all at once. There is a ladder up. It takes 7 years to get to that \$15, but, Mr. Speaker, make no doubt that we need to do it.

Mr. Speaker, right now, today, people working full time qualify for food stamps, housing assistance, and medical assistance because their employers don't pay them enough to make it. And I know that everybody in this House knows that, when people work hard, they ought to be able to make it in America.

If you work full time, you shouldn't be in poverty. You should be able to afford a good apartment. You should be able to have good scheduling for your job. You should have some benefits. This is all the American Dream is about, being able to work hard and get paid fairly for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to let you know that between 2009 and 2013, we saw the top 1 percent of income earners get 85 percent of the income growth in this country. That means we have historic inequality not seen since the Great Depression. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker. And if we can defeat this previous question, we should do everything we can to pass this excellent

piece of legislation that Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT has authored in this body.

Mr. SCOTT and I, as well as many other Members, have been all over this country, and right here in D.C. standing with workers explaining to us their struggles, how they haven't seen a raise, how they haven't seen their pay go up. And they are serious, Mr. Speaker, about wanting to be part of this economy, too.

Pass this minimum wage increase. Give America a raise.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the reason why we are trying to bring this to the floor by way of defeating the previous question is because the Republican majority in this House had basically locked everything down so we can't get important bills to the floor.

We can't even get amendments to the underlying bill that we are debating here today. It is really unfortunate and sad for this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill wrongfully endorses political interference with professional law enforcement leaders. With no legal authority, both President Trump and his Texan look-alike, Governor Greg Abbott, want to deny funds and intimidate local governments, who rightfully refuse to place politics above public safety.

I will tell my Republican colleague from Georgia, and his colleagues, that the only lawlessness that exists here is the lawlessness of President Trump in trying to do this to such an extent that a Federal court order stopped him. And they will also, I believe, stop Governor Abbott on his outrageous Senate Bill 4.

Our police chiefs in San Antonio and in Austin, our courageous Sheriff, Sally Hernandez, like many law enforcement professionals from Texas to New Jersey, they say that maintaining the trust and confidence of the immigrant community to report crime, to be witnesses concerning crime, that this makes us all safer—immigrant and nonimmigrant alike.

Any proper arrest warrant presented by ICE will be honored everywhere. Detainers, which are merely a bureaucratic message saying the bureaucracy is suspicious of someone who should be imprisoned based on that suspicion, will not be kept imprisoned—and Federal courts have said they should not be—under the Constitution.

I would say that the only sanctuary that this bill provides is a sanctuary for prejudice. It is a sanctuary that defies the reality of the America we have today, particularly in the Southwest.

We should reject this bill and affirm welcoming cities, like mine, that are a refuge from anti-immigrant hysteria, but have a strong commitment to safe-

ty and to effective law enforcement, and looking to our local law enforcement, not political interference from Washington telling us how to protect our families.

This very week, four years ago, an overwhelming bipartisan United States Senate majority approved comprehensive immigration reform. And like the amendments that are being blocked today, these House Republicans were so fearful that that bill might become law that they will not even permit us to even debate it four years later on the floor of this House.

Instead of this anti-immigrant hysteria, instead of this sorry piece of legislation, what we need is broad immigration reform, and we need it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), our former chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the underlying bill, H.R. 3003, No Sanctuary for Criminals Act; and I thank the chairman, BOB GOODLATTE, and Representatives STEVE KING and ANDY BIGGS for introducing it.

This legislation keeps dangerous criminal immigrants off our streets and out of our neighborhoods, and it holds sanctuary cities accountable for breaking Federal immigration laws. I have a special interest in this legislation because it enforces a bill I sponsored in 1969, which was enacted into law and made sanctuary cities illegal.

The American people sent a clear message to Congress last November when they elected a President who promised to enforce our immigration laws. A recent poll shows that 80 percent—80 percent—of voters want cities that arrest illegal immigrants for crimes to be required to turn them over to immigration authorities. Eighty percent. That is a Harvard-Harris poll.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act is a down payment on our pledge to protect innocent Americans from criminal immigrants who deserve to be jailed or sent back to their home countries. We need to enact this legislation. There is simply no excuse for local governments to ignore immigration laws at the expense of American's safety and well-being.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to the entire Congress from the American Immigration Lawyers Association in opposition to this bill; a letter from Amnesty International in opposition to this bill; and a letter from

Church World Services in opposition to this bill.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN IMMIGRATION LAWYERS ASSOCIATION OPPOSING THE “NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT” (H.R. 3003) AND “KATE’S LAW” (H.R. 3004), JUNE 27, 2017.

As the national bar association of over 15,000 immigration lawyers and law professors, the American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA) opposes “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act” (H.R. 3003) and “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004). AILA recommends that members of Congress reject these bills which are scheduled to come before the House Rules Committee on June 27 and to the floor shortly thereafter. Though Judiciary Chairman Goodlatte stated that the bills will “enhance public safety,” they will do the just the opposite: undermine public safety and make it even harder for local law enforcement to protect their residents and communities. In addition, the bills which were made public less than a week before the vote and completely bypassed the Judiciary Committee, include provisions that will result in violations of due process and the Fourth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

At a time when over 9 out of 10 Americans support immigration reform and legalization of the undocumented, Republican leadership is asking the House to vote on enforcement-only bills that will lead to more apprehensions, deportations, and prosecutions of thousands of immigrants and their families who have strong ties to the United States. Instead of criminalizing and scapegoating immigrants, Congress should be offering workable reforms that will strengthen our economy and our country.

#### THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT, H.R. 3003

H.R. 3003 would undermine public safety and interfere with local policing: H.R. 3003 would amend 8 U.S.C. 1373 to prevent states or localities from establishing laws or policies that prohibit or “in any way” restrict compliance with or cooperation with federal immigration enforcement. The bill dramatically expands 8 U.S.C. §1373 which is more narrowly written and prohibits local law enforcement from restricting the sharing and exchange of information with federal authorities, but only with respect to an individual’s citizenship or immigration status.

Rather than empowering localities, the extremely broad wording of H.R. 3003 would strip localities of the ability to enact common-sense crime prevention policies that ensure victims of crime will seek protection and report crimes. The bill would also undermine public safety by prohibiting DHS from honoring criminal warrants of communities deemed “sanctuary cities” if the individual being sought by local law enforcement has a final order of removal.

Under H.R. 3003, localities that fail to comply with federal immigration efforts are penalized with the denial of federal funding for critical law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and Byrne JAG programs that provide hundreds of millions of dollars to localities nationwide.

In an effort to force localities to engage in civil immigration enforcement efforts, including those against nonviolent undocumented immigrants, the bill would make it far more difficult for many localities, including large cities, to arrest and prosecute potentially dangerous criminals. The bill could

even offer criminals a form of immunity, knowing that any crimes they commit in a designated sanctuary city would result, at most, in their removal from the country as opposed to criminal prosecution.

H.R. 3003 would run afoul of constitutional safeguards in the Fourth Amendment: By prohibiting localities from restricting or limiting their own cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, H.R. 3003 effectively compels localities to honor ICE detainer requests—a controversial and constitutionally suspect practice that is nonetheless widely-used by ICE. Federal courts have found that ICE use of detainers violates the Fourth Amendment, and that localities may be held liable for honoring them.

The bill also expands detainer authority by establishing that ICE may issue detainer requests for localities to hold undocumented immigrants for up to 96 hours—twice what is currently allowed—even if probable cause has not been shown. Courts have concluded that localities cannot continue detaining someone unless ICE obtains a warrant from a neutral magistrate who has determined there is probable cause, or in the case of a warrantless arrest, review by a neutral magistrate within 48 hours of arrest. The expansive provisions in H.R. 3003 would force localities to choose between detaining people in violation of the Constitution or being punished as a “sanctuary city.”

Furthermore, this bill provides government actors and private contractors with immunity if they are sued for violating the Constitution. Provisions in this bill transfer the financial burden of litigation by substituting the federal government for the local officers as the defendant. If H.R. 3003 becomes law, American taxpayers would be stuck paying for lawsuits brought by those who are unjustly detained.

The bill goes even further by creating a private right of action allowing crime victims or their family members to sue localities if the crime was committed by someone who was released by the locality that did not honor an ICE detainer request.

H.R. 3003 would violate the Tenth Amendment: H.R. 3003 would compel states and localities to utilize their local law enforcement resources to implement federal civil immigration enforcement in violation of the Tenth Amendment’s “commandeering” principle. The Tenth Amendment does not permit the federal government to force counties and cities to allocate local resources, including police officers, technology, and personnel, to enforce federal immigration law. The federal government also cannot withhold funds from localities refusing to participate in federal efforts if the programs affected are unrelated to the purpose of the federal program, or if the sanctions are punitive in nature.

H.R. 3003 would expand detention without due process: H.R. 3003 would increase the use of detention without ensuring those detained have access to a bond determination. Under the bill, nearly anyone who is undocumented, including those who have overstayed their visa would be subject to detention without a custody hearing. The bill also establishes that DHS has the authority to detain individuals “without time limitation” during the pendency of removal proceedings. These provisions would dramatically expand the federal government’s power to indefinitely detain individuals, and would likely result in ever growing numbers of undocumented immigrants held in substandard detention facilities.

#### KATE’S LAW, H.R. 3004

H.R. 3004 would expand the already severe penalties in federal law for illegal reentry

(NA 276; 8 U.S.C. 1326). The number of people prosecuted for illegal reentry has grown steadily to about 20,000 prosecutions each year, and such cases comprise more than one quarter of all federal criminal prosecutions nationwide. H.R. 3004 adds sentencing enhancements for people who are convicted of minor misdemeanors and people who have reentered multiple times but have no criminal convictions. This bill will not improve public safety and will undermine due process and protections for asylum seekers. H.R. 3004 would waste American taxpayer funds by imposing severe prison sentences upon thousands of people who pose no threat to the community and who have strong ties to the country and are trying to unite with their loved ones.

H.R. 3004 would impose severe sentencing enhancements upon people with minor offenses: H.R. 3004 would add sentencing enhancements for minor misdemeanor convictions, including driving without a license and other traffic-related offenses. Under the current version of INA §276, if a person is charged with reentering the U.S. after being removed, their punishment is enhanced by up to ten years only if they have been convicted a felony or three or more misdemeanors involving drugs or violence. Under H.R. 3004 someone who has been convicted of any three misdemeanors regardless of severity would be subject to a term of up to ten years.

This expansion would unfairly target large numbers of people who are not a threat to public safety but instead are trying to reunite with family members and have other strong ties to the United States. Currently half of all people convicted of illegal reentry have one child living in the country. Increasing sentences for illegal reentry would also waste taxpayer dollars, costing huge amounts of money to lock up non-violent people.

H.R. 3004 would punish people who attempt to seek asylum at the border: H.R. 3004 expands the provisions of INA 276 to punish not only people who reenter the U.S. or attempt to reenter the U.S., but also people who cross or attempt to cross the border. The bill goes on to define “crosses the border” to mean “the physical act of crossing the border, regardless of whether the alien is free from official restraint.” That means that people who present themselves at ports of entry to request asylum and are taken into custody by CBP to await a fear screening would be subject to criminal charges based on a past removal, even though they are seeking refuge in the U.S.

H.R. 3004 would impose severe sentencing enhancements for people with multiple entries: The bill would also create new sentencing enhancements for people who have reentered the U.S. multiple times, even if they have no other criminal convictions. If someone has been removed three or more times, and is found in the United States or attempts to cross the border again, H.R. 3004 law would provide for sentencing enhancements of up to ten years. The bill makes no exception for bona fide asylum seekers, which means that people who are seeking refuge in the U.S. from atrocities abroad could be subject to a lengthy prison sentence under these provisions.

H.R. 3004 would undermine due process by blocking challenges to unfair removal orders: The bill will prevent an individual from challenging the validity of a removal order, even it was fundamentally unfair in the first place. The Supreme Court held in *U.S. v. Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828 (1987) that due

process requires that a challenge be allowed if a deportation proceeding is used as an element of a criminal offense and where the proceeding “effectively eliminate[d] the right of the alien to obtain judicial review.” This provision in H.R. 3004 is likely unconstitutional and will cause grave injustice to defendants, such as asylum seekers who were deported without the opportunity to seek asylum.

—  
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL,  
June 28, 2017.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL USA URGES A VOTE  
“NO” ON H.R. 3003 AND H.R. 3004

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Amnesty International USA (“AIUSA”) and our more than one million members and supporters nationwide, we strongly urge you to oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act (H.R. 3003) and Kate’s Law (H.R. 3004). Both bills are scheduled for House floor votes as early as June 28. If passed, both bills would pave the way for and accelerate the implementation of policies that increase the criminalization and detention of immigrants and asylum seekers, thereby violating the United States’ obligations under international law.

AIUSA will be scoring these votes.

I. The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act (H.R. 3003) would prevent municipalities from determining how law enforcement agencies are engaging in immigration enforcement, and would dramatically expand indefinite detention and mandatory detention of immigrants in jail-like facilities with subpar dangerous conditions, in violation of international human rights standards.

H.R. 3003 would prevent localities from enacting community trust policies that instruct local police not to carry out federal immigration enforcement, thereby undermining policing practices designed to build trust and confidence between local law enforcement and the communities they serve. This bill would open the door to racial profiling against Latinos and other communities of color, including U.S. citizens.

International law firmly prohibits discrimination, and the United States’ commitment to those obligations applies to citizens and non-citizens alike.

States that have passed anti-immigrant legislation that requires local law enforcement to cooperate with immigration agencies or to inquire about immigration status regarding any interactions with law enforcement have compromised the right to justice for immigrant survivors from reporting crimes.

The U.S. government has an obligation to prevent and address abuse of immigrants and ensure that all immigrants are able to access available remedies. This includes acting with due diligence to investigate and punish criminal conduct committed by private individuals, and guaranteeing access to justice for immigrant victims of crime.

Amnesty International has also documented how the increased involvement of state and local law enforcement agencies in immigration enforcement, without adequate oversight and accountability to prevent abuses, contributes to the rise in reports of racial profiling for Latino communities and other communities of color. Numerous studies have demonstrated that programs that integrate the criminal justice system and law enforcement as an entry point for immigration enforcement have led to racial profiling and other abuses.

In addition, H.R. 3003 would dramatically expand the Department of Homeland Security (“DES”) immigration detention powers

by authorizing mandatory detention “without time limitation.” This would empower the DHS to detain untold numbers of immigrants for as long as it takes to conclude immigration court removal proceedings, even if that takes years. Section 4 would also authorize indefinite mandatory detention. Without providing the basic due process of an immigration judge bond hearing to determine if the immigrant’s imprisonment was justified in the first place. Finally, section 4 would expand mandatory detention of immigrants with no criminal record whatsoever, including immigrants who overstayed a visa or lack legal papers.

The mandatory detention system, which provides for the automatic detention of individuals, amounts to arbitrary detention, and is in violation of international law, which requires that detention be justified in each individual case and be subject to judicial review. The expansion of offenses which would fall under mandatory detention as demonstrated in H.R., as proposed by H.R. 3003, amounts to arbitrary detention, and is in violation of international law, which requires that detention be justified in each individual case and be subject to judicial review. U.S. federal courts have also consistently held that detaining immigrants for months and years without bond hearings raises serious problems under the Due Process Clause of the Constitution.

The proposed dramatic expansion of immigration detention powers envisioned in H.R. 3003 comes at a time when immigration detention has already hit record-highs, with the average daily population (“ADP”) exceeding 40,000 in comparison to a 34,000 ADP for the preceding seven years. This sharp escalation in the number of detained immigrants also comes at a time when Human Rights Watch (“HRW”) has reported new evidence of dangerously subpar medical care in immigration detention, including unreasonable delays in care and unqualified medical staff that are likely to expose a record number of immigrants to dangerous conditions. This recent HRW report is only the latest of a series of shocking reports documenting DHS’s failure to provide care to ill or injured immigrants in its custody.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which the United States has ratified, guarantees all people the rights to be free from discrimination and arbitrary arrest and detention, and the right to due process, including fair deportation procedures. Finally, noncitizens who are detained have a right to humane conditions of detention and are entitled to prompt review of their detention by an independent court. The mass expansion of mandatory detention and immigration detention proposed by H.R. 3003 violates all of these international human rights standards.

II. H.R. 3004 would increase mass incarceration of immigrants, including survivors of persecution or torture, by increasing criminal penalties for the mere act of migration—in violation of international human rights standards.

Current law already criminalizes illegal reentry in violation of international law and standards under 8 U.S.C. §1326, imposing a sentence of up to 20 years on anyone convicted of illegal reentry after committing an aggravated felony. According to data compiled by the Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse at Syracuse University, in fiscal year 2016 federal criminal prosecutions for illegal entry, reentry, and similar immigration violations made up 52 percent of all federal prosecutions nationwide—surpassing

drugs, weapons, fraud and thousands of other crimes.

Criminal penalties for unauthorized entry are obstacles for identifying the victims of human rights abuses, and prevent victims from seeking justice. They undermine human rights protections afforded in international law, including the right to seek asylum. The Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants has repeatedly stressed that where detention is used as a punitive measure, it is disproportionate and inappropriate, and stigmatizes undocumented immigrants as criminals.

The criminal prosecution of illegal reentry has grown exponentially over the past decade. In 2002 there were 8,000 prosecutions for illegal reentry; in 2012 these prosecutions had increased to 37,000. Nearly 99 percent of illegal reentry defendants were sentenced to federal prison time, ranging from a few days to 10 years or more for felony reentry before they are eventually deported.

Beyond the trend towards more aggressive criminal prosecutions for illegal reentry, a 2015 U.S. Sentencing Commission report found nearly 50 percent of people sentenced in fiscal 2013 for illegal reentry had at least one child living in the U.S. Many of the individuals charged with illegal reentry previously resided in the U.S. for many years and are desperate to return to their family in the U.S.

On top of this longstanding trend of harsher criminal prosecution for illegal reentry—the sponsors of H.R. 3004 would seek to expand the category of individuals subject to illegal reentry prosecution to include people who surrender themselves at the southern border to seek protection in the U.S. The bill would also expand sentencing enhancements for illegal reentry, and would prosecute people for illegal reentry even if their previous removal orders were unlawful or deprived them of the opportunity to seek protection. For example, the bill would criminalize asylum seekers who return to the U.S. after being previously denied the opportunity to present their claims for protection.

While all sovereign states have a legitimate interest in regulating entry into their territories, they can only do so within the limits of their obligations under international law. The U.S. government has an obligation under international human rights law to ensure that its laws, policies, and practices do not place immigrants at an increased risk of human rights abuses. Specifically, individuals have a right to seek asylum from persecution and protection from refoulement, and prosecuting asylum seekers prior to adjudication of their asylum applications violates U.S. obligations under the Refugee Convention. Similarly the Convention Against Torture prohibits a State from expelling, returning, or extraditing a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that s/he would be in danger of being subjected to torture. Finally, all individuals, regardless of immigration status, have a right to family unity which can include limits on the State’s power to deport, as recognized by the Human Rights Committee’s interpretation of ICCPR obligations.

All of these international human rights standards are violated by H.R. 3004.

AIUSA strongly urges you to oppose both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

Sincerely,

JOANNE LIN,  
Senior Managing Director,  
Advocacy and Government Affairs.



CWS STATEMENT TO OPPOSING H.R. 3003, THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT, AND H.R. 3004, KATE'S LAW

As a 71-year old humanitarian organization representing 37 Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox communions and 34 refugee resettlement offices across the country, Church World Service (CWS) urges all Members of Congress to support the longstanding efforts of law enforcement officials to foster trusting relationships with the communities they protect and serve. As we pray for peace and an end to senseless acts of violence that are too prevalent in this country, CWS encourages the U.S. Congress to refrain from politicizing tragedies or conflating the actions of one person with an entire community of our immigrant brothers and sisters and oppose H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law.

H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, would target more than 600+ cities, counties, and states across the country and threaten to take away millions of dollars in federal funding that local police use to promote public safety. Communities are safer when they commit to policies that strengthen trust and cooperation between local law enforcement, community leadership and institutions, and all residents, regardless of immigration status. The Federal government should not hurt intentional, community-based policing efforts that are vital in communities across the country. Many cities have already recognized that requests by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to hold individuals beyond their court-appointed sentences violate due process and have been found unconstitutional by federal courts. This bill would raise profound constitutional concerns by prohibiting localities from declining to comply with ICE detainer requests even when such compliance would violate federal court orders and the U.S. Constitution. Local police that refuse ICE detainer requests see an increase in public safety due to improved trust from the community. It is precisely this trust that enables community members to report dangerous situations without the fear of being deported or separated from their families. When local police comply with ICE detainer requests, more crimes go unreported because victims and witnesses are afraid of being deported if they contact the police. This bill would also undermine local criminal prosecutions by allowing the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ignore state or local criminal warrants and refuse to transfer individuals to state or local custody in certain circumstances. This bill would reduce community safety by preventing state and local jurisdictions from holding people accountable.

The United States already spends more than \$18 billion on immigration enforcement per year, more than all other federal law enforcement agencies combined. H.R. 3004, Kate's Law, would expand the federal government's ability to prosecute individuals for "illegal reentry" and impose even more severe penalties in these cases—even though prosecutions for migration-related offenses already make up more than 50% of all federal prosecutions. Yet, this bill does not include adequate protections for individuals who reenter the U.S. in order to seek protection, which would place asylum seekers at risk of being returned to the violence and persecution they fled. We have seen how Border Patrol's current practices violate existing U.S. law and treaty obligations by preventing viable asylum claims from moving forward. DHS has found that in some areas, Border

Patrol refers asylum seekers for criminal prosecution despite the fact that they have expressed fear of persecution. In May 2017, a report was released highlighting that many asylum seekers, who had expressed a fear of returning to their home countries are being turned away by GBP agents. New barriers to protection are unnecessary and would dangerously impede our obligations under international and U.S. law.

Federal, state, and local policies that focus on deportation do not reduce crime rates. Individuals are being deported who present no risk to public safety and who are long-standing community members, including parents of young children. Immigrants come to this country to reunite with family, work, and make meaningful contributions that enrich their communities. Several studies over the last century have affirmed that all immigrants, regardless of nationality or status, are less likely than U.S. citizens to commit violent crimes. A recent report found a correlation between the increase in undocumented immigrants, and the sharp decline in violent and property crime rates. Immigration is correlated with significantly higher employment growth and a decline in the unemployment rate, and immigrants have high entrepreneurial rates, creating successful businesses that hire immigrant and U.S. citizen employees.

As communities of faith, we are united by principles of compassion, stewardship, and justice. CWS urges all Members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law. What we need are real solutions and immigration policies that treat our neighbors with the dignity and respect that all people deserve and affirm local law enforcement officer's efforts to build trust with their communities.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, Mr. Speaker, our objection is that Washington doesn't always know best. We ought to trust our local law enforcement officials, our local police as to what is effective in terms of protecting the citizens of our community.

To introduce legislation that would essentially punish our local police for doing what they think is in the best interest of their communities, this bill should be renamed "punish our local police," because that is what it does.

I can't believe that we are going down this road. Maybe it is a nice sound bite, maybe it is a nice press release, maybe it fits in with the Trump campaign rhetoric on immigrants and immigration; but this is just a lousy idea. And I think if we did hearings on this bill, if we actually spent some time being thoughtful about this issue, my colleagues would come to that conclusion.

Again, I would say that what we should be talking about is fixing our broken immigration system. We need comprehensive immigration reform. The Senate, in a bipartisan way, stepped up to the plate and did it. It is about time Members of this House have the guts to bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the floor and fix our broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3003. This is a very positive first step toward coming to grips with an issue that has divided this country because it is causing great damage to so many Americans.

What we are talking about is not immigrant hysteria. That type of mixing legal immigrants with illegal immigrants, that is the true racism because it hurts those people who have come here legally. Now, what we have got here are legal immigrants who are being cast into the same pot as illegals, with the opposition to this bill.

People who are here legally understand that we need protection for people who are here in this country against, especially, criminals who come from overseas and illegal aliens who are criminals, at that.

Working Americans of every race, religion, and ethnic group have seen that their families are less secure, and they are even sometimes being murdered by the insane lack of action on the part of our government to protect our citizens.

Our number one responsibility is to make sure our own people, legal immigrants, and all Americans of every race, creed, and color are protected.

And what do they see?

This massive flood of illegals coming into our country, taking jobs, bidding down wages, lowering the education standards and the healthcare that most Americans rely upon.

□ 1315

No wonder the American people want action. But then, when they are faced with a city saying even criminals who have committed acts of aggression, murder, et cetera, upon our citizens, that we are going to let them just stay, and that there is going to be a block.

Whose side are you on is what this amendment is all about. Are we on the side of the American people? Are we on the side of those victims who work hard every day and try to raise their families; or are we on the side of a massive flow of people, many of whom, and most of whom, are good people?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Most of the people who come here, most of the people flooding here, even the illegals, are basically wonderful people. But that doesn't mean that we can bring in more than that, 1 million—

By the way, we need to understand, don't condemn America on its immigration policy. We let a million legal immigrants into our country every year, and that is more than the rest of the world combined. We can be proud of that.

But, at the same time, we have to make sure that our people are protected, that they don't lose their jobs,



or they don't have to accept less money for the same work because you have got somebody here who will work for nothing.

We want to make sure when they need their healthcare, they get their healthcare. That will bankrupt our system. Are we going to have a sanctuary healthcare system, too, so anybody in the world can come here and use up our scarce health dollars?

No, it is time for us to strike a blow for the protection of Americans and legal immigrants of every race and religion and ethnic background, not to show these things. Immigrant hysteria; shame, shame, shame.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD a letter to every Member of Congress from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights in opposition to this bill; a letter to all of us from the ACLU in opposition to this bill; a letter to every Member of Congress from the National Task Force to End Sexual & Domestic Violence that is in opposition to this bill; as well as a letter to Members of Congress from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Catholic Charities USA in opposition to this bill; and a letter from NETWORK, which is a lobby for Catholic social justice in opposition to this bill.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE  
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

OPPOSE THE "NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT" (H.R. 3003) AND "KATE'S LAW" (H.R. 3004)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition of more than 200 national advocacy organizations, I urge you to oppose H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," and H.R. 3004, "Kate's Law." These two bills may sound "tough," but they would ultimately make the problems with our national immigration system even worse than they already are.

H.R. 3003 would unnecessarily and unwisely penalize states and municipalities that are attempting to strike the delicate balance between cooperating with federal immigration authorities, on one hand, and respecting the constraints imposed on them by the U.S. Constitution, on the other. At the same time, it would do nothing to address the constitutional concerns raised by the use of immigration "detainer" requests, concerns that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) itself has recognized in the past.

Among its provisions, H.R. 3003 would eliminate various federal law enforcement grants to states and municipalities, such as the "Cops on the Beat" program, unless jurisdictions comply with all DHS detainer requests. It aims to overturn local policies adopted by over 300 jurisdictions across the country that have determined, as a matter of constitutional law and sound public policy, including community policing efforts, that they cannot hold individuals beyond their release dates solely on the basis of a DHS detainer request.

The senseless and tragic 2015 killing of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco has renewed the debate over so-called "sanctuary cities." Yet the term suggests, incorrectly,

that certain states and municipalities are refusing to work with federal immigration enforcement authorities. The truth is that state and local law enforcement agencies ("LEAs") throughout the country already aid in the identification of individuals who are subject to immigration enforcement action through the sharing of fingerprints of those who are taken into custody. LEAs with limited detainer policies have determined, however, that they cannot continue to detain individuals for immigration enforcement purposes, under the Fourth Amendment and pursuant to numerous court rulings, unless DHS obtains a judicial warrant, as all other law enforcement agencies are required to do.

H.R. 3003 would not address the Fourth Amendment concerns raised by the use of DHS detainers. Instead, it would leave many state and municipal governments in an untenable position: either they must disregard their constitutional responsibilities and erode the trust they have built between the police and the communities they serve, or they will face the loss of vital federal law enforcement funding that helps them fight crime in their jurisdictions. Congress should not force such an arbitrary and unwise choice on cities.

H.R. 3004, the other immigration-related bill expected to come to the House floor this week, would significantly increase sentences for previously-removed individuals who reenter the country. While the bill is an improvement over other bills by the same name, in that it does not include mandatory minimum sentencing provisions, it would still lead to a likely increase in the federal prison population without any tangible benefits. The Department of Justice's "Operation Streamline" program, upon which this bill would build, has already shown that increased criminal prosecutions do little but waste resources while failing to deter unauthorized border crossings. It should be ended, not expanded.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote against H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

Sincerely,

VANITA GUPTA,  
President & CEO.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Re ACLU Opposes H.R. 3003 (No Sanctuary for Criminals Act) and H.R. 3004 (Kate's Law).

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU"), we submit this letter to the House of Representatives to express our strong opposition to H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law.

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT (H.R. 3003)

H.R. 3003 conflicts with the principles of the Fourth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 defies the Fourth Amendment by amending 8 USC Section 1373 of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") to force localities to comply with unlawful detainer requests or risk losing federal funding. This is despite the fact that an "increasing number of federal court decisions" have held that "detainer-based detention by state and local law enforcement agencies violates the Fourth Amendment," as recognized by

former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson in 2014.

Disturbingly, H.R. 3003 seeks to penalize the 600+ localities that abide by the Fourth Amendment. These jurisdictions have recognized that by entangling local authorities and federal immigration enforcement, immigration detainers erode trust between immigrant communities and local law enforcement. In this way, immigration detainers ultimately undermine public safety, as entire communities become wary of seeking assistance from police and other government authorities that are supposed to provide help in times of need. Thus, by forcing jurisdictions to comply with unlawful detainer requests, H.R. 3003 will only make communities less safe, not more.

H.R. 3003 would also amend Section 287 of the INA to allow the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") to take custody of a person being held under a detainer within 48 hours (excluding weekends and holidays) "but in no instance more than 96 hours" following the date that the individual would otherwise be released from criminal custody. This, again, raises serious Fourth Amendment concerns, as the Supreme Court has stated that the Constitution requires a judicial finding of probable cause within 48 hours of arrest. This provision would disregard the Court's ruling entirely and allow a local law enforcement agency to hold a person for up to 7 days before requiring DHS intervention—and never requiring the person be brought before a judge for a probable cause hearing.

Protection against unreasonable detention by the government is the bedrock of the Constitution's Fourth Amendment, which provides that the government cannot hold anyone in jail without getting a warrant or approval from a neutral magistrate. This constitutional protection applies to everyone in the United States—citizen and immigrant alike.

Immigration detainers, however, do not abide by these standards. Detainers are one of the key tools that DHS uses to apprehend individuals who come in contact with local and state law enforcement agencies. An immigration detainer is a written request from DHS to that local law enforcement agency, requesting that they detain an individual for an additional 48 hours after the person's release date, in order to allow immigration agents extra time to decide whether to take that person into custody for deportation purposes.

DHS' use of detainers to imprison people without due process, without any charges pending, and without probable cause of a criminal violation flies in the face of our Fourth Amendment protections. Policies that allow DHS to detain people at-will are ripe for civil and human rights violations and have resulted in widespread wrongful detentions, including detentions of U.S. citizens. That is why many of the 600+ localities targeted by H.R. 3003 have decided not to execute a DHS immigration detainer request unless it is accompanied by additional evidence, a determination of probable cause, or a judicial warrant.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3003 does nothing to address the fundamental constitutional problems plaguing DHS's use of immigration detainers. Rather than fix the constitutional problems by requiring a judicial warrant, the bill perpetuates the unconstitutional detainer practices and forces the federal government to absorb legal liability for the constitutional violations which will inevitably result. This is irresponsible lawmaking. Instead of saddling taxpayers with the liability

the federal government will incur from Fourth Amendment violations, Congress should end the use of DHS's unconstitutional detainer requests.

H.R. 3003 violates the Due Process Clause by allowing DHS to detain people indefinitely without a bond hearing.

Section 4 of H.R. 3003 radically expands our immigration detention system by amending Section 236(c) of the INA to authorize mandatory detention "without time limitation." This empowers DHS to detain countless immigrants for as long as it takes to conclude removal proceedings—even if that takes years—without the basic due process of a bond hearing to determine if their imprisonment is even justified. This is a clear constitutional violation, as the federal courts have overwhelmingly held that jailing immigrants for months and years without bond hearings raises serious problems under the Due Process Clause.

Although the bill claims to provide for the "detention of criminal aliens," it massively expands mandatory detention to people with no criminal record whatsoever, including immigrants who lack legal papers or who overstay a tourist visa. The "lock 'em up" approach to immigration enforcement is cruel, irrational, and unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has permitted brief periods of mandatory detention only in cases where individuals are charged with deportation based on certain criminal convictions. The Court has not endorsed the mandatory lock-up of people who have never committed a crime.

KATE'S LAW (H.R. 3004)

H.R. 3004 is piecemeal immigration enforcement that expands America's federal prison population and lines the coffers of private prison companies.

Increasing the maximum sentences for illegal reentrants is unnecessary, wasteful, and inhumane. H.R. 3004 envisions a federal criminal justice system that prosecutes asylum-seekers, persons providing humanitarian assistance to migrants in distress, and parents who pose no threat to public safety in returning to the U.S. to reunite with children who need their care (individuals with children in the United States are 50 percent of those convicted of illegal reentry).

Current law already imposes a sentence of up to 20 years on anyone convicted of illegally reentering the country who has committed an aggravated felony. U.S. Attorneys' Offices aggressively enforce these provisions. According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, immigration prosecutions account for 52 percent of all federal prosecutions—surpassing drugs, weapons, fraud and thousands of other crimes. Nearly 99 percent of illegal reentry defendants are sentenced to federal prison time.

H.R. 3004 would drastically expand America's prison population of nonviolent prisoners at a time when there is bipartisan support to reduce the federal prison population. It offends due process by cutting off all collateral attacks on unjust prior deportation orders, despite the Supreme Court's contrary ruling in *United States v. Mendoza-Lopez*. Profiteering by private prison companies has been the main consequence of border-crossing prosecutions, which the Government Accountability Office and the DHS Office of Inspector General have criticized as lacking sound deterrent support.

H.R. 3004 is an integral part of this administration's mass deportation and mass incarceration agenda. Longer sentences for illegal reentry are not recommended by any informed federal criminal-justice stakeholders; rather they represent this administration's

anti-immigrant obsession and would expensively expand substandard private jail contracting despite the life-threatening conditions in these facilities.

In conclusion, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 are fraught with constitutional problems that threaten the civil and human rights of our immigrant communities, undercut law enforcement's ability to keep our communities safe, and would balloon our federal prison population by financing private prison corporations. Rather than taking a punitive approach to local law enforcement agencies that are working hard to balance their duties to uphold the Constitution and to keep their communities safe, Congress should end DHS's unconstitutional detainer practices or fix the constitutional deficiencies by requiring judicial warrants for all detainer requests. Congress should also repeal mandatory detention so that all immigrants receive the basic due process of a bond hearing and reject any attempt to unfairly imprison individuals who are not a threat to public safety.

For more information, please contact ACLU Director of Immigration Policy and Campaigns.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,  
National Political Director.  
LORELLA PRAELI,  
Director of Immigration Policy and Campaigns.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END  
SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,

June 27, 2017.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), comprised of national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual assault and domestic violence victims and representing hundreds of organizations across the country dedicated to ensuring all survivors of violence receive the protections they deserve, write to express our deep concerns about the impact that H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," and H.R. 3004, or "Kate's Law," will have on victims fleeing or recovering from sexual assault, domestic violence, or human trafficking, and on communities at large.

This year is the twenty-third anniversary of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA") which has, since it was first enacted, included critical protections for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence. H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have the effect of punishing immigrant survivors and their children and pushing them into the shadows and into danger, undermining the very purpose of VAWA. Specifically, the nation's leading national organizations that address domestic and sexual assault oppose H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 because:

Community trust policies are critical tools for increasing community safety. Laws that seek to intertwine the federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will undermine the Congressional purpose of protections enacted under VAWA and will have the chilling effect of pushing immigrant victims into the shadows and undermining public safety. Immigration enforcement must be implemented in a way that supports local community policing and sustains community trust in working with local law enforcement. H.R. 3003 runs contrary to community policing efforts and will deter immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault survivors not only from reporting crimes, but also

from seeking help for themselves and their children. While H.R. 3003 does not require that local law enforcement arrest or report immigrant victims or witnesses of criminal activity, the language in the bill provides no restriction prohibiting such practices.

Perpetrators use fear of deportation as tool of abuse. Local policies that minimize the intertwining of local law enforcement with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) help protect the most vulnerable victims by creating trust between law enforcement and the immigrant community, which in turn help protect entire communities. Abusers and traffickers use the fear of deportation of their victims as a tool to silence and trap them. If immigrants are afraid to call the police because of fear of deportation, they become more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Not only are the individual victims and their children harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to abstain from reporting violent perpetrators or seeking protection and, as a result, dangerous criminals are not identified and go unpunished.

As VAWA recognizes, immigrant victims of violent crimes often do not contact law enforcement due to fear that they will be deported. Immigrants are already afraid of contacting the police and HR 3003 proposes to further intertwine federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will only exacerbate this fear. The result is that perpetrators will be able to continue to harm others, both immigrant and U.S. Citizen victims alike. Since January of 2017, victim advocates have been describing the immense fear expressed by immigrant victims and their reluctance to reach out for help from police. A recent survey of over 700 advocates and attorneys at domestic violence and sexual assault programs indicate that immigrant victims are expressing heightened fears and concerns about immigration enforcement, with 78% of advocates and attorneys reporting that victims are describing fear of contacting the police; 75% of them reporting that victims are afraid of going to court; and 43% reporting working with immigrant victims who are choosing not to move forward with criminal charges or obtaining protective orders.

In addition, according to Los Angeles Police Chief Charlie Beck, reporting of sexual assault and domestic violence among Latinos has dropped significantly this year, possibly due to concerns that police interaction could result in deportation. According to Chief Beck, reports of sexual assault have dropped 25 percent among Los Angeles' Latino population since the beginning of the year compared to a three percent drop among non-Latino victims. Similarly, reports of spousal abuse among Latinos fell by about 10 percent among Latinos whereas the decline among non-Latinos was four percent. The Houston Police Department reported in April that the number of Hispanics reporting rape is down 42.8 percent from last year. In Denver, CO, the Denver City Attorney has reported that some domestic violence victims are declining to testify in court. As of late February, the City Attorney's Office had dropped four cases because the victims fear that ICE officers will arrest and deport them. Both the City Attorney and Aurora Police Chief have spoken on the importance of having trust with the immigrant community in order to maintain public safety and prosecute crime.

HR 3003 Will Unfairly Punish Entire Communities.

H.R. 3003 punishes localities that follow Constitutional guidelines and refuse to

honor detainee requests that are not supported by due process mandates. H.R. 3003 likely covers more than 600 jurisdictions across the country, most of which do not characterize their policies to follow constitutional mandates as “sanctuary” policies. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating their access to various federal grants, including federal law enforcement grants, such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and other federal grants related to law enforcement or immigration, such as those that fund forensic rape kit analysis. Withholding federal law enforcement funding would, ironically, undermine the ability of local jurisdictions to combat and prevent crime in their communities.

In addition, the fiscal impact of both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will result in limited federal law enforcement resources being further reduced as a result of shifting funding from enforcing federal criminal laws addressing violent crimes, including those protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, to the detention and prosecution of many non-violent immigration law violators.

H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 Will Unfairly Punish Victims.

By greatly expanding mandatory detention and expanding criminal penalties for re-entry, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have harsh consequences for immigrant survivors. Victims of human trafficking, sexual assault, and domestic violence are often at risk of being arrested and convicted. In recognition of this fact, existing ICE guidance cites the example of when police respond to a domestic violence call, both parties may be arrested or a survivor who acted in self-defense may be wrongly accused. In addition, if the abuser speaks English better than the survivor, or if other language or cultural barriers (or fear of retaliation from the abuser) prevent the survivor from fully disclosing the abuse suffered, a survivor faces charges and tremendous pressure to plead guilty (without being advised about the long-term consequences) in order to be released from jail and reunited with her children. In addition, victims of trafficking are often arrested and convicted for prostitution-related offenses. These victims are often desperate to be released and possibly to be reunited with their children following their arrests or pending trial. These factors—combined with poor legal counsel, particularly about the immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—have in the past and will likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges and/or prostitution. H.R. 3003 imposes harsh criminal penalties and H.R. 3009 imposes expanded bases for detention without consideration of mitigating circumstances or humanitarian exceptions for these victims.

In addition, H.R. 3004 expands the criminal consequences for re-entry in the U.S. without recognizing the compelling humanitarian circumstances in which victims who have been previously removed return for their safety. Victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking fleeing violence in their countries of origin will be penalized for seeking protection from harm. In recent years, women and children fleeing rampant violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, have fled to the United States, seeking refuge. Frequently, because of inadequate access to legal representation, they are unable to establish their eligibility for

legal protections in the United States, resulting in their removal. In many cases, the risk of domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or human trafficking in their countries of origin remain unabated and victims subsequently attempt to reenter the U.S. to protect themselves and their children. Other victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking may be deported because their abusers or traffickers isolate them, or prevent them from obtaining lawful immigration status. They are deported, with some victims having to leave their children behind in the custody of their abusers or traffickers. Under H.R. 3004, these victims risk harsh criminal penalties for re-entry for attempting to protect themselves and their children.

On behalf of the courageous survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking and human trafficking that our organizations serve, we urge you to vote against HR 3003 and 3004, and to affirm the intent and spirit of VAWA by supporting strong relationships between law enforcement and immigrant communities, which is critical for public safety in general, and particularly essential for domestic and sexual violence victims and their children.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL TASKFORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ([www.4vawa.org](http://www.4vawa.org)).

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB/COM), and Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) to express our opposition to H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

The Catholic Church holds a strong interest in the welfare of migrants and how our nation welcomes and treats them. Our parishes include those with and without immigration status, unfortunately some who have witnessed or been victims of crime in the United States, including domestic violence, armed robbery, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We oppose H.R. 3003 because it would impose obligations on local governments that we fear—and that many of them have warned—would undermine authority and discretion of local law enforcement. This, in turn, would hamper the ability of local law enforcement officials to apprehend criminals and ensure public safety in all communities.

Furthermore, Section 2 of H.R. 3003 would deny to jurisdictions vital federal funding related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, and naturalization if those jurisdictions are deemed to be non-compliant with H.R. 3003. The Catholic service network, including Catholic Charities, works in partnership with the federal government on a number of Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security initiatives, including disaster response and recovery, naturalization and citizenship services, and services for the immigrant, including victims of human trafficking, and domestic violence. These services are incredibly valuable to the protection and promotion of the human person and in some instances life-saving. Cutting grants related to these important national objectives, or threat of such cuts, is not humane or just, nor is it in our national interest.

Also, we oppose H.R. 3004 as it would lead to an expansion of incarceration and does not include adequate protections for people who re-enter the U.S. for humanitarian reasons or seek protection at the border. While

H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal offenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government's ability to prosecute illegal re-entry cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are efficiently utilized to prosecute and convict the most violent offenders of violent crimes. Expanding who is eligible to be prosecuted for entry or re-entry as well as enhancing sentencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that communities are safer. Furthermore, we are concerned that, as introduced, H.R. 3004 would also prevent vulnerable asylum seekers and unaccompanied children, (who have presented themselves repeatedly at the U.S. border in the flight from violence), from being able to access protection, and instead face fines, imprisonment or both.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on balancing the needs and rights of immigrants with our nation's best interests and security.

The United States has a long and proud history of leadership in welcoming newcomers regardless of their circumstances and promoting the common good. We stand ready to work with you on legislation that more closely adheres to this tradition and appreciate your serious consideration of our views in this regard.

Sincerely,

MOST REV. JOE VÁSQUEZ,  
*Bishop of Austin,*  
*Chairman, USCCB*  
*Committee on Migration.*

SR. DONNA MARKHAM, OP,  
PhD,  
*President & CEO,*  
*Catholic Charities*  
*USA.*

JUNE 27, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice stands in strong opposition to the “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act” (H.R. 3003) and “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004) to be considered this week by the House of Representatives. We urge Congress to reject these bills. In a country that prides itself on being the land of welcome and opportunity, we must ensure that our immigration laws reflect our shared values.

As Congress continues to delay comprehensive immigration reform and a permanent solution for the nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants, we are left with the status quo—an enforcement-only approach that tears apart families and keeps people in the shadows. Despite the gridlock in Congress, localities across the country still have the responsibility to uphold safety and peace in their communities. To fulfill this goal, local police and residents have fostered mutual trust to root out crime and promote public safety, encouraging community members to cooperate with local authorities. The “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act” (H.R. 3003) does nothing to promote public safety and instead will make communities more dangerous while striking fear in the hearts of our immigrant families.

Likewise, “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004) would criminalize immigrants who simply want an opportunity to succeed in the United States,

and often are simply trying to be reunited with their family. Punishing immigrants for wanting to provide for their families with fines and imprisonment is harsh and cruel—we, as a nation, are called to be better than that. Again, we ask Congress to abandon the “enforcement first” policies that have been the de facto U.S. strategy for nearly thirty years, yielding too many costs and too few results. Our antiquated system that does not accommodate the migration realities we face in our nation today does not serve our national interests and does not respect the basic human rights of migrants who come to this nation fleeing persecution or in search of employment for themselves and better living conditions for their children.

Pope Francis cautions that “migrants and refugees are not pawns on the chessboard of humanity” and he asks political leaders to create a new system, one that “calls for international cooperation and a spirit of profound solidarity and compassion.” This is a holy call to embrace hope over fear. Congress should recognize the God-given humanity of all individuals and uphold our sacred call to love our neighbor and welcome the stranger in our midst. Any action that further militarizes our borders, criminalizes assistance to immigrant communities, or weakens legal protection of refugees is neither just nor compatible with the values that we, as Americans, strive to uphold.

Sincerely,

SR. SIMONE CAMPBELL, SSS,

*Executive Director,*

*NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I, again, would simply say that if we really want to do something about immigration, we ought to come together, like the Senate did not long ago, and pass comprehensive immigration reform. But, apparently, that is not in the DNA of the current leadership of this House.

Instead, we have bills that demagogue the immigration issue, that demean immigrants, that cause hysteria, and I find that very unfortunate.

This bill is a bad idea. It falls in the same category as that other bad, stupid idea of building a wall across our country.

What we ought to be doing is serious legislating, enough demagoguing, and let's get back to doing the people's business, and that includes comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we need to fix our immigration laws. When a mother in the Philippines has to wait 25 years or more for a visa to reunite with her son in the United States, is that system working? No.

To lose the entire childhood and young adulthood of your son? What mother wouldn't try to enter the United States some other way, in fact, any way that she could in order to be with her child?

When your daughter is threatened with rape and murder if she doesn't become a sexual slave to gang members; when your son and the entire family is threatened with death if the boy doesn't join the gangs, wouldn't you run away and try to find safety someplace else?

And when the family arrives at the U.S. border and they actively seek out the U.S. Border Patrol and voluntarily surrender to them and ask for safe refuge and asylum, is that really entering our borders illegally?

You know, when you have been an upstanding member of the community for 10, 15, 20 years or more in the United States, and you get pulled over because the tags have expired on your car, or your license, do you really deserve to be deported, to tear apart your family, to leave behind the businesses that you have spent a lifetime creating?

And does anyone in this Chamber honestly think that if this father or mother is deported, that they won't do everything they can to try to come back to be with their kids?

I mean, these are real stories. It is not fiction. They are not fantasies. It is real. And if you listened to people in your community, you would know these stories.

If you paid attention to your local police, you would know why it is so damaging to turn them in to ICE, because they rely on these community members to inform them of criminal activities in their community. The police don't want to do what you are asking them to do. Why would you force this on them? And why would you punish them by taking away essential Federal funding to help them protect the citizens of this country?

This is a bad idea. I guess, maybe it is a good press release. Maybe Steve Bannon thinks it is a good idea. Maybe it is a good sound bite for Trump. Who knows what the rationale behind this is. But it is not sensible. It is not thoughtful.

So if you want to get serious about these issues, you know, come together, like the Senate did, in a bipartisan way, and come up with comprehensive immigration reform. That is our duty. That is our job, as Members of Congress, not this garbage. This is a waste of time. This is an insult to the American people. We ought to be able to do better.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this. I urge them to defeat the previous question so we can have a debate and vote on whether or not to increase the minimum wage to \$15 to give people a raise. Again, we have to do that because this House is being so tightly controlled that you can't get anything to the floor.

I would remind my colleagues that the underlying bill that we are talking about here today on immigration is under a closed rule. We will have another closed rule tomorrow. So much for democracy. So much for deliberative process. So much for openness. There is no such thing here. I mean, the Rules Committee has become a place where democracy goes to die, where everything gets shut down.

We need to do better. This process stinks, and this bill is lousy. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, vote “no” on the rule, and if it gets to the point we have to debate this, vote “no” on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that in just a little bit we will be debating this bill. I do believe in just a short time it will pass.

I think what was very interesting, Mr. Speaker, is the frustrations of my friend, and I believe they are true frustrations, and the stories of folks coming from terrible places around the world wanting to get here. We are the light on a hill. We are the ones that everybody wants to come to. I grant you that.

But I do have a question. For these folks who are leaving disaster, places in which law and order are not enforced, in which people are dying, and they are striving to get someplace else, why in the world would we want to get to here to find that we have a situation in which local law enforcement can sort of decide what they want to do, where law and order is not followed?

You are leaving one area to get to an area in which what they say is law and order is what is needed and what is followed and why they come here, but yet we are saying no.

I think it has also been, possibly, Mr. Speaker, a vast mischaracterization to say that all police are against this. In fact, if we have seen, there was 200 that was identified earlier, the vast majority of police departments in this country uphold the law. So let's don't make a blanket assessment of police here.

I think it is just an interesting development here. I think you can talk about laws. You can like laws, you cannot like laws, you can do something about immigration.

But I do think we also need to address something else. It wasn't a part of this bill, but we wanted to make it a part of this bill, and that is comprehensive immigration reform.

I do agree with my friend. There needs to be immigration reform. I think it needs to start with security and safety and protection. It needs to start with actually enforcing law, and then begin the foundation of finding a way to get workers here—our guest worker program, our ag worker program, the things that we need to make our expansion so that we do it properly. I agree completely.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do find it has been amazing here because, just in the context of this debate, these were words that were used: We're demagoguing this issue. We didn't have the guts to address this issue. Our DNA of leadership is to obstruct or to not bring this forward.

Well, I think the one thing that I do need to remind is, this body, Mr. Speaker, if you are very familiar with this, over the last few weeks, we have been dealing with a very difficult issue—we passed it out of the House—that is healthcare, which was passed when this body was filled in a majority of a different party, my friends across the aisle, when they had, at times, filibuster-proof majorities.

They worked to pass healthcare. They worked to pass Dodd-Frank. They worked to pass their priorities.

My interesting question is, they did not work to pass comprehensive immigration reform. I am not sure why now we decide that it is such their issue that they are now blaming us, many of us who want to find a way forward.

But I think the answer is plain and obvious in history. They chose not to do it. I repeat, they chose not to do it.

So I think in the discussion of this battle, we will continue these discussions. We will continue to have differences of opinion. I think it is sort of amazing though that we do have to have a discussion here on telling police to enforce the law and work out the details as we go, work out what is in this bill.

But it also is about priorities, Mr. Speaker. For those of us who have had to look at the tragedies left behind as a result of some of these decisions that they have made to “better” their community, the deaths, the tragedies, then it is a pretty interesting choice. Is the death more important or less important than your policy?

All we are simply saying is: just don’t take the money. Look at it from that perspective.

And we will continue to have these debates. My friend and I will continue to be passionately different on this, and that is okay. That is what this floor is for because, at the end of the day, we are going to have a vote. One side is going to win and one side is going to lose in this vote. And the debate is going to happen, and the bill is going to come forward. There will be another vote. And then it will go to the Senate.

I disagree with my friend from Massachusetts, respect his opinion, but, in this case, I believe the debate is fairly clear to most Americans. All we are asking is, and what the current law already states, follow the rules. And all we are simply saying is, follow the rules.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 414 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to provide for in-

creases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated,

control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 190, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—235

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham     | Bucshon       | Diaz-Balart   |
| Aderholt    | Budd          | Donovan       |
| Allen       | Burgess       | Duffy         |
| Amash       | Byrne         | Duncan (SC)   |
| Amodei      | Calvert       | Duncan (TN)   |
| Arrington   | Carter (GA)   | Dunn          |
| Babin       | Carter (TX)   | Emmer         |
| Bacon       | Chabot        | Estes (KS)    |
| Banks (IN)  | Chaffetz      | Farenthold    |
| Barletta    | Cheney        | Faso          |
| Barr        | Coffman       | Ferguson      |
| Barton      | Cole          | Fitzpatrick   |
| Bergman     | Collins (GA)  | Fleischmann   |
| Biggs       | Collins (NY)  | Flores        |
| Bilirakis   | Cramer        | Fortenberry   |
| Bishop (MI) | Crawford      | Fox           |
| Bishop (UT) | Culberson     | Franks (AZ)   |
| Black       | Curbelo (FL)  | Frelinghuysen |
| Blackburn   | Davidson      | Gaetz         |
| Blum        | Davis, Rodney | Gallagher     |
| Bost        | Denham        | Garrett       |
| Brady (TX)  | Dent          | Gianforte     |
| Brat        | DeSantis      | Gibbs         |
| Bridenstine | DesJarlais    | Gohmert       |
| Brooks (AL) |               | Goodlatte     |
| Brooks (IN) |               | Gosar         |
| Buchanan    |               | Gowdy         |
| Buck        |               | Granger       |

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Deutch         | Lee            |
| Aguilar         | Dingell        | Levin          |
| Barragán        | Doggett        | Lewis (GA)     |
| Bass            | Doyle, Michael | Lieu, Ted      |
| Beatty          | F.             | Lipinski       |
| Bera            | Ellison        | Loeb sack      |
| Beyer           | Engel          | Lofgren        |
| Bishop (GA)     | Eshoo          | Lowenthal      |
| Blumenauer      | Espallat       | Lowe y         |
| Blunt Rochester | Esty (CT)      | Lujan Grisham, |
| Bonamici        | Evans          | M.             |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Foster         | Luján, Ben Ray |
| F.              | Frankel (FL)   | Lynch          |
| Brady (PA)      | Fudge          | Maloney,       |
| Brown (MD)      | Gabbard        | Carolyn B.     |
| Brownley (CA)   | Gallo          | Maloney, Sean  |
| Bustos          | Garamendi      | Matsui         |
| Butterfield     | Gonzalez (TX)  | McCollum       |
| Capuano         | Gotthelmer     | McEachin       |
| Carbajal        | Green, Al      | McGovern       |
| Cardenas        | Green, Gene    | McNerney       |
| Carson (IN)     | Grijalva       | Meeks          |
| Cartwright      | Gutiérrez      | Meng           |
| Castor (FL)     | Hanabusa       | Moore          |
| Castro (TX)     | Hastings       | Moulton        |
| Chu, Judy       | Heck           | Murphy (FL)    |
| Cicilline       | Higgins (NY)   | Nadler         |
| Clark (MA)      | Himes          | Neal           |
| Clarke (NY)     | Hoyer          | Nolan          |
| Clay            | Huffman        | Norcross       |
| Cleaver         | Jackson Lee    | O'Halleran     |
| Clyburn         | Jayapal        | O'Rourke       |
| Cohen           | Jeffries       | Pallone        |
| Connolly        | Johnson (GA)   | Panetta        |
| Conyers         | Johnson, E. B. | Pascroll       |
| Cooper          | Kaptur         | Payne          |
| Correa          | Keating        | Pelosi         |
| Costa           | Kelly (IL)     | Perlmutter     |
| Courtney        | Kennedy        | Peters         |
| Crist           | Khanna         | Peterson       |
| Crowley         | Kihuen         | Pingree        |
| Cuellar         | Kildee         | Pocan          |
| Davis (CA)      | Kilmer         | Polis          |
| Davis, Danny    | Kind           | Price (NC)     |
| DeFazio         | Krishnamoorthi | Quigley        |
| DeGette         | Kuster (NH)    | Raskin         |
| Delaney         | Langevin       | Rice (NY)      |
| DeLauro         | Larsen (WA)    | Richmond       |
| DelBene         | Larson (CT)    | Rosen          |
| Demings         | Lawrence       | Roybal-Allard  |
| DeSaulnier      | Lawson (FL)    | Ruiz           |

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Davis (CA)     | Johnson (GA)   |
| Agullar         | Davis, Danny   | Johnson, E. B. |
| Barragán        | DeFazio        | Kaptur         |
| Bass            | DeGette        | Keating        |
| Beatty          | Delaney        | Kelly (IL)     |
| Bera            | DeLauro        | Kennedy        |
| Beyer           | DelBene        | Khanna         |
| Bishop (GA)     | Demings        | Kihuen         |
| Blumenauer      | DeSaulnier     | Kildee         |
| Blunt Rochester | Deutch         | Kilmer         |
| Bonomici        | Dingell        | Kind           |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Doggett        | Krishnamoorthi |
| F.              | Doyle, Michael | Kuster (NH)    |
| Brady (PA)      | F.             | Langevin       |
| Brown (MD)      | Ellison        | Larsen (WA)    |
| Brownley (CA)   | Engel          | Larson (CT)    |
| Bustos          | Eshoo          | Lawrence       |
| Butterfield     | Espalliat      | Lawson (FL)    |
| Capuano         | Esty (CT)      | Lee            |
| Carbajal        | Evans          | Levin          |
| Cárdenas        | Foster         | Lewis (GA)     |
| Carson (IN)     | Frankel (FL)   | Lieu, Ted      |
| Cartwright      | Fudge          | Lipinski       |
| Castor (FL)     | Gabbard        | Loeb           |
| Castro (TX)     | Gallago        | Loeb           |
| Chu, Judy       | Garamendi      | Lowenthal      |
| Cicilline       | Gonzalez (TX)  | Lowe           |
| Clark (MA)      | Gottheimer     | Lujan Grisham, |
| Clarke (NY)     | Green, Al      | M.             |
| Clay            | Green, Gene    | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Cleaver         | Grijalva       | Lynch          |
| Clyburn         | Gutiérrez      | Maloney,       |
| Cohen           | Hanabusa       | Carolyn B.     |
| Connolly        | Hastings       | Maloney, Sean  |
| Conyers         | Heck           | Matsui         |
| Cooper          | Higgins (NY)   | McCollum       |
| Correa          | Himes          | McEachin       |
| Costa           | Hoyer          | McGovern       |
| Courtney        | Huffman        | McNerney       |
| Crist           | Jackson Lee    | Meeks          |
| Crowley         | Jayapal        | Meng           |
| Cuellar         | Jeffries       | Moore          |

Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman

Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres

Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Fleischmann  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Griffith  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hastings  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Himes  
Hollingsworth  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Issa  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson, Sam  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Larsen (WA)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lewis (MN)  
Lipinski  
Loudermilk

Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McHenry  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Panetta  
Pascarella  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Posey  
Raskin  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis

Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce (CA)  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Suozzi  
Takano  
Taylor  
Thornberry  
Titus  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Wagner  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Womack  
Yarmuth  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McGovern  
McKinley  
McSally  
Moolenaar  
Moore  
Murphy (PA)  
Neal  
Nolan  
O'Halleran  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Price (NC)  
Ratcliffe  
Reed

Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rogers (AL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Rush  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schrader  
Sewell (AL)  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Soto  
Swalwell (CA)

Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Westerman  
Wittman  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—8

Collins (NY)  
Cummings  
Long

Napolitano  
Renacci  
Sánchez

Scalise  
Stivers

□ 1357

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 332, providing for consideration of H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 331 and 332 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3003. I would have also voted “nay” on H. Res. 414—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3003—No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 183, answered “present” 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—232

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)

Buchanan  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clay  
Cole  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Cuellar  
Culberson

Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Demings  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Estes (KS)  
Estry (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Ferguson

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Babin  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Blum  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brooks (AL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Castor (FL)  
Chaffetz  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Collins (GA)  
Comer  
Conaway

NAYS—183

Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Crist  
Crowley  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Denham  
DeSantis  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Emmer  
Españat  
Faso  
Fitzpatrick  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Fudge  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Gibbs  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Grothman  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hartzler  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.

Higgins (NY)  
Holding  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Hurd  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
LaHood  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larson (CT)  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lofgren  
Love  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Rice (SC)  
Tonko

## NOT VOTING—16

Cummings  
Delaney  
Doggett  
Gohmert  
Grijalva  
Jones

Long  
Napolitano  
Norcross  
Peters  
Quigley  
Renacci

□ 1404

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 28, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 28, 2017, at 9:28 a.m.:

Clerical correction to an appointment made on March 22, 2017 to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## PROTECTING ACCESS TO CARE ACT OF 2017

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1215.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 382 and rule



XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1215.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1407

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system, with Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is modeled on California's highly successful litigation reforms that have lowered healthcare costs and made healthcare much more accessible to the people of that State.

Because the evidence of the effects of those reforms on lowering healthcare costs is so overwhelming, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that, if the same reforms were applied at the Federal level, they would save over \$50 billion over a 10-year period.

Because the evidence that those reforms increase access to healthcare is so overwhelming, they are supported by a huge variety of public safety and labor unions, community clinics and health centers, and organizations dedicated to disease prevention, all of which have seen the beneficial effects of these reforms in California.

So popular are these reforms among the citizens of California that a ballot initiative to raise the damages cap, backed and funded by trial lawyers, was defeated by an over 2-to-1 margin in 2014.

This bill's commonsense reforms include a \$250,000 cap on inherently unquantifiable noneconomic damages and limits on the contingency fees lawyers can charge. They allow courts to require periodic payments for future damages instead of lump sum awards so bankruptcies in which plaintiffs would receive only pennies on the dollar can be prevented. They include provisions creating a "fair share" rule by which damages are allocated fairly in direct proportion to fault.

This bill does all this without in any way limiting compensation for 100 per-

cent of plaintiffs' economic losses, which include anything to which a receipt can be attached, including all medical costs, lost wages, future lost wages, rehabilitation costs, and any other economic out-of-pocket loss suffered as the result of a healthcare injury. Far from limiting deserved recoveries in California, these reforms have led to medical damage awards in deserving cases in the \$80 million and \$90 million range.

Unlike past iterations, this bill only applies to claims concerning the provision of goods or services for which coverage is provided in whole or in part via a Federal program, subsidy, or tax benefit, giving it a clear Federal nexus. Wherever Federal policy directly affects the distribution of healthcare, there is a clear Federal interest in reducing the costs of such Federal policies.

The legislation before us today also protects any State law that otherwise caps damages—whether at a higher level or lower than the caps in the bill—or provides greater protections that lower healthcare costs.

When President Ronald Reagan established a special task force to study the need for Federal tort reform, that task force concluded as follows: "In sum, tort law appears to be a major cause of the insurance availability and affordability crisis which the Federal Government can and should address in a variety of sensible and appropriate ways."

Indeed, the Reagan task force specifically recommended "eliminate joint and several liability," "provide for periodic payments of future economic damages," "schedule"—that is, limit—"contingency fees" of attorneys, and "limit noneconomic damages to a fair and reasonable amount." All of these recommended reforms are part of the bill before us today.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that would enact much-needed commonsense and cost-saving litigation reforms that would increase healthcare accessibility for all.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: I write in regard to H.R. 1215, Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017, which was referred in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee will forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1215, the Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and will be appropriately consulted and involved as

this or similar legislation moves forward to address any remaining issues within the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1215 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report on the legislation or the Congressional Record during its consideration on the House floor.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2017.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on the Judiciary and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1215, the "Protecting Access to Care Act," so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your foregoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1215 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1215 will do little to protect Americans' access to safe and affordable healthcare. Instead, it will deny victims of medical malpractice and defective medical products the opportunity to be fully compensated for their injuries and to hold wrongdoers accountable.

This legislation imposes various restrictions on lawsuits against healthcare providers concerning the provision of healthcare goods or services that would apply regardless of the merits of the case, the misconduct at issue, or the severity of the victim's injury.

There are so many problems with this bill, but to begin with, this bill would cause real harm by severely limiting the ability of victims to be made whole. For instance, the bill's \$250,000 aggregate limit for noneconomic damages, an amount established more than 40 years ago pursuant to a California statute, would have a particularly adverse impact on women, children, the poor, and other vulnerable members of our society.

These groups are more likely to receive noneconomic damages in healthcare cases because they are less able to establish lost wages and other economic losses. Women, for example, are often paid at a lower rate than men, even for the same job. Also, they are more likely to suffer noneconomic loss, such as disfigurement or loss of fertility. Imposing a severe limit on noneconomic damages, therefore, hurts them disproportionately.

□ 1415

Finally, this bill is particularly harmful for veterans, members of the military, and their families. Because the bill prevents State tort law in any healthcare-related lawsuit that includes any coverage provided by a Federal health program, all cases arising from substandard care received in a Veterans Administration facility or a military hospital would be subject to the bill's restrictions.

As a diverse coalition of veterans organizations noted in their letter of opposition, H.R. 1215 would limit the ability of veterans and military families to hold healthcare providers, drug manufacturers, and medical products providers accountable for pain and suffering and death that result from substandard care, preventable medical errors, and defective drugs and devices.

For these and other reasons, I implore and urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1215.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, in the Congress, too many Republicans and Democrats are obsessed with health insurance, often at the expense of the reforms that could reduce the cost of healthcare. If we cut the cost of healthcare, we make solutions far more attainable for affordable coverage.

I support this tort reform legislation because it will make healthcare in America more accessible and less expensive.

Defensive medicine costs Americans over \$50 billion. Commonsense reform will eliminate these costs, help patients afford healthcare, all while reducing the Federal deficit.

It is no surprise that defensive medicine costs so much. One survey recently reported that 93 percent of doctors practice defensive medicine due to a broken tort system.

It is outrageous that we force doctors to subject patients to costly, unnecessary, and occasionally harmful tests just to avoid frivolous lawsuits.

Let's go back to performing medical tests when needed for the patient, not to simply avoid exposure in litigation

for insurance companies. This will lower healthcare costs.

The New England Journal of Medicine found that 1 in every 14 doctors gets sued each year. An earlier Harvard study revealed that 40 percent of these malpractice suits were groundless, yet over a quarter of these frivolous cases are settled, and the average payout was \$300,000.

Groundless cases overburden our legal system, making it harder for people with legitimate grievances to have their day in court.

Frivolous claims drive up the cost of insurance for all healthcare providers, driving many physicians away from the healthcare profession. We need more doctors and hospitals, not less. Without reform, we get higher costs, fewer doctors, a larger Federal deficit, and worse healthcare outcomes.

Let's pass this bill and start delivering on more accessible healthcare for the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member CONYERS for yielding me time. Mr. Chair, I share your grief over last night's loss. Sorry about that.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a loss, too. It is a loss to people who have been injured by defective drugs, defective medical devices, been harmed in nursing homes, or been harmed by medical malpractice because it sets a cap on noneconomic damages of \$250,000, no matter whom the person is, whatever their position was, no matter what damages they suffered.

Trial lawyers aren't the most liked people in America. They are a little bit above Congress people, I think, but it is right in there with used car salesmen. None of the three of us are doing real good. So it is easy to kind of beat us up.

But people like their doctors. I see Dr. ROE over there. People like doctors. Doctors provide healthcare, if they are allowed to by Federal law and given the opportunity to get reimbursed and have a system. People don't generally like trial lawyers. But the fact is, trial lawyers do a public service because they represent people. When they do it on contingency fees, they do it for people who wouldn't have the money to hire a lawyer, necessarily, but have been harmed. And they go in on the idea that sometimes they will get nothing, but if they win, they get a contingency fee, and they give representation to people who otherwise couldn't afford it.

When they win, they win because a jury—which is like a little focus group of America—says there was a duty that the doctor breached and a harm done to the patient and the patient should be compensated.

My chairman says this is just like California, and there he goes again

with that Reagan stuff. Reagan was 40 years ago, I think, 35 years ago. Whatever. Californians thought this isn't California's law. This goes further than California on joint liability. The fact is, when you eliminate joint and several liability in certain places, a certain part of it is California, a certain part of it isn't, it is less likely that the injured party is going to be able to collect.

It goes further in terms of setting a statute of limitations, but the big picture is States' rights. Normally, the folks on the other side of the aisle are all for States' rights. They are for States' rights when it comes to voting rights. They are for States' rights when it comes to civil rights. They are for States' rights on all kinds of things that generally tend to tamp down the lower economic folk in our country, particularly in the South.

But here on medical malpractice, which has always been a province of the States, they want to usurp it and make a Federal standard that applies to everybody.

If a State hasn't set a cap on damages, then the Federal cap of \$250,000 would go into place. So if you have a State that says it is unconstitutional to have a cap because you have got a right to a jury trial, then you might not be able to have that cap, and you will have this \$250,000 cap set.

There are all kinds of problems with Federalism, all kinds of problems with people who have been injured getting compensated, and other problems.

Go Tigers.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity. I have been sitting here listening very carefully to this debate. It sounds like a partisan fight. Democrats say this is a bad bill. Republicans say it is a good bill. If you are watching at home, you think: Here we go again. Just gridlock in Washington. Can't get something done.

Well, let me tell you and let me suggest that preserving and protecting access to care should not be a partisan issue. Why do I say that? I am from West Virginia, and 14 years ago we passed medical liability reform very similar to what we are getting ready to pass today, including \$250,000 caps on noneconomic damages.

Why do I know it was not a partisan issue back then is because the Governor of West Virginia who introduced the bill, House Bill 2122, was Congressman Governor Bob Wise. Bob Wise had been a Member of Congress for 18 years as a Democrat here in Congress. He introduced the bill 14 years ago in West Virginia. He signed the bill. It was his bill.

The West Virginia Legislature, the House of Delegates, was 68 percent

Democrat. The West Virginia Senate was 70 percent Democrat. A Democrat Legislature, a Democrat Governor, and the reform is just like what we are getting ready to pass today.

Here is what Democrat Governor Bob Wise said about the bill and why they did it. What was the goal? "To work together towards a common goal preserving the healthcare system that serves all West Virginians."

What else did Governor Democrat Bob Wise say? He said, "This is a prime example of how government can work for the people," when he passed this bill and signed it.

On the day he signed the bill, this is what Democrat Bob Wise's newsletter said: "My number one commitment is the health and safety of the citizens of West Virginia?"

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, this should not be a Democrat/Republican issue. This should be an American healthcare issue. This should be preserving and protecting access to quality care. Just like Democrat Congressman Bob Wise in West Virginia 14 years ago set the example, we ought to set the example here of passing this with strong bipartisan support. This is quality care for the American citizens.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, the previous speaker is right. This shouldn't be a partisan issue, but the Republican Party in both houses has been doing its best to destroy healthcare for the American people in the last couple of months. This is just a different piece of the same plot. Bob Wise didn't always have the best judgment.

This cruel legislation does exactly the opposite of what its title states. It would place an artificial and very low cap on noneconomic damages in medical malpractice cases, and it would lock that figure into law without adjustment for inflation, which would reduce its value almost to zero over time.

By capping damages, this bill would ensure that many victims of medical malpractice will not be fairly compensated for their injuries. Many other victims may be unable even to file a case in the first place because they will be unable to retain a lawyer. That is because medical malpractice cases often require significant upfront costs, as high as \$100,000 on average, and few attorneys will take a case if the cap on damages means that there will be no reasonable likelihood of recouping their costs.

This bill's cap on noneconomic damages is particularly insidious because

of its discriminatory effect on many women, children, and seniors. They often have little or no lost wages to calculate, and, therefore, they may recover very little in the form of economic damages. But they may still have suffered a real and lasting injury that deserves compensation. This includes women who may have chosen to stay home and raise a family, children who have yet to begin their careers, or seniors who have retired and left the workforce.

Why should they be punished under this bill and get very little compensation for a lost limb or something else?

The law recognizes that pain and suffering, and other noneconomic damages, are worthy of compensation, but supporters of this bill think Congress, not juries, should decide what those injuries are worth, and it is shamefully little.

This legislation is based on the California law that includes a cap of \$250,000 for noneconomic damages, but it was enacted back in 1975. Whether or not that was an appropriate figure 40 years ago, in today's dollars, it is clearly inadequate.

After adjusting for inflation, the cap would need to be approximately \$1.128 million to be the same as the \$250,000 cap was when it was enacted.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NADLER. Thinking of it another way, that \$250,000 cap is now worth just over \$56,000, nearly a fifth as much.

Even assuming that \$250,000 is the appropriate figure today, fairness demands that this cap be indexed for inflation going forward so that we do not see a similar erosion of value. But this bill locks in an already low cap and lets it dwindle away until it is worth essentially zero.

I offered an amendment to adjust the cap to reflect 40 years of inflation, and to index it going forward, but the Rules Committee did not make it in order. Instead, we are forced to vote on a bill that, over time, will consider pain and suffering to be worth nothing at all.

This bill would not reduce the cost of malpractice insurance, it would not drive bad doctors out of practice, and it would certainly not protect patients.

What it would do is give a free ride to a healthcare provider, or a healthcare entity, that seriously harms a patient or a consumer.

I urge my colleagues to reject this unfair and unnecessary legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1215, the Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017, a much needed piece of legislation aimed at reforming medical malpractice law

in order to help drive down the cost of providing healthcare and, thereby, making it more affordable for all Americans.

I had the privilege of practicing medicine in the great State of Tennessee for 31 years before coming to Congress. The one thing that took away some of the joy from that practice was the threat of frivolous lawsuits.

Because of trial attorneys, over the years, the premiums for malpractice insurance have ballooned to levels that make it difficult for providers to practice and are driving more people out of practice, away from small practices, and into large hospital systems just so they can survive as a practitioner. Worse still, the jury awards aren't going to the victims of actual malpractice.

□ 1430

In Tennessee, prior to implementing some malpractice reforms, over half the premium dollars were paid out to attorneys, and less than 40 cents of every dollar paid out have gone to people who have actually been injured. So we are not compensating the injured party.

Thankfully, States like my home State of Tennessee are taking action and have enacted much-needed reforms in the last decade, and the costs associated with providing care have plummeted since then. In 2008, the Tennessee Medical Malpractice Act was signed into law and created requirements that the plaintiff in a healthcare liability action provide the defendant with a pre-suit notice of the claim as well as a qualified expert to review the case and certify it has merit.

Adding onto these reforms, in 2011, the Tennessee Civil Justice Act was signed into law, and it included a \$750,000 cap for noneconomic damages and a cap on punitive damages at the greater of twice the compensatory damages or \$500,000.

With these changes, between 2008 and 2014, the number of medical malpractice lawsuits in Tennessee decreased by 36 percent, from 584 to just 374. And, Mr. Chairman, between 2009 and 2014, the annual medical malpractice premium for an OB/GYN doctor like myself decreased from \$52,000-plus to \$33,000-plus, nearly a \$20,000 decrease in premiums per year.

Those of us who were here in 2009 when the Affordable Care Act was debated remember that President Obama acknowledged that the cost of defensive medicine was a bipartisan concern and something that he wanted to address. Despite the fact that our legislation is modeled on a California law that has stood the test for 40 years through both Republican and Democratic Governors, Democrats made no serious attempt to address medical malpractice as their healthcare bill was pushed through, which is yet another flaw of the ACA.

Today's bill is common sense. With these reforms, we will ensure patients, not trial attorneys, are compensated for legitimate malpractice claims—and there are legitimate claims out there. But we will also prevent frivolous litigation from moving forward.

For those concerned about the 10th Amendment, this bill respects States' rights and only subjects claims with a Federal nexus to this law, while giving a great deal of latitude to States to act in their own accord.

Mr. Chairman, I loved what I did while I was in practice. I had the chance to deliver about 5,000 babies, and it never felt like a job. It is just what I did and enjoyed doing. But at a time when healthcare costs are spiraling out of control, an easy fix like H.R. 1215 just makes sense and is just another piece of the puzzle to help the costs of healthcare go down.

I strongly support the much-needed reforms in this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of final passage.

One final thing, Mr. Chairman. I have a list here of our premiums in the State of Tennessee, and under every specialty listed here—and there are numerous—there were dramatic decreases in each of these.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the most active Member in the 115th Congress.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues that this is about bad medicine, not good medicine, and it is about undermining good healthcare, as we have seen in the TrumpCare saga, causing some 49 million people to lose their insurance. Here we go again.

I would offer to say that the most difficult, hurtful, and harmful aspect of this particular legislation is that it would make it more difficult for plaintiffs to seek redress for medical injuries that have been proven in court.

In addition, it proposes to make dangerous and potentially unconstitutional changes to our Nation's Federal system, intruding on State sovereignty, the very thing that Republicans seem to relish and to support, because this bill attempts to preempt the several areas of tort law that have been traditionally reserved to the States.

I would tell my good friends in Tennessee and West Virginia: Deal with your States, just as other individuals deal with their own States.

This bill, as well, has a very difficult impact on medical malpractice. Because it was written so vaguely, the broad language sweeps into not only doctors and other medical professionals, but hospitals and clinics and almost every entity that contributes in any way to making any healthcare product or service available. That

clearly impacts the healthcare of Americans.

When your child is injured through no fault of their own or your own, you need relief for that child. Interestingly enough, the American Bar Association that represents all lawyers, trial lawyers, of which there is an attempt to impugn their work, contempt for trial lawyers and the good work that they do. But the ABA says they are opposed to this bill, and they represent lawyers who fight every day to make sure the injustices don't happen.

But here is the real cause of my angst for this particular bill: "Medical Error Leaves Family With Unanswered Questions."

"Olivia was a senior in high school in Santa Monica, California, an accomplished scholar, actress, and musician who had earned early acceptance to Smith College."

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. "Olivia was born with a congenital heart condition."

She was going into college, but had a condition that caused her to go into the hospital. When she went in, she had a small procedure. Her vitals were dropping. Hospital staff waited more than 10 minutes before attempting resuscitation, but it was too late. She remained in a coma and died.

Mr. Chairman, I include the article in the RECORD.

#### MEDICAL ERROR LEAVES FAMILY WITH UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Research has found that 440,000 Americans die every year from preventable medical errors each year.

Olivia was a senior in high school in Santa Monica, California, an accomplished scholar, actress, and musician who had earned early acceptance to Smith College.

Olivia was born with a congenital heart condition that was monitored throughout her childhood.

The fall that Olivia was supposed to start college, she underwent a routine procedure to help doctors figure out if she could be considered for a surgery that would improve her condition.

The procedure was completed without complications, but while Olivia was still under anesthesia, a cardiology fellow-in-training pulled the catheter lines, causing Olivia's heart rate, pulse, and blood pressure to drop rapidly. Even though her vitals were dropping, hospital staff waited more than 10 minutes before attempting resuscitation. But it was too late.

Olivia would never regain consciousness and died that winter, never having lived her dream and attending college.

Her future was stolen from her, and immediately her family tried to understand what had gone wrong. They began to ask questions on how this could have happened, but they were given very few answers from the hospital.

Finally, the hospital gave her family incomplete medical records to sift through and find answers. They sought the help of an attorney because, despite their best efforts,

they still did not fully understand what caused their daughter's death. But due to California's out dated \$250,000 cap on medical negligence damages, it was nearly impossible to find one.

Olivia's life was cut short by a preventable medical error, and unfortunately, she is not alone. In the U.S., preventable medical errors are the third leading cause of death.

Our focus should be on improving patient safety and preventing medical errors, not limiting the rights of injured patients and their families. Lawmakers who seek to limit the accountability of health care providers are seeking to limit our rights and our avenues to justice.

Don't our loved ones deserve better?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, what do you want families to face—no relief? Or do you want these constant errors to go unrecognized and reconciled? This bill will do that by denying the ability.

It provides immunity for healthcare providers who dispense defective or dangerous products. It makes it harder for victims to attain adequate legal representation, and it imposes a risk or loss on victims rather than wrongdoers. This bill undermines healthcare and it undermines good healthcare.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Bar Association opposing this bill.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, February 27, 2017.

Re Concerns Regarding H.R. 1215, the "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017."

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House  
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,  
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND RANKING MEMBER CONYERS: On behalf of the American Bar Association, which is the largest voluntary membership organization of legal professionals in the United States, consisting of more than 400,000 members from all 50 states, the District of Columbia and other jurisdictions, I am writing to express our opposition to H.R. 1215, the "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017." I understand that your committee is scheduled to mark up this bill as early as tomorrow.

For over 200 years, the authority to determine medical liability law has rested in the states. This system, which grants each state the autonomy to regulate the resolution of medical liability actions within its own borders, is a hallmark of our American justice system. The states also regulate the insurance industry. Because of the roles they have played, the states are the repositories of experience and expertise in these matters. Therefore, the ABA believes that Congress should not substitute its judgment, as is proposed in H.R. 1215, for the systems that have evolved in each state over time.

Specifically, I would like to share with you the ABA's concerns and other views regarding key provisions in the proposed legislation relating to damages, proportionate liability, and contingent fees.

Damages. The ABA believes that compensatory damages should not be capped at either the state or federal level, and, as a result, we have serious concerns regarding Section 3(b) of H.R. 1215 that would cap non-economic damages for a plaintiff's injuries at \$250,000 regardless of the number of parties against whom the action is brought or

the number of separate claims or actions brought with respect to the same injury. For more than thirty years, the ABA has studied the research on federal and state legislative efforts to impose limits on noneconomic damages, including pain and suffering. Empirical research has shown that caps diminish access to the courts for low wage earners, like the elderly, children, and women; if economic damages are minor and noneconomic damages are capped, victims are less likely to be able to obtain counsel to represent them in seeking redress.

Those affected by caps on damages are the patients who have been most severely injured by the negligence of others. These patients who reside in communities around the country should not be told that, due to an arbitrary limit set by members of Congress in Washington, DC, they will be deprived of the compensation determined by a fair and impartial jury. The courts already possess and exercise their powers of remittitur to set aside excessive jury verdicts, and that is the appropriate solution rather than an arbitrary cap. For these reasons, the ABA opposes those provisions in H.R. 1215, such as Section 3(b), which would place a dollar limit on recoverable damages and operate to deny full compensation to a patient in a medical liability action.

**Proportionate Liability.** Section 3(d) of H.R. 1215 would create a "fair share rule" under which each party would be liable only for its share of any damages, and, as a result, the provision would preempt existing state laws that provide for joint and several liability in medical liability cases. The ABA believes that, at the state level, the laws providing for joint and several liability should be modified to recognize that defendants whose responsibility is substantially disproportionate to liability for the entire loss suffered by the plaintiff should be held liable for only their equitable share of the plaintiff's noneconomic loss. Although the ABA supports this principle and encourages other improvements to the tort laws at the state level, it opposes federal preemption of the medical liability laws of the states and territories. Therefore, the ABA opposes Section 3(d) to the extent that it would preempt existing state laws and to the extent that it would apply a proportionate liability rule to all damages, not just the plaintiff's noneconomic damages.

**Contingent Fees.** Section 4(a) of H.R. 1215 would empower a court to reduce the contingent fees paid from a plaintiff's damage award to an attorney, redirect damages to the plaintiff, and further reduce contingent fees in cases involving minors and incompetent persons. The ABA opposes sliding scales for contingent fees and other special restrictions on such fees. In 1985, the ABA created a Special Committee on Medical Professional Liability ("Special Committee") to study the initiatives proposed at that time in an Action Plan of the American Medical Association Special Task Force on Professional Liability and Insurance. Among the initiatives was a recommendation of sliding scales on contingent fees, having effects comparable to the caps proposed here. After review, the Special Committee concluded the following:

"A sliding scale for contingency fees in medical malpractice litigation may very well reduce total awards for patient-victims by depriving them of representation by a trial lawyer sufficiently skilled at obtaining the highest appropriate award. Mandatory sliding scale systems could also inhibit claimants' access to the court system by

limiting the availability of counsel. And imposing sliding scales only in medical malpractice cases would, in effect, create different level of skills among available counsel for plaintiffs in medical malpractice cases from those available to claimants in other tort cases."

As a result of this finding, the ABA adopted a policy in 1986 that "no justification exists for imposing special restrictions on contingent fees in medical malpractice actions." Therefore, the ABA opposes the limits on contingent fees contained in Section 4 of H.R. 1215.

The American Bar Association remains committed to maintaining a fair and efficient justice system where victims of medical malpractice can obtain redress based on state laws, without arbitrary or harmful restrictions. We offer these perspectives for your consideration as you mark up H.R. 1215.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. SUSMAN,  
*Director, Governmental Affairs Office.*

Mr. CHAIR, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1215, the so-called "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017."

I oppose this misguided and ill-considered legislation for several reasons.

Specifically, the bill before us should be rejected because:

1. H.R. 1215 violates state sovereignty;
2. H.R. 1215 applies well beyond medical malpractice;
3. Unjustifiably caps noneconomic damages, which will have a disproportionately adverse impact on women, the poor, and other vulnerable groups.
4. Provides unjustifiable immunity for health care providers who dispense defective or dangerous pharmaceuticals or medical devices;
5. Imposes an excessively short statute of limitations period;
6. Makes it harder for victims to obtain adequate legal representation; and
7. Inequitably imposes the risk of loss on victims rather than wrongdoers.

For over 200 years, the authority to determine medical liability has rested in the states.

This system, which grants each state the autonomy to regulate the resolution of medical liability actions within its own borders, is a hallmark of our American justice system.

H.R. 1215 would preempt state law in all 50 states with a rigid, uniform set of rules designed to make it more difficult for malpractice victims to obtain relief in the courts.

Victims injured by the negligent conduct of others, who have lost limbs, suffered traumatic brain injury, or lost their vision following medical procedures should not be subject to additional burdens of a possible limited recovery, currently available under state patients' bills of rights and other protections under the Affordable Care Act.

The definitions in H.R. 1215 are written in such vague and broad language as to potentially sweep in not only doctors and other medical professionals, hospitals and clinics, but also every entity that contributes in any way to making any health care product or service available, including insurance companies, pharmaceutical manufacturers, health product manufacturers, pharmacists, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, and mental health treatment centers, and drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility, among others.

H.R. 1215 will do nothing to strengthen protections for patients.

It goes in the opposite direction, by excusing the health care industry from accountability for carelessness, and shifting the burden for shouldering the consequences of preventable medical injury to the injured patients, their families, their employers, their insurance companies, and taxpayers.

Current provisions of the Affordable Care Act prohibit insurance companies from denying coverage for preexisting conditions, mandate coverage for young adults and children under the age of 26, and secure lifetime coverage caps, ensuring patients receive the care they need.

Empirical research has shown that caps on damages, such as those envisioned by H.R. 1215, diminish access to the courts for the most vulnerable, such as low wage earners, like the elderly, children, and women.

The bill arbitrarily caps so-called "non-economic loss"—which sweeps in essentially everything that is not loss of salary or additional medical expenses—at \$250,000 for the patient's lifetime, punishing those patients with the most devastating, life-altering injuries.

The bill forces the injured patient to take the amounts received for future expenses resulting from the injury in a "structured settlement," which may not match up with the patient's actual needs as they arise, and would further reduce the amount the careless health care provider actually pays.

Preventable medical errors are the third-leading cause of death in the United States, with an estimated 440,000 deaths each year following a medical error or hospital-caused infection during a hospital stay.

Addressing this problem must be a national priority.

And although policies to promote and require safer practices are key to this effort, that is insufficient.

We cannot assign a government monitor to every hospital operating room and every doctor's office.

Effective protection should also include enabling patients and their families to hold health care providers accountable for errors that cause harm.

H.R. 1215 would unfortunately take several major steps backward from this goal.

The bill twists important protections found in many state laws into an additional legal hurdle.

An extended statute of limitations protection allows patients who do not discover their injury until much later, sometimes many years after the medical procedure or intervention, to still have a chance to seek legal help.

But in the bill, the period in which an injured patient can seek legal help is actually shortened to one year.

The bill cuts off a patient injured as a young child if their family fails to bring legal action on their behalf, long before they are old enough to legally act on their own behalf.

This legislation would impose various restrictions on medical malpractice lawsuits, causing these restrictions to apply regardless of how much merit a case may have, the negligence at issue, or the severity of the issue.

If economic damages are minor and noneconomic damages are capped, victims are

less likely to be able to obtain counsel to represent them in seeking redress in these personal injury malpractice cases that often operate under contingency fee.

Those affected by caps on damages are the patients who have been most severely injured by the negligence of others.

These patients who reside in communities around the country should not be told that, due to an arbitrary limit set by members of Congress in Washington, DC, they will be deprived of the compensation determined by a fair and impartial jury.

The courts already possess and exercise their powers of remittitur to set aside excessive jury verdicts, and that is the appropriate solution rather than an arbitrary cap.

I am concerned that H.R. 1215 would put patient safety at higher risk, by significantly undermining the accountability of those who provide patients with medical care.

H.R. 1215 undercuts patients in situations in which carelessness or misconduct by several health care providers combines to injure the patient.

It arbitrarily "divides" blame among those actors and then if one of them evades accountability for any reason, the others who caused the injury are excused from having to make up the difference, and the injured patient is short-changed.

H.R. 1215 shifts accountability away from the careless health care providers who caused the injury and onto "collateral sources," such as the patient's insurance company or employer, or the government, that pay for part of the patient's medical expenses or other expenses resulting from the injury.

In effect, these other sources provide involuntary free insurance to careless health care providers.

The bill excuses doctors and other health care providers from any responsibility of looking into the safety and effectiveness of any medication or medical product, so long as it has been approved by the FDA.

Accordingly, I strongly oppose H.R. 1215 for these and many more reasons and urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the statement that this bill caps or limits States on economic or noneconomic damages is incorrect. In fact, I would point the gentlewoman from Texas to page 6 of the bill, that says, under State Flexibility, that specifies a particular monetary amount of economic or economic damages, there is no provision in this section that shall be construed to preempt State law. We wrote that specifically to respect the States' rights.

I recall a number of these pieces of legislation that have come before this Congress. I can remember it back at least until 2007. I was uneasy about the constitutionality because it did reach in and preempt State law.

And I am a respecter of States' rights, but we have a Federal interest in healthcare. That is the provision that is written into the bill. If there are Federal dollars involved, if it is a

Federal program, then the Federal Government has an interest in limiting these damages.

We capped the damages in this bill, not the economic damages. Those real damages that are economic damages are fully compensated, without limit, without cap, and without the interference of this law, unless States choose to cap economic damages.

Noneconomic damages, however, are capped at \$250,000; and that \$250,000 cap is something that has existed in California State law for more than 40 years, signed into law by the very durable Jerry Brown. But if the States want to change that, if they want to raise the cap beyond \$250,000, that is their right to do so. We specify that in the bill.

I would like to discuss a need for this bill. It is necessary to preserve fiscal sanity in Federal healthcare policy. And I would like to point out, also, at the outset that this bill only applies to claims concerning the provision of goods and services for which coverage is provided in whole or in part by a Federal program, a Federal subsidy, or a Federal tax benefit. It is a clear, clear, Mr. Chairman, Federal nexus. Wherever Federal policy affects the distribution of healthcare, there is a clear Federal interest.

So, the bill's commonsense reforms, which have been the law in California for over 40 years and that the CBO has scored a couple of times here—the previous score was \$54 billion; this score is \$50 billion—is over \$50 billion in savings to the people who are paying for healthcare in this country, and that includes our taxpayers and the healthcare users.

But the \$250,000 cap is reasonable. It has sustained itself over those 40 years in California, and it is good enough for other States to emulate.

When I hear some pushback from Texas, I am kind of thinking they want to keep the system they have, and they don't want to have to compete with the rest of the country. I think we might lose a vote or two to from Texas on that alone: We have ours; we don't want America to have anything like that because then we have to compete with all of America.

This bill will allow courts to require periodic payments for future damages instead of lump sum awards. That helps limit bankruptcies so plaintiffs that might receive only pennies on the dollar can be prevented. And it includes provisions creating a "fair share" rule by which damages are allocated fairly in direct proportion to fault. That has got to help a lot when you are thinking about the cost of healthcare.

The bill does all this without in any way limiting compensation for 100 percent of the plaintiffs' economic losses, which include anything to which a receipt can be attached, including all

medical costs, lost wages, future lost wages, rehabilitation costs, or any other economic out-of-pocket loss suffered as a result of a healthcare injury.

Far from limiting deserved recoveries in California, these reforms have led to medical damage awards in deserving cases, Mr. Chairman, in the area of the \$80 million to \$90 million range.

The Washington Post reported a few months ago: "U.S. healthcare spending . . . is projected to accelerate over the next decade. . . . A study by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services projects that the average growth in health spending will be even faster in 2016" on up through the decade of 2025. "The projections are based on an assumption that the legislative status quo will prevail."

If we don't change the law, we are going to see these costs going up.

As Nate Silver pointed out in *The New York Times*, not my favorite document: "All the major categories of Federal Government spending have been increasing relative to inflation. But essentially all of the increase in spending relative to economic growth and the potential tax base has come from entitlement programs, and about half of all of that has come from healthcare entitlements specifically."

Studies show that as healthcare costs rise, wages fall; and the more companies pay in healthcare costs, the less they can pay in wages. So when healthcare costs increase and that growth increases, wages stagnate; and when healthcare costs growth slows, wages go up.

Members who want to see wages increase should vote for this bill—it is good for the healthcare workers—because one of the drivers of higher healthcare spending is so-called defensive medicine.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

That is a very real phenomenon confirmed by countless studies in which healthcare workers conduct many additional costly tests and procedures with no medical value. That is charged to our Federal taxpayers, and it is simply to avoid excessive litigation costs.

A survey published in the *Archives of Internal Medicine* found that 91 percent of the over 1,000 doctors surveyed "reported believing that physicians order more tests and procedures than needed to protect themselves from malpractice suits."

The study also asked: "Are protections against unwarranted medical malpractice lawsuits needed to decrease the unnecessary use of diagnostic tests?" And the answer, an identical number: 91 percent of the doctors surveyed agreed.

But there is one *Newsweek* reporter who described the personal experience



of individual doctors this way: “Typical was one doctor, who had a list as long as my arm of procedures ER docs perform . . . for no patient benefit. They include following a bedside sonogram . . . with an “official” sonogram because it’s easier to defend yourself to a jury if you’ve ordered the second one; a CT scan for every child who bumped his or her head, to rule out things that can be diagnosed just fine by observation; X-rays that do not guide treatment, such as for a simple broken arm; CTs for suspected appendicitis that has been perfectly well diagnosed without it.

“Although doctors may hate practicing defensive medicine, they do it so they don’t get sued. . . . Nationwide, physicians estimate that 35 percent of diagnostic tests they ordered were to avoid lawsuits, as were 19 percent of hospitalizations, 14 percent of prescriptions, and 8 percent of surgeries. . . . All told,” according to the *Newsweek* article, \$650 billion in unnecessary care every year was provided by these doctors. Another ER doctor said he ordered 52 CT scans in one 12-hour shift for a total of \$104,000 in a single day.

These are the things we are dealing with, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

One of the most recent studies, published a few months ago in the *Journal of the American College of Radiology* studied the effects of tort reform on just radiographic tests alone and found that there were “2.4 million to 2.7 million fewer radiographic tests annually attributed to tort reforms.”

Just imagine what savings would occur if such reforms were attached to all Federal healthcare programs, as this bill would do.

□ 1445

It causes me to think of an orthopedic surgeon who told me that he can diagnose an ACL almost every time, yet he is compelled by his liability insurance to do additional tests, 97 percent of which are unnecessary.

That is the kind of thing we are dealing with, Mr. Chairman, and it is time for us to bring sanity to this litigation that we have in this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman very much. I think the question to the gentleman from Michigan, and the gentleman’s comments from Iowa, is the question of good medicine, and additional tests may, frankly, just be good medicine.

Maybe, Mr. Chair, Mr. CONYERS would agree that we should gather about insurance reform and capping premiums so that we can help our doc-

tors. And I would assure you that they would be very happy on that.

But to the gentleman’s point, I’m sorry to say he was incorrect, because we note that there are almost 20 States that have a variety of noncaps on certain aspects, and now the Federal intrusion will come in and now tell them where they do not have caps, that they have to have caps.

In fact, he is incorrect, and this bill does skew the medical service or medical treatment in our States.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1215, which should be more accurately called the taking away access to care and justice act. This bill will do nothing to strengthen patient protections and will make careless healthcare providers less accountable.

It will severely limit when an injured person is allowed to bring a healthcare lawsuit by shortening the time that injured people have to seek relief. It will also impose a one-size-fits-all cap on how much compensation victims of medical malpractice can receive for pain and suffering, regardless of the severity of a person’s injury—in order to benefit insurance companies and wrongdoers.

This cap even applies to intentional acts of misconduct. This bill would unfairly limit a patient suing a healthcare provider for sexual assault, as well as a veteran who has received substandard medical care. The bill is written so broadly, it shields both negligent doctors and manufacturers of dangerous drugs and medical devices from liability.

H.R. 1215 is before us at a time when Republicans in the Senate are working hard to pass a bill that eliminates health coverage for 22 million people in order to give the wealthiest Americans and insurance companies a huge tax cut. The American people deserve better than this.

Our legal and healthcare system should work for the benefit of hard-working Americans, the people we represent, not for the powerful special interests. Republicans are chomping at the bit for the opportunity to eliminate health coverage for honest, hard-working Americans and are making deep cuts to Medicaid just so they can give the richest people in this country a \$600 billion tax cut.

And now, they want to prevent injured people from getting justice when they are hurt. Middle class families need to see that we are on their side. They don’t need bills like H.R. 1215, which will rig the healthcare and justice systems against them.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 1215.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, it is just interesting to me to hear this discussion about the Senate addressing the healthcare situation in America. I stood on this floor time, after time, after time, and in 2010, March 23 of 2010, the final passage of ObamaCare was sent out of the Congress to the President of the United States, who signed it immediately before the sun could come up in the morning.

And I was sick at heart at what happened to our Constitution, our rule of law, our individual rights. And now we have a mess of a healthcare system in America. This is a component of the fix. We don’t have a single Democrat in the House or Senate that is willing to even commit to work with us to put up a single vote to try to improve the healthcare system in America.

They made a mistake, and they passed ObamaCare. They served it over to us and said: Now you fix it. Well, we are going to declare it a mess no matter what you do. We are going to fix it. It is going to take some time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, the ranking member from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I am thrilled to hear my colleague talk about the Constitution. I am sorry that the Constitution that he is talking about doesn’t include the right to a jury trial because that is the Constitution that I read.

And this piece of legislation, H.R. 1215, will threaten that constitutional right. We have been told there is nothing to worry about in this bill because it will cover 100 percent of economic costs—anything that comes with a receipt, we were told.

I am going to tell you what is wrong with this bill and the stories of four people: a young child who goes in for a simple procedure and leaves the hospital paralyzed; a young adult who requires the amputation of his left leg, but the doctor amputates the right leg and he leaves the hospital with neither; the woman whose physician used his power to sexually assault her while she is sedated; and the rape of a nursing home patient by a trusted healthcare provider.

Mr. Chairman, there will be no receipts that will cover the costs that those four individuals would suffer for the rest of their lives that could be turned in, compensated, and subject to this artificial cap.

Why is it that my colleagues believe that they are in a better position to determine how those wronged individuals should be compensated for the atrocities that happened to them instead of



allowing a jury of their peers do the same?

This bill is not meant to help reduce costs. This is an assault on injured people. This is an assault on those who value access to the courtroom in order to see justice.

I urge my colleagues, in the strongest possible terms, to reject this anticonsumer, this terrible piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, as you listen to the stories that are here that have been delivered by the gentleman from Florida, I am wondering why we haven't heard these stories come out of California. Because this legislation essentially mirrors California legislation. That was the model that we followed. And they have had over 40 years to repeal or amend it, and it has been sustainable.

There is a right to a jury trial under this. It is just that there are caps that are set, that are reasonable caps, and the States are free to change those caps up or down.

So I don't quite follow this, but I would say someone who is raped in a nursing home is not covered under this. This legislation doesn't affect it at all. It has to have an affect by a diagnosis, a prevention, or a treatment of a disease impairment; and a rape is not that. So it would not be covered under this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I know that my opposition would like to have this legislation killed. I would just point out something that I heard on the floor of the House here about 10 years ago, and it was this: We can pass this legislation, but the Senate may not pass it. And I would urge them to take it up. There is a special interest, and it is the Trial Lawyers Association. They are the ones who will not come out of this very well.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. As the House Liberty Caucus wrote, this bill violates the 10th Amendment that conservatives have always supported.

More troubling is the way this bill is worded. It could lead to what the Liberty Caucus describes as a "massive expansion of Federal authority" because it could make almost every medical malpractice case a Federal case. Every case should not be a Federal case.

The States have already put pretty severe limits on medical malpractice cases. I have two other problems with this bill. I am in my 29th year in Congress. The doctors were asking for this \$250,000 limit then, too. \$250,000 29 years ago is certainly not \$250,000 today.

Finally, this bill, in the end, is saying there are really no limits on suits against 99.8 percent of the people I represent, but we are going to have special protection for this one very respected group of people. Conservatives have traditionally had more faith in people than in government.

I was a judge for 7.5 years before coming to Congress. Conservatives used to believe strongly in the jury system, and still should believe in that today.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I point out also that this bill keeps these cases in State court. It doesn't move them to Federal court. Previous legislation that has been brought to this floor, a decade or so ago, did move a lot of these cases to Federal court. But it is carefully drafted to keep this with the maximum amount of respect for States' rights that can be held and still have a Federal interest.

There has to be a Federal interest in every dollar involved in this. In every single case, there has to be Federal dollars involved in it, or this bill wouldn't affect it at all. And so I am one who is also a great respecter of States' rights. And in this legislation, as drafted, there are provisions in there over and over again that protect as many of the States' rights as can be. And if you take the other side of this argument, then it is far stronger that the right of the Federal Government would be usurped by the States if we don't have this legislation.

That is what is taking place now—States that choose not to make a decision, not to set caps, and we are seeing huge settlements going on around the country. This is what we want to end, so that we can save the \$50 to \$54 billion for the taxpayers. But the thing that is even worth more than this is, how much of that \$650 billion in defensive medicine will no longer be used in this country, and how much safer and less expensive will our healthcare be in America?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just have to add here that H.R. 1215 deeply intrudes on States' sovereignty. In particular, H.R. 1215 preempts State law governing joint and several liability, the availability of damages, the ability to introduce evidence of collateral source benefits, attorneys' fees, and periodic payments of future damages.

Members should not be fooled by assertions that the bill preserves State law. In fact, the rule of construction contained in the bill expressly states that it preempts State law, except in very limited circumstances where State law is more favorable to defendants.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1215. First of all, my home State of Washington is one of those States where our Supreme Court has ruled and said that caps are not constitutional. So this bill is an intrusion of our States' rights.

This bill also clearly puts the interests of big corporations over everyday people and sends a signal to medical and health providers that they can act irresponsibly, perhaps to make more money, and get away with it.

Let me give you a very real example of what happens when hospitals put profit over people. The neurology program at Swedish Medical Center-Cherry Hill in Seattle is under investigation for negligent care arising out of a program designed to incentivize neuroscience doctors to take on heavy case-loads of complicated cases that lead to serious errors and even death.

One of the patients was Talia Goldenberg, a talented and vibrant young woman. Talia went in for a cervical spinal fusion with a neurosurgeon who had been embroiled in numerous investigations. And as a result of gross medical malpractice, Talia died.

According to a Seattle Times investigation, numerous problems surfaced around her care—or lack thereof—and attention to the surgery and medical complications that arose from it.

When Talia went in for her surgery, she was filled with hope. In thinking about the life that she might have after surgery, she wrote this: So who am I? I am an artist, a dreamer. I am a stationary biker. I am a woman, a girl, a person. I am a skier. I am an aspiring pole vaulter. I am a reluctant, yet faithful, believer of the power of lucky underwear. I am someone with a voice.

Talia died. She is one of the many tragic instances of people losing their lives to medical malpractice, and, even in my own office, two of my staffers have lost three of their grandparents due to medical malpractice. We have to make sure that we have consequences when we entrust our healthcare to someone, and there are grave errors.

For the sake of Talia and so many others like her who have dreams that are violated by preventable errors, we must defeat this bill.

A "no" vote is a vote for the American people.

□ 1500

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little surprised to hear that a judge in the State of Washington had ruled that caps are unconstitutional. In fact, it is kind of curious to hear the same arguments—or conflicting arguments coming out of the other side. One of them says it is the States' rights to be able to set the

caps. The other one says it is unconstitutional to set the caps. So I think that conflict, it would be good if that were resolved.

I think, in either case, that I disagree with both of those positions, Mr. Chairman.

If a Washington State judge says caps are unconstitutional, on what basis?

That would say, then, that a State legislature couldn't cap them; Congress can't cap them; that this is essentially, then, a function of the courts.

I remember a decision that came out of the State of Washington. It was a Federal judge that essentially ruled that the President's executive order on, let's say, migrants coming into the United States was unconstitutional, even though Congress specifically granted the authority to their President. So I am not going to defer to a single judge's opinion in that fashion.

I would point out, too, that we do protect States' rights. There is provision in this bill after provision, and it is titled State Flexibility. Look through there and find all the provisions of State Flexibility where we respect States' rights. And it is written as carefully as it can be to respect the maximum amount of States' rights.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, let's be clear: this bill has nothing to do with litigation reform. It has nothing to do with a good faith attempt to improve our healthcare system.

In fact, this bill was described as phase 3 of an effort to improve our healthcare by the majority leader on the other side of the aisle. I put out a search committee. I still can't find phase 1 or phase 2. It has nothing to do with reforming our healthcare system.

This bill is an unprecedented attack on States' rights. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a solution in search of a problem. It is nothing more than a reckless legislative joyride guaranteed to crash and burn on the American people.

This bill, if enacted, will hurt working families, middle class people, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, and nursing home residents.

The American people deserve a litigation system that works for everyone, not simply the wealthy and the well-off. The American people deserve a litigation system that puts the public's interest ahead of special interests. The American people deserve a litigation system that promotes public health, not just excessive wealth.

This bill fails on all of those counts. It is mean-spirited, it is cruel, it is heartless. Mr. Chairman, that is why it must be defeated.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would just point out to the body that I didn't hear a single fact in the previous 2 minutes. It is all opinion and hurled accusations. But I think it is important for this body to deliberate over the facts themselves, and I have delivered a lot of that data.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, the floor leader has invited us to stick to the facts, so I want to stick to the facts in order to clear up some of the propaganda I have heard today for this terrible bill.

First of all, it has nothing to do with "groundless cases or frivolous claims," because the draconian new limits proposed in their legislation applied only to valid claims in serious cases. It has nothing to do with groundless cases and frivolous claims. That is an irrelevant distraction from their own legislation, which is an attempt to reduce what you can recover with a perfectly valid claim when a jury has awarded you damages.

Number two, the floor leader says that it would not apply in the case of someone being raped in a nursing home. Perhaps he thinks it wouldn't apply to my constituent, a 15-year-old girl who got raped by her dentist.

But as I read the bill, it says, "healthcare lawsuit means any action against a healthcare provider," and that includes anyone who is providing healthcare. So if a nursing home is providing healthcare or a dentist is providing healthcare, they would be covered by the law.

But I would invite the floor leader to clear this up, because if he is representing now that rapes of patients in a nursing home or in a dentist's office don't count, that should be definitive legislative history that we establish today because we tried to amend the bill to that effect in committee and the majority voted it down. But he has just represented that a rape would not count, and I want him to definitively commit whether or not a rape by a healthcare provider would count.

Finally, the gentleman from Iowa says it won't preempt the States, it will not impose Federal laws because it is still in the State courts. It is still in the State courts, but Federal law now applies.

There are 28 States which have said that you cannot limit people's access to noneconomic damages when a jury wants to award them those damages for pain and suffering. They have either said in their Constitution there can be no limits at all, or the legislatures have said it, or the State su-

preme courts have struck it down. And their legislation is a bulldozer that will run over the laws of 28 States.

And they claim, Mr. Chairman, that somehow they are acting in the guise of federalism. They are destroying federalism. That is why I was so happy that Mr. DUNCAN, a former State Judge from Tennessee, and a member of the GOP majority, got up to say this is antithetical to everything they stand for.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out, first of all, the gentleman from Maryland must know that this isn't a criminal statute. This is civil law. It doesn't have anything to do with crime or criminal law, so let's keep our discussion to the civil actions that we are discussing here.

It is not propaganda. It is facts that we have delivered on this side. So I want to put this into the RECORD verbatim, Mr. Chairman. Regarding cases of rape or physical abuse, H.R. 1215 does not cover such cases at all. That is because the bill only applies to medical malpractice claims based on the provision or use of healthcare services; and healthcare services are defined in the bill as things related to the diagnosis, prevention, or treatment of any human disease or impairment.

Clearly, rape or any other physical abuse, and the neglect of basic sanitary conditions, is not related to the diagnosis, prevention, or treatment of any human disease or impairment. So in cases involving rape or physical abuse by anyone, or neglect of basic needs, the bill simply does not apply.

But it does respect States' rights. It is carefully written to protect States' rights. It is a significant and huge improvement upon some efforts we have seen in the past, and one of those reasons is because many of us care about States' rights, and we pay attention to the Constitution. There is a Federal nexus in everything that goes on here, and States are not limited from raising caps on economic or noneconomic damages or lowering those caps. We respect the States in every way possible, and still get a positive result out of H.R. 1215.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, there are only three States in the Union that set the limit where they want Congress to set it for every State, which is \$250,000. They are overriding the laws of 28 States which allow for unlimited damages.

Number two, the gentleman from Iowa says: Well, a rape is criminal, so it is not related.

But you can bring civil actions against the same conduct that constitutes a crime. So if you look at your

own bill, it says any theory of liability, so that would include intentional acts.

Now, again, Mr. Chairman, is the majority representing that this will not apply to intentional torts?

Because they were very definitive in committee that it would apply to intentional torts, including rapes and assaults. So I would like to know: Does it apply or does it not?

Because this is a critical matter, because people have been—we are not talking about the good doctors. Everybody loves the good doctors. We are talking about doctors or nursing home providers or dentists who rape their patients and assault their patients.

They would be limited—juries could try to give millions of dollars, but their legislation would limit you to \$250,000 in noneconomic damages. We have got to clear this up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1215, a misguided and misnamed bill that will limit access to justice, especially for women.

The bill caps the amount of compensation a jury can award to a victim who suffers medical injuries, even catastrophic injuries, because it creates a lifetime cap of \$250,000 for noneconomic damages.

This means that women, or men, for that matter, who are at home raising their families, or children who are victims of devastating medical malpractice are told that the value of their injuries and their lives is less than that of their wage-earning counterparts. That is patently unfair. It disproportionately penalizes people who are family caregivers—a very important job, but one that does not involve wages.

Furthermore, many women across the country have been victims of medical malpractice that has left them unable to bear children.

How can we say to these women that the loss they have suffered, the loss of an opportunity to be a mother is without value?

That is unacceptable, and it is cruel.

Many medical errors are preventable. We should be focusing on improving patient safety, not taking away rights from victims.

I oppose this bill, and I will continue to fight back against attempts to limit access to justice for those who need it most. Please join me in voting “no.”

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the gentleman from Maryland say that this legislation would override the laws of 28 States. That was a surprise to me to hear that when I heard the number before Rules Committee, which I think I

actually recall it was 27. But 28, 27, it doesn't override laws. It is the absence of laws.

There are States that don't have caps. That is what we are talking about here. So it is not overriding State laws in States where there are no laws. It simply is setting a Federal foundation and a guideline for them.

And if I am in a State legislature, I know I have the authority to raise or lower the cap on economic and on noneconomic damages, and that my laws are not being overridden, but they are being provided by the wisdom of the American people, then I am going to be thankful I have that to work with until I can amend it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I refer my colleague, the floor leader on the other side to section 9 of the bill. We have just looked at it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1215 and to express my extreme concerns with this bill.

I am from California, and I am an attorney, and I can tell you that this bill goes beyond medical malpractice. It goes way beyond that. It includes cases involving unsafe drugs and nursing home abuse and neglect. That is not happening in California.

If passed, it would prevent cases where seniors have endured tragic deaths and injuries, like an 88-year-old California woman who was sexually assaulted by her nursing assistant after she suffered a stroke, resulting in lifelong mental and physical pain.

Over 80 senior and healthcare groups, including the American Association for Justice and the California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform, have come out against this bill. They recognize that we need to protect our vulnerable seniors.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, here we are dealing with some amount of irony with H.R. 1215. The year 1215 was the year the Magna Carta was signed, something that created the seeds of the American right to jury trial, for Heaven's sake.

You know, we were pleased to hear Representative DUNCAN from Tennessee say: “Conservatives believe strongly in the jury system.” And I do, too, and Americans do, too. Our Founding Fathers believed in it.

Here in America, where we trust juries to decide life and death for criminal defendants, why wouldn't we trust

them to set a proper and fair dollar amount on a malpractice case?

By definition, these are meritorious cases, cases where there was actual negligence, actual recklessness, actual intentional harm by healthcare providers or nursing homes.

□ 1515

But maybe most importantly, none of us, nary a soul in this House would deny that standing up for veterans and our military families is a core value for all of us. This is a bill that prevents accountability for harm done to military and veterans of the VA system.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CONYERS very much for yielding.

The good gentleman from Iowa invites us to believe that the laws of the States are not being overridden because some of these States don't have laws. That's right, because their State supreme courts have said that their constitutions forbid the imposition of a cap on what juries would award people who are injured in medical cases.

So, in Arizona, Arkansas, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming, there are State constitutional prohibitions explicitly on damage caps. In New York and Oklahoma, there are explicit caps on damages in wrongful death cases. And in 11 States, State supreme courts have struck down statutorily enacted medical malpractice damage caps: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Now, what is interesting in my State, the 15-year-old girl who was raped by her dentist could recover up to \$785,000 because we had a whole special session of our general assembly to arrive at that figure. But there are other States where they said you can't have any limits at all, and those are the States that are being attacked by this legislation because now they are reducing them from potentially \$20 million or \$10 million to \$200,000, an outrageous invasion in states' rights and the rights of juries to decide how people need to be compensated.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Numerous consumer, labor, veterans, and legal groups all oppose H.R. 1215, including the AFL-CIO, the American College of Physicians, the Consumers Union, Public Citizen, Vietnam Veterans of America, 12 other national veterans organizations, and the Liberty Caucus.

H.R. 1215 is an extremely flawed bill that will deny access to justice for victims of medical malpractice and especially those who are the most vulnerable among us. It would deny full compensation for injuries suffered by veterans and military families, children, the elderly, and the poor.

I hope my colleagues will join us in opposing this very unnecessary, mean-spirited bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I inquire as to the amount of time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, I say in response to the gentleman from Maryland's discussion about the States courts that have prohibited caps. That is one of the reasons that we need this legislation, is that you have out-of-control liberal judges that have decided that even their State legislatures can't pass the laws. They want to come in and preempt the states' rights of we, the people, of the individual States who elect their general assemblies to make their decisions.

Often, the judges are set in lifetime appointments where they are not held accountable, so it would be interesting to look back into each of these States that the gentleman from Maryland has mentioned and address this thing from "we, the people" because we, the people, are the power in this country. Our rights come from God, and they are vested in we, the people.

I thought the gentleman from Pennsylvania's look at H.R. 1215 was a really deft way to focus on this and speak about the Magna Carta, but there wasn't anybody back in old England in that time that had any shot at filing a liability claim, let alone receiving a frivolous claim that would make one individual vastly wealthy at the expense of a lot of other folks. So this is something that has accumulated over the last 502 years since the Magna Carta was signed.

So I would say this: healthcare costs are out of control due in large part to unlimited lawsuits and other problems ObamaCare failed to solve or else ObamaCare made worse. H.R. 1215 is commonsense litigation reform legislation that will rein in overly aggressive and healthcare lawsuits while preserving the ability of plaintiffs to recover unlimited economic damages.

The bill applies only to claims concerning the provision of healthcare goods or services for which coverage is provided in whole or in part by a Federal program, a Federal subsidy, or a Federal tax benefit giving it a clear Federal nexus.

This isn't criminal legislation. It doesn't address the cases of rape. We

should arrest those people and lock them up in prison and punish them to the max, but it is not the subject of this legislation.

So wherever the Federal policy directly affects the distribution of healthcare, there is a clear Federal interest in reducing the cost of such Federal policy. This bill's commonsense reforms, which have been the law in California for over 40 years, are conservatively estimated by CBO to save at least \$50 billion. The previous estimate was \$54 billion in Federal healthcare dollars. At the same time, this bill doesn't in any way limit compensation for 100 percent of plaintiffs' losses.

As reported in The Washington Post last month, the U.S. healthcare spending is projected to accelerate over the next day. A study by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services project that the average growth in healthcare spending will be even faster between 2016 and 2025. The projections are based on an assumption that the legislative status quo will prevail. Studies show that, as healthcare costs rise, wages fall. H.R. 1215 will save billions of dollars in healthcare costs and will, thereby, increase wages for workers nationwide.

Mr. Chairman, as I look at the picture of how I watched this defensive medicine grow over the years and over the decades, \$650 billion potentially, reported by a Newsweek article, in unnecessary defensive medicine tests that are done. A doctor that ordered CT scans in massive numbers in a single day, when I see 97 percent of the MRIs just to be sure that the diagnosis of an ACL knee injury is protected in the case of liability insurance, we are not going to see just \$50 billion in savings here. We are going to see hundreds of billions of dollars in savings.

And as an anesthesiologist told me that—he was practicing in Texas—when Texas passed the law that is roughly a mirror of California law, that his premium as an anesthesiologist was \$26,000 a year; and after the law passed in Texas, it dropped to \$6,500, exactly one-fourth. A 75 percent reduction in that particular case. He is now practicing in Iowa. Iowa passed mirror legislation as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a

substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

#### H.R. 1215

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Encouraging speedy resolution of claims.
- Sec. 3. Compensating patient injury.
- Sec. 4. Maximizing patient recovery.
- Sec. 5. Authorization of payment of future damages to claimants in health care lawsuits.
- Sec. 6. Product liability for health care providers.
- Sec. 7. Definitions.
- Sec. 8. Effect on other laws.
- Sec. 9. Rules of construction.
- Sec. 10. Effective date.

#### SEC. 2. ENCOURAGING SPEEDY RESOLUTION OF CLAIMS.

(a) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—The time for the commencement of a health care lawsuit shall be 3 years after the date of injury or 1 year after the claimant discovers, or through the use of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the injury, whichever occurs first. In no event shall the time for commencement of a health care lawsuit exceed 3 years after the date of injury unless tolled for any of the following—

- (1) upon proof of fraud;
  - (2) intentional concealment; or
  - (3) the presence of a foreign body, which has no therapeutic or diagnostic purpose or effect, in the person of the injured person.
- Actions by a minor shall be commenced within 3 years from the date of the injury except that actions by a minor under the full age of 6 years shall be commenced within 3 years of injury, or 1 year after the injury is discovered, or through the use of reasonable diligence should have been discovered, or prior to the minor's 8th birthday, whichever provides a longer period. Such time limitation shall be tolled for minors for any period during which a parent or guardian and a health care provider have committed fraud or collusion in the failure to bring an action on behalf of the injured minor.

(b) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—No provision of subsection (a) shall be construed to preempt any state law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that—

- (1) specifies a time period of less than 3 years after the date of injury or less than 1 year after the claimant discovers, or through the use of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the injury, for the filing of a health care lawsuit;
- (2) that specifies a different time period for the filing of lawsuits by a minor;
- (3) that triggers the time period based on the date of the alleged negligence; or
- (4) establishes a statute of repose for the filing of health care lawsuit.

#### SEC. 3. COMPENSATING PATIENT INJURY.

(a) UNLIMITED AMOUNT OF DAMAGES FOR ACTUAL ECONOMIC LOSSES IN HEALTH CARE LAWSUITS.—In any health care lawsuit, nothing in this Act shall limit a claimant's recovery

of the full amount of the available economic damages, notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (b).

(b) **ADDITIONAL NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.**—In any health care lawsuit, the amount of noneconomic damages, if available, shall not exceed \$250,000, regardless of the number of parties against whom the action is brought or the number of separate claims or actions brought with respect to the same injury.

(c) **NO DISCOUNT OF AWARD FOR NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.**—For purposes of applying the limitation in subsection (b), future noneconomic damages shall not be discounted to present value. The jury shall not be informed about the maximum award for noneconomic damages. An award for noneconomic damages in excess of \$250,000 shall be reduced either before the entry of judgment, or by amendment of the judgment after entry of judgment, and such reduction shall be made before accounting for any other reduction in damages required by law. If separate awards are rendered for past and future noneconomic damages and the combined awards exceed \$250,000, the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced first.

(d) **FAIR SHARE RULE.**—In any health care lawsuit, each party shall be liable for that party's several share of any damages only and not for the share of any other person. Each party shall be liable only for the amount of damages allocated to such party in direct proportion to such party's percentage of responsibility. Whenever a judgment of liability is rendered as to any party, a separate judgment shall be rendered against each such party for the amount allocated to such party. For purposes of this section, the trier of fact shall determine the proportion of responsibility of each party for the claimant's harm.

(e) **STATE FLEXIBILITY.**—No provision of this section shall be construed to preempt any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that specifies a particular monetary amount of economic or noneconomic damages (or the total amount of damages) that may be awarded in a health care lawsuit, regardless of whether such monetary amount is greater or lesser than is provided for under this section.

#### **SEC. 4. MAXIMIZING PATIENT RECOVERY.**

(a) **COURT SUPERVISION OF SHARE OF DAMAGES ACTUALLY PAID TO CLAIMANTS.**—In any health care lawsuit, the court shall supervise the arrangements for payment of damages to protect against conflicts of interest that may have the effect of reducing the amount of damages awarded that are actually paid to claimants. In particular, in any health care lawsuit in which the attorney for a party claims a financial stake in the outcome by virtue of a contingent fee, the court shall have the power to restrict the payment of a claimant's damage recovery to such attorney, and to redirect such damages to the claimant based upon the interests of justice and principles of equity. In no event shall the total of all contingent fees for representing all claimants in a health care lawsuit exceed the following limits:

(1) Forty percent of the first \$50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).

(2) Thirty-three and one-third percent of the next \$50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).

(3) Twenty-five percent of the next \$500,000 recovered by the claimant(s).

(4) Fifteen percent of any amount by which the recovery by the claimant(s) is in excess of \$600,000.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The limitations in this section shall apply whether the recovery is

by judgment, settlement, mediation, arbitration, or any other form of alternative dispute resolution. In a health care lawsuit involving a minor or incompetent person, a court retains the authority to authorize or approve a fee that is less than the maximum permitted under this section. The requirement for court supervision in the first two sentences of subsection (a) applies only in civil actions.

(c) **STATE FLEXIBILITY.**—No provision of this section shall be construed to preempt any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that specifies a lesser percentage or lesser total value of damages which may be claimed by an attorney representing a claimant in a health care lawsuit.

#### **SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT OF FUTURE DAMAGES TO CLAIMANTS IN HEALTH CARE LAWSUITS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In any health care lawsuit, if an award of future damages, without reduction to present value, equaling or exceeding \$50,000 is made against a party with sufficient insurance or other assets to fund a periodic payment of such a judgment, the court shall, at the request of any party, enter a judgment ordering that the future damages be paid by periodic payments, in accordance with the Uniform Periodic Payment of Judgments Act promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section applies to all actions which have not been first set for trial or retrial before the effective date of this Act.

(c) **STATE FLEXIBILITY.**—No provision of this section shall be construed to preempt any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that specifies periodic payments for future damages at any amount other than \$50,000 or that mandates such payments absent the request of either party.

#### **SEC. 6. PRODUCT LIABILITY FOR HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.**

A health care provider who prescribes, or who dispenses pursuant to a prescription, a medical product approved, licensed, or cleared by the Food and Drug Administration shall not be named as a party to a product liability lawsuit involving such product and shall not be liable to a claimant in a class action lawsuit against the manufacturer, distributor, or seller of such product.

#### **SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION SYSTEM; ADR.**—The term "alternative dispute resolution system" or "ADR" means a system that provides for the resolution of health care lawsuits in a manner other than through a civil action brought in a State or Federal court.

(2) **CLAIMANT.**—The term "claimant" means any person who brings a health care lawsuit, including a person who asserts or claims a right to legal or equitable contribution, indemnity, or subrogation, arising out of a health care liability claim or action, and any person on whose behalf such a claim is asserted or such an action is brought, whether deceased, incompetent, or a minor.

(3) **COLLATERAL SOURCE BENEFITS.**—The term "collateral source benefits" means any amount paid or reasonably likely to be paid in the future to or on behalf of the claimant, or any service, product, or other benefit provided or reasonably likely to be provided in the future to or on behalf of the claimant, as a result of the injury or wrongful death, pursuant to—

(A) any State or Federal health, sickness, income-disability, accident, or workers' compensation law;

(B) any health, sickness, income-disability, or accident insurance that provides health benefits or income-disability coverage;

(C) any contract or agreement of any group, organization, partnership, or corporation to provide, pay for, or reimburse the cost of medical, hospital, dental, or income-disability benefits; and

(D) any other publicly or privately funded program.

(4) **CONTINGENT FEE.**—The term "contingent fee" includes all compensation to any person or persons which is payable only if a recovery is effected on behalf of one or more claimants.

(5) **ECONOMIC DAMAGES.**—The term "economic damages" means objectively verifiable monetary losses incurred as a result of the provision or use of (or failure to provide or use) health care services or medical products, such as past and future medical expenses, loss of past and future earnings, cost of obtaining domestic services, loss of employment, and loss of business or employment opportunities, unless otherwise defined under applicable state law. In no circumstances shall damages for health care services or medical products exceed the amount actually paid or incurred by or on behalf of the claimant.

(6) **FUTURE DAMAGES.**—The term "future damages" means any damages that are incurred after the date of judgment, settlement, or other resolution (including mediation, or any other form of alternative dispute resolution).

(7) **HEALTH CARE LAWSUIT.**—The term "health care lawsuit" means any health care liability claim concerning the provision of goods or services for which coverage was provided in whole or in part via a Federal program, subsidy or tax benefit, or any health care liability action concerning the provision of goods or services for which coverage was provided in whole or in part via a Federal program, subsidy or tax benefit, brought in a State or Federal court or pursuant to an alternative dispute resolution system, against a health care provider regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of claimants, plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of claims or causes of action, in which the claimant alleges a health care liability claim. Such term does not include a claim or action which is based on criminal liability; which seeks civil fines or penalties paid to Federal, State, or local government; or which is grounded in antitrust.

(8) **HEALTH CARE LIABILITY ACTION.**—The term "health care liability action" means a civil action brought in a State or Federal court or pursuant to an alternative dispute resolution system, against a health care provider regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action, in which the claimant alleges a health care liability claim.

(9) **HEALTH CARE LIABILITY CLAIM.**—The term "health care liability claim" means a demand by any person, whether or not pursuant to ADR, against a health care provider, including, but not limited to, third-party claims, cross-claims, counter-claims, or contribution claims, which are based upon the provision or use of (or the failure to provide or use) health care services or medical products, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of

plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action.

(10) **HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.**—The term “health care provider” means any person or entity required by State or Federal laws or regulations to be licensed, registered, or certified to provide health care services, and being either so licensed, registered, or certified, or exempted from such requirement by other statute or regulation, as well as any other individual or entity defined as a health care provider, health care professional, or health care institution under state law.

(11) **HEALTH CARE SERVICES.**—The term “health care services” means the provision of any goods or services by a health care provider, or by any individual working under the supervision of a health care provider, that relates to the diagnosis, prevention, or treatment of any human disease or impairment, or the assessment or care of the health of human beings.

(12) **MEDICAL PRODUCT.**—The term “medical product” means a drug, device, or biological product intended for humans, and the terms “drug”, “device”, and “biological product” have the meanings given such terms in sections 201(g)(1) and 201(h) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(g)(1) and (h)) and section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)), respectively, including any component or raw material used therein, but excluding health care services.

(13) **NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.**—The term “noneconomic damages” means damages for physical and emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, physical impairment, mental anguish, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of society and companionship, loss of consortium (other than loss of domestic service), hedonic damages, injury to reputation, and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature incurred as a result of the provision or use of (or failure to provide or use) health care services or medical products, unless otherwise defined under applicable state law.

(14) **RECOVERY.**—The term “recovery” means the net sum recovered after deducting any disbursements or costs incurred in connection with prosecution or settlement of the claim, including all costs paid or advanced by any person. Costs of health care incurred by the plaintiff and the attorneys’ office overhead costs or charges for legal services are not deductible disbursements or costs for such purpose.

(15) **REPRESENTATIVE.**—The term “representative” means a legal guardian, attorney, person designated to make decisions on behalf of a patient under a medical power of attorney, or any person recognized in law or custom as a patient’s agent.

(16) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof.

#### SEC. 8. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

##### (a) VACCINE INJURY.—

(1) To the extent that title XXI of the Public Health Service Act establishes a Federal rule of law applicable to a civil action brought for a vaccine-related injury or death—

(A) this Act does not affect the application of the rule of law to such an action; and

(B) any rule of law prescribed by this Act in conflict with a rule of law of such title XXI shall not apply to such action.

(2) If there is an aspect of a civil action brought for a vaccine-related injury or death to which a Federal rule of law under title XXI of the Public Health Service Act does not apply, then this Act or otherwise applicable law (as determined under this Act) will apply to such aspect of such action.

(b) **OTHER FEDERAL LAW.**—Except as provided in this section, nothing in this Act shall be deemed to affect any defense available to a defendant in a health care lawsuit or action under any other provision of Federal law.

#### SEC. 9. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **HEALTH CARE LAWSUITS.**—Unless otherwise specified in this Act, the provisions governing health care lawsuits set forth in this Act preempt, subject to subsections (b) and (c), State law to the extent that State law prevents the application of any provisions of law established by or under this Act. The provisions governing health care lawsuits set forth in this Act supersede chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to the extent that such chapter—

(1) provides for a greater amount of damages or contingent fees, a longer period in which a health care lawsuit may be commenced, or a reduced applicability or scope of periodic payment of future damages, than provided in this Act; or

(2) prohibits the introduction of evidence regarding collateral source benefits, or mandates or permits subrogation or a lien on collateral source benefits.

(b) **PROTECTION OF STATES’ RIGHTS AND OTHER LAWS.**—Any issue that is not governed by any provision of law established by or under this Act (including State standards of negligence) shall be governed by otherwise applicable State or Federal law

(c) **STATE FLEXIBILITY.**—No provision of this Act shall be construed to preempt any defense available to a party in a health care lawsuit under any other provision of State or Federal law.

#### SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall apply to any health care lawsuit brought in a Federal or State court, or subject to an alternative dispute resolution system, that is initiated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that any health care lawsuit arising from an injury occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act shall be governed by the applicable statute of limitations provisions in effect at the time the cause of action accrued.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–179. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–179.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 2, line 18 and insert the following:

##### (a) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the time for the commencement of a health care lawsuit shall be, whichever occurs first of the following:

(A) 3 years after the date of the occurrence of the breach or tort;

(B) 3 years after the date the medical or health care treatment that is the subject of the claim is completed; or

(C) 1 year after the claimant discovers, or through the use of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the injury.

(2) **TOLLING.**—In no event shall the time for commencement of a health care lawsuit exceed 3 years after the date of the occurrence of the breach or tort or 3 years after the date the medical or health care treatment that is the subject of the claim is completed (whichever occurs first) unless tolled for any of the following—

(A) upon proof of fraud;

(B) intentional concealment; or

(C) the presence of a foreign body, which has no therapeutic or diagnostic purpose or effect, in the person of the injured person.

(3) **ACTIONS BY A MINOR.**—Actions by a minor shall be commenced within 3 years after the date of the occurrence of the breach or tort or 3 years after the date of the medical or health care treatment that is the subject of the claim is completed (whichever occurs first) except that actions by a minor under the full age of 6 years shall be commenced within 3 years after the date of the occurrence of the breach or tort, 3 years after the date of the medical or health care treatment that is the subject of the claim is completed, or 1 year after the injury is discovered, or through the use of reasonable diligence should have been discovered, or prior to the minor’s 8th birthday, whichever provides a longer period. Such time limitation shall be tolled for minors for any period during which a parent or guardian and a health care provider have committed fraud or collusion in the failure to bring an action on behalf of the injured minor.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 382, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Session) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment with Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, also a member of the House Rules Committee, and also a gentleman from my home State of Texas.

The goal of our amendment is to strengthen the underlying legislation by clarifying the point at which the statute of limitations begins to run.

In Texas, the statute of limitations begins to run from the date the alleged negligence occurs or date of last treatment. This is a certain date that does not leave room for controversy. I believe aligning the underlying text with this approach will benefit both physicians and patients to clarify exactly where harm might occur.

My amendment clarifies that when the date of the breach or tort is known, the statute runs from that date. When the date of the breach or tort is not known, the statute runs from the last

date of treatment. By this method, certainty is provided to defendant, plaintiff, and the court. Easy understanding. For example, if there is a surgical mishap, the statute would run from that date. On the other hand, if the injury is from the prescription medication over a long period of time, it would run from the date of last treatment.

I am pleased that the Texas Medical Association, the Texas Alliance for Patient Access, the Health Coalition of Liability and Access, as well as the National Physicians' Council for Healthcare Policy support this process and this amendment. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this commonsense, reasonable reform that comes to us today in an amendment.

I thank Chairman BOB GOODLATTE from Virginia and his awesome staff for their work to make sure this amendment and the underlying legislation conform with their ideas consistent with the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does even more damage than the bill does because it makes it possible that there will be even less time for a plaintiff, once they are aware of their injury, to bring action.

This is something that lessens the statute of limitations. That is what the bill is trying to do, is to see that less people get their opportunity to get to court, which is what statute of limitations are intended to do. That is the purpose.

When somebody has been injured from a medical malpractice case or negligence from a nursing home, we should encourage people to get relief and let a jury decide.

These bills—and I suspect these amendments because they are aimed at the same thing—are opposed by the AFL-CIO; the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; the American Bar Association—not exactly a liberal lion—the Center for Justice and Democracy; and the National Conference of State Legislatures. Also, because this is a foray into federalism—unheard of before, making this a Federal issue, not a State issue—the Consumer Federation of America, the Consumers Unions, Public Citizen, and Vietnam Veterans of America. There are many other groups as well.

This amendment does more to see that folks don't get access to a jury. And the irony of it is that the national Republican effort seems to be to talk badly about Washington and Congress and drain the swamp and believe in the individuals back home and folks at home.

Well, the most pure form of justice comes from a jury where you have a

jury of your peers in your own community who are chosen to determine what happened, to determine the facts, and to determine the damages. Instead, they are proposing that the Republicans in Congress know better what to do to put limits on what a jury can award their fellow citizens.

And they are also putting limitations on the statute of limitations and lessening that, and on joint and several liability, which go toward helping people who have gotten judgments be able to collect on judgments, which is so important. A judgment is no good unless you can collect on it. It is just counter to what the Republican Party philosophy generally is and has been, that I have kind of perceived recently, about being against Washington and laws coming on down high from Washington, D.C.

□ 1530

Much of what we heard at our discussion from a gentleman from West Virginia was about a West Virginia law. That is what you are supposed to have is a West Virginia law. Then somebody else talked about a Texas law, and they are holding up a California law.

Each State is supposed to make its own laws. We have got 50 States. They talk a lot about the 50 States and the electoral college, and the States have an important function in our system of government. They are supposed to be areas where they have provinces and act. Juries, jury trials, and trial courts, that is all State law, and that should be determined by West Virginia, Texas, California, and Florida, not up here.

This bill, when it went through committee, passed by one vote because a couple of folks—I think it was Judge POE and Judge GOHMERT; I am pretty sure it was the two of them—two judges from the State of Texas felt it went too far in encroaching on the States' province dealing with tort law. This amendment just goes the same direction.

This is just unfortunate that what we are trying to do is help, really, insurance companies; it is not so much doctors. Doctors might benefit some, but it is the insurance companies that would benefit the most, and that is who this is about.

So we oppose the amendment and we oppose the bill. We support the American people and the right of the people and the juries to dispense justice that the facts dictate and that justice demands.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the debate that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had was completely clear, which I would disagree with that statement. The gentleman from Iowa stated very clearly that there are surgeries, there are proce-

dures, and there are processes that cost the Federal Government hundreds of millions, and the gentleman even went into the billions of dollars, which are parts of practices of medicine that doctors do as a defensive part of medicine to avoid exactly what we are talking about: getting sued. It is costing the Federal Government an enormous amount of money.

The gentleman did refer to two Members of Congress from Texas. We will see how they vote.

But the clarifying amendments that we are offering now, amendment No. 1 and amendment No. 2, come directly from negotiations with and understanding with the Texas Medical Association and the National Physicians' Policy Council to ensure that, in fact, the compliance is made that people not only in Texas, but also in other States, would have that would offer a physician the ability for them to use their knowledge, their training, and their expertise as opposed to practicing defensive medicine that harms every single taxpayer. That is why we are offering this today.

I am delighted. I believe what we have done is right.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I want to express, Mr. Chairman, how much I appreciate the work that has been done by so many people and their part in this bill.

I rise in support of this improving amendment—it comes out of the minds of Texas, I might add—which would clarify the timing of the statute of limitations in the provision base of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the Sessions amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment—a bad amendment—that makes a bad bill worse. All those folks from Texas ought to be going to Austin. Where this belongs is in Austin, not in Washington. These are State issues.

We had an amendment that said that these defensive measures that you say that they are taking that waste all this money and time, we had an amendment that said these caps wouldn't apply if you cut off the wrong arm, and you all wouldn't take it. So I don't know how many defensive measures they have got.

This is the right arm; this is the left arm. When you go in to do surgery and you have to amputate an arm, take off the right arm or the left arm, but not the wrong arm. If you take off the wrong arm—damages big time. You all didn't accept that amendment.

This is shutting the courthouse door, closing down juries, and not having



faith in the American people to be able to ascertain facts and damages as they have throughout time immemorial. It is a power grab from Washington. It is the swamp draining over to flood the State houses of all 50 of our States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman, Mr. KING, has argued the point very successfully, and that is we believe it is in the best interests of not only the taxpayers, but physicians, physicians who have used their training, their expertise, and their knowledge to perform the necessary missions that are necessary. When those physicians do make mistakes—and mistakes will happen—then we believe that the rights of those that are reported in California and Texas would be consistent with those that would be great for the country. We are willing to share, and we appreciate the opportunity to present this.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment that I have presented today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-179.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 13, insert after “goods or services” the following: “(including safety, professional, or administrative services directly related to health care)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 382, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer my thanks not only to Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, but also the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for his work on behalf of all Members on the floor today, for his work not only for the Judiciary Committee, but people of faith and confidence that this country can address the issues and needs.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, who is also from my home State of Texas as well as a member of the Rules Committee.

The goal of our amendment is to clarify that healthcare liability claims covered by the legislation include safety, professional, and administrative services directly related to healthcare. In other words, we are bringing in the

entire scope, not just necessarily the medical procedure.

I was glad to see that H.R. 1215 adopts many of the reforms that States across this country have thoroughly tested in their efforts to improve medical liability law, including my home State of Texas.

Not all claims asserted against healthcare providers arise from the direct provision of medical care. My amendment addresses the full spectrum of healthcare claims by following the model that Texas has successfully implemented.

Common examples of administrative claims related to healthcare are cases for negligence involving credentialing fraud against hospitals and those serving on their professional committees. In these cases, the plaintiff typically is not a patient of the physician serving on the committee; however, there is significant exposure to liability for the physician.

Safety claims are another necessary component in the scope of this bill. In these cases, a patient's injury does not arise out of the rendition of healthcare, but pertains to the safety of the patient.

The Texas Medical Association, the Texas Alliance for Patient Access, and the National Physicians' Policy Council are among those organizations who not only support this narrowly tailored amendment, but also their support of the entire bill and the inclusions of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is called the Protecting Access to Care Act, but that is really a misnomer because the purpose of these amendments in the bill takes as a given that there are going to be allegations that doctors, medical device companies—not exactly limited financial resources or in potential for harm—and nursing homes are going to be alleged to have committed torts against individuals and that when that happens, if this becomes law, there will be less opportunity for individuals to get their day in court.

Because most people in the United States are not wealthy, most of the people that get injured not being wealthy are going to bear the brunt of this when they don't get to court within the statute of limitations or they don't collect because of the joint and several liability changes in the law or they get less with noneconomic damages because of the \$250,000 cap.

Who is going to benefit from this? Who is going to benefit? It is going to be the person who a jury has found to have been negligent and violated their

duty of care: a nursing home, a medical device company, or a physician. They are going to have less damages, less judgments against them, and less costs. Insurance companies can then make more money, and doctors will have lesser premiums.

Who loses? People who have been injured by medical device defective merchandise, nursing home negligence, or medical malpractice.

We are not talking about limiting damages and the ability to recover by having a lesser joint and several liability law. We are not talking about people who have not gotten a judgment. We are talking about people who have gotten a judgment for negligence.

Just like the Republican healthcare bill, this gives billions of dollars to the richest people in America with tax cuts at the expense of poor people who get Medicaid, people with disabilities, pregnant women, poor people, and seniors in nursing homes. They suffer.

This is a microcosm of the healthcare proposals that the Senate can't get 50 votes for—and they didn't even try for 60, which they normally do, because they knew it was not going to be that sufficient, but now they can't even get 50 under reconciliation—and it is a microcosm of hurting the poor and enriching the rich.

These are cases where there will be judgments—juries finding negligence, harm, and damages—if you get to the courthouse on time, and then you won't be able to collect as much.

So who wins? The rich, the medical device companies, the nursing homes, and the physicians. Who loses? Those who have suffered, those whom juries have found to be victims, and victims who should be able to collect but we are limiting how much they can collect and we are making it more difficult for them to collect.

That is not what this Congress should be doing is enriching the wealthy and hurting those who have been harmed by negligence. If it is going to happen, it ought to happen in the States. So it is an attack on the 10th Amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN from Tennessee came here and gave beautiful testimony about a consistent life protecting the 10th Amendment, and that is what Mr. GOHMERT and Judge POE also did about what is left to the States. That is why this amendment and the bill are both bad.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman I respect very much, not only the perspective that the gentleman holds, but perhaps some of his argument could be true.

Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do is to balance out the opportunity for

the American people to have access to healthcare where, many items, they are denied.

I was reminded by the gentleman, the young chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Dr. PHIL ROE, who served his great State of Tennessee and the American people as an obstetrician and gynecologist, I was reminded of the facts of the case, as it were, where, when Texas passed this, counties all along our Texas borders received, instead of midwives and others who might perform these important services to deliver babies, all of a sudden medical professionals, doctors, came into play who had been shut out because of the fear of malpractice lawsuits against them. Texas added, in the first year, some 4,500 doctors who came to Texas knowing that it was a level playing field.

In this case, Mr. Chairman, we are arguing that the United States of America and the citizens would not have to pay outrageous amounts of money for defensive medicine, whereby physicians, in order to protect themselves and to protect themselves in a difficult circumstance, might order, as a defensive mechanism, excessive amounts of either X-rays or other procedures that really cost the government money instead of providing better healthcare.

□ 1545

This has been an advantage in the State of California, and in the State of Texas, where physicians use not only their training and their professional conduct, but they use what is in the best interest of the patient. That is why we are here today.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on the Rules Committee and in many other ways; and I also thank Dr. BURGESS, another gentleman from Texas on the Rules Committee whose amendment is being offered by Mr. SESSIONS.

As I listen to this dialogue, Mr. Chairman, I am just thinking that States do have rights. They have the right to control any of the healthcare services that are funded by individuals or States. This only affects that because it has Federal dollars in it. We drive at a 55-mile-an-hour speed limit because the Federal Government sets that.

So I rise in support of this amendment, but the States are not funding Medicare, Medicaid, or ObamaCare.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), because I think it helps my case.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I am happy to accept the time from the gentleman from Tennessee and make the point that hasn't been made very well here today that—apparently, not well enough or the gentleman wouldn't have yielded the time to me, I don't believe—where there are Federal dollars involved, there have been Federal regulations that have matched along with that.

We have written all kinds of legislation in this Congress, a lot of which I disagreed with. But there was a Federal nexus, and it hasn't been litigated successfully time after time after time.

We saw ObamaCare itself was litigated over and over again and the Supreme Court came down with rulings that let that legislation stand. That is one of the reasons why we have the angst that we have today.

But the case that this usurps States' rights is thin. It is not without some consequence, but it is very thin. We have gone way over to the other side, and we have written everything that we can possibly write into this bill that respects the rights of States. There is always a Federal nexus—we can count on that—and it is so small in comparison to so many other Federal things. Some of the things in our Federal Government are overreach. This is not. This is a minimal, de minimis reach in order to regulate over-the-top trial lawyers, who are the ones who are the only losers today, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROE OF TENNESSEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-179.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 11. LIMITATION ON EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in a health care profession requiring licensure under the laws of a State shall be competent to testify in any court of law to establish the following facts—

(1) the recognized standard of acceptable professional practice and the specialty thereof, if any, that the defendant practices, which shall be the type of acceptable professional practice recognized in the defendant's community or in a community similar to the defendant's community that was in place at the time the alleged injury or wrongful action occurred,

(2) that the defendant acted with less than or failed to act with ordinary and reasonable

care in accordance with the recognized standard, and

(3) that as a proximate result of the defendant's negligent act or omission, the claimant suffered injuries which would not otherwise have occurred, unless the person was licensed to practice, in the State or a contiguous bordering State, a profession or specialty which would make the person's expert testimony relevant to the issues in the case and had practiced this profession or specialty in one of these States during the year preceding the date that the alleged injury or wrongful act occurred.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The requirements set forth in subsection (a) shall also apply to expert witnesses testifying for the defendant as rebuttal witnesses.

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The court may waive the requirements in this subsection if it determines that the appropriate witnesses otherwise would not be available.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 382, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, medical malpractice lawsuits in this country have gotten out of hand, which is hurting both providers and patients. Something must be done.

I have spent 31 years practicing medicine in Tennessee before coming to Congress. In that time, I saw my medical malpractice insurance premiums increase from \$4,000 a year to over \$50,000 a year, by the time I left practice.

Why were the premiums so expensive? My practice group took everyone: private insurance, Medicare, Medicaid, TRICARE, and the uninsured. Some practices limit their patient populations, but when you are in rural Appalachia, you take all comers.

The reality is, when you are taking care of patients with elevated risk, you get more frequent negative outcomes, increasing your risk for lawsuits, and this creates an issue for patient access to care.

Finally, right when I was leaving practice in 2008, Governor Haslam signed into law some of the best reforms we have in Tennessee, in the Tennessee Medical Malpractice Act, which created a 60-day notice statute and a certificate of good faith certifying a case has merit before it can be filed.

In 2011, Governor Haslam then signed the Tennessee Civil Justice Act into law, which contained a restriction on who could testify as an expert witness in medical malpractice litigation.

Too often, physicians practicing medicine are pitted in litigation against a professional witness who has gone to medical school but specialized in a different field and wasn't even licensed to practice in their State or a contiguous State. Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely wrong.

The fact is, these changes work. In Tennessee, we saw medical malpractice premiums reduced from 2009 to 2014 by between 25 and 40 percent, depending on the specialty. OBs saw average premiums reduced from over \$52,000 to just over \$33,000; neurosurgeons saw average premiums reduced from \$49,000 to \$35,000; cardiovascular surgeons saw their premiums go down from \$44,000 to \$31,000. There were other changes that were put into place that helped, including caps, but the fact was, this change had a major impact.

My amendment follows Tennessee's law and strengthens the changes contained in the underlying text of the bill, H.R. 1215, by adding further restrictions to those individuals who would qualify as an expert witness for medical malpractice litigation. My amendment limits who can be called as an expert witness, not only by the individual's professional accreditation, but also by his or her geographic location.

The fact is, as Tennessee's law proved, we needed medical professionals from the area where the incident in question occurred to testify as an expert, not a foreign jurisdiction hundreds of thousands of miles away. If that proves to be impossible, the court can waive this requirement if a witness that fits these criteria is otherwise unavailable.

Mr. Chairman, no one knows the people or healthcare providers in an area better than the people and healthcare providers in that area. Whether testifying for the plaintiff or defendant, it is important that those individuals called as experts really know the people in the area and aren't simply flown in from a faraway place just to get a paycheck.

We all want improved quality and lower costs of care. Reforming the litigation process is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage Members to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, this is the Tennessee law. I remember it. It is probably not such a wonderful law, even in Tennessee, even though some of us didn't care because Tennessee is an unusual State.

You see it when you go to Rock City. From Rock City, you see seven, eight, or nine States. That is pretty good, even without the help of the Southern College of Optometry.

If you are in Memphis, the bill would say that you could have an expert from Arlington, Virginia, come to Memphis. That is a long way, yet we are so much closer to Springfield, Illinois, or even to Dallas, Texas, or we are much closer to Baton Rouge, where they have got a lot of great doctors. Those doctors

from Baton Rouge could come to Memphis. They would be closer to Memphis than somebody from Arlington, Virginia.

The fact is, the State should decide this. Tennessee made this contiguous State or your own State law. For Alaska, that means you have got Alaska. For Hawaii, it means you have got Hawaii. The States should decide who is an expert and who isn't.

It also says you have got to be in practice for the previous year. If somebody is not in practice and they are a professor at a medical school and maybe the outstanding expert on cardiovascular diseases, and they happen to be someplace like Harvard, they wouldn't be able to go to a State that is not contiguous to Massachusetts. If they weren't practicing, they wouldn't be able to be an expert at all.

These arbitrary time limits, arbitrary requirements, and arbitrary demographic limitations are not aimed at justice or saving costs. They are aimed at reducing the number of experts who might be available.

In a State, it is more difficult to get an expert to come testify because you may get ostracized by your fellow professionals. It might be easier for a plaintiff to find an expert from a State that is a little bit of a distance.

I am not that familiar with Maine. Does it touch maybe Vermont and New Hampshire? It kind of limits itself, too. In Tennessee, you would have 9 or 10 States; in Alaska, none; Hawaii, none; Maine, two. Minnesota has got to be limited because we wouldn't go to Canada because that is not part of our system.

Of course, this isn't really part of our system either because our system is a Federal system, where we give States the right to make these decisions and not make them up in Washington with a one-size-fits-all way to stop people who have been damaged by medical malpractice, medical device defects, or nursing home negligence from getting whole compensation.

We put a limit from Washington on the old person who is being taken advantage of by some individual in a nursing home or some individual who has been given a defective valve in their heart because of a medical device problem.

We in Washington, under this bill, think we know more than what a jury should know about the effects and the damages when that person testifies in that courtroom in front of that jury and before that judge and have their damages proven. You can see that individual and know the harm they have been caused, but their damages are going to be limited because of something that goes on here in Washington, D.C.

That is something the other side argues against constantly. They say things should be decided back home in

the States—things like voting rights and trying to limit the opportunity for people in the Justice Department to see to it that people get a chance to vote. They say that States' rights are primary when it suits their purposes.

In Tennessee, the doctors own the medical malpractice insurance company. I think it has the word "Volunteer" in it. It is the doctors who own it. So they will be direct beneficiaries.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, where the subsidies were going in our State were to the lawyers, since they got over 60 percent of any medical malpractice settlement. The poor patients got less than forty cents on the dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank Dr. ROE, the gentleman from Tennessee, for bringing this amendment.

Looking at the language here, it is interesting that the concern was that the witnesses may not be available within a large State. I notice, as I read the language, that unless the person was licensed for practice in the State or a contiguous border State—that is pretty good. If you are Hawaii, maybe not so good. But Dr. ROE, typical to his style, anticipated these things by putting the waiver authority in the last provision in the amendment, which says: "The court may waive the requirements in this subsection if it determines that the appropriate witnesses otherwise would not be available."

So this is a sound, well thought-out directive that ensures that we have a high level of professionalism.

When the gentleman earlier talked about a jury of your peers, what about having professionals who are highly credentialed that do understand the locality and the normal practices within the region?

So not only do I support this amendment, but I encourage its adoption. It requires expert witnesses to have knowledge of the standard of care in their local communities. It is a commonsense amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I was going to try to find that language.

Years ago, a trial lawyer named J.D. Lee told me when I was just a 28-year-old constitutional convention delegate: Don't go down rabbit trails. The gentleman from Iowa is throwing rabbit trails out there, and I am not going to go down one.

The fact is, this is a State issue that should be determined by the States and should be determined by judges and jurors in their jurisdiction who see the defendant and see the plaintiff with their own eyes and determine the facts

as the facts dictate and justice demands, is what we hear and what we live by in jury cases. That is what we should live by in Washington in determining what damages are, and not making the decisions up here in Washington, D.C.

This is a bad amendment. It is a bad bill. It is contrary to the mantra that you normally hear from the other side.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wish the damages did go to patients in Tennessee. They don't. The majority goes to lawyers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), my good friend and a fellow OB/GYN.

□ 1600

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. Like Dr. ROE, I, too, have been an OB-GYN.

The standard of care is defined by local physicians. Let me say that again. The standard of care should be defined by local physicians, and how medicine is practiced may vary from location to location. No matter what, all physicians, especially in rural settings, don't have access to all the luxuries in tertiary centers. Demanding that experts representing either side of a dispute practice medicine in the State of jurisdiction is just common sense.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, as a physician I have seen firsthand how frivolous lawsuits against experienced physicians have hindered the health care system and increased costs to all patients.

It is imperative we address this through common sense legislation.

This amendment would require expert witnesses in medical malpractice negligence cases to have practiced in the same specialty and geographical area as the physician defendant.

This limitation ensures that the expert witness has the qualified experience with and knowledge of the standard of care recognized in their local communities. I was a heart surgeon. I was not qualified to testify in a dermatology case.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting yes on Dr. ROE's amendment and the Protecting Access to Care Act.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-179.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

**SEC. 11. COMMUNICATIONS FOLLOWING UNANTICIPATED OUTCOME.**

(a) PROVIDER COMMUNICATIONS.—In any health care liability action, any and all statements, affirmations, gestures, or conduct expressing apology, fault, sympathy, commiseration, condolence, compassion, or a general sense of benevolence which are made by a health care provider or an employee of a health care provider to the patient, a relative of the patient, or a representative of the patient and which relate to the discomfort, pain, suffering, injury, or death of the patient as the result of the unanticipated outcome of medical care shall be inadmissible for any purpose as evidence of an admission of liability or as evidence of an admission against interest.

(b) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—No provision of this section shall be construed to preempt any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that makes additional communications inadmissible as evidence of an admission of liability or as evidence of an admission against interest.

**SEC. 12. EXPERT WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any health care lawsuit, an individual shall not give expert testimony on the appropriate standard of practice or care involved unless the individual is licensed as a health professional in one or more States and the individual meets the following criteria:

(1) If the party against whom or on whose behalf the testimony is to be offered is or claims to be a specialist, the expert witness shall specialize at the time of the occurrence that is the basis for the lawsuit in the same specialty or claimed specialty as the party against whom or on whose behalf the testimony is to be offered. If the party against whom or on whose behalf the testimony is to be offered is or claims to be a specialist who is board certified, the expert witness shall be a specialist who is board certified in that specialty or claimed specialty.

(2) During the 1-year period immediately preceding the occurrence of the action that gave rise to the lawsuit, the expert witness shall have devoted a majority of the individual's professional time to one or more of the following:

(A) The active clinical practice of the same health profession as the defendant and, if the defendant is or claims to be a specialist, in the same specialty or claimed specialty.

(B) The instruction of students in an accredited health professional school or accredited residency or clinical research program in the same health profession as the defendant and, if the defendant is or claims to be a specialist, in an accredited health professional school or accredited residency or clinical research program in the same specialty or claimed specialty.

(3) If the defendant is a general practitioner, the expert witness shall have devoted a majority of the witness's professional time in the 1-year period preceding the occurrence of the action giving rise to the lawsuit to one or more of the following:

(A) Active clinical practice as a general practitioner.

(B) Instruction of students in an accredited health professional school or accredited residency or clinical research program in the same health profession as the defendant.

(b) LAWSUITS AGAINST ENTITIES.—If the defendant in a health care lawsuit is an entity that employs a person against whom or on

whose behalf the testimony is offered, the provisions of subsection (a) apply as if the person were the party or defendant against whom or on whose behalf the testimony is offered.

(c) POWER OF COURT.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the power of the trial court in a health care lawsuit to disqualify an expert witness on grounds other than the qualifications set forth under this subsection.

(d) LIMITATION.—An expert witness in a health care lawsuit shall not be permitted to testify if the fee of the witness is in any way contingent on the outcome of the lawsuit.

(e) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—No provision of this section shall be construed to preempt any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that places additional qualification requirements upon any individual testifying as an expert witness.

**SEC. 13. AFFIDAVIT OF MERIT.**

(a) REQUIRED FILING.—Subject to subsection (b), the plaintiff in a health care lawsuit alleging negligence or, if the plaintiff is represented by an attorney, the plaintiff's attorney shall file simultaneously with the health care lawsuit an affidavit of merit signed by a health professional who meets the requirements for an expert witness under section 14 of this Act. The affidavit of merit shall certify that the health professional has reviewed the notice and all medical records supplied to him or her by the plaintiff's attorney concerning the allegations contained in the notice and shall contain a statement of each of the following:

(1) The applicable standard of practice or care.

(2) The health professional's opinion that the applicable standard of practice or care was breached by the health professional or health facility receiving the notice.

(3) The actions that should have been taken or omitted by the health professional or health facility in order to have complied with the applicable standard of practice or care.

(4) The manner in which the breach of the standard of practice or care was the proximate cause of the injury alleged in the notice.

(5) A listing of the medical records reviewed.

(b) FILING EXTENSION.—Upon motion of a party for good cause shown, the court in which the complaint is filed may grant the plaintiff or, if the plaintiff is represented by an attorney, the plaintiff's attorney an additional 28 days in which to file the affidavit required under subsection (a).

(c) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—No provision of this section shall be construed to preempt any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that establishes additional requirements for the filing of an affidavit of merit or similar pre-litigation documentation.

**SEC. 14. NOTICE OF INTENT TO COMMENCE LAWSUIT.**

(a) ADVANCE NOTICE.—A person shall not commence a health care lawsuit against a health care provider unless the person has given the health care provider 90 days written notice before the action is commenced.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—A health care lawsuit against a health care provider filed within 6 months of the statute of limitations expiring as to any claimant, or within 1 year of the statute of repose expiring as to any claimant, shall be exempt from compliance with this section.

(c) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—No provision of this section shall be construed to preempt

any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that establishes a different time period for the filing of written notice.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 382, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, access to a fair and just court system is a vital part of the makeup of the United States. It is important that courts are used to seek justice, not for the financial benefit of lawyers looking to take advantage of patients. Basic protections these amendments provide from frivolous lawsuits will provide peace of mind for the vast majority of physicians who work so hard to protect and heal their patients.

Patients in States that have enacted comprehensive medical liability reform have seen their healthcare costs decrease and their access to quality medical care increase. Enacting these reforms at the Federal level will benefit patients nationwide.

All provisions within this amendment defer to State laws and directly address the issues covered.

The first provision is called the Sorry Provision. This provision would allow a physician to apologize to a patient for an unintended outcome without having that apology count against them in a court of law. Thirty-two States plus the District of Columbia have an apology provision in place.

The second issue in this amendment is Notice of Intent. This provision would require a plaintiff to provide a notice of intent to the physician 90 days before a lawsuit is filed. Cases are often settled before reaching a verdict, and this provision would encourage settlement before court proceedings begin.

The third provision is Affidavits of Merit. This provision would require a plaintiff to have a physician in the same specialty as the defendant physician to sign an affidavit certifying the merits of the case before the lawsuit could be brought to court. Twenty-seven States have some form of affidavits of merit, though the standards vary from State to State.

The final provision in the amendment is Expert Witness Qualifications. This provision would require that any expert witness called to testify during a trial would need to meet the same licensing requirements as the defendant physician. Forty-eight States plus the District of Columbia have some form of expert witness qualification, though the standards vary from State to State.

So you see, these are very common-sense provisions. They are provisions that many States already have, and they will lead to lower costs and better care for patients, which ought to be our goal in the end.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to my friend's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the introduction of apologies as evidence of liability, imposes on States the qualifications for expert witnesses in a healthcare lawsuit, requires plaintiffs to obtain a certificate of merit from a healthcare professional in order to pursue a healthcare lawsuit, and has a 90-day pre-suit notification requirement.

This amendment is very, very difficult in that it says that, if you apologize, a doctor apologizes, the hope is that the doctor can apologize and the patient may think: Oh, he apologized. That is nice. I won't sue him. But then if you decide to sue him or her, you can't put that apology in evidence against him. So it is kind of maybe crocodile tears, a crocodile apology.

But it also requires a plaintiff to get a certificate of merit from a healthcare professional to pursue a healthcare lawsuit—not from a lawyer, but from a healthcare professional. You have got to go to the fraternity to sue a fellow fraternity brother. That is a strange one.

This amendment would add numerous problematic provisions that significantly expand this bill beyond what was even discussed in the Judiciary Committee and in Rules, and it violates State sovereignty, all without any proper legislative vetting before coming to the floor. This is the first I have seen it or I think anybody has seen this proposal—not necessarily regular order.

Its apology provision is overly broad and undermines the legal right of patients. This provision states any apology by a healthcare provider given to a patient or their family is inadmissible for any purpose as evidence of liability or an admission against interest. If it is a true apology, it should be admitted, but it won't be.

The purpose of so-called apology laws that occur sometimes at the State level, which is where they should be, is to encourage a doctor to apologize to the patient for any harm while preserving that patient's ability to offer evidence of wrongdoing. Yet this amendment upends this balance by prohibiting the admission of all expressions of empathy or apology for any purpose of evidence or admission of liability.

This overbroad language undermines the patient's ability to offer evidence that he or she was harmed by wrongdoing. By making inadmissible admissions of fault by the provider, the amendment goes further than many State laws that do not prohibit admissions of fault and would still allow apology evidence to be used for pur-

poses other than proving liability, such as impeaching a witness.

Second, the amendment imposes highly restrictive expert witness qualifications on State courts, which we just discussed with Mr. ROE's amendment. This amendment requires the expert witness to be an exact carbon copy of the defendant. The expert must teach or practice in the same specialty and must have been doing so at the time of the occurrence that forms the basis of the lawsuit and for 1 year preceding the occurrence.

Under this provision, someone with 30 years of professional experience may not qualify; whereas, a person with 1 year of experience could qualify as an expert. Indeed, this rule excludes retired professionals, many academics, and researchers from testifying as experts. It should be up to a judge in the courtroom or to a State that has province over this jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.

Third, this amendment imposes further burdens on injured plaintiffs beyond the already onerous requirements of the underlying bill before they can even file a lawsuit. The amendment requires an injured patient to obtain a certificate from a healthcare professional attesting to the legal merit of the case. This requires injured plaintiffs to find a healthcare professional, not a lawyer, to evaluate the legal merits of the case at the time of filing—closed frat house.

Certificates of merit are a costly, unnecessary obstacle and only serve to block injured plaintiffs access to the courts. There is little proof that such requirements reduce frivolous litigation or costs to medical providers, and certainly they don't help people who have been harmed by negligent treatment.

This requirement overrides State supreme court decisions in Arizona, Arkansas, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Washington, which held that similar lawsuit certification laws violated their State constitutions.

The amendment also requires an injured plaintiff to provide a healthcare provider 90 days' written notice before commencing the lawsuit. This notice requirement is another unnecessary hurdle intended to increase the cost of litigation for injured plaintiffs and dissuade them from filing suit. There is scant evidence that such notice reduces frivolous litigation or facilitates the compensation of the injured party.

Finally, the amendment represents the extreme intrusion on States' rights, which this whole bill does, and is such a flip from the normal Republican thought processes.

Each previously described provision includes the so-called State flexibility provisions in an attempt to brush off federalism concerns that these provisions are mostly one-way preemptive. They only preserve State laws that

mirror the amendments' requirements and State laws which include requirements in addition to those imposed by the amendment. While it preserves State notice requirements, it overrides State laws that do not have such.

The States, not Congress, should determine the qualifications for appearing as an expert witness in State court proceedings, determine the appropriate uses of apology evidence, and decide whether certificates are proper or not.

For these reasons, I, unfortunately, have to oppose the amendment by my good friend Mr. HUDSON, who is a great Tar Heel.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much how time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this improving amendment which would save even more Federal taxpayer dollars by requiring the filing of affidavits of merit from an appropriately qualified specialist, requiring that expert witnesses have speciality backgrounds relevant to the case, allowing doctors to apologize without fear of penalty, and requiring a 90-day cooling-off period before lawsuits can be filed to facilitate voluntary settlements.

I urge its adoption by the House, and I would point out that, as the gentleman from Tennessee referred to a fraternity of healthcare professionals as if somehow they couldn't come to an objective decision on their own profession, there has to be a fraternity of lawyers that are making these decisions for all of America right now. What we are seeking to do today is to bring this back to common sense, bring it back to we the people, keep it within the bounds of the Constitution, and reduce the cost of healthcare across America \$54 billion, and we are looking at a potential for \$650 billion a year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, and I also would like to express my appreciation to my colleague from Tennessee.

We all care about patients and we all care about patients seeking justice, but I just think maybe we disagree how to get there at this point.

The one point he raised about the crocodile tears, the way he describes the Sorry Provision, look, doctors are human beings and sometimes things happen. It should be appropriate for a physician to be able to express those feelings that they are sorry that that happened without that being seen as

some sign that there is guilt involved. So I think the Sorry Provision is important because the doctor-patient relationship is very important, and these are human beings.

The other argument that was raised, that it is an undue burden to have to have an expert witness, listen. A lot of these cases are very detailed and very specific. If you are talking about a cardiothoracic event, you need a cardiothoracic surgeon to discuss that. A lot of these speciality fields, it is important that you have someone from that field as an expert.

Frankly, there are folks out there who have the profession of being professional witnesses. They travel around the country and testify on behalf of the plaintiff bar. Frankly, I think we need to have experts testifying that are qualified to talk about those very specific cases that they are testifying against.

The other thing that was raised is that the 90-day notice is an unfair burden on a patient. Frankly, I believe that having a little bit of time where individuals can talk could actually help that patient get to a settlement, get some redress earlier.

I don't think you are delaying any kind of justice for individuals, but I think it is important that there is notification time, there is time for both parties to communicate. I think, in the end, you might end up having justice delivered much quicker than going through a lengthy trial that could have been avoided if you had a notice in the beginning.

This amendment simply is seeking to provide justice for those who deserve it much more quickly with much less expense, but also to preserve our healthcare system.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-179.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

#### SEC. 11. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a health care lawsuit, it shall be an affirmative de-

fense to any health care liability claim alleged therein that the defendant complied with a clinical practice guideline that was established, published, maintained, and updated on a regular basis by an eligible professional organization and that is applicable to the provision or use of health care services or medical products for which the health care liability claim is brought.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINE.—The term "clinical practice guideline" means systematically developed statements based on the review of clinical evidence for assisting a health care provider to determine the appropriate health care in specific clinical circumstances.

(2) ELIGIBLE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION.—The term "eligible professional organization" means a national or State medical society or medical specialty society.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 382, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend Chairman GOODLATTE and Congressman KING and others who worked on H.R. 1215, the Protecting Access to Care Act, which aims to address the real problem of junk lawsuits in the context of medical care.

Seventy-five percent of the doctors will face a malpractice lawsuit over the course of their careers, and many of these claims are frivolous, which drives up the cost of healthcare, encourages defensive medicine, and contributes to the Nation's severe shortage of doctors and nurses, especially in high-risk areas such as obstetrics, neurosurgery, and emergency medicine.

We need to enact sensible medical malpractice reform, and given the clear Federal interest in reducing taxpayer costs wherever Federal policy affects the distribution of healthcare, I support H.R. 1215.

However, H.R. 1215 does not go far enough to discourage the practice of defensive medicine, the provision of health services, tests, and procedures designed to shield the provider from legal liability but which may not be medically necessary or in the best interests of the patient.

Defensive medicine is a major driver of healthcare costs and also reduces the quality of patient care.

□ 1615

In that spirit, I offer this amendment, which would expand upon the reforms in H.R. 1215, to protect physicians from frivolous lawsuits, while promoting the practice of evidence-based medicine to lower costs and improve healthcare quality.

My amendment offers a legal safe harbor in the form of an affirmative defense for defendants who can show that they adhered to clinical practice guidelines in their area of medical practice. Rather than Washington-based care,



the guidelines would be developed by the physician community-based on the best available scientific evidence. This allows doctors to focus on practicing medicine and improves healthcare quality by encouraging the practice of evidence-based, not defensive medicine.

A New England Journal of Medicine study on clinical practice guidelines and tort reform stated that "Safe harbor rules hold promise for realigning legal incentives with good medical practice and promoting fast uptake of proven modes of care." By promoting adherence to clinical practice guidelines that are already maintained by medical specialty groups, this amendment would encourage physicians to provide higher quality care, while reducing medical errors and waste.

Several States have already adopted safe harbor legislation and have significantly lowered the length and costs associated with medical malpractice cases. My amendment would build on the success of State safe harbor laws by expanding it to a national level, while not infringing on States' ability to implement additional tort reform.

Americans deserve healthcare reform that will help lower the cost of care and protect the sacred doctor-patient relationship. The current reforms within H.R. 1215 are an important first step to reducing the high costs of medical malpractice claims. My amendment will further strengthen this legislation to promote affordable evidence-based patient care, reduce defensive medicine, and allow health professionals to focus on patients' actual needs.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to my friend's misguided amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is incongruous with the rest of the discussion we have had. It is consistent in that it is an attempt to say that people who have been harmed won't be able to recover, and it makes it harder to recover; and it protects the physicians—and the people—who basically are determined to have been negligent.

But, it says that, it is an affirmative defense to any healthcare liability claim—that is not just to a doctor. A healthcare liability claim could be to a nursing home or a medical device company—where the defendant complied with a clinical practice guideline developed by a national or State medical society or medical specialty society that is applicable.

They have just argued that for the plaintiff to have an expert witness, that expert witness has to come from the State where the action is brought, or a contiguous State. But, for the defendant, you can have a national practice guideline as an affirmative de-

fense. So when you are in Memphis, you can't get an expert witness from Harvard or the University of Michigan or the University of Southern California because those States aren't contiguous, but the physician could get a medical society's or a national society's perspective and have it be an affirmative offense.

It is inconsistent. The whole purpose of this law is inconsistency, to give an advantage to those who have much and who do harm at the expense of those who have been harmed and have less. We see this continual attack on the poor and the injured.

In the healthcare bill, we talk about less opportunity because of diminution in Medicaid for the poor, disabled, seniors, and pregnant women to get healthcare. Here, we are talking about people who have been injured—actually, in fact, injured. And we are saying that a medical society's rule should be an affirmative defense, no matter where they are. We limit the experts you can have, and we limit the damages you can collect.

And this isn't to some specious group. This is to people who have actually been injured, and the juries in their home districts have found them to be plaintiffs who proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant tort fees, or doctor, nursing home, or medical device company, breached the standard of care to which they were held to. It is giving them protections of the law given by Washington, almighty Washington.

Once again, I submit to you that the swamp is not being drained but is overflowing to flood the courthouses and not allow justice to come to those who have been harmed by negligence. For time and memorial, it has been the province of the States, the Tenth Amendment. Tort liability and court systems should be determined by legislators and bar associations, maybe medical societies, but back home, not national medical specialty societies or national medical societies as defenses, which is what this particular amendment brings forth.

I heard my friend from Tennessee say that in Tennessee, 60 percent of the verdicts go to lawyers. That is not true. He first talked about a law passed in 2008, that limits attorneys' fees. So since then, it certainly has not been 60 percent, and even before then it wasn't 60 percent. The typical contingency fee is a third, and nothing if you don't win, and there are great expenses incurred.

This is closing the courthouse door to injured parties who juries have found to be injured and limiting their access to recovery. This allows a national medical society to be a part of a fraternity to give an affirmative defense to another frat brother.

I oppose the amendment, I oppose the bill, and I am in favor of an open and free court system that punishes mal-

feasance and rewards those who have been injured by people who do not practice up to the standard of care that is dictated for them in their own State.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, in brief response to my friend from Tennessee, the safe harbor legislation would not supplant the standard of care, but it would allow for evidence-based medicine to improve healthcare quality. Those standards would be developed by local doctors participating in their medical societies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement before me from Chairman GOODLATTE, the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee. I am going to represent this as his statement, but the chairman thanks the gentleman from Kentucky for his clarification while he remains opposed to the amendment because it provides an overly broad definition of the eligible professional organizations authorized to issue the guidelines that would be used as an affirmative defense, and because it is not supported by the wider coalition of medical groups supporting the base bill. He looks forward to working with the gentleman to further refine and improve his legislative proposal.

That concludes Chairman GOODLATTE's statement that he would like read into this RECORD.

And I would say on my own behalf, Mr. Chairman, that I very much appreciate the work that Mr. BARR has brought to this. The language that he presented originally, that had to be amended in order to conform with the parliamentarian, I believe, does define this with clarity. So I am inclined to support the gentleman from Kentucky. We will see what happens if there is a recorded vote.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. Chairman, the clinical practice guideline safe harbor policies have been supported by the American for Tax Reform, American College of Radiology, Healthcare Leadership Council, American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, American Society of Anesthesiologists, American Academy of Neurology, American Urological Association, American College of Surgeons, American Health Care Association, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Association of Neurological Surgeons, Alliance of Specialty Medicine, Third Way, American College of Physicians, American College of Emergency Physicians, American Osteopathic Association, American College of Cardiologists, and the American Academy of Ophthalmology.



As originally drafted, the amendment set forth the procedure in detail.

Nevertheless, the process by which clinical practice guidelines are proved and published is well established and well known. The text of the amendment clearly references that existing and well-defined process that provides for guidelines to be proposed, submitted, approved, and published through the National Guideline Clearinghouse under the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. This is a process that ensures the integrity and quality of the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GOODLATTE for his honest testimony and submitting it. For that reason, among others, I will be voting “no” on this amendment, and I hope that it will be found to be “no” by the Chair. Because when the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, a fine Republican lawyer, says that the amendment is beyond what they intended, it shouldn’t really be part of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-179 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. BARR of Kentucky.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 197, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

#### AYES—222

|               |                 |                   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Abraham       | Gohmert         | Noem              |
| Aderholt      | Goodlatte       | Norman            |
| Allen         | Gosar           | Nunes             |
| Arrington     | Gowdy           | Olson             |
| Babin         | Granger         | Palazzo           |
| Bacon         | Graves (GA)     | Palmer            |
| Banks (IN)    | Graves (LA)     | Paulsen           |
| Baretta       | Graves (MO)     | Pearce            |
| Barr          | Grothman        | Peters            |
| Barton        | Guthrie         | Peterson          |
| Bera          | Handel          | Pittenger         |
| Bergman       | Harper          | Poliquin          |
| Biggs         | Harris          | Ratcliffe         |
| Bilirakis     | Hartzler        | Reed              |
| Bishop (MI)   | Hensarling      | Reichert          |
| Bishop (UT)   | Herrera Beutler | Rice (SC)         |
| Blackburn     | Hice, Jody B.   | Roby              |
| Blum          | Higgins (LA)    | Roe (TN)          |
| Bost          | Hill            | Rogers (KY)       |
| Brady (TX)    | Holding         | Rohrabacher       |
| Brat          | Hollingsworth   | Rokita            |
| Bridenstine   | Hudson          | Rooney, Francis   |
| Brooks (AL)   | Huizenga        | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Brooks (IN)   | Hultgren        | Rosen             |
| Buchanan      | Hunter          | Roskam            |
| Buck          | Hurd            | Ross              |
| Bucshon       | Issa            | Rothfus           |
| Budd          | Jenkins (KS)    | Rouzer            |
| Burgess       | Jenkins (WV)    | Royce (CA)        |
| Byrne         | Johnson (LA)    | Ruiz              |
| Calvert       | Johnson (OH)    | Rutherford        |
| Carter (GA)   | Johnson, Sam    | Schweikert        |
| Carter (TX)   | Jordan          | Scott, Austin     |
| Chabot        | Joyce (OH)      | Sensenbrenner     |
| Chaffetz      | Katko           | Sessions          |
| Cheney        | Kelly (MS)      | Shimkus           |
| Coffman       | Kelly (PA)      | Shuster           |
| Cole          | King (IA)       | Simpson           |
| Collins (GA)  | King (NY)       | Smith (MO)        |
| Collins (NY)  | Kinzinger       | Smith (NE)        |
| Comer         | Knight          | Smith (TX)        |
| Comstock      | Kustoff (TN)    | Smucker           |
| Conaway       | Labrador        | Stefanik          |
| Cook          | LaHood          | Stewart           |
| Correa        | LaMalfa         | Taylor            |
| Costello (PA) | Lamborn         | Tenney            |
| Cramer        | Lance           | Thompson (PA)     |
| Crawford      | Latta           | Thornberry        |
| Cuellar       | Lewis (MN)      | Tiberi            |
| Culberson     | Loudermilk      | Tipton            |
| Davis, Rodney | Love            | Trott             |
| Denham        | Lucas           | Upton             |
| Dent          | Luetkemeyer     | Valadao           |
| DeSantis      | MacArthur       | Wagner            |
| DesJarlais    | Marchant        | Walberg           |
| Donovan       | Marino          | Walden            |
| Duffy         | Marshall        | Walker            |
| Duncan (SC)   | Mast            | Walorski          |
| Dunn          | McCarthy        | Walters, Mimi     |
| Emmer         | McCaul          | Weber (TX)        |
| Estes (KS)    | McClintock      | Webster (FL)      |
| Farenthold    | McHenry         | Wenstrup          |
| Faso          | McKinley        | Westerman         |
| Ferguson      | McMorris        | Williams          |
| Fitzpatrick   | Rodgers         | Wilson (SC)       |
| Fleischmann   | McSally         | Wittman           |
| Flores        | Meadows         | Womack            |
| Fortenberry   | Meehan          | Woodall           |
| Fox           | Messer          | Yoder             |
| Franks (AZ)   | Mitchell        | Yoho              |
| Frelinghuysen | Moolenaar       | Young (AK)        |
| Gaetz         | Mooney (WV)     | Young (IA)        |
| Gallagher     | Mullin          | Zeldin            |
| Gianforte     | Murphy (PA)     |                   |
| Gibbs         | Newhouse        |                   |

#### NOES—197

|                 |                   |             |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Adams           | Boyle, Brendan F. | Cartwright  |
| Aguilar         | Brady (PA)        | Castor (FL) |
| Amash           | Brown (MD)        | Castro (TX) |
| Barragán        | Brownley (CA)     | Chu, Judy   |
| Bass            | Bustos            | Cicilline   |
| Beatty          | Butterfield       | Clark (MA)  |
| Beyer           | Capuano           | Clarke (NY) |
| Bishop (GA)     | Carbajal          | Clay        |
| Blumenauer      | Cárdenas          | Cleaver     |
| Blunt Rochester | Carson (IN)       | Clyburn     |
| Bonamici        |                   | Cohen       |

|                   |                   |                |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Connolly          | Keating           | Posey          |
| Conyers           | Kelly (IL)        | Price (NC)     |
| Cooper            | Kennedy           | Quigley        |
| Costa             | Khanna            | Raskin         |
| Courtney          | Kihuen            | Rice (NY)      |
| Crist             | Kildee            | Richmond       |
| Crowley           | Kilmer            | Ros-Lehtinen   |
| Curbelo (FL)      | Kind              | Roybal-Allard  |
| Davidson          | Krishnamoorthi    | Ruppersberger  |
| Davis (CA)        | Kuster (NH)       | Rush           |
| Davis, Danny      | Larsen (WA)       | Russell        |
| DeFazio           | Larson (CT)       | Ryan (OH)      |
| DeGette           | Lawrence          | Sánchez        |
| Delaney           | Lawson (FL)       | Sanford        |
| DeLauro           | Lee               | Sarbanes       |
| DelBene           | Levin             | Schakowsky     |
| Demings           | Lewis (GA)        | Schiff         |
| DeSaulnier        | Lien, Ted         | Schneider      |
| Deutch            | Lipinski          | Schrader       |
| Diaz-Balart       | LoBiondo          | Scott (VA)     |
| Dingell           | Loeb sack         | Scott, David   |
| Doggett           | Lofgren           | Serrano        |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Lowenthal         | Sewell (AL)    |
| Duncan (TN)       | Lujan Grisham, M. | Shea-Porter    |
| Ellison           | Luján, Ben Ray    | Sherman        |
| Engel             | Lynch             | Sinema         |
| Eshoo             | Maloney,          | Sires          |
| Espallat          | Carolyn B.        | Slaughter      |
| Esty (CT)         | Maloney, Sean     | Smith (NJ)     |
| Evans             | Massie            | Smith (WA)     |
| Foster            | Matsui            | Soto           |
| Frankel (FL)      | McCollum          | Speier         |
| Fudge             | McEachin          | Suozi          |
| Gabbard           | McGovern          | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Galleo            | Meng              | Takano         |
| Garamendi         | Moore             | Thompson (CA)  |
| Garrett           | Moulton           | Thompson (MS)  |
| Gonzalez (TX)     | Murphy (FL)       | Titus          |
| Gottheimer        | Nadler            | Tonko          |
| Green, Al         | Neal              | Torres         |
| Green, Gene       | Nolan             | Tsongas        |
| Griffith          | Norcross          | Turner         |
| Grijalva          | O'Halleran        | Vargas         |
| Gutiérrez         | O'Rourke          | Veasey         |
| Hanabusa          | Pallone           | Vela           |
| Hastings          | Panetta           | Velázquez      |
| Heck              | Pascrell          | Visclosky      |
| Higgins (NY)      | Payne             | Walz           |
| Himes             | Pelosi            | Wasserman      |
| Hoyer             | Perlmutter        | Schultz        |
| Huffman           | Perry             | Waters, Maxine |
| Jackson Lee       | Pingree           | Watson Coleman |
| Jayapal           | Pocan             | Welch          |
| Jeffries          | Poe (TX)          | Wilson (FL)    |
| Johnson (GA)      | Polis             | Yarmuth        |
| Kaptur            |                   |                |

#### NOT VOTING—14

|                |            |             |
|----------------|------------|-------------|
| Amodei         | Langevin   | Renacci     |
| Black          | Long       | Rogers (AL) |
| Cummings       | McNerney   | Scalise     |
| Johnson, E. B. | Meeks      | Stivers     |
| Jones          | Napolitano |             |

□ 1646

Ms. TSONGAS changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 334.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 116, noes 310, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—116

|               |               |                |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abraham       | Graves (LA)   | Roe (TN)       |
| Aderholt      | Graves (MO)   | Rogers (KY)    |
| Allen         | Guthrie       | Rohrabacher    |
| Amodei        | Harris        | Rokita         |
| Barletta      | Hice, Jody B. | Rooney, Thomas |
| Barr          | Holding       | J.             |
| Bera          | Hollingsworth | Rosen          |
| Bergman       | Hudson        | Roskam         |
| Bilirakis     | Huizenga      | Ross           |
| Bishop (UT)   | Hunter        | Rothfus        |
| Brooks (AL)   | Jenkins (KS)  | Rouzer         |
| Bucshon       | Jenkins (WV)  | Ruiz           |
| Budd          | Johnson (LA)  | Schrader       |
| Carter (GA)   | Joyce (OH)    | Schweikert     |
| Cheney        | Kaptur        | Scott, Austin  |
| Cole          | Kelly (PA)    | Sessions       |
| Comstock      | King (IA)     | Simpson        |
| Correa        | Kustoff (TN)  | Sinema         |
| Costello (PA) | Labrador      | Smith (MO)     |
| Cuellar       | LaMalfa       | Smith (NE)     |
| Davidson      | Lamborn       | Smucker        |
| Davis, Rodney | Loudermilk    | Stewart        |
| Dent          | MacArthur     | Tenney         |
| DeSantis      | Marchant      | Thompson (PA)  |
| DesJarlais    | Marino        | Tiberi         |
| Duffy         | Marshall      | Valadao        |
| Duncan (SC)   | Mast          | Wagner         |
| Dunn          | McCauley      | Walberg        |
| Farenthold    | McMorris      | Walker         |
| Ferguson      | Rodgers       | Webster (FL)   |
| Fitzpatrick   | Meadows       | Wenstrup       |
| Fleischmann   | Meehan        | Westerman      |
| Fortenberry   | Mooney (WV)   | Williams       |
| Fox           | Mullin        | Wilson (SC)    |
| Franks (AZ)   | Norman        | Woodall        |
| Gaetz         | Nunes         | Yoder          |
| Gallagher     | Palmer        | Young (AK)     |
| Gianforte     | Pearce        | Young (IA)     |
| Gosar         | Peters        |                |
| Graves (GA)   | Rice (SC)     |                |

NOES—310

|                 |              |                |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Carbajal     | DeLauro        |
| Aguilar         | Cárdenas     | DelBene        |
| Amash           | Carson (IN)  | Demings        |
| Arrington       | Carter (TX)  | Denham         |
| Babin           | Cartwright   | DeSaulnier     |
| Bacon           | Castor (FL)  | Deutch         |
| Banks (IN)      | Castro (TX)  | Diaz-Balart    |
| Barragan        | Chabot       | Dingell        |
| Barton          | Chaffetz     | Doggett        |
| Bass            | Chu, Judy    | Donovan        |
| Beatty          | Cicilline    | Doyle, Michael |
| Beyer           | Clark (MA)   | F.             |
| Biggs           | Clarke (NY)  | Duncan (TN)    |
| Bishop (GA)     | Clay         | Ellison        |
| Bishop (MI)     | Cleaver      | Emmer          |
| Black           | Clyburn      | Engel          |
| Blackburn       | Coffman      | Eshoo          |
| Blum            | Cohen        | Espallat       |
| Blumenauer      | Collins (GA) | Estes (KS)     |
| Blunt Rochester | Collins (NY) | Esty (CT)      |
| Bonamici        | Comer        | Evans          |
| Bost            | Conaway      | Faso           |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Connolly     | Flores         |
| F.              | Conyers      | Foster         |
| Brady (PA)      | Cook         | Frankel (FL)   |
| Brady (TX)      | Cooper       | Frelinghuysen  |
| Brat            | Costa        | Fudge          |
| Bridenstine     | Courtney     | Gabbard        |
| Brooks (IN)     | Cramer       | Gallego        |
| Brown (MD)      | Crawford     | Garrett        |
| Brownley (CA)   | Crist        | Gibbs          |
| Buchanan        | Crowley      | Gohmert        |
| Buck            | Culberson    | Gonzalez (TX)  |
| Burgess         | Curbelo (FL) | Goodlatte      |
| Bustos          | Davis (CA)   | Gottheimer     |
| Butterfield     | Davis, Danny | Gowdy          |
| Byrne           | DeFazio      | Granger        |
| Calvert         | DeGette      | Green, Al      |
| Capuano         | Delaney      | Green, Gene    |

|                 |                 |                |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Griffith        | Luetkemeyer     | Roybal-Allard  |
| Grijalva        | Lujan Grisham,  | Royce (CA)     |
| Grothman        | M.              | Ruppersberger  |
| Gutiérrez       | Luján, Ben Ray  | Rush           |
| Hanabusa        | Lynch           | Russell        |
| Handel          | Maloney,        | Rutherford     |
| Harper          | Carolyn B.      | Ryan (OH)      |
| Hartzler        | Maloney, Sean   | Sánchez        |
| Hastings        | Massie          | Sanford        |
| Heck            | Matsui          | Sarbanes       |
| Hensarling      | McCarthy        | Schakowsky     |
| Herrera Beutler | McClintock      | Schiff         |
| Higgins (LA)    | McCollum        | Schneider      |
| Higgins (NY)    | McEachin        | Scott (VA)     |
| Hill            | McGovern        | Scott, David   |
| Himes           | McHenry         | Sensenbrenner  |
| Hoyer           | McKinley        | Serrano        |
| Huffman         | McNerney        | Sewell (AL)    |
| Hultgren        | McSally         | Shea-Porter    |
| Hurd            | Meeks           | Sherman        |
| Issa            | Meng            | Shimkus        |
| Jackson Lee     | Messer          | Shuster        |
| Jayapal         | Mitchell        | Sires          |
| Jeffries        | Moolenaar       | Slaughter      |
| Johnson (GA)    | Moore           | Smith (NJ)     |
| Johnson (OH)    | Moulton         | Smith (TX)     |
| Johnson, E. B.  | Murphy (FL)     | Smith (WA)     |
| Johnson, Sam    | Murphy (PA)     | Soto           |
| Jones           | Nadler          | Speier         |
| Jordan          | Neal            | Stefanik       |
| Katko           | Newhouse        | Suozzi         |
| Keating         | Noem            | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Kelly (IL)      | Nolan           | Takano         |
| Kelly (MS)      | Norcross        | Taylor         |
| Kennedy         | O'Halleran      | Thompson (CA)  |
| Khanna          | O'Rourke        | Thompson (MS)  |
| Kihuen          | Olson           | Thornberry     |
| Kildee          | Palazzo         | Tipton         |
| Kilmer          | Pallone         | Titus          |
| Kind            | Panetta         | Tonko          |
| King (NY)       | Pascarell       | Torres         |
| Kinziger        | Paulsen         | Trott          |
| Knight          | Payne           | Tsongas        |
| Krishnamoorthi  | Pelosi          | Turner         |
| Kuster (NH)     | Perlmutter      | Upton          |
| LaHood          | Perry           | Vargas         |
| Lance           | Peterson        | Veasey         |
| Langevin        | Pingree         | Vela           |
| Larsen (WA)     | Pittenger       | Velázquez      |
| Larson (CT)     | Pocan           | Visclosky      |
| Latta           | Poe (TX)        | Walden         |
| Lawrence        | Poliquin        | Walorski       |
| Lawson (FL)     | Polis           | Walters, Mimi  |
| Lee             | Posey           | Walz           |
| Levin           | Price (NC)      | Wasserman      |
| Lewis (GA)      | Quigley         | Schultz        |
| Lewis (MN)      | Raskin          | Waters, Maxine |
| Lieu, Ted       | Ratcliffe       | Watson Coleman |
| Lipinski        | Reed            | Weber (TX)     |
| LoBiondo        | Reichert        | Welch          |
| Loeb            | Rice (NY)       | Wilson (FL)    |
| Loeb            | Richmond        | Wittman        |
| Lofgren         | Roby            | Womack         |
| Love            | Rogers (AL)     | Yarmuth        |
| Lowenthal       | Rooney, Francis | Yoho           |
| Lowe            | Ros-Lehtinen    | Zeldin         |
| Lucas           |                 |                |

NOT VOTING—7

|           |            |         |
|-----------|------------|---------|
| Cummings  | Napolitano | Stivers |
| Garamendi | Renacci    |         |
| Long      | Scalise    |         |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1653

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. RICE of South Carolina and DENT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote 335, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system, and, pursuant to House Resolution 382, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1215 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 11. COMBATTING THE OPIOIDS EPIDEMIC.**

For purposes of this Act, the term “health care lawsuit”, as defined in section 7, does not include a claim or action which pertains to the grossly negligent prescription of opioids.

Mr. GAETZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Like so many communities and States across this country, New Hampshire has been devastated by the heroin and opioid epidemic. Last year alone, my State lost 500 people to substance use disorder.

Helping families, first responders, treatment providers, law enforcement officials, and family advocates in the Granite State confront this crisis has been my number one priority in Congress.

In 2015, Mr. Guinta and I founded the Bipartisan Congressional Heroin Task Force to raise awareness of this crisis and to advocate in a collaborative way for solutions at the Federal level. I am proud to report that our bipartisan task force is now 90 members strong, and we have made important progress in passing legislation and securing critical funding.

But the causes of this crisis are complex, requiring a multifaceted approach addressing every angle of the epidemic, from treatment to recovery, from education and prevention to law enforcement and interdiction.

A primary cause of opioid misuse resulting in heroin dependence is the overprescribing of opioid pain medication.

The data is astonishing. A December 2016 study found that opioids were prescribed to 91 percent of patients after they had experienced an overdose, and, in fact, 63 percent of patients on high-dose opioids were still prescribed high-dose opioids after overdosing.

We have all heard the stories: teens who had their wisdom teeth removed receiving 30-day supplies of opioids, or a person with back pain receiving prescriptions for extended release opioids even though Tylenol would keep them comfortable.

America consumes 80 percent of the global supply of opioid medication, and 650,000 opioid prescriptions are written every single day.

Earlier this year, a study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found the following extraordinary fact: if 100 people take opioid medication for 1 day, 6 percent will still be using 30 days later; and if 100 people take opioid medication for 30 days, 35 percent of those patients will still be using opioids a year later.

Our task force is working closely with the medical community to strengthen prescribing practices so that patients can manage their pain in an effective and responsible way.

Through my role on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am working with my colleagues to improve pain management practices at the VA and to better understand alternative methods for pain management.

The White River Junction VA facility in Vermont serving New Hampshire veterans is a great example where they have cut opioid prescriptions nearly in half by incorporating alternative treatments.

While there is much work that we can do to understand this issue, there remain bad actors across this country who are exploiting those who suffer from substance use disorder for their own financial gain.

In rural communities and elsewhere, pill mills churn out opioid prescriptions with no regard for the well-being of their patients. And just last month, a doctor in New England pled guilty to healthcare fraud for overprescribing opioids, including writing more than 1,100 Oxycodone prescriptions in a single month.

Victims of exploitative prescribing practices must have the unencumbered capacity of our legal system to recoup their damages and to deter negative industry practices.

I am concerned that arbitrary limitations in this legislation on legal damages could limit their ability to effectively respond to the opioid epidemic, and that is why my amendment would simply exempt from the legislation any claim or action that pertains to grossly negligent prescription of opioids. Should this bill become law, this provision will help protect those who have been exploited by predatory physicians operating pill mills.

There is so much we should do to roll back this crisis, and I look forward to our continued bipartisan work. But today I urge my colleagues to approve this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit is ambiguous, as there is no legal standard currently for that which constitutes gross negligence in the area of prescriptions.

Already this legislation does not apply to circumstances in which there is criminal conduct. That means that bad doctors with bad intent will be prosecuted, and in every State in America, there are legal standards by which those very doctors would lose their license were they to engage in the conduct that the gentlewoman highlighted.

Mr. Speaker, healthcare costs are rising at alarming rates due to the failures of ObamaCare. This bill will reduce healthcare costs. It will improve the quality of care received.

Mr. Speaker, through this underlying legislation, we will enhance the relationship between patients and doctors. We will reduce frivolous litigation. And by ultimately addressing the chal-

lenges that arise with increasing healthcare costs, we will make it more easy to get to the affordability challenges with healthcare coverage.

This will ultimately increase wages for the American worker because, due to the failures of ObamaCare, more businesses are having to put money into healthcare premiums and not into wages, not into job creation, and not into the success of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if what we really aspire to are better healthcare outcomes and more doctors able to treat people who are dealing with the challenges of opioid addiction, I would ask my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit, support this bill, and get better healthcare outcomes for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1500.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 235, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—191

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Cohen          | Fudge          |
| Aguilar         | Connolly       | Gabbard        |
| Barragán        | Conyers        | Gallego        |
| Bass            | Cooper         | Garamendi      |
| Beatty          | Correa         | Gonzalez (TX)  |
| Bera            | Costa          | Gothelmer      |
| Beyer           | Courtney       | Green, Al      |
| Bishop (GA)     | Crist          | Green, Gene    |
| Blumenauer      | Crowley        | Grijalva       |
| Blunt Rochester | Cuellar        | Gutiérrez      |
| Bonamici        | Davis (CA)     | Hanabusa       |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Davis, Danny   | Hastings       |
| F.              | DeFazio        | Heck           |
| Brady (PA)      | DeGette        | Higgins (NY)   |
| Brown (MD)      | Delaney        | Himes          |
| Brownley (CA)   | DeLauro        | Hoyer          |
| Bustos          | DelBene        | Huffman        |
| Butterfield     | Demings        | Jackson Lee    |
| Capuano         | DeSaulnier     | Jayapal        |
| Carbajal        | Deutch         | Jeffries       |
| Cárdenas        | Dingell        | Johnson (GA)   |
| Carson (IN)     | Doggett        | Johnson, E. B. |
| Cartwright      | Doyle, Michael | Kaptur         |
| Castor (FL)     | F.             | Keating        |
| Castro (TX)     | Ellison        | Kelly (IL)     |
| Chu, Judy       | Engel          | Kennedy        |
| Ciциlline       | Eshoo          | Khanna         |
| Clark (MA)      | Espallat       | Kihuen         |
| Clarke (NY)     | Esty (CT)      | Kildee         |
| Clay            | Evans          | Kilmer         |
| Cleaver         | Foster         | Kind           |
| Clyburn         | Frankel (FL)   | Krishnamoorthi |

|                   |               |                |                   |               |               |                 |                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Kuster (NH)       | Nolan         | Serrano        | Rogers (AL)       | Shimkus       | Wagner        | Hensarling      | McClintock        | Schweikert    |
| Langevin          | Norcross      | Sewell (AL)    | Rogers (KY)       | Shuster       | Walberg       | Herrera Beutler | McHenry           | Scott, Austin |
| Larsen (WA)       | O'Halleran    | Shea-Porter    | Rohrabacher       | Simpson       | Walden        | Hice, Jody B.   | McKinley          | Sensenbrenner |
| Larson (CT)       | O'Rourke      | Sherman        | Rokita            | Smith (MO)    | Walker        | Higgins (LA)    | McMorris          | Sessions      |
| Lawrence          | Pallone       | Sinema         | Rooney, Francis   | Smith (NE)    | Walorski      | Hill            | Rodgers           | Shimkus       |
| Lawson (FL)       | Panetta       | Sires          | Rooney, Thomas J. | Smith (NJ)    | Walters, Mimi | Holding         | Meadows           | Shuster       |
| Lee               | Pascrell      | Slaughter      | Ros-Lehtinen      | Smith (TX)    | Weber (TX)    | Hollingsworth   | Messer            | Simpson       |
| Levin             | Payne         | Smith (WA)     | Roskam            | Smucker       | Webster (FL)  | Hudson          | Mitchell          | Smith (MO)    |
| Lewis (GA)        | Pelosi        | Soto           | Ross              | Stefanik      | Wenstrup      | Huizenga        | Moolenaar         | Smith (NE)    |
| Lieu, Ted         | Perlmutter    | Speier         | Rothfus           | Stewart       | Westerman     | Hultgren        | Mooney (WV)       | Smith (NJ)    |
| Lipinski          | Peters        | Suozi          | Rouzer            | Taylor        | Williams      | Hunter          | Mullin            | Smith (TX)    |
| Loeb sack         | Peterson      | Swalwell (CA)  | Royce (CA)        | Tenney        | Wilson (SC)   | Hurd            | Murphy (PA)       | Smucker       |
| Lofgren           | Pingree       | Takano         | Russell           | Thompson (PA) | Wittman       | Issa            | Newhouse          | Stefanik      |
| Lowenthal         | Pocan         | Thompson (CA)  | Rutherford        | Thornberry    | Womack        | Jenkins (KS)    | Noem              | Stewart       |
| Lowey             | Polis         | Thompson (MS)  | Sanford           | Tiberi        | Woodall       | Jenkins (WV)    | Norman            | Taylor        |
| Lujan Grisham, M. | Price (NC)    | Titus          | Tipton            | Trotter       | Yoder         | Johnson (LA)    | Nunes             | Tenney        |
| Luján, Ben Ray    | Quigley       | Tonko          | Turner            | Turner        | Yoho          | Johnson (OH)    | Olson             | Thompson (PA) |
| Lynch             | Raskin        | Torres         | Upton             | Upton         | Young (AK)    | Johnson, Sam    | Palazzo           | Thornberry    |
| Maloney,          | Rice (NY)     | Tsongas        | Sensenbrenner     | Valadao       | Young (IA)    | Jordan          | Palmer            | Tiberi        |
| Carolyn B.        | Richmond      | Vargas         | Sessions          |               | Zeldin        | Joyce (OH)      | Paulsen           | Tipton        |
| Maloney, Sean     | Rosen         | Veasey         |                   |               |               | Katko           | Pearce            | Trott         |
| Matsui            | Roybal-Allard | Vela           | Brady (TX)        | Napolitano    | Stivers       | Kelly (MS)      | Perry             | Turner        |
| McCollum          | Ruiz          | Velázquez      | Cummings          | Renacci       |               | Kelly (PA)      | Pittenger         | Upton         |
| McEachin          | Ruppersberger | Visclosky      | Long              | Scalise       |               | King (IA)       | Poliquin          | Valadao       |
| McGovern          | Rush          | Walz           |                   |               |               | King (NY)       | Ratcliffe         | Wagner        |
| McNerney          | Ryan (OH)     | Wasserman      |                   |               |               | Kinzing         | Reed              | Walberg       |
| Meeks             | Sánchez       | Schultz        |                   |               |               | Knight          | Reichert          | Walden        |
| Meng              | Sarbanes      | Schultz        |                   |               |               | Labrador        | Rice (SC)         | Walker        |
| Moore             | Schakowsky    | Waters, Maxine |                   |               |               | LaHood          | Roby              | Walorski      |
| Moulton           | Schiff        | Watson Coleman |                   |               |               | LaMalfa         | Roe (TN)          | Walters, Mimi |
| Murphy (FL)       | Schneider     | Welch          |                   |               |               | Lamborn         | Rogers (AL)       | Webster (TX)  |
| Nadler            | Schrader      | Wilson (FL)    |                   |               |               | Lance           | Rogers (KY)       | Wenstrup      |
| Neal              | Scott (VA)    | Yarmuth        |                   |               |               | Latta           | Rohrabacher       | Westerman     |
|                   | Scott, David  |                |                   |               |               | Lewis (MN)      | Rokita            | Williams      |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | LoBiondo        | Rooney, Francis   | Wilson (SC)   |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | Loudermilk      | Rooney, Thomas J. | Wittman       |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | Love            | Roskam            | Womack        |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | Lucas           | Ross              | Woodall       |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | Luetkemeyer     | Rothfus           | Yoder         |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | MacArthur       | Rouzer            | Yoho          |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | Marchant        | Royce (CA)        | Young (AK)    |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | Marshall        | Rutherford        | Young (IA)    |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | Mast            | Ryan (WI)         | Zeldin        |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | McCarthy        | Sanford           |               |
|                   |               |                |                   |               |               | McCaul          |                   |               |

## NOT VOTING—7

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1712

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call no. 336, I was unavoidably detained to cast my vote in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

## AYES—218

|               |                 |              |               |              |               |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abraham       | Duncan (SC)     | King (IA)    | Abraham       | Burgess      | Dunn          |
| Aderholt      | Duncan (TN)     | King (NY)    | Aderholt      | Byrne        | Estes (KS)    |
| Allen         | Dunn            | Kinzing      | Allen         | Calvert      | Farenthold    |
| Amash         | Emmer           | Knight       | Amodei        | Carter (GA)  | Faso          |
| Amodei        | Estes (KS)      | Kustoff (TN) | Arrington     | Carter (TX)  | Ferguson      |
| Arrington     | Farenthold      | Labrador     | Babin         | Chabot       | Fitzpatrick   |
| Babin         | Faso            | LaHood       | Bacon         | Chaffetz     | Fleischmann   |
| Bacon         | Ferguson        | LaMalfa      | Banks (IN)    | Cheney       | Flores        |
| Banks (IN)    | Fitzpatrick     | Lamborn      | Barletta      | Coffman      | Fortenberry   |
| Barletta      | Fleischmann     | Lance        | Barr          | Cole         | Fox           |
| Barr          | Flores          | Latta        | Barton        | Collins (GA) | Franks (AZ)   |
| Barton        | Fortenberry     | Lewis (MN)   | Bergman       | Collins (NY) | Frelinghuysen |
| Bergman       | Fox             | LoBiondo     | Biggs         | Comer        | Gaetz         |
| Biggs         | Franks (AZ)     | Loudermilk   | Comstock      | Conaway      | Gallagher     |
| Bilirakis     | Frelinghuysen   | Love         | Cook          | Cramer       | Goodlatte     |
| Bishop (MI)   | Gaetz           | Lucas        | Crawford      | Gowdy        | Gosar         |
| Bishop (UT)   | Gallagher       | Luetkemeyer  | Culbertson    | Granger      | Graves (GA)   |
| Black         | Garrett         | MacArthur    | Davis, Rodney | Huizenga     | Graves (LA)   |
| Blackburn     | Gianforte       | Marchant     | Denham        | Hultgren     | Graves (MO)   |
| Blum          | Gibbs           | Marino       | Dent          | Hunter       | Griffith      |
| Bost          | Gohmert         | Marshall     | DeSantis      | Hurd         | Grothman      |
| Brat          | Goodlatte       | Massie       | DesJarlais    | Issa         | Guthrie       |
| Bridenstine   | Gosar           | Mast         | Diaz-Balart   | Jenkins (KS) | Handel        |
| Brooks (AL)   | Gowdy           | McCarthy     | Donovan       | Jenkins (WV) | Cohen         |
| Brooks (IN)   | Granger         | McCaul       | Duffy         | Johnson (LA) | Connolly      |
| Buchanan      | Graves (GA)     | McClintock   |               | Johnson (OH) | Conyers       |
| Buck          | Graves (LA)     | McHenry      |               | Johnson, Sam | Cooper        |
| Bucshon       | Graves (MO)     | McKinley     |               | Jones        | Correa        |
| Budd          | Griffith        | McMorris     |               | Jordan       | Costa         |
| Burgess       | Grothman        | Rodgers      |               | Joyce (OH)   | Costello (PA) |
| Byrne         | Guthrie         | McSally      |               | Katko        | Courtney      |
| Calvert       | Handel          | Meadows      |               | Kelly (MS)   | Crist         |
| Carter (GA)   | Harper          | Meehan       |               | Kelly (PA)   | Crowley       |
| Carter (TX)   | Harris          | Messer       |               |              | Cuellar       |
| Chabot        | Hartzler        | Mitchell     |               |              | Curbelo (FL)  |
| Chaffetz      | Hensarling      | Moolenaar    |               |              | Davis (CA)    |
| Cheney        | Herrera Beutler | Mooney (WV)  |               |              | Davis, Danny  |
| Coffman       | Hice, Jody B.   | Mullin       |               |              | DeFazio       |
| Cole          | Higgins (LA)    | Murphy (PA)  |               |              |               |
| Collins (GA)  | Hill            | Newhouse     |               |              |               |
| Collins (NY)  | Holding         | Noem         |               |              |               |
| Comer         | Hollingsworth   | Norman       |               |              |               |
| Comstock      | Hudson          | Nunes        |               |              |               |
| Conaway       | Huizenga        | Olson        |               |              |               |
| Cook          | Hultgren        | Palazzo      |               |              |               |
| Costello (PA) | Hunter          | Palmer       |               |              |               |
| Cramer        | Hurd            | Paulsen      |               |              |               |
| Crawford      | Issa            | Pearce       |               |              |               |
| Culbertson    | Jenkins (KS)    | Perry        |               |              |               |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Jenkins (WV)    | Pittenger    |               |              |               |
| Davidson      | Johnson (LA)    | Poe (TX)     |               |              |               |
| Davis, Rodney | Johnson (OH)    | Poliquin     |               |              |               |
| Denham        | Johnson, Sam    | Posey        |               |              |               |
| Dent          | Jones           | Ratcliffe    |               |              |               |
| DeSantis      | Jordan          | Reed         |               |              |               |
| DesJarlais    | Joyce (OH)      | Reichert     |               |              |               |
| Diaz-Balart   | Katko           | Rice (SC)    |               |              |               |
| Donovan       | Kelly (MS)      | Roby         |               |              |               |
| Duffy         | Kelly (PA)      | Roe (TN)     |               |              |               |

## NOES—210

|                 |                |                   |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Adams           | DeGette        | Keating           |
| Aguilar         | Delaney        | Kelly (IL)        |
| Amash           | DeLauro        | Kennedy           |
| Barragán        | DelBene        | Khanna            |
| Bass            | Demings        | Kihuen            |
| Beatty          | DeSaulnier     | Kildee            |
| Bera            | Deutch         | Kilmer            |
| Beyer           | Dingell        | Kind              |
| Bishop (GA)     | Doggett        | Krishnamoorthi    |
| Blumenauer      | Doyle, Michael | Kuster (NH)       |
| Blunt Rochester | F.             | Kustoff (TN)      |
| Bonamici        | Duncan (TN)    | Langevin          |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Ellison        | Larsen (WA)       |
| F.              | Emmer          | Larson (CT)       |
| Brady (PA)      | Engel          | Lawrence          |
| Brown (MD)      | Eshoo          | Lawson (FL)       |
| Brownley (CA)   | Espallat       | Lee               |
| Bustos          | Esty (CT)      | Levin             |
| Butterfield     | Evans          | Lewis (GA)        |
| Capuano         | Foster         | Lieu, Ted         |
| Carbajal        | Frankel (FL)   | Lipinski          |
| Cárdenas        | Fudge          | Loeb sack         |
| Carson (IN)     | Gabbard        | Lofgren           |
| Cartwright      | Gallego        | Lowenthal         |
| Castor (FL)     | Garamendi      | Lowey             |
| Castro (TX)     | Garrett        | Lujan Grisham, M. |
| Chu, Judy       | Gohmert        | Luján, Ben Ray    |
| Cicilline       | Gonzalez (TX)  | Lynch             |
| Clark (MA)      | Gottheimer     | Maloney,          |
| Clarke (NY)     | Green, Al      | Carolyn B.        |
| Clay            | Green, Gene    | Maloney, Sean     |
| Cleaver         | Griffith       | Marino            |
| Clyburn         | Grijalva       | Massie            |
| Cohen           | Gutiérrez      | Matsui            |
| Connolly        | Hanabusa       | McCollum          |
| Conyers         | Hastings       | McEachin          |
| Cooper          | Heck           | McGovern          |
| Correa          | Higgins (NY)   | Himes             |
| Costa           | Himes          | McNerney          |
| Costello (PA)   | Hoyer          | McSally           |
| Courtney        | Huffman        | Meehan            |
| Crist           | Jackson Lee    | Meeks             |
| Crowley         | Jayapal        | Meng              |
| Cuellar         | Jeffries       | Moore             |
| Curbelo (FL)    | Johnson (GA)   | Moulton           |
| Davis (CA)      | Johnson, E. B. | Murphy (FL)       |
| Davis, Danny    | Jones          | Nadler            |
| DeFazio         | Kaptur         | Neal              |

Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen

Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier

Suoizzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—6

Cummings  
Long

Napolitano  
Renacci

Scalise  
Stivers

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1719

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ROBERT EMMET PARK ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1500) to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—423

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barragán  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer

Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)

Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz

Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Demings  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
DeJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Emmer  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)

Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBlundo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Norman  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sanford

Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto

Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner

Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—10

Burgess  
Castor (FL)  
Cummings  
Long

Napolitano  
Pittenger  
Renacci  
Scalise

Stivers  
Woodall

□ 1727

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 334, No. 335, No. 336, No. 337, and No. 338 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Hudson Amendment. I would have also voted "nay" on the Barr Amendment. I would have also voted "yea" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 1215. I would have also voted "nay" on the Final Passage of H.R. 1215—Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017. I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 1500—Robert Emmet Park Act of 2017.

## RECOGNIZING THE CENTRAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Central Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired.

Established in Utica in 1929, CABVI, as it is known, provides a wide range of opportunities for the blind and visually impaired, helping them to acquire job skills and training, good wages and benefits, and a greater independence and quality of life.

In their important mission, CABVI employs a segment of our population that experiences among the highest levels of unemployment in the country.

CABVI also provides vital health and rehabilitation services for people experiencing vision loss. Their resources and services have improved the quality of life for many in our region, including my late father who spent the last 7 years of his life legally blind and confined to a wheelchair. My family is forever grateful to them for their care and kindness.

Today I was honored to welcome to Washington my good friend Rudy D'Amico, president and CEO of CABVI; Robert Porter, public policy director; and Leta Laukitis, executive assistant. Joining them from the southern tier, colleague Ken Fernald, CEO of the Association for Visual Rehabilitation and Employment in Binghamton, New York. All joined by Jennifer Small, chief operating officer; John Ellzey, assistive technology instructor; Katie Lawson, switchboard operator; and Chervelle Amaker, purchasing agent and buyer.

Mr. Speaker, I thank them for their important work and their continued dedication to our community. I look forward to continuing to advocate for them throughout my time in Congress.

□ 1730

#### LET'S GET IT DONE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Senate Republicans delayed a vote on their bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This is a bill that Republicans wrote in secret. They allowed no input from the public or members of the Democratic Caucus, yet they still could not find the votes to pass their bill.

Maybe that is because it eliminates health insurance for 22 million Americans; it imposes an age tax on older Americans; it allows insurance companies to discriminate based on pre-existing conditions; it slashes Medicaid and leaves Medicare to wither on the vine. But no matter the reason, the lesson is clear: it is time for Republicans to give up on their effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The American people are benefiting from this law. Seniors like that they are saving money on prescriptions. Parents like that their kids can stay on their plan until they are 26. Workers like that their employers have to offer healthcare coverage.

It is not perfect, but let's work together to approve the Affordable Care Act to make sure it works even better for the American people. Democrats are willing to do that. If Republicans will give up the idea of repeal, we can work together to make the Affordable Care Act even better. Let's get this done for our constituents and the American people.

#### WAYZATA GIRLS CHAMPS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Wayzata High School girls synchronized swimming team, who recently won the Minnesota High School State Championship.

The Trojans triumphed at the State meet last month, where the undefeated team earned the championship title for the 11th consecutive year. They faced tough competition, but Wayzata's excellent figure scores put them over the edge to secure the win.

This talented team of dedicated girls, led by Head Coach Hensel, worked hard all season, winning each of their meets by at least 11 points. That commitment didn't stop at the pool. It is also in the classroom, where each of these students excelled as well.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to all the members, athletes, students, teachers, coaches, families, and fans of the Wayzata High School girls synchronized swimming team on their outstanding performance this season.

#### TAX BILL DISGUISED AS A HEALTHCARE BILL

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I am angry.

I am angry that Republicans are trying to fool the American people. The Republican healthcare bill is nothing more than a tax bill disguised as a healthcare bill.

TrumpCare is an almost \$570 billion tax break for health insurance companies, pharmaceutical companies, and the extremely wealthy. It is a bill that asks working families to pay more for less: less coverage, less access, and less care.

Recently, a concerned constituent called my office after discovering that his son would need surgery at birth for a heart defect and then subsequent surgeries later on. He wanted to know what he could do to stop TrumpCare and protect his son, who would be born with a preexisting condition and face thousands of dollars of cost throughout his life.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass healthcare legislation that invests in and protects the healthcare of all Americans, holds the healthcare industry accountable, and lowers cost.

#### 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF DALLAS POLICE SHOOTING

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, July 7, 2016, is forever marked by the sadness and loss our community suffered when five Dallas police officers were gunned down in the deadliest attack for law enforcement in the United States since the September 11 attacks.

These officers were killed as they protected Dallas citizens exercising their constitutional right to protest. They put their own lives on the line for the safety of others.

Reflecting on the events of last July 7, what stands out to me is the heroism of those who answered when duty called and a community that banded together during this tragic event. We are in the midst of an environment that can be deeply divided. We should all seek to follow the example of the Dallas community.

I want to acknowledge former Dallas Chief of Police David Brown and offer my sincere gratitude for his leadership; as well as the Dallas Police Department; first responders; the Parkland hospital; Baylor University hospital, where this iconic photograph was taken, for providing excellent emergency care; and others who helped the victims of this attack.

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize the sacrifice of the men and women and the critical role they played to protect our communities.

#### RECOGNIZING KELLY CRAFT AS U.S. AMBASSADOR TO CANADA

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud President Trump's selection of Ms. Kelly Craft as the next U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

Canada is the number one export market for my home State of Kentucky. Agriculture is the major industry in my congressional district, and Canada is a critical export market for Kentucky farm products. As a result of our successful history of trade with the nation of Canada, I cannot think of a better person to lead relations between these two countries than my dear friend, Kelly Craft.

Kelly was raised in Glasgow, Kentucky, which is 30 miles from my hometown. She has a lifetime of achievements and is extremely qualified. On a personal note, Kelly has always been there for and believed in me, and I am very appreciative of her support and friendship.

I look forward to Kelly Craft's great leadership as Ambassador to Canada, and I urge a swift confirmation process in the Senate.

# SENATE BILL A MARCH BACK TO BAD OLD DAYS FOR WOMEN

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, some of my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to claim that, under the Senate's healthcare plan, women will be protected from discrimination. They won't be charged more for their healthcare than men. However, the facts show that nothing could be further from the truth.

The Senate bill actually targets women for the cruelest cuts of all. It does so by allowing States to do away with guaranteed access to essential health services, now available under the Affordable Care Act. They are services like maternity care, no-cost birth control, and mammogram screening.

But the Senate plan would allow States to completely waive any guarantee of service. States could, once again, allow insurers to consider pre-existing conditions, like pregnancy, in setting fees and allow them to charge more. Plus, \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts and defunding Planned Parenthood disproportionately harms women.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times they say otherwise, they are marching back to the bad old days for women.

## DEBT AND DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who has always treated me very kindly.

## NAFTA NEGOTIATIONS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as NAFTA renegotiation approaches, I rise to call attention to the mammoth U.S. trade deficit with our NAFTA nation partners.

Our current deficit with NAFTA nations is \$74 billion. This red on the chart translates into tens of thousands of lost U.S. jobs, all while wages are depressed for North America's struggling workers. Since NAFTA's passage, there hasn't been a single year of trade balance for this country. That translates into lost jobs.

Thus far, President Trump has failed to correct these trade deficits. In fact, the trade deficit this year has ballooned to more than \$22 billion from the same period in 2016.

Balanced trade accounts in 5 years should be first on our agenda. My bill, the Balancing Trade Act, H.R. 2766, requires the administration to address

trade deficits of more than \$10 billion with any nation.

As negotiations near, let's focus on key principles such as vigorously enforcing a first world rule of law; including labor provisions that allow workers across this continent to improve their standard of living and outlaw labor trafficking; enact environmental standards for human health and forge an agricultural labor agreement that helps displaced farmers; reform the unaccountable tribunals called Investor-State Dispute Settlements so that they work for people, not just big corporations; address currency manipulation; and, finally, stamp out the illegal drug trade that is plaguing this continent.

The wealth NAFTA created has not been shared by all, but only a very few, and often only the very rich. Our foundational principle for NAFTA reform must be free and fair trade among free people with a rule of law.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those things I partially do, I think, as therapy. About once every other month, I ask for a block of time to try to take a bunch of very complex numbers and try to find ways to put them on boards and demonstrate them.

I am going to take a little divergence just for a moment or two, in response to some of the things I have heard today. We are actually going to focus on debt and deficit and what is actually demographically driving them, what is really happening in this country, and what is going to drive all public policy in our life.

You have had a handful of things said about the ACA—many people know it as ObamaCare—and our replacement. I know some of the things that the Senate is working on.

There is a math problem—and it is very simple—in the individual market. So if you hear someone turn to you and say, This is about healthcare for everyone or this is employer-based, or Medicare, it is not.

In my congressional district, less than 2 percent of my population actually purchased in the individual market. So you have to start putting this in perspective.

Here is your math problem. Because the prices kept moving up and the deductibles kept becoming larger and larger, half of our population—that 50 percent that only uses 3 percent of healthcare dollars—stopped buying.

I came across a number earlier this week—I haven't had a chance to vet it, but it was in a publication—saying that, of the 18- to 30-year-old population that would be in the individual purchasing market, only about 17 percent of them were actually buying the insurance.

So those of you who do math, you start to understand what happens in a world where half the population that really uses very little healthcare services doesn't buy a product and those

who are purchasing it are those who are the high users of it.

Remember, 50 percent of all healthcare dollars are used by 5 percent of the population. So you start to see it is this hockey stick curve that shoots up. That is the math problem that is trying to be fixed.

In the last 3 years, if you are from Arizona, you have had a 190 percent price hike in the mean plan and you have a single choice. So if we are going to be intellectually honest, should we hold our brothers and sisters around here to their own words and their own promises? You remember the promises a few years ago about keep your doctor, \$2,500 discount, lots of choices, lots of options, well, in Arizona, your prices have skyrocketed, you didn't get to keep your doctor, and you now have a single choice.

□ 1745

That is the reality of the math. Sometimes it is just so hard sitting here when you hear people just pulling things out of the air, and then you go to the bill and say: But I can't find that.

And you get these weird logic trains that if this happened and a meteor hit here and this and that. At some point we need to be honest with the American people saying it is a math problem. This is not about removing costs from the healthcare system. It is actually moving around, how you fairly distribute the cost of it.

This summer now we are starting to work on it, just like we voted on about an hour ago a piece of legislation that starts to remove cost out of the system. It is these future pieces of legislation, like the tort liability bill that was just passed out of the House here, that will actually start to drive down costs.

Remember a really important conceptual idea: in 1986, there was a law passed here, signed by President Reagan, that said you cannot deny an American health services if they show up at the emergency room, if they show up at the hospital.

So if you actually look at the number of procedures in society in the last 30, 31 years, pre-ACA, after the ACA came into effect, what we see in the future, we haven't removed procedures and costs. We have just moved the money around.

All right. So what is happening in our country? Do you remember when the President introduced his budget, what, about 6 weeks ago, 2 months ago, and the gnashing of teeth and the wailing and the crying?

We have a math problem, and it is based on demographics. We are going to see this multiple times in these slides. I am one of them. I am at the very tail end. I am a baby boomer. There are 76 million of us who are baby boomers, who are heading towards retirement. That demographic curve is



changing the cost structure of government.

On the slide you see next to me, this is 9 years from now. Remember, we are working on, what, the 2018 budget? So actually less than that. This is what the world will look like in 2026.

Do you see the Social Security being 24 percent of all spending? Do you see Medicare being 19 percent of all spending? Do you see interest on the debt?

If you start to add up everything, you have to understand the world we are in is we are heading toward a time where three-quarters of spending—actually, even more than that are what we call mandatory. They are formulas. You get this benefit because you turned a certain age. You get this benefit because you fell under a certain income. You get this benefit because you served in the military.

But what so many of us talk about as being government is becoming tiny. In 2026, which is not that long from now, 11 percent of the budget is going to be defense; 11 percent of the budget will be nondefense. So that is your parks, that is your medical research, that is your education. That is this branch of government. So 22 percent will be what we call discretionary. It is what I get to come down here and vote on because everything else is run by a formula.

So if you are someone who comes to me and says: I really think we should be going to Mars. I really think we should be doing this type of healthcare research. I really think we need this money in education.

Okay. I agree they are all incredibly important in our society. Are you going to help me find a way to reform what we call mandatory spending, entitlements?

Entitlements—because of the aging of our population—is the primary driver, are consuming every incremental dollar.

In a decade, this government will be spending \$1 trillion more, and every dime of that will functionally have gone into entitlements. We will have gone 10 years where what we call discretionary spending—you know, these little two parts here—has stayed flat for a decade.

This huge growth in government is actually in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security. Certain other entitlements are things you get because you fell below a certain income, and interest on the debt. Until we are actually honest about this—because it is so dangerous for a political person to even say the words “Medicare”—we have to look at the numbers and understand the trust funds are bleeding.

If you really want to protect our brothers and sisters and protect retirees, some of these are things we should have done a decade ago. And we keep avoiding them because so often Washington cares more about the political

up side of attacking each side from even mentioning what is going on demographically and in these numbers.

We are going to try to run through a bunch of these slides. Some of them, I apologize, when you blow them up on the big printer, they are going to get a little fuzzy, but we are going to just try to walk through these numbers. Hopefully, they will make some sense.

Why is this slide up?

This one is really important.

When you get down to the very last bar chart, do you happen to notice something? You notice how they basically touch each other.

That is 2027.

How many years from now—how many budget years from now?

So about 9 budget years from now.

Do you see the lighter blue?

Okay. That is Social Security. The gray is the Medicare. Then the Medicaid. Then you get up to net interest. Then you see the green at the very top, and that is other mandatory.

Oh, heaven. Do you understand what that slide is telling you?

That is saying, in 9 years, just the mandatory spending consumes all revenues, meaning defense will be on borrowed money, meaning almost everything you think of as government—once again, the Park Service, medical research, education—will be on borrowed money.

At that point we are going to be borrowing probably a little over \$1 trillion a year every year, and it gets worse and worse.

I am incredibly blessed. I have a 20-month-old, and since the blessing of her coming into my life and my wife's life, I think constantly: In the time I am spending here in Congress, what am I handing to her?

Because right now the game is we spend it today, we consume it today, and we are going to let our kids and our grandkids pay it back.

How does this become ethical?

Yet if you listen to the speeches that happened on this floor today, it was speech after speech of: We want more money for something.

At the same time—this is important—do you know how much we are going to borrow today?

We are going to borrow over \$1.6 billion today.

I have 1 hour to speak here to you. Hopefully, if we are all blessed, I won't go that long.

Okay. So \$1.6 billion divided by 24. Sixty-six million dollars an hour.

Start to divide that and just think about that is just the borrowing side of spending, because we are going to spend about \$11 billion today on a \$4 trillion-plus budget. So just understand that this is where we are going. This is already baked into the cake. This is the math.

It is time for almost revolutionary thoughts on we need to look at the

budget holistically. That means no longer having this little silo over here of this is discretionary, this is mandatory; and if you even talk about mandatory, you lose your political office.

In many ways, this one is sort of doing the same thing but letting you see what is happening on the debt side.

Now, why is the debt side so incredibly important to also focus on?

We have to pay interest on it. We are borrowing money from your retirement, from the Union retirement, from the State retirement, but we are also borrowing money from a thrifty family in China, and we owe interest on it. We also make ourselves, as a nation, much more fragile to the world markets.

We have been incredibly lucky the last few years of these stunningly low interest rates.

How many of you actually believe the interest rates when you look at a 10-year instrument today that I think was at 2.2 and believe that is normal?

If we actually just moved back to nominal interest rates, our interest would grow very quickly in the next couple of years to be greater than our entire defense budget.

As you look at this slide, look out to 2026, many years from now, except it is not that long from now. Do you see the green bar up there?

That is total debt. That total debt is starting to crash in on \$30 trillion.

A bit of trivia. You often hear the differential people say: Well, there is public debt and there is publicly issued debt, and then there is debt where we borrow from the trust funds. Okay. And many of the economists really only score debt that is sold in the open markets.

Okay. Fine. I understand that is the practice, but there is something that is intellectually lazy, because we still owe the money back to the Medicare trust fund, to the Social Security trust fund. It has been a while since I checked this, but I think last year I checked, and we were paying a 3.1 percent interest spiff. So we pay a higher interest rate for borrowing those monies out of those trust funds.

Do we have an obligation to pay that back?

Of course we do. But for the intellectually lazy, it is just so much more comforting to say: Well, let's just not look at that because, if we look at that, we are already over 100 percent of debt-to-GDP when we put in those dollars we have loaned to the general fund. Let's just call it that.

Let's move on to the next one. If you look at this slide, you notice there is starting to be a theme here. I am trying desperately to get my brothers and sisters in this body to understand the greatest threat to our society is the money we are spending that we actually don't have a way to pay for. If you actually look at demographics and where this debt curves, it just blows off the charts.

This is an interesting little slide. This is a CBO slide for 2027. When you actually look at it saying: Okay. What does the world look like if mandatory—Okay. Do you see the blue?

That is mandatory and defense spending. Because many people say: Look, we are going to spend on defense.

We will be down to only—11 percent of this budget will be things you think of as government. Everything else will be entitlements or defense.

Just as a perspective, we did this slide just so you could sort of see. I hear candidates running for office say: We are going to take care of waste and fraud, and that will balance the budget.

Really? When only 11 percent of the budget in just a few years will be everything that isn't mandatory or isn't defense?

You have got to understand the scale.

This one is a little hard to read. I am going to reach over to it and play with my pen.

When you actually look at this, what I am begging of you also to understand is—I think this is the 2016 year—we spent actually a bit over \$3.9 trillion, but we only took in \$3.3 trillion.

You see the nature of the differential?

□ 1800

And when you start to look at, first off, the beige there in the upper, we have been really blessed with incredibly low interest rates. So at a time where we should have actually been having an interest bill that would have been approaching a few hundred billion, we had less than \$250 billion.

Now, the dear Lord and the interest markets have been very, very kind to us. When you actually look at the curve, so much of the spending, once again, is what we call mandatory. But if you actually look at—we will call it the rust over there, something most people don't understand. I am going to reach over and point to what is the individual income tax portion. What most people don't understand is the individual income tax is the majority of the income to this country that is not intended for one of the trust funds.

If you actually look at the corporate income tax, it has been going up, but it is still a fairly small sliver. Now, why did that change? And so often I will get people that bring me charts and say: "David, 25, 30 years ago, the corporations paid so much more." Well, also, 25, 30 years ago, there was this new concept of pass-throughs: LLCs and partnerships.

So what happened is many things that used to be corporations in the fifties, sixties, seventies, up and through the eighties, at the end of the eighties there was this revolution where States all over said: Hey, why don't we create these pass-through entities; they're more tax efficient.

How many of you actually have had an LLC? Well, that is a pass-through entity. But that is where you actually see the shift of corporate taxes going down and individual taxes going up. It is not that corporations all of a sudden start escaping taxes. It is their taxes now were actually booked as individual income. Just to understand, so when you see those charts, you have got to be able to sort of process and think that through.

This is sort of important to understand where the taxes are. But, do you see that circle there, that 40 percent of the entire curve? That is payroll taxes. That is the income that goes into your unemployment, your Social Security disability, your Social Security, your Medicare. Those are revenues that are specifically for either your retirement future, if you have a break in your employment, or, God forbid, you become permanently or temporarily disabled, with Social Security disability having its definition of what temporarily disabled is.

Just to understand, those are our revenue sources.

Then you will see the little slivers on the bottom, and some of that is tariffs and some of the other fees that come in, partially through trade.

I know, sometimes these slides are a little hard to see, so we actually blew a couple of them up. The idea here was just so you could actually see the total revenues.

Now, this is for 2017, so this is our projection of what is going on this year.

And my wife, right about now is when she would typically start texting me and saying I am putting everybody to sleep. But I am married to an accountant, so that could explain why we have no friends.

That is the payroll taxes.

Do you see the far side? Let's call it turquoise. That is the individual income tax. That is why those of us on the Ways and Means Committee, when we are actually working on tax reform, many of us believe we have to sort of do an organic, a unified budget or a tax reform proposal that actually does everything from what you see here, corporate, which actually is much of our job engine, over to the individual, which is also now a huge portion of our job engine.

Do not let someone just talk about lowering rates and not also understand that what you see on the individual side may be what you pay as a worker, but also, if you are an employer but you are organized as an LLC or partnership or pass-through, you are also on that side, just to know it is out there.

Now we get to some of the more fun stuff.

You were just looking at some of our revenues. We already know that this year, if you use the President's bud-

et—or Office of Budget and Management—we are about \$600 billion short. If we use that of the Congressional Budget Office, we are, let's just call it, \$550 billion short, meaning we are spending that much more money than we are taking in.

But, once again, let's actually just look at where we are spending the money. So the turquoise, Social Security, Medicare, and other health programs, so Medicare and Medicaid. National defense is this. Then come over here. This is everything else, and this is interest.

So, last year, we spent about \$245 billion in interest. This year, we are still blessed with incredibly low interest rates. We are only expecting about \$266 billion in interest. Still stunning amounts of money. But the little white area is what most people will think of as government.

So if you look at last year—and the nice thing about using this one is it is booked. We know what it is. We took in \$3.3 trillion; we spent \$3.9 trillion. You already start to see the structural difference.

So, if you actually start to come over here, now this is much better than it was a few years ago. The problem is, in this fairly strong economy, it is closed, and now, demographically, it is about to start to move away from us. This is the line you always have to constantly think about.

If that is my revenues and I drop my line down, you have to start understanding that everything beyond that line is borrowed money. Just visually, I have always found this easiest when you actually start to show different groups saying: "Look, this is just where we are at." And then you will stand up and say: "Hey, why don't we do this? Tell me what I can cut because you want a balanced budget this year."

All right. Understand the math. If we are going to borrow \$600 billion, that is most of defense.

Okay. How about the other side, everything else we call discretionary? We could actually eliminate all of it and, believe it or not, you still don't have enough money to cover the borrowing. So, if you are borrowing \$600 billion this year, I believe that is greater than all of the nondefense spending in the government this year.

So let's actually start going through a little bit more where we are at and what is actually about to happen. The frustrating thing here is we have a number of charts that we have worked on about why we have been so off on our economic growth projections. If you go back a couple of years ago, we had these fairly rosy pictures where we were going to be, yet the country has not grown nearly fast enough.

We are hoping this year, with the new administration, you are actually starting to see economic growth that will take care of a lot of these sins. I

think GDP now, as of a couple of days ago, the Atlanta Fed's calculator was at about 2.9 percent of GDP. You would like to be substantially higher, but if we could hold 2.9 through the rest of the year, we will take it because it is so much healthier than where we have been the last few years.

Why this is important is, I just want to show, the Congressional Budget Office's baseline for 2017, \$559 billion more spending than we are taking in. But I am going to reach way over here and say, hey, what does the world look like 10 years from now? Ten years from now it is saying the annual shortfall, the annual borrowing, will be 1.4—actually, let's be accurate—\$1.408 trillion.

So just the borrowing in 9 budget years will be greater than all of the discretionary spending of this year. And it is growth in entitlements; it is growth in mandatory spending.

Why isn't that what you hear behind these microphones all day long? I have to believe that those of us who get behind those microphones, we love our kids and we love our grandkids, but this is absolute decimation of the future.

And do not blame the parts of the government that we vote for, the discretionary, because the math doesn't show that. When you actually take a look at this, you see the darker and the lighter. The darker is defense, the lighter is nondefense.

One more time, I know this is sort of geeky. But if you actually look from 1996 to 2001, yes, we have had certain economic upheavals; we have had an attack on our country. But if you actually look at the percentages of gross domestic product, which is how so many economists sort of look at our spending and say, "Hey, you are spending 3 percent over here of your GDP on defense," it is pretty much identical where we were last year as to where we were 10 years or 20 years earlier.

So, once again, what is exploding on us? Well, if you want to break it down, if you actually look at the different categories—and we are only going to do this slide for a second—the different categories will have stayed almost flat in the discretionary area for 10 years.

So what is happening in our society? We are getting older. Something I thought was just fascinating because I have a great interest in the reality: We knew people were going to be turning 65. We knew baby boomers were going to be turning 65 for how many years? This body knew we had 76 million of our brothers and sisters who were born in an 18-year period that would be moving into their time with their earned benefits, and we did what to prepare for it? So we are now about our fifth year into the baby boomers retiring, and we are now beyond the inflection point.

If you went to school many years ago and you sat in a demographics class, they talked about, oh, in the 2000s,

there is going to be this time where you are coming up against this inflection where the spending is going to explode.

You are going to see a couple of slides in a moment where I am going to show you what has happened now where, when I was a child, for every \$4 spent for children, \$1 was spent for seniors. Today, that is reversed. There is some math difference in there and there is some population difference, but that is where we are at.

This is an interesting slide. You do understand, as a nation, we functionally have zero population growth without immigration. In about 25 or 30 years, the country of Nigeria will have more population than the United States. So when you hear someone talk, saying, "Well, I am uncomfortable with trade," they have got to understand, if we need consumers for our products, we need to be finding these countries that are going to have lots of young people, and they are our future markets.

We in the United States are moving down. I think our average age this year is 37.2, and that will continue to go up for about the next 25 years.

I just put this up because it is fascinating seeing where the young people are going to be in the world, and we need to start thinking about, if we are getting older as a society, how do we still use our intellectual prowess, our creativity, our manufacturing prowess to make things that are desirable to growing populations, and let's make sure we have built a world and environment here where we can sell things to them.

□ 1815

Because if we don't, we don't have the market ourselves. We are not going to have enough young consumers. So you have got to take that into reality.

Once again, this one is a tough chart. It is on here just basically to understand what is happening in the world. What is incredibly fascinating is many Americans see China as our primary competitor, and in many products they are.

On high-value products, countries like Germany, actually, are more of a competitor. But do you see this line here, this collapse? That is the Chinese demographics. If you understand that line, you understand a lot of things that China is doing around the world in trying to buy assets that produce income so they will actually have an income stream to start paying for their senior population.

The United States is this dark here, and you will see—here is where we are at. We are sliding. But look at how many of our trading partners also are in the same demographic curve. It is just worth understanding that when you see many of us who lean towards being free traders, we are looking for

where there are populations in the world that we can go sell things to. I am an American; I want to sell you something.

Now, within the Nation, just fascination, if year 2000 the average age in the United States was 35.3, 16 years later, we are 37.9, that is a huge shift. I know that may not seem like a big difference when you start talking about two-and-a-half some points. That is a big shift in 16 years on average age.

But also what is fascinating is for those of us out in the West, we will actually be somewhat younger than the middle of the country and back East. I am blessed to be from Maricopa County, Arizona, the fastest growing county in the country. Come visit us. But it is also to understand that this aging of America also is going to require different societal needs, and different States are going to have very different approaches.

If you actually look at a State like Utah, it remains fairly young. Some of our States back East actually get quite old and are going to actually have very different societal needs.

This is the mandatory spending chart. I actually wanted to spend just a moment over here on some of the percentages. This one I know is really hard to read, but if you actually start to look at the second part over here, "discretionary," do you see all of those little tiny percentages? This is where a lot of our discussions get very disingenuous around here.

We will have people coming behind these microphones almost acting like their hair is on fire because some dollars have been removed from this agency, or dollars are going to be removed from this spending program, and the unwillingness to understand the scale that we are talking about. It is just real simple.

If that is every dollar of discretionary spending plus defense, and every dollar of mandatory, the mandatory is what, two-and-a-half times bigger? So if you are going to have a discussion of spending priorities, are we going to be a mature enough group to actually deal with the reality where the dollars are at? I promise, we are down to the last couple of these.

So the share of the budget outlays, and this one is more—I am not being judgemental on this. It is just more of a thought experiment. This is actually from the Urban Institute, which it is always interesting to see a Republican using charts from the Urban Institute. This is a couple of years old, and the chart now is actually more aggressive. I just couldn't get the newest one printed.

Do you see this little edge right here? This is sort of the Federal spending. Ten percent is going to children. Forty-one percent of the spending goes to seniors. It is just a thought experiment. We want to honor and keep our

commitments to the earned entitlements, but the reality of the demographics keep moving up, and as we keep those commitments, the pressure on everything else is going to get much more cantankerous, much more cranky, much more difficult.

We have a saying in our office: It is always about the money. Some of the disharmony you hear around here is going to get louder because, as you have already seen, the trillion-dollar engine over the next few years that consumes the next trillion dollars is all mandatory spending, is all demographics. So that is just another thought experiment.

Every once in while we will get the people who come to us and say: Hey, David, why don't you remove this program or that program? One more time, we are borrowing—so much for my writing—\$1.6 billion every single day. And that is just the borrowing side, and we are spending close to \$11 billion every single day.

So on occasion, you will get a group that comes in and says: David, we want you to get rid of all foreign aid, but we want to make sure you still protect Israel, and we still want to help the countries that are trying to help us deal with narcotics.

And you start to get down and say: Okay, so you want us to cut half of the foreign aid budget?

Okay, great. Well, that would be about 14 days of borrowing—not spending, borrowing. Because remember, we are borrowing \$1.6 billion every day. And there becomes the intellectual problem where you will get an individual who comes in and says: David, just take care of the waste and fraud. And there is waste and fraud out there, and we are going to have to do it. And we are going to have to be much more disciplined in the adoption and the use of technology.

But a lot of that language is gimmickry until you have someone who is willing to step up and actually just talk about the demographics that are our Nation.

So think about this: I will have stood behind this microphone—let's just pretend it is an hour. Do you feel like you got \$66 million worth of speechifying? Because we are borrowing \$66 million a minute, \$1.6 billion a day, and it is just not that.

One of the reasons this is such a powerful chart—and this is from a private organization that does the U.S. debt clock. You do realize, the majority of debt in this country is borrowed.

There was an article in *Politico* a couple of years ago that did this brilliant job. If you actually think about this, all of the student loans, all of the mortgages that have Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, Ginnie Mae, SBA, all of these things, it was somewhere around 63 or 64 percent of all debt in the United States, you and I as taxpayers guarantee.

The unfunded liabilities in Medicare itself over the 75 years, many actuaries have over \$100 trillion. So when you see us fussing with each other down here, it is almost always about the money. And until we are willing to start talking about these numbers that are spinning out of control, the fussing is just going to get more and more angry until we step up and deal with the reality of what is driving our future, and that is demographics.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PRIDE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, and I am proud to do so, to present the Pride Resolution as June is Pride Month.

I am also very proud tonight to have with me a member of the LGBT Equality Caucus, who happens to be the co-chair—one of the co-chairs. There are 6 co-chairs and 11 vice chairs, 109 members.

So at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the co-chair, after which I shall make some additional comments.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. GREEN of Texas, for bringing forward a resolution simply acknowledging the importance of this month to the millions of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender Americans across the country.

AL GREEN's resolution stands in stark contrast to the silence of the Trump administration. For the first time in nearly a decade, there was no White House proclamation to celebrate Pride. And, you know what, Mr. Speaker, we are all proud of being Americans, and we all are proud of our heritage, and we are proud of who we are. Just as people are proud of their Irish-American heritage, or their Catholic heritage, or they are proud to be women or proud to be men, people who are LGBT in our country no longer need to stay in the closet.

They can be fully authentic with who they are, and they can celebrate in a spirit of brotherhood and sisterhood with their allies, and other LGBT Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I got to participate in the Pride festivities in Denver this year, and I am looking forward next week to, for the very first time, being the grand marshal of a parade, the Colorado Springs Pride Parade. I have never had the opportunity to be a grand marshal before.

But I am glad that AL GREEN and his cosponsors, including myself, are lending their voice, to say that this body,

the House of Representatives, wants to, of course, honor and respect the full diversity of our country, and in the inclusive spirit, celebrate the civil rights accomplishments of the LGBT movement as well as recognize the work ahead to make sure that LGBT Americans are fully equal under the law.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words, and I especially thank him for coming to the floor tonight. It means a lot that a member of the caucus would be here, and I want to let him know that I wish him the very best with the Pride parade next year.

In Houston, we had our Pride parade. It is one of the largest events in Houston, Texas. Literally, thousands upon thousands of people line the streets, and everybody is celebrating a rich history that is American history. Again, I thank the gentleman for his attendance.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution has 26 original cosponsors, and this resolution is one that we have presented for many years. As I am grateful to the many who have signed on to this resolution, I have to mention Senator SHERROD BROWN because he has presented a resolution on the Senate side to acknowledge June as Pride Month.

He has done so because of the circumstance that was called to our attention by Mr. POLIS. The White House has not issued a resolution, breaking with an 8-year tradition. This is something that is expected. It is something that has occurred, and people tend to look to the top for the tone and tenor of our behavior to be demonstrated.

I regret that we did not get the resolution from the White House. My prayer is that at some point the White House will have a change of heart, a change of mind, and will present a resolution.

But be that as it may, tonight we are proud to present this resolution, and it is important that I present it as an ally of the LGBTQ community. I am an ally of the community for good reason, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know what discrimination smells like. I know what it talks like. I know what it walks like. I know what it looks like. I have been the victim of invidious discrimination. I lived in the South. I am a son of the South, and the rights that were accorded me under the Constitution of the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, were denied by my fellow citizens of the South.

I lived in the South, Mr. Speaker, born in Louisiana, lived in the South at a time when I had to drink from colored water fountains. And I must tell you, a good many of them were not the kinds of fountains that you would want to drink from. They were filthy, to be quite frank with you.

I lived in the South at a time when I had to sit in the back of the bus. There

could be many seats available in the front of the bus, but I had to make my way to the back to claim my seat.

I lived in the South at a time when I had to sit in the balcony of the movie. It didn't matter that there were seats in the lower level. I was always shown the balcony.

□ 1830

At a time when I had to receive my food from the back door, couldn't go in to many restaurants, and if I did have a restaurant that I could go in, it was some room in the back that was set aside for coloreds only—colored water fountains, colored restrooms, back of the bus, balcony of the movie, and, when we were locked up at that time, it was in the bottom of the jail.

I know what invidious discrimination is like, Mr. Speaker, which is why I am here tonight, because I believe that, until all of us are free of invidious discrimination, every one of us is at risk of being a victim of invidious discrimination.

This resolution is important because it speaks of the many gains that have been made in the LGBTQ community: Barney Frank, the first openly gay Member of Congress; Annise Parker, first openly gay mayor in the city of Houston; speaks of Stonewall; speaks of many accomplishments; speaks of a lot of the tears that have been shed.

But tonight I want to really focus on the very end of the resolution. Rather than go through all of the whereases, I want to go to the be it resolved.

Resolved: That the House of Representatives recognizes that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer—LGBTQ—rights are human rights and are protected by the Constitution, the Constitution of the United States of America; recognizes that all Americans should be treated fairly and equally, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

This is important, Mr. Speaker, because in this country today, in the United States of America today, we still have people who are being discriminated against because of who they are.

In the United States of America, there are still people who have rights that are accorded them under the Constitution, very similar to my circumstances—not the same, but very similar, very similar, not the same, to my circumstances—wherein the rights that were accorded under the Constitution were denied by my fellow Americans, and people today are having rights denied by their fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. CICILLINE, DAVID CICILLINE, Representative CICILLINE, has a bill, H.R. 2282, the Equality Act. This bill has 195 cosponsors. This bill would address the inequalities that we see in America.

Examples are always good. In this country, the Supreme Court has made

marriage equality the law of the land. One would think that, if it is the law of the land, all persons who are married would be treated the same as all other persons who are married. All persons who happen to be of the LGBTQ community would be treated like I would be treated if I were married, as a person who is not a member of the community, but an ally.

That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. In the United States of America, if you are married and you are of the LGBTQ community and you wear your ring to work the next day and proudly announce that you are married, you can be fired. You can be fired for engaging in an act that is constitutional in the United States of America.

Why? Because we have about 31 States that have not clearly defined the fact that all persons are to be treated equally, endowed by their Creator with these certain inalienable rights, among them, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. All persons, this would include people who are of the LGBTQ community. But, unfortunately, in a good many States, they can be fired for just showing up to work and announcing that they are of the LGBTQ community.

Mr. Speaker, no one should be denied the right to work because of who the person happens to be when it is a lawful—lawful—status that you occupy. Marriage is lawful in this country. People ought not be punished for being married.

People ought not be punished for their sexual orientation in this country. In this country, you can be denied service, certain services, because of your sexual orientation. One would think that we were long past the time when people would judge you and draw conclusions about who you are and what you represent simply because of your sexual orientation.

Sexual orientation is not a limitation on a person's dignity, on a person's humanity. Sexual orientation does not divest a person of citizenship, does not divest a person of rights supported under the Constitution. Sexual orientation is but a means by which a person was born into this world.

I believe that my God doesn't make any junk. I believe that my God created people purposefully and created them as they are to be who they are in a world where all persons should be treated equally, created equally by God, treated fairly and equally by humanity.

So since I believe this and I have had these experiences, it is appropriate that I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives to say to the world that we as a great nation should not allow ourselves to continue to deny human rights and human dignity to people because of their status, a status that they were born with, a status that the Supreme Court recognizes, a status

that is to be protected under the Constitution of the United States of America.

I am proud to stand here and take up the challenge and the cause. I am a person who believes that, until we have paid the debts to others for the work that they have done to accord us our freedom, we still have a job to do. There is still great work to be done.

I didn't get here because of my work alone. I didn't get here because I am the person who ought to have this position. There were people who sacrificed and made it possible for me to have this opportunity. There were people who surrendered their lives so that I would have the opportunity to stand here tonight.

So I owe a debt, and I am standing here tonight to continue to repay the debt I owe to others who made it possible for me to have the rights and enjoy the rights—to be more specific, enjoy the rights—that I enjoy in this country, and I want others to enjoy these rights as well.

This is not to say that all of the discrimination against African Americans is over and the world is a perfect place. It is not. But it is perfect enough for me to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and stand for justice for others just as persons have stood for justice for me.

So I thank you for the time, Mr. Speaker. It has been time well spent, in my opinion. I am honored that this resolution has been presented. I am honored that it has cosponsors—26.

My prayer is that one day the House of Representatives will pass this resolution; my prayer is that one day Mr. BROWN's resolution will pass in the Senate; and my prayer is that one day this President will issue a proclamation, if you will, a resolution of a sort, recognizing June as Pride Month, LGBTQ Pride Month.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 27, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1238. To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 29, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 91. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for women veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces (Rept. 115-197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2825. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ROYCE of California, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 3089. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to ensure that persons who form corporations or limited liability companies in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations or limited liability companies, in order to prevent wrongdoers from exploiting United States corporations and limited liability companies for criminal gain, to assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, and other misconduct involving United States corporations and limited liability companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H.R. 3090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent individuals receiving work authorizations under certain deferred action programs from being eligible for the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3091. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to limit the authority of State election officials to remove registrants from the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office in the State on the basis of interstate cross-checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 3092. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to modify the Federal Parent Locator Service to improve search functions and include

State responsible father registry search functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 3093. A bill to amend the Volcker Rule to permit certain investment advisers to share a similar name with a private equity fund, subject to certain restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 3094. A bill to authorize a national grant program for on-the-job training; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. BANKS of Indiana):

H.R. 3095. A bill to prohibit or suspend certain health care providers from providing non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care services to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3096. A bill to implement a mandatory random drug testing program for certain employees of the Indian Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3097. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit credit for service for purposes of a Federal annuity to employees of the Social Security Administration for certain violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certified adult day services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3099. A bill to establish Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie National Park in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 3100. A bill to require the President to develop a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 3101. A bill to enhance cybersecurity information sharing and coordination at ports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H.R. 3102. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the provision of naturalization assistance to members of the uniformed services, including new recruits, who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H.R. 3103. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to jointly conduct a study and submit a report on deported veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. PELOSI):

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. SEN-SENBRENNER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. KIND):

H. Res. 418. A resolution urging the Secretary of the Interior to recognize the cultural significance of Rib Mountain by adding it to the National Register of Historic Places; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 419. A resolution encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H. Res. 420. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of July 9 through July 15, 2017, as "Sarcoma Awareness Week" and July 15, 2017, as

"Leiomyosarcoma Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 421. A resolution urging the Administration to develop more effective and timely responses to famine in Africa, especially efforts to end the conflicts in South Sudan, Nigeria, and other countries that cause or exacerbate famine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 3090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States, but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states: The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 3094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power [...] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several "States . . ."

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 3095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 3098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 3100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 3101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COOK and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 25: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 95: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 112: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 173: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 187: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 203: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 291: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 377: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 392: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 490: Mr. WALKER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 525: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 535: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 579: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 631: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 664: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 750: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 757: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 807: Mr. DENT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 825: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 828: Mr. HOLDING and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 849: Mr. BARTON and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 880: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 931: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MENG, Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 947: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 959: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 986: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 997: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1002: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1017: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1038: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1057: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1094: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1098: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1148: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1149: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1160: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1164: Mr. MESSER and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1168: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1200: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1223: Mr. SIREN and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1225: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HILL, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1227: Mr. HUNTER and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1261: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1311: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1326: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1444: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1456: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1478: Mr. RUSH and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1487: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1583: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1599: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COLE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1606: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1626: Mr. POSEY and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1639: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1651: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HURD, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1661: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1676: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1697: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TROTT, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1698: Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1699: Mr. COLE and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1753: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1810: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1811: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 1814: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1820: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1823: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1825: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1838: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1905: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1928: Mr. MASSIE.



H.R. 1957: Ms. STEFANIK.  
 H.R. 1970: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. RASKIN.  
 H.R. 2029: Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H.R. 2101: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 2123: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 2149: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. BABIN.  
 H.R. 2193: Mr. DENT and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2200: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 2287: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BIGGS.  
 H.R. 2315: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2322: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2356: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 2383: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 2386: Mr. PETERSON.  
 H.R. 2401: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H.R. 2404: Ms. BASS.  
 H.R. 2422: Mr. KEATING, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. VELA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. BARTON.  
 H.R. 2432: Mr. PETERSON.  
 H.R. 2480: Mr. DONOVAN.  
 H.R. 2499: Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 2535: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 2544: Mr. RASKIN.  
 H.R. 2550: Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 2587: Mr. WALZ and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2589: Mr. AMODEI.  
 H.R. 2640: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 2646: Mr. DONOVAN and Ms. GRANGER.  
 H.R. 2651: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
 H.R. 2657: Mr. BIGGS.  
 H.R. 2695: Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. KHANNA.  
 H.R. 2696: Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. KHANNA.  
 H.R. 2723: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2735: Ms. BONAMICI.  
 H.R. 2738: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2740: Mr. MEADOWS.  
 H.R. 2747: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.  
 H.R. 2749: Mr. DUNN.  
 H.R. 2777: Mrs. TORRES.  
 H.R. 2781: Mr. BERGMAN.  
 H.R. 2801: Mr. WESTERMAN.  
 H.R. 2806: Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 2820: Mr. KINZINGER.  
 H.R. 2823: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H.R. 2838: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 2839: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 2851: Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 2862: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
 H.R. 2901: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SOTO.  
 H.R. 2902: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
 H.R. 2907: Mr. GOSAR.  
 H.R. 2909: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 2918: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 2936: Mr. STEWART.  
 H.R. 2939: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2940: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2944: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 2972: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 2973: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 2976: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 2983: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H.R. 3003: Mr. ARRINGTON.  
 H.R. 3004: Mr. GARRETT.  
 H.R. 3009: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 3058: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 3084: Mr. KIND and Ms. ESHOO.  
 H.R. 3087: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 3088: Mr. O'HALLERAN.  
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. BARTON and Mr. STIVERS.  
 H.J. Res. 106: Mr. KING of Iowa.  
 H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. DONOVAN.  
 H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H. Res. 161: Mr. KHANNA.  
 H. Res. 185: Mr. KEATING.  
 H. Res. 218: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. BIGGS.  
 H. Res. 219: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H. Res. 274: Mr. COOK.  
 H. Res. 279: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H. Res. 317: Mr. SIRES, Mr. COOK, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. SUOZZI.  
 H. Res. 359: Mr. SUOZZI.  
 H. Res. 362: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. EVANS.  
 H. Res. 400: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. CLAY.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CAPTAIN DAVID  
LEMIRE AS THE 2016 MARQUETTE  
POLICE OFFICER OF THE YEAR

**HON. JACK BERGMAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Captain David Lemire as the 2016 Marquette Police Officer of the Year. The Marquette Police Officer of the Year Award is presented annually to a well-rounded law enforcement officer who has excelled in the line of duty by demonstrating a distinct pattern of community service and professional achievement.

Captain Lemire was born and raised in Marquette, where, after serving for a decade in the U.S. Army, he returned to give back to his community. For 25 years, David served the citizens of Marquette with distinction, honesty, and a willingness to take responsibility. Honor is David's defining characteristic, and he undertakes every endeavor with discipline and dedication. As a decorated officer, he has received numerous awards that speak to his character, including: A Life Saving Citation for the rescue of two persons on a capsized boat on Lake Independence, the Michigan State Police Award for Professional Excellence, an award for Exemplary Performance and Professionalism from the Michigan Army National Guard for his assistance after a helicopter crash, and the Outstanding Instructor Award at the Northern Michigan University Regional Police Academy in both 2002 and 2010.

These awards only begin to describe David's commitment to his community. For every recognized deed, there are hundreds of small achievements that are never acknowledged in the public eye. There is no doubt that Captain Lemire's countless achievements are a contributing factor to Marquette being named one of the safest cities in the United States. Moreover, it's clear that he has positively impacted the citizens of Marquette County. David has received myriad letters of appreciation from citizens thanking him for his comfort and kind words after the death of a family member or at the scene of a tragic accident. His commitment to justice and public service has gone beyond the call of duty. Captain David Lemire has consistently set an example of what a police officer should strive to achieve in their career.

Mr. Speaker, Captain Lemire's long list of accomplishments cannot be understated, and I am confident that he will continue to serve as a role model for the next generation of great community leaders in Michigan's First District. His wife, Cindy, and son, Mitchell, can take pride in knowing the Upper Peninsula is a better place thanks to David's work. On behalf of my constituents and the First District of Michigan, I wish to congratulate Captain David

Lemire on being named the 2016 Marquette Police Officer of the Year.

HONORING THE NEWTOWN BEE

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Newtown Bee, a weekly paper based in Newtown, Connecticut, upon the 140th Anniversary of its first publication. For well over a century, The Newtown Bee has chronicled the town's history and informed the Newtown community.

The Newtown Bee was first published on June 28, 1877, and was initially led by editor John Pearce. Brothers Reuben and Allison Smith purchased the paper in 1881, and their leadership brought the paper increased prominence. Successive generations of the Smith family have been committed to The Newtown Bee's success and have ensured the paper's weekly publication, totaling over 7,000 issues. Despite changes in journalism, The Newtown Bee has remained a relevant part of the Newtown community, while keeping its historic charm. It is still published as a traditional eight column broadsheet newspaper, but it also pioneered Connecticut's first online newspaper in 1995.

The Newtown community has looked to The Newtown Bee paper for information on town government activities, the work of public officials and business leaders, and even profiles of their neighbors. Since 1903, The Newtown Bee has been run from the same historic building on Church Hill Road, which is topped with an iconic bee weathervane. Moreover, members of the Smith family have been active members of our community, supporting local sports teams, the arts, and community organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club.

Mr. Speaker, The Newtown Bee has been a vital and successful institution in Newtown, Connecticut for 140 years, and the leadership of the Smith family has ensured the community is informed and engaged in civic life. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor the paper and the many leaders who have ensured its success here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. RICK LARSEN**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, due to a request by the Governor of Washington to lead the largest-ever state delegation

to the International Paris Air Show, I was unable to participate in floor proceedings for the week of June 19–23, 2017.

Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 309; YEA on Roll Call No. 310; NAY on Roll Call No. 311; NAY on Roll Call No. 312; NAY on Roll Call No. 313; YEA on Roll Call No. 314; NAY on Roll Call No. 315; NAY on Roll Call No. 316; NAY on Roll Call No. 317; YEA on Roll Call No. 318; NAY on Roll Call No. 319; YEA on Roll Call No. 320; NAY on Roll Call No. 321; YEA on Roll Call No. 322.

THE UNITED STATES MUST NOT  
ABANDON THE PEOPLE OF TIBET

**HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tibet are living under China's repressive rule and their culture, religion, and way of life is at risk of being extinguished. The human rights abuses and constant repression on Tibetans perpetrated by China are intolerable and must be resisted by the United States and this Congress. Religious freedom and the preservation of Tibetan cultural and linguistic traditions are essential to a new generation of Tibetans, both inside Tibet and in exile communities in India, Nepal, and the United States (including our vibrant community in Minnesota).

Past U.S. administrations have supported human rights, democracy, and education programs for the people of Tibet. Whether it is Tibetan language broadcasts as a source of independent information, the Tibetan Scholarship Program, or the Ngawang Choephel Fellows Program, these modest U.S. investments have had a strong and positive impact on creating a pathway for Tibetan leaders and voices of freedom. USAID has made important investment in support of Tibetans inside Tibet and living as refugees.

It is unacceptable that the Trump administration's fiscal year 2018 budget eliminates funding for many of the important programs supporting the people of Tibet. It is up to Congress to ensure necessary funds are appropriated to sustain the Tibetan programs for the coming fiscal year. Eliminating these funds, as proposed, is an abandonment of the Tibetan people and will give China a green light to accelerate their cruel repression and destruction of Tibetan lives and culture.

There is one additional issue that is of utmost urgency, the appointment of a new Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues at the Department of State. This position, authorized in the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, is intended to guide U.S. policy toward Tibet and communicate directly with the Chinese government. I

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

would urge Secretary Tillerson and the White House to fill this position immediately.

Last weekend, Minnesota had the honor of hosting His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama. I had the privilege of attending a public event with His Holiness and giving remarks before Minnesota's large and strong community of Tibetan refugees. The remarks below were delivered at that event and I ask that they be included in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSWOMAN BETTY MCCOLLUM—COMMUNITY PUBLIC TALK WITH THE TIBETAN AMERICAN FOUNDATION OF MINNESOTA HONORING HIS HOLINESS THE 14TH DALAI LAMA OF TIBET, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA, JUNE 24, 2017

Good morning! I am so pleased to be here with Minnesota's strong and thriving Tibetan community.

I wish to thank the Tibetan American Foundation of Minnesota for inviting me to join you this morning.

Only one month ago—in May—I was in Dharamsala, India as part of an official congressional delegation led by the Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi. In Dharamsala my colleagues and I were humbled to be received very warmly and graciously by His Holiness the Dalai Lama. We had a very special visit with His Holiness.

Today, it is our honor to welcome His Holiness to Minnesota and his presence is a blessing and inspiration for all of us.

Please accept my offer of strong support for Tibetans in Minnesota and across the U.S., for the Tibetan community in India and Nepal, and all Tibetans living in exile.

The refugee experience, being forced from ones homeland, fleeing violence and persecution, is a journey of loss, pain, and suffering. You never forget home, but now you have a second home and together we must make this home in America one of safety, hope, and opportunity.

We want this home to be welcoming for your families and a place where you have the freedom to maintain your culture, practice your beliefs, and sustain your rich traditions as Tibetans. I know firsthand the important contributions Tibetan-Americans are making here in Minnesota and I am grateful. Your community makes Minnesota a stronger, better state.

In 2015, I was in Tibet, your homeland. I experienced the mountains, the thin air in my lungs, and the warmth of the Tibetan people I met. But, there was also the heavy burden of a land that is not free. The people of Tibet are not free.

Today, let us focus our minds, our hearts, our prayers, and, as free people, let us work to make the people of Tibet free. It is long past time for China's repression in Tibet to end. The human rights abuses must stop. The prisoners of conscience must be set free. The destruction of Tibetan culture and the repression of Buddhist monks and scholars must stop.

With great sadness, I must tell you that two weeks ago I received a letter from China's Counsel General in Chicago asking me to refrain from "any contact with the Dalai Lama in any form." The letter called today's gathering a platform for a separatist plot.

There is no plot, only a path of peace and dialogue. Let us follow His Holiness on that path, a path to separate the Tibetan people from political repression, a path to separate Tibet from endless acts of cultural destruction, and a path to separate the political and religious prisoners from their cells and their suffering.

As a Member of Congress, I urge the Congress and the President of the United States

to stand with the people of Tibet to promote human rights, religious freedom, and a meaningful political dialogue.

China is a powerful country. But, the United States is a free and powerful country. The United States must never abandon our commitment to freedom, justice, and human rights around the world. And, we must never abandon the people of Tibet.

I will work in Congress to continue U.S. funding for all Tibetan programs, scholarships, and assistance for refugees. And, I will work to pass H.R. 1872—the "Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2017."

Let me also urge President Trump to meet directly with His Holiness the Dalai Lama and listen to his wise and compassionate insights. Mr. Trump needs to hear why ongoing U.S. support for Tibet is vital.

The teachings of His Holiness are not only wise, they are in the best interest of the United States and of all of mankind. Let us love our planet and work to stop climate change. Let us welcome refugees and all who flee violence and suffering whether Buddhist, Christian or Muslim. Let us open our hearts to the poor and the vulnerable—in our own communities and around the world.

Minnesota is blessed by our Tibetan brothers and sisters. And, today we are blessed by the presence of His Holiness and his teachings.

May peace be upon us all and may we follow its path together.

Thank you.

#### HONORING NINE SOFTBALL PLAYERS FOR RECEIVING ALL-STATE HONORS

#### HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize nine exceptional young women from Michigan's First District who have been recognized as All-State athletes in the state of Michigan by the Michigan High School Softball Coaches Association. Receipt of All-State Honors signifies that these young women dedicated themselves entirely, through countless hours of practice and preparation, to their sport.

These outstanding young women may represent different schools and different teams, but they all share a unique love of the game. Onaway Cardinals pitcher Calley Selke, for instance, earned the right to be called an All-State athlete.

Additionally, the Alpena Wildcats took their seventh straight Big North Conference title with outfielder Liz Kendzierski and utility player Jade Schultz represented among those who earned All-State Honors.

The Rogers City Hurons had several players who were selected to receive All-State Honors including pitcher Jayna Hance, shortstop Kayla Rabeau, third baseman Hannah Fleming, outfielder Taylor Fleming, and designated player Saige Wagner. These young women led the Hurons to their sixth straight district title and fourth regional title in five years.

Not to be outdone, the Indian River Inland Lakes Bulldogs, a team that boasted two All-State athletes of its own in pitcher Chloe Mallory and catcher Pamela Braund, ultimately prevailed as Division 4 State Champs.

Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize these young women as recipients of All-State Honors for the sport of softball. Their accomplishments have brought pride to their teams, schools, and hometowns. They have set a positive example of what is possible for anyone in Michigan's First District. On behalf of my constituents, I wish to congratulate Jayna Hance, Kayla Rabeau, Hannah Fleming, Taylor Fleming, Saige Wagner, Chloe Mallory, Pamela Braund, Calley Selke, Liz Kendzierski, and Jade Schultz and wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

#### CONGRATULATING LA CROSSE FIRE CHIEF GREGG CLEVELAND ON HIS RETIREMENT

#### HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2017

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the career of La Crosse Fire Chief Gregg Cleveland, who will be retiring in June of 2017. He has served as a firefighter for more than 36 years, including 11 years as the La Crosse Fire Chief.

Chief Cleveland's years of service as a firefighter are exemplary in every respect. He earned an Associate Degree in Fire Protection from Fox Valley Technical College, a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration from Lakeland College, and a Master's Degree in Public Administration from the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. He is also a graduate of the Executive Fire Officer's program.

Chief Cleveland began his career more than three decades ago with the Menasha Fire Department. He then served as Chief of the Marshfield Fire Department for 15 years, and later took over as chief of the La Crosse Fire Department in 2006. In addition to this service in fire departments, Chief Cleveland has also been active in other firefighting organizations, including the Wisconsin State Fire Chiefs Association, where he served as President and advocated for the organization on numerous issues. He also served with the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), where he was a member of NFPA's North Central Regional Fire Code Development Committee, and served as Secretary of NFPA's Fire Service Section.

Under Chief Cleveland's leadership, the City of La Crosse has seen numerous changes for the better in the fire service industry. In 2014, the La Crosse Fire Department received international accreditation, demonstrating the quality of the Department. That same year, he was instrumental in consolidating the La Crosse Building and Inspection Department into the Fire Department, which created a new Division of Fire Prevention and Building Safety. He also helped the Department lead the way on health issues, making the Department one of the first in the state to carry an opioid overdose antidote.

Chief Cleveland's leadership was crucial to the City of La Crosse when the city faced emergency situations and natural disasters. These included an EF2 tornado that struck the south side of La Crosse in 2011 and a building explosion on the north side of the city in

2014. Thanks to Chief Cleveland's leadership, the City of La Crosse has been able to recover from these situations and continue to grow and prosper.

It has been an honor for me to serve as U.S. Representative for Wisconsin's Third Congressional District during Chief Cleveland's tenure in La Crosse. He will be greatly missed by the La Crosse Fire Department and the people he helped throughout his career. On behalf of my constituents in Wisconsin and a grateful nation, I would like to thank and commend Chief Cleveland for his years of service in the fire service industry. I wish him and his family all the best in his retirement.

**HONORING GEORGEANN COWLES  
EISKAMP**

**HON. JIMMY PANETTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau's Farmer of the Year for 2017, Ms. Georgeann Cowles Eiskamp. Georgeann owns Cowles Berry Farm, where she and her family grow berries. The Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau selected her for this honor, and presents this award annually to farmers who contribute beyond their normal duties in service to their community.

Born and raised in Watsonville, California, Georgeann graduated from Watsonville High School in 1957 and earned her Bachelor of Science degree from Purdue University in 1971. In 1999, she returned to Watsonville to work on her father's ranch. During this time, Georgeann learned the farming industry from the ground up, from weeding to bookkeeping. When Georgeann's father passed away in 2006, she took over farming operations at Cowles Berry Farm, making her a 5th generation farmer. In addition to berries, Georgeann has grown Syrah wine grapes and had a successful wine submission at the 2008 Santa Cruz County Fair.

Georgeann is a model of productive civic engagement, and serves her community in a myriad of ways. She serves as the Founding Co-Chair of the Down to Earth Women Luncheon Committee, which raises funds for local agricultural education programs. Additionally, Georgeann currently serves on the Board of Directors for the educational organization Agriculture. This remarkable organization based in Watsonville operates numerous programs that raise awareness about the complexities of the agriculture industry in an easily accessible way. In particular, the "Focus Agriculture" program, a first-in-the-nation program, provides opportunities for community leaders to participate in an intensive program to learn about a broad spectrum of agriculture topics. I had the chance to participate in this award-winning program, and have found the lessons I learned there to be very helpful to me as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. Georgeann is also an active member of the Watsonville Rotary Club and regularly leads fundraising efforts for wonderful causes in her community and around the world. Some of

these causes include support for victims of the 2010 Haitian earthquake, new vans for Renaissance High School, and providing medical care and clean water to a village in Peru.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Georgeann Cowles Eiskamp as the Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau's 2017 Farmer of the Year. I am sure we will continue to hear more of her great work in the community for years to come.

**WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON  
JAE-IN**

**HON. TOM MARINO**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome South Korean President Moon Jae-in on his first trip to the United States.

South Korea is one of our staunchest allies and has been an excellent friend to the United States. I recently had the awesome opportunity to visit South Korea and was able to meet with many different government officials to hear more about the issues and concerns that are confronting the region. While there are several pressing concerns facing South Korea, and the region, if we remain committed as allies and friends we will continue to see peace and stability.

I know that President Trump and President Moon will have an excellent, friendly, and productive meeting. I look forward to continuing to support South Korea as a Member of Congress and hope that President Moon enjoys his time in the United States.

**TRIBUTE TO DAVID COX, BOY  
SCOUTS 2017 DANIEL BOONE VI-  
SIONARY AWARD RECIPIENT**

**HON. HAROLD ROGERS**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a remarkable leader in southern and eastern Kentucky, Mr. David Cox, upon receiving the 2017 Daniel Boone Visionary Award presented by the Boy Scouts of America Daniel Boone Council.

The Daniel Boone Visionary Award was developed to recognize community leaders who make significant contributions to improve the local district, including Whitley, Laurel, Knox, Bell, Clay, Harlan and Jackson counties. The award recipients are recognized for their contributions to economic growth, education and leadership development in our youth.

David Cox is a worthy recipient of this prestigious award due to the tremendous vision and leadership he has exemplified as Superintendent of the Corbin Independent School System. He has dedicated 25 years as an educator and administrator for the Corbin Independent School System and in less than two years at the helm, students are making marked improvements. Currently, the Corbin Independent School System is ranked fourth

out of 173 school districts in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, based on the Kentucky Core Content Test, placing the district in the state's 98th percentile for achievement. Additionally, Corbin Redhounds consistently rank among the top in the state for College and Career Readiness preparation and average ACT scores. Not only do they excel in academics, but students achieve incredible success in arts and athletics as they rank among the state elite each year as well.

Mr. Cox continues to lead his high performing students and staff by living the school's motto: "Striving to be the Best!" He has worked diligently to ensure students in our region have access to the most innovative technology, advanced facilities and the very best opportunities for education.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the outstanding contributions that David Cox has made in educating our future leaders in southern and eastern Kentucky, and the inspiration and drive he instills in them to give back to their communities—a core mission of the Boy Scouts. Congratulations to David Cox on receiving the 2017 Daniel Boone Visionary Award.

**RECOGNIZING CINDA KLINKNA**

**HON. RODNEY DAVIS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cinda Klickna, a friend, educator, public servant, and president of the Illinois Education Association. After a long and successful career, Cinda will be retiring later this year.

Cinda's career began in Springfield, Illinois, where she taught high school English and Advanced Placement Literature. In 1997, she was awarded the Illinois State Genealogical Society Community Service Award for her classroom's research of an abandoned cemetery at Lake Sangchris.

After leaving the classroom, Cinda started with the IEA as a legislative intern, working with the late State Senator Vince Demuzio, State Representative Richard Reilly, and State Senator Terry Bruce. Before becoming an IEA officer, Cinda served on the IEA Board of Directors, the National Education Association Board of Directors, and as president of the Springfield Education Association. Additionally, she has chaired committees on Partnerships for Educational Innovation and the Legislative Committee for the IEA, as well as the Membership Services and Affiliate Relationships for the NEA.

Cinda has been recognized as the first teacher to serve as the chair of the Education Committee for the Greater Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce, and her public service has extended to membership on United Way Board.

I am honored to recognize Cinda's accomplishments and her dedication to education and the Illinois Education Association. Best wishes for a happy retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF BRENDA  
WOOD**HON. JOHN LEWIS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Brenda B. Wood, a premier broadcast journalist, one of the best in our region, who has been a newsmaker and news breaker in the Atlanta metro area since 1988. She decided to retire this year after dedicating over 40 years to her career, but I understand she will be returning to the small screen to work on special creative projects. We want to pay tribute to her as she moves into this next phase of her contribution to metropolitan Atlanta.

Ms. Wood was born in Washington, DC, graduated from Takoma Park Academy and got her degree in mass media from Loma Linda University in Southern California in 1977. She reported for several stations in Alabama and Tennessee following her graduation from college but was hired as the evening news anchor and reporter in the Atlanta market first by WAGA-TV, where she hosted an Emmy award-winning news magazine show called Minute by Minute. In 1997, she joined WXIA-TV as its 6 p.m. and 11 p.m. weekday news anchor and spent the next 20 years of her career at the station. Ms. Wood became a trusted voice on the air. We could depend on her to get to the heart of the issues and keep the metro area informed with all the news we needed to know to participate effectively in a democratic society. Her coverage was incisive, balanced, and comprehensive.

During her tenure, Ms. Wood interviewed top newsmakers like President Jimmy Carter, Egypt's former First Lady Jehan Sadat, Ambassador Andrew Young, Cher, the rapper T.I. and many others. She produced several award-winning prime time specials, including Remembering the 1996 Olympics, the year Atlanta hosted the games, A Conversation Across America, 50 Years of Change, Mission of Hope. Ms. Wood developed several special broadcast series like, Journeys with Brenda Wood, a news magazine show, The Last Word commentaries, and The Daily 11 at 7 with Brenda Wood, another award-winning primetime show.

She has taken home 20 Emmy awards and garnered many different honors. Most notably, Ms. Wood was named Georgia Woman of the Year in 2013, was granted the Legacy Award of the Atlanta Business League, the NAACP's Phoenix Award for Best News Anchor, and inducted into the Atlanta Press Club Hall of Fame in 2014, among a host of other honors.

Our community has loved to watch her tell the stories that gave meaning to our lives in the South and described our world so accurately. Ms. Wood never ceased to inform us, inspire us, and will always be a shining light for our city. We all will miss seeing her on the air, but know that Brenda Wood will continue to serve our community as a leader who can bring people and good ideas together.

RECOGNIZING DETECTIVE SCOTT  
J. WILLIAMS FOR HIS SERVICE**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Detective Scott J. Williams, who is retiring from the Moline Police Department. Detective Williams has honorably served the people of Moline for the past 30 years and he will be greatly missed.

Detective Williams began his lifelong career in public service in 1981 as a correctional officer with the Rock Island County Sheriff's Office prior to joining the United States Marine Corps, where he served with the Department of State in Embassy Security. Upon returning home, he continued his education and joined the Moline Police Department in 1987.

Detective Williams has served every level of our community with great distinction and heart over the past three decades. His impressive career has spanned from undercover work with the Quad-City Metropolitan Enforcement Group to reduce drugs on our streets, to working as a DARE officer in newly created drug education programs. Detective Williams has always gone above and beyond to strengthen our community in these roles, in addition to being president of the Police Benevolent Association.

Detective Williams has dedicated his career to ensuring public safety, and striving to protect and improve the lives of individuals within his community. I am confident that he will continue to do just that as he joins the United States Marshal's Office at the Scott County Federal Courthouse in the next chapter of his career. I am proud to have such dedicated civil servants in Illinois' 17th Congressional District, and the role he has played in bettering our community will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Detective Williams for his commitment to public service and the example he has set for our community. I congratulate him again and wish him luck in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DIETRICH  
STROEH**HON. JARED HUFFMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Dietrich (Diet) Stroeh, who passed away on May 30, 2017, after a lifetime of public service to his community. Born on October 22, 1936, Mr. Stroeh attended the University of Nevada where he earned a degree in civil engineering before joining the United States Air Force Reserves in 1955. After joining the Marin Municipal Water District as an engineer in 1960, he served a variety of roles in the agency, and became the General Manager in 1974. After twenty years with the agency Mr. Stroeh co-founded an engineering firm in 1980, which eventually became CSW/Struber-Stroeh Engineering group. He successfully ran the firm for 37 years until his passing.

Mr. Stroeh's legacy to the community extends from a personal mission to serve the public that was evident throughout his professional life. As the General Manager of the Marin Municipal Water District, his creative leadership was critical for securing Marin County's water supply during the 1976 California Drought. His solutions led to the development of a new in-county water supply, the county's first comprehensive water management plan, and the implementation of conservation education throughout the region. These events led the local press to declare him "the hero of the drought," because he not only ran the agency during this time, but genuinely inspired a community ethic to conserve water as an ongoing practice. Mr. Stroeh had a dual life as a civil engineer by trade and a tireless public servant throughout his tenure on numerous volunteer boards and commissions. His volunteer services include such roles as Director of the North Coast Rail Road Authority, Director of the Bank of Marin, chair of the Novato Economic Development Commission, member of the Bay Area Water Works Association, and president of the Golden Gate Bridge District's Board of Directors, among many others.

Mr. Stroeh is survived by his wife Dawna Gallagher-Stroeh and his beloved children: Christina Stroeh, Jody Hunter, Erica Antonio, David Brown and Dona Brown, his seven grandchildren, five nieces and nephews, and four cats.

Mr. Speaker, the depth of Mr. Stroeh's service to his community has left a positive legacy across the Bay Area, and he will be dearly missed. When asked about his role on the Golden Gate Bridge District, Mr. Stroeh once reflected that he was "just a cog in the machine," a typically humble comment from a man who dedicated his life to public service. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to him today and honor the memory of leadership that sought service above self.

HONORING THE FIRST RESPONDERS  
OF THE JUNE 14, 2017  
SHOOTING AT EUGENE SIMPSON  
PARK**HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the City of Alexandria's First Responders to the scene of the shooting at Eugene Simpson Memorial Park in my district in Alexandria, Virginia.

Two weeks ago today, Wednesday, June 14th, around 7:00 a.m., a man fired scores of shots at Members of Congress who were practicing for the annual Congressional Baseball Game. The shooting wounded House Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, Capitol Police Officers David Bailey and Crystal Griner, Congressional staffer Zack Barth, and former Congressional staffer Matt Mika.

The timely response of Alexandria's First Responders almost certainly saved lives. Alexandria Police Officers Nicole Battaglia, Alexander Jensen and Kevin Jobe arrived within

minutes of the 911 call. Officer Battaglia came under fire upon arriving at the scene, and Officers Jensen and Jobe immediately engaged the shooter upon arrival. In the opinion of Alexandria Police Chief Mike Brown, the officers showed true bravery as they responded to a combat zone before working with Capitol Police to neutralize the shooter. Medical care provided by members of the Alexandria Fire Department, including Fiona Apple and Richard Krimmer and dozens of other paramedics and firefighters who operated while the scene was still dynamic, ensured this senseless act of violence did not become a multiple fatality event.

I am honored to commend these valiant individuals for their selfless service; I thank them not only for saving the lives of the victims of this evil, mindless gun violence, but for their daily positive impact on the extraordinary community of Del Ray in the exceptional City of Alexandria.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON  
JAE-IN

**HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome President Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea to the United States. This visit presents the United States and the Republic of Korea an opportunity to strengthen our relationship and advance cooperation on mutually beneficial economic, energy, cultural, and global security issues. Our shared commitment to upholding the rule of law, democracy, and a free market economy is rooted in our two countries' historic friendship. Our nations have a long history dating back to when the United States and the Republic of Korea established diplomatic relations in 1882. This vibrant connection between our nations and New Jersey's prominence as a home to immigrant communities from all walks of life, Koreans have always found a place in my home state. In my congressional district we are proud to have a strong and engaged Korean-American population that has attracted several North American headquarters of South Korean businesses. Because of our nations' connection, I am thankful President Moon has found time to visit the United States. I hope this visit allows our nations the opportunity to broaden and deepen our partnerships and alliances.

HILDALE PARK PRESBYTERIAN  
CHURCH'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Hildale Park Presbyterian Church, located in the Township of Hanover, New Jersey, on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary. From humble beginnings, this church's birth from a hillside bungalow has

grown to be a thriving religious center and school for the greater Morris County community, a bible-centered congregation.

Hildale Park Presbyterian Church's history began in 1916 when Cedar Knolls transitioned from a summer destination to a town of permanent residency. At that time, residents needed to travel long distances for their religious services. This was an impetus for Mr. and Mrs. Horace Greenway and Mrs. Mathilda Pfeiffer to establish a Sunday school within the community. As a result, on April 17, 1917, the very first service was held in the Greenway bungalow. Soon after, on July 19, 1917, a meeting was held to elect the first Board of Trustees who renamed the chapel the Hildale Park Union Chapel.

On August 11, 1918, Reverend Greenway officiated the first session and dedication was held in the newly erected chapel. As time passed, there was an apparent need for a sturdier structure that could withstand the frequent storms. With the advent of the 1955 Christmas Eve service, the dedication of a new sanctuary was held. The Church's aspiration to select a full-time minister was also met on July 13, 1959, as Reverend Alan Loy McGinnis was moved into the newly built manse. With Reverend McGinnis at the helm, the church not only delivered religious services, but also held a Sunday school constituting 200 students. In fact, the church's altruism was demonstrated by its postponement of additions to the school building to instead pledge \$10,000 to add a wing on to a hospital in Brazil.

The Church continued to expand, as newly selected Reverend MacNaughton made it his ambition to build a Christian Education Building, and for the church to become more active in the local community. Reverend MacNaughton secured a Cable TV spot, in order to broadcast each Sunday service. This still continues to service the community profoundly. Reverend MacNaughton retired in 2012 after serving forty-one years, and was succeeded by Reverend Ross H. Lang, who is dedicated to continuing the traditions and promises of Hildale Park Presbyterian Church. To remain a thriving faith based organization, 100 years later, is a testament to the extraordinary efforts of Hildale Park Presbyterian Church, its members and Trustees.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Hildale Park Presbyterian Church on the occasion of its Centennial Anniversary.

HONORING THE CAREER OF  
SISTER MARALYNN SCIARRINO  
UPON HER RETIREMENT

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Maralynn Sciarrino as she steps down from her position as Director of the Mercy Speech Center after 49 years of extraordinary service. Sister Maralynn's skill as a speech pathologist and her caring presence provided countless chil-

dren from Western New York with the skills and confidence necessary to be articulate and successful in school and in life.

Founded in 1956 by Sister Maureen Kelly, Mercy Speech Center provides professional evaluation and speech therapy to children with speech and language disorders. The Center puts the needs of children first as it provides services to families who may not have been able to afford such personal attention.

Sister Maralynn has devoted her life to helping and serving others since joining the Sisters of Mercy at the age of 18. She taught elementary school for several years before beginning her career at The Mercy Speech Center in 1962. Focused on helping children overcome speech and language disorders, Sister studied speech pathology and audiology at the Catholic University of America, eventually earning a masters degree.

Sister Maralynn put that degree to work as she helped children with speech and auditory processing challenges when no one else could, earning the love, respect and gratitude of all those lives she so positively impacted. Sister Maralynn founded the Magic Penny Program at the Center which combines basic speech therapy with a literacy program, enabling students to develop their speaking abilities as well as their reading abilities. Her innate ability to connect and communicate with children contributed to her success as a speech pathologist and the invaluable impact of the Mercy Speech Center.

Known for her laughing eyes, bright smile and the kindest of hearts, Sister Maralynn remains a gift to education and a valued member of her community. She changed lives and her own life serves as an example of how one person truly can make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize Sister Maralynn Sciarrino and her impactful career at the Mercy Speech Center. Sister Maralynn's life of service to the youth of Western New York is inspirational, impressive and worthy of recognition. I am proud to honor Sister Maralynn and wish her continued health and happiness as she begins the next chapter of her remarkable life.

RECOGNIZING OFFICER NATHAN  
MILLER

**HON. RODNEY DAVIS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Officer Nathan Miller, of the Jerseyville Police Department, who was injured in the line of duty while responding to a burglary alarm during the early morning hours of June 13, 2017.

After responding to the burglary call, Officer Miller pursued the suspect for several blocks before the suspect opened fire on him. Officer Miller was hit several times, and was immediately transported to St. Louis University Hospital.

The willingness of Officer Miller to put his own life on the line to protect his community is truly an act of bravery and has not gone unnoticed. Officer Miller was greeted with a

hero's welcome as he returned home to finish out the rest of his recovery; the Jerseyville community lined the streets to show their support for the officer with signs and other "back the blue" decorations.

I ask that you join me in keeping Officer Miller in your thoughts as he makes a speedy recovery. May God Bless Officer Nathan Miller and all of the other first responders who work to keep us safe.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DAWN LUCIEN

##### HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and accomplishments of Dawn Lucien, an exemplary and civically-minded leader who, for decades, provided the city of Tacoma and its surrounding community with invaluable contributions.

After moving to Tacoma in 1947, Dawn quickly became involved in her city's civic and political life. Believing that Tacoma was truly the "gem of the universe," one of Dawn's first accomplishments in the city was becoming one of just two women elected to the Tacoma Board of Freeholders in 1956. Just four years later, Dawn served as an appointed member of the Tacoma City Council until 1962.

Dawn's early contributions not only gained the recognition of many at the local level, but also caught the attention of leaders at a national level. In 1962, she was a Nominee to Congress, and was then approached by Vice President Hubert Humphrey to assist overseas. Her commitment to her duties in her beloved Tacoma was so strong that she nearly turned down the opportunity to represent the United States at the 1967 United Nations Economic and Social Council in Geneva.

Continuing her commitment to community organizing, Dawn was instrumental in the 1990s rebirth of downtown Tacoma, and in the creation of the Tacoma campus of the University of Washington. She sought to revitalize her city through the promotion of the arts and education. Dawn was a fearless and independent leader who people viewed as the "godmother" of the city. She is remembered for working with others to bridge divides within her community. Dawn even won the Greater Tacoma Peace Prize for her 1988 work to resolve hotly disputed land claims between developers and the Puyallup Tribe of Indians.

Dawn's decades-long commitment to fiercely serving her community and getting results, has played a key role in the growth of the city of Tacoma since she arrived in 1947.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great privilege that I recognize the life of Dawn Lucien. She is truly an exceptional reminder of the high level of commitment to our communities that we should all aspire to every day.

#### KANSAS STATE SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND 150TH ANNIVERSARY

##### HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th Anniversary of the Kansas State School for the Blind.

The Kansas State School for the Blind was founded in 1867 and is one of the historical treasures of Kansas City, Kansas.

It serves students from pre-K through high school who are blind or visually impaired, and has some of the most talented, caring, and innovative teachers you'll find in the profession.

I've had the opportunity to visit the school, including last August, when I spent time with a group of students and saw the amazing technology that assists them every day as they learn and engage the world around them.

I want to thank outgoing superintendent Madeleine Burkindine and Principal Jon Harding for their leadership, and sharing with me how KSSB is making a difference in the lives of these students in our community.

Our community and state are stronger because of them.

Mr. Speaker, the Kansas State School for the Blind has made a tremendous difference over the last 150 years, and I look forward to our continued work together.

#### TRIBUTE TO RYAN REINHOLD FOR 41 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

##### HON. TOM O'HALLERAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with respect and admiration that I rise today to honor Judge Ryan Reinhold for his outstanding legacy and service to the State of Arizona. On June 30, 2017, Ryan retires after 41 years as a Navajo County Justice of the Peace, municipal court judge, White Mountain Apache tribal judge, and Navajo County Constable.

Ryan was born in Phoenix, served in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves, and graduated from San Jose State University in 1972. He moved to Pinetop and married Lorinda "Rindy" Skousen in 1976. Rindy recently retired after 30 years as a kindergarten teacher. They have two children, Kent and Britni; Kent is a helicopter pilot and Congressional Liaison in the U.S. Coast Guard and Britni is a second-grade teacher in Lakeside, Arizona. Ryan and Rindy were blessed with their first grandchild, Lucas Robert, in October 2016.

Ryan was elected as Justice of the Peace in 1978. In 1984, he received the Kenneth L. MacEachern Award for the Most Outstanding Non-Lawyer Judge in the United States. He was re-elected five times and honorably led the court for 22 years before retiring in 2000. During his tenure, he adjudicated civil and criminal cases in 19 Arizona courts and four tribal courts. Ryan was appointed Navajo County Constable for Precinct Six in 2003 and elected in 2006. He was subsequently re-

elected two times and served the citizens of the White Mountains with distinction.

Ryan is known for his tireless efforts to benefit all aspects of the community. He regularly donates his time to help area young people overcome societal challenges and establish proper footing towards purposeful lives. He has led hundreds of volunteers as District Chairman of the Boy Scouts of America, President of the Blue Ridge High School Scholarship Fund, and President of the local Lions Club, Chamber of Commerce, and Rotary Club. In 2007, Ryan was elected as Assistant District Governor of the Rotary Club and was instrumental in orchestrating a robust international exchange student program for dozens of teenagers.

On behalf of the State of Arizona, I would like to congratulate and thank Ryan Reinhold for his selfless and dedicated public service. In retirement, I hear he plans on making regular scuba diving trips, traveling the world, and spending quality time with his beloved family and friends. We extend our best wishes as Ryan begins the next chapter of his life. Cheers to a truly wonderful career.

#### INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1215

##### HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2017*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an amendment I introduced to Rules Committee Print 115-10 on H.R. 1215:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

#### SEC. 11. REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTION OF CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES.

(a) SELECTION.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, eligible professional organizations that have established, published, maintained, and updated on a regular basis, clinical practice guidelines, including when applicable, appropriate use criteria, that incorporate best practices, may submit such guidelines to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Not later than 6 months after the last day for submitting such guidelines, the Secretary shall select and designate one or more eligible professional organizations to provide and maintain such clinical practice guidelines on behalf of the Secretary. Not later than 6 months after designating each such eligible professional organization, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with each such eligible professional organization for maintenance, publication, and updating of such clinical practice guidelines.

#### (b) MAINTENANCE.—

(1) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Not later than 5 years after the Secretary enters into an agreement with each eligible professional organization under subsection (a), and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall review the clinical practice guidelines of such organization and shall, as necessary, enter into agreements with additional eligible professional organizations, as appropriate, in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) UPDATE BY ELIGIBLE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION.—An eligible professional organization that collaborated in the establishment of a clinical practice guideline may



submit amendments to that clinical practice guideline at any time to the Secretary for review by the Secretary.

(3) **NOTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN UPDATES.**—An amendment under paragraph (2) may not add, materially change, or remove a guideline from a set of guidelines, unless notification of such update is made available to applicable eligible professionals.

#### SEC. 12. DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **GUIDELINE STANDARDS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, the development of clinical practice guidelines are guided by the Standards for Developing Trustworthy Clinical Practice Guidelines of the Institute of Medicine and—

(1) are developed through a transparent process that minimizes conflicts of interest;

(2) are developed by a knowledgeable, multidisciplinary panel of experts and representatives from key affected groups;

(3) take into consideration important patient subgroups and patient preferences, as appropriate;

(4) are based on a systematic review of the existing evidence;

(5) except in the case of diagnostic guidelines, provide a clear explanation of the relationship between care options and health outcomes;

(6) except in the case of diagnostic guidelines, provide ratings of both the quality of evidence and strength of recommendation;

(7) are reconsidered and revised when new evidence emerges; and

(8) clearly identify any exceptions to the application of the clinical practice guideline.

(b) **REQUIRED DISCLOSURES FROM ELIGIBLE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—Any person who is affiliated with an eligible professional organization and who directly participated in the creation of a clinical practice guideline shall follow that particular eligible professional organization's conflict of interest protocol.

#### SEC. 13. NO LIABILITY FOR GUIDELINE PRODUCERS.

Neither an eligible professional organization nor the participants in its guideline development and approval process, may be held liable for any injury alleged to be caused by adhering to a clinical practice guideline to which they contributed.

#### SEC. 14. INTERNET PUBLICATION OF GUIDELINES.

The Secretary shall publish on the Internet through the National Guideline Clearinghouse or other appropriate sites or sources, all clinical practice guidelines, including all data and methodology used in the development and selection of the guidelines in compliance with data disclosure standards in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191).

#### SEC. 15. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.

In the case of a health care lawsuit, it shall be an affirmative defense to any health care liability claim alleged therein that the defendant complied with a clinical practice guideline that was applicable to the provision or use of health care services or medical products for which the health care liability claim is brought.

#### SEC. 16. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of sections 11 through 14:

(1) **APPLICABLE ELIGIBLE PROFESSIONAL.**—The term “applicable eligible professional” means a physician practicing within clinical practice guidelines submitted by an eligible professional organization and includes employees and agents of a physician.

(2) **APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA.**—The term “appropriate, use criteria” means estab-

lished evidence-based guidelines developed or endorsed by an eligible professional organization that specify when the health benefits of a procedure or service exceed the expected health risks by a significantly wide margin.

(3) **CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINE.**—The term “clinical practice guideline” means systematically developed statements based on the review of clinical evidence for assisting a health care provider to determine the appropriate health care in specific clinical circumstances.

(4) **DIAGNOSTIC GUIDELINE.**—The term “diagnostic guideline” means a clinical practice guideline that provides recommendation regarding the utility of diagnosis procedures for a specific clinical scenario.

(5) **ELIGIBLE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION.**—The term “eligible professional organization” means a national or State medical society or medical specialty society.

(6) **FEDERAL PAYOR.**—The term “Federal payor” includes reimbursements made under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act or the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act, premium tax credits under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or cost-sharing reductions under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, or medical screenings, treatments, or transfer services provided pursuant to section 1867 of the Social Security Act.

(7) **HEALTH CARE ORGANIZATION.**—The term “health care organization” means any person or entity which is obligated to provide or pay for health benefits under any health plan, including any person or entity acting under a contract or arrangement with a health care organization to provide or administer any health benefit.

(8) **HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.**—The term “health care provider” means any person or entity required by State or Federal laws or regulations to be licensed, registered, or certified to provide health care services, and being either so licensed, registered, or certified, or exempted from such requirement by other statute or regulation.

(9) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

#### SIEMENS MAKES EXTRAORDINARY GRANT

#### HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in SC Biz News titled “Siemens, USC announce \$628M in-kind technology grant,” details a remarkable new partnership between Siemens and the University of South Carolina. The article explains:

The in-kind grant will provide Siemens' product lifecycle management software to USC's College of Engineering and Computing, and a combination of Siemens automation and controls hardware in a digital factory innovation lab at USC's McNAIR Center for Aerospace Innovation and Research.

Bill Kirkland, executive director of USC's Office of Economic Engagement, said the new partnership represents the top three investments Siemens has made in a university in the United States.

The article further shows the important relationship between industry and education in South Carolina:

Raj Batra, president of Siemens Digital Factory Division, U.S., said the grant gives back in all different forms. “With this investment in software and hardware, students and faculty will get hands on experience with the same state of the art design engineering platforms that are used by leading manufacturers around the world . . .”

USC President Harris Pastides called the announcement an important day in the modern history of the University of South Carolina . . . Pastides said, “Our graduates will have experience in Siemens' software, ready to take the leading jobs in our state and around the world.”

The article concludes with an accurate statement from Governor Henry McMaster:

The number of companies wanting to do business in the state has accelerated in the last few years due to the assets found here . . . This collaboration just goes to prove the progress we are making.

I am grateful for the efforts of Governor Henry McMaster, USC President Harris Pastides, Executive Director Bill Kirkland, Siemens Digital Factory President Raj Batra, and U.S. Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross in creating jobs and promoting economic growth.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 29, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 12

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 943, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, S. 1223, to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act, and S. 1285, to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands.

SD-628

**SENATE—Thursday, June 29, 2017**

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, source of all goodness, use our lawmakers today for Your glory. Make them undaunted people who strive to know Your will and experience Your power. Provide them with exactly what they need to accomplish Your purposes. May they receive Heaven's approbation for their faithful service to You and country. Lord, transform their intractable problems with solutions from Your throne. We commit the work of this day to You, receiving Your strength to honor Your Name.

And, Lord, we thank You for the faithfulness of our summer pages. Bless these young people as they prepare to leave us.

We pray in Your generous Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The President pro tempore.

**MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1460**

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1460) to provide for the modernization of the energy and natural resources policies of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION****EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rao nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until the cloture vote will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The majority leader is recognized.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators and the White House are continuing discussions on the path forward for bringing relief from ObamaCare and its collapsing markets. We have made good progress, and we will keep working. As we do, our focus will remain on the major ObamaCare problems that continue to hurt Americans all across our country.

Under ObamaCare, premiums have skyrocketed. Over the past several years, ObamaCare has caused premiums to climb by an average of 105 percent in the vast majority of States on the Federal exchange, and it has caused them to triple in some States.

Next year, ObamaCare is expected to raise premiums again, as high as 30 percent or greater in States like Connecticut and Virginia, by as much as 40 percent or greater in Maine and Iowa, and by as much as an astonishing 80 percent in New Mexico. Obviously, Americans deserve a lot better than that.

Under ObamaCare, choices have diminished, even disappeared, in States

all across our country. ObamaCare has left 70 percent of counties with little or no insurance options on the exchanges this year. Even worse, next year, dozens more counties could have zero choice at all—potentially leaving thousands trapped, forced by law to purchase ObamaCare insurance but left without the means to do so. For instance, as we learned just yesterday, as many as 14 of Nevada's 17 counties could now be left without any insurance options under ObamaCare at all in 2018. Americans deserve a lot better than that.

Under ObamaCare, mandates have forced families into plans they don't want or can't afford, preferred doctors have become less accessible to many patients, and plans have grown less desirable but more extensive. Americans deserve better than that. That is why we are continuing to work hard. Fixing ObamaCare's failures and protecting families from its consequences is not an easy task.

It is disappointing that our Democratic colleagues made clear early on that they were not interested in joining our efforts in a serious, comprehensive manner, especially given how many of their constituents have been hurt by the law they themselves voted for and continue—continue—to defend. The Republican conference continues to work through solutions to help those who have been hurt by this failing system because, as we can all agree, ObamaCare's status quo is simply unsustainable and unacceptable. We have to act, and we are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**REMEMBERING ARTHUR J. JACKSON**

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we lost another great American this month with the passing of Arthur J. Jackson. He received the Medal of Honor in 1945 for his service in the Pacific theater of World War II. His name may not be as familiar as it once was. In retirement, he lived a quiet life. I didn't want to let his death pass without paying tribute to him, his family, and the extraordinary acts of courage with which he defended our country. Although, to be sure, "extraordinary" doesn't really describe the half of it.

It was September 1944, and Private Jackson, a 19-year-old Ohio native, was serving with the 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division on the island of Peleliu. Their mission sounded simple enough: Take the island as quickly

as possible, inch ever closer to retaking the Philippines, and ultimately defeat Japan.

Simple it wasn't. His platoon was hailed by a steady stream of fire from a heavily fortified position. To charge forward would be to march toward certain death, and that is exactly what he did. He attacked a pillbox, holding about 35 enemy soldiers, and as his Medal of Honor citation reads, "[P]ouring his automatic fire into the opening of the fixed installation to trap the occupying troops, he hurled white phosphorus grenades and explosive charges brought up by a fellow Marine, demolishing the pillbox and killing all of the enemy."

The enemy fire continued unabated, his cover was light at best, and yet Private Jackson proceeded to storm one position after another—wiping out a total of 12 pillboxes and 50 enemy soldiers. It was a stunning act of bravery. I can only imagine the pride of President Truman when he pinned the Medal of Honor on Private Jackson's uniform. I can only imagine the awe of his fellow Americans as they showered him with ticker tape in a New York City parade to celebrate.

Yes, Arthur Jackson was one of the greats, and like with many great men, his career had a somewhat tragic ending. After a stint in the Army, he rejoined the Marines and was stationed at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in September 1961. It was only months after the Bay of Pigs and just over a year from the Cuban Missile Crisis. Tensions were high; suspicions were too.

On one night, then-Captain Jackson discovered a Cuban busdriver in a restricted part of the base. He wasn't supposed to be there, nor was he authorized to be there. The man had been identified as a spy for Fidel Castro's regime but was allowed to keep his job for the time being. Captain Jackson and a fellow officer escorted the man to a back gate to see him off the premises, only to discover the gate was locked. While the other officers went off to find tools, Captain Jackson pried the lock open, and, suddenly, the man lunged at him, aiming for a sidearm. Captain Jackson fired back in self-defense and killed the man on the spot.

Instead of reporting the man's death, however, he and some of his fellow Marines buried the body on the base. Many decades later, he told a newspaper columnist he feared, if he reported the death, he would be tried in a Cuban court and possibly tortured.

He had hoped no one would find out, but word got out, and he was forced to leave the Marine Corps. He ended life as a mail carrier in California. It was a disappointing end to an until-then brilliant career. This was a man who loved his country, who put everything on the line to defend it, and if one night that love blinded his judgment, it only shows the intensity of his commitment.

Arthur Jackson went on to work for the Veterans' Administration in San Francisco before moving to Boise, ID, in 1973. He lived out the remainder of his life there, where he was beloved by the community. As a neighbor of his put it, "He flies the U.S. flag and the Marine Corps flag every day. It bothers him if someone flies a dirty or tattered flag. He tells them to take it down and replace it."

A little thing with a big meaning: Arthur Jackson showed as much love for the flag as he did for our country, and now we lost him to the ages. We still have his memory, his example, his stories of derring-do, which will inspire future generations of Americans for decades to come.

#### REMEMBERING JOE DALE BURGESS

Mr. President, I attended the signing ceremony at the White House last week for the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. It was a happy occasion, but I received some sad news.

A son of Arkansas who served in uniform passed away earlier this year at the far-too-young age of 31. His name was Joe Dale Burgess. Though he was not widely known, he was especially well loved by all who did know him. Today I want to recognize him briefly for his service.

Joe Dale served in the U.S. Army—specifically, Delta Company, 2-506th Infantry Battalion, 101st Airborne Division; 2-506th, the same unit in which I served in Iraq.

In March, 2008, he was deployed to Khost Province in Afghanistan, where he took the fight to the enemy for 12 straight months. He was a fearless soldier, but his platoon leader says what he will probably be best remembered for is being an awful comedian. He loved to crack jokes and play pranks, even though, as his best battle buddies attest, he didn't show a particular talent for either of them. He always got laughs, and he always lifted their spirits. When you are living in a war zone, I can tell you that counts for a lot.

But in his battle buddies' minds, Joe Dale means more than memories of sharing a few laughs. What stands out is his humility. His platoon leader says he was completely selfless. He did whatever was asked of him—no matter how unpleasant, no matter how tedious, how irritating, or how dangerous. He never lost sight of the mission. He never forgot why he was there, and it made an impression. Ask any one of his battle buddies what they think of Joe Dale, and you will not get a bad word out of them, not one in the whole bunch. His platoon leader says: "We would all gladly serve with him again." That is a pretty good measure, the quality of a troop.

I am sorry to say Joe Dale, who endured a tour of duty that cost the lives of seven soldiers in his company, died in April of testicular cancer. It had spread to his spine, which after several

surgeries left him paralyzed. He suffered several other afflictions: PTSD, pain in his joints, trouble sleeping. He didn't ask for care or a disability rating from the VA until it was too late.

It seems so unfair that this man—a man who braved the mountains of the Hindu Kush, a man who was awarded the Combat Infantryman's Badge and the Army Commendation Medal—ultimately succumbed to disease at home at such a young age. In fact, it seems almost cruel because he left behind a fiancée, Alice Hart, and a 2-year-old daughter, Zoe Hart-Burgess. I suppose we must remember that the Lord God in Heaven has His own purposes, and He works in His own mysterious ways.

To see the outpouring of love for this man—a quiet man, a humble man, a man whose only ambition was to serve his country—it tells you, indeed, that Joe Dale Burgess was one impressive man. May he rest in peace.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Ex.]

YEAS—59

|           |           |           |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Alexander | Flake     | Murkowski |
| Barrasso  | Gardner   | Nelson    |
| Blunt     | Graham    | Paul      |
| Boozman   | Grassley  | Perdue    |
| Burr      | Hatch     | Portman   |
| Capito    | Heitkamp  | Risch     |
| Carper    | Heller    | Roberts   |
| Cassidy   | Hoeven    | Rounds    |
| Cochran   | Inhofe    | Rubio     |
| Collins   | Isakson   | Sasse     |
| Corker    | Johnson   | Scott     |
| Cornyn    | Kennedy   | Shelby    |
| Cotton    | King      | Strange   |
| Crapo     | Lankford  | Sullivan  |
| Cruz      | Lee       | Thune     |
| Daines    | Manchin   | Tillis    |
| Donnelly  | McCain    | Toomey    |
| Enzi      | McCaskey  | Wicker    |
| Ernst     | McConnell | Young     |
| Fischer   | Moran     |           |

NAYS—36

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Baldwin      | Franken    | Murray     |
| Bennet       | Gillibrand | Peters     |
| Blumenthal   | Harris     | Reed       |
| Booker       | Hassan     | Schatz     |
| Brown        | Heinrich   | Schumer    |
| Cantwell     | Kaine      | Shaheen    |
| Cardin       | Klobuchar  | Stabenow   |
| Casey        | Leahy      | Tester     |
| Coons        | Markey     | Van Hollen |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez   | Warren     |
| Duckworth    | Merkley    | Whitehouse |
| Feinstein    | Murphy     | Wyden      |

NOT VOTING—5

|        |         |        |
|--------|---------|--------|
| Durbin | Sanders | Warner |
| Hirono | Udall   |        |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 36.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO SOLOMON "SOL" ATKINSON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week I have been coming down to the floor of the Senate to talk about a special Alaskan, someone in my State who, through their hard work and community service, whether to their neighbors or to their country, makes Alaska a better place for all of us. We call these people the Alaskans of the Week. Learning about these individuals and sharing their stories with my Senate colleagues, Alaskans, and Americans who watch what we do here or who are in the gallery, is probably one of the best parts of my week every week.

Like most of my colleagues, I will soon be going home for the Fourth of July. We will celebrate this very special holiday with our families and our communities. Some of us will go to barbecues or march in parades or attend other community gatherings. Some of us will gather in spots across our State and watch fireworks. Personally, I will be with my family catching king salmon at my family's ancestral fish camp up on the Yukon River, one of my favorite places in the entire world.

Regardless of where we are, all of us will certainly feel a swell of pride for our country. We will remember the

hard-fought battles that brought us independence, and we will remember those who have served and sacrificed to keep our country the land of the free and the home of the brave. They are the heroes among us, and Alaska is chock-full of these heroes.

Today I want to recognize one of them, a very special hero who is our Alaskan of the Week—Solomon Atkinson, who spent nearly his entire adult life serving our country with honor and dignity and now serves his community in Alaska tirelessly.

Let me tell you a little bit about Sol and his illustrious career in the military. Sol was born in 1930 to Harris and Elizabeth Atkinson in Metlakatla, AK. Metlakatla is on Annette Island on the Inside Passage, where so many Americans take cruises to see the glaciers and the whales. It is home to the only federally recognized Indian reservation in our State.

Sol could have continued to live in Metlakatla, where he was a commercial fisherman as a young man, but, like so many patriotic Alaskans, he chose to leave his home and join the military. Sol joined the U.S. Navy, and for 22 years—from 1951 to 1973—he had by anybody's standards a remarkable patriotic military career.

In 1953, Sol volunteered for the Navy's legendary Underwater Demolition Team and was deployed to the Pacific, including Korea. Some history buffs will know and recall that the Underwater Demolition Team, the UDT, was the precursor to the present-day Navy SEALs—frogmen, as they liked to call themselves. In fact, Sol was on the very first Navy SEAL team created by President Kennedy in 1962, and I have a copy of the SEAL Team One plank owners certificate, commissioned on January 1, 1962, with Sol's name proudly displayed.

So Sol became a Navy SEAL—the first Navy SEAL, literally. He became a SEAL team training instructor, training new Navy SEAL recruits. He was affectionately referred to as "the Mean Machine" by the Navy SEALs. He also had the honor of training 48 astronauts, including Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Jim Lovell, just to name a few, in underwater weightlessness simulations. His prized possession is a framed plaque bearing the signature of all those astronauts, all those American heroes whom he trained.

Sol completed three combat tours in Vietnam. By the time he retired from the military, he had earned numerous awards and medals for personal valor, including the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. But what is truly remarkable about Sol is that after he retired from the Navy, he moved back home to Metlakatla and continued to serve his country and serve his community. He served on the Indian Community Council, on the school board, and as mayor

of Metlakatla. He has also been very involved in veterans affairs and was the president of the first veterans organization on the island and was instrumental in starting that organization. He has spent years reaching out to his fellow veterans to make sure they receive the benefits, honor, and dignity they earned.

Jeff Moran, the superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Metlakatla, said this about Sol:

I could go on and on regarding the wonderful things that Sol has done for his community. We would not be here today without his leadership and knowledge [and commitment].

I, too, can go on about Sol. Many Alaskans can go on about Sol and all the things he has done. But I also want to mention, particularly on the eve of the Fourth of July, that he is part of a long tradition in my State of Alaskan Natives who have served in the military, who have served our country even during darker times in our history when many Alaskan Natives were discriminated against and denied basic rights.

On the eve of the Fourth of July, we celebrate America's independence but also in particular those who have fought for that independence over the last 200 years. As I mentioned, one proud element of my great State is that we have more veterans per capita than any State in the country, and Alaska Native veterans serve at higher rates in the U.S. military than any other ethnic group in the country—something I like to refer to as a special kind of patriotism because they have been doing this for decades, like Sol—even at times, as I mentioned, when the country hasn't always treated that group of patriotic Americans with the respect and dignity they deserve. Sol personifies this special patriotism.

The SEALs who served with him wrote this about him in a tribute:

Sol's story will continue to be told by the men he trained, by the officers who relied on him, by the Frogmen who all respect him. An officer, a gentleman, an athlete, a friend, Sol Atkinson is all of these, but of all of these traits, he is first a Frogman.

We can see the pride the Navy SEALs have for Sol, a plank owner for the entire organization.

In conclusion, I will add that he is a patriotic Alaskan through and through, and I thank him for all he has done for Alaska, for our veterans, and for America.

Sol, congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week. Happy Fourth of July to you, to Alaska, and to all the men and women in our military and the citizens of our great Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, from all indications, our Republican friends continue to negotiate amongst themselves, behind closed doors, to revive the healthcare bill they had to pull from the floor on Tuesday.

I would suggest to my friends on the other side that there is no tweak or change or modification that will fix what is wrong with this Republican healthcare bill. The core of the bill is the problem. The American people are opposed to tax cuts for the wealthy and the reduction of the social safety net of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

The Republican TrumpCare bill is built on a crumbling, decrepit foundation, and that is because it is based on the premise that special interests and a very small number of wealthy Americans deserve a tax break while millions of Americans—middle class families, older Americans in nursing homes, folks with a preexisting condition—ought to receive less healthcare at a higher cost.

That idea is so backward, so out of step with what America wants and what actually works, it can never succeed, no matter how it is tweaked.

The one thing my Republican friends are latching on to—that their bill will bring down average premiums several years down the line—is really a bait and switch. The bait is lower premiums, but the switch is higher deductibles and copays so that, in the end, the average American pays more than they would have otherwise. They are luring people in with a lower premium, but then they have to pay such a high percentage of their medical costs, the insurance policy is virtually worthless.

The Republican TrumpCare bill tells insurers they can offer much less generous healthcare plans than under the current system, even allowing States to opt out of covering essential benefits like treatment for opioids, mental health coverage, prescription drug coverage, and maternity care.

The result of these changes is that insurers may charge smaller premiums on some plans, but they will cover way less and, in fact, the deductibles and copays will go up—way up—in order to make the difference. So this isn't: Oh, you are not paying for some esoteric item; your insurance policy will pay for virtually nothing at the beginning if you have a high deductible.

The CBO report estimates that for an average 40-year-old with an income of \$26,500 a year, looking at insurance on

the marketplace, deductibles would increase by thousands. If that 40-year-old decided on a "bronze" plan, for instance, their deductible would be \$6,000 a year, the CBO estimates. That is \$5,200 more than under current law. So we know what that means: They have to pay the first \$6,000 of healthcare, no matter what your insurance policy is. What good is that? Not much. Good for the insurance industry, maybe; not good for the average citizen. Some of my colleagues on the other side are claiming they want lower premiums, but if those lower premiums come with higher deductibles and higher copays, nobody benefits. It is a bait and switch.

What the Republican bill gives with one hand in this area, it more than takes away with the other because the lower premiums are made up for by higher deductibles and copays, so the average person pays more, not less, even when their premium goes down.

Who in America believes that folks should have higher out-of-pocket costs than before? Who in America believes that folks making over \$1 million a year—God bless them; they are doing well—deserve another \$57,000 tax break? Who in America believes that we should be making it harder to afford nursing home care or maternity care or opioid abuse treatment? Who in America believes a child born with a preexisting condition should hit their lifetime insurance limit before they even leave the hospital for the first time? Who believes in that in this America?

It turns out, almost no one. A poll yesterday showed that only 12 percent of Americans support the Republican bill. No amendment or compromise or tweak or adjustment in formula can solve that.

So I repeat the offer I made to President Trump and my Republican friends yesterday: Let's start over. Drop this fundamentally flawed approach—abandon cuts to Medicaid, abandon tax breaks for the wealthy—and we can discuss the problems that Americans are actually concerned about: the cost, quality, and availability of healthcare.

I suggested that President Trump invite all Senators to Blair House to begin anew on a bipartisan approach to healthcare. Unfortunately, the President said I wasn't serious. Mr. President: Try me. The minute you make the invitation, we will take it in a very serious way. It is not that audacious of an idea. President Obama did the same thing early in his Presidency to discuss healthcare with Members of both parties in front of the American people. Our only condition: Drop the wrong-headed idea of slashing Medicaid to give tax breaks to the wealthy. It is perfectly reasonable, and a vast majority of Americans agree with us.

Nonpartisan institutions like the American Medical Association, the National Association of Medicaid Directors, AARP, and America's largest

nursing home groups are all against the Republican approach. The Congressional Budget Office and other expert analyses say that it will not actually fix the problems in our healthcare system—high deductibles, high premiums, counties with too few insurance options—and the American people are as roundly against it as any piece of major legislation I have ever seen.

So I don't believe it is unserious to ask my Republican friends to drop this particular bill and talk to us about actually fixing the problems in our healthcare system.

I don't believe it is unserious to say to President Trump: You campaigned on bringing costs down and providing care for everyone. You campaigned on not cutting Medicaid and controlling the outrageous costs of prescription drugs. These are all your words in the campaign. Well, we Democrats agree with all of that. So let's talk about it.

Fundamentally, I don't believe that seeking a bipartisan solution on the great issues of our time should ever be considered unserious.

President Trump, you have complained about a lack of bipartisanship—unfairly, in our opinion. We are offering a way to implement bipartisanship, and right now it is you, not we, who are stopping it.

I hope my Republican friends, President Trump, and the majority leader think long and hard before dismissing our offer out of hand. I challenge them again: Invite all of us to Blair House the first day we get back from recess. If you think we are not serious, try us. Democrats are ready to turn the page on healthcare. When will my Republican friends realize it is time for them to do the same?

#### RUSSIA SANCTIONS

Finally, Mr. President, as to Russia sanctions, on June 15, nearly 2 weeks ago, the Senate, in an act of bipartisanship, passed a tough Russia sanctions bill on a 98-to-2 vote. There are very few things of such significance that this body does with such a large bipartisan vote—Democrats and Republicans, all but two coming together.

The majority leader, Senator McConnell, and I worked hard to pass it before a possible meeting between President Trump and President Putin at the G20 summit. We wanted to send a message to Mr. Putin: If you interfere with our democratic institutions, you will be punished. These new sanctions should also help to deter future Russian interference.

At the Speaker's request, I hope this morning the Senate will pass a technical correction to address the blue-slip issue. It is important for Speaker Ryan to get the House to act on this legislation before the July 4th recess. It is critical that Congress speak in a loud, clear, and unified voice to President Putin: Interfering with our elections—the wellspring and pride of our

democracy for over two centuries—will not be tolerated, and the United States will always respond forcefully, including with the power of economic sanctions.

I want to put the House on notice. If they water down the bill, weaken the sanctions, add loopholes to the legislation, they will find stiff resistance here in the Senate.

Later today, we will break for the July 4th recess. The Fourth of July is a day to remember the audacity of a ragtag group of colonies who declared themselves free and independent from the tyranny of one of the great, mighty foreign powers. What better way to mark the occasion than for the Congress of that once fledgling Nation—now the mightiest Nation in the world, ourselves—to pass a bill that says, 241 years since that fateful day, that we intend to defend our democracy as fiercely as the patriots who put down their plows and took up muskets on Bunker Hill did?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VENEZUELA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the rise of a failed state, Venezuela, and the man-made tragedy President Maduro has imposed on his citizens.

For 3 months, Venezuelans have taken to the streets in daily protests. They are speaking out against their country's economic collapse, against widespread food shortages, the disintegration of their medical system, against endemic corruption, and against a government that denies them their human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Appallingly, President Maduro has responded to the protests by unleashing his National Guard. As a recent Washington Post article stated, "Mr. Maduro and the corrupt clique around him are hanging on by the brute force of tear gas, water cannons, mass arrests, and shootings by snipers."

Since April, Venezuela's increasingly unstable crisis has left over 75 dead, thousands jailed, and thousands more injured. Yet, instead of listening to his people's legitimate demands and mitigating this tragedy, President Maduro is attempting to rewrite the Constitution, despite widespread opposition. Additionally, he declared this week that "what couldn't be done with votes would be done with weapons."

This is our hemisphere. This is a hemisphere that prides itself in demo-

cratic states, and here is the President of Venezuela saying he doesn't care what the voters say. With Maduro threatening to use arms against his people, one can only imagine the bloodshed and abuses will continue unabated.

Despite these threats, protests endure because Venezuelans see no alternatives. They have no other recourse against standing in lines for endless hours to scour the empty shelves at their markets. They have no other way to channel their sorrow over the spike in maternal and infant mortality rates in hospitals that lack supplies to treat the most basic diseases. They have no other way to express their outrage at the military profiting from corruption in food procurement contracts, even while children increasingly suffer the ravages of malnutrition.

Parallel to the protests, chaos is becoming commonplace. In the past 72 hours, the National Guard troops have stormed the National Assembly and assaulted opposition legislators. They came into the Parliament and assaulted the opposition. The supreme court has stripped the attorney general, Luisa Ortega, of her authorities for her criticism of President Maduro.

We have seen lootings and the burning of government buildings. Alarmingly, a rogue police officer commandeered a helicopter and launched grenades and small arms fire while flying over the supreme court. These incidents from just the last 3 days should make it clear to all we are now dealing with a failed state in our own hemisphere.

As this crisis cripples Venezuela, I call on all sides to refrain from violence. I also want to recognize that the current situation is the product of 18 years of systematic efforts to dismantle Venezuela's democratic institutions.

Since coming to power, President Maduro—like Hugo Chavez before him—has filled the ranks of government with loyalists who have led the economy to hyperinflation and the brink of default. State oil companies like PDVSA, the country's only source of revenue, has been purged of its expertise. In a truly devastating blow to democracy and the rule of law, the judiciary has been entirely sapped of its independence so it now functions as a political appendage of the executive branch.

In the 18 months since the opposition coalition won control of the National Assembly—and I must tell you there was hope when we saw the voters in Venezuela enacted a new government in their Parliament—the supreme court has overturned every piece of legislation passed, gave itself authority to approve the national budget, and in April temporarily usurped the rest of the legislature's authorities, completely reversing the will of the people.

Additionally, as Venezuela's civilian and military justice systems have become accomplices to persecution and torture, the number of political prisoners has soared. Leopoldo Lopez, Judge Afiuni, Daniel Ceballos—these are just some of the more well-known names among the more than 350 political prisoners recognized by Venezuelan human rights NGO Foro Penal. These are people who are in prison as a result of their political beliefs.

It is no surprise the decay of judicial independence has led to an alarming rise in corruption and impunity. It is now a stated fact that senior officials have syphoned billions out of Venezuela and are engaged in the illegal drug trade.

In response, the United States has designated a dozen people under the Kingpin sanctions, including Vice President Tareck El Aissami. Interior Minister Reverol was indicted in the United States last year for drug trafficking. Even Maduro's nephews were convicted in the United States on drug charges.

The sum of these trend lines is truly disturbing. Today, Venezuela is a failed state, where authoritarian leaders profit from links to corruption and drug trafficking, while the Venezuelan people are subject to precarious humanitarian conditions and human rights abuses. Against this backdrop, we require little explanation why more than 18,000 Venezuelans sought asylum in the United States last year.

We are all concerned about the flight of people at risk. What is happening in Venezuela directly impacts people trying to seek safety coming into the United States. If all this wasn't enough, in late 2016, Venezuelan State oil company PDVSA used its U.S. subsidiary Citgo as collateral to secure a loan from Rosneft, a company that is controlled by the Russian Government and is currently under U.S. sanctions. The result is, the Russian Government holds at least 49.9 percent of Citgo's mortgage and could come into control of critical U.S. energy infrastructure, including refineries, terminals, and a large network of pipelines. This should concern every Member of the U.S. Senate.

So the question for the United States and the international community is, How do we respond? What do we do? We cannot let this circumstance continue.

Thankfully, supported by a growing diplomatic coalition that includes Mexico, Brazil, Costa Rica, Peru, Canada, and the United States, the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Luis Almagro, is marshalling international pressure. Mr. Almagro has called on President Maduro to heed the demands of his citizens, free political prisoners, permit the delivery of humanitarian assistance, commit to a timetable for overdue elections, and restore the authority of the National Assembly.

However, despite Mr. Almagro's leadership, the results of last week's meeting of Foreign Ministers was a stunning failure to reach consensus on a hemisphere response. Appallingly, eight countries refused to vote their conscience, among them Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Trinidad, and Suriname. They did not use the power under the OAS to recognize that Venezuela today is not living up to its charter commitment to be a democratic state. There is a process at the OAS to take action. They were unable to do that—a major setback.

As efforts at the OAS continue, all must remain clear that there are no alternative facts when it comes to Venezuela, there is just a manmade tragedy that demands collective action.

While providing full support for multilateral diplomacy, the United States must also lead. In May, I introduced bipartisan legislation to address the multifaceted crisis in Venezuela. My bill will authorize humanitarian assistance and require the State Department to coordinate an international approach to humanitarian challenges. The legislation will also provide strong congressional backing for OAS efforts, as well as funding for international election observers and civil society groups working to defend human rights and democratic values.

Given the rising instability in Venezuela, the bill would codify two lines of targeted sanctions against Venezuelan officials involved in corruption and undermining democratic governance—the very authorities the administration used to rightly sanction members of the Venezuelan supreme court last month.

Congress should act, as we have done in so many other places where we show congressional leadership to make it clear that this type of activity will not be allowed to continue and that Congress will take a strong position to give appropriate authority to sanction those individuals who are responsible.

Finally, the bill would require the State Department and U.S. intelligence community to prepare a report on the role of Venezuelan officials in corruption and drug trafficking.

As the instability in Venezuela grows, every day we decide not to act only makes the crisis worse. I urge my colleagues to work with legislation I have filed. Let's work with the Congress and the President to make it clear to the Venezuelan people they are not alone, and we will not tolerate a country in our hemisphere to become a failed state.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CORRECTING THE ENGROSSMENT OF S. 722

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 210, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 210) to correct the engrossment of S. 722.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DIRECTING RETURN OF PAPERS REQUEST

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the return of the papers for S. 722 from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued REQUESTS FOR AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They do not have the approval of the Democratic leader for the eighth consecutive legislative day; therefore, they will not be permitted to meet after 1 p.m. I ask unanimous consent that the list of committees requesting authority to meet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Committee on Environment and Public Works; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, Congress and our country desperately need to have an honest, meaningful, transparent, and bipartisan conversation about improving our healthcare system. It shouldn't be a tall order, but around here things that seem common sense to the rest of the country are never simple. Instead, partisanship too often wins. We have seen that with the Senate Republican healthcare bill, as it was crafted behind closed doors without allowing any Democrats or the public to see it until it was a proposal.

It is good news that a vote on the bill was delayed, but we must continue to have this conversation as the debate continues. That bill was bad for North Dakota. Only when we seek real bipartisan solutions do I believe we will be successful in improving our healthcare system.

We need to reform our healthcare system. I have been saying it for years. In fact, I have proposed a number of fixes over the past 3½ years, but none of those fixes are embodied in the Republican healthcare bill. It is just not the right direction.

Just yesterday, I joined many of my colleagues to bring up some common-sense bills we can and should take up right now to make sure American families aren't hurt in the near term. We called on Republicans to work with us, but, unfortunately, they objected. I want to work in a bipartisan way. I want real healthcare reform. But, unfortunately, I do not believe everyone in Congress feels that way.

First, we need to talk about the facts of the Senate Republican bill—facts that are from very reputable non-partisan sources.

Earlier this week, the Congressional Budget Office issued a report reinforcing that the Senate Republican bill is just as terrible as the bill that came out of the House of Representatives a few months ago. The Senate bill would rip away health insurance from 22 million Americans by 2026, including 31,000 North Dakotans who would lose private health coverage. You can't put a few band-aids on a bad bill and expect that North Dakota would not feel that pain.

Just as in the House bill, the biggest savings would come from severe cuts to Medicaid—a program that would see a 26-percent cut in 2026. The bill would slash a lifesaving program that 90,000 North Dakota children, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and low-income families rely on for affordable,



quality care. That includes 36,000 children in my State.

The Senate Republican healthcare bill would get rid of the Medicaid expansion and cap the amount of Federal funding States can get to cover those traditional Medicaid patients. That would drastically reduce the amount of Medicaid funds going to the States. This would push those remaining costs onto States and counties that can't afford it. Importantly, it also would push the cost onto other patients. The American Hospital Association estimates that North Dakota Medicaid would lose \$1.2 billion through 2026. At the same time, North Dakota forecasts a \$46 million shortfall for 2015 through 2017—that is our biennial period—and another \$103 million shortfall for 2017 through 2018. You tell me how our State would pick up these extra costs for our families and our children. Unfortunately, we just will not be able to do it. We would be forced to discontinue care. That is just wrong.

Those Medicaid cuts would also imperil rural hospitals, which have seen their amount of bad debt fall by 45 percent because of Medicaid expansion. Helping those rural hospitals keep their doors open and deliver care close to home for farmers, ranchers, and communities is absolutely vital to rural development and vital to those people who are still working in rural America to put food on our table.

Additionally, the North Dakota Hospital Association released a study showing that healthcare and social assistance accounts for one of every seven workers in this State. I am going to repeat that: Healthcare and social assistance accounts for one of every seven workers in our State. Spending reductions under this Senate bill would curtail those jobs, hurt economic development—especially in rural communities—and make delivery of healthcare even more expensive for our rural families.

The cuts to Medicaid would take away coverage from many North Dakotans who are also seeking treatment for opioid abuse and addiction, which has reached an epidemic level in our State, as well as across the Nation. In fact, I had one North Dakota healthcare provider who was looking at providing additional behavior and mental health services. In the traditional hospital setting, about 14 to 15 percent of the patients are on Medicaid. He believes that once this hospital opens, anywhere from 60 to 70 percent of the patients will be dependent on Medicaid funding for their healthcare. If that money is not there, if there is no reliability about that money, how do we build the treatment services we need to attack this epidemic?

I want to dispel a myth about Medicaid, and that is that these are just people who can go to work every day, that they are not even working, that

they are just on the public dole, and that they are just getting this money. The truth is that in North Dakota 83 percent of adult Medicaid enrollees are in families with a worker. That is a statistic according to the nonpartisan Kaiser Family Foundation.

For North Dakotans who get coverage on the individual marketplace, this bill would raise premiums 76 percent higher than what would be required to be paid under the current law. That statistic, again, is according to Kaiser Family Foundation. Seniors would be especially hard hit, with premiums more than doubling for those older than 55. The bill would disproportionately push the costs on to older Americans, who tend to live in rural communities, like all of those across North Dakota.

Under the Senate bill, in 2026 a 64-year-old with an income of \$56,800 would pay annually \$20,500 for a silver-level healthcare insurance plan. That is more than one-third of his or her entire income, and that is more than eight times what the same person would pay under the current law, which is \$6,800.

The bill would also enable insurance companies to impose lifetime maximums on coverage, once again, making it unaffordable for many people with life-threatening or long-term illnesses or disorders to get the treatment they need to live by.

This bill is a not so thinly veiled attempt to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals at the expense of rural communities, like those across our State. Nearly 45 percent of the tax cuts in the Senate bill would go to the top 1 percent of incomes, those people making over \$875,000 a year. I will say that again. Nearly 45 percent of the tax cuts in the Senate bill would go to the top 1 percent of incomes, those making over \$875,000 a year, according to the Tax Policy Center.

But what is more telling about these striking statistics is the stories. I have heard from so many North Dakotans about how scared they are that this bill could pass and how it would hurt them if it ever happened. I have heard from North Dakotans with preexisting conditions, like cancer or asthma, parents of children with disabilities on Medicaid, adults with elderly patients in nursing homes, farmers and those in rural communities who rely on rural hospitals, and those receiving treatment for opioid abuse.

The consequences of this bill for North Dakotans are real. I want to tell some of those very real stories across my State, because way too often we forget this is an issue that could not be more personal.

I want to introduce you to Allison and Jennifer Restemayer. This is her wonderful family. This is Allison here. Allison, from West Fargo, was almost 2 years old when she was diagnosed with

a rare genetic disease. Allison's parents were told she would become severely mentally delayed by age 3, and she would likely pass away by the time she was 10 years old. I am so proud to tell you and so glad to tell you that this prediction did not come true.

Over the past several years, Allison has been able to get new, very expensive therapy that helps slow the progression of her disorder. Because there are currently no lifetime limits on coverage, Allison's family has been able to afford this treatment. Today, Allison is 16 years old. Allison needs physical therapy multiple times per week to truly make a difference in her life day to day and to help her live longer. Her private insurance covers just 12 physical therapy appointments per year. Allison is one of many children with disabilities or special needs on Medicaid, which covers the rest of her physical therapy.

For her and her family—you can see them here—who are so proud of the courage of Allison, it has been a lifeline, and it has been a lifegiver. But the Republican bill would enable insurance companies to impose lifetime maximums on coverage, which many North Dakotans, like Allison, would reach in no time. It would slash Medicaid—both expansion and traditional Medicaid—making it harder for families like Allison's to afford coverage and critical treatment for their children with special needs. The Restemayers should never ever have to worry.

I have spent a lot of time with Allison, and I think anyone who meets her knows that this world is a much better place with Allison healthy and alive. We are so proud to call her one of our friends. She has been an inspiration to me and my staff. She has participated in a lot of dialogues, and her advocacy has been absolutely instrumental in telling the story of families like hers in North Dakota.

I want to talk about Emerie and Amy Thom. At just 2 months old, Emerie, from Bismarck, had her first set of seizures and was diagnosed with a rare neurological condition. Her parents, Amy and Johnny, have crisscrossed North Dakota and visited many hospitals out of State to get Emerie the care she needs and to control her life-threatening seizures.

Emerie is now almost 4 years old and has spent a total of 8 weeks in the hospital since she was born. She receives therapy multiple times per week and needs various medical equipment. Just 1 month of therapy out-of-pocket would cost her family—good, hard-working people—\$3,000. Emerie is on Medicaid, which has enabled her family to afford her hospital stays, her home healthcare, and her therapy. It has also enabled them to keep their daughter home with them in a loving family relationship, in a lovely family situation.

It is because of the access to Medicaid that this family has been able to stay in their home and keep their jobs, but the Senate Republican healthcare bill would rip Medicaid away from families like Emerie's. This family does not deserve that, and neither does any family who is working hard to take care of their children. These are all of our children, the children we see today who suffer from disabilities, who live and inspire us with their disabilities and their hope. This small help these families ask for from the Medicaid system should not be threatened, and these families should not be calling congressional offices begging us to please, please do everything we can.

Finally, I want to talk about Frances. Frances is one of the nicest people you are ever going to meet. For 25 years, she was a third grade teacher in Fessenden. When she was 21 years old, while she was teaching, she was diagnosed with a syndrome that affects the nerve endings in her body. She became paralyzed but taught herself to walk again. For the rest of her life, she will have to face the challenges that come with this disorder. Today, Fran can't walk anymore, and she has been in a wheelchair for the past 24 years.

For most of her life, Fran lived independently with her husband, who passed away in 2000. In the past few years, she has reached a point where she needs full-time care. She is now 84 years old. She lives in a nursing home in Harvey, and she has been there for 4 years. Fran had been in and out of nursing homes a few times beforehand, all which required private pay. Because of the extreme costs, Fran doesn't have any money or savings left. She spent it all on her healthcare.

Now she is one of many seniors on Medicaid, which enables her to afford the quality, long-term care she needs to live with dignity and support. At the nursing home, she gets extensive assistance with bathing, dressing, and doing any activities. Fran doesn't know what she would do without Medicaid. She doesn't have any children to help her. Her siblings are all older than she is, and they wouldn't be able to provide her with the level of care she needs. If it weren't for Medicaid, Fran would be out of options.

The Senate Republican bill threatens the coverage that Fran has and that so many others rely on. You know what, we cannot let that happen.

This issue has many faces. These are just three North Dakota faces I want to talk to you about. These families aren't interested in politics. They couldn't care less about politics. They want the ability to take care of themselves. There is no guilt to any of these conditions. There is no "you did it to yourself" to any of these conditions. This is the human condition.

We have to decide as a country, are we together in taking care of each

other, or are we all on our own? That is the issue. How do we take care of the sickest among us? Are we together, or are we on our own? I believe we are stronger when we stand together to provide care to each other and to those who are not as fortunate.

I was talking to some of the families. It is hard when you are a mom, I think, to think about, well, what was your life with your child growing up? I had two children, born extraordinarily healthy. They barely missed a day of school, they were so healthy. They had an opportunity to engage in every level of activity, giving me and my husband the freedom to pursue other things in our lives. That is a gift. It is also a gift that we as a society can help those who don't have that level of good fortune but have children who need some special attention, children whose care you cannot afford on your own.

From the discussions I have had with so many of the families, very few of us could ever afford the medications and the therapies that guarantee quality of life not only for the child but for the family in terms of respite care.

Allison, Emerie, and Fran, we are going to keep talking about this, and we are going to keep evaluating all of the proposals that come our way. When they don't do right by you, Emerie, Allison, and Fran, when it is not the right solution for your family, it is not the right solution for North Dakota, and it is not the right solution for this country. We have work to do.

I know the Presiding Officer has been one of the leaders in analyzing and reviewing these bills. We have had a chance to have some discussions. I hope we will have further discussions about how we can continue to care for these wonderful North Dakotans.

The Presiding Officer knows story after story, having been a physician. Being a physician, my husband can tell you story after story about people who are challenged. In this system of healthcare, we all have to decide whether we stand alone or together. I believe America is stronger when we stand together and help each other.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ABOLISH HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to come to the floor to talk about healthcare, a subject I know the Presiding Officer feels passionate about as a medical doctor. But before I delve into the healthcare debate, I want to discuss briefly two important bipartisan pieces of legislation that I have

been working on with my colleagues across the aisle and that are moving forward today.

I know the strange thing about this place—by "this place" I mean Washington, DC—is that the bipartisan work we are able to do rarely gets much attention. What gets attention in the news is when we fight over controversial topics, but bipartisan legislation that actually helps people and that gets done here is rarely heralded or even noticed. So I think it is worth highlighting a couple of examples today.

Today, in the Senate Judiciary Committee, we passed the Abolish Human Trafficking Act, which I introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR. As the father of two daughters, I am always reminded of the profile of a victim of human trafficking in this country, a girl between the ages of 12 and 14 years old, who perhaps has run away from home. Who knows what the circumstances are at home? But they are looking for a better life, only to find themselves in too many instances exploited and the victims of human trafficking.

This bill reauthorizes several critical trafficking victims protection act programs that help fight the scourge of trafficking so that survivors can get the help they need and our law enforcement officers can go after the perpetrators of this terrible crime.

A vital provision of this bill is an extension of the Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund, which provides critical resources that victims need to recover from this crime. Part of the fund is financed through fines collected on convicted traffickers, and last year it provided almost \$5 million in services for victims. Let me dwell on that for just a minute.

When I was privileged to be attorney general of the State of Texas, part of the job was to administer the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund. This was a fund into which fines and penalties of people convicted of criminal acts went into the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund, so we could then use grants for the victims of crime to help them recover. That is exactly the kind of model we created with the Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund. My hope is that over time it will produce more money that will be available to help the victims of human trafficking to a greater extent. That is the idea, and these are not tax dollars, so that is an additional benefit. It is actually the fines and penalties of the perpetrators that go into this fund that then help the victims to heal.

This bill also makes the Human Trafficking Advisory Council permanent so that the group of survivors who advise people like us on what additional tools are needed to combat trafficking can continue to do so.

On the preventive end, this legislation lends a hand to our Nation's law

enforcement so they can track down perpetrators of the crime and bring them to justice. It implements screening protocols for the Department of Homeland Security so that law enforcement officials at every level know how to spot trafficking victims and how to respond. This is actually a really important element of fighting human trafficking.

A few years ago, when we had the Super Bowl in Dallas, TX, I was shocked to learn that the Super Bowl is one of the largest human trafficking events during the year. That is pretty sobering and, frankly, disgusting. Training people, including law enforcement, to be able to identify victims of human trafficking, some of whom may not consider themselves a victim until it is too late, only to find themselves a victim of modern day human slavery—but being able to identify victims of trafficking so that we can get law enforcement involved and get them rescued is a big, important part of fighting this crime.

In the long run, this legislation requires the Department of Justice to implement a national strategy to reduce the demand of human trafficking by essentially putting the johns—the people who buy sex from trafficking victims—out of service. This is a cause that clearly crosses partisan lines, and it is literally a nonpartisan issue.

I am glad we are making progress on this. I am thankful for the bipartisan support of my colleague from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR, as well as the Judiciary Committee members like the chairman, Senator GRASSLEY, and the ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, and many other Members on both sides who are cosponsors.

#### JOBS FOR OUR HEROES ACT

Mr. President, the second piece of legislation I want to mention is the Jobs for Our Heroes Act of 2017. This, too, is a bipartisan bill that makes it easier for our veterans to get jobs in our Nation's trucking industry. The men and women in our military learn valuable skills that can easily be transferred to the private sector when they leave the military and become a veteran, and this bill is designed to help veterans transition from their military service to getting jobs in our Nation's trucking industry. This is an area that is constantly in need of trained people with commercial drivers' licenses who can work in this industry.

As I suggested, many of our military servicemembers have experience driving similar vehicles while serving in the Armed Forces. Yet for them to get a job in trucking, they are required to go through a very expensive and time-consuming training program as if they have absolutely no knowledge or job experience whatsoever, largely duplicating what they already know just because of the regulations. That doesn't make any sense to me.

The legislation that I have introduced with Senators ELIZABETH WARREN, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, and THOM TILLIS takes into consideration the previous training and experience of veterans and allows them to apply for an exemption so they can quite literally get on the road and start working without delay.

This bill is twofold. Not only does it encourage our transportation industry to hire veterans, it helps our veterans transition into civilian life, connecting them to a well-paying job and a meaningful career. I expect the Commerce Committee to consider and pass this bill, as well, today.

These are two bipartisan examples that show we actually can work together in the U.S. Senate in ways that will help all of our States and the people we serve.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, there are subjects that are controversial. If there is one that sort of stands out above the rest, it is healthcare. Unfortunately, this has become all too much of a polarizing issue politically.

I happened to be in the Senate Chamber on Christmas Eve in 2009, at 7:30 in the morning, right before Christmas, of course, when our Democratic friends jammed through on a party-line vote the Affordable Care Act, now known as ObamaCare. I remember the promises the President made at the time. President Obama said: If you like your policy, you can keep your policy. That proved not to be true. He said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Well, that wasn't true, either. Then he said: Well, you will be able to save \$2,500 per family of four on your premiums. What experience has shown us is that instead of a \$2,500 savings, a family of four has experienced a \$3,000 increase in their premiums. That is 105 percent in the 39 States or so that have ObamaCare exchanges.

ObamaCare has been a failure if you consider the promises that were made and the promises that were broken. In experience, what we have seen is insurance companies, because of flaws in the design, literally leaving the States, leaving insured people with no option when it comes to their insurance. Perhaps they do have an insurance policy available, but their premiums have gone through the roof, as I indicated earlier—105 percent on balance since 2013. Their deductible is frequently so high that they are denied the benefit of what insurance they have because they are basically self-insured at \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, or more.

Yesterday, we announced that our work on a market-driven, patient-centered healthcare reform plan to replace ObamaCare would continue over the next few weeks. As I said yesterday, I expect that we will revisit the Better Care Act when we come back for the July work period, which is the week

after the Fourth of July. As the Republican conference has continued our discussion on our plan to replace the failed Affordable Care Act, three things have become clear to me.

Let me start with the first one. The first one is that our Democratic colleagues are not willing to lift a finger to help. Surely, they have constituents, as I do in Texas, who are contacting them, telling them about their horror stories with regard to no access to policies, premiums that are sky high, and deductibles that are unaffordable. Apparently, they are unmoved by those stories.

As we continue to move toward a Republican healthcare solution, which is what we are left with when our Democratic colleagues refuse to participate, I want to remind my colleagues as to why we have this choice before us and why the hard work is worth it.

All of us have our stories from our States about premium hikes and lost coverage and frustration at the hands of a convoluted law, but I want to talk about the story of a young lady from Fort Worth, TX.

She is a nurse who graduated from Texas Christian University in 2010. By her own account, she is young, in good health, and has a fulfilling career in the healthcare industry. Her first job took her to the Rio Grande Valley in South Texas. While she had to pay out-of-pocket for care, she only had a monthly healthcare premium of \$71, but after the ObamaCare bill passed in 2013, she said: "My plan disappeared." In other words, she was one of those who suffered from the broken promise that if you liked your plan, you could keep it, because it disappeared.

There was a new plan, but her deductible rose to \$8,500. Now, I do not know many people who could pay out-of-pocket \$8,500 for their healthcare before their health insurance kicked in. To add insult to injury, her monthly premium skyrocketed from \$71 to \$300. She is paying \$300 a month for a policy with a deductible of \$8,500. It is not worth very much. One year later, this plan under Blue Cross Blue Shield also disappeared, leaving her to consider the cheapest marketplace plan for \$400 a month. She started at \$71, went to \$300, and then went to \$400 a month for, what she called, a "dismal" policy.

Ultimately, she did find a more affordable plan for \$247 a month. Yet, every year, she has seen her premium grow. She started out at \$71, finally to end with \$247. That is three times-plus what she originally paid, and her premium continues to grow every year.

Yet, as a nurse, her perspective is not just about herself. She cares passionately about her patients as well.

She wrote this to me:

I'm irritated, but at least I can afford it. But who can't? A lot of folks and a lot of my patients! I certainly couldn't if I had a family.

Doing nothing is not an option, which is why I am mystified that our Democratic colleagues have simply refused to participate in the process. For 7 years, we have promised the American people we would replace ObamaCare with something better that would include market-based solutions in order to provide care that more people could afford. This is based on a principle that, I believe, is a core principle: If people have the choice between products, they will choose the one that is best for them at a price they can afford. Competition actually benefits consumers by providing a better product at a cheaper cost. That is what market-driven competition is all about.

To me, the choice is pretty simple. We either get rid of this failed law and replace it with real reform or ObamaCare will continue to collapse, and millions more people will continue to be harmed.

Now, this is something former President Clinton said, you will remember, during the campaign, which proved to be a little bit of an embarrassing comment when he said that ObamaCare was the “craziest thing in the world.” This was the former President of the United States, a Democrat, who was the husband of the Democratic nominee for President in the 2016 election. He called ObamaCare the “craziest thing in the world” because he knew well that no matter who won the election, whether it was Hillary Clinton or President Trump, that we would be talking about how to protect the American people from this failing system known as ObamaCare.

Yet our Democratic friends are apparently resigned to continue to let the American people suffer rather than try to do what is right and help make things better.

The work we are left to do is hard, but it is no excuse for not trying. ObamaCare is hurting our country, and we have a chance to make it better and to right the path. I remain hopeful and optimistic because doing nothing is not an option.

Let me just conclude with this observation: What we are trying to accomplish with the Better Care Act encompasses four things.

First, we are trying to stabilize the current insurance market to make sure there are actually insurance policies available for people to buy rather than to see them flee the marketplace.

Second, we are trying to make sure we do everything we can to bring insurance premiums down—in other words, to make it more affordable—by eliminating some of the mandates that make it unaffordable right now.

The third thing we are trying to do is to protect people with preexisting conditions. The Better Care Act or the BCRA as it is known—the Better Care Reconciliation Act—maintains the sta-

tus quo when it comes to protecting people against preexisting conditions. We do not want anybody who has lost his coverage to be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition when he tries to buy insurance from another insurance company. That is what happens when you change your job. That is what happens when insurance companies decide to leave the marketplace. They simply cannot afford to continue to write policies so you have to change policies, like this young lady—the nurse whom I mentioned—had to do on a couple of occasions.

The fourth thing we are trying to do is to stabilize one of the most important safety net programs in our country, which is Medicaid. There are three basic entitlement programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. We are doing everything we can to stabilize Medicaid because we believe it is important for low-income citizens to have access to healthcare through Medicaid if they cannot afford it through private insurance.

I want to just address some of the misinformation and, I think, outright falsehoods we have heard from some people about what the Better Care Reconciliation Act does to Medicaid.

I keep hearing people say this cuts Medicaid. It reduces the rate of growth of Medicaid, which is true. We basically put Medicaid on a budget, and we grow it year, after year, after year, as I will mention in a moment, but nowhere other than in Washington, DC, would anybody consider this a cut.

For example, in 2017, we will spend \$393 billion on Medicaid. Now, because this is a State-Federal cost share, in my State, it is either the No. 1 or No. 2 most expensive item in our spending under our State budget each year. It crowds out a lot of other things because it is so expensive. Yet it is uncontrolled, so, in 2017, we will see \$393 billion spent.

At the end of the budget window—10 years, reflected by 2026—the Federal Government will have spent, under the Budget Control Act, \$464 billion. That is a \$71 billion difference between 2017 and 2026. In no other alternate universe that I am aware of would this be considered a cut. This is an increase in Medicaid.

Now, we can have discussions—and we should and we are having discussions—as to: Is this an adequate rate of growth of Medicaid to meet the growing population and to make sure people are taken care of?

Nothing we do in this bill drops anybody from Medicaid, and the suggestion that it does is simply, I would suggest, not accurate, nor is it a cut. We can have discussions about what the proper rate of growth is, and we are having those discussions, but it is a fact, reflected by the Congressional Budget Office—which is the official scorekeeper in Congress—that, in 2017,

we will spend \$393 billion, and under the Better Care Reconciliation Act, we will spend \$464 billion, which is a difference of \$71 billion over that 10 years.

I know we will have a lot more to talk about as we continue to debate this bill. My hope is that we will have a bill that we will be able to send to the Congressional Budget Office, which will take a couple of weeks to score—that is a requirement—before we can actually bring it to the floor. I hope that at some point in the not-too-distant future, we will be able to bring a bill to the floor and have a real debate and have an amendment process that will allow everybody and anybody in the Senate to offer amendments in order to change or modify the bill.

In the end, I believe we have to decide because doing nothing is not an option. Doing nothing means consigning the people who are being hurt by ObamaCare today to continue to be hurt and to be priced out of healthcare entirely. To my mind, that is not a responsible thing for us to do.

That is why I support the Better Care Reconciliation Act. It is not a perfect bill, but it is the next step in helping us turn our current healthcare disaster around. At some point, I hope our Democratic friends will join with us, as they have done under the two bills I mentioned earlier, for this is one of the most important things we will do in the Congress. If you think about what touches people's lives in such a personal way, it is hard to think of anything that does that more than healthcare.

Right now, we are hearing a lot of scare stories and inaccuracies about what this bill does. There is plenty of room for debate and differences of opinion based on the facts, but as the saying goes, you are entitled to your own opinion, but you are not entitled to your own facts. Facts are facts, and based on the facts, we ought to argue our policy differences and then vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, it

be in order to move to proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 104, William Hagerty to be Ambassador to Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 104, William Hagerty to be Ambassador to Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 3, 2017, THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 10, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, July 3, at 6 p.m., Thursday, July 6, at 9 a.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, July 6, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, July 10; that following the prayer and

pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Rao nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time on the Rao nomination expire at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

##### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the cloture vote on the nomination of Neomi Rao to be the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the White House Office of Management and Budget.

On vote No. 155, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture on the Rao nomination.

This administration has dedicated itself to undermining many of the commonsense regulations that protect public health, workers, consumers, students, and the environment.

Ms. Rao's previous writings show that, as OIRA Administrator, she would likely continue this trend and actively work to prevent any new regulations from being implemented.

She has previously called for increased political oversight of independent agencies, like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and dramatically limiting the regulatory authority of other Federal agencies.

This is concerning as OIRA plays a critical role in the Federal regulatory process and often determines how new regulations are implemented.

Therefore, I would have voted against cloture on Ms. Rao's nomination as I do not believe she will adequately defend agencies' duties to set safety standards that protect the public.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. LONNIE G. BUNCH III

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC has as its newest treasure, the National Museum of African American History and Culture. It is the work of many and would not be there without its founding director, Dr. Lonnie G. Bunch III.

I know as a member of the Smithsonian board of regents that Dr. Bunch is the single most important person bringing about this magnificent museum and one which will speak to the history of African Americans in this country more than anything else.

We all know that history has seen an enormous amount of pain caused by violence and deaths resulting from racism in America. When you come into that moving museum, as I have many times, the last thing you would expect is someone who would leave the ultimate symbol of racism, a noose, hanging in it. I know the dismay felt by people of all races when it was found, but probably what has helped the healing the most is the op-ed of June 23, 2017, in the New York Times, written by my friend, Lonnie Bunch.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the op-ed, so that all can see it and so that it will be part of the history of the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 23, 2017]

A NOOSE AT THE SMITHSONIAN BRINGS

HISTORY BACK TO LIFE

(By Lonnie G. Bunch III)

The person who recently left a noose at the National Museum of African American History and Culture clearly intended to intimidate, by deploying one of the most feared symbols in American racial history. Instead, the vandal unintentionally offered a contemporary reminder of one theme of the black experience in America: We continue to believe in the potential of a country that has not always believed in us, and we do this against incredible odds.

The noose—the second of three left on the National Mall in recent weeks—was found late in May in an exhibition that chronicles America's evolution from the era of Jim Crow through the civil rights movement. Visitors discovered it on the floor in front of a display of artifacts from the Ku Klux Klan, as well as objects belonging to African-American soldiers who fought during World War I. Though these soldiers fought for democracy abroad, they found little when they returned home.

That display, like the museum as a whole, powerfully juxtaposes two visions of America: one shaped by racism, violence and terror, and one shaped by a belief in an America where freedom and fairness reign. I see the nooses as evidence that those visions continue to battle in 2017 and that the struggle

for the soul of America continues to this very day.

The people responsible knew that their acts would not be taken lightly. A noose is a symbol of the racial violence and terror that African-Americans have confronted throughout American history and of the intensity of resistance we've faced to any measure of racial equality. During slavery, one of the main purposes of lynching was to deter the enslaved from escaping to freedom. But lynching did not end with slavery; it was also a response to the end of slavery. It continued from the 1880s until after the end of World War I, with more than 100 people lynched each year. So prevalent was this atrocity that between 1920 and 1938, the N.A.A.C.P. displayed a banner at its national headquarters that read simply, "A man was lynched yesterday."

Lynching was not just a phenomenon of the American South or the Ku Klux Klan. And in many places, as black people fought for inclusion in American life, lynchings became brutal spectacles, drawing thousands of onlookers who posed for photographs with the lifeless bodies. This collective memory explains why the noose has become a symbol of white supremacy and racial intimidation.

So, what does it mean to have found three nooses on Smithsonian grounds in 2017? A noose inside a Missouri high school? A noose on the campus of Duke University? Another at American University?

As a historian, who also happens to be old enough to remember "Whites Only" signs on motels and restaurants that trumpeted the power of laws enforcing segregation, I posit that it means we must lay to rest any notion that racism is not still the great divide.

As someone who has experienced the humiliating sting of racial epithets and the pain of a policeman's blow—simply because I was black and in a neighborhood not my own—I would argue that it answers a naive and dangerous question that I hear too often: Why can't African-Americans get over past discrimination?

The answer is that discrimination is not confined to the past. Nor is the African-American commitment to American ideals in the face of discrimination and hate.

The exhibitions inside the museum combine to form a narrative of a people who refused to be broken by hatred and who have always found ways to prod America to be truer to the ideals of its founders.

In the process of curating these experiences, I have acquired, examined and interpreted objects that stir feelings of intense pain. Anger and sadness are always parts of this work, but I never let them dominate it. Instead, I use them to help me connect with the people who have suffered and continue to suffer immeasurable pain and injustice, while clinging to their humanity and their vision of a better country.

I see the nooses in the same way. They are living history. Viewed through this lens, they are no less a part of the story the museum tells than the Klan robes, the slave shackles small enough to fit a child, the stretch of rope used to lynch a Maryland man in 1931 or the coffin used to bury the brutally murdered Emmett Till.

If you want to know how African-Americans continue to persevere and fight for a better America in the face of this type of hatred, you need only visit the museum, where the noose has been removed but the rest of the remarkable story of our commitment to overcome remains. Anyone who experiences the National Museum of African American History and Culture should leave with that

realization, as well as the understanding that this story is continuing. The cowardly act of leaving a symbol of hate in the midst of a tribute to our survival conveyed that message as well as any exhibit ever could.

#### 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last night in the Kennedy Caucus Room, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society honored the Senate Appropriations Committee with a celebration of its 150th anniversary. Past and present committee members and staff gathered to reflect on the history of the committee, and Senate Historian Betty Koed gave a wonderful keynote address.

Established on March 6, 1867, the committee's powers are rooted in article 1, section 9, of our Constitution which states, "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law." The Founders recognized the power of the purse as one of the most important tools Congress has to ensure our system of checks and balances and to conduct oversight of the executive and judicial branch—but it is much more than that. The Appropriations Committee is where we translate the priorities of a nation into the realities of the people.

Our country is not a business, where we allocate resources only according to the bottom line. We do not invest in order to make a profit or a one-for-one dollar in return. We invest in those areas where it is uniquely right for government to take the lead. We invest in the areas that make a difference in the everyday lives of Americans and that help build the foundations of our country and our economy—infrastructure, national security, our environment, education, science and research, healthcare.

I want to thank the U.S. Capitol Historical Society for organizing this anniversary celebration, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks given by Senate Historian Betty Koed be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 150TH ANNIVERSARY

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2017

BETTY K. KOED, SENATE HISTORIAN

On March 6, 2017, the Senate reached an important milestone in the history of its committees. The Committee on Appropriations turned 150 years old.

For its first quarter-century, the Senate operated without permanent legislative committees. Instead, it relied on temporary "select" committees to manage proposals and write bills. In 1816, having created nearly a hundred of these ad hoc committees, the Senate decided on something more permanent.

In December of 1816, it created eleven standing committees, including Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Commerce, and Finance.

However, it did not create a Committee on Appropriations.

Over the next five decades, the Finance Committee handled most appropriations, but that overworked committee struggled with the haphazard funding requests of executive agencies.

Wishing to appear frugal, agency directors often understated their funding needs to the House of Representatives and then, in the hectic final days of a session, quietly turned to the Senate for emergency funds.

The threat of suspended operations usually convinced Congress to replenish the coffers. If agencies ran a surplus, directors simply spent those funds as they pleased.

By the 1860s senators realized that they needed to gain better control over appropriations. The Civil War had vastly expanded federal spending. In fact, in 1865, expenditures passed the billion-dollar mark for the first time in our national history.

The lack of centralized control over appropriations also played to the president's advantage, and the executive often spent millions without first securing formal congressional appropriations.

In other words, by the end of the Civil War, no less than the power of the purse was at stake.

On March 6, 1867, two years after similar action taken by the House, Senator Henry Anthony of Rhode Island proposed a new committee to consider spending bills.

The Senate agreed—by unanimous consent—and passed subsequent legislation to better regulate how such funds were used.

Before long, this new committee became a Senate powerhouse. Led by strong chairmen like Iowa's William B. Allison, the Appropriations Committee reached new heights of influence during the Senate's Gilded Age.

Not surprisingly, senators who did not serve on the committee began to complain. Did this upstart committee have too much power? Chairmen of the legislative committees, as well as the heads of executive agencies, said yes, and looked for ways to wrest back some of that power.

In the 1890s, senators curtailed the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, giving control over spending in certain areas, such as agriculture, military affairs, and pensions, back to legislative committees.

Committee chairs were delighted, but with no centralized control over the budgetary process, the committees ran amok. Spending increased with little or no accountability.

And so, in 1921, again prompted by war-related costs that had pushed annual spending to more than \$25 billion a year, Congress passed the Budget and Accounting Act.

Signed by President Warren G. Harding, the 1921 law required an annual budget from the president, created the General Accounting Office (now GAO), the Bureau of the Budget (now the OMB), and led to the establishment of permanent subcommittees for Appropriations.

But passage of that bill was just the beginning. In implementing the new law, Chairman Francis E. Warren of Wyoming shaped the future of the committee.

In 1922 Warren introduced a successful resolution to again centralize the appropriations process. He also included in his resolution a revision to Rule 16, requiring that all general appropriation bills, and amendments to such bills, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

This, in essence, established the broad jurisdiction that the committee enjoys today.

Since that time, the Appropriations Committee has continued to evolve as its duties

and workload were amended by subsequent legislation.

Of course, the biggest change came in 1974 with the Budget Act, which created the House and Senate Budget Committees along with the Congressional Budget Office. But, again, the Appropriations Committee remained intact.

In the 1980s and 90s, other elements were added—Gramm-Rudman, budget summits, PAYGO, CRs—but you know that history better than I do. You've been living it.

Today—150 years after its creation—the Senate Committee on Appropriations, ably led by Chairman Cochran and Vice Chairman Leahy, continues to be a powerful and influential voice in national policymaking.

Of course, that doesn't mean that the appropriations process has always been easy. In fact, at times, it has been downright testy.

For example, on a hot day in August of 1950, as the Senate continued working past its targeted adjournment date, tempers inside the committee room got to be nearly as hot as the scorching summer sun.

"The Senate is beginning to show signs of overwork," observed newspaper columnist Jack Anderson. "Sessions are growing longer," he wrote, "and tempers shorter."

Among the confrontations that caught Anderson's eye was a battle between two of the Hill's best known curmudgeons, Tennessee senator Kenneth McKellar and Missouri Representative Clarence Cannon.

They were the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and for years they had argued bitterly over federal spending. That battle reached a climax in 1950.

"A gavel-bashing, name-calling clash between 81-year-old . . . McKellar, and 71-year-old . . . Cannon, was broken up . . . just short of physical violence," noted the Washington Post on August 19, 1950.

While meeting in conference, Senator McKellar had sharply commented on Cannon's personality, using language peppered with words such as blind, stupid, and pig-headed.

Enraged, Cannon sprang from his chair, rushed towards McKellar, and shouted, "I've taken all I'm going to [take]." Startled but defiant, McKellar snatched the gavel and tried to rap it on Cannon's head.

"In the nick of time," the Post reported, a staff member "grabbed Cannon" and "two senators seized the gavel from McKellar."

Peace was restored . . . for the moment.

A decade later, another chairman of the Appropriations Committee—Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona—fought so bitterly with old Clarence Cannon that the two houses of Congress had to establish neutral ground.

Like McKellar, Hayden was an old hand at appropriations. With 50 years of congressional service behind him, his skillful management of spending bills had earned him the label, "the third senator from every state."

But Hayden's notable length of service had not prepared him for Clarence Cannon. In the House since 1923, Cannon knew his way around bicameral disputes.

This was a battle of the titans on Capitol Hill.

"Government agencies are frantically going broke," wrote a reporter in June of 1962, just because two members of Congress "keep yelling at each other."

For months, Cannon and Hayden had delayed action on legislation while they argued over seemingly petty issues.

The press dubbed it the "Battle of the Oc-togenarians," but underlying this crisis was a dispute as old as Congress itself.

Was the Senate truly the "upper house"?

Fueling the argument was a long-simmering House resentment of the Senate's general air of superiority, an attitude which had resulted in some rather high-handed practices.

For example, for nearly two centuries, all conference committees had been chaired by senators, and such meetings had always been held on the Senate side of the Capitol.

In 1962, the House decided to challenge this old custom of senatorial privilege. Leading the charge was Appropriations Chairman Clarence Cannon.

Defending the Senate's prerogatives—Carl Hayden.

Cannon informed Hayden that he refused to make the trek to the Senate side of the Hill for conference meetings. From now on, he insisted, senators had to walk to the House side—at least half of the time! Furthermore, he demanded that he be allowed to chair half of the conferences.

Hayden countered. In that case, he insisted, the Senate would initiate half of all appropriations bills.

The resulting stalemate lasted for months. Meeting after meeting produced no agreement. The appropriations process remained stalled well past the end of the fiscal year, while government agencies scrambled for funds.

Finally, Carl Hayden called for a truce. He suggested a special meeting to be held on neutral ground and turned to Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield for a solution.

Needless to say, Mansfield was anxious to end the battle. He searched for a proper meeting space. Finally, he opened EF-100, a small room located off the crypt, in the exact center of the Capitol.

"I even agreed to have it surveyed," Mansfield explained, "so that the conference table would not be so much as an eighth of an inch more on one side than the other."

Presented with this option, Chairman Cannon agreed to meet in conference, but stood firm in his demands to co-chair meetings.

To end the crisis, and probably urged on by Mansfield, Carl Hayden relented. The Senate sacrificed a few of its cherished privileges, and government operations returned to normal.

Pundits dismissed the battle as a tempest in a teapot, but more astute observers recognized that this high-profile battle was another chapter in an on-going struggle over the shared constitutional powers of the Senate and the House.

Finally, this evening I would like to highlight an important but mostly forgotten milestone in this committee's history.

Since 1867, about 300 senators have served on the committee. Of those 300, a mere dozen have been women. The first woman to serve was, of course, Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, who joined the committee in 1953.

As you all know, in 2012, Senator Barbara Mikulski—the second woman to serve on the committee—became the first woman to chair it.

Those are both major milestones in Senate history.

Here's one more.

Way back in 1911, a woman served as chief clerk to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Her name was Leona Wells. She joined the Senate's clerical staff in 1901 and remained on the payroll for 25 years. I believe her to be the first woman to hold a top committee position in the Senate.

Born in Illinois in 1877, Wells moved to Wyoming when she turned 21, because this

young suffragist could cast a vote in Wyoming. There she met Senator Francis E. Warren, whose patronage brought her to Washington.

As chair of the Military Affairs Committee, Senator Warren appointed Wells to the committee's clerical staff. When he became chairman of Appropriations in 1911, he brought Wells with him, giving her the position of chief clerk—although it appears that the Senate never officially gave her that title.

At the time, Leona Wells was unusual—a well-paid professional woman on Capitol Hill. In fact, she was so unusual that she attracted media attention.

Leona Wells "is probably the most envied woman in government service," reported the Boston Globe in an article titled "Uncle Sam's Highest Salaried Woman."

Not only did she earn a good salary, the Globe noted, but she is "the first woman employee of the Senate to be placed in charge of the affairs of a big committee."

Wells scouted new territory for female staff, but one area remained off limits—the Senate Chamber. When Chairman Warren was on the floor doing committee business, Wells had to wait outside.

Male committee clerks freely entered the chamber, but the Senate was not yet ready to admit a female staffer. Instead, as the Globe reported, Wells waited "just outside the swing doors of the chamber . . . and kept the door an inch or two ajar that she might hear everything that went on inside."

Leona Wells is largely forgotten now, but her service on the Appropriations Committee opened a door so other women could follow. Her story is also part of this committee's history.

This has been an all-too-brief summary of the history of this important committee, but I hope it will serve as a reminder.

Just like Francis Warren or Carl Hayden or even Leona Wells, all of you—chairs, vice chairs, members, and staff—are part of the history of the Committee on Appropriations.

## ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-68, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$175 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-68

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$100 million.

Other \$75 million.

Total \$175 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred sixty-eight (168) MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) Conversion Kits.

Non-MDE includes: Shipping containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services.

(iv) Military Department: Navy.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: FMS Cases TW-P-AJX and TW-P-AKB.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) Conversion Kits

TECRO has requested a possible sale of MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) Conversion Kits. This request provides the recipient with MK-54 LWTs in support of their LWT program. This sale will include LWT containers, torpedo support, torpedo spare parts, publications, training, weapon system support, engineering and technical assistance for the upgrade and conversion of one hundred sixty eight (168) MK-46 Mod 5 Torpedoes to the MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) configuration. The total estimated program cost is \$175 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient

and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhance capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The will be various contactors involved in this case.

There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this proposed sale, a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-68

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

Annex Item No vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The MK 54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) has been in service in the U.S. Navy (USN) since 2004. The version offered in this sale is the MK54 Mod 0 of the system. The purchaser currently does not have this weapon system in its inventory. The proposed sale consists 168 MK-54 Mod 0 LWT conversion kits, containers, spare and repair parts, weapon system support and integration, personnel training, training equipment, test equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services and other related elements of logistical support.

a. Although the MK 54 Mod 0 LWT is considered state-of-the-art-technology, there is no Critical Program Information associated with the MK 54 Mod 0 LWT hardware, technical documentation or software. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical manual that will be exported is CONFIDENTIAL. The technical manual is required for operation of the MK 54 Mod 0 LWT. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET.

2. Loss of hardware, software, publications or other items associated with the proposed sale to a technologically advanced or competent adversary, poses the risk of the destruction of the countermeasures or replication and/or improvements to the adversary's Undersea Weapon Systems, weakening U.S. defense capabilities.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives in the Policy justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for re-

lease and export to the government of Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (IECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-69, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$250 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-69

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$150 million.

Other \$100 million.

Total \$250 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Forty-six (46) MK 48 Mod 6AT Heavyweight Torpedoes (HWT).

Non-MDE includes: Shipping containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services.

(iv) Military Department: Navy.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc. Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Notification Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—MK 48 Mod 6AT Heavyweight Torpedo (HWT)

Taiwan has requested a possible sale of forty-six (46) MK 48 Mod 6AT Heavyweight Torpedoes (HWT). This sale will include HWT containers, torpedo support, torpedo spare parts, publications, training, weapon system support, engineering and technical assistance. The total estimated program cost is \$250 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

There are no prime contractors associated with this case as all materials will be procured from U.S. Navy stocks. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this this proposed sale a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-69

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

#### Annex Item No vii

##### (vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The MK 48 Heavy Weight Torpedo (HWT) has been in service in the U.S. Navy (USN) since 1972. This sale furnishes the MK 48 Mod 6 Advanced Technology (AT) version of the system. The purchaser currently does not have this weapon system in its inventory. The proposed sale consists of 46 HWTs, containers, spare and repair parts, weapons system support and integration, personnel training, training equipment, test equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services and other related elements of logistical support

a. There is no Critical Program Information associated with the MK 48 Mod 6AT HWT hardware, technical documentation or software. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical manual that will be exported is CONFIDENTIAL. The technical manual is required for operation of the MK 48 Mod 6AT HWT. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET. The MK 48 Mod 6AT HWT meets Anti-Tampering requirements.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives in the Policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended,

we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-67, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$125 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-67

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment \$100 million.

Other \$25 million.

TOTAL \$125 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Sixteen (16) Standard Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IIIA All-Up Rounds (AUR) Forty-seven (47) MK 93 MOD 1 SM-2 Block IIIA Guidance Sections (GSs).

Five (5) MK 45 MOD 14 SM-2 Block IIIA Target Detecting Device (TDDs) Shrouds.

Non-MDE includes: Seventeen (17) MK 11 MOD6 SM-2 Block IIIA Autopilot Battery Units (APBUs) maneuverability upgrades on the GSs, sixty-nine (69) section containers and sixteen (16) AUR containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (LHT).

(v) Prior Related Cases if any: FMS Cases TW-P-LGQ.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See attached annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—SM-2 Block IIIA Standard Missiles and Components

TECRO has requested a possible sale of sixteen (16) Standard Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IIIA All-Up Rounds (AUR), forty-seven (47) MK 93 MOD 1 SM-2 Block IIIA Guidance Sections (GSs), and five (5) MK 45 MOD 14 SM-2 Block IIIA Target Detecting Devices (TDDs) Shrouds. This request also includes Seventeen (17) MK 11 MOD6 SM-2 Block IIIA Autopilot Battery Units (APBUs) maneuverability upgrades on the GSs, sixty-nine (69) section containers and sixteen (16) AUR containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services. The total estimated program cost is \$125 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will

help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The SM-2 Block IIIA missiles and components proposed in this purchase will be used to supplement existing inventories of SM-2 Block IIAs to be used for self-defense against air and cruise missile threats on-board their destroyer-class surface ships. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missiles Systems Company of Tucson, Arizona. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this proposed sale, a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-67

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

#### Annex Item No. vii

##### (vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. A completely assembled STANDARD Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IIIA with or without a conventional warhead, whether a tactical or inert (training) configuration, is classified CONFIDENTIAL. Missile component hardware includes: Guidance Section (classified CONFIDENTIAL), Target Detection Device (classified CONFIDENTIAL), Warhead (UNCLASSIFIED), Rocket Motor (UNCLASSIFIED), Steering Control Section (UNCLASSIFIED), Safe and Arming Device (UNCLASSIFIED), and Autopilot Battery Unit (classified CONFIDENTIAL).

2. SM-2 operator and maintenance documentation is considered CONFIDENTIAL. Shipboard operation/firing guidance is considered CONFIDENTIAL. Pre-firing missile assembly/pedigree information is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that recipient can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

HON. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-73, concerning the Department of the Air Force proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$185.5 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-73

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$83.5 million.

Other \$102.0 million.

Total \$185.5 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Fifty-six (56) AGM-154C Joint Standoff Weapons (JSOWs).

Non-MDE includes: JSOW integration, captive flight vehicles, dummy training missiles, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission Planning System updates, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QBZ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—AGM-154C Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) Missiles

TECRO requested a possible sale of fifty-six (56) AGM-154C JSOW Air-to-Ground Missiles. This request also includes: JSOW integration, captive flight vehicles, dummy training missiles, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission Planning System updates, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$185.5 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with U.S. law and policy as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic, and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and to maintain a credible defensive capability. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance, and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

Currently, market research is being conducted to determine the viability of a qualified contractor in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The purchaser typically requests offsets, but any offsets will be determined between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives outside the United States.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-73

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AGM-154C Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) is a low observable, 1,000 lb. class, inertial navigation and global positioning satellite guided family of air-to-ground glide weapons. JSOW consists of a common airframe and avionics that provides for a modular payload assembly to attack stationary and moving massed flight-armored and armored vehicle columns, surface-to-air, soft to hard, relocatable, and fixed targets. JSOW provides combat forces with an all-weather, day/night/multiple kills per pass, launch and leave, and standoff capability.

2. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical documentation to be exported is SECRET, but no radar cross-section and infrared signature data nor U.S.-only tactics or tactical doctrine will be disclosed. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET; however, no software source code will be disclosed. All reprogramming of missile microprocessor memories must be accomplished by U.S. Government personnel or U.S. Government approved contractors.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release

and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

HON. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-75, concerning the Department of the Air Force proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$400 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-75

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE)\* \$0 million.

Other \$400 million.

Total \$400 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Non-MDE includes: Follow-on sustainment package for the Surveillance Radar Program (SRP) that includes contractor logistics support (sustainment); engineering services and technical updates to address equipment obsolescence; transportation and material costs associated with contractor repair and return services; spare and repair parts; support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QAP).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: TW-D-DAH—\$831 million—27 Oct 2004; TW-D-QAI—\$370 million—25 May 2012.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—Surveillance Radar Program (SRP) Operation and Maintenance Support

TECRO requested a possible sale of SRP Operations and Maintenance follow-on sustainment package that includes, contractor logistics support (sustainment); engineering services and technical updates to address equipment obsolescence; transportation and material costs associated with contractor repair and return services; spare

and repair parts; support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$400 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale contributes to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security and defensive capability of the recipient, which has been and continues to be an important force for political stability, military balance, and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale improves the recipient's capability to provide early warning against current and future airborne threats. The SRP is a key component to the recipient's Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance architecture. It will use the requested updates and sustainment as a defensive deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen its homeland defense. This potential sale will not introduce new capabilities, but will continue a similar sustainment package to one currently in place.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

Currently, market research is being conducted to determine the viability of a qualified contractor in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The purchaser typically requests offsets, but any offsets will be determined between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives outside the United States.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-75

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

#### Annex Item No. vii

##### (vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The purchaser currently owns an Early Warning Radar (EWR) that serves as a critical element to its Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) infrastructure. The radars provide a robust capability to detect, acquire, and track theater ballistic missiles, air breathing targets, and cruise missile threats. The system is able to operate in severe clutter and jamming environments amid high levels of background radio frequency interference. The follow on sustainment package requested will not introduce new capabilities.

2. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is UNCLASSIFIED. The highest classification of the technical documentation to be exported is SECRET. There are technical manuals as well as Engineering Change Proposals, drawings, and specifications required as part of the sustainment updates. Components requiring depot level maintenance will be shipped to the U.S. for servicing. The highest level of software to be exported is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information

could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-74, concerning the Department of the Air Force proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$147.5 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXLEY,  
*Vice Admiral, USN, Director.*

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-74

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$47.5 million.

Other \$100.0 million.

Total \$147.5 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Fifty (50) AGM-88B High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARMs).

Ten (10) AGM-88B Training HARMs.

Non-MDE includes: HARM integration, LAU-118A Launchers, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission Planning System update, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QBZ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—AGM-88B High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARM)

TECRO requested a possible sale of fifty (50) AGM-88B HARMs and ten (10) AGM-88B Training HARMs. This request also includes: HARM integration, LAU-118A Launchers, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission Planning System update, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$147.5 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with U.S. law and policy as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic, and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and to maintain a credible defensive capability. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance, and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

Currently, market research is being conducted to determine the viability of a qualified contractor in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The purchaser typically requests offsets, but any offsets will be determined between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives outside the United States.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-74

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

#### Annex Item No. vii

##### (vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. AGM-88B High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missile (HARM) is a supersonic air-to-surface missile designed to seek and destroy enemy radar-equipped air defense systems. HARM has a proportional guidance system that hones in on enemy radar emissions through a fixed antenna and seeker head in the missile nose. The missile consists of four sections; guidance section, warhead, control section, and rocket motor.

2. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical documentation to be exported is SECRET, but no radar cross-section and infrared signature data nor U.S.-only tactics or tactical doctrine will be disclosed. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET; however, no software source code will be disclosed. All reprogramming of missile microprocessor memories must be accomplished by U.S. Government personnel or U.S. Government approved contractors.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification and in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-70, concerning the Department of the Navy proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$80 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RILEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-70

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$0 million.

Other \$ 80 million.

Total \$ 80 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Non-MDE Includes: AN/SLQ-32(V)3 Electronic Warfare System upgrade hardware, software, support equipment and parts, publications, training, engineering and technical assistance.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (LHW).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: FMS Cases TW-P-SDV, TW-P-GNT, and TW-P-GOU.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—AN/SLQ-32(V)3 Upgrade

TECRO has requested a possible sale to upgrade the AN/SLQ-32(V)3 Electronic Warfare Systems in support of four

(4) ex-KIDD Class (now KEELUNG Class) destroyers. This sale will include AN/SLQ-32(V)3 upgrade hardware, software, support equipment and parts, publications, training, engineering and technical assistance. The total estimated program cost is \$80 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The proposed sale will improve operational readiness and enhance the electronic warfare capability onboard the ex-KIDD Class destroyers. The recipient will have no difficulty in absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems Company of Tucson, Arizona. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this proposed sale, a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-70

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

Annex Item No vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AN/SLQ-32(V)3 is an electronic warfare system providing shipboard identification and cataloging of the electronic signature of missiles and aircraft. The system consists of sensors and computers which process electronic signals within parameters established in a threat library. The customer currently has an earlier version of this equipment in inventory.

a. The AN/SLQ-32(V)3 upgrade consists of hardware, technical documentation, and software. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of software to be exported is SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sen-

sitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives in the Policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

#### MARKETPLACE CERTAINTY ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am expressing sentiments for myself and on behalf of Senators WYDEN and MURRAY, as a fair reading of the Affordable Care Act, ACA, makes clear, S. 1462, the Marketplace Certainty Act, is not necessary to provide a permanent appropriation for the payment of cost-sharing reductions under the ACA. The ACA already prescribes that such payments are to be made from such a permanent appropriation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1324. This is because an essential component of the ACA's system for ensuring the availability of affordable health insurance coverage is its two-part package of subsidies: tax credits and cost-sharing reductions. Whereas the premium tax credits make it more affordable for an individual to purchase health insurance, the cost-sharing reductions make healthcare more affordable by reducing the often daunting costs, such as copayments and deductibles, that even those with health insurance must pay to obtain healthcare, ACA, sections 1401, 1402, 26 U.S.C. 36B, 42 U.S.C. 18071. The ACA directs the Secretary of the Treasury to "establish" a single, integrated "program" to "make advance payment" of both subsidies to insurance companies, who are accordingly mandated to reduce individuals' premium payments to insurers, and their cost-sharing obligations to healthcare providers. To assure insurers and covered individuals that these equally essential funds will both be available, the act provides that requisite payments are to be jointly made from a permanent appropriation, 31 U.S.C. 1324, rather than be subject to the year-to-year whims of the annual appropriations process.

Despite the fact that the current permanent appropriation in section 1324 plainly covers these cost-sharing reduction payments, pending litigation brought by the House Republican leadership—which is currently being held in abeyance in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals—and the current administration's mixed signals as to whether it will continue to make these payments required by law, could generate instability in individual insurance markets. S. 1462 removes all basis for any further questions about what is already clear from a fair reading of the ACA as a whole: both subsidies are to be funded from the same permanent appropriation. In addition, the amendment includes provisions that will strengthen

the existing subsidy provisions, and, in light of developments since the ACA was enacted in 2010, make insurance more affordable for beneficiaries and help stabilize State-level individual insurance markets.

#### NOMINATION OBJECTION

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Steven Gill Bradbury, of Virginia, to be General Counsel for the Department of Transportation.

#### LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize LGBTQ Pride Month, a time to openly acknowledge and celebrate the contributions lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning individuals have made to our Country and the progress they have made over the years toward equality and civil rights.

Pride, equality, freedom—these values are at the core of Pride Month for LGBTQ individuals and families in Maryland and across the United States. Every American deserves the same freedoms, the same opportunities and the same protections under the law to love whom they love.

Respect, dignity, hope—LGBTQ Americans have helped drive the innovation and bold ideas that make America exceptional. They have stood sentry in our military, made scientific advances, created jobs from Main Street to Wall Street, made all of America laugh and cry, and so much more. LGBTQ individuals have enriched our communities and made us a stronger nation.

Fear, apprehension, caution—those of us who defend civil rights every day understand that these are discouraging and uncertain times. It pains me to say the full admission of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning individuals into society has yet to be granted. The open expression of one's sexual orientation and gender identity has been—and oftentimes still is—wrought with discrimination and hardship.

Despite the highs of Windsor and Obergefell, the LGBTQ community feels the pain of the senseless shooting at Pulse nightclub 1 year ago, blatant discrimination in States like North Carolina, and the incomprehensible abandonment of transgender students in schools, and the decades of injustice that reach back far beyond Stonewall. The results of last year's Presidential election brought an unwanted chill to the winds of momentum that had swept through the LGBTQ community. Insensitive language from the current administration adds an ominous cloud over the potential for future progress.

To all of my lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning

sisters and brothers, I say this: You are not alone. I support you. I will fight alongside you. We will not allow extremism to take away the inherent rights afforded to each and every one of us. Equality and liberty will prevail over any who would use hate and bigotry to frighten or intimidate others.

I have joined with nearly half of the U.S. Senate as a sponsor of the Equality Act, S. 1006, historic, comprehensive Federal legislation that would ensure full Federal nondiscrimination equality for LGBTQ individuals by adding sexual orientation and gender identity to other protected classes, such as race or religion, in existing Federal laws. Despite major advances in equality for LGBTQ Americans, including nationwide marriage equality, the majority of States still do not have explicit LGBTQ nondiscrimination protection laws. The Equality Act would fill in the gap by explicitly banning discrimination in a host of areas, including employment, housing, public accommodations, jury service, access to credit, and Federal funding.

When the White House broke more than a decade of tradition by failing to recognize June as LGBTQ Pride Month, I joined my colleagues in picking up the mantle by introducing the first-ever Senate resolution recognizing June as LGBTQ Pride Month. The resolution notes major milestones in the fight for equal treatment of LGBTQ Americans and resolves to continue efforts to achieve full equality for LGBTQ individuals.

As we build a new future of equality for all, despite the current headwinds, it is important that we learn from our Nation's past and use it as a source of strength and a teachable moment for those unaware of the history the LGBTQ community and what our Nation has been through. It is my firm hope that we are not seeing a redux of a McCarthy-like rise in political-driven discrimination.

For this reason, I was taken back a bit at the confirmation hearings of Rex Tillerson and Nikki Haley, who are now serving as America's top diplomats, that neither of them would say the phrase "LGBTQ." Following that peculiarity, it has been widely reported that the Trump administration has scrubbed LGBTQ content from various Federal Government websites—in some cases changing the agency's official nondiscrimination policy.

Juxtaposed with the Obama administration that lit up the White House in rainbow lights during Pride month and backed up those concrete actions of support, this attempt to erase LGBTQ individuals from government was disturbing. I was alarmed because I knew that it had been tried before during the McCarthy era. It had a damaging effect on U.S. foreign policy back then, and it cannot be repeated.

In what came to be known as the Lavender Scare, according to the State

Department's Bureau of Diplomatic Security, employees were forced out on the ostensible grounds that their real or perceived sexual orientation rendered them vulnerable to blackmail, prone to getting caught in "honey traps," and a general security risk. Many more individuals were prevented from joining the State Department due to a screening process that was put in place to prevent those who "seemed like they might be gay or lesbian" from being hired.

David Johnson's "The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government," University of Chicago Press, 2006, the definitive academic study of the issue, found that at least 1,000 people were dismissed from the U.S. Department of State alone for alleged homosexuality during the 1950s and well into the 1960s before the "scare" ran its course.

The Senate bears a special measure of responsibility for the Lavender Scare, as the State Department's actions were in part in response to congressional investigations into "sex perversion of federal employees," reports on the employments of "moral perverts by Government Agencies," and hearings or pressure placed on the Department through the appropriations process.

Last year, in my role as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I urged then-Secretary of State John Kerry to shine a spotlight on this dark period in American diplomatic history by issuing the first-ever public apology for the Department of State's targeting due to perceived sexual orientation.

This month, I introduced new legislation called the Lavender Offense Victim Exoneration Act of 2017, or the LOVE Act. Similar to what was enacted for the men and women of our military, who also were forced to hide their real self to the world, the LOVE Act would make amends and help right the wrongs that were leveled against our U.S. diplomats during this un-American and unacceptable episode in our history. The Lavender Scare is a painful but little-known chapter in American history, and even though times have thankfully changed in so many ways for the LGBT community, we must have the courage of our conviction to recognize wrong, apologize, and move forward with common sense and compassion whenever it is required.

A few have asked me, Why now? Why do we need to relive past transgressions when there are "more important things to do"? The answer is clear: The current administration may work to avoid using the words lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender, but Congress should take firm action to show LGBTQ Americans that their valuable contributions to our country—today or



60-plus years ago—are very real and they are recognized. We cannot and should not turn our backs on the individuals who sacrificed so much for the benefit of the American people. We cannot and will not turn back the clock on the hard-fought civil rights of the LGBTQ community.

The theme of the 2017 Baltimore Pride celebration is “Pride Unleashed,” a commitment to “work boldly and to live freely.” I can think of no better mantra for LGBTQ Marylanders and allies as we fight side by side to protect civil rights and celebrate the strength of our diversity.

I implore you and all of our colleagues to join the fight for LGBTQ equality. The administration also should take firm action to show LGBTQ Americans that their valuable contributions to our country are recognized and appreciated. It is the responsibility of each and every citizen to root out systemic intolerance. Inclusion and diversity are some of our Nation’s greatest strengths; yet these values are now in peril. We cannot and will not turn back the clock on hard-fought civil rights for the LGBTQ community.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BALLARD LOCKS IN WASHINGTON STATE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, with my colleague Senator CANTWELL, I wish to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the construction and operation of the Hiram M. Chittenden Locks, more commonly known in Washington State as the Ballard Locks. The Ballard Locks are not just symbolic of our region’s rich maritime history, but a century later, they remain vital to the economy, public safety, environment, and more in Puget Sound.

As early as the 1850s, settlers in Puget Sound recognized the benefits of connecting the region’s freshwater lakes to the saltwater of Puget Sound. Shortly thereafter, the U.S. Navy expressed interest. Ultimately, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Army Corps, initiated planning for the locks in the late 1890s and work began in earnest under Hiram M. Chittenden, the Seattle district engineer for the Army Corps from April 1906 to September 1908. Construction began in 1911 after the locks received approval from Congress, and the Ballard Locks were formally opened for vessel traffic on July 4, 1917.

The Ballard Locks enable commercial and recreational vessels to travel to the docks, shipyards, warehouses, maintenance and repair facilities, and marinas in the region’s freshwater lakes while also reducing maintenance costs and prolonging vessel life in the freshwater environment. The importance of the locks is underscored by

their annual usage. Each year, the Ballard Locks support 45,000 vessel transits and 14,000 lockage counts, which makes them the busiest lock in the United States in overall vessel traffic. If you only count commercial vessels from fishing fleets to oceangoing freight shippers and more, the Ballard Locks are the 12th busiest in the Nation.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleague Senator MURRAY in commemorating the Ballard Locks’ 100th anniversary. As our constituents in Washington State know, these locks are an integral part of our regional economy. The safe and efficient operation of the Ballard Locks supports \$1.2 billion in total lock-related economic activity, more than 3,000 full-time jobs, and more than 1 million tons of freight. With over 1.3 million visitors a year to see the locks and the fish ladder and visit the Carl S. English Jr. Botanical Gardens, the Ballard Locks are one of the region’s top tourist attractions generating another \$40 million in economic activity per year.

The Ballard Locks provide critical public safety and environmental functions, maintaining the water level of Lake Washington and Lake Union and preventing salt water intrusion from Puget Sound into these freshwater lakes. The locks support two floating highway bridges—Interstate-90 and State Route-520—the water and sewer systems that serve Mercer Island residents, and approximately 75 miles of developed commercial, municipal, and residential shoreline. It also allows for emergency response by the Seattle Fire Department, Seattle Harbor Patrol, King County Sheriff, and U.S. Coast Guard. The facilities spillway and fish ladder serve as a link for salmon and steelhead migrating from the ocean upstream to freshwater spawning grounds, which is important to fulfilling Federal Tribal treaty responsibilities.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, like other infrastructure across Washington State and the Nation, the Ballard Locks are showing their age. Senator CANTWELL and I commend the Army Corps for its work to restore and modernize the locks, and we are doing our part in Congress to support these efforts. Year after year, we work to help Presidential administrations understand the critical importance of the Army Corps’ work, and we make sure budgets actually reflect that need. We stand ready to continue to work with our partners in Puget Sound to complete the necessary repairs and upgrades of the Ballard Locks, as our regional economy and the more than 200 businesses that rely upon the locks cannot afford an extended, unplanned closure.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, together Senator MURRAY and I will continue to advocate for this critical in-

frastructure, working to ensure our colleagues and the administration understand the importance of the waterways and navigation systems in the Pacific Northwest. Investing in our water infrastructure supports jobs, economic security, and healthy communities. Senator MURRAY and I are proud to fight for the investments the Army Corps needs to operate, maintain, and restore the Ballard Locks.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO MARVIN QUALLEY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Marvin Qualley, a dedicated basketball official from Roosevelt County. This past week, Marvin was selected by the Montana High School Association for induction into the 2017 Montana Officials’ Association Hall of Fame.

Marvin’s recognition as a hall of fame official is clearly well earned. He has been a bedrock official in the northeast Montana basketball circuit for many years. From Plentywood to Poplar, the communities of northeast Montana have benefited from Marvin’s officiating. The 36-year duration of Marvin’s contributions to youth sports is simply amazing. The quality of his hall of fame career is evident in his frequent selection to officiate postseason competitions. He was behind the whistle for 15 State basketball tournaments and 60 total tournaments. In addition to his accomplishments as a referee, Marvin has spent many years behind the wheel of a school bus helping students in the Froid and Medicine Lake communities safely reach their destination.

Both behind the wheel and behind the whistle, Marvin’s commitment to safety and fair play has helped a generation of Montana students. Officiating youth sports is often a thankless task. Looking back on Marvin’s distinguished career, it is appropriate to sum it up with a sincere “Good job, ref!”

##### TRIBUTE TO MARY JO CODEY

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the legacy of a great New Jersey woman upon her retirement from a 40-year teaching career. As Mary Jo Codey wraps up her final school year at Gregory Elementary, a public school in West Orange, NJ, we congratulate her on a long and fruitful career inspiring and educating our children while putting them on the path to success. Even as the first lady of New Jersey under the administration of her husband, Richard Codey, Mary Jo refused to leave the children she loved so much, saying, “When asked if I would resign my teaching responsibilities during my tenure as the First Lady,



my response was consistently 'no.' Teaching was and is my passion!" Her dedication and service to her students and to her State will not soon be forgotten.

While teaching may have been Mary Jo's first passion, her drive to make life better for children and families extends well beyond the classroom. I have been honored over the years to work closely with Mary Jo on an issue near and dear to her heart. Ten to 20 percent of women across America are suffering from postpartum depression, and after the birth of her first son in 1984, Mary Jo was one of them. Then, after the birth of her second son, her depression returned, but this time she was able to recognize it and seek treatment for it. Instead of hiding her illness or being ashamed of it, Mary Jo's personal struggle became the motivation for her to raise awareness for postpartum depression and work tirelessly to improve diagnostic and treatment options on the State and Federal level.

Thanks to her leadership, New Jersey became the first State to provide resources to ensure that uninsured mothers can receive postpartum depression screening and treatment. I am proud to say that Mary Jo and I worked together to pass the Melanie Blocker Stokes Mom's Opportunity To Access Health, Education, Research, and Support for Postpartum Depression Act, or MOTHERS Act, as part of the Affordable Care Act in 2010. This legislation encourages better education, support services, and research for postpartum depression, and we owe its passage largely to advocates like Mary Jo Codey. Now, we still have a long way to go to ensure that postpartum depression and other aspects of maternal mental health are given the awareness and resources that they deserve. However, even as she closes the book on her teaching career, I know that Mary Jo's work is far from over, and she will not rest until we reach our goal. Whether it is her advocacy on behalf of postpartum depression or breast cancer, of which she is a survivor, her commitment to improving the lives of children, mothers, and families is unwavering.

With that, I look forward to continuing to work with Mary Jo in the coming years, thank her for her incredible service to New Jersey and all of us, and congratulate her on her retirement.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages

from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:42 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1215. An act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.

H.R. 1500. An act to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1215. An act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1500. An act to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1460. A bill to provide for the modernization of the energy and natural resources policies of the United States, and for other purposes.

#### PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator TESTER, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Brooks D. Tucker, of Maryland to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans' Affairs (Congressional and Legislative Affairs), vice Joan M. Evans.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with amendments:

H.R. 1029. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other ac-

tivities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

\*J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

\*David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

\*Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2021.

\*Derek Kan, of California, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1472. A bill to reauthorize the Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1474. A bill to prohibit the use of fiscal year 2018 funds for the closure, consolidation, or elimination of certain offices of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1475. A bill to provide for the identification and documentation of best practices for cyber hygiene by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1476. A bill to safeguard the United States and our allies from Russian ballistic and cruise missile threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1477. A bill to prohibit the use of official time for labor organizing activities by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs unless all veterans seeking hospital care or medical services from the Department are able to schedule their appointments within the wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1478. A bill to improve the Defense Siting Clearinghouse; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1479. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to improve the supplemental agricultural disaster assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1481. A bill to make technical corrections to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1482. A bill to provide a permanent easement to the Shishmaref Native Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1483. A bill to establish an account for amounts due to Shee Atika Incorporated under the Cube Cove Land Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1484. A bill to provide for a land exchange relating to the Admiralty Island National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1485. A bill to satisfy certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1486. A bill to amend the Barrow Gas Field Transfer Act of 1984 with respect to the Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation sand and gravel resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1487. A bill to provide for certain conveyances of surface estate under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1488. A bill to require full spending of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, to provide for expanded uses of the Fund, and to prevent cargo diversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1489. A bill to amend section 3312 of title 38, United States Code, to restore Post-9/11 Educational Assistance and other relief for veterans affected by school closures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1490. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act regarding the Nagamut selection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act with respect to the Native Villages of Haines, Ketchikan, Petersburg, Tenakee, and Wrangell, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1492. A bill to establish a Regional Corporation for Natives who are non-residents of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1493. A bill to require a study and report identifying the impacts on Chugach Alaska Corporation land that resulted from changes in Federal law or Federal or State land acquisitions in the Chugach region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1494. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in order to increase the dividend exclusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1495. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act regarding the treatment of fractional shares of stock by Regional Corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1496. A bill to amend the definition of Village Corporation in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1497. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1498. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive American women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1499. A bill to increase from \$10,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1500. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that the reciprocal deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1501. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to support maker education and makerspaces; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1502. A bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1503. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1504. A bill to direct the Attorney General to study issues relating to human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1505. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1506. A bill to improve the handling of instances of sexual harassment, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1507. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HATCH, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to modify the authorized uses of certain county funds and to extend the deadline for participating counties to initiate

projects and obligate funds; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1509. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize an extension of exclusivity periods for certain drugs that are approved for a new indication for a rare disease or condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1510. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for online voter registration and other changes and to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve voting, to require the Election Assistance Commission to study and report on best practices for election cybersecurity and election audits, and to make grants to States to implement those best practices recommended by the Commission; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1511. A bill to bring stability to the individual insurance market, make insurance coverage more affordable, lower prescription drug prices, and improve Medicaid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1512. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality from considering, in taking any action, the social cost of carbon, the social cost of methane, the social cost of nitrous oxide, or the social cost of any other greenhouse gas, unless compliant with Office of Management and Budget guidance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1513. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1514. A bill to amend certain Acts to reauthorize those Acts and to increase protections for wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1515. A bill to facilitate access to university technical expertise in support of Department of Defense missions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1516. A bill to expand health care choices by allowing Americans to buy health care coverage across State lines; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1517. A bill to enhance the Human Exploitation Rescue Operations Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CORKER:

S. Res. 210. A resolution to correct the engrossment of S. 722; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 211. A resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 212. A resolution recognizing June 2017 as "LGBTQ Pride Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 213. A resolution honoring the memory of Dallas Police Department Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, Sergeant Michael Smith, Officer Michael Krol, Officer Patrick Zamarripa, and Dallas Area Rapid Transit Police Officer Brent Thompson, who were killed during the attack in Dallas, Texas, that occurred 1 year ago, on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 214. A resolution designating June 19, 2017, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery legally came to an end in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 215. A resolution designating July 14, 2017, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Con. Res. 20. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the overtime rule published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Labor on May 23, 2016, would provide millions of workers with greater economic security and was a legally valid exercise of the authority of the Secretary under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Con. Res. 21. A concurrent resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 27, a bill to establish an independent commission to examine and report on the facts regarding the extent of Russian official and unofficial cyber operations and other attempts to interfere in the 2016 United States national election, and for other purposes.

S. 41

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 41, a bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 45

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 45, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed and for other purposes.

S. 65

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to address financial conflicts of interest of the President and Vice President.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 736

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, *supra*.

S. 1028

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1028, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1034

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1162

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1162, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a high technology education pilot program, and for other purposes.

S. 1279

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs through the use of non-Department health care providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, *supra*.

S. 1349

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to provide that the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisors to the commanders of the combatant commands shall be equivalent to the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for other purposes.

S. 1366

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1366, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1368

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1393, a bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. 1412

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1412, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a percentage of student loan forgiveness for public service employment, and for other purposes.

S. 1418

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1418, a bill to establish protections for passengers in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1426

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1426, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, and for other purposes.

S. 1435

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1435, a bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearm Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes.

S. 1465

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1465, a bill to terminate the prohibitions on the exportation and importation of natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, *supra*.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1478. A bill to improve the Defense Siting Clearinghouse; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1478

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defense Siting Clearinghouse Improvement Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. DEFENSE SITING CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) CODIFICATION.—Chapter 7 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 183 the following new section:

#### "§ 183a. Defense Siting Clearinghouse for review of mission obstructions

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a Defense Siting Clearinghouse (in this section referred to as the 'Clearinghouse').

"(2) The Clearinghouse shall be—

"(A) organized under the authority, direction, and control of an Assistant Secretary of Defense designated by the Secretary; and

"(B) assigned such personnel and resources as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

"(b) FUNCTIONS.—(1) The Clearinghouse shall serve as a clearinghouse to coordinate Department of Defense review of applications for energy projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 and received by the Department of Defense from the Secretary of Transportation.

"(2) The Clearinghouse shall accelerate the development of planning tools necessary to determine the acceptability to the Department of Defense of proposals included in an application for an energy project submitted pursuant to such section.

"(3) The Clearinghouse shall perform such other functions as the Secretary of Defense assigns.

"(c) REVIEW OF PROPOSED ACTIONS.—(1) Not later than 30 days after receiving from the Secretary of Transportation a proper application for an energy project under section 44718 of title 49 that may have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness, the Clearinghouse shall conduct a preliminary review of such application. The review shall—

"(A) assess the likely scope, duration, and level of risk of any adverse impact of such energy project on military operations and readiness; and

"(B) identify any feasible and affordable actions that could be taken by the Department, the developer of such energy project, or others to mitigate the adverse impact and to minimize risks to national security while allowing the energy project to proceed with development.

"(2) If the Clearinghouse determines under paragraph (1) that an energy project will have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness, the Secretary of Defense shall issue to the applicant a notice of presumed risk that describes the concerns identified by the Department in the preliminary review and requests a discussion of possible mitigation actions.

"(3) The Clearinghouse shall develop, in coordination with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, an integrated review process to ensure timely notification and consideration of energy projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 that may have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness.

"(4) The Clearinghouse shall establish procedures for the Department of Defense for the coordinated consideration of and response to a request for a review received from another Federal agency, a State government, an Indian tribal government, a local government, a landowner, or the developer of an energy project, including guidance to personnel at each military installation in the United States on how to initiate such procedures and ensure a coordinated Department response.

"(5) The Clearinghouse shall develop procedures for conducting early outreach to parties carrying out energy projects that could have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness and to clearly communicate to such parties actions being taken by the Department of Defense under this section.

"(d) COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the military impacts of projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49.

"(2) In developing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

"(A) assess of the magnitude of interference posed by projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49;

"(B) for the purpose of informing preliminary reviews under subsection (c)(1) and early outreach efforts under subsection (c)(5), identify geographic areas selected as proposed locations for projects filed, or which may be filed in the future, with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 where such projects could have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness and categorize the risk of adverse impact in such areas; and

"(C) specifically identify feasible and affordable long-term actions that may be taken to mitigate adverse impacts of projects filed, or which may be filed in the future, with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49, on military operations and readiness, including—

"(i) investment priorities of the Department of Defense with respect to research and development;

"(ii) modifications to military operations to accommodate applications for such projects;

"(iii) recommended upgrades or modifications to existing systems or procedures by the Department of Defense;

"(iv) acquisition of new systems by the Department and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government and timelines for fielding such new systems; and

"(v) modifications to the projects for which such applications are filed, including changes in size, location, or technology.

"(e) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DETERMINATION OF UNACCEPTABLE RISK.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not object to an energy project filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49, except in a case in which the Secretary of Defense determines, after giving full consideration to mitigation actions identified pursuant to this section, that such project would result in an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States. Such a determination shall constitute a finding pursuant to section 44718(f) of title 49.

"(2) Not later than 30 days after making a determination of unacceptable risk under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on such determination and the basis for such determination. Such report shall include an explanation of the operational impact that led to the determination, a discussion of the mitigation options considered, and an explanation of why the mitigation options were not feasible or did not resolve the conflict. The Secretary of Defense may provide public notice through the Federal Register of the determination.

"(3) The Secretary of Defense may only delegate the responsibility for making a determination of unacceptable risk under paragraph (1) to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, an under secretary of defense, or a principal deputy under secretary of defense.

"(f) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to request and accept a voluntary contribution of funds from an applicant for a project filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49. Amounts so accepted shall remain available until expended for the purpose of offsetting

the cost of measures undertaken by the Secretary of Defense to mitigate adverse impacts of such a project on military operations and readiness or to conduct studies of potential measures to mitigate such impacts.

“(g) EFFECT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HAZARD ASSESSMENT.—An action taken pursuant to this section shall not be considered to be a substitute for any assessment or determination required of the Secretary of Transportation under section 44718 of title 49.

“(h) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or limit the application of, or any obligation to comply with, any environmental law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘adverse impact on military operations and readiness’ means any adverse impact upon military operations and readiness, including flight operations, research, development, testing, and evaluation, and training, that is demonstrable and is likely to impair or degrade the ability of the armed forces to perform their warfighting missions.

“(2) The term ‘energy project’ means a project that provides for the generation or transmission of electrical energy.

“(3) The term ‘landowner’ means a person that owns a fee interest in real property on which a proposed energy project is planned to be located.

“(4) The term ‘military installation’ has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c)(4) of this title.

“(5) The term ‘military readiness’ includes any training or operation that could be related to combat readiness, including testing and evaluation activities.

“(6) The term ‘military training route’ means a training route developed as part of the Military Training Route Program, carried out jointly by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense, for use by the armed forces for the purpose of conducting low-altitude, high-speed military training.

“(7) The term ‘unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States’ means the construction, alteration, establishment, or expansion, or the proposed construction, alteration, establishment, or expansion, of a structure or sanitary landfill that would—

“(A) endanger safety in air commerce, related to the activities of the Department of Defense;

“(B) interfere with the efficient use and preservation of the navigable airspace and of airport traffic capacity at public-use airports, related to the activities of the Department of Defense; or

“(C) significantly impair or degrade the capability of the Department of Defense to conduct training, research, development, testing, and evaluation, and operations or to maintain military readiness.”.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REPEAL OF EXISTING PROVISION.—Section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (49 U.S.C. 44718 note) is repealed.

(2) REFERENCE TO REGULATIONS.—Section 44718(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “211.3 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 6, 2014” both places it appears and inserting “183a(i) of title 10”.

(3) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of title 10 is amended by inserting after the

item relating to section 183 the following new item:

“183a. Defense Siting Clearinghouse for review of mission obstructions.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by subsection (a), any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (49 U.S.C. 44718 note) that is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue in effect and apply to the extent such rule or regulation is consistent with the authority under section 183a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), until such rule or regulation is otherwise amended or repealed.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1497. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as a father of four and a traveling family, I know how important and challenging it is for nursing mothers to find a space to care for and feed their children. As our society and economy becomes ever more transient, we need to provide spaces for mothers on the go and ease their return to the workforce. Last Congress, I helped ensure the Bottles and Breastfeeding Equipment Screening Act became law, which eased the burden traveling mothers experienced. We need to continue easing this burden and expand facilities in public buildings.

Federal agencies, under current law, are required to provide space for nursing mothers to pump breastmilk for their newborns. Additionally, General Services Administration requires installation of these spaces for all newly constructed federal buildings, as well as those undergoing modernizations. These rooms are a simple hygienic place, other than a bathroom, that are shielded from view, free from intrusion, contain a chair, a table surface, and an electrical outlet. This is good policy and should be extended to the public when visiting Federal facilities for business or other purposes.

That is why I am introducing the Fairness For Breastfeeding Mothers Act. This legislation would simply extend the use of these facilities in public buildings to visitors, ensuring all mothers can continue to care for their children.

I want to thank Senator MERKLEY for being the Democrat lead as well as Congresswoman NORTON’s lead in the House of Representatives. I ask my Senate colleagues to join us in support of this important legislation.

S. 1497

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

# SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fairness For Breastfeeding Mothers Act of 2017”.

## SEC. 2. LACTATION ROOMS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 3315, 3316, and 3317 as sections 3316, 3317, and 3318, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 3314 the following:

### “§ 3315. Lactation rooms in public buildings

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY.—The term ‘appropriate authority’ means—

“(A) the head of a Federal agency;

“(B) the Architect of the Capitol; and

“(C) another official authority responsible for the operation of a public building.

“(2) COVERED PUBLIC BUILDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered public building’ means a public building that—

“(i) is open to the public; and

“(ii) contains a public restroom.

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘covered public building’ includes a building listed in section 5101 or 6301.

“(3) LACTATION ROOM.—The term ‘lactation room’ means a hygienic place, other than a bathroom, that—

“(A) is shielded from view;

“(B) is free from intrusion; and

“(C) contains—

“(i) a chair;

“(ii) a working surface; and

“(iii) if the public building is supplied with electricity, an electrical outlet.

“(b) LACTATION ROOMS REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the appropriate authority of a covered public building shall ensure that the building contains a lactation room that is made available for use by members of the public to express breast milk.

“(c) EXCEPTIONS.—A covered public building may be excluded from the requirement in subsection (b) at the discretion of the appropriate authority if—

“(1) the public building—

“(A) does not contain a lactation room for employees who work in the building; and

“(B) does not have a room that could be repurposed as a lactation room or a space that could be made private using portable materials, at a reasonable cost; or

“(2) new construction would be required to create a lactation room in the public building and the cost of the construction is not feasible.

“(d) NO UNAUTHORIZED ENTRY.—Nothing in this section authorizes an individual to enter a public building or portion of a public building that the individual is not otherwise authorized to enter.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 3315 through 3317 and inserting the following:

“3315. Lactation rooms in public buildings.

“3316. Delegation.

“3317. Report to Congress.

“3318. Certain authority not affected.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself,  
Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN,



Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1498. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive American women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, along with the senior Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act. This bill would establish an American women's history museum in our Nation's capital.

American women have made invaluable contributions to our Country in diverse fields such as government, business, medicine, law, literature, sports, entertainment, the arts, and the military. Telling the history of American women matters, and a museum recognizing these achievements and experiences is long overdue.

In 1999, a Presidential commission on commemorating women in American history concluded that an "appropriate celebration of women's history in the next millennium should include the designation of a focal point for women's history in our Nation's capital." In 2014, Congress took an important step toward realizing this goal when it passed legislation creating an independent, bipartisan Commission to study the potential for establishing such a museum in Washington, DC. Following 18 months of study, the bipartisan Commission unanimously concluded, "America needs and deserves a physical national museum dedicated to showcasing the historical experiences and impact of women in the country." Mr. President, I could not agree more.

The bill we are introducing today is the next step toward creating this national museum. Incorporating the recommendations of the bipartisan Commission, the bill would establish a national museum to collect, study, and create programs incorporating and exhibiting a wide spectrum of American women's experiences, contributions, and history. Although the Smithsonian Institution would be the governing body, the bill requires that the construction of the museum be financed entirely with private funds.

Mr. President, nearly 100 years ago, American women won the right to vote after a decades-long fight for suffrage. The story, leaders, and lessons of women's suffrage are among the most powerful in our Nation's history. As the centennial celebration of that historic moment nears, I can think of few better ways to honor those women and that momentous achievement than by passing this legislation. A museum dedicated to women's history would help ensure that future generations un-

derstand what we owe to those American women who have helped build, sustain, and advance our society. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1507. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing the State Flood Mitigation Revolving Fund Act of 2017 along with Senators KENNEDY and MENENDEZ.

The purpose of this bill is to reduce flood risk and the costs associated with flooding by establishing a State revolving loan program to fund mitigation projects for homeowners, businesses, and communities. This includes activities such as home elevations, flood proofing, acquisitions, and environmental restoration. By funding projects that reduce risk, the bill also provides an avenue to help middle-income and low-income property owners reduce their flood insurance premiums.

Mr. President, flooding is the most common and costly hazard facing American property owners. Every year, we are reminded of this when we see catastrophic flooding in communities across the country. Since 2010, my home State of Rhode Island has experienced two Presidentially-declared flooding disasters, which have cost the Federal government over \$86 million in payments from the National Flood Insurance Program. Nationally, disasters like these have caused FEMA to pay out an average of nearly \$3 billion a year in flood insurance claims over the last five years—not to mention the billions in disaster payments for uninsured damage.

Almost universally, experts remind us that the best way to reduce the cost of flooding is to engage in proactive, not reactive, flood mitigation. This is what the State Flood Mitigation Revolving Fund Act seeks to do.

Modeled on the successful Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, this bill creates a straightforward and easily accessible program through which States can offer low-interest loans to homeowners, businesses, and communities who want to mitigate their flood risk. By creating a revolving fund, the bill will allow States to design and more efficiently implement their own flood mitigation strategies provided that they help achieve Federal objectives such as reducing disaster payments.

Within this construct, the bill gives States the flexibility to undertake

flood mitigation projects without the red tape associated with other Federal disaster mitigation programs. The bill requires state to provide a match of 20 percent, but they would have an incentive to further leverage Federal dollars, as many already do under the drinking water and clean water SRFs.

Additionally, the bill ensures mitigation assistance is focused on where the flood risk is greatest and where people are most vulnerable. The bill requires States to prioritize mitigation assistance for low-income homeowners and geographic areas, pre-FIRM buildings, and severe repetitive loss and repetitive loss buildings. Finally, it gives States the option of providing additional subsidization for low-income property-owners and communities that simply do not have the wherewithal to assume additional debt.

Mr. President, as we talk about appropriate investments in infrastructure, mitigation is one place where we should be putting our money. FEMA reports that every \$1 we spend on mitigation generates \$4 in future savings. Not only will this legislation lead to a healthy return on investment, it will also create jobs through the work it funds.

I invite my colleagues to join me, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator MENENDEZ in supporting this legislation.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 210—TO CORRECT THE ENGROSSMENT OF S. 722

Mr. CORKER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

#### S. RES. 210

*Resolved*, That in the engrossment of S. 722, an Act to provide congressional review and to counter Iranian and Russian governments' aggression, the Secretary of the Senate shall—

(1) in section 216(c)—

(A) strike paragraph (4) and insert the following:

"(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.";

(B) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), strike "section 216 A3 that is described as" and insert "subsection (a)(3)(A) that relates to"; and

(ii) in clause (ii), strike "section 216 A3 that is described as" and insert "subsection (a)(3)(B) that relates to"; and

(C) in paragraph (7)(A), strike "but applicable" and all that follows through "disapproval,"; and

(2) in section 236, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

"(b) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—No provision affecting sanctions



or licensing actions under this title or an amendment made by this title shall apply to any portion of a sanction or licensing action that affects the importation of goods.”.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 211—CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND PERSECUTION IN CHECHNYA

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 211

Whereas, on April 1, 2017, the Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta reported that authorities in Chechnya, a republic of the Russian Federation, had abducted, detained, and tortured over 100 men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas multiple independent and firsthand accounts have subsequently corroborated the Novaya Gazeta report, and describe a campaign of persecution by Chechen officials against men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas, as a result of this persecution, at least three deaths have been reported and many individuals have been forced to flee Chechnya;

Whereas Chechen officials have denied the existence of such persecution, including through a statement by the spokesman for Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov that “You cannot arrest or repress people who don’t exist in the republic.”;

Whereas the same spokesman for Ramzan Kadyrov has also stated that “If such people existed in Chechnya, law enforcement would not have to worry about them, as their own relatives would have sent them to where they could never return,” and credible reports indicate that Chechen authorities have encouraged families to carry out so-called “honor killings” of relatives due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas Chechnya is a constituent republic of the Russian Federation and subject to its laws, and Ramzan Kadyrov was installed as the leader of Chechnya by Russian President Vladimir Putin;

Whereas Chechen authorities have a long history of violating the fundamental human rights of their citizens, including through extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, and torture of government critics;

Whereas Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov dismissed reports of persecution in Chechnya and termed them “phantom complaints”;

Whereas Russia’s Human Rights Ombudsman, Tatyana Moskalkova, has also claimed that such reports should not be believed because formal complaints have not been registered with the appropriate authorities;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Se-

curity and Cooperation in Europe and a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and thus has agreed to guarantee the fundamental human rights of all of its citizens;

Whereas, on April 7, 2017, the United States Department of State issued a statement saying “We categorically condemn the persecution of individuals based on their sexual orientation” and urging the Government of the Russian Federation to take steps to ensure the release of all those wrongfully detained in Chechnya, and to conduct a credible investigation of the reports; and

Whereas, on April 17, 2017, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley issued a statement saying “Chechen authorities must immediately investigate these allegations, hold anyone involved accountable, and take steps to prevent future abuses. We are against all forms of discrimination, including against people based on sexual orientation. When left unchecked, discrimination and human rights abuses can lead to destabilization and conflict.”: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the violence and persecution in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease the abduction, detention, and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(3) calls on the United States Government to continue to condemn the violence and persecution in Chechnya, demand the release of individuals wrongfully detained, and identify those individuals whose involvement in this violence qualifies for the imposition of sanctions under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) or the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Public Law 114-328); and

(4) affirms that the rights to freedom of assembly, association, and expression and freedom from extrajudicial detention and violence are universal human rights that apply to all persons, and that countries that fail to respect these rights jeopardize the security and prosperity of all their citizens.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 212—RECOGNIZING JUNE 2017 AS “LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 212

Whereas individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to

in this preamble as “LGBTQ”) include individuals from all States and the District of Columbia and all faiths, races, national origins, socioeconomic statuses, education levels, and political beliefs;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have made, and continue to make, vital contributions to the United States and to the world in every aspect, including in the fields of education, law, health, business, science, research, economic development, architecture, fashion, sports, government, music, film, technology, literature, civil rights, and politics;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve as law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders in all States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, the United States Army, Coast Guard, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, honorably and with distinction and bravery;

Whereas an estimated number of more than 100,000 brave men and women were discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States between the beginning of World War II and 2011 because of their sexual orientation, including the discharge of more than 13,000 men and women under the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy in place between 1994 and 2011;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, in positions in the Federal Government and State and local governments, including as members of Congress, Governors, mayors, and city council members;

Whereas, throughout much of the history of the United States, same-sex relationships were criminalized in many States and many LGBTQ people in the United States were forced to hide their LGBTQ identities while living in secrecy and fear;

Whereas, on June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in Obergefell v. Hodges, 135 S. Ct. 2584, that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and acknowledged that “many same-sex couples provide loving and nurturing homes to their children,” and that laws prohibiting same-sex marriage “harm and humiliate the children of same-sex couples”;

Whereas Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (referred to in this preamble as “AIDS”) has disproportionately impacted LGBTQ people in the United States partly caused by a lack of funding and research devoted to finding effective treatment for AIDS and the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (referred to in this preamble as “HIV”) during the early stages of the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas gay and bisexual men and transgender women of color have a higher risk of contracting HIV;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has maintained its unwavering commitment to ending the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face disparities in employment, healthcare, education, and many other areas central to the pursuit of happiness in the United States;

Whereas 31 States have no explicit ban on discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace, housing, or public accommodations, and 36 States have no explicit ban on discrimination against LGBTQ individuals in education;

Whereas LGBTQ youth are at increased risk of suicide, homelessness, and becoming victims of bullying and violence;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has faced discrimination, inequality, and violence throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States, in particular transgender individuals, face a disproportionately high risk of becoming victims of violent hate crimes;

Whereas members of the LGBTQ community have been targeted in acts of mass violence, including—

(1) the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida on June 12, 2016, where 49 people were killed; and

(2) the arson attack at the UpStairs Lounge in New Orleans, Louisiana on June 24, 1973, where 32 people died;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face persecution and violence in many parts of the world, including State-sponsored violence;

Whereas, in 2017 alone, hundreds of LGBTQ people around the world have been arrested in countries and territories such as Chechnya, Indonesia, and Bangladesh;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has gathered in some of the most dangerous places in the world to hold Pride festivals and marches, despite threats of violence or arrest;

Whereas, in 2009, President Barack Obama signed “Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act” (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2835) into law to protect all people in the United States from crimes motivated by the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of an individual;

Whereas the demonstrators that protested on June 28, 1969 following a law enforcement raid of the Stonewall Inn, an LGBTQ club in New York City, are pioneers of the LGBTQ movement for equality;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have fought for equal treatment, dignity, and respect;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have achieved significant milestones, ensuring that future generations of LGBTQ people in the United States will enjoy a more equal and just society;

Whereas, despite being marginalized throughout the history of the United States, LGBTQ people in the United States continue to celebrate their identities, love, and contributions to the United States in various expressions of Pride; and

Whereas the inclusion of LGBTQ people in the United States continues to expand every day and LGBTQ people in the United States remain determined to pursue equality, respect, and inclusion for all individuals regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the rights, freedoms, and equal treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this resolving clause as “LGBTQ”) people in the United States and around the world;

(2) acknowledges that LGBTQ rights are human rights that are to be protected by the United States Constitution and numerous international treaties and conventions;

(3) commits to ensuring the equal treatment of all people in the United States, regardless of sexual orientation and gender identity;

(4) commits to ensuring that the United States remains a beacon of hope for the equal treatment of people around the world, including LGBTQ individuals; and

(5) encourages the celebration of June as “LGBTQ Pride Month” in order to provide a lasting opportunity for all people in the

United States to learn about the discrimination and inequality that the LGBTQ community endured, and continues to endure, and to celebrate the contributions of the LGBTQ community throughout the history of the United States.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 213—HONORING THE MEMORY OF DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT SENIOR CORPORAL LORNE AHRENS, SERGEANT MICHAEL SMITH, OFFICER MICHAEL KROL, OFFICER PATRICK ZAMARRIPA, AND DALLAS AREA RAPID TRANSIT POLICE OFFICER BRENT THOMPSON, WHO WERE KILLED DURING THE ATTACK IN DALLAS, TEXAS, THAT OCCURRED 1 YEAR AGO, ON JULY 7, 2016**

Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 213

Whereas the horrific act of violence and hatred that occurred in Dallas, Texas, on July 7, 2016, was the deadliest attack on United States law enforcement officers since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the attack occurred during a lawful, peaceful, nonviolent demonstration and took place with the intention of targeting police officers;

Whereas law enforcement personnel and first responders performed their duties and responsibilities admirably during the attack and risked being killed for the safety of the people of Dallas;

Whereas President Barack Obama, President George W. Bush, and other officials joined together for a memorial service following the attack;

Whereas the Dallas Police Chief helped a wounded community heal in the aftermath of the attack and called on members of the community to join law enforcement and become part of the solution;

Whereas the Dallas Area Rapid Transit (referred to in this preamble as “DART”) Police Chief demonstrated strong leadership and compassion in responding to the first fallen officer from DART in the line of duty;

Whereas Friday, July 7, 2017, marks 1 year since the attack;

Whereas the community of Dallas and communities across Texas and the United States continue to support the victims of this attack and the families, friends, and loved ones of those victims; and

Whereas the community of Dallas and communities across Texas and the United States continue to support the brave men and women of local law enforcement for the dedicated service that local law enforcement provides to the community: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the victims killed in the heinous attack in Dallas, Texas, on July 7, 2016, and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(2) honors the survivors of the attack and pledges continued support for the recovery of the survivors;

(3) expresses the belief of the Senate that an attack on a law enforcement officer is an affront to the rule of law, the promise of justice, domestic tranquility, common defense,

general welfare, and the blessings of liberty secured by the Constitution of the United States;

(4) applauds the bravery and dedication exhibited by the hundreds of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials, emergency medical responders, and others who offered support and assistance during and after the attack; and

(5) stands together united against violence and hatred, and in support of the brave and honorable police officers across the United States who work every day to keep the United States safe.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 214—DESIGNATING JUNE 19, 2017, AS “JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY” IN RECOGNITION OF JUNE 19, 1865, THE DATE ON WHICH SLAVERY LEGALLY CAME TO AN END IN THE UNITED STATES**

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 214

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach the frontier areas of the United States, in particular the State of Texas and the other Southwestern States, until months after the conclusion of the Civil War, more than 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as “Juneteenth Independence Day”, as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas African-Americans from the Southwest have continued the tradition of observing Juneteenth Independence Day for over 150 years;

Whereas 45 States and the District of Columbia have designated Juneteenth Independence Day as a special day of observance in recognition of the emancipation of all slaves in the United States;

Whereas Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves and the descendants of former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race;

Whereas slavery was not officially abolished until the ratification of the 13th

Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in December 1865; and

Whereas, over the course of its history, the United States has grown into a symbol of democracy and freedom around the world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 19, 2017, as “Juneteenth Independence Day”;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the United States;

(3) supports the continued nationwide celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(4) recognizes that the observance of the end of slavery is part of the history and heritage of the United States.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 215—DESIGNATING JULY 14, 2017, AS COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES**

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 215

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 14, 2017, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day”;

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of

the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE OVERTIME RULE PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR ON MAY 23, 2016, WOULD PROVIDE MILLIONS OF WORKERS WITH GREATER ECONOMIC SECURITY AND WAS A LEGALLY VALID EXERCISE OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938**

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 20

Whereas the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) established overtime compensation requirements for certain employees when they work more than 40 hours in a given workweek;

Whereas under section 13(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(a)(1)), Congress delegated to the Secretary of Labor the authority to define and delimit the terms relating to the exemption for bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees (commonly known as the “white collar exemption”);

Whereas for more than 75 years, the Secretary of Labor has exercised its delegated authority to issue regulations that define and delimit the terms relating to the white collar exemption by applying a duties test and applying a minimum compensation level or salary threshold;

Whereas the Secretary of Labor began utilizing a salary threshold in the initial regulations defining and delimiting the terms relating to the white collar exemption, which were first issued in 1938;

Whereas Congress has long approved the use of a salary threshold by the Secretary of Labor, as demonstrated by the fact that Congress has amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 at least 10 times since 1938 and has not precluded the Secretary from using a salary threshold;

Whereas the salary threshold became woefully out of date and ineffective as a result of not being sufficiently updated to keep pace with a changing economy, as evidenced by the fact that more than half of all full-time salaried workers were covered by the salary threshold in 1975 and only 8 percent of these workers were covered by the salary threshold in 2015;

Whereas the salary threshold of \$455 per week, or \$23,660 per year, that was in effect on May 22, 2016, was below the poverty line for a family of 4;

Whereas the Secretary of Labor updated the salary threshold on May 23, 2016, through a final rule entitled “Defining and Delimiting the Exemptions for Executive, Administrative, Professional, Outside Sales and

Computer Employees” (81 Fed. Reg. 32391) by increasing the salary threshold to the 40th percentile of earnings of full-time salaried employees in the lowest-wage Census Region, resulting in a salary threshold of \$913 per week or \$47,476 per year;

Whereas the final rule would benefit more than 13,000,000 employees by providing overtime compensation protections to 4,200,000 new employees and strengthening overtime compensation protections for 8,900,000 additional employees;

Whereas the Secretary of Labor went through a thorough process in crafting the final rule, seeking public input and conducting extensive economic analysis, including—

(1) spending more than a year meeting with more than 200 interested parties to obtain input before issuing the proposed rule in 2015;

(2) considering more than 270,000 comments received during the 60-day public comment period on the proposed rule; and

(3) making significant changes in response to public input before issuing the final rule;

Whereas the public comments submitted to the Secretary of Labor regarding the proposed rule were overwhelmingly positive and supportive of the rule;

Whereas the increase in the salary threshold, included in the final rule, to the 40th percentile of earnings of full-time salaried employees in the lowest-wage Census Region, resulting in a threshold of \$913 per week or \$47,476 per year, was a strong yet measured increase by almost any measure, including as compared to—

(1) the higher salary threshold of \$970 per week or \$50,440 per year, initially put forward by the Secretary of Labor in the proposed rule;

(2) the salary threshold of \$984 per week or \$51,168 per year, which would be necessary to fully account for the erosion to the value of the salary threshold since 1975 due to inflation;

(3) the salary threshold of \$1,122 per week or \$58,344 per year, which would be necessary to cover the same share of all salaried workers as were covered in 1975 after accounting for changes in the economy; and

(4) the salary threshold of \$1,327 per week or \$69,004 per year, which would be necessary to cover the same percentage of all salaried workers as were covered in 1975;

Whereas the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas erroneously called the authority of the Secretary of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 into question when it issued a preliminary injunction enjoining the Department of Labor from enforcing the final overtime rule; and

Whereas millions of workers eagerly await a fair day’s pay for a hard day’s work: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress that the final rule issued on May 23, 2016, by the Secretary of Labor entitled “Defining and Delimiting the Exemptions for Executive, Administrative, Professional, Outside Sales and Computer Employees” (81 Fed. Reg. 32391)—

(1) would provide more than 13,000,000 workers with greater economic security;

(2) was created through the legally valid exercise of the congressionally-delegated authority of the Secretary of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; and

(3) should be defended and enforced with due haste.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO UNCONDITIONALLY RELEASE LIU XIAOBO, TOGETHER WITH HIS WIFE LIU XIA, TO ALLOW THEM TO FREELY MEET WITH FRIENDS, FAMILY, AND COUNSEL AND SEEK MEDICAL TREATMENT WHEREVER THEY DESIRE

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 21

Whereas Liu Xiaobo has inspired untold numbers of people in the People's Republic of China and globally for his courageous stands for democracy, the protection of human rights, and peaceful change in China;

Whereas, on December 9, 2008, a diverse group of more than 300 Chinese scholars, writers, lawyers, and activists issued Charter 08, a manifesto calling on the Chinese Communist Party to abandon authoritarian rule in favor of democracy, the guarantee of human rights, and the rule of law;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was one of the original drafters of Charter 08 and was taken into custody one day before the manifesto was released;

Whereas, in December 2009, a Beijing court sentenced Liu Xiaobo to 11 years in prison for "inciting subversion of state power," in part for his role in Charter 08;

Whereas, in recognition of Liu Xiaobo's long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in the People's Republic of China, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 2010;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo's wife, Liu Xia, has been held in extralegal home confinement since October 2010, 2 weeks after her husband's Nobel Peace Prize award was announced, and has reportedly suffered severe health problems over the years which required hospitalization;

Whereas, in May 2011, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention issued opinions declaring that the Chinese Government's imprisonment of Liu Xiaobo and the detention of Liu Xia both contravened the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was diagnosed with terminal liver cancer in May 2017 and granted permission to access medical treatment outside of prison, and is currently hospitalized in China;

Whereas, according to news and family reports, Liu Xiaobo's cancer has metastasized and the Government of the People's Republic of China has refused requests by his family to transfer him to Beijing for medical treatment; and

Whereas Liu Xiaobo currently cannot freely meet with friends and family or seek medical care outside of China: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) recognizes Liu Xiaobo for his decades of peaceful struggle for basic human rights and democracy in the People's Republic of China;

(2) urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire; and

(3) urges the President to seek humanitarian transfer from the People's Republic of China for Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, so that he can seek medical treatment in the United States or elsewhere overseas.

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Steven Gill Bradbury, of Virginia, to be General Counsel for the Department of Transportation, dated June 29, 2017.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 3, 2017, AT 6 P.M.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:45 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 3, 2017, at 6 p.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MATTHEW P. DONOVAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE LISA S. DISBROW, RESIGNED.

ELLEN M. LORD, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY, AND LOGISTICS, VICE FRANK KENDALL III.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

CHRISTOPHER CAMPBELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE CYRUS AMIR-MOKRI, RESIGNED.

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PETER B. DAVIDSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, VICE KELLY R. WELSH, RESIGNED.

### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

ROBERT L. SUMWALT III, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE CHRISTOPHER A. HART.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BRENDA BURMAN, OF ARIZONA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION, VICE ESTEVAN R. LOPEZ.

DOUGLAS W. DOMENECH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE ESTHER PUAKELA KIA'AINA.

### UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

JASON KEARNS, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2024, VICE DEAN A. PINKERT, RESIGNED.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LUIS E. ARREAGA, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA.

KRISHNA R. URS, OF CONNECTICUT, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PERU.

### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

JEROME M. ADAMS, OF INDIANA, TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, AND TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE VIVEK HALLEGGERE MURTHY.

### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

JANET DHILLON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2022, VICE JENNY R. YANG, TERM EXPIRING.

SION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2022, VICE JENNY R. YANG, TERM EXPIRING.

### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

WILLIAM J. EMANUEL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2021, VICE KENT YOSHIO HIROZAWA, TERM EXPIRED.

### NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

GERALD W. FAUTH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2020, VICE HARRY R. HOGLANDER, TERM EXPIRED.

### THE JUDICIARY

JOSHUA A. DEAHL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ERIC T. WASHINGTON, RETIRED.

### OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

SUSAN M. GORDON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE PRINCIPAL DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE, VICE STEPHANIE O'SULLIVAN.

### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ERIC S. DREIBAND, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE THOMAS E. PEREZ, RESIGNED.

### FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ANDREW K. ABORDONADO, OF CALIFORNIA  
KAREN A. ANTONYAN, OF NEVADA  
TOBEI B. ARAI, OF GEORGIA  
CLAIRE T. BEA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
KAREN D. BETTENCOURT, OF CALIFORNIA  
BENJAMIN B. CHAPMAN, OF MARYLAND  
HEATHER M. CHASE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
JOHN T. CHENG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
BERNARDO A. DIAZ, OF NEW MEXICO  
CAROLINA ESCALERA, OF FLORIDA  
REBECCA E. FARMER, OF WASHINGTON  
BENJAMIN M. FEHRMAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA  
PAUL R. FLEMING, OF FLORIDA  
ERIC W. GROFF, OF WASHINGTON  
COLIN B. GUARD, OF WASHINGTON  
JULIAN A. HADAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
THEODORE L. HO, OF CALIFORNIA  
STEPHEN E. HUNKE, OF FLORIDA  
ARIEL R. JAHNER, OF CALIFORNIA  
CHRISTOPHER D. JOHNSON, OF NEW YORK  
JOSHUA R. JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA  
BRIANA N. JONES, OF NEW YORK  
JEFF JUNG, OF CALIFORNIA  
JOHN-MARSHALL KLEIN, OF VIRGINIA  
PATRICK E. KOUCHERAVY, OF VIRGINIA  
VICKY KU, OF NEW YORK  
ADAM M. LEVY, OF MASSACHUSETTS  
ANGELO M. MAESTAS, OF WASHINGTON  
MARK R. MALONEY, OF VIRGINIA  
SHIVA A. MARVASTI, OF CONNECTICUT  
AMY R. MONSARRAT, OF VIRGINIA  
THERESA L. MUSACCHIO, OF ILLINOIS  
DEBRA N. NEGRON, OF VIRGINIA  
STEPHANIE K. PARENTI, OF FLORIDA  
RACHAEL N. PARRISH, OF FLORIDA  
SAPNA K. PATEL, OF TEXAS  
SANDRA V. PIZARRO, OF IDAHO  
AARON H. PRATT, OF MINNESOTA  
ALEKSANDRA RISTOVIC, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
LAUREN B. ROBERTS, OF VIRGINIA  
ERIN E. ROBINSON, OF COLORADO  
ALEKSEY SANCHEZ, OF FLORIDA  
TABITHA J. SNOWBARGER, OF TENNESSEE  
RAEJEAN K. STOKES, OF CONNECTICUT  
KARLA R. THOMAS, OF WASHINGTON  
EMILY J. TIETZE, OF TEXAS  
PHILLIP C. TISSUE, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA  
DANIEL G. TOWNE, OF CALIFORNIA  
LAURA J. TRAVIS, OF VIRGINIA  
SARAH M. VAN HORNE, OF CALIFORNIA  
JOHN VOLKOFF, OF MARYLAND  
LILA F. WADE, OF OREGON  
PETER B. WINTER, OF NEW MEXICO

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

BRENDAN CARR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018, VICE THOMAS EDGAR WHEELER.

BRENDAN CARR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 29, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 29, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JODY B. HICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### GOP HEALTHCARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have offered their share of passionate words about the GOP healthcare bill.

And as can happen, the debate has been deeply polarized here, leaving Americans to wonder sometimes whether the facts get obstructed by the politics of the day.

So I want to take a minute and share what some experts have had to say about the Republican healthcare proposal. These are not politicians; far from it. These words come from folks who operate outside the walls of Washington's halls and have dedicated themselves to fighting for those struggling with mental illness.

According to the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the Republican healthcare plan will “force people with mental illness out of work, onto the streets, and into jails and emergency rooms.”

The legislation “shows dangerous disregard for the well-being of people

with substance use disorders and their families and erases decades of progress,” says the Association for Addiction Professionals.

Mental Health America tells us that this bill “will ultimately do significant harm to people with all chronic conditions, including mental illness, while increasing the cost of healthcare to everyone.”

The National Association for Rural Mental Health agrees, saying, “these actions will leave millions of Americans with serious mental health and substance use conditions without life-sustaining and essential health insurance coverage, especially at a time when the Nation is suffering from the largest opioid epidemic in history.”

In short, this bill would be, according to the American Psychiatric Association, “particularly devastating to the millions of Americans in need of mental health and substance use treatment.”

Mr. Speaker, these groups are not political organizations. They are doctors; they are healthcare professionals; they are patients; they are advocates who have dedicated their lives day and night to filling the gaps of a badly broken mental health system. Take it from them.

This is what TrumpCare is offering our country. This is what they are trying to sell us at a time when we are losing nearly 100 Americans a day to an opioid epidemic. This is what is being negotiated behind closed doors as we speak while the rest of us read reports that tell us that the death toll from opioids could reach well over half a million people in the next decade.

So let me be clear: You cannot advocate for comprehensive mental health reform and then stand on the opposite side of nearly every major mental health organization in this country. You cannot claim to be a champion for those suffering from mental illness and then support a bill that guts funding for Medicaid, which is the largest payer of mental healthcare in this country.

You cannot say that you are committed to addressing the opioid epidemic and then stand behind a piece of legislation that gives insurance companies cover to deny those patients addiction treatment and to tell those in the grips of addiction to summon just a little more will.

You have to choose: With these families or with this bill? Which side are you on?

### JULY AS PARKS AND RECREATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution with Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS to designate July as Parks and Recreation Month. It is a fitting time to celebrate our Federal, State, and local parks and recreation systems as so many start this summer season by visiting these facilities that are available within our communities or even a short commute.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 406 recognizes the important role that public parks, recreation facilities, and activities plays in the lives of Americans and the contributions of employees and volunteers who work daily to maintain public parks across the Nation.

As a lifelong resident of rural Pennsylvania and an avid outdoorsman, I strongly support our Nation's parks and recreation facilities. Our parks provide countless recreational and educational opportunities for individuals and families to engage in the outdoors.

This resolution simply recognizes and supports Parks and Recreation Month and the many benefits, including health benefits, that a healthy active lifestyle contributes in our park settings that is provided to all Americans.

Our parks generate opportunities for people to come together and experience a sense of community. They pay dividends to communities by attracting businesses and jobs and increasing housing values.

In the United States, public park operations and capital spending generates nearly \$140 million in economic activity annually.

Ninety percent of people in the United States agree that public park recreation activities and facilities are important government services, a figure that displays a base of support that spans across all people in the country regardless of race, income, gender, or political party affiliation.

Nearly 75 percent of Americans agree that it is important to ensure all members of their community have equitable access to public parks and recreation facilities. The most economically sound communities are those with ample and healthy public parks and recreation facilities and activities. In fact, a key factor in business expansion and location decisions is the quality of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

life for employees, with a premium placed on adequate and accessible public parks and open space.

Mr. Speaker, public parks and recreation facilities foster a variety of activity that also contribute to a healthier society. People who use public parks and open spaces are three times more likely to achieve recommended levels of physical activity than nonusers.

Americans living within a 10-minute walk of a park have a higher level of physical activity and lower rates of obesity.

Recreation programs at public parks provide children with a safe place to play, access to healthy foods, opportunities to be physically active, and enrichment facilities that help prevent at-risk behavior such as drug abuse and gang involvement.

Mr. Speaker, as our Nation celebrates Independence Day next week, scores of Americans will visit public parks and recreation facilities to spend time outdoors with family, friends, and neighbors. We are blessed with beautiful outdoor facilities. I wish everyone a safe and happy Fourth of July. Get out and enjoy the parks in your area.

#### CUTS TO MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of children and adults living with disabilities across the United States.

The cuts to Medicaid outlined in the dangerous Senate healthcare repeal bill will not only result in the loss of healthcare access for millions of Americans, but will also significantly reduce funding for In-Home Supportive Services in my home State of California.

Medicaid covers 50 percent of the program costs for In-Home Supportive Services. These funds provide care for an estimated 531,000 disabled children and seniors throughout California, which permits them to continue to live with dignity in their own home.

The \$772 billion cut to Medicaid outlined in this bill will have a devastating impact on seniors and people with disabilities who rely on Medicaid as their safety net for necessary long-term care services.

These cuts will directly affect the lives of my constituents, including 15-year-old Crystal from Santa Maria, California, in my district. Crystal was born with spina bifida, weighing in at just 2 pounds. She has survived under the dedicated care of her mother and grandmother, who are her primary caretakers. Crystal is covered by Medicaid, which allows her to receive specialized medical attention, adaptive medical equipment, physical therapy, and pharmaceuticals. Crystal's condi-

tion requires 24-hour care, a need that is fulfilled by the In-Home Supportive Services program. Her life is contingent upon this program.

I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to vote against this cruel healthcare repeal, also known as TrumpCare, for Crystal and the millions of our constituents like her who are at risk of losing their quality of life.

#### PLAYER OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Logan Aleshire, a senior at St. Cloud Tech High School, on recently being named the Minnesota High School Class AAA Baseball Player of the Year by the Minnesota State High School Baseball Coaches Association.

Logan is a star athlete, and due to his leadership and skills as a pitcher and shortstop, he helped lead his team to an undefeated season in this year's State tournament.

Logan excelled on the field this year, but we have known about him for a while. In fact, he has been a three-time All-Central Lakes Conference pick, and just last year he was a Times Baseball All-Area Team selection.

While his high school baseball career is coming to a close, I have no doubt we will see great things from this young man both athletically and scholastically in the future. We look forward to seeing what he will accomplish next.

#### A FARM FAMILY TO CELEBRATE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Kreitlow and Ford family on being recently named the 2017 Farm Family of the Year.

Built in 1898, the Kreitlow farm has been passed from generation to generation for more than a century, with each generation teaching the next about hard work and successful farming. Today, the Kreitlow farm is successfully operated by Willard Kreitlow, his daughter Marienne, and her husband Jerry Ford.

The farm was once a dairy operation, but since 1990, the farm has mainly become a vegetable and pasture operation. However, the work the Kreitlow and Ford family has accomplished goes far beyond the fresh produce they harvest. In fact, this hardworking family goes above and beyond by striving to educate others through their work with the Sustainable Farming Association of Minnesota.

I want to thank the Kreitlow and Ford family for not only providing quality food for Minnesotans, but also for educating others about the benefits of sustainable farming and giving back to their community. Our State is a healthier place because of their dedicated work.

#### 50 YEARS OF GIVING BACK

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the United Way of Central Minnesota for helping families throughout our communities escape poverty for an incredible 50 years.

Over the past half century, the United Way of Central Minnesota has raised more than \$100 million, allowing them to help fund other nonprofits who provide services that help Minnesota families in need.

It is largely because of the generous contributions from the United Way of Central Minnesota that the Boys and Girls Club of Central Minnesota was able to get off the ground in the 1970s and to be able to grow into what it is today.

Thankfully, the United Way of Central Minnesota continues to grow strong. In fact, they recently announced their latest partnership with the St. Cloud School District to create neighborhood resource centers for students and their families. It is inspiring to see an organization solely devoted to helping others. Sometimes when someone is down on their luck, all it takes is a helping hand to get them back on their feet.

On behalf of thousands of Minnesotans, I would like to thank the United Way of Central Minnesota for being that helping hand for the past 50 years, and we look forward to many successful years to come.

□ 1015

#### GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the 4 years that I have been privileged to represent the remarkable people and amazing communities of Illinois' Second Congressional District, I have come to this floor many times to urge action.

I have called for a budget that invests in jobs, farmers, and rural communities. I have called for action to address the trillion-dollar student debt crisis. I have called for real solutions that make healthcare affordable for all American families. I have spoken on many issues facing this House, but nothing I have spoken on is more important than protecting American lives.

I have begged for commonsense reforms that prevent children from being shot while playing at a playground. I have begged; I have pleaded; I have screamed; I have cried; and I have even ground the people's House to a halt with last year's historic sit-in.

What answer was I given? Was I given answers to take home to grieving mothers and police widows? Was I able to tell them that their loved one's death wasn't in vain and that we were

going to do something to save the next life? No. I was met with silence, and worse, an active effort to silence my voice and the voice of millions of Americans.

So I ask myself: Why? What is the issue? Why can't I, an elected Representative of the American people who draws my authority directly from the United States Constitution, get something done to save lives? Why can't we get a vote on commonsense, lifesaving legislation that is supported by 90 percent of Americans and more than 70 percent of NRA members?

Mr. Speaker, tragically, the answer is simple. It is greed.

Mr. Speaker, what is the cost of your inaction? It seems that \$5,950 you took from the NRA matters more to you than the 7,490 Americans we have already lost this year to gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that just 79 cents for an American life is the cost of your silence and inaction.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it might be easy for you to ignore the connection between those dollars and the lives lost, but I cannot—and I will not—ignore it. I will not let you ignore or forget it either.

I am going to stand here and remind you, remind the people of Wisconsin's First District, and remind all Americans that money matters more to you than these American lives. One dollar—one name. One dollar—one grieving family. One dollar—one lost American:

One dollar—Xavier Joy, 23, was a success story. He was playing football at Morehouse, was an AmeriCorps volunteer, and wanted to change Chicago for the better;

Two dollars—Blair Holt, 16, was killed shielding his friend on a CTA bus;

Three dollars—Hadiya Pendleton, 15, killed just weeks after performing at President Obama's inauguration.

While Chicago might make headlines, gun violence is killing people in every community, in every city, and in every town, including Wisconsin's First District.

Four dollars—Paramjit Kaur, 41, killed while trying to pray;

Five dollars—Satwant Singh Kaleka, 65, killed at the temple he founded;

Six dollars—Prakash Singh, 39, a reader at his temple;

Seven dollars—Sita Singh, 41, killed by a White nationalist for wearing a turban;

Eight dollars—Ranjit Singh, 49, murdered at his church;

Nine dollars—Suveg Singh, 84, killed while expressing his love for his God;

10 dollars—Harry Canady, Jr., 20, killed sitting on a porch in Racine;

11 dollars—Sean Bialas, 23, of Kenosha, shot and killed while physically unable to defend himself;

12 dollars—David Bauspies, 36, of McHenry, accidentally shot and killed in East Troy;

13 dollars—Jose Torres, 36, murdered on the 1600 block of Holmes Avenue in Racine;

14 dollars—Nicholas Chaulkin, 17, of Racine, killed by a domestic abuser, likely while defending his mother;

15 dollars—David Tilton, 37, of Janesville;

16 dollars—James Norris, 37, was killed at his job as a restaurant delivery driver in Racine;

17 dollars—Jeremy Trawitzki, 38, killed in Muskego;

18 dollars—Thomas Kruse, 41, killed in Muskego;

19 dollars—Joseph Hensel, 27, killed in Elkhorn;

20 dollars—Andrew Jones, Jr., 27, also killed by his friend in Racine;

21 dollars—Maurice Carter was shot and killed in a Racine County robbery;

22 dollars—Carl Nichols, 26, shot and killed by a friend in Kenosha.

#### AMERICA: LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one thing that we can all agree on is that America is the land of opportunity. Our beautiful country has remarkable stories about those young and old, who, through adversity, have gone on to achieve great things. Those human stories are often the best way for us to demonstrate why our country is so special. I would like to share two stories with you this morning.

Emily Torchiana recently visited my office while she was here in Washington, D.C., after being chosen for a Jefferson Award for community service. Just last week, she was also awarded the Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis Award for Public Service. Emily is from Collegeville, in my congressional district, and, after her own experience with severe cyberbullying led to a suicide attempt, she began telling her story.

Emily found people would reach out to her after each speech to share their own experiences and thank her for being so open with her journey. She is now the founder of a nonprofit focused on mental health advocacy, awareness, and services.

Emily's nonprofit supports mental health workshops in schools as well as workshops for parents and teachers so adults can learn how to support children and young adults suffering from mental illness. The mission statement of Emily's nonprofit includes working to reduce the stigma surrounding mental health, something I believe is a critical aspect for us all as we continue to develop and advance solutions for those facing mental illness.

Quoting from Emily's nonprofit website, she writes: "My hope is that the more people who will open up about

their struggles, the more others will feel comfortable reaching out for help. . . . Unlike physical illnesses, these mental illnesses are not seen, but that does not mean they are not there. I hope this will give us all the opportunity to walk briefly in the shoes of the fellow human beings we come across every day."

Emily's work is an inspiration to us all.

Congratulations, Emily, for being recognized for your outstanding service to communities across our country, and we wish you the best of luck with your career.

Ammar Al-Rubaiay is another young adult who has an inspiring and remarkable story. A reporter in my congressional district recently shared Ammar's story with me, and I want to take a moment to share a story about opportunity, hard work, and a young man fulfilling his dreams.

A native of Baghdad, Iraq, Ammar became a naturalized U.S. citizen in 2015. He was participating in a youth exchange program that transferred him to West Vincent Township, in Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District, where he attended Owen J. Roberts High School and ultimately attended Westtown School.

Ammar came face to face with al-Qaida before his move. In a column in 2009, journalist Michael Rellahan remembered reading Ammar's college essay.

Mr. Rellahan wrote: "In striking detail, Ammar recalled the day in June 2007 when he sat in his classroom at the Gifted Students School in his native Baghdad and a teacher came in to announce simply that: 'They are here—al-Qaida.'"

Ammar wrote in his journal: "At that time, I felt like I was a few minutes away from death, getting closer every second. I was scared, but not because I thought that I was going to die. I was scared because I was thinking about what might happen to my family when they heard that I got killed. My dad always told me, 'Don't go to school; your life is more important than your education,' but I never listened, and I always argued with him because I believe that my education was important enough to take the risky chance."

The gunman entered the room, looked around, and went away. They stole some cars, but left everyone alive. Ammar recalled: "Those seconds felt like years; they were the longest seconds in my life."

Here is the great part of the story: It is not a story; it is real life. Ammar was granted political asylum, and in 2013, he graduated from Bard College and has since completed medical school, moving on to a career to help others and improve their healthy lives.

We should be proud of him and the thousands of other young men and



young women every day who are fighting through adversity to achieve, who will go on to make this a greater country than it already is; and it is a reminder to all of us in what is, at times, a very divisive political environment that the reason that we do these jobs is to make sure that we are providing opportunity for the next generation, and it is they who will make our country an even greater place. It is their achievements that are the cornerstone of our country and a great reminder to all of us that we are a special country with special people doing great things every single day.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments and remarks of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) with regard to being mindful of the deaths from gun violence that plague our communities all across the country, and particularly as the summer has begun, these deaths will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about another kind of gun violence that makes our streets and homes unsafe, and that is the deadly encounters between civilians and police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I have wracked my brain trying to understand these deaths. I have grieved with the mothers who have lost their children. I have met with experts and attended roundtables on how to find a way to mitigate these fatal police encounters.

Let me tell you, I think I can propose a solution that we can all support, and that is H.R. 3060, the Preventing Tragedies Between Police and Communities Act, which would link law enforcement training on deescalation techniques to receipt of Federal Byrne JAG funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish that I could take full credit for this concept because I think that this legislation would both save civilian lives and police lives; however, this idea is rooted in the Police Executive Research Forum report which both Republicans and Democrats have cited. It was written by police officer peers and by police officer experts.

Mr. Speaker, what they found is that police academies require 58 hours of training on how to use a firearm and another 49 hours on other defensive tactics. While they don't require, they offer 8 voluntary—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8—voluntary hours on how to employ deescalation tactics in crisis intervention. We need to require this deescalation training.

This deescalation training curriculum would be to use verbal and physical tactics to avoid escalating the situation, use the lowest level of force

as possible and a safe response to identified threats, and be aware of mental health and substance abuse issues and crisis intervention strategies in order to appropriately respond. This training would provide police with the tools they need to prevent violent interactions and save not only their lives, but the lives of civilians, too.

We know that kids are out of school and that the tensions in our streets are high. Police are on alert, and far too many of us are distrustful of the police due to the painful and frightful memories of how many deadly encounters have dominated headlines—close to 1,000 in 1 year.

How can this Congress recess for the summer and not take up this bill? Yes, the Affordable Care Act is a big issue here before us in Congress, but if you live in communities of color around the country, the immediate healthcare issue for you is being shot by a police officer who has been sworn to protect you.

□ 1030

If you die at age 12, like Tamir Rice, who was shot by police for playing with his sister on a playground in Cleveland, how can you be concerned with Medicaid?

If you are killed at 31 years old, like Dontre Hamilton, who was shot 14 times by police for resting on a park bench in Milwaukee, nursing home care is not your priority. You won't have the good fortune of living that long.

I ask my colleagues to prioritize preserving lives by supporting this legislation.

#### RECOGNIZING RETIRED COLONEL ROBERT A. ATOR, II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize one of Arkansas' finest, Colonel Robert A. Ator, II, of Little Rock.

A veteran of the United States Air Force, Colonel Ator retired on June 3, 2017, after proudly serving our country for 28 years. Before joining the Arkansas National Guard, Colonel Ator served 11 years on Active Duty with the United States Air Force. He is a veteran of several major combat operations, including Operation Desert Shield, Operation Desert Storm, Operation Provide Comfort, Operation Provide Promise, Operation Joint Forge, and Operation Noble Eagle.

Ator is a graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy, where he married Michelle, his wife of 28 years, just 3 days after graduation. Today, his son, Cadet Third Class Robert A. Ator, III, is a sophomore.

Colonel Ator is the recipient of numerous awards and medals, including the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious

Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Medal, the Aerial Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster, and the Air Force Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster.

Colonel Ator is an example that all Arkansans and Americans can admire. I wish him and his family the very best in their future endeavors.

#### SALINE COUNTY CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the proposed plans for a career and technical education center in my district.

Lamont Cornwell of the Saline County Economic Development Corporation presented detailed plans to the Arkansas Economic Development Commission on June 8 for a center that is specifically aimed at training our State's skilled workforce community.

The center would allow students to enroll in science and technology career preparatory classes, careers that will only become more invaluable as our Nation moves forward.

The center will impact parents and children of all socioeconomic statuses and positively change our technical career education environment in central Arkansas.

As co-chair of the Congressional Skilled American Workforce Caucus, I was encouraged to see the recent passage of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education Act. I am encouraged to see leaders in Saline County step up and embrace a passion for our skilled workforce community.

#### HONORING FOSTER PARENTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of foster families around Arkansas and the organizations dedicated to their recruitment.

According to recent Arkansas data, the number of foster youths has outpaced the number of spaces available in foster homes by 1,283. Many families have already stepped up to the plate to provide a loving home for children in the foster system.

One such family, Andrew and Amy Baker of Searcy, Arkansas, was recently named Foster Family of the Year by our State's Division of Children and Family Services for their dedicated efforts to reunify foster children with their biological parents.

In addition, there are organizations around our State that have been at the forefront of recruitment efforts for foster families, including 50 families in the month of April alone.

One such organization is entitled The CALL, locally directed by Lauri Currier, who notes that a stable, loving home can make a huge difference in a child's life, specifically with regard to escaping the grasp of neglect and abuse.

Today I want to emphasize Ms. Currier's statement that if one family from each of the 6,000 churches around

Arkansas came forward to adopt, no more children would ever be waiting for a forever family.

#### FISHING WITH A HERO SUMMER PROGRAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a hands-on mentorship program in my district created through a partnership between the Bryant Police Department and the Boys and Girls Clubs of Bryant.

The summer program entitled "Fishing with a Hero" pairs Boys and Girls Clubs students with local police heroes to bond over the longstanding, joyful pastime of fishing.

Through a 2-day fishing instruction program, local police officers are able to build quality mentoring relationships with students in traditionally underserved or impoverished communities.

Along with being one of the students' favorite programs, the established relationships aid in creating long-term bonds between our law enforcement officers and local youth.

The stability and prosperity of our local communities hinges on mutual respect between our citizens and our law enforcement officers. The creation of genuine relationships at a young age ensures the longevity of that important respect.

#### HONORING ROBIN CREOLE AND DANNY REVIS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recent selfless actions of two extraordinary individuals in the Second Congressional District of Arkansas, Robin Creole and Danny Revis. Both men work tirelessly in the Benton School District transportation program.

#### MEDICAID IS A LIFELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, how many of us here have had an aging parent, a grandparent, an aunt or uncle who could no longer stay in their home alone? Seniors with Alzheimer's, dementia, and other special needs, someone to watch over them at home so they don't get lost or injure themselves or leave the stove on and injure others? Seniors with Parkinson's who need help to walk, to move, to get out of their chair, seniors too frail to care for themselves, or need long-term rehabilitation after a fall and an injured hip or an injured femur?

How many of us have worried about where they would live and how they would get the care that they need? And oftentimes, the real question is: How are they going to pay for that care?

Most people work their entire lives, save for retirement, pay into the system, yet still find themselves struggling to afford the care that they need. Both parents in middle class families have to work to barely make ends

meet; no money and nobody home to care for their parents or grandparents.

I understand the tough decision. You want to keep your loved one close, you want to care for them yourself, but you have to work and make ends meet to barely keep going. That is why most of the 1.4 million people across the country living in nursing homes rely on Medicaid.

For Americans in nursing homes, Medicaid is a lifeline. That is why TrumpCare's Medicaid cuts would devastate our Nation's seniors, leaving the 64 percent of nursing home residents who depend on Medicaid out in the cold. In fact, nursing homes account for 42 percent of Medicaid spending.

Under TrumpCare, many seniors will lose their nursing home care, grandmothers with disabilities would find it harder to be cared for, harder to walk, harder to eat, harder to bathe. Nursing homes give patients a safe and caring place to recuperate when they are weakened by disabilities but don't need to be in a hospital, and they provide families peace of mind knowing that their loved one has a safe and caring place to get around-the-clock care.

That is why we must stop TrumpCare. We cannot allow these deep cuts to Medicaid threaten the health of our seniors. We cannot rip these services away from the most vulnerable among us.

We must put seniors first. We must give voice to vulnerable seniors. Let's put people above partisanship, and solutions above ideology.

I oppose TrumpCare, and I will continue to fight to protect care for seniors and for all Americans.

#### RECOGNIZING RON AND DIANE WITHEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two lifelong servants from the State of Nebraska, former Speaker of Legislature Ron Withem and his wife, Diane.

Speaker Withem is retiring this month from 2 decades with the University of Nebraska, where he has served as the associate vice president for university affairs and the director of governmental relations.

As we see the end of one's historic career, we are reminded of the positive impact one person can have on so many. Ron and Diane Withem have selflessly dedicated their lives to the State of Nebraska both in educating our youth as well as through the legislative process. The impact they have made on the entire State of Nebraska is evident all around us in Nebraska.

The story of the Withems is one full of many accomplishments. After moving to Papillion, Ron and Diane both became respected teachers in our local

school district. Prior to entering politics, Ron was a teacher of history. Diane spent nearly 4 decades teaching in the Papillion-LaVista schools and prepared many students for college and success, including my own chief of staff, Mark Dreiling.

As leaders in our Democratic Party, Diane and Ron's political journey began in 1976, when they campaigned for Hess Dyas during the U.S. Senate primary. Later that year, they both worked for another former Second District Congressman, John Cavanagh, in the general election. Following Congressman Cavanagh's victory, Ron served as a congressional aide in his local office.

By the 1980s, Ron was a member of the Papillion-LaVista School Board and was a member of the Papillion Planning Commission. When the legislative seat in District 14 became vacant in 1983, Ron was tapped by Governor Bob Kerry to serve out the term. And serve he did.

Ron Withem dedicated 14 years of his life in our legislature, serving as the chairperson of the Urban Affairs Committee, the chairperson of the Education Committee, and the high mark being his election as the first Democratic speaker since 1970, which happened in a Republican-majority body of our officially nonpartisan legislature.

During that time, he rose to become one of the most well-respected voices in our unicameral, proudly working on issues that he was passionate about and that would have had a profound impact on our State.

Some of his accomplishments are easily visible, such as the Harrison Street Interstate Exchange. Working alongside local elected officials and business leaders, Ron's strong advocacy paved the way for what is now one of our most vibrant areas in the district.

A leader among leaders, Ron was instrumental in sponsoring and guiding many other important pieces of legislation into law. He negotiated the State's first major reform in K-12 educational funding, sponsored legislation granting tuition waivers for veterans' dependents, led efforts to improve accessibility and the transparency of our elections, and he worked to create Nebraska's first bone marrow drive system.

Through his years in public office, he was well-respected by both his colleagues as well as his constituents. Ron was known for his uncanny ability to remember bill numbers, the year a bill was discussed, and even the most minute details surrounding the debate. As his former aide, Michelle Waite, said: "He might be a donkey, but Ron had the memory of an elephant for sure." He was considered a master legislative strategist who knew how to pull together a coalition from both parties to get the people's business done.

After 14 years of serving in the legislature, Ron went to work for the University of Nebraska. During his tenure, he made a tremendous impact on our State by leading the university's legislative relations strategy. He also was the force behind the Building a Healthier Nebraska legislative initiative. The result of this initiative was a new cancer center, veterinary diagnostic center, and a health sciences center facility.

Ron was one of the architects behind the compromise that transferred the Nebraska State fairgrounds to the University of Nebraska for the development of the Nebraska Innovation Campus. This public-private partnership leverages university research for economic benefit, all the while preserving some of the history of our State fairgrounds.

His colleagues at the university talk about their tremendous respect for Ron. He was known for building quality relationships with others and his ability to meet daily challenges with positivity. Ron once said: "My goal is to communicate to policymakers the enormous value the University of Nebraska brings to the State and its people."

His passion for the university and the success of Nebraska's youth motivated him to work in higher education State relations. His achievements in higher education State relations did not go unnoticed. At the Higher Education Government Relations Conference in 2013, Ron was awarded the Marvin D. "Swede" Johnson Achievement Award, a very prestigious national level award.

As a fellow citizen of Papillion, I want to thank both Ron and Diane Withem for their positive impact that they have made serving our community and our State.

#### ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible work of the Anti-Defamation League, or ADL.

The founder of this uplifting organization, Sigmund Livingston, envisioned an America where we all are created and treated equally. This is an objective that remains ever-relevant in today's America. Through programming in schools, the ADL creates dialogue to educate and prepare students to fight back against hate and confront discrimination wherever it may exist. In addition, the ADL works to bring individuals together to build understanding.

□ 1045

I have had the pleasure of meeting a special person, Rabbi Gruenberg, a

leader in Congregation Beth El, in my community, as well as the Philadelphia ADL, earlier this year. I am proud to stand with my neighbors, advocates, and elected officials of every stripe to reaffirm that there is no room for hate or discrimination in any of our communities.

The work of the Anti-Defamation League must continue and expand, because the only way we can end senseless hate is by building bridges and engaging with people we may perceive as being different from ourselves.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the ADL for the incredibly important work they are doing. I stand with them, as should everyone in this Chamber.

#### SANCTUARY CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, finally, this week, we are taking up two pieces of legislation that will address a huge problem in my home State of California for a long time.

As California moves more and more towards becoming a sanctuary State, already having several sanctuary cities, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 move in the right direction toward law and order and what people expect from their government in providing for the public safety.

We go back to the story of two Californians I can think of off the top of my head immediately, Kate Steinle and Jamiel Shaw, Jr., taken needlessly by people who shouldn't have even been in the country. They were illegal immigrants who were allowed to slip through the system and cause the death of both of those fine young people in California.

Juan Sanchez was an illegal immigrant with a record of seven felonies. He had been caught and deported not once, not twice, by five times. He should not have been on the streets of California. But on July 1, he was roaming around free in San Francisco. He stole a gun out of a Federal officer's car, fired shots in public, and shot Kate Steinle in the back. San Francisco is a so-called sanctuary city, but it was not a sanctuary city for Kate Steinle.

By shielding illegal immigrants from Federal authorities, sanctuary cities are disobeying the law. These actions have fatal consequences, as Kate Steinle and her family found out.

Action we take this week on H.R. 3004, Kate's Law, will toughen the punishment for illegal immigrants who re-enter the country. The second bill, H.R. 3003, No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, cracks down on sanctuary cities, protects the public from dangerous criminals, and sends a message that if you are not with us in enforcing the

law, then you are not going to receive funding or other help from the Federal Government.

I think that is finally the right message coming out of Washington, D.C., for those who don't uphold the laws and see to the first duty of government, which is to protect and stand up for the safety of its citizens.

#### HONORING AL ST. LAWRENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Savannah-Chatham Metro Police Department's construction of its newest training facility, which memorializes long-time Sheriff Al St. Lawrence.

After 21 years of service as an officer, St. Lawrence ran for Chatham County Sheriff in 1992. Because of his outstanding service to our community, his constituents reelected him five times. He held this position until he passed away on November 25, 2015.

Sheriff St. Lawrence was also responsible for overseeing the significant renovation of the county jail, which ultimately added an additional 400,000 square feet to the facility and doubled inmate occupancy.

Remembering Sheriff St. Lawrence's dedication to training personnel, the Chatham County Police Department developed the Al St. Lawrence Recruitment and Training Range. This range will not only provide effective training resources to officers but will also house the Sheriff's Office Internal Affairs Division and the U.S. Marshals Service.

The facility is located on 10 acres of property at the Chatham County Sheriff's Office and includes several training ranges, including cable ranges, steel target ranges, and a Rogers Range, which improves an officer's aim when discharging a firearm.

Twice a month, the facility will also host a civilian gun class, which is open to the public. Educating the public on firearm safety will reduce the risk of accidental deaths from the misuse of guns.

Sheriff St. Lawrence's enduring service will forever be etched in the history of Chatham County, and his contributions will ensure that Chatham County will remain a safe, thriving community for years to come.

#### LINEMAN APPRECIATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our electric linemen, the men and women who ensure our lights stay shining every day.

In Georgia, electric utility companies have started a movement to recognize the hard work linemen do every day. Companies such as Georgia Power and MEAG Power celebrate their workers, who make modern living possible.

Without linemen, we would not have many of the things we have grown accustomed to using. Air conditioning,

refrigerators, warm showers, entertainment devices, and plenty more, are all things we would have to learn to live without. It is easy to take these services for granted, but it is important to remember the people who make it all possible.

Earlier this year, we witnessed the valuable and honorable service these individuals provide when severe thunderstorms and tornadoes tore through Georgia over 3 days. Homes and businesses were destroyed and thousands of citizens were left in the dark. Crews of linemen all across the State joined together and selflessly worked for 2 weeks until every light was back on.

It is our duty not to overlook the workers and services that make our lives easier. I want to take this time and sincerely thank not just linemen in Georgia, but all linemen across the Nation, for powering the life inside our homes.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Bishop Stephen E. Blaire, Diocese of Stockton, Stockton, California, offered the following prayer:

O God, in this House, many words are spoken just as in our houses of worship.

Grant us, O Lord, the wisdom to speak words that will always be edifying—to build up our Nation as a people.

Let our words not only denounce war, violence, and injustices, but promote all that is necessary for building genuine peace through right relationships.

Let our words not only condemn exploitation, racism, and abuses of wealth, but demonstrate that the cries of the poor and excluded have been heard. Let our words promote building just systems that ensure the common good and protect the inherent dignity of every human life.

Let our words not only lament environmental degradation but promote all that is necessary for respecting the Earth as our common home.

Lord God, grant that our words will always build "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING BISHOP STEPHEN E. BLAIRE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to be joined by a special guest from my district, Bishop Stephen Blaire, who had the privilege of leading us in our opening prayer. Bishop Blaire oversees the Diocese of Stockton, and he was appointed by Pope John Paul II in 1999, becoming the fifth Bishop of Stockton.

Throughout his career, he has been a staunch advocate for workers' rights, commonsense legislation to reduce gun violence, and has promoted and worked towards social justice gains. As a newly appointed bishop, he followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, continuing to address the needs of Spanish-speaking parishioners by bringing more Spanish-speaking priests to the diocese and maintaining the ministry to migrant workers.

I want to leave Members with some words of wisdom from Bishop Blaire that I believe we can all take to heart as we head into the Fourth of July holiday. When he was appointed Bishop of Stockton, he said that his vision was to build a church that was strong in faith but also strong in service to the community. As we head home to celebrate the birth of our Nation, let us remember that, as Members of Congress, our job is to build a government the American people have faith in because of our commitment to serving their needs.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### ACA'S ONGOING COLLAPSE

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, every day there are more stories about the Affordable Care Act's, or ObamaCare's, ongoing collapse.

Insurers have been dropping out of the ACA's markets for 3 years now. It is estimated that two out of every five, or 40 percent, of all counties in the country will have only one insurer on the exchanges, and many markets may soon have none at all.

The House passed compromise legislation to provide the American people, especially those in the individual market, with more flexibility and choice and fewer Washington mandates, all while putting Medicaid, a critical safety net program, on a sustainable path.

Critics of this legislation have responded with hyperbolic, irresponsible rhetoric, and no solutions, other than higher taxes, more spending, and more Washington control.

Some ACA defenders are actually calling for a single-payer system, which would result in unbearably high taxes, even tighter grips from Washington, and unsustainable spending. It would destroy innovation, create scarcity, degrade quality, and drive up costs. Even the liberal California legislator seems to have abandoned the single-payer fantasy this week.

Instead of careening toward single payer, let's keep the promises we made to repeal and replace ObamaCare and meet the expectations of those who sent us here.

#### DEMOCRACY AND AUTONOMY FOR HONG KONG

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1997, Britain transferred sovereignty over Hong Kong to China. Under a "one country, two systems" arrangement with London, Beijing promised to allow universal suffrage as an ultimate aim, along with other freedoms.

But 20 years later, that promise remains unfilled. Last March, a new chief executive was elected, not by the people of Hong Kong, but by a committee whose members have close ties to the Chinese Government. Human rights groups have documented an erosion of press freedom and growing threats to judicial independence. Hong Kong's freedoms are at grave risk.

This Saturday, Chinese President Xi Jinping will visit Hong Kong to mark the 20th anniversary of the handover. Some protesters have already been detained, including Joshua Wong, who I have met, and newly elected legislator, Nathan Law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this Chamber to hold China to its word

and speak out in support of democracy and autonomy for Hong Kong.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to address illegal immigration and what House Republicans are doing to ensure Americans' safety. This week, we voted to defund sanctuary cities that harbor criminals like the man who murdered Kate Steinle in San Francisco.

My heart goes out to her parents and families around the country who have lost loved ones to foreign nationals who should have never been in this country in the first place.

We passed Kate's Law to increase penalties on previously deported illegal immigrants. Also, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act would defund sanctuary cities and prevent lawsuits against local governments that follow Federal law.

Shockingly, Nashville, in my home State of Tennessee, has been considering a sanctuary bill, even though murders this year already outnumber last year's total.

Some on the city council want Nashville to become a magnet for violent gangs that transport drugs and human beings. Sanctuary policies endanger not only San Francisco or Nashville but the entire U.S.

President Trump is cracking down on immigration crime. Illegal border crossings are down, and arrests and deportations of criminal aliens are up, just as Americans demanded last November.

Here in the House, we are keeping our promises and our country safe.

#### COMMUNITY-BASED POLICING EFFORTS VITAL TO PUBLIC SAFETY

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3003, a partisan bill that seeks to punish so-called sanctuary cities, strikes at the heart of community-based policing efforts vital to public safety.

Under this bill, States and counties where local police focus on community priorities rather than immigration enforcement would be punished, losing millions of dollars that could be used to build up communities, improve our Nation's infrastructure, and strengthen local government.

Moreover, this bill would jeopardize public safety by discouraging people from trusting law enforcement, sharing information, or reporting crime.

Across the country, most police chiefs have expressed serious concerns about policies that may lead to racial profiling or requiring their officers to break up families.

They have said that immigration enforcement should remain a Federal responsibility. Instead of forcing local police to act as immigration officers, we should work on passing comprehensive immigration reform that includes a pathway to citizenship for aspiring Americans.

And if we truly want to make the streets of America safer, Congress should act to strengthen bonds between community and police, invest in mental health and substance abuse services, reduce gun violence, and reform the criminal justice system.

#### TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT HENRY J. NYKAMP

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Staff Sergeant Henry J. Nykamp of Milford, New Jersey. This July, Sergeant Nykamp will be awarded the French Legion of Honour, normally reserved for French nationals. However, other nationals who have aided France or promoted its ideals can receive the recognition as well.

Due to Sergeant Nykamp's tremendous dedication to the allied cause in World War II, from June of 1943 to October of 1945, there is no one more deserving of the honor.

During World War II, Sergeant Nykamp was stationed in Hardwick, England, where he flew 35 missions as a B-25 nose gunner. Some of Sergeant Nykamp's most important operations involved low-level flying in support of ground forces during the Battle of the Bulge. He was awarded four Bronze Stars and five Air Medals.

Sergeant Nykamp's is a story of great sacrifice and courage. Mission after mission, flight after flight, he answered the call of duty. He entered World War II at one of the world's darkest hours and did not rest until the struggle was over and the forces of right had prevailed.

I am pleased that France is recognizing Sergeant Nykamp for his role in its liberation, and I also thank him for his tremendous service not only to the United States but to the allied cause.

#### IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IS RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R.

3003. This bill before the Chamber today, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, is another attack on the immigration communities and communities of color in my home State of Texas and communities throughout the country.

This misguided legislation would strip critical Federal funding for our local police agencies, such as COPS grants, that do not comply with Federal immigration detainers. Doing so would only undermine the public safety in our communities in Houston and Harris County.

Our local law enforcement officers for Houston Police Department and Harris County sheriffs are responsible for protecting the people of our great city and county and upholding our local laws.

They are not, nor should they be, de facto Federal immigration agents. The U.S. Constitution is clear that immigration enforcement is the responsibility of the Federal Government and not the States or local governments. To require local police officers to enforce Federal immigration law would not only violate our 200-year tradition of federalism but will tear apart the local trust our police and sheriffs have built with the immigrant community and communities of color over the years.

I ask my colleagues to let our local law enforcement protect our families and our homes and not be immigration agents.

#### SANCTUARY CITIES UNDERMINE FEDERAL LAW

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. So-called sanctuary cities have become a safe haven for illegal immigrants who have committed crimes. They undermine Federal law and put the safety of law-abiding citizens at risk.

Kate Steinle was murdered in San Francisco by an illegal immigrant who had seven felonies and had been deported five times. Where was Kate's sanctuary?

We are a country of laws, and we must enforce them and hold accountable anyone who violates them.

Sarah Root was killed by an illegal immigrant, street racing drunk. Grant Ronnebeck was murdered in cold blood by working the nightshift at a convenience store.

Mr. Speaker, no family should ever have to go through what these families have faced.

Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act will help protect our communities and help protect families from these senseless and preventable tragedies.

### COMBATING ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans get it. Frankly, it is just common sense. We can't continue to reward folks who come to our country illegally while those who work hard and play by the rules struggle to get ahead.

It is way past time to fix our broken immigration policies in America.

Today, the House is considering two commonsense reforms to combat illegal immigration, restore rule of law, and protect public safety.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act defunds sanctuary cities and cracks down on dangerous sanctuary city policies that shield criminal investigations from Federal immigration enforcement and puts American citizens at risk.

Kate's Law increases penalties for deported felons who return to America and commit further crimes.

Kate's Law was named after a young woman who was tragically gunned down by a five-time deported felon nearly 2 years ago to this day. It is outrageous.

The Federal Government's first duty is to protect its citizens. I urge my colleagues to support these much-needed reforms and then do more to stop illegal immigration in the United States.

□ 1215

### HONORING THE LIFE OF EMIL FRANZI

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Emil Franzi, a dear friend and a legend in our southern Arizona community.

Born on the Fourth of July, Emil Franzi was a patriot and outspoken conservative commentator, political strategist, columnist, and talk show host who had an encyclopedic knowledge of local politics. Franzi's radio career spanned three decades, and he was host for the "Inside Track." His passing marks the end of an era.

Franzi loved classical opera, guns, and the old west. He worked to preserve local western heritage through his "Voices of the West" radio show.

Underneath his curmudgeonly exterior was a soft and charitable heart. Not only did he raise three successful daughters, he also took in a number of youth as a foster parent with his wife, Kathy. Franzi also adopted many stray animals. One of them, here, he named after me: Martha, this 6-month-old puppy—one of the highest honors I have received as a fellow dog lover.

Emil Franzi passed away on June 7 after battling cancer. He was 78. He left

an indelible mark on southern Arizona. I am deeply grateful for Emil's friendship, advice, and his faithful support. He will be sorely missed.

### POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of June as National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month.

Millions of our Nation's heroes experience post-traumatic stress upon returning home from their service. Invisible wounds like PTS are just as important and worthy of treatment as physical injuries. Seeking help for PTS is not a sign of weakness or defeat, but a show of strength and commitment to a full and healthy life.

Treating PTS is not a one-size-fits-all process either. Our veterans need options to find the treatments that work best for their unique needs. That is why I am proud my legislation, the COVER Act, has been signed into law and will help increase access to evidence-based alternative therapies at the VA.

For National PTS Awareness Month, I stand committed to serving our Nation's heroes and improving their treatment options.

### HONORING THE ARKANSAS FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an extreme honor to note the accomplishment of a hardworking Arkansas Fourth District family. Mark and Shay Morgan and their daughter, Kate, of Clarksville, were named last December as the 2016 Arkansas Farm Family of the Year, and will compete this coming October among nine other State winners to be the 2017 Southeastern Farmer of the Year.

The Morgans' diverse farm is best known for its Peach Pickin' Paradise which consists of 3,500 peach and nectarine trees on 17 acres. I was fortunate to visit Peach Pickin' Paradise last fall and sample some of their produce. With peaches making up 60 percent of the farm's operation, it also consists of 600 acres of hay used for their 300 head of beef cattle.

Beyond their hard work on the family farm, the Morgans are a vital part of their local community, participating in a number of organizations that display the hard work ethic they live by.

Congratulations to Mark, Shay, and Kate Morgan as they have exhibited exemplary testimony to the American

Dream and to the Fourth District of Arkansas.

### RECOGNIZING RAY HECKLER, A TRUE AMERICAN HERO

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American hero, Ray Heckler, who is being laid to rest in Arlington today with full military honors.

Ray began his service to his country as a private in the Army, and retired after 40 years as a command sergeant major in the Illinois National Guard in Urbana. During his time in the Army, he served in Germany, Berlin, Japan, Paris, Africa, Morocco, Casablanca, and Marcel in France. He was awarded the Bronze Star in France for his heroic and praiseworthy service on the field of battle.

Remembered by those closest to him as being a helping hand whenever needed, Ray spent time with his community by working to construct and rehabilitate homes through Habitat for Humanity.

It is my honor to recognize Mr. Heckler and his devotion to our country. My thoughts and prayers are with his family as they mourn the loss of a truly courageous and selfless man.

Rest in peace, Ray Heckler.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM "RYAN" OWENS

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 2017, U.S. Navy Chief Special Warfare Operator William "Ryan" Owens was killed during a raid in Yemen. At the age of 36, he gave the ultimate sacrifice in order to protect our great Nation. He is survived by his wife and three young children.

This week I introduced a bill which would rename the Chillicothe, Illinois, post office in honor of Ryan's life and service as a Navy SEAL. My office and I worked closely with the U.S. Postal Service, the U.S. Navy Congressional Liaison Office, Central Illinois Gold Star Families, and, most importantly, Ryan's family. All of us were determined to make sure we got this right. His wife ultimately made the decision to name the post office after Ryan in Chillicothe, a town in my district, where Ryan graduated high school.

This effort has the backing and bipartisan support of the entire Illinois delegation, and it is our hope that the post office will forever remind the community of their hometown hero and his commitment to serving our country.

While we can never fully repay Chief Owens and his family for the sacrifices

he made, renaming the post office in his honor is a small effort to thank him for his service and his dedication to protecting America.

He and his family are forever in our hearts and prayers.

#### WELCOMING SOUTH KOREAN PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN TO WASHINGTON

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to rise to welcome Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea to the United States on the occasion of his first visit as President.

The United States and the Republic of Korea share a longstanding pivotal defense alliance, and we are bound together as fellow democracies who share common values.

The U.S.-Korea relationship has been a growing partnership, and now they are the United State's sixth largest trading partner. It is Florida's third largest export market, and we have over 1,700 Korean Americans in my district.

Korea is one of only five U.S. mutual defense allies in Asia, one of only three nations in the region to have completed a bilateral trade agreement with the United States, and hosts a U.S. military presence of nearly 38,000 Americans.

The Republic of Korea is our foundational partner in facing the gravest threats to the world's peace and security, and that is the rogue nuclear regime of Kim Jong-un. We will continue to stand together to address this grave threat and maintain our close bilateral relationship.

I give my most sincere congratulations to President Moon Jae-in on his first electoral victory, and I welcome him warmly to Washington during such an important time.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 29, 2017, at 9:11 am.:

Appointments:  
Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.  
Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission.

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3004, KATE'S LAW, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 3, 2017, THROUGH JULY 10, 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 415 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 415

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2017.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Armed Services may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017, file a report to accompany H.R. 2810.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my dear friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3004, also known as Kate's Law.

It should be instructive, also, Mr. Speaker, to recognize that H.R. 3004 had a companion bill that we debated on the rule yesterday—not voted on, we will vote on these today—that was a companion bill to this that is a very important bill. These are both effective law enforcement tools that need to be made available not only to protect the people of the United States, but, in particular, people who live in many of the jurisdictions that are being denied that support by effective law enforcement because of political policies that are being instructed by city councils and mayors across the country.

Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 2015, Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez shot and killed Kate Steinle at Pier 14 in San Francisco, California, while she was walking with her father. Mr. Lopez-Sanchez claims that he does not fully recall the murder, as he took strong sleeping pills prior to the incident.

Mr. Speaker, this senseless and cowardly murder should never have happened. Mr. Lopez-Sanchez is and was an unlawful criminal alien who had previously been deported five times from the United States of America.

□ 1230

He had numerous felony convictions in the United States of America, including for the possession of heroin and the manufacturing of narcotics in the United States of America.

Despite his lengthy history of criminal acts dating back to 1991, Mr. Sanchez was able to illegally reenter the United States again and again and again with minimal consequences, showcasing serious fault lines in one of our systems of deterrence: our border.

For years, the lack of immigration enforcement and the spread of dangerous sanctuary policies have failed the American people and cost lives. The death of innocent Americans, such as Kate, Sarah Root, Grant Roanebeck, and too many others across this country, is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. The American people have had enough. And I believe Congress has heard from the people, and we have heard enough and had enough.

The bottom line is we now have a President, Donald J. Trump, who not only heard this same story as he went around the country running for President, but had a different answer, because I assure you, the major candidates running for President on the Republican and Democratic ticket heard this same content. One person



stepped up to the plate. He is now our President: Donald J. Trump.

The American people are sick and tired of turning on their TVs or radios or newspapers and seeing yet another senseless murder committed by a previously deported criminal alien. Their deaths are especially devastating since I believe they could have been prevented if our immigration laws had been carefully enforced or we had, really, what I call the national deterrent: the will to stop these senseless acts. Kate's Law gets close to doing just that.

The underlying legislation that the House will be able to vote on in this rule and in the legislation today enhances the current maximum sentences for illegal reentry. The bill raises the maximum sentence for criminal aliens who reenter the United States to between 10 and 25 years in Federal prison, depending upon the criminal's history.

For all those who are attempting to politicize this legislation—and, yes, they are—I would encourage them to read the bill. Mr. Speaker, I have that bill in front of me as we speak, and it is really not too much of a lift. It is half of a page and four other pages.

Members of Congress do have time to read the bill. Members of Congress do have time to understand why we are here today. And it is more than just that is just the way it is. It is, in fact, a reality that has become all too known by every single American, and especially moms and dads, moms and dads and uncles and grandparents who hurt when our children are hurt.

So regardless of your position on general immigration reform, I would hope that you would join us today, join us today in agreeing that we should do everything we can to discourage murderers and criminal aliens.

Disagreeing one way or another on immigration policy is not what this is about. This is about where even there is the slightest potential that there could be citizens who would be harmed, we need a second look, a second opportunity, and a chance to address the issue.

The American people, I believe, need and deserve stronger deterrence of those who have come here illegally and have already proven that they are willing to break our Nation's most serious laws.

These are not huddled masses yearning to be free or families attempting to come here for a better life. These are bad people, and we call them criminals. They have violated the criminal conduct code here in the United States of America. They are people who we know are capable of terrible crimes, who, via their own criminal actions, have made sure that they have taken away the right that others had and, in doing so, have harmed the lives of our citizens.

The American people spoke clearly in November. President Donald J. Trump

understood that. This is a criminal matter; this is not a politics issue; and the time of letting the worst criminals back in our country over and over and over again must stop. The process begins again today.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all of us mourn the death of Kate Steinle, tragically shot and killed in San Francisco in 2015. Indeed, there isn't a parent anywhere who doesn't worry constantly about the well-being and the health and the safety of a child. And we all know, even though we may not have lost our own, we have deep sympathy with those who do. But as the Cato Institute has outlined, the legislation before us today would not have prevented that tragedy.

As the Cato Institute has said, the alleged shooter "did not end up in San Francisco due to lax border security, and the case actually shows the opposite. In recent years, Border Patrol caught him each time he attempted to cross."

He was only in the city because the U.S. Justice Department failed to do its job, and that is why Cato has called this bill, "a waste of Federal resources." Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, that these are the words of the Cato Institute, a group founded by the well-known conservative Charles Koch. Cato could not have been more clear when they said it this week: "Kate's Law would not have helped Kate."

Now, our country has listened as President Donald J. Trump called Mexican immigrants "criminals, drug dealers, and rapists." The public has watched him promote the formation of a deportation force to tear apart immigrants from their families and sign an executive order directing Federal resources toward the construction of a wall along the border between the U.S. and Mexico, where there is one mostly already that has not done that much deterring, but that is despite the fact that Federal spending on border security over the last few years has been at the highest level that our country has ever seen. It seems the majority has now taken a page from the President's playbook, apparently trying to turn his dangerous rhetoric into law.

It is shameful that they are prioritizing a bill that is completely unnecessary, since current law already imposes adequately severe penalties for illegal reentry, including enhanced penalties for criminal offenses. It is already covered, Mr. Speaker, but we do have something we need to fill the afternoon since the health bill failed. All the while, the majority is ignoring

the many, many, many major issues facing the Nation today.

Now, I know, and we all know, that the bill wasn't the only thing they were hoping to ram through here before we adjourned for the district work period. They also hoped to pass their healthcare repeal bill so quickly before leaving town that the American people wouldn't notice; but, frankly, even as I say that, they have noticed, as I understand now, that the approval rating for that bill is 12 percent. They have noticed. I think what they have noticed is that they are going to kill Medicaid.

The reason they wanted to do this in a hurry, repeal healthcare first, was in order to fulfill their tax bill promise of corporate tax cuts as well as tax cuts for the richest people in the United States. They wanted to take from the health bill, the expanded Medicare money, \$80 billion to pay for tax cuts. The devastation that that would create, I think most American people understand it.

If they have a loved one in a nursing home, that means that, since 64 percent of the cost of nursing care is borne by Medicaid, that they would very likely have to bring the person home.

It means that 22 million people would lose their health insurance. You know, we just say that, "22 million people." Let me put that number in some perspective. That number, 22 million, is more than the population of Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, D.C., West Virginia, and Wyoming combined. That is pretty impressive, isn't it?

In February, our President Trump said: "Nobody knew healthcare could be so complicated." Well, Mr. Speaker and Mr. President, those of us on our side who worked for more than a year to craft the Affordable Care Act knew that very well. I was chair of the Rules Committee at the time, and just the Rules Committee heard from 46 different Members of Congress over the course of three meetings which, together, lasted more than 20 hours, one of them a full Saturday of hearings.

So, together with the work done by the other committees of jurisdiction, the healthcare reform law received such a thorough vetting—and I want to get this on the record because I hear all the time it was written behind closed doors and strange people and nobody knew what it was and that we were all surprised. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Bill Kristol proclaimed on FOX News: "This is the most thoroughly debated piece of legislation in my memory in Washington."

I feel like I need to say that again, but I won't take the time, but how important it is. But those of us who were there knew it. We knew how many

committee meetings were held on this legislation.

On the bill you are talking about from your side, the majority side, not a single committee has heard it. I wager that the vast majority of the Republicans—who deserve to see it—have not even seen that bill, and that is a tragedy. We do not operate the United States of America that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison between the open, the transparent, and lengthy process that we went through to craft the Affordable Care Act—which, by the way, was written by experts—and what the majority is trying to do with this disastrous repeal bill.

And while I am at it, so many times when I was doing the rule on the repeal bills—and, you know, repeal and replace, repeal and replace. We know now that all those 7 years and those more than 60 votes that we paid for while we are running the House, that all this time there was no replacement. They still don't have a replacement. If that wasn't a hoax on the American people, I don't know what was. But the process we are seeing now is defined by backroom deals and secrecy and a complete disregard for regular order.

And I understand that, between now and tomorrow afternoon, there will be a lot of big deals changing hands so that we won't know next week what is there anyway, but we wait to see the new CBO score and see what that says.

Nearly every President since Theodore Roosevelt tried to enact healthcare reform. That is a long time. Teddy Roosevelt tried it and many Presidents after him. But after decades of failed attempts and false starts, President Obama, working with a Democratic Congress, was finally able to deliver.

The majority should work with us again. We are willing to do that. And what we would really like to see you do is take the ACA and the problems that it has and let's work together and improve that law, which has already been in effect now for a number of years, since 2014, and we could just move ahead and get on with things that are terribly important to us.

We wish that you would do that instead of trying to dismantle it. If it were dismantled, it would disrupt the markets. It would harm the sick and disproportionately impact those in nursing homes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), a distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, Kate's Law, the bill that this rule brings to the floor, is very personal to the people of my district because of two other names that we will never forget.

□ 1245

On October 24, 2014, Sacramento County Sheriff's Deputy Danny Oliver and Placer County Detective Michael Davis were brutally gunned down in one of the most cold-blooded rampages in the history of either county.

It began when Deputy Oliver approached a car in a parking lot to ask if he could help a couple who seemed to be lost. He was shot dead.

A bystander who was too slow turning over his car keys became the next victim. Miraculously, he survived a gunshot wound to the head but vividly remembers the smile on the gunman's face as he pulled the trigger.

The next victim was Detective Michael Davis. His father, a Riverside County Sheriff's deputy, had lost his life in the line of duty on the very same day 26 years earlier.

These crimes should never have happened. Their assailant had repeatedly entered this country illegally. While here, he had been apprehended for committing other crimes and repeatedly deported, only to easily recross the border without being challenged.

I have heard it said there is no evidence that illegal immigrants commit crimes at any higher rate than the general population. Well, that is just not true. It is true that crime statistics don't aggregate by legal status. Some States, like California, no longer even report the legal status of inmates. They can tell us by race, gender, age, background, and jurisdiction who stole a car last year, but they won't tell us how many illegal immigrants did.

By painstakingly piecing together all of the available fragmented data in 2015, FOX News concluded that illegal immigrants are three times more likely to be convicted of murder than the legal population.

According to this report, illegals account for 3.7 percent of the population but are convicted of 13.6 percent of all crimes, including 12 percent of all murders, 20 percent of all kidnappings, and 16 percent of drug trafficking. Each year, 900,000 illegal immigrants are arrested for crimes.

Citing the GAO, FOX reported that 55,000 illegal immigrants were in Federal prison and 296,000 in State and local jails in 2011. The real tragedy is that there should be zero crimes committed by illegal immigrants because there should be zero illegal immigrants in this country.

For 16 years, two Presidents—one Republican and one Democrat—ignored their constitutional responsibility to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Well, thank God, we finally have a President who takes that responsibility seriously.

This rule brings a bill to the floor that increases penalties for those who return to our country after they have been deported. The other to be debated today adds long-overdue sanctions to

local jurisdictions that refuse to protect their own citizens, and I rise in strong support of that bill as well.

It is too late for Officers Davis and Oliver. It is too late for Kate Steinle. It is too late for thousands of other Americans killed by illegal immigrants. But perhaps it is just in time for your neighbor, your family member, or yourself.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday marks the 2-year anniversary of the death of Kate Steinle, which was a tragedy for her family and for our entire community. My colleague from California has mentioned the murder of Officers Davis and Oliver, something that shook our northern California community.

These things are terrible, and I think we can agree that every Member of this House objects to, mourns, and is tremendously distressed and opposed to these criminal acts. But H.R. 3004 is not the solution to prevent such tragedies.

The bill expands criminal sentences for illegal reentry offenses, but, as has been mentioned by the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the person charged in connection with Kate's death—I believe he is, in fact, the murderer—spent over 16 years in Federal prison. He was repeatedly deported. It didn't prevent his crime.

I think it is important to recall that we are not here writing bumper stickers. We are here writing laws. So we need to examine what is the current law and what is the proposal to change the current law.

The discussion I have heard seems to assume that there are no harsh penalties in law for people who reenter without inspection. Nothing could be further from the truth. Right now, there is a felony provision for attempts to reenter. There are criminal penalties for reentry of certain removed aliens. For example, if you are removed subsequent to a conviction for a commission of three or more misdemeanors involving drugs, crimes against a person, or both, or a felony, there is a 10-year sentence. If you are removed subsequent to commission of an aggravated felony, it is a 20-year sentence, and on and on.

What does the bill do? It, for example, changes the 20-year sentence to a 25-year sentence. Well, you can argue whether that is wise or unwise. I personally think whether it is 20 or 25 is not going to be the major difference for a heinous criminal.

It also expands the definition of the misdemeanors that must be committed to entail these tremendous penalties. Right now, I mentioned it is penalties

involving violence or drugs. This would just be garden-variety misdemeanors. If you were driving without a license, if you were loitering, that would count for the 10 years in Federal prison.

I don't think that those provisions are likely to make a material difference in the kinds of crimes that we all abhor, but there is something else that is in this bill that I think needs to be attended to. The bill's sponsor claims this targets immigrants with criminal convictions, but the reality is the bill mostly affects other people.

The bill, for the first time, would make it a criminal offense for an individual who was previously denied admission or ordered removed to seek to reenter the country legally, even if the individual has no criminal history, no history of repeated reentries. The bill does this by adding a definition to the term "crosses the border" that includes those who enter the country in "official restraint."

This small change means it would be a felony for a person who has been previously denied admission or previously removed to present themselves at a port of entry to request asylum, parole, admission, or another form of entry consistent with immigration laws. This is a drastic departure from current law.

Under current law, an individual can be prosecuted for illegal entry if they are trying to evade or intend to evade detection. If they are trying to sneak in, they get caught, we charge them with a crime. An individual who comes to a port of entry and voluntarily presents herself to an immigration officer to ask permission to enter the country legally has not committed a crime. This bill would change that.

Think about that for a minute. The bill makes it a crime to come to a port of entry not with the intent to enter the U.S. illegally, but to ask for a form of entry provided by the immigration laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. In other words, this bill makes it a crime for someone to try to reenter legally.

If you are a victim of human trafficking and come to a port of entry to seek protection and, ultimately, a T visa, which the law allows, you would commit a crime under this bill. If your U.S. citizen relative is critically injured and you show up at the port to ask for humanitarian parole so you can donate blood or an organ to your U.S. citizen relative, you have committed a crime. In each of these cases, you can be prosecuted and put in jail for up to 2 years, even if you ultimately win your immigration case.

I also want to make a point about some of the other types of people this bill would affect.

According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, at least half of all the individuals convicted of illegal entry under the current statute, which is the most common Federal prosecution in law today, were coming to reunite with their family in the United States. Half of them had at least one child living in the U.S. Two-thirds of the offenders had other family members—a spouse or others—they were trying to get back to.

So, in addition to the people who are trying to enter legally, this bill massively increases penalties on people who are trying to get back to their families, many of whom are U.S. citizens.

The desperation of these broken families is a direct result of our failed immigration policy. Hundreds of thousands of immigrant parents have been deported over the years, leaving their U.S. citizen children as orphans in the United States. These parents—and I understand it—are trying to get back to their kids.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. We may think that is a good thing or a bad thing, but we don't think that it is a crime to love your child and want to get back to that child.

The desperation that these families feel is a direct result of our inability to create a top-to-bottom reform of our immigration laws that allows families to be united, allows the economy to meet its needs, allows the crops to be picked legally. We have created this problem by failing to enforce our laws.

This bill doesn't solve the crime problem that we all care about. It creates new problems. It is not the answer to the terrible offenses that are at the name of it. In fact, those terrible crimes seem to me to be merely an excuse to expand deportation for the many, many people whose only offense is wanting to be near their families.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the continuing work he does as the chairman of the Rules Committee. It is very important work for this Nation and the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are some debates on this floor that are very complicated. They hinge on technicalities and complex judgment calls. You need to properly weigh all the data, all the studies, and all the nuances.

But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that today's debate is not complicated. This

is not about nuance. The subject is not complex. This is about answering a simple question: Is the purpose of our government to protect the American people first, or is the purpose of our government to protect felons who have entered our country illegally, broken our laws, and threatened our people?

I wish this were an exaggeration, but American citizens have died because some local governments have refused to uphold our laws. These so-called sanctuary cities offer safety for illegal felons, but they do so by putting our families, neighbors, and fellow Americans in danger.

The American people now look to their government and they are uncertain. They elected people to represent them, but would those Representatives rather protect felons here illegally or their fellow citizens?

As far as this House is concerned, let us end the uncertainty today. Our government should, and always will, put the safety of American people first. Cities offering sanctuary for criminals will no longer be ignored. Criminals who threaten our citizens and reenter our country with no respect for our laws will be punished.

□ 1300

Kate Steinle, an American citizen, a daughter, and a promising young woman would be alive today if local governments did not act as a safe haven for lawbreakers. Juan Lopez-Sanchez shot Kate after being deported five times. He had seven felony convictions before he murdered her.

After this crime, we asked the same questions the rest of America did: How could this man be let free? Why was he in America in the first place? How can cities across our Nation continue to shield such people from the law?

In America, the Federal Government has little right to tell States and localities how to conduct affairs properly left to them. But our Federal Government has every right to demand that these governments follow our just laws written in accordance with our Constitution. And if they do not, if those cities protect criminals at the expense of law-abiding Americans, they should not expect their fellow citizens to help them through the Federal Government.

For those cities with laws designed to harbor immigrants who have entered this country illegally, our legislation will prohibit those laws, cut off Federal grant money, and allow the families who suffer as a result of their foolishness the right to have their day in court.

And to the criminals: If you break our laws and ever return, justice will come for you, and the penalty will be severe.

Mr. Speaker, being an American means something. We should never forget that. If America is your home, you are a citizen. If you are part of this national community, rest assured, the

government is here for you. The American people come first.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I inquire if my colleague has more speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have several more speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished young gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SESSIONS for his continued leadership here in the House of Representatives, and especially on this issue in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, which we are calling Kate's Law. Mr. Speaker, we are calling this crackdown on illegal immigration and sanctuary city policies Kate's Law after Kate Steinle.

For those of you who don't know the story of Kathryn "Kate" Steinle, she was a beautiful 32-year-old woman from northern California who was murdered on the streets of San Francisco while walking on a pier with her father 2 years ago this weekend. Murdered.

The alleged murderer, an illegal immigrant named Juan Francisco, had seven felony convictions and had been deported from the United States five times. Deported five times. Let that sink in. It is truly unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

Yet he was back in our country after maneuvering through the previous administration's weak southern border and negligent immigration enforcement. Then he lived in San Francisco due to that city's blatant disregard for Federal law, a sanctuary city. San Francisco was no sanctuary for Kate; no sanctuary for that beautiful 32-year-old woman.

If this story isn't a clear sign that our system is broken, I don't know what is. We need Kate's Law to increase criminal penalties for illegal felons like Juan Francisco who have been convicted for crimes, deported, and then decided once again to illegally re-enter the United States of America, a sovereign nation.

Kate's Law is straightforward, it is common sense, and it is the right beginning to make our homeland safer and get smart about immigration policy. It is time for us to make America safe again by addressing the lack of enforcement of Federal law. Kate's Law is the right answer.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for introducing Kate's Law so we can crack down on this kind of illegal behavior that so often means life or death for American citizens. It is time to enforce the law.

The gentlewoman, a few minutes ago, was talking about the law. Well, there

are laws on the books that say it is illegal to enter this country. There are laws on the books that prohibit these types of sanctuary cities or sanctuary campuses as we are now seeing. I hope Congress will cut off the funding to these cities. It is time to get their attention, to enforce Federal law.

I am pleased the White House has vocalized their support for the underlying bill should it reach President Trump's desk.

Now I call upon my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support the rule and the underlying bill. It is time again to make America safe again and honor young women like Kate.

This should be a bipartisan issue. Respect for the rule of law and protecting the American citizens is really that simple.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump campaigned on the promise of bringing jobs back home and removing barriers to job creation. But despite these promises, President Trump's budget does the complete opposite. It cuts job training programs by 39 percent, and its draconian spending cuts would lead to massive job losses.

My colleagues will be happy to hear that I have an amendment that will ensure that the President keeps his promise of bringing jobs back home.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative PASCRELL's Bring Jobs Home Act, H.R. 685.

H.R. 685 will close a tax loophole that rewards companies for moving jobs overseas, while providing a tax credit to companies that move jobs back to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, because I listened very carefully, I hope that, while I am opposed to the rule, we are debating a bill, in my estimation, to reinforce negative stereotypes about the immigrants.

I have listened to the response, perhaps, to that. Are you impugning through the Chair the record of Democrats on fulfilling our oath of office, the first part of which is to defend America from within and from without?

That is the oath of office. As co-chairman of law enforcement in the

Congress of the United States for over 14 years, I am very close to the law enforcement community.

I think we ought to hesitate a second before we start pointing fingers. We are good at it, all of us, on both sides.

While we are doing that, most of our constituents are concerned about how to defend middle class jobs and bolster our manufacturing base. The majority of Americans agree that keeping U.S. jobs from moving overseas should be a top priority. Yet, despite the empty promises made by this President, the flow of jobs overseas has not stopped.

Mr. Speaker, the administration had awarded government contracts to companies that continue to offshore jobs. This is worse than empty words. These are the facts.

In fact, we use our tax money to help those corporations go offshore. I hope that makes you feel really good.

In December, then-President-elect Trump told hundreds of workers at the Carrier manufacturing plant in Indiana that he would save their jobs. Six hundred union jobs from that plant are moving to Monterrey, Mexico. This is happening despite Carrier receiving \$7 million in tax incentives from the State of Indiana to keep the plant open.

Chuck Jones, president of United Steelworkers Local 1999, which represents Carrier employees, said that the President "lied his" you know what "off."

Layoffs at the company start July 20. We don't stop companies from offshoring American jobs by holding rallies. We do it by making good policy, an exercise this administration and this Congress has refused.

So what we haven't settled for—and we can't—is empty words and pyrrhic victories while we undermine our values. If they want to change that, my friends on the other side can start right now, and we will help them.

Under current law, when companies move overseas, we give them a tax break for the cost. That is unbelievable. We need to stop offshoring. This Congress could defeat the previous question and bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill eliminates the tax deduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives a tax credit of up to 20 percent of the cost to U.S. businesses that bring jobs back to the United States. The companies would have to add jobs to claim the tax credit.

Let's stop subsidizing companies that ship jobs overseas, and start bringing jobs back to our shores. In fact, we used it in the last campaign as a reason why we have a problem with employment, because the immigrants take

these jobs. That has been an empty fact. No details. No facts. No science.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't get much simpler than this. This is not a new idea. President Obama and Congress raised the bill for years. The House blocked it on the majority—on the other side.

Senator STABENOW of Michigan leads this bill in the Senate, where it cleared a procedural vote 93-7.

I challenge you today to stop the small talk, put your money where your mouth is, take up and pass this bill to stand for American manufacturing and the workers here at home who need help.

I urge a “no” vote on the previous question so we can bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act and start bringing jobs back to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to upholding the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President of the United States, including by repeating remarks made elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

This Saturday, July 1, marks 2 years since the tragic death of 32-year-old Kate Steinle, who was shot and killed by an illegal immigrant who had seven prior felony convictions and who had also been deported five times.

□ 1315

Kate's death is a clear reminder that we must do more to stop the abuse of our immigration laws by criminals who repeatedly flaunt the rule of law by illegally reentering the United States.

Kate's Law puts in place new guidelines for stiffer penalties for criminal aliens who continue to reenter the United States illegally. Kate's Law is desperately needed to protect the residents of the State of Texas.

Nicodemo Coria-Gonzalez—who had been deported five times to Mexico for crimes, including three DWIs—reentered the United States illegally and was charged with committing multiple sexual assaults and kidnapped a woman solely for the purpose of setting her on fire.

Current policy enables criminals to roam American streets—no matter where they come from—with little fear of arrest and deportation. Kate's Law imposes stronger consequences and is an important step in restoring law and order. It will protect American lives.

Sadly, there are local and State officials in our great Nation who put the

interests of criminal aliens before the safety of American citizens. These officials should take the time to meet with the families of the many victims of these criminal aliens, like I have. They will see the resulting tragedy of sanctuary city policies.

To rein in such States and localities, we need to pass the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, which will impose consequences on State and local jurisdictions that ignore Federal immigration law by refusing to work with Federal immigration officials to remove criminal aliens from the United States.

In the first month of the Trump administration, Immigration and Customs Enforcement issued over 3,000 detainers. These are orders for local authorities to keep criminal aliens in custody for 48 hours to enable ICE agents to come and get them for deportation. Remarkably, 206 of these detainers were declined by sanctuary city jurisdictions. In other words, local authorities deliberately ignored ICE's detainer request and released these dangerous individuals onto American streets.

These weren't just petty criminals, folks. Their crimes included homicide, rape, assault, domestic violence, indecent exposure to a minor, sex offenses against a minor, aggravated assault with a weapon, vehicle theft, kidnapping, driving under the influence, hit and run, and sexual assault.

Passing the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act is common sense, as it cuts off certain Federal Department of Justice grants to these sanctuary cities. Our bill redirects these funds to States and localities that are cooperating with Federal immigration authorities and making America safer.

The message of this legislation is clear: American taxpayers are tired of footing the bill for States and localities that threaten their safety.

Criminal aliens with final deportation orders make up more than 50 percent of foreign-born inmates sitting in our prisons right now. Our streets will be made safer by deporting these criminal aliens, rather than letting them loose onto American streets.

Local law enforcement officials should work with Federal law enforcement agencies to keep criminals out of our country and off of these streets. This is why we must pass Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act to prevent other deaths like Kate Steinle's.

I am proud to support these two commonsense, law and order bills, and strongly urge my House colleagues to vote in favor of them today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), one of the leading voices in Congress, not only on this issue, but also issues of great importance and it's

Americanism: that our country is a great country, and that we live in the greatest country in the world. There isn't one time that I am not around this gentleman that he does not speak about American exceptionalism, the rule of law, and the important attributes of our country that make us world leaders.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reciprocate in a compliment to the gentleman from Texas, who stands here and leads in this Congress every day, and takes on a heavy load in the Rules Committee. A lot of times those are late night meetings—maybe the rest of us have put our feet up, not so much me, but some of the rest of us, Mr. Speaker—and PETE SESSIONS is up there working away, keeping organization in this House, and helping bring these things to the floor. We would not be here on the floor today if we didn't have a Rules Committee to work with and that cooperated.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for joining with me on this and putting his name on top of this bill as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, or we would be still stuck back in hearings and markups.

This is a great week to be debating these immigration bills that are here. A big reason for that is that this is a hold-their-feet-to-the-fire week that many of us have joined, as the radio talk show hosts that believe in secure borders, the rule of law, enforcing immigration law, and building a wall come together at the Phoenix Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. We talk about the rule of law and enforcing immigration law. That has gone on now for a long time. I have joined in most of those.

But, also, this is a week that the grieving families, who have lost a loved one at the hands of a criminal alien in this country, have not only come to this city and joined in the radio discussion that has taken place at the Phoenix Park Hotel, but they also were invited out to the White House to meet with the President yesterday, where there were a number of these families that were there to be represented and respected. I would say two-thirds to three-quarters of them are people who I have worked with from nearly the beginning of the tragedy that struck their family.

I am greatly respectful of the individuals who have had the courage to step forward that President Trump has identified. I recall those times when he asked some of these families—Jamiel Shaw, for example; Michelle Root; Mary Ann Mendoza; and Sabine Durden, whose son Dominic was killed by an illegal alien.

These families are families that have paid a huge price, but they were strong

enough and courageous enough to step up on the stage with Presidential candidate Donald Trump and recount their stories to the media, some of them to speak before the national convention and reiterate these stories.

Just this morning, I heard Jamiel Shaw reiterate the story of the murder of his son that took place within the sound of the gunshots of the living room that Jamiel Shaw was sitting in. I have heard that now for 9 years, but the pain has not gone out of his voice, Mr. Speaker. We have some obligations here. And I heard it in the previous speaker: Keep our people safe.

Well, of those who die at the hands of criminal aliens, illegal aliens—anyone who is unlawfully present in America and perpetrates violence against an American citizen, kills an American citizen, or someone who is lawfully present in America—every one of those are preventable crimes, 100 percent preventable crimes.

I would just direct the attention here, Mr. Speaker, of a tweet that I had them pull down for me. I didn't know the date, but I saw the news story about Kate Steinle. It says: "Family devastated after woman shot, killed in San Francisco.

"The family of a San Francisco woman who was killed in a seemingly random act of violence is mourning her loss as police continue to search for a . . ."

And then it is lost in space—the article that I read.

But it must have been published on the 2nd of July—she was killed on the 1st—of 2015. My tweet came up on the 3rd, the very next day. I didn't stop to think about it. I didn't wait to see if it became a national story that Bill O'Reilly would bring up. By the way, I thank Bill O'Reilly. He helped a lot in getting us here today.

But here is a message I sent out, with a picture of Kate Steinle. It says: "100 percent preventable crime. Just enforce the law. This will make you cry, too, and it happens every day."

That is within only 142 characters, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a tweet regarding Sarah Root.

Sarah Root, 21, would be alive, living & loving life if Obama had not violated his oath & ordered ICE to stand down.

Teen charged in Iowa woman's death may've fled the country

Authorities say a teenager who was at the wheel of a car that was involved in a crash in Omaha last month that killed an Iowa woman has missed a court hearing and may have fled the country . . .

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, every day in this country, at the hands of criminal aliens, people who are lawfully here are suffering, and they are paying a huge price. There isn't a way that we quantify loss to a crime. The crime victim is often out of the equation when it comes to enforcing the law.

I sat in on a case where I was the subject of a severe property rights crime. I listened to them announce the case, the case of the State v.—I remember his name—Jason Martin Powell. It occurred to me that I am not in this. My name isn't part of the proceedings because we don't honor the victims enough.

Well, we are honoring them here today in a couple of pieces of legislation that are coming down, and we are honoring the life of Kate Steinle, and we are honoring the work of Jim Steinle, the rest of her family, and all of those adults who came forward and put their necks on the line for this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a gentleman who my party prays for on a daily basis.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot. We hear every day about healthcare.

This is a healthcare bill. It is for the health of Americans, the physical health of people, so that they have the right to good health, health that is sometimes prevented by those people who are foreign nationals that commit crimes in the U.S., go to prison, get deported, go back, come back to the U.S., and commit another crime. It is a healthcare bill. And I would hope that our friends on the other side would vote for at least one healthcare bill this year, and this is that bill.

The idea that a person could commit a crime in this country, get deported, come back, commit more crimes back and forth across the border, as we have heard, and continue to do it with lawlessness and arrogance is nonsense because the law is not enforced.

Our cities talk about the immigrant communities that live there. I live in Houston, Texas. This bill helps protect the immigrant population. We have got MS-13 gangs, criminal gangs, who come to the U.S. They set up shop in our immigrant communities, they terrorize those communities, and they do it with lawlessness because they believe, if they ever get caught, they will eventually be able to come back into the United States and continue their wicked ways.

This bill helps prevent that. If cities do not want to protect their immigrant communities, and law enforcement does not want to help enforce the law, then those communities shouldn't get Federal funds for law enforcement. That is what these two bills do.

So I would hope Members of Congress would understand the importance that this bill deals with criminal aliens that run through the United States committing crimes, get deported, and continue to come back. This legislation helps us, all together, to protect the American

health of everybody—those people who live in big cities and those people who live in small cities. It is a bill that protects the people who live in the United States and makes them healthier because we make sure that those people, who want us to be unhealthy by their criminal violent acts, are not in the United States.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 38th closed rule allowing no amendments that House Republicans have brought to the floor this year alone, and it is only June. At this rate, the majority is well on its way to becoming the most closed Congress in history.

Regular order seems to be a thing of the past under this leadership, with bills coming to the House floor, as these two are, for a vote without even going through the committee process. The immigration bills we considered this week didn't even go through regular order. The disastrous healthcare repeal bill, which would impact one-sixth of the Nation's economy, didn't get a single hearing, and hardly anybody saw it.

No experts were ever called to discuss its impacts, and it was jammed through the Chamber last month without even a score from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office outlining its costs or its impacts. The Senate has also completely bypassed the committee process.

I was proud to bring the Affordable Care Act, as I said earlier, to the House floor in 2009, as chair of the Rules Committee. That process couldn't have been more different.

Let me remind those watching today that the House held 79 bipartisan hearings and markups on health insurance reform in 2009 and 2010. During this time, House Members heard from 181 witnesses from both sides of the aisle, considered 239 Democratic and Republican amendments, and accepted 121 of them.

□ 1330

That process was entirely different from what we go through today. In fact, a lot of the Members of the House are really cut out of most of the process. The idea of getting an amendment is really pretty rare.

The legislation we consider here should be able to withstand scrutiny, but, more and more, the Nation's business is done in the dark, or by a few people.

Let's get out of the back rooms, Mr. Speaker, and let legislators of both parties do their job under an open process. That is what the Speaker promised when he took the gavel, and it is what all the books and Rules of the House of Representatives desire, and it is certainly what the American people deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we should not consider a bill that would cost tens of millions of people to lose health insurance, and not consider the anti-immigration bills before us today.

So I am going to urge a “no” vote on the previous question, on the rule, and the bill, and hope for better days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dialogue today with the gentlewoman, my friend, from New York, the ranking member of the committee, not only for her professional conduct today, but also for her day-to-day service to the Rules Committee as both she and I work through these difficult issues that face our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today has a lot to do with two bills that were taken out of a larger immigration bill. Yesterday, we heard a debate on H.R. 3003, and today, on H.R. 3004. They are, in sense, companion bills. Balancing acts is what I would refer to them as, acts about addressing two very specific problems that are in our country that are very interrelated.

These are law enforcement bills. Make no mistake about it. These are not political. These are law enforcement bills that are designed to make sure that we effectively codify into Federal law the viewpoint that cities cannot harbor criminals, rapists, murderers, or people who are robbing and killing people as they choose—multiple times—and cities turning a blind eye to not even recognize requests from other cities that might want these people, but also from the Federal Government.

The second bill that we have got is one that says that what we are going to do is not only not fund these cities that are sanctuary cities, but we are going to deal more effectively with these criminals in the system. That is Kate’s Law.

Both of these bills, H.R. 3004 and H.R. 3003, effectively balance each other because, as Members of Congress, we hear from people back home, many times, not just families from people who are impacted, but really citizens who are worried about our country dividing itself on this issue of criminals.

Make no mistake about it, these are criminals. Make no mistake about it, this is a law enforcement bill. Make no mistake about it, the United States Congress needs to ensure that our cities and States follow the laws, the Federal laws that we know have been, not only cleared by Congress, but signed by the President of the United States. They will be subject to review by the courts. We will be very pleased to take that review also.

Because, in fact, what we are doing is protecting American citizens. We are answering the call. And I would say, we are also making sure that we support the President of the United States,

President Trump, who spoke very clearly on these issues, not only during the campaign, but he was elected therein.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 415 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 685) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 685.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to

yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 190, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—235

|            |             |             |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Abraham    | Barletta    | Blackburn   |
| Aderholt   | Barr        | Blum        |
| Allen      | Barton      | Bost        |
| Amash      | Bergman     | Brady (TX)  |
| Amodei     | Biggs       | Brat        |
| Arrington  | Bilirakis   | Bridenstine |
| Babin      | Bishop (MI) | Brooks (AL) |
| Bacon      | Bishop (UT) | Brooks (IN) |
| Banks (IN) | Black       | Buchanan    |



|                 |               |                   |                   |                |                |                 |              |                   |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Buck            | Higgins (LA)  | Poe (TX)          | Green, Al         | Luján, Ben Ray | Sánchez        | Cole            | Issa         | Reichert          |
| Bucshon         | Hill          | Poliquin          | Green, Gene       | Lynch          | Sarbanes       | Collins (GA)    | Jenkins (KS) | Renacci           |
| Budd            | Holding       | Posey             | Grijalva          | Maloney,       | Schakowsky     | Collins (NY)    | Jenkins (WV) | Rice (SC)         |
| Burgess         | Hollingsworth | Ratcliffe         | Hanabusa          | Carolyn B.     | Schiff         | Comer           | Johnson (LA) | Roby              |
| Byrne           | Hudson        | Reed              | Hastings          | Maloney, Sean  | Schneider      | Comstock        | Johnson (OH) | Roe (TN)          |
| Calvert         | Huizenga      | Reichert          | Heck              | Matsui         | Schrader       | Conaway         | Johnson, Sam | Rogers (AL)       |
| Carter (GA)     | Hultgren      | Renacci           | Higgins (NY)      | McCollum       | Scott (VA)     | Cook            | Jones        | Rogers (KY)       |
| Carter (TX)     | Hunter        | Rice (SC)         | Himes             | McEachin       | Scott, David   | Costello (PA)   | Jordan       | Rohrabacher       |
| Chabot          | Hurd          | Roby              | Hoyer             | McGovern       | Serrano        | Cramer          | Joyce (OH)   | Rokita            |
| Chaffetz        | Issa          | Roe (TN)          | Huffman           | McNerney       | Sewell (AL)    | Crawford        | Katko        | Rokita            |
| Cheney          | Jenkins (KS)  | Rogers (AL)       | Jackson Lee       | Meeks          | Shea-Porter    | Culberson       | Kelly (MS)   | Rooney, Francis   |
| Coffman         | Jenkins (WV)  | Rogers (KY)       | Jayapal           | Meng           | Sherman        | Curbelo (FL)    | Kelly (PA)   | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Cole            | Johnson (LA)  | Rohrabacher       | Jeffries          | Moore          | Sinema         | Davidson        | King (IA)    | Ros-Lehtinen      |
| Collins (GA)    | Johnson (OH)  | Rokita            | Johnson (GA)      | Moulton        | Sires          | Davis, Rodney   | King (NY)    | Roskam            |
| Collins (NY)    | Johnson, Sam  | Rooney, Francis   | Johnson, E. B.    | Murphy (FL)    | Scott, David   | Denham          | Kinzing      | Ross              |
| Comer           | Jordan        | Rooney, Thomas J. | Jones             | Nadler         | Slaughter      | Dent            | Knight       | Rothfus           |
| Comstock        | Joyce (OH)    | Ros-Lehtinen      | Kaptur            | Neal           | Smith (WA)     | DeSantis        | Kustoff (TN) | Rouzer            |
| Conaway         | Katko         | Roskam            | Keating           | Nolan          | Soto           | DesJarlais      | Labrador     | Royce (CA)        |
| Cook            | Kelly (MS)    | Ross              | Kelly (IL)        | Norcross       | Speier         | Diaz-Balart     | LaHood       | Russell           |
| Costello (PA)   | Kelly (PA)    | Rothfus           | Kennedy           | O'Halloran     | Suozzi         | Donovan         | LaMalfa      | Rutherford        |
| Cramer          | King (IA)     | Rouzer            | Khanna            | O'Rourke       | Swalwell (CA)  | Duffy           | Lamborn      | Sanford           |
| Crawford        | King (NY)     | Royce (CA)        | Kihuen            | Pallone        | Takano         | Duncan (SC)     | Lance        | Scott, Austin     |
| Culberson       | Kinzing       | Russell           | Kildee            | Panetta        | Thompson (CA)  | Duncan (TN)     | Latta        | Sensenbrenner     |
| Curbelo (FL)    | Knight        | Rutherford        | Kilmer            | Pascrell       | Thompson (MS)  | Dunn            | Lewis (MN)   | Sessions          |
| Davidson        | Kustoff (TN)  | Sanford           | Kind              | Payne          | Titus          | Emmer           | LoBiondo     | Shimkus           |
| Davis, Rodney   | Labrador      | Schweikert        | Krishnamoorthi    | Pelosi         | Tonko          | Estes (KS)      | Loudermilk   | Shuster           |
| Denham          | LaHood        | Scott, Austin     | Kuster (NH)       | Perlmutter     | Torres         | Farenthold      | Love         | Simpson           |
| Dent            | LaMalfa       | Sensenbrenner     | Langevin          | Peters         | Tsongas        | Faso            | Lucas        | Smith (MO)        |
| DeSantis        | Lamborn       | Sessions          | Larsen (WA)       | Peterson       | Vargas         | Ferguson        | Luettkemeyer | Smith (NE)        |
| DesJarlais      | Lance         | Shimkus           | Larson (CT)       | Pingree        | Veasey         | Fitzpatrick     | MacArthur    | Smith (NJ)        |
| Diaz-Balart     | Latta         | Shuster           | Lawrence          | Polis          | Vela           | Fleischmann     | Marchant     | Smith (TX)        |
| Donovan         | Lewis (MN)    | Simpson           | Lee               | Price (NC)     | Velázquez      | Flores          | Marino       | Smucker           |
| Duffy           | LoBiondo      | Smith (MO)        | Levin             | Quigley        | Visclosky      | Fortenberry     | Marshall     | Mast              |
| Duncan (SC)     | Loudermilk    | Smith (NE)        | Lewis (GA)        | Raskin         | Walz           | Fox             | McCarthy     | McCauley          |
| Duncan (TN)     | Love          | Smith (NJ)        | Lieu, Ted         | Rice (NY)      | Wasserman      | Frelinghuysen   | McCauley     | McClintock        |
| Dunn            | Lucas         | Smith (TX)        | Lipinski          | Richmond       | Schultz        | Gaetz           | McClintock   | McKinley          |
| Emmer           | Luettkemeyer  | Smucker           | Loeb              | Rosen          | Waters, Maxine | Gallagher       | McClintock   | McMorris          |
| Estes (KS)      | MacArthur     | Stefanik          | Lofgren           | Roybal-Allard  | Watson Coleman | Garrett         | McClintock   | Rodgers           |
| Farenthold      | Marchant      | Stewart           | Lowenthal         | Ruiz           | Welch          | Gianforte       | McClintock   | Meehan            |
| Faso            | Marino        | Taylor            | Lowey             | Ruppersberger  | Wilson (FL)    | Gibbs           | McKinley     | Messer            |
| Ferguson        | Marshall      | Tenney            | Lujan Grisham, M. | Rush           | Yarmuth        | Gohmert         | McMorris     | Mitchell          |
| Fitzpatrick     | Massie        | Thompson (PA)     | Cummings          | Ryan (OH)      |                | Goodlatte       | Rodgers      | Moolenaar         |
| Fleischmann     | Mast          | Thornberry        | Engel             | Gutiérrez      | Scalise        | Gosar           | Moolenaar    | Mooney (WV)       |
| Flores          | McCarthy      | Tiberi            | Franks (AZ)       | Long           | Stivers        | Gowdy           | Mooney (WV)  | Mullin            |
| Fortenberry     | McCauley      | Tipton            |                   | Napolitano     |                | Granger         | Mullin       | Murphy (PA)       |
| Frelinghuysen   | McClintock    | Trott             |                   |                |                | Graves (GA)     | Murphy (PA)  | Newhouse          |
| Gaetz           | McHenry       | Turner            |                   |                |                | Graves (LA)     | Newhouse     | Noem              |
| Gallagher       | McKinley      | Upton             |                   |                |                | Graves (MO)     | Pearce       | Norman            |
| Garrett         | McMorris      | Valadao           |                   |                |                | Griffith        | Perry        | Nunes             |
| Gianforte       | Rodgers       | Wagner            |                   |                |                | Grothman        | Pittenger    | Olson             |
| Gibbs           | McSally       | Walberg           |                   |                |                | Guthrie         | Pittenger    | Palazzo           |
| Gohmert         | Meadows       | Walden            |                   |                |                | Handel          | Pittenger    | Palmer            |
| Goodlatte       | Meehan        | Walker            |                   |                |                | Harper          | Pittenger    | Paulsen           |
| Gosar           | Messer        | Walorski          |                   |                |                | Harris          | Pittenger    | Pearce            |
| Gowdy           | Mitchell      | Walters, Mimi     |                   |                |                | Hartzler        | Pittenger    | Perry             |
| Granger         | Moolenaar     | Weber (TX)        |                   |                |                | Hensarling      | Pittenger    | Reed              |
| Graves (GA)     | Mooney (WV)   | Webster (FL)      |                   |                |                | Herrera Beutler | Pittenger    |                   |
| Graves (LA)     | Mullin        | Wenstrup          |                   |                |                | Hice, Jody B.   | Pittenger    |                   |
| Graves (MO)     | Murphy (PA)   | Westerman         |                   |                |                | Higgins (LA)    | Pittenger    |                   |
| Griffith        | Newhouse      | Williams          |                   |                |                | Hill            | Pittenger    |                   |
| Grothman        | Noem          | Wilson (SC)       |                   |                |                | Holding         | Pittenger    |                   |
| Guthrie         | Norman        | Wittman           |                   |                |                | Hollingsworth   | Pittenger    |                   |
| Handel          | Nunes         | Womack            |                   |                |                | Hudson          | Pittenger    |                   |
| Harper          | Olson         | Woodall           |                   |                |                | Huizenga        | Pittenger    |                   |
| Harris          | Palazzo       | Yoder             |                   |                |                | Hultgren        | Pittenger    |                   |
| Hartzer         | Palmer        | Yoho              |                   |                |                | Hunter          | Pittenger    |                   |
| Hensarling      | Paulsen       | Young (AK)        |                   |                |                | Hurd            | Pittenger    |                   |
| Herrera Beutler | Pearce        | Young (IA)        |                   |                |                |                 | Pittenger    |                   |
| Hice, Jody B.   | Pittenger     | Zeldin            |                   |                |                |                 | Pittenger    |                   |

## NOT VOTING—8

□ 1357

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WALKER and WITTMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

## AYES—236

|                   |              |            |            |             |             |                   |              |                   |
|-------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Adams             | Castor (FL)  | Delaney    | Abraham    | Biggs       | Buchanan    | Adams             | Cicilline    | Dingell           |
| Aguilar           | Castro (TX)  | DeLauro    | Aderholt   | Bilirakis   | Buck        | Aguilar           | Clark (MA)   | Doggett           |
| Barragán          | Chu, Judy    | DeBene     | Allen      | Bishop (MI) | Bucshon     | Barragán          | Clarke (NY)  | Doyle, Michael F. |
| Bass              | Demings      | Demings    | Amash      | Bishop (UT) | Budd        | Bass              | Clay         | Ellison           |
| Beatty            | Clark (MA)   | DeSaulnier | Amodei     | Black       | Burgess     | Beatty            | Cleaver      | Engel             |
| Bera              | Clarke (NY)  | Deutch     | Arrington  | Blackburn   | Byrne       | Bera              | Clyburn      | Eshoo             |
| Beyer             | Clay         | Dingell    | Babin      | Blum        | Calvert     | Bishop (GA)       | Connolly     | Español           |
| Bishop (GA)       | Cleaver      | Doggett    | Bacon      | Bost        | Carter (GA) | Blumenauer        | Conyers      | Esty (CT)         |
| Blumenauer        | Clyburn      | Fudge      | Banks (IN) | Brady (TX)  | Carter (TX) | Blunt Rochester   | Cooper       | Evans             |
| Blunt Rochester   | Cohen        | Gabbard    | Barletta   | Brat        | Chabot      | Bonamici          | Correa       | Foster            |
| Bonamici          | Connolly     | Gallo      | Barr       | Bridenstine | Chaffetz    | Boyle, Brendan F. | Costa        | Frankel (FL)      |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Conyers      | Garamendi  | Barton     | Brooks (AL) | Cheney      | Boyle, Brendan F. | Courtney     | Fudge             |
| Brady (PA)        | Cooper       | Gottheimer | Bergman    | Brooks (IN) | Coffman     | Brady (PA)        | Crist        | Gabbard           |
| Brown (MD)        | Correa       |            |            |             |             | Brown (MD)        | Crowley      | Gallego           |
| Brownley (CA)     | Costa        |            |            |             |             | Brownley (CA)     | Cuellar      | Garamendi         |
| Bustos            | Courtney     |            |            |             |             | Bustos            | Davis (CA)   | Gonzalez (TX)     |
| Butterfield       | Crist        |            |            |             |             | Butterfield       | Davis, Danny | Gottheimer        |
| Capuano           | Crowley      |            |            |             |             | Capuano           | DeFazio      | Green, Al         |
| Carbajal          | Cuellar      |            |            |             |             | Carbajal          | DeGette      | Green, Gene       |
| Cardenas          | Davis (CA)   |            |            |             |             | Cardenas          | DeLauro      | Grijalva          |
| Carson (IN)       | Davis, Danny |            |            |             |             | Carson (IN)       | DeBene       | Gutiérrez         |
| Cartwright        | DeFazio      |            |            |             |             | Cartwright        | Demings      | Hanabusa          |
|                   | DeGette      |            |            |             |             | Castor (FL)       | DeSaulnier   | Hastings          |
|                   |              |            |            |             |             | Castro (TX)       | Deutch       | Heck              |
|                   |              |            |            |             |             | Chu, Judy         |              | Higgins (NY)      |

## NOES—191

|                   |              |                   |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Adams             | Cicilline    | Dingell           |
| Aguilar           | Clark (MA)   | Doggett           |
| Barragán          | Clarke (NY)  | Doyle, Michael F. |
| Bass              | Clay         | Ellison           |
| Beatty            | Cleaver      | Engel             |
| Bera              | Clyburn      | Eshoo             |
| Beyer             | Cohen        | Español           |
| Bishop (GA)       | Connolly     | Esty (CT)         |
| Blumenauer        | Conyers      | Evans             |
| Blunt Rochester   | Cooper       | Foster            |
| Bonamici          | Correa       | Frankel (FL)      |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Costa        | Fudge             |
| Brady (PA)        | Courtney     | Gabbard           |
| Brown (MD)        | Crist        | Gallego           |
| Brownley (CA)     | Crowley      | Garamendi         |
| Bustos            | Cuellar      | Gonzalez (TX)     |
| Butterfield       | Davis (CA)   | Gottheimer        |
| Capuano           | Davis, Danny | Green, Al         |
| Carbajal          | DeFazio      | Green, Gene       |
| Cardenas          | DeGette      | Grijalva          |
| Carson (IN)       | DeLauro      | Gutiérrez         |
| Cartwright        | DeBene       | Hanabusa          |
| Castor (FL)       | Demings      | Hastings          |
| Castro (TX)       | DeSaulnier   | Heck              |
| Chu, Judy         | Deutch       | Higgins (NY)      |

|                |               |                |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Himes          | Matsui        | Shakowsky      |
| Hoyer          | McCollum      | Schiff         |
| Huffman        | McEachin      | Schneider      |
| Jackson Lee    | McGovern      | Schrader       |
| Jayapal        | McNerney      | Scott (VA)     |
| Jeffries       | Meeks         | Scott, David   |
| Johnson (GA)   | Meng          | Serrano        |
| Johnson, E. B. | Moore         | Sewell (AL)    |
| Kaptur         | Moulton       | Shea-Porter    |
| Keating        | Murphy (FL)   | Sherman        |
| Kelly (IL)     | Nadler        | Sinema         |
| Kennedy        | Neal          | Sires          |
| Khanna         | Nolan         | Slaughter      |
| Kihuen         | Norcross      | Smith (WA)     |
| Kildee         | O'Halleran    | Soto           |
| Kilmer         | O'Rourke      | Speier         |
| Kind           | Pallone       | Suozi          |
| Krishnamoorthi | Panetta       | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Kuster (NH)    | Pascarell     | Takano         |
| Langevin       | Payne         | Thompson (CA)  |
| Larsen (WA)    | Pelosi        | Thompson (MS)  |
| Larson (CT)    | Perlmutter    | Titus          |
| Lawrence       | Peters        | Tonko          |
| Lawson (FL)    | Peterson      | Torres         |
| Lee            | Pingree       | Tsongas        |
| Levin          | Pocan         | Vargas         |
| Lewis (GA)     | Polis         | Veasey         |
| Lieu, Ted      | Price (NC)    | Vela           |
| Lipinski       | Quigley       | Velázquez      |
| Loeback        | Raskin        | Visclosky      |
| Lofgren        | Rice (NY)     | Walz           |
| Lowenthal      | Richmond      | Wasserman      |
| Lowey          | Rosen         | Schultz        |
| Lujan Grisham, | Roybal-Allard | Waters, Maxine |
| M.             | Ruiz          | Watson Coleman |
| Luján, Ben Ray | Ruppersberger | Welch          |
| Lynch          | Rush          | Wilson (FL)    |
| Maloney,       | Ryan (OH)     | Yarmuth        |
| Carolyn B.     | Sánchez       |                |
| Maloney, Sean  | Sarbanes      |                |

## NOT VOTING—

|             |            |         |
|-------------|------------|---------|
| Cummings    | Long       | Scalise |
| Franks (AZ) | Napolitano | Stivers |

□ 1404

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 339 and No. 340 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of 3004. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 415—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3004—Kate's Law.

## NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 414, I call up the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). Pursuant to House Resolution 414, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3003

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act".

## SEC. 2. STATE NONCOMPLIANCE WITH ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no Federal, State, or local government entity, and no individual, may prohibit or in any way restrict, a Federal, State, or local government entity, official, or other personnel from complying with the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))), or from assisting or cooperating with Federal law enforcement entities, officials, or other personnel regarding the enforcement of these laws.";

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no Federal, State, or local government entity, and no individual, may prohibit, or in any way restrict, a Federal, State, or local government entity, official, or other personnel from undertaking any of the following law enforcement activities as they relate to information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, the inadmissibility or deportability, or the custody status, of any individual:

"(1) Making inquiries to any individual in order to obtain such information regarding such individual or any other individuals.

"(2) Notifying the Federal Government regarding the presence of individuals who are encountered by law enforcement officials or other personnel of a State or political subdivision of a State.

"(3) Complying with requests for such information from Federal law enforcement entities, officials, or other personnel.";

(3) in subsection (c), by striking "Immigration and Naturalization Service" and inserting "Department of Homeland Security"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) COMPLIANCE.—

"(1) ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN GRANT PROGRAMS.—A State, or a political subdivision of a State, that is found not to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b) shall not be eligible to receive—

"(A) any of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to the State or political subdivision under section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)), the 'Cops on the Beat' program under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.), or the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.); or

"(B) any other grant administered by the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security that is substantially related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, or naturalization.

"(2) TRANSFER OF CUSTODY OF ALIENS PENDING REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—The Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, may decline to transfer an alien in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security to a State or

political subdivision of a State found not to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b), regardless of whether the State or political subdivision of the State has issued a writ or warrant.

"(3) TRANSFER OF CUSTODY OF CERTAIN ALIENS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary shall not transfer an alien with a final order of removal pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) or (5) of section 241(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)) to a State or a political subdivision of a State that is found not to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b).

"(4) ANNUAL DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine for each calendar year which States or political subdivision of States are not in compliance with subsection (a) or (b) and shall report such determinations to Congress by March 1 of each succeeding calendar year.

"(5) REPORTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue a report concerning the compliance with subsections (a) and (b) of any particular State or political subdivision of a State at the request of the House or the Senate Judiciary Committee. Any jurisdiction that is found not to be in compliance shall be ineligible to receive Federal financial assistance as provided in paragraph (1) for a minimum period of 1 year, and shall only become eligible again after the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the jurisdiction has come into compliance.

"(6) REALLOCATION.—Any funds that are not allocated to a State or to a political subdivision of a State due to the failure of the State or of the political subdivision of the State to comply with subsection (a) or (b) shall be reallocated to States or to political subdivisions of States that comply with both such subsections.

"(e) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall require law enforcement officials from States, or from political subdivisions of States, to report or arrest victims or witnesses of a criminal offense."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that subsection (d) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373), as added by this section, shall apply only to prohibited acts committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

## SEC. 3. CLARIFYING THE AUTHORITY OF ICE DETAINERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 287(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) DETAINER OF INADMISSIBLE OR DEPORTABLE ALIENS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is arrested by any Federal, State, or local law enforcement official or other personnel for the alleged violation of any criminal or motor vehicle law, the Secretary may issue a detainer regarding the individual to any Federal, State, or local law enforcement entity, official, or other personnel if the Secretary has probable cause to believe that the individual is an inadmissible or deportable alien.

"(2) PROBABLE CAUSE.—Probable cause is deemed to be established if—

"(A) the individual who is the subject of the detainer matches, pursuant to biometric confirmation or other Federal database records, the identity of an alien who the Secretary has reasonable grounds to believe to be inadmissible or deportable;

"(B) the individual who is the subject of the detainer is the subject of ongoing removal proceedings, including matters where

a charging document has already been served;

“(C) the individual who is the subject of the detainer has previously been ordered removed from the United States and such an order is administratively final;

“(D) the individual who is the subject of the detainer has made voluntary statements or provided reliable evidence that indicate that they are an inadmissible or deportable alien; or

“(E) the Secretary otherwise has reasonable grounds to believe that the individual who is the subject of the detainer is an inadmissible or deportable alien.

“(3) TRANSFER OF CUSTODY.—If the Federal, State, or local law enforcement entity, official, or other personnel to whom a detainer is issued complies with the detainer and detains for purposes of transfer of custody to the Department of Homeland Security the individual who is the subject of the detainer, the Department may take custody of the individual within 48 hours (excluding weekends and holidays), but in no instance more than 96 hours, following the date that the individual is otherwise to be released from the custody of the relevant Federal, State, or local law enforcement entity.”.

(b) IMMUNITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State or a political subdivision of a State (and the officials and personnel of the State or subdivision acting in their official capacities), and a nongovernmental entity (and its personnel) contracted by the State or political subdivision for the purpose of providing detention, acting in compliance with a Department of Homeland Security detainer issued pursuant to this section who temporarily holds an alien in its custody pursuant to the terms of a detainer so that the alien may be taken into the custody of the Department of Homeland Security, shall be considered to be acting under color of Federal authority for purposes of determining their liability and shall be held harmless for their compliance with the detainer in any suit seeking any punitive, compensatory, or other monetary damages.

(2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS DEFENDANT.—In any civil action arising out of the compliance with a Department of Homeland Security detainer by a State or a political subdivision of a State (and the officials and personnel of the State or subdivision acting in their official capacities), or a nongovernmental entity (and its personnel) contracted by the State or political subdivision for the purpose of providing detention, the United States Government shall be the proper party named as the defendant in the suit in regard to the detention resulting from compliance with the detainer.

(3) BAD FAITH EXCEPTION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any mistreatment of an individual by a State or a political subdivision of a State (and the officials and personnel of the State or subdivision acting in their official capacities), or a nongovernmental entity (and its personnel) contracted by the State or political subdivision for the purpose of providing detention.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) CAUSE OF ACTION.—Any individual, or a spouse, parent, or child of that individual (if the individual is deceased), who is the victim of a murder, rape, or any felony, as defined by the State, for which an alien (as defined in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(3))) has been convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment of at least one year, may bring an action against a State or political subdivision of a State in the appropriate Federal or

State court if the State or political subdivision released the alien from custody prior to the commission of such crime as a consequence of the State or political subdivision's declining to honor a detainer issued pursuant to section 287(d)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(d)(1)).

(2) LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.—An action brought under this subsection may not be brought later than ten years following the occurrence of the crime, or death of a person as a result of such crime, whichever occurs later.

(3) ATTORNEY'S FEE AND OTHER COSTS.—In any action or proceeding under this subsection the court shall allow a prevailing plaintiff a reasonable attorneys' fee as part of the costs, and include expert fees as part of the attorneys' fee.

#### SEC. 4. SARAH AND GRANT'S LAW.

(a) DETENTION OF ALIENS DURING REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226) is amended by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears (except in the second place that term appears in section 236(a)) and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”.

(B) Section 236(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(a)) is amended by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security or” before “the Attorney General”.

(C) Section 236(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(e)) is amended by striking “Attorney General's” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security's”.

(2) LENGTH OF DETENTION.—Section 236 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LENGTH OF DETENTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an alien may be detained, and for an alien described in subsection (c) shall be detained, under this section without time limitation, except as provided in subsection (h), during the pendency of removal proceedings.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—The length of detention under this section shall not affect detention under section 241.”.

(3) DETENTION OF CRIMINAL ALIENS.—Section 236(c)(1) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) is unlawfully present in the United States and has been convicted for driving while intoxicated (including a conviction for driving while under the influence or impaired by alcohol or drugs) without regard to whether the conviction is classified as a misdemeanor or felony under State law, or

“(F)(i)(I) is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(i),

“(II) is deportable by reason of a visa revocation under section 221(i), or

“(III) is deportable under section 237(a)(1)(C)(i), and

“(ii) has been arrested or charged with a particularly serious crime or a crime resulting in the death or serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365(h)(3) of title 18, United States Code) of another person;”;

(C) by amending the matter following subparagraph (F) (as added by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph) to read as follows:

“any time after the alien is released, without regard to whether an alien is released related to any activity, offense, or conviction described in this paragraph; to whether the alien is released on parole, supervised re-

lease, or probation; or to whether the alien may be arrested or imprisoned again for the same offense. If the activity described in this paragraph does not result in the alien being taken into custody by any person other than the Secretary, then when the alien is brought to the attention of the Secretary or when the Secretary determines it is practical to take such alien into custody, the Secretary shall take such alien into custody.”.

(4) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—The Attorney General's review of the Secretary's custody determinations under subsection (a) for the following classes of aliens shall be limited to whether the alien may be detained, released on bond (of at least \$1,500 with security approved by the Secretary), or released with no bond:

“(1) Aliens in exclusion proceedings.

“(2) Aliens described in section 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4).

“(3) Aliens described in subsection (c).

“(h) RELEASE ON BOND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien detained under subsection (a) may seek release on bond. No bond may be granted except to an alien who establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the alien is not a flight risk or a danger to another person or the community.

“(2) CERTAIN ALIENS INELIGIBLE.—No alien detained under subsection (c) may seek release on bond.”.

(5) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 236(a)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking “conditional parole” and inserting “recognizance”.

(B) Section 236(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(b)) is amended by striking “parole” and inserting “recognizance”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any alien in detention under the provisions of section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226), as so amended, or otherwise subject to the provisions of such section, on or after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. This simple, straightforward bill combats dangerous sanctuary policies that permit criminals to go free. We are all too familiar with how sanctuary policies have devastated families across

the United States, and today we are taking action to prevent these senseless tragedies and save American lives.

For years, the lack of immigration enforcement and spread of sanctuary policies have cost too many lives. The Obama administration encouraged or, at the very least, turned a blind eye to jurisdictions nationwide that implemented sanctuary policies designed to prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from being able to effectively enforce Federal law. Foolhardy jurisdictions continue to pass legislation and implement policies aimed at stymieing and maligning Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Earlier this year, a Baltimore City Council member introduced a resolution calling on ICE to arrest only those posing a "serious risk." In discussing this initiative, the council member likened ICE officers to Nazis several times. Such rhetoric is reprehensible, creating a moral equivalent between genocide and a nation exercising a fundamental right and obligation of sovereignty.

In a deeply troubling move on the other coast, San Francisco announced that it would no longer participate in the Joint Terrorism Task Force because of concerns that the task force's duties may coincide with immigration enforcement.

Sanctuary policies often focus on flouting ICE detainers, notices issued by ICE to allow it to take custody of aliens in law enforcement custody in order to initiate removal proceedings.

These irresponsible policies have led to a sharp drop in ICE's intake of aliens from criminal detention facilities, which forces ICE agents to engage in the far more time-consuming and dangerous task of picking them up on the streets. This, among other factors, led to a drop in the number of criminal aliens removed from the interior of the United States from almost 87,000 in fiscal year 2014 to approximately 63,500 the following 2 fiscal years.

We must discourage, not encourage, sanctuary policies and practices. H.R. 3003 addresses sanctuary policies and also takes great strides in clarifying Federal immigration detainer policy.

Since the 1990s, Federal law has barred jurisdictions from restricting communication with Federal immigration officials regarding immigration status; however, this provision has never been enforced. H.R. 3003 amends current law and expands this prohibition against impeding Federal law enforcement. Instead of merely focussing on communication, the bill ensures that no jurisdiction may restrict assistance or compliance with immigration enforcement.

To be clear, this bill imposes no affirmative duty to act on the part of any jurisdiction. Should a jurisdiction not comply with this provision, the jurisdiction will not be eligible for cer-

tain grant programs administered by the Department of Justice and Homeland Security. Eligibility for many of these grant programs is already predicated on compliance with this provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

This section is also in line with a recent memo by Attorney General Sessions outlining compliance with this provision as the single factor that the Justice Department will use in identifying sanctuary jurisdictions.

Regarding detainer policy, Congress has long heard that jurisdictions will not comply with ICE requests to hold individuals due to a lack of probable cause inherent in the detainer. I am pleased that H.R. 3003 provides the probable cause standards necessary to ensure that ICE only places detainees on aliens for whom they have probable cause and are deportable.

In addition, the bill mandates that ICE must take custody of the subject of a detainer within 48 hours, excluding weekends and holidays. Jurisdictions who comply in good faith with detainer requests will be immune from liability associated with that detainer, and if such an action does arise, the U.S. Government will substitute itself in as the defendant. This ensures that jurisdictions do not go bankrupt defending against never-ending litigation. And in those jurisdictions that refuse to honor a detainer resulting in an alien committing a crime, the victim or victim's family will be provided with the opportunity to bring a lawsuit against that jurisdiction.

The third section of H.R. 3003 is named for Sarah Root and Grant Ronnebeck, two young people whose lives were suddenly taken by criminal aliens who remain at large today. This section was originally introduced as separate bills by Judiciary Committee members STEVE KING and ANDY BIGGS, who worked tirelessly to bring these tragic cases to the attention of the committee and the Congress.

This section provides that aliens who are arrested or charged with serious crimes that result in death or serious bodily injury of another must be held without bond during the pendency of their removal proceedings.

□ 1415

In addition, aliens convicted of even one drunk driving offense will also be ineligible for bond during their removal proceedings. The latter would have prevented the August 2010 death of Sister Denise Mosier, a Catholic nun in Virginia, at the hands of a drunk driving illegal alien who was released from ICE custody on bond. These classes of individuals present a clear and present danger to society and should not be permitted to roam our communities during the pendency of their removal hearings.

The commonsense provisions of H.R. 3003 will provide better immigration

enforcement and the peace of mind that no criminal will be provided sanctuary from our immigration laws.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear at the outset of this debate that this legislation does nothing to make our communities safer, and it does nothing to improve our immigration system. Instead, H.R. 3003 will trample the rights of States and localities to determine what is in the best interest of their public safety, and it will conscript law enforcement to enforce Federal immigration law.

The ultimate experts on community safety are communities themselves, and hundreds of them have determined that, as community trust increases, crime decreases. This is because immigrants will come out of the shadows and report crimes to local law enforcement when they are not threatened with deportation. In fact, a recent study found that community trust jurisdictions are actually safer than their counterparts.

Against this considered judgment, H.R. 3003 forces localities to abandon community trust principles and mandates the conscription of local offices into Federal immigration enforcement. Some localities, of course, would rightfully resist this conscription. As punishment, H.R. 3003 would rob them of vital law enforcement funding that they depend on to prevent crime, prosecute criminals, and boost community policing ranks.

Localities, therefore, would face a losing choice: they can abandon community trust policies and leave their communities in danger, or they can leave community trust policies in place but forgo law enforcement funding, leaving their community in danger.

It is important that we consider that this is more than just bad policy. It is also likely unconstitutional for multiple reasons. First, H.R. 3003 likely violates the 10th Amendment by commandeering States to comply with detainer requests that drain their resources.

In addition, the bill's changes to the Department of Homeland Security's detainer authority exacerbate the current Fourth Amendment concerns associated with immigration detainees. The bill does not require any particularized finding about the individual that may form the basis of a probable cause determination and fails to provide for a prompt judicial determination of probable cause.

The bill further compounds constitutional concerns by eliminating the ability for a detained individual to obtain an independent, individualized review of his or her bond determination by a neutral decisionmaker.

For these reasons—and there are others—I urge my colleagues to please oppose this dangerous, mean-spirited, and constitutionally suspect legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee not only for working with and cooperating on all this legislation, but for the relentless work that has come forward in the committee. He has spent a lot of time on this floor and in committee, and we are getting some progress here today.

This is a big week, and we are starting to restore the rule of law. The sanctuary cities legislation, which is before us right now, is something I just looked back through my records and wondered: How long have I slugged away on this?

The first amendment I brought was in 2005 to cut off some funding to sanctuary cities. At each appropriations opportunity, along with CJS and Homeland Security, when there was a chance, I would bring another amendment and another amendment, 2005 on through 2014 and 2015. In 2015, then I introduced the broader sanctuary cities legislation which is the basis for this legislation.

I also had the misfortune and fortune of having the Root family as my constituents. Sarah Root was tragically killed by an illegal alien on the streets. Her father and mother both have been here to testify. Her mother is in town this day. Her father, Scott Root, testified before the committee. He said this:

They bailed the killer of my daughter out of jail for less money than it took to bury her, and he was out of this country before we could have the funeral.

Those words were some of the most chilling and mournful words that I have heard in this Congress. This bill today honors his daughter's life, Michelle's daughter's life, Sarah, and it also brings into play the enforcement that we need to have.

We have got to put an end to sanctuary cities and ban those policies—which the bill does—block the DOJ grants if they don't comply with the Federal law, and refuse the warrants to the sanctuary cities because they will just release them on the streets and let ICE take custody of them within 48 hours. And then the good faith hold harmless for ICE detainees, when they got the wrong recommendation out of the Obama administration, this makes the right recommendation to local jurisdictions.

The private cause of action is also very useful to us. It is a good, solid bill. I thank the chairman and all those who put the work in this today, and I urge its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who is a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't about fixing our immigration system. In fact, it makes the system more dysfunctional and puts communities in peril. This bill is about telling communities how to police themselves and protect their people. It says: We here in D.C. know better than you do, local police, across the United States.

Now, 600 or more local governments engaged in what they call community trust policies. These policies promote, among other things, allowing immigrant victims and witnesses to crime to report these offenses to local authorities without fear of immigration consequences. Years of locally informed experience have proven that this approach best ensures these communities' safety.

I think that is why we have received communications from the National Fraternal Order of Police in opposition to this bill, from the Law Enforcement Task Force—that is 36 sheriffs and chiefs across the country—in opposition to this bill, from the Major County Sheriffs of America in opposition to this bill, from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence against this bill, as well as the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties.

ICE is not prohibited from doing their job, but as the San Jose Police Department has told me, San Jose police are not enforcing the securities laws, they are not enforcing the Federal tax laws, and they are not enforcing the immigration laws of the United States. They are doing their job to protect their community against crime.

Now, because they are doing that, the threat is to remove funding from jurisdictions.

Now, what would that funding be?

It is grants against violent gangs. It is grants for the Anti-Heroin Task Force and the Anti-Methamphetamine Program, grants on port security to prevent terrorists from getting into the United States, and grants for the BioWatch Program to prevent terrorists from getting biohazards and killing us all.

That is not smart to take those programs away from local governments that are working with us to help keep America safe.

Now, I always think, as I said earlier, we are not doing bumper stickers here. We are doing laws. It is important to take a look at the details of what is in this proposed bill. In addition to banning collaborative grants with localities, the remedies it has made available is if a community has a community trust policy, the Department of Homeland Security can refuse to honor

warrants—legal warrants—that are issued by that jurisdiction.

That is astonishing. That is simply astonishing because what the local governments have said on the detainer policies is that the Fourth Amendment prevents them from holding people whose sentences have been served. In fact, there are a number of Federal courts that have made that determination, you can't hold somebody on a civil detainer request without violating the Fourth Amendment.

There is a remedy to that: get a warrant like anybody else. The Fourth Amendment means something, and there is a remedy. Go get a warrant. I don't know why our Federal Government feels that they can upend constitutional law for their own convenience.

Now, there is a provision in this bill that I find shocking. What it says is that if local governments violate the law—violate a court order—that they cannot violate the Fourth Amendment, that they are immunized, the Federal Government is going to pay, go ahead and violate the law. I cannot remember a time when we had a bill before us that said to States and localities: go ahead, violate the law because we are going to indemnify you for the violation.

That is not the way our Federal system should work, and it is not the way those of us who believe in our oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States think that things ought to work.

Now, finally, it creates something that I think is truly astonishing: a private cause of action against a State or locality if because the detainer cannot be honored because of the Federal Court cases and a person is released and, for any reason, commits a crime that it is the locality that bears the cost, not the criminal. This is a crazy provision.

We should oppose this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the gentlewoman from northern California that what is crazy is what the city of San Francisco is doing with their taxpayer dollars, since it was reported just yesterday that San Francisco taxpayers could soon pay \$190,000 in a lawsuit settlement with an illegal immigrant who claimed he was reported to Federal immigration authorities in violation of the city of San Francisco's sanctuary city ordinance.

□ 1430

The city attorney's office confirmed this, and the settlement is expected to be confirmed by San Francisco's supervisors in future hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Now, people who are murdered, people who are injured by people who are

unlawfully present in the United States should have their day in court with the city of San Francisco or anyone else just as well as they are apparently willing to pay money to people who are illegally in the country because they were properly turned over to Federal authorities to be deported from this country.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, our chairman, for his leadership on this, and I rise in strong support of the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, which has been worked on by a whole number of Members of the House.

The adoption of dangerous sanctuary policies across the country makes it more difficult to adequately enforce our immigration laws, which, in turn, needlessly puts Americans' lives at risk.

Unfortunately, sanctuary cities that fail to comply with Federal law and deliberately refuse to cooperate with Federal authorities become safe havens for undocumented criminal immigrants, because criminals know they are less likely to be detained in those cities, which are, by definition, sanctuary cities.

Far too many innocent lives are put at risk when a criminal alien convicted, for example, of drunk driving or charged with another serious offense is not detained so they could be appropriately dealt with and, if warranted, deported from our country according to the law.

That is why it is essential that we pass this resolution, which will strengthen our Nation's immigration laws, hold sanctuary cities accountable, and enhance public safety by requiring detention of criminal aliens.

The bottom line is, if we expect our Federal immigration authorities to enforce our Nation's immigration laws and protect the American people, State and local officials need to cooperate, not defy Federal immigration laws. And those local officials who refuse to do so and instead give so-called sanctuary to those that have come to our country illegally and then committed crimes here, they are putting the very people who they were sworn to serve and to protect at risk. And unfortunately, this has been happening all over the country, where literally people come here illegally, commit crimes, and local entities decide not to enforce the law.

We need to pass this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ), a gentleman on the committee who has worked tirelessly with myself and Ms. LOFGREN to make this measure more understandable.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, ever since Donald Trump descended the

golden escalators at Trump Tower to announce his candidacy by saying Mexican immigrants are rapists, murderers, and drug dealers, the Republican Party has had Mexican fever, and they have been working feverishly to paint immigrants all as criminals. And when something goes bad, they go back to their old favorite.

When Trump's Muslim ban was blocked in the courts, out came the Attorney General to say they were doing everything they could to do more roundups and that no immigrant was safe in America.

The Russia investigation not going well for the dear leader at the White House? Hey, let's whip out that Mexican thing, as Vice-President PENCE said. Maybe it will keep our voters happy and distracted.

Healthcare not going well? Let's just hate some Mexicans today.

Listen, almost 8 out of 10 Latinos in the United States are citizens, 1 out of 10 are legal permanent residents. That leaves 1 in 10 who are undocumented, but this policy is about going after all of us, whether we are citizens or not of the United States of America.

These bills are nothing new, and they are not really about fighting crime. They are about racial profiling and putting Latinos "in their place." Latinos, African Americans, Muslims, women, they know what it is like to be targeted.

Ninety-nine percent of the votes for this bill today will come from people who do not have to worry about racial profiling for themselves, for their children, or the people who they represent, but let's be clear. Sheriff Joe Arpaio in Arizona is the poster child for the kinds of policies the Republicans want to impose on every city and county in the country, and we know the results. Sheriff Arpaio embodies racial profiling and rounding up people because they are brown. Oh, we will sort out their papers later, he says, whether they are citizens or legal permanent residents or whatever.

I have talked to U.S. citizens who were detained by Sheriff Arpaio because they didn't carry with them their birth certificate or a passport at all times in the country in which they were born.

Let's be clear. Sheriff Arpaio has been sued successfully to stop his racial profiling, and he has been charged criminally in Federal court for his racial profiling tactics, and still the Republicans of the House want to make the law he is being sued for legal in the United States of America.

Sometimes Democrats have to stand up for justice, for what is right when the chips are down. Well, the chips are down, and every immigrant family and every immigrant in America is going to remember who stood up for them when they needed Democrats to fight to keep families together when the chips were down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President or Vice President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding and for his leadership on this legislation. It is an honor to serve with him on the House Judiciary Committee. And I am grateful to Representative KING as well for producing Sarah's Law.

Today, the House of Representatives can pass a crucial piece of legislation to codify the tenets of two of President Trump's executive orders on immigration enforcement.

H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, will finally hold accountable States, cities, and local law enforcement agencies that provide safe haven to criminally violent illegal immigrants by refusing to cooperate with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

You know what is astonishing and you know what is shocking, is that there are jurisdictions in this country that blatantly choose to endanger their communities by providing protection to criminals. Passage of H.R. 3003 ensures that these communities will no longer be given rewards for their dereliction of duty.

Importantly, this bill also contains a section entitled Sarah and Grant's Law, which recognizes two young Americans who were murdered by criminally violent illegal aliens who had no right to be on our streets.

In January 2015, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk and constituent of mine, Grant Ronnebeck, was working the graveyard shift at QuickTrip in Mesa, Arizona. Just before 4 a.m., an illegal alien with a long criminal record, awaiting deportation proceedings, walked in and demanded a pack of cigarettes. When Grant tried to count the money before handing them over, the man shot him and left him to die.

Sarah and Grant are far from the only Americans who have been impacted by illegal immigration. In 2014, Mesa, Arizona, police officer Brandon Mendoza was killed in a wrong-way car crash by an illegal immigrant driving under the influence of drugs and alcohol.

Despite tragic stories like these, the Obama administration continued to promote policies that circumvented many of our immigration laws, allowing thousands of criminals to return to our communities. It is time for these reckless policies to end.

H.R. 3003 specifically targets illegals who commit serious crimes by preventing them from being released onto our streets during their deportation proceedings.

After 8 years of policies that have placed a priority on protecting all illegal aliens, including those who are violent criminals, over the rights and safety of Americans, it is refreshing to have a President who is willing to follow regular law and order. President Trump has taken active steps to reverse the failed policies of the previous administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BIGGS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump has taken active steps to reverse the failed policies of the Obama administration and has been vocally supportive of Congress' efforts to do the same.

Passing this bill is a positive step toward our duty of enforcing the Nation's immigration laws, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the Intellectual Properties Subcommittee.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3003. This legislation would withhold needed law enforcement funding from cities that choose not to assist Federal authorities in enforcing the immigration laws.

Besides being constitutionally suspect, this bill is also highly counterproductive. Recognizing that good policing depends on building trust with their residents, many cities forbid their law enforcement officers from questioning victims of crime or witnesses to a crime about their immigration status, and they do not share immigration information with Federal authorities.

They believe that their communities are at greater risk when a victim of domestic violence is afraid to ask the police for protection from her abuser for fear of deportation, or when witnesses to a murder refuse to assist law enforcement in tracking down the perpetrator because they are afraid their immigration status will be discovered.

These cities have concluded that taking on themselves the Federal responsibility to enforce immigration laws would destroy trust between immigrants and local law enforcement, which would make everyone less safe.

Perversely, this bill would punish these cities by denying them the funds that they need to protect public safety. Funding to hire new police officers, grants to combat the opioid crisis, and money to reduce the rape kit backlog could all be taken away under this bill. Not only does this raise serious constitutional concerns, it is simply bad policy that will lead to more crime, not less.

As if this were not bad enough, the bill would also authorize mandatory indefinite detention of certain categories of immigrants without sufficient due process even if they present no danger to their communities.

Indefinite detention is repugnant to our values of fairness and individual liberty, but this bill perpetuates the ugly myth that immigrants are more dangerous and likely to commit more crimes than native-born Americans, and it erodes the fundamental protections that we guarantee to all who are present in this country.

Instead of taking positive steps to improve communication between Federal, State, and local authorities, this bill demonizes immigrants, punishes communities that seek to build trust between immigrants and law enforcement, and authorizes indefinite detention of certain immigrants, all while making us less safe.

For each of these reasons, this bill should be defeated, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about two very honorable lives, Paul Besaw and Lahiri Garcia, who were both taken from us far too soon by the criminal acts of one who was illegally in our country.

A death of our innocent neighbors is especially devastating when it could have been prevented had our immigration laws been upheld and had they been working.

Paul and Lahiri were paramedics in my community, dedicated to saving lives, but on January 1, a man illegally in our country, driving drunk, collided with their ambulance and killed both of them.

Paul left behind his loving wife, Dawn, and his 6-year-old daughter, Allison, who you see here behind me. When I spoke with Paul's widow, she rightfully said that if our country wasn't "too afraid or inept to enforce immigration law," her husband would still be with her today, and she is absolutely right.

Lahiri's wife, Julie Garcia, told me how hard it was for her four children to not have their father this Father's Day. She expected to grow old with her husband, but because this man wasn't sent home the first three times he was pulled over, she will no longer have that opportunity.

Both wives, both mothers, expressed to me sincere disbelief. They don't understand why this was allowed to happen, and, for the life of me, I can't understand why it is allowed either.

The bottom line is that this should never happen to anyone. Sanctuary cities are a violation of the rule of law, they are absolutely unacceptable, they cannot be tolerated. We must enforce this rule of law.

It is, in fact, the right of every American to be protected by this government. It is not the right of anybody to spend one day, one moment, in our country illegally or without invitation.

Today, Congress is addressing this epidemic. Our bills, they crack down on dangerous sanctuary policies that put these kind of innocent lives at risk.

So let us ensure that unlawful immigrants convicted of crimes are, in fact, detained and are, in fact, deported.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass these bills. More importantly, let us be convicted that what happened to Paul and what happened to Lahiri is never allowed to happen again.

□ 1445

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that none one of us who comes to this floor doubts that any local law enforcement, our neighbors, do any second-guessing to arrest drunk drivers, murderers, and others, and that they are held to the high calling of justice. I do not want to be associated with being mild-mannered and weak on those who would do serious harm, kill, and maim, no matter who they are. That is not this debate.

This debate is whether or not this bill interferes with the legitimate enforcement of the law and whether or not it takes away the mercy that we are known for in the United States. Let me tell you why.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Fraternal Order of Police—which, by no means, is shy about enforcing the law—writing to oppose this legislation, saying that local police departments answer to local civilian government, and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER

OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, 27 June 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,  
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,  
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to reiterate the FOP's opposition to any amendment or piece of legislation that would penalize law enforcement agencies by withholding Federal funding or resources from law enforcement assistance programs in an effort to coerce a policy change at the local level. The House will



consider H.R. 3003 on the floor this week and Section 2 of this bill would restrict the hiring program administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne-JAG) programs, as well as programs administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The FOP has been very clear on this issue: we strongly believe that local and State law enforcement agencies should cooperate with their Federal counterparts. That being said, withholding needed assistance to law enforcement agencies—which have no policymaking role—also hurts public safety efforts.

Local police departments answer to local civilian government and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances in their communities. Law enforcement officers have no more say in these matters than any other citizen and—with laws like the Hatch Act in place—it can be argued they have less. Law enforcement officers do not get to pick and choose which laws to enforce, and must carry out lawful orders at the direction of their commanders and the civilian government that employs them. It is unjust to penalize law enforcement and the citizens they serve because Congress disagrees with their enforcement priorities with respect to our nation's immigration laws.

The FOP issued a statement in January of this year regarding the approach of the Administration on sanctuary cities as outlined in President Trump's Executive Order. The President recognized that it is unfair to penalize the law enforcement agencies serving these jurisdictions for the political decisions of local officials. It allows the U.S. Attorney General and Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to make an informed decision about the public safety impact without an automatic suspension from Federal grant programs. In Section 2 of H.R. 3003, there is no such discretion and it countermands the Administration's existing policy.

The FOP opposed several bills in the previous Congress, which were outlined in a letter to the Senate leadership, and we will continue to work against proposals that would reduce or withhold funding or resources from any Federal program for local and State law enforcement. If Congress wishes to effect policy changes in these sanctuary cities, it must find another way to do so.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to urge the House to reject H.R. 3003's punitive approach and work with law enforcement to find a better way to improve public safety in our communities.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,  
*National President.*

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION, UNITED  
STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC  
BISHOPS,

Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

CATHOLIC CHARITIES USA,  
Alexandria, VA, June 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB/COM), and Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) to express our opposition to H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

The Catholic Church holds a strong interest in the welfare of migrants and how our nation welcomes and treats them. Our parishes include those with and without immigration status, unfortunately some who have witnessed or been victims of crime in the

United States, including domestic violence, armed robbery, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We oppose H.R. 3003 because it would impose obligations on local governments that we fear—and that many of them have warned—would undermine authority and discretion of local law enforcement. This, in turn, would hamper the ability of local law enforcement officials to apprehend criminals and ensure public safety in all communities.

Furthermore, Section 2 of H.R. 3003 would deny to jurisdictions vital federal funding related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, and naturalization if those jurisdictions are deemed to be non-compliant with H.R. 3003. The Catholic service network, including Catholic Charities, works in partnership with the federal government on a number of Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security initiatives, including disaster response and recovery, naturalization and citizenship services, and services for the immigrant, including victims of human trafficking, and domestic violence. These services are incredibly valuable to the protection and promotion of the human person and in some instances life-saving. Cutting grants related to these important national objectives, or threat of such cuts, is not humane or just, nor is it in our national interest.

Also, we oppose H.R. 3004 as it would lead to an expansion of incarceration and does not include adequate protections for people who re-enter the U.S. for humanitarian reasons or seek protection at the border. While H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal offenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government's ability to prosecute illegal re-entry cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are efficiently utilized to prosecute and convict the most violent offenders of violent crimes. Expanding who is eligible to be prosecuted for entry or re-entry as well as enhancing sentencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that communities are safer. Furthermore, we are concerned that, as introduced, H.R. 3004 would also prevent vulnerable asylum seekers and unaccompanied children, (who have presented themselves repeatedly at the U.S. border in the flight from violence), from being able to access protection, and instead face fines, imprisonment or both.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on balancing the needs and rights of immigrants with our nation's best interests and security.

The United States has a long and proud history of leadership in welcoming newcomers regardless of their circumstances and promoting the common good. We stand ready to work with you on legislation that more closely adheres to this tradition and appreciate your serious consideration of our views in this regard.

Sincerely,

MOST REV. JOE VÁSQUEZ,  
*Bishop of Austin, Chairman, USCCB  
Committee on Migration.*

SR. DONNA MARKHAM, OP, PHD,  
*President & CEO, Catholic Charities USA.*

[From the Houston Chronicle, Apr. 30, 2017]

POLICE CHIEFS: SB 4 IS A 'LOSE-LOSE' FOR  
TEXAS

(By Art Acevedo and James McLaughlin)

No one believes in the "rule of law" more than the Texas Police Chiefs Association and the Texas Major Cities Chiefs, which besides Houston include Austin, Arlington, Dallas, Fort Worth and San Antonio. We work tirelessly to make our communities safer, within the confines of the U.S. Constitution, by arresting those who commit criminal actions that threaten our communities. We specifically target those individuals committing violent crimes and arrest anyone who threatens the safety of our communities, regardless of their immigration status.

Police chiefs across the state work extremely hard to develop law enforcement agencies that build and maintain trust, communication and stronger relationships with minority communities through community-based policing and outreach programs. So we know well that no good can come of Senate Bill 4, which the state House of Representatives, joining the state Senate, passed last week.

SB 4 requires local law enforcement to take a more active role in immigration enforcement; this will tear down what we've worked so hard to build up. Officers will start inquiring about the immigration status of every person they come in contact with, or worse, only inquire about the immigration status of individuals based on their appearance. This will lead to distrust of police, less cooperation from members of the community and will foster the belief that they cannot seek assistance from police for fear of being subjected to an immigration-status investigation.

This is a lose-lose situation for everyone.

Distrust and fear of contacting or assisting the police has already become evident among legal immigrants. Legal immigrants are beginning to avoid contact with the police for fear that they themselves or undocumented family members or friends may become subject to immigration enforcement. Such a divide between the local police and immigrant groups will result in increased crime against immigrants and in the broader community, create a class of silent victims, and eliminate the potential for assistance from migrants in solving crimes or preventing crime.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Law enforcement officers have to be able to abide by the law. It is unjust to penalize law enforcement and the citizens they serve because Congress disagrees with the enforcement priorities with respect to our Nation's immigration laws. And they are right. But they also say that they need to build trust in our communities.

This bill destroys community trust. It also penalizes hardworking governments of mayors and county leaders who are, in fact, trying to run the government and ensure that victims of domestic violence and crime, even as immigrants, are able to be treated in a manner where justice is had.

What about the National Sheriffs' Association or the Texas Police Chiefs in Texas' major cities who indicate that this bill will serve no good and no good can come to a similar bill in the States?

Let me say to you, I stand with the Catholic church, and I am not Catholic.

What are our values? This church opposes the idea of our values.

Let me be very clear as I close. We are doing the sanctuary cities bill, but I want to know about the integrity of this place.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3003, the “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act,” which requires state and local cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, expands DHS detainer authority, and expands detention authority.

I oppose this bill mainly because it directly violates the Constitution of the United States.

If H.R. 3003 were to become law, it will coerce states and localities to cooperate with immigration enforcement, it will hurt victims and witnesses to crimes, and ultimately make communities less safe, which directly contravenes the stated and alleged goals of this bill.

Police Chiefs across the nation are responding to less disturbances, not because crime is magically disappearing, but because immigrant communities are afraid to report them out of fear of being targeted.

H.R. 3003 will completely strip state and local jurisdictions of their ability to enact common-sense policies that breed respect and trust and turn local law enforcement into an auxiliary arm of the federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

To ensure compliance, this bill coerces states and localities by imposing penalties that will deny federal funding for critical law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives.

This divisive and vindictive administrative policy abridges the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which states:

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

H.R. 3003 also violates the Fourth Amendment’s proscription against unreasonable searches and seizures in respect to the changes it makes to DHS’s detainer authority.

It expands upon current DHS detainer practice by broadening the ways in which DHS can determine it has probable cause to issue a detainer and it significantly expands the time an individual may be held by law enforcement.

The Supreme Court has stated that the Fourth Amendment requires a judicial finding of probable cause, usually within 48 hours of arrest.

H.R. 3003, however, allows law enforcement to hold a person up to 96 hours before DHS takes custody, and there is no mention of when the person will even see an immigration judge.

H.R. 3003 compounds these constitutional violations by eliminating the ability for a detained individual to obtain an independent, individualized review of his or her bond determination by a neutral decision-maker.

This bill also authorizes DHS to detain individuals in removal proceedings without time limitation and it expands the categories of individuals who would be subject to such a detention on a mandatory basis.

These provisions make it substantially more difficult, if not impossible, for individuals to obtain release on bond while removal proceedings are pending, thus increasing deten-

tion costs and separating families while they seek to litigate their immigration cases.

H.R. 3003 is nothing but an anti-immigrant, enforcement-only proposal that represents another step in Trump’s mass deportation plan.

Mr. Speaker, rather than forcing state and local officials into a one-size-fits-all federal enforcement scheme, Congress and the administration should enact legislation and adopt policies that integrate unauthorized immigrants into our communities—approaches that the American public supports by a wide margin.

For these reasons, I join with local law enforcement chiefs and faith community leaders in denouncing and opposing this mean-spirited, ill-considered, and un-American legislation.

I end, Mr. Speaker, by apologizing to Mika Brzezinski, to the press, for the horrible words that were said about a bleeding face.

There is no way that we can entrust this law or any other laws to this President of the United States. He has lost the trust, and I will vote for nothing until he steps down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While we have heard a good amount of inflammatory rhetoric, my remarks will speak solely to the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of keeping America safe. In less than 2 years, over 8,000 undocumented immigrants, all subject to ICE detainment, were released because of local non-cooperation policies.

Sixty-three percent of those illegal aliens had prior convictions or had been marked a public safety concern. After being released, they went on to be rearrested nearly 4,300 times, committing nearly 7,500 new offenses.

The facts are clear: States and local governments that do not comply with our immigration laws are putting American citizens at risk.

The U.S. Sentencing Commission found that, in 2014, 75 percent of all criminal defendants who were convicted and sentenced for Federal drug offenses were illegal immigrants. As of 2014, illegal immigrants made up roughly 3.5 percent of our population but committed over 10 percent of all murders.

Refusing to turn over criminal illegal immigrants poses a threat to our society, our safety, and our economy. American citizens pay nearly \$19 million a day to house and care for the 450,000 criminal immigrants in jails and prisons who are all eligible for deportation.

When cities ignore Federal immigration laws, the results are often tragic.

The sheriff of Travis County, Texas, decided she would only turn over ille-

gal aliens who have committed a narrow list of crimes. Her policy allowed one illegal alien to be released on bail despite sexually abusing his girlfriend’s 9-year-old daughter.

A Cook County sheriff released an illegal immigrant after he served a brief domestic assault sentence, despite an ICE detainer. Soon after, he went on to kill a 15-year-old girl.

America wept as 32-year-old Kate Steinle was killed by a stray bullet. The illegal immigrant who shot that gun had seven previous felony convictions.

There are thousands more stories of innocent lives lost, of families destroyed, and of crimes that could have been prevented. Every day in America, another family grieves because of the policies of sanctuary cities.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the protection of our citizens, the safety of our communities, the defense of our country, and to ultimately see the end of sanctuary cities.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), our Democratic Caucus chair.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Much of the same rhetoric we are hearing right now from the other side of the aisle is similar to the same rhetoric we heard back in the 1840s, 1850s, and 1860s against the Irish when they came to America. We heard it said about Italian Americans in the 1880s and 1890s.

We continue to hear the same type of rhetoric about African Americans in our country in terms of the percentage of criminal activity that takes place. What we have seen happen is the further incarceration and enslavement of African Americans in our Nation today because of similar rhetoric.

I want to make it very clear: “Immigrant” and “criminal” are not synonyms. You make it out to be that way by the passage of this legislation.

Talking about law enforcement, in New York City, James O’Neill, the police commissioner, has said this law will make New York City less safe than it is today.

I remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that 9/11 happened in my hometown, in my city. Since then, there have been no major incidents of terrorism in New York City because they have been able to collect information—much of it from the undocumented community in our city—to prevent similar events from happening again. That is why this bill is so egregious.

The first responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens from foreign invasion, foreign attack, terrorist attacks. This bill will withhold terrorism money from New York City. It will prevent the city of New York from continuing to collect

the information they and other cities around this country need to protect their citizens, to develop the trust that the community has to have in its police department and the police department in its communities.

That is how law enforcement works, that is how they catch the criminals, and that is how they help the Federal Government deport criminals who have committed criminal offenses in a city like New York.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire at this time how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, across the country, more than 300 municipalities have adopted policies to limit local law enforcement cooperation with Federal authorities, making it harder to keep our families and communities safe.

Back in my home State of Tennessee, the Nashville City Council has recently been advancing legislation to become one of these sanctuary cities. Giving Federal funds to sanctuary cities defies logic and it demands attention.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment to expand the bill before us today so that sanctuary cities would no longer have access to Community Development Block Grants and certain other economic development grants, as well, that send more than about 300 billion taxpayer dollars a year to local communities.

On its website, the Community Development Block Grant program says its purpose is to provide services to vulnerable communities and address issues that “pose an immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community.”

What population is more vulnerable than a 6-year-old girl in Lebanon, Tennessee, who was sexually molested while she was sleeping? Just last month, charges were brought against a criminal illegal immigrant for repeatedly breaking into her room at night and making videos while he assaulted her. The evil individual had been in police custody before.

For Kate Steinle, who has been talked about many times on the floor, her killer had a criminal record of not one, two, or three, but seven felonies. He had been deported not once, twice, or three times, but five times. Is that who liberal legislators around the country want to give “sanctuary”?

We need more communication and cooperation between local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers who are trying to keep our communities safe, not less. It is time to stop giving taxpayer dollars to these cities. I am

voting for this bill today to do just that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member, for yielding.

I don't know what our friend from Tennessee was talking about. I am not here as a liberal legislator. I am here as a local government person. I spent 14 years in local government.

We are not sanctuary cities. We are trying to solve crimes by seeking cooperation from the immigrant community. This bill will make it harder. Most of our local police chiefs would tell you that—if you would listen to them.

Oddly enough, the Members supporting this bill are the same Members who sanctimoniously decry Federal mandates and overreach—except when they want one. Here we are, dictating how local governments should implement Federal immigration laws.

At the local level, we know effective, community-based policing relies on trust between the police and communities. This bill would erode that collaboration and that trust.

How can we expect our Nation's immigrants to turn to the police if they witness or fall victim to a crime if they are afraid of being deported or separated from their families?

The bill will punish local police departments and those relationships. It should be defeated. This local government guy will oppose this bad policy bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was at the White House with President Trump and the parents and relatives of those daughters and sons who were killed by those who are here illegally. The stories were very heavy. They should weigh on all of us.

One story that was shared was given by Michelle Root about her beautiful daughter who was struck down and killed in a senseless way by someone here illegally. Michelle is in the gallery here today, and she is a great advocate.

In late January 2016, Sarah's parents, Michelle and Scott Root, started their day with joy. On that day, their beautiful daughter, Sarah, graduated. She had the whole world ahead of her. But for Michelle and Scott, the day ended with loss and tragedy. It was the unimaginable loss of their daughter. Sarah was killed by a drunk driver here illegally. It is so senseless. Sarah had her whole life in front of her.

Through incompetence and uncertainty about the law or the policy, or both—but for sure, a lack of common sense—Sarah's killer was released. Today, Sarah's killer is free.

Today, Sarah's parents, Michelle and Scott, and Sarah's brother, Scotty, fight for Sarah's justice. They fight for her honor. They fight to make sure no other parent or loved one has to go through the tragic ordeal they had to go through.

□ 1500

My vote today is about policy, but it is in honor of Sarah Root. It is hard to find a love stronger than a parent has for their child. Sarah will always be loved and certainly not forgotten by her family and friends and those who never even met her. She has touched their hearts. They continue to advocate, and so must we.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, my colleagues in Iowa and across the border in Nebraska who support this legislation and fought for it to be incorporated into this bill.

God is taking care of Sarah now. Her memory lives on. I urge the passage of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not in order to refer to persons in the gallery.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a former justice to the Texas Supreme Court.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the only sanctuary involved here today is the sanctuary that this sorry bill provides for prejudice. This is the Trump counterpart to the outrageous SB4 that Governor Greg Abbott has been promoting in Texas. It all goes back to the rhetoric of last year about the “bad hombres” and the attacks on Mexico and Mexicans.

I will tell you, I want the bad hombres off the street no matter where they come from, but I look to my local police chiefs, to my local sheriffs and law enforcement officers to tell me what the best way is to protect our families from crime. They say maintaining the confidence of the immigrant community is vital, and that measures like this, which simply have politicians in Washington interfering with and attempting to intimidate local law enforcement officers, do exactly the opposite of what all these speeches claim that they do.

Anti-immigrant hysteria, what a way to leave for July Fourth from a Congress that has accomplished practically nothing but to attack immigrants as we depart instead of standing by and supporting local law enforcement and making our communities safe.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond and point out that many, many of the victims of these crimes are Hispanic, African American, and others, and they were seated around the Cabinet table at the White House yesterday pleading for this legislation because they had lost their loved ones. They would much rather have been able to rewind the

tape and be with those loved ones who were killed by people who were illegally present in the United States. The victims would never have suffered if our laws had simply been enforced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

Congress has a responsibility to protect the rule of law in our country and to provide for the safety of our citizens. The American people overwhelmingly oppose sanctuary cities and believe that we should be doing more to enforce our Federal immigration laws.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act clarifies the authority of the Department of Homeland Security to order the detainment of illegal immigrants arrested for crimes until they can be processed for deportation.

It also cuts off certain Federal grants to cities and States that violate Federal immigration law. It is simple: If you don't comply with the Federal immigration law, you are not eligible for certain Federal grants.

It is time for us to enforce our immigration laws.

National attention was brought to the consequences of the sanctuary city policies by the death of Kate Steinle, who was killed by an illegal immigrant who had previously been convicted of seven felonies and deported five times. If the city of San Francisco had worked with the Federal Government to enforce the Federal immigration law instead of releasing this criminal, Kate Steinle would be alive today.

Our current system of laws failed Kate and all those who have died at the hands of convicted felons in this country illegally. The people who I am honored to represent do not understand why some American cities get to flout the law and not cooperate with Federal officials. This legislation makes it clear that they don't, that sanctuary cities are illegal. By holding these jurisdictions accountable and stopping sanctuary cities, we will make Americans of every background safer on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a dedicated civil rights leader.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3003.

In jurisdictions within my district, Cook County, cities like Chicago, Evanston, and Skokie, which are immigrant rich, we have adopted sanctuary cities, sometimes called welcoming cities, ordinances in order to reassure immigrants that they can, with safety, talk to law enforcement within our jurisdictions.

Skokie Mayor George Van Dusen said: "It has taken the Village of Sko-

kie years—decades really—to form the bridges that we have of trust with our immigrant community."

These policies work. A January study found that sanctuary cities tend to be safer and have stronger economies than not.

This bill would push communities to abandon sanctuary city policies, breaking down that hard-earned trust between immigrants and law enforcement. Turning law enforcement into immigration enforcement makes cities less safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it makes immigrants less likely to report crimes. This bill protects criminals in our communities and not victims.

I urge my colleagues to vote for safer communities and vote against this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for making sure this bill gets to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am registering my support for Kate's Law and H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals—for Criminals—Act. I support these bills for the sake of Kate Steinle and every single one of those who share her tragic fate.

She was murdered in broad daylight by a violent, criminal illegal alien. This was an easily preventable and heartbreaking crime, and we simply cannot fail the American people by refusing to act on these bills.

The government's first responsibility is the security and protection of our homeland, a duty that should not be abdicated or yielded based on convenience.

In 2011–2011—a GAO study found that aliens committed more than 25,000 homicides, more than 69,000 sexual offenses, 14,000 kidnappings, 42,000 robberies, and 213,000 assaults, among other offenses. Every single one of these is too many.

Very few things in this world we can get at 100 percent, but these are 100 percent preventable if these people would not have been here. These are preventable crimes, completely preventable, and we must stop the willful neglect of complacency by government officials who refuse to enforce existing—this is not new. This is existing law we are asking them to enforce, we are requiring them to enforce.

According to a March 2017 Washington Times article, nearly 500 jurisdictions have sanctuary policies that block—that block—that limit ICE from apprehending criminal aliens.

A January 2017 article from the Washington Examiner reported that, from January 2014 to September 2015,

sanctuary jurisdictions rejected 17,000 ICE detainees. Those are 17,000 criminals that are out on the street that we know about that we let go.

Adding insult to injury, these sanctuary jurisdictions seek Federal funds to help them defy Federal law enforcement efforts to remove the dangerous criminal aliens from the streets.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put Americans first, and we support the restoration of law and order by supporting these proposals.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the National Fraternal Order of Police; Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force; National League of Cities; U.S. Conference of Mayors; and the National Association of Counties in opposition to this bill.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, 27 June 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,  
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,  
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to reiterate the FOP's opposition to any amendment or piece of legislation that would penalize law enforcement agencies by withholding Federal funding or resources from law enforcement assistance programs in an effort to coerce a policy change at the local level. The House will consider H.R. 3003 on the floor this week and Section 2 of this bill would restrict the hiring program administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne-JAG) programs, as well as programs administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The FOP has been very clear on this issue: we strongly believe that local and State law enforcement agencies should cooperate with their Federal counterparts. That being said, withholding needed assistance to law enforcement agencies—which have no policy-making role—also hurts public safety efforts.

Local police departments answer to local civilian government and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances in their communities. Law enforcement officers have no more say in these matters than any other citizen and—with laws like the Hatch Act in place—it can be argued they have less. Law enforcement officers do not get to pick and choose which laws to enforce, and must carry out lawful orders at

the direction of their commanders and the civilian government that employs them. It is unjust to penalize law enforcement and the citizens they serve because Congress disagrees with their enforcement priorities with respect to our nation's immigration laws.

The FOP issued a statement in January of this year regarding the approach of the Administration on sanctuary cities as outlined in President Trump's Executive Order. The President recognized that it is unfair to penalize the law enforcement agencies serving these jurisdictions for the political decisions of local officials. It allows the U.S. Attorney General and Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to make an informed decision about the public safety impact without an automatic suspension from Federal grant programs. In Section 2 of H.R. 3003, there is no such discretion and it countermands the Administration's existing policy.

The FOP opposed several bills in the previous Congress, which were outlined in a letter to the Senate leadership, and we will continue to work against proposals that would reduce or withhold funding or resources from any Federal program for local and State law enforcement. If Congress wishes to effect policy changes in these sanctuary cities, it must find another way to do so.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to urge the House to reject H.R. 3003's punitive approach and work with law enforcement to find a better way to improve public safety in our communities. Please feel free to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my Washington office if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,  
National President.

LAW ENFORCEMENT  
IMMIGRATION TASK FORCE,

June 28, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As law enforcement leaders dedicated to preserving the safety and security of our communities, we have concerns about legislative proposals that would attempt to impose punitive, "one-size-fits-all" policies on state and local law enforcement. Rather than strengthening state and local law enforcement by providing us with the tools to work with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in a manner that is responsive to the needs of our communities, these proposals would represent a step backward.

Attempts to defund so-called sanctuary cities regularly sweep too broadly, punishing jurisdictions that engage in well-established community policing practices or adhere to federal court decisions that have found federal immigration detainers to violate constitutional protections. We oppose these approaches and urge Congress to work to encourage—rather than compel—law enforcement agency cooperation within our federal system.

We believe that law enforcement should not cut corners. Multiple federal courts have questioned the legality and constitutionality of federal immigration detainers that are not accompanied by a criminal warrant signed by a judge. Even though the legality of such immigration holds is doubtful, some have proposed requiring states and localities to enforce them, shielding them from lawsuits. While this approach would reduce potential legal liability faced by some jurisdictions and departments, we are concerned these proposals would still require our agencies

and officers carry out federal directives that could violate the U.S. Constitution, which we are sworn to follow.

Immigration enforcement is, first and foremost, a federal responsibility. Making our communities safer means better defining roles and improving relationships between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities. But in attempting to defund "sanctuary cities" and require state and local law enforcement agencies. Local control has been a beneficial approach for law enforcement for decades—having the federal government compel state and local law enforcement to carry out new and sometimes problematic tasks undermines the delicate federal balance and will harm locally-based policing.

Rather than requiring state and local law enforcement agencies to engage in additional immigration enforcement activities, Congress should focus on overdue reforms of the broken immigration system to allow state and local law enforcement to focus their resources on true threats—dangerous criminals and criminal organizations. We believe that state and local law enforcement must work together with federal authorities to protect our communities and that we can best serve our communities by leaving the enforcement of immigration laws to the federal government. Threatening the removal of valuable grant funding that contributes to the health and well-being of communities across the nation would not make our communities safer and would not fix any part of our broken immigration system.

Our immigration problem is a national problem deserving of a national approach, and we continue to recognize that what our broken system truly needs is a permanent legislative solution—broad-based immigration reform.

Sincerely,

Chief Chris Magnus, Tucson, AZ; Chief Sylvis Moir, Tempe, AZ; Ret. Chief Roberto Villaseñor, Tucson, AZ; Chief Charlie Beck, Los Angeles, CA; Ret. Chief James Lopez, Los Angeles County, CA; Sheriff Margaret Mims, Fresno County, CA; Sheriff Mike Chitwood, Volusia County, FL; Sheriff Paul Fitzgerald, Story County, IA; Chief Wayne Jerman, Cedar Rapids, IA; Sheriff Bill McCarthy, Polk County, IA.

Public Safety Director, Mark Prosser, Storm Lake, IA; Sheriff Lonny Pulkhabek, Johnson County, IA; Chief Mike Tupper, Marshalltown, IA; Chief William Bones, Voise, ID; Ret. Chief Ron Teachman, South Bend, IN; Ret. Chief James Hawkins, Garden City, KS; Commissioner William Evans, Boston, MA; Chief Ken Ferguson, Framingham, MA; Chief Brian Kyes, Chelsea, MA; Chief Tom Manger, Montgomery County, MD.

Chief Todd Axtell, Saint Paul, MN; Sheriff Eli Rivera, Cheshire County, NH; Chief Cel Rivera, Lorain, OH; Public Safety Commissioner Steven Pare, Providence, RI; Chief William Holbrook, Columbia, SC; Sheriff Leon Lott, Richland County, SC; Ret. Chief Fred Fletcher, Chattanooga, TN; Chief Art Acevedo, Houston, TX.

Sheriff Edward Gonzalez, Harris County, TX; Sheriff Sally Hernandez, Travis County, TX; Sheriff Lupe Valdez, Dallas County, TX; Ret. Chief Chris Burbank, Salt Lake City, UT; Sheriff John Urquhart, King County, WA; Asst. Chief Randy Gaber, Madison, WI; Chief Michael Koval, Madison, WI; Chief Todd Thomas, Appleton, WI.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,

Cleveland, OH, June 28, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 19,000 cities and towns represented by the

National League of Cities (NLC), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003). The bill, which was made public just recently, completely bypassed the House Judiciary Committee and includes provisions that will result in violations of due process and the Fourth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

We are very troubled by the fact that the bill—which preempts local authority, jeopardizes public safety, and exposes local governments to litigation and potential liability—was drafted with no input from local officials.

NLC has consistently opposed federal legislation that would impose harmful sanctions on local governments—sanctions that prohibit or restrict compliance when a detainer request is issued by the Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Specifically, NLC has significant concerns with the provisions in H.R. 3003 that:

1. Undermine local government's authority to govern their public safety and local law enforcement programs. The bill would prevent localities from establishing laws or policies that prohibit or "in any way" restrict compliance with or cooperation with federal immigration enforcement. H.R. 3003 would strip local governments ability to enact common-sense crime prevention policies that ensure victims of crime will seek protection and report crimes.

2. Penalize local governments that fail to comply with federal immigration efforts with the denial of federal funding for critical law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and Byrne JAG programs that provide hundreds of millions of dollars to localities nationwide.

3. Compel local governments to honor Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainer requests, even though the federal courts have determined that ICE use of detainers violates the Fourth Amendment, and that localities may be held liable for honoring them.

4. Expand ICE's detainer authority requiring localities to hold undocumented immigrants for up to 96 hours, which is twice what is currently allowed even if probable cause has not been shown. The bill also does not provide any additional funding to local governments to cover the costs associated with detaining the undocumented immigrants. Requiring cities to shoulder the financial burden being forced upon them with no input impacts our ability to pay for essential infrastructure and services such as roads, schools and libraries.

5. Create a "private right of action" that would allow crime victims or their family members to sue localities if the crime was committed by someone who was released by the locality that did not honor an ICE detainer request. This provision could allow frivolous lawsuits against a local government by anyone who alleges that they were a victim of a crime committed by an immigrant.

6. Compel local governments to utilize their local law enforcement resources to implement federal civil immigration enforcement in violation of the Tenth Amendment's "commandeering" principle. The Tenth Amendment does not permit the federal government to force counties and cities to allocate local resources, including police officers, technology, and personnel, to enforce

federal immigration law. The federal government also cannot withhold funds from localities refusing to participate in federal efforts if the programs affected are unrelated to the purpose of the federal program, or if the sanctions are punitive in nature.

Since the inception of the United States of America, lawful immigrants and refugees have played a vital role in the civic, economic and social life of cities. We recognize that local governments address issues associated with federal immigration laws in a variety of ways that best meet the needs of all their residents. Some cities provide greater leniency towards undocumented immigrants who do not violate state and local laws by not dedicating municipal resources to enforce federal immigration laws. Unfortunately, these cities are wrongfully characterized as safe havens for undocumented immigrants who violate state and local laws.

We believe the power to enforce federal immigration laws remains exclusively a federal power and we strongly oppose federal efforts to commandeer our local law enforcement to take on the duties of federal immigration enforcement agents.

Our nation's local elected officials call on you to do the right thing and vote against H.R. 3003 when it is considered on the floor. We urge you to move beyond punitive bills like H.R. 3003 and work with us to develop a positive legislation that will fix our broken immigration system and make our cities safer.

Thank you for your leadership and for willingness to stand up for America's cities by voting against this legislation that would impose harmful sanctions on local governments.

Sincerely,

MATT ZONE,  
President, National  
League of Cities,  
Ward 15 Councilman.

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE  
OF MAYORS,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to register the strong opposition of the nation's mayors to H.R. 3003, a partisan bill that seeks to punish so-called "sanctuary cities," which is expected to be considered by the full House this week.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors represents well over a thousand mayors and nearly 150 million people. Today, we concluded the 85th Annual Meeting of The U.S. Conference of Mayors and adopted policy that reinforces and builds on previous positions we have taken which oppose provisions in this bill. Specifically, the nation's mayors:

urge members of Congress to withdraw legislation that attempts to cut local law enforcement funding necessary to ensure the safety of our communities, indemnify conduct that violates the constitutional rights afforded to both United States citizens and immigrant populations, and further criminalizes immigration and infringes on the rights of immigrant;

oppose punitive policies that limit local control and discretion, and urge instead that Congress and the Administration pursue immigration enforcement policies that recognize that local law enforcement has limited resources and community trust is critical to local law enforcement and the safety of our communities;

oppose federal policies that commandeer local law enforcement or require local authorities to violate, or be placed at risk of

violating, a person's Fourth Amendment rights; expend limited resources to act as immigration agents; or otherwise assist federal immigration authorities beyond what is determined by local policy.

H.R. 3003 would do all of these things and more:

It would jeopardize public safety by withholding critical public safety funding from jurisdictions that tell their police officers not to ask an individual their immigration status. Many departments have such policies to encourage crime victims and witnesses to report crimes and to build trust with immigrant communities.

It would put jurisdictions at risk of violating an individual's Fourth Amendment rights by establishing probable cause standards for ICE's issuance of detainers that do not require a judicial determination of probable cause. Numerous federal courts have found that continued detention under an ICE detainer, absent probable cause, would state a claim for a violation of the Fourth Amendment and subject the detaining officer or jurisdiction to civil liability.

While it says it would provide immunity to jurisdictions which comply with detainers and hold them harmless in any suits filed against them, they would still be subject to Fourth Amendment challenges.

Further compelling and expanding compliance with certain enforcement provisions, such as immigration detainers, and cutting off federal funding to jurisdictions which do not comply with these provisions likely conflict with the Tenth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 is a bad bill for our cities and their residents and for our nation. It would jeopardize public safety, preempt local authority, and expose local governments to litigation and potential findings of damages. America's mayors call on you to do the right thing and vote against H.R. 3003 when it is considered on the floor.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors urges you instead to focus on positive legislation that will fix our broken immigration system and make our cities safer. The nation's mayors pledge to work with you on bipartisan immigration reform legislation that will fix our nation's broken immigration system. We need to move beyond punitive bills like H.R. 3003 and develop an immigration system that works for our nation, our cities and our people.

To make our cities safer we urge you to consider legislation that will help us to fight crime and prevent terrorism. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the Major Cities Chiefs Association agree that to make the streets of America safe, Congress must act to strengthen bonds between communities and police, expand homeland security grants, invest in mental health and substance abuse services, reduce gun violence, and reform the criminal justice system and strengthen re-entry services.

Sincerely,

MITCHELL J. LANDRIEU,  
Mayor of New Orleans,  
President.

MAJOR COUNTY SHERIFFS OF AMERICA  
AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
COUNTIES,

June 29, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,  
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY AND REPRESENTATIVES PELOSI AND HOYER: On behalf of the Major County Sheriffs of America (MCSA) and the National Association of Counties (NACo), we write to express our commitment to work with Congress and the Administration on measures to prevent crime and violence, but are concerned that H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act is not an effective approach. While we applaud measures to protect the public from repeat, violent predators, we cannot support further cuts in funding that weaken crime prevention efforts, officer recruitment, and safety and wellness programs.

Most sheriffs want to cooperate with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) so that it may remove criminal illegal aliens from the United States, but sheriffs must follow the law that has rendered current ICE requests illegal. Without proper arrest authority, sheriffs cannot willfully disregard an individual's 4th amendment rights as articulated in these court cases. Make no mistake, the American public has a right to know which jurisdictions are blatantly ignoring the rule of law and are endangering community safety and they should be held accountable. If a jurisdiction is following the law of its state or a binding court ruling, it is misguided for Congress to cut funding for programs that support State and local law enforcement agencies in nearly every jurisdiction in this country.

ICE's removal of illegal aliens who are committing crimes in our communities is important to ensure public safety. Their removal mitigates the drain on sheriffs' resources by ensuring these criminals are not sitting in our jails and that our deputies are not continually investigating their crimes. As leaders in law enforcement, the MCSA been working collaboratively with the Department of Homeland Security to find an agreeable solution that is lawful, effects good public safety policy, and allows ICE to effectively do its job of removing criminal illegal aliens from our country.

We know Members of Congress believe that efforts to stop violence in American cities must be strengthened, not weakened. While we appreciate Congress' support for law enforcement, we strongly feel a law enforcement grant penalty solution would not only negatively impact law enforcement efforts across the country, but also not achieve its intended purpose.

Very Respectfully,

MICHAEL J. BOUCHARD,  
Sheriff, Oakland  
County (MI), Vice  
President—Govern-  
ment Affairs, Major  
County Sheriffs of  
America (MCSA).

MATTHEW D. CHASE,



*Executive Director,  
National Association  
of Counties (NACo).*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H.R. 3003 because, if this bill passed, it would punish our communities more than it would punish the criminals. As written, this bill would deny critical funding for our police departments.

As a former 20-year prosecutor in local counties, I know firsthand how much our local police rely on Federal funding not just to do their job, but to be safe when they keep our communities safe. Any decrease in any sort of funding would decrease the safety of our officers as they strive to protect and serve our communities. This law will not only affect our police officers' safety, but it will negatively affect the sense of security in our communities.

Yes, the underlying intent of the law is to make it easier for ICE to target undocumented people who are criminals—I get it—but it is not that simple.

In the past few months, my district has seen two large-scale raids by ICE. Yes, they swept up criminals, but they also snagged collaterals, law-abiding people who were here in the wrong place at the right time. Those operations cast a complete pall over the community that affected our ability to enforce our laws.

As a gang prosecutor, over and over I experienced people who were afraid to come forward out of fear of retaliation. Now they are afraid of the police, afraid of the courts, and afraid of our government. That is why I am opposed to H.R. 3003.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to reflect back on why localities adopt these community trust policies.

The chairman of the committee mentioned somebody in San Francisco who is suing the city. In a way, that shows the efficacy of the trust policies.

This man, Mr. Figueroa-Zarceno, was a victim of crime. His truck was stolen. He went into the police department to report that his truck was stolen. There was a removal order that was 10 or 20 years old. He has an American citizen child. He is a working person. When he went outside, he was picked up by ICE.

I think what that tells other people who are victims of crime who might have an outstanding removal order is: Don't report the crime. It is one thing if you have lost your truck. It has been stolen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. Not that I am for stealing trucks, but here is a bigger problem.

The cities of Houston and Los Angeles report a dramatic drop-off in reports of sexual violence. Why? Because immigrants are afraid to report; and not just because they might be undocumented, but they might have a sister or a next-door neighbor or a spouse who is undocumented, even if they are a citizen. So what has happened is with these threats come an unwillingness of immigrants to report crime, to be witnesses to crime, to keep our communities safe.

These stories that we have heard of the victims of crime are heartbreaking, but we are not without remedies under current law.

The most important law in our country is the Constitution. The Constitution includes the Fourth Amendment.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LOFGREN. The Constitution is the most important law we have. We read it aloud on the first day of our Congress. It includes the Fourth Amendment, which requires probable cause and warrants. A bunch of courts have made that ruling relative to detainers.

Well, that doesn't leave the Federal Government without remedies. Get a warrant. There is not a jurisdiction in the United States that will not honor a judicial warrant. Don't blame the local police. Look to the Department of Homeland Security for why they have dropped the ball and been unwilling to take the steps that are well within their authority today to make sure if there is someone that they need, they get a warrant and they obtain that person for whatever is the next step in their process.

To somehow suggest that this misguided bill is the answer is a big mistake.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this bill today. I stand in support of the rule of law. I stand in support of our institutions.

I also stand in memory of Sarah Root, a young woman who was murdered by a drunk driver on January 16. She was killed in my district—or Nebraska 02—a short time after graduating from Bellevue University with a 4.0 grade point average, with a bright future ahead of her. She was loved by her parents and her extended family. If you see her picture, that beautiful smile would warm any room.

The perpetrator was here illegally from Honduras. He posted bail and never was seen again. ICE failed to hold him, and justice was denied. We can't let this happen again.

The bill today will fix this. We can't let a travesty of justice like this ever happen again. Our systems have to hold people accountable. When ICE lets people go like this and they leave, a travesty of justice occurs.

Today we stand with Michelle Root, the mother of Sarah Root, who is here, and we stand with Scott Root. We remember Sarah Root, and we say: Never again.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3003 is not making our communities safer. If it was, the bill's sponsors would have heeded the strong opposition of organizations like the National Fraternal Order of Police, who stated that, "withholding needed assistance to law enforcement agencies—which have no policymaking role—hurts public safety efforts;" and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, who cautioned, "H.R. 3003 is a bad bill for our cities and their residents and for our Nation. It would jeopardize public safety, preempt local authority, and expose local governments to litigation and potential findings of damage."

Instead, this legislation is a down payment on the President's and the Republican majority's mass deportation plan.

This bill, and the one that we will debate later today, is a portion of the mass deportation bill known as the "Davis-Oliver Act," which has been cited as a priority for the Trump administration, and is supported by anti-immigrant groups, such as NumbersUSA and the Center for Immigration Studies.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, let me be clear: the only law enforcement agencies that risk losing any Federal grants because of this legislation are those agencies that, without any outside compulsion, deliberately choose to violate Federal law by outright prohibiting their law enforcement officers from voluntarily communicating with ICE and cooperating with it in the enforcement of Federal law.

Second, let me also be clear that this bill does not require State and local law enforcement agencies to comply with ICE detainers, and it does not seek to cut off any Federal grants to jurisdictions that choose not to comply.



Finally, it is a long-settled principle of constitutional law. And let me remind you that all of these law enforcement officers vowed to defend the Constitution, and the Constitution grants supremacy to Federal immigration law.

When there is a conflict with Federal immigration law, State laws that are in conflict are invalid, preempted by Federal law under the 10th Amendment. Under the 10th Amendment, State and local law enforcement agencies have no obligation to comply with unconstitutional provisions of State or local law that asks them to violate title 8, United States Code, section 1373.

Then, again, getting back to the amazing news that we have, the city of San Francisco has just agreed to pay \$190,000 to an illegal alien because the San Francisco sheriff complied with an ICE detainer and turned the alien over to ICE, apparently in violation of San Francisco policy. That individual, under Federal law, because he was the victim of a crime, will be eligible to apply for a U visa.

Respect for the rule of law is the way to keep communities safe. Respect for the rule of law is the way to make sure that people like Kate Steinle are not murdered in the city of San Francisco, as we have heard of other murders all during the debate today, by people who are unlawfully present in the United States. Therefore, they are all preventable crimes.

Law enforcement in this country needs to cooperate. Most law enforcement officers want that to be done. Let's support them, let's support this legislation, and make sure that the rule of law is upheld.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following additional letters in opposition to H.R. 3003. These are additional letters of opposition that I mentioned earlier on H.R. 3003.

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB/COM), and Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) to express our opposition to H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

The Catholic Church holds a strong interest in the welfare of migrants and how our nation welcomes and treats them. Our parishes include those with and without immigration status, unfortunately some who have witnessed or been victims of crime in the United States, including domestic violence, armed robbery, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We oppose H.R. 3003 because it would impose obligations on local governments that we fear—and that many of them have warned—would undermine authority and discretion of local law enforcement. This, in turn, would hamper the ability of local law enforcement officials to apprehend criminals and ensure public safety in all communities.

Furthermore, Section 2 of H.R. 3003 would deny to jurisdictions vital federal funding related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, and naturalization if those jurisdictions are deemed to be non-compliant with H.R. 3003. The Catholic service network, including Catholic Charities, works in partnership with the federal government on a number of Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security initiatives, including disaster response and recovery, naturalization and citizenship services, and services for the immigrant, including victims of human trafficking, and domestic violence. These services are incredibly valuable to the protection and promotion of the human person and in some instances life-saving. Cutting grants related to these important national objectives, or threat of such cuts, is not humane or just, nor is it in our national interest.

Also, we oppose H.R. 3004 as it would lead to an expansion of incarceration and does not include adequate protections for people who re-enter the U.S. for humanitarian reasons or seek protection at the border. While H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal offenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government's ability to prosecute illegal re-entry cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are efficiently utilized to prosecute and convict the most violent offenders of violent crimes. Expanding who is eligible to be prosecuted for entry or re-entry as well as enhancing sentencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that communities are safer. Furthermore, we are concerned that, as introduced, H.R. 3004 would also prevent vulnerable asylum seekers and unaccompanied children, (who have presented themselves repeatedly at the U.S. border in the flight from violence), from being able to access protection, and instead face fines, imprisonment or both.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on balancing the needs and rights of immigrants with our nation's best interests and security.

The United States has a long and proud history of leadership in welcoming newcomers regardless of their circumstances and promoting the common good. We stand ready to work with you on legislation that more closely adheres to this tradition and appreciate your serious consideration of our views in this regard.

Sincerely,

MOST REV. JOE VÁSQUEZ,  
*Bishop of Austin,  
Chairman, USCCB  
Committee on Migration.*

SR. DONNA MARKHAM, OP,  
PHD.,  
*President and CEO,  
Catholic Charities  
USA.*

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END,  
SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,  
June 27, 2017.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), comprised of national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual assault and domestic violence victims and representing hundreds of

organizations across the country dedicated to ensuring all survivors of violence receive the protections they deserve, write to express our deep concerns about the impact that H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," and H.R. 3004, or "Kate's Law," will have on victims fleeing or recovering from sexual assault, domestic violence, or human trafficking, and on communities at large.

This year is the twenty-third anniversary of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA") which has, since it was first enacted, included critical protections for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence. H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have the effect of punishing immigrant survivors and their children and pushing them into the shadows and into danger, undermining the very purpose of VAWA. Specifically, the nation's leading national organizations that address domestic and sexual assault oppose H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 because:

Community trust policies are critical tools for increasing community safety. Laws that seek to intertwine the federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will undermine the Congressional purpose of protections enacted under VAWA and will have the chilling effect of pushing immigrant victims into the shadows and undermining public safety. Immigration enforcement must be implemented in a way that supports local community policing and sustains community trust in working with local law enforcement. H.R. 3003 runs contrary to community policing efforts and will deter immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault survivors not only from reporting crimes, but also from seeking help for themselves and their children. While H.R. 3003 does not require that local law enforcement arrest or report immigrant victims or witnesses of criminal activity, the language in the bill provides no restriction prohibiting such practices.

Perpetrators use fear of deportation as tool of abuse. Local policies that minimize the intertwining of local law enforcement with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) help protect the most vulnerable victims by creating trust between law enforcement and the immigrant community, which in turn help protect entire communities. Abusers and traffickers use the fear of deportation of their victims as a tool to silence and trap them. If immigrants are afraid to call the police because of fear of deportation, they become more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Not only are the individual victims and their children harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to abstain from reporting violent perpetrators or seeking protection and, as a result, dangerous criminals are not identified and go unpunished.

As VAWA recognizes, immigrant victims of violent crimes often do not contact law enforcement due to fear that they will be deported. Immigrants are already afraid of contacting the police and HR 3003 proposes to further intertwine federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will only exacerbate this fear. The result is that perpetrators will be able to continue to harm others, both immigrant and U.S. Citizen victims alike. Since January of 2017, victim advocates have been describing the immense fear expressed by immigrant victims and their reluctance to reach out for help from police. A recent survey of over 700 advocates and attorneys at domestic violence and sexual assault programs indicate that immigrant victims are expressing heightened fears and concerns about immigration enforcement, with 78 percent of advocates and

attorneys reporting that victims are describing fear of contacting the police; 75 percent of them reporting that victims are afraid of going to court; and 43 percent reporting working with immigrant victims who are choosing not to move forward with criminal charges or obtaining protective orders.

In addition, according to Los Angeles Police Chief Charlie Beck, reporting of sexual assault and domestic violence among Latinos has dropped significantly this year, possibly due to concerns that police interaction could result in deportation. According to Chief Beck, reports of sexual assault have dropped 25 percent among Los Angeles' Latino population since the beginning of the year compared to a three percent drop among non-Latino victims. Similarly, reports of spousal abuse among Latinos fell by about 10 percent among Latinos whereas the decline among non-Latinos was four percent. The Houston Police Department reported in April that the number of Hispanics reporting rape is down 42.8 percent from last year. In Denver, CO, the Denver City Attorney has reported that some domestic violence victims are declining to testify in court. As of late February, the City Attorney's Office had dropped four cases because the victims fear that ICE officers will arrest and deport them. Both the City Attorney and Aurora Police Chief have spoken on the importance of having trust with the immigrant community in order to maintain public safety and prosecute crime.

**H.R. 3003 Will Unfairly Punish Entire communities.**

H.R. 3003 punishes localities that follow Constitutional guidelines and refuse to honor detainer requests that are not supported by due process mandates. H.R. 3003 likely covers more than 600 jurisdictions across the country, most of which do not characterize their policies to follow constitutional mandates as "sanctuary" policies. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating their access to various federal grants, including federal law enforcement grants, such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and other federal grants related to law enforcement or immigration, such as those that fund forensic rape kit analysis. Withholding federal law enforcement funding would, ironically, undermine the ability of local jurisdictions to combat and prevent crime in their communities.

In addition, the fiscal impact of both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will result in limited federal law enforcement resources being further reduced as a result of shifting funding from enforcing federal criminal laws addressing violent crimes, including those protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, to the detention and prosecution of many non-violent immigration law violators.

**H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 Will Unfairly Punish Victims.**

By greatly expanding mandatory detention and expanding criminal penalties for reentry, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have harsh consequences for immigrant survivors. Victims of human trafficking, sexual assault, and domestic violence are often at risk of being arrested and convicted. In recognition of this fact, existing ICE guidance cites the example of when police respond to a domestic violence call, both parties may be arrested or a survivor who acted in self-defense may be wrongly accused. In addition, if the abuser speaks English better than the survivor, or if other language or cultural barriers (or fear of retaliation from the abuser)

prevent the survivor from fully disclosing the abuse suffered, a survivor faces charges and tremendous pressure to plead guilty (without being advised about the long-term consequences) in order to be released from jail and reunited with her children. In addition, victims of trafficking are often arrested and convicted for prostitution-related offenses. These victims are often desperate to be released and possibly to be reunited with their children following their arrests or pending trial. These factors—combined with poor legal counsel, particularly about the immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—have in the past and will likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges and/or prostitution. H.R. 3003 imposes harsh criminal penalties and H.R. 3004 imposes expanded bases for detention without consideration of mitigating circumstances or humanitarian exceptions for these victims.

In addition, H.R. 3004 expands the criminal consequences for re-entry in the U.S. without recognizing the compelling humanitarian circumstances in which victims who have been previously removed return for their safety. Victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking fleeing violence in their countries of origin will be penalized for seeking protection from harm. In recent years, women and children fleeing rampant violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, have fled to the United States, seeking refuge. Frequently, because of inadequate access to legal representation, they are unable to establish their eligibility for legal protections in the United States, resulting in their removal. In many cases, the risk of domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or human trafficking in their countries of origin remain unabated and victims subsequently attempt to reenter the U.S. to protect themselves and their children. Other victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking may be deported because their abusers or traffickers isolate them, or prevent them from obtaining lawful immigration status. They are deported, with some victims having to leave their children behind in the custody of their abusers or traffickers. Under H.R. 3004, these victims risk harsh criminal penalties for re-entry for attempting to protect themselves and their children.

On behalf of the courageous survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking and human trafficking that our organizations serve, we urge you to vote against HR 3003 and 3004, and to affirm the intent and spirit of VAWA by supporting strong relationships between law enforcement and immigrant communities, which is critical for public safety in general, and particularly essential for domestic and sexual violence victims and their children.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL TASKFORCE TO END SEXUAL  
AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ([www.Avawa.org](http://www.Avawa.org)).

JUNE 28, 2017.

Re Vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 407 undersigned local, state, and national immigrant, civil rights, faith-based, and labor organizations, we urge you to oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, and any similar legislation that jeopardizes public safety, erodes

the goodwill forged between local police and its residents, and perpetuates the criminalization and incarceration of immigrants. H.R. 3003 would strip badly needed law enforcement funding for state and local jurisdictions, runs afoul of the Tenth and Fourth Amendment, and unnecessarily expands the government's detention apparatus. H.R. 3004 unwisely expands the federal government's ability to criminally prosecute immigrants for immigration-based offenses, excludes critical humanitarian protections for those fleeing violence, and doubles down on the failed experiment of incarceration for immigration violations.

Over 600 state and local jurisdictions have policies or ordinances that disentangle their state and local law enforcement agencies from enforcing federal immigration law. The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, seeks to attack so-called "sanctuary" jurisdictions (many of whom do not consider themselves as such) by penalizing state and local jurisdictions that follow the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by refusing to honor constitutionally infirm requests for detainers. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating various federal grants, including funding through the Cops on the Beat program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other federal grant related to law enforcement or immigration. Importantly, using the threat of withholding federal grants to coerce state and local jurisdictions likely runs afoul of the Tenth Amendment's prohibition on commandeering, a position supported by over 300 law professors.

"Sanctuary" policies are critical to promote public safety for local communities. Fearing referral to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, victims and witnesses of crime are significantly less likely to communicate with local law enforcement. Local law enforcement authorities have repeatedly echoed this sentiment, acknowledging that community policing policies are paramount to enhancing public safety. Indeed, "sanctuary" jurisdictions have less crime and more economic development than similarly situated non-"sanctuary" jurisdictions. Withholding critically-needed federal funding would, paradoxically, severely cripple the ability of state and local jurisdictions to satisfy the public safety needs of their communities.

Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, would further criminalize the immigrant community by drastically increasing penalties for immigrants convicted of unlawful reentry. Operation Streamline encapsulates our nation's failed experiment with employing criminal penalties to deter migration. Under Operation Streamline, the federal government prosecutes immigrants for reentry at significant rates. By all practical measures, Operation Streamline has failed to deter migration, wasted billions of taxpayer dollars, and unfairly punished thousands of immigrants who try to enter or reenter the United States to reunite with their children and loved ones. We fear that H.R. 3004's increased penalties for reentry would double down on this failed strategy, explode the prison population, and cost billions of dollars.

Instead of passing discredited enforcement-only legislation, Congress should move forward on enacting just immigration reform legislation that provides a roadmap to citizenship for the nation's eleven million aspiring Americans and eliminates mass detention and deportation programs that undermine fundamental human rights. Legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local

democratic processes, and raises serious constitutional concerns represents an abdication of the Congress' responsibility to enact fair, humane, and just immigration policy. In light of the above, we urge you to vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

Please contact Jose Magana-Salgado, of the Immigrant Legal Resource Center, if you have any questions regarding this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

America's Voice Education Fund; American Federation of Teachers; American Friends Service Committee (AFSC); American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; Americans Committed to Justice and Truth; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF); Asian Americans Advancing Justice-AAJC; Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Asian Law Caucus; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO (APALA); Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; ASISTA; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Casa de Esperanza; National Latin@ Network; Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.; Center for American Progress; Center for Employment Training; Center for Gender & Refugee Studies; Center for Law and Social Policy; Center for New Commu-

Center for Popular Democracy (CPD); Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Refugee & Immigration Ministries; Christian Community Development Association; Church World Service; Coalition on Human Needs; CODEPINK; Columbian Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES); Community Initiatives for Visiting Immigrants in Confinement (CIVIC); Defending Rights & Dissent; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Disciples Home Missions; Dominican Sisters of Sparkill; Drug Policy Alliance; Easterseals Blake Foundation; Equal Rights Advocates; Farmworker Justice; Freedom Network USA; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Fuerza Mundial.

Futures Without Violence; Grassroots Leadership; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic National Bar Association; Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters—USA-JPIC; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Intercommunity Peace & Justice Center; Interfaith Worker Justice; Isaiah Wilson; Jewish Voice for Peace; Jewish Voice for Peace—Boston; Jewish Voice for Peace—Tacoma chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Western MA; Justice Strategies; Kids in Need of Defense (KIND); Lambda Legal; Laotian American National Alliance; Latin America Working Group; Latino Victory Fund; LatinoJustice PRLDEF.

League of United Latin American Citizens; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Mi Familia Vota; Milwaukee Chapter, Jewish Voice for Peace; NAACP; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA); National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON); National Education Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the NLG; National Iranian American Council (NIAC); National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC); National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Latina/o Psychological Association; National Lawyers Guild; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; People's Action; PICO National Network; Queer Detainee Empowerment Project; Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services (RAICES); School Social Work Association of America; Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, New Windsor; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); Southern Border Communities Coalition; Southern Poverty Law Center; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank.

The National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health; The Queer Palestinian Empowerment Network; The Sentencing Project; The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants; UndocuBlack Network; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Legislative Ministry of New Jersey; Unitarian Universalist Service Committee; UNITE HERE; United Child Care, Inc.; United for a Fair Economy; UU College of Social Justice; UURISE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee & Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women's Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.

#### STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

(MILU) Mujeres Inmigrantes Luchando Unidas; #VigilantLOVE; 580 Cafe/Wesley Foundation Serving UCLA; Acting in Community Together in Organizing Northern Nevada (ACTIONN); Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Alianza; All for All; Alliance San Diego; Allies of Knoxville's Immigrant Neighbors (AKIN); American Gateways; Aquinas Center; Arkansas United Community Coalition; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Atlanta; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—LA; Asian Americans United; Asian Counseling and Referral Service; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center; Asylee Women Enterprise; Atlas: DIY.

Bear Creek United Methodist Church—Congregation Kol Ami Interfaith Partnership; Bethany Immigration Services; Brighton Park Neighborhood Council; Cabrini Immigrant Services of NYC; Campaign for Hoosier Families; Canal Alliance; Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition; CASA; Casa Familiar, Inc.; Casa Latina; Casa San Jose; Catholic Charities; Catholic Charities San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin; Causa Oregon; CDWBA Legal Project, Inc.; Central American Legal Assistance; Central New Jersey Jewish Voice for Peace; Central Pacific Conference of the United Church of Christ; Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative (CVIIC); Centro Laboral de Graton.

Centro Latino Americano; Centro Legal de la Raza; Centro Romero; Chelsea Collaborative; Chicago Religious Leadership Network on Latin America; Church Council of Greater Seattle; Church of Our Saviour/La Iglesia de Nuestro Salvador Episcopal; Church Women United in New York State; Cleveland Jobs with Justice; Coalicion de Lideres Latinos-CLILA; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Coalition of African Communities; Coloradans For Immigrant Rights, a program of the American

Friends Service Committee; Colorado People's Alliance (COPA); Columbia Legal Services; Comite Pro Uno; Comite VIDA; Committee for Justice in Palestine—Ithaca; Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, Inc.; Community Legal Services and Counseling Center.

Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto; Community of Friends in Action, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.; CRLA Foundation; CT Working Families; DC-Maryland Justice for Our Neighbors; Delaware Civil Rights Coalition; Do the Most Good Montgomery County (MD); Dominican Sisters—Grand Rapids (MI); Dream Team Los Angeles DTLA; DRUM-Desis Rising Up & Moving; East Bay Sanctuary Covenant; Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon; El CENTRO de Igualdad y Derechos; El Monte Wesleyan Church; Emerald Isle Immigration Center; Employee Rights Center; Encuentro; End Domestic Abuse WI; English Ministry—Korean Presbyterian Church of St. Louis.

Episcopal Refugee & Immigrant Center Alliance; Equal Justice Center; Equality California; Erie Neighborhood House; First Congregational UCC of Portland; First Unitarian Universalist Church of Berks County; Florida Center for Fiscal and Economic Policy; Florida Immigrant Coalition, Inc. (FLIC); Franciscans for Justice; Frida Kahlo Community Organization; Friends of Broward Detainees; Friends of Miami-Dade Detainees; Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights; Gethsemane Lutheran Church; Grassroots Alliance for Immigrant Rights; Greater Lafayette Immigrant Allies; Greater New York Labor Religion Coalition; Greater Rochester COALITION for Immigration Justice; Grupo de Apoyo e Integracion Hispanoamericano; HACES.

Hana Center; Harvard Islamic Society; Her Justice; HIAS Pennsylvania; Hispanic Interest Coalition of Alabama; Hispanic Legal Clinic; Hudson Valley Chapter of JVP; Human Rights Initiative of North Texas; ICE-Free Capital District; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immanuel Fellowship; a bilingual congregation; Immigrant Justice Advocacy Movement (IJAM); Immigrant Legal Advocacy Project; Immigration Action Group; Immigration Center for Women and Children; Inland Empire-Immigrant Youth Coalition (IEIYC); Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity; International Institute of Buffalo; Irish International Immigrant Center; IRTF—InterReligious Task Force on Central America and Colombia.

Japanese American Citizens League, San Jose Chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albany, NY chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albuquerque; Jewish Voice for Peace—Austin; Jewish Voice for Peace—Bay Area; Jewish Voice for Peace—Cleveland; Jewish Voice for Peace—DC Metro; Jewish Voice for Peace—Denver; Jewish Voice for Peace—Ithaca; Jewish Voice for Peace—Los Angeles; Jewish Voice for Peace—Madison; Jewish Voice for Peace—New Haven; Jewish Voice for Peace—Philadelphia; Jewish Voice for Peace—Pittsburgh; Jewish Voice for Peace—Portland; Jewish Voice for Peace—San Diego; Jewish Voice for Peace—South Florida; Jewish Voice for Peace—Syracuse, NY; Jewish Voice for Peace—Triangle NC; Jolt.

Justice for our Neighbors Houston; Justice for Our Neighbors Southeastern Michigan; Justice For Our Neighbors West Michigan; JVP-HV. Jewish Voice for Peace—Hudson Valley; Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Kids for College; Kino Border Initiative; Kitsap Immigrant Assistance Center; KIWA (Koreatown Immigrant

Workers Alliance); Korean Resource Center; La Casa de Amistad; La Coalición de Derechos Humanos; La Comunidad, Inc.; La Raza Centro Legal; Lafayette Urban Ministry; Las Vegas Chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Latin American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Latino Racial Justice Circle; Latinx Alliance of Lane County; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County.

Legal Services for Children; Lemkin House Inc.; Long Island Wins; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Middle East Crisis Response (MECR); Migrant and Immigrant Community Action Project; Migrant Justice/Justicia Migrante; MinKwon Center for Community Action; Mission Asset Fund; Mississippi Immigrants Rights Alliance (MIRA); Mosaic Family Services; Movement of Immigrant Leaders in Pennsylvania (MILPA); Mujeres Unidas y Activas; Mundo Maya Foundation; National Lawyers Guild—Los Angeles Chapter; New Jersey Alliance for Immigrant Justice; New Mexico Dream Team; New Mexico Immigrant Law Center; New Mexico Voices for Children.

New Sanctuary Movement of Philadelphia; New York Immigration Coalition; NH Conference United Church of Christ Immigration Working Group; North Carolina Council of Churches; North County Immigration Task Force; North Jersey chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Northern Illinois Justice for Our Neighbors; Northern Manhattan Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project (NWIRP); OCCORD; Occupy Bergen County (New Jersey); OneAmerica; OneJustice; Oregon Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice—IMrJ; Organized Communities Against Deportations; OutFront Minnesota; Pangea Legal Services; PASO—West Suburban Action Project; Pax Christi Florida; Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition.

Pilgrim United Church of Christ; Pilipino Workers Center; Polonians Organized to Minister to Our Community, Inc. (POMOC); Portland Central America Solidarity Committee; Progreso: Latino Progress; Progressive Jewish Voice of Central PA; Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; Project Hope-Proyecto Esperanza; Project IRENE; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Racial Justice Action Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; Refugees Helping Refugees; Refugio del Rio Grande; Resilience Orange County; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network (RMIAN); Rural and Migrant Ministry; Safe Passage; San Francisco CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates); Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN).

Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, Philadelphia/ Delaware Valley Chapter; Sisters of St. Francis, St. Francis Province; Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester, Inc.; Skagit Immigrant Rights Council; Social Justice Collaborative; South Asian Fund For Education, Scholarship And Training (SAFEST); South Bay Jewish Voice for Peace; South Texas Immigration Council; Southeast Immigrant Rights Network; St John of God Church; Students United for Nonviolence; Tacoma Community House; Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition; Teresa Messer, Law Office of Teresa Messer; Thai Community Development Center; The Garden, Lutheran Ministry; The International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit; The Legal Project; Tompkins County Immigrant Rights Coalition; Transgender Resource Center of New Mexico.

Trinity Episcopal Church; U-Lead Athens; Unitarian Universalist Mass Action Net-

work; Unitarian Universalist PA Legislative Advocacy Network (UUPLAN); United African Organization; United Families; University Leadership Initiative; University of San Francisco Immigration and Deportation Defense Clinic; UNO Immigration Ministry; UPLIFT; UpValley Family Centers; VietLead; Vital Immigrant Defense Advocacy & Services, Santa Rosa, CA; Volunteers of Legal Service; Washtenaw Interfaith Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Watertown Citizens for Peace, Justice, and the Environment; Wayne Action for Racial Equality; WeCount!; WESPAC Foundation; Wilco Justice Alliance (Williamson County, TX).

Women Watch Afrika, Inc.; Worksafe; Young Immigrants in Action; YWCA Alaska; YWCA Alliance; YWCA Berkeley/Oakland; YWCA Brooklyn; YWCA Clark County; YWCA Elgin; YWCA Greater Austin; YWCA Greater Pittsburgh; YWCA Greater Portland; YWCA Madison; YWCA Minneapolis; YWCA Mount Desert Island; YWCA NE KANSAS; YWCA of Metropolitan Detroit; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA Olympia; YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley; YWCA Rochester & Monroe County; YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts; YWCA Southern Arizona; YWCA Tulsa; YWCA Warren; YWCA Westmoreland County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 414, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. DEMINGS. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Demings moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3003 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, insert after line 5 the following:

“(7) PUBLIC SAFETY EXCEPTION.—For purposes of this subsection, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, shall not be found to be out of compliance with subsection (a) or (b) if the State or political subdivision of the State certifies to the Attorney General that such compliance would endanger public safety.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today not just as a Member of Congress, but as a 27-year veteran of law enforcement and as a former police chief. As such, I am compelled to warn of the harm this

bill, in its current form, will cause for our law enforcement agencies.

As a police chief, it was my responsibility to reduce crime and maintain livable neighborhoods; neighborhoods where families can live in peace, and enjoy local parks, community centers, restaurants, and shopping; neighborhoods where children can walk to school and play in their front yard and backyard without fear.

That is the kind of community that everyone in America deserves—one where they feel safe and secure.

H.R. 3003 impedes on law enforcement's ability to effectively do its job. It will create an environment that will erode the trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

The local police are the first ones to respond. They are the thin blue line that stands between those who are in this country, who are trying to live in peace, and those that would do them harm. We want our neighbors—immigrants—to call the police to report crimes without fear or hesitation. When they do not, Mr. Speaker, our community is at the mercy of the criminals.

This does not make our communities more safe, yet that is what is at stake with the bill before us. Supporters of the bill claim that it has an exemption for victims and witnesses, but it is not a complete exemption.

Law enforcement officers investigate and interview witnesses. Their goal is to solve crimes, regardless of the immigration status of victims and witnesses, including victims of sexual assault and domestic violence.

I filed an amendment with the Rules Committee that would have exempted victims and witnesses from all of the bill's intrusive requirements. The Rules Committee blocked me from offering that amendment, but the bill, in its current form, would undermine law enforcement's ability to do its job, therefore, making our communities less safe.

Mr. Speaker, don't just take my word for it. The National Fraternal Order of Police stands against the bill. They represent over 330,000 law enforcement officers across the Nation. These officers are not responsible for creating laws, and eliminating Federal grant funding for political reasons impedes their ability to solve crimes.

As the FOP writes:

Withholding assistance to law enforcement agencies, which have no policymaking rule, will hurt public safety efforts.

No one knows our communities better than the law enforcement officials sworn to protect their communities, which is why I have offered this motion which would exempt from the mandates and penalties in the bill those jurisdictions in which local law enforcement officials conclude that the mandates in this bill would endanger public safety.

Politics should never impede public safety. The President has said that, when lawmakers vote on this bill, they should put America's safety first.

I strongly agree, and I urge my colleagues to support this motion and put our public safety first.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is quite correct: everyone deserves to feel safe.

Kate Steinle deserved to feel safe when she was walking down the pier with her father in San Francisco, when she was killed.

Not enacting this legislation endangers public safety, not the opposite, as those on the other side have argued.

How would you trust local government officials, who have instructed their law enforcement officers to not cooperate with Federal law enforcement officers to take dangerous criminals off of our streets, when this motion to recommit would say: "Oh, they will have to certify that such compliance would endanger public safety and then the law wouldn't apply?"

It is circular reasoning.

The nonenforcement of immigration laws has led to the bolstering of sanctuary jurisdiction policies in communities throughout the United States. These policies hamper the enforcement of Federal law and do nothing to truly promote trust between law enforcement and U.S. citizens.

This bill provides a commonsense approach to fixing the damage caused by sanctuary policies without mandating any affirmative duty. In order to be in compliance with section 1373 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended in this bill, States and localities have no affirmative duties to act. They have no obligations to cooperate or communicate, or even engage with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement at any level.

□ 1530

Instead, they simply may not affirmatively restrict a government entity, including law enforcement, from cooperating or communicating with ICE.

So I am shocked that so many on the other side of the aisle view compliance with this provision as a condition for eligibility for certain grant programs as outlandish. This is not a novel concept. And compliance with section 1373 is already a condition of eligibility for these grant programs.

As for detainers, H.R. 3003 creates the probable cause standard that so many have argued was lacking for so long. Once enacted, States and localities can look to Federal law to receive clarifi-

cation on what probable cause standard is employed before a detainer request is placed.

To further aid jurisdictions, the threat of expensive and time-consuming frivolous litigation is abated by providing immunity for jurisdictions that exercise good faith in honoring a detainer.

Finally, this bill ensures that dangerous criminal aliens convicted of drunk driving or not yet convicted of very serious crimes are prevented from freely walking the streets of our communities during their removal hearings. This bill is a strong first step in ensuring that our immigration laws are enforced.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this motion to recommit, to vote for the base bill, and to send a message that sanctuary policies will not be tolerated so that the rule of law will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### KATE'S LAW

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 415, I call up the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 415, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3004

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as "Kate's Law".

#### SEC. 2. ILLEGAL REENTRY.

Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1326) is amended to read as follows:

##### "REENTRY OF REMOVED ALIEN

"SEC. 276. (a) REENTRY AFTER REMOVAL.—Any alien who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed, or who has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding, and subsequently enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found

in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

"(b) REENTRY OF CRIMINAL OFFENDERS.—Notwithstanding the penalty provided in subsection (a), if an alien described in that subsection was convicted before such removal or departure—

"(1) for 3 or more misdemeanors or for a felony, the alien shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

"(2) for a felony for which the alien was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 30 months, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both;

"(3) for a felony for which the alien was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 60 months, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both; or

"(4) for murder, rape, kidnapping, or a felony offense described in chapter 77 (relating to peonage and slavery) or 113B (relating to terrorism) of such title, or for 3 or more felonies of any kind, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 25 years, or both.

"(c) REENTRY AFTER REPEATED REMOVAL.—Any alien who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed 3 or more times and thereafter enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(d) PROOF OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS.—The prior convictions described in subsection (b) are elements of the crimes described, and the penalties in that subsection shall apply only in cases in which the conviction or convictions that form the basis for the additional penalty are—

"(1) alleged in the indictment or information; and

"(2) proven beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant.

"(e) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES.—It shall be an affirmative defense to a violation of this section that—

"(1) prior to the alleged violation, the alien had sought and received the express consent of the Secretary of Homeland Security to reapply for admission into the United States; or

"(2) with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed, the alien—

"(A) was not required to obtain such advance consent under the Immigration and Nationality Act or any prior Act; and

"(B) had complied with all other laws and regulations governing the alien's admission into the United States.

"(f) LIMITATION ON COLLATERAL ATTACK ON UNDERLYING REMOVAL ORDER.—In a criminal proceeding under this section, an alien may not challenge the validity of any prior removal order concerning the alien.

"(g) REENTRY OF ALIEN REMOVED PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF TERM OF IMPRISONMENT.—Any alien removed pursuant to section 241(a)(4) who enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in, the United States shall be incarcerated for the remainder of the sentence of imprisonment which was pending at the time of deportation without any reduction for parole or supervised release unless the alien affirmatively demonstrates that the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to the alien's reentry. Such alien shall be subject to

such other penalties relating to the reentry of removed aliens as may be available under this section or any other provision of law.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section and section 275, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) CROSSES THE BORDER TO THE UNITED STATES.—The term ‘crosses the border’ refers to the physical act of crossing the border, regardless of whether the alien is free from official restraint.

“(2) FELONY.—The term ‘felony’ means any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 1 year under the laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.

“(3) MISDEMEANOR.—The term ‘misdemeanor’ means any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of not more than 1 year under the applicable laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.

“(4) REMOVAL.—The term ‘removal’ includes any denial of admission, exclusion, deportation, or removal, or any agreement by which an alien stipulates or agrees to exclusion, deportation, or removal.

“(5) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on H.R. 3004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, illegal reentry of criminal aliens has been viewed as a minor felony with only a fraction of those repeat offenders ever seeing the inside of a Federal courtroom. Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides Federal prosecutors with the tools necessary to truly deter criminal aliens from reentering the United States.

Unfortunately, the section simply does not go far enough to act as a deterrent. Criminal aliens view the risk as worth the reward, as most charged under this section of law are given minuscule sentences that belie the severity of the crime.

Aliens who reenter the United States after being removed, demonstrate a flagrant disregard for our immigration laws and pose a tremendous threat to public safety and national security in every community nationwide.

This Congress has heard from countless victims and family members of victims whose lives were forever changed or completely destroyed by criminal aliens preying on our citizens.

This bill is named in memory and in honor of Kate Steinle. On July 1, 2015, Ms. Steinle was enjoying an evening at a popular attraction in San Francisco with her father. As three shots were fired, Ms. Steinle collapsed screaming. Her father, Jim, performed CPR until paramedics arrived, but she ultimately succumbed to the severe damage caused by the bullet and she died hours later.

Her murderer was arrested an hour later and identified as a middle-aged criminal alien who had been removed from the United States and had returned at least five times. The gun used had been stolen from a Federal officer with the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Speaker, these horrific events must be better deterred and prevented. No legislation can prevent every tragic situation, but this Congress has a duty to take every action possible to mitigate this harm and danger.

It is in this vein that I am proud to bring Kate’s Law to the House floor today. This bill seeks to amend and greatly improve section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by enhancing the maximum sentences for criminal aliens who seek to reenter the United States.

While an alien reentering this country is subject to a sentence of up to 2 years, current law only subjects certain criminals to enhance penalties. Specifically, only criminal aliens previously convicted of an aggravated felony, as defined in our immigration laws, controlled substance violations, crimes against other persons, or certain felonies would trigger an enhanced sentence of either 10 or 20 years.

Kate’s Law closes the loophole into which so many criminal aliens fall. The bill provides that a criminal alien, previously convicted of any three misdemeanors or any felony, would, upon conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 10 years.

Aliens previously convicted of a crime for which they were sentenced to at least 30 months, would, upon conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 15 years.

Aliens previously convicted of a crime for which they were sentenced to at least 60 months, would, upon conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 20 years.

Aliens previously convicted for murder, rape, kidnapping, a peonage offense, or any three felonies, would, under conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 25 years.

These are significant enhancements to our immigration laws and are long overdue. I would be remiss, however, if I failed to mention a caveat added to the bill. If enacted, Kate’s Law adds affirmative defenses for aliens charged under this section. If an alien can

prove that they had the express consent of the Secretary of Homeland Security to reapply for admission, or that an alien previously denied admission and removed was not required to obtain such consent, then the alien may present that as an affirmative defense to the illegal reentry crime.

This safeguard will ensure that only aliens who illegally reenter the United States may be convicted and sentenced to enhanced penalties under this section.

This is missing from the current statute, and I am sure my colleagues on both side of the aisle would agree that due process protections such as these add to the efficacy of such a measure.

Nothing that this Congress can pass will ever bring Kate Steinle back, nor take away the pain suffered by her family, and countless other victims of crimes committed by criminal aliens. Kate’s Law, however, will offer a deterrent against future criminal aliens who seek to illegally reenter the United States. Knowing they may face up to 2 years in Federal prison is one thing, but the possibility of a sentence of 10, 15, 20, or 25 years will have the desired effect.

I agree with many of my colleagues on both side of the aisle that we must take many other steps to address our immigration system. This Congress must pass strong measures to ensure that immigration enforcement in the interior of the United States remains a priority. Kate’s Law is an essential component of that larger effort to bring about true enforcement of our immigration laws, and protect this Nation from criminal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3004 is an anti-immigrant enforcement-only proposal that represents yet another step in President Trump’s mass deportation plan.

This legislation significantly expands the Federal Government’s ability to prosecute individuals for illegal entry and attempted reentry into the United States.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say this bill is about protecting us from criminals. But don’t be fooled about the ultimate effect of this bill. It does far more than target immigrants with criminal histories.

For the first time, this legislation would make it a felony for an individual who has been previously removed or merely denied admission to come to an official port of entry to ask for reentry into the country legally. This is true even if the individual has no criminal history whatsoever.

For instance, the expanded offense would apply to persecuted asylum seekers voluntarily presenting themselves at a port of entry to request asylum under our own immigration laws.



It would reach desperate victims of sex trafficking who approach the Customs and Border Protection officer to seek protection.

It would even extend to persons asking to enter on humanitarian parole to donate lifesaving organs to United States citizen relatives.

Under H.R. 3004, all of these individuals could face up to 2 years in prison simply for coming to an official port of entry to request immigration benefits provided under our immigration laws.

Finally, this bill perpetuates the fiction that immigrants are somehow inherently criminal. Nothing could be further from the truth. Numerous studies examining this issue conclude that immigrants actually commit crimes at a significantly lower rate than native-born Americans.

Given this legislation's defects, it comes to us as no surprise that organizations across the Nation join with me in opposition. They include:

The conservative Cato Institute, which called H.R. 3004, "a waste of Federal resources" that fails to safeguard "Americans against serious criminals."

Cities For Action, representing over 150 mayors and municipal leaders, warned the bill would place asylum seekers at further risk.

And the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, which described how this measure, H.R. 3004, will punish victims of domestic and sexual violence merely for requesting protection.

H.R. 3004 is not what its sponsors would like us to believe. In truth, it is a mean-spirited bill that would have far-reaching consequences by making it a crime to ask for benefits that our immigration laws provide.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this dangerous legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for working this legislation through and facilitating that it comes to the floor this week.

This week, the event of "Hold Their Feet to the Fire" is being held where many of the families of those who have been killed by illegal aliens are here to contribute. They went to the White House, and the message has been sent across the country. They have gone and done radio shows, and they have been part of this for a long time.

I think of how far back this goes, Kate Steinle's law. From my perspective, she was murdered on the streets of San Francisco on July 1, 2015. It hit the news, I think, the next day. I sent out a tweet on July 3 that said it was a 100 percent preventable crime. Just enforce the law. This story will make you cry, too. And it happens every day.

What we are trying to accomplish with Kate's Law is sentencing that is enhanced for those who overstay or those who have been deported from the United States and come back into the United States.

I want to compliment former Congressman Matt Salmon from Arizona, who, after her death on July 1, introduced legislation only 8 days later, which was the foundation for what we are talking about here with this bill. That was H.R. 3011, introduced on July 9, 2015.

□ 1545

Matt is retired. I picked up that legislation in the first days of this year, and we have cooperated in this Judiciary Committee to get this here to this time.

But, also, Bill O'Reilly, who made this a national issue, it hit my heart as soon as I saw the story. It hit the hearts of America when it went out over television, and it is too bad that we can't look at data and come here and fix a massive problem that we have.

It is too bad it has to be focused on individuals and personalities, when there are many other families out there that have suffered equally with that of the Steinle family and the other families we have talked about here today.

Nonetheless, if that is what it takes to get America to move, we are here now. We are here this week. We have the right legislation in front of us. I urge its adoption.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), our senior Representative on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. The bill is part of a larger mass deportation bill marked up by the House Judiciary Committee earlier this month. I think the message it is intended to convey is that this bill is needed to keep us safe.

We have heard the sad story of the murder of Kate Steinle, which was not news to any of us in northern California. That was a horrible murder, and the fact is, this bill would not have prevented that murder. The offender had been deported multiple times. He had served 16 years in Federal prison, so the idea that the 10-year enhancement would have somehow fixed this is just misplaced.

When we talk about the bill, it is as if we don't have harsh penalties now for misbehavior in the law. If you take a look at the enhancements, it expands criminal sentences for individuals who reenter the country after removal. We already have very strong penalties against that.

To say that this bill will keep us safe because, for example, we have a 20-year—under current law, a 20-year sen-

tence for a conviction for an aggravated felony, this would raise it to 25; I don't think that is going to fix this problem. If it were only that, we could have a discussion which, unfortunately, we never did on a bipartisan basis.

The bill does other things that are very damaging. It actually makes it a felony, punishable by up to 2 years, to attempt to reenter the country legally, in full compliance with our immigration laws; and this is true for individuals who have no criminal background whatsoever.

Now, the sponsors of the bill may argue that is necessary, but I have seen no rationale for why that would make any sense, nor why it would certainly not have prevented the tragic murder of Kate Steinle.

Now, let's give some examples of who that could apply to. You have individuals who have lived here, we have met them, DREAMers, people who have been here all their lives, brought over as children, who were removed. If that person who has been removed becomes a victim of sex trafficking, the process is this: They can come and seek asylum. They can flee from their traffickers. And if they present themselves to our port of entry today, they are not trying to evade detection. No, they are trying to be found. They are turning themselves in, saying: I am fleeing from the sex traffickers; I want to make a claim for asylum; I need to be kept safe from the sex traffickers. This bill would make that act a felony.

Now, the chairman has said how wonderful it is that we have created an affirmative defense in the act. What he has neglected to mention is that right now we don't need an affirmative defense because it is not a crime to go to the port of entry and seek a benefit, either humanitarian parole for a purpose that is sometimes granted to travel if a member of your family is dying, to provide an organ donation to a member, an American citizen, who is in the U.S. who is dying. That is not a crime today, and you don't need an affirmative defense because it is not a crime.

Now, I think the fact that it eliminates an important constitutional provision is problematic. We all know we can't change the Constitution by statute. The case of *U.S. v. Mendoza-Lopez* basically says this: If you are going to prosecute somebody for entry after removal, which happens all the time—in fact, that is the single most prevalent Federal prosecution in the system today; that is number one—you have to—and you did not have an opportunity to actually contest the first removal because, for example, you were never notified at a hearing—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. Since that is an element of the offense, the Mendoza case



says you have to be able to at least collaterally attack that because you never had a chance to do so initially. This eliminates that constitutional case. You can't do that by statute.

So the point I am making is that the majority of those who enter the United States without inspection are coming back to try and get next to their families, their U.S. citizen kids, their U.S. citizen spouses. They are not criminals. They are not creating any kind of crime.

We all oppose crime, but this remedy is unrelated to the horror stories that we have heard.

You know, we are creating law here, not bumper stickers. I hope that we will vote against this misplaced law and work together to solve the real problems that we face.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I especially want to thank him for his leadership on this.

Nearly 2 years ago, Kate Steinle, a young woman with a promising future, had her life tragically taken away from her when she was brutally murdered by an undocumented criminal who had been convicted of a series of felonies and had been deported five times; five times, and then he kept coming back, and then he finally killed this innocent young woman, Kate Steinle.

Sadly, this tragic event barely registered with the previous administration and other supporters of dangerous sanctuary city policies. During a July 2015 hearing, shortly after Kate's murder, I asked President Obama's Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson whether the White House had reached out to the Steinle family.

I will never forget what the Secretary said to me. He responded: Who? He had no idea who Kate Steinle or her family were. I had to explain to him what had happened to Kate Steinle. It was embarrassing.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I have heard countless stories from families who, like the Steinles, have fallen victim to heinous crimes because of the failure to enforce our Nation's immigration laws. We can and must do better to protect all the Kate Steinles all across America from being victimized by undocumented criminals who should never have been here in the first place.

I really can't emphasize enough how important this issue is, and H.R. 3004 will help address this problem finally and enhance public safety by toughening the penalties for criminal aliens who have been deported from our country, but then keep returning to the United States, and, again, far too many of them who commit crimes against innocent Americans like Kate Steinle.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. This draconian legislation would dramatically expand the penalties for illegal reentry into the United States, even for people who have committed minor and nonviolent offenses.

Although most people who illegally reenter the country do so to reunite with their families or to flee violence or persecution, this bill considers them all dangerous criminals who deserve lengthy prison sentences.

This bill is nothing less than fearmongering, based on the widely debunked myth that immigrants commit crimes at a higher rate than native-born Americans when, in fact, we know it is just the opposite.

Let me tell you about one of these supposed dangerous criminals who was mercifully released from ICE custody just yesterday, after 4 months in detention.

In 1986, 17-year-old Carlos Cardona illegally entered the United States, having fled threats of violence in his native Colombia. At age 21, he made a foolish mistake and committed a non-violent drug offense. He served 45 days in prison, and, ever since then, for the last 27 years, he has lived a crime-free and a productive life as an active member of his community in Queens, New York.

Not only that, after the September 11 attacks on this country, he volunteered as a recovery worker at Ground Zero. Like so many other workers there, due to his sacrifice, he developed acute respiratory issues from the toxic fumes and other illnesses that have put his life in jeopardy.

Unfortunately, although he is married to an American citizen, he was unable to adjust his immigration status because of his decades-old conviction. However, he was allowed to stay in the country in recognition of his services after 9/11, as long as he checked in periodically with immigration authorities, which he did.

But shortly after President Trump took office, Mr. Cardona was detained after appearing for a routine appointment with ICE, and he was placed in deportation proceedings and in custody. It was only thanks to a major public campaign and the compassion of Governor Cuomo, who pardoned his almost 30-year-old drug conviction, that he was released.

Under this legislation, had Mr. Cardona been deported and then illegally reentered the country to see his wife and daughter, he would face up to 10 years in prison because of his decades-old prior conviction. Even if he presented himself to border agents and sought asylum, on the reasonable basis that he had reasonable fears because,

in fact, two of his brothers back in Colombia have been murdered, he would still be subject to prosecution and massive penalties, just for appearing at the border.

This is both callous and irrational. This bill would dramatically expand the mass incarceration of immigrants, even for those with minor offenses and those who simply seek refuge in our country.

It serves no purpose, increases no one's safety, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this cruel legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to quote from a letter from the Sergeants Benevolent Association that we received 2 days ago in support of Kate's Law, and I want to read a sentence from it.

"In recent years, the need to protect our citizens from those aliens who enter the United States illegally, commit crimes here, are deported, and who illegally return to the U.S. and commit additional crimes has become a top concern of the law enforcement community."

This is from the Sergeants Benevolent Association, Police Department, City of New York. I include it in the RECORD.

SERGEANTS BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION, POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY OF NEW YORK,

New York, NY, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing on behalf of the more than 13,000 members of the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 3004, "Kate's Law," that will be considered by the House of Representatives later this week. We are grateful that the Congress is moving expeditiously to take up this important legislation.

In recent years, the need to protect our citizens from those aliens who enter the United States illegally, commit crimes here, are deported, and who illegally return to the U.S. and commit additional crimes has become a top concern of the law enforcement community. It is a problem that was exemplified in the horrific murder of the young woman in whose honor H.R. 3004 is named, Kate Steinle. In 2015, Ms. Steinle was shot and killed on a San Francisco pier while out for a walk with her father. Her murderer was a career criminal who had already been deported five previous times, had a long criminal history, had served multiple prison sentences, and was on probation in Texas at the time of the shooting. Nearly two years has passed since Steinle's murder, and little has been done to address the scourge of violence perpetrated by those who break our laws and continue to illegally reenter the United States. That is why prompt congressional action on "Kate's Law" is so critically important.

H.R. 3004 will ensure that those deported aliens with criminal histories who decide to illegally reenter the U.S. will face stiff prison sentences upon their return. First, the bill provides for monetary fines and between 10 and 25 years in prison for those aliens deported or removed who illegally return, depending on the severity of their prior crimes.

In addition, this legislation provides for up to 10 years in prison for any alien who has been refused entry, deported, or removed from the U.S. three times or more, but who returns or attempts to reenter the U.S.

Finally, for any criminal aliens who were removed from the U.S. prior to the completion of a prison term and who then attempt to reenter, H.R. 3004 requires that such individuals be incarcerated for the remainder of their sentenced prison term without any possibility for parole or supervised release. The passage of "Kate's Law" is critical to ensuring that deported aliens with criminal records are deterred from illegally reentering the U.S., and will help law enforcement protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the U.S.

On behalf of the membership of the Sergeants Benevolent Association, thank you again for your efforts on this and other issues important to law enforcement across the nation.

Sincerely,

ED MULLINS,  
*President.*

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

□ 1600

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of Kate's Law and No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. These important bills represent an important step towards keeping Americans safe.

Yesterday, I participated in a roundtable discussion at the White House with the President and family members of individuals who were murdered by criminal illegal immigrants.

The stories I heard were heart-breaking. Sadly, they are not uncommon. See, when I was mayor of Hazleton, I sat with the victims' families and listened to their stories. These stories have changed my life.

Everyone talks about the illegal immigrant, but very seldom do we ever talk about the victims. I sat with the family of Derek Kichline, a 29-year-old Hazleton city man and father of three young children who was murdered by the head of the Latin Kings while working on his pickup truck in his driveway.

Derek's killer was arrested and let go in New York City, a sanctuary city.

I also talked with the father of Carly Snyder, a beautiful 21-year-old girl who was studying to be a veterinarian. Her father told me that Carly was brutally stabbed 37 times and murdered by her next door neighbor. She had knife wounds on the palms of her hand and knife wounds in her back as she died on the kitchen floor.

An illegal immigration and Federal fugitive with a long history of gang violence and drug use killed Carly. Carly's killer was apprehended trying to cross the southern border but was released on \$5,000 bond and disappeared into the United States until one day he showed up at Carly Snyder's doorstep.

I have never forgotten these stories. I understand that there is nothing that we can do to bring these people back. I know there is nothing we can do to relieve the pain that their families still feel.

But by passing these bills, we can prevent these crimes from happening to other families. Let me be clear: violent crimes committed by illegal immigrants are preventable. The illegal immigrant who committed these violent crimes should not have been present in this country and certainly should not have been walking around free. Too many mayors and local governments think that they are above Federal law, and we have a chance to change that today.

We can send a clear message to the American people that their government is serious about keeping them safe. I thank the President today for standing up for the victims of these preventable crimes, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same by voting "yes" on these important bills.

This is a test of the willingness of Congress to stand for families across this country who have lost loved ones to crimes committed by criminals who had no business being in this country in the first place. It is time that we side with the victims like Derek Kichline, Carly Snyder, and Kate Steinle instead of criminals.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about H.R. 3004, but let me first talk about two of my constituents, Officer Jose Vargas, one of the most decorated police officers in the State of California, and the other, Jose Angel Garibay, a young marine that made the ultimate sacrifice for America.

In 1977, Jose Vargas was named as 1 of the 10 most outstanding police officers in America by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. But it wasn't always that way. At age 16, Jose Vargas headed north to the border for a better life.

Officer Vargas crossed the border 15 times over 4 years. Officer Vargas was probably the only police officer who we know that spent time in a Federal holding cell. America today is better because of Jose Vargas. Jose Vargas added to the greatness of this country and to the security of this country.

Jose Angel Garibay, a young marine, was the first soldier from Orange County, California, to make the ultimate sacrifice in the Middle East. He also came to this country undocumented and became a U.S. citizen posthumously.

Mr. Speaker, yes, we must keep out the bad hombres. We don't welcome those who would do us harm, but America must continue to welcome those who come to America to work hard and to contribute. This bill fails to make this critical and important distinction.

At the end of the day, we are all immigrants and we are all part of this great country, and I urge my colleagues today: do not brand millions of immigrants as criminals when their only crime is searching for the American Dream.

I urge Members to vote "no" on H.R. 3004.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee for their work on this issue. And as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, the issues being debated and voted on this week are an area of critical importance when it comes to keeping our Nation and our people safe.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of immigrants. I am the grandson of Irish immigrants. We are also a nation of laws. Both must be respected and honored by all of us. Left, right, or center, we can all agree that our immigration system is broken, and given that broken status, it is the responsibility of this body to fix it. This goal cannot be achieved by selectively choosing which laws we enforce and which laws we ignore.

As a former FBI agent, I worked each day to keep Americans and keep our Nation safe. And as a Federal prosecutor, I prosecuted cases that resulted in the removal of violent felons who were in our country illegally in order to keep our communities safe.

I have seen firsthand the threats our Nation faces from a fragmented and broken immigration system and a porous border. We cannot and must not allow partisanship to prevent sensible fixes from being implemented. Our Nation's security depends on us.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is one borne of a preventable tragedy. Kate Steinle was a bright, aspiring, 32-year-old woman with a life of possibilities ahead of her. Let this bill be her legacy. Let this bill result in Kate Steinle saving the lives of others. Let us do her that honor.

Kate's Law will increase penalties for those who reenter our country following their removal from the U.S., including Federal prison sentences up to 25 years for those previously deported who have criminal records.

Moreover, this bill supports our brave women and men in law enforcement as they work to keep violent gangs and criminal cartels, including the likes of MS-13, out of our communities. I am a cosponsor of this legislation, and I am proud to advance it.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now for us to step up and protect those who elected us to serve on their behalf, and I urge all of my colleagues to make a bold bipartisan statement to our communities back home today. Join me in support of H.R. 3004. Let's get this done for Kate Steinle and her family.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of opposition to H.R. 3004, namely, the Federal Defenders of New York and 407 local, State, national immigrant civil rights, faith, and labor organizations.

FEDERAL DEFENDERS  
OF NEW YORK, INC.  
New York, NY, June 29, 2017.

Re H.R. 3004, Kate's Law

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-  
ington, DC.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chair, House Judiciary Committee, Washington,  
DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,  
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. RYAN, MS. PELOSI, MR. GOOD-  
LATTE, AND MR. CONYERS: We write on behalf  
of the Federal Public and Community De-  
fenders in response to inquiries for our views  
on H.R. 3004. We oppose the bill for the fol-  
lowing reasons.

H.R. 3004 would make it a crime to openly  
and directly present oneself to immigration  
officials seeking asylum, temporary protec-  
tion, or for other innocent reasons. In doing  
so, the bill would incentivize people with  
genuine claims of fear to enter the country  
surreptitiously.

Even while criminalizing essentially inno-  
cent conduct and drastically increasing po-  
tential penalties, the bill would purport to  
deprive defendants of the right to challenge  
the validity of fundamentally unfair or un-  
lawful removal orders.

The bill would transform a basic element  
of the criminal offense into an affirmative  
defense and would thereby unfairly place the  
burden on the alien to produce records in the  
government's control.

The bill would unjustifiably increase po-  
tential penalties, including for those with  
truly petty criminal records, and create a  
significant risk that defendants, in mass  
guilty plea proceedings on the border as  
occur now, would be pressured to admit prior  
convictions that they do not have.

Finally, H.R. 3004 raises serious federalism  
issues and would impinge on States' sover-  
eign interests by ordering them to impose  
certain state prison sentences thereby im-  
peding States' ability to manage their own  
criminal justice systems and prison popu-  
lations.

The bill would harm individuals, families  
and communities not just on the border but  
across the nation. Nearly 21 percent of re-  
entry prosecutions in fiscal year 2016 were in  
districts other than those on the southwest  
border, in every state and district in the  
country. And though there may be a percep-  
tion that illegal reentry offenders are dan-  
gerous criminals, the motive for most people  
returning to the United States after being  
removed is to reunite with family, return to  
the only place they know as home, seek  
work to support their families, or flee vio-  
lence or persecution in their home countries.  
Further, according to a recent Sentencing  
Commission study, one quarter of reentry of-  
fenders had no prior conviction described in  
§1326(b), and the most common prior offense  
was driving under the influence, followed by  
minor non-violent misdemeanors and felo-  
nies, illegal entry, illegal reentry, and sim-  
ple possession of drugs. Nearly half (49.5%)  
had children in the United States, and over

two thirds (67.1%) had relatives in this coun-  
try. Over half (53.5%) were under the age of  
18 when they first entered the United States,  
and almost three quarters (74.5%) had  
worked here for more than a year at some  
point before their arrest. These are not hard-  
ened criminals.

I. THE BILL WOULD MAKE IT A CRIME TO OPENLY  
AND DIRECTLY PRESENT ONESELF TO IMMI-  
GRATION OFFICIALS, SEEKING ASYLUM, TEM-  
PORARY PROTECTION, OR FOR OTHER INNO-  
CENT REASONS, AND WOULD THUS INCENTIVIZE  
SURREPTITIOUS ENTRY

The bill would add as criminal acts in vio-  
lation of 8 U.S.C. §1326, "crosses the border"  
or "attempts to cross the border," and would  
define "crosses the border" as the "physical  
act of crossing the border, regardless of  
whether the alien is free from official re-  
straint." This would mean that people pre-  
viously denied admission or removed who  
present themselves at a designated port of  
entry seeking asylum or for other innocent  
reasons, and who intend to be and are in fact  
under official restraint, would for the first  
time be guilty of violating §1326.

Freedom from official restraint is an es-  
sential part of the definition of entering, at-  
tempting to enter, and being found in the  
United States under the law of most circuits.  
Entering has long required both "physical  
presence" in the country and "freedom from  
official restraint." Attempting to enter re-  
quires proof of specific intent to commit the  
completed offense of entry, and so requires  
intent to enter "free of official restraint." Similarly, an alien cannot be "found in" the  
United States unless he has been free from  
official restraint. An alien is under official  
restraint whenever he "lacks the freedom to  
go at large and mix with the population," in-  
cluding when he directly and voluntarily  
surrenders himself to immigration officials  
at a port of entry to seek asylum, protec-  
tion, or imprisonment.

Thus, an alien who walked directly across  
the border to a marked border patrol car and  
asked to be taken into custody did not at-  
tempt to re-enter the United States because  
he intended to be, and was, under official re-  
straint. Likewise, an alien who crossed the  
border after being beaten by gang members  
in Mexico, in a delusional belief that they  
were chasing him, with the sole intent of  
placing himself in the protective custody of  
U.S. officials, could not be guilty of attempt-  
ing to enter. In a similar case, the govern-  
ment dismissed the charges after the border  
patrol agent's report confirmed that the de-  
fendant had crossed the border and asked the  
agent for protection from people he feared  
were trying to kill him. Similarly, an alien  
who went directly to the border station and  
presented himself for entry was not "found  
in" the United States because he was never  
free from official restraint.

Thus, under current law, an alien who di-  
rectly and overtly presents herself to immi-  
gration officials at a port of entry, as op-  
posed to evading official restraint, has not  
violated §1326; even one who crosses the bor-  
der outside a port of entry but in sight of im-  
migration officials, and who presents herself  
directly to such officials, has not done so.  
But absent the "freedom from official re-  
straint" requirement, the law would "make  
criminals out of persons who, for any num-  
ber of innocent reasons, approach immigra-  
tion officials at the border." Argueta-  
Rosales, 819 F.3d at 1160. "For example, [an  
alien] might approach a port of entry to seek  
asylum, or he might be under the mistaken  
assumption that he has been granted permis-  
sion to reenter. Under those circumstances,

the alien would not have committed the gra-  
vamen of the offense of attempted illegal  
entry in violation of §1326(a)." United States  
v. Valdez-Novoa, 780 F.3d 906, 923 (9th Cir.  
2015) (Bybee, J.). Because "in a literal and  
physical sense a person coming from abroad  
enters the United States whenever he  
reaches any land, water or air space within  
the territorial limits of this nation," "free-  
dom from official restraint must be added to  
physical presence." Vavilatos, 209 F.2d at  
197.

Permitting arrest and prosecution regard-  
less of whether the person was free from offi-  
cial restraint is particularly troubling be-  
cause although border patrol agents are re-  
quired by law to refer an alien for a "credible  
fear" or "reasonable fear" interview with an  
asylum officer upon indication that she fears  
persecution or has suffered or may suffer tor-  
ture, people are increasingly being turned  
away at the border without the required pro-  
tection screening. Under H.R. 3004, agents  
would now be empowered to arrest them  
rather than turn them away.

By eliminating the "freedom from official  
restraint" requirement, the bill would cast  
aside well-settled century-old law from the  
civil immigration context that for nearly as  
long has functioned well in the criminal im-  
migration context to distinguish illicit or  
clandestine entries from legitimate attempts  
to bring oneself to the attention of U.S. au-  
thorities at the border.

Since it would now be a crime to openly  
seek help, H.R. 3004 would have the perverse  
effect of incentivizing people with genuine  
claims of fear to "jump the fence" in the  
hope of not being caught and returned to a  
country where the danger is real. Faced with  
a choice between being killed or risking  
being caught and removed, the logical, life-  
sustaining choice is obvious.

II. THE BILL WOULD PERVERSELY CRIMINALIZE  
REPEATED UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS TO GAIN  
ASYLUM, EVEN AS BORDER PATROL AGENTS  
INCREASINGLY TURN AWAY ASYLUM SEEKERS  
IN VIOLATION OF LAW

The bill would create a new crime for an  
alien who has been denied admission, ex-  
cluded, deported or removed three or more  
times who subsequently enters, attempts to  
enter, crosses the border, attempts to cross  
the border, or is found in the United States,  
subject to punishment for up to ten years.  
This would criminalize, for the first time, re-  
peated efforts to seek asylum that are gen-  
uine but unsuccessful, as each attempt  
counts as a denial of admission or removal.

As noted above, border patrol agents are  
increasingly turning away asylum seekers  
without referring them for appropriate  
screening as required by law. Human rights  
organizations have documented at least 125  
cases of asylum seekers being turned away  
without proper safeguards to protect their  
right to seek protection between November  
2016 and April 2017, often repeatedly. For ex-  
ample, a Honduran family whose son was  
murdered by a gang after he was denied asy-  
lum, another Honduran family whose son  
showed the agent a bullet hole wound in his  
chest, and a Mexican woman whose father,  
son, grandfather and uncle were all killed  
within seven days, were repeatedly turned  
away without referral for protection screen-  
ing or asylum adjudication. Agents informed  
people seeking refuge that the United States  
no longer gives asylum, threatened them  
with force, or threatened to call Mexican im-  
migration authorities to deport them to the  
country they were fleeing.

A person who presents himself at a port of  
entry without a valid visa is subject to de-  
nial of admission or expedited removal. But

if such a person expresses fear of return, he is entitled by law not to be expelled but to be interviewed by an asylum officer. When border patrol agents simply expel people who express fear without allowing them a chance to be interviewed and to press their claims, the agents are breaking the law and giving these people a removal order or a denial of admission that they should not have. Thus, bona fide asylum-seekers—those most likely to accumulate “three strikes”—would face criminal prosecution rather than what they are entitled to—a non-adversarial interview with an asylum officer that could ultimately lead to persecution-based relief.

### III. THE BILL WOULD PURPORT TO UNCONSTITUTIONALLY PROHIBIT CHALLENGES TO THE VALIDITY OF REMOVAL ORDERS

The bill would state that “an alien may not challenge the validity of any prior removal order concerning the alien.” This provision, perhaps more than any other, demonstrates the overreaching and unduly harsh nature of these proposed changes to existing law. The bill seeks to visit criminal convictions and drastic penalties on noncitizens who reenter even when the administrative process that led to their original deportation or removal was fundamentally unfair or achieved an unlawful result, and even when they were deprived of judicial review of that fundamental injustice. The Supreme Court long ago held, in *United States v. Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828 (1987), that a defendant cannot be convicted and punished under §1326 when the deportation order was issued in an agency proceeding bereft of due process that no court ever reviewed. But this bill seeks to do precisely that, and at the same time to criminalize attempts to enter the country legally and in most cases to increase the penalties that may be imposed.

### IV. THE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES WOULD BE UNAVAILABLE TO MOST, DO NOT ADDRESS ANY EXISTING PROBLEM, AND WOULD UNFAIRLY PLACE THE BURDEN ON DEFENDANTS TO PRODUCE RECORDS IN THE GOVERNMENT’S CONTROL

The bill would purport to create two affirmative defenses: (1) “prior to the alleged violation,” the alien “sought and received express consent of [DHS] to reapply for admission,” or (2) “with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed,” the alien “was not required to obtain such advance consent under the [INA] or any prior Act,” and “had complied with all other laws and regulations governing his or her admission into the United States.” The first defense would be unavailable to anyone who did not have the wherewithal, resources and time to file the proper form and get it approved before arriving in the United States. The second defense is not available to anyone whose period of inadmissibility has not expired, usually ten years. These requirements are simply unrealistic for those with little or no education or money or who are fleeing violence.

Moreover, this is a solution in search of a problem, and it would undermine due process. Because the absence of most of these conditions is currently an element, see 8 U.S.C. §1326(a)(2), the government routinely provides the defense with the relevant records, which are in the individual’s “A file,” maintained in government custody and otherwise available to the individual only through a FOIA request. Placing the burden on the defendant to prove an affirmative defense would illogically and unfairly require him to produce records that are in the government’s control.

### V. THE BILL WOULD UNJUSTIFIABLY INCREASE POTENTIAL PENALTIES, INCLUDING FOR THOSE WITH TRULY PETTY CRIMINAL RECORDS

While it appears that the statutory maximum would increase for most defendants under the bill, there is no evidence that any increase is needed to reflect the seriousness of these offenses, or that such increases would be effective in deterring illegal immigration. At the same time, the cost of additional incarceration would be steep—approximately \$32,000 per prisoner per year. If each of the 16,000 persons convicted of illegal reentry in 2016 received one additional year, it would cost the taxpayers an extra half a billion dollars.

Increasing sentences for these offenders is also unnecessary and unfair because noncitizens suffer much harsher conditions of confinement than other federal prisoners. BOP contracts with private prison companies to detain noncitizens convicted of immigration offenses and other federal crimes. A recent analysis shows that many persons incarcerated in “immigrant only contract prisons” suffer serious medical neglect, in some cases leading to death. An investigation done by the American Civil Liberties Union found that “the men held in these private prisons are subjected to shocking abuse and mistreatment, and discriminated against by BOP policies that impede family contact and exclude them from rehabilitative programs.”

Two of the penalty increases are particularly unwarranted. The bill would increase a defendant’s statutory maximum from two to 10 years if he was removed subsequent to conviction of any three misdemeanors, whereas the 10-year maximum currently applies only if the three misdemeanors involved drugs, crimes against the person, or both. This would apply to a re-entrant with a truly petty criminal record. If the defendant had three misdemeanor convictions for driving without a license, a common scenario for undocumented immigrants and other impoverished people, his maximum sentence would more than triple. And because the bill does not require that the three misdemeanors stem from three separate occasions, a 10-year statutory maximum would apply to a re-entrant with convictions from a single incident for disorderly conduct, public intoxication and public urination.

Likewise, the 25-year maximum for any three felonies would increase the maximum sentence by 15 years for garden variety felonies, such as felony possession of a small quantity of drugs. Worse, if the definition of “felony” means any offense “punishable by a term of more than 1 year under the laws of” the convicting jurisdiction, it would punish defendants who were never convicted of a felony by up to 25 years, because the maximum punishment is more than one year for misdemeanors in many states, including Colorado, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Vermont. We are also concerned that definition of “felony,” by mistake or by design, indicates that if a particular kind of offense is punishable by more than one year in any jurisdiction, it is a felony; it states that “any offense” is a felony if it is punishable by more than one year “under the laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.”

### VI. THE BILL WOULD CREATE A SIGNIFICANT RISK THAT DEFENDANTS WOULD BE PRESSURED INTO ADMITTING PRIOR CONVICTIONS THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE

The bill would require that prior convictions upon which increased statutory maximums are based be alleged in an indictment and

proved beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant. Records of prior convictions are notoriously unreliable and national criminal databases that generate “rap sheets” frequently contain purported convictions that have been misrecorded, expunged, or even belong to other individuals. In border districts where the great majority of illegal re-entry prosecutions take place, re-entry cases have often been rapidly “processed” in batches of up to eighty defendants at once, with 99% of cases ending in guilty pleas. Given the way these cases are handled on the border, and the fact that many if not most of the defendants speak little or no English and have little or no education, this provision carries a significant risk that defendants will be pressured to admit to convictions they do not have and thus significantly raise their sentencing exposure.

### VII. THE BILL WOULD IMPINGE ON STATES’ SOVEREIGN INTERESTS IN MANAGING THEIR OWN PRISON POPULATIONS

The bill would mandate that any alien removed pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1231(a)(4) who enters or attempts to enter, crosses or attempts to cross the border, or is found in the United States, “shall be incarcerated for the remainder of the sentence that was pending at the time of deportation without any reduction for parole or supervised release” unless the alien affirmatively demonstrates express consent. Section 1231(a)(4)(B) provides that the Attorney General may remove an alien convicted of a non-violent offense before he has completed a sentence of imprisonment (i) of an alien in federal custody and the Attorney General determines that removal is appropriate and in the best interest of the United States, (ii) of an alien in State custody if the chief state official determines that removal is appropriate and in the best interest of the State and submits a written request for removal. Thus, for example, an alien sentenced to 8 years who is eligible for parole in 6 years may apply for early conditional release and be removed after 5 years. Under H.R. 3004, if he illegally re-entered thereafter, he would be required to serve all three years that were pending when he was removed.

As far as we are aware, §1231(a)(4)(B)(i) has never been systematically implemented for federal inmates. Some states, however, have implemented some sort of program to avail themselves of §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii). A handful have entered into an MOU with ICE in which they agree that a person removed pursuant to §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) who returns illegally will serve the remainder of the original sentence. Other states release prisoners to ICE under §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) through state legislation or parole board policy under which they do not agree to that condition.

H.R. 3004 would require any State that releases a prisoner to ICE under §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) to incarcerate such a person for the remainder of the sentence should they return unlawfully. It would thus impinge on States’ sovereign interests in managing their own prison populations according to their own priorities and resources. The bill would remove the flexibility that States currently have to treat unlawfully returned prisoners as they see fit, and would ossify the ICE MOU into law.

Thank you for considering our views, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Very Truly Yours,

NEIL FULTON,  
Federal Defender,  
North and South  
Dakota, Co-Chair,

*Federal Defender  
Legislative Committee.*  
DAVID PATTON,  
*Executive Director,  
Federal Defenders of  
New York, Co-Chair,  
Federal Defender  
Legislative Committee.*  
JON SANDS,  
*Federal Defender, Dis-  
trict of Arizona, Co-  
Chair, Federal De-  
fender Legislative  
Committee.*

JUNE 28, 2017.

Re Vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 407 undersigned local, state, and national immigrant, civil rights, faith-based, and labor organizations, we urge you to oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, and any similar legislation that jeopardizes public safety, erodes the goodwill forged between local police and its residents, and perpetuates the criminalization and incarceration of immigrants. H.R. 3003 would strip badly needed law enforcement funding for state and local jurisdictions, runs afoul of the Tenth and Fourth Amendment, and unnecessarily expands the government's detention apparatus. H.R. 3004 unwisely expands the federal government's ability to criminally prosecute immigrants for immigration-based offenses, excludes critical humanitarian protections for those fleeing violence, and doubles down on the failed experiment of incarceration for immigration violations.

Over 600 state and local jurisdictions have policies or ordinances that disentangle their state and local law enforcement agencies from enforcing federal immigration law. The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, seeks to attack so-called "sanctuary" jurisdictions (many of whom do not consider themselves as such) by penalizing state and local jurisdictions that follow the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by refusing to honor constitutionally infirm requests for detainees. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating various federal grants, including funding through the Cops on the Beat program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other federal grant related to law enforcement or immigration. Importantly, using the threat of withholding federal grants to coerce state and local jurisdictions likely runs afoul of the Tenth Amendment's prohibition on commandeering, a position supported by over 300 law professors.

"Sanctuary" policies are critical to promote public safety for local communities. Fearing referral to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, victims and witnesses of crime are significantly less likely to communicate with local law enforcement. Local law enforcement authorities have repeatedly echoed this sentiment, acknowledging that community policing policies are paramount to enhancing public safety. Indeed, "sanctuary" jurisdictions have less crime and more economic development than similarly situated non-"sanctuary" jurisdictions. Withholding critically-needed federal funding would, paradoxically, severely cripple the ability of state and local jurisdictions to

satisfy the public safety needs of their communities.

Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, would further criminalize the immigrant community by drastically increasing penalties for immigrants convicted of unlawful reentry. Operation Streamline encapsulates our nation's failed experiment with employing criminal penalties to deter migration. Under Operation Streamline, the federal government prosecutes immigrants for reentry at significant rates. By all practical measures, Operation Streamline has failed to deter migration, wasted billions of taxpayer dollars, and unfairly punished thousands of immigrants who try to enter or reenter the United States to reunite with their children and loved ones. We fear that H.R. 3004's increased penalties for reentry would double down on this failed strategy, explode the prison population, and cost billions of dollars.

Instead of passing discredited enforcement-only legislation, Congress should move forward on enacting just immigration reform legislation that provides a roadmap to citizenship for the nation's eleven million aspiring Americans and eliminates mass detention and deportation programs that undermine fundamental human rights. Legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local democratic processes, and raises serious constitutional concerns represents an abdication of the Congress' responsibility to enact fair, humane, and just immigration policy. In light of the above, we urge you to vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

Please contact Jose Magana-Salgado, of the Immigrant Legal Resource Center if you have any questions regarding this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

National Organizations:

America's Voice Education Fund; American Federation of Teachers; American Friends Service Committee (AFSC); American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; Americans Committed to Justice and Truth; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF); Asian Americans Advancing Justice—ANC; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Asian Law Caucus; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO (APALA); Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; ASISTA; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network; Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.; Center for American Progress; Center for Employment Training; Center for Gender & Refugee Studies; Center for Law and Social Policy; Center for New Community.

Center for Popular Democracy (CPD); Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Refugee & Immigration Ministries; Christian Community Development Association; Church World Service; Coalition on Human Needs; CODEPINK; Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES); Community Initiatives for Visiting Immigrants in Confinement (CIVIC); Defending Rights & Dissent; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Disciples Home Missions; Dominican Sisters of Sparkill; Drug Policy Alliance; Easterseals Blake Foundation; Equal Rights Advocates; Farmworker Justice; Freedom Network USA; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Fuerza Mundial.

Futures Without Violence; Grassroots Leadership; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic National Bar Association; Holy Spirit Mis-

sionary Sisters—USA—JPIC; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Intercommunity Peace & Justice Center; Interfaith Worker Justice; Isaiah Wilson; Jewish Voice for Peace; Jewish Voice for Peace—Boston; Jewish Voice for Peace—Tacoma chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Western MA; Justice Strategies; Kids in Need of Defense (KIND); Lambda Legal; Laotian American National Alliance; Latin America Working Group; Latino Victory Fund; LatinoJustice PRLDEF.

League of United Latin American Citizens; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Mi Familia Vota; Milwaukee Chapter, Jewish Voice for Peace; NAACP; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA); National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON); National Education Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the NLG; National Iranian American Council (NIAC); National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC); National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Latina/o Psychological Association; National Lawyers Guild; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; People's Action; PICO National Network; Queer Detainee Empowerment Project; Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services (RAICES); School Social Work Association of America; Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, New Windsor; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); Southern Border Communities Coalition; Southern Poverty Law Center; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank.

The National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health; The Queer Palestinian Empowerment Network; The Sentencing Project; The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants; UndocuBlack Network; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Legislative Ministry of New Jersey; Unitarian Universalist Service Committee; UNITE HERE; United Child Care, Inc.; United for a Fair Economy; UU College of Social Justice; UURISE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee & Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women's Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.

State and Local Organizations: (MILU) Mujeres Inmigrantes Luchando Unidas; #VigilantLOVE; 580 Cafe/Wesley Foundation Serving UCLA; Acting in Community Together in Organizing Northern Nevada (ACTIONN); Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Alianza; All for All; Alliance San Diego; Allies of Knoxville's Immigrant Neighbors (AKIN); American Gateways; Aquinas Center; Arkansas United Community Coalition; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Atlanta; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—LA; Asian Americans United; Asian Counseling and Referral Service; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Pacific American Legal

Resource Center; Asylee Women Enterprise; Atlas: DIY.

Bear Creek United Methodist Church—Congregation Kol Ami Interfaith Partnership; Bethany Immigration Services; Brighton Park Neighborhood Council; Cabrini Immigrant Services of NYC; Campaign for Hoosier Families; Canal Alliance; Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition; CASA; Casa Familiar, Inc.; Casa Latina; Casa San Jose; Catholic Charities; Catholic Charities San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin; Causa Oregon; CDWBA Legal Project, Inc.; Central American Legal Assistance; Central New Jersey Jewish Voice for Peace; Central Pacific Conference of the United Church of Christ; Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative (CVIIC); Centro Laboral de Graton.

Centro Latino Americano; Centro Legal de la Ran; Centro Romero; Chelsea Collaborative; Chicago Religious Leadership Network on Latin America; Church Council of Greater Seattle; Church of Our Saviour/La Iglesia de Nuestro Salvador Episcopal; Church Women United in New York State; Cleveland Jobs with Justice; Coalicion de Lideres Latinos—CLILA; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Coalition of African Communities; Coloradans For Immigrant Rights, a program of the American Friends Service Committee; Colorado People's Alliance (COPA); Columbia Legal Services; Comite Pro Uno; Comite VIDA; Committee for Justice in Palestine—Ithaca; Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, Inc.; Community Legal Services and Counseling Center.

Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto; Community of Friends in Action, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.; CRLA Foundation; CT Working Families; DC-Maryland Justice for Our Neighbors; Delaware Civil Rights Coalition; Do the Most Good Montgomery County (MD); Dominican Sisters Grand Rapids (MI); Sanctuary Covenant; Ecuemencal Ministries of Oregon; EL CENTRO de Igualdad y Derechos; El Monte Wesleyan Church; Emerald Isle Immigration Center; Employee Rights Center; Encuentro; End Domestic Abuse WI; English Ministry Frean Presbyterian Church of St. Louis.

Episcopal Refugee & Immigrant Center Alliance; Equal Justice Center; Equality California; Erie Neighborhood House; First Congregational UCC of Portland; First Unitarian Universalist Church of Berks County; Florida Center for Fiscal and Economic Policy; Florida Immigrant Coalition, Inc. (FLIC); Franciscans for Justice; Frida Kahlo Community Organization; Friends of Broward Detainees; Friends of Miami-Dade Detainees; Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights; Gethsemane Lutheran Church; Grassroots Alliance for Immigrant Rights; Greater Lafayette Immigrant Allies; Greater New York Labor Religion Coalition; Greater Rochester COALITION for Immigration Justice; Grupo de Apoyo e Integracion Hispanoamericano; HACES.

Hana Center; Harvard Islamic Society; Her Justice; HIAS Pennsylvania; Hispanic Interest Coalition of Alabama; Hispanic Legal Clinic; Hudson Valley Chapter of JVP; Human Rights Initiative of North Texas; ICE-Free Capital District; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immanuel Fellowship: a bilingual congregation; Immigrant Justice Advocacy Movement (IJAM); Immigrant Legal Advocacy Project; Immigration Action Group; Immigration Center for Women and Children; Inland Empire—Immigrant Youth Coalition (IEIYC); Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity;

International Institute of Buffalo; Irish International Immigrant Center; IRTF—InterReligious Task Force on Central America and Colombia.

Japanese American Citizens League, San Jose Chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albany, NY chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albuquerque; Jewish Voice for Peace—Austin; Jewish Voice for Peace—Bay Area; Jewish Voice for Peace—Cleveland; Jewish Voice for Peace—DC Metro; Jewish Voice for Peace—Denver; Jewish Voice for Peace—Ithaca; Jewish Voice for Peace—Los Angeles; Jewish Voice for Peace—Madison; Jewish Voice for Peace—New Haven; Jewish Voice for Peace—Philadelphia; Jewish Voice for Peace—Pittsburgh; Jewish Voice for Peace—Portland; Jewish Voice for Peace—San Diego; Jewish Voice for Peace—South Florida; Jewish Voice for Peace—Syracuse, NY; Jewish Voice for Peace—Triangle NC; Jolt.

Justice for our Neighbors Houston; Justice for Our Neighbors Southeastern Michigan; Justice For Our Neighbors West Michigan; JVP-HV. Jewish Voice for Peace-Hudson Valley; Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Kids for College; Kino Border Initiative; Kitsap Immigrant Assistance Center; KIWA (Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance); Korean Resource Center; La Casa de Amistad; La Coalición de Derechos Humanos; La Comunidad, Inc.; La Raza Centro Legal; Lafayette Urban Ministry; Las Vegas Chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Latin American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Latino Racial Justice Circle; Latinx Alliance of Lane County; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County.

Legal Services for Children; Lemkin House Inc; Long Island Wins; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Middle East Crisis Response (MECR); Migrant and Immigrant Community Action Project; Migrant Justice / Justicia Migrante; MinKwon Center for Community Action; Mission Asset Fund; Mississippi Immigrants Rights Alliance (MIRA); Mosaic Family Services; Movement of Immigrant Leaders in Pennsylvania (MILPA); Mujeres Unidas y Activas; Mundo Maya Foundation; National Lawyers Guild—Los Angeles Chapter; New Jersey Alliance for Immigrant Justice; New Mexico Dream Team; New Mexico Immigrant Law Center; New Mexico Voices for Children.

New Sanctuary Movement of Philadelphia; New York Immigration Coalition; NH Conference United Church of Christ Immigration Working Group; North Carolina Council of Churches; North County Immigration Task Force; North Jersey chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Northern Illinois Justice for Our Neighbors; Northern Manhattan Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project (NWIRP); OCCORD; Occupy Bergen County (New Jersey); OneAmerica; OneJustice; Oregon Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice—IMrJ; Organized Communities Against Deportations; OutFront Minnesota; Pangea Legal Services; PASO—West Suburban Action Project; Pax Christi Florida; Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition.

Pilgrim United Church of Christ; Pilipino Workers Center; Polish-Americans Organized to Minister to Our Community, Inc. (POMOC); Portland Central America Solidarity Committee; Progreso: Latino Progress; Progressive Jewish Voice of Central PA; Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; Project Hope-Proyecto Esperanza; Project IRENE; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Racial Justice Action Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; Refugees

Helping Refugees; Refugio del Rio Grande; Resilience Orange County; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network (RMIAN); Rural and Migrant Ministry; Safe Passage; San Francisco CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates); Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN).

Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, Philadelphia/Delaware Valley Chapter; Sisters of St. Francis, St. Francis Province; Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester, Inc; Skagit Immigrant Rights Council; Social Justice Collaborative; South Asian Fund for Education, Scholarship and Training (SAFEST); South Bay Jewish Voice for Peace; South Texas Immigration Council; Southeast Immigrant Rights Network; St. John of God Church; Students United for Nonviolence; Tacoma Community House; Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition; Teresa Messer, Law Office of Teresa Messer; Thai Community Development Center; The Garden, Lutheran Ministry; The International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit; The Legal Project; Tompkins County Immigrant Rights Coalition; Transgender Resource Center of New Mexico.

Trinity Episcopal Church; U-Lead Athens; Unitarian Universalist Mass Action Network; Unitarian Universalist PA Legislative Advocacy Network (UPLAN); United African Organization; United Families; University Leadership Initiative; University of San Francisco Immigration and Deportation Defense Clinic; UNO Immigration Ministry; UPLIFT; UpValley Family Centers; VietLead; Vital Immigrant Defense Advocacy & Services, Santa Rosa, CA; Volunteers of Legal Service; Washtenaw Interfaith Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Watertown Citizens for Peace, Justice, and the Environment; Wayne Action for Racial Equality; WeCount!; WESPAC Foundation; Wilco Justice Alliance (Williamson County, TX).

Women Watch Afrika, Inc.; Worksafe; Young Immigrants in Action; YWCA Alaska; YWCA Alliance; YWCA Berkeley/Oakland; YWCA Brooklyn; YWCA Clark County; YWCA Elgin; YWCA Greater Austin; YWCA Greater Pittsburgh; YWCA Greater Portland; YWCA Madison; YWCA Minneapolis; YWCA Mount Desert Island.

YWCA NE KANSAS; YWCA of Metropolitan Detroit; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA Olympia; YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley; YWCA Rochester & Monroe County; YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts; YWCA Southern Arizona; YWCA Tulsa; YWCA Warren; YWCA Westmoreland County.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to this bill from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, the CATO Institute, Church World Service, and the ACLU.

#### NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL & DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,

June 27, 2017.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), comprised of national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual assault and domestic violence victims and representing hundreds of organizations across the country dedicated to ensuring all survivors of violence receive the protections they deserve, write to express our deep concerns about the impact that H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," and H.R. 3004, or "Kate's Law,"



will have on victims fleeing or recovering from sexual assault, domestic violence, or human trafficking, and on communities at large.

This year is the twenty-third anniversary of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”) which has, since it was first enacted, included critical protections for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence. H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have the effect of punishing immigrant survivors and their children and pushing them into the shadows and into danger, undermining the very purpose of VAWA. Specifically, the nation’s leading national organizations that address domestic and sexual assault oppose H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 because:

Community trust policies are critical tools for increasing community safety. Laws that seek to intertwine the federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will undermine the Congressional purpose of protections enacted under VAWA and will have the chilling effect of pushing immigrant victims into the shadows and undermining public safety. Immigration enforcement must be implemented in a way that supports local community policing and sustains community trust in working with local law enforcement. H.R. 3003 runs contrary to community policing efforts and will deter immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault survivors not only from reporting crimes, but also from seeking help for themselves and their children. While H.R. 3003 does not require that local law enforcement arrest or report immigrant victims or witnesses of criminal activity, the language in the bill provides no restriction prohibiting such practices.

Perpetrators use fear of deportation as tool of abuse. Local policies that minimize the intertwining of local law enforcement with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) help protect the most vulnerable victims by creating trust between law enforcement and the immigrant community, which in turn help protect entire communities. Abusers and traffickers use the fear of deportation of their victims as a tool to silence and trap them. If immigrants are afraid to call the police because of fear of deportation, they become more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Not only are the individual victims and their children harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to abstain from reporting violent perpetrators or seeking protection and, as a result, dangerous criminals are not identified and go unpunished.

As VAWA recognizes, immigrant victims of violent crimes often do not contact law enforcement due to fear that they will be deported. Immigrants are already afraid of contacting the police and H.R. 3003 proposes to further intertwine federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will only exacerbate this fear. The result is that perpetrators will be able to continue to harm others, both immigrant and U.S. Citizen victims alike. Since January of 2017, victim advocates have been describing the immense fear expressed by immigrant victims and their reluctance to reach out for help from police. A recent survey of over 700 advocates and attorneys at domestic violence and sexual assault programs indicate that immigrant victims are expressing heightened fears and concerns about immigration enforcement, with 78% of advocates and attorneys reporting that victims are describing fear of contacting the police; 75% of them reporting that victims are afraid of going to court; and 43% reporting working with immigrant victims who are choosing not to move

forward with criminal charges or obtaining protective orders.

In addition, according to Los Angeles Police Chief Charlie Beck, reporting of sexual assault and domestic violence among Latinos has dropped significantly this year, possibly due to concerns that police interaction could result in deportation. According to Chief Beck, reports of sexual assault have dropped 25 percent among Los Angeles’ Latino population since the beginning of the year compared to a three percent drop among non-Latino victims. Similarly, reports of spousal abuse among Latinos fell by about 10 percent among Latinos whereas the decline among non-Latinos was four percent. The Houston Police Department reported in April that the number of Hispanics reporting rape is down 42.8 percent from last year. In Denver, CO, the Denver City Attorney has reported that some domestic violence victims are declining to testify in court. As of late February, the City Attorney’s Office had dropped four cases because the victims fear that ICE officers will arrest and deport them. Both the City Attorney and Aurora Police Chief have spoken on the importance of having trust with the immigrant community in order to maintain public safety and prosecute crime?

#### H.R. 3003 WILL UNFAIRLY PUNISH ENTIRE COMMUNITIES

H.R. 3003 punishes localities that follow Constitutional guidelines and refuse to honor detainer requests that are not supported by due process mandates. H.R. 3003 likely covers more than 600 jurisdictions across the country, most of which do not characterize their policies to follow constitutional mandates as “sanctuary” policies. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating their access to various federal grants, including federal law enforcement grants, such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and other federal grants related to law enforcement or immigration, such as those that fund forensic rape kit analysis. Withholding federal law enforcement funding would, ironically, undermine the ability of local jurisdictions to combat and prevent crime in their communities.

In addition, the fiscal impact of both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will result in limited federal law enforcement resources being further reduced as a result of shifting funding from enforcing federal criminal laws addressing violent crimes, including those protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, to the detention and prosecution of many non-violent immigration law violators.

#### H.R. 3003 AND H.R. 3004 WILL UNFAIRLY PUNISH VICTIMS

By greatly expanding mandatory detention and expanding criminal penalties for re-entry, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have harsh consequences for immigrant survivors. Victims of human trafficking, sexual assault, and domestic violence are often at risk of being arrested and convicted. In recognition of this fact, existing ICE guidance cites the example of when police respond to a domestic violence call, both parties may be arrested or a survivor who acted in self-defense may be wrongly accused. In addition, if the abuser speaks English better than the survivor, or if other language or cultural barriers (or fear of retaliation from the abuser) prevent the survivor from fully disclosing the abuse suffered, a survivor faces charges and tremendous pressure to plead guilty (without being advised about the long-term

consequences) in order to be released from jail and reunited with her children. In addition, victims of trafficking are often arrested and convicted for prostitution-related offenses. These victims are often desperate to be released and possibly to be reunited with their children following their arrests or pending trial. These factors—combined with poor legal counsel, particularly about the immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—have in the past and will likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges and/or prostitution. H.R. 3003 imposes harsh criminal penalties and H.R. 3004 imposes expanded bases for detention without consideration of mitigating circumstances or humanitarian exceptions for these victims.

In addition, H.R. 3004 expands the criminal consequences for re-entry in the U.S. without recognizing the compelling humanitarian circumstances in which victims who have been previously removed return for their safety. Victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking fleeing violence in their countries of origin will be penalized for seeking protection from harm. In recent years, women and children fleeing rampant violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, have fled to the United States, seeking refuge. Frequently, because of inadequate access to legal representation, they are unable to establish their eligibility for legal protections in the United States, resulting in their removal. In many cases, the risk of domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or human trafficking in their countries of origin remain unabated and victims subsequently attempt to reenter the U.S. to protect themselves and their children. Other victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking may be deported because their abusers or traffickers isolate them, or prevent them from obtaining lawful immigration status. They are deported, with some victims having to leave their children behind in the custody of their abusers or traffickers. Under H.R. 3004, these victims risk harsh criminal penalties for re-entry for attempting to protect themselves and their children.

On behalf of the courageous survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking and human trafficking that our organizations serve, we urge you to vote against H.R. 3003 and 3004, and to affirm the intent and spirit of VAWA by supporting strong relationships between law enforcement and immigrant communities, which is critical for public safety in general, and particularly essential for domestic and sexual violence victims and their children.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL TASKFORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

[From the CATO Institute]

KATE’S LAW: A WASTE OF FEDERAL RESOURCES

(By David Bier)

The House of Representatives will vote on a bill this week titled “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004). While it is nominally an “immigration” bill, its principal aim relates to criminal justice—namely, an increase in the maximum sentences for immigrants who reenter the country illegally after a deportation. The bill is a waste of federal resources. It would likely balloon America’s population of nonviolent prisoners, while not protecting Americans against serious criminals.

KATE’S LAW WOULD NOT HAVE HELPED KATE

The bill’s namesake is Kate Steinle, a 32-year-old medical sales rep killed in San



Francisco in 2015. Her killer was Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez who was in the country without status after five removals. Proponents of this bill—providing lengthier prison sentences for people who reenter the country after a removal—believe that this would have somehow helped Kate Steinle. This assertion cannot withstand a moment's contact with the facts of the case, which I have previously laid out in detail here.

After his last three apprehensions, the government prosecuted Lopez-Sanchez for felony illegal reentry. He served 15 years in federal prison in three five-year increments. None of the facts of this case would have changed if he had served those 15 years consecutively. Indeed, because Lopez-Sanchez never actually made it across the border without being caught since 1997, the only reason that he ended up in San Francisco is because the Bureau of Prisons inexplicably decided to ignore a request for transfer from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Instead, it shipped him to the city based on a 20-year-old marijuana charge—an offense no longer even exists in the city. Thus, deterrence against reentry has no relevance whatsoever to this case.

#### THE PROVISIONS OF KATE'S LAW

This legislation introduced by House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-VA) should not be confused with other bills of the same name introduced in the House and the Senate by Rep. Steve King (R-IA) and Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX), respectively. The entire purpose of the prior iterations of "Kate's Law" was to create mandatory minimum sentences for crossing the border illegally after a removal. Indeed, the alternate title for the bills was the "Establishing Mandatory Minimums for Illegal Reentry Act." This new Kate's Law, however, mercifully contains no mandatory minimum sentences—a sign that criminal justice reformers' criticisms of them (including Cato's) have started to penetrate the mainstream.

But the purpose of the law in the broader sense remains: trying to lock up more immigrants for longer periods. Most of the actual text comes from section 3705 of the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill (S. 744) passed in June 2013, but the Kate's Law authors have added several odious provisions. The heart of the bill would create a new 10-year maximum sentence for any person removed or denied entry more than two times who reenters. The current maximum for regular reentry is just 2 years. It would increase the maximum sentences for people who reenter after being convicted of various criminal offenses—including for immigration offenses—to up to 25 years.

Kate's Law deletes two important provisions from the 5.744 language that would have protected from prosecution non-felon juveniles (p. 772-73) and humanitarian groups that provide immigrants caught in deserts or mountains food, water, or transportation to safety, which are sometimes the target of the "aiding and abetting" statutes (p. 774). Kate's Law would also prohibit challenging the legality or validity of a prior removal order, which is a common defense in these cases. If the earlier removal was not valid, as in at least one case where a U.S. citizen was deported, it should not be the basis of prosecution.

Kate's Law also would allow for prosecutions of immigrants who attempt to enter the United States unsuccessfully. Under current judicial interpretation, an alien must be "free from official restraint"—that is, not in the custody or control of a government official. The 9th Circuit has interpreted to in-

clude even chases along the border. Thus, the bill would significantly expand the number of people eligible for prosecution for the criminal reentry statute.

#### KATE'S LAW WOULD FURTHER OVER-CRIMINALIZATION

The U.S. Sentencing Commission estimated that the original mandatory minimums version of Kate's Law would increase the federal prison population by almost 60,000 in 5 years—a massive 30 percent increase in the total federal prison population. Unfortunately, the House is moving this new version—revealed late last week—without an estimate of either its financial impact or its impact on the federal prison population. But the law would likely completely reverse the recent 5 percent decline in the federal prison population, the first reduction since the 1970s.

Immigration offenses are already the top reason for a federal arrest, composing half of all federal criminal arrests up, a share that has doubled since 2004. From 1998 to 2010, 56 percent of all federal prison admissions were for immigration crimes. Locking up immigrants requires taxpayers to pay to watch, house, clothe, and feed them, and unlike U.S. citizens who are released into the interior, their incarceration does not prevent other U.S. residents from being exposed their criminal behavior (assuming illegal crossing is a concern in that regard).

While naturally locking people up has some deterrent effect on future crossing, Border Patrol doesn't bother to keep good data on this impact compared to its other efforts. Given the costs of incarceration—both to the person incarcerated and to the U.S. taxpayer—this seems like a critical insight. In any case, if Congress was serious about discouraging illegal immigration, it would make legal immigration significantly easier. As I have shown, the availability of work permits has a major impact on illegal immigration.

It's not clear that the motivation for Kate's Law is reducing illegal immigration per se, but rather the belief that illegal immigrants are more likely to commit serious crimes and so should be singled out. Yet as my colleagues' recent paper demonstrates, illegal immigrants are much less likely to end up behind bars than U.S.-born citizens. Because unauthorized immigrants are required to serve sentences before their removal, this is the best indication that they are less likely to commit crimes that require jail time.

In the end, Kate's Law is an improvement on its prior versions, but still an unjustifiable use of federal resources.

#### CWS STATEMENT TO OPPOSING H.R. 3003, THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT, AND H.R. 3004, KATE'S LAW

As a 71-year old humanitarian organization representing 37 Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox communions and 34 refugee resettlement offices across the country, Church World Service (CWS) urges all Members of Congress to support the long-standing efforts of law enforcement officials to foster trusting relationships with the communities they protect and serve. As we pray for peace and an end to senseless acts of violence that are too prevalent in this country, CWS encourages the U.S. Congress to refrain from politicizing tragedies or conflating the actions of one person with an entire community of our immigrant brothers and sisters and oppose H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law.

H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, would target more than 600+ cities,

counties, and states across the country and threaten to take away millions of dollars in federal funding that local police use to promote public safety. Communities are safer when they commit to policies that strengthen trust and cooperation between local law enforcement, community leadership and institutions, and all residents, regardless of immigration status. The Federal government should not hurt intentional, community-based policing efforts that are vital in communities across the country. Many cities have already recognized that requests by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to hold individuals beyond their court-appointed sentences violate due process and have been found unconstitutional by federal courts. This bill would raise profound constitutional concerns by prohibiting localities from declining to comply with ICE detainer requests even when such compliance would violate federal court orders and the U.S. Constitution. Local police that refuse ICE detainer requests see an increase in public safety due to improved trust from the community. It is precisely this trust that enables community members to report dangerous situations without the fear of being deported or separated from their families. When local police comply with ICE detainer requests, more crimes go unreported because victims and witnesses are afraid of being deported if they contact the police. This bill would also undermine local criminal prosecutions by allowing the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ignore state or local criminal warrants and refuse to transfer individuals to state or local custody in certain circumstances. This bill would reduce community safety by preventing state and local jurisdictions from holding people accountable.

The United States already spends more than \$18 billion on immigration enforcement per year, more than all other federal law enforcement agencies combined. H.R. 3004, Kate's Law, would expand the federal government's ability to prosecute individuals for "illegal reentry" and impose even more severe penalties in these cases—even though prosecutions for migration-related offenses already make up more than 50% of all federal prosecutions. Yet, this bill does not include adequate protections for individuals who reenter the U.S. in order to seek protection, which would place asylum seekers at risk of being returned to the violence and persecution they fled. We have seen how Border Patrol's current practices violate existing U.S. law and treaty obligations by preventing viable asylum claims from moving forward. DHS has found that in some areas, Border Patrol refers asylum seekers for criminal prosecution despite the fact that they have expressed fear of persecution. In May 2017, a report was released highlighting that many asylum seekers, who had expressed a fear of returning to their home countries are being turned away by CBP agents. New barriers to protection are unnecessary and would dangerously impede our obligations under international and U.S. law.

Federal, state, and local policies that focus on deportation do not reduce crime rates. Individuals are being deported who present no risk to public safety and who are long-standing community members, including parents of young children. Immigrants come to this country to reunite with family, work, and make meaningful contributions that enrich their communities. Several studies over the last century have affirmed that all immigrants, regardless of nationality or status, are less likely than U.S. citizens to commit

violent crimes. A recent report found a correlation between the increase in undocumented immigrants, and the sharp decline in violent and property crime rates. Immigration is correlated with significantly higher employment growth and a decline in the unemployment rate, and immigrants have high entrepreneurial rates, creating successful businesses that hire immigrant and U.S. citizen employees.

As communities of faith, we are united by principles of compassion, stewardship, and justice. CWS urges all Members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law. What we need are real solutions and immigration policies that treat our neighbors with the dignity and respect that all people deserve and affirm local law enforcement officers' efforts to build trust with their communities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Re ACLU Opposes H.R. 3003 (No Sanctuary for Criminals Act) and H.R. 3004 (Kate's Law)

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU"), we submit this letter to the House of Representatives to express our strong opposition to H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law.

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT (H.R. 3003)

H.R. 3003 conflicts with the principles of the Fourth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 defies the Fourth Amendment by amending 8 USC Section 1373 of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") to force localities to comply with unlawful detainer requests or risk losing federal funding. This is despite the fact that an "increasing number of federal court decisions" have held that "detainer-based detention by state and local law enforcement agencies violates the Fourth Amendment," as recognized by former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson in 2014.

Disturbingly, H.R. 3003 seeks to penalize the 600+ localities that abide by the Fourth Amendment. These jurisdictions have recognized that by entangling local authorities and federal immigration enforcement, immigration detainers erode trust between immigrant communities and local law enforcement. In this way, immigration detainers ultimately undermine public safety, as entire communities become wary of seeking assistance from police and other government authorities that are supposed to provide help in times of need. Thus, by forcing jurisdictions to comply with unlawful detainer requests, H.R. 3003 will only make communities less safe, not more.

H.R. 3003 would also amend Section 287 of the INA to allow the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") to take custody of a person being held under a detainer within 48 hours (excluding weekends and holidays) "but in no instance more than 96 hours" following the date that the individual would otherwise be released from criminal custody. This, again, raises serious Fourth Amendment concerns, as the Supreme Court has stated that the Constitution requires a judicial finding of probable cause within 48 hours of arrest. This provision would disregard the Court's ruling entirely and allow a local law

enforcement agency to hold a person for up to 7 days before requiring DHS intervention—and never requiring the person be brought before a judge for a probable cause hearing.

Protection against unreasonable detention by the government is the bedrock of the Constitution's Fourth Amendment, which provides that the government cannot hold anyone in jail without getting a warrant or approval from a neutral magistrate. This constitutional protection applies to everyone in the United States—citizen and immigrant alike.

Immigration detainers, however, do not abide by these standards. Detainers are one of the key tools that DHS uses to apprehend individuals who come in contact with local and state law enforcement agencies. An immigration detainer is a written request from DHS to that local law enforcement agency, requesting that they detain an individual for an additional 48 hours after the person's release date, in order to allow immigration agents extra time to decide whether to take that person into custody for deportation purposes.

DHS's use of detainers to imprison people without due process, without any charges pending, and without probable cause of a criminal violation flies in the face of our Fourth Amendment protections. Policies that allow DHS to detain people at-will are ripe for civil and human rights violations and have resulted in widespread wrongful detentions, including detentions of U.S. citizens. That is why many of the 600+ localities targeted by H.R. 3003 have decided not to execute a DHS immigration detainer request unless it is accompanied by additional evidence, a determination of probable cause, or a judicial warrant.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3003 does nothing to address the fundamental constitutional problems plaguing DHS's use of immigration detainers. Rather than fix the constitutional problems by requiring a judicial warrant, the bill perpetuates the unconstitutional detainer practices and forces the federal government to absorb legal liability for the constitutional violations which will inevitably result. This is irresponsible lawmaking. Instead of saddling taxpayers with the liability the federal government will incur from Fourth Amendment violations, Congress should end the use of DHS's unconstitutional detainer requests.

H.R. 3003 violates the Due Process Clause by allowing DHS to detain people indefinitely without a bond hearing.

Section 4 of H.R. 3003 radically expands our immigration detention system by amending Section 236(c) of the INA to authorize mandatory detention "without time limitation." This empowers DHS to detain countless immigrants for as long as it takes to conclude removal proceedings—even if that takes years—without the basic due process of a bond hearing to determine if their imprisonment is even justified. This is a clear constitutional violation, as the federal courts have overwhelmingly held that jailing immigrants for months and years without bond hearings raises serious problems under the Due Process Clause.

Although the bill claims to provide for the "detention of criminal aliens," it massively expands mandatory detention to people with no criminal record whatsoever, including immigrants who lack legal papers or who overstay a tourist visa. The "lock 'em up" approach to immigration enforcement is cruel, irrational, and unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has permitted brief periods of

mandatory detention only in cases where individuals are charged with deportation based on certain criminal convictions. The Court has not endorsed the mandatory lock-up of people who have never committed a crime.

KATE'S LAW (H.R. 3004)

H.R. 3004 is piecemeal immigration enforcement that expands America's federal prison population and lines the coffers of private prison companies.

Increasing the maximum sentences for illegal reentrants is unnecessary, wasteful, and inhumane. H.R. 3004 envisions a federal criminal justice system that prosecutes asylum-seekers, persons providing humanitarian assistance to migrants in distress, and parents who pose no threat to public safety in returning to the U.S. to reunite with children who need their care (individuals with children in the United States are 50 percent of those convicted of illegal reentry).

Current law already imposes a sentence of up to 20 years on anyone convicted of illegally reentering the country who has committed an aggravated felony. U.S. Attorneys' Offices aggressively enforce these provisions. According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, immigration prosecutions account for 52 percent of all federal prosecutions—surpassing drugs, weapons, fraud and thousands of other crimes. Nearly 99 percent of illegal reentry defendants are sentenced to federal prison time.

H.R. 3004 would drastically expand America's prison population of nonviolent prisoners at a time when there is bipartisan support to reduce the federal prison population. It offends due process by cutting off all collateral attacks on unjust prior deportation orders, despite the Supreme Court's contrary ruling in *United States v. Mendoza-Lopez*. Profiteering by private prison companies has been the main consequence of border-crossing prosecutions, which the Government Accountability Office and the DHS Office of Inspector General have criticized as lacking sound deterrent support.

H.R. 3004 is an integral part of this administration's mass deportation and mass incarceration agenda. Longer sentences for illegal reentry are not recommended by any informed federal criminal-justice stakeholders; rather they represent this administration's anti-immigrant obsession and would expensively expand substandard private jail contracting despite the life-threatening conditions in these facilities.

In conclusion, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 are fraught with constitutional problems that threaten the civil and human rights of our immigrant communities, undercut law enforcement's ability to keep our communities safe, and would balloon our federal prison population by financing private prison corporations. Rather than taking a punitive approach to local law enforcement agencies that are working hard to balance their duties to uphold the Constitution and to keep their communities safe, Congress should end DHS's unconstitutional detainer practices or fix the constitutional deficiencies by requiring judicial warrants for all detainer requests. Congress should also repeal mandatory detention so that all immigrants receive the basic due process of a bond hearing and reject any attempt to unfairly imprison individuals who are not a threat to public safety.

For more information, please contact ACLU Director of Immigration Policy and Campaigns, Lorella Praeli.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,  
National Political Director.  
LORELLA PRAELI,  
Director of Immigration Policy and  
Campaigns.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a former member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3004, Kate's Law. This is politically driven legislation intended to create a fear of immigrants, even though repeated studies have shown immigrants commit less crimes.

It enhances criminal penalties against immigrants, the vast majority of whom have come here peacefully to rejoin loved ones. All that, and it doesn't even do what it claims to, address the situation that led to the tragic death of Kate Steinle.

There are those who might imply that this bill came from H.R. 15, the comprehensive bipartisan immigration bill that could have passed the House if allowed to vote on the floor, but this is not true. I know, because I was one of the lead sponsors of this bill.

Our bill would have vastly improved the pathways to immigrate legally to the U.S. This bill makes no distinction between those immigrants trying to rejoin their families and those who may be prone to commit crimes.

Instead, it treats all immigrants attempting to reenter the U.S. as criminals and significantly expands sentences for persons with misdemeanors such as driving without a license or loitering. Even asylum seekers, who present themselves at the border to escape deadly gang violence in their home country, could be subject to criminal prosecution.

Turning our backs on asylum seekers and refugees doesn't make us safer. It makes us weak, and it is just plain wrong.

We were horrified by Kate Steinle's murder, but the provisions in this bill would not have prevented it. The man charged with killing her was convicted for multiple illegal reentry offenses, serving more than 16 years in prison. He had been caught each time he attempted to cross the border. His presence in San Francisco was not due to lax penalties for reentry or weak border security.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation ripped from the pages of Donald Trump's mass deportation and anti-immigrant playbook.

I include in the RECORD five documents from organizations that are opposed to this bill as well as the sanctuary bill, and that is the 15,000 immigration lawyers and law professors who are members of the American Immigration Lawyers Association; the 1.6 mil-

lion members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, or AFSCME; the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union, SEIU; the Asian Americans Advancing Justice; and the Fair Immigration Reform Movement.

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION  
LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Statement of the American Immigration Lawyers Association Opposing the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003) and "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004)

Contact: Gregory Chen, Director of Government Relations.

As the national bar association of over 15,000 immigration lawyers and law professors, the American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA) opposes "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003) and "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004). AILA recommends that members of Congress reject these bills which are scheduled to come before the House Rules Committee on June 27 and to the floor shortly thereafter. Though Judiciary Chairman Goodlatte stated that the bills will "enhance public safety," they will do just the opposite: undermine public safety and make it even harder for local law enforcement to protect their residents and communities. In addition, the bills which were made public less than a week before the vote and completely bypassed the Judiciary Committee, include provisions that will result in violations of due process and the Fourth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

At a time when over 9 out of 10 Americans support immigration reform and legalization of the undocumented, Republican leadership is asking the House to vote on enforcement-only bills that will lead to more apprehensions, deportations, and prosecutions of thousands of immigrants and their families who have strong ties to the United States. Instead of criminalizing and scapegoating immigrants, Congress should be offering workable reforms that will strengthen our economy and our country.

THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT, H.R.  
3003

H.R. 3003 would undermine public safety and interfere with local policing.

H.R. 3003 would amend 8 U.S.C. §1373 to prevent states or localities from establishing laws or policies that prohibit or "in any way" restrict compliance with or cooperation with federal immigration enforcement. The bill dramatically expands 8 U.S.C. §1373 which is more narrowly written and prohibits local law enforcement from restricting the sharing and exchange of information with federal authorities, but only with respect to an individual's citizenship or immigration status.

Rather than empowering localities, the extremely broad wording of H.R. 3003 would strip localities of the ability to enact common-sense crime prevention policies that ensure victims of crime will seek protection and report crimes. The bill would also undermine public safety by prohibiting DHS from honoring criminal warrants of communities deemed "sanctuary cities" if the individual being sought by local law enforcement has a final order of removal.

Under H.R. 3003, localities that fail to comply with federal immigration efforts are penalized with the denial of federal funding for critical law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), Community Ori-

ented Policing Services (COPS), and Byrne JAG programs that provide hundreds of millions of dollars to localities nationwide.

In an effort to force localities to engage in civil immigration enforcement efforts, including those against nonviolent undocumented immigrants, the bill would make it far more difficult for many localities, including large cities, to arrest and prosecute potentially dangerous criminals. The bill could even offer criminals a form of immunity, knowing that any crimes they commit in a designated sanctuary city would result, at most, in their removal from the country as opposed to criminal prosecution.

H.R. 3003 would run afoul of constitutional safeguards in the Fourth Amendment.

By prohibiting localities from restricting or limiting their own cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, H.R. 3003 effectively compels localities to honor ICE detainer requests—a controversial and constitutionally suspect practice that is nonetheless widely-used by ICE. Federal courts have found that ICE use of detainers violates the Fourth Amendment, and that localities may be held liable for honoring them.

The bill also expands detainer authority by establishing that ICE may issue detainer requests for localities to hold undocumented immigrants for up to 96 hours—twice what is currently allowed—even if probable cause has not been shown. Courts have concluded that localities cannot continue detaining someone unless ICE obtains a warrant from a neutral magistrate who has determined there is probable cause, or in the case of a warrantless arrest, review by a neutral magistrate within 48 hours of arrest. The expansive provisions in H.R. 3003 would force localities to choose between detaining people in violation of the Constitution or being punished as a "sanctuary city."

Furthermore, this bill provides government actors and private contractors with immunity if they are sued for violating the Constitution. Provisions in this bill transfer the financial burden of litigation by substituting the federal government for the local officers as the defendant. If H.R. 3003 becomes law, American taxpayers would be stuck paying for lawsuits brought by those who are unjustly detained.

The bill goes even further by creating a private right of action allowing crime victims or their family members to sue localities if the crime was committed by someone who was released by the locality that did not honor an ICE detainer request.

H.R. 3003 would violate the Tenth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 would compel states and localities to utilize their local law enforcement resources to implement federal civil immigration enforcement in violation of the Tenth Amendment's "commandeering" principle. The Tenth Amendment does not permit the federal government to force counties and cities to allocate local resources, including police officers, technology, and personnel, to enforce federal immigration law. The federal government also cannot withhold funds from localities refusing to participate in federal efforts if the programs affected are unrelated to the purpose of the federal program, or if the sanctions are punitive in nature.

H.R. 3003 would expand detention without due process.

H.R. 3003 would increase the use of detention without ensuring those detained have access to a bond determination. Under the bill, nearly anyone who is undocumented, including those who have overstayed their visa

would be subject to detention without a custody hearing. The bill also establishes that DHS has the authority to detain individuals "without time limitation" during the pendency of removal proceedings. These provisions would dramatically expand the federal government's power to indefinitely detain individuals, and would likely result in ever growing numbers of undocumented immigrants held in substandard detention facilities.

#### KATE'S LAW, H.R. 3004

H.R. 3004 would expand the already severe penalties in federal law for illegal reentry (INA §276; 8 U.S.C. §1326). The number of people prosecuted for illegal reentry has grown steadily to about 20,000 prosecutions each year, and such cases comprise more than one quarter of all federal criminal prosecutions nationwide. H.R. 3004 adds sentencing enhancements for people who are convicted of minor misdemeanors and people who have reentered multiple times but have no criminal convictions. This bill will not improve public safety and will undermine due process and protections for asylum seekers. H.R. 3004 would waste American taxpayer funds by imposing severe prison sentences upon thousands of people who pose no threat to the community and who have strong ties to the country and are trying to unite with their loved ones.

H.R. 3004 would impose severe sentencing enhancements upon people with minor offenses.

H.R. 3004 would add sentencing enhancements for minor misdemeanor convictions, including driving without a license and other traffic-related offenses. Under the current version of INA §276, if a person is charged with reentering the U.S. after being removed, their punishment is enhanced by up to ten years only if they have been convicted a felony or three or more misdemeanors involving drugs or violence. Under H.R. 3004 someone who has been convicted of any three misdemeanors regardless of severity would be subject to a term of up to ten years.

This expansion would unfairly target large numbers of people who are not a threat to public safety but instead are trying to reunite with family members and have other strong ties to the United States. Currently half of all people convicted of illegal reentry have one child living in the country. Increasing sentences for illegal reentry would also waste taxpayer dollars, costing huge amounts of money to lock up non-violent people.

H.R. 3004 would punish people who attempt to seek asylum at the border.

H.R. 3004 expands the provisions of INA §276 to punish not only people who reenter the U.S. or attempt to reenter the U.S., but also people who cross or attempt to cross the border. The bill goes on to define "crosses the border" to mean "the physical act of crossing the border, regardless of whether the alien is free from official restraint." That means that people who present themselves at ports of entry to request asylum and are taken into custody by CBP to await a fear screening would be subject to criminal charges based on a past removal, even though they are seeking refuge in the U.S.

H.R. 3004 would impose severe sentencing enhancements for people with multiple entries.

The bill would also create new sentencing enhancements for people who have reentered the U.S. multiple times, even if they have no other criminal convictions. If someone has been removed three or more times, and is found in the United States or attempts to

cross the border again, H.R. 3004 law would provide for sentencing enhancements of up to ten years. The bill makes no exception for bona fide asylum seekers, which means that people who are seeking refuge in the U.S. from atrocities abroad could be subject to a lengthy prison sentence under these provisions.

H.R. 3004 would undermine due process by blocking challenges to unfair removal orders.

The bill will prevent an individual from challenging the validity of a removal order, even if that is fundamentally unfair in the first place. The Supreme Court held in *U.S. v. Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828 (1987) that due process requires that a challenge be allowed if a deportation proceeding is used as an element of a criminal offense and where the proceeding "effectively eliminate[d] the right of the alien to obtain judicial review." This provision in H.R. 3004 is likely unconstitutional and will cause grave injustice to defendants, such as asylum seekers who were deported without the opportunity to seek asylum.

#### AFSCME,

Washington, DC, June 28, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to oppose the punitive and unnecessary No Sanctuary for Criminals Act (H.R. 3003) and its companion bill that increases penalties for certain immigrants (H.R. 3004). These bills together weaken the rights of immigrants, cut funding to vital state and local programs, and further criminalize immigrants.

H.R. 3003 and 3004 are deeply flawed pieces of legislation that would add chaos to an already broken immigration system when comprehensive reform is what is needed. The bills undermine state and local policing strategies that have worked well for many communities. Implementing this "one size fits all" approach, as proposed in these bills, jeopardizes the trust that diverse communities have placed in their police force and undermines federal grants that are aimed at helping law enforcement and that support the very programs needed to reduce crime.

H.R. 3003 forces communities to devote local resources to enforcing federal immigration law and penalizes them if they don't comply. H.R. 3004 mandates increased penalties on immigrants for reentry, which could lead to a large increase in the prison population without additional resources. This would create new financial liability for federal, state, and local governments, that are already cash strapped, at a time when funding is urgently needed for investments in public safety, infrastructure and other vital community needs.

We urge the House to reject both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Legislative Affairs.

#### SEIU,

Washington, DC, June 28, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the two million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), I urge you to vote no on H.R. 3004 and H.R. 3003, which are currently scheduled to come to the House floor this week. These mean-spirited and unwise bills would waste taxpayer dollars, shackle local law enforcement efforts to

protect the public, and make our nation's immigration laws even meaner and less reasonable than they already are.

H.R. 3004, "Kate's Law," would increase the prison population of nonviolent offenders who pose no public safety risk, without evidence that its harsh provisions would have any impact on unlawful immigration, and without any other justification of its cost or impact on prison overcrowding. Those affected would include immigrants who have only committed minor misdemeanors such as driving without a license or other traffic-related offenses, and others who have never committed any crimes besides unauthorized entry. H.R. 3004 would also penalize persons fleeing persecution who voluntarily present themselves at the border to apply for asylum, and it would short circuit the current minimal due process protections that protect persons whose previous deportation was unlawful.

H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," is intended to commandeer state and local law enforcement resources to perform federal deportation activities. It is one part of the ongoing effort to villainize immigrants by unfairly—and against all available evidence—painting them all with a criminal brush for the misdeeds of a few. Rather than protecting the public, the provisions of H.R. 3003 would frustrate policies by states and localities that increase public safety by encouraging cooperation between law enforcement and the communities they serve. There is mounting evidence that localities with such policies experience lower crime because they build trust between the police and those they serve, thereby inspiring the community collaboration and assistance that is a key ingredient to maintaining safe neighborhoods.

It should be pointed out that the provisions of H.R. 3003 are sufficiently radical that even those who do not support sanctuary cities should vote no. The bill would deny important law enforcement funding to localities that are unwilling to honor any and all federal immigration detainer requests, including requests that courts have said are unconstitutional. It would empower private individuals to sue a locality if they or their family are victimized by a crime committed by an individual who was released despite a federal detainer request. It would render local governments powerless to prioritize local needs over immigration enforcement, even for local agencies funded by local taxes. And, if that weren't enough, a separate provision would significantly increase the categories of individuals subject to mandatory detention and prolonged detention without bond, thereby filling local jails and private prisons with individuals who pose no danger to themselves and no flight risk.

For the reasons listed above, both of these bills should be defeated. SEIU therefore asks you to vote no, and may add votes on any of them to our scorecard. If you have any questions, please contact Josh Bernstein.

Sincerely,

ROCIO SÁENZ,

Executive Vice President.

#### ASIAN AMERICANS

ADVANCING JUSTICE,

June 28, 2017.

FIVE CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSE LATEST IMMIGRATION ACTIONS IN THE HOUSE  
HOUSE REPUBLICANS INTRODUCE TWO ANTI-IMMIGRANT BILLS DURING IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

WASHINGTON, DC.—Representative Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) introduced a set of anti-

immigrant bills that are scheduled for a vote later this week. These are the latest in a line of bills that outline a clear anti-immigrant strategy by House leadership and this administration.

H.R. 3003 seeks to authorize the Federal Government to withhold millions of dollars in federal funding for localities with limited detainer policies, sanctuary city policies, and community trust policies aimed at complying with the Constitution and making communities safer. H.R. 3004 would expand the Federal Government's ability to prosecute people for illegal reentry into the U.S., excludes humanitarian exemptions for people fleeing violence, and heightens penalties in those cases.

Asian Americans Advancing Justice, an affiliation of five civil rights organizations, issues the following statement in response:

"Asian Americans Advancing Justice strongly opposes H.R. 3003 (the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act), H.R. 3004 (known as Kate's Law), and the passage of any immigration enforcement legislation that would increase indiscriminate enforcement, further the criminalization of immigrants, and instill more fear in already terrified communities. Approximately 40 percent of all immigrants come to the U.S. from Asia, and 1.6 million of those immigrants are undocumented. Anti-immigrant policies create a climate of fear for all immigrants, regardless of status.

We are horrified and dismayed that House leadership has chosen to line up behind the administration in its scapegoating of immigrants. Both of these bills further the administration's goals of criminalizing all immigrants and expanding mass incarceration. Since the administration failed in its attempt to strip funding from municipalities with sanctuary and community trust policies in federal court, it is looking for Congress to fulfill its anti-immigrant agenda.

There is abundant evidence that sanctuary and community trust policies make communities safer. As Arizona and Texas have shown us, forcing local law enforcement to enforce immigration laws increases racial profiling and distrust of law enforcement by communities of color.

Rapidly pushing these bills through the House as America looks toward a holiday that celebrates the best of our American ideals is clearly an effort to slide this legislation under the radar of anyone who would oppose it, including millions of Americans who support immigrants' rights.

Vilifying and punishing immigrants who may be fleeing violence or seeking a better life for their families does not makes us safer, just inhumane. We call on Congress to reject this latest anti-immigrant strategy. This vote will be a test for Members of Congress to show which side of justice they are on."

Asian Americans Advancing Justice is a national affiliation of five leading organizations advocating for the civil and human rights of Asian Americans and other underserved communities to promote a fair and equitable society for all. The affiliation's members are: Advancing Justice/AAJC (Washington, DC), Advancing Justice-Asian Law Caucus (San Francisco), Advancing Justice-Los Angeles, Advancing Justice-Atlanta, and Advancing Justice-Chicago.

FAIR IMMIGRATION  
REFORM MOVEMENT,

June 29, 2017.

HOUSE GOP CONTINUES CRUEL CRUSADE  
AGAINST IMMIGRANTS

WASHINGTON.—Kica Matos, spokesperson for the Fair Immigration Reform Movement

(FIRM), issued the statement below after the House voted on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act and Kate's Law:

"Republicans in the House are hell bent on criminalizing the hard working immigrants who contribute so much to our country. This week they voted on two heartless bills that do nothing more than continue to fuel Trump's deportation machine.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act punishes "sanctuary cities," local jurisdictions addressing immigration issues without federal interference, and expands the government's inhumane practice of indefinite detention of immigrants.

The second bill, "Kate's Law" is a thinly veiled attempt to give prosecutors more power to continue the vicious mass incarceration of black and brown people by expanding on legal penalties for re-entry. The bill also limits the already limited protections for people reentering the country for humanitarian reasons.

The attacks on brown and black people by Republicans are not going unnoticed. The people are on our side—they marched with us on May 1st, they showed up after Trump issued the first refugee ban and they called out elected officials at town halls. Our message to Congress is clear: the only solution to fix the broken immigration system is a pathway to citizenship.

These two bills are the antithesis of our values and should be condemned by everyone.

The Fair Immigration Reform Movement (FIRM) is the nation's largest immigrant-rights coalition, with grassroots organizations fighting for immigrant rights at the local, state and federal level.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and his committee for their diligent work on this extremely important and timely law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3004, Kate's Law. Our immigration system here in the United States is the most generous in the world. Good people from all over the globe who understand the American Dream seek to join us, and we are better for it.

Alexander Hamilton, Levi Strauss, Albert Einstein, and so many others have called themselves Americans because of it. But as we continue to draw on that spirit of understanding and acceptance, we have to remember that a nation without borders is not a nation.

We have a responsibility here in Congress to be proactive and protect our communities and our citizens from unlawful and criminal immigrants, and that is what this legislation does.

Kate's Law, named in honor of 32-year-old Kate Steinle, who was shot and killed in the prime of her life by an unlawful immigrant who had accumulated seven felony convictions, been deported five different times—you have heard this many times said—aims to strengthen public safety by imposing harsher mandatory prison sentences for deported felons who return to the U.S. and increasing penalties for unlawful immigrants who have been convicted of nonimmigration-related crimes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation just makes sense, and I am confident that we can continue to welcome the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free in our country without giving free rein to dangerous convicted criminals in any of our communities.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, for almost 100 percent of the people who would go to jail if this bill is enacted, they are not criminals and have no brush with the law. They were people who lived here for years, who had no chance of coming legally in the first place, and no way to get legal once they were here. Most have lived here for 10, 20, 30 years. They live in families with children, and their children are citizens of the United States just like you and me and our children. They have mortgages and car notes.

The problems these moms and dads are trying to solve is if they get deported, how do I make sure my kids are safe in the country in which they were born, the United States? How do I keep a roof over their head and get them ready for school? How do I keep my business open or my career continuing in the U.S. where I have lived, in some cases, for decades?

That is the problem they have, and guess what, they come back after they are deported. That person, to me, is not a felon, never committed a crime. That person is not a hardened criminal, never killed anyone.

□ 1615

That is a parent fighting for their family.

So in painting a picture of all immigrants as resembling a career criminal, like the guy who killed Kate Steinle, Republicans are doing the old bait and switch.

The people we are hitting with this bill come back to the lives they have built over decades by the only means we have made available, and now we are going to add a felony and 15 years to that.

Let's give moms and dads different alternatives. The people who would go to jail if this bill were enacted would rather have come with a visa. They would get in line for hours to get legal if there were a line to get in, but there isn't, and most Americans believe we should create such a line for them. They would come back legally if they could, but they can't.

We should be looking at how to solve that problem. We should be looking at ways to eliminate illegal immigration, and stop hoping that our strategy of the last 30 years of deportation, more restriction, and more criminalization would somehow miraculously start working.

It hasn't. It won't. It is time for us to enact comprehensive immigration reform in the Congress and to fulfill our responsibility to the Nation.

Look, the question today isn't whether or not this bill is going to pass. It is going to pass. The Republicans are making it a primary purpose.

The question really, for me, is: Are Democrats going to participate? Are Democrats going to participate in allowing this to pass?

I have just got to say that I know it is difficult.

Some people say: Well, I might not come back.

It will be difficult. My constituents demand this.

Well, let me just say that when I was elected in 1986 to the Chicago City Council, I was there but a month and they had the human rights bill for the gay and lesbian community. I remember the banner headlines: "Cardinal Says 'No.'"

Here I was a Catholic all my life, an altar boy, had three of the seven Catholic rites: communion, baptism, and marriage. Ten years later, I got to the Congress and was confronted here with the Defense of Marriage Act. We passed it. There were only about 70 of us who voted against it.

But guess what. Thirty years after I took that vote for gay rights in the Chicago City Council, the Supreme Court said that marriage equality was the law of the land and discriminating against them was against the Constitution of the United States of America.

That is the way you create social justice, not by doing a poll and not by trying to figure out what the next election consequences are going to be.

I say to my Democratic colleagues: Stand up for social justice today.

It wasn't easy as a Democrat to stand up for reproductive rights for women. I remember going to church and I remember being chastised by the priest. I remember being booed by some of the congregants as I left that church. But I stood up for what I believe are women's rights. My children were chased down the street during Halloween by pro-choice people who said I didn't deserve to be trick-or-treating with my children, that I was a bad father and I was a murderer. We stood up, and women have rights in this country.

That is the way we do that, Democrats. We stand up for what is right. We don't take a poll, and we don't think of the next election. We do what is right.

The immigrant community is looking for champions today, and it is my hope that, as Democrats, we, too, will stand up. When hate visits you, you need to repudiate it. You need to repudiate it because that hate might visit you in some personal way and it might cause you to hate yourself ultimately.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement in opposition to the bill from the Tahirih Justice Center.

TAHIRIH JUSTICE CENTER,  
Falls Church, VA, June 27, 2017.

STATEMENT OF THE TAHIRIH JUSTICE CENTER  
OPPOSING THE "NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS  
ACT" (H.R. 3003) AND "KATE'S LAW" (H.R. 3004)

The Tahirih Justice Center ("Tahirih") respectfully submits this statement to the United States House of Representatives as it considers "The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003; "The Act") and "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004). The House Rules Committee is set to review these bills today, followed by the full House in the near future. Tahirih is a national, nonpartisan organization that has assisted over 20,000 immigrant survivors of gender-based violence over the past 20 years. Our clients include women and girls who have endured horrific abuses such as rape and human trafficking and are in dire need of humanitarian relief.

Tahirih urges members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003 and 3004: By further entangling federal and local immigration enforcement, H.R. 3003 will not only put survivors of human trafficking and domestic violence at greater risk of criminal harm, but will embolden violent criminals who pose a danger to us all. H.R. 3004 will unjustly punish asylum seekers who sought safe haven in the U.S., but were improperly denied access to the asylum process the first time around.

H.R. 3003: The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act: The Act seeks to erase the distinction between federal and local immigration enforcement. Such measures erode immigrant community trust of police, who rely on victims and witnesses to help get dangerous criminals off the streets. When immigrants know they can call 911 without fear of deportation, it is perpetrators—not victims or their children—that are deterred and punished. Abusers and traffickers deliberately manipulate and isolate victims to limit their access to information about their legal rights. Despite longstanding protections under the Violence Against Women Act, even victims who hold lawful immigration status succumb to intimidation, and remain afraid of deportation if they come forward. For some survivors, deportation means sentencing a US citizen child to the custody of a violent abuser. Following the recent passage of a state law to increase local immigration enforcement, a client aptly noted, "This is exactly what [my abuser] has been waiting for." We are all less safe when we make it easier for perpetrators to commit crimes.

The Act will also increase prolonged detention of survivors, resulting in further traumatization, separation from young children, and limited access to legal assistance and due process. The Act also punishes localities that refuse to comply, by revoking critical funding for core programs that address gun violence, gang violence, and other criminal activity. When local agencies must "choose" between continuing these programs and compromising community trust, it is the public that pays the steepest price.

H.R. 3004: Kate's Law: Tahirih and other advocates routinely assist clients whose initial requests for asylum at the border are met with hostility, intimidation, and coercion. These individuals are unlawfully denied access to the asylum process by U.S. officials. With their lives in grave danger, women and girls in this situation have no choice but to request safe haven in the U.S. a second or even third time. They are not asking to appeal denial of their claims; rather, they are merely seeking a threshold determination that they may apply for asylum or related protections. Our domestic laws

and international humanitarian obligations require that they have this opportunity. H.R. 3004 will punish women fleeing horrific abuse who persist in their quest for asylum by limiting their ability to challenge initial, unlawful removals, and by unnecessarily and unjustly subjecting them to criminal prosecution.

We appreciate the opportunity to offer this statement in opposition to H.R. 3003 and 3004, and we urge Congress to unequivocally reject these harmful bills that undermine the safety of survivors of gender-based violence.

ARCHI PYATI,

*Director of Policy and Programs.*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Human Rights First: American Ideals. Universal Values.

HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST,

June 28, 2017.

Re H.R. 3004—115th Congress (2017–2018).

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write to urge you to oppose H.R. 3004 ("Kate's Law") and any similar legislation that would have severely negative consequences for asylum seekers and refugees fleeing persecution.

H.R. 3004 seeks to expand the scope of immigrants who may be prosecuted for unlawful reentry and further expands penalties for those who are convicted. But the criminal prosecution of asylum seekers for offenses such as illegal entry, illegal reentry, and document fraud violates U.S. treaty obligations and risks sending genuine refugees back to their countries of persecution.

For one, many asylum seekers are forced to "reenter" the United States because they were wrongfully deported in the first place through the expedited removal system. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), as well as Human Rights First and other groups, has long documented deficiencies and flaws in the implementation of the expedited removal process, a summary process which gives immigration officers the authority to order non-citizens deported without a hearing. In its 2005 report on expedited removal, USCIRF found that in a significant number of cases, border agents failed to follow U.S. law and refer asylum seekers to the "credible fear" process, even when USCIRF researchers were present during the secondary inspection process.

Even when border agents make the proper referral for a credible fear screening, asylum seekers are often traumatized and exhausted by their experiences in their home countries, their flight to the United States, and their arrest by U.S. authorities. They are often interviewed by telephone by an officer they cannot see and are at the mercy of interpretation problems and other arbitrary factors that hinder communication. As a result, some may incorrectly be found to not have a credible fear, and may be deported as a result. These asylum seekers must then "reenter" the United States after facing continuing persecution in their home countries to seek protection yet again.

Moreover, H.R. 3004 would redefine "reentry" to encompass an even broader group of individuals, as it will define reentry as including cases of individuals who had been previously denied admission. Human Rights First release a report in May 2017, titled *Crossing the Line*, which documents cases of



asylum seekers who have been turned back at U.S. ports of entry, despite stating to border agents that they had a fear of persecution or intended to seek asylum. While DHS officials have acknowledged that border agents should be following U.S. law and referring asylum seekers to the asylum process, Human Rights First and other groups have found that this practice continues. H.R. 3004 seeks to penalize an overly broad group of individuals that would even include those who were wrongfully turned away from our ports of entry in violation of U.S. law.

Secondly, prosecuting asylum seekers for their illegal entry or presence—even in the case of “reentry”—is a violation of U.S. treaty obligations under the Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. Article 31 of the Refugee Convention requires that states refrain from imposing “penalties” on refugees on account of their illegal entry or presence in the country where they are seeking asylum. For this reason, in 2015, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General found that prosecutions under “Operation Streamline” may place the United States in violation of its treaty obligations.

If Congress passes H.R. 3004, more asylum seekers like Maria will be subjected to wrongful criminal prosecutions.

“Maria,” a transgender woman from Honduras, who had been raped and subjected to other sexual violence, fled to the United States in 2014. U.S. immigration officials failed to respond to her requests for asylum and she was deported back to Honduras through expedited removal without ever seeing an immigration judge or having her fear of persecution assessed by an asylum officer. Facing ongoing persecution in Honduras, she fled to the United States again in 2015, and was apprehended upon entry. U.S. border agents referred her for criminal prosecution and she was convicted of illegal reentry. After she was transferred back to immigration custody, she was determined to be a “refugee” who qualified for withholding of removal. Yet, the United States had already penalized her for “illegal entry” despite being a refugee.

Please contact Olga Byrne at Human Rights First if you have any questions regarding this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR ACER,  
*Senior Director, Refugee Protection.*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from Cities for Action.

CITIES FOR ACTION,  
*June 28, 2017.*

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Cities for Action (C4A) is a coalition of over 150 mayors and municipal leaders that advocates for policies to promote the well-being of our foreign born residents. Our coalition, representing over 50 million residents, has a considerable interest in protecting all our residents and ensuring that immigrants are not unjustly criminalized. We are writing to you today to urge that you oppose Representative Goodlatte’s bill, H.R. 3004, Kate’s Law.

Kate’s Law expands already tough penalties for illegal reentry and allows the government to detain immigrants indefinitely

without bond or a court hearing. It also mistakenly implies that illegal reentry cases are under-enforced. Indeed, illegal reentry prosecutions already account for 52 percent of all federal prosecutions. H.R. 3004 would make the criminal sentences for reentry extremely harsh. Additionally, it would impose severe sentencing enhancements on people with minor offenses who reenter the country.

H.R. 3004 would also limit the ability to challenge the validity of any prior removal order that forms the basis for a prosecution for illegal reentry, subjecting people to prosecution even in cases where the prior order was issued without due process or was otherwise flawed. In addition, the bill does not provide adequate protections for people who reenter the United States for humanitarian reasons or those who seek protection at the border, putting asylum seekers and families at risk.

Cities and counties are opposed to this bill because these measures do not improve public safety and it is based on a false premise that immigrants pose a threat to our communities. Local governments have a strong interest in protecting all residents and maintaining public safety. Therefore, we urge you to oppose Kate’s Law and stop its passage into law at every possible turn.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,

CITIES FOR ACTION.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Catholic Charities USA.

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB/COM), and Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) to express our opposition to H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

The Catholic Church holds a strong interest in the welfare of migrants and how our nation welcomes and treats them. Our parishes include those with and without immigration status, unfortunately some who have witnessed or been victims of crime in the United States, including domestic violence, armed robbery, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We oppose H.R. 3003 because it would impose obligations on local governments that we fear—and that many of them have warned—would undermine authority and discretion of local law enforcement. This, in turn, would hamper the ability of local law enforcement officials to apprehend criminals and ensure public safety in all communities.

Furthermore, Section 2 of H.R. 3003 would deny to jurisdictions vital federal funding related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, and naturalization if those jurisdictions are deemed to be non-compliant with H.R. 3003. The Catholic service network, including Catholic Charities, works in partnership with the federal government on a number of Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security initiatives, including disaster response and recovery, naturalization and citizenship services, and services for the immigrant, including victims of human trafficking, and domestic violence. These services are incredibly valuable to the protection and promotion of the human person and in some instances life-saving. Cutting grants

related to these important national objectives, or threat of such cuts, is not humane or just, nor is it in our national interest.

Also, we oppose H.R. 3004 as it would lead to an expansion of incarceration and does not include adequate protections for people who re-enter the U.S. for humanitarian reasons or seek protection at the border. While H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal offenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government’s ability to prosecute illegal re-entry cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are efficiently utilized to prosecute and convict the most violent offenders of violent crimes. Expanding who is eligible to be prosecuted for entry or re-entry as well as enhancing sentencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that communities are safer. Furthermore, we are concerned that, as introduced, H.R. 3004 would also prevent vulnerable asylum seekers and unaccompanied children, (who have presented themselves repeatedly at the U.S. border in the flight from violence), from being able to access protection, and instead face fines, imprisonment or both.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on balancing the needs and rights of immigrants with our nation’s best interests and security.

The United States has a long and proud history of leadership in welcoming newcomers regardless of their circumstances and promoting the common good. We stand ready to work with you on legislation that more closely adheres to this tradition and appreciate your serious consideration of our views in this regard.

Sincerely,

MOST REV. JOE VÁSQUEZ,  
*Bishop of Austin,*  
*Chairman, USCCB*  
*Committee on Migration.*

SR. DONNA MARKHAM, OP,  
PHD,  
*President & CEO,*  
*Catholic Charities*  
*USA.*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from Friends Committee on National Legislation: A Quaker Lobby in the Public Interest.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON  
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,  
*June 27, 2017.*

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT (H.R. 3003) AND KATE’S LAW (H.R. 3004)

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) is a Quaker lobby in the public interest committed to pursuing policies that build just societies, peaceful communities, and equitable relationships among all people. FCNL looks to Congress to legislate on immigration in a manner that honors the value of immigrants and American citizens alike and urges congressional representatives to reject any legislation which would undermine immigrant families and communities. Congress is tasked with creating lasting solutions for our nation. FCNL therefore urges members of Congress to oppose H.R.



3003 and H.R. 3004 which together further criminalize immigrants, expand detention, undermine community well-being, and offer no legislative remedy for a punitive and outdated immigration system.

H.R. 3003 is an extreme interior enforcement proposal that would affect over 600 cities, counties, and states and raises serious fourth and tenth amendment concerns. Effective policing depends on building authentic trust between police officers and the communities they serve; blurring the lines between federal immigration enforcement and local police results in fewer reported crimes and makes communities with large immigrant populations more vulnerable. Perpetrators of crime, assault, and abuse know that these communities are less likely to report the crime if they legitimately fear it will result in the deportation or detention of an immigrant neighbor, a loved one, or themselves. Law enforcement officials and advocates for survivors of domestic violence agree that the proposals included in this bill would be damaging for the communities they serve. FCNL heeds this call to ensure safety for the most vulnerable among us, and urges members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003.

H.R. 3004 would expand grounds for indefinite detention and decrease legal opportunities for certain migrants challenging their removal. Our call as Quakers to welcome the stranger does not rest on the legal status of any individual. Criminalizing entire immigrant communities based on the senseless actions of a few individuals tears at the moral fabric of our society and will not make our communities safer. H.R. 3004 could prevent migrants from adequately accessing asylum and would increase family hardship through separation by offering no meaningful opportunity for family members to pursue a legal route when seeking reunification across borders. These provisions will only fuel the brokenness of our system, which is already heavy-handed on indefinite detention and dangerous deportations at great expense to U.S. taxpayers and our collective moral conscience. Thousands of faith leaders have urged members of Congress to reject similar proposals in the past and live up to our call to minister to all those in need, especially those who have been marginalized. In keeping, FCNL urges members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3004.

FCNL looks instead for legislation that proceeds from a recognition of the inherent worth of all individuals, as acknowledged in our Quaker faith, as well as in our shared Constitution, laws, and American values. We call on Congress to reform the U.S. immigration system so that it is in line with the Quaker principle to answer to that of God in everyone and ensures we live up to our legacy as a country that thrives because we are a nation of diverse peoples and immigrants. Congress has the opportunity to enact practical solutions for comprehensive reform that includes clear and workable processes for legal entry and eventual citizenship. FCNL is eager to partner on such efforts, and seek the fundamental policy changes we need to help U.S. communities truly prosper.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

JUNE 27, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice stands in strong opposition to the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003) and "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004) to be considered

this week by the House of Representatives. We urge Congress to reject these bills. In a country that prides itself on being the land of welcome and opportunity, we must ensure that our immigration laws reflect our shared values.

As Congress continues to delay comprehensive immigration reform and a permanent solution for the nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants, we are left with the status quo—an enforcement-only approach that tears apart families and keeps people in the shadows. Despite the gridlock in Congress, localities across the country still have the responsibility to uphold safety and peace in their communities. To fulfill this goal, local police and residents have fostered mutual trust to root out crime and promote public safety, encouraging community members to cooperate with local authorities. The "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003) does nothing to promote public safety and instead will make communities more dangerous while striking fear in the hearts of our immigrant families.

Likewise, "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004) would criminalize immigrants who simply want an opportunity to succeed in the United States, and often are simply trying to be reunited with their family. Punishing immigrants for wanting to provide for their families with fines and imprisonment is harsh and cruel—we, as a nation, are called to be better than that. Again, we ask Congress to abandon the "enforcement first" policies that have been the de facto U.S. strategy for nearly thirty years, yielding too many costs and too few results. Our antiquated system that does not accommodate the migration realities we face in our nation today does not serve our national interests and does not respect the basic human rights of migrants who come to this nation fleeing persecution or in search of employment for themselves and better living conditions for their children.

Pope Francis cautions that "migrants and refugees are not pawns on the chessboard of humanity" and he asks political leaders to create a new system, one that "calls for international cooperation and a spirit of profound solidarity and compassion." This is a holy call to embrace hope over fear. Congress should recognize the God-given humanity of all individuals and uphold our sacred call to love our neighbor and welcome the stranger in our midst. Any action that further militarizes our borders, criminalizes assistance to immigrant communities, or weakens legal protection of refugees is neither just nor compatible with the values that we, as Americans, strive to uphold.

Sincerely,

SR. SIMONE CAMPBELL, SSS,  
Executive Director, NETWORK Lobby  
for Catholic Social Justice.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the previous administration's biggest homeland security failures were the lack of prosecution and enforcement for crimes committed by illegal immigrants. For far too long, the Obama administration failed to adequately punish illegal immigrants who committed felonies in the United States.

A simple deportation is not enough. The United States must prosecute and sentence all individuals who commit crimes and hurt Americans.

When we enforce the law, we create a deterrent mechanism for future bad be-

havior. Failure to enforce the law is a failure to the American people. That is why I support Kate's Law.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his strong work and leadership on this issue for the safety and security of the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding. I appreciate his boldness in protecting the citizens of America with great legislation.

Mr. Speaker, when the father of Kate Steinle, Jim, testified before Congress, he said: "Everywhere Kate went throughout the world, she shined the light of a good citizen from the United States of America. Unfortunately, due to unjoined laws and basic incompetence of the government, the United States has suffered a self-inflicted wound in the murder of our daughter by the hand of a person that should have never been on the streets in this country."

Well, today we can resolve that.

Two years ago this weekend, Kate's life was ended when she was gunned down by a five-time deported criminal illegal alien with seven prior felony convictions.

Kate's Law would stiffen penalties, helping to stop these preventable tragedies.

Additionally, today the House will pass the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act as well.

You just heard: Will Democrats participate?

Well, 80 percent of Americans support ending sanctuary cities, and no citizen should be in danger because politicians think they are above the law.

So will Democrats participate? Will they listen to their constituents?

Eighty percent of Americans feel pretty good about this law.

Both pieces of legislation serve the basic functions of our government by keeping the people of our States and country safe from those who wish to do us harm.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule of law, of strengthening the enforcement of our immigration system, and of improving the security of our Nation's borders. The safety and security of our constituents should be our absolute top priority for this Congress.

Sanctuary cities are a direct threat to our safety. That is why I led an effort to defund sanctuary cities through the appropriations process, and those

sanctuary cities and their threat to our safety is why we are here today.

What happened to Kate Steinle was a tragedy. No parent should have to go through the anguish of losing their child, especially when it could have been avoided.

Unfortunately, the deadly toll of sanctuary cities is not limited to Kate. Last year, in my own community back in Kansas, Master Deputy Brandon Collins, a Johnson County sheriff's deputy with nearly 21 years of service, was struck and killed by a drunk driver while he was performing a routine traffic stop. Deputy Collins was a devoted and caring husband, father, son, brother, uncle, and friend whose life was tragically cut short.

The drunk driver, who fled from the scene of the crash, was an undocumented or an illegal immigrant who had prior convictions for DUI in California in 2001, and was also arrested for driving without a license in 2013. He should have never been behind the wheel of that car when he killed Deputy Collins.

Despite his prior offenses, the man was able to remain in the country. He was able to be here to commit this crime because of the failure to enforce the law, and it ultimately led to Deputy Collins' death.

No nation of laws should tolerate this.

For these reasons—for Deputy Collins and the many other victims and their loved ones dealing with an unspeakable loss—for them, I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Michigan has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), and I ask unanimous consent that she may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a really tough bill because this is a really difficult subject. We mourn the loss of Kate Steinle, and we have an obligation to take action to keep our streets safe. But this bill doesn't do that.

Our goal has to be to remove dangerous criminals from our streets so that they don't harm people. That has got to be our focus.

That is why I am so frustrated that we are taking out of a comprehensive

immigration reform bill—which could have done just that—a provision that would have addressed this issue in a more rational way; in a way that doesn't go after people seeking asylum; in a way that doesn't say, "If you have been convicted of three nonviolent misdemeanors, you go to jail for 10 years;" and in a way that doesn't punish people who are victims of human trafficking who—if they spent time in our prisons as a result of what they were forced to do, go back to their country, come back seeking asylum—could be forced to go to jail. These victims could be forced to go to jail for 20 years.

None of that is going to keep our communities safer.

We ought to work together. I urge my Republican colleagues to work with us to move forward with comprehensive immigration reform that will include provisions—like what is in this bill—that are still humane, provisions that will help keep American citizens safe, but that don't demonize immigrants.

It is possible to do both. My friends on the other side of the aisle know that it is possible to do both, and we ought to work together to get that done. That is the best way to keep our communities safe and to respect our values as Americans.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have only one speaker remaining, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I think is worth addressing is the provision of this bill that changes current law relative to unlawful entry or attempted unlawful entry.

Under 8 U.S.C. 1326, this is a crime if the individual evaded detection. This has been the principle in Federal law for more than 100 years. Since 1908, the Federal courts have recognized that illegal entry and illegal reentry require entry free from something called official restraint, otherwise known as detention.

Now, this bill would change that longstanding law. The bill amends U.S.C. 1326 to make the physical act of crossing the border a crime for any individual who has been previously removed or denied admission regardless of whether the individual was "free from official restraint" when doing so.

Now, why is this a problem?

As I mentioned earlier, individuals who, for one reason or another, need to come into the United States go to a port of entry, and they ask to see the Border Patrol agent. Under this law, that is a crime.

Now, let me give you some examples of what that would mean. I will just

talk about the case of Juliza, who was a Guatemalan-Indian woman. She faced violent persecution really based on her ethnicity. She was raped by family members who referred to her as a dirty Indian as they assaulted her. As she went to report this assault to the police, she was sexually propositioned by the officers.

After a family member threatened her with sexual violence and death, she fled to the United States. She sought asylum, but she was promptly deported—turned away—by the Customs and Border Patrol. Within a month of returning to Guatemala, she was drugged, raped, and thrown into a river. She fled to the United States for a second time and, once again, was turned away without seeing an immigration judge or speaking to an asylum officer.

Finally, the third time she came, her 8-year-old son had been threatened by gang members, and she was finally allowed to make her case and was granted asylum.

□ 1630

Or the case of Carla. In June of 2016, Carla, who was from Mexico, and her children sought asylum after her father, son, grandfather, and uncle were killed in a span of 7 days, targeting her family. She went to the border to turn herself in. She was turned away by CBP agents twice.

After the family sought assistance from an attorney, they went back to the border, to the port of entry, and the CBP officers finally processed them appropriately under American immigration law. This was their third attempt. The U.S. immigration judge in Texas ruled that they were indeed refugees and granted asylum.

Now, I raise these two cases because you think deported, if you are turned away at the border, it counts for removal under the law. These individuals would be felons under this bill.

Making Juliza and her 8-year-old son or Carla a felon does not save an American from crime; it just doesn't. The two are not connected. And so to think that this bill, which does such harm to asylum seekers, is necessary to save Americans from threats is simply incorrect. It is important to stand up for our long-term values in international law.

There are other ways that one could become a criminal by showing up at the border. It is not uncommon that young people who have a valid visa issued by a U.S. consulate or Embassy come. They fly into the country and they are interviewed by a Customs and Border Patrol agent.

Now, if that person on the visitor visa is a 20-year-old young man who is unmarried, doesn't have a job in the country he is from, doesn't own a home, and is from kind of a poor country, it is not all that uncommon for the

Border Patrol agency to make a decision that that person is not a good risk for entry, that they might overstay their visa and not return home.

I am not questioning that exercise of judgment, but if that same individual, 20 years later, is now a doctor and he has got a J visa to come in and be a doctor in the middle of America where there is a doctor shortage, he lands at Kennedy Airport with his visa to be a doctor, that would be a felony.

So the point I am making is there is much in this bill that does nothing about crime but to make criminals of people who have done nothing wrong. That is one of the reasons why we should vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of immigrants. There is not a person who has participated in this debate today who cannot go back a few years, a few generations or several generations and find someone in their family who came here to the United States, but we are also a nation of laws. The loss of respect for the rule of law is absolutely a serious problem in this country, and the step-by-step approach to restoring respect for the rule of law and reforming our immigration laws starts with these bills, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act and Kate's Law.

We are all about today, in this legislation, enhancing public safety, securing our borders, and restoring the rule of law.

We give discretion to Federal judges—discretion to Federal judges, I would add—to make sure that people who have entered this country previously illegally and who reenter the country can be given enhanced sentences. It is not mandatory by any means, and, in fact, in many instances, it would be better to send the person outside the country and not have the taxpayers bear the expense.

But in the case of the individual who murdered Kate Steinle and had reentered the country five times and had committed other crimes while in the United States, having that additional time that the judge could impose on that individual who was just being released for having been convicted of illegally entering the country, Bureau of Prisons should have turned him over to ICE to send him out again. But if the ICE agents wanted to, when he entered illegally the previous time, recommend that he be given more time than the sentence he just served, he would have still been in prison when Kate Steinle walked down that pier with her father and was murdered by him.

So when those on the other side say this was not preventable by this law, they are entirely wrong. This law would have prevented that if a judge had chosen to impose that additional

time that we are today providing in these cases.

We also clear up some uncertainty regarding this current law, and I think it is entirely appropriate to do so. It will deal with some of the situations that those on the other side have discussed, but most importantly, it will discourage people from entering the United States illegally, particularly when they have already entered illegally earlier and have been convicted of a crime for doing so.

So, to me, this is absolutely the beginning point of restoring to law enforcement at every level in our country the necessary tools to enforce our immigration laws, to work together to keep American citizens safe, like Kate Steinle and many, many others.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to meet with about a dozen representatives of families who lost loved ones to the criminal acts of people who were not lawfully present in the United States. And so it is also entirely true to say that, had those individuals not been present in the United States, those crimes would not have been committed, those, in most instances, murders, in all instances, killings, would not have taken place.

Therefore, when you enforce our immigration laws, unlike laws applying to American citizens who also commit crimes, in the case of people who are not lawfully present in the United States, these crimes are entirely preventable if we enforce our immigration laws. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act to make sure that we go down this road of restoring the trust of the American people in their system of government, in their protection by their government, and in their own respect for the rule of law and know that their government is upholding that with regard to other individuals as well.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following additional letter of opposition to H.R. 3004. This is a letter I mentioned earlier on the bill.

NATIONAL IMMIGRANT JUSTICE  
CENTER,  
June 27, 2017.

H.R. 3003 AND 3004 UNDERMINE AMERICAN VALUES NIJC OPPOSES THE "NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT" AND "KATE'S LAW"

This week the House of Representatives will vote on two bills that attempt to rewrite our nation's immigration laws to reflect a dangerous philosophy of governance. For decades now, elected officials across the bipartisan divide have joined together calling for a compassionate and common sense approach to immigration legislation. These bills move us further away from that goal. H.R. 3003, ironically named the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," will endanger the safety of our communities by forcing local

police to abandon community policing efforts and become a full partner with the administration's massive deportation force. H.R. 3004, known as "Kate's Law," will result in the unnecessary incarceration of countless immigrants for the mere act of migration.

The National Immigrant Justice Center calls on elected officials to reject such nonsensical and harmful legislation. In the face of hateful rhetoric, now is the time to stand with immigrant communities.

H.R. 3003, THE "NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT", WILL FURTHER ERODE COMMUNITY TRUST IN LOCAL POLICE AND PUT OUR COMMUNITIES IN DANGER

H.R. 3003 amends 8 U.S.C. §1373 to prohibit states and localities from enacting policies that in any way limit cooperation with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), even when federal courts have ruled such cooperation unconstitutional.

The law would strip localities of vital discretion to enact immigration-enforcement-related laws and policies that are smart and effective for their communities. Specifically, it prohibits localities from declining to comply with requests from ICE to jail individuals under detainer requests even when doing so will put them in blatant violation of binding federal court orders. Our communities are safer when residents feel safe calling for help and assisting police in investigating and prosecuting crimes. By effectively forcing localities into the business of federal immigration law, this law will preclude cities and counties from using their limited local resources to address public safety concerns in the ways they deem most appropriate and effective.

On top of the danger the bill poses to community safety, this law arguably violates the "anti-commandeering" principle of the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

H.R. 3003 punishes jurisdictions for engaging in smart community policing.

The law would punish jurisdictions that choose to limit cooperation with federal immigration enforcement by stripping federal funding that fulfills vital law enforcement needs, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), the "Cops on the Beat Program," the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other grant administered by the Departments of Justice or Homeland Security that are deemed "substantially related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, or naturalization." In addition to running further afoul of the Tenth Amendment, this law cruelly forces jurisdictions to choose between maintaining critical funds, including for community policing, or exposing themselves to the significant legal and financial liability that accompany compliance with detainer requests under the Fourth Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 upends the criminal justice system by permitting and in some cases requiring ICE to ignore criminal warrants issued by state and local jurisdictions that it deems in non-compliance with other provisions of the bill.

H.R. 3003 vastly expands ICE's authority to force localities to detain immigrants with no regard for the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and gives local actors immunity for resulting constitutional violations.

The law makes a mockery of the Fourth Amendment by giving lip service to the notion of "probable cause" but in reality allowing ICE to ask localities to detain immigrants longer than they would otherwise be

held simply on the basis of a belief that the individual is removable from the United States. The law then goes on to provide local actors immunity for resulting constitutional violations. In practice, this piece of the law essentially requires local actors to violate the constitution and then gives them immunity for doing so. It is legislative overreach at its worst.

H.R. 3003 demonizes immigrants by creating a new private right of action for victims of crime solely on the basis of the citizenship status of the perpetrator of the crime.

The law provides that an individual or surviving relative can bring a lawsuit against a state or locality if the perpetrator of the offense is a non-citizen and was released from custody pursuant to a trust policy. This provision allows the worst kind of scapegoating, manipulating individual tragedies to demonstrate all immigrants.

H.R. 3003 expands the already damaging "mandatory detention" provisions of immigration law, requiring no-bond detention for large categories of undocumented individuals for the duration of deportation proceedings against them.

The law thumbs its nose at the basic due process protections of our United States Constitution, explicitly approving of indefinite detention for individuals in immigration custody regardless of their community ties to the United States or necessity for detention. Specifically, the law expands greatly the categories of immigrants who are denied access to any individualized bond determination throughout their time in immigration jail. With deaths in immigration detention occurring with alarming frequency and rates of representation in detention alarmingly low, these provisions are nothing but cruel.

H.R. 3004, "KATE'S LAW," WILL FURTHER THE MASS INCARCERATION OF IMMIGRANTS—INCLUDING ASYLUM SEEKERS—BY INCREASING PENALTIES FOR THE MERE ACT OF MIGRATION

H.R. 3004 expands the existing criminal offense of illegal reentry to punish legitimate asylum seekers fleeing violence in their countries of origin.

The law expands the category of individuals punishable by section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to include even those men and women who surrender themselves at the southern border to seek protection in the United States.

H.R. 3004 senselessly expands sentencing enhancements for illegal reentry at a time when more than half of all federal prosecutions target migration-related offenses.

The law provides incredibly harsh sentencing enhancements for individuals seeking to return to the United States after a previous removal on the basis of prior convictions or entries. Apart from the cruel and unnecessary use of federal prison to separate families, this bill will prove exorbitant in its costs at a time when taxpayers have already footed a bill of more than \$7 billion to incarcerate migrants for migration-related offenses over the past decade.

H.R. 3004 punishes immigrants for illegal reentry even if their previous deportation orders were unlawful and deprived them of the opportunity to seek protection. This law entirely prohibits defendants in illegal reentry cases from challenging the validity of their prior deportation orders. This provision is blatantly unconstitutional and in violation of Supreme Court jurisprudence that protects against punishing immigrants on the basis of legally defective deportation orders. See *U.S. v. Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828

(1987). This law will criminalize, for example, asylum seekers who return to the United States after being previously denied the opportunity to present their claims for protection. Given the already anemic protections for asylum seekers at our southern border, these provisions will inevitably harm the most vulnerable among us.

A vote for H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 is a vote for hatred and a vote against community safety. NIJC calls on Members of Congress to stand on the right of history and oppose these harmful measures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 415, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. LOFGREN. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Lofgren moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3004 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

#### SEC. 3. PROTECTING VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 276 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) PROTECTING VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.—It shall not be a violation of this section for a victim of sex trafficking to voluntarily present herself or himself at a port of entry to request protection."

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle insist that today's bill is intended to keep Americans safe by enhancing penalties for criminals who reenter illegally or attempt to do so. I am offering an amendment that takes Republicans at their word.

This amendment would make clear that H.R. 3004 would not be used to criminally prosecute and incarcerate sex trafficking victims merely for seeking protection at ports of entry.

As should be evident at this stage of debate, the provisions of this bill extend well beyond immigrants with criminal histories; in fact, they reach many of the most vulnerable and persecuted members of society. Perhaps

most egregiously, H.R. 3004 authorizes, for the first time, the prosecution of individuals who voluntarily present themselves at points of entry to seek relief consistent with our immigration laws, and that includes individuals seeking protection as victims of sex trafficking.

Let's be clear on the law. Today, it is not a crime for an individual who has been previously denied admission or removed to voluntarily present herself at a port of entry seeking to reenter the country legally. This bill changes that by making the simple act of going to the port of entry, which itself requires the physical act of crossing the border, a felony offense for such individuals.

These are not individuals attempting to evade immigration agents. They are not trying to sneak into the United States. They are simply exercising the right to lawfully approach a U.S. port of entry to seek permission to enter.

Under this bill, the act of approaching CBP agents now becomes criminally prosecutable as an illegal reentry. Anyone with a prior removal order or even merely denied admission commits a crime by so much as stepping into the port of entry.

I mentioned the two asylee seekers a few moments ago. These are people who are fleeing danger and under our laws have the right to present their cases. Now, H.R. 3004 would do this to the women I mentioned: It would make them criminals, and it would allow for the prosecution and imprisonment for up to 2 years.

Now, even if our immigration system awarded these victims protection, such as a T visa for human trafficking, the criminal justice system could take away her liberty.

I strongly hope that my colleagues across the aisle would not seek to punish women who are fleeing from sex traffickers, because there are thousands of women who are innocent, abused, sexually trafficked by the worst of civilization, and instead of offering help to these women, this bill would put them in prison. It would prosecute them for asking, of all things, that their life be saved.

I mentioned earlier, we put in the RECORD, the opposition of the Tahirih Justice Center to this bill. They advocate for victims of trafficking and gender-based violence, and they oppose this bill with all their strength. Here is what they say, and it is a quote: "H.R. 3004 will punish women fleeing horrific abuse. . . ."

Now, I disagree with some of the elements of this bill, and I have tried to make clear why, but I take Mr. GOODLATTE at his word that he wants to make sure that we have a safe society. I think, if that is his hope, we will make clear that sex trafficking victims are not going to be prosecuted or considered criminals when they enter a port of entry and present themselves to U.S. officials.

This amendment is the chance for Republicans to show that they really are for the rule of law. It would stipulate that this bill would not subject sex trafficking victims to criminal prosecution merely for voluntarily presenting themselves at the border to request protection from the unspeakable harm that they have suffered.

I will close with this. Years ago, we worked together on a bipartisan basis to fight sex trafficking. We created the U and T visas. It was a broad bipartisan coalition. I remember now Governor Sam Brownback and others, people who are at other ends, opposite ends of the ideological spectrum, but we came together to fight sex trafficking. We should do the same thing today. Let's not forget that we can work together to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit not only changes the bill before us, but it also changes current law. It has long been Federal law that an alien who has been deported and who returns to the U.S. is subject to possible criminal prosecution.

□ 1645

Under this bill, an alien who has received consent from the Department of Homeland Security to return or is not required to seek consent from DHS has an affirmative defense.

Obviously, such an alien will never be prosecuted. Never has, never will. In fact, because this is current law—and the gentlewoman was the chairman of the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee for 4 years and never offered such an amendment to current law—I see no reason to address it in this legislation.

I will say that we have all been committed in a very bipartisan fashion to combating sex trafficking. We passed several bills through this House, some with the gentlewoman's support, some without, that do indeed combat sex trafficking.

But back to the issue before us today. Criminal aliens are reentering the United States after being removed all the time. Without stronger enforcement measures in place, this government cannot provide an appropriate deterrence for these reentries.

Kate's Law takes a tough approach to dealing with criminal aliens who reenter the United States. Instead of the majority being subjected to no more than a 2-year maximum sentence, this bill takes an individual's criminal history into consideration and provides enhanced penalties accordingly. While

the 2-year sentence may not deter illegal reentry, a potential 25-year sentence certainly would.

Nothing can bring Kate Steinle back and nothing can absolutely prevent such crimes from occurring in the future. This legislation is meant to honor her memory and clearly demonstrate that this Congress will act.

This legislation is another step in bringing stronger enforcement measures to improve our immigration enforcement capabilities. Longer sentences for those criminal aliens who reenter the United States illegally is an important aspect of that mechanism.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this motion to recommit, vote for the underlying bill, and to truly deter criminal aliens from reentering the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 29th I voted in favor of H.R. 3004, Kate's Law, which increases penalties for deported criminals that return to the United States.

The bill is named after Kate Steinle, who was killed in San Francisco by a Mexican national who had seven felony convictions on his record and had been deported five times and had once again returned to the United States.

I have always argued that we need comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken immigration system. In 2013, I cosponsored the House Democratic comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. This bill included similar provisions to Kate's Law and had broad bipartisan support in the House and Senate.

Opponents of the bill argue that the bill does not make exceptions for asylum seekers or victims of human trafficking. That is why I voted in favor of a Motion to Recommit H.R. 3004 offered by Representative ZOE LOFGREN which would safeguard vulnerable victims of human trafficking that voluntarily present themselves at a port of entry. Unfortunately, it failed on a 193 to 232 vote.

I have always maintained that undocumented immigrants who commit a crime in the U.S. should be deported. While this bill is not perfect, Kate's Law ensures that dangerous criminals are prosecuted accordingly. I am committed to regaining control of our country's borders and have fought to restrict individuals who would do our citizens harm—both through terrorist attacks, drug smuggling, and other illicit activity—from entering the United States.

H.R. 3004 is not a perfect bill. It now heads to the Senate, where I hope it will be improved to include exceptions for victims of trafficking and those seeking asylum, similar to the comprehensive bill in 2013, and sent back to the House for further debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 722) "An Act to provide congressional review and to counter Iranian and Russian governments' aggression."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 3003;

Passage of H.R. 3003, if ordered;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 3004; and

Passage of H.R. 3004, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 230, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—181

|                 |               |             |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|
| Adams           | Brown (MD)    | Clark (MA)  |
| Aguilar         | Brownley (CA) | Clarke (NY) |
| Barragán        | Bustos        | Clay        |
| Bass            | Butterfield   | Cleaver     |
| Bera            | Capuano       | Clyburn     |
| Bishop (GA)     | Carbajal      | Cohen       |
| Blumenauer      | Cárdenas      | Connolly    |
| Blunt Rochester | Cartwright    | Conyers     |
| Bonamici        | Castor (FL)   | Cooper      |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Castro (TX)   | Correa      |
| F.              | Chu, Judy     | Costa       |
| Brady (PA)      | Cicilline     | Courtney    |

|                |                |                |              |                 |               |               |                 |                 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Crist          | Kihuen         | Polis          | Lucas        | Poliquin        | Smith (TX)    | Blum          | Harris          | Perry           |
| Crowley        | Kildee         | Price (NC)     | Luetkemeyer  | Posey           | Smucker       | Bost          | Hartzler        | Peterson        |
| Cuellar        | Kilmer         | Quigley        | MacArthur    | Ratcliffe       | Stefanik      | Brady (TX)    | Hensarling      | Pittenger       |
| Davis (CA)     | Kind           | Raskin         | Marchant     | Reed            | Stewart       | Brat          | Herrera Beutler | Poe (TX)        |
| Davis, Danny   | Krishnamoorthi | Rice (NY)      | Marino       | Reichert        | Taylor        | Bridenstine   | Hice, Jody B.   | Poliquin        |
| DeFazio        | Kuster (NH)    | Richmond       | Marshall     | Renacci         | Tenney        | Brooks (AL)   | Higgins (LA)    | Posey           |
| DeGette        | Langevin       | Rosen          | Massie       | Rice (SC)       | Thompson (PA) | Brooks (IN)   | Hill            | Ratcliffe       |
| Delaney        | Lawrence       | Roybal-Allard  | Mast         | Roby            | Thornberry    | Buchanan      | Holding         | Reed            |
| DeLauro        | Lawson (FL)    | Ruiz           | McCarthy     | Roe (TN)        | Tiberi        | Buck          | Hollingsworth   | Renacci         |
| DelBene        | Lee            | Ruppersberger  | McCaul       | Rogers (AL)     | Tipton        | Bucshon       | Hudson          | Rice (SC)       |
| Demings        | Levin          | Ryan (OH)      | McClintock   | Rogers (KY)     | Trott         | Budd          | Huizenga        | Roby            |
| DeSaulnier     | Lewis (GA)     | Sánchez        | McHenry      | Rohrabacher     | Turner        | Burgess       | Hultgren        | Roe (TN)        |
| Deutch         | Lieu, Ted      | Sarbanes       | McKinley     | Rokita          | Upton         | Byrne         | Hunter          | Rogers (AL)     |
| Dingell        | Lipinski       | Schakowsky     | McMorris     | Rooney, Francis | Valadao       | Calvert       | Hurd            | Rogers (KY)     |
| Doggett        | Loeb           | Schiff         | Rodgers      | Rooney, Thomas  | Wagner        | Carter (GA)   | Issa            | Rohrabacher     |
| Doyle, Michael | Lofgren        | Schneider      | McSally      | J.              | Walberg       | Carter (TX)   | Jenkins (KS)    | Rokita          |
| F.             | Lowenthal      | Schrader       | Meadows      | Ros-Lehtinen    | Walden        | Cartwright    | Jenkins (WV)    | Rooney, Francis |
| Ellison        | Lowey          | Scott (VA)     | Meehan       | Roskam          | Ross          | Chabot        | Johnson (LA)    | Rooney, Thomas  |
| Engel          | Lujan Grisham, | Scott, David   | Messer       | Rothfus         | Walorski      | Cheney        | Johnson (OH)    | J.              |
| Eshoo          | M.             | Serrano        | Mitchell     | Rouzer          | Walters, Mimi | Coffman       | Johnson, Sam    | Roskam          |
| Espallat       | Luján, Ben Ray | Sewell (AL)    | Moolenaar    | Royce (CA)      | Weber (TX)    | Cole          | Jones           | Ross            |
| Esty (CT)      | Lynch          | Shea-Porter    | Mooney (WV)  | Russell         | Webster (FL)  | Collins (GA)  | Jordan          | Rothfus         |
| Evans          | Maloney,       | Sherman        | Mullin       | Rutherford      | Wenstrup      | Collins (NY)  | Joyce (OH)      | Rouzer          |
| Foster         | Carolyn B.     | Sinema         | Murphy (PA)  | Sanford         | Westerman     | Cramer        | Katko           | Royce (CA)      |
| Fudge          | Maloney, Sean  | Sires          | Newhouse     | Schweikert      | Williams      | Crawford      | Kelly (MS)      | Russell         |
| Gabbard        | Matsui         | Slaughter      | Noem         | Scott, Austin   | Wilson (SC)   | Cuellar       | Kelly (PA)      | Rutherford      |
| Gallego        | McColum        | Soto           | Norman       | Sensenbrenner   | Wittman       | Culberson     | King (IA)       | Sanford         |
| Garamendi      | McEachin       | Speier         | Olson        | Sessions        | Womack        | Davidson      | Kinzing         | Schweikert      |
| Gonzalez (TX)  | McGovern       | Suozi          | Palazzo      | Shimkus         | Woodall       | Davis, Rodney | Knott           | Scott, Austin   |
| Gottheimer     | McNerney       | Swalwell (CA)  | Palmer       | Shuster         | Yoder         | Denham        | Kustoff (TN)    | Sensenbrenner   |
| Green, Al      | Meng           | Takano         | Paulsen      | Simpson         | Yoho          | Dent          | Labrador        | Sessions        |
| Green, Gene    | Moore          | Thompson (CA)  | Pearce       | Smith (MO)      | Young (AK)    | DeSantis      | LaHood          | Shimkus         |
| Grijalva       | Moulton        | Thompson (MS)  | Perry        | Smith (NE)      | Young (IA)    | DesJarlais    | LaMalfa         | Shuster         |
| Gutiérrez      | Murphy (FL)    | Titus          | Pittenger    | Smith (NJ)      | Zeldin        | Duffy         | Lamborn         | Simpson         |
| Hanabusa       | Nadler         | Tonko          | Poe (TX)     |                 |               | Duncan (SC)   | Lance           | Smith (MO)      |
| Hastings       | Neal           | Torres         |              |                 |               | Dunn          | Latta           | Smith (NE)      |
| Heck           | Nolan          | Tsongas        |              |                 |               | Emmer         | Lewis (MN)      | Smith (TX)      |
| Higgins (NY)   | Norcross       | Vargas         | Beatty       | Huffman         | Nunes         | Estes (KS)    | LoBiondo        | Smucker         |
| Himes          | O'Halleran     | Veasey         | Beyer        | Huizenga        | Rush          | Farenthold    | Loudermilk      | Stefanik        |
| Hoyer          | O'Rourke       | Vela           | Bishop (UT)  | Katko           | Scalise       | Faso          | Love            | Stewart         |
| Jackson Lee    | Pallone        | Velázquez      | Carson (IN)  | Larsen (WA)     | Smith (WA)    | Frelinghuysen | Lucas           | Taylor          |
| Jayapal        | Panetta        | Visclosky      | Chaffetz     | Larson (CT)     | Stivers       | Gaetz         | Luetkemeyer     | Tenney          |
| Jeffries       | Pascrell       | Walz           | Cummings     | Long            | Walker        | Gallagher     | MacArthur       | Thompson (PA)   |
| Johnson (GA)   | Payne          | Wasserman      | Frankel (FL) | Meeks           |               | Garrett       | Marchant        | Thornberry      |
| Johnson, E. B. | Pelosi         | Schultz        | Gosar        | Napolitano      |               | Gianforte     | Marino          | Tiberi          |
| Kaptur         | Perlmutter     | Waters, Maxine |              |                 |               | Gibbs         | Marshall        | Tipton          |
| Keating        | Peters         | Watson Coleman |              |                 |               | Gohmert       | Massie          | Trott           |
| Kelly (IL)     | Peterson       | Welch          |              |                 |               | Goodlatte     | Mast            | Turner          |
| Kennedy        | Pingree        | Wilson (FL)    |              |                 |               | Gowdy         | McCarthy        | Upton           |
| Khanna         | Pocan          | Yarmuth        |              |                 |               | Granger       | McCaul          | Valadao         |

## NAYS—230

|              |               |                 |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham      | Cook          | Grothman        |
| Aderholt     | Costello (PA) | Guthrie         |
| Allen        | Cramer        | Handel          |
| Amash        | Crawford      | Harper          |
| Amodei       | Culberson     | Harris          |
| Arrington    | Curbelo (FL)  | Hartzler        |
| Babin        | Davidson      | Hensarling      |
| Bacon        | Davis, Rodney | Herrera Beutler |
| Banks (IN)   | Denham        | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Barletta     | Dent          | Higgins (LA)    |
| Barr         | DeSantis      | Hill            |
| Barton       | DesJarlais    | Holding         |
| Bergman      | Diaz-Balart   | Hollingsworth   |
| Biggs        | Donovan       | Hudson          |
| Bilirakis    | Duffy         | Hultgren        |
| Bishop (MI)  | Duncan (SC)   | Hunter          |
| Black        | Duncan (TN)   | Hurd            |
| Blackburn    | Dunn          | Issa            |
| Blum         | Emmer         | Jenkins (KS)    |
| Bost         | Estes (KS)    | Jenkins (WV)    |
| Brady (TX)   | Farenthold    | Johnson (LA)    |
| Brat         | Faso          | Johnson (OH)    |
| Bridenstine  | Ferguson      | Johnson, Sam    |
| Brooks (AL)  | Fitzpatrick   | Jones           |
| Brooks (IN)  | Fleischmann   | Jordan          |
| Buchanan     | Flores        | Joyce (OH)      |
| Buck         | Fortenberry   | Kelly (MS)      |
| Bucshon      | Fox           | Kelly (PA)      |
| Budd         | Franks (AZ)   | King (IA)       |
| Burgess      | Frelinghuysen | King (NY)       |
| Byrne        | Gaetz         | Kinzing         |
| Calvert      | Gallagher     | Knight          |
| Carter (GA)  | Garrett       | Kustoff (TN)    |
| Carter (TX)  | Gianforte     | Labrador        |
| Chabot       | Gibbs         | LaHood          |
| Cheney       | Gohmert       | LaMalfa         |
| Coffman      | Goodlatte     | Lamborn         |
| Cole         | Gowdy         | Lance           |
| Collins (GA) | Granger       | Latta           |
| Collins (NY) | Graves (GA)   | Lewis (MN)      |
| Comer        | Graves (LA)   | LoBiondo        |
| Comstock     | Graves (MO)   | Loudermilk      |
| Conaway      | Griffith      | Love            |

## NOT VOTING—22

Huffman  
Huizenga  
Katko  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Long  
Meeks  
Napolitano

□ 1707

Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. DUFFY, HUNTER, and LAM-BORN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. VELA, DOGGETT, HOYER, SWALWELL of California, SHERMAN, and COHEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 341, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

## YEAS—228

|           |            |             |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Abraham   | Bacon      | Biggs       |
| Aderholt  | Banks (IN) | Bilirakis   |
| Allen     | Barletta   | Bishop (MI) |
| Amodei    | Barr       | Bishop (UT) |
| Arrington | Barton     | Black       |
| Babin     | Bergman    | Blackburn   |

## NAYS—195

|                 |              |                |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Carson (IN)  | DeFazio        |
| Aguilar         | Castor (FL)  | DeGette        |
| Amash           | Castro (TX)  | Delaney        |
| Barragán        | Chu, Judy    | DeLauro        |
| Bass            | Cicilline    | DelBene        |
| Beatty          | Clark (MA)   | Demings        |
| Bera            | Clarke (NY)  | DeSaulnier     |
| Beyer           | Clay         | Deutch         |
| Bishop (GA)     | Cleaver      | Diaz-Balart    |
| Blumenauer      | Clyburn      | Dingell        |
| Blunt Rochester | Cohen        | Doggett        |
| Bonamici        | Connolly     | Donovan        |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Conyers      | Doyle, Michael |
| F.              | Cooper       | F.             |
| Brady (PA)      | Correa       | Ellison        |
| Brown (MD)      | Costa        | Engel          |
| Brownley (CA)   | Courtney     | Eshoo          |
| Bustos          | Crist        | Espallat       |
| Butterfield     | Crowley      | Esty (CT)      |
| Capuano         | Curbelo (FL) | Evans          |
| Carbajal        | Davis (CA)   | Foster         |
| Cárdenas        | Davis, Danny | Frankel (FL)   |

Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack

Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—10

Chaffetz  
Cummings  
Gosar  
Long

Meadows  
Napolitano  
Nunes  
Scalise

Smith (NJ)  
Stivers

□ 1714

Mr. REICHERT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2017, I was not present for the vote on H.R. 3003. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 342 (Final Passage of H.R. 3003).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 342.

## KATE'S LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to re-entry of removed aliens, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

## YEAS—193

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Español  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge

Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal

Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NAYS—232

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn

Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole

Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan

Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)

King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Posey  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—8

Chaffetz  
Cummings  
Gosar

Long  
Napolitano  
Nunes

Scalise  
Stivers

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1720

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 257, noes 167, not voting 9, as follows:



[Roll No. 344]

## AYES—257

Abraham Goodlatte Noem  
 Aderholt Gottheimer Norman  
 Allen Gowdy O'Halleran  
 Amodei Granger Olson  
 Arrington Graves (GA) Palazzo  
 Babin Graves (LA) Palmer  
 Bacon Graves (MO) Paulsen  
 Banks (IN) Griffith Pearce  
 Barletta Grothman Perry  
 Barr Guthrie Peterson  
 Barton Handel Pittenger  
 Bergman Harper Poe (TX)  
 Biggs Harris Poliquin  
 Bilirakis Hartzler Posey  
 Bishop (MI) Hensarling Ratcliffe  
 Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler Reed  
 Black Hice, Jody B. Reichert  
 Blackburn Higgins (LA) Renacci  
 Blum Higgins (NY) Rice (SC)  
 Bost Hill Roby  
 Brady (TX) Holding Roe (TN)  
 Brat Hollingsworth Rogers (AL)  
 Bridenstine Hudson Rogers (KY)  
 Brooks (AL) Huizenga Rohrabacher  
 Brooks (IN) Hultgren Rokita  
 Buchanan Hunter Rooney, Francis  
 Buck Hurd Rooney, Thomas  
 Bucshon Issa J.  
 Budd Jenkins (KS) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Burgess Jenkins (WV) Roskam  
 Byrne Johnson (LA) Ross  
 Calvert Johnson (OH) Rothfus  
 Carter (GA) Johnson, Sam Rouzer  
 Carter (TX) Jones Royce (CA)  
 Cartwright Jordan Ruppelberger  
 Chabot Joyce (OH) Russell  
 Cheney Katko Rutherford  
 Coffman Keating Sanford  
 Cole Kelly (MS) Schweikert  
 Collins (GA) Kelly (PA) Kind  
 Collins (NY) Kind Scott, Austin  
 Comer King (IA) Sensenbrenner  
 Comstock King (NY) Sessions  
 Conaway Kinzinger Shimkus  
 Cook Knight Shuster  
 Cooper Kuster (NH) Simpson  
 Costello (PA) Kustoff (TN) Sinema  
 Courtney Labrador Smith (MO)  
 Cramer LaHood Smith (NE)  
 Crawford LaMalfa Smith (NJ)  
 Crist Lamborn Smith (TX)  
 Cuellar Lance Smucker  
 Culberson Langevin Speier  
 Curbelo (FL) Larson (CT) Stefanik  
 Davidson Latta Stewart  
 Davis, Rodney Lewis (MN) Swallow (CA)  
 DeFazio Lipinski Taylor  
 Demings LoBiondo Tenney  
 Denham Loudermilk Thompson (PA)  
 Dent Love Thornberry  
 DeSantis Lucas Tiberi  
 DesJarlais Luetkemeyer Tipton  
 Diaz-Balart Lynch Trott  
 Donovan MacArthur Turner  
 Duffy Marchant Upton  
 Duncan (SC) Marino Valadao  
 Duncan (TN) Marshall Wagner  
 Dunn Massie Walberg  
 Emmer Mast Walden  
 Estes (KS) McCarthy Walker  
 Esty (CT) McCaul Walorski  
 Farenthold McClintock Walters, Mimi  
 Faso McHenry Weber (TX)  
 Ferguson McKinley Webster (FL)  
 Fitzpatrick McMorris Wenstrup  
 Fleischmann Rodgers Westernman  
 Flores McSally Williams  
 Fortenberry Meadows Wilson (SC)  
 Foxx Meehan Wittman  
 Franks (AZ) Messer Womack  
 Frelinghuysen Mitchell Woodall  
 Gaetz Moolenaar Yoder  
 Gallagher Mooney (WV) Yoho  
 Garrett Mullin Young (AK)  
 Gianforte Murphy (FL) Young (IA)  
 Gibbs Murphy (PA) Zeldin  
 Gohmert Newhouse

## NOES—167

Adams Barragán Bera  
 Aguilar Bass Beyer  
 Amash Beatty Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer Grijalva Pelosi  
 Blunt Rochester Gutiérrez Perlmutter  
 Bonamici Hanabusa Peters  
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings Pingree  
 F. Heck Pocan  
 Brady (PA) Himes Polis  
 Brown (MD) Hoyer Price (NC)  
 Brownley (CA) Huffman Quigley  
 Bustos Jackson Lee Raskin  
 Butterfield Jayapal Rice (NY)  
 Capuano Jeffries Richmond  
 Carbajal Johnson (GA) Rosen  
 Cárdenas Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard  
 Carson (IN) Kaptur Ruiz  
 Castor (FL) Kelly (IL) Rush  
 Castro (TX) Kennedy Ryan (OH)  
 Chu, Judy Khanna Sánchez  
 Cicilline Kihuen Sarbanes  
 Clark (MA) Kildee Schakowsky  
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schiff  
 Clay Krishnamoorthi Schneider  
 Cleaver Larsen (WA) Schrader  
 Clyburn Lawrence Scott (VA)  
 Cohen Lawson (FL) Scott, David  
 Connolly Lee Serrano  
 Conyers Levin Sewell (AL)  
 Correa Lewis (GA) Shea-Porter  
 Costa Lieu, Ted Sherman  
 Crowley Loebbeck Sires  
 Davis (CA) Lofgren Slaughter  
 Davis, Danny Lowenthal Smith (WA)  
 DeGette Lowey Soto  
 Delaney Lujan Grisham, M.  
 DeLauro Luján, Ben Ray Suozzi  
 DeBene Maloney, Carolyn B. Takano  
 DeSaulnier Carolyn B. Thompson (CA)  
 Deutch Maloney, Sean Thompson (MS)  
 Dingell Maloney, Sean Titus  
 Doggett Matsui Tonko  
 Doyle, Michael F. McCollum Torres  
 Ellison McGovern Tsongas  
 Engel Meeks Vargas  
 Eshoo Meng Veasey  
 Espallat Moore Vela  
 Evans Moulton Velázquez  
 Foster Nadler Visclosky  
 Frankel (FL) Neal Walz  
 Fudge Nolan Wasserman  
 Gabbard Norcross Schultz  
 Gallego O'Rourke Waters, Maxine  
 Garamendi Pallone Watson Coleman  
 Gonzalez (TX) Panetta Welch  
 Green, Al Pascrell Wilson (FL)  
 Green, Gene Payne Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—9

Chaffetz Long Nunes  
 Cummings McEachin Scalise  
 Gosar Napolitano Stivers

□ 1726

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 341, No. 342, No. 343 and No. 344 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3003. I would have also voted "nay" on the Final Passage of H.R. 3003—No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. I would have also voted "yea" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3004. I would have also voted "nay" on H.R. 3004—Kate's Law.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Thursday, June 29, 2017, I was unable to cast a vote on a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Rollcall 341—"Nay."

Rollcall 342—"Yea."

Rollcall 343—"Nay."

## Rollcall 344—"Yea."

URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO UNCONDITIONALLY RELEASE LIU XIAOBO, TOGETHER WITH HIS WIFE LIU XIA, TO ALLOW THEM TO FREELY MEET WITH FRIENDS, FAMILY, AND COUNSEL AND SEEK MEDICAL TREATMENT WHEREVER THEY DESIRE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 67, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 67

Whereas Liu Xiaobo has inspired untold numbers of people in the People's Republic of China and globally for his courageous stands for democracy, the protection of human rights, and peaceful change in China;

Whereas, on December 9, 2008, a diverse group of more than 300 Chinese scholars, writers, lawyers, and activists issued Charter 08, a manifesto calling on the Chinese Communist Party to abandon authoritarian rule in favor of democracy, the guarantee of human rights, and the rule of law;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was one of the original drafters of Charter 08 and was taken into custody one day before the manifesto was released;

Whereas in December 2009, a Beijing court sentenced Liu Xiaobo to eleven years in prison for "inciting subversion of state power", in part for his role in Charter 08;

Whereas in recognition of Liu Xiaobo's long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in the People's Republic of China, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 2010;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo's wife Liu Xia, has been held in extralegal home confinement since October 2010, two weeks after her husband's Nobel Peace Prize award was announced, and has reportedly suffered severe health problems over the years which required hospitalization;

Whereas in May 2011, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention issued opinions declaring that the Chinese Government's imprisonment of Liu Xiaobo and the detention of Liu Xia both contravened the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was diagnosed with terminal liver cancer in May 2017 and granted permission to access medical treatment outside of prison and is currently hospitalized in China;

Whereas, according to news and family reports, Liu Xiaobo's cancer has metastasized and the Chinese Government has refused requests by his family to transfer him to Beijing for medical treatment; and

Whereas Liu Xiaobo currently cannot freely meet with friends and family or seek medical care outside of China: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—*

(1) recognizes Liu Xiaobo for his decades of peaceful struggle for basic human rights and democracy in the People's Republic of China;

(2) urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire; and

(3) urges the Administration to seek humanitarian transfer from the People's Republic of China for Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, so that he can seek medical treatment in the United States or elsewhere overseas.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 353

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2017, TO MONDAY, JULY 3, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday, July 3, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY RICHARD "THE KING" PETTY

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, our country will celebrate our independence and the rebuke of the British monarchy. Even still, we know across America, but especially in the great State of North Carolina, we have our own king, who turns 80 on Sunday.

Richard "The King" Petty is the most decorated and respected driver in the history of motor sports. His legendary 43 car dominated race tracks for decades. He has even been awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George H.W. Bush.

More importantly than Mr. Petty's work on the track are the lives that he has impacted. The Petty family, through the work of multiple charities and the impactful Victory Junction Camp, has served children with disabilities in incredible ways.

Mr. Petty, you and Kyle and the rest of the family even showed what grace and dignity looks like in the loss of a grandson.

We wish you a happy birthday today, Richard "The King" Petty. Thank you for all you do for the people of North Carolina, and I will be looking for that hat, those sunglasses, and that bright smile for years to come.

#### TRANSFORM STUDENT DEBT TO HOME EQUITY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act.

Today, 40 million Americans have Federal student loan debt totaling \$1.3 trillion. Additionally, at the end of 2016, 17.2 million habitable homes sat vacant in our country.

These two trends are intertwined. Student debt is prohibiting millions and millions from buying their first home. We must find a solution, or thousands more will be saddled with sunk debt depriving them of building wealth through building home equity.

The Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act offers us a road forward. This bill allows the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Housing Finance Agency to start a pilot program that connects creditworthy Federal student debt holders with habitable homes for sale from the Federal ledger.

By recalculating financing terms and interest rates, some student debtors can transition their debt into homeownership. Eventually creditworthy participants would pay off debt and help strengthen neighborhoods simply by maintaining their home mortgage.

We must use our power and resources to transform debt to equity. Transforming a student debt to home ownership is a pathway forward for the aspiring generation.

I encourage my colleagues to support our measure, and let us unleash the stranglehold of debt on the next generation and allow them to build wealth through homeownership.

#### CONGRATULATIONS CASSY LESTER AND ALL ART COMPETITION WINNERS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today this House welcomes the winners of the Congressional Art Competition to the Nation's Capital. Students from all over the country have traveled to Washington to proudly display their works of art in the tunnel to the Capitol for the next year.

The Congressional Institute hosts the nationwide competition each year to showcase and inspire the artistic talent of high school students from each congressional district. I am proud of the 37 students from my district who submitted entries.

I am thrilled to welcome our first-place winner, Cassy Lester of Reynoldsville, for her acrylic painting titled "Chocolate Lab." Cassy attends Jeff Tech, and it is an honor to recognize a career and technical education student as our winner this year.

She was honored with her fellow winners from the States across the Nation at this afternoon's luncheon, and earlier today, I was able to give Cassy and her family a tour of the Capitol.

Congratulations to Cassy and all of this year's winners. We are grateful to have your art brighten the walls of the tunnel of this Capitol for the year ahead.

#### HONORING ANDREW ROGERS

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give special recognition to Andrew Rogers, the last surviving member of the heroic 1941 Willamette University Bearcats football team. The 1941 season was a tremendous success for the team, going 8-2, capturing the Northwest Conference title.

But we remember that Bearcats historic season for far more than just athletics. At the end of the season, Willamette University was invited to play the University of Hawaii on December 6, 1941.

The following morning, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor began. Rogers,

the entire team, and visiting Willamette supporters volunteered to guard the Punahou School for 10 days while others helped with the injured.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, Rogers volunteered to join the United States Marine Corps, where he served as an infantry platoon leader for the 3rd Marine Division throughout the Second World War. He served meritoriously during the final phase of the recapture of Guam, as well as during the Battle of Iwo Jima.

Rogers reminds all Americans of the impact we can have when we step up in times of need. His military service during a dark, uncertain time in our history is another shining example of the Greatest Generation.

I am proud to share his story and offer this small piece of recognition for all that Andrew Rogers has done for this great country.

#### NO CITY IS ABOVE THE LAW

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

Many cities across America have adopted sanctuary policies over the past few years. This is an obvious disregard of Federal law and puts American lives at risk.

In my home State of Georgia, sanctuary cities have been outlawed since 2009. Last year, Georgia's law was amended to require local governments to certify they are cooperating with Federal immigration officials in order to get State funding.

The way I see it, the law is the law. Sanctuary cities' policies are dangerous to all American communities as they can shield unlawful and criminal immigrants from Federal immigration enforcement. President Trump promised to end sanctuary cities, and this is the first step toward keeping that promise.

How many more innocent American lives need to be stolen because our immigration laws are not being enforced?

No person or city is above the law, and that is why my colleagues and I passed this very important bill today.

#### OPPOSE DANGEROUS SENATE VERSION OF TRUMPCARE

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the dangerous and shameful Senate version of TrumpCare.

According to the new Congressional Budget Office estimate, this bill will leave 22 million Americans without in-

surance by 2026. In my district, that amounts to over 91,000 of my constituents, and over 2 million Floridians in total.

TrumpCare would allow insurers to charge seniors up to five times more than younger people.

In addition, we have more than 1.3 million Americans who are in nursing homes, and 62 percent of those pay for their stay and their care with Medicaid dollars, including three in five Floridians who are in a nursing home.

The majority promised Americans that they would fix TrumpCare in the Senate. Instead, 13 men made a backroom deal and they left seniors out of it. Make no mistake, while billionaires reap huge tax breaks in this bill, older middle class Americans will suffer.

I urge my Republican colleagues to find their backbone—and look for their hearts while they are at it—and stand up for our seniors.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are not to applaud.

#### CONGRATULATING JOANNA HARLACHER ON AWARD-WINNING WEBSITE

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a student from my district who has achieved something truly remarkable.

More than half a million students from around the world participated in this year's National History Day contest, each one making a film, exhibit, website, or other presentation on this year's theme, which was "Taking a Stand in History."

Joanna Harlacher, a graduate of Donegal High School, took first place for her website. Her website focused on someone we all know and love: fellow Pennsylvanian Fred Rogers. Joanna used to watch reruns of his PBS show and wanted to showcase his impact on Americans during his life and his career.

I would also like to recognize retired Donegal teacher Elizabeth Lewis, who helped Joanna create the award-winning website.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't be prouder to represent this exceptional young woman and thousands of students across my district who impress us each and every day.

Congratulations, Joanna Harlacher, her family, Mrs. Lewis, and Donegal High School on this globally recognized accomplishment.

#### HONORING JUDGE RYAN REINHOLD

(Mr. O'HALLERAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with respect and admiration that we honor Judge Ryan Reinhold for his outstanding legacy and service to the State of Arizona.

This week, Ryan retires after 41 years as Navajo County justice of the peace, municipal court judge, White Mountain Apache tribal judge, and Navajo County constable.

Throughout his career, he has been known for his tireless efforts to benefit his community in every aspect. I want to take a moment to share some of the highlights of his career.

Ryan was first selected as justice of the peace in 1978. In 1984, he received the Kenneth L. MacEachern Award for Outstanding Non-Lawyer Judge in the United States. He was reelected five times and honorably led the court for 22 years before retiring in 2000.

He was appointed Navajo County constable for precinct six in 2003 and elected in 2006.

He has led hundreds of volunteers as the district chairman of the Boy Scouts of America, and he serves as the president of the Blue Ridge High School Scholarship Fund and Lions Club.

In retirement, I hear that he plans to be making regular scuba diving trips, traveling the world, and spending quality time with his beloved family and friends—all well deserved.

Mr. Speaker, Ryan Reinhold is a pillar of his community and has done so much for Arizona. I extend my best wishes as Ryan begins the next chapter of his life.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY, AMERICA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, July 4, 1776, Philadelphia, 56 misfits, rebels, and freedom fighters all filled a small room with the intent to form a new nation. They pledged their lives, their honor, and their futures on one simple idea: that all people are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As these ideas were put forth on paper, it was clear to the Founders that governments are instituted among men to preserve those rights. In that hot room, these 56 men put together the first foundation of our government, declaring independence from King George III.

From July 4, 1776, forward, the term "independence" has defined America. After 7 long, grueling years of war, America gained that independence.

So Tuesday, as Americans across the Nation watch parades packed with patriotic red, white, and blue and families gather for picnics, hot dogs, barbecue, and fireworks, all small towns

and big towns throughout the country will remember and pay tribute to our Founders who instilled those three principles in our government: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Stars and Stripes are forever. Happy birthday, America. Happy Fourth of July.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1745

#### THE SENATE'S BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION ACT

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, this week, it was confirmed that the Senate's Better Care Reconciliation Act is not just mean, it can't even be passed by the majority party.

The nonpartisan CBO revealed that if that bill did pass, in our Nation, 22 million people would lose their healthcare coverage over the next 10 years. That means in my district, on the central coast of California, 49,000 people would lose their insurance, and 16,000 people would lose their coverage they gained due to the Affordable Care Act.

So because of that score, the Senate couldn't pass the bill, and they delayed the vote on it. So now, we have the time. So now, let's slow down. Let's do something the American people are yearning for. Let's come together, Republicans and Democrats, not just to repair our Nation's healthcare, but to find bipartisan solutions for what is best for all of our constituents and all of our communities for healthcare all across our country.

#### EDEN PRAIRIE BOYS BASEBALL CHAMPS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Eden Prairie Boys Baseball team on becoming high school State champs recently. They secured a 5-1 win over Forest Lake.

After a challenging first four innings, the Eagles, led by senior pitcher Jack Zigan, came back to win their very first State Championship since 2010. Jack threw a complete game, surrendering only three hits and one unearned run, with an impressive 11 strikeouts.

This marked the end of a fantastic season for the Eagles, who finished the year 18-9 after entering the State tournament without a seed. They were never expected to get this far. They were never expected to win, but they defeated the number 1, the number 2, and the number 4 seed teams by a combined score of 25-2.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again, I would just like to congratulate this hard-working team of student athletes, their coaches, and their parents for their State Championship win. This really does go to show that perseverance and hard work pay off.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HONG KONG'S TRANSFER TO CHINA

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in 1984, before the United Kingdom handed Hong Kong over to China, the Chinese Government promised "a high degree of autonomy" for the territory in the Joint Declaration on the Question of Hong Kong: providing for an independent executive, legislature, and judiciary; ensuring the freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion; prohibiting the central government from interfering into the affairs that Hong Kong administers on its own according to the Basic Law; and pledging a path to universal suffrage.

In 1997, when the handover occurred, America was hopeful that the people of Hong Kong would achieve the free, democratic future they deserved. But 2 decades later, we see China's promise of "one country, two systems" is not being met. The Chinese have not honored that promise, and the British Government has ignored it.

Since 2014's "Umbrella Revolution," the people of Hong Kong have faced a barrage of unjust and harsh restrictions on their freedoms. Hong Kong's pro-Beijing government is slapping democratically elected opposition lawmakers with expensive lawsuits in a backhanded attempt to disqualify them from their seats.

Peaceful activists are being rounded up and detained by the hundreds for exercising their right to protest the new government.

Five booksellers were abducted, smuggled across the border to China and forced to confess—so-called confess—their so-called crimes on national television, simply because their employer sold books critical of Beijing.

And, just this week, the democracy activists and heroes of the "Umbrella Movement," Joshua Wong and Nathan Law, were arrested while peacefully protesting the visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping, where they unfurled a banner in support of Liu Xiaobo.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend this body, especially our colleague, Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, for the resolution that he put forth earlier, a resolution that recognized Liu Xiaobo's contribution to democratic freedoms as a global hero, and urging the Chinese Government to allow him to seek medical care wherever, including in the United States.

In mainland China, Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Government continues to jail journalists, human rights lawyers, those fighting to practice their own religion, and democracy activists at an alarming rate. And the Chinese Government is brutally trying to erase the religion, culture, and language of the Tibetan people.

America has a moral duty to speak out in defense of the legitimate political aspirations of the people of Hong Kong. If we do not speak out for human rights in China because of economic concerns, then we lose all moral authority to talk about human rights in any other place in the world.

As we mark this solemn 20th anniversary, we must stand up for all who are demanding the promises of "one country, two systems" be honored.

#### INTRO—JOINT DECLARATION

In 1984, before the United Kingdom handed over Hong Kong to China, the Chinese government promised 'a high degree of autonomy' for the territory in the Joint Declaration on the Question of Hong Kong:

—providing for an independent executive, legislature and judiciary;

—ensuring the freedom of speech, press, assembly and religion;

—prohibiting the central government from interfering in the affairs that Hong Kong administers on its own according to the Basic Law;

—and pledging a path to universal suffrage.

In 1997, when the handover occurred, America was hopeful that the people of Hong Kong would achieve the free, democratic future they deserved.

But two decades later, we see China's promise of 'one country, two systems' is not being met. The Chinese have not honored that promise, and the British have ignored it.

#### RECENT CRACKDOWN

Since 2014's 'Umbrella Revolution,' the people of Hong Kong have faced a barrage of unjust and harsh restrictions on their freedoms.

Hong Kong's pro-Beijing government is slapping democratically-elected opposition lawmakers with expensive lawsuits in a backhanded attempt to disqualify them from their seats.

Peaceful activists are being rounded up and detained by the hundreds for exercising their right to protest the new government.

Five booksellers were abducted, smuggled across the border to China and forced to confess their so-called crimes on national television—simply because their employer sold books critical of Beijing.

#### WONG ARREST

And, just this week, the democracy activists and heroes of the 'Umbrella Movement,' Joshua Wong and Nathan Law, were arrested while peacefully protesting the visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping—where they unfurled a banner in support of Liu Xiaobo.

This egregious attempt at smothering free speech is alarming, illegal and deserves the swift condemnation of the international community.

We must honor the protestors' chant—"the world is watching"—and condemn the arrest of Wong and the other demonstrators.

Unfortunately, Beijing shows absolutely zero signs of ceasing its aggressive campaign of intimidation against democracy and human rights activists.

CLOSE

In Mainland China, the Chinese government continues to jail journalists, human rights lawyers, those fighting to practice their own religion and democracy activists at an alarming rate.

And the Chinese Government is brutally trying to erase the religion, culture and language of the Tibetan people.

America has a moral duty to speak out in defense of the legitimate political aspirations of the people of Hong Kong.

If we do not speak out for human rights in China because of economic concerns, then we lose all moral authority to talk about human rights in any other place in the world.

As we mark this solemn anniversary, we must stand up for all those who are demanding the promises of 'one country, two systems' be honored.

#### THE LAST BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA

(Mr. FASO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, as we plan to celebrate Independence Day on the Fourth of July, it is important for us also to recognize a human rights tragedy and an abomination of democracy as totalitarian rulers of Venezuela are suppressing their people in our southern hemisphere.

To call attention to this tragic situation where thousands of people are being suppressed, where armed mobs are running around the streets intimidating people, and where Venezuelans cannot achieve the basic necessities of life, I include in the RECORD an article that recently appeared in *The Wall Street Journal*, "The Last Battle for Democracy in Venezuela," and to call attention to the human rights tragedy which is occurring in South America.

[From *The Wall Street Journal*, June 23, 2017]

#### THE LAST BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA

Under Nicolás Maduro, a country that had been one of Latin America's wealthiest is having its democratic institutions shredded amid rising poverty and corruption

(By David Luhnow and José de Córdoba)

Almost two decades after Venezuela's late president, Hugo Chávez, came to power in an electoral landslide, his country's transformation seems to be taking an ominous new turn. A country that was once one of one America's wealthiest is seeing its democratic institutions collapse, leading to levels of disease, hunger and dysfunction more often seen in war-torn nations than oil-rich ones.

Mr. Chávez's successor, President Nicolás Maduro, has called for a National Constitutional Assembly to be elected on July 30 to draft a new constitution, in which ill-defined communal councils will take the place of

Venezuela's traditional governing institutions, such as state governments and the opposition-dominated Congress. The new assembly appears to be rigged to heavily represent groups that back the government.

The Maduro government says that the new assembly will find a peaceful way forward for a country enduring an economic depression and standing on the brink of civil conflict. The government says it is building on the legacy of Mr. Chávez, a military man who vowed to fight corruption, dismantle the venal old political establishment and be a voice for millions of poor Venezuelans. But the opposition, which is boycotting the assembly vote, calls it a naked attempt to end democracy and turn the country into a Cuba-style communist autocracy. The government's own attorney general calls the vote illegal.

The 545-member assembly, a modern-day soviet, would hold unlimited power while it writes a new governing charter, which could take years. Meantime, the assembly is widely expected to scrap next year's presidential elections.

"This is the last battle for democracy in Venezuela," says David Smilde, a Venezuela expert at Tulane University.

For the U.S., the prospect of a new Cuba sitting atop trillions of dollars of oil reserves is profoundly unpleasant. For the past decade, Venezuela has aligned itself with Russia, China, Iran and Syria. Whether it thrives or implodes, Mr. Maduro's petrostate could cause far greater headaches to the U.S. and Latin America than isolated Cuba. An implosion could mean bigger shipments of cocaine to Central America and the U.S., as well as a massive increase in the current flow of tens of thousands of refugees already fleeing the country for the U.S., Colombia, Brazil and elsewhere. And a consolidation of power could let Mr. Maduro deepen his partnership with U.S. adversaries.

The Trump administration has criticized Mr. Maduro's plans to change the constitution, urging "respect for democratic norms and processes." The U.S. has called for Venezuela to free political prisoners, respect the opposition-controlled congress and "hold free and democratic elections."

Mr. Maduro's move has aggravated Venezuela's political crisis. The opposition, sensing a do-or-die moment, plans to ramp up daily street protests. Some 80 people have died in such demonstrations in the past three months, and the president is unlikely to ease off on the tear gas, rubber bullets and water cannons. "Maduro's ultimate aim is to turn Venezuela into Cuba. And we will not accept being put in that cage," says Julio Borges, the head of the opposition-dominated National Assembly.

Venezuela's momentous new step isn't taking place amid the kind of revolutionary euphoria that Mr. Chávez may have imagined before he died of cancer in 2013. Rather, it is being pushed by an unpopular government trying to keep power amid an economic implosion.

By year's end, Venezuela's economy will have shrunk by nearly a third in the past four years—a plunge similar to Cuba's after the fall of the Soviet Union, and one rarely seen outside of conflict zones. In a nation estimated to be sitting on as much oil as Saudi Arabia, it is common to see poor families rummaging through garbage for food, even as the wealthy pack nearby gourmet restaurants.

Inflation was estimated by the International Monetary Fund at 720% this year; it is expected to surpass 2,000% next year.

Shortages are so acute that three out of four Venezuelans lost an average of 18 pounds last year, according to a survey by Venezuelan universities. Diseases not seen there in decades, such as malaria, are back.

"The government is desperate because they know the next presidential election will be their last," says César Miguel Rondón, a popular radio host. When the host recently tried to leave Venezuela on a business trip to Miami with his family, he had his passport seized. "I'm a hostage in my own country," he said.

Amid the economic crisis and protests, the government has headed down an increasingly authoritarian path. It has raised the number of political prisoners over the past year to 391, according to the Venezuelan human-rights group Foro Penal—nearly four times the total from a year ago. Most are being tried in military courts. And the government is seeking to remove its rebellious attorney general through a case in the supreme court. The government didn't answer requests for comment.

The so-called Bolivarian revolution has become less about ideology and more about money. Venezuelans often call it a "*robolución*" rather than a "*revolución*," using the Spanish word for robbery. If Cuba is an ideologically motivated communist dictatorship, Venezuela is something different; as oil-rich as Saudi Arabia, as authoritarian as Russia and as corrupt as Nigeria.

Spectacular accusations of drug trafficking and corruption have sullied Mr. Maduro's own family. Two nephews of Venezuela's first lady, Cilia Flores, are awaiting sentencing in New York after being found guilty last year of conspiring to import 800 kilos of cocaine to the U.S. through Honduras. They pleaded not guilty.

The interior minister, Gen. Néstor Reverol, has been indicted in the U.S. for drug trafficking; Vice President Tareck El Aissami is on the U.S. Treasury Department's kingpin list for allegedly protecting drug traffickers; and the head of Venezuela's supreme court is on another Treasury blacklist far gutting the country's democratic institutions. They all say that they are innocent and accuse the U.S. of trying to destabilize Venezuela.

In some ways, analysts say, the extent of these accusations has made a negotiated solution to Venezuela's crisis more difficult. "The regime's connection to crime and drugs is what makes it difficult for them to give up power," says Harold Trinkunas, an expert on Venezuela at Stanford University. "Many have to be worried that if they step down, they will be put on a plane to the U.S."

In Cuba, the Castro dynasty has kept power despite decades of disastrous economic policies due to devotion to the charismatic Fidel, popular achievements such as universal free health care, ideological loyalty to Marxism, discipline enforced by security forces, and the nationalistic frisson of facing off against the U.S. In Venezuela, aside from a similar devotion to Mr. Chávez, the glue that has held the regime together is simpler: oil-soaked corruption on an epic scale.

Former planning minister Jorge Giordani, one of Mr. Chávez's closest confidantes, said in 2015 that of an estimated \$1 trillion in oil revenue received during the Chávez years, two-thirds had been distributed to workers through subsidies and cash transfers. The rest, more than \$300 billion, had "fallen through the cracks," he said. Mr. Giordani quit Mr. Maduro's government in disgust in 2014 and now lives in a quiet neighborhood of Caracas.

This year, the U.S. Treasury Department put Samark López, a Venezuelan businessman, on a blacklist, accusing him of being a

frontman for Vice President El Aissami, an alleged drug trafficker. Announcing the seizure, Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin said that the U.S. had frozen assets worth “tens of millions” of dollars when it seized a slew of properties and firms owned or controlled by Mr. López in the U.S., the U.K. and elsewhere. In a statement, Mr. López denied any wrongdoing and called the accusations “politically motivated.”

The government didn’t respond to requests for comment, but in the past, Mr. Maduro and other officials have dismissed accusations of corruption, economic mismanagement and repression as part of an “economic war” being waged by Venezuela’s private sector, in cahoots with the U.S., to destabilize and overthrow the socialist government.

As in many petrostates, oil accounts for 95% of Venezuela’s foreign-currency earnings. Since the government administers the oil, one sure way to get ahead is not by creating a new business but by getting close to the government to secure access to oil rents. Venezuelans call the enterprising class following this model “*los enchufados*”—the plugged-in ones.

The path to power in Venezuela is often said to run through the army and oil. Once in power, the populist Mr. Chávez went after the oil, eventually firing 19,000 employees of the state-run oil firm *Petróleos de Venezuela* to stack the company with his yes-men. After a brief and unsuccessful coup against him in 2002, he also cleaned out the barracks, handing over indoctrination and training to his Cuban allies.

In the following years, oil prices rose sharply, and Mr. Chávez spent lavishly. He saved none of the windfall, ran large budget deficits even at peak-oil prices, raided the country’s rainy-day oil fund, and borrowed heavily, first from Wall Street and then from the Chinese and the Russians. He handed out billions of dollars worth of cut-rate oil to Cuba, Nicaragua and even Boston and London to show off Venezuela’s growing energy clout.

The number of government employees doubled, to five million, and spending skyrocketed. Printing so much money caused inflation, so the government set prices, sometimes below the cost of production. Companies that refused to sell at a loss were seized, aggravating shortages. Less local production made the country ever more reliant on imports.

But once the price of oil began to drop in 2014, Venezuela could no longer afford the imports, which have fallen from \$66 billion in 2012 to about \$15.5 billion this year. And there is little domestic industry left to pick up the slack.

“It is classic Latin American populism on steroids, and now we have the worst hangover in history,” said Juan Nagel, a Venezuelan economist living in Chile.

Beyond some new public housing, little was built. Mr. Chávez left Venezuela littered with the bones of ambitious, half-finished public-works projects. Among them was a \$20 billion scheme to build a train network, which now lies abandoned. In Caracas, a new subway line ended up being just one additional stop on an existing line, prompting local wags to call it the Centi Metro (centimeter) rather than just a plain Metro.

Unperturbed, the flamboyant leader focused on projects like changing Venezuela’s time zone by half an hour. He renamed the country the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. And to mark the shift in Venezuela’s political course, he changed the direction of a wild stallion on the country’s coat of arms, making the horse gallop left instead of right.

Mr. Chávez’s revolution attacked the old elites, sending nearly two million Venezuelans—and billions of dollars—packing in the past 10 years. But in their stead rose a new elite: the so-called *Boliburgueses*, or Bolivarian bourgeoisie, who enjoyed a life of premium wines, Scotches and cars as poverty levels rose.

“You don’t see that in Cuba or Vietnam. But here, you see Hummers, private jets and obscene new mansions,” says Miguel Pizarro, an opposition leader whose father was a Marxist guerrilla in Venezuela and whose mother served in Mr. Chávez’s first political party in the mid-1990s. “These guys literally bought the homes where Venezuela’s elite lived, tore them down and built even bigger ones.”

Few enjoyed *la dolce vita* of Caracas more than Wilmer Ruperti, a businessman who earned Mr. Chávez’s loyalty in 2002 when he helped break an oil strike. Mr. Ruperti was a familiar sight in Caracas, riding in an armored Jaguar accompanied by two North Korean bodyguards. The magnate cemented his friendship with Mr. Chávez by buying a pair of Simón Bolívar’s pistols for \$1.7 million in a New York auction and presenting them to the Venezuelan leader.

Last year, Mr. Ruperti paid the multi-million-dollar legal fees for the criminal defense of Mr. Maduro’s nephews. At the same time, Mr. Ruperti’s firm won a \$138 million contract from the state oil company. Mr. Ruperti said it was his patriotic duty to pay the nephews’ legal fees as a way of relieving the pressures on Mr. Maduro. He denied any link between the payment of the fees and the state oil-firm contract.

Corruption helps the government maintain political control. And no tool has been more effective than exchange controls, initially adopted by Mr. Chávez in 2002 during a national strike to control capital flight. Fifteen years later, they have reshaped Venezuela’s economy and given the government enormous power to pick who gets dollars from the country’s oil wealth—often at absurdly low rates.

For instance, firms and others who import food get dollars at the official rate of 10 bolívars. But they can turn around and sell those dollars on the black market for 8,300 bolívars.

Venezuela’s army recently got the rights to set up its own mining and oil companies, and the armed forces are in charge of most critical imports. In 2016, 18 generals and admirals were tasked with importing key foods and sanitary items. One brigadier general was put in command of acquiring black beans; another was charged with acquiring toilet paper, feminine napkins and diapers. Logically, an admiral was placed in charge of acquiring fish.

No one knows how much money has been lost. Mr. Giordani estimated that a third of the \$59 billion that the government handed out to companies to bring imports into the country in 2012 might have ended up in fraudulent schemes.

“It’s a terrible economic model, but it’s great for politics and power,” says Asdrúbal Oliveros, a prominent Venezuelan economist.

The opposition and the regional governments don’t know how to turn the tide. An Organization of American States resolution this week urging Venezuela to return to democracy was supported by every major country in the hemisphere but blocked by Venezuelan allies like Nicaragua and a handful of statelets like St. Kitts and Nevis.

Many in Venezuela hope that parts of the army haven’t been tempted by money and

will want to honor the country’s democratic past. Ibsen Martínez, who helped write some of the country’s most beloved soap operas, says that hope is likely in vain.

“The army is now a criminal organization,” he said in an interview from Bogotá, where he now lives in exile. “But in every culture, there are mythical creatures. In Venezuela, it is the idea of an institutional military man, who will come out like Captain America to resolve everything.” That instinct, he added, led to Mr. Chávez in the first place.

His revolution’s mournful impact can be seen everywhere. Venezuela’s national baseball league now plays to empty stadiums and is considering suspending this year’s season. The Teresa Carreño theater, an architectural masterpiece in Caracas, used to produce some of the region’s best operas and dramas; it now mostly hosts government rallies. In the nearby Caracas Museum of Contemporary Art, water drips into buckets near paintings by Picasso and Mondrian. The museum is so empty that a thief replaced a Matisse portrait with a fake without anyone noticing for several years.

Alberto Barrera, the author of a biography of Mr. Chávez who now lives in Mexico City, thinks that the time is fast approaching when he and the opposition may need to say goodbye to their hopes. “I wonder when I will wake up and realize, ‘They beat us.’ That it’s all over and the county I knew is gone,” he said.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that we stand up on this Fourth of July, not just for democracy here in the United States, but for democracy in other parts of the world as people are struggling.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, and Happy Fourth of July to all of our countrymen around the United States of America.

#### TRUMPCARE IS A DEVASTATING BILL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we go home to commemorate the birth of this Nation, to wish all well, we would hope we would be able to go home by feeling comfortable that the administration was taking care of the American people.

We have come to find out that the EPA is reversing a decision of the Obama administration to allow a pesticide by the name of—trade name Lorsban, that is chlorophyll-based, to be utilized on fruits and vegetables.

I understand the needs of farmers, but there are documented studies that indicate that it may have a significant impact on the brain function of little children as young as 7 years old.

Where is the care of the Nation by this administration?

And then, they are planning a healthcare bill that will see this young lady lose her healthcare.

In my district, 89,000 people will lose their insurance when they cut \$854 billion out of Medicaid; 16,000 will be children.

Where will the hospitals survive if they are closed in rural and urban America, and where will the seniors be when their nursing home puts them out because the Medicaid that has been for working seniors but now retired in nursing homes who rely on Medicaid?

The TrumpCare bill in the Senate is a devastating bill. We need to have an administration that takes care of the American people.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UTICA OBSERVER-DISPATCH

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 200th anniversary of the Utica Observer-Dispatch. Founded in 1817, the Utica OD was one of only 421 papers in the country, and the fifth newspaper founded in New York State.

For the past 200 years, the Utica OD has kept our region informed through quality reporting on important issues impacting our local community.

As an unwavering member of the fourth estate, the Utica Observer-Dispatch had a leading role in exposing the inner workings of our once organized crime-influenced city. For this dedicated service on this very issue, and its campaign for justice against corruption, the Utica Observer-Dispatch was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1959.

I commend the Utica OD for its 200 years of steadfast reporting, and I encourage the Observer-Dispatch and its committed members of the fourth estate to continue with its stated mission, to keep our citizens informed through impartial investigative reporting.

Also, on a personal note, when I was a teenager, I actually delivered the Utica Observer-Dispatch, and it was an honor to do it and a small way for me to start off my earning a living.

So I just want to thank the Utica OD and congratulate them again on 200 years.

#### THERE IS NO HEART IN THE SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate version was supposed to be the one, according to the President, with heart. There is no heart in this bill.

Sixty percent of my constituents live in Los Angeles County which, in total, has about 5 percent—one county in the country has about 5 percent—of this country's Medicaid recipients. The proposed Senate bill cuts to Medicaid

would put more than a quarter of those currently receiving Medicaid assistance in L.A. County, nearly 900,000 people, at risk for losing health insurance.

This is not a healthcare bill. This is a tax cut for the wealthy, dressed up to look like serious legislation. The rich get richer, while everyone else is left to get poorer and sicker.

This is not who we are as Americans.

#### A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I will become the first House Democrat in Congress to introduce a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. My bill will prohibit the Federal Government from spending more than it receives except in the case of war or recession.

Democrats and Republicans may not always agree on the best way to balance the budget, but we all care about our country and our children, and both are at risk unless we rein in our unsustainable deficits and debt.

In 45 of the last 50 years, the Federal Government spent more than it received. The Federal debt has ballooned to over \$14 trillion. That is 77 percent of GDP, a figure that is expected to reach 150 percent in 30 years if we do not change course.

Just as every family is expected to balance their budget, so, too, should the Federal Government. This is about taking responsibility and making tough decisions, exactly what our constituents elected us to do.

A balanced budget amendment will compel Congress to walk the walk, not just talk the talk, when it comes to being responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars. I hope my colleagues on both sides of aisle will support this bill.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and have an opportunity, in this great deliberative body, to bring up the subject matters of my choice, and the purpose is to inform you and the American people.

Before I go into the topics that I am prepared to speak of, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

#### MEANINGFUL ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 115TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for kindly yielding and allowing me to take a few minutes to

have a little bit of reflection with the American people as we head into the Fourth of July weekend.

Mr. Speaker, despite widespread cynicism from Washington elites and those in the media, the 115th Congress and President Trump have taken meaningful action over the past 6 months to improve the lives of hardworking Americans.

According to a recent analysis, this Congress has been the most productive in the modern era. By June 8, we had passed 158 bills, compared to the 60 bills by the 103rd Congress under Bill Clinton, 67 bills by the 107th Congress under President Bush, and 131 bills by the 111th Congress under President Obama.

President Trump has signed 39 bills into law, including 14 bills passed under the Congressional Review Act, stopping harmful regulations handed down by the previous administration. According to one analysis, repealing these rules could save the economy millions of hours of paperwork, nearly \$4 billion in regulatory costs to the Federal agencies, and an astounding \$35 billion in regulatory costs for the private sector.

We sent to the President, and he signed, legislation to bring accountability to the Veterans Administration. And the House has acted to stop ObamaCare's job and freedom-crushing mandates, and acted to put a critical safety net program on a sustainable path.

The House also voted to repeal and replace Washington's Financial Control Law, Dodd-Frank, to get capital flowing to our small businesses and to improve choices for consumers.

The past 6 months have been a strong start, and I look forward to the House continuing its work to advance important goals of strengthening our economy and creating jobs.

#### CELEBRATING OUR NATION'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, every year at this time, our Nation celebrates our birthday. It is the perfect time to reflect on the founding of our country and the principles that made our Nation exceptional.

□ 1800

At the height of the Cold War with the Soviet Union, President Kennedy, in his inaugural address, reflected on our founding principles.

JFK said: "And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the State, but from the hand of God."

President Kennedy understood the words of our Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."



A little more than 100 years before President Kennedy's inauguration, our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln, defended the Declaration and taught all those around him, as well as future generations, how to revere and embrace unwaveringly the sacred and transcendent truths expressed in this monumental document.

Lincoln said in 1858: "Now, my countrymen, if you have been taught doctrines conflicting with the great landmarks of the Declaration of Independence, if you have listened to suggestions which would take away from its grandeur, and mutilate the fair symmetry of its proportions; if you have been inclined to believe that all men are not created equal in those inalienable rights enumerated by our chart of liberty, let me entreat you to come back. Think nothing of me, take no thought for the political fate of any man whomsoever, but come back to the truths that are in the Declaration of Independence. You may do anything with me you choose, if you will but heed these sacred principles."

Today, Mr. Speaker, let us recommit to the principles set forth in our Declaration, that all are endowed by your Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And let those who have admired the leaders of our country who have reasserted these principles, from Lincoln to Kennedy, join together and continue to fight for the protection of these God-given rights, especially the first right, "the right to life."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for having extended to me this opportunity to share these thoughts with the American people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his presentation in bringing this topic together in a way that he has. And in his method of addressing the Declaration of Independence on the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, I would expound on that as well.

Life is the most paramount. It is a priority right, and our Founding Fathers knew what they were doing. They set up life as the first priority, liberty as the second priority, and the third priority was the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I will start from the bottom because, of the three, I think it deserves the most explanation. That pursuit of happiness is often viewed as maybe a fun tailgate party or a bliss of some kind or maybe a barbecue outdoors with the family, the things that we love. That is the enjoyment of our life.

The pursuit of happiness, as it was understood by our Founding Fathers, came from the Greek word "eudaimonia." And that is spelled, E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A. And under the

Greek word "eudaimonia," it means developing the whole human being. And it is not just the mental well-being, but it is developing the intellectual human being, the physical human being, the knowledge base that is there, and the spirit within us, and our theology and our souls—the whole package of what we are as human beings, developing that to the maximum, these God-given gifts, developing them for his glorification, and that is the concept of the pursuit of happiness that our Founding Fathers understood.

So the principle is that we have a right to pursue happiness, developing our whole human being, which includes the human enjoyment that we think of when we say pursuit of happiness.

But no one in their pursuit of happiness can trample on someone else's liberty because liberties are God-given. And the liberties that we have cannot be subordinate to the pursuit of happiness, but they are subordinate to the life of others because life is the most sacred.

Human life is sacred in all of its forms. It is the number one paramount right. So the protection of human life is the principle and is the highest priority in the Declaration of Independence.

And the liberties that we have—freedom of speech, religion, the press, the right to keep and bear arms, a jury of our peers, no double jeopardy, the whole list in the Bill of Rights—those are God-given liberties, as conceived by our Founding Fathers and enshrined in the Bill of Rights, and, of course, in our Constitution.

The rights that we have cannot be trampled upon or subordinated to someone else's pursuit of happiness. Life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, a well-thought-out, prioritized list in our Declaration that gives us the inspiration that was the foundation for our Constitution and the principles of our lives in America today.

So I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his explanation of this and for giving me an opportunity to flesh this out a little bit in the concepts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But the segue that he has served up to me is this: that our debates today here in this Congress on the immigration bills that have now just passed the Congress have been focused on the right to life—the right to life versus the criminals that took the liberty to take them. They have violated the very foundations of our Declaration, and, of course, they violated our laws in a number of ways.

But I think, especially, of the onset of this discussion, and I think of Sarah Root. And her legislation that is Sarah's Law was introduced by me in this Congress. I have a copy of this bill today. We introduced it last year also,

but in this Congress, it became H.R. 174, and it came about, and then we incorporated it into the broader bill today that we call the sanctuary cities legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Sarah Root had just graduated from Bellevue University in Omaha. Her hometown is Modale, Iowa. She had just finished her graduation the day before with a perfect 4.0 grade point average, and her major was in criminal investigation. She would, today, be investigating criminals if it hadn't been for the criminal that killed her the day after she graduated.

And the individual who is responsible here, Eswin Mejia, who ran her over, ran into her vehicle on the streets with triple the blood alcohol content that is legal. Eswin Mejia was on a first-name basis with at least two of his immigration attorneys. When he was taken into custody, interestingly, as bad as the accident was, Sarah was rendered unrecognizable and she was on life support for a little while while the parents were deciding what decision to make.

And she was also an organ donor. Sarah saved six. And many days I wear this bracelet that says, "Sarah Root saved six." And this bracelet hangs on the antlers in my man cave. And when I walk down there in the morning, I often say a prayer for all of those bracelets that are hung on the antlers in my man cave that represent those individuals whose lives have been lost at the hands of criminal aliens who were unlawfully present in the United States and perpetrated violence against generally American citizens but others that are generally those that are at least lawfully present in America.

Sarah Root was one of those victims, a stellar young lady with a 4.0 grade point average and a fresh diploma from Bellevue University; her whole life and a world ahead of her, and run down on the streets.

Her father came to testify here in the Judiciary Committee in Congress, and he said: "The judge bailed Eswin Mejia, this perpetrator, out of jail for less money than it cost to marry my daughter, and he was back home in his home country before we could bury my daughter."

Those were some of the most powerful and moving and memorable words that I have heard in my time here in Congress. We think Eswin Mejia went back to Honduras, his home country. He had been incarcerated before. He had been encountered by law enforcement before, and they turned him loose on the streets.

This happens again and again in America every day, local law enforcement picking up people that are unlawfully present in America, violating our immigration laws. The law requires that they be placed into removal proceedings. That is the law, but they turn them loose anyway and turn them out

on the streets because we have sanctuary cities and sanctuary cities policies. Some local jurisdictions that don't have a written policy, but they just simply—it is a practice that they have evolved into accepting.

So when I say every one of the Americans who died at the hands of someone who is unlawfully present in America, illegal aliens, generally speaking, every one of those are a preventable death. If we enforced the law, they wouldn't have been in America in the first place to commit the crimes they committed against our American citizens, our innocent people like Sarah Root, this beautiful young lady with a perfect grade point average, the world ahead of her, a happy, joyful young lady that, today, would be living, loving, laughing, and learning and contributing to our society. But she is in her grave today because Eswin Mejia got triple drunk, was unlawfully in the United States, and ran her car down and killed her on the streets and absconded for a \$5,000 bond.

What we did with Sarah's Law—this is H.R. 174, the original language—and I wanted to assure the family of Sarah Root that this language is incorporated into the bill we passed today. It is incorporated into sanctuary cities legislation that we passed today. And what it does is it prohibits the judge from releasing an illegal alien on bond if they have been charged with or subject to a homicide or a crime where there is serious bodily injury.

Once this issue came up in Omaha, Nebraska, and the public knew about this, we tried to unseat the judge that released this criminal that may have done damage again. But the judge that had let him out on \$5,000 had a similar case. The next time, the bond went way up into six or even seven figures. So I think he got the message, but the public got the message, too.

And I don't know whether he will be able to hold his seat or not, but we have got to bring the right things. We have got to put the fixes in place. You would think we would have a judge that would understand this, yet, somehow in the political culture of America, we are watching criminal aliens be turned loose on the streets over and over again.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, sitting in on immigration hearings in the Judiciary Committee. This is over a number of years now, and I suppose there are a couple of people in this Congress that have sat through more, not many. The witnesses would be—every week or so we would have a hearing and there would be witnesses that would testify about how many people died in the Arizona desert trying to sneak into America. And that number would be 200 in a year, 250 in a year, maybe the next year it went to 300. I remember that number going to 400 or more who died in the Arizona desert on the way into trying to sneak into America.

Finally, with this parade of witnesses that were experts on why we ought to open the border so they didn't have a difficult time getting into America—that is the lunacy that we have heard in the debate today over on this side of the floor, from my view, Mr. Speaker.

I began to ask the witnesses this question: You are an expert on immigration and you have come to testify on how many didn't make it through the desert. Could you tell me how many Americans died at the hands of those who did make it through the desert?

And I would ask the witnesses—generally four witnesses—and they would go down the line: I don't know the answer; I don't know the answer; I don't know the answer.

And that went on for a while.

And the fourth witness in one of those days was a former INS agent, Michael Cutler. And we are just a few years after September 11, 2001, when I asked him this question: How many Americans died at the hands of those who made it through the desert?

Which is the phrase to imply how many Americans died at the hands of those who were unlawfully present in America.

And Michael Cutler's answer was: I don't know the answer to that, but I can tell you it is in multiples of the victims of September 11.

Now, think of that. Three thousand Americans were killed that day. Multiples of that would be at least 6,000. If he is right—and he is confident he is right, and now I am confident he was right—that started me thinking.

□ 1815

So shortly after that, I commissioned a GAO study. That GAO study dug down deeply into the records that we had access to.

It is hard to get this Congress to compare apples to apples, so I began to ask the questions: Of the people in the prisons of America, what are they in prison for? How many of them are criminal aliens?

We did a report on that. They sliced and diced it and narrowed it down. It never actually became apples to apples, but it did come down to this substantial number that has been supported a couple of other times in other studies, in one subsequent that I had done in 2011. The number is very close to 28 percent of the inmates in our Federal penitentiaries are criminal aliens—28 percent.

So it is reasonable to do a calculation and an extrapolation off of this, if 28 percent of these inmates are criminal aliens, what percentage of the murders are they committing? What percentage of the rapes are they committing? What percentage of the violent crimes are they committing? Or are they in jail for just simply violating a law of immigration? You will find out

very few are in prison for violation of immigration law.

They are the reflection on criminal aliens. They are similar, a very similar, if not identical, proportion of the crimes that are committed by others.

So when you put that on there and hit the calculator—I am not going to speak those numbers into the RECORD here, Mr. Speaker, because it is shocking and stunning how many Americans have lost their lives at the hands of people who shouldn't have been here in the first place—Sarah Root included, Kate Steinle included, and many more.

A few days after Sarah Root was killed, I sent out a tweet that just said: Sarah Root would be alive living and loving life if the President had not violated his oath and ordered ICE to stand down.

That is what happened during the 8-year period of time President Obama asserted that he had this thing called prosecutorial discretion. Now, that is something that is established in law, at least in precedent, but it has to be done on an individual basis, and he delivered it in a blanket basis. Janet Napolitano delivered the document. I questioned her on it in the committee.

They decided that prosecutorial discretion can be defined. They created four categories of people and essentially granted amnesty to all of them and turned them loose. They turned criminals loose on the streets in America—36,007 of them in one bunch. Some of them were murderers out on to the streets of America.

You can see what happens to the crime in this country. If you are importing people from the most violent countries in the world, and when they are encountered by law enforcement turning them loose, or if they are picked up for a taillight or speeding or getting in a fight or shoplifting, whatever the case may be, failure to signal, running a stoplight, they are picked up for that.

When local law enforcement encounters them, they look at their identification. They ask them a few questions. It isn't hard to figure out whether they are legal or not. Some are good enough liars. But any time that law enforcement encounters people unlawfully present in America, they are to put them in removal proceedings, and ICE is to do it. Yet thousands have been turned loose on the streets.

At least 300 cities in America have established sanctuary policies that they turn them loose. Some of the cities have passed policies that refuse to allow their law enforcement to even gather information or accept information on illegal aliens that they encounter.

So, for example, this is how bad it is even in a place like Iowa. One of my staff people who was involved in a car accident that was caused by an illegal alien who had no license and had no insurance but he did have an illegal job

in the town where he caused the accident crashed into my staff and wrecked my staff's car.

So when I got the phone call on that, I turned to my then-chief of staff who is a lights-outs, University of Chicago School of Law lawyer. I said: I want you to go to this town and stay there until you can get this resolved. And I want to find out: What can we get accomplished to enforce the law?

This was our opportunity to learn if a Member of Congress' staff can be run into by an illegal alien without a driver's license and without insurance with an illegal job in town and owning a car, and I have a topnotch lawyer chief of staff to go up there and communicate with law enforcement to try to bring the law enforcement in place so we could at least deport the guy.

After 3 or 4 days up there and a number of phone calls from me down here, I finally got the message back that finally convinced me we couldn't crack through the code of local law enforcement to be able to deport the individual who was clearly illegal. He was unlawfully working—no driver's license and no insurance.

The practice of simply staying out of immigration law because they were local law enforcement and didn't want to touch it was so ingrained that we could not move the bubble off the center.

Finally, I said: Okay, we have got other people to take care of. We are not going to get this solved, so let's turn our focus back to other things.

That is so very frustrating. I tell this, Mr. Speaker, to let the world know the frustration of families who had a loved one who was killed by illegals and watched them turned loose on the streets, and then have them abscond and go back to their home country or go back into the shadows and hide.

That is the thing that happened with Sarah Root. Today, we did honor to her and her life by passing Sarah's Law as part of the sanctuary city law. How utterly appropriate to bring a ban on sanctuary cities, to pass it off the floor of the House, and wrapped up in the same bill is Sarah's Law to respect her; her life; the sacrifice of her life; the sacrifice of her mother, Michelle; her father, Scott; and her only sibling, her brother, Scotty, who carries the whole load now for the next generation—all of that.

Finally, Congress did some justice for Sarah Root. It is only a small piece of justice. It is the least we can do, but it is the right thing for us to do. What her family wants is that no other families have to suffer like they have suffered.

This is the story of Sarah Root whose name was elevated on the national stage by President Trump. As much as I push things out of this Congress, I don't come close to having as big a megaphone as Donald Trump. So I

want to thank the President of the United States for picking up the case of Sarah Root when he came to Iowa to campaign for the nomination of the Presidency of the United States.

When he began to make his immigration cases and lay out the platform for his immigration policy, I noticed that it mirrored mine very closely. I mentioned to him one day: Mr. President, I have market tested your immigration policy for 14 years in Iowa. It shouldn't have been a surprise that they understand these issues. They support the rule of law, they support securing the border, they support building a wall, and they support banning sanctuary cities. That is not just Iowa values, that is at least heart of the heartland values.

Those are American values—American values that want to live in a country that has the rule of law, a country where our children can be safe, and where they can play in the streets and they don't have to be looking over the shoulder; or a mother or a father doesn't have to keep them indoors because the streets are too dangerous.

This morning, we have heard from Jamiel Shaw who has been in to this Congress and testified before my committee maybe as far as back as 8 or 9 years ago. He is from Los Angeles. His son, who was a star football player, Jazz Shaw, was shot down and killed by an illegal alien gang member who went on the hunt that day with an assignment, as I understood it, to go shoot a Black person.

Jazz Shaw was murdered on the streets close enough to his father, Jamiel's, house that his father said this morning on FOX News that he could hear the gun shots. He went out there to see his son laying on the street in the blood pooling in the street. A ghastly murder for the sake of what? A gang challenge and a race label.

That would not be the case if that murderer had been deported back to his country. It would not be the case if he came back in and we picked him up a second time.

Under Kate's Law, the killer of Jamiel Shaw's son would not have been in America if we had had Kate's Law and had enforced Kate's Law because he had been encountered before and had been deported.

This is the evil murderer, Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez. This is the beautiful young lady, 32 years old, Kate Steinle, who was down on the wharf in San Francisco with her father enjoying a day and was simply shot down and killed for no reason and at random by this individual who had been five times deported and convicted of something like seven different felonies in this country.

Under Kate's Law, that jacks that penalty up. He would have been locked up for a good, long time if that law had

been in place, or the sanctuary city legislation we passed today outlawing sanctuary cities. They would be turning over these kinds of criminals to ICE where they would get their just sentence in Federal penitentiary and then be deported.

But even though we have these laws now passed, and if the Senate takes them up and passes them into law, the President will sign them. We are confident of that. He asked that these bills be brought before the House of Representatives as soon as possible. Of course, that was today. So if these acts that we passed today become law, then many Americans will be saved from the kind of carnage that we have heard about in case after case.

When I saw the story come through of Kate Steinle, I looked at that. It was the most tragic story. Here is a clip of what I sent out that day. This is July 3, 2015. It is a picture of Kate Steinle. The message in the tweet is: A 100 percent preventable crime—dated July 3, as I said, 2015—100 percent preventable crime. Just enforce the law. This will make you cry, too, and it happens every day. Every day in America, there are Americans that die at the hand of illegal aliens.

I recall the case in Cottonwood, Minnesota, where an illegal alien who had been encountered by law enforcement before and turned back on the streets of our country who didn't have a driver's license, didn't have insurance, and should have been deported at least once and probably more times than that ran a school bus off the road in southwest Minnesota.

Four kids in that school bus were killed. Two of them were siblings. Three families lost children in that bus accident where the bus was run off the road by the illegal criminal alien.

The dialogue that came from the left—the people that we heard debate over here today and voted against every one of these bills—was: this doesn't have anything to do with illegal immigration. It has got nothing to do with that. It is just the happenstance of life. In every society, there are car accidents, there are murders, there are rapes, there is assault, there is battery, and there is grand theft.

Every society has that to some degree, but every single victim of a criminal alien that is in deportable category is a preventable crime. I have made that case over and over again for years, Mr. Speaker. But I made the point. They will say that it was just an accident, it was happenstance, and it has nothing to do with immigration.

My district director looked at me. He is a mild-mannered, soft-spoken, and judicious kind of a person. He said: If they believe that, if they say that, then you say to them: then you go up there to Cottonwood, Minnesota, and tell their parents that their children would still be dead if we had deported

the illegal that ran the bus off the road.

That hits home to me, too, Mr. Speaker. It rings so true. Any family that is suffering the loss of a loved one—the Steinle family, the Root family, and so many other families, the families in Cottonwood, Minnesota, the families in Omaha, and the families around in my district—those families know that if he had enforced the law then their child or their husband would still be alive.

So as part of the sanctuary city legislation that we moved through here today, and as in Kate's Law just passed—I need to make sure that I state that—and in Sarah's, they would both be alive today living, loving, laughing, learning, contributing to our society, sharing joy, and giving joy.

There is another case that I have just picked up. A teen charged in an Iowa woman's death may have fled the country. Authorities say a teenager who was at the wheel of a car that was involved in a crash in Omaha last month that killed an Iowa woman—that is Sarah—has missed a court hearing and may have fled the country.

Well, that is a little memo that says: He absconded, we think, to Honduras. He may be living in the shadows.

Here is another story, and that is addressed, Mr. Speaker, by legislation that was brought by ANDY BIGGS of Arizona. I thank him for advancing this legislation, also.

This is the story of Grant Ronnebeck. He was 21 years old. He was gunned down in January of 2015, while working at a QuickTrip in Mesa, Arizona. The man charged with killing him, Apolinar Altamirano, was 29 years old, in the country illegally, and had been released by Immigration and Customs Enforcement even though he had previously been convicted of a felony burglary charge.

Now, why are we turning people loose in the streets of America to walk the streets again when they were deportable before they committed the felony burglary charge, convicted of a felony burglary charge, and then turn them loose again? Does the judge decide that somehow he has a right to be in America? That is a clear deportation requirement.

I recall when we had John Ashcroft as the Attorney General. He testified before the committee that when they released criminal aliens on to the streets without bond with a date set for a hearing, 84 percent of them didn't show up.

□ 1830

And that was before President Obama sent the message that it didn't matter. Those numbers have gone up, not down.

Here is another one. This was just another ghastly, tragic story that happened in Omaha. Louise Sollowin died

in July of 2013. Three days after the attack in her home, according to Omaha police, an officer sent to the south Omaha house Sollowin had lived in for 71 years found her body covered in blood in her bedroom about 9 a.m.

The officer said Sergio Martinez-Perez, 19—I am going to skip some of this, because it is too nasty to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—was passed out there, having raped the 93-year-old woman. Authorities believed that Martinez-Perez entered the home through an unlocked door. He, too, was an illegal alien who had been encountered by law enforcement and was released and went out to rape and murder.

So when the President said that we have people who do these things among those who have come from some of those countries, that is clearly true. A lot of good people also, but we need to have the rule of law. We need to enforce the rule of law.

And when they are coming from these other countries that have corruption but don't have the benefit of the rule of law and the respect for the law that we have, they are importing those low standards in here.

We must sustain the rule of law, restore the respect for the rule of law. If we do that, we will sustain ourselves as a First World country. If we fail to do so, if we lose the rule of law, then we will devolve into a Third World country eventually. The core of this from the beginning for me, Mr. Speaker, has always been to restore the respect for the rule of law.

Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty act in 1986. I give him credit for at least naming it—calling it what it was, an amnesty act. It was a reward for law breakers. The cabinet around him encouraged him to sign the amnesty act.

Me, you know, I kicked my filing cabinet the day I heard on the news that he had signed it, and I kicked a dent in it because—well, out of frustration was why.

But I believe Ronald Reagan would see with clarity that you can't reward law breakers and think that somehow you are going to be able to put that behind you and that the law will be enforced and respected from that point forward.

There were to be a million people that received amnesty in 1986. Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty act, and it became 3 million people because they probably counted a little wrong, and there was a lot of fraud, a lot of people who presented themselves and alleged that they were to be included. This was a faster track to citizenship for them.

Three million people received amnesty in 1986, and I said then that none of them should have, that they should not be rewarded for breaking the law. Yet they got their amnesty.

The signature that Ronald Reagan put on that amnesty legislation was

supposed to be in exchange for enforcement of the law, but the law didn't get enforced. The amnesty was delivered triple what was expected. And I knew then that we would have a long, hard slog restoring the respect for the rule of law, but I have set about doing that since that period of time.

More than 30 years later, we are here on the floor strengthening the rule of law after all this time, after the amnesty that has been advocated by others.

Each decade we seem to have to have a battle. They want to come with what they now call comprehensive immigration reform. Just about anybody in America knows if you say "comprehensive immigration reform," you really mean amnesty.

I say to them: Just be honest. If you think amnesty is a good idea, why do you say all those three words when you can say "amnesty" and be honest? People know what you mean. If the public is ready for amnesty, then you can pass it. If we are not, you can't.

The American people understand this intuitively, that we have got to stop the law-breaking and that we cannot be rewarding those who break the law.

Now, there are those who think that we should somehow find a path of amnesty for those individuals identified unconstitutionally by Barack Obama in his DACA program—Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. They aren't all innocent little waifs who have been brought in by their mother against their will, as many would say. Instead, many of them are prime gang-age recruitment, young men.

I have gone down there and watched that flow of epic humanity coming out of Central America, coming through Mexico, some from Mexico—a diminishing number from Mexico—coming into the United States. The numbers we looked at were 81 percent male. And if they are under 18, they are coming on their own—if they are 14, 15, 16 or 17 years old. And they don't always tell you the truth either, Mr. Speaker.

So this large group of people are prime gang-age recruitment youth. And these youth are coming from some of the most violent countries in the world. And 11 of the 13 most violent countries in the world are south of the Rio Grande, and one of those countries is not Mexico. So when they come into America, they bring with them the violence and the culture that is part of it, and we can expect our crime rates to go up.

The people from the inner cities, who generally sit over on that side of this Congress, want to get them out of places like El Salvador and Guatemala and put them into the inner cities, in places like east St. Louis and Detroit and Newark, and a number of other cities where the violent crime rate is very high, to get them away from the violence that is part of their neighborhood. I would submit, Mr. Speaker,

that we may be putting them into neighborhoods that are more dangerous than the countries that they come from, but we don't log those crime statistics very clearly because it is so sensitive to the people in the inner city, they don't want to talk about it.

So crime has been pervasive in these countries. They are sending young men especially that are prime gang-age recruitment. They are being recruited to MS-13. Judge Jeanine Pirro said the other day that 30 percent of them become MS-13 members.

Mr. Speaker, let me inquire, if I could, the amount of time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that response.

I wanted to roll through what our sanctuary cities legislation does that we just passed today, and it goes a pretty good, long, comprehensive way.

I pointed out that I brought the first sanctuary cities legislation into this Congress that I could find a record of. It was in 2005 when I brought an amendment through the Homeland Security appropriations to cut all funding to sanctuary cities. 2005. And then along the way, each opportunity that was there, I brought an amendment to cut off funding to sanctuary cities. Most of the time it was in the Judiciary, the justice appropriations bill. And I see a number of them here scattered in my memo that I asked staff to put together.

So as far back as 12 years ago, I have been working to end Federal funding going to sanctuary cities that defy local law enforcement. And we have gotten resistance from the other side of the aisle consistently. Barack Obama was never going to sign anything like that, but I kept beating the drum every year to cut off funding to sanctuary cities.

Finally, I introduced the legislation on sanctuary cities in 2015, and then again at the beginning of this Congress. And Chairman BOB GOODLATTE was gracious enough to pull that together so we could bring it to the floor today. And we have had a lot of cooperation from many others on this.

I see the first date I introduced the sanctuary cities legislation as a standalone bill was November 4 of 2015, and here we are today finally passing it.

I thought I had been at it for a long time, Mr. Speaker, and it added up to 12 years that I have been actively engaged, at least—maybe 14—until I talked to Congressman LOU BARLETTA from Hazleton, Pennsylvania, who, as a mayor in 1999, began to raise the issue and made it a national issue. He was selected to this Congress. He has been at it 18 years. Others have been at this a long time, too.

So many of us are grateful today that the sanctuary cities language has

passed and that Sarah's Law, Kate's Law, all of that that I was able to introduce into this Congress has passed out of the House of Representatives and messaged to the Senate. And I hope the Senate picks it up.

The sanctuary cities language does this:

It bans their policies, for starters, Mr. Speaker.

It blocks the Department of Justice grants to the sanctuary cities that defy Federal law and refuse to cooperate with Federal law enforcement on immigration. And those grants would be generally grants that have to do with law enforcement that would be effected by DOJ.

It allows the Department of Homeland Security to refuse warrants from the sanctuary cities. The sanctuary cities might serve a warrant to someone in custody, and DHS can say: We are not going to hand this person over to you because we are pretty confident you are just going to turn them loose on the streets.

So that piece in there is a protection that keeps some from being released.

And then it requires ICE to take custody of these criminal aliens within 48 hours of the notice that comes from the State or local government that would have them picked up.

It also establishes a good faith provision that holds local government harmless for honoring ICE detainees.

Now, that is something that was undetermined on February 25 of 2015 by then-Acting Director of ICE, Dan Ragsdale, who sent a letter out that just simply advised local law enforcement that an ICE detainee is a suggestion, not an order.

Well, the law and the rule says that it is an order, not a suggestion. This statute clarifies it and firms it up with respect to detainees.

And then if a local jurisdiction is sued by, say, the ACLU, as they are wont to do, it gives them a protection, and it lets the Department of Justice and the Federal Government substitute itself for local government, and it holds local government harmless when it comes to the case of ICE detainees.

Here is a very powerful piece, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: the sanctuary cities legislation passed today, H.R. 3003, provides a cause of action against any jurisdiction that releases an alien who subsequently commits a felony.

Now, that is a powerful provision, and it is something that moves me in my heart. As a former crime victim, it occurred to me when they announced the name of the case that I wasn't involved in that equation at all even though it nearly destroyed my business, and I began to think about how this is.

Our criminal law comes from old England. And in old England, if you committed a crime—the king owned everything. If you killed one of his serf,

you killed the king's serf. That was the murder that took place. If you shot a deer, you shot the king's deer. If you stole something, it was a violation against the crown.

And we transferred the criminal law into America, and the State has replaced the crown. So when you commit a crime, that crime is committed against the State as if you had killed one of the king's deer, but it doesn't consider the victim hardly at all. We are doing a little better in recent years, but this allows the crime victims to have a recourse, Mr. Speaker. And I think we will hear a lot about this provision in the sanctuary cities law as this moves over to the Senate.

I think we made a lot of progress today. It has been a good day to do honor to the lives of Sarah Root, a beautiful young lady whose mother is here in this Capital City today and speaking and testifying and doing radio and meetings.

And one day I hope we hunt down Eswin Mejia, the killer of this beautiful young woman. And one day I hope we have the relationship with his home country where they will hunt him down and extradite him to the United States of America. That is, of course, a law we need to have in a civilized world.

And Kate Steinle, I thank not only Matt Salmon for bringing this forward, but Bill O'Reilly and the President of the United States.

Something this President has done is he asked the family members of the victims of criminal aliens in America to step up on the stage with him around the campaign trail over and over again. One would think that they were props for a campaign. That kind of criticism flowed out. But here is what he has really done: he illuminated the pain that they went through over and over again. When he came back to Iowa on a "thank you" tour, he had some of the crime victims there. He brought them up on the stage. You can tell by the look in his eye that they moved him.

He has said the thing that moved him the most in the entire campaign were the families who had an illegal kill their daughter, their son, their family member. That moved him the most. He has done honor to that.

He has asked that we bring this legislation to the floor. We have done so. We have passed it out of the House.

And the President, yesterday, met with a dozen or so of these families at the White House. He will continue to push this legislation till it becomes law. And I expect at the bill signing ceremony, these families will be invited back to the White House and they will get a closure on the pain that they are going through this day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1845

## HONORING WILBERT AUSTIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Reverend Wilbert Austin of Waco, Texas, who passed away on June 19, 2017.

Wilbert grew up poor in a small shack in the southern part of Waco in a racially segregated area called Sandtown. His father was a day laborer who picked cotton for a living, while his mother was a laundress and cafe worker. Wilbert used to play by the old rendering plant that was next to the cemetery in Sandtown.

Even in their poverty, Wilbert's parents were able to raise five children. His meager upbringing is something that would shape him for the rest of his life and molded him into a great servant.

During his life, Wilbert worked many jobs, including working for a glass bottle manufacturer, Owens-Illinois, and as a leader of the local chapter of the NAACP. During his time at the NAACP, he was known for advocating for civil rights in Waco. Always seeking to make Waco a better place, he would often make sure that children and families had a safe area to play and enjoy by keeping out drug dealers, occasionally doing so in a face-to-face basis manner.

Wilbert was a passionate advocate for his Christian faith and decided to share his faith in the pulpit. He became a pastor of Moody's Peaceful Rest Baptist Church, where he would serve for 38 years. He was known to his congregation and around Waco as someone with a servant's heart. Wilbert would mow lawns for the elderly and collect gift cards at Christmas to distribute to needy families.

In 1974, Wilbert led an effort to change local city government, and that made him an important part of Waco's history.

In the 1950s, the city had adopted an at-large district after an African-American individual nearly won a city council seat. As a result of his tireless and dedicated efforts, Waco dropped the at-large system and divided its city into five districts, with each district having a single elected representative. His perseverance changed the at-large system because it did not fairly represent the electoral choices of the African-American areas of Waco.

Though he never believed he would run for city council, Wilbert's desire to serve eventually led him to campaign for a seat. Wilbert showed great perseverance as he ran for city council five times, ultimately winning a seat in 2006.

He went on to serve as the councilman for District One for 11 years before having to step down earlier this year due to declining health. Today's Waco is a diverse and inclusive city because of his community service.

Wilbert was also a devoted and loving husband to his late wife of 50 years, Annie Pearl Austin, who passed away from breast cancer in 2012. Annie was supportive of her husband's efforts to help Waco and would often tell her children: "No matter what or why he's out in the public, always love your dad and support him." They were blessed with 5 children, and they were the grandparents to 10 grandchildren.

During the last years of his life, Wilbert fought a battle with cancer that he ultimately lost. Throughout his battle, he never lost sight of where he was going. In a farewell address at his retirement party, Wilbert stated: "I'm all packed up. When you hear of my passing, don't grieve for me. I'm just another soldier going home to be with the Lord."

Mr. Speaker, Wilbert Austin worked tirelessly to better our central Texas community and did so by serving his congregation, his community, reducing crime, and serving in elected office.

He is loved by our community and certainly left an enduring impression on the greater Waco area. He will forever be remembered as a community leader, pastor, civil rights activist, servant, husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Austin family. We also lift up the family and friends of Wilbert in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the United States Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Reverend Wilbert Austin.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

## HONORING GENERAL JOE HANOVER

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor General Joe Hanover of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on May 22, 2017.

Joe was born in McGregor, Texas, on February 10, 1918. He grew up in a farming community and attended grade school in Wheelock before graduating from Franklin High School in 1938.

Wheelock was a special place to Joe because it is where he met the love of his life, Lucille, in the first grade.

During his high school years in Franklin, Joe became interested in engineering, an interest that would guide much of the rest of his life. Upon graduation from high school, Joe went to Texas A&M University in College Station, where he would go on to earn a bachelor of civil engineering degree in

1940. In 1941, he married Lucille and started his engineering career by working for the Texas Highway Department in Hearne.

World War II interrupted Joe's early career and family life, as he was called into Active Duty in 1941. He was commissioned into the U.S. Army 10 months prior to Pearl Harbor and still carried his original orders to report to Camp Wallace, Texas, until the day he passed away.

During his service in World War II, Joe served in the European theater, notably in Belgium and France. He served in the 54th Coastal Artillery, a division that had 3,000 African-American soldiers in it.

At the conclusion of the war, Joe was given command of a German prisoner of war camp in Marseilles, France. In an interview with the local newspaper, Joe was quoted as saying: "I started as a commander of Black soldiers, fighting against the world's greatest racist, Adolph Hitler, and finished as the commander of a prison holding German soldiers who had tried to carry out Hitler's plans."

Joe's enlistment lasted 5 years, and he was given orders to go home in February 1946. He also joined the Army Reserve, from which he retired in 1971 with the rank of brigadier general. When he returned to the United States, he went back to work for the Texas Highway Department, embarking on a career that would last for more than 35 years.

Joe worked on numerous projects throughout the State and is best known in College Station for overseeing the completion of the University Drive overpass. On the 50-year anniversary of the opening of that structure, the City of College Station declared March 21 of each year going forward to be Joe Hanover Day.

Texas A&M played a large role in Joe's life, and he was known for his great love of the university. He regularly attended Fightin' Texas Aggie sporting events, especially baseball and football games. When recounting the best days of his life, Joe would routinely tell you that the day he married Lucille and the day he was baptized were the two greatest days of his life.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Hanover fought in service of our country and worked tirelessly to better the Bryan-College Station area. He is loved by our community and certainly left an enduring impression on the Brazos Valley. He will be forever remembered as a hero, community leader, husband, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Hanover family. We also lift up the family and friends of Joe Hanover in our prayers.

I requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of General Joe Hanover.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country

during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about persecution, worldwide, of people of the Christian faith. We don't hear much about Christian persecution through world media, and I think it is important that Americans understand that persecution of minority religious groups throughout the world continues, and especially continues against Christians.

Each month, Mr. Speaker, 332 Christians are killed, 214 churches are destroyed, and 772 forms of violence are committed against Christians. Once again, every month, 332 Christians are killed, 214 churches are destroyed, and 772 forms of violence are committed against individuals of the Christian faith.

In 2013, Christians faced persecution in 102 out of 190 countries. For the second year in a row, Christians are the most persecuted religious group in the entire world.

In 2016, 90,000 Christians were killed for their faith worldwide. In 2016, roughly 600 million people were prevented from practicing their faith through intimidation, forced conversions, bodily harm, or even death. Many Christians are brutally murdered simply for their belief in Jesus.

Oppression is not limited to Christians worldwide. Religious minorities throughout the world are restricted in their practices or persecuted for their beliefs. Eighty-two countries, worldwide, require people in minority religious groups in that country to register with the government, while 99 countries restrict their practicing of religion.

Here are the top 10 Christian persecution countries in the world.

It is no surprise that North Korea is number one on the hit list that wants to punish and persecute Christians. Little Kim takes delight in torturing people, especially people of religious beliefs, including Christians. Christians are often sent to prison camps for just owning a Bible. Those Bibles are smuggled in through other countries, but generally they come from South Korea.

Approximately 80,000 to 120,000 are imprisoned in labor camps for their religious beliefs. That is 80,000 to 120,000 people are in prison camps, labor camps, because of their religion in little Kim's dictatorship of North Korea.

So, number one is North Korea. I will give you the other nine, Mr. Speaker.

Somalia is number two; number three is Afghanistan; Pakistan is number four; Sudan is number five. Of the 10 worst countries for Christian persecution, number six, no surprise, is Syria. Iraq is number seven; Iran is number eight; Yemen is number nine; and Eritrea is number 10 of the top 10 countries that persecute Christians for simply believing in the Christian faith.

The Pew Research Council says 95 percent of the countries in the Middle East and North Africa have instances of government harassment or use of force against religious groups; 75 percent had instances of government harassment against even Muslims, people that believe differently than the government faith.

In Asia, there has been an uptick in persecution by governments in Islamic extremism. Christians in this region are targeted by national religious movements—the Muslim, the Hindu, and the Buddhist—in countries like Pakistan, India, and Myanmar. Christians around the world routinely face blasphemy laws for simply speaking about their faith.

A country that I haven't mentioned yet is Communist Vietnam. Yes, Mr. Speaker, whether we leave off that phrase Communist Vietnam, they are still a communist country, an atheistic country. New laws led by the government punish anyone who dares to practice their religion or speak out against the authoritarian regime.

New laws are being used to crack down on citizens' basic human right of the right to believe and practice their religion. New rounds of arrests this year are proof.

Human Rights Watch says 110 people are prisoners of conscience or imprisoned in harsh conditions after unfair trials. These prisoners are not criminals, but the government thinks they are criminals because they practice their religion. They are advocates for human rights and social justice. They are pastors and priests. They are in jail for believing in the Almighty. Pastor Nguyen Cong Chinh has been in prison in Vietnam since 2011.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, I might add here that prisons in Vietnam haven't changed much over the years. It is still a Communist country, and when you go to jail in Vietnam, you are in a prison like no other. Those prisons still exist, and they house people because the government puts people of Christian faith in jail.

Pastor Nguyen has been tortured and beaten. He has no contact with his family. They give him food, and they make fun of him because in the food they give him, they break up glass and put the glass in that food.

He is being held in solitary confinement, and all because he took a stand

for Christianity and he told officials—and he told officials from the United States—about his treatment in jail. The security officials not only give him physical torture, they give him mental torture as well.

His wife has also suffered for her faith. Last year, she was beaten and jailed while peacefully campaigning for religious freedom.

You see, Mr. Speaker, when they go out in Vietnam and advocate the human right of religious freedom, the Government of Vietnam persecutes them for that—beats them, tortures them, and puts them in jail. Americans need to be aware of what is taking place in this country and others.

His wife suffered for her faith, but she continued to preach the word even against this evil injustice.

Even to this day, the Vietnamese Communists harass her as well as her husband who is incarcerated.

Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim majority nation. But there are communities of Hindus and Christians and Buddhists. These three groups of religious individuals are persecuted because they are not the faith of the government.

There is an alarming shift in tolerance. Indonesia used to claim and be, to some extent, tolerant of other religious faiths other than the Muslim faith. They were proud of that. But there is a shift in the government to not tolerate religious minorities.

Recently, the governor of Jakarta was sentenced to prison for 2 years for blasphemy against the Muslim faith. His charge is based on statements the governor made about the Koran that were seen as offensive to Islam, therefore offensive to the government, and there he goes, off to jail in Indonesia.

Religious tolerance and free speech is being lost, while in Indonesia hard line Islamic forces are encouraging this persecution.

Pakistan. Pakistan is a country I have talked about frequently on this House floor, but Pakistan churches have been bombed and people have been killed.

In one town, a 14-year-old Christian boy, because he was a Christian, was beaten and set on fire. Persecution of the young. Persecution of the elderly. All because of their religious faith.

In Pakistan, Pakistan not only persecutes Christians, they persecute other Muslims who don't agree with the government position on Islam, including the Murji'ah.

In the Middle East, Egypt has recently come under scrutiny because of the increase in attacks from Islamic extremists who target Christians.

In May, gunmen forced Coptic Christian pilgrims from buses, took them out of the buses, and executed 28 of them because they were Coptic Christians.

Palm Sunday this year, twin bombings on Christian churches in Egypt



killed almost 50 people. A man cloaked in explosives snuck through security and detonated his bomb, killing 28 and wounding 70.

At the same time, another suicide bomber attacked St. Mark's Church in Alexandria, Egypt, killing another 17 people, and injuring scores more.

Over a 3-day period in 2013, Coptic Christians experienced the worst attack against their churches in 700 years in Egypt. Forty churches were destroyed, and more than 100 other sites were severely damaged.

One boy was beaten to death for wearing a cross around his neck. He is walking down the street, he has got a cross around his neck, and, lo and behold, he is attacked, beaten to death because of his religious belief.

Tens of thousands of Coptic Christians have fled the country. Well, no kidding. They are leaving because their lives depend on it.

ISIS has decimated ancient Christian communities in the Middle East as well. We have this issue of governments persecuting Christians or allowing persecution to exist. But alongside this, we have this terrorist group ISIS that it is part of their mission wherever they are in the world to kill people who don't agree with their religion. And, of course, that includes Christians as well.

In Iraq, before there was ISIS, there were approximately 300,000 Christians who lived in Iraq. No one knows how many remain today, but hundreds of thousands have left the country or been killed.

In Mosul, for example, 10 years ago, about 35,000 Christians lived in Mosul—10 years ago. Now there are 20, maybe 30 Christians. They have been killed, tortured, or fled the country.

ISIS' campaign to destroy historic sites and monuments of Christians is now something that the world media is talking about. ISIS destroyed the monastery of St. Elijah outside Mosul. This monastery stood there in Mosul for 1,400 years, and here comes the terrorist group ISIS that tears it down because it is a site where Christians practiced Christianity.

ISIS has been so fervent in their killing of Christians that this House even passed legislation stating that ISIS is committing genocide against Christians. And they are.

So you got ISIS in different parts of the world. One of their goals is to kill religious folks who disagree with them, especially Christians. And to some extent, they have been very successful at that.

When we talk about destroying and eliminating ISIS, we need to remember that we will eliminate their genocide against Christians as well, if we destroy ISIS.

In Iran, Open Doors USA ranked the persecution level of Christians in Iran as extreme. Religious police move

about the city kind of like the Gestapo, and when they suspect Christians are gathering for worship, they raid the homes, arrest the leaders, and destroy Bibles. That is what the religious police, the Gestapo police as I call them, in Iran do.

Iranians who come to study in the United States and become a Christian, they can't go back to Iran. They go back to Iran, Iran puts them in jail, and they suddenly disappear. Converts to Christianity face charges of apostasy and possible death sentences if they ever return. People who become Christians in Iran, who make that choice as a believer, also know that their days are numbered in Iran if the religious police catch them.

In Libya, the Islamic State captured and beheaded 21 people because they were Christians. I don't think that we should be insensitive to this act of beheading folks altogether because of their religious faith. We shouldn't be insensitive because it continues on in Libya as well.

In Libya, where they murdered the 21 people, the victims' families wanted to build a church in their honor. Well, as they were building the church, they were beaten by people who were of the Muslim faith to make sure that that church did not exist. And that is Libya.

In Syria, the head of the Franciscans in the Middle East has reported that of the 4,000 inhabitants of the village of Ghassanieh, no more than 10 people remain in that town, and they have been killed by Assad's thugs and the militant groups like ISIS. Christians have really got it bad in Syria because everybody is after them. You got ISIS that is after them, and then you got Assad the dictator, the brutal dictator, he kills them as well.

Moving on, I want to mention Russia. Russia seems to be something everybody wants to talk about. Why don't we talk about Russia and what they are doing to Christians today.

I went to the Soviet Union back in the 1980s, when it was the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union persecuted people who were religious at all. I mean, if you owned a Bible, you are going to jail. If you tried to worship, you are going to jail. They constantly did that under the Soviet regime of people of any religious faith. Primarily it was Orthodox Christians, and it was also Jews.

The wall came down, and now we have Putin in charge. The world needs to understand that Putin is moving in the direction of persecuting people of religious beliefs just like when he was a member of the KGB under the Soviet Union. Putin. I call him the Napoleon of Siberia. So what are they doing?

Well, they are starting out with laws requiring missionaries to have a permit, and they make house churches illegal. What is a house church? A house church is where two or three are gath-

ered together in a house in the Lord's name and try to worship. You can't do that. That is against the law.

If you are going to worship, you have to get a permit to worship in a structured building, and only certain religious groups get a permit to even practice any religion. That is difficult in itself. So you have to be in a structured building approved by the government, and that particular denomination or religious faith has to have a permit to do so.

If you are in Russia, you cannot practice religion online. You know, that online happens all over the world except if you are in Russia, you are not going to be able to promote any type of religion or you are going to jail. This is the greatest threat to Christianity in Russia since the Soviet days. We haven't heard much about that. We have heard other things, but this is something that we need to be aware of, the persecution of people because of religious faith.

One of my daughters recently went to Russia, and she experienced and saw this very thing that I am talking about. No home church worship services, only structured buildings where you have the Russian police watching what takes place. So they are moving in a direction like they were under the Soviet days of persecuting people who have religious faith.

Putin is taking Khrushchev's—I am older than you are, Mr. Speaker. I remember when Khrushchev was here. He made the comment when he was the dictator of the Soviet Union that Christianity will never exist in the Soviet Union. It cannot. I don't think it can be legislated out, but Khrushchev was determined to make sure that Christianity and other religious faiths did not exist in the Soviet Union. Of course, I believe it will continue whether or not Christians are persecuted anyway.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that people from Texas should get more time because we talk slower, and might even think slower. But, anyway, I appreciate the 12 minutes, and I will use it.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor, and other Members are cosponsors, of a bill that will provide expedited visa protection and processing for Christians and Yazidi refugees from the Middle East. They are targets of genocide in Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, Iran, and Libya, and we hope to expedite visas for those people who are trying to flee religious persecution.

Hopefully, the President of the United States will address the issues of human rights violations in Vietnam. Members of Congress, including myself, have asked the President to address

this when he deals with the country of Vietnam.

And, of course, there is other legislation sponsored by Mr. TRENT FRANKS from Arizona which calls upon the U.S. to use its influence in the United Nations to condemn the ongoing sexual violence against women and children of religious faith.

These young women and girls are being sexually assaulted because of their religious faith or their religious beliefs. A lot of that is being done by ISIS.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of other things.

Watchdog groups report that each month 332 Christians are killed by their faith and 214 churches and Christian properties are destroyed. Of course Christians, like other religious minorities, have been persecuted for years. A little history is in order here, Mr. Speaker.

In this country, we have religious freedom. We are a nation that believes that all people should have religious freedom.

When our Forefathers got together and they declared independence from Great Britain, which we will celebrate next Tuesday, and they got together and they wrote the Constitution, they added 10 Amendments to the Constitution.

The First Amendment of the Constitution is not first by accident. It is first because it is the most important of all rights, and there are five rights in the First Amendment. The first right in the First Amendment is the most important right. Here is what it is, and I will read just a portion of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Religious freedom is the number one right of Americans. It doesn't just say to believe what you want to believe. It says you have the right to practice it, to get out there and practice it, even in public, number one.

Number two, "Congress shall make no law . . . prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress. . . ."

There are five rights in the First Amendment. The first one: religious freedom.

Many, many people came to this new world seeking religious freedom. That is why they came here, primarily Christian religious freedom. They were being persecuted in Europe. They came to the United States and made sure that we do not persecute people of religious faith.

The opposite is true. It is a right. I feel very strongly, as I think most peo-

ple do, that it is the first right, and it is the most important right. And it is a human right. It is not just a right for Americans. It is a right for all people.

People in Syria, Iran, North Korea, Yemen, and all those countries I mentioned, those people—who we don't know who they are—have the right, the human right, of religious freedom. That is a basic right of all people everywhere. I hope that we as a people encourage other people and governments throughout the world: Let folks worship the way they want to worship because it is a human right, and, I believe, that we have gotten it from the Almighty.

And the last thing I would comment on is we need to be careful in this country that we don't end up persecuting by legislation or by the judiciary, infringing upon the First Amendment, the first right, of the free exercise of religion. That is a story for another day, Mr. Speaker.

So, as we get close to the Fourth of July, the Declaration of Independence—our ancestors got together and said they wanted freedom, and they pledged to themselves and to others their sacred honor. Many of them lost everything, the war between us and England, the biggest and most powerful empire that had ever existed. It took over 7 years, but it was worth it.

That is why the Fourth of July is important, because it is a declaration of independence. And it is also, as Thomas Jefferson said in the Declaration of Independence, a statement of human rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments are instituted among men to secure those rights.

Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July, we need to remember our country, remember the people who lived here and gave us this country, and it is our job to make sure we keep it.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### DEVASTATING IMPACTS ILLEGAL MARIJUANA GROW OPERATIONS ARE HAVING ON OUR NATION'S PUBLIC LANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I have a presentation here, but, first, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my friend, who has a very important topic to cover as well. I appreciate his friendship and his strong leadership on the things that really count around here.

#### LIU XIAOBO RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my very good friend from California for his gracious-

ness in yielding me this time and for his wonderful work as a Member of Congress on human rights and pro-life issues. I thank him for that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise and note to my colleagues that the news of Nobel Peace Prize winner Liu Xiaobo's diagnosis of terminal liver cancer was a jarring shock to everyone who admires this champion of freedom and democracy.

Tonight, the House has under consideration an urgent resolution, a truly urgent resolution, H. Con. Res. 67, which I introduced, joined by Ms. PELOSI, and several of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, she and I together, some bipartisanship in a place where we have had little of it lately. But here we are joined, and we are joined very strongly on behalf of Liu Xiaobo and his dire, dire situation, and that of his wife.

The legislation urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife, Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel, and seek medical treatment wherever they desire.

The operative language of the resolution makes it very clear that it recognizes Liu Xiaobo for his decades of peaceful struggle for basic human rights and democracy and, again, urges that he be able to seek medical care, including treatment in the United States or wherever else he would like to receive it.

I want to thank Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY. This resolution was introduced yesterday. The majority leader made sure that this legislation came to the floor just a few hours ago to ensure that we went on the record as a Congress showing our solidarity of Liu Xiaobo and his wife and our deep, deep compassion and concern for the plight that he finds himself in.

I want to thank Speaker RYAN, who also expressed strong concern for Liu Xiaobo, and, of course, NANCY PELOSI and STENY HOYER because this required bipartisan support to bring it up on the UC; and also ED ROYCE, the chairman of the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, the famous gentleman from California, and, of course, the ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, in February of 2010, I led a bipartisan group of lawmakers nominating Liu Xiaobo for the Nobel Peace Prize and, at the same time, nominating two other persecuted Chinese human rights advocates, Chen Guangcheng and Gao Zhisheng, to be joint recipients of this most prestigious award. Others, including the great Vaclav Havel, also pushed for Liu to get this important recognition which we had hoped would help push the human rights agenda in China.

The Nobel Peace Prize Committee agreed and awarded the Nobel Peace Prize to Liu Xiaobo for his "long and

nonviolent struggle for fundamental human rights in China.”

I attended the Oslo ceremony, at the invitation of the family, along with Leader PELOSI. It was a moving ceremony, Mr. Speaker. The now famous empty chair spoke volumes about the Chinese Communist Party's abiding fear that human rights and democracy will undermine its power. There, on the stage, was this chair without the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize.

After that, I held several hearings both in the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations and also on the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, which I co-chair with MARCO RUBIO. And again, we always had a picture of the empty chair where Liu Xiaobo should have been rightly honored and hopefully freed to pursue the righteousness of his human rights work.

He said, in absentia, that day: “Freedom of expression is the foundation of human rights, the source of humanity, and the mother of truth. To strangle freedom of speech is to trample on human rights, stifle humanity, and suppress truth.”

Chinese authorities have gone to great lengths to stifle Liu Xiaobo's ability to speak truth to power. In 2009, he was given an 11-year prison sentence for “inciting subversion of state power.”

His wife, Liu Xia, also was detained in de facto form “house arrest” since 2010. She is in urgent need of medical care, as well, having been hospitalized for a heart condition. Over the past year, authorities have allowed her to visit her husband only on a very few occasions.

According to Chinese authorities, Liu's conviction was based on Charter 08, a treatise signed by over 300 intellectuals and activists. That document states that freedom, equality, and human rights are universal values of humankind, and that democracy and constitutional government are the fundamental framework for protecting these values.

Sadly, Liu Xiaobo and Liu Xia, his wife, are not alone in facing unjust repression. As of September 2017, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, which collects and maintains probably the most effective and comprehensive political database for any country—and this is on China—contains information on at least 1,400 cases of known political or religious prisoners.

According to the annual report, the government of President Xi Jinping has engaged in an extraordinary assault on the rule of law, human rights, ethnic minority groups, and civil society in recent years.

Under Xi's leadership, the Chinese Government has pushed through new laws and drafted legislation that would

legitimize political, religious, and ethnic repression, further curtail civil liberties, and expand censorship of the internet. And the whole issue of the one child, now maybe two child per couple policy, coercion and population control, continues to harm women and children with extreme hurtfulness. It is just beyond the pale of what a government should be doing to its own people.

It is tempting to be pessimistic about China's future and the future of U.S. relations. Frankly, I am not pessimistic, despite the circumstances, because I do believe Liu Xiaobo is the future, and people who have his belief in fundamental human rights.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by just saying I believe that someday China will be free; someday the people of China will be able to enjoy all of their God-given rights, and a nation of free Chinese men and women will honor and celebrate Liu Xiaobo as a hero. He will be honored, along with all of the others like him, who have sacrificed so much for so long for freedom.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SMITH for standing up for that important issue and making that known. So, I thank him, and I appreciate him joining with us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss the devastating impacts that illegal marijuana grow operations are having on our public lands—even private lands, as well.

As pictured here, this is not an uncommon scene in my district in northern California, in many of the Western States, or anywhere where people think they can get away with it, where someone may not be paying attention. We see that very often on our Federal lands because, honestly, regrettably, they are not managed very well and they are not managed very often.

We hope to see that turn around under this new administration, this new leadership, that U.S. Forest Service lands have more attention to them, that they are managed more with timber harvest, thinning, things of that nature, to make the forests healthier.

This certainly does not cause a healthier situation for our forests, as you see pictured here, the amount of damage that can come from that. I will tell you a little bit about it here.

The devastating effects inflicted on the habitat and wildlife due to the non-permitted water diversions, extensive grading of the terrain—which, people in agriculture and construction have to get permits to do grading—and use of illegal toxicants and pesticides purchased outside of the United States—chemicals, products you can't even use here, that haven't been subjected to an EPA label process that ag chemicals and household chemicals have to do—this is what is coming in and being used on our public lands, poisoning them, poisoning the wildlife, and making it very dangerous for any people that might go in there.

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, many threatened and endangered species which we are bending over backwards to try to recover, to try to protect, have tested positive for these poisons and other contaminants used at these illegal grow sites.

□ 1930

Preliminary tests of game animals, including birds and deer, have also tested positive for these illegal pesticides, again, that are banned by the EPA, not allowed to be used in the United States, haven't been subject to the labeling requirements that are legal materials that we use in agriculture and other things that they have gone through.

So it is difficult to understand how the Federal Government can spend extensive resources going after farmers, ranchers, miners, whoever for doing legal operations. In agriculture, it might be disking or plowing. In mining, it might be panning for gold or normal mining operations.

So we have people cultivating their land for food. We have people extracting minerals that are needed for our daily lives, whether it is paving a road, driveway, concrete, whatever it might be. We have people legally doing these actions. They are the ones who have been—at least until recent months with the new administration—harassed with rules that hadn't even been subject to congressional attention.

But at the same time, until recent months, this blatant criminal activity has been allowed to stand.

Is it because law enforcement can't go into those—areas they are not authorized?

I know local law enforcement is really interested in doing this. But it has been a hands-off approach by some of our Federal officials who have either not wanted to put the resources together or haven't had the wherewithal to put enough of the resources together to go out and enforce on these foreign nationals doing these devastating things to our lands and the danger they cause.

What good are these Federal laws and statutes if we do not properly enforce the law to protect our public lands?

We are protecting, on one hand, again, the wrong people by inaction; and we are criminalizing normal activity, people farming, ranching, mining, et cetera. The priorities have been backwards. I hope to see a big change in that with the new direction of the new administration.

As if the environmental effects are not disturbing enough, the safety of the general public is at risk. Heavily armed drug cartels are using our National Forest to engage in large-scale illegal grow operations. You can see the haul on some of the weapons that have been taken from some of the raids that have been successfully done. This is pretty dangerous stuff.

Somewhere in the picture are people who have grenade-launching devices, if I am not mistaken.

So what kind of situation do we have going on where this kind of heavy armament is coming into our forests?

And on the other hand, law-abiding, Second Amendment-loving Americans are subject to confiscation, threatening high cost of ammunition, multitudes of anti-gun rhetoric that, again, makes you ask the questions: Who are we protecting and who are we criminalizing?

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, for example, has been forced to temporarily close refuge units during hunting season to protect the public from stumbling on to an illegal grow that might be guarded heavily by these criminals with these weapons.

In 2012, the DEA's Domestic Cannabis Eradication/Suppression Report indicated more than 10,000 or more illegal firearms seized nationwide in raids. This is the people's property. The public should be able to hunt, fish, camp, recreate with their families on it as they wish, safe from this criminal activity.

Unfortunately, the number of illegal grow sites on Federal lands continues to rise at an alarming rate. Even in States that have legalized marijuana for recreational use, like California—regrettably—and Colorado, they still are doing the illegal grows in lands that are in States that have so far legalized marijuana.

According to the U.S. Forest Service, in 2016, the Pacific Southwest region saw a 52 percent increase in marijuana production on Forest Service lands compared to a previous year.

So maybe the answer hasn't been in legalizing marijuana grows. The activity is still going on. It is still a sought-after market for those people who want to be using it.

While the statistics seem staggering, it is believed that the true number of illegal grows on Federal lands is actually much higher than that 10,000 figure, much higher than what has been documented, much higher than the 52 percent increase that we are talking about.

So with the heavy rainfall that the Western States saw this winter—thankfully, we have gotten the rain—the regions are expecting an even higher surge of illegal marijuana production on the people's public lands.

The law enforcement capabilities of the U.S. Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management are not currently equipped to handle an issue of this high magnitude. These law enforcement officers are doing what they can with the resources allotted and the permission they are allowed by their higher-ups, but we need much more additional means and support to develop a coordinated approach to enforce against these foreign nationals and others that

are doing these illegal grows, despite what the public might be wanting with legalized marijuana in their own grows.

While confronting the challenges of illegal marijuana cultivation in our National Forests is a large undertaking, it is important that we face this head on. Strong enforcement needs to come from the Federal Government that is supposed to be overseeing these lands. So we are talking about scenes like this right here. This is what is allowed to happen.

That is why criminalizing people doing legal activities, such as farming, ranching, mining, what have you, for tiny, very narrow occasional violations, this is what is being fostered out there. Look at this. The trash that is allowed to happen; empty chemical containers; everything else involved in the grow; people camping up there illegally, because the Federal Government, until recently, does not seem to have an interest in enforcing against these illegal grows.

Protecting our public lands from these destructive environmental threats, making sure our National Forests are safe for the public's use, for the habitat, for the wildlife, these are of key importance. This is what the public demands that we do. It is our job to keep the public safe and the lands, as well, in good stewardship. Much more needs to be done.

The Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, they have immediate jurisdiction over these. They need to allow and partner with local law enforcement as well, who knows the lands better than anybody in Washington, D.C., ever would.

And I don't need to remind you once again that marijuana is still classified, Federally, as an illegal drug. So these States—no matter how the voters have been duped, coerced, overwhelmed with dollars at the ballot box and on campaigns, this is still an illegal drug. It is an illegal activity that has been going on.

So I hope what we are hearing from the Department of Justice—they will be looking really hard at whether this is even a legal activity in States that have been legalizing marijuana, and the harmful effects it is going to have on society as this stuff gets more powerful, more potent, and more available to kids.

We have a job to do. It all starts right here: taking care of these lands, the habitat and environment for wildlife that we all care about, the habitat for people, and the water quality.

What is going to come out of here as the water runs downstream through this stuff? What is that going to mean for our streams, rivers, lakes, to the water supplies that the people draw from here, that the animals draw from here?

It is not good. So the Federal Government needs to take a stronger ap-

proach, whether it is DOJ, in concert with the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and that input from local law enforcement in local communities. This could be a very good team operation if we are allowed to do it and we aggressively go after that.

I am seeing the seeds of that in the conversations that are coming out of our agencies here in Washington, D.C. Let's push forward on that and let's hear from the American public on making this happen as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 3, 2017, at 11 a.m.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

KAREN C. HANDEL  
RALPH NORMAN

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1805. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Joseph W. Rixey, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1806. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas J. Trask, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1807. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing nine officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1808. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michelle D. Johnson, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106,

Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1809. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Air Force's proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India, Transmittal No. 17-33, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1810. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Air Force's proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia, Transmittal No. 17-12, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1811. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-106, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1812. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-122, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1813. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-132, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1814. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-138, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1815. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-003, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1816. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-004, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1817. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-007, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1818. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-011, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1819. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-019, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1820. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-023, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1821. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-034, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1822. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-013, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-064, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1824. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal

Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2016 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York and financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1825. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Agency Response for the period of October 1, 2016, to March 31, 2017, in accordance with Sec. 5 of Public Law 94-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1826. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Interior, transmitting notification that the Department issued payments to eligible local governments under the Payments In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1827. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Waterfront Construction [Docket No.: 160830798-7517-02] (RIN: 0648-BG32) received June 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1828. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Court's annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); Public Law 90-351, Sec. 802 (as amended by Public Law 111-174, Sec. 6(3)); (124 Stat. 1217); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3104. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to States to support the establishment and operation of grocery stores in underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3105. A bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3106. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for perfluorinated compounds (including perfluorooctanesulfonic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. REED, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3107. A bill to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3108. A bill to strengthen Federal consumer protection and product traceability with respect to commercially marketed seafood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 3109. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the "Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TROTT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. KIHUEN):

H.R. 3110. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3111. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of dental, vision, and hearing care under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 3112. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an option to claim a delayed retirement credit in a partial lump sum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3113. A bill to require the chief election officials of the States to provide voter registration forms at certain naturalization proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BRAT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 3114. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. EMMER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3115. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving Federal land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Weeks Law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3116. A bill to allow railroad employees to remain on duty as necessary to clear a blockage of vehicular traffic at grade crossings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 3117. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality from considering the social cost of carbon, the social cost of methane, or the social cost of nitrous oxide, in taking any action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3118. A bill to prevent further access of Iran and Hizballah into the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 3119. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to local educational agencies to encourage girls and underrepresented minorities to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3120. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the volume of future electronic health record-related significant hardship requests; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MESSER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MENG, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BERA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 3121. A bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 3122. A bill to protect individuals who are eligible for increased pension under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the basis of need of regular aid and attendance from dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAN-GEVIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 3123. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. REED, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 3124. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently deter-

mined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3125. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Ebenezer D. Bassett, the first African-American diplomat; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to individuals for legal expenses paid with respect to establishing guardianship of a family member with disabilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 3127. A bill to amend section 111 of the Clean Air Act to exclude energy efficiency projects, pollution control projects, and reliability projects from the definition of a modification; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 3128. A bill to amend section 111 of the Clean Air Act to clarify when a physical change in, or change in the method of operation of, a stationary source constitutes a modification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KILMER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3129. A bill to direct the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund to perform an outreach program for the new markets tax credit to underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 3130. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to promote active citizenship, including volunteerism, community dialogue, and service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 3131. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):



H.R. 3132. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to promote accuracy, integrity, and security in the administration of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 3133. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reduce unnecessary permitting delays by clarifying associated procedures to increase economic development and support coastal restoration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 3134. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency to develop a program to provide assistance to creditworthy borrowers with Federal student debt in purchasing certain foreclosed homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 3135. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to make grants to consortia of States and communities to hire individuals to coordinate the Community Rating System program under the National Flood Insurance Program for the States and communities who are members of the consortia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 3136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit fellowship and stipend compensation to be saved in an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3137. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to increase the participation of women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics occupations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 3138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian tribal governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3139. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr.

TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 3140. A bill to establish a National and Community Service Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 3141. A bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 3142. A bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 3143. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to make certain strategic energy infrastructure projects eligible for certain loan guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 3144. A bill to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 3145. A bill to provide the legal framework and income tax treatment necessary for the growth of innovative private financing options, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3146. A bill to direct the United States Trade Representative to initiate negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Turkey to seek to enter into a bilateral



free trade agreement with Turkey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3147. A bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3148. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on duty hours for yardmaster employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3149. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits for the production of renewable chemicals and investments in renewable chemical production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3150. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to helicopter crash resistant fuel systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3151. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HECK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 3152. A bill to require full spending of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, to provide for expanded uses of the Fund, and to prevent cargo diversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide uniform standards for the use of electronic signatures for third-party disclosure authorizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3154. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 3155. A bill to amend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to modify the authorized uses of certain county funds and to extend the deadline for participating counties to initiate projects and obligate funds; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3156. A bill to establish the Water Science Centers within the United States Ge-

ological Survey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 3157. A bill to improve the handling of instances of sexual harassment, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3158. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire, recruit, and train employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the taxable estate by the value of certain family-owned business interests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3160. A bill to transform neighborhoods of extreme poverty by reforming the public housing demolition and disposition rules to require one-for-one replacement and tenant protections, and to provide public housing agencies with additional resources and flexibility to preserve public housing units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 3161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CORREA, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. COSTA):

H.J. Res. 107. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SWALLOWELL of California, Mr. PALONE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. ADAMS):

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the over-

time rule published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Labor on May 23, 2016, would provide millions of workers with greater economic security and was a legally valid exercise of the authority of the Secretary under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 422. A resolution urging adherence to the "one country, two systems" policy as prescribed in the Joint Declaration between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of the Hong Kong; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 423. A resolution condemning in the strongest terms the unprovoked and racially motivated murder of Lt. Richard W. Collins III in College Park, Maryland, on May 20, 2017, expressing concern for the rising tide of racist and hate-based activities being committed on our college campuses, and reaffirming our support for inclusion, diversity, and safety in our higher education institutions in the wake of these attacks; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H. Res. 424. A resolution congratulating the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (in this resolution referred to as "NATCA") on the celebration of its 30th anniversary and recognizing its members' vital contributions to the United States and our National Airspace System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MENG, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 425. A resolution supporting the protection of the name Harlem; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CORREA, Ms. LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 426. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H. Res. 427. A resolution protecting Religious Freedom in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETERS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 428. A resolution expressing support for the designation of "National Eating Disorders Awareness Week" and supporting the goals and ideals to raise awareness and understanding of eating disorders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 429. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need for Congress to have the power to implement and enforce limits on when money can be spent on campaign activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

73. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 67 memorializing the Congress to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Louisiana to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to two hundred nautical miles off the coast of Louisiana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

74. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 136, memorializing the Congress to review federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures to ensure that veterans and their family members have convenient access to military service and medical records; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

75. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 120, memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are nec-

essary to support the domestic beef industry; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Agriculture.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 3105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The General Welfare Clause:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 3108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 8.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

"The Congress shall have Power To . . . establish Post Offices and post Roads . . ."

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 3110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The General Welfare Clause:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 3114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 3117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 3121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that

Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years. Article I, Section 8, Clause 13:

To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 3127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 3128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 3129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 3131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I, Section 8, Clause 18;

U.S. Const., Amend X

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 3133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 3135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 3136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in congress).

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

“All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives”

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

2nd Amendment of the US Constitution

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 9—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2: The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to waterways for the development of hydroelectric power and flood control.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states that “Congress shall have the power . . . [t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations . . .” and that “Congress shall have the power . . . [t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PASCARELL:

H.R. 3149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 3150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 grants Congress the power to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states.”

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 1;

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 3157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. CONST. art. I, §1

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.J. Res. 107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which provides as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one

or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress. . . ."

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 40: Ms. BASS.  
H.R. 113: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. HANABUSA.  
H.R. 173: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 233: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 299: Mr. MCEACHIN.  
H.R. 305: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 367: Mr. ROSS.  
H.R. 422: Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 449: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 489: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 490: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. ROTHFUS.  
H.R. 502: Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 525: Mrs. WALORSKI.  
H.R. 545: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PITTINGER.  
H.R. 619: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 631: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 664: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 721: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 747: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 754: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. MEADOWS.  
H.R. 767: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 778: Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
H.R. 785: Mr. PALMER.  
H.R. 807: Mr. VELA, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 820: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FASO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 825: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 846: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 873: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. REED.  
H.R. 911: Ms. JAYAPAL.  
H.R. 930: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. REED.  
H.R. 959: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 986: Mr. BLUM.  
H.R. 1017: Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 1057: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.  
H.R. 1058: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 1094: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. GABBARD.  
H.R. 1116: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.  
H.R. 1141: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 1143: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 1164: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1173: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
H.R. 1225: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.  
H.R. 1231: Mr. DONOVAN.  
H.R. 1251: Mr. MOULTON.  
H.R. 1261: Mr. POE of Texas.  
H.R. 1264: Mr. HURD and Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 1276: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 1318: Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 1361: Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 1413: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 1421: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HIMES.  
H.R. 1456: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 1472: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 1494: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. NEAL.  
H.R. 1511: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1528: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 1539: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 1550: Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 1554: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 1568: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 1575: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 1661: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 1676: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. CRIST.  
H.R. 1683: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H.R. 1686: Mr. MEEHAN.  
H.R. 1697: Mr. BARLETTA.  
H.R. 1698: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 1699: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 1731: Mr. DENT and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1772: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 1777: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 1810: Mr. REED.  
H.R. 1820: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
H.R. 1881: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 1889: Ms. MENG, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.  
H.R. 1904: Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 1928: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H.R. 1960: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 1963: Mr. MAST.  
H.R. 1987: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 1989: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JONES, and Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 2010: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 2049: Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2061: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ISSA.  
H.R. 2069: Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 2076: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. RICHMOND.  
H.R. 2092: Mr. MARINO and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2142: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 2147: Mrs. WALORSKI.  
H.R. 2150: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HECK, Mr. BACON, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 2152: Mr. PALMER.  
H.R. 2158: Mr. SIRES.  
H.R. 2228: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 2259: Mr. BEYER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. DONOVAN.  
H.R. 2287: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 2309: Mr. DEFazio and Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 2327: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H.R. 2341: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2386: Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 2394: Mr. RENACCI.  
 H.R. 2418: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2422: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 2431: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. FERGUSON.  
 H.R. 2482: Mr. SUOZZI.  
 H.R. 2501: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 2515: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GOHMERT.  
 H.R. 2519: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
 H.R. 2550: Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H.R. 2595: Mr. COFFMAN and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
 H.R. 2603: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 2633: Mr. BACON.  
 H.R. 2646: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
 H.R. 2651: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.  
 H.R. 2670: Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 2687: Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 2695: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 2696: Mr. RASKIN.  
 H.R. 2701: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
 H.R. 2711: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2712: Mr. GARRETT.  
 H.R. 2732: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. DUNN.  
 H.R. 2740: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio and Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 2746: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 2777: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. POSEY.  
 H.R. 2826: Mrs. NOEM.  
 H.R. 2827: Mr. KEATING.  
 H.R. 2838: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 2839: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 2851: Mr. MARINO and Mr. FARENTHOLD.  
 H.R. 2854: Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 2858: Mr. BEYER.  
 H.R. 2862: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Ms. ROSEN.  
 H.R. 2870: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 2871: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.  
 H.R. 2901: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2902: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 2909: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, and Mr. MCCAUL.  
 H.R. 2913: Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 2915: Ms. JAYAPAL.  
 H.R. 2918: Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 2948: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. EMMER, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WILIAMS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 2967: Mr. KHANNA.  
 H.R. 2989: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 2994: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. GIBBS.  
 H.R. 2996: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
 H.R. 2997: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FASO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MAST, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WOODALL.  
 H.R. 2999: Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 3000: Mr. TROTT and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
 H.R. 3030: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. KINZINGER.  
 H.R. 3031: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 3040: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
 H.R. 3059: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 3087: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
 H.R. 3088: Ms. BARRAGAN.  
 H.R. 3097: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. JODY B.

HICE of Georgia, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. STEWART.  
 H.R. 3101: Mr. CORREA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.J. Res. 31: Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.J. Res. 102: Mr. WELCH.  
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BARTON.  
 H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. NUNES.  
 H. Res. 15: Mr. EVANS.  
 H. Res. 28: Mr. EVANS and Mr. JONES.  
 H. Res. 128: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MAST, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. WAGNER.  
 H. Res. 220: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H. Res. 257: Mr. OLSON.  
 H. Res. 259: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. KEATING.  
 H. Res. 271: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H. Res. 274: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H. Res. 279: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee and Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H. Res. 296: Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H. Res. 307: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. GOSAR.  
 H. Res. 317: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
 H. Res. 376: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
 H. Res. 399: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. OLSON.  
 H. Res. 400: Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KATKO, Mr. SANFORD, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HULTGREN.  
 H. Res. 407: Mrs. HARTZLER.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
 H. Res. 353: Mrs. HARTZLER.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING HIS HOLINESS  
GURUDEV RAKESHBHAI  
JHAVERI, SPIRITUAL LEADER OF  
THE SHRIMAD RAJCHANDRA  
MISSION IN DHARAMPUR

## HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, today I honor His Holiness Gurudev Rakeshbhai Jhaveri, spiritual leader of the Shrimad Rajchandra Mission in Dharampur and living embodiment of Jainism—a dynamic religion which exemplifies the highest and noblest values, moral upliftment and spiritual elevation—as he makes a historically important visit to Jain devotees across North America.

The Jain Society of Metropolitan Chicago was founded in 1970 to provide a temple for religious services and a community center for the social, cultural and educational needs of the Jain community in northern Illinois. The Jain Society engages in various activities and endeavors centered around spirituality, character-building, and human welfare.

Born in 1966, His Holiness Gurudev Rakeshbhai Jhaveri realized his calling early in life and since a very early age has dedicated himself to service and to the spiritual practice of Jainism. Over time, his outstanding virtues of austerity, self-control, devotion, humility and service have earned him the affectionate title Pujya. Following in the footsteps of his guru Shrimad Rajchandra, Pujya has pledged to propagate peace and perform acts of service, especially in this time of such unrest in the world.

Every time I visit the Jain Society and witness the beautiful work of its volunteers, I learn more and reaffirm my admiration of Jainism and its values. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support my many friends who follow the path of Jainism throughout the country, especially under the guidance of such an influential leader.

I honor His Holiness Gurudev Rakeshbhai Jhaveri, spiritual leader of the Shrimad Rajchandra Mission in Dharampur, on the occasion of his visit to the Jain Society of Metropolitan Chicago in July of 2017.

LEE RASCH

## HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of Lee Rasch, who is retiring at the end of this month as president of Western Technical College in Wisconsin. There is an old saying, "Think

Globally, Act Locally." No saying better reflects the work of Lee.

For twenty-eight years, Lee has led Western, working in a collective manner with governmental and business leaders in the eleven (11) county, three campus region to expand workforce development opportunities and enhance job skills training to students who were comprised of recent high school graduates to those who were recently unemployed. With a mannerism of respect and understanding, Lee led the college with a style that emphasized listening, learning and collaboration. Under his leadership, Western continued to grow and evolve, working with employers to identify programs and courses that grow the economies of our region and state, while also ensuring that the students have the skills they need to meet the ever-changing demands of the workplace.

Lee's leadership at Western emphasized community engagement. As such, he contributed a significant amount of his time and effort to improve the economic vitality of downtown La Crosse and the greater Coulee Region. La Crosse and western Wisconsin were not the only communities where Lee made an impact. As the La Crosse Tribune wrote in an article in December 2016 when they named him the 2016 Tribune Person of the Year: "He has been instrumental in building the sister city relationship between La Crosse and Kumbo, Cameroon, after a chance encounter with a member of the Tertiary Sisters of St. Francis at Western." His efforts have led to greater educational training and the improvement of nearly a dozen rural schools near Kumbo. Lee's love of education has improved the lives of people at the local and global level.

I congratulate Lee Rasch for his work. I wish him and his wife, Susan Fox, much joy and happiness in a well-deserved retirement. The people, businesses and communities in western Wisconsin, Kumbo, Cameroon, and countless others are better off as a result of your work.

IN MEMORY OF NICKY HAYDEN

## HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my constituent, Nicky Hayden, an international motorcycle racer who tragically passed away following a bicycle accident in Italy last month at the age of thirty-five. Nicky, known around the world as the "Kentucky Kid," was a beloved member of the Owensboro community.

Nicky was riding by age three, and he followed in his older brother's footsteps to begin a career in racing when he was just sixteen years old and attending Owensboro Catholic

High School. He won his first AMA Grand National Championship in 1999. In 2002, he shared a podium with both of his brothers, Tommy and Roger Lee at the Springfield IT race. Eventually he joined the Honda Repsol MotoGP team in 2003 and won the MotoGP world title in 2006. He continued to race in international competitions in the years that followed, and was competing in the Motul Italian Round in May before he passed away.

In his personal life, Nicky was a son, a brother, and a fiancé. And he always considered Owensboro home, traveling back and forth from there to his international races.

Nicky's favorite bible verse was Proverbs 14:23: "All hard work brings a profit, but mere talk only leads to poverty." While the community continues mourning our loss, we can all be grateful that we were lucky enough to have shared this earth with Nicky. I am grateful for his passion for life and his dedication to his family and hometown community of Owensboro. We will miss him.

HONORING MINEOLA WISENER  
FIELD AIRPORT

## HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize 100 years of aviation at Mineola Wisener Field Airport located in Wood County, Texas. On July 4, 1917, a United States Army Signal Corps Curtiss JN-4 "Jenny" aircraft, piloted by Lt. Ralph W. Stone, landed just outside Mineola, Texas. The site was established as "Massingale Meadow" and was used as an emergency landing site for Love Field Airport. The site was published in books in 1920 and 1921 and many early aviators and pioneers frequented the site.

Robert "Henry" Wisener, Jr. was 12 years old when he observed the first landing from his family farm in 1917. When he was 17, Henry was taught to fly by Roy Wilson, a Hollywood stunt pilot who spent time at the field. Henry's love and passion for aircraft grew from there. On June 1, 1926, Henry leased "Massingale Meadow" and named the airport the Royal Field. Here he built the first airplane hangar and offered flight training, aircraft repairs and fuel. He later based the Royal Flying Circus here and together with his brother Bryce, performed aerial acrobatics throughout Texas and the Southwest and Midwest regions of the U.S.

In 1941, Henry purchased "Massingale Meadow" along with a 50 acre tract to lengthen the runway. In 1946, an aircraft maintenance shop, classroom, and flight office were built to provide training under the GI Bill. During that year a decommissioned Department

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of Commerce Airways Beacon Tower and Beacon were disassembled and moved to "Massingale Meadow".

From 1963 to 1983, the city of Mineola leased the airport and it operated as the Mineola Municipal Airport. The airport was renamed Mineola Wisener Field Airport at the expiration of the lease.

Wisener Field and its early founders and operators have been recognized throughout the years on many occasions, including by the Texas Historical Commission. The Texas Aeronautics Commission and the Federal Aviation Administration recognized Mineola Wisener Field Airport as the "second oldest, continuously-used, uncontrolled airport in the state." As Wood County's first airport, Wisener Field has made a long-lasting impact on the economy, as well as aviation enthusiasts.

As the Representative of the 5th Congressional District of Texas, it is an honor to recognize Wisener Field on the 100th Anniversary of its first landing.

#### HOW TRUMPCARE WILL EXACERBATE THE TRANSPORTATION BARRIER

**HON. TERRI A. SEWELL**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, America is a global leader in health care innovation and discovery. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, we've made great progress in making sure more Americans have access to health insurance in recent years. We must recognize that much work remains to ensure all Americans have practical access to health services. Financial and structural barriers continue to exist for countless Americans, particularly those in rural and under resourced communities where distance to a hospital is long and the concentration of health professionals is sparse.

Health care access presents a problem for people in rural areas where distance is a taxing obstacle. People in suburban and urban settings, while they may live closer to a doctor or hospital, can still have trouble with transportation. Often, households share one vehicle between many family members if they own one at all. Low-income neighborhoods are often subject to unreliable public transportation. Birmingham is the only city in my district with a public transportation system but it faces many challenges that the city is trying to rectify. For the disabled, obese, or chronically ill, the lack of reliable transportation options lead to missed appointments and overall lower health outcomes.

Patients miss doctor's appointments simply because they do not have transportation to get there. Without transportation access, patients may wait for a medical emergency just to be able to see a doctor. In rural parts of Alabama, the problem is worse among minorities. Throughout the nation, 55 percent of African American and 60 percent of Hispanic survey respondents reported that transportation was a major barrier to medical treatment, compared to 38 percent of white respondents.

Eligibility requirements vary, but each state has a "non-emergency medical transport" benefit for people with Medicaid. It covers a certain number of rides for medical care per month. Some states contract with local companies to provide rides for citizens who otherwise would have no way to receive regular medical attention. These are just some of the benefits millions of beneficiaries will have no access to if Trumpcare becomes law.

The Affordable Care Act's expansion of Medicaid and reforms to the individual insurance market has helped to lower the uninsured rate for African Americans. Between 2013 and 2016, the uninsured rate for African Americans declined from 18.9 percent to 11.7 percent. However, African Americans still have higher uninsured rates than whites (7.5 percent) and Asian Americans (6.3 percent). Repealing the ACA and cutting Medicaid programs reverses the progress America has made to make healthcare more accessible and affordable in recent years.

One's access to quality health care should not depend on where they live, what their race is, or how much money they have. This country should uphold the values it claims to have and ensure that healthcare is not a preferential benefit, but a human right for every citizen.

IN HONOR OF MR. BILL  
DEBERRY, SR.

**HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Bill DeBerry, Sr., one of the finest businessmen in Denton, Texas. As the founder and owner of a funeral home in Denton, Bill devoted much of his life to assisting others during some of the most difficult times of their own lives.

Bill left school at an early age to help support his family when he began driving an ambulance for a funeral home. The owner of the funeral home at the time noticed Bill's work ethic and encouraged him to finish his education. With both high school and University of North Texas degrees in hand, Bill worked his way through the Dallas Institute of Mortuary Services.

After graduating with his specialized degree, Bill began his mortuary career at Schmitz-Floyd-Hamlett Funeral Home in Denton. After gaining valuable experience in the industry, he opened Bill DeBerry Funeral Directors in 1990. This local business continues to serve the Denton community today under the leadership and dedication of his sons.

I would like to offer my sincere condolences to Mr. DeBerry's family, friends, and colleagues. He will be remembered for his compassion and commitment to excellence throughout his 60 year career, as well as his service to our Denton community.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDUARDO  
AND MARIA VALADAO

**HON. DAVID G. VALADAO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my parents, Eduardo and Maria Valadao, on being nominated the 2017 Kings County Dairy Couple of the Year.

This year, Mr. and Mrs. Valadao are being honored as the 2017 Kings County Dairy Couple of the Year at the Kings County June Dairy Month Committee Dinner in Hanford, California. This award is given to members who are actively involved in industry activities. As parents, grandparents, and lifetime dairy farmers, Eduardo and Maria Valadao exemplify the values, leadership, and commitment this award stands for by improving the image of the dairy industry.

Eduardo F. Valadao was born on October 14, 1943, in Fontinhas, a civil parish on the Terceira Island in the Portuguese Azores. Almost thirteen miles southwest, Maria F. Goncalves was born in Ribeirinha, on February 17, 1953. The couple's relationship bloomed after first meeting at a bull fight in front of Maria's childhood home. Mr. Valadao migrated to Los Angeles County in January of 1969. He immediately took a job milking cows, in hopes of creating a successful life for his future wife and children. After establishing a life in the States, Eduardo traveled back to the Azores and proposed to Maria. Following her fiancé, Maria immigrated to the United States in 1972. The couple married on April 28, 1973, in Artesia, California.

The youngest of eight, Eduardo Valadao was raised on a dairy, and worked close with his father and brothers. He wanted to continue the lifestyle he was raised in, to guarantee his days would be spent with his family, teaching his sons about hard work. After their first son, Eduardo "Eddie" Goncalves Valadao, was born on March 18, 1974, the family partnered with another Portuguese family and purchased their first cows on a dairy in Riverdale. Mr. Valadao worked to grow this dairy until it was large enough to support both families involved. After Mrs. Valadao gave birth to their second son, Miguel "Mike" Goncalves Valadao on August 13, 1975, Mr. Valadao moved his family from Los Angeles County to Riverdale in September of 1975.

As a result of the Valadao household increasing, Mr. Valadao moved on from the partnership and rented a larger dairy facility in Tulare, California, in 1977. The family then welcomed their third son, David Goncalves Valadao, on April 14, 1977. Eduardo continued to farm in Tulare until he was ready to invest in his own dairy. Following the birth of their only daughter, Melinda Goncalves Valadao, on June 16, 1985, Mr. Valadao purchased the family's first dairy facility located in Hanford, California. Eduardo and Maria continued to farm and raise their children on this dairy for twelve years. In 1997, they decided to expand their operation and purchased the land of the current dairy. It wasn't until February of 2000 when the current dairy was in full production.



Today, Eduardo and Maria Valadao remain actively involved in their dairy. Eduardo, continuing the tradition of hard work, can be found at the dairy on a daily basis. This humble dairy couple has successfully raised their sons with the same work ethic, knowledge, and passion for the industry as they each manage their own dairies. The first dairy is still in the family, owned and operated by Eddie Valadao. Due to their lifetime commitment to dairying, and priority to instill those values in their family, Mr. and Mrs. Valadao have become staples in the dairy community.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing my parents for their strong presence in the dairy industry, and congratulating them on being Kings County Dairy Couple of the Year.

CONGRATULATING THE MARYLAND TERRAPINS ON THEIR WOMEN'S AND MEN'S NATIONAL LACROSSE CHAMPIONSHIPS

**HON. STENY H. HOYER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to congratulate the University of Maryland on its double victory last month in the NCAA Division I lacrosse national championships. Both the women's Terrapin and men's Terrapin teams brought the highest prize home to College Park in Maryland's Fifth District, representing the first time that both Maryland lacrosse teams won championships in the same year.

Lacrosse has deep roots in Maryland, an older version having been played across eastern and central North America for centuries by Native American nations. That game inspired European settlers and their descendants in the United States and Canada to implement the modern game of lacrosse, which has become one of our country's most popular sports. Played in youth leagues, high schools, and colleges across America, lacrosse teaches teamwork, sportsmanship, athleticism, strategy, and leadership.

The University of Maryland's lacrosse program has been competitive nationally even long before the NCAA's national championships first began for men in 1971 and for women in 1982. Since the 1930's, the Terrapin men's team won the Wingate Memorial Trophy several times as the victors of the U.S. Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association national championship. For the modern tournament, the Terrapin men won championships in 1973 and 1975 before beginning a forty-two year drought that ended last month with their 9-6 victory over Ohio State in the 2017 championship game, led by Head Coach John Tillman. Coach Tillman took over the Maryland lacrosse program seven years ago and has brought the team to six NCAA Final Four tournaments and five national championships. This year's men's roster included eight All-Americans, who helped make 2017 a year to remember.

For the Terrapin women, winning championships became a tradition, with thirteen national

titles since 1982, including a streak of seven consecutive victories from 1995 to 2001. This year, they beat Boston College 16-13 in a closely contested game held in Massachusetts to secure their fourteenth national championship. Head Coach Cathy Reese, herself an alumna of the University of Maryland, has been leading the Terrapin women since 2007. As a former Terrapin lacrosse star, Coach Reese was a two-time All-American and was named the NCAA tournament's 'Most Valuable Player' in 1998. This year, her Terrapins finished the season with an undefeated, 23-0 record, capped by this latest national title. This is their third championship victory in the last four years. Five of the team's athletes were named All-Americans for 2017.

Both teams were led by standout stars, and for the first time in NCAA lacrosse history both recipients of the prestigious Tewaaraton Award, which honors the top men's and women's players each year, were won by Maryland athletes. For the women's team, midfielder and captain Zoe Stukenberg brought home the award, while for the men attackman Matt Rambo received the honor. Both of them have also been nominated for Espy awards, with the winners to be announced on July 12.

I'm proud that the University of Maryland is a national powerhouse for both athletics and academics, leading the country both on the playing field and in classrooms and laboratories. I join in congratulating our victorious Terrapins and wishing them much success as they prepare for next season and to defend their historic double-victory.

RECOGNIZING ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, June marks Alzheimer's Awareness Month, a time when we especially recognize the patients and caregivers who are fighting Alzheimer's—a terrible disease that impacts 11 percent of South Carolina's seniors.

As a member of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's, I am dedicated to working with my colleagues in Congress to support patients and caregivers and to encourage the advancement of treatment.

I was grateful to support the Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act, legislation that supports families facing Alzheimer's. I was also grateful that the House passed the 21st Century Cures Act—legislation that encourages and supports innovations in research and medical treatments.

I appreciate the service of advocates from the Alzheimer's Association-South Carolina Chapter, especially those who serve the Midlands and Aiken-Barnwell communities: Program Director Sheila Lewis, Program Director Elizabeth Brantley, Director of Development Alexis Watts, and Director of Communications and Advocacy Taylor Wilson.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops, and may we never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

IN HONOR OF DR. ROBERT B. TOULOUSE

**HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and public service of Robert B. Toulouse. Dr. Toulouse, provost emeritus and dean of the Toulouse Graduate School at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas, devoted his life to the education of others.

Robert Toulouse served his country for 25 years. Beginning in World War II, Dr. Toulouse served five years of active duty in the United States Air Force and twenty years in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. In 1978, he retired at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

Dr. Toulouse earned three degrees in education from the University of Missouri, which led him to a robust career in academia. In 1948, Dr. Toulouse began his distinguished career in education as assistant professor in the University of North Texas' College of Education. He made a significant impact on campus through his service as dean of the graduate school from 1954 to 1982. During this time, the graduate school grew to host more than 100 graduate programs, increasing from just a few hundred graduate students to more than 5,000.

After 28 years at the helm of the graduate school, Dr. Toulouse joined the university's leadership team as provost and vice president for academic affairs in 1982. After he retired as provost emeritus, the University of North Texas named the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies in 1990 in honor of his tremendous professional and personal contributions to the institution.

Dr. Toulouse passed away this year at the age of 98, leaving a rich legacy of service to our community. I would like to offer my sincere sympathy to the Toulouse family on their loss. I am grateful for the service Dr. Robert B. Toulouse rendered to this nation and to the university of which I am a proud alumnus.

TRIBUTE TO MR. RICHARD BICE

**HON. ROD BLUM**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Richard Bice of Cedar Rapids, for his services as a local ambassador for the Cedar Rapids Alzheimer's Association. Earlier this year, Mr. Bice was awarded the Alzheimer's Association Advocate of the Year for the Greater Iowa Chapter.

Mr. Bice has dedicated himself to service throughout his life: serving in the United States Army, running a successful insurance business in Cedar Rapids, serving as a state president for Multiple Sclerosis and Muscular Dystrophy associations in Iowa, and forming the Cedar Rapids Metro Optimists Club. Mr. Bice was also a dedicated husband to his late wife, Carolyn Bice, who was diagnosed with

Alzheimer's in 2002. Mr. Bice cared for her at home for over 11 years until her death in 2013.

Although he misses his wife dearly, Mr. Bice has maintained a positive outlook on life and has continued to better the community around him. Mr. Bice is a tremendous advocate for the Alzheimer's Association, where he discusses the journey that he and his wife went through after her Alzheimer's diagnosis. Thanks to the hard work of Richard and countless others we have hope that new opportunities for a cure will be available for future generations. It is clear that Richard lives by the words of his father, "whatever you've been given, if you give back, it'll double."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to recognize Mr. Bice during Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month, and thank him for his outstanding contributions to the Eastern Iowa community, to the State of Iowa, and to our country.

---

RECOGNIZING THE LIBERTY  
STORE FOR OVER 100 YEARS OF  
BUSINESS

**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Liberty Store in Auburn, New York, as this family-owned business celebrates over 100 years serving our community.

For over a century, The Liberty Store has provided a large variety of menswear items to Cayuga County. When the Goldman family first opened the doors of its small business in 1915, it advertised shoes, pants, and socks. Over the years, the Goldman family has grown The Liberty Store into a one-stop shop for individuals and businesses alike, including the Auburn Correctional Facility. This small business has evolved over the past century to meet the needs of its clients and our community—now serving jails, police, and fire departments in 30 states. The Liberty Store has become an integral part of Auburn's landscape and still provides menswear for Central New Yorkers of all ages.

I am proud to recognize The Liberty Store and to congratulate the Goldman family on 102 years in business. This fourth-generation company has become a staple for the Auburn community and I wish The Liberty Store continued success in the years to come.

---

IN MEMORY OF PAUL BERLIN

**HON. KEVIN BRADY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize the life of a local icon: longtime Texas and Houston radio legend, Paul Berlin.

Spanning nearly seven decades, Paul's career in radio began after he won a local "So You Want to be an Announcer" contest at the young age of 17. Although a native of Mem-

phis, Tennessee, Paul moved to Houston when he was 19, where he officially began his radio career as a local disc jockey at KNUZ Radio.

Paul's warm personality, jovial manner, and unique radio persona attracted fans from all genres of music, but his love of music went far beyond his radio appearances. As the owner of a string of nightclubs, Paul promoted concerts and dances hosted by legends such as Chuck Berry, Jerry Lee Lewis, and Nat King Cole, across the Houston area.

His passion for music eventually carried him overseas, where Paul toured U.S. military bases across Europe and brought the sounds of home to thousands of our young service members.

Over the years, Paul worked with music legends such as Elvis Presley, Johnny Cash, Ray Charles, Mary Tyler Moore, and Sonny & Cher. However, he never stopped playing the music of local Houston singers, and he is credited with starting many songwriters' careers.

Before he retired in 2004, Paul went on to DJ at three other Houston stations. Six years after retiring, his love for music pulled him back into the radio business, and he returned to host a Saturday evening special at KSEV.

In 1998, Paul was inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, and in 2002, he was inducted into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame. Paul's storied career earned him many honors, such as the American Women in Radio & TV Media's Radio Personality of the Year and Marconi Award Nominee for Major Market Personality of the Year.

Paul was preceded in death by his precious wife of over sixty years, Nezzie. He is survived by five sons, Brad and his wife Patti, Glenn and his wife Sue, Bruce and his wife Dana, Craig and his wife Jamie, and Donald; nine grandchildren, Evan, Elise, Ross and his wife Melissa, Valerie, Denise and her husband Josh, Austin and his wife Cam, Paul, Carson, and Courtney; three great grandchildren, Samantha, Paige, and Tate; and many nieces and nephews.

Paul's formula for happiness, "someone to love, something to do, and something to look forward to," rings true today, and his love of music and dedication to his community made Houston a far happier place. On June 23, 2017, Paul passed away at the age of 86, and he will be sorely missed.

---

IN RECOGNITION OF KELBY  
THORNTON'S BACK TO BACK  
WINS AT THE NATIONAL  
SKILLSUSA MASONRY CHAM-  
PIONSHIP

**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kelby Thornton on his back to back championships at the 2016 and 2017 Annual National SkillsUSA Masonry Contest in Louisville, Kentucky.

A senior at Central Cabarrus High School, Kelby and Coach Todd Hartsell, the masonry

teacher at Central Cabarrus, returned to Louisville this year to defend Kelby's title. SkillsUSA is a national organization represented by students, teachers and industry professionals who want to provide educational opportunities. The masonry competition pits high school students from all over the country against each other as they test their practiced trade. North Carolina currently holds more National Masonry Championships than all other states combined, thanks to strong competitors like Kelby representing our great state.

This year's event brought a host of talent and I am extremely proud of Kelby for his hard work. I am also thankful for the teachers, coaches and volunteers who made the event possible. I look forward to many more years of successful competition and wish Kelby the best of luck as he continues pursuing his dreams.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in recognizing Kelby Thornton for his second consecutive National Masonry Championship.

---

CELEBRATING INDIA'S  
FRIENDSHIP

**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over more than 70 years we have developed a strong strategic partnership with India. We have a lot in common when it comes to national security and counterterrorism.

But our partnership doesn't end there. Our trade relations have grown increasingly stronger over the years. In 2016, our trade with India totaled nearly \$115 billion, making India our largest goods trading partner.

Over the past year, we've also been exporting more and more LNG to India. 65 percent of Indians are under 35 and the U.S. has more natural gas than we can use. Trade in energy with India just makes sense. It helps both of us and deepens our bilateral ties.

Earlier this month, Secretary Perry approved an LNG export application that will send 1.8 billion cubic feet per day to India: Mr. Speaker, the world's largest democracy and the oldest democracy are natural partners.

Our shared values and interests ensure that our strategic partnership of over 70 years will endure.

And that's just the way it is.

---

HONORING MARILYN HOPKINS

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Marilyn Hopkins upon her retirement as Provost and Chief Operating Officer (COO) of Touro University, California. She is retiring after more than 35 years of administrative and teaching experience in higher education. Dr. Hopkins has been an active member of the academic and medical communities during her successful career.

Dr. Hopkins earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing at California State University, Sacramento in 1970. She went on to earn her Master's and Doctoral degrees in Nursing at the University of California, San Francisco.

Prior to her appointment as Provost and Chief Operating Officer in 2009, Dr. Hopkins worked as a registered nurse for nearly 20 years at three different hospitals in California. She was employed as a full professor with tenure at California State University, Sacramento from 1974 to 1997, teaching graduate and undergraduate courses on diverse medical subjects. Dr. Hopkins then served as the Dean for the College of Health and Human Services at California State University, Sacramento.

Touro University, California offers accredited graduate programs in several medical fields, and is located in Vallejo, California. As Provost and COO, Dr. Hopkins provided leadership in institutional assessment and comprehensive strategic planning. She created a pre-hospital infrastructure to support research, grant-writing and publication opportunities for faculty and students and worked closely with the academic deans to recruit and retain a talented and diverse faculty. Since moving to Solano County, Dr. Hopkins has been actively engaged in local and regional community initiatives. She serves on the Board for the Vallejo Education Business Alliance and was recognized by the Solano County Library Foundation during Women's History Month for her contributions to women and the community.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Marilyn Hopkins has led a long career in both nursing and academia. She is an active member of our community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement.

#### THE LEGACY OF RON HOWARD

#### HON. TED BUDD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, Ron Howard, of Canton, North Carolina, has passed away. After 31 years of military service, this city, Washington, D.C., was his last battlefield. The jungles of Vietnam were his first. I regret deeply that his final hours were spent preparing for battle against the bureaucracy of the country to which he had given so much.

Any man who has seen combat and death knows how precious life is. A normal man who serves his country for 31 years takes the rest and ease that he has more than earned. Ron was an extraordinary man, and he used the remainder of his time to build his company, his community, and his country. He gave his time, and he knew its price, but it was a price he paid gladly. We are all the better for it.

His legacy lies in his beautiful family, his company, and in the magnificent airplane that he brought into existence. When a Hellfire missile leaves one of the rails on the Archangel and its rocket motor comes to life, hammering down pain and misery on ISIS terrorists, that too is Ron's legacy. His was a truly

great American life, and an inspiration to those who knew him. He will not be forgotten, not by me, not by anyone who knew him

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN MILLS CARTER, SR.

#### HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. John Mills Carter, Sr., a beloved member of the Fort Worth community who passed away on June 23, 2017.

Mr. Carter was born in 1936 in Shreveport, Louisiana. A graduate of Booker T. Washington High School and Spauldings Business College, Mr. Carter distinguished himself in the food service industry throughout his celebrated career. As a child, he would help his father service the commissary at the plantation where he worked. This established his passion for food service. After college, Mr. Carter opened a small nightclub and cafe in Louisiana before moving to Texas in 1961 in search of better opportunities for him and his family.

After moving to Texas, Mr. Carter managed several restaurants in the Dallas-Fort Worth area before opening his own restaurant in Fort Worth in 1992. His restaurant, "John Carter's Place Restaurant" served award winning home style soul food and was known for its quality service. Mr. Carter was especially proud of the restaurant's People's Choice Award and its being named "Best of Tarrant [County]" for several years. Before passing it down to his family as his health declined, Mr. Carter also established and grew catering operations for the restaurant.

Along with his successes in the restaurant business, Mr. Carter was also very involved in his community. Throughout his life, he was committed to supporting local charities, schools, and religious organizations as well as helping new restaurateurs get started. Mr. Carter was recognized as a KKDA Coca-Cola African-American Hero, Quest for Success Honoree, Dr. Marion J. Brooks "Living Legend", East Fort Worth Business Association Award Winner, Phi Beta Sigma Business Award recipient, and Tarrant County Youth Advocacy Award recipient, along with many other accolades and recognitions.

As a faithful member of the Greater Mt. Tabor Christian Center for more than 45 years, Mr. Carter served as a Deacon, a member of the Executive Leadership Council, a Sunday school teacher, a choir member, and a Food Service Ministry volunteer.

Mr. Carter was married to his wife, Louella, for 55 years until her passing on Christmas Day of last year. He is survived by his three children, Robert, Denise, and John Jr., along with several grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

I honor Mr. John Mills Carter, Sr.'s positive impact on the Fort Worth community.

#### HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF PHIL WALTON

#### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Phil Walton, who is retiring from public service after a remarkable 42 year career with the Social Security Administration. Mr. Walton exemplifies the sterling qualities of a public servant who upholds the highest standards of federal service: one of a loyal and enlightened corps of highly trained, honorable civil servants. The administrative capabilities of individuals like Mr. Walton hold this Republic together.

Phil Walton began his career with the Social Security Administration in Rock Island, Illinois, where he started as a claims representative. He soon began rising through the ranks as a field representative, operations supervisor, operations officer, area administrative assistant, executive assistant and district manager. He was first named District Manager in Chillicothe, Ohio, moving to Toledo, Ohio in 1993 where he has ably guided the Toledo agency since.

In addition to his leadership of the Toledo Social Security Office, Phil has been an active community leader since his arrival to the Toledo area. He served as a Cubmaster, Den Leader and Area Commissioner for the Boy Scouts of America. He has been a member of the Friends of Wood County CASA, currently serving as Board Chair. He has also served on the Advisory Board of the Toledo Legal Aid Society.

As a member of the National Council of Social Security Management Associations, Phil was awarded the Public Service Award in 2009 "in recognition of his years of volunteer work." Erin Thompson, public affairs specialist for the Toledo Social Security Office, stated, "We would like to take the time to thank Phil Walton for his 42 years of service with Social Security, where he started as a Claims Representative in 1975 in Rock Island, Illinois and completes his career as a District Manager of Toledo downtown, where he has been since 1993. In addition to leading the Toledo office, he has been on numerous boards, most notable as the Chairperson for the Area Office on Aging 2009 to the present. In addition to his service for seniors, he has also served as Board President for the Friends of Wood County CASA from 2007 to present."

Phil has given of his time and talents to the Area Office on Aging of Northwest Ohio Board of Directors, serving in various capacities since 1993 and as Board President since 2009. Billie Johnson, President and CEO of the agency, notes "Phil Walton has been a dedicated Board member of the Area Office on Aging of Northwest Ohio, Inc. for more than twenty years. His leadership, compassion and wisdom helped the agency grow and develop many vital services for older adults, caregivers and disabled persons living in northwest Ohio. Phil helped the agency navigate through several monumental funding challenges. He has given his time, personal resources and energy to so many people and

various communities in northwest Ohio. We are extremely grateful for his commitment, dedication and leadership. Phil is the current Board Chairman for the Area Office on Aging."

American labor leader Walter Reuther said, "There is no greater calling than to serve your fellow men. There is no greater contribution than to help the weak. There is no greater satisfaction than to have done it well." Phil Walton's life and career have been given over to serving his fellow citizens, to helping the weakest among us—those who are elderly, those who are disabled, children. He has done it very well. His legacy is in the lives which were made better for his efforts, in those with whom he worked to ensure a top-notch federal government agency and services, in the organizations which have benefitted from his investment and leadership, and a community richer for his contributions. On this day as Phil turns the page from career to retirement, we offer a most heartfelt "thank you" for his extraordinary commitment to our nation and its people. As he ends his public life and looks toward retirement, he has fulfilled Mohammad Ali's call that "Service to others is the payment you make for your space here on earth."

#### THE BENTON WAVE

#### HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recent selfless actions of two extraordinary individuals in my district: Mr. Robin Creel and Mr. Danny Revis.

Both men work tirelessly for the Benton school district transportation program.

Last month, about 40 students from Shelby County in Memphis piled onto a bus and began their journey toward the popular Magic Springs amusement park in Hot Springs, Arkansas.

Unfortunately, as they traveled down I-30, their bus broke down.

Through the Arkansas State Police, word got to Mr. Revis that an entire busload of children was stranded.

After discussion with officials of the Tennessee school district from which the students hailed, Mr. Creel volunteered to use a Benton school bus to quickly transport the Memphis students to Magic Springs, where, after a full day of enjoyment, a Shelby County bus would pick them up.

Along with its well-known Benton Wave, a gesture of genuine friendliness noticeable throughout the city, Mr. Revis and Mr. Creel's commendable actions contribute to Benton's long-standing aura of friendship and compassion.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF PONY BIRD

#### HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, children and adults who are mentally and phys-

ically disabled have a great friend in an organization called Pony Bird, Incorporated located in Jefferson County, Missouri.

Named after a children's book about a young boy and his magical flying pony, Pony Bird is celebrating its 40th anniversary. It began in 1977 in one home devoted to caring for 10 severely disabled children. Today, Pony Bird provides 24-hour care in six residential homes for up to 60 individuals unable to walk or meet their daily living needs.

The facilities in Mapaville and De Soto allow residents to receive a maximum level of personalized care. They lead happy lives through socialization, participation, work and the opportunity to volunteer as members of their community.

Pony Bird has been recognized many times by the State of Missouri Department of Mental Health for its outstanding level of care. It is my great privilege to celebrate their 40 years of caring for our most vulnerable citizens today before the United States House of Representatives.

#### HONORING LET MON LEE ON HIS DISTINGUISHED CAREER

#### HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Mr. Let Mon Lee, upon his retirement from his position as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works and over three decades of public service.

Mr. Lee assumed his most recent position in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 2009. In his role as Deputy Assistant Secretary, Mr. Lee has been responsible for the executive direction of Army Civil Works projects involving flood risk management, storm damage prevention, navigation, and environmental restoration. Prior to this, Mr. Lee served at the Army Corps Headquarters for almost 20 years. His work with Army Corps were separated by a five-year stretch on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Lee on our shared efforts to improve the level of flood protection for Sacramento, in my district. Sacramento is defined by its two great rivers, the American and the Sacramento, which makes it the most at-risk major American city for flooding. Mr. Lee has been a great champion for Sacramento's flood control projects, and together we have been able to better protect the lives and livelihoods of my constituents.

Mr. Lee has been wonderful to work with on both a professional and personal level. I wish him many years of happiness in retirement with his wife and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Lee for his service.

#### 12 CARRIER ACT

#### HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that my bill, the 12 Carrier Act, was included in last night's NDAA markup. This legislation will play a critical role in rebuilding our nation's military.

With ongoing perils around the world, including increasing violence by ISIS and persistent threats by North Korea, it is vital to our nation's security that our Navy is fully equipped with the resources and capabilities to respond to these threats. By including my bill in the Committee's mark, we will be increasing the statutory limit for carriers from eleven to twelve. In doing so, this measure will empower the Navy with the tools they desperately need to meet Combatant Commander requirements, deter conflict, prolong the lives of our fleet, and send a message to potential adversaries that we will not allow our decisive advantage in worldwide maritime force projection to erode.

Since the end of the Cold War, aircraft carrier requirements have increased while the aircraft carrier force structure has declined. The Navy has stated that the current forces cannot support global requirements. For years, this strain has caused our fleet to operate at maximum capacity, limiting aircraft carrier at-sea training, increasing deployment lengths and decreased time available for maintenance. To express the shortcomings of our carrier fleet, Navy Rear Admiral Thomas Moore has stated "We're an 11-carrier Navy in a 15-carrier world". President Trump also recently stressed the necessity of adding a twelfth carrier to our fleet.

Maintaining the required operational tempo with 12 carriers relieves significant stress both in terms of manpower, as well as keeping the proper maintenance cycles of the carriers themselves. When the carrier fleet is at full strength of 12, regional combatant commanders will be able to rely on the imposing presence of U.S. forces and will be able to respond to threats in a more expedited manner.

I am encouraged that my fellow members of the Armed Services Committee agree with my concerns about the shrinking size and capabilities of the United States Navy, and acted in a bipartisan fashion to include my "12 Carrier Act" into the markup. I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Subcommittee Chairman WITTMAN for their support on this measure, and I look forward to seeing this measure passed by the House as part of the FY18 National Defense Authorization Act.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF DAWN WRIGHT

#### HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dawn Wright on the occasion of

her retirement from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) after 36 years of honorable service.

Born to Robert and Nancy Warren, Dawn is the oldest of four children. Robert, a Marine officer for much of his life, served in multiple locations across the U.S. This gave Dawn and her siblings the opportunity to grow up in California, Virginia, North Carolina, and Hawaii.

Growing up in a military family, Dawn joined the United States Navy in July 1974 with the goal of becoming an air traffic controller. She quickly became a ground-controlled approach (GCA) controller at Naval Air Station Kingsville before transferring to Rota, Spain where she gained experience working in a control tower alongside Spanish controllers.

After leaving the Navy in 1979, Dawn was hired to work for the FAA in August 1981. Her first assignment was Bridgeport Tower in Stratford, Connecticut where she became a full-fledged air traffic controller for the FAA. There, she received a number of 'on the spot' awards and recognition for her outstanding work.

In 1986, Dawn moved to Massachusetts and worked at both Cape Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) and Hyannis Air Traffic Control (ATCT), quickly climbing the ranks to a supervisory role by 1991. In 1994 Dawn decided to become an automations specialist where she learned computer programming, software, networking and operating systems. It was during this time that she received recognition for building a computer for Cape TRACON out of scrapped, non-working computers. She has since become a staff specialist and her responsibilities have included air traffic controller testing on Nantucket, teaching the Automated Radar Terminal Systems (ARTS) course to new air traffic controllers, ensuring quality assurance at the facility, and evaluations for multiple facilities including Boston ATCT and Providence ATCT.

Outside of work, Dawn is an accomplished rower, having been part of a crew team from 2001 to 2012 as a Masters rower. In her spare time she is an avid amateur ballroom dancer, rides motorcycles and pursues recording her family's genealogy. While her childhood was not spent in Massachusetts, she has since learned that she has historic ties to the Commonwealth. She is a descendent of Thomas Mayhew, the first governor of Martha's Vineyard, and John Swain, one of the original proprietors of Nantucket Island.

Dawn will be celebrating her retirement on June 30th and will be dearly missed by all at Cape TRACON. With her retirement she plans to spend more time with her family, including her boyfriend, her parents, and her son Brian and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Dawn Wright for her many years of steadfast service to public safety, the aviation industry, and our country. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her a happy retirement and many more years of health and happiness.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I missed one vote on June 28, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 332.

#### CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF TACO PALENQUE

### HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 30th Anniversary of Taco Palenque.

Taco Palenque opened on July 1st, 1987, with the purpose of serving delicious and authentic Mexican cuisine. Over its thirty years of existence, it has served some of the best food in all of South Texas. Founded by Mr. Juan Francisco "Pancho" Ochoa in Laredo, TX, Taco Palenque has seen much success. With over 1,500 employees and 21 locations across Texas, including in San Antonio, Laredo, McAllen, and Mission, Taco Palenque has shown to be a top-quality restaurant chain.

Offering everything from traditional tacos to homemade menudo, Taco Palenque never fails to provide excellent cuisine to Texans. The hard work and effort that is shown through Taco Palenque's cuisine speaks to the dedication of Mr. Ochoa, who always made sure to never serve any food that he does not personally like. This mindset has brought him many honors including The Chamber of Commerce's Laredo Businessman of the Year award. He has also been honored by the Texas legislature for his work and contributions to the restaurant industry.

His restaurants have also been recognized for their outstanding customer service which came through Mr. Ochoa's dedication to customer satisfaction. For Mr. Ochoa, no task is too small to preserve the famous taste of his restaurants. Regardless of the cost, customer satisfaction takes priority. This is one of the many reasons for Taco Palenque's ongoing success.

Taco Palenque is not just a thriving business but a family owned operation. From the outset, this organization would not have been possible without the help and expertise of Pancho's family members. Mr. Ochoa's wife, Florida, was instrumental in helping to create some of Taco Palenque's most famous recipes. She worked tirelessly with Mr. Ochoa to perfect everything that is served. As the business expanded, his children took on several important roles in the business, including General Director of the company and manager of several different restaurants.

I would also like to note that Taco Palenque has supporters here in our nation's Capital. Over the last several years, my office has hosted "Laredo Day", a widely attended and bi-partisan reception that features the culture

and cuisine of Laredo, TX. At this event we serve Taco Palenque which is often noted by our guests to be some of the best food that they have ever had. These guests include members of Congress, ambassadors, and cabinet officials. The food is so popular my office oftentimes has to limit the number of guests to the reception.

Taco Palenque does not limit itself to merely serving good food. Throughout Taco Palenque's existence, the restaurant has partnered with advocates and organizations that promote the well-being of the local community. As a sponsor of multiple youth sports teams and organizations, such as Mercy Ministries of Laredo, the Boys and Girls Club of Laredo, and the American Cancer Society Relay for Life, community is clearly important to this establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of Taco Palenque, my dear friend Pancho Ochoa, and all his staff.

#### HONORING JUDGE EDWARD PHILMAN

### HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Hearing Officer and Former Gilchrist County Court Judge Edward Philman, who passed away on May 17th.

Judge Philman was a pillar of the community and served the citizens of Gilchrist County as their County Court Judge for 24 years before his retirement in 2012. He then went on to work as a Senior Judge and as a Civil Traffic Hearing Officer for the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Florida.

His achievements were many during his lifetime. He served his country in the U.S. Army infantry and was a combat veteran in Vietnam. He was named the Gilchrist County Citizen of the Year in 1989. Judge Philman was an involved member of the Trenton Rotary Club and served as district governor from 2012 to 2013.

Judge Philman also instituted the Fifth-Grade Mock Trials in Gilchrist County. Since it began, the Mock Trials have taught hundreds of local students how the judicial system actually works.

Judge Philman earned his Juris Doctor from Mercer University in 1981 with honors and his Bachelor of Arts from the University of Florida in 1978. He also attended Lake City Community College and Lake City Forest Ranger School, after graduating Bell High School.

He has been quoted saying, "Let my life and the work I have done speak for me."

Mr. Speaker, Judge Philman's life and work have truly spoken to the character of the extraordinary man we lost last month. Please join me in honoring a man who dedicated his life to the letter of the law, the late Judge Edward Philman.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE  
COST ESTIMATE**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with House Report 115–193, I include in the RECORD the following Congressional Budget Cost Estimate for H.R. 1684.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1684, the Disaster Assistance Support for Communities and Homeowners Act of 2017.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Robert Reese.

Sincerely,

MARK P. HADLEY  
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 1684—DISASTER ASSISTANCE SUPPORT  
FOR COMMUNITIES AND HOMEOWNERS ACT OF  
2017

As passed by the House of Representatives  
on June 26, 2017

H.R. 1684 would require the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to provide technical assistance to community, homeowner, and similar associations. FEMA would be required to help such associations take actions after a disaster that would make them eligible to receive reimbursement from entities that receive FEMA grants. This legislation also would require FEMA to submit a report to the Congress on expanding the areas of condominiums and housing cooperatives that are eligible for federal disaster relief.

Based on information provided by FEMA, about the cost to collect information necessary to complete the report, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1684 would cost \$1 million in 2018; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting H.R. 1684 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1684 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 1684 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Meghan Shewsbury and Robert Reese. The estimate was approved by Theresa Gullo, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FOOD  
DESERTS ACT**HON. ANDRÉ CARSON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in June of 2017, Marsh Supermarkets grocery stores announced the closure of many stores throughout the Midwest. Many of these stores were located in my district where already many families lack a car or reliable public transportation to get to the nearest alternative, often located over a mile away. Today, thousands of my constituents are struggling to find the food they need, with many forced to rely on fast food restaurants and convenience stores. These options are neither healthy nor affordable.

Sadly, this situation is not unique. Over 29 million people, almost 10 percent of the U.S. population, live without ready access to affordable, nutritious food and over 2 million people have no transportation to get to their nearest store. Many have seen their local stores close their doors during the recent economic downturn. Others lost access years ago and are now facing the serious long-term impacts of obesity, diabetes, malnutrition and other diet related ailments. Unfortunately, residents in these low-income areas tend to spend less on groceries, leaving little financial incentive for traditional grocery chains to make costly investments for new locations.

In the wealthiest country on Earth, nutritious food should be an expectation, not a luxury. That is why I am introducing the Food Deserts Act, which creates new avenues to fund stores in underserved communities. This bill will create USDA funded, state operated revolving funds that will issue low interest loans for the operation of grocery stores in food deserts. The bill ensures that recipients of these loans, including for-profit, non-profit and municipal entities, will provide affordable, healthy food, including fresh produce and staples like milk, bread and meat. It will also ensure that USDA professionals are available to provide technical assistance to recipients who need it.

Access to healthy food is something that most of us take for granted. But despite our own experiences, we need to remember that millions of our constituents are struggling every day to feed their families. With this market driven approach, I hope to complement existing federal programs and efforts around the country by ensuring a stable lending stream for struggling grocery stores and sustainable access to food for communities in need.

RECOGNIZING CANADA'S SESQUI-  
CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF  
CONFEDERATION**HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of United States' closest allies and neighbor, the nation of Canada, on its sesquicentennial anniversary of confederation.

Minnesota shares a special bond with our neighbor to the north through many deep cultural, economic, and environmental ties. As Minnesota's largest trading partner, Canada helps generate \$20 billion of economic activity, a clear indicator of its importance to our state. However, perhaps even more meaningful are connections we share to our precious cultural and natural heritage. The Great Lakes and the pristine natural beauty of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness not only form Minnesota's northern border with Canada, but they also help define our collective identities, drawing visitors from both near and abroad who come to explore and marvel over the world's largest reserve of fresh water, and accessible and beautiful wilderness. It is because of the natural wonders that we both share, that Minnesota and Canada also share a commitment to action in addressing climate change and protecting our natural resources for future generations.

Minnesotans and Canadians are also deeply connected on a cultural level. Long before Europeans arrived, Indigenous Americans and First Nations created thriving communities and lived off of the abundance of the vast forests, plains, lakes and rivers. Europeans who later settled these lands chose names derived from indigenous languages. Minnesota came from two Dakota words; Mni meaning "water" and Sota meaning "sky-tinted," while Canada is derived from the Iroquois-Huron word Kanata meaning "village" or "settlement." Later on, threads of early French influence were interwoven into each of our historical tapestries. This can easily be seen in the names of streets in the Twin Cities of Saint Paul and Minneapolis, and in our state motto "L'Etoile du Nord", "The Star of the North". Minnesota and Canada share so much culturally, that Canadians will often jokingly refer to Minnesota as the 11th province.

Minnesotans and Canadians continue to share a strong affinity to the land and outdoors pursuits, including, hiking, boating, hunting and fishing. Perhaps nothing defines our bond more clearly today than a love of hockey. Minnesota is proudly known as "the State of Hockey" and Canadians of all stripes similarly display unparalleled energy and passion for the sport.

As we join the nation of Canada in celebrating 150 years since its confederation, let us remember the unwavering friendship and security alliance between not only our two countries, but also between the people of Canada and Minnesota. Rarely is it that two peoples, separated by national borders, hold the other in such high esteem as the people of Minnesota and Canada do for one another. As Canada embarks on another 150 years, let us continue to foster a relationship that is truly unique amongst the nations of the world. On behalf of the residents of Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District, it is my honor to wish Canada a happy 150th birthday.

## TRIBUTE TO ROBERT P. EVERLY

**HON. KEN CALVERT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contribution to our national security has been exceptional. After eight years of active duty service in the U.S. Navy and decades of work dedicated to the development and assessment of U.S. Navy weapons delivery platforms as a civilian, Robert "Bob" Everly is retiring on June 30, 2017.

Between his active duty service and civilian work directly supporting the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Corona Division, Mr. Everly spent nearly fifty years supporting the U.S. Navy. That civilian employment includes thirty-three years managing projects and programs supporting weapons and combat systems performance assessment, Fleet exercise assessments, metrology systems engineering, RM&A assessment, range systems engineering, telecommunications engineering, information systems engineering, software development, Information Assurance/Accreditation, and classified network operations.

Mr. Everly has also dedicated a tremendous amount of time as an essential member of various community-based organizations. That includes his service as an Executive Board Member and Co-Chair of the Science and Technology Education Program (STEP). As the Honorary Chairman of STEP, I have been incredibly fortunate to work closely with Mr. Everly to develop a successful program that sparks students interest in math, science and engineering. Mr. Everly also served as Chairman of the Board, President and Vice-President of the Measurement Science Conference, as a member of the Corona and Riverside Chambers of Commerce, and participated as a member of state and local Naval Surface Warfare Center Corona Retention Committees during the Base Realignment and Closer (BRAC) process.

Mr. Everly has contributed immensely to the betterment of our region and military and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and my friend. To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Everly for his service to our country and the Inland Empire—his dedication, insight and passion will be greatly missed.

IN HONOR OF JAMES MARTIN  
KIDWELL

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Leesburg Virginia's longest serving Police Chief, James Martin Kidwell, who passed away on June 19, 2017, at the age of seventy-seven. A lifelong resident of Leesburg, Chief Kidwell was renowned for his public service and longstanding community involvement, as he dedicated his career to pro-

tecting the people of his hometown. Throughout his life, he was a revered leader in the Leesburg community who brought honor and integrity to his profession and will be remembered as one of the town's finest and most devoted policemen.

Chief Kidwell was born and reared in Leesburg and graduated from Loudoun County High School. After graduation, Chief Kidwell initially intended to follow in the footsteps of his uncle and work as a plumber. However, only after a few days in this occupation, when he came across a nest of snakes, Chief Kidwell realized that he wanted to pursue a different line of work. Then in 1961, at the age of twenty, he became a police officer in Leesburg, marking the commencement of his thirty-four year career with Leesburg's Police Department. In 1972, he assumed the position of Chief of the Leesburg Police Department and held that post until his retirement in 1995.

Mr. Kidwell's remarkable career spanned multiple decades, and as Chief, he oversaw Leesburg's Police Department during a period of unprecedented development in the town. As the town expanded and confronted new complex challenges, Chief Kidwell ensured that the police department was equipped to handle the city's massive population surge and transformed the department from a meager force of only four police officers, one patrol car, and no radio system into a modern police department. During his tenure, the department burgeoned into a thirty-five person force that was able to effectively combat the increasingly serious crimes stemming from Leesburg's rapid growth. But despite the town's enlargement, Chief Kidwell always remained engaged with Leesburg's residents and maintained a small-town approach to law enforcement.

After retirement, Chief Kidwell spent much of his time playing golf, watching sports, especially his beloved Washington Redskins, and caring for his grandchildren. He is survived by his wife, Dorothy Knox Kidwell, his daughters, Kelly Bradley, Kerri Spinks, and Kristi Kidwell, his sisters Catherine Howard and Page Kidwell, his brother Bradley Kidwell, seven grandchildren, three great-grandchildren, and many nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me and countless others as we recognize the innumerable contributions of Chief Kidwell. Chief Kidwell's steadfast commitment and selfless dedication to keeping the residents of Leesburg safe will be greatly missed, and the services he provided to the Town of Leesburg and Virginia's Tenth Congressional District will never be forgotten. He was an exemplary officer and the true embodiment of a public servant, and today we honor him for his legacy of a lifetime of service.

IN HONOR OF NEW CITIZENS

**HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate the individuals who will take their oath of citizenship on July 4, 2017.

In true patriotic fashion, on the day of our great Nation's celebration of independence, a naturalization ceremony will take place, welcoming new citizens of the United States of America. This memorable occasion, coordinated by the League of Women Voters of the Calumet Area and presided over by Magistrate Judge Andrew Radovich, will be held at The Pavilion at Wolf Lake in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. The oath ceremony is a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On July 4, 2017, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Adriana Solis, Dhanwant Singh, Syneth Lorana Gardner, Roberto Diaz, Virginia Reformina Wilson, Khalid Javed, Maria Wiederhold, Glendie Mallen, Liljana Stojceska, Oliver Cadikovski, Gagandeep Khatra, Hernan Ezequiel Barenboim, Jose Lauro Sanchez Ruvalcaba, Sambath Cheakhun, Mariel Claudia Lopez, Sabine Marie Helene Shive, Maria del Rayo Tirado, Mary Madhulatha Vennamalla, Ding Lin, Aurelia Ruiz, Alanoud Hashem Mahmoud Alshurafa, Yan Zhu, Guadalupe Juan Ramirez, Aleksandra Gardijan, Nevenka Nanic, Brenda Beatriz Medina, Maria de los Angeles Garduno Hernandez, Woo Young Yang, Lucy Amparo Perdomo Lopez, Marjan Risteski, J. Guadalupe Gama Macias, Delroy Anthony Roomes, Sonali Shukla, Erlinda Treyes Alvarez, Ma Dolores Serrano del Real, Gelma Ordaniza Hogue, Damaris Mituki Kariuki, Ravi Nigam, Jayesh Shantilal, Minnie Marchan Damico, Teresa Bautista Alcalá, Mico Mileusnic, Mathy Bukassa McKinney, Israel Jacinto-Contreras, Norielyn Langres Heitzmann, Genevieve Blayee, Manuel Angel Corazzari, Martin Gonzalez, Hannan Hassan Sheikh, and Emilio Soria.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country "... of the people, by the people, and for the people." They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating these individuals, who will become citizens of the United States of America on July 4, 2017, the anniversary of our Nation's independence. They, too, are American citizens, and they, too, are guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit



of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

2016 LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT  
AWARD

**HON. PAUL MITCHELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Kelmendi, a member of the Albanian-American Community of Michigan.

In 2002, Professor John P. Kelmendi was elevated to Knighthood by his Majesty King Leka I of Albania. This honor represents his leadership and courage in bringing freedom, liberty, and democracy to citizens of Albania. Dedicating his life to service, Dr. Kelmendi was also presented with the Mother Theresa Humanitarian Award by the President of Albania and now resides in Michigan.

Dr. Kelmendi's efforts continue to influence the lives of high school students as an educator and scholar in Michigan. On March 31, 2017, the Albanian-American Community of the USA awarded Dr. Kelmendi the 2016 Lifetime Achievement Award. His contribution to education and culture in America has been extraordinary.

I join the Albanian-American Community of Michigan, in Shelby Township, in congratulating and thanking Dr. John P. Kelmendi for his service.

HONORING STARK COUNTY  
COURTHOUSE'S BICENTENNIAL

**HON. BOB GIBBS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Stark County Courthouse, which celebrates its bicentennial this year.

The halls of the Stark County Courthouse have a significant place in American history—recounting the area's evolution into a prominent community in Northeast Ohio. President William McKinley argued cases before the court as Stark County Prosecutor, and citizens would travel to the courthouse to hear news and updates from the battlefield during the Civil War.

The current courthouse is the third constructed on the grounds in Stark County, sculpted from brick, sandstone, and marble. The building itself is an illustration of justice, with the clock tower adorned with four Trumpeters of Justice symbolizing the Courthouse occupants' devotion to truth and integrity. The triangular sandstone pediment on the front of the Courthouse demonstrates figures of commerce, justice, agriculture, and industry produced in Stark County.

The Stark County Courthouse is a treasure of Northeast Ohio, and I am proud to join in celebration of its place in our history.

HONORING OBERLIN COLLEGE  
PRESIDENT MARVIN KRISLOV

**HON. JIM JORDAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the many contributions of Dr. Marvin Krislov. Dr. Krislov is departing the presidency of Oberlin College and Conservatory tomorrow after ten years of distinguished service in that office.

A Rhodes Scholar and a graduate of Yale Law School, Dr. Krislov initially pursued a career in law, clerking for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California in San Francisco. He then spent three years working at the White House Counsel's Office and then in various senior roles at the Department of Labor.

Dr. Krislov came to Oberlin College in 2007 after nine years as Vice President and General Counsel at the University of Michigan. Over the last decade, the Oberlin community has benefited greatly from his outstanding management skills and willingness to engage with students, who hold him in the highest regard. Hundreds took advantage of his standing offer to meet personally with any graduating senior seeking career advice.

To fulfill his desire to make the college more inclusive and accessible to students from every economic background, Dr. Krislov created the Oberlin Access Initiative. This initiative helped alleviate the loan burden of many lower-income students.

Dr. Krislov has been hailed for his fundraising efforts—especially his leadership of the most successful comprehensive campaign in Oberlin's history, which came in well ahead of its goal and ahead of schedule. This campaign has allowed for significant campus expansions and renovations.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Krislov will soon assume the presidency of Pace University in New York. On behalf of the people of Ohio's Fourth Congressional District, I offer him my thanks for his long and distinguished career at Oberlin. His legacy of innovative and earnest leadership will benefit Oberlin College for years to come. I wish him and his family every success as they move to this new chapter in their lives.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN EDWARD  
HASSE

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations to Dr. John Edward Hasse on his retirement as Curator of Music at the National Museum of American History, a position he has served in since 1984.

Dr. Hasse is a recognized leader in the field of jazz scholarship and education, distinguishing himself through publications, programming, lectures, and public service. Most notably, Dr. Hasse conceived and founded

Jazz Appreciation Month, which was endorsed by the U.S. Congress in 2003. Today, Jazz Appreciation Month is celebrated each April in all 50 states and in over forty other countries.

Dr. Hasse also worked with me to found the Smithsonian Jazz Masterworks Orchestra, the jazz-ensemble-in-residence at the National Museum of American History, now in its 26th year of domestic concerts and international tours for the U.S. State Department.

In addition to his work at the Smithsonian, Dr. Hasse is an accomplished writer, contributing chapters to a number of books and articles in *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, eight academic journals, and eight encyclopedias. He has lectured on music, the arts, and leadership in 20 countries on six continents, advancing cultural diplomacy, often on behalf of the U.S. State Department. He has served on a number of boards, including the federal New Orleans Jazz Commission, the board of the International Association for Jazz Education, and as a founding member of the Jazz Educators Network. He has been a consultant with the U.S. Postal Service, the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences, and UNESCO.

Dr. Hasse earned a B.A. cum laude from Carleton College, M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Indiana University, and a Certificate in Business Administration from The Wharton School. His honors include appointment as Herb Alpert Scholar-in-Residence at the Berklee College of Music, two ASCAP-Deems Taylor Awards for excellence in writing about music, two Grammy Award nominations, and two honorary doctorates.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincerest thanks to John for many years of friendship, and I know I speak for the entire Smithsonian Institute when I say Dr. Hasse will be sorely missed in his current capacity at the Smithsonian. However, if there is one thing I know about John, it is that he will never be far from the musical community he has fostered for the past few decades. We cannot thank him enough for the many years of service he has offered, and we look forward to seeing what the next stage of life holds for him.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY  
OF FLORENTINO "TINO" DURAN

**HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life and legacy of Florentino "Tino" Duran, a publisher, veteran, and philanthropist who worked tirelessly to help San Antonians.

Born in San Antonio, Texas in 1934, Tino graduated from Lanier High School and went on to serve in the U.S. Air Force. He attended San Antonio College where he first flexed his journalism muscle while working on the school paper, *The Ranger*. After earning his bachelor's degree in political science, Tino continued his education and completed a master's degree in public administration at St. Mary's University.

Tino later became general manager of Dallas newspaper *El Sol de Tejas* and then

served as president and CEO of Fort Worth's El Infomador Hispano. But his crowning professional achievement was his tenure as publisher of La Prensa De San Antonio, the first bilingual publication in Texas. According to his family, Tino strove to inform, educate, and inspire San Antonians, particularly the Hispanic community.

A compassionate, generous man who understood the power of education, Tino established the La Prensa Foundation in 1995 with his wife Amelia "Millie" Duran to award college scholarships to local students. Since its creation, the La Prensa Foundation has provided more than 200 students with over \$2 million of financial assistance to attend institutions throughout Texas.

Tino is survived by his beloved wife of 62 years, Millie; his three sons Tino Jr., David, and Steve, and their wives Susan, Norma and Virginia; his daughters Nina and Margie, and Margie's husband Kenneth; 13 grandchildren; and 18 great-grandchildren.

I offer my condolences to Tino's family and share the gratitude so many San Antonians have for Tino's tremendous service to our community.

IN APPRECIATION OF BRUCE  
NEWCOMB'S SERVICE TO IDAHO

**HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said, "Few things are harder to put up with than a good example." I can tell you there is no finer example of a greater man than my dear friend, Bruce Newcomb. I have had the distinct pleasure and opportunity to be part of Bruce's life for over 30 years and in that time I have known him in several capacities, an Idaho rancher, a state legislator, a majority leader, and the Speaker of the Idaho House. I have seen him as a husband; father, grandfather, uncle and brother. But, the role I know him best as, is friend, and not just to me, but to all he meets.

My friend is retiring for the second time. He retired from the Idaho State Legislature in 2006 where he served for 20 years, the last eight serving as Speaker of the Idaho House—making him the longest-serving speaker in state history. Bruce is the type of leader that defines America, a leader who has strong values and convictions, but is willing to listen and show compassion to all. A leader who isn't afraid to stand up for what is right or take the road that is more difficult, knowing in the end it will lead to a successful outcome.

When Bruce retired from the Idaho Legislature he could have sought any job he wanted in public office or in the private sector. His commitment to students led him to Boise State University where he pursued expanding higher education opportunities in Idaho. Bruce also established a scholarship program for Burley High School students to attend college.

Friday, June 30, 2017, my friend Bruce will retire from BSU where he served as the university's director of government relations. The University recognized Bruce earlier this year

and presented him with the 'Commitment to Idaho' Award. There is no one more deserving of this award than Bruce Newcomb.

If you ask Bruce why he entered public service, he will tell you President John F. Kennedy inspired him with his famous quote, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." But I know that Bruce always wanted to help others; it is simply part of his soul.

Bruce is loyal. That's a simple statement, but a trait that's not easy to achieve. He puts God and family first, and friends are so close to that line it is hard to decipher. I am beyond fortunate to be inside his circle and am forever grateful.

I congratulate Bruce, and look forward to seeing him more.

HONORING CIRCUS JUVENTAS

**HON. BETTY McCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate St. Paul's own Circus Juventas, and to congratulate them on their performance in today's opening ceremony for the Smithsonian Folklife Festival.

This year the Folklife Festival marks its 50th Anniversary, and the youth performers of Circus Juventas will be sharing their artistry with hundreds of thousands of visitors in performances throughout the two weeks of the festival.

The founders of Circus Juventas, Dan and Betty Butler, not only build confidence and excellence in their students through a multicultural circus arts education, but also inspire more than 50,000 audience members every year with their professional-level performances. Circus Juventas is a key member of the vibrant arts community in Minnesota's 4th District.

Since its founding in 1994, Circus Juventas has grown into the largest performing arts circus school in North America. Over 2,500 students participate in their year round and summer camp programs. The students of Circus Juventas learn world-class skills in traditional and contemporary circus arts. As these young people come together to put on their collaborative cirque nouveau performances, they also learn the values of teamwork, self-confidence, discipline, dedication, leadership, and collaboration.

As their Member of Congress, I commend all the students of Circus Juventas and Dan and Betty Butler as they bring their renowned performances and community engagement to the National Mall as the Folklife Festival celebrates the Circus Arts.

The creativity that they inspire and the connections they build are a gift to our community, and we are all proud of their chance to share those gifts on a national stage.

IN TRIBUTE TO SISTER JOEL  
READ

**HON. GWEN MOORE**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Joel Read who has served as a mentor, teacher, college professor, a fierce advocate for women's rights and academic administrator. She was the longtime leader of Alverno College and her vision of placing abilities over grades put her among the nation's top college innovators. Sister Joel Read died, May 25, 2017 at the age of 91 years.

Sister Read led her alma mater for nearly 35 years. The women's college located on Milwaukee's south side reflected her trailblazing approach. The depth of her influence reached far beyond the Alverno campus because of her involvement not only in local and national academic issues, but also due to her international network of contacts. She oversaw multi-million dollar fund raising campaigns that expanded the campus footprint, as well as scholarship and academic offerings. Under her leadership, Alverno launched one of the first internship programs in the country and initiated Weekend College targeted at working women. Sister Read focused on students developing abilities, rather than making grades to demonstrate skills and knowledge. The distinctive ability-based, "assessment-as-learning" curriculum approach introduced in 1973, still draws educators from around the world to visit Alverno.

She was a member of the School Sisters of St. Francis since 1945. She was a fierce advocate for women's rights and was one of the founders of the National Organization for Women in 1966. President Gerald Ford appointed her to the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year in 1975. National leaders in political and education circles also sought her counsel. President Jimmy Carter appointed her to the National Council on the Humanities. Presidents George H.W. Bush, George W. Bush and Bill Clinton invited her to the White House to discuss educational policy. She was singled out as one of a handful of college presidents who broke educational ground in the past 100 years, in the book, "The Many Lives of Academic Presidents".

Alverno College has opened doors to those who did not see college in their future. Alverno's enrollment is roughly 2,200. Forty-five percent of the undergrad population comes from the city of Milwaukee, and 44 percent are women of color. Nearly seven in 10 are first-generation college students. Alverno consistently receives high ratings in US News & World Report. A 2015 report by The Education Trust found Alverno had both the highest percentage (36.2 percent) of federal Pell Grant recipients and minority undergrads (35.7 percent) among Wisconsin colleges and universities. Pell Grants provide need-based grants to low-income students.

She retired as President of Alverno College in 2003 having served as one of the nation's longest serving college presidents and remained an energetic force in retirement. Mr.

Speaker, I am proud to recognize Sister Joel Read. She has left a legacy of advocacy and compassion. She was a true trailblazer. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District, the State of Wisconsin and the nation have benefited tremendously from her dedicated service. I am honored for these reasons to pay tribute to Sister Joel Read.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE TRANSFORM STUDENT DEBT TO HOME EQUITY ACT

#### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act of 2017—a bill that enables graduates to transform their student debt into an opportunity to purchase and own a home.

With an estimated \$1.3 trillion student debt owed to the federal government, plunging homeownership rates among young people, and 17.2 million habitable homes sitting vacant in the United States, our nation must find a way to address the student debt vs. housing conundrum. Luckily, there is a popular lending instrument already in widespread use that could serve as a significant bridge to the future: the home mortgage. This common lending tool, overtime, has the power to transform student loan repayments into a financial instrument for building equity: the home.

Creating a path for credit worthy student debt holders to convert their debt payment stream into home equity would require many federal departments to collaborate. However, an initial effort to test the concept can take the form of a pilot program through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA).

This is what the Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act achieves. The bill authorizes HUD and FHFA to establish a pilot that connects creditworthy federal student debt holders with housing properties for sale but held by the federal government. By arranging financing that recalculates terms, debt-to-income ratios, interest rates, and other factors, short-term student debt could transition into longer-term home ownership. Eventually, participants would help restore neighborhoods, and buoy property values locally and on the federal ledger simply by maintaining and investing in a home mortgage.

The status quo has created a permanent class of millions of student debtors without the opportunity for equity homeownership. We have the resources, the power, and a compelling economic interest to do something about it.

Let's get started. I encourage my colleagues to support this measure and unleash this debt stranglehold on the next generation.

#### CONGRATULATING NEW YORK CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL DEBATE CHAMPIONS FOR 2016 AND 2017—MIDDLE SCHOOL 50

#### HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

MS. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and honor that I rise to congratulate the students, and teachers from Middle School 50 (MS 50)—the John D. Wells School on its successful reign as New York City Middle School Debate Champions for 2016 and 2017.

MS 50 is located in the Southside of Williamsburg, Brooklyn of my district. It serves students from 6th thru 8th grade and has an enrollment that is 82 percent Latino with 21 percent of the students being English Language Learners. Despite personal challenges, these students have persevered and are competitive debaters. The school's debate program has helped students develop lifelong skills like critical thinking, verbal and written communication, leadership, teamwork, and determination. They understand that debate is an art form that requires the tactful ability to argue or refute a policy while maintaining proper decorum.

Today, debate remains the bedrock of our constitution and political system. It is uplifting to know that these students recognize the power of words and understand the art of debate. I am extremely proud of them. I also want to recognize and commend Principal Ben Honoroff, Debate Coaches Jason Warren, Matthew Mason, Thuy-An Vo, Andrew Geathers, and Carolina Hidalgo, and teachers for their support of this program and working with the Middle School Quality Initiative, a New York City Department of Education program focused on preparing middle school students for college. Please join me in saluting the MS 50 Debate New York City Champion Debate Team of 2016 and 2017.

Kevin Ascension, Jusue Canatero Nixon, Brandy Flores, Anthony Imbert, Kelvin Imbert, A-Tiyana Johnson, Leslie Malin, Tracey McKeever, Victoria Paredes, Reynaldo Ramos, Grant Shan, Daiana Valencia, Emma Pichardo, Crisagnelly Canario, Tarek Ali, Denise Merino, Bryan Jacinto, Mohammed Islam, Evelis Rodriguez.

Deirra DuBois, Samantha Espinal, Quanique Walker, Yariel Cruz Hernandez, Solina Perez, Heaven Nesbitt, Wendy Calderon, Ariel Roman, Trystan Keohane, Michel Reyes, Fernando Espinal, Dawlin Paredes, Carlos Francisco, Merelin Penalo, Lisa Diaz, Lesly Deleon Clemente, Albert Sanchez, Yisneiry Rodriguez.

#### NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH 2017

#### HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the House Committee on Finan-

cial Services' Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance in recognition of June as National Homeownership Month.

For many families across this country, homeownership is the cornerstone of achieving their American Dream.

It has proven to be one of the most effective ways for lower-and middle-income families to build wealth.

Unfortunately, nearly a decade after the 2008 Financial Crisis, realizing the American Dream is still out of reach for too many Americans due to tightened mortgage credit standards throughout the industry.

Each year, National Homeownership Month provides us the opportunity to recognize and identify the significant benefits of homeownership and the resources needed to help more Americans become homeowners.

In that spirit, it is equally important that we continue to support efforts to improve financial literacy in the home buying process through the many housing counseling programs across the country.

That is why I introduced the Housing Financial Literacy Act, H.R. 851, which will help make homeownership a reality for more families by giving first-time homebuyers who complete a Department of Housing and Urban Development-certified housing counseling course a discount on their Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance premium of 25 basis points.

Let's make the American Dream of homeownership accessible for more Americans this National Homeownership Month and every month throughout the year.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF TRAFFORD REALTY CO.

#### HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a true success story in the world of American small business. Trafford Realty Co., based in Brevard County, Florida, is celebrating its 100th Anniversary, a true milestone for any small business.

In 1917, A. R. "Roy" Trafford and Russell Field opened Trafford and Field Realtors in Historic Cocoa Village to serve the residents of the City of Cocoa and the Brevard County community. Years later, Roy's son Al became Trafford's president and continued to lead the organization until 2009 at which time, at the age of 94, he promoted vice president and general manager Terry Lolmaugh to the position of president. Al continued to be active in the company until his passing in 2014 at the age of 99.

To recognize his many contributions to our community, the City of Cocoa renamed its amphitheater at Cocoa Riverfront Park to the Al Trafford Amphitheater in 2009.

Trafford Realty Co.'s leadership has witnessed the growth of Brevard County, from an area originally known for commercial fishing, citrus, and tourism to the center for space exploration. The company has survived and prospered through every national and local

event of the 20th and 21st centuries, successfully enduring the effects of World Wars, economic depressions and recessions, local natural disasters, and man-made catastrophes.

Trafford Realty Co. has managed the sales and purchases of thousands of homes and commercial properties in Brevard County, and was instrumental in the development of some of Brevard County's most well-known subdivisions dating from 1924 through the 1970s, including: Carleton Terrace, Riverview Acres and Hardee Circle, Cocoa Isles, South Merritt Estates, and The Ranches.

Trafford Realty Co. has over 20 professional associates. Together, they have more than 345 years in cumulative real estate selling and buying experience. The Trafford Realty Co. prides itself on its experience, integrity and longevity. It will continue to serve the residents and businesses of Brevard County, with a reputation as one of our most trusted and respected businesses.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Trafford Realty and its employees for their continuing contributions to our community and for achieving 100 successful years in business.

**CONGRATULATING JEREMY BOWDEN ON WINNING THE CONGRESSIONAL ART CONTEST FOR THE 24TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**HON. KENNY MARCHANT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeremy Bowden for his winning piece in the Congressional Art Competition for the 24th District of Texas. Jeremy's artwork, titled "Lazy Day in Downtown Carrollton," is an oil painting of the center of Carrollton, Texas, where Jeremy lives with his fraternal twin brother Jason, his sister Kyra, and his parents Rhonda and Blake. The Congressional Art Competition is a great chance for students such as Jeremy to showcase their artistic talents and attain national recognition for their work.

As a child, Jeremy's strong interest in art, particularly drawing, was clear to Rhonda and Blake. His parents note that, from a young age, Jeremy had always been able to entertain himself with only a pencil and paper. This interest became even more prominent during parent-teacher conferences, where Rhonda and Blake learned that Jeremy had a habit of drawing and doodling on everything he could get his hands on, including homework and essays.

It wasn't until high school, however, that Jeremy decided to take his interest in art seriously. Once he dedicated himself, he spent numerous hours in art lessons and working on art projects, submitting a few of these pieces in competitions. Some of these projects included work in animation, figure drawings, oil paintings, as well as sculptures. During his junior year in high school, his hard work and dedication to becoming a more skilled artist gained him some prestigious recognitions, including winning the 24th Congressional District of Texas Art Competition.

After Jeremy completes his senior year at Hebron High School, he hopes to attend an art college in the fall of 2018 to continue pursuing his goal of becoming a professional artist. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Jeremy on winning the Congressional Art Contest for the 24th District of Texas: I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in wishing Jeremy the best of luck in his future endeavors.

**RECOGNIZING THE BIRTHDAY OF LUCI BAINES JOHNSON, THE YOUNGER DAUGHTER OF U.S. PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND HIS WIFE, FORMER FIRST LADY, LADY BIRD JOHNSON**

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with Congressman BARTON, to recognize the birthday of Luci Baines Johnson. Ms. Luci Baines Johnson is the Chairwoman of LBJ Holding Co. She also serves as Vice President of The Business Suites and as a Director of LBJ Broadcasting Co. Ms. Johnson is also a member of the Board of Directors of the National Wildflower Research Center, a member of the advisory boards of both the Center for Battered Women and of "Believe in Me", and a life trustee of Seton Fund. After many years of service, we are pleased to recognize her today. On Sunday, July 2, 2017, she will be celebrating her 70th birthday.

Ms. Johnson has degrees from Georgetown University School of Nursing, the University of Texas, and St. Edward's University. Ms. Johnson has served as a Trustee of Boston University, is a past chairman of the Affiliate Fund-raising Drive for the American Heart Association, a former chairman of the University of Texas System School of Nursing, and a former member of the Board of Review of the National League of Nursing.

Through our shared passion for public service, we have developed a close relationship that continues to grow stronger by the year. Much like her parents before her, she has dedicated her life to public service and it has been an honor to see the contributions she has made throughout the state of Texas.

Throughout her life, she has constantly displayed the virtues of compassion, passion, and integrity. By staying true to herself in the midst of adversity, she has managed to accomplish so much. Through her philanthropic efforts, she has been able to turn dreams into realities for so many.

Mr. Speaker, we congratulate Luci Baines Johnson on her successes, and we wish her a happy 70th birthday. We wish her success as she continues to fight for so many people, not only in the Great State of Texas, but across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the recognition of the birthday and accomplishments of Luci Baines Johnson are worth acknowledging.

**TRIBUTE TO ANDREA GUY**

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to announce that an educator from my district has been awarded the Gilder Lehrman Institute's Tennessee History Teacher of the Year Award.

Ms. Andrea Guy was nominated by her own students from Hardin Valley Academy for this very prestigious award.

Just one year ago, Andrea was selected to participate in the Supreme Court History Society's Summer Teacher Institute in Washington, D.C.

The education of our young people can only be as good as our teachers, and Andrea has showcased what great education looks like through her hard work and dedication to her students and to the history of Our Nation.

This is a very high honor that I am proud to recognize.

**PAYING TRIBUTE TO TRAILBLAZING HOOSIER DERRICK BURKS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT**

**HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Derrick Burks as he retires from Ernst & Young, a trailblazing Hoosier whose leadership has been transformative in our community. Derrick, a life-long Hoosier, was born in Indianapolis and is one of twelve children. He attended Indianapolis Public Schools from Kindergarten until graduation. Upon graduation from Shortridge High School in 1974, Derrick and his twin brother Darrell, through the encouragement of an older brother enrolled at Kentucky State University. Despite losing both parents at an early age and in the face of a tight budget both Derrick and Darrell enrolled. They found great success academically and then decided to transfer to Indiana University. They both pursued degrees in accounting and graduated with distinction in 1978.

After graduation, Derrick went to work at Arthur Andersen in Indianapolis while his twin Darrell pursued his successful accounting career in Detroit, Michigan. During his time with Arthur Andersen, Derrick was recognized for his contributions to the firm on several occasions. In 1991, Derrick was promoted and became a partner at the firm, a position he held until May of 2000. When, at the age of 43, he was selected to become the Managing Partner. He was the first African-American to be named to this position by a large CPA firm in the state of Indiana. As the Managing Partner, Derrick was instrumental in the Arthur Andersen and Ernst & Young merger in 2002. He was then named the Managing Partner for Ernst & Young in 2004. Derrick has displayed exemplary capability and leadership throughout his entire career. As a member of the

Ernst & Young's America's Ethnicity Diversity Task Force, Derrick embodied values that encouraged his colleagues to always do the right thing. Derrick's expertise is wide-ranging: his clients include small businesses, large multi-location corporations, and public companies across numerous fields of business. In addition to his work at the firm, Derrick has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to our community through numerous civic and community activities over the years.

Derrick is a prominent leader in the African-American community through his involvement with the Indiana Black Expo, the Indianapolis Museum of African American History, and the 100 Black Men of Indianapolis. Derrick is also involved with two historically African American fraternities, Kappa Alpha Psi, his undergraduate fraternity, as well as Sigma Pi Phi a post-graduate professional fraternal organization. Kappa Alpha Psi, founded in Bloomington, Indiana, strives to support their members in "achievement in every field of human endeavor". Sigma Pi Phi, also known as the Boule, was the first Greek-letter fraternity to be founded by African American men. Its membership consists of men with college or professional degrees who are prominent and contributing members of their communities.

In addition to his career in the accounting field, he is and has been actively involved in civic and community organizations including the Stadium Board, Goodwill Education Initiatives (Indianapolis Met Academy Charter Schools), Goodwill Industries, Boy Scouts of America, the Children's Museum, the United Way, Circle City Classic, the Mayor's Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee, Indianapolis Convention & Visitors Association Board, Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy and Kelley School of Business Dean's Advisory Council to name a few. Derrick is a member of the American Institute of CPAs and the Indiana CPA Society. He also served the Indiana community as Commissioner of the Indiana State Board of Accountancy and served as Treasurer for the 2012 Indianapolis Super Bowl Host Committee.

On behalf of all Hoosiers and as a dear friend and soccer parent who spent countless memorable hours over many years with the Burks family, I wish to extend a heartfelt thank you to Derrick for his contributions to Indiana businesses as well as his exemplary service and leadership to our community. I wish the very best to Derrick, to his special partner in life his wife Celeste, and his three amazing daughters, Channing, Ciersten, and Courtney in his well-deserved retirement and in the next exciting chapter of his life.

H.R. 3003 AND H.R. 3004

**HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to two punitive, anti-immigrant bills: H.R. 3003, the so-called "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," and H.R. 3004, the so-called "Kate's Law." These cruel and unnecessary bills help to convert Donald Trump's vi-

cious immigration rhetoric into policy that threatens the safety of our country and our communities.

H.R. 3003 coerces states and localities to cooperate with federal immigration enforcement, and bans them from receiving crucial federal funds if these jurisdictions don't comply. The bill also expands DHS's authority to detain individuals, even allowing them to be held in detention indefinitely, a provision which may violate the Fourth Amendment.

H.R. 3004 expands prosecutions for individuals for unauthorized re-entry and attempted re-entry into the United States. Under this bill, even asylum seekers and victims of human trafficking could be prosecuted by the federal government for simply entering the country. It would even allow prosecution of individuals who seek to re-enter the U.S. with legal authorization to do so.

These bills do clear and direct damage to America's safety and America's values. We do not make America more secure by holding ransom local law enforcement funds that keep us safe. We don't fight crime by making residents less likely to report crime. We do not honor America's humanitarian history by prosecuting asylum seekers and human trafficking victims. We do not honor family values by keeping immigrant families separated. We do not preserve America's strength as a thriving nation of immigrants by encouraging fear of those who have come to make our nation stronger. We do not preserve, protect, and defend the U.S. Constitution by letting law enforcement flout the Fourth Amendment, or by detaining individuals indefinitely.

These bills leave American communities less protected in the face of threats large and small. These bills insult America's reputation as a welcoming beacon for every nation, race, and faith. We must keep America safe, but we will not do so by demonizing and persecuting innocent immigrants. We need a sensible immigration policy, not one rooted in fear and hate. I call on Republicans to join me and my Democratic colleagues in developing a comprehensive immigration reform plan that keeps our borders secure, addresses the need for temporary workers, resolves the status of DREAMers and millions of other undocumented immigrants, and provides a path to citizenship.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROGER  
THOMAS

**HON. JACKIE SPEIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with Congressman JARED HUFFMAN and Congressman MIKE THOMPSON to recognize Roger Thomas, Captain of the Salty Lady, member of the California Outdoor Hall of Fame, and lifelong advocate to keep west coast salmon fisheries alive and sustainable. Many in this chamber, the California Legislature and multiple agencies have worked with Roger for decades and are proud to call this honorable and remark-

able man a friend, mentor and colleague. He is one of the most decent and hard-working human beings one can know.

Roger's passion for fishing started as a child. Born in Gilroy, California, he started fishing at an early age for striped bass from the beaches along Monterey Bay and later for salmon from a small boat launched at the Monterey Pier. He was hooked on salmon fishing and became a regular customer on charter boats out of San Francisco. Before too long, one of the captains offered Roger a job as a deck hand and, as they say, the rest is history. Roger received his captain's license in 1968.

While working full-time for the County of Santa Clara on housing issues, he ran charter boats on weekends. At one point he had acquired a fleet of five boats that were run by several captains. In 1981, he retired from his government job and dedicated all of his time and energy to fisheries and ocean conservation. There hasn't been a salmon related association or council that Roger hasn't served on.

Since 1973, he has been the President of the Golden Gate Fishermen's Association which represents charter boats from Fort Bragg to Monterey and carries some 200,000 anglers each year. He is also the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Salmon Association which represents commercial and recreational fishermen and works on protecting salmon habitat. For 14 years, he has served on the Pacific Fisheries Management Council which, among other duties, sets the ocean salmon seasons. Roger is a member of the Bay Delta Advisory board, the Winter Run-Captive Broodstock Committee, the Central Valley Fisheries Coalition, the Marine Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce, the Coastal Resources Foundation, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, the National Sea Grant Review Panel and the Marine Resources Committee.

Roger runs his charters on the Salty Lady out of Sausalito and Half Moon Bay. He proudly calls himself a salmon charter operation, but additionally runs whale watching and nature trips and has introduced thousands of children and adults to the magic of marine life. He has spent more than 10,000 days on the ocean and you will be hard-pressed to find someone with deeper knowledge and appreciation for that ecosystem. He also has the gift of storytelling and a mind that remembers every detail, including one of his most vivid ones from his childhood. He saw the last of the San Joaquin Spring run chinook salmon, before they went extinct. His uncle took him to Friant Dam right after it was constructed. The salmon were stuck at the end of the line imposed to divert water to fields in the San Joaquin valley. They were "big fish," Roger says stretching out his arms, "just big fish."

Roger is a familiar face in Congress where he has represented the interests of the charter boat fleet and the health of west coast salmon stocks for decades. In the 1980s, he was appointed by then Vice President George Bush to the National Sea Grant Review Panel. In this role he traveled to ports around the country and helped decide which projects were worthy and would be funded.

Roger was instrumental in former Representative George Miller's 1992 Central Valley Improvement Act and its eventual passage. The CVP is a key law to stop environmental harm to salmon and the Bay Delta. When salmon populations collapsed in 2008 and 2009, Roger worked closely with Representative MIKE THOMPSON to provide disaster relief to salmon fishermen.

Roger Thomas' tireless work has earned him the respect and adoration of countless people. With his recent tragic diagnosis of late stage cancer, it is our intention to express our appreciation for his outstanding work and lasting contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to join us in celebrating the life of Roger Thomas who loves fish, loves the ocean, and above all loves people. He has touched many hearts, protected many livelihoods and has earned the admiration of coastal communities up and down the western seaboard.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TROOP 100 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**HON. CHRIS COLLINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Boy Scouts of America Troop 100 of the District of Columbia on its 100th anniversary, and for its long history of heritage and service. As a co-chair of the Scouting Caucus and a life-long eagle scout, I am proud to recognize the oldest Troop in Washington, D.C.

The Boy Scouts of America was founded on February 8, 1910, here in Washington, D.C., when Chicago Publisher Mr. William D. Boyce and Washington, D.C. Railroad Tycoon Mr. Colin H. Livingstone filed the papers of incorporation. Less than a month later, in March 1910, the first Troop in Washington, D.C., Troop 1, was formed at the G Street branch of the Y.M.C.A. On June 15, 1916, the Federal Charter of the Boy Scouts of America was signed into law by President Woodrow Wilson.

In the summer of 1917, due to size limitations, Troop 1 split, with the majority of its membership forming a new Troop. Subsequently, this newly formed Troop was ceremoniously given the Troop number of "100" by the District of Columbia Boy Scout Council, now known as the National Capital Area Council.

Over the years, Troop 100 has become the preeminent Troop in the Council by virtue of winning almost every special Scout Award available, including the Service Awards, Drill Awards, Signaling & Orienteering Awards, the Evening Star Inspection Trophy, and the coveted Washington Post Advancement Trophy. Additionally, Troop 100 has a history of demonstrating patriotism and heroism. Members have earned the War Service Awards for selling War Bonds, rescued individuals from burning buildings, and answered the call of duty by serving in one of the branches of the United States military.

Today, the Boy Scouts of America has more than 2.4 million active members, and 1 million adult volunteers. The Boy Scouts of America and Troop 100 continues to prepare young people to exercise ethical and moral judgments by teaching them the values of the Scout Oath and Scout Law, and remains faithful to its mission of "patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred values," and its goal of providing "citizenship, service, and leadership."

Again, I would like to congratulate Washington, D.C.'s Boy Scouts of America Troop 100 on the occasion of their 100th anniversary, and its over 100 years of service, character and leadership development, and for instilling the values of the Scout Oath and the Scout Law in America's youth.

HONORING THE 154TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

**HON. SCOTT PERRY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today we remember the Battle of Gettysburg, a clear turning point in our American history. I'm privileged and humbled to represent these hallowed grounds. This weekend, we commemorate the 154th Anniversary of the Battle—one that pit brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor, for three days of horrific and abject combat—not for hatred, but rather unbridled passion and loyalty to their respective causes; a loyalty that drove these Soldiers to give, in President Lincoln's words, "the last full measure of devotion."

Everything our Nation has achieved since that time—the expansion of freedom and liberty, civil rights, and centuries of human achievements—was borne of the sacrifice and struggle of the Soldiers who valiantly fought this Battle.

Beginning in 1888, Veterans from both sides of the conflict held reunions in Gettysburg to celebrate our unity and hopes for the future. The reunions would culminate with the lighting of the Eternal Light Peace Memorial in July 1938, the 75th Anniversary of the Battle, and the final Veteran's reunion. In the years since, millions of people from all over the world annually travel to Gettysburg to learn about our Nation's "new birth of freedom," and the National Park Service and an array of dedicated citizens and partners perform the critical work of inspiring us to learn and appreciate the significance of the Gettysburg Campaign, the Gettysburg Address and the Civil War.

On this 154th Anniversary, may God continue to bless the brave men and women who served and sacrificed at the Battle of Gettysburg. And may He rededicate us to "... the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF IRELAND'S AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES ANNE ANDERSON

**HON. RICHARD E. NEAL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Ambassador Anne Anderson, the Irish Ambassador to the United States, as she retires from her position in the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs.

Throughout her time in the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Anderson has served in assignments of great prestige as well as been the first woman to represent Ireland in all these positions. Her first post was as Ireland's Ambassador to the United Nations (UN) in Geneva in 1995. While there, she chaired the World Trade Organization (WTO) Trade Policy Review Body in 1996, followed by chairing the UN Commission on Human Rights in 1999. In 2001, she became Ireland's Permanent Representative to the European Union (EU), the first woman from any EU country to represent their nation in the European Parliament. In 2005, Ambassador Anderson became Ireland's Ambassador to France before being appointed as Ireland's Ambassador to the United Nations in New York in 2009. During her time at the UN, Ambassador Anderson focused on human rights, development, and gender equality issues. Furthermore, the Ambassador oversaw a review of the UN Peace-building machinery and facilitated preparations for the 2013 UN Special Event on the Millennium Development Goals.

On January 15, 2013, Ambassador Anderson was appointed as Ireland's 17th Ambassador to the United States. Throughout her time in Washington, Ambassador Anderson has focused on further strengthening Ireland-U.S. relations in regards to economics, trade, immigration, and culture. She especially did an exemplary job with all the U.S. events around the centenary of the 1916 Rising. Furthermore, Ambassador Anderson has focused on keeping the U.S. engaged in issues regarding Northern Ireland. Her engagement with the Friends of Ireland Caucus throughout her tenure has been critical in our country's continued involvement with the entire island of Ireland. In recognition of her outstanding service, Ambassador Anderson was presented with the International Leadership Award by the Ireland Funds this past March.

Mr. Speaker, as a co-chairman of the Friends of Ireland Caucus, I have gotten to know Ambassador Anderson very well as both a colleague and a friend. Anne has made momentous strides in strengthening Ireland-U.S. relations on numerous fronts and has been a great influence to our country. She will be greatly missed and I wish her all the best with her retirement and future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EARLINE  
MILES**HON. MARC A. VEASEY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Earline Miles, a beloved member of the Fort Worth community and dear friend, who passed away on June 23, 2017.

Earline Dolores Miles was born on March 2, 1930, in Sherman, Texas, to Henri Jewel and William Andrew Miles. Earline was the only girl in a household with four brothers. She attended I.M. Terrell High School and was presented as an Assembly Debutante in 1948. After high school, Ms. Miles attended Sam Houston State University where she pledged Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. and was a member of the Ivy Leaf Club. She then went on to finish her undergraduate studies at Huston-Tillotson University, where she graduated Cum Laude with a Bachelor's of Arts in Business Administration in 1952.

In 1971, Earline achieved the great accomplishment of becoming the first black female lawyer in Tarrant County after earning her law degree from Thurgood Marshall School of Law at Texas Southern University. She also became the first black attorney to work for Rattikin Title Company as a Title Researcher.

While Ms. Miles had an extensive professional career as a lawyer and teacher, most people remember Earline for her fierce passion for political activism and civil rights. She spearheaded countless voter registration drives and fought hard to ensure that African Americans had equal opportunities in Tarrant County and equal representation in the media.

As part of her political career, Earline worked tirelessly to ensure that African Americans were elected to public office. She broke fundraising records for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and worked on several campaigns for African American politicians in Texas.

In addition to being a fierce advocate for civil rights, Earline was a devoted daughter, sister, and true friend. She was also just as much fun as she was known as the "cool aunt" to her nieces and nephews. Earline is survived by her goddaughter, two younger brothers, several nieces and nephews, and a host of cousins, great nieces and nephews, extended family members, and friends.

I honor Ms. Earline Miles's significant impact on the African American community.

RECOGNIZING ALZHEIMER'S AND  
BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH**HON. J. LUIS CORREA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month this June and to honor the over five million Americans that are currently living with this disease right now.

Alzheimer's is a progressive neurodegenerative brain disorder that disables the memory of individuals and causes cognitive decline. Of the top ten leading causes of death in the United States, Alzheimer's is the only disease that cannot be prevented, cured, or even slowed. On top of that, more than 15 million Americans are currently providing unpaid care for loved ones that suffer from Alzheimer's.

As a nation, we have a duty to serve all members of our community. We cannot allow this disease to progress unchecked, which is why I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in honoring Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month and ensuring that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has the necessary funding to continue Alzheimer's research. When it comes to the health of Americans, we cannot afford to take shortcuts.

Though Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month has come to an end, our efforts must continue. Mr. Speaker, it is with situations like this that our nation must come together. I am honored to help raise awareness for this worthy cause and invite my colleagues in Congress to join me on this fight.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF  
MR. WILLIAM SINKLER**HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life Mr. William Sinkler, 79, a dedicated educator who spent his life committed to serving the children and schools of Southwest Virginia. William (Bill) Sinkler was born on October 9, 1937, in Eutawville, South Carolina and his contributions to his community, particularly to young students, are impressive.

Mr. Sinkler was a true Southern gentleman, dignified, and held in high regards by all of us who him. As an educator, he set high expectations for his students and modeled respect and integrity.

At the time of his retirement, Mr. Sinkler had spent 40 years as an educator, and was the first African-American to serve on the Salem School Board. For his commitment to the young minds of Lynchburg, Roanoke, and Salem, Mr. Sinkler received a Virginia General Assembly Resolution to recognize his devotion to the students. In the Resolution, he was recognized for his life motto, "I've got to be me," and how he brought his personality and talents into each endeavor he undertook.

He grew up in South Carolina, graduated from Morris College in 1960, and then served in the United States Army. After his service in the armed forces, Mr. Sinkler studied at Virginia State College and earned a Master's Degree in Education at University of Virginia. He taught Math and Science, and served as an Assistant Principal and a Principal. By the time of his retirement, Bill was the Vice-Chairman of the Salem School Board, where he had served from 1993 to 2009.

I remember Mr. Sinkler's friendship and his ability to work closely with officials on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Sinkler was a very involved member of the community, for years he served on the City of Salem's Fair Housing Board and Planning Commission, and was an active member of the Salem Rotary Club, Boule, The Links, Inc., NAACP, Kappa Delta Pi, and Phi Beta Sigma. He was also a dedicated member of the Shiloh Baptist Church, in Salem, Virginia. There, he served as a member of the Board of Trustees, and the superintendent of the church's Sunday school, as well as teaching Sunday school classes.

Mr. Sinkler was recognized through numerous awards, such as the Salem Police Department Citizen Academy Certificate of Recognition, and Roanoke Valley Father of the Year, for Education.

My thoughts and prayers are with Mr. Sinkler's wife of 52 years, Marzetta; two sons, William and Wayne; two grandchildren, Karis and Mitchell; Sister Mary Q. Sinkler, and numerous extended family, as well as friends and loved ones.

It is impossible to measure the impact of such a dedicated educator. Mr. Sinkler's legacy as an educator will live in the achievements of all the students who were positively impacted by his hard work and devotion.

SOUTH KOREA'S NEW PRESIDENT,  
MOON JAE-IN**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate South Korean President Moon Jae-in on his recent election. He will be visiting the U.S. this week and I'd like to be among the first to extend a hand of welcome.

South Korea is one of the United States' most critical allies. Not only do our two nations share a thriving economic partnership, but we cooperate closely on some of the most important security threats facing our world.

South Korea's neighbor to the North is one of these threats. Little Kim is no friend to the United States and he is no friend to the Republic of Korea.

I look forward to seeing how President Moon and the Trump Administration use this opportunity to deepen our friendship and further our economic and security cooperation. The U.S.-ROK alliance was forged in blood and continues under our shared commitment to democratic principles.

Working together, we can combat the forces of evil in this world.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE CAREER OF  
GENERAL DANIEL B. ALLYN**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of the 35th Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Daniel B. Allyn.



General Allyn's work ethic took him to the highest ranks of the military, serving as Commanding General of the United States Army Forces Command and XVIII Airborne—this in addition to leading forces on the Korean Peninsula and the Middle East.

After graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point, and several years of military experience, General Allyn attended the United States Naval War College where he received a Master of Arts degree in National Security and Strategic Studies. Beginning his career at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, General Allyn was a member of the venerated 82nd Airborne Division.

Deployed on numerous operational assignments all over the globe and through some of our nation's toughest times; General Allyn stood ready to answer the call to serve our great nation. Some of his most notable engagements were Operation Urgent Fury in Grenada during the Korean War, Operation Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia, Operation Desert Spring in Kuwait, Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq, and Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. Throughout these operations, he delivered on the promise to keep America safe and confront our enemies head on under the most difficult conditions.

During these deployments, General Allyn received numerous medals, including the Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, and Joint Service Commendation Medal. These stunning achievements propelled General Allyn to one of the highest posts in the military, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army.

Confirmed by the United States Senate on July 23, 2014; General Allyn served as Vice Chief of Staff of the Army for nearly three years. This country cannot repay the debt we owe to General Allyn; he was truly one-of-a-kind.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in commemorating the retirement of the 35th Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Daniel B. Allyn.

#### IN HONOR OF THE PINEY WOODS VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS POST 4816

#### HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the 50th Anniversary of The Piney Woods Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 4816 in Porter, Texas.

Since the founding of Post 4816, on May 30, 1967, it has grown from a small unit of just forty members to a far-reaching organization of over three-hundred and fifty dedicated, engaged, and inspiring veterans.

For fifty years, this post has been an integral part of the Porter Community. Its members have dedicated their time and resources to giving back to local veterans and the entire Porter population. Every year, their fundraising efforts allow them to contribute over \$300,000

to local causes, improving the lives of everyone in their community. Among the recipients are local children's hospitals, community assistance centers, and veterans and military families in need.

In an effort to encourage community involvement and civil awareness, Post 4816 has created an awards program that recognizes outstanding teachers and students who display academic excellence and patriotism. Similar awards are reserved to recognize local law enforcement officers, medical first responders, and other public servants who show a clear dedication to improving their community.

Post 4816's commitment to service has gone far deeper than just public recognitions and charitable donations. By organizing hospital and home visits to sick and disabled veterans, Post 4816 has left a lasting impact on the lives of many of our community's former service members.

This support system is just one way that Post 4816 embodies the mission of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. By fostering a comradery amongst the veterans of overseas conflict, serving the current service members and veterans in our community, and advocating on behalf of all United States veterans, the members of Post 4816 have completed this mission many times over.

It is my honor to join our local veterans, the citizens of Porter, and the entire Eighth District of Texas to congratulate the veterans of Post 4816 on their fifty-year anniversary, to recognize their history of public service, and to thank them for their dedicated work for our veterans and our community.

#### IN MEMORY OF BILL SHEALY

#### HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 2016, South Carolina lost an American Hero with the passing of Bill Shealy. Bill and his brothers have an extraordinary history of military service during World War II. Of the seven brothers in the Shealy family, five served at the Invasion of Normandy, including Bill.

Bill and his twin brother, Bobby Shealy, served with the U.S. Navy on the same ship, the USS *Dale W. Peterson*. Remarkably, the USS *Dale W. Peterson* captured a German submarine headed to New York and the crew held the submarine for ten days until relief arrived to transport the submarine and its crew. During its final deployment to Japan, the Enola Gay dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and the ship was ordered to return to Pearl Harbor.

I am grateful for the admirable service and sacrifice of Bill Shealy and his brothers. The following thoughtful obituary was published in *The State* on December 16, 2016:

WEST COLUMBIA—Services for Billy "Bill" Shealy, 91, will be conducted at 11:00 a.m., Saturday, December 17, 2016, at Mt. Hermon Lutheran Church with The Rev. Eric Friedrichs officiating. Burial will follow in the church cemetery. Visitation will be from

6 to 8 p.m., Friday, December 16, 2016, at Barr-Price Funeral Home and Crematorium, Lexington Chapel. Memorials may be made to Mt. Hermon Lutheran Church "Growing on Holy Ground Fund", 3011 Leaphart Rd., West Columbia, SC 29169. Mr. Shealy died Wednesday, December 14, 2016.

Born December 2, 1925, in Cayce, SC, he was a son of the late Thad Shealy and Lizzie Derrick Shealy. A member of Mt. Hermon Lutheran Church, the Henri Bishop Sunday School Class, and Woodmen of the World Lodge 1276, he had retired from SC Department of Mental Health as an electronic technician. A US Navy and WWII veteran, he was in the Normandy invasion along with four of his brothers.

Survivors include his daughter Renee Coleman-Greenbaum (Dave); son Edwin Shealy; grandchildren; Amanda Robinette (Eddie), Russell Coleman (Brandy); great grandchildren Alex and Parker Greer; Zeke Coleman; brother Joe Shealy (Margie); along with many nieces and nephews whom he loved dearly. In addition to his parents, he was preceded in death by his wife, Doris Risinger Shealy, brothers Ryan Shealy, Carroll Shealy, Muller "Mutt" Shealy, Charles "Chick" Shealy, Bobby Shealy; sisters Fredia Keisler, and Vanna Royalty.

#### TRIBUTE TO CHERYL DEATLEY

#### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to someone who has spent her career making a difference in the lives of children across Maryland and the National Capital region. I've known Cheryl DeAtley for many years and seen her passion and commitment to early childhood education up close. Cheryl started as a coordinator for Charles County's Judith P. Hoyer Early Child Care and Family Education Center, named in honor of my late wife, who dedicated her career to early childhood education and achievement as well. Since 2007, she has been at the Maryland State Department of Education, overseeing the entire network of Judy Centers, as they are known.

In leading the Judy Centers, Cheryl has presided over a period of rapid expansion. Under her guidance, the number of Judy Centers has more than doubled, growing from twenty-four locations in 2007 to fifty-one today. They serve more than 18,000 children across our state, helping to close the achievement gap for those entering elementary school by ensuring they and their families have access to a range of beneficial services. These include early education, medical and dental screenings, family literacy courses, and early intervention for children with special needs. For parents, adult education takes place on-site as well. Judy Centers are a one-stop-shop for low-income families to prepare their children to enter school ready to learn and grow alongside their peers.

Cheryl DeAtley has been critical to the program's success. Tirelessly, she's written grant proposals, overseen program finances, advocated before state and federal agencies, and publicized the merits of the Judy Centers in

support of expanding the full-service, community school model around the country. Particularly, she's been instrumental in creating public-private partnerships, such as with the Baltimore Community Foundation, to sponsor new Judy Centers. Cheryl has made a point of visiting every single Judy Center annually. I've worked closely with her to ensure that Judy Centers and the Maryland children and families they serve have the resources they need. Sadly for the program, Cheryl will be leaving next month to become a Program Manager at the non-profit Center for Children for its Healthy Families Southern Maryland Program, serving Charles and St. Mary's counties. Thankfully, this means Maryland families will continue to benefit from Cheryl's talent and experience.

Earlier in her career, before a stint in the private sector with a company operating after-school programs, Cheryl served for seven years with the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA). There, she oversaw the GSA's child care program for the entire National Capital Region, supervising a network of twenty-six child care centers serving federal employees. For her last two years at GSA, Cheryl held the position of Child Care Policy Advisor to the Associate Administrator for Child Care, bringing her depth and breadth of experience to the shaping of nation-wide federal child care policies. Cheryl holds a bachelor's degree in Management Studies from the University of Maryland University College and a master's degree in Early Childhood Human Development from the University of Maryland College Park.

I want to thank Cheryl for her outstanding contributions to early childhood education and to furthering the full-service, community school model in Maryland. It's been a real pleasure working with her over the years to enhance the work of the Judy Centers, and I look forward to working with Cheryl in her new capacity to advance the cause of early childhood health and wellness in Maryland's Fifth District. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Cheryl DeAtley on all she has achieved in service to Maryland and wish her well in her next endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE  
FERNANDES FAMILY

**HON. DAVID G. VALADAO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fernandes Family on being nominated the 2017 Kings County Dairy Family of the Year.

The Fernandes Family legacy began when Adao Fernandes immigrated from the Terceira Island of the Portuguese Azores to Tulare, California, in 1977 with dreams of owning a dairy. Once in the United States, Adao worked as a herdsman for Phillipe Ribeiro and Sons, a dairy in Tulare. In 1979, Adao met his wife, Maria Osvalda Avila, who also immigrated from the Azores at a young age, at the Tulare County Fair. The couple married on June 21, 1981 in Tulare at Saint Aloysius Catholic Church.

Mr. and Mrs. Fernandes spent the next nineteen years in Tulare, while Adao continued to work at Phillipe Ribeiro and Sons dairy. In this time, the couple raised three children, Adam, Osvaldo, and Mark. Their eldest son, Adam Fernandes, was born on April 21, 1983. Adam and his wife, Christen, have two boys, Adam and John, and own a local small business, Lost Sock Laundromat. Osvaldo "Ozzie" Fernandes and his wife Katie have two children, Carsyn and Ella. Ozzie, recently made partner, works with his father on the dairy as a partner in the family business. The Fernandes' youngest son, Mark, resides in Hanford, California, and is an employee for the County of Kings.

In 1990, Adao Fernandes partnered with his brother in law, Arnold Avila. With the help of the Valadao Family, the partners established the Avila and Fernandes Dairy consisting of four hundred and fifty cows. In 1999, Adao and Arnold ended their partnership to each manage their own dairy, and Adao's operation became known as the Fernandes Dairy. Adao Fernandes expanded his dairy to host approximately 1,300 cows. In 2016, Fernandes Dairy received the Dairy Herd Improvement Association Lifetime Milk Award.

This year, the Fernandes Family is being honored as the 2017 Kings County Dairy Couple of the Year at the Kings County June Dairy Month Committee Dinner in Hanford, California. This award is given to prominent dairy families in the community. The Fernandes Family upholds the principles, responsibility, and dedication this award stands for by successfully representing the dairy industry.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Fernandes Family for their influence in the dairy industry, and congratulating them on being Kings County Dairy Family of the Year.

GAGGING THE LAWYERS: CHINA'S  
CRACKDOWN ON HUMAN RIGHTS  
LAWYERS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS  
FOR U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2017*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I made the following remarks at the hearing held by the Congressional-Executive Commission on China which I co-chair with Senator MARCO RUBIO regarding China's crackdown on human rights lawyers:

Chinese officials repeatedly tell me I should focus more on the positive aspects of China and not dwell so much on the negative.

That is an extremely difficult task when you read the horrifying and sadistic accounts of torture and enforced disappearances experienced by lawyers and rights advocates.

It is hard to be positive when you contemplate Liu Xiaobo's cancer diagnosis and the fact that China effectively silenced its most brilliant democracy advocate.

The empty chair at Oslo speaks volumes about the Communist Party's abiding fear that

freedom will upend the power of the privileged few when they should be seeing liberty as a path to greater peace and prosperity.

At a hearing last month in the Subcommittee on Global Human Rights in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I heard testimony from the wives of five detained or disappeared human rights lawyers. These courageous women have become effective advocates from their husbands and for all those detained in the "709" crackdown.

They described in horrifying detail the physical, mental, and psychological torture experienced by their husbands, including marathon interrogation sessions, sleep deprivation, beatings, crippling leg torture, and prolonged submersion in water.

Many of their husbands also were forced to take alarming quantities of drugs including tranquilizers, barbiturates, antipsychotic drugs, and other unknown substances daily.

What they described was shocking, offensive, immoral, and inhumane. It is also possible that Chinese officials believe the international community will not hold them accountable.

After the hearing, I wrote to the heads of the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the World Health Organization, as well as to Secretary of State Tillerson and Ambassador Nikki Haley.

I have asked for condemnation of the practice of torture and medical experimentation on prisoners of conscience. I have also asked for investigations so that serious questions will be asked of the Chinese government.

Finally, I have asked for accountability. I have urged Secretary Tillerson to start investigations under the Global Magnitsky Act, a bill that I lead on the House side last year, so that any Chinese government officials complicit in torture should never be allowed to benefit from entry to the U.S. or access to our financial system.

The issues of torture and "residential surveillance in a designated location"—effectively enforced disappearances—will be priorities of mine and of this Commission moving forward. I believe these are issues where diverse and multi-level coalitions can be built to raise issues with the Chinese government.

I would also like to do more to prioritize the protection of human rights lawyers and their families.

At the hearing last month I heard the phrase "The War on Law" used to describe the systematic effort to eviscerate the network of human rights lawyers.

That phrase struck me because, though the number of human rights lawyers in China is small, what they stand for was nothing less than the rule of law for everyone—particularly those persecuted or aggrieved by the Communist Party.

They stand for the right of everyone in China—religious believers, ethnic minority, petitioners, labor activists, or victim of corruption or a barbaric population control policies—to have a fair hearing, due process, and a justice that is not politicized.

The Communist Party sees this as a dangerous idea. It means that they should be accountable to the people—to hundreds of millions of people in fact seeking redress for persecution and Party corruption.

Xi Jinping is feted in Davos for his commitments to openness and the rule of law, but it is rule of law for the few and privileged and rule by law for the rest.

The failure to implement the rule of law, to favor a type of lawlessness in the pursuit of keeping the Communist Party in power, has serious and lasting implications for U.S.-China relations.

We must recognize, after the failure of two and a half decades of the engagement policies, that China's domestic repression drives its external aggression, its mercantilist trade policies, and its unimaginable decisions to keep propping up a murderous North Korean regime.

I know the Chinese government wants me to focus on positive things. I think one positive development here is that the spouses (and families) of rights advocates and lawyers have given Beijing a rightly deserved headache. They have refused to be silent about their spouse's detentions or disappearances and have used the Internet and media to get out their message.

This trend is something new, something different, something we need to honor because they are under great pressure to be silent—through intimidation, harassment, and detention.

I want to say to our witness Chongyu (CHONG-YOU) that we appreciate your testimony here today and the fact that you are speaking out on behalf of your father. We want you to know that this Commission is an advocate for you, your family, and your father.

If you or your family face reprisals because of your testimony here today, the Congress will take it as a personal affront to the work of this body.

I know your petition has gathered 94,000 signatures, please make sure that my name is 94,001.

The one thing that gives me hope is that the people of China long for liberty, justice and opportunity.

The need for principled and consistent American leadership is more important than ever, as China's growing economic power, and persistent diplomatic efforts, have succeeded in dampening global criticism of its escalating repression and failures to adhere to universal standards.

The U.S. must be a beacon of liberty and a champion of individual rights and freedoms. The U.S. must also continue to be a voice for those silenced, jailed, or repressed in China.

We cannot . . . will not . . . forget those in China bravely seeking liberty and justice and the unalienable rights we all share. Like China's human rights lawyers—and like Liu Xiaobo—those who bravely seek peaceful change in China.

It is their stand for liberty, human rights, and the rule of law that remain the best hope for a peaceful and prosperous future for the U.S. and China.

RECOGNIZING MACKENZIE GORE AS 2016-17 GATORADE NORTH CAROLINA BASEBALL PLAYER OF THE YEAR

### HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say that North Carolina is home to many great student athletes that serve as community role models.

One prime example is MacKenzie Gore who graduated from Whiteville High School this month and has been named the 2017 Gatorade North Carolina Baseball Player of the Year. And, not only that, he was just recently selected 3rd overall in the Major League Baseball draft by the San Diego Padres!

MacKenzie not only demonstrates athletic excellence, but also exemplary character and work ethic—the two primary traits necessary for great success. Very few have achieved as much as early in life, and it's the culmination of years of hard work and commitment.

As with all who earn success, MacKenzie is blessed to have a big decision to make: go pro and play for the Padres or head to East Carolina University to play for the Pirates. Whatever MacKenzie decides, we are all proud of him and wish him the very best.

### CELEBRATING IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

### HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Immigrant Heritage Month. The month of June is a time for us to celebrate the people that have come to the United States to make a better life for themselves and their families. These individuals have come from all over the globe and play an integral part in the development of our country.

Since its founding, America has been a nation of immigrants. It is important that we acknowledge their contributions to our communities and remember that it was the goals and dreams of immigrants that formed our great nation. I am honored to represent Central Washington, where our culture and economy are deeply enriched by our immigrant neighbors and friends.

Please join me in honoring Immigrant Heritage Month, as I continue to work to ensure opportunity and prosperity for immigrants in my district and across the country.

H. CON. RES. 67—LIU XIAOBO

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, Mr. Speaker,

and urge the House to pass this resolution. We need to signal the Congress's unanimous support for Liu Xiaobo, and his wife Liu Xia, in this time of need.

The news of Liu Xiaobo diagnosis with terminal liver cancer was a jarring shock to everyone who admires this champion of freedom and democracy.

Unfortunately, I have heard talk that the world has forgotten Liu Xiaobo. The Chinese state media says he is irrelevant.

We must never forget this Václav Havel of China because his efforts to bring human rights and political reforms are so critical to the future of U.S.-China relations.

We must never forget his enduring contributions—whether during the Tiananmen Massacre where he helped save the lives of many students or with Charter 08—the treatise urging political and legal reforms in China based on constitutional principles.

For the past seven years, Members of Congress have repeatedly called on China to release unconditionally Liu Xiaobo and Liu Xia.

Today, we similarly ask that the Chinese government end this absurdity and its unjust and lawless treatment of these noble citizens—release them, allow them to freely meet with friends and family, and allow them to seek urgent medical care wherever they desire.

In February 2010, I led a bipartisan group of lawmakers in nominating Liu Xiaobo for the Nobel Peace Prize, at the same time nominating two other persecuted human rights advocates, Chen Guangcheng and Gao Zhisheng, to be joint recipients of that most prestigious award.

The Nobel Committee rightly awarded the Peace Prize to Liu Xiaobo for his “long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in China.” I attended the Oslo ceremony at the invitation of the family—along with Leader PELOSI.

It was a moving ceremony; the now famous empty chair spoke volumes about the Chinese Communist Party's abiding fear that human rights and democracy will undermine its power.

I will always remember the moving words of Liu Xiaobo's speech that day:

“Freedom of expression is the foundation of human rights, the source of humanity, and the mother of truth. To strangle freedom of speech is to trample on human rights, stifle humanity, and suppress truth.”

Chinese authorities have gone to great lengths to stifle Liu Xiaobo's ability to speak truth to power. In 2009, Liu was given 11 years in prison for “inciting subversion of state power.”

His wife Liu Xia was also detained in de facto form “house arrest” since 2010. Liu Xia also is in urgent need of medical care having been hospitalized for a heart condition. Over the past year, authorities have allowed her to visit her husband only on a very few occasions.

According to Chinese authorities, Liu's conviction was based on Charter 08, a treatise signed by over 300 intellectuals and activists. That document states that freedom, equality, and human rights are universal values of humankind, and that democracy and constitutional government are the fundamental framework for protecting these values.

Sadly, Liu Xiaobo and Liu Xia are not alone in facing unjust repression. As of September 2017, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China'' (CECC) Political Prisoner Database, perhaps the most complete database of its kind in the world, contains information on 1,400 cases of known political or religious prisoners.

According to CECC's Annual Report, the government of President Xi Jinping has engaged in an extraordinary assault on the rule of law, human rights, ethnic minority groups, and civil society in recent years.

Under Xi's leadership, the Chinese government has pushed through new laws and drafted legislation that would legitimize political, religious, and ethnic repression, further curtail

civil liberties, and expand censorship of the Internet.

It is tempting to be pessimistic about China's future and the future of U.S.-China relations. I am not pessimistic, despite the circumstance we consider here today. Constant repression has not dimmed the desires of the Chinese people for freedom and reform. I attribute this fact, in part, to Liu Xiaobo's ideas and example.

Nevertheless, the U.S. cannot be morally neutral or silent in the face of the Chinese government's repression of fundamental freedoms. We must show leadership and resolve because only the U.S. has the power and prestige to stand up to China's intransigence.

The U.S. must not shy away from meeting with China's other Nobel Laureate the Dalai

Lama or other dissidents. We must use Congressionally-authorized sanctions to hold Chinese officials accountable for torture and gross abuses. We must connect Internet and press freedoms as both economic and human rights priorities. And we must demand, repeatedly and clearly, that the unconditional release of political prisoners is in the interest of better U.S.-China relations.

I believe that someday China will be free. Someday, the people of China will be able to enjoy all of their God-given rights. And a nation of free Chinese men and women will honor and celebrate Liu Xiaobo as a hero. He will be honored along with all others like him who have sacrificed so much, and so long, for freedom.

**SENATE—Monday, July 3, 2017**

The Senate met at 6:32 and 46 seconds p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARCO RUBIO, a Senator from the State of Florida.

—————

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
*Washington, DC, July 3, 2017.*

*To the Senate:*

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARCO RUBIO, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. RUBIO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

—————

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY,  
JULY 6, 2017, AT 9 A.M.**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:33 and 9 seconds p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 6, 2017, at 9 a.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 3, 2017

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 3, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALEXANDER X. MOONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God, You created us endowed with freedom. We give You thanks for giving us another day.

On the eve of America's national holiday, may all citizens be mindful of the wonder of our Nation's inception. Men and women of goodwill, from various backgrounds and sections of the colonies, from disparate faith traditions, came together in prayer, and united by a vision of political and economic autonomy, courageously placed their lives, their liberty and their fortunes on the line to found these United States.

May all Americans be renewed in their commitment to our representative government. May each American citizen expect of themselves intelligent participation in the political process, so that the Members of Congress they elect might be statesmen and -women who are able to represent the interests of their constituents while also faithfully honoring their oath to defend the Constitution in doing what is best for our Nation.

In all the celebrations on this weekend, may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 415, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), the whole number of the House is 433.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JULY 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to Section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Pub. L. 114-196), I am pleased to appoint the following Members to serve as Commissioners to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission:

From private life:  
Grant Hill of Orlando, Florida  
Amy Gutmann of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
Noah Griffin of San Francisco, California  
Thank you for your attention to these recommendations.  
Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 415, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, July 6, 2017, at 9 a.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1829. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2016 annual report on bankruptcy statistics, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 159(b)(3); Public Law 109-8, Sec. 601(a); (119 Stat. 119); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1830. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9490; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-26-AD; Amendment 39-18914; AD 2017-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1831. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0531; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-178-AD; Amendment 39-18916; AD 2017-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1832. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9512; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-27-AD; Amendment 39-18909; AD 2017-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1833. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0740; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-18905; AD 2017-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1834. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9553; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-18904; AD 2017-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1835. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0016; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-18917; AD 2017-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1836. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9115; Directorate Identifier

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

2016-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-18903; AD 2017-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1837. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS AIRCRAFT LTD. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0194; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-18915; AD 2017-11-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1838. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the annual compilation of financial disclosure statements filed by the members of the board of the Office of Congressional Ethics for the pe-

riod between January 1, 2016, and December 31, 2016, pursuant to Clause 3 of House Rule XXVI (H. Doc. No. 115—50); to the Committee on Ethics and ordered to be printed.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 52: Mr. RUSH and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 93: Mr. HIMES.  
 H.R. 95: Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 257: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 435: Mr. BARR.  
 H.R. 525: Mr. MASSIE.  
 H.R. 772: Mr. MESSER.  
 H.R. 918: Mr. SOTO.  
 H.R. 986: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. CORREA.  
 H.R. 1144: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H.R. 1377: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1444: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1690: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1784: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1861: Mr. BUCK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1889: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1896: Mr. RENACCI and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1897: Mr. RENACCI and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2130: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2434: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 2465: Mr. FASO, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 218: Mr. RENACCI.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VISIT WITH HIS HOLINESS  
MAHANT SWAMI MAHARAJ AT  
BAPS MANDIR

## HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 2017

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, today I honor His Holiness Mahant Swami Maharaj, the new spiritual leader and guru of the Bochasanwasi Akshar Purushottam Sanstha (BAPS)—a global Hindu socio-spiritual organization—as he makes a historically important visit to BAPS devotees across North America.

BAPS is an impactful organization, aiming to preserve the values of family unity, selfless service, interfaith harmony and peaceful coexistence. They reach these goals through various activities and endeavors centered around spirituality, character-building, and human welfare. This often includes large-scale charitable events, community outreach activities, and in-depth educational programs for young people.

His Holiness Mahant Swami Maharaj is now the sixth guru of BAPS, having been blessed by Pramukh Swami Maharaj as his successor. His Holiness has been an enthusiastic devotee of BAPS since his youth, having taken diksha (i.e. being appointed a saint) in 1961. Over time, his outstanding virtues of austerity, self-control, devotion, humility and service have earned him his affectionate title. Following in Pramukh Swami's footsteps, Mahant Swami has pledged to propagate peace, especially in a time of unrest in the world.

Every time I visit the beautiful BAPS Mandir in Bartlett, Illinois and visit with their devotees and volunteers there, I am reminded of the excellent virtues that BAPS represents and that America should celebrate.

I honor His Holiness Mahant Swami Maharaj, the spiritual leader and guru of the BAPS Swaminarayan Sanstha organization.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 29, 2017, I was unable to record my Roll Call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on Roll Call vote No. 341, on the motion to recommit H.R. 3003, with instructions.

HONORING IVAN LEE WELTY

## HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Ivan Lee Welty, as he retires from a 45-year career as an engineer and land surveyor on the Mendocino Coast.

Born in Hill City, Kansas, in 1942, Mr. Welty received his degree in Civil Engineering from Kansas State University before making his way to Mendocino, California. He distinguished himself quickly by participating in efforts to establish the Class K Housing designation that expanded affordable housing options in rural Mendocino County. In 1975 he started his business, I.L. Welty and Associates, which has provided engineering and design services for more than 40 years.

As a business owner, Mr. Welty provided pro bono engineering and design work to numerous nonprofits including the Mendocino Coast Botanical Gardens, the Humane Society, the Mendocino Coast Hospitality Center, the Kelley House Museum, and Habitat for Humanity. In addition to donating his time, Mr. Welty paid his staff to assist on many of these projects over the years.

Mr. Welty married the love of his life, Sally, in 1974. Together they were active in many environmental and community issues. They helped found the Mendocino Land Trust and reinstitute the historic Mendocino Fourth of July Parade. They were also strong supporters of the Mendocino Whale Wars, in which community members fought the international whaling fleets to end whaling in and around Cape Mendocino. The first Mendocino Whale War Festival, now the Mendocino Coast Whale Festival, swiftly became an annual tradition that continues today.

Lee Welty's career is one of dedicated service to his community and the environment. Please join me in congratulating him on his retirement and expressing our deep appreciation for his outstanding contributions to the Mendocino Coast.

CONGRATULATING REP. MIKE  
TYRON ON BEING NAMED GRAND  
MARSHAL OF THE CRYSTAL  
LAKE INDEPENDENCE PARADE

## HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 2017

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dedicated public servant from the Sixth Congressional District of Illinois, Representative Mike Tyron of Crystal Lake. In July, he was named the Grand Marshal of the Crystal Lake 2017 Independence Parade.

As a resident of Crystal Lake since 1983, Representative Tyron has served as a model citizen. He first entered public office in 1989 as a McHenry County Board member, and nine years later was unanimously selected to be its Chairman. He served in this capacity until being elected to the Illinois House of Representatives in 2004.

During his tenure as a state representative, Representative Tyron was an exemplary leader and public servant. He spearheaded a re-writing of the tax-cap law to save taxpayers millions of dollars and close a loophole. He pushed an initiative to create an online transparency portal to list all state government salaries, contracts and expenditures, one of the first of its kind. He also helped create the county veterans' courts. The specialized court allows returning veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder or other service-related disabilities who commit nonviolent offenses to receive treatment and have charges dismissed upon successful completion of the program.

Representative Tyron has represented McHenry County, Crystal Lake, and the surrounding community well. He has been a strong voice for the Village of Crystal Lake throughout his time in public office. His long service to the people of Crystal Lake and to Illinois is truly commendable. Although he retired from public service in January, Crystal Lake will continue to benefit from his involvement as a member of the community.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, please join me in congratulating Representative Mike Tyron on 28 years of public service, and on being named the Grand Marshal of the Crystal Lake 2017 Independence Parade.

HONORING JULES HERMAN  
SITRICK

## HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 2017

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the wartime service of longtime resident of the Village of Morton Grove, Illinois.

Earlier this month, the Consul General of France in Chicago, Vincent Floreani, recognized J. Herman Sitrick as a French Knight of the Legion of Honor. The award recognizes Mr. Sitrick's extraordinary bravery and critical contribution to allied efforts to liberate France from Nazi occupation.

Joining the United States Army as a teenager, Mr. Sitrick participated in the D-Day landings on the beaches of Normandy, helping to open a second allied front in occupied Europe and suffering a shrapnel wound in the process. He fought with his unit as allied forces pushed back German forces across Europe.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

In January 1945, Mr. Sitrick found himself stationed in the Ardennes Forest, participating in what history calls the Battle of the Bulge. It was during that action that Mr. Sitrick had the quick thinking and bravery to capture twenty-one German soldiers as they sought shelter from the biting cold—turning them over to reinforcing units the next morning.

I am forever grateful to J. Herman Sitrick for his service. We must not forget what he and so many other service members went through in World War II as they risked, and in many cases sacrificed, their lives to defend freedom.

I also want to recognize the efforts of the French government, as they work to recognize veterans who have done their duty and deserve recognition.

I thank Mr. Sitrick for all that he's done for our country.

---

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL  
SCLERODERMA AWARENESS  
MONTH

---

**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 3, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Scleroderma Aware-

ness Month and on behalf of scleroderma patients throughout the United States. Initiatives like Scleroderma Awareness Month help raise awareness about the disease while driving research and action that results in new treatments for this and other illnesses.

Scleroderma is a chronic and disabling connective tissue and rheumatic disorder resulting from an overproduction of collagen in the skin, tissue, and underlying muscle. The disease manifests itself in two forms: localized scleroderma, affecting the skin and underlying tissue, and systemic scleroderma, also known as systemic sclerosis, a potentially life-threatening disease that attacks internal organs including the lungs, heart, kidneys, esophagus and gastrointestinal tract. The wide range of symptoms as well as the localized and systemic variations of the disease make it especially hard to diagnose. The average diagnosis is made 5 years after the onset of symptoms. Once diagnosed, however, people with Scleroderma can only look forward to symptomatic relief, as there is no known cure.

It is critical that we work to raise awareness of scleroderma and related diseases while encouraging research that could lead to breakthroughs in treating this disease. Scleroderma often leads to swelling, hardening and thickening of the skin, blood vessel spasms with severe discomfort in the fingers and toes,

weight loss, joint pain, swallowing difficulties, non-healing ulcerations on the fingertips and extreme fatigue. In its more advanced forms, scleroderma can prevent patients from performing even the simplest tasks. Given the lack of treatment options and the disease's effects on individuals' quality of life, we must continue to explore therapies and treatments to alleviate these symptoms. I was proud to cosponsor legislation last Congress that would encourage continued research investment in this area so that innovative therapies can be developed, and it is my hope that we continue our efforts to combat scleroderma.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing June as National Scleroderma Awareness Month. We must continue to support investment in this area so that there will one day be a cure for this devastating disease.

**SENATE—Thursday, July 6, 2017**

The Senate met at 9 and 1 second a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARCO RUBIO, a Senator from the State of Florida.

—————

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
*Washington, DC, July 6, 2017.*

*To the Senate:*

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARCO RUBIO, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. RUBIO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

—————

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
JULY 10, 2017, AT 3 P.M.**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 10, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9 and 32 seconds a.m., adjourned until Monday, July 10, 2017, at 3 p.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 6, 2017

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 6, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK MEADOWS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Dan C. Cummins, Skyline Wesleyan Church, San Diego, California, offered the following prayer:

Lord, lift us up, and let us stand, once more by faith on Heaven's tableland, to a higher plane than we have ever, ever been before. Lord, plant America's feet on higher ground.

Let not one heart desire to stay where hate arises and terror displays. Though some may dwell where this evil abounds, let our prayer, our aim, be holy ground.

O, may we live above that world where Satan's darts forever hurl and in one voice make a joyful sound, the song of saints on higher, holy ground.

Let Congress scale the utmost height and catch a gleam of Your glory bright. Through trials and tests, we will be found, our feet at last on solid ground.

We are pressing on that upward way, new heights by faith every day. And on our way, let it not be lost, the upward way is through Your cross.

Lord Jesus, plant our feet, plant my feet on holy ground.

In Your name we pray.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 415, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JUNE 30, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Hu-

manities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b)), I am pleased to reappoint The Honorable CHELLIE PINGREE of Maine to serve on the National Council on the Arts.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JUNE 30, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2081, I am pleased to reappoint the Honorable MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 415, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, July 10, 2017.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 10, 2017, at 10 a.m.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, NEPAL, INDIA, AND BELGIUM, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 4 AND MAY 13, 2017

| Name of Member or employee     | Date    |           | Country       | Per diem <sup>1</sup> |                                                      | Transportation   |                                                      | Other purposes   |                                                      | Total            |                                                      |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
|                                | Arrival | Departure |               | Foreign currency      | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi .....        | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. James Sensenbrenner ..... | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. Eliot Engel .....         | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. James McGovern .....      | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. Betty McCollum .....      | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. Judy Chu .....            | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. Joyce Beatty .....        | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. Pramila Jayapal .....     | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Wyndee Parker .....            | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Drew Hammill .....             | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Reva Price .....               | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Bina Surgeon .....             | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Emily Berret .....             | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Bart Forsyth .....             | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Sajit Gandhi .....             | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Dr. Brian Monahan .....        | 5/5     | 5/6       | Germany ..... |                       | 568.38                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 568.38                                               |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi .....        | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Hon. James Sensenbrenner ..... | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | (3)                                                  |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, NEPAL, INDIA, AND BELGIUM, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 4 AND MAY 13, 2017—Continued

| Name of Member or employee     | Date    |           | Country       | Per diem <sup>1</sup> |                                                      | Transportation   |                                                      | Other purposes   |                                                      | Total            |                                                      |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
|                                | Arrival | Departure |               | Foreign currency      | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> |
| Hon. Eliot Engel .....         | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Hon. James McGovern .....      | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Hon. Betty McCollum .....      | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Hon. Judy Chu .....            | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Hon. Joyce Beatty .....        | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Hon. Pramila Jayapal .....     | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Wyndee Parker .....            | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Drew Hammill .....             | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Reva Price .....               | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Bina Surgeon .....             | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Emily Berret .....             | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Bart Forsyth .....             | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Sajit Gandhi .....             | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Dr. Brian Monahan .....        | 5/6     | 5/8       | Nepal .....   |                       | 514.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 514.00                                               |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi .....        | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Hon. James Sensenbrenner ..... | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Hon. Eliot Engel .....         | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Hon. James McGovern .....      | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Hon. Betty McCollum .....      | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Hon. Judy Chu .....            | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Hon. Joyce Beatty .....        | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Hon. Pramila Jayapal .....     | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.13                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.13                                             |
| Wyndee Parker .....            | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Drew Hammill .....             | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Reva Price .....               | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Bina Surgeon .....             | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Emily Berret .....             | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Bart Forsyth .....             | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Sajit Gandhi .....             | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Dr. Brian Monahan .....        | 5/8     | 5/12      | India .....   |                       | 1,150.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> ) 496.12                              |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,646.12                                             |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi .....        | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Hon. James Sensenbrenner ..... | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Hon. Eliot Engel .....         | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Hon. James McGovern .....      | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Hon. Betty McCollum .....      | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Hon. Judy Chu .....            | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Hon. Joyce Beatty .....        | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Hon. Pramila Jayapal .....     | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Wyndee Parker .....            | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Drew Hammill .....             | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Reva Price .....               | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Bina Surgeon .....             | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Emily Berret .....             | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Bart Forsyth .....             | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Sajit Gandhi .....             | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Dr. Brian Monahan .....        | 5/12    | 5/13      | Belgium ..... |                       | 376.15                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 376.15                                               |
| Committee total .....          |         |           |               |                       |                                                      |                  |                                                      |                  |                                                      |                  | 49,674.48                                            |

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, June 12, 2017.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA AND IRELAND, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 24 AND MAY 30, 2017

| Name of Member or employee   | Date    |           | Country       | Per diem <sup>1</sup> |                                                      | Transportation   |                                                      | Other purposes   |                                                      | Total            |                                                      |
|------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
|                              | Arrival | Departure |               | Foreign currency      | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup> |
| Hon. Michael Turner .....    | 5/26    | 5/30      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,364.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,364.00                                             |
| Hon. Gerry Connolly .....    | 5/26    | 5/29      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,023.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,023.00                                             |
| Hon. Rob Bishop .....        | 5/26    | 5/29      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,023.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,023.00                                             |
| Hon. Bill Johnson .....      | 5/26    | 5/29      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,023.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,023.00                                             |
| Hon. Mike Kelly .....        | 5/26    | 5/29      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,023.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,023.00                                             |
| Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner ..... | 5/26    | 5/29      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,023.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,023.00                                             |
| Hon. Rick Larsen .....       | 5/26    | 5/29      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,023.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,023.00                                             |
| Jessica Calio .....          | 5/26    | 5/30      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,364.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,364.00                                             |
| Janice Robinson .....        | 5/25    | 5/30      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,705.00                                             |                  | 8,373.00                                             |                  |                                                      |                  | 10,078.00                                            |
| Ed Rice .....                | 5/26    | 5/29      | Georgia ..... |                       | 1,023.00                                             |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 1,023.00                                             |
| Hon. Rob Bishop .....        | 5/29    | 5/30      | Ireland ..... |                       | 205.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 205.00                                               |
| Hon. Gerry Connolly .....    | 5/29    | 5/30      | Ireland ..... |                       | 205.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 205.00                                               |
| Hon. Bill Johnson .....      | 5/29    | 5/30      | Ireland ..... |                       | 205.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 205.00                                               |
| Hon. Mike Kelly .....        | 5/29    | 5/30      | Ireland ..... |                       | 205.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 205.00                                               |
| Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner ..... | 5/29    | 5/30      | Ireland ..... |                       | 205.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 205.00                                               |
| Hon. Rick Larsen .....       | 5/29    | 5/30      | Ireland ..... |                       | 205.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 205.00                                               |
| Ed Rice .....                | 5/29    | 5/30      | Ireland ..... |                       | 205.00                                               |                  | ( <sup>3</sup> )                                     |                  |                                                      |                  | 205.00                                               |
| Committee total .....        |         |           |               |                       | 13,029.00                                            |                  | 8,373.00                                             |                  |                                                      |                  | 21,402.00                                            |

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, June 23, 2017.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1839. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commission Delegated Authority Provisions and Technical Amendments (RIN: 3038-AE42) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1840. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 2016 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, pursuant to

15 U.S.C. 78ggg; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1841. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities Program; Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities (RIN: 1820-AB74) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1842. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-060, pursuant to Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1843. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-036, pursuant to Sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1844. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-071, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1845. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-128, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1846. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List [Docket No.: 170411380-7380-01] (RIN: 0694-AH39) received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1847. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification on an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1848. A letter from the White House Liaison, Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1849. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Non-appropriated Fund Federal System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AN48) received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1850. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a notice of a vacancy, designation of acting officer, and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1851. A letter from the White House Liaison, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting a notification

of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1852. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1853. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9405; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-22-AD; Amendment 39-18918; AD 2017-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1854. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9432; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-18922; AD 2017-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1855. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0573; Directorate Identifier 2017-SW-001-AD; Amendment 39-18919; AD 2017-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1856. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9571; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-139-AD; Amendment 39-18925; AD 2017-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1857. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9387; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-182-AD; Amendment 39-18926; AD 2017-12-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1858. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4220; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-18923; AD 2017-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1859. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (Embraer) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3143; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-047-AD; Amendment 39-18924; AD 2017-12-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1860. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Aspen, CO; and Pueblo, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0054; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-2] received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1861. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Idaho towns; Lewiston, ID; Pocatello, ID; and Twin Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0216; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-7] received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1862. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9178; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-12] received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1863. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Removal of VOR Federal Airways; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0107; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AEA-11] received June 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1864. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modernization of the Customs Brokers Examination [Docket No.: USCBP-2016-0059] [CBP Dec. No.: 17-05] (RIN: 1651-AB07) received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YODER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3162. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2810. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for

military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 3163. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a home infusion therapy services temporary transitional payment under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3164. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to home dialysis therapy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3165. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide grants to veterans service organizations for upgrading local chapter facilities, including technology at such facilities, in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 3166. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide under the Medicare program for independent accreditation for dialysis facilities and assurance of high quality surveys with respect to such facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 3167. A bill to provide that, in the event that the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that the debt ceiling will be reached, the Secretary is required to issue GDP-linked bonds to pay the principal and interest on the public debt and the President is authorized to request the rescission of certain unobligated balances and sell certain mortgage-related assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 3168. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide continued ac-

cess to specialized Medicare Advantage plans for special needs individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. LYNCH):

H. Res. 430. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Journeyman Lineman Recognition Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

76. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 79, to support and encourage the International Criminal Court to conduct an independent investigation into the human rights violations allegedly occurring in the Chechen Republic of Russia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

77. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

78. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 59, urging the President and Congress of the United States to continue funding the Essential Air Service program throughout Michigan; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

79. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 113, urging the United States Congress to continue full funding for the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams on the campus of Michigan State University; which was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 3162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Con-

gress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 3163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 3165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 3166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 9:

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution which states in part: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 3168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 126: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 149: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 252: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 656: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 669: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 849: Mr. YODER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 931: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1002: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1038: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1057: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1143: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.



H.R. 1148: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. GOODLATTE.  
H.R. 1155: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 1163: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 1225: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1247: Mr. FASO.  
H.R. 1300: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H.R. 1606: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 1928: Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. GRANGER.  
H.R. 2422: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. ADAMS.  
H.R. 2694: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2820: Mr. FASO.  
H.R. 2908: Mr. HIMES and Mr. POLIS.  
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HARPER, Mr. COMER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. MCKINLEY.  
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. KEATING and Mr. SHERMAN.  
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. MCCARTHY and Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H. Res. 31: Mr. EVANS, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. BASS.  
H. Res. 282: Mr. MEEHAN.  
H. Res. 362: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 419: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CRIST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. VEASEY.

---

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

58. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Glenwood Springs, CO, relative to Resolution 2017-28, urging the United States Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act to allow local governments to collect tax revenues from online purchases as they would from local businesses; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## HONORING ART IBLETO, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

## HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Art Ibleto, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Mr. Ibleto is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Mr. Ibleto was born in Argentina and raised in Sesta Godono, Italy. He immigrated to the United States in 1949. He is a successful businessman and a well-known Italian chef.

During World War II, Mr. Ibleto was imprisoned for refusing to fight for Mussolini's army against the Americans because he was opposed to fascism. He escaped and joined an underground network known as the "Partisans" to oppose Nazi Germany and the Axis Powers. Following the war, Art immigrated to the United States and settled in Sonoma County, California, where he worked as a vegetable picker, a mechanic, truck driver, and factory worker. He and his wife Vicki joined the Sons of Italy in 1958 to help other Italian Americans in the United States, and he served as both the Vice President and President of the California State Chapter. He continues his public service as a member of the Sonoma County Farm Bureau and Chamber of Commerce.

His business career began in 1961, when he bought a small farm to raise hogs and cows and grow potatoes, before moving on to sell Christmas trees and building duplexes. In 1974 he began Spaghetti Palace at the Sonoma County Fair and it became an instant success, leading him to begin a career supplying pasta and Italian cuisine to Californians. His reputation and the success of Spaghetti Palace has led him to become affectionately referred to as "The Pasta King." He now owns a restaurant and catering business by the same name in addition to 75 acres of grapes used by local wineries. He cooks pasta for many charity organizations in our community. His successes and volunteer work have led him to be the recipient of both the City of Santa Rosa and City of Rohnert Park Honorary Citizen of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Mr. Art Ibleto for his achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor him here today with the American Dream Award.

## IN RECOGNITION OF ROGER THOMAS

## HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise along with my colleagues, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN and Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, to recognize Roger Thomas, Captain of the *Salty Lady*, member of the California Outdoor Hall of Fame, and lifelong advocate to keep west coast salmon fisheries alive and sustainable. Many in this chamber, the California Legislature and multiple agencies have worked with Roger for decades and are proud to call this honorable and remarkable man a friend, mentor and colleague. He is one of the most decent and hard-working human beings one can know.

Roger's passion for fishing started as a child. Born in Gilroy, California, he started fishing at an early age for striped bass from the beaches along Monterey Bay and later for salmon from a small boat launched at the Monterey Pier. He was hooked on salmon fishing and became a regular customer on charter boats out of San Francisco. Before too long, one of the captains offered Roger a job as a deck hand and, as they say, the rest is history. Roger received his captain's license in 1968.

While working full-time for the County of Santa Clara on housing issues, he ran charter boats on weekends. At one point he had acquired a fleet of five boats that were run by several captains. In 1981, he retired from his government job and dedicated all of his time and energy to fisheries and ocean conservation. There hasn't been a salmon related association or council that Roger hasn't served on.

Since 1973, he has been the President of the Golden Gate Fishermen's Association which represents charter boats from Fort Bragg to Monterey and carries some 200,000 anglers each year. He is also the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Salmon Association which represents commercial and recreational fishermen and works on protecting salmon habitat. For 14 years, he has served on the Pacific Fisheries Management Council which, among other duties, sets the ocean salmon seasons. Roger is a member of the Bay Delta Advisory board, the Winter Run-Captive Broodstock Committee, the Central Valley Fisheries Coalition, the Marine Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce, the Coastal Resources Foundation, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, the National Sea Grant Review Panel and the Marine Resources Committee.

Roger runs his charters on the *Salty Lady* out of Sausalito and Half Moon Bay. He proudly calls himself a salmon charter oper-

ation, but additionally runs whale watching and nature trips and has introduced thousands of children and adults to the magic of marine life. He has spent more than 10,000 days on the ocean and you will be hard-pressed to find someone with deeper knowledge and appreciation for that ecosystem. He also has the gift of storytelling and a mind that remembers every detail, including one of his most vivid ones from his childhood. He saw the last of the San Joaquin Spring run chinook salmon before they went extinct. His uncle took him to Friant Dam right after it was constructed. The salmon were stuck at the end of the line imposed to divert water to fields in the San Joaquin valley. They were "big fish," Roger says stretching out his arms, "just big fish."

Roger is a familiar face in Congress where he has represented the interests of the charter boat fleet and the health of west coast salmon stocks for decades. In the 1980s, he was appointed by then Vice President George Bush to the National Sea Grant Review Panel. In this role he traveled to ports around the country and helped decide which projects were worthy and would be funded.

Roger was instrumental in former Representative George Miller's 1992 Central Valley Improvement Act and its eventual passage. The CVP is a key law to stop environmental harm to salmon and the Bay Delta. When salmon populations collapsed in 2008 and 2009, Roger worked closely with Representative MIKE THOMPSON to provide disaster relief to salmon fishermen.

Roger Thomas' tireless work has earned him the respect and adoration of countless people. With his recent tragic diagnosis of late stage cancer, it is our intention through these extended remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to express our appreciation for his outstanding work and lasting contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to join us in celebrating the life of Roger Thomas who loves fish, loves the ocean, and above all loves people. He has touched many hearts, protected many livelihoods and has earned the admiration of coastal communities up and down the western seaboard.

## HONORING SUZANNE SMITH, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

## HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Suzanne Smith, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Ms. Smith is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Suzanne Smith was born in Sechelt, British Columbia, Canada and immigrated to the United States at the age of six. She is the successful Executive Director of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority and the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority.

As Executive Director of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority, Ms. Smith has orchestrated numerous projects, including the widening of Highway 101 and the development of the SMART rail line. She lobbied at the state and federal levels to secure funding for these projects while also securing a voter approved sales tax measure to support future transportation developments in Sonoma County. She is the founder of the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA), where she helped establish a climate action plan in Sonoma County to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions 25 percent by 2020. The RCPA was recognized by President Barack Obama as one of sixteen Climate Action Champions in the United States.

Suzanne Smith serves on the boards of the Red Cross, Leadership Santa Rosa, Tomorrow's Leaders Today and as a member of Sonoma County's Democratic Central Committee. Ms. Smith holds a BA in Political Science from the University of California, San Diego and an MPA from the University of San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Ms. Suzanne Smith for her achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor her here today with the American Dream Award.

#### HONORING WILLIAM K.W. KIM, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

##### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 6, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. William K.W. Kim, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to California's 5th Congressional District communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Mr. Kim exemplifies these attributes and is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Mr. Kim was born in Daegu, South Korea and immigrated to the United States. He and his wife Yolanda came to Vallejo in 1980. He is a successful business owner and a hard-working member of our community.

Over the past 36 years, Mr. Kim taught over 10,000 students to be leaders in society through Taekwondo in Vallejo. The philosophy of Taekwondo and Mr. Kim's teaching have

helped students from all walks of life. Many struggling young people have found support and personal growth through their lessons from Mr. Kim. He currently operates William Kim's Taekwondo Center, one of the nation's largest martial arts facilities. He holds the highest rank in Taekwondo, the 9th Degree Black Belt, and was inducted into the "Taekwondo Hall of Fame" in 2009.

In addition to running his business and mentoring our youth, Mr. Kim is an active member of the Vallejo community. Most notably, he initiated the Sister City Relations with Jincheon, South Korea and the City of Vallejo in 1999. He has helped us improve our community's relationship with the people of South Korea. Mr. Kim currently serves as the International Liaison Officer for the two cities. Mr. Kim and his wife have a son and two daughters. They strive to live positive lives and help others do the same.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Mr. William K.W. Kim for his achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor him here today with the American Dream Award.

#### WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN

##### HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 6, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome President Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea upon his first visit to the United States.

Rooted in rich history, the United States and the Republic of Korea share a special relationship based on robust bonds of collaboration and camaraderie. The most illustrative manifestations of American and Korean partnership have been the economic and security alliances formed since the early 1950s. Together, we have worked to thwart the spread of territorial and international threats while also engaging in mutually beneficial trade and investment. In the 21st century, our special relationship will only expand as we face new challenges to regional and global security and promote free and fair trade. Our nations must forge ahead to put an end to North Korea's nuclear program. Failure on this front would compromise global peace and state sovereignty. And, ultimately, we must continue to seek an end to the conflict between the North and the South—which has destroyed lives and entire families—by reunifying the Korean Peninsula. As our nations encounter a critical moment in history—a moment simultaneously fraught with peril yet abound with opportunity—this visit provides an opportunity to enhance our established commitment to security and the advancement of strategic interests.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome President Moon and look forward to our continuous and prosperous partnership with the Republic of Korea.

#### HONORING LUISA ACOSTA, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

##### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 6, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Luisa Acosta, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Ms. Acosta is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Ms. Acosta was born in Mexico and immigrated to the United States. She is a successful community activist and is committed to social justice, particularly for employee rights.

Luisa Acosta, the daughter of immigrant farmworkers, spent her childhood in the fields harvesting pears and walnuts and working in a fruit packing facility. Though this work was difficult, her time as a farmworker instilled in her a fierce determination, resilience and desire to better her community through social justice work. She has worked as a Lake County Substance Abuse Counselor, a paralegal and a grant writer for United Farmworkers of America, a representative for Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local and an internal organizer for National Union of Health Workers.

Ms. Acosta is an active participant in local politics and serves on the Lake County Democratic Central Committee. She finds time to direct and instruct various Latino cultural programs, including the Kelseyville Ballet Folklorico and the Lake County Fair Latino Fiesta. Ms. Acosta cites the farmworker activist and leader, Cesar Chavez, as one of her inspirations, and she strives to impact her community as he did—through humility, kindness and fearless leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Ms. Luisa Acosta for her achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor her here today with the American Dream Award.

#### HONORING GUSTAVO BRAMBILA, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

##### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 6, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Gustavo Brambila, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship

and Innovation, or Community Service. Mr. Brambila is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Mr. Brambila was born in Jalisco, Mexico, and immigrated to the United States in 1957. He is a successful vintner and his hard work and ingenuity makes him one of our community's finest entrepreneurs.

Mr. Brambila developed an interest in wine making as he watched his father work in winery maintenance. He later joined Mike Grgich and Jim Barret in 1976 at Chateau Montelena to begin his career in the wine community. Shortly after, he joined Mike Grgich in the opening of Grgich Hill Cellars in 1977, where, in his first harvest, he produced the winning chardonnay in the Great Chardonnay Showdown of 1980. Inspired by old-world wine making techniques, Mr. Brambila produced his first wine under the Gustavo Wine label in 1996.

Mr. Brambila has been a trail blazer for both vintners and Mexican-Americans. He was one of the first Latinos to earn a degree in Fermentation Science from University of California, Davis's oenology program. He has also traveled to Washington, D.C., with a group of Mexican-American Vintners to support the mission of the Smithsonian Institution. Mr. Brambila has been active in our community, appearing on our local news channel and hosting events like an outdoor movie night for local families. He has gained international recognition with his involvement in the landmark wine competition known as the Judgment of Paris.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Mr. Gustavo Brambila for his achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor him here today with the American Dream Award.

**HONORING MARYAM MOHSENZADEH, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD**

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Maryam Mohsenzadeh, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Dr. Mohsenzadeh is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Dr. Mohsenzadeh was born in Iran and immigrated to the United States at the age of 14. She moved to St. Helena, California in 2006 with her husband, Dr. Hossein Razavi. She is the Director of Queen of the Valley Hospital's Mobile Dental Clinic Community where she delivers oral care to the most vulnerable children of our community.

Dr. Mohsenzadeh grew up in a small town in Iran, where she did not have the right to an education. Her ambition to go to school and her brave choice to leave her home without

her parents' knowledge, shows the grit and determination she needed to immigrate to the United States. With a Doctoral degree in Dental Surgery and additional training in Hospital Dentistry, Dr. Mohsenzadeh is an example of how hard work and sacrifice enriches our communities.

Dr. Mohsenzadeh transformed her suffering into the empathy she needs in order to be a focused, compassionate and fearless dentist for the most vulnerable members of our community. Through her work with Queen's Mobile Dental Clinic, Dr. Mohsenzadeh delivers free dental care to children and young adults who are uninsured or unable to pay for the high cost of dental care. She has made more than 45,000 clinic visits to children from the underserved population of Napa County since 2008.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Dr. Maryam Mohsenzadeh for her achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor her here today with the American Dream Award.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF RAYMOND V. WALENDZAK**

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Raymond V. Walendzak, who served for over 20 years as the Chief of the Oregon Fire Department. Ray passed away in his Oregon home surrounded by his family on June 7, 2017.

Ray was born in Toledo, Ohio on September 27, 1941 to Joan and Stanley Walendzak. He played football and wrestled for Clay High School, from which he graduated in 1959. Ray continued his education at Findlay College, and then joined the United States Air Force and served in West Germany.

In 1968, Ray became an Oregon firefighter, where he began his service in the department's maintenance division, became a fire prevention officer, a district chief, and the assistant chief. Ray's father also served as a firefighter, which helped Ray bridge the differences between the different generations who were serving as firefighters. He appreciated the traditions of fire service, and also the need to modernize fire service with technology.

Ray became Fire Chief in 1986 and retired in 2007 for a total of 39 years of fire service. While Fire Chief, Ray made sure his department was current in training and technology, and made sure that the department had the right equipment. Ray has said that his biggest achievement was getting a fire training facility built in Oregon.

His passion about the fire-fighting community led him to serve its various organizations which include serving as the past president of the Ohio Fire Chiefs Association, Lucas County Fire Chiefs Association, Oregon Fire Fighters Association, Ottawa County Fireman's Association, and, for over 26 years, as past president and secretary of the Northwest Ohio Volunteer Fire Association.

He had received the Ohio Fire Chiefs' Association's Distinguished Service Award, and was inducted into the Ohio Fire Service Hall of Fame. Ray served as a Governor appointee to the State of the Ohio Board of Emergency Medical Services for 12 years. He was inducted into the Clay High School Hall of Fame in 2014.

Ray's commitment to his community did not just stop with the fire department—it extended through his service to his church, St. Ignatius, and through many of the civic organizations he was a member of: the American Legion Christ Dunberger Post No. 537, Knights of Columbus, Swiss Club at the GAF, and the Clay Boosters.

Ray dedicated an enormous amount of time to the youth of his community, where he was a longtime coach of youth baseball through the Oregon Recreation Department. Ray also served as a football coach at Oregon Clay High School. His dedication to the young members of his community led him to run for four terms on the Oregon Board of Education where he also served as Board President.

Ray will be remembered for his dedication to his chosen profession of Fire Fighting and for his dedication to the Oregon community at large.

We offer Ray's children, Dean, Donald and Dennis, his six grandchildren, his family and friends our prayers and hope that they find comfort in the wonderful memories of what Ray had meant to each of the institutions that he served.

**HONORING MYRNA LARDIZABAL DE VERA, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD**

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayor Myrna Lardizabal De Vera, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Mayor De Vera is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Mayor De Vera was born in Cebu City, Philippines and immigrated to the United States. She has lived in Hercules, CA since 1991. She is a successful insurance agency owner and public servant.

Mayor De Vera learned the value of community service from her parents who were both active in their Cebu City community. She began volunteering with the Cebu Jaycees and Rotary Club of Cebu-West when she was six years old. She received her Bachelor's Degree in Architecture from the University of the Philippines before immigrating to the United States. Mayor De Vera honors her parents' Filipino heritage and legacy of community service by working with organizations such as the Filipina Women's Network and Hercules Democratic Club.

Mayor De Vera was elected to be the Mayor of Hercules in 2011, 2014 and 2017. She is the only woman and Filipina on the city council, something she does not take lightly saying, "I took on the challenge of changing the stereotyping of Filipinas." Ms. De Vera dedicates herself to public service not just in Hercules, but throughout the region, serving on various commissions and committees to help improve the lives of those around her. Her great work led the Hercules Chamber of Commerce to name her Citizen of the Year in 2014.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Mayor Myrna Lardizabal De Vera for her achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor her here today with the American Dream Award.

---

HONORING NATALY DEHERRERA,  
RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN  
DREAM AWARD

---

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Nataly Deherrera, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Ms. Deherrera is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Ms. Deherrera was born in Angeles City, Philippines and immigrated to the United States. She is a successful business owner and a compassionate volunteer.

Ms. Deherrera is driven by integrity. Her personal success and contributions to our community are examples of the American Dream at work. As owner of TaxAce Group Inc., a five star accounting firm, she voluntarily assists hospice groups, firefighters, and teachers with their annual tax returns. She also provides free tax classes for small business owners and free educational workshops for families. She volunteers for the national organization, City Impact, which supports urban youth, families and neighborhoods.

With a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Accounting and Computing, Ms. Deherrera has set an exceptional example for her two daughters, Natasha and Andrea. Natasha is a graduate of the University of California at Davis, and Andrea is currently attending San Francisco State University.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Ms. Nataly Deherrera for her achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor her here today with the American Dream Award.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF DIANE  
GRIFFITHS

**HON. KAREN BASS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate Diane Griffiths on a long career of service to the State of California, and on her retirement on June 1, 2017.

Diane Griffiths served many years as chief of staff to my friend and former colleague in the California legislature, Robert Hertzberg, including during his two terms as the 64th Speaker of the California Assembly, as well as after his election to the California Senate. As a former Speaker myself, I know how vital a role the Speaker's chief of staff plays in the success of each legislative session and the legislature overall. Diane worked diligently to keep herself informed on the substance of a wide range of issues, while also handling the myriad management tasks involved in the running of an operation as complex as a legislative leadership office.

She has worked in the Legislature in many different roles and handled a broad range of policy, legal and administrative issues. Senator Hertzberg describes her as "the consummate chief of staff" and praises her for always striving to help others to be as effective as possible.

Previously, Diane served as chief of staff to the University of California Board of Regents. She was also General Counsel to California's Fair Political Practices Commission. A graduate of the Boalt Hall School of Law at the University of California, Berkeley, she clerked for the California and Alaska Supreme Courts after graduation.

Diane will be missed, but I appreciate the decades of service that she gave to the citizens of California and I wish her all the best in her new endeavors.

---

HONORING SONU CHANDI, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

---

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Sonu Chandi, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Mr. Chandi is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Mr. Chandi was born in India and immigrated to the United States in 2000, at the age of sixteen. He is the successful founder and CEO of Chandi Hospitality Group, which manages fourteen restaurants and the North Bay branch of Mountain Mike's Pizza.

Though Sonu Chandi arrived in the United States with little money and knowledge of English, his powerful work ethic helped him achieve his dream of owning a restaurant. After seeing his father work tirelessly in restaurant kitchens, Sonu and his brothers helped their father open his own restaurant, forming the Chandi Hospitality Group. In 2007, the Chandi Hospitality Group invested in the Mountain Mike's Pizza franchise and became integral to the franchise's development in the North Bay area of California.

Mr. Chandi's business strategy is community centered, and he has used his profits to support local organizations, such as Food for Thought, The Cancer Society, The Living Room, and The Heart Association. The Chandi Hospitality Group has also funded programs for Santa Rosa Junior College, Sonoma State University and several local public schools. Sonu Chandi is an active member of the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce. He is a fine example of a socially conscious businessman, using his impressive success to nourish his local community.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Mr. Sonu Chandi for his achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor him here today with the American Dream Award.

---

HONORING NEWTON LUU AND JACKIE TRUONG, RECIPIENTS OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

---

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 6, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Newton Luu and Mrs. Jackie Truong, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Mr. Newton Luu and Mrs. Jackie Truong are very deserving of this award and recognition.

Mr. Luu was born in Vietnam and immigrated to the United States in 1975, following the fall of Saigon in the Vietnam War. Mrs. Truong, also born in Vietnam, arrived in the U.S. shortly after the end of the Vietnam War.

Newton Luu and Jackie Truong met while attending San Francisco State University. Newton is now the president and founder of LeChat Nail Care Products. Jackie is the head of international product education and is the driving force in product development. Together, they have built a company that does business with hundreds of distributors and salons in over 40 countries.

Newton and Jackie received the U.S. Department of Commerce President's "E" Award for their business. Though Newton and Jackie have achieved international business success, Mr. Luu and Mrs. Truong have kept the company headquartered in the Bay Area, with facilities in Hercules and Richmond providing

*July 6, 2017*

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 163, Pt. 7

**10251**

employment opportunities for underserved communities.

Newton and Jackie volunteer for local Vietnamese American groups and fundraise for local elections. Their greatest happiness is

being parents to two daughters: Logan, age 13, and Megan, age 12.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Mr. Newton Luu and Mrs. Jackie Truong for their achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting

and proper that we honor them here today with the American Dream Award.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 10, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 10, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Reverend Gary Studniewski, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we give You praise and thanksgiving for the United States of America, birthed on the American creed that You have endowed every person with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We know that true liberty nor happiness is possible without recourse to Your divine will.

Bless the Members of this governing assembly with the wisdom of discerning Your will concerning our national affairs and help them exercise their powers at the service of the rights of each citizen.

Bless this House and the country it serves with Your protection and peace, You who are source of peace, now and forever.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 415, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JULY 6, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to Section 431(a)(3) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017 (Pub. L. 115-31), I am pleased to appoint the following individuals to serve as Commissioners to the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission:

Ms. Nicola Miner of San Francisco, California

Ms. Jennifer Siebel Newsom of San Francisco, California

Thank you for your attention to these recommendations.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 415, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1865. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service; Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment [Doc. No.: AMS-LPS-16-0071] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1866. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2016 Operational Energy Annual Report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1867. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Financial Management, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid/CHIP Program; Medicaid Program and Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP); Changes to the Medicaid Eligibility Quality Control and Payment Error Rate Measurement Programs in Response to the Affordable Care Act [CMS-6068-F] (RIN: 0938-AS74) received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1868. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Titanium Dioxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0252; FRL-9961-82] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1869. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyroxsulam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0066; FRL-9962-60] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1870. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxirane, 2-methyl, polymer with oxirane, hydrogen sulfate, ammonium salt and potassium salt; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0780; FRL-9962-19] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1871. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Labeling Relief; Formaldehyde Emission Standards for Composite Wood Products [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0243; FRL-9963-05] (RIN: 2070-AK30) received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1872. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indaziflam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0166; FRL-9962-61] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1873. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flubendiamide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0099; FRL-9962-13] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1874. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0254; FRL-9962-05] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1875. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Compliance Date Extension; Formaldehyde Emission Standards for Composite Wood Products [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0244; FRL-9963-74] (RIN: 2070-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



AK35) received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1876. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Buprofezin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0595; FRL-9962-06] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1877. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0415; FRL-9962-53-Region 9] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1878. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Site-specific Sulfur Dioxide Requirements for USG Interiors, LLC [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0081; FRL-9964-49-Region 5] received June 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1879. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1880. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 "Joint Communiqué", the treatment by the Government of Cuba of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 "Joint Statement", and the United States-Cuba January 2017 "Joint Statement", together known as the Migration Accords, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, Sec. 2245; (112 Stat. 2681-824); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1881. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-74, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1882. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-68, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1883. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-67, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1884. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-75, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1885. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, De-

partment of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-002, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1886. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-027, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1887. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-091, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1888. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-024, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1889. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-025, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1890. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-91, "Primary Date Alteration Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1891. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-90, "St. Mary's Way Designation Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1892. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-92, "Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Relocation Temporary Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1893. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas 2016 management report and financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1894. A letter from the Inspector General, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the results of an audit of the U.S. House of Representatives' annual financial statements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016; to the Committee on House Administration.

1895. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revival of Abandoned Applications, Reinstatement of Abandoned Applications and Cancelled or Expired Registrations, and Petitions to the Director [Docket No.: PTO-T-2010-0016] (RIN: 0651-AC41) received July 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1896. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule, technical amendment, withdrawal — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Moses Lake, WA; Olympia, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0217; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-8] received July 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1897. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Rules of Procedure Governing Cases Before the Office of Hearings and Appeals (RIN: 3245-AG82) received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Small Business.

1898. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report titled "Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used By Dual Eligibles: 2017", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 note; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 3313(a)(2); (124 Stat. 477); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 3169. A bill to improve the hiring, training, and efficiency of acquisition personnel and organizations of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 3170. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3171. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that certain orthotist's and prosthetist's clinical notes under Medicare be treated as part of the patient's medical record; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3172. A bill to amend the Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 to extend the Medicare Patient IVIG Access Demonstration Project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3173. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create alternative sanctions for technical noncompliance with the Stark rule under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. KILMER, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 3174. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts with industry intermediaries for purposes of promoting the development of and access to apprenticeships in the technology sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

80. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, encouraging the Federal Government to work with states to plan and implement state-tailored, innovative Medicaid programs that maximize states' flexibility and choice; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

81. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 11, urging the President of the United States to direct the United States Department of State's Directorate of Defense Trade Controls to cease labeling gunsmiths as manufacturers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

82. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 4, requesting that Utah's congressional delegation submit federal legislation amending federal block grant maintenance-of-effort requirements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

83. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 7, expressing support for Utah ranchers grazing livestock on Utah's public lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

84. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 11, urging that sufficient funding be budgeted to complete the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project, as well as the entire Central Utah Project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

85. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 5, supporting the intended proposed United States House Bill to increase oil royalties to the Utah Navajo Trust Fund; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

86. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 6, supporting the Re-Em-

powerment of the States Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

87. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, affirming the resolve of the state Legislature and the Governor to protect the civil liberties, religious freedoms, and dignity of all Americans, legal immigrants, and refugees seeking protection against persecution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

88. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, urging Congress to authorize states to regulate air ambulance billing and collections of patient care costs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

89. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 13, urging the United States Congress to authorize the creation of for profit corporations by the several states; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

90. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 3, urging Congress to enact legislation permitting commercial drivers who are 18 to 21 years old to operate a commercial motor vehicle in a contiguous state; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

91. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to House Petition 1120, urging the United States Congress to reduce tariffs on lobster and seafood products to keep Maine and domestic lobster and seafood products competitive with Canadian lobster and seafood products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

92. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 17, urging the President of the United States and Congress to recognize state authority and take action to restore power to the states; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Rules, the Budget, and Oversight and Government Reform.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 3171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 3174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 449: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 506: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 592: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DONOVAN, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 858: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WALZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 916: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1002: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1094: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1552: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1575: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1606: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1673: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1692: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1698: Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1802: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1841: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1847: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1884: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1904: Mr. TONKO and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2059: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2260: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2519: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COMER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. MESSER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2774: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2785: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2956: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 3027: Mr. HECK.

**SENATE—Monday, July 10, 2017**

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, all power and authority belong to You. You even rule the raging of the sea.

Guide our lawmakers as they strive to serve Your purposes for their lives in this generation. May they acknowledge You as the source of their strength, finding their security in the wisdom and love of Your unfolding providence. Make our Senators a shining example of trustworthy and responsible stewardship. Use them to strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation and world. Lord, give them a renewed sense of reverence and wonder that You have chosen them to serve You and country.

We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The majority leader is recognized.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, ObamaCare has been hurting toward collapse for years. Today it sits on the edge of a total meltdown. Unless we do something about that, even more Americans are going to get hurt.

These are the men and women we represent—Americans who didn't do anything wrong and Americans who, in too many cases, have been hurt by ObamaCare already—and we have a responsibility to help before ObamaCare literally comes crashing down around them.

I think each of us understands this. Yet, too often, this central fact seems to get lost amidst the din of cable news sound bites and over-the-top attacks. Too many seem to have forgotten the pain ObamaCare has brought to so many families over the years. Too

many seem to have forgotten that even more will be hurt if the ObamaCare status quo is allowed to continue.

I recently shared a letter from a constituent in Lancaster who told me about her struggle to make ends meet under ObamaCare. Here is what she said: "Why is there a law forcing me to pay for something I can't afford," she asked. "Either I can eat and pay my mortgage or [I can] pay for insurance."

I recently shared the story of a single mom from Berea, a full-time student trying to make ends meet. When she began searching for a plan on the ObamaCare exchanges, she told me she saw a startling picture: high premiums and a staggering deductible.

"At this rate," she wrote, "I would honestly be better not to take health insurance at all and hope for the best. Americans like myself need something better."

Premiums have been skyrocketing under ObamaCare for years now—by as much as an average of 105 percent in the majority of the States' Federal exchanges. Unless we act, premiums are poised to continue skyrocketing.

Customers are now learning what they can expect next year, and the situation is concerning. ObamaCare premiums could climb by as much as 30 percent in my State, over 40 percent in Tennessee, and over 50 percent in Georgia. Unfortunately, these States are not alone. This is a trend we are seeing all across our country.

To make matters worse, many have been left behind with fewer options as ObamaCare has forced insurance options literally out of the marketplace. Unless we act, choices will continue to decline on the exchanges, just as they have over the past several years.

I recently shared a Lexington native's account about the limited options she found on the exchanges. Here is what she said: "I live in one of the three largest cities in our state, and I had two options for insurance this year. The lowest deductible option," she continued, "was \$10,000."

I recently shared a Louisville mother's pleas for Congress to bring relief from ObamaCare's limited options. Here is what she said: "Middle class Kentuckians are hurting because of ObamaCare," she said. "Residents [have] little choice for health plans and our family is not the only one suffering from the high costs of health insurance."

"I hope," she concluded, that "you will push hard to fix our healthcare system."

This year, families in 70 percent of counties had just one or two insurance

options on ObamaCare. As a survey out just yesterday showed, the number of uninsured grew in 2017, with nearly 2 million people dropping ObamaCare coverage. Now we are hearing even more negative projections for next year.

In fact, it is expected that in 2018, thousands could be left without any ObamaCare options at all in States like Nevada and Missouri and Ohio, while thousands more are left with just one choice, which is really no choice at all.

A new CMS report released just a few minutes ago found that nearly 40 percent fewer insurers have filed to participate in the ObamaCare exchanges next year. This reduction in choice is a trend we have been seeing under ObamaCare, and it seems only to keep getting worse.

Higher prices, fewer options, diminished hope, that is the legacy of ObamaCare for too many. It has been failing the American people for years, and it will collapse around them if we fail to act.

We will not make things better if we go backward with even more Federal control. We will not solve this problem by simply throwing more money at it. Band-aids just will not work here. The American people deserve solutions that finally empower them in making more of their own decisions about their families' healthcare.

I regret that our Democratic colleagues have made clear they are not interested in working seriously with us to pursue the types of comprehensive reforms needed to improve healthcare for hard-working Americans who have been hurt by this law, but the Senate Republican conference will continue working to help these families because we believe they deserve better than ObamaCare and its years of failures.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as Senators continue to return from the

State work period, we return here in the Senate to the topic of healthcare, which everyone in America should continue to focus on.

Even after weeks of work, it seems my friends on the other side are no closer to having enough votes to proceed to their bill—which, of course, they insisted on doing with no Democratic votes or input.

The biggest challenge proposed to the legislation during the break was an amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas, TED CRUZ, which would remove crucial protections for sicker Americans and unbalance the marketplace. The Cruz amendment is a hoax. Under the guise of lowering premiums, the Cruz amendment would actually make healthcare more expensive because deductibles and copayments would be so onerous that many Americans would pay more, not less, in out-of-pocket expenses than they pay today. These lower premium policies will have such high deductibles and copays that the policies themselves would be virtually worthless. Imagine you have a \$2,000 premium and a \$1,000 deductible in your policy. Imagine now that, under the Cruz amendment, an insurance company is allowed to offer a cheaper policy because they aren't required to cover very many services. That policy might have a premium of \$1,000 but a deductible of \$10,000. You would be paying less monthly, but you would have to put down a huge amount of money for your policy to even kick in. In that way, a Cruz insurance policy is worse than no policy at all because the vast majority would pay a monthly premium and never hit their deductible, so they would be getting no health insurance benefit at all. You would pay the premium, but the deductible is so high, your insurance never kicks in. What good is that? In effect, for many, it is a policy that would have a premium but no insurance.

In addition, Americans with pre-existing conditions will almost certainly be left without access to affordable and quality healthcare, making the Senate bill even meaner than the House bill on this issue. Even the Republican Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, said that about the Cruz amendment. Here is what he said:

There's a real feeling that [it's] subterfuge to get around pre-existing conditions. . . . If it has the effect of annihilating the pre-existing condition requirement that we have in the existing bill, then obviously I would object to that.

Those are the words of Senator GRASSLEY.

Members of both parties agree that the most significant potential change to the Republican TrumpCare bill is an amendment that would make the legislation even worse. So make no mistake about it—the Cruz amendment is a cruel, mean hoax.

Let's not forget that even without the Cruz amendment, the substance of

the base Senate Republican bill is devastating. The CBO reports it would cause costs to go up, care to go down, and force 22 million Americans off their health insurance. It would end Medicaid as we know it.

This weekend, I had the good experience once again to go to the Utica Boilermaker, a famous 15K road race in my dad's hometown, the largest in the country. People from 45 States participated.

As usual, I walked through the crowd afterwards, congratulating people on a great race. They were sweaty, but they were happy. I came upon three men in wheelchairs. Here they are. Just after they crossed the finish line, the first thing they said to me was this: "Senator, please protect Medicaid; we'd be lost without it."

These were proud men, and they deserved to be proud for finishing a difficult race made harder by their disability. They could be forgiven for taking a moment to celebrate. Instead, they wheeled up to me to talk about how important Medicaid was to them.

These are not slackers. They wouldn't be in a race like this if they were. They needed some help. They are disabled. I don't know how their disabilities came about—probably from work. They look like really strong guys. Are we going to take away their Medicaid so we can give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America? I hope not.

These folks know that Medicaid is a lifesaver for Americans with disabilities. They want it maintained and strengthened, not dismantled so our Republican friends can give another tax break to the very wealthy.

These three should remind everyone that dismantling Medicaid is the wrong way to go. It is time to move on from the failing Republicans-only approach and start over in a bipartisan way in healthcare.

Republican leadership has been trying to cajole their Members into voting for this bill by saying that if Republicans fail to pass this bill, they will have to work with Democrats. Republican leadership is not telling their Members: Vote for this bill because it is a good bill. No, they are saying: Vote for this bill or you will have to work with Democrats.

When you can't defend the substance of the bill at all, it is time to move on. When using bipartisanship as a threat is your only argument, it is time to move on.

My Republican friends should not be so afraid of working with Democrats that they are bullied into supporting a terrible bill. The Senate—we all know this—was intended as a forge for bipartisan consensus—a cooling saucer, as the Founding Fathers said. In the Senate, bipartisanship should be the first option, not the last resort.

I repeat: We Democrats are willing to work. We are ready to work with our

Republican colleagues on healthcare. Today Democratic leadership sent a letter to my friend the majority leader again offering to work with him on specific legislation to stabilize the marketplaces and improve the quality and lower the cost of care.

The majority leader said over the break that he may be forced to work with Democrats to stabilize marketplaces. Democrats say: Let's do it. Let's do it now.

We sent the majority leader four specific proposals, led by Senator SHAHEEN's amendment to guarantee cost-sharing reduction payments—the most important thing we can do to stabilize the marketplace and even lower premiums for many right now. Whatever your views on healthcare, we should agree that we need to stabilize the marketplaces. I look forward to a response from the majority leader to our letter.

When will my Republican friends realize that their partisan approach to healthcare is a dead end, that the only way to truly improve our Nation's healthcare system is to finally heed Democrats' requests to come together and work in a bipartisan way? I hope our Republican colleagues realize this sooner, not later.

#### PRESIDENT TRUMP'S MEETING WITH PRESIDENT PUTIN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, there was the G-20 and President Trump's bilateral meeting with President Putin. While a few good things came out of this summit, overall, it was an embarrassment to our country and our ideals. Clearly, the lowest moment of all was President Trump's meeting with Vladimir Putin, on several counts.

As our intelligence community has concluded, the President of Russia deliberately interfered in our elections and sought to undermine our democracy. That is not Democrats making it up. That is 17 intelligence agencies—men and women, many of whom risk their lives for us every day, people we look up to, people we admire. They are the ones who said there was interference—not Democrats, not politicians. I wish President Trump would stop saying it was Democrats who came up with this idea. It was our own intelligence community. Rather than decisively confront the Russian President on these actions—the Russian interference—the President reportedly acquiesced to Putin's denial.

To give equal credence to the findings of 17 U.S. intelligence agencies and an assertion by Mr. Putin is disgraceful. They are not equal. Our 17 intelligence agencies are far more important to us and far more credible to us than Vladimir Putin. Every American—every American—no matter their party affiliation, should take umbrage with the President of the United States

equating our own hardworking, dedicated intelligence community with Mr. Putin, who has shown contempt for our democracy and has spent his professional and political career trying to undermine it.

This almost certainly paves the way—the President's actions almost certainly pave the way—for future Russian interference on our elections. If Russia feels there will be no punishment for interfering in our elections, no reprimand at all from the United States, surely they will try and try again.

President Trump went so far as to float the absolutely absurd possibility of a joint cyber security unit with the Russians. Then he backtracked after he was hailing it as one of the great things about the summit. When he got such reaction—particularly, from Senators MCCAIN and RUBIO, from his own party—he backtracked.

The thought of working with our adversary on cyber security should send chills down the backs of all Americans. It is clear that President Trump is not willing to be the guardian of American interests when it comes to Vladimir Putin. The House of Representatives must step in and fill the void by passing the Senate's tough, bipartisan sanctions bill to finally punish Russia for their intrusions in our 2016 elections.

The Founding Fathers established Congress as a check and balance on the executive branch when necessary. The House must be that check and balance now.

Given the President's actions at the G-20, there is now even more reason for the House to pass the Senate sanctions bill, which passed 98 to 2—overwhelmingly bipartisan.

Given President Trump's casual dismissals of the findings of our intelligence community and face-value acceptance of Mr. Putin's word, there is even greater cause to tie the hands of this administration with a tough Russian sanctions bill.

Now more than ever, it is clear that President Trump should not have the final and only authority to lift sanctions on Russia. He has shown that he is willing to turn a blind eye to the direct assault on our democracy and did so this weekend in his meeting with Mr. Putin.

Congress should step up and say: President Trump, if you are not going to punish Russia for meddling with our democracy, we will.

The American people are wondering: How can the President of the United States fail to stick up for our democracy? How can the President fail to seriously challenge the man responsible for violating the sanctity of our elections?

Candidly, I am dismayed that the Republican leadership in this body and in the other has been so quiet in the wake

of these events. The Republican Party's foreign policy for decades was predicated on opposition to the Soviet Union and now Russia. It was the linchpin of their foreign policy. Now, when a President of their party is soft on Russia—even after Russia blatantly interfered in our elections—we hardly hear a peep from the Republican leadership.

I certainly acknowledge, respect, and admire the words of my friends, Republican Senators MCCAIN, GRAHAM, SASSE, and RUBIO, who have spoken out and should be recognized and applauded for it. They have been the exception, not the rule. We need to hear more from the Republican leadership because this situation is getting ever more troubling.

#### RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, a word on the revelation that President Trump's son, his son-in-law, and his campaign manager met with a lawyer with ties to the Kremlin with the pretext of discussing information that would be damaging to Secretary Clinton's campaign.

This revelation should be the end of the idea pushed by the administration and the President that there is absolutely no evidence of an intent by the Trump campaign to coordinate or collude. It is certainly not proof positive—we don't know what was said in the meeting—but these reports in the press at least demand further investigation.

It defies credulity that the President's campaign manager, his son, and his son-in-law, at the height of a very, very heated campaign—three people very close to the President and at the helm of that campaign—were all going to a meeting with a Russian lawyer to discuss Russian adoption. Indeed, Donald Trump, Jr., has now admitted—after he first said the purpose of the meeting was adoption—that he agreed to meet to get potentially damaging information about Hillary Clinton.

The Senate Intelligence Committee has already indicated that it will look into the possibility of coordination or collusion as part of their broader investigation. This meeting and the background behind it should be included in future document requests and additional lines of inquiry.

After providing documents to the Intelligence Committee, Donald Trump, Jr., must also testify before the committee to explain why three of the highest level members of the Trump administration thought it was appropriate to meet with a Russian source to receive information about a political opponent. We are talking about the wellspring and pride of our democracy—free and fair elections without foreign interference.

When the President of the United States is unwilling to forcibly defend

our democracy, a violation of our sovereignty, face to face with its chief adversary, when we continue to learn of additional meetings between his campaign and Russian sources, when we hear that the White House is actively working to water down or stall a bill of tough Russia sanctions, we in Congress need to step up and defend the vital interests of our country. Both parties should be united in that effort because, at least for now, the President seems unwilling to do so.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on nominations, which were just mentioned in a noncamera briefing at the White House, I understand the White House is complaining about the pace of nominations, citing the obstruction of Senate Democrats. If the White House is looking for a cause of the delay, they only need to look in the mirror.

No administration in recent memory has been slower in sending nominees to the Senate. In the last few weeks, the administration has sent several nominees without all of their paperwork or their ethics agreements complete. We can't go forward until that happens.

The White House has sent nominees for the Cabinet on down without the paperwork or ethics agreements completed. That is almost unprecedented in its degree. Time and again, they have stalled on providing committees with the information they need to proceed on nominations.

After campaigning on "draining the swamp," the Trump administration has sent the Senate a slew of nominees with a myriad of conflicts of interest and ethics entanglements. It is our duty in the Senate to vet these nominees properly because the American people are entitled to ethical government. Yet the White House blames the delay on obstruction in the Senate.

It is typical of the Trump administration to do something wrong and blame someone else for their problem.

Mr. President, I yield the floor for my good friend and colleague from the great State of Florida.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before the Senator, our leader, yields the floor, will he yield for a quick question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator told about the comments that have been made during the July 4th recess—comments about the healthcare bill—to various Senators.

Would the Senator believe that this Senator had innumerable people come up to him all over Florida, whatever venue that I was in—and I was in public venues quite a bit—and say: Please

don't let them take away my healthcare.

Would the Senator further believe that, in visiting the State of an unnamed Republican Senator where that Senator and I ended up in an airport together in that Senator's State, lo and behold, this Senator observed innumerable constituents of that Republican Senator in the airport coming up and saying: Please don't take my healthcare away. Would the Senator believe that?

Mr. SCHUMER. In answer to my friend, I absolutely would because I have experienced the same thing. I was in my State in many areas that are Republican, many areas that Donald Trump carried. The same thing happened. I have not previously seen this depth of concern from people of all different backgrounds, all different economic levels, all different races, religions, creeds, colors saying the exact same thing. People are so afraid of this TrumpCare bill that they are begging us, almost, to please stop it. In answer to the Senator's question: No, I am not surprised because I have experienced the same thing in some of the most conservative, rural, Republican parts of my State during this break.

Mr. NELSON. I would say just quickly, and further, that this Senator gathered up a group of constituents who had written to our office. In this particular case it was the Tampa office, and three of them have been helped enormously by being on the Federal exchange, since the State of Florida has not adopted an exchange. One person who is on Medicaid said that they would not be alive had they not had the sanctity and the integrity of the existing Medicaid system, which covers some 70 million people in the country.

Would the Senator tell me, is it accurate that the Senate Republican bill would eviscerate Medicaid by taking some \$800 million out of Medicaid over a decade?

Mr. SCHUMER. The Senator is exactly correct. It affects people across the board, including these fine people whom I met at the Utica Boilermaker 15K race.

I thank my colleague for his, as always, astute questions.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rao nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1521 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NELSON. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know we are all glad to be back in Washington, DC, at work after a few days back home, and I know many of us are eager to continue our work to rescue the American people from the failures of the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

The failures of ObamaCare are well documented, and while they don't necessarily apply to everyone, particular individuals and small businesses in the so-called individual market have seen a meltdown of the insurance exchanges. The Presiding Officer in her home State of Iowa, I know, has had insurance companies pulling out to the point where people can't even find an insurance carrier who will sell a policy that qualifies under the Affordable Care Act. That is because the Affordable Care Act was, unfortunately, a partisan exercise and a Big Government experiment that has failed.

All you have to do is look at the promises that were made at the time that ObamaCare was being sold back in 2009 and 2010. The President himself said that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Well, that proved to be not true. He said that if you liked your policy, you can keep your policy. Well, that proved not to be true as well because people saw their policies canceled because they couldn't qualify under the new requirements of the Affordable Care Act.

Perhaps the thing that stung the most was the fact that the President said back in 2009 and 2010 that an average family of four would see a reduc-

tion in their health insurance premiums by an average of \$2,500. Well, what we have seen since 2013 is a 105-percent increase in insurance premiums under the Affordable Care Act, and so instead of seeing a cut in their out-of-pocket costs of \$2,500, what people have experienced—families of four—is an insurance premium increase of \$3,000. Now, some people may be able to absorb that cost, but most people I know cannot. What it has meant is, they have had to reprioritize their spending so they have less to spend on other things in their life.

We do know, based on the promises made at the time the Affordable Care Act was being sold to the American people, that it has been a failed experiment. So the question is, What are we going to do about it? What are we going to tell the folks in Iowa who can't find an insurance policy or an insurance company who is willing to sell them an insurance policy on the individual market? What are we going to tell people in Texas who have seen their premiums go up by 105 percent since 2013 and have been priced out of the market or who found that the only policy they can afford is one with deductibles that are so high that basically they are denied the benefit of their insurance at all? What are we going to do about it?

A number of my colleagues have noted that even if Hillary Clinton were elected President of the United States, we would still have to be revisiting the failures of the Affordable Care Act because the failures are all too obvious and public and can't be denied, but despite that, and acknowledging many of ObamaCare's failings, many of our friends across the aisle—in fact, all of them so far in the Senate—have made clear they want nothing to do with providing any help or any aid to the people who are being hurt by the failures of ObamaCare. They don't want to lift a finger to help the people who can't find insurance, who can't afford it, and the policies they are forced to buy limit them in a way that they simply have decided to opt out.

So instead of working together with us—you would think they would do that. It would just be a logical thing to do because their constituents are the ones who are being hurt, in many instances. Instead, they have fought us tooth and toenail to preserve the broken status quo in healthcare that has failed so many people across the country, and they have made dubious claims about our efforts to address the problem to the best of our ability.

It reminds me of the old saying: Don't let the facts get in the way of a good story. Our friends across the aisle have simply washed their hands of any responsibility, even though they are the ones who passed the Affordable Care Act and created this failed experiment and put so many people in distress. Now they are in the process of

attacking those of us who are trying to help people who are hurting, rather than lending a helping hand and working together with us in a bipartisan way.

Let me talk just a minute about Medicaid because this is one of the big attacks that is being made by our Democratic colleagues on our efforts to try to salvage healthcare for people who are hurt by the failures of the Affordable Care Act. Much of the conversation has revolved around Medicaid and rightly so.

In my home State, 4.7 million folks currently rely on Medicaid. It is an important safety net program for people who are in low-income status—so for poorer folks. For those Americans, I want to make sure they understand, notwithstanding all the scare tactics, Medicaid is not going away.

Now, one of the common refrains is that Medicaid spending is slashed in the Better Care Act, but the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that Medicaid spending will grow by \$74 billion over 10 years. So when they have talked about it being cut, it actually grows by \$71 billion over 4 years.

I would also point out there are some who think the current rate of spending on Medicaid can go forward unabated without any changes, and that is simply not true. We know that according to the Congressional Research Service, Medicaid spending across the country totaled \$494 billion in 2014. I guess that was the last year for which full statistics were available—\$494 billion. If we do nothing to check the rate of growth of Medicaid spending, in 2023, it will be \$835 billion. So you go from \$494 billion to \$835 billion. We simply cannot keep up with that pace of spending.

Many of us—the Presiding Officer being one of them—are concerned about cuts in our military, which is the one thing the Federal Government has to do because nobody else can do it. Right now, we have seen, during the last administration, cuts of about 20 percent in our defense spending.

Well, when you have runaway spending in entitlement programs like Medicaid, where nobody is placed on a budget and forced to spend wisely and efficiently, essentially by forcing the Federal Government to spend \$835 billion for Medicaid spending alone, that is going to crowd out a lot of other meritorious and important spending, including for defense spending as well.

So we need to make sure Medicaid is there but that Medicaid is put on a responsible budget that grows year after year. In fact, during the life of this particular bill, over the next 10 years, it will go up \$71 billion.

Here is another thing. Our friends across the aisle act like Medicaid is the very best program to come down the pike. Well, it is not, and there are a number of reasons for that. One is that

Medicaid recipients don't always get the quality of care or the access to care we would hope for. That is because the States, which set the rate of reimbursement of doctors for Medicare beneficiaries, set it so low that it is roughly half the amount that is reimbursed based on private insurance. That is the reason why, in 2000, 67 percent of Texas physicians accepted new Medicaid patients. Today, it is 31 percent. So if you are on Medicaid, there is a two-thirds chance you will not be able to find a doctor to see you as a Medicaid beneficiary.

What we have done, instead, in the Better Care Act—particularly for the single adult population between 100 percent and 135 percent of the Federal poverty level—is, we said we will give you a refundable tax credit you can use to buy private insurance. Private insurance is highly preferable to Medicaid because, for one thing, it reimburses physicians at a higher rate and gives people greater access to physicians, hospitals, and greater quality of care. In my State alone, in the State of Texas, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation, as many as 600,000 new low-income Texans will benefit from the provisions of the Better Care Act. It will help qualify them for a tax credit not available to them under ObamaCare.

Simply throwing money at Medicaid will not help people at all. We need to reform Medicaid and make it more efficient. Frankly, one of the things I did back when we were debating the Affordable Care Act in the Senate Finance Committee, I actually filed an amendment that said Members of Congress would go on Medicaid. Well, it failed, but the point I was trying to make is that if Members of Congress were on Medicaid, we would fix Medicaid. Right now, it is substandard healthcare for the reasons I mentioned. Two-thirds of the doctors in my State alone refuse to see a new Medicaid patient because it pays them so far under the standard of private insurance or even Medicare.

By providing low-income Americans access to private insurance instead of Medicaid, we can assist those who were previously left out of the healthcare market and will now be able to purchase a plan of their choice perhaps for the first time. Unless we act, we are going to continue to see skyrocketing premiums and deductibles and lost coverage.

The American people were told time and time again that under ObamaCare costs would go down and they would be able to keep their doctor, which has proven not to be the case.

I mentioned before on the floor of the Senate that in my previous life as attorney general of Texas, we had something called the Consumer Protection Division, and if some business made false claims about a service or product

to the American people when it came to their healthcare, the U.S. Government would take them to court and we would win because it is simply a deceptive trade practice in that context. It is deception. It is deceit. Unfortunately, the American people were bamboozled by promises that were not kept.

We also know that about \$1 trillion in ObamaCare taxes—new taxes that were imposed to pay for ObamaCare—have ultimately been saddled on American families with higher costs for healthcare. When ObamaCare was passed and all these new taxes were passed, my friends across the aisle acted as though they would simply be absorbed by somebody, but we all know that simple economics means that ultimately the consumers are the people who actually pay the tab. They are the ones who end up paying the taxes.

Some of our colleagues on the other side recognized the destructive nature of the Affordable Care Act tax scheme. For example, five Democratic Senators, including my colleagues from Minnesota, voted to repeal the medical device tax just 2 years ago. The medical device tax was a draconian form of taxation. It wasn't based on income—in other words, where you could deduct your expenses and just pay taxes on your net income—it was a gross receipts tax. In other words, it said in effect that everything you have earned before you deduct your costs of doing business is going to be taxed at a given rate, and that was true of the medical device tax.

Perversely, a tax on medical devices meant not only did the jobs to produce those medical devices move offshore, in the case of one Texas-based company, they moved their business essentially to Costa Rica in order to avoid the taxes because they simply couldn't afford to pay them and stay in business and keep the jobs they had.

It was also a tax on innovation, and that is the reason we saw a bipartisan response to repeal the medical device tax just 2 years ago, because this tax has chased away jobs and innovation in the medical sector and saddled consumers with higher costs.

By repealing those taxes in the Better Care Act, we not only will lower the bill at the pharmacy or the doctor's office, but we encourage competition, and that is common sense and ultimately benefits consumers.

Our plan also protects consumers from government mandates requiring them to buy insurance that they don't want and can't afford. This way, families can choose what works best for them, free from the penalties by the government. Some individuals may choose to go with no plan at all.

The dirty little secret about the Affordable Care Act is that it can't work without a government mandate that you buy government-approved health



insurance or else you pay a penalty. I can't think of any other instance where the government says "You do what we say, or we are going to punish you and penalize you," as the Affordable Care Act does.

Even with the individual mandate and this threat of a penalty, we know that about 28 million Americans are currently not covered by insurance. Many of them are covered by so-called hardship exceptions. About 6.5 million of them just pay the penalty because it is cheaper to pay the penalty than it is to buy the insurance because the prices are so high.

When some of the critics say that without this economic gun to the head of a penalty, people will choose not to buy insurance for themselves, that is a choice they will make as Americans. We believe in freedom of choice, and when the marketplace provides a product that they believe adds value at a price they can afford, that is when consumers buy a product or a service. But they shouldn't have to do it because the government forces them to do so and penalizes them if they don't. The Better Care Act gives people the ability, free from a government mandate, to choose not to buy something they don't want. The Washington-forced mandates are gone.

The nonpartisan budget office has estimated that under our plan, average premiums will decrease by nearly one-third in 3 years.

These are some of the important facts we need to be debating, not the misrepresentations that unfortunately seem to fill the void.

I have shared multiple stories from my constituents back home in the last few weeks on the floor, and I plan to keep doing that as we continue our work on this legislation. The stories that I and my colleagues have heard are what have inspired me and motivated me from the beginning of this entire process. In fact, it is our job to represent our constituents. I would encourage all of our colleagues to listen to their own States and to share the trials of their constituents as well because the status quo is simply unacceptable. The Democratic leader has said as much. He said that if we set aside the Better Care Act and are actually interested in helping "fix" ObamaCare, they are willing to do that. But do you know what that is? Basically, what that represents is a huge, multimillion-dollar bailout of insurance companies without any other reform. That is what our Democratic colleagues are supporting by their failure to engage with us in making sure there are reforms in addition to the other things that we do.

The other alternative plan—you might ask: Well, if ObamaCare didn't work as was advertised—which it clearly hasn't—and something needs to be done, what does that something look like?

In the case of our friend the Senator from Vermont, Mr. BERNIE SANDERS, he said: I have an idea. Let's just make the Federal Government provide insurance coverage for everybody, single-payer.

Well, that is simply a solution we can't afford when we look at the trade-offs. It would essentially supplant all the private insurance that people get from their employers and require incredible increases in taxes in order to do that across the board. So I don't think that is an alternative our friends across the aisle want to support. They love the mandate, they love penalizing free American citizens when they don't purchase a product the government mandates, but they are not going to defend that. They are not going to defend that. They certainly won't advocate, at least openly here on the floor, for a single-payer system.

We saw one committee of the legislature in California recently vote out a single-payer system. This was just one committee, I think, in one house. The estimated cost of a single-payer system in California alone was double the annual budget of the entire State. You can imagine what the numbers would be here at the national level.

Like any piece of legislation, our draft bill can be strengthened, and we would invite anyone in good faith who is interested in strengthening the bill to work with us to do so. We are going to continue to talk and listen and exchange ideas on how we can continue to make improvements, but in the end, the choice is clear: You either ultimately support ObamaCare and the status quo, or you are willing to try to work with us to produce something better that provides more affordable healthcare from the doctor and healthcare provider of your choice. That is simply the choice people are going to have. A "no" vote against the alternative is simply a vote for the status quo for ObamaCare, and we know where that is going to lead—it is going to lead with a big, multibillion-dollar bailout of insurance companies without any reform. That is what our Democratic colleagues are hoping for if we are unsuccessful. But we think there is a better way to approach this, one that brings down cost and maintains choices and the freedom of choice for the individual consumer.

We will continue to plow ahead with or without their help because we think it is our duty to do so, and we have confidence that, working together, we can come up with a better care plan that suits the needs of Americans when it comes to their healthcare.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, from day one, this administration, President Trump, and congressional Republicans have attacked rules that protect working families.

Just 1 hour after taking the oath of office, President Trump indefinitely suspended a plan that made it easier for working families to be able to afford a mortgage. Ten days later, he issued an Executive order that requires agencies to identify and eliminate two rules for every one new rule they issue, and that was just the beginning. Congressional Republicans spent the first few months of the year eliminating rules that protected workers, students, and families. They killed a rule that required companies in dangerous industries to track when their employees were injured. They even killed a rule that helped keep guns out of the hands of the mentally ill.

These rules all had one thing in common—they all made sure the public health, safety, and security of Americans came ahead of industry's bottom line.

Oh, and there was a second thing in common for these rules: Industry hated them. With President Trump in office and Republicans in the majority in Congress, those industries were ready to cash in, and they had their wish list ready.

Although the attack on public-centered rules has increased in intensity during this administration, I just want to say it is not new. Powerful companies have long understood that the fight in Congress is just the first of many battles. If Big Business can't weaken or kill bills they don't like in Congress, they turn their attention to the agencies tasked with implementing those laws, working to tilt the rule-making process in their favor, and they don't waste any time getting started.

Long before rules are even announced, giant corporations intensely lobby agencies—setting up meeting after meeting—to make sure the agencies will prioritize corporate interests. As rules wind their way through the rulemaking process, the lobbying intensifies. Companies bury agencies in mountains of expensive, industry-funded comments. They cite sham research and bought-and-paid-for experts. If, at the end of that long, arduous process, a strong, public-centered rule is published anyway, those companies sue, looking to busy judges who are unfamiliar with the issues to overturn the decision of expert agencies.

There are no two ways about it. The rulemaking process is broken. There are far too many opportunities for giant corporations to influence the rulemaking process, and there are far

too few opportunities for meaningful public participation, but Republicans don't want to fix this problem—no way. They want to make the rulemaking process work even better for their corporate buddies and work even harder against American families.

And, boy, did they pick the right person to lead the charge. President Trump nominated Neomi Rao—a law school professor who advocates for weakening and handcuffing agencies—to run the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs known as OIRA.

OIRA is a small, little-known but intensely powerful office that renews economically significant Federal rules. Before the Department of Labor can issue a rule on workplace safety, for example, or the Environmental Protection Agency can issue a rule restricting water pollution or the Department of Education can issue a rule protecting students from shady, for-profit colleges, that rule must be submitted to OIRA to sign off. If OIRA doesn't like the rule, it can change the rule or hold it up for months at a time. When a rule finally makes it out of the OIRA ringier, chances are that any changes will be slanted in favor of corporate interests.

Professor Rao's view of agencies makes her the wrong person to lead this powerful agency. She believes judges should pay less attention to the conclusions of experts at Federal agencies, and Professor Rao is especially critical of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—the CFPB. This is the agency that has forced the biggest corporations and banks in this country to return more than \$12 billion directly to Americans they have cheated and held big banks like Wells Fargo accountable when they have ripped off customers.

Professor Rao says the CFPB's problem is its independence—seriously. Maybe Professor Rao thinks that little agency just doesn't kowtow enough to the big banks. If Professor Rao had her way, independent agencies like the CFPB would be handcuffed by OIRA, the agency she wants to run. It is no surprise that the Wall Street giants that have been trying to take down the CFPB for years love Professor Rao's views.

If confirmed, Professor Rao will be perfectly positioned to put her theories into practice. She will head the Trump administration's efforts to toss out the rules big businesses don't like. She will determine whether rules go through the slanted OIRA process. She will have a chance to gut strong rules that help working families.

The rulemaking process is broken, and there is a lot Congress should be doing to fix it, to try to make it work better for people all across this country—for workers and for families and for people who get cheated, but the Trump administration wants to go in the opposite direction.

Any Senator who believes corporations need more say in the rulemaking process should vote for Neomi Rao, but anyone who thinks we are supposed to be here to work for the American people will vote to reject her nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STRANGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rao nomination?

Mr. STRANGE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Ex.]

#### YEAS—54

|           |          |           |
|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Alexander | Ernst    | McCain    |
| Barrasso  | Fischer  | McCaskill |
| Blunt     | Flake    | McConnell |
| Boozman   | Gardner  | Moran     |
| Burr      | Graham   | Paul      |
| Capito    | Grassley | Perdue    |
| Carper    | Hatch    | Risch     |
| Cassidy   | Heitkamp | Roberts   |
| Cochran   | Heller   | Rounds    |
| Collins   | Hoeven   | Rubio     |
| Corker    | Inhofe   | Sasse     |
| Cornyn    | Isakson  | Scott     |
| Cotton    | Johnson  | Shelby    |
| Crapo     | Kennedy  | Strange   |
| Cruz      | King     | Thune     |
| Daines    | Lankford | Toomey    |
| Donnelly  | Lee      | Wicker    |
| Enzi      | Manchin  | Young     |

#### NAYS—41

|            |              |            |
|------------|--------------|------------|
| Baldwin    | Cantwell     | Duckworth  |
| Bennet     | Cardin       | Durbin     |
| Blumenthal | Casey        | Feinstein  |
| Booker     | Coons        | Franken    |
| Brown      | Cortez Masto | Gillibrand |

|           |         |            |
|-----------|---------|------------|
| Harris    | Merkley | Shaheen    |
| Hassan    | Murphy  | Stabenow   |
| Heinrich  | Murray  | Tester     |
| Hirono    | Nelson  | Van Hollen |
| Kaine     | Peters  | Warner     |
| Klobuchar | Reed    | Warren     |
| Leahy     | Sanders | Whitehouse |
| Markey    | Schatz  | Wyden      |
| Menendez  | Schumer |            |

#### NOT VOTING—5

|           |          |       |
|-----------|----------|-------|
| Murkowski | Sullivan | Udall |
| Portman   | Tillis   |       |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Rao nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 157 Ex.)

## YEAS—97

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Alexander    | Flake      | Murray     |
| Baldwin      | Franken    | Nelson     |
| Barrasso     | Gardner    | Paul       |
| Bennet       | Gillibrand | Perdue     |
| Blumenthal   | Graham     | Peters     |
| Blunt        | Grassley   | Reed       |
| Booker       | Harris     | Risch      |
| Boozman      | Hassan     | Roberts    |
| Brown        | Hatch      | Rounds     |
| Burr         | Heinrich   | Rubio      |
| Cantwell     | Heitkamp   | Sanders    |
| Capito       | Heller     | Sasse      |
| Cardin       | Hirono     | Schatz     |
| Carper       | Hoeven     | Schumer    |
| Casey        | Inhofe     | Scott      |
| Cassidy      | Isakson    | Shaheen    |
| Cochran      | Johnson    | Shelby     |
| Collins      | Kaine      | Stabenow   |
| Coons        | Kennedy    | Strange    |
| Corker       | King       | Tester     |
| Cornyn       | Klobuchar  | Thune      |
| Cortez Masto | Lankford   | Tillis     |
| Cotton       | Leahy      | Toomey     |
| Crapo        | Lee        | Udall      |
| Cruz         | Manchin    | Van Hollen |
| Daines       | Markey     | Warner     |
| Donnelly     | McCain     | Warren     |
| Duckworth    | McCaskill  | Whitehouse |
| Durbin       | McConnell  | Wicker     |
| Enzi         | Menendez   | Wyden      |
| Ernst        | Merkley    | Young      |
| Feinstein    | Moran      |            |
| Fischer      | Murphy     |            |

## NOT VOTING—3

|           |         |          |
|-----------|---------|----------|
| Murkowski | Portman | Sullivan |
|-----------|---------|----------|

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 97, and the nays are 0.

The motion is agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's information is available to the full Senate, I

ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-34, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$101.4 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
*Vice Admiral, USN, Director.*

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-34

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia

(ii) Total Estimated Value:  
Major Defense Equipment\* \$100.0 million.  
Other \$1.4 million.  
Total \$101.4 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Thirty-two (32) Multifunctional Information Distribution Systems—Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS JTRS) with four channel Concurrent Multi-Network (CMN-4).

Thirty-nine (39) AN/ALQ-214A(V)4 Countermeasure Systems.

Non-MDE includes: Also included in this sale are system integration and testing, software development/integration, test sets and support equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documents, U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (XX-P-GQF A1).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: AT-P-SAF—\$2.2B—02 May 07 (F/A-18F aircraft procurement).

AT-P-GQY—\$358M—6 May 11 (first AF/A-18F sustainment).

AT-P-LEN—\$992M—13 September 12 (Airborne Electronic Attack kit procurement).

AT-P-SCI—\$1.3B—4 July 13 (EA-18G aircraft procurement).

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: Jul 10 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

## POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Australia—Upgrades for F/A-18E/F Super Hornet Aircraft

The Government of Australia requested the possible sale of thirty-two (32) Multifunc-

tional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS JTRS) with four channel Concurrent Multi-Network (CMN-4), and thirty-nine (39) AN/ALQ-214A(V)4 Countermeasure Systems. This will also include all system integration and testing, component improvement, test and tools equipment upgrades, support equipment replenishment, supply support, publications and technical document updates, personnel training and training equipment upgrades, aircrew trainer device upgrades, U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$101.4 million.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major contributor to political stability, security, and economic development in the Western Pacific. Australia is an important Major non-NATO Ally and partner that contributes significantly to peacekeeping and humanitarian operations around the world. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist our ally in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale will improve Australia's capability in current and future coalition efforts. This equipment will help the Royal Australian Air Force better communicate with and protect its F/A-18 aircraft, and the addition of MIDS JTRS will accomplish the goal of making U.S. and Australian aircraft more interoperable when supporting operational forces. Australia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment does not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be the Harris Corporation, Melbourne, FL. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale may require the assignment of U.S. contractor representatives to Australia which will be determined at a later date.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-34

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. Multifunctional Information Distribution System (MIDS) Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) Concurrent Multi-Network (CMN-4) is classified CONFIDENTIAL. MIDS JTRS CMN-4 is a secure data and voice communication network using the Link-16 architecture. The system provides enhanced situational awareness, positive identification of participants with the network, secure fighter-to-fighter connectivity, and secure voice capability. It provides three major functions: Air Control, Wide Area Surveillance, and Fighter-to-Fighter. The MIDS JTRS CMN-4 can be used to transfer data in Air-to-Air, Air-to-Surface and Fighter-to-Fighter scenarios.

2. The AN/ALQ-214A(V)4 is an advanced airborne Integrated Defensive Electronic Countermeasures (IDECM) programmable modular automated system capable of intercepting, identifying, processing received radar signals (pulsed and continuous) and applying an optimum probability of survival from a variety of surface-to-air and air-to-

air RF threats. The system operates in a standalone or Electronic Warfare (EW) suite mode. In the EW suite mode, the system operates various dispensable countermeasures and the onboard radar in the F/A-18E/F in a coordinated, non-interference manner, sharing information for enhanced information. The ALQ-214 was designed to operate in a high-density Electromagnetic Hostile Environment with the ability to identify and counter a wide variety of multiple threats including those with Doppler characteristics. Hardware with the AN/ALQ-214A(V)4 is classified CONFIDENTIAL.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent system which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that Australia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Australia.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-40, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$58.2 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREG KAUSNER  
(For J.W. Rixey, Vice Admiral,  
USN, Director).

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-40

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: The Government of the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$30.0 million.

Other \$28.2 million.

Total \$58.2 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case NE-B-WGC for Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) for the Netherlands' AH-64D Apache helicopters, was below the congressional notification threshold at \$8.2M (all non-MDE) and included a total of thirty-three (33) AN/AVR-2B laser detecting sets and communications, logistics and support equipment. The Netherlands has requested the case be amended to include the Common Missile Warning Systems (CMWS). This amendment, which will add \$30M of MDE and \$20M of non-MDE, will push the current case above the congressional notification threshold, requiring notification of the entire case before the amendment can be offered.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Thirty-two (32) AN/AAR-57A(V)7 Common Missile Warning Systems (CMWS).

Non-MDE: Thirty-three (33) AN/AVR-2B laser detecting sets, mission equipment, hardware and services required to implement customer unique post modifications, communications and navigation equipment, special tools and test equipment, ground support equipment, technical data, publications, MWO/ECP, technical assistance, and training, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (XX-B-WGC Amend 1).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: NE-B-WES.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 10, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of the Netherlands—AN/AAR-57A(V)7 Common Missile Warning System (CMWS)

The Government of the Netherlands has requested the possible sale of thirty-two (32) AN/AAR-57A(V)7 Common Missile Warning Systems (CMWS). This would be in addition to the thirty-three (33) AN/AVR-2B laser detecting sets with various support elements included in an earlier FMS case valued at \$8.2M. Also included in the amended FMS case would be mission equipment, hardware and services required to implement customer unique post modifications, communication and navigation equipment, special tools and test equipment, ground support equipment, technical data, publications, MWO/ECP, technical assistance, and training, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is \$58.2 million.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of the Netherlands which has been, and continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist the Netherlands to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale will improve the Netherlands' capability to meet current and future threats and will be employed on the Netherlands' AH-64D Apache helicopters. The Netherlands will use the enhanced capability to strengthen its homeland defense, deter regional threats, and provide direct support to coalition and security cooperation operations. The Netherlands will have no difficulty absorbing these systems into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of these systems will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be BAE Systems, Nashua, NH. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel or contractor representatives to the Netherlands.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-40

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AN/AAR-57A(V)7 CMWS is the detection component of the suite of countermeasures designed to increase survivability of current generation combat aircraft and specialized special operations aircraft against the threat posed by infrared guided missiles.

2. The KIV-77, is a Common Crypto Application for Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) that provides Mode 4/5 capability. The KIV-77 can be removed from the host and stored as an UNCLASSIFIED Controlled Cryptographic Item (CCI).

3. A determination has been made that the Government of the Netherlands can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the Netherlands.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-35, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Romania for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$3.9 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
*Vice Admiral, USN, Director.*

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-35

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Romania.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$1.3 billion.

Other \$2.6 billion.

Total \$3.9 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: Seven (7) Phased Array Tracking to Intercept of Target (Patriot) Configuration-3+ Modernized Fire Units consisting of:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Seven (7) AN/MPQ-65 Radar Sets.

Seven (7) AN/MSQ-132 Engagement Control Stations.

Thirteen (13) Antenna Mast Groups.

Twenty-eight (28) M903 Launching Stations.

Fifty-six (56) Patriot MIM-104E Guidance Enhanced Missile Tactical Ballistic Missile (GEM-T) Missiles.

One hundred sixty-eight (168) Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) Missile Segment Enhancement (MSE) Missiles.

Seven (7) Electrical Power Plants (EPP) III.

Non-MDE includes: Also included with this request are communications equipment,

tools and test equipment, support equipment, prime movers, generators, publications and technical documentation, training equipment, spare and repair parts, personnel training, TAFT team, U.S. Government and contractor technical, engineering, and logistics support services.

Systems Integration and Checkout (SICO), field office support, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 10, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

##### Romania—Patriot Air Defense System and Related Support and Equipment

The Government of Romania has requested the possible sale of seven (7) Patriot Configuration-3+ Modernized Fire Units consisting of: seven (7) AN/MPQ-65 radar sets, seven (7) AN/MSQ-132 engagement control stations, thirteen (13) antenna mast groups, twenty-eight (28) M903 launching stations, fifty-six (56) Patriot MIM-104E Guidance Enhanced Missile-TBM (GEM-T) missiles, one hundred and sixty-eight (168) Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) Missile Segment Enhancement (MSE) missiles, and seven (7) Electrical Power Plants (EPP) III. Also included with this request are communications equipment, tools and test equipment, support equipment, prime movers, generators, publications and technical documentation, training equipment, spare and repair parts, personnel training, TAFT team, U.S. Government and contractor technical, engineering, and logistics support services, Systems Integration and Checkout (SICO), field office support, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$3.9 billion.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally that has been, and continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress within Europe. The proposed sale of the Patriot system will support Romania's needs for its own self-defense and support NATO defense goals.

Romania will use the Patriot missile system to strengthen its homeland defense and deter regional threats. The proposed sale will increase the defensive capabilities of the Romanian military to guard against aggression and shield the NATO allies who often train and operate within Romania's borders. Romania should have no difficulty absorbing this system into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of these missiles and equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be Raytheon Corporation in Andover, Massachusetts, and Lockheed-Martin in Dallas, Texas. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require approximately 30 U.S. Government and 40 contractor representatives to travel to Romania for an extended period for equipment de-processing/fielding, system checkout, training, and technical and logistics support.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-35

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

##### Annex Item No. vii

##### (vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Patriot Air Defense System contains classified CONFIDENTIAL hardware components, SECRET tactical software and CRITICAL/SENSITIVE technology. Patriot ground support equipment and Patriot missile hardware is classified CONFIDENTIAL and the associated launcher hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Information on system performance capabilities, effectiveness, survivability, missile seeker capabilities, select software/software documentation and test data are classified up to and including SECRET. The items requested represent significant technological advances for Romania Patriot. The Patriot Air Defense System continues to hold a significant technology lead over other surface-to-air missile systems in the world.

2. The Patriot Air Defense System's sensitive/critical technology is primarily in the area of design and production know-how and primarily inherent in the design, development and/or manufacturing data related to certain components. The list of components is classified CONFIDENTIAL. For more information contact the PEO Missiles and Space Lower Tier Project Office.

3. The loss of this hardware, software, documentation and/or data could permit development of information which may lead to a significant threat to future U.S. military operations. If an adversary were to obtain this sensitive technology, the missile system effectiveness could be compromised through reverse engineering techniques.

4. This proposed sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Romania.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-31, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$50 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREG KAUSNER  
(For J.W. Rixey, Vice Admiral,  
USN, Director).

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-31

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia

(ii) Total Estimated Value:  
Major Defense Equipment\* \$49 million.  
Other \$1 million.

Total \$50 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

##### Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Six thousand thirty (6,030) rounds of M865 120mm Target Practice Cone Stabilized Discarding Sabot-Tracer (TPCSDS-T) Tank Projectiles.

Eight thousand six hundred ten (8,610) rounds of M1002 120mm Target Practice Multipurpose Tracer (TPMP-T) Tank Projectiles.

Non-MDE includes: Also included are U.S. Government technical assistance, technical data, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (XX-B-UJL).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: AT-B-UGR.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 10, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

##### Australia—120mm Tank Ammunition and Related Support Services

The Government of Australia has requested the possible sale of six thousand thirty (6,030) rounds of M865 120mm Target Practice Cone Stabilized Discarding Sabot-Tracer (TPCSDS-T) Tank Projectiles and eight thousand six hundred ten (8,610) rounds of M1002 120mm Target Practice Multipurpose Tracer (TPMP-T) Tank Projectiles. Also included are U.S. Government technical services, technical data, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$50 million.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major contributor to political stability, security, and economic development in the Western Pacific. Australia is an important Major non-NATO Ally and partner that contributes significantly to peacekeeping and humanitarian operations around the world. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist our ally in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale of 120mm tank ammunition will improve Australia's capability to meet out-year operational readiness and training requirements. Australia will use this ammunition to help sustain necessary training levels for its tank operators. Australia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

This requirement will be provided from U.S. Army inventory. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. or contractor representatives to Australia.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-23, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Kingdom for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$1.035 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,  
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-23

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: United Kingdom.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$887 million.

Other \$148 million.

Total \$1.035 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): Two thousand seven hundred forty-seven (2,747) Joint Light Tactical Vehicles (JLTV).

Non-MDE: Also included with this request are baseline integration kits, basic issue item kits, B-kit armor, engine arctic kits, fording kits, run-flat kits, spare tire kits, silent watch kits, power expansion kits cargo cover kits, maintainer and operator training, U.S. government technical assistance and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission. Fee, etc., Paid. Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 10, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

United Kingdom—Joint Light Tactical Vehicles (JLTV) and Accessories

The Government of the United Kingdom (UK) has requested a possible sale of up to two thousand seven hundred forty-seven (2,747) Joint Light Tactical Vehicles (JLTV). This possible sale also includes baseline integration kits, basic issue item kits, B-kit armor, engine arctic kits, fording kits, run-flat kits, spare tire kits, silent watch kits, power expansion kits cargo cover kits, maintainer and operator training, U.S. government technical assistance and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. Total estimated cost is \$1.035 billion.

This proposed sale supports the foreign policy and national security policies of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally which has been, and continues to be, an important partner on critical foreign policy and defense issues.

The proposed sale will help improve the UK's Light Tactical Vehicle Fleet and enhance its ability to meet current and future threats. The UK will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor of this sale will be Oshkosh Defense, LLC, Oshkosh, Wisconsin. The procured items will require minimum contractor support until the foreign customer can eventually transition to internal organic support. There is no known offset agreement associated with this proposed sale.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-23

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. This sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to the Government of the United Kingdom. The Joint Light Tactical Vehicle platform is classified as SECRET. The Joint Light Tactical Vehicle fleet will incorporate ballistic armor kits for protection from improvised explosive devices.

2. Sensitive and/or classified (up to SECRET) elements of the proposed Joint Light Tactical Vehicle include hardware and accessories, components and associated software: baseline integration kits, basic issue items, ballistic-kit armor, engine arctic kits, fording kits, run-flat kits, silent watch energy kits, power expansion kits and cargo covering kits.

3. A determination has been made that the United Kingdom can provide substantially the same degree of protection for this technology as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary in furtherance of U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of the UK.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. BENJAMIN TUGGLE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Benjamin Tuggle who served as the regional director for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's southwest region. A skilled communicator and accomplished biologist, Dr. Tuggle dedicated more than 38 years of service to advancing the mission of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

I had the opportunity to work directly with Dr. Tuggle on a number of issues important to Arizona, including restoring the Willow Beach National Fish Hatchery, which is a key economic asset for Lower Colorado River communities. We may not have always agreed on agency policies, but Dr. Tuggle maintained an open dialogue and willingness to engage directly with local communities.

The challenges faced by the service and Region 2 are daunting. Our unique southwest landscape and wildlife are under constant threat from oppressive drought and catastrophic wildfire. Dr. Tuggle was rarely presented with easy decisions to make, but he always labored to strike the right balance between competing interests on complex issues. I thank him for his service.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF PATERSON, NEW JERSEY

• Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the city of Paterson's 225th anniversary. Through the dedicated service of municipal employees, elected leaders, local volunteers, community activists, and, most importantly, the incredible residents who have supported and loved the city through many generations, the city of Paterson has grown and prospered, earning its reputation as an outstanding community in my home State.

The town of Paterson was officially established in 1792 through a charter signed by then-Governor of New Jersey, William Paterson. Paterson was one of the Nation's first planned industrial cities, a brainchild of one of our Founding Fathers, Alexander Hamilton, and the Society for Establishing Useful Manufacturers.

Because of Paterson's proximity to what was then called the Great Falls of the Passaic River, the city was at the forefront of the development of water power systems for industrial use. In fact, the energy harnessed from the Great Falls was crucial in the effort to establish industrial freedom from Britain. Today the Paterson Great Falls, a scenic and historic waterfall on the Passaic River, continues to be just as important to the city as it was when Paterson was first founded.

As a regional industrial epicenter, Paterson became the birthplace of many "invention firsts," including the first steam and electric-powered model trains. After milling steel for the Union effort in the American Civil War, Paterson refocused to become the center of our Nation's silk industry, thus earning its nickname the "Silk City." The city also played a vital role during our Nation's Second World War, serving as a hub for the aircraft engine manufacturing industry.

Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park served as the primary inspiration for William Carlos Williams' five-volume epic poem, Paterson. In 1950, Williams received the first National Book Award for Poetry for Paterson, Book III. Our beloved Silk City has weaved its way into the works of many other renowned American writers including Junot Diaz, John Updike, Jack Kerouac, and Allen Ginsberg.

In addition to literature, Paterson natives have served as esteemed representatives in these hallowed halls. I would be remiss if I recognized the city of Paterson without mentioning the contributions of two of its favorite sons, Congressman BILL PASCRELL, Jr., and the late Senator Frank Lautenberg, who have served New Jersey and our country with honor and distinction.

From Downtown Paterson's commercial historic district, to our national historical park, to Larry Doby Field, the architectural, natural, and cultural landmarks are abundant across this great city. Paterson is among our most diverse communities, attracting residents from dozens of different cultures who have greatly enriched the abundant tapestry of diversity and pluralism in the city of Paterson and across the entire State of New Jersey. I am delighted to have the opportunity to stand before you today to celebrate the profound history and legacy of New Jersey's third-largest city. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating the city of Paterson on this important milestone, sending our warmest greetings as it celebrates its incredible history and extending our best wishes as it looks toward the future.●

#### 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF BMW GROUP PLANT SPARTANBURG

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the BMW Group Plant Spartanburg in Spartanburg, SC.

Twenty-five years ago, BMW decided to make an investment in South Carolina. Today I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the risk and vision it took to begin this venture. The Spartanburg workforce has a world-renowned reputation and is second to none. Without this workforce, we would have nothing to celebrate, so it is with great pride that I extend my sincerest gratitude for all of their efforts.

In addition to the contributions BMW has made to South Carolina, we are also celebrating the strong relationship between Germany and the Palmetto State. Globalization and trade are crucial to South Carolina's economic success and play a huge role in maintaining a positive relationship with the United States and Germany. I am proud to be an owner of a made-in-South Carolina BMW X5 because it represents all that makes our country great.

BMW has been a gift that keeps on giving for South Carolina, and South Carolina has been a wise investment for BMW. Thank you to all the hard-working men and women of South Carolina who have made this day a possibility. It is because of their dedication and diligence that South Carolina continues to be a prime destination for companies looking to invest and grow.●

#### RECOGNIZING THE BILLINGS PUBLIC LIBRARY

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Billings Public Library for promoting a center of reading and learning for folks in Montana.

The Billings Public Library was established in 1901 and was named for

Parmly Billings, the only member of the founding Billings family to reside in the city.

More than 100 years later, the 200,000-volume library has grown and expanded, entrenching itself deeply in the fabric of the Billings community. It has grown from one location to two and now has two mobile components to increase the number of people with access to the library's resources.

The Billings Public Library as an institution has also been tirelessly dedicated to Montana historical preservation through its "Montana Collection," which has collected historical information about Montana since 1902.

Beyond providing families in Billings with access to information through books and computers, the Billings Public Library has provided residents with the opportunity to make their voice heard and participate in countless townhall meetings and listening sessions, including many on topics ranging from the future of our public lands to the quality of care at the VA.

The library will celebrate its 116th anniversary in August 2017, making it one of Montana's oldest and most cherished learning spaces. The Billings Public Library has had a profound impact on the city of Billings and is a true example of fine service to the Montana people.●

#### 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SISSETON, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Sisseton, SD. The town of Sisseton will be celebrating its quasiquicentennial on July 14 through 16, 2017. Sisseton will host quasiquicentennial events, which include food and craft vendors, various exhibits, entertainment, parades, athletic competitions, a veterans museum display, Native American flute music, a rodeo, and much more.

Sisseton is located on the northern edge of the Coteau des Prairies in Roberts County. The Sisseton area has long been known as a community enriched with Native American and immigrant history. It is home to more than 2,450 people and almost 200 businesses with many unique cultural and recreational opportunities. Since its founding 125 years ago, the community of Sisseton continues to serve as a strong example of South Dakota values and traditions.

I offer my congratulations to the citizens of Sisseton on their quasiquicentennial celebration and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

#### TRIBUTE TO REVEREND RICHARD LEE BUCKINGHAM

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to an exceptional faith leader in my own neighbor-

hood in Kensington, MD. After 32 years of gifted service to St. Paul's United Methodist Church in Kensington, the Reverend Richard Lee Buckingham will retire at the end of July and it is an occasion that deserves recognition and celebration.

My own family worships at St. Paul's, and my children have been the beneficiaries of Rick Buckingham's wise counsel and leadership. He has long directed programs at St. Paul's for the benefit of young people, and he is recognized throughout many faith communities as a leader in Christian education and the spiritual nourishment of teens and young adults.

Reverend Buckingham has served in ministry to the local church for 43 years and arrived at St. Paul's United Methodist Church in 1985. He has worked with nine different senior pastors, offering counsel and wisdom to each in his role as minister of education and youth.

Reverend Buckingham has instructed over 350 young people during confirmation classes and watched proudly as they took their vows of faith. He has led eight different trips to witness the realities of faith and conflict in the Holy Land; he escorted young leaders to eight different international gatherings of United Methodist Youth leaders; he organized 20 different youth mission trips to Appalachia, Puerto Rico, and places beyond; he has leveraged his own interest in church history to take students to places where they will learn about their faith and will conclude that work with a trip to Germany later this year to celebrate the 500th anniversary of Martin Luther's launch of the Protestant Reformation.

Rick Buckingham has always been on the go; always introducing young people to a wider world, mindful of the observation of John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, that "the world is our parish." He visits recent graduates of St. Paul's UMC at their colleges, conducts their weddings—34 to date—and takes them to annual rock-faith events in Ocean City, although I suspect he uses an occasional earplug.

The reverend is also recognized for his leadership as a deacon of the United Methodist Church, a designation with specific responsibilities, and he has given to his wider denomination as much as he has given to his own local congregation.

Rick Buckingham teaches us all how to be a "humble servant" in accordance with our faith and at a time when we need examples of what true community service, faith, and civility looks like in the public square. It is a personal honor for me to recognize this leader in my own church and a leader in the wider community beyond.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by



Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3003. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3004. An act to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire.

### MEASURES REFERRED

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 123. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require multi-line telephone systems to have a default configuration that permits users to directly initiate a call to 9-1-1 without dialing any additional digit, code, prefix, or post-fix, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-124).

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1519. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-125).

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1024. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-126).

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1518. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts with industry intermediaries for purposes of promoting the development of and access to apprenticeships in the technology sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1519. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1520. A bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1521. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce the interest rate caps for Federal Direct student loans, to eliminate loan origination fees on all Federal Direct student loans, and to provide for refinancing of Federal Direct student loans and Federal family education loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1522. A bill to establish an Every Kid Outdoors program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1523. A bill to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. Res. 216. A resolution calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 45

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 45, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed and for other purposes.

S. 251

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 251, a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board in order to ensure that it cannot be used to undermine the Medicare entitlement for beneficiaries.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 334

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 334, a bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State.

S. 378

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 378, a bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require the maintenance of databases on awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 545, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of

Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 683

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 683, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the requirement to provide nursing home care to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 705, a bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

S. 819

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and

health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1124

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1124, a bill to grant the Director of the United States Marshals Service authority to appoint criminal investigators in the excepted service.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.

S. 1186

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1186, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to designate certain entities as centers of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education, and for other purposes.

S. 1256

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters, Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1311, a bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1325

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1325, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire, recruit, and train employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1426

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1426, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, and for other purposes.

S. 1427

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1427, a bill to provide States with the option of applying for and receiving temporary waivers for the States to experiment with new approaches that integrate Federal programs in order to provide more coordinated and holistic solutions to families in need, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

S. 1465

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1465, a bill to terminate the prohibitions on the exportation and importation of natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1489, a bill to amend section 3312 of title 38, United States Code, to restore Post-9/11 Educational Assistance and other relief for veterans affected by school closures, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S.J. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 16, a joint resolution approving the discontinuation of the process for consideration and automatic implementation of the annual proposal of the Independent Medicare Advisory Board under section 1899A of the Social Security Act.

S. RES. 102

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr.

KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 102, a resolution reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mexico, and recognizing bilateral cooperation that advances the national security and national interests of both countries.

S. RES. 201

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 201, a resolution affirming the importance of title IX, applauding the increase in educational opportunities available to women and girls, and recognizing the tremendous amount of work left to be done to further increase those opportunities.

S. RES. 211

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 211, a resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

S. RES. 213

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 213, a resolution honoring the memory of Dallas Police Department Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, Sergeant Michael Smith, Officer Michael Krol, Officer Patrick Zamarripa, and Dallas Area Rapid Transit Police Officer Brent Thompson, who were killed during the attack in Dallas, Texas, that occurred 1 year ago, on July 7, 2016.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1521. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce the interest rate caps for Federal Direct student loans, to eliminate loan origination fees on all Federal Direct student loans, and to provide for refinancing of Federal Direct student loans and Federal family education loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to talk about a heavy financial burden that too many of our fellow Americans are being forced to deal with. What I am talking about is student loans. You may be surprised to know that the second largest amount of debt in America, next to home mortgage debt, is student loan debt. Student loan debt is \$1.3 trillion more than all the credit card debt combined in America. Graduates from the class of 2016 have more than \$37,000 in student loan debt, on average, when they graduate.

To make matters worse, the Federal Government last week announced that it was increasing interest rates on Federal student loans for this coming school year, which starts in September. For undergraduate students, rates are increased from last year at 3.76 percent

to 4.45 percent, almost three-quarters of a percent. That started on July 1.

Well, our economy is built on the ingenuity and creativity of young entrepreneurs who have taken a risk on something new, but today, instead of sending our graduates off to be creative and conquer the world, we are sending them off with a tremendous amount of debt that they are struggling to afford.

While I was in Florida last week over the July 4th recess, I met with a group of recent graduates, and we wanted to discuss their student loans. They were not shy about telling me about it. Many of them had high interest rates. They wondered how they were going to pay off that debt, how they were going to be able to be unshackled from that financial burden so they could get on about the business of building their career and starting a family.

Let me give you some examples of the students I met with. One young lady graduated from the University of Central Florida in 2015 with \$50,000 in student loan debt. The interest rate on her debt was 4.85 percent. She knows that her parents, who have helped her before—they are small business owners—are not going to be able to continue to help her financially. Even so, she was the first person in her family to graduate from college. That student is currently attending George Washington University for graduate school, after which she is estimating her total debt will be \$90,000 in student loans. She told me about what every student longs to do: Purchase a home, start a family, and get on with their career. But that is increasingly becoming a pipe dream for millennials because of the burden of student loan debt.

I met another student from Deltona, FL, who works as a social worker for the homeless. She graduated with a bachelor's degree in social work and a master's degree in the same from Florida State. She has dedicated her life to public service and helping the most vulnerable among us, yet she is facing \$75,000 in student loan debt while carrying interest rates that range from 5.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

In Florida alone, students graduating with a 4-year degree are leaving with an average of more than \$23,000 in student loan debt. The thought of trying to start a career with that much debt is discouraging when some students, even after attending college in the first place, are still struggling. They want to go on to grad school or they are still in school wanting to finish their degree, but then they have that constant fear of having more and more debt when they graduate. That is not in anyone's interest—not the student's, not the family's, not the community's, and it is certainly not in the country's best interest. If we really want to build a strong middle class, we have to make higher education more affordable.

That is why today I am introducing legislation to lower the cap on student

loan interest and the so-called lender origination fees and to allow those with existing loans to refinance at a lower rate; namely, 4 percent.

Remember I told you about that one student I met who had loans that went anywhere from 5.5 up to 6.8 percent? That was the interest rate in that particular year of their education. I think they ought to be able to refinance all of that at a maximum of 4 percent.

The bill that I am filing today, which we are calling the Student Loan Relief Act, would cap student loan interest rates for undergraduates at 4 percent, graduates at 5 percent, and parents at a cap of 6 percent. It would also help students borrow less by ending the loan origination fees the government charges students to process their loan. For example, if it is a \$10,000 loan, they will take out a loan origination fee of \$400, so the actual loan the student gets is \$9,600. These fees are taken out before the student receives the loan. The bill we are filing would eliminate those fees all together.

One other thing the bill would allow for any borrower with an existing Federal student loan is to refinance their loans one time to a lower rate. Once the Federal Government sets the student loan interest rates for the year, they are fixed now under current law for the lifetime of that loan and they can't be refinanced, even if the rates go lower. That is certainly not in the interest of the student. For example, borrowers who took out loans between July of 2006 and July of 2013 likely have a fixed rate of 6.8 percent. Despite the significant drop in interest rates since 2013, currently those borrowers are barred from refinancing their existing loans. That is not common sense. Between 2006 and 2013, the interest rate on student loan debt got as high as 6.8 percent. Students who took out loans during that time are now stuck with those rates. They can't refinance that debt as you could with a home loan. This bill would fix that by letting those borrowers refinance their debt with the new loans that have the lower interest rates.

Capping interest rates, ending loan origination fees, and allowing borrowers to refinance existing loans would certainly help make education more affordable for our students. It would help to ease the financial stress that is weighing down our economy and keeping some graduates from making the types of investments that traditionally lead to stronger middle-class membership like, for example, home ownership.

Sometimes, in all of the partisan back-and-forth, some folks begin to forget why we are here: to serve the people. I urge our colleagues to take a serious look at this bill and join with me in helping those we represent.

We can't continue to leave our graduates saddled with so much student

debt and no way out. We have to do something to ease the burden, and I believe this is a good way to start.

I would just conclude by recalling what I said at the outset: You may be surprised to learn that student loan debt is the second largest debt carried in America next to home mortgage debt.

You can take all the credit card debt in America and combine it all and it is not as much as the \$1.3 trillion of student loan debt that is carried today. We need to help those students, and thereby we are helping our country.

#### NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2017 second quarter Mass Mailing report is Tuesday, July 25, 2017.

An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable pdf document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically or delivered to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records is open from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224-0322.

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Carol A. Mandel of New York.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2:15 p.m., Tuesday, July 11; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Nye nomination; finally, that all time during morning business, recess, adjournment, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Nye nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

#### CLIMATE DISRUPTION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, climate disruption is the seminal challenge of our generation. It affects everything from our farming to our fishing to our forestry. We see the impact in disappearing glaciers, shrinking ice sheets, melting permafrost, dying coral reefs, more powerful storms, and migrating animals and insects.

In response, communities across the globe are transforming their energy economies. They are increasing the energy efficiency of their buildings and their vehicles and their appliances, and they are replacing carbon-polluting fossil fuel energy with clean, renewable energy.

How much do you know about the changes underway? Let's find out.

Welcome to episode No. 2 of the Senate Climate Disruption Quiz.

First question: Which car company announced just last week that all of its new models will have an electric motor starting in 2019? Was it Toyota, which has the Prius currently, the Prius plug-in? Was it Volvo, known for its safety, or Honda, which advocates its fuel efficiency, or Ford, which has the all-electric Focus?

The answer is B: Volvo. On July 5, Volvo announced that beginning in 2019, every new model in its fleet will have some form of electric propulsion. These cars will include so-called "mild" hybrids featuring regenerative braking like the Prius, plug-in hybrids like the Volt, and fully electric cars like the Tesla. Volvo intends to do all of these forms.

Now with electric cars in mind, let's move on to question No. 2: Which European country plans to ban the sale of new diesel and gas vehicles by the year 2040? Is it France or Spain or the United Kingdom or Switzerland? The answer is France.

Last week, on July 6, France's Environment Minister Nicolas Hulot announced a new environmental plan for his country to reflect France's commitment to the Paris climate agreement. Minister Hulot not only said that France will ban the sale of new diesel and gas cars starting in 2040, but will seek to shut down all of its coal-powered electric plants over the next 5 years—by the year 2022—and to pursue a "carbon-neutral" economy by the year 2050. That is the same as a net zero production of carbon dioxide.

Let's turn to a different part of the world. Let's go to the Southern Hemi-

sphere. A crack in the Antarctic ice shelf will soon create an iceberg of what size? Will it be the size of Oregon, my home State, which is roughly 100,000 square miles; or the size of the Superdome in New Orleans, about 6 acres; or how about the size of Manhattan, 23 square miles; or Delaware, which is much larger, at about 2,000 square miles? The answer is D, Delaware.

The crack in this ice shelf will create an iceberg about the size of Delaware.

This is Antarctica's fourth largest ice shelf. The crack is now 120 miles long, and in some spots now it is 2 miles wide, and there are just 3 miles left in which it is attached to the ice shelf. So given the stresses that are being applied to that vast sheet of ice, the break is expected to happen in the next couple of weeks. When that happens, we will have an iceberg larger than 2,000 square miles—about the size of Delaware—and this will be such a large iceberg that it will contain roughly 1 trillion tons of ice.

Question No. 4: Global production of what fossil fuel fell by 6.2 percent in 2016? Was it coal or was it oil or was it natural gas?

The answer is A: coal. According to British Petroleum's annual report, global coal production fell by over 6 percent last year—the largest decline since they started keeping statistics in 1950. What is driving the decline? It is shrinking coal production in both the United States and in China.

What is happening in the other two sectors—oil and gas? There was a slight increase in the production of oil last year, and the production of natural gas was basically flat.

Now, compare these to renewable energy, which grew very quickly last year. Global wind energy grew by more than 15 percent in a single year, but that is a small amount compared to global solar energy, which grew by almost 30 percent—in a single year, almost a one-third increase in global production. And renewable energy is now taking up a larger share of the primary energy production worldwide.

Finally question No. 5: How many U.S. cities have joined the "We Are Still In" coalition? That is the coalition that was formed after President Trump announced he was going to withdraw the United States from the Paris accord. Is it 15 cities, 125 cities, 500 cities, or just 100 cities?

The correct answer is B, and of course the number is increasing even as we speak. President Trump announced on June 1 that he would pull the United States out of the Paris accord and, in just that short period since—a little over 5 weeks—125 cities, 9 States, 900 businesses and investors, and 183 colleges and universities have declared that they are committed to the vision of the Paris Agreement and to taking steps to be part of obtaining

and securing that vision. Together, this coalition represents 120 million Americans and a \$6.2 trillion share of the U.S. economy.

It includes cities from the West, like Los Angeles, and the East, such as Baltimore. It includes cities in red States, like Houston, TX, and Tucson, AZ. It includes cities from the Southwest and Southeast, like Santa Fe, NM, from the Southwest, and Charleston, SC, in the Southeast.

These are just a few of the 125 cities—cities led by Democrats and Republicans—because the fact is, the threat of climate disruption to our planet is not a partisan issue. It is not a red issue or a blue issue; it is an issue that impacts everyone on this globe, regardless of political ideology.

So there you have it, folks. Episode No. 2 of the Senate Climate Disruption

Quiz—questions ripped right from the headlines. How did you score?

Every week we have surprising new facts—new facts on the ground about the changes in the environment and new facts about the response of communities across the globe.

There is no question that we are racing the clock to take this on as human civilization, and there is no time to spare. So stay engaged in the fight.

In the near future, I will bring you Episode No. 3 of the Senate Climate Disruption Quiz to present some of the new issues that will unfold in the coming days. If you are following this quiz at home and have a good idea for a climate disruption question, please tweet it to me at @SenJeffMerkley on Twitter, using the hash tag ClimateQ4Jeff.

Let's fight together and save our beautiful blue-green planet.

I yield the floor.

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2:15 P.M.  
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 2:15 p.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 2:15 p.m.

---

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 10, 2017:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NEOMI RAO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOOMERS

#### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor bloomers, a full-service floral shop in San Francisco, California, upon their 40th Anniversary.

On July 9, 1977, Patric Powell opened bloomers, which offers artistic arrangements designed with fresh flowers of exceptional quality. bloomers' reputation for excellent service and beautiful arrangements has established an incredibly high standard in the flower community. Patric and the designers at bloomers have decades of experience choosing local flowers and materials to incorporate into their designs.

After many years of cultivating relationships in the business, Patric and his employees have become good friends with their customers and the wider community. Their work has brought delight, happiness and pleasure to many people over the years. Patric also frequently donates flowers, arrangements and gift certificates to local schools, churches and charities.

Making it in the small business universe is a challenge for anyone. Establishing a business that is successful for 40 years is a testament to Patric's business acumen and his wisdom in hiring and retaining talented people. Success only happens when a great boss cares about both his business and the people that work for him. Patric is passionate about his work and is committed and loyal to his employees and customers. His employees praise Patric as the most kind, generous and dedicated person they know.

Mr. Speaker, Patric T. Powell and bloomers has been providing well-designed floral arrangements to his customers in the Bay Area of California for the past 40 years. I am proud of this hardworking man and everyone that has made bloomers a success over the years. It is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

### IN RECOGNITION OF LABOR OF LOVE OUTREACH MINISTRIES FOR ITS 35 YEARS OF SERVICE TO SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN

#### HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Labor of Love Ministries for 35 years of service to the southeast Michigan community and the groundbreaking for its new

building in Pittsfield Township. Labor of Love has impacted countless lives through its outreach and religious service locally and internationally.

Originally founded in 1982 in Ann Arbor, Michigan, by a small group of individuals including Pastor Hawthorne and First Lady Hawthorne, Labor of Love Ministries has grown substantially to fulfill its mission of offering religious and education services to the community at large. In addition to holding regular prayer services, Labor of Love provides a variety of additional spiritual, counseling and support services to meet the needs of its congregation. These include training programs for those with individuals with a variety of backgrounds, as well as mission trips overseas for members of the church. Additionally, the church organizes charity drives and volunteer efforts to assist those in need in nearby communities, and these initiatives have helped provide important aid to less fortunate members of the congregation and groups in need. Collectively, these efforts by Pastor Hawthorne and others have helped establish Labor of Love as an effective organization that provides important services and support throughout the community.

Labor of Love Ministries has provided key spiritual guidance and assistance to its congregation and the greater southeast Michigan community. Throughout its 35 years, the church has continued to grow to meet the evolving needs of its members, and its new building will allow it to better serve those in need while fulfilling its mission of spiritual outreach and education. The growth and development of Labor of Love Ministries underscores its effectiveness in serving the community, and it is my hope that the church's new facilities in Pittsfield Township will allow it to strengthen its offerings in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Labor of Love Ministries for 35 years of service and religious guidance. The organization has had a significant impact through its religious and charitable initiatives.

### HONORING FRANCISCA "CISCA" P. TISHER

#### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Francisca "Cisca" P. Tisher upon her retirement as a judge on the Superior Court of Napa County in California. She is retiring after more than 20 years of judicial experience and service and has been an active member of our community for many years during her successful career.

Born in the Netherlands, Judge Tisher emigrated with her family at the age of three. She

received a Bachelor of Arts degree in economics from the University of California, Davis in 1974. She went on to earn her Juris Doctorate degree in 1980 from the Empire College School of Law in Santa Rosa, California, and was admitted to the California State Bar later that year.

Prior to her appointment as a judge, Judge Tisher specialized in family law. She and her husband Tim have three children, so she worked hard to balance her family life and her career. In 1993, she received the Pro Bono Attorney of the Year Award for Napa County.

Judge Tisher was appointed to the Napa County Superior Court by California Governor Pete Wilson in 1995, becoming the first female judge on the court. She served as the presiding judge from 2006 to 2008. Over her 22 years as a judge, Judge Tisher ruled on many cases on a variety of topics. For Judge Tisher, no case was trivial, and every case mattered and was important to the parties involved.

In addition to her work in the judiciary, Judge Tisher has been an active member of the Napa community. She has served on several boards, including the Napa Valley Domestic Violence and Prevention Board and the Napa Valley Activity Center Board. Judge Tisher is a compassionate and determined individual, and she has made a tremendous impact on Napa County.

Mr. Speaker, Francisca "Cisca" P. Tisher has led a long career in our community's judicial system. She is an active member of our community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement.

### HONORING THE BIRTHDAY OF HIS HOLINESS THE XIV DALAI LAMA

#### HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 82nd birthday of His Holiness the XIV Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso. Born on July 6th, 1935 to a farming family in Northeastern Tibet, His Holiness was recognized as the reincarnation of the previous Dalai Lama at the age of two.

Unlike previous Dalai Lamas, His Holiness has visited the west many times to speak with religious and political leaders on the importance of understanding and respect among faiths. His efforts toward peace and universal values of tolerance and compassion earned him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989.

My district has had the honor of hosting His Holiness four times to speak at my Alma Mater, the University of California, Santa Barbara. The University has now established a Tibetan Studies endowment in his honor, the XIV Dalai Lama Endowed Chair in Tibetan Buddhism and Cultural Studies.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama's commitment to preserving Tibetan culture, and his teachings which promote respect for human rights and non-violent solutions are invaluable lessons for the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with the global religious community in wishing the XIVth Dalai Lama a very happy birthday.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LORAIN  
CITY COUNCILMAN EDDIE C.  
EDWARDS

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the life of a respected public official and very dear friend, Lorain City Councilman Eddie C. Edwards. He passed away peacefully on June 27, 2017, after courageously battling illness over the last several years. Please let me offer the deepest condolences of our entire citizenry to his son Gregory Edwards, daughter Darnisha Hunter and the countless friends and family whose lives he touched. A true public servant in the every sense, Eddie dedicated his life not only to making government work better for the people he served, but by striving to make the lives of all people, better.

Eddie began his career in politics in 1996, first elected to represent South Lorain's Fifth Ward. Throughout his eighteen years of service on City Council, Eddie fought hard for his community—making his neighborhood safer, parks cleaner, improving education in schools and working toward enhancing and growing small businesses.

While Councilman Edward's service to the City of Lorain will forever be remembered, Eddie's contributions to the Lorain community started decades earlier.

Born and raised in the small town of Dyersburg, Tennessee, Eddie moved to Lorain when he was 20 years old, with less than 13 dollars in his pocket, seeking a better life. He immediately enrolled in school studying business and construction management, which jumpstarted a new life of helping build Lorain forward.

Eddie, who was the owner-operator of Edwards Trucking & Excavating for more than two decades, understood the role small businesses play in driving healthy local economies. Moreover, Eddie knew the value of minority owned small businesses. As a founding member of the Lorain County Minority Contractors Association and Executive Board Member of the Minority Trucking and Transportation Association—Eddie paved the way for countless entrepreneurs to use their skills, grow our local economy and improve our community. His friends, family and colleagues recall his passion and willingness to stand up and speak his mind, always working toward equal rights and fighting for those left behind.

During the rise of the civil rights movement, Eddie was a founding member of the Committee for Positive Change in the Black Community and was the past president of the Lorain NAACP. And as an ordained Baptist Dea-

con, Eddie was a true champion and relentless advocate for African Americans and all those in need throughout our community.

A man of strong faith, Eddie worked each day fighting for those less fortunate. I myself recall a time when Eddie and I joined the Full Gospel Ministries and Pathways Enrichment Center in Lorain, planting a community garden as part of a community driven effort to produce fresh fruits and vegetables for the local food pantry.

As an African American, there is no question Councilman and businessman Edwards wrote a new chapter in the history of Lorain. As a man and leader in the community, the successes and struggles of Eddie's generous life represent a beacon for generations to follow.

Last year, The Smithsonian opened the only national museum solely dedicated to recording and underscoring African Americans' many contributions in art, history, culture and life. I would like to submit this Congressional Record to the National Museum of African American History and Culture on behalf Eddie's family to hallmark the life and lasting contributions of a true public servant.

Today, my thoughts and prayers are with the entire Edwards family. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Eddie C. Edwards, a loyal friend, a defender of democracy, a true public servant, a dedicated father, a loving husband and a courageous man.

HONORING CARMELA SANDOVAL  
AND MARIA SANCHEZ, RECIPIENTS  
OF THE AMERICAN DREAM  
AWARD

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor sisters, Ms. Carmela Sandoval and Ms. Maria Sanchez, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Ms. Sandoval and Ms. Sanchez are very deserving of this award and recognition.

Ms. Sandoval and Ms. Sanchez are daughters of Mexican immigrants to the United States. Together they own and manage Bere's Bridal and Christening Wear in Vallejo, California. They are both successful and inspiring community leaders.

Prior to moving to Vallejo, Ms. Sandoval and Ms. Sanchez grew up and attended school in Los Angeles. Though she loved school, Maria had to withdraw to begin working to support her family. Their diligence, perseverance and sacrifice for their family at such a young age embodies the ideals of the American dream and foreshadows their future roles as dedicated community leaders in Vallejo, California.

Carmela and Maria volunteer regularly for Vallejo Together, a nonprofit in our community

that provides resources to homeless individuals. They also volunteer for Centro Latino, an organization that advocates for Latino youth in Vallejo. Every year, the sisters organize a holiday "posada" for underserved children, which includes a gift drive and a hot meal for all the youth in attendance. While Carmela and Maria are ambitious leaders, they remain humble and willing to lend a helping hand. Both sisters take pride in being loving parents, and, for Maria, being a grandparent as well.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Ms. Carmela Sandoval and Ms. Maria Sanchez for their achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor them here today with the American Dream Award.

TRUMP'S VOTER FRAUD COMMISSION IS A FRAUD AND SHOULD  
BE DISBANDED NOW

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, unable to cope with the brutal fact that he lost the popular vote to Hillary Clinton by 2.9 million votes, the largest vote deficit of any president in American history, Donald Trump tweeted that he would have won the popular vote but for "millions of people who voted illegally."

Instead of producing any credible evidence to support this claim, a hoax that has been repeatedly and decisively debunked by experts, the President doubled down and issued an Executive Order establishing the "Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity" (PACEI), appointing Kris Kobach, anti-immigration warrior and poster-child for voter fraud conspiratorialists everywhere, to lead the Commission.

It would be more accurate to characterize the PACEI as the "Presidential Advisory Commission on Voter Suppression." Voter suppression is real but the oft-repeated claim that American elections are rife with voter fraud is a myth.

According to a comprehensive 2014 study published in The Washington Post, out of more than a billion votes cast between 2000 and 2014, only 31 credible instances of impersonation fraud were found, and even this tiny number was likely inflated because the study's author counted not just voter fraud prosecutions or convictions but all credible claims. Numerous other reports have reached the same conclusion.

Any lingering doubt regarding the true purpose of the PACEI should be laid to rest by the request made by Commissioner Kobach on June 28, 2017 when he wrote each of the nation's state secretaries of state requesting that they provide the Commission with "the full first and last names of all registrants, middle names or initials if available, addresses, dates of birth, political party (if recorded in your state), last four digits of social security number if available, voter history (elections voted in) from 2006 onward, active/inactive status, cancelled status, information regarding any felony convictions, information regarding voter registration in another state, information regarding



military status, and overseas citizen information."

The information requested by the Commission will not prevent voter fraud. It will violate rather than protect voter privacy.

And it will make it easier to craft legislation and devise campaign strategies intended to suppress the vote in urban clusters and among targeted demographic groups, particularly minority voters.

It is important that all voters, and the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas whom I am privileged to represent, be fully protected.

While supplying only public voter information may seem secure, the sad fact is that it is not. There is no publicly accessible database of voter registration information in any of the 50 states or the District of Columbia.

That is because information of this kind is protected from public disclosure under the settled principle of "collective privacy" recognized by the Supreme Court in the landmark decision of *NAACP v. Alabama*, 377 U.S. 288, 84 S. Ct. 1302, 12 L. Ed. 2d 325 (1964), which held that compelled disclosure of affiliation with groups engaged in advocacy may constitute an impermissible chilling effect on the freedom of association guaranteed by the First Amendment, a holding that has been affirmed repeatedly.

Accordingly, neither Texas nor any state can, consistent with the U.S. Constitution, supply the voter information requested by the PACEI.

Indeed, if the information sought was as public in nature as PACEI contends, there simply would be no need for it to request the information from state governments.

Trump's voter suppression commission is a solution in search of a problem.

Contrary to what Trump and Kobach would have the public believe, American elections are not rife with widespread voter fraud. Studies have shown that it is more likely an American "will be struck by lightning than that he will impersonate another voter at the polls."

No, the major ill affecting our election system is not that too many people vote due to voter fraud, but that too many people are prevented from voting due to vote suppression schemes such as discriminatory photo identification requirements, curtailment of early voting, too few polling stations leading to long lines and excessive wait times, purging of election rolls.

Even in the wholly unimaginable event that the commission created by Donald Trump and led by Kris Kobach could be trusted enough for states to cooperate by sharing their voter data, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that information would be kept secure and the privacy of voters protected.

Recent cyberattacks have made clear the vulnerability of large central databases to cyberattack. An information security breach at the Department of Veterans Affairs compromised sensitive personal data of 26.5 million persons and cost the VA between \$100 million to \$500 million to remediate; another occurring at the Office of Personnel Management impacted 22 million current and former federal employees, many of whom held sensitive security clearances; and the attack on Yahoo, the mother of all security breaches, re-

sulted in 1.5 billion user accounts being compromised.

Because large centralized databases are targets of opportunities for criminals, terrorists, and foreign adversaries, it would be the height of recklessness for Texas or any state to provide the PACEI with personal information of millions of persons via unsecured email address to be stored in undersecured databases on undersecured servers.

One of the biggest strengths of the American election system is its decentralized nature.

Aggregating all voter data into one centralized database with questionable security protections makes that data highly vulnerable to a cyberattack that could lead to the personal information of hundreds of millions of Americans being stolen and misused.

Voter privacy and the integrity of the secret ballot are integral to American democracy. Voter privacy rights should and must be protected.

This is especially true since we are now certain that adversaries like Russia are actively involved in cyberwarfare campaigns to undermine our democracy.

There is no denying that our election system is under assault, but not in the way Trump imagines.

Instead of wasting taxpayer money to fund an investigation into voter fraud, which is as mythical as a unicorn, American democracy would be better served by focusing on and correcting the real problem with our elections—voter suppression and external, illegal, and international interference in our national elections.

I am not opposed to employing reasonable, legitimate, and workable means to safeguard the integrity of our electoral system and to protect the precious right to vote. But Trump's Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity is incapable of doing either and thus should be disbanded and dissolved immediately.

#### HONORING THE HARRIET TUBMAN FREEDOM MUSIC FESTIVAL

**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the second annual Harriet Tubman Freedom Music Festival in Auburn, New York.

Auburn is a place that Harriet Tubman once called home, and our community is proud to preserve and highlight her extraordinary life's work. This concert pays tribute to Harriet Tubman's remarkable legacy through music.

The Harriet Tubman Freedom Music Festival's creator, Sean McLeod, is an Auburn native and descendant of a slave rescued by Harriet Tubman. McLeod is a member of the Thompson AME Zion Church and has devoted much of his life to the Harriet Tubman Home, now a National Historic Park. McLeod established the Harriet Tubman Freedom Music Festival to develop both a local and global impact through partnerships with a variety of businesses and nonprofits. McLeod also com-

posed "A Soundtrack for Harriet Tubman," which will be featured at this year's Music Festival.

This celebration is a fitting tribute to a woman who escaped slavery and devoted her life to advancing the freedom and equality of African Americans and the rights of women. I am honored to recognize the Harriet Tubman Freedom Music Festival and I wish it continued success in the years to come.

#### HONORING AMELIA MORÁN CEJA, RECIPIENT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AWARD

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2017*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Amelia Ceja, whom I have selected to receive the American Dream Award for California's 5th Congressional District. This award recognizes the achievements of immigrants in my district who have made remarkable contributions to our communities in the areas of Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service. Ms. Ceja is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Ms. Ceja was born in Las Flores, Jalisco, an agricultural village in Mexico, and immigrated to the United States at the age of 12. She is a successful businessperson and an important member of our community.

Ms. Ceja moved with her family to the Napa Valley American Viticulture Area in California as a child. Her parents worked for a local vineyard management company, her father as a mechanic and her mother as a farm worker. She met her husband, Pedro Ceja, while picking grapes with their families. In 1983, the Ceja family came together to purchase 15 acres and to plant their own grapes. The family later founded Ceja Vineyards, Inc. in 1999. Today they own 113 producing acres. Ms. Ceja is the first Mexican American woman to be the president of a California winery. Her vineyard and winery are famous for their quality grape harvests and production of premium Carneros wines.

Ms. Ceja cares deeply about the family business and employees. She is dedicated to producing the highest quality of wine. The California Legislature recognized her contributions to the community on March 15, 2005 by naming her "Woman of the Year." Ms. Ceja's story is one of sacrifice and determination. Stories like hers make America great.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize Ms. Amelia Morán Ceja for her achievements and for enriching our community. It is fitting and proper that we honor her here today with the American Dream Award.

IN RECOGNITION OF REV. JIM HOLLEY FOR HIS CAREER AS A PASTOR AND COMMUNITY ACTIVIST

### HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rev. Jim Holley of the Historic Little Rock Missionary Baptist Church. For 45 years, Rev. Holley has been a tireless advocate on behalf of Detroit as a faith leader and community activist.

After receiving theological training at the Chicago Theological Seminary, Rev. Holley began his career as a pastor at the Little Rock Baptist Church in Detroit, Michigan. During his time with the church, Rev. Holley has distinguished himself as a key member of the greater Detroit community who understands the spiritual needs and concerns of the city and its residents. His service in church leadership roles, including President of the Council of the Baptist Pastors, speaks to his dedication to the congregation and the well-being of the city at large. Rev. Holley has also been involved in the business community, working with local real estate organizations and founding an advertising agency to empower Detroit's residents and create jobs. In addition to these duties, Rev. Holley also served as the City of Detroit's Director of Community and Civic Affairs during Mayor Duggan's administration, where he was a liaison between the mayor's office and the Detroit community at large.

Rev. Holley has played a critical role in helping to create a vibrant Detroit through his work as a pastor, businessman, and public official. As a result of his work with city leaders and stakeholders, the city has been able to address the needs of its residents through its blight reduction and jobs programs. Additionally, Rev. Holley's deep relationships in the community and firsthand knowledge of Detroit's needs have been key to helping drive action to address issues facing the city. He has been a true leader both in the church and the community, and it is my hope that the City of Detroit continues to build on his work in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Rev. Jim Holley for his outstanding efforts on behalf of Detroit. Rev. Holley has been a dedicated leader in the city while advocating for economic development and empowerment of its residents.

### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 11, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

#### JULY 12

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-124

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Joel Trachtenberg, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Owen West, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary, Ryan McCarthy, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army, and Charles Douglas Stimson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Christopher A. Wray, of Georgia, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

SD-226

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine nourishing our golden years, focusing on how proper and adequate nutrition promote healthy aging and positive outcomes.

SD-562

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider S. 822, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, S. 1447, to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program, S. 1359, to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, S. 810, to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, S. 1395, to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in Delaware, General Services Administration resolutions, and the nominations of Annie Caputo, of Virginia, and David Wright, of South Carolina, each to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Susan Parker Bodine, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the use of the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act and innovative financing

in improving infrastructure to enhance safety, mobility, and economic opportunity.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine force multipliers, focusing on how transportation and supply chain stakeholders are combating human trafficking.

SR-253

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Mark Andrew Green, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and routine lists in the Foreign Service; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Taylor Force Act.

SD-419

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine a record six million United States job vacancies, focusing on reasons and remedies.

RHOB-2020

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy  
To hold hearings to examine American leadership in the Asia Pacific, focusing on promoting democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018".

SD-124

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 943, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, S. 1223, to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act, and S. 1285, to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration

To hold hearings to examine the problem of visa overstays, focusing on a need for better tracking and accountability.

SD-226

#### JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the attempted coup in Montenegro and malign Russian influence in Europe.

SD-G50

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the 2017 Trafficking in Persons Report.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor, and Marvin Kaplan, of Kansas, and William J. Emanuel, of California, both to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

SD-430

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine opportunities in global and local markets, specialty crops, and organics, focusing on perspectives for the 2018 Farm Bill.

SR-328A

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Semi-annual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness

To hold hearings to examine reopening the American frontier, focusing on promoting partnerships between commer-

cial space and the United States government to advance exploration and settlement.

SR-253

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, and Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-215

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018".

SD-106

2 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Transportation.

SD-192

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

3:30 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing on energy insecurity in Russia's periphery.

SD-G11

## POSTPONEMENTS

JULY 12

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine managing security sector assistance to support foreign policy.

SD-419

## SENATE—Tuesday, July 11, 2017

The Senate met at 2:15 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ROB PORTMAN, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God, source of righteousness and the center of our joy, forgive us when we assume we know what is right without seeking Your wisdom. Inspire our lawmakers to think Your thoughts, to listen for Your directions, and to follow Your guidance. Lord, lead them to seek what is best for our Nation and world, depending always on Your sovereignty and might. May they constantly remember that You possess all power and can accomplish the seemingly impossible if they would only believe. Continue to sustain them with Your might, showering them with Your bountiful blessings.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, July 11, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB PORTMAN, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. PORTMAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Nye nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am going to speak for about 5 minutes. Before I begin, I will reference an item that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD following my speech.

I rise to share real stories of real hardships from hard-working families in my home State of Iowa. Seven years ago, Americans were promised that the Affordable Care Act would make health insurance cheaper and healthcare more accessible. Well, I will not pretend to break any news here. The facts speak for themselves: ObamaCare is not living up to its promises. When passing the law, the other side made promises they knew could not be kept.

The irony is, the so-called Affordable Care Act is anything but affordable. I have heard from many Iowans who tell me, in no uncertain terms, that they cannot afford to buy health insurance because ObamaCare is unaffordable. In fact, 72,000 Iowans can't even get help from the exchange because there isn't an insurance company to service them.

One Iowan wrote to me:

I am forced to pay \$230 a month for a healthcare plan that covers nothing until I reach \$11,000 in deductible. So on top of paying 100 percent of my medical bills anyway, now I also have to pay for insurance I can't use.

How did we get to this point?

Seven years ago, I spoke right here on the Senate floor and predicted what would happen to the cost of insurance if ObamaCare passed. So let's go back to that period of time when I spoke in October of 2009. This is my own quote from that speech:

And while some of the supporters of these partisan bills may not want to tell their constituents, we all know that as national spending on health care insurance increases, American families will bear the burden in

the form of higher premiums. So let me be very clear, as a result of the current pending health care proposals, most Americans will pay higher premiums for health insurance.

That is the end of my quote from a speech in the Senate in October of 2009.

Now, I don't have a magic crystal ball, but it was easy to read the writing on the wall. I knew that layers of new taxes and burdensome new mandates in ObamaCare would lead us to where we find ourselves today: a broken healthcare system that is not better off than it was 7 years ago, and for millions of Americans—including those 72,000 Iowans—it is much worse.

So where do we go from here? After 7 years of rising premiums, soaring deductibles, and climbing copays, Republicans are committed to fixing the damage caused by the Affordable Care Act. Not only is it unaffordable for too many people, it is unsustainable. ObamaCare is unable to fulfill its promises to the American people.

Here is what every lawmaker in Congress ought to agree on: Insurance isn't worth having if patients can't afford to use that insurance. The facts are clear. A one-size-fits-all, government-run plan from Washington, DC, is driving insurers out of the exchanges, driving up premiums, driving away customers, and driving up the tab to the tax-paying public.

ObamaCare has overregulated, overtaxed, and oversold its promises to the American people. ObamaCare has not healed what ails the U.S. healthcare system. It is time to move forward.

Mr. President, I also want to speak about Medicaid for a moment.

Medicaid, as we know it, is not sustainable. The Federal Government and States spent \$553 billion on Medicaid in 2016. That amount is very close to \$593 billion spent on the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government—our Nation's defense.

Every decade since Medicaid started, it has grown faster than the economy. Medicaid is now unmatched as a driver of the deficit of our country. We cannot sit by and leave this kind of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

Dollars are not the only metric by which we measure Medicaid. Medicaid is a program that should supply healthcare to diverse populations and should have quality measured, but it does not.

Medicaid dollars should be spent efficiently, but they are not. Activists in Washington, DC, are fighting to preserve the status quo and, of course, in the process, scaring the daylights out of the American people.

Yet Iowans tell me that there are waiting lists for Medicaid waivers to

obtain services for children with disabilities. Others tell me that medicines that will cure diseases are rationed to be used only with those with the most advanced disease. In other words, you have to get really sick for Medicaid to cover medical expenses.

It is a fact that Medicaid is not working the way it should for everyone. The time to act to preserve and improve Medicaid as the safety net for the most vulnerable citizens is right now.

I am holding up a letter here because, under a Democratic President, proposing to do what we are doing, 46 Democrat Senators wrote to President Clinton and expressed their "strong support" for Medicaid per capita caps. The letter went on to say that it would give States the flexibility to achieve savings without cuts to essential services. That is what the current proposal aims to do as well.

We are proposing per capita caps as a way to make sure tax dollars are spent wisely on the most vulnerable people in our Nation. Medicaid dollars should be spent on a child with cystic fibrosis who needs a blockbuster drug. A person with severe mental illness should be able to rely on Medicaid for care.

Medicaid cannot continue to be a limitless credit card for the States to spend money without any accountability to the people who need it. I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan dogma and work to solve this problem for the American people.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
December 13, 1995.

President WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
*The White House,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to express our strong support for the Medicaid per-capita cap structure in your seven-year budget. We have fought against Medicaid block grants and cuts in the Senate, and we are glad you acknowledge the importance of our position.

We support a balanced budget. We are glad you agree with us that we can balance the budget without undermining the health of children, pregnant women, the disabled, and the elderly.

The savings level of \$54 billion over seven years included in your budget will require rigorous efficiencies and economies in the program. However, after consulting with many Medicaid Directors and service providers across the country, we believe a reduction of this level is possible to achieve without dramatic limits on eligibility or cuts to essential services. States will need flexibility to achieve these savings, and you have taken steps toward granting it in your bill.

We were encouraged that your Medicaid proposal does not pit Medicaid populations against one another in a fight over a limited pot of federal resources.

We were further encouraged to hear Chief of Staff Panetta relay your commitment to veto any budget not containing a fundamental guarantee to Medicaid for eligible Americans.

We commend you on the courage you have exercised in making these commitments to Americans eligible for Medicaid. There is a bottom line when it comes to people's health; do not allow the current Congressional leadership to further reduce our commitment to Medicaid beneficiaries.

Your current proposal is fair and reasonable, and is consistent with what we have advocated on the Senate floor. We urge you in the strongest possible terms to hold fast to these commitments in further negotiations. We are prepared to offer any assistance you may need in this regard.

Sincerely,

Bob Graham; John Breaux; Jay Rockefeller; Herb Kohl; Patrick Leahy; Frank R. Lautenberg; Ted Kennedy; Tom Daschle; Patty Murray; Barbara Boxer; David Pryor; Barbara A. Mikulski; Max Baucus; Paul Simon; Kent Conrad; Wendell Ford; Harry Reid; Paul Wellstone; Richard H. Bryan; Ernest Hollings; Dianne Feinstein; Tom Harkin; Byron L. Dorgan; Chris Dodd; J. Bennett Johnston; Joe Lieberman; Paul Sarbanes; Carol Mosely-Braun; John Glenn; Jeff Bingaman; Carl Levin; Bill Bradley; John F. Kerry; Bob Kerrey; Joe Biden; Daniel K. Akaka; Dale Bumpers; Daniel Inouye; Chuck Robb; J. James Exon; Howell Heflin; Claiborne Pell; Russ Feingold; Daniel P. Moynihan; Sam Nunn; Robert C. Byrd.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MISSISSIPPI PLANE CRASH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to start this afternoon by offering deepest condolences to the Marine Corps and to all those who lost loved ones in the tragic plane crash yesterday in Mississippi. We are still learning details about the incident, but we know that at least 16 on board the plane perished as a result of the crash. Our hearts break for all those impacted and the many lives cut short in this tragedy. We are reminded of the bravery that our voluntary servicemembers exhibit, putting their lives on the line, both at home and abroad, in order to defend our communities and our freedom. We are indebted to them for their courageous, courageous sacrifice.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on a totally different matter, ObamaCare is a direct attack on the middle class. Seven years ago, Democrats imposed it on our country. In the years since, Americans have found themselves at the mercy of its failures repeatedly. Choice was supposed to go up, but it plummeted. Costs were supposed to go down, but they skyrocketed.

ObamaCare's defenders spent years trying to deny these clear realities. When the weight of the evidence became too clear to ignore, some appeared to bemoan ObamaCare's harmful impact on our country.

The Democratic Governor of Minnesota declared that it was "no longer affordable." President Clinton branded it "the craziest thing in the world." Other Democrats said similar things.

Such acknowledgements of the obvious seemed to many of us like progress, but they turned out to be just rhetoric. In the last election, voters delivered Congress the opportunity to finally address the ObamaCare status quo. Yet Democrats made clear early on that they did not want to work with us in a serious, bipartisan way to actually do so.

I wish they had made a different choice. I wish their sudden calls for bipartisanship now were even somewhat serious, but this is the reality before us. We must accept it because that is where we are.

As my Republican colleagues know, this is the charge we must accept as well. The American people are looking to us for a better way. That is why, despite the headwinds, I chose to keep working toward a better solution than ObamaCare. I have seen the pain in the eyes of too many of my constituents because of this law. I think they deserve better than what ObamaCare has given them. I hope, in the end, that a majority of the Senate will agree.

We have been continuing with ongoing conversations across the conference about how to get there. Members shared significant input over the State work period. We are going to keep working very hard on this. We will continue to focus on the fundamentals that have guided the process from the start, like improving the affordability of health insurance and stabilizing collapsing insurance markets before they leave even more Americans without any options at all.

We also want to strengthen Medicaid for those who need it most by giving States more flexibility while ensuring that those who rely on the program don't have the rug pulled out from under them.

Many States want the ability to reform their Medicaid programs so they can actually deliver better care at a lower cost. Under current law, States have some ability to do so. Indiana, for example, has launched a particularly notable effort, thanks to the leadership of now-CMS Director Seema Verma.

Ms. Verma has also helped States like Kentucky develop their own plans, but the process is still too restrictive. It hinders broader innovation, and it is very slow. Kentucky's plan, for instance, still has not been approved by the Federal Government.

The Senate's healthcare legislation contains a provision to dramatically expand the State's authority to improve its Medicaid system. It is an idea that could significantly improve healthcare in States across the country. The Wall Street Journal wrote in a recent editorial:

This booster shot of federalism could become the greatest devolution of federal power to the states in the modern era. [It could] launch a burst of state innovation.

The Journal went on further:

Introducing many competing health-care models across the country would be healthy. California and South Carolina don't—and shouldn't—have to follow one uniform prototype designed in Washington, and even a state as large as California doesn't have the same needs from region to region [within the State]. If nothing else the repeal and replace debate has shown that liberals, conservatives and centrists have different health-care priorities, and allowing different approaches and experimentation would be politically therapeutic. The more innovative can become examples to those that stay heavily regulated.

It is clear that we have an important opportunity to achieve positive things for our country. It is also clear that, if we let this opportunity pass by, the options left are not good ones.

The Senate Democratic leader acknowledges that ObamaCare isn't working the way they promised, but his solution, as he noted in a statement last week, is simply more money for insurance companies. The solution would be an insurance company bailout—no reforms, no changes, just more money to paper over the problems under the current law. It is a multibillion-dollar bandaid, not a real solution.

Senator SANDERS acknowledges that ObamaCare isn't working, too, but his solution, as he stated in my State over the weekend, is to move to the kind of fully government-run single-payer system that was already abandoned in his home State of Vermont, that 80 percent of the voters recently rejected in Colorado, and that even the California State Legislature and its huge Democratic majority is finding rather hard to swallow.

Is it any wonder? The so-called single-payer plan Senator SANDERS proposed in his Presidential campaign would strip Americans of so many facets of decisionmaking over their own healthcare and literally hand it over to the government. It would require almost unimaginably high tax increases—unimaginably high.

The cost, according to a recent analysis by the Urban Institute, stands at an astonishing—listen to this—\$32 trillion. That is trillion with a “t.” That represents a greater sum than the entire economy of the most populous nation on Earth—China. It is more than Japan's economy, too—and Germany's, Britain's, and France's. It is the same with Italy's, Brazil's, India's, and Canada's.

In fact, the cost of Senator SANDERS' healthcare plan is projected to be roughly equal to the size of all nine of those countries' economies combined. It would total more than the entire economy of the European Union twice over. If you laid out 32 trillion one-dollar bills end to end, they would stretch from the Earth to Neptune. It took the Voyager 2 spacecraft 12 years to reach Neptune.

That is the government-run single-payer plan put forward by the most famous proponent of the idea. Many in

the Senate Democratic leadership now support single-payer, too, and these days, increasing numbers on the left seem to openly comment on the failures of ObamaCare, as if they see an opportunity to finally realize their leftwing dream of total government dominance of the healthcare system.

That is the dream of many on the other side in this body. That will not happen if we succeed in our charge today. Americans deserve better than what we are getting under ObamaCare. They deserve better than what they get under an even more government-heavy system than we have now. They also deserve better than a bandaid solution.

The people we represent deserve more affordable health insurance. They deserve improved healthcare choice. They deserve a more flexible Medicaid system that can help improve outcomes for those truly in need. They deserve a more responsive healthcare market that trusts the American people to make more of their own choices, not the government.

That is what we have been fighting for throughout this debate. That is what we are going to keep fighting for today.

Mr. President, on one final matter, believe it or not, the current business before the Senate is the consideration of a noncontroversial nominee to be a U.S. district judge in Idaho—Idaho.

How do we know he is noncontroversial? Well, the Judiciary Committee reported out his nomination on a voice vote, and, then, every single Senate Democrat voted yesterday for cloture on his nomination, thereby agreeing that there is no need to continue debate on this noncontroversial nomination—a noncontroversial district court judge.

Why are we still having a debate on a noncontroversial district court judge? If they agree that the Senate should bring the debate on the nomination to a close, then, why did they insist on dragging out the 30 hours of postcloture debate time in order to debate a nomination that not a single Democrat said needed to have more debate?

We all know the answer. It is that the unnecessary procedural vote yesterday served our colleagues' apparent purpose of wasting—literally wasting—more of the Senate's time. Unfortunately, this has become a common practice for our friends across the aisle.

At this point in President Obama's Presidency, we allowed more than 90 percent of his nominees to clear by simple voice vote. Let me say that again. At this point in President Obama's Presidency, we allowed more than 90 percent of his nominees to clear by a simple voice vote, and we only asked for those procedural votes known as cloture votes eight times. At the same point under this current

President, President Trump, Democrats have allowed voice votes 10 percent of the time. While 90 percent of Obama's nominees got a voice vote, 10 percent of Trump's got a voice vote, and they forced procedural hurdles 30 times.

These delays have nothing to do with the credentials or whether Democrats support the nominee. In many cases, in fact, they do support the nominee, like the nominee before us.

As the Wall Street Journal observed yesterday:

Democratic obstruction against nominees is nearly total, most notably including a demand for cloture filings for every nominee—no matter how minor the position.

What does this mean? It means a 2-day waiting period and then another 30 hours beyond that. It is not about changing the outcome; it is about wasting time to make it more difficult for the President to make appointments.

According to the nonpartisan Partnership for Public Service, at this point in President Obama's administration, he had 183 of his nominees confirmed. While the current President has made 178 nominations—almost as many—the Senate has confirmed only 46 of them.

The Wall Street Journal editorial I mentioned goes on to note that the extent of this Democratic obstruction extends far beyond the cloture vote issue. I have discussed this issue before, and I urge the Democratic minority to think critically about the consequences for the Senate and our country if they allow this near-total obstruction to continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal editorial I just mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 10, 2017]  
RUNNING THE SCHUMER BLOCKADE: THE GOP SENATE NEEDS TO STOP DEMOCRATIC ABUSE OF THE RULES

(By the Editorial Board)

The Trump Presidency is well into its seventh month but the Trump Administration still barely exists. Senate Democrats are abusing Senate rules to undermine the executive branch, and Republicans need to restore normal order.

President Trump got an inexcusably slow start making nominations, but in the past few weeks he's been catching up to his predecessors. According to the Partnership for Public Service, as of June 28 Mr. Trump had nominated 178 appointees but the Senate had confirmed only 46. Barack Obama had 183 nominees confirmed by that date in his first term, and George W. Bush 130.

The White House has understandably begun to make a public issue of the delays, and Minority Leader Chuck Schumer says it “has only itself to blame.” But a press release Mr. Schumer sent out Monday made the White House case, showing that the Senate has received 242 nominations but confirmed only 50 through June 30. Democrats are now the problem.

Among the non-controversial nominees awaiting confirmation: Kevin Hassell to lead the White House Council of Economic Advisers; David Malpass, under secretary at Treasury for international affairs; two nominees needed to review pipelines and other projects at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and Noel Francisco for Solicitor General. Mr. Malpass was nominated in March and voted out of committee in mid-June. Mr. Trump's State Department is barely functioning with only eight confirmed appointees.

Democratic obstruction against nominees is nearly total, most notably including a demand for cloture filings for every nominee—no matter how minor the position. This means a two-day waiting period and then another 30 hours of debate. The 30-hour rule means Mr. Trump might not be able to fill all of those 400 positions in four years. The cloture rule also allows the minority to halt other business during the 30-hour debate period, which helps slow the GOP policy and oversight agenda.

Democrats have also refused to return a single “blue slip” to the Judiciary Committee, which has the effect of blocking consideration of judicial nominees from their home states. Senators like Minnesota's Al Franken and Amy Klobuchar are holding hostage the eminently qualified Minnesota Supreme Court Justice David Stras for the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals for no reason other than politics.

Minority Leader Chuck Schumer's troops are even invoking an obscure rule that prohibits committees from doing business more than two hours after the Senate opens for the day. Republicans have had to cancel briefings on national security and Russia electoral interference, as well as scrap a markup of two human-trafficking bills.

Democrat Harry Reid didn't have the cloture headache when he was Majority Leader because in 2013 he cut a deal with Republicans. The GOP traded the ability to offer more amendments to legislation in return for letting Mr. Reid limit post-cloture debate for most nominations to eight hours. This rule let Mr. Reid confirm dozens of judicial and lower-cabinet nominations every week. But the deal expired in early 2015, and good luck getting Mr. Schumer to grant the GOP the same terms.

Frustrated Republicans may soon begin listening to Oklahoma Senator Jim Lankford, who wants the majority to impose the eight-hour rule unilaterally. Most debate about nominees occurs during vetting and in committees. Eight hours on the floor is enough for all but the most controversial nominees, and the Senate could then get back to other business.

As for the blue-slip tradition, it was designed to facilitate advice and consent by allowing Senators to use their home-state knowledge about local judges to better inform the White House. But it is a courtesy, not a rule, and Judiciary Chairman Chuck Grassley can ignore Senators who are using their blue slips as ideological vetoes of qualified candidates.

Mr. Trump has nominated first-rate judges, and Mr. Grassley is justified in suspending blue-slip privileges on a case-by-case basis. Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has also been starting the Senate at different times of the day to get around the Democratic sabotage of committee work. But note Mr. Schumer's childishness in forcing a game of Senate hide-and-seek.

Mr. McConnell will be wary of Mr. Lankford's advice to change a Senate rule in

the middle of the term, but the Majority Leader rightly did so when Democrats staged a historic filibuster of Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch. Democrats aren't using cloture to raise the level of debate or highlight unqualified nominees. They are using it—and have said as much—to sabotage a Presidency. That isn't what the Founders intended, and Republicans have every right to stop this abuse of process to let the President form a government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as the leader has very ably pointed out, the Democratic obstruction when it comes to President Trump's nominees is reaching an unprecedented level if you compare it to any past administration. He pointed out the number of nominees President Obama was able to get in and the way in which Republicans here in the Senate cooperated with him on his nominees. This state of affairs here in the Senate really is taking the obstructionism when it comes to trying to block even getting people into the administration, into their positions, to an entirely new level.

Frankly, about the only thing that probably exceeds the pileup of President Trump's nominees who are not getting into his administration is the pileup of bad ObamaCare news stories. Just take a look at a few of the recent headlines.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer: “Another insurer leaves Ohio health care exchange.”

From Bloomberg: “Anthem's Exit Creates Obamacare ‘Crisis’ for Rural Nevadans.”

From the Washington Free Beacon: “Recent Obamacare Insurer Exits Lead to 2 More Counties With No Choices.”

This is another headline from the Washington Free Beacon: “19th Obamacare Co-Op Folds, Leaving Only 4 Operating in 2018.”

Across the United States, the story is the same—huge premium increases, fewer choices, and a system that is well on its way to complete collapse.

In late May, the Department of Health and Human Services released a report comparing the average individual market insurance premium in 2013, which was the year most of ObamaCare's regulations and mandates were implemented, with the average individual market exchange premium in 2017 in the 39 States that use healthcare.gov. This is what they found:

Between 2013 and 2017, the average individual market monthly premium in the healthcare.gov States increased by 105 percent. That is in the 4-year timeframe since ObamaCare was implemented. On average, individual market premiums more than doubled in just those few years.

In my home State of South Dakota, premiums increased by 124 percent, or \$3,588. That is money South Dakota

families had to take from other priorities, such as saving for retirement or investing in their children's education. Over the past 5 years, the average individual market yearly premium has increased by \$4,800 in Arizona; \$8,364 in Alaska; \$3,648 in Louisiana; \$5,064 in North Carolina; \$4,488 in Tennessee; and \$5,292 in West Virginia.

Premium hikes aren't over. In fact, in many cases, they are getting worse. Here are some of the premium hikes insurers are proposing for 2018. In Maryland, one insurer has proposed an average premium increase of 52 percent. An Iowa insurer is seeking an average 43.5 percent premium increase. In North Carolina, an insurer is pursuing an average 22.9 percent hike. A Virginia insurer is looking for an average rate increase of 38 percent. A Delaware insurer is looking for an average rate hike of 33.6 percent. A Maine insurer is seeking an average rate hike of 40 percent. I could go on. Remember, these are rate hikes for just 1 year. The double-digit rate hikes for next year are in addition to years upon years of dramatic Obama premium increases, as I already pointed out.

The ObamaCare status quo is not sustainable. This law was fatally flawed from the beginning, and it is rapidly imploding. The American people need relief. Inaction is not an option.

My colleagues across the aisle seem to want to do one of two things. They either want to do nothing, which would leave Americans even worse off than they are now, or they want to double down on ObamaCare's failures by giving the government even more control over Americans' healthcare and then raising Americans' taxes to pay for it. Neither one of those so-called solutions will provide relief to the American people.

Republicans are committed to providing real help to the millions of Americans who have been hurt by ObamaCare, and we are working on legislation to do just that. My colleagues in the House made a good start, and we are working to build on their bill here in the Senate.

We are committed to helping to stabilize the collapsing insurance markets that left millions of Americans with no options. We are committed to freeing the American people from the onerous ObamaCare individual mandate, which requires Americans to purchase insurance that they may not want or can't afford. We are committed to improving the affordability of health insurance, which keeps getting more expensive under ObamaCare. We are committed to preserving access to care for Americans with preexisting conditions. We are committed to strengthening Medicaid for those who need it most by giving States more flexibility while ensuring that those who rely on this program don't have the rug pulled out from under them.



The American people have suffered under ObamaCare for long enough. It is time to give them some relief, and that is what we intend to do.

#### NORTH KOREA

Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes today to discuss the serious threat posed by a nuclear-capable North Korea.

Last week, on the Fourth of July, North Korea leader Kim Jong Un took the latest and possibly most alarming step in his unwavering quest for a nuclear weapon by successfully testing an intercontinental ballistic missile. Estimates suggest that the missile tested had a range of more than 4,000 miles, which means it could reach Alaska. North Korea has not yet demonstrated the ability to arm these missiles with nuclear warheads, but that day may not be far off.

North Korea's nuclear program has achieved a disturbing number of milestones in this year alone. The United States must do everything we can to prevent a nuclear-capable North Korea, but we must also be prepared should Kim Jong Un put the final pieces together, and that starts with maintaining a credible military deterrence.

This weekend's B-1 bomber flights were but a sliver of the response the United States could bring to bear in direct military engagement.

Gen. Terrence O'Shaughnessy, commander of the Pacific Air Forces, said of the exercises:

Let me be clear, if called upon, we are trained, equipped, and ready to unleash the full, lethal capability of our allied air forces.

We need to make sure we maintain that lethal capability. Congress has a key role to play here by making sure we adequately fund our military and pass defense appropriations in a timely manner.

While Kim Jong Un has not shown much of an inclination toward rationality, we need to keep emphatically reminding him that his regime would not survive a war on the Korean Peninsula.

A robust and redundant defense is also an important component of the U.S. and allied response to North Korea. A key part of building our defenses should be a rigorous test schedule to inform research and development of anti-ballistic missile technology.

It is true that some U.S. missile intercept tests have failed, but those setbacks have led to improvements. Some of our best men and women are working to keep us ahead of threats. We must repeatedly and aggressively test intercept systems to ensure that they are effective.

Gen. John Hyten, the head of U.S. Strategic Command, has pointed out that our testing schedule for intercept systems lags behind the pace of North Korea's aggressive missile testing.

Tuesday's successful THAAD missile defense system test against a simu-

lated intermediate-range ballistic missile attack was a timely demonstration of this critical defense capability, and I hope we see further deployment of this promising system. Placing THAAD or the Aegis Shore missile defense system in Japan would bolster frontline defenses against future North Korean missile launches.

We should also increase information sharing and military cooperation in the area around the Korean Peninsula to ensure that sanctions are enforced. The joint maritime operations conducted by the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard and the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force are good examples of this cooperation.

We must also examine how we have gotten to this state. For a so-called hermit kingdom, North Korea has made significant advancements, while evading international sanctions. Those advancements, which build off a legacy of Soviet support, have been facilitated by North Korea's ties with Iran and a passive China providing North Korea with an economic lifeline. Not all the blame rests with China, but we know President Xi has proved largely unwilling to curtail North Korea's agenda.

Late last month, Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin announced sanctions on Chinese entities with financial ties to North Korea. This is a positive first step, but more can be done to target banking and front companies that serve as financial conduits for North Korea. Increased transparency in Chinese customs and export reporting, for example, would restrict oil and steel exports to North Korea and ensure that China is adhering to its ban on coal imports from North Korea.

The United States should also weigh whether new sanctions, both punitive and preventive, could exert additional pressure on China to rein in North Korea. I hope the administration will seriously consider such sanctions alongside measures to address other problematic Chinese actions, such as its continued military buildup on disputed reefs in the South China Sea.

Kim Jong Un is clearly ready and willing to threaten the United States and its allies, and we should have no illusions that he is planning to reverse course. We need to make sure that we are prepared for any threat he or his regime poses.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to speak on behalf of a group of Florid-

ians I have met with who would be tremendously hard-hit by the healthcare bill, whether it be the one that has already been published by the majority leader or some of the iterations that are being discussed.

I want to talk on behalf of and be the spokesperson for these people who have cried out to me. I want to say that people are crying out. It is not just the group of four families I assembled in my Tampa office last week, but it also includes walking down the street, being in an airport, or going into a public building. Constantly, folks are walking up to me and saying: Please, don't let them take away my healthcare.

Just this past week, I was in—it shall remain nameless—a Republican Senator's State. It happened in the airport there as my colleague, the Republican Senator in that State other than mine—the travelers, the constituents of that Senator in the airport as we were waiting for the airplane walked up to that Republican Senator and begged: Please don't take away my healthcare.

What we have seen in this Republican bill is that it takes health insurance away from millions of Americans. That is not my conclusion; that is the conclusion of the Congressional Budget Office. According to CBO, it also cuts back some \$800 billion out of Medicaid over a decade, and it allows insurance companies to hike rates for older Americans.

Under the bill, 22 million people would lose their insurance by 2026. Over 2 million of these folks are in Florida. In fact, the bill would increase the uninsured rate in Florida by 62 percent. That is not what I want inflicted on the folks in Florida.

This bill lets insurance companies go back to the days when they had annual and lifetime limits on coverage and refused to cover basic health benefits, such as prescription drugs, mental health services, and even maternity care. This Republican healthcare bill, which has been so much the subject in the news and the center of the debate here for the past innumerable weeks, really does cut Medicaid. According to CBO—again, not my words; CBO's words—funding will be 26 percent lower in Medicaid by the year 2026 than under the existing law.

My home State of Florida is projected to lose \$5.7 billion in Federal Medicaid funding from 2020 to 2026 under the bill that is proposed by the majority leader. If that is not enough, the Senate bill would dramatically increase healthcare costs for Americans between the ages of 50 to 64 before they turn that magic age of 65 when they are eligible for Medicare. It dramatically increases those costs. That dramatic rise in cost is due in large part to a provision that would allow insurance companies to charge older Americans up to five times what younger

people are charged. The current law, the Affordable Care Act, has a differential of 3 to 1. This bill as proposed has a differential of 5 to 1. So if you are not on Medicare because you haven't turned 65 and you are an older American in those ages—which increasingly seem very young to me—up to age 64 when the differential from what the insurance company charges the young person is five times, not three times, as is the current law, this would especially be felt among those older individuals making between \$42,000 and \$48,000 a year who, after that point, no longer qualify for the tax credits under the Republican bill to make coverage more affordable.

Remember, in the current law, up to 400 percent of poverty level, you are entitled to get tax credits according to what your income is to help you buy private health insurance from insurance companies on the marketplaces in each State. Even that is going to be reduced.

This bill also includes a backdoor provision that undermines the protections that currently exist for people with preexisting conditions. In defending the bill, people will argue that it doesn't do that, but look what the bill says. It says that it can be left up to the States to determine that. What is a way that the State can lessen the cost of insurance premiums? Take away the guarantee that someone can get insurance if they have a preexisting condition.

I have given a number of speeches. I have had some experience in this as the former elected insurance commissioner of Florida, when it was an elected position. It was also a constitutional position of the State treasury. I held that position for 6 years, and I have dealt with insurance companies. I have seen some insurance companies say: You have a preexisting condition. We are not going to insure you because you have asthma. I have even seen an insurance company cite: We are not going to insure you because you have a preexisting condition; you had a rash.

Under the current law, an insurance company cannot deny you insurance because of whatever your preexisting condition is. Your preexisting condition may be that you have a weak heart, and you, of all people, would want health insurance. Before, you couldn't get it. Now, under the current law, you can.

I don't want you to hear this plea over and over again from me. I want the pleas from several Floridians to reach out across the State lines and get to the Senators who are going to be voting on this. I want them to hear from some of my constituents. When I met with them last week in Tampa, I had many who said that they would be devastated if Medicaid were cut.

I want to share with you how this has personally affected them and how ap-

prehensive and plain scared they are right now that the healthcare they are getting will cease if this bill proposed by the majority leader is to become law.

Take, for example, Michael Phillips. He is 36 years old, and he has spinal muscular atrophy. It is a genetic disorder that affects control of his muscle movement. He relies on a tracheotomy, a breathing tube, and uses assistive computer technology to be able to talk. The computer talks for him.

Michael was supposed to join us on that day, but he wasn't feeling well, and, of course, there is always the added exposure to germs in his weakened immune condition. Instead came his two caregivers, his single mother Karen and his brother Brian. Michael relies on Medicaid, which allows him to live at home with his mom and have a personal care assistant. He benefits from the Medicaid home and community-based waivers. If the waivers are eliminated because of the whacking of billions and billions of dollars from Medicaid, he would ultimately end up in a nursing home, away from his mother and his family, being forced to compromise his level of care and quality of life.

You may have seen this fellow and his mom interviewed by the national news networks. He is one and the same, Michael Phillips.

The Senate healthcare bill ends Medicaid as we know it. Whether it is a cap on the amount of money going to the State or it is called a block grant, the effect is the same. It will put people like Michael at risk of losing critical services, and it will certainly take away his independence and his quality of life.

I have already said that the bill certainly takes away the guarantee of coverage with a preexisting condition. Let me tell you about another Floridian who was in that meeting. Elizabeth Isom is from St. Petersburg, and she told me that the Affordable Care Act saved her life and allowed her to purchase insurance for the very first time. If it is taken away, she doesn't know how she is going to be able to afford coverage because of lifetime caps. An insurance company cannot put those lifetime caps on what they pay out. For example, in the old days, before the existing law, an insurance company would say: I'll pay you as long as it doesn't exceed, say, \$25,000 or \$50,000. That was all figured into their insurance payment and their premiums. In the current law there are essential health benefits. There are about a dozen of them.

Elizabeth was a social worker before she developed a sinus tumor. She went without insurance for 3 years, during which time her health was deteriorating. Because she did not have health insurance, she could not afford to have that tumor operated on. What I do not

know is if she knew this at the time—because she hadn't had the operation—or if she thought it was cancerous. As it turned out, later, when she was able under the Affordable Care Act to get health insurance and to have the operation, thank the good Lord it was benign. But her health had deteriorated to the point that as this thing started to grow into her sinus passages and into her brain cavity, she actually thought she was approaching death. She ended up having vital organ damage and reached the point of complete disability. The mass in her sinus had extended into her skull.

After the ACA became the law of the land, she purchased insurance through healthcare.gov. She says that it is the best insurance she has ever had because it covered essential health benefits like preventive services. It certainly provided for her to go on and get the operation, and it saved her life.

If this Senate bill passes, services that Elizabeth relies on may no longer be covered, and she likely will never be able to afford a decent health insurance package again. She obviously has a preexisting condition. She would be one of the 22 million people whom the Congressional Budget Office estimates would lose their health insurance if the bill proposed by the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, were to become law.

Let me tell you about another Floridian. Regina Hebert is from Tampa. She is a small business owner. She was diagnosed with stage IIB breast cancer at the age of 57. She, too, told me that the ACA saved her life. Without the ACA, she would not have received health insurance because her cancer is considered a preexisting condition—57 years old, preexisting condition, stage II breast cancer. She obtained health insurance through the ACA. She had two surgeons, months of chemo and radiation, and she told me that if her cancer comes back and she doesn't have insurance, then she is going to have to choose between going bankrupt—not through what she is doing now with her small business. She is paying taxes. She is contributing to society.

What is her other choice? Her other choice is to give up. Take away her insurance and those are her choices: bankruptcy or giving up. I don't think we want to put Americans in that position. The Senate healthcare bill allows States to waive the essential health benefits—the dozen I talked about that are listed, like those needed if they have a preexisting condition.

There was another lady I met named Olivia Babis. She is from outside of Tampa, a place called Lutz. She also has a preexisting condition. She told me that she uses the essential health benefits guaranteed by the existing law. She is scared that insurance companies would take away the coverage of

treatments for her disability and also reinstate annual and lifetime limits on coverage.

Let me tell you about this young lady. She is just amazing. She was born without arms. She uses her feet and her toes to be able to function in the place of hands and fingers. She had to have a total knee replacement in one leg by the time she turned 30. She works as a community organizer. She doesn't qualify for Medicaid in Florida because her income is considered too high. She actually has an income. Olivia purchased health insurance through healthcare.gov with the help of tax credits to help her afford health insurance.

This young lady, now in her midthirties, is just amazing. With no arms, she uses her feet and her toes, and she is capable of getting around in her wheelchair. She is capable of driving a car. She has a business. She has an income, and she is paying taxes. She is able to function because she has health insurance.

Now, thanks to the ACA, people like Olivia benefit because there are bans on lifetime limits in insurance policies, and, thanks to the ACA, she lives an active life. She goes snorkeling, hiking, and even skydiving. Her legs are good, except for the knee replacement that she had so that she can walk. Then, when she has to do the normal functions with hands and arms, she sits down, and she uses her legs, her feet, and her toes. She told me that, without the ACA, she is trapped.

I told you about this unnamed Republican Senator who was in an airport in another State—that of the Republican Senator's. What happened to that Republican Senator happens to me back in Florida with people coming up and begging me: Please do not take away my healthcare.

We should not continue to waste our time with this healthcare bill that only takes away healthcare and charges more for less coverage. We have said—so many of us out here on this floor—that we should be looking for ways to improve the existing law, the Affordable Care Act, not to undo all of the good that it has done. We have Floridians and folks across the country who are grateful for it. They want us to fix it, not repeal it, and they say that over and over: Why can't you guys get together in a bipartisan way and fix it?

These are the personal stories of Olivia, Michael, Regina, and Elizabeth, along with the hundreds of people who have come up to me in the street or in the airport and have begged me: Do not take it away. They do not want us to get rid of this. As you have heard, several of them claim that they would not be alive today without the ACA. Alternatively, they would be bankrupt if it were not for Medicaid in the ACA.

In order to truly improve our healthcare system, why don't we work

together to make it better? We need to look at real solutions. I am happy to say that this Senator has been talking to Republican Senators, and we have talked about specific things. I told some of these Senators about my experiences as the formerly elected insurance commissioner of Florida.

When I had a problem after the monster Hurricane Andrew in the early 1990s and we had a paralyzed marketplace in which you could not get homeowner's insurance in Florida from insurance companies because they were scared to death that the next big one was coming and that the losses were going to be so great that they would have to price the premiums so high, what did we do? We created a reinsurance fund called the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Fund, which builds up the reserves that would reinsure the companies if they were to have a catastrophic loss.

The same principle with hurricanes can apply to health insurance, which is that of creating a reinsurance fund that will insure the health insurance companies against catastrophic loss, which, occasionally, they will have. Do you know something? I costed that out in Florida, and it would reduce the premiums from the marketplace in Florida by 13 percent. Now, that is a real savings, and that is just one solution for a fix. We ought to be looking at approaches like this.

I welcome all of our colleagues on this side and on that side—and I have been talking to some on that side—to join together and do something productive, like getting behind ideas just like the one that I suggested.

I heard our colleague this morning. One of our favorite colleagues out here is JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia, and I heard him being interviewed on one of the morning shows. He was terrific. He said: We need to be working together. We should not be divided by party over this, and we should not be divided ideologically on this. We ought to be openly trying to work together to figure out how to drive down healthcare costs and increase coverage for more Americans.

That is what those folks in Tampa, FL, told me last week with whom I met. That is what those hundreds of folks are telling me who come up to me in the airport, on the airplane, on the street corner, in the public buildings, in the hospitals—wherever I am: Please, get together, and work it out. They are asking us to fix what needs fixing. That is what the American people are asking us today, and that is what I beg of the Senate.

As the good Lord says: Come. Let us reason together. Let us use some of our common sense.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I thank my good friend from Florida for his inspiring words. He is always trying to work together on bipartisan solutions. He represents one of the largest and most diverse States in the country—a State that very much depends on having good healthcare. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will heed his words.

MISSISSIPPI PLANE CRASH

Mr. President, first, I send my sincere condolences to the Marine Corps, which lost 15 of its finest today, as well as 1 Navy corpsman, in a plane crash in Mississippi. It was the deadliest crash in the Marine Corps family since 2005. According to reports, the aircraft that crashed this morning was based at Stewart Air National Guard Base in my home State of New York.

Our hearts break for the families of these sailors and marines. We mourn their loss and wish comfort to their families and their loved ones in this time of tragedy.

May they rest in peace.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, the majority leader said today that we are going to stay in an extra 2 weeks during the August break. We Democrats are willing to stay 2 weeks, 2 months, 2 years to get a good healthcare bill, but in all due respect to my good friend, the majority leader from Kentucky, it is not time that is the problem here. Our Republican colleagues for 7 years said: Repeal ObamaCare. But they had nothing to put in its place. Then President Trump was elected with a Republican majority in the House and the Senate. Since January 4, when they deliberately excluded us from all discussions by enacting a reconciliation bill, they have been trying to put together a healthcare bill. They cannot. It is not because of a lack of time. Two weeks is not going to help. The problem is the substance of the bill.

The bill provides massive tax cuts for the wealthy, and, just as bad, if not worse, it puts a dagger in the heart of the Medicaid Program, which has become a program that affects so many Americans. With kids—poor kids—is where it started, but now it affects people who have Mom and Dad in a nursing home and who might face thousands of dollars of expenses, those on opioid treatment, those who have kids with disabilities, and many, many, many with preexisting conditions. Those are all helped by Medicaid, and our Republican colleagues here want to slash it.

Just like my colleague from Florida, I was in some very conservative parts in New York State, places that voted for Trump by over 60 percent. The revulsion—"revulsion" is the word—and the fear that this healthcare bill has put in the hearts of those folks in Republican areas are dramatic.

So I would say to my good friend the leader that we are willing to stay as long as he wants, but he is not going to solve his problem until he abandons tax cuts on the rich, abandons the decimation of Medicaid, and works with us to improve the existing law. His problem and our Republican colleagues' problem is not time. It is the substance of the bill.

I will say one more thing. If I were a Republican, I would not want to go home either. Every time they go home, they are lambasted because the American people have such a negative feeling about the bill. So, of course, they would want to stay here, but that is not the answer. The answer is to change the bill. Work with us. We have been begging, pleading, asking, cajoling for a month or two, when it was clear their bill was going to fail. I would say that is very important.

Mr. President, I heard the majority leader complain about the slow pace of nominations.

Our Republican friends, when they are worried about the slow pace of nominations, ought to look in the mirror. This President has nominated fewer nominees than has anyone else, and seven of the major nominees had to withdraw their nominations. Many of them were brought here to the Senate without the necessary documentation—the paperwork, the ethics reports, the FBI reports. The chaos in the White House is now spreading to the Republican Senate. Our President seems to blame somebody else when his administration makes a mess. Let's not do that here.

Again, the number of nominees that this President has submitted is lower than that of any President's in recent memory. My colleague complained about this nominee from Idaho. He was outraged that he had to file cloture. I would remind the majority leader that this district judge was nominated by President Obama in the last Congress and that he was the majority leader in the last Congress, which was responsible for putting nominees on the Senate calendar. The district court judge is only one of many nominees who the Republicans failed to move in the last Congress—a Congress which confirmed the fewest number of judges of any Congress since the Eisenhower administration. That goes to show how desperate our Republican leadership is to shift blame and attention away from its healthcare bill to hypocritical and preposterous complaints on nominations. It is in order to distract from the healthcare bill. They can try other tactics.

On one more point, I would remind my colleagues that it is the majority leader who has the power to put nominees on the floor. In the Department of Defense, we have been asked about three nominees. Leader MCCONNELL has the power to put them on the floor—in-

stead of this judge from Idaho, instead of the nominee for OMB, and instead of the Ambassador to Japan—tomorrow, if he chose. It is his choice. If he puts them on the floor—these Defense nominees—in regular order next week, they will be approved.

So, again, to deflect from healthcare and the mess our poor Republican colleagues are in, to point falsely at the nomination process, which has been slow-walked by President Trump and many of the committees, is not going to succeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the moment President Trump and Republicans began trying to jam TrumpCare through Congress, I heard from family after family in my home State about the damage their efforts to undermine families' healthcare would do, and this last week was no different. Again and again, my constituents told me what a difference it makes to have affordable insurance, to know that benefits like substance abuse treatment are covered, or to worry about how they would manage if TrumpCare ever became law.

I heard some of my Republican colleagues went out of their way to avoid those kinds of stories when they were home, so I wanted to make sure they heard a few examples now that they are back in town. And I appreciate that many of my Democratic colleagues will also be sharing stories they heard from their constituents over the past few days.

Like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I come from a State in which the opioid epidemic has had a devastating impact. It has been both heartbreaking and inspiring to talk with patients and families who are doing everything they can to fight back. Right now, the message I am getting from them loud and clear is that they do not want TrumpCare.

Daniel, one of my constituents, was injured in the military. He was given a prescription for painkillers. He was on them for 8 years, and he told me that during that time, his three daughters wondered why he wouldn't play with them. Eventually, Daniel changed doctors and was prescribed Suboxone, which made all the difference for him. He is now able to work again. He manages a grocery store. He relies on Medicaid for healthcare coverage, which covers the hundreds of dollars a month his prescriptions cost. Daniel told me that if he loses Medicaid under TrumpCare, he will not be able to make ends meet and all of the progress he has made will be threatened.

I heard from a constituent named Rachel of Seattle who was addicted to opioids and living in her car when she found out she was eligible for Medicaid. She got connected with Swedish Medical Center in Seattle, where she received wraparound health services, including mental healthcare and primary healthcare. Now she and her husband are successfully in recovery. They are raising a family, and Rachel is going to school. But, just like Daniel, they do not know what they will do if TrumpCare becomes law and the Medicaid coverage that is keeping them going is taken away.

Those are just two of the countless stories I heard from patients and families and doctors in my home State and nationwide. I have heard from cancer survivors who have fought back as hard as they can and are worried that TrumpCare will allow insurance companies to price them out of care because they are now labeled with a pre-existing condition. I heard from young parents of medically fragile children who stay up at night worrying about how to afford care for their toddler if lifetime caps on coverage are imposed under TrumpCare. I heard from seniors who simply don't have the savings to cover the premium spikes TrumpCare would cost. I heard from women and men who are furious, and rightly so, that a group of 13 men wrote a bill in secret to defund Planned Parenthood—the Nation's largest provider of women's healthcare—removing a quality, affordable provider from communities in which it is now very difficult to get care.

These stories are powerful. They make it undeniably clear just how much TrumpCare would hurt people. So it is no wonder that Senate Republicans spent the last week lying low and avoiding defending, oddly, the indefensible. Senate Republicans have read the same independent Congressional Budget Office analysis as we all have. They have heard from countless doctors and nurses and hospitals and nursing homes and patient advocates about all of the ways TrumpCare would raise families' costs and take away coverage. They know that people across the country are completely, resoundingly rejecting TrumpCare. It is the least popular bill in three decades, according to one study.

All in all, TrumpCare shatters every promise President Trump and Republicans made about providing insurance to everybody and making sure no one is worse off. And, incredibly, the extreme rightwing still thinks it leaves too much of the Affordable Care Act intact.

Even though it seems one would be hard-pressed to find anyone who wants to stick up for TrumpCare—including, by the way, President Trump—Senate Republican leaders are still doing everything they can to jam this through

Congress as quickly as they can. They are working on backroom deals as we speak and coming up with new ways to sweeten the deal for Senate Republicans who are rightly wary of voting for a bill that would so clearly do so much harm.

In particular, this afternoon I wanted to address the ongoing effort by extreme conservative Senators to double down on pulling the rug out from under patients with preexisting conditions. They put together this two-track plan to make middle-class workers and families pay more. If they get their way, insurance companies would be back in charge and could tell patients with preexisting conditions or anyone who happens to get sick in the middle of the year “tough luck,” and they will do that in a way that even conservative experts predict will cause premiums and deductibles to skyrocket. Senate Republicans are coming up with other ideas, too, such as an opioid fund that a Republican Governor said is like “spitting in the ocean.”

Let me be clear. There is no “fixing” TrumpCare. No tweak around the edges is going to turn TrumpCare—which, by the way, is just a tax break for special interests and the healthcare industry on the backs of patients—into a healthcare bill that actually helps people. There is just no way. TrumpCare, as the President said, is mean at its core, and unless it is dropped altogether, Senate Republicans are going to have to decide whether they stand with their party or the people they came here to represent.

So to everyone out there who has called and written and rallied and tweeted, you are having an impact. You are why TrumpCare isn’t already law. But you cannot give up now, and Democrats here in the Senate won’t either. We are going to keep doing everything we can to make sure Senate Republicans can’t hold their noses and vote for TrumpCare just to hand big corporations a tax break and President Trump a hollow political win, whether it is next week or the weeks into August.

I also want to remind my Senate Republican colleagues again that we have made clear all along the way that there is a better way to do this. Democrats are ready. We are willing to work with you on policies that make healthcare more affordable and workable for patients and families.

So I am here today to say I hope you all listen to the stories our Democratic colleagues are bringing to the floor. Think about how devastating TrumpCare would be, and do the right thing. Drop this mean bill once and for all so all of us can get to work on real healthcare solutions that actually help people afford care, get covered, and stay healthy. If you do, you won’t have to defend this defenseless bill a minute longer.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to thank Senator MURRAY, a member of our leadership, for taking this time to talk about accounts from home, what we have heard from those we have the honor to represent, and I think this is exactly what is appropriate at the beginning of this work period.

I just come off of eight open-to-all townhall meetings in my home State of Oregon. Five were in counties won by President Trump, three were in counties won by Hillary Clinton, and the single unifying issue that dominated each one is that TrumpCare is a loser. Across the political spectrum—Democrats, Republicans, liberals, and conservatives—what I was told is that the Congress ought to set this TrumpCare bill aside, that the one MITCH MCCONNELL has been working on ought to be dropped, and after it is dropped, Democrats and Republicans ought to get together and look for the common ground by trying to show some common sense.

I am going to spend a little time talking about what I heard, what people are concerned about, and then briefly talk about, as Senator MURRAY said, what we would like to do if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will drop this ill-advised, “our way or the highway” approach and do what the Senate has traditionally done when we are talking about tackling a big issue, which is find common ground.

It doesn’t get much bigger than healthcare. We are spending \$3.2 trillion each year now on healthcare. It comes to something like \$10,000 for every man, woman, and child. We are spending enough money; the real question is whether we spend it in the right place, and this very flawed TrumpCare bill will compound that problem.

During those eight townhall meetings over the past week, Oregonians asked me: When is this flawed TrumpCare bill coming to a vote? How are my frail, not physically well, older parents supposed to get by if this bill passes and they lose their health care coverage?

As I have talked about with Senator MURRAY, we know that Medicaid picks up the bill for what amounts to two out of three older people in nursing homes. What often is not mentioned is that it also covers home- and community-based services for seniors. I remember from my days as director of the Oregon Gray Panthers that the whole goal was to create this continuum of choices for older people and, as Senator MURRAY touched on, the older people who need nursing homes and nursing home benefits. She is absolutely right. We also need to protect the Medicaid guarantee for the seniors for whom care is appropriate in other settings, such as home- and community-based services.

At those townhall meetings at community centers and auditoriums, folks knew that I am the senior Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee.

We have another talented member from the committee, Senator BENNET, here, as well as my knowledgeable colleague from Oregon, Senator MERKLEY.

I have worked on these issues with respect to taxes and healthcare for some time, and I have really dedicated my professional life to trying to find that common ground, show common sense in the areas of healthcare and taxes. But the fact is, this version of TrumpCare is a tax break for some of the most powerful special interests masquerading as a health plan, and when Oregonians heard that, whether it was in a Trump county or in a Clinton county, everybody started nodding.

The secret is out. This is not a plan to fix anybody’s healthcare or hold down the premiums; this is one big handout to the most powerful special interests. People heard that Republicans were saying those tax cuts were going to create jobs. That is not very likely when they have made the tax cuts retroactive. What that means—they made the big one retroactive to January 1—is that if you have a capital gain say in March, and if this bill is passed in its present form, if that capital gain is \$1 million, you get a tax break of \$38,000. That is not creating jobs, it is creating windfalls, and the American people have caught on.

Now that the Senate is back in session, the public is reading about the newest proposal on offer. It is a Hail Mary pass from Senator CRUZ and Republican leaders, trying to put together \$50 billion for their version of TrumpCare. And we know in the Finance Committee, they have billions and billions of dollars that they can use to try to find those extra votes.

I will tell you, this Senator CRUZ proposal as it relates to healthcare is a prescription for mayhem in the private health insurance marketplace. It is going to mean misery for so many Americans dealing with illnesses. Forget the talk about bringing costs down. This plan is going to send health expenses into the stratosphere.

The plan tells insurance companies: You are off the hook as it relates to basic consumer protections. You get to bring back annual and lifetime caps on coverage.

Think about that. In the State of Alabama and everywhere else in America under the Affordable Care Act, the 160 million people who get their care through their employer heard about this bill and said: We are home free. It really does not affect us. They got a little extra bonus. The Affordable Care Act gave them a major catastrophic benefit if they had that employer coverage. With this Republican bill, all of those folks who thought they were home free with the employer coverage

should know that once again there would be limits on what insurance companies could pay.

I will tell you, for anyone who is listening to this, if someone gets cancer at home, they are going to bust that cap in a hurry. This bill means they are not automatically protected. You can forget about essential health benefits. You get to flood the market with bargain-basement insurance plans as long as you offer one comprehensive option, and you get to price that plan through the roof.

If you pass this bill—the Cruz fantasy proposal—it is going to be a tale of two health symptoms. The young and healthy will opt for the barebones insurance plans that don't cover much of anything, but there are millions of people in the country who can't get by, can't make it with skimpy insurance that covers nothing but stitches and aromatherapy.

There are people who have had a cancer scare or suffer from diabetes or people who get hurt on the ski slopes or slip off a ladder. The only coverage that works for them will come with an astronomical price tag.

By the way, the people between 55 and 64, who can get charged five times as much as younger people, get fewer tax credits under this Republican proposal. They can't get by with skimpy coverage. A lot of them have really serious health problems. Skimpy coverage for them is just a prescription for trouble.

The fact is, this new proposal basically starts marching America back to the days when healthcare was reserved for the healthy and wealthy. What I will say is that there would be plenty of opportunities for Democrats and Republicans to find common ground if this proposal is set aside.

Nobody has said the Affordable Care Act is perfect. What we would do is go to work to stabilize the private insurance market. That would be business No. 1. We would look at ideas, as Senator NELSON has just thoughtfully outlined, like reinsurance. Then a special priority of mine is to clamp down on skyrocketing prescription drug prices. I think there are a number of ideas that are teed up for both sides to come together.

I recently put in a bill called the SPIKE bill. What it says is that these big drug companies should have to justify their big price hikes. I don't think that is an extreme position to say they ought to have to publicly, justifiably make it part of the public record.

In the last few years, we have had a whole new industry emerge. They represent States and companies and labor unions, and they are supposed to be negotiating a good deal for patients. They are called pharmaceutical benefit managers, but we don't know what they put in their pocket and what they put in our pocket.

I have said: How about some transparency, folks? Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

Those are the kinds of ideas—reinsurance, stabilizing the private insurance market, clamping down on prescription drug prices, particularly using the power in the marketplace—that both sides ought to be able to get together.

The recess is over, but the healthcare debate is far from over. What I will say is what I told my constituents. I see my friend Senator MERKLEY here. We had rallies at home. I said: Folks, in stopping the McConnell bill before the July break, you proved that political change in America is not trickle-down; it is bottom-up.

For weeks before that July break, Americans of all ages and political philosophies called and texted and wrote and came to rallies and town meetings. They said: This TrumpCare bill is a loser for us. It doesn't work. Drop it and move on to approaches that involve common sense. Look for common ground that both sides could support. It is absolutely vital.

The events of the last few weeks have shown the power of the grassroots. I walked through for my constituents what could have happened if 2 weeks ago the Republican leader had brought his bill to the floor. It was in the morning. I described how the bill could have gotten through the Senate. Maybe the House would have stayed in; maybe the House would have passed it; maybe the President would have signed it. One of my constituents said that morning: If that had happened and we had lost the ACA, even though it is not perfect, that morning we would have been in mourning.

Let us show today that we can tackle this in a way that the Senate historically has worked best. Let's block the deeply flawed bill, and then let's turn around immediately to show that we can come together, find common ground.

I see one of our colleagues, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who has one of the important reinsurance bills here. We have a variety of ideas that we can pursue, that I think would have appeal on both sides of the aisle, but there is a step you have to take before you get on to those commonsense ideas. You have to stop the flawed bill before the U.S. Senate at this point.

I ask the people of this country to continue what they have done over the last few weeks and show political change, bottom-up rather than top-down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member of the Finance Committee for his leadership not only on this bill but also healthcare over the decades. He knows something about the right way of doing it and the

wrong way of doing it, which is partly what brings me to the floor today.

I want to say something that I think will be uncontroversial to the people at home but may be news to some people here, and that is whether you support the Affordable Care Act or whether you don't support the Affordable Care Act, whether you have been a supporter of ObamaCare or whether you are not a supporter of what is called ObamaCare, in general, people are pretty dissatisfied with our healthcare system at home. In general, people are pretty dissatisfied with the rate their insurance goes up. They are pretty dissatisfied with the fact that a lot of people are still uncovered in this country. If they are a senior, they are pretty dissatisfied not just with the idea but with the practice that month after month, people have to cut their medicines in half just to get through the month. They are pretty dissatisfied with the fact that they call an insurance company to make a claim to say "My child was sick" and point out that month after month they have paid their premiums only to find that on the day they make that claim, there is someone at that insurance company who has more time than they do to stay on the phone, to keep them on that phone, to deny them their claim. They are pretty dissatisfied about that.

As a whole, I think the American people are dissatisfied by the fact that we spend 16 percent of our gross domestic product, our entire economy, on healthcare when every other industrialized country in the world spends half of that or less than half of that on healthcare and—this is going to come as news to some people in this Chamber—get better results. We are moving in the wrong direction on too many dimensions when it comes to our healthcare.

I have said all of that as a proponent of the Affordable Care Act. I spent a year and a half in Colorado, in certain places, being called a Bolshevik or a socialist, being accused of advocating for a government takeover of our healthcare system. This was at a time when the tea party was very active, and people would come and say, quite rightly: Read the bill. Read the bill. We need to take our government back.

We tried to do some things to help in that bill. For the first time in the country's history, we tried to say that it wasn't OK to discriminate against people who were sick or have what is called a preexisting condition when they went to buy health insurance. As the Senator from Oregon said, it wasn't OK that if you did get sick when you had insurance and you got something like cancer that an insurance company could just throw you off their rolls because you hit their cap.

We said that we thought it wasn't OK that there were millions of people, many of them children, who didn't

have access to primary care; that is, a doctor to be able to give you a checkup and see how you are doing so that you weren't getting treated in the emergency room—the most expensive, least intentional way of running a healthcare system that is imaginable. In fact, I would say that is the Bolshevik way of running a healthcare system: When you are sick, you get to show up at the emergency room, and somebody is going to take care of you. It gives you the results of a Bolshevik system because you are paying more for less of an outcome.

We tried to address some of those things, and that became the Affordable Care Act. That became ObamaCare. That became something that was politicized for 7 years, as the House of Representatives cynically, month after month, voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Then the majority of the House went home to their districts and said: We repealed ObamaCare. We voted to repeal ObamaCare.

You didn't repeal it.

No, we voted to repeal it. If you send me back there next week, I will do the same thing. I will do it the week after that.

Then at some point, people started to say: Well, you keep having the vote on repealing ObamaCare. Why haven't you actually done it?

They said: Well, we didn't have the Senate.

They have had the Senate now for two Congresses.

Well, we didn't have the Presidency.

Now we have the same party in Presidency, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. This terrible bill we are considering is not a bill that anybody—that is an exaggeration—virtually anybody in my State supports or has asked for. That is what we have in front of us.

I know somebody else who knew that the American people were dissatisfied with their healthcare system, and that was Donald J. Trump when he was running for President of the United States.

I hope, in particular, the people who voted for the President, as a way of keeping Washington accountable, will remember that he said he was going to provide the American people “a terrific plan,” to “cover everyone at a fraction of the cost.” The President, when he was running—he still does it—was very fond of talking about—his words—how stupid everybody in Washington was and he knew how to make deals and he was going to come here and make great deals and he was going to cover everybody at a fraction of the price with a terrific plan. That is what he promised the American people. That is what he was peddling when he was running for President. He said: “Everybody is going to be taken care of much better than you are taken care of now.” That is what he said. This isn't fake news. This isn't CNN or the New York Times

or the Wall Street Journal or whoever is in the crosshairs. This is what the President said on the campaign trail when he was running because he detected, quite rightly, that the American people are unhappy with the way our healthcare system works—unhappy in the richest country of the world to have a healthcare system where people have to make decisions about their lives and about their children's lives that no one in the industrialized world has to make about their lives or their children's lives—and they wonder why.

I think the diagnosis has a lot to do with what some people have said, which is special interests having a grasp on Washington, DC. That is what the President said he was going to give to the American people. This is what his promise was to the American people. What did we get instead? We have a bill passed by the House that was a massive tax cut for the richest people in America, which, literally, nobody in my townhalls in red or blue parts of my State has ever said is something that would help with their healthcare. Not a single person has said what they want for healthcare is a massive tax cut for people making more than \$250,000 a year—not one, not one person.

There is a 25-percent cut to Medicaid in this bill. That was done in the name of, I guess, reforming entitlements. The argument has been made that there are a lot of lazy people who are on Medicaid, and if you cut Medicaid by 25 percent, they will go to work, and they should go to work. Well, there are two issues with that. The first is, it is important to understand who is on Medicaid.

In my State, 50 percent of the people are children. Are they supposed to be at work or can they go to school? Then there are a whole bunch of people on Medicaid—in fact, it is a very large share of the population of Medicaid who have spent their entire life savings down for the privilege of being in a nursing home paid for by Medicaid. Are they supposed to work? Then there are a lot of people—I am ashamed to say this—there are a lot of people in this country who are working one job, two jobs and can't make enough money to buy private insurance in the United States of America. That is a shame. Do they need to get a third or fourth job before we are saying they are not lazy or should we fix this healthcare system so it is more affordable, more predictable, more transparent for American families? Those were the promises the President made. That is the content of the bill with one addition. They slipped in—between that tax cut and that 25-percent cut to Medicaid, which is paying for that tax cut for the wealthiest Americans—what my colleague RAND PAUL, a Republican from Kentucky, has described accurately as ObamaCare lite. He is absolutely right about that.

If you hate ObamaCare, you will hate ObamaCare lite. If you are looking in a rural part of my State or the country, and you already can't afford insurance because there is no market there and you can't get a subsidy that will help you because you are making too much money, you are going to hate that even more. Wait until they pass the Cruz amendment, which he is calling the freedom amendment—freedom to have to endure something no one else in the industrialized world has to put up with, which is buying lousy insurance that doesn't cover anything. You can create the worst product in the world and make it affordable. That is not hard to do.

We have come a long way from Franklin Roosevelt's four freedoms, if we are talking about the freedom of insurance companies to be able to throw you off if you hit the lifetime cap, freedom not to give you insurance if you have a preexisting condition. We have come a long, long way.

Finally, my colleagues are here so I am going to stop. I do want to say one word about the process. The majority leader today announced that he is going to keep the Senate in for 2 weeks in August because they have to finish their work on healthcare or maybe it is 3 weeks in August. I don't care if it is a month. I don't care if they cancel every recess we have between now and the end of the year. I don't care if we work on weekends if it will create a situation where we can actually improve healthcare for the American people. I am glad to stay. In fact, I think we should stay, but, unfortunately, that is not what he is trying to do. What he is trying to do is jam through a bill that is incredibly unpopular with the American people. That is why, until 2 weeks ago, it was a secret. Until two Thursdays ago, it was a secret.

I have to suspect that one reason they want to keep us in August is because they don't want to go home because they were just beaten to death over the July 4th recess because people came out in Republican and Democratic parts of their States and said: Are you out of your minds? This bill has nothing to do with our healthcare. They probably don't want to repeat that in August.

I will close just by saying this, and I said this again to the people who came to my townhalls and were highly critical of the Affordable Care Act and the process: I want to remind you folks that back then—the Senator from Oregon will remember this—back then, we spent over a year debating that bill here in the Congress. We had countless—somebody could count them up—but countless committee hearings in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Finance Committee. We had almost 200 amendments that were Republican amendments that were adopted as part of that bill. Everybody remembers, no Republican



voted for it, but there were 200 Republican amendments adopted as part of that bill. We have not had a single committee hearing in the Senate about this healthcare bill—not one.

So you can keep us in for 2 weeks or 3 weeks longer in August, but a better idea might be to follow the regular order around this place. Talk about take our country back, take our government back, make it work, have hearings, have witnesses. I can think of 100 Coloradans, off the top of my head, who would like to come here and testify. I would even say 50 of them can be Republicans and 50 of them can be Democrats. Have them come testify what would make healthcare better for them. That is what this should be about: families all across this country who are struggling because of our healthcare system and who need relief from this Congress and who so far aren't getting it.

I will close just by saying, if the President could submit a proposal that actually would meet the criteria he set out when he was running for President—instead of having a bill he couldn't pass with even 51 Republican votes—he would have a bill he could pass with 100 votes here in the Senate, and that is what we should strive to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, let's revisit recent history. Four weeks ago, my Republican colleagues were meeting secretly in this building, in a hallway that the press was not allowed in because they didn't want to have the press see them sneaking in and sneaking out of this completely undemocratic process—13 Republican men crafting a healthcare plan to destroy healthcare for 22 million Americans. That is where we were 4 weeks ago.

We made a big deal out of the fact that is not the way a Congress is supposed to operate. You are supposed to have committee hearings. You are supposed to have committee debate and invite experts in. You are supposed to have time to consult with your constituents back home, but none of that was happening. No, we had the Republican zero-zero-zero process: Zero committee meetings. How does that compare to more than 100 committee meetings and roundtables and walkthroughs from 8 years ago? Zero committee amendments. How does that compare to more than 400 amendments that were considered 8 years ago and more than 100 minority amendments, Republican amendments, that were adopted in this process? Zero exposure of the bill to the folks back home and to the healthcare stakeholders.

Then, 2 weeks ago, we had a draft, and we had a chance to circulate that draft and get a few folks from home to weigh in on what it looked like. We received a CBO analysis. Yes, it looked a

lot like the House bill. The House bill was going to eliminate 14 million healthcare policies in a year, and the Senate was going to best that by eliminating healthcare for 15 million Americans and 22 million Americans over a 10-year period.

The President had called the House bill mean, but we had the even meaner Senate bill. Fortunately, we were able to create such a fuss that the majority leader canceled the vote—the vote that was going to take place with the zero committee hearings and zero amendments and that would give my colleagues the opportunity to go home and talk to their constituents. But what happened?

Well, in the course of this entire year, two-thirds of my Republican colleagues haven't held a single townhall, and last week, when they had a full opportunity to finally take their secret 13 bill—zero-zero-zero bill—and ask their constituents what they thought, they didn't hold townhalls. By best count, 2 Senators across the aisle held a townhall out of 52.

Why are my colleagues so terrified of their constituents? Is it because wiping out health insurance for struggling Americans is a travesty? Is it because wiping out healthcare for working Americans is a crime—a crime against decency? Is it because their bill proceeds to give \$33 billion to the richest 400 Americans? No, that is not \$33,000 or \$33 million, that is \$33 billion to the richest 400 Americans—more than several hundred billion dollars to the richest Americans overall. You know, the money they want to give to the top 400 richest Americans would fund healthcare for more than 700,000 Americans under Medicaid.

Well, I went home. I went to a lot of places. I went to three cities in what you might call blue Oregon. I went to 13 towns in what can clearly be called red Oregon—predominantly Republican Oregon. I went to towns like Echo and Helix; Adams and Athena; Weston and Sumpter; Granite and Greenhorn, with 37 individuals; and Adams, with a population of 348. I went to larger towns like North Powder and Wallowa; and Baker City, Burns and Nyssa.

In six of those Republican towns, I held full townhalls, and what did I hear? I heard that the top concern was healthcare because constituents in red America across this country are terrified of the secret 13's bill and all that it involves. What would it do in my home State? Well, 400,000 Oregonians under the Oregon Health Plan would lose their care. At least another 100,000 would lose their care because of the changes in the way the exchange operates. They kind of put their minds to work at what the picture looks like from the draft the Republicans were willing to circulate after we applied extensive pressure. And what did we hear? Well, we heard that they are very

concerned about extinguishing the expansion of Medicaid. Those are folks who are working hard but struggling, often in multiple part-time jobs.

We heard about the fact that Medicaid pays for more than two out of three individuals on long-term care in rural America. In fact, I went to one nursing home and asked: Does Medicaid—Oregon Health Plan—pay for two-thirds of your residents?

They said: No, Senator. Here in Klamath Falls, it is nearly 100 percent.

Realize that an individual who is getting paid-for, long-term care under Medicaid has to have assets of less than \$2,000. So there is no backup plan. You wipe out healthcare for those 400,000 individuals who are on expanded Medicaid, many of whom are in long-term care, and they have no backup plan.

One woman, Debra, said to me: Senator, I am paid for by Medicaid, and if they cut Medicaid, I will be out on the street. That will be a problem because I can't walk.

That is right, Debra, you are in trouble, and so is every other individual who is funded through Medicaid for long-term care.

What about maternity care? One out of three individuals in rural Oregon and rural America who is preparing to have a baby is funded through Medicaid. Children and the disabled are funded through Medicaid.

What do we get as an alternative now that the Republicans are back, having ducked their constituents? They want a new plan to offer? Well, they are talking about the Cruz plan. Now, this is interesting. It is a plan that says an insurance company can offer policies that cover nothing as long as they have at least one policy that covers quite a bit, which means the young and the healthy buy the policy that covers almost nothing, and then the policy that covers quite a bit that older Americans and those with preexisting conditions need becomes incredibly expensive because the group in that pool are people with lots of healthcare problems, and it creates a death spiral in insurance.

Well, at the one end of the spectrum, you have a death spiral for insurance policies that cover a lot; at the other end of the spectrum, you have fake insurance because it covers virtually nothing. Oh, maybe it only costs \$50 a month. Oh, isn't that wonderful—until you find out it doesn't cover a day in the hospital; doesn't cover a trip to the emergency room; doesn't cover maternity care; doesn't cover drugs. In fact, it doesn't cover anything.

Why is it that a President who is so concerned about fake news is so interested in supporting fake insurance?

My constituents back home told me a lot of stories. These are stories that I hope to share in the next couple of days, but right now, I think it is important that we hear from my colleague from Virginia, Senator TIM

KAINE, because he has also been looking in detail at this bill. He also understands what a devastating consequence TrumpCare will have for American healthcare.

Can't we come together with a better vision? Can't we come together and make the marketplace work better, restore the reinsurance that has ripped apart the ability of insurance companies to go into new markets? Can't we restore the cost-sharing payments that buy down the premiums, in fact improve them, so there are lower premiums and lower deductibles? Can't we come together and do a better job of funding opioid treatment? Can't we come together and take on the high costs of drugs in general, which is driving costs in the healthcare system? Just those four things would be something very positive to make our current healthcare system even better.

Let's work together to make healthcare here in the United States of America even better, not tear it down and destroy it, as is being proposed by my Republican colleagues.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise to talk about the healthcare proposal on the floor, and I thank my colleague from Oregon and all my colleagues who have taken the floor on this issue.

I will just state at the top a punch line: I will vote for any healthcare bill that meets President Trump's promises. He said that in his replacement, no one would lose coverage, no one would pay more, no one would get kicked around because of a preexisting condition, and he wouldn't cut Medicaid. And any bill that meets those criteria, I am voting for, but I won't vote for a bill that shatters all those promises, and that is what this current proposal does.

There is a lot to talk about with the bill, and I just want to talk about one thing—the proposed cuts to the Medicaid Program and especially the effect of those cuts on children.

In the current Senate proposal, which is being sort of adjusted and modified, there is a slashing of Medicaid by about \$770 billion over 10 years. And if you add to that additional cuts to Medicaid proposed by the President's budget, we are now north of \$1 trillion of cuts to Medicaid in the next 10 years.

Who receives Medicaid? In Virginia, between 50 and 60 percent of those who receive Medicaid are children. In Virginia, 600,000 young people are Medicaid recipients.

If you go to school and you are receiving an individualized education plan because you have a designated disability, Medicaid is paying for it.

About 50 percent of childbirths in Virginia are paid for by Medicaid.

If you are a kid who is doing everything right, but your family is dysfunc-

tional and a juvenile court judge has to decide whether to keep you with your family or put you in a group home, if the judge decides to send a social worker to your house 5 hours a week, Medicaid pays for that.

If you are a child with autism and you are getting services for your autism after school so you can succeed in school, Medicaid pays for that.

In Virginia, 600,000 children receive Medicaid.

We recently had the administration's OMB—Office of Management and Budget—Director, Mick Mulvaney, before us, and I asked him about these Medicaid cuts. These cuts are catastrophic. How can you say these cuts are a good thing? This is his quote:

We are no longer going to measure compassion by the number of programs or the number of people on programs like Medicaid. We are going to measure compassion . . . by the number of people we get off those programs and back in charge of their own lives.

So the philosophy that drives this is, we want to get people off Medicaid and back in charge of their own lives—600,000 kids.

I had a roundtable yesterday in Springfield, VA, here in Northern Virginia, and I had five families, parents and children, come to talk about what Medicaid cuts would mean to them.

Angie and Anna are from Haymarket, VA. Anna is a little 5-year-old and, her mom says, typical in so many ways. She loves to play with her brothers, and she loves to play with dolls. But she has cerebral palsy and tracheal bronchial malacia and subglottic stenosis and chronic lung disease. In 2014, she developed a condition that caused her to have 30 bone breaks in 18 months.

Anna is in school. Anna is in school with a wheelchair that Medicaid pays for. Anna is in school with some home health that Medicaid pays for. Medicaid enables this child who has so many needs to actually go to school so she can be all that she can be. Her family has TRICARE through the military because the dad is in the military, but they couldn't make it without Medicaid.

Jen and Cailyn are from Sterling, VA, also in Northern Virginia. Cailyn is about 9½. Within a week after she was born, the family knew there were some things wrong. She was finally diagnosed at age 3½ with a very rare, noninherited genetic anomaly. The family was able to get her qualified for a Medicaid waiver when she was about a year old. And this is secondary insurance. The family works and they have private insurance, but it doesn't cover a wheelchair, a hospital bed, and things that she needs to succeed. Again, this little girl who is 9½—and her mother testified that she functions on about the range of a 6-month old—she is able to go to school because Medicaid can pay for some of the technology she needs.

Kim and Isaac are from Ashburn, VA, in Loudoun County. Isaac is a youngster, a very active kid, but he has a tracheotomy. He is feeding-tube dependent. His family has private insurance, but they couldn't get along without Medicaid. He is in the Loudoun County schools succeeding because of Medicaid.

Dylan is another kid in Loudoun County schools. Corinne is his mother. Dylan has a rare neuromuscular disease called spinal muscular atrophy with respiratory distress. He has a tracheotomy tube. He relies on a ventilator to breathe. Little Dylan was at this meeting. The family has private insurance, but they couldn't succeed without Medicaid. Dylan is able to go to school because of Medicaid.

Finally, there is a family from Richmond—Amy is the mom, and the son is Declan. Declan is not in school because he is only 18 months old. He has cerebral palsy, and his medical needs are intense. With Medicaid, he is able to get some home nursing help, and he is able to get some machinery at home that helps him succeed.

These are beautiful parents, one of whom had adopted her child—first as a foster care and then adopted knowing the special needs of this child. This was Angie and Anna. These parents are the saints of the world, and these kids are fighting so hard. They are fighting so hard just to try to develop every talent they have, every capacity they have, but with Medicaid cuts, they would be in deep, deep jeopardy.

Why would we vote for a bill that slashes Medicaid to families like these when President Trump said we are not going to cut Medicaid? Why would we vote for a bill that shatters those promises, that takes health insurance away from 20 million people, that increases premiums for seniors, that subjects those with preexisting conditions to being cast in the shadows yet again? That is what this bill would do.

I had a conclusion written, but I will tell you, one of my moms yesterday gave me a better one. She gave me a better conclusion.

We had this roundtable with five families. We had some great folks from the American Academy of Pediatricians who were there, too, saying what a bad bill this would be for kids.

After the hearing was over, one of the moms looked at me and said: You know, they kind of picked the wrong group of people to fight with—talking about this bill.

I said: What you do mean by that, wrong group of people to fight with?

She said: Parents of kids with disabilities.

I said: I don't get where you are going.

And this is what she said to me: From the moment our children are born, all we do is fight. We fight so that our kids can survive. We fight so

that our kids can have as normal a life as possible. We have to fight with hospitals. We have to fight with insurance companies. We have to fight with school systems. We have to fight with cultural stigmas about people with disabilities. If you are a parent of a child with a disability, from the day they are born, all you do is fight. And if they think that we are going to pass a bill to cut Medicaid to these kids and their families and that we are not going to fight about it, that we are not going to stand up and be heard, they have seriously underestimated us.

I think we can do the right thing, as my colleagues have said, if we will get together. I am on the HELP Committee, Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the only topic that has been taboo on my committee this year is health. We have had hearings about nominees. We have had hearings about the FDA. We have not been allowed to have a hearing about this health proposal—either the House bill or the Senate bill.

Let's have a hearing, listen to patients, listen to parents, listen to hospitals, listen to doctors, listen to people who are worried about their premium costs, listen to insurance companies, and listen to medical innovators. If we listen, we will get this right. But if we shut down a process, if we don't allow the public in, don't listen, don't have hearings, and rush it through, we will get it wrong.

This is the biggest sector of the American economy, and it is the most important expenditure that anybody ever makes in their life. On behalf of the 600,000 children in Virginia and the 30 million children in this country who receive Medicaid, let's get this right.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, Senator RISCH, to speak on the nomination of Judge David Nye to be a U.S. district judge for the Federal district of Idaho.

First, let me acknowledge the diligent work of Judiciary Committee Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member FEINSTEIN in expediting the confirmation process for Judge Nye's renomination.

I also thank both President Obama and President Trump for nominating Judge Nye to the Federal bench. It is rare to be nominated by Presidents of two different parties, but it is a fitting testament to Judge Nye's sterling reputation that he has secured that distinction.

Finally, I appreciate the majority leader giving Judge Nye the honor of being the first U.S. district judge by the 115th Congress.

Judge Nye is supremely qualified as a candidate for the Federal district court seat, having a unanimous "well qualified" rating from the American Bar As-

sociation and having received approval from the Senate Judiciary Committee without dissent twice in a little less than a year.

Judge Nye has long been ready to assume this high office. A longtime member of Idaho's legal community, Judge Nye has been a law clerk, a practicing lawyer, and since 2007 a judge on Idaho's Sixth Judicial District Court. This court handles all felony criminal cases, major civil cases, and appeals from the magistrate court from six counties throughout the southeast portion of Idaho. He also served from 2009 to 2012 as the administrative district judge for the Idaho Sixth Judicial District, elected by his peers on the court for the 3-year term to this position.

He is not just a well-respected jurist in Idaho. Judge Nye is heavily involved in the training and orientation of new Idaho judges, and he serves on the Idaho Supreme Court's committees on judicial education and felony sentencing.

Action on Judge Nye's nomination is critical and timely. Idaho is one of only three States having just two authorized district court judgeships. The nonpartisan Judicial Conference of the United States has declared a judicial emergency for Idaho and has recommended in every one of its reports to Congress since 2003 that Idaho be authorized a third district judge position. For the past 2 years, Idaho has had a three-judge caseload handled by just one active judge. What is even more challenging is that our lone remaining active judge is already eligible to take senior status since this past March. Even with Judge Nye's confirmation, Idaho still needs another U.S. district court judge.

Confirmation of Judge Nye today or tomorrow is undoubtedly a proud day for the entire Nye family, including Judge Nye's wife Katre and their eight children. Knowing that a successful public servant draws so much strength from the family surrounding him or her, I salute their partnership with Judge Nye in making this important occasion possible.

Again, I strongly endorse Judge Nye's nomination and appreciate the Senate's confirmation of him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the remarks from my distinguished colleague and close personal friend, Senator CRAPO, and join him in urging our fellow Senators to quickly confirm Judge Nye.

As pointed out by Senator CRAPO, this will be the first district judge to be confirmed by this Congress. So it should be an honor for Judge Nye, and I am sure he views it that way.

This has been, literally, years in the making. As Senator CRAPO pointed out, we have only one active Federal judge right now, and he is handling what is

essentially a three-judge load. Some time ago, when this vacancy occurred, Senator CRAPO and I went to work on this. Most Americans don't understand how this works, but to become a U.S. district judge, it takes essentially the concurrence of three people—that is, the President of the United States and the two Senators from that particular State, be they two Republicans, two Democrats, or one of each—because we have what is called a blue slip process, where if any one of the three can and do object to a person, then that person will not be permitted to go forward.

In this particular case, we negotiated with the Obama White House for literally months and months, and it turned into years. I believe we acted in good faith on both sides in trying to find a person who would be the right fit for Idaho. Again, we literally vetted well over 50 individuals for this position, and for one reason or another, we were unable to get any of those across the finish line.

Finally, we settled on Judge Nye. I shouldn't say "settled" on him. He had not really applied. After going through the 50 being vetted and not really getting where we wanted to be, we sought out Judge Nye and talked with him about it, and we went forward on that basis. The White House came along, and before President Obama left office, he nominated Judge Nye, pursuant to my and Senator CRAPO's request. Unfortunately, that was just about the time that we ran out of time processing judges. The election came and went. President Trump was inaugurated, and we started all over again. I want to personally thank the White House for very quickly renominating Judge Nye for this position, again, at the request of myself and Senator CRAPO.

Too many States have a shortage of judges, and there is a movement afoot right now to attempt to boost the Federal judgeship load, which is in bad need. For instance, in the last seven surveys that the Judicial Conference has undertaken, they recommended that Idaho get a third judge. Senator CRAPO and my predecessor before me and, I think, even Senator CRAPO's predecessor before him have also been pushing for this judge. We continue to do that, and I am seeing some green sprouts that perhaps we will be moving somewhere in that direction.

In any event, yesterday we had the vote on moving forward on his nomination, and that vote was 97 to 0, which certainly is a testament to Judge Nye himself. I would urge our fellow Senators, when we get to this vote, which will either be later today or midday tomorrow, to proceed with the same kind of vote. It was a bipartisan vote on cloture, and we hope it will remain a bipartisan vote as we move forward on this confirmation.

With that, I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY, who obviously is pressed by

everyone who has a vacancy, and Senator MCCONNELL, who has lots of things on his mind these days and is struggling with challenges that come at him from all directions, for choosing Judge Nye at our constant and gentle urging over the recent months and years and moving him to the front of the line. I want to personally thank Senator MCCONNELL for doing that. Of course, I want to thank my distinguished colleague for his work on the Judiciary Committee and moving it through the Judiciary Committee.

I think Judge Nye will be a person who will make us all proud. Certainly, we are going to be very happy to have this judgeship filled in Idaho and, particularly, with someone of the quality of Judge Nye.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we move forward in our efforts to repeal and replace the failed ObamaCare law, it is worth remembering the reasons why this work is so urgent and why it is so important. The Affordable Care Act has left many American families paying far more for healthcare than they did beforehand, and it has taken away their freedom to choose the doctor they want or the health plan they want. That is, of course, all contrary to what was promised at the time ObamaCare was passed back in 2009 and 2010.

We all remember what the President said, and none of it has proven to be true in terms of your plan, your doctor, or the costs. In fact, as I mentioned before, the cost has gone up 105 percent for people in the individual market since 2013 alone. So rather than seeing a \$2,500 decrease in the cost to their health coverage, they have seen a \$3,000 increase, and the prices continue to go up. It is actually getting worse by the day, which is another reason for the urgency of what we are about to do. A report from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, or CMS, released yesterday, found that 40 percent fewer insurers have applied to participate in the ObamaCare exchanges next year. The reason why that is important is because when fewer insurance companies choose to participate, of course, consumers have less choice and there is less competition in terms of quality of service or the price they charge. The damage goes far beyond the damage to the doctor-patient relationship and the damage to our pocketbooks, when we are told things will cost us less and

they cost us more. The damage of the Affordable Care Act has literally permeated our entire economy and has led to a lot of people losing their jobs along the way.

ObamaCare consists of a number of mandates, government coercion, and punishment if you didn't comply with the mandates that forced many Americans to buy a product they would not have bought of their own volition and in many instances simply could not afford. But if you refused to do it, the government fined you, punished you. That represents a radical change in the nature and guiding philosophy of this country. This country was founded on the concept of individual freedom, not on Big Government coercing you to buy something that you don't want and you can't afford. But that is the theory behind ObamaCare.

In addition to that, for small business owners, it included a penalty for any business that exceeded more than 50 employees who did not provide government-approved health insurance policies. It cost them at least an additional \$70,000 a year, in addition to other increases in healthcare costs.

Let's say you are a small business of 50 or so employees. You are sure not going to hire over the cap and subject yourself to the additional \$70,000 a year in costs. What you are likely to do is to hire fewer than 50 employees in order to protect yourself from that expense, and that is exactly what happened.

I still remember, after the Affordable Care Act passed, having lunch in San Antonio, TX, with a friend of mine who was an architect at the particular time. When I described to him the nature of the employer mandate and its effect, he made it clear to me that he would rather lay off some of his employees in order to avoid that additional expense under the employer mandate. In fact, that is just what he did.

This is just another bit of evidence about the pernicious impact of the Affordable Care Act. It is not just about premiums. It is not just about deductibles. It is not just about freedom of choice. Literally, it has been a wet blanket on our economy.

This damage reaches across many different sorts of industries. According to a recent study by the Mercatus Center, an estimated 250,000 jobs nationwide were lost due to this mandate. That strikes me, frankly, as too small a number, but that is the number they projected. A quarter of a million people lost their jobs because of this mandate because small employers were motivated to keep their numbers under the cap in order to avoid the extra expense. This does not even take into account the consideration of businesses that were forced to shut their doors altogether.

In other words, ObamaCare was, in part, premised on this idea that busi-

nesses could endlessly absorb additional taxes and new costs and mandates and somehow continue to keep their doors open and do business as usual, but that is not the real world.

It also does not take into consideration the many businesses that choose to cut the hours their employees can work instead of firing them. This is another one of those stealth characteristics of ObamaCare, in which employers are judged on the number of full-time employees they have.

I remember talking to a restaurant owner in East Texas—in Tyler, TX—who told me he had to lay off a single mother who was working as a waitress in his restaurant. He could not afford to have her work full time. He had to put her on part time in order to avoid the penalties that are associated with ObamaCare. What that meant for this single mom is that she essentially had to go out and get two jobs in order to fill the gap that was left by her going from full-time work to part-time work. That is not the only story I can tell you.

A small business owner in Donna, TX, epitomizes this reality in a letter that was written to me a few weeks ago. This gentleman said he and his wife are both on Medicare. Of course, they are unaffected directly by ObamaCare because Medicare covers people who are 65 years and older while ObamaCare covers people who are younger than that. While they were left unaffected personally by ObamaCare's changes, on behalf of his 54 employees, he wrote that after ObamaCare went into effect, he was faced with a choice, either he could buy his employees expensive health insurance that his business could not afford or he could pay fines totaling more than \$100,000. Instead, he made the painful choice to lay off six of his employees in order to remain under the ObamaCare-imposed threshold. As he pointed out, this meant more than just simply laying off six people; it also meant risking the well-being of each of those families represented by those six people.

Small business owners should not be forced to choose between growing their businesses and providing jobs or risking the financial livelihoods of their entire companies and their employees just to satisfy the demands of Big Government. Even beyond causing layoffs, ObamaCare has effectively ensured that many businesses cannot grow and that existing businesses will not hire any more employees.

ObamaCare did not just lead to a new form of healthcare coverage, as some have claimed, as two-thirds of the small businesses that were surveyed by the Mercatus Center report already offered insurance. Two-thirds of the businesses affected by ObamaCare already had healthcare coverage, but that was effectively displaced and replaced by

government-approved healthcare, which proved to be far more expensive.

Instead of having the choice to shop around for the insurance that best meets their needs and the needs of their employees, these businesses have been forced to either pay the penalty or to pay the piper—that is the Federal Government—when it comes to these mandates and these demands.

It ought to be clear by now—7 years into the implementation of ObamaCare—that this kind of one-size-fits-all mandate should not be applied to a country of 320 million people, especially when it comes to something as personal as healthcare. Each of us is a unique human being. Each of our families has its own unique needs and desires. Frankly, we ought to be able to choose the sort of healthcare coverage that best suits our needs as well as our incomes and our desires to buy health insurance. Some people want policies that provide purely for catastrophic coverage when they go to the hospital. Maybe they prefer to have savings accounts that use pretax dollars under health savings accounts in order to save money so as to pay for their doctors' visits, and they combine that with a high deductible health insurance plan. You literally cannot do that under ObamaCare, but you will be able to do that under the Better Care Act, which we will be voting on next week.

What we have tried to do is to look at the meltdown of ObamaCare and say that we need some emergency measures to take place because of the phenomenon I mentioned earlier in which insurance companies are pulling out, people's premiums are going through the roof, or deductibles are so high that they are effectively being denied the benefit of their health insurance. We need to do something quickly and urgently.

What we are going to do is take measures to stabilize the insurance markets because if insurance companies continue to pull out of the insurance markets and deny people a choice or competition or even access to a qualifying policy at all, that is going to put people in an impossible situation. So the first thing we are going to do is to stabilize the marketplace.

The second thing we are going to do is to repeal the mandates that have made health insurance so unaffordable and restore the freedom to choose the sorts of policies and create a marketplace in which people can choose the policies that best suit their needs and at prices they can afford. It will literally bring down the cost of what people are charged in order to buy healthcare coverage.

Because we understand the importance of protecting families against preexisting condition exclusions, we are going to make sure the current law remains in effect that protects people from exclusions when they change jobs

or lose jobs based upon preexisting conditions.

The fourth thing we are going to do in the Better Care Act is put Medicaid on a sustainable growth rate. Medicaid is an important program. It provides the healthcare safety net for the Nation, but unfortunately it is unsustainable at the current rate of spending. Over the next 10 years, we propose to spend \$71 billion more than we do today on Medicaid. In other words, it is going to continue to grow but at a more controlled and fiscally responsible rate.

We are also going to provide people with tax credits who have an income between zero and 350 percent, including those people who are left out in the event that the Medicaid expansion is not embraced by their States and States like Texas—people who are now at 100 percent of the Federal poverty level up to 138 percent who were left out because of the fact that Texas did not expand Medicaid to able-bodied adults. They are going to be able to use that tax credit to buy private insurance. Private insurance provides much better access to coverage because, right now, Medicaid pays doctors and hospitals about 50 cents on the dollar when it reimburses them. Private insurance pays them much better so it improves the range of choices available to consumers.

Our bill continues to be a work in progress. We have done our best to try to work with everybody who has been willing to work with us and to use their ideas. What we have tried to build is a consensus bill, but the fact is, our friends on the other side of the aisle have simply refused to participate in the process, thus leaving it up to us to save people and help people who are currently being hurt by the status quo. We are going to do our duty. We are going to fulfill our responsibility to our constituents the best we can under these circumstances. In recognizing that no bill is ever going to be perfect, certainly, we have to do what we can in order to help the people who are being hurt now under the status quo.

Let me just close by saying that I have heard my friend the Senator from New York—the Democratic leader—talk about this bill. If we are unsuccessful in getting this bill passed next week, he wants to engage in a bipartisan negotiation in order to address healthcare. Yet what I predict is this: What he is really talking about is a massive, multibillion-dollar bailout of insurance companies without there being any reform. To me, that is an exercise that, frankly, I am not willing to participate in. I will never support a multibillion-dollar bailout of insurance companies and not be able to reform the system that created the problem in the first place.

I urge all of our colleagues to work together with us. Bring us your best

ideas. Work with us. Try to figure out a way to be constructive in this process and help us to achieve a result. It is not going to be the final result. We will have other opportunities, for example, in the Children's Health Insurance Program, which is a bipartisan program that expires by the end of September. We will have another opportunity to come back—hopefully, then on a bipartisan basis—to do additional things that we were unable to do because of the constraints of the budget reconciliation process and the fact that our Democratic colleagues simply refuse to participate in saving the people who are being hurt today by ObamaCare.

I encourage my colleagues not to be lured by the seductive message of our friends across the aisle about doing something bipartisan after this bill is unsuccessful. They are not interested in changing anything about the structural defects in ObamaCare. If all we are going to do is propose to pay insurance companies billions of dollars more in order to bail them out—in order to support the same flawed structural program known as the Affordable Care Act—you can count me out.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to share with my colleagues the experiences I had in the State of Maryland during our most recent work period and shortly before that, when I took the opportunity to meet with different groups with regard to the healthcare debate.

I had a townhall meeting this past week at Atrium Village, which is a senior living place in Baltimore County. We had a robust discussion primarily with seniors, but not just seniors, about their concerns as to whether the changes in the healthcare law would affect their ability in the Medicare system as well as relating to long-term care and Medicaid.

A little bit earlier than that, I had a townhall meeting at one of our local hospitals where we had a chance to talk with lots of people. It was an open townhall meeting, and a lot of people from the community showed up. They expressed their concerns about what would happen under the changes being suggested in healthcare on coverage and quality of coverage, and we had a very robust discussion.

I also had a chance to meet with leaders of the faith community as we talked about our responsibility to make sure healthcare is a right and not a privilege in the United States.

I met with the leaders of the community health centers in Park West, in

Baltimore City, to talk about the impact on the viability of health centers if the Medicaid Programs were cut.

I had a chance to visit with Mosaic Behavioral Health Center, which deals with behavioral health in Baltimore, and their concern is, if we eliminate the essential health benefits of mental health and addiction, what impact that would have on access to care.

There was a consistent message from each of the places I met with, with regard to whether we would be able to maintain coverage—under the Affordable Care Act, we expanded coverage by tens of millions—and whether that coverage would be compromised under the legislation being considered in the Senate.

We also had a chance to talk about whether there would be a weakness in what benefits would be covered. I already mentioned mental health and addiction. There were also concerns expressed about reductions of benefits regarding obstetrics and how it would affect women, and pediatric dental care, which is a particular concern in Maryland after the tragic death of Deamonte Driver.

They also raised many issues concerning discrimination in healthcare that was present before the Affordable Care Act and whether these conditions would be returning. A young father told me a story about how his daughter was born prematurely and, as a result, the baby was in the neonatal intensive care unit for 4 months. When his daughter was 4 months old, she had reached her lifetime limit of what the insurer would pay for healthcare if we returned to lifetime limits. Whether we would be returning to the predatory-type practices of the insurance companies that were present before the Affordable Care Act and whether we would be returning to preexisting conditions or doing that indirectly through what benefits would be covered—that was expressed at several of my healthcare meetings.

I already mentioned the concerns that the elderly expressed, including the discrimination of the near elderly, if we go to a 5-to-1 ratio on health premiums, so that those who are 60 or 62 years of age paying five times higher premiums than younger people are paying. All of that was brought out during my townhall meetings.

The one message I just wanted to leave with my colleagues is that there was a strong interest that we work together—Democrats and Republicans—because we all acknowledge that the Affordable Care Act can be made better. We don't want to repeal it. We want to improve it.

Before we left for the July 4th break, I introduced legislation that deals with some of these issues. The legislation would improve competition by putting the so-called public option in the exchanges so that we know there would

be at least one governmental option without subsidies, without any additional breaks over private insurance companies, to guarantee more competition in the marketplace.

I also included in my legislation a solution to deal with the two major problems that we have under the Affordable Care Act. For some people, the insurance premiums are too high. Why? Well, I asked CareFirst, which is the major health insurer in Maryland, about the uncertainty as to whether President Trump is going to fund the cost-sharing issues. My legislation makes it clear that those funds will be made available, as was anticipated under the Affordable Care Act.

I also provide predictable subsidies for lower income families, up to 400 percent of poverty, so that we can help bring down the cost of premiums in that marketplace, and we reimpose the reinsurance program so that we can spread the risk so the insurance companies know that they have a more predictable risk when they set their premiums.

All of this would make a big difference. CareFirst said that, in the individual marketplace in Maryland, if you do that and endorse the individual mandate, we could reduce our premium increases by 50 percent.

So I am trying to work, I hope with Democrats and Republicans, to deal with the problems that have been brought to our attention on higher premiums and then to deal with healthcare costs generally.

More and more people talk to me about bringing down the costs of prescription drugs. It is outrageous that Americans pay twice what our friends in Canada pay for the same medicines that are manufactured here in the United States. So why don't we have a more competitive marketplace? Why don't we have the rebates that we have in the Medicaid and the Medicare systems, and why don't we allow for more collective bargaining for prices in the pharmaceutical industry? My legislation would do that, and I know there is bipartisan support for that.

Lastly, we deal with more integrated care. I mentioned Mosaic, a behavioral health facility in Baltimore City. They have an integrated care model. If you come into their community health center, they will treat whatever your problems are. They are not going to say: Well, come in one day and we will deal with diabetes, and the next day we will deal with high blood pressure. Let's deal with the whole patient in a coordinated and integrated care model, and that would help save on costs.

My bottom line is this. No, I am not going to support weakening the Affordable Care Act. I am not going to support legislation that would diminish those who currently have coverage or the quality of their coverage. Let's work together—Democrats and Repub-

licans—to deal with the real problems of bringing down costs in our healthcare system—everybody benefits from that—and to make sure there is more competition in our exchanges and to make sure there is better premium support for those who cannot afford their premiums. If we do that, then, I really think we would be carrying out what the people of Maryland were asking me to do during the recess; that is, not to go back on the progress we have made under the Affordable Care Act. Let's build on that. Let's make healthcare more affordable, and let's deal with more competition on the premium costs.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

VENEZUELA

MR. RUBIO. Mr. President, I have, since the year 2014, come to the Senate floor on numerous occasions, perhaps more than I hoped to, to discuss the developing situation in the nation of Venezuela.

The reason why I have taken such an interest in this issue is because of the impact it has, first and foremost, on my home State of Florida. We are blessed in Florida, particularly in my hometown of Miami and in South Florida, to have a vibrant and diverse community with people from across the world and, particularly, from the Western Hemisphere. That, of course, includes a very substantial number of people from Venezuela, some who live in Florida for part of the year and some who have made it their permanent home. They have contributed greatly to our economy, to our culture, and to our lives.

It is through their eyes that I have witnessed the tragedy that has unfolded in that nation over the last 5 years. I use the word "tragedy," but I don't use it lightly. Venezuela is one of the richest countries in the world, blessed with natural resources that God has blessed that nation with and the largest crude oil reserves on the planet—certainly, more than the United States and Canada combined, as an example. They have highly educated and capable people and a long tradition of democracy. Venezuela has one of the oldest traditions of democracy in the Western Hemisphere. As much as anything else, not only is it a tragedy for the people of Venezuela—what has happened—but it is a tragedy for the hemisphere and, ultimately, for the world. We look at some of the great causes that the world is confronting and think what a democratic and prosperous Venezuela could be contributing, what its extraordinary people could be contributing. But the last 5 to 10 years—particularly the last 5—have largely been taken up by internal strife.

At the end of the day, my interest on the issue of Venezuela has never been the removal of anyone from power. It



has been about the restoration of the democratic order so that the people of Venezuela can choose their path forward. We look at the history of our hemisphere, here in the Western Hemisphere, and we see that up until about 25 years ago, most of the nations in the Western Hemisphere were governed by dictators and strongmen on both the left and the right, and few, if any, people in our hemisphere had a role to play in choosing their leaders. Today, but for the exception of a handful of places—predominantly, Cuba and the Caribbean and some others—almost all of the people of the region get to choose their leaders, and that has been the story of Venezuela up until very recently. Sometimes they choose leaders who agree with America, and sometimes they do not. But they choose their leaders.

In the end, we know that democracies very rarely start wars because their peoples do not tolerate it. Democracies always seek stability and prosperity because their peoples demand it, and they get rid of leaders who don't deliver.

So our goal from the beginning—my goal, in particular—has consistently been the restoration of the democratic order and, through that, the respect for basic rights and dignity of all people, particularly in Venezuela. It is sad to see what has happened because I think it is fair to say that the situation today in Venezuela is worse than it has been at any point since 2014.

We saw about a week ago the horrifying images of armed thugs storming the National Assembly—the democratically elected National Assembly—and attacking members of that assembly. It would be the equivalent of protestors storming the Capitol doors and attacking Senators and Congressmen. We saw images of uniformed personnel, some of whom, basically, are the equivalent of our Capitol Police, roughing up the very members of that assembly whom they are supposed to be protecting. We have seen the images of protests in the streets, of national guard troops firing on people with tear gas and rubber bullets and, in some instances, with guns.

We have seen these irregular groups called “colectivos” going after people in the streets. By the way, in fairness, we have seen violence on both sides of it, although the vast majority of people in the opposition—the enormous majority—seek a peaceful resolution to this. Anytime you put hundreds of thousands of people in the street, chaos happens.

You think not just of the protestors, but you think of their family members on the other side of it. We forget that these national guard troops, holding up their shields and wearing the uniforms, have sisters and brothers and husbands and wives and loved ones on the other side of that barricade, deeply dividing this proud nation with an incredible

history of contributions that it has made.

The situation has now reached what I believe is the tipping point. Later this month, the Government of Venezuela—I should say the executive branch, under its current President—has scheduled an unconstitutional assembly. They call it a constituent assembly. It violates the very Constitution of the country, not to mention that the supreme court has already kind of canceled the democratic order and this adds to that. I just say this with deep sadness. If that goes forward, I think it fundamentally changes the situation permanently.

I had an occasion early this morning to speak to the President on this topic for a few minutes, as I know he is headed overseas. He expressed his continued dissatisfaction with the course of events. I think it should be abundantly clear to everyone that this government in the United States is prepared to take additional significant measures if, in fact, that constituent assembly moves forward at the end of this month—basically, all but admitting to the world what we already know; that is, that the democratic order in Venezuela has ended.

I do believe that there is still a path forward—a path forward that doesn't involve vengeance, that involves reconciliation; a path forward designed to restore the democratic order. I believe deeply that all of my colleagues here in the Senate and in the Congress and the President of the United States are prepared to play whatever role they can to help facilitate that. I think that, obviously, ultimately, it would involve restoring democracy. It would involve respecting its own Constitution. It would involve holding free and fair elections, internationally supervised, not by the United States but by the United Nations or by neighboring countries. I just left a meeting a few minutes ago with the Foreign Minister of Mexico, a nation that has shown that it is willing to step forward and be constructive and productive in this endeavor.

That is the goal. The goal is to restore peace and order and to restore democracy and to grant amnesty and freedom to those who have been imprisoned because of their political views. Within that space, there are those within the government who themselves perhaps seek the same thing but feel trapped by the circumstances before the nation today.

So I do believe there is a path forward, but I also think it would be unfair if I didn't make clear that the time for that path is running out and the door will permanently close if, at the end of this month, the Maduro government moves forward with this assembly, which is illegal and unconstitutional. At that point, it would be clear for all that they have no interest and no intent of restoring democracy. I fear

the consequences of that, not simply because of what the U.S. Government and the Trump administration might do but what it would mean to those in the streets who are already desperate as it is.

I do think that path is there. I do believe that opportunity is still available, but it will not be around forever. My hope is that cooler heads will prevail. My hope is that patriots in Venezuela—no matter what side of this debate they have been on up to this point—realize it is time to step up and further this process of reconciliation, not with a goal of vengeance or punishment but with a goal of freeing those who have been imprisoned unjustly, with the goal of having free and democratic elections, with the goal of living up to constitutional principles, with the goal of restoring democracy to a great people and a great nation.

I know that I, for one, despite all of my criticisms and all of the speeches I have given and all of the measures we have taken, am prepared to do all I can to be helpful in that endeavor, to help the people of Venezuela take control of their destiny once again and restore the democratic order, the constitutional order in a way that unites the country, not one that further fragments and divides it.

I know the President has expressed a willingness to be involved in that process in whatever capacity is appropriate, knowing that other nations in the region are prepared to lead as well.

I thought it was important on this 11th day of July, as we get closer to that measure—which I think will do irreparable harm to this possibility—that I come here to the Senate floor and express this. In the end, I think all of us in this hemisphere and, ultimately, the world would benefit greatly from a Venezuela that fulfills its potential—the potential of its people, the potential of its economy, the potential of its proud history of democracy. Whatever we can do to be helpful in that endeavor, I know that this Nation is prepared to do in whatever capacity is appropriate in the eyes of the people of Venezuela.

Ultimately, the future of Venezuela belongs to the people of Venezuela, and that is what we stand for. We hope that we can be helpful in a process that brings them together—and not further divides them—and restores what they once had and deserve to have again: a proud democracy, a vibrant economy, and a people with extraordinary and unlimited potential to achieve great things on behalf of their nation, their countrymen, and the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

WELCOMING THE PAGES

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to welcome our new pages. They have been here all of 24 hours or so. I talked



to some of them earlier today. They come from all over this country, and we welcome each of them.

I understand they are with us for 3 weeks, and we wish it could be longer. Who knows? Maybe it will be. We will see.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I am here today to talk about healthcare. That is a subject we have talked a lot about, not just on this floor this week, this month, and this year but for years. A lot of times, when we talk about it, we seem to forget that this involves real people, people who live in our home States. They are moms and dads; they are parents. They are children. They are grandparents, aunts, and uncles. They are young, and they are old. They are people from different walks of life. They are real people.

I want to talk today about one of them. Delaware is a little State. I like to kid my colleagues that a lot of days in the week I visit all the counties in Delaware. We have only three. Yesterday I got to go to all three of them.

In the southern part of our State is Sussex County, which is the third largest county in America. I think there are 3,000 counties in America. The third largest is Sussex County, DE. The county seat for Sussex County is called Georgetown.

Before I came over here yesterday afternoon to be here for the convening of the Senate, I stopped off and hosted a roundtable. There were about 20 patient advocates from organizations across the State of Delaware. We were in Georgetown at a place called the CHEER Community Center, which is a gathering place for seniors in the southern part of our State. A lot of good activities happen there for seniors from all over Southern Delaware.

Some of the organizations on the frontlines of our healthcare system were there. I am going to mention a couple of them. They include the Mental Health Association, the National Alliance on Mental Illness in Delaware, the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Autism Delaware, the American Heart Association, the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, the Alzheimer's Association, and atTAcK addiction. The folks at the roundtable explained to me and to others how the new plan that was presented several weeks ago would dramatically diminish their ability to care for the Delawareans they serve.

During our roundtable, we heard directly from representatives of these organizations, and we heard directly from patients. These Delawareans shared with us just how devastating a repeal of the Affordable Care Act would be for them and for their families.

One person's story stood out to me. She is a woman I have met before. Her name is Jan White. She is pictured here with her husband Mike. They live in Newark, which is at the other end of

the State. If you drive up I-95 from Washington through Baltimore, on up to the Delaware line, the first town you come to in Delaware is Newark. That is where the University of Delaware is located. That is where they live.

Jan and her husband were college sweethearts. This October they are going to celebrate their 30th wedding anniversary. They run a successful small business in Delaware. It involves setting up meetings, running them, organizing and running special events.

Together they have one child, a son named Ethan. This September, Ethan will start his senior year at the University of Delaware, which is one of my alma maters. I went to graduate school there after the end of the Vietnam war on the GI bill. It is a wonderful school. He will be a senior there this fall.

Jan, depicted here with her husband, was doing everything she was supposed to do to stay healthy. She ate right. She exercised. In fact, she was studying martial arts.

I eat right too. I exercise almost every day of my life and have since I headed to Pensacola, FL, as a newly minted ensign in the Navy. I still work out, just like Jan. One thing she has done that I haven't—she has studied martial arts and achieved her third-degree black belt. She did it a couple of years ago, in April of 2015.

Jan also worked hard at their business and helped to raise Ethan. Jan, Mike, and their son Ethan were living the American dream, but their lives were irreparably changed in April of 2016—a year after she earned her third-degree black belt.

Something happened. What happened was that Jan was diagnosed with aggressive stage IV non-Hodgkin lymphoma. It had invaded her chest and her spine. She went from teaching kickboxing and studying for her fourth-degree black belt to relying on a walker.

Jan underwent over 5 months of intense chemotherapy. I am told it was 102 continuous hours every 3 weeks. Think about that: 102 continuous hours of intense chemotherapy every 3 weeks. She had two injections into something called—I think it is a cavity in our brain—the Ommaya. She had two injections every 3 weeks for her spinal tumor, a high dosage of inpatient chemotherapy, and a month of radiation.

Jan was pronounced in remission earlier this year. Thank God. She desperately hopes to stay there, and our prayer is that she will.

When Jan was sick, she and her husband Mike kept working. There was no quit on that team. They kept working at their business, although it certainly wasn't possible to keep up with everything. That business had its usual pace that they followed.

As Jan has said, the bills don't stop just because you have cancer. That is

true. Today she continues physical therapy repair damage from spinal cord compression from the tumor and the chemotherapy for the spinal tumor. She continues this therapy, even though her insurance-approved visits ran out a long time ago.

Jan monitors daily for relapse, hoping and praying it will not happen. She and Mike have worked hard to keep their business doors open and to try to put their lives back together.

The current debate in Washington over the Affordable Care Act makes Jan and Mike wonder if they will be able to afford the premiums that they face. Their current premiums now—not including deductibles, out-of-pocket expenses, or denials—are double their mortgage payments.

Jan told me that they wonder if they will have to forgo Jan's medical care. They wonder if they will have to choose to pay for care and maybe put their family in bankruptcy. What if the treatments don't work?

Most of us know that cancer is a hard battle. In my own family, we know that my grandfather, his wife, and others who have fought cancer ultimately succumbed to it. It is a hard battle. Jan shouldn't have to fight for the chance to fight and survive. That is what she is doing.

We are encouraged that she has had better than a fighting chance. Jan and her family hope that those of us in this body—in the Senate—and our friends in the House of Representatives will do the right thing. That is why she is now involved with the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society as a patient advocate.

It is up to those of us in Washington to do the right thing by Jan—not only to do the right thing by her but by the 1.2 million people who have blood cancer, including roughly 400 Delawareans and the 50,000 cancer survivors who live in my State.

I will close by saying this: Last week we had the Fourth of July recess. The place was closed, and most of us were in our States. I covered the State of Delaware almost every day. I saw thousands—probably tens of thousands—of people during the course of that time. I am amazed at how many people talked to me about healthcare legislation. They called on us to do the right thing.

The other thing they called on us to do was to work together. Any number of people said to me: This shouldn't be all Republicans trying to solve this; this shouldn't be all Democrats trying to solve this. This should be everyone working together.

I couldn't agree more. I think we have a great opportunity right now to hit the pause button and not retreat to our different corners around here but to figure out how we can engage and do three things with respect to the Affordable Care Act: Figure out what in the

Affordable Care Act needs to be fixed and let's fix it; figure out what in the Affordable Care Act needs to be preserved and let's preserve it; and if there are provisions in it that should be dropped, let's figure out how to drop them.

I talked with one of my colleagues, a former Navy guy from Arizona on the other side of the aisle. We came to Congress together in 1982. We served in the Navy together before that. We were talking yesterday about a path forward for us. We both said almost at the same time: What we should do is regular order.

I don't know if our new pages have heard that term, "regular order." What it means is pretty much this: If someone has a good idea—or maybe a not-so-good idea—on an important issue, introduce it as a bill. It gets assigned a committee, and the committee chair, ranking member, senior Republican, senior Democrat talk about scheduling a hearing. They hold a hearing—maybe not just one hearing but maybe a series of bipartisan hearings. Sometimes they actually schedule some roundtables in addition to hearings, which are more of an informal discussion, which are sometimes helpful in working out consensus around the very difficult issues like healthcare.

The regular order is that after there has been a lot of testimony, a lot back-and-forth, a lot of questioning, they have a markup in the committee on jurisdiction. The markup is to vote on the bill before we vote on the bill. We have the opportunity for members—Democrats and Republicans have the opportunity to offer amendments to the legislation, amendments for and against, amendments that would change and hopefully improve the underlying bill.

After the amendments are offered, there would be a vote on the underlying bill, to keep it in committee or report it out. In regular order, if it is reported out, then it competes for time on the floor. That is something our leaders, Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER, would need to work out amongst themselves.

If the bill makes its way to the floor, in regular order, we would have time for debate, especially for something this important. As I recall, when we debated the Affordable Care Act in committees, hearings, and roundtables, I think we spent 80 days. All told, I think over 300 amendments were offered. There were 160 Republican-sponsored amendments adopted to the Affordable Care Act. Is it perfect? No. Anything that big, that complex, should have been even more bipartisan than it was. This is something we need to get right.

I will close with this thought: If you go back 8 or 9 years ago, we had a new administration. I was a brandnew member of the Finance Committee,

which has jurisdiction over Medicaid and Medicare. We share jurisdiction in the Senate on healthcare legislation; the other committee is the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, which is led by Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee and Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington State, two very able people and leaders. I would suggest that they are the kind of leaders who can help us actually figure out what is the right thing to do.

I don't know that either party is smart enough to figure it out by themselves, but if you ask a lot of people around this country, including people like Jan and her family or folks who are providers, such as doctors, hospitals, and nurses, and folks who work in pharmaceuticals, health economists—if you ask a lot of people "What do you think?" there is a much better chance to ultimately get this right.

I will add a P.S. as a former Governor of Delaware, as some of my colleagues know. I call myself a recovering Governor. We have a new page here from Ohio. One of the guys from Ohio is now a pharmacist. John Kasich, my old colleague from the House, is now Governor of Ohio. He has been a strong voice in favor of just what I am talking about doing, and that is to hit the pause button and figure out how we can do this together, and we need to.

In closing, I will paraphrase something Mark Twain used to say. Mark Twain used to say: "When it doubt, tell the truth. It will confound your enemies and astound your friends." Think about that.

In this case, maybe we should paraphrase Mark Twain: When in doubt, try regular order. When in doubt, try working together. When in doubt, try a bipartisan approach that is focused on getting this country and our healthcare delivery system a lot closer to where it needs to be.

Every President since Harry Truman said as President that we need to change our healthcare delivery system so that everybody in this country has access to healthcare. By the time we took up the Affordable Care Act in the Finance Committee and the Senate, we were spending, as a nation, 18 percent of the gross domestic product on healthcare in this country. I have a friend, and if you ask him how he is doing, he says: Compared to what? We are spending 18 percent GDP. What were they spending 8 years ago in Japan? They were spending 8 percent of GDP for healthcare in Japan. Did they get worse results? No. They got better results—higher rates of longevity, lower rates of infant mortality. In Japan they covered everybody. They still do. They are getting better results for less money.

Frankly, what we did in writing the Affordable Care Act was we looked around the world, including Japan, and we looked around this country, includ-

ing at places like Mayo, the Cleveland Clinic, and others, to see what they are doing to get better results. We tried to put a lot of that in the legislation, in the law. Wonder of wonders, some is actually delivering good results—better value, better results for less money. That is part of the Affordable Care Act we want to maintain and preserve.

I have probably stood here long enough talking about this today. This is an important issue. It is one-sixth of our economy, and healthcare eventually affects us all. People who get sick will eventually get care. For too long, the care they have gotten has been in the emergency room of a hospital. By the time they get sick enough to go there, sometimes they are very sick. It is very expensive. They don't spend an hour or two in the emergency room of a hospital; they may spend a week or two in the hospital and really run up the tab. That is a hugely expensive way to provide healthcare. Who pays for it? The rest of us. We have to be smarter than that.

I am hoping that in the days ahead, particularly as our Governors gather up in Providence, RI, later this week to discuss, among other things, providing healthcare for their constituents in 50 different States, my hope is that some of what I said here today will be on their minds: Hit the pause button. Fix the things in the Affordable Care Act that need to be fixed. Preserve the aspects that need to be preserved. Let's do it together.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I represented the congressional district of Springfield, IL, for 14 years, and this is my 21st year in the Senate. It is a big State with 102 counties. We are proud of our diversity in our State, which runs from the great city of Chicago, to deep, deep Southern Illinois, to a town of Cairo, IL, which is literally south of Richmond, VA, by latitude. They grow cotton down there in the State. So it is a very big and diverse State. I am proud to represent it.

I have spent some time doing my best to understand the challenges that businesses, individuals, and families face and to measure their sentiments on issues over the years.

For the last several months, I have spent my time visiting every corner of downstate Illinois, which is the more rural, smalltown area of our State outside of Chicago. It is more conservative politically. President Trump ran well in some parts of downstate Illinois.

And I have been in this area—representing it, growing up in it—to measure what I consider to be the topic and issue of the day, and that is the issue of healthcare in America. It is an issue which each of us takes very seriously and personally because each of us is called on in a variety of different ways in our lives to have healthcare for ourselves and our family—the people we love—at critical moments.

We are now engaged in a national debate about the future of healthcare in America. The Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and have been from the beginning opposed to the Affordable Care Act, which was passed under President Obama. I voted for it. I think it was the right vote. I think it has achieved a great many things. I hope we can build on it to make an even better healthcare system for our Nation. It is not perfect. There are areas that need to be changed, improved, and areas that I think need to be strengthened over the long haul to make sure America has more fairness when it comes to healthcare for our people.

Last week, I visited about a half dozen healthcare facilities in Illinois. I jokingly said to my staff that I have come to know hospital administrators in my State far better today than I ever have.

Here is what they told me. They told me the healthcare bill that Senator MCCONNELL has proposed in the U.S. Senate would be devastating to the families, the patients, the employees, and the healthcare facilities in our State. They told me that nearly \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts would cripple rural hospitals and health clinics. Not only would this harm patients in rural communities, but 35 percent cuts in the Medicaid Program would also cost jobs in Illinois. The Illinois Hospital Association in my State estimates that the Republican bill, which passed the House and now is being considered in the Senate, would cost us 60,000 healthcare jobs.

I went to Granite City, IL, which is near the St. Louis area. I met a young woman named Sam, who has Down syndrome and her mother Missy. They are worried about the Republican plan to cap Medicaid spending. Sam's health needs can't always be anticipated. There are not some that can be capped in terms of future needs, and the amount of care can hardly be determined in advance for this young woman who is doing her best to lead an active and involved life facing this disability, which she does. This is so true for so many people nationwide.

Some of my Republican colleagues in Illinois have said: We just don't understand why Medicaid as a program has grown so much. Well, it may be hard to understand until you look inside the program and realize what it does. Medicaid may have started as a small idea,

but it has really grown into a major provider of healthcare in America. In my State of Illinois, it is responsible for paying for the prenatal care, birth, and care of mothers and their children after they have been born for more than 50 percent of the kids.

It is an important provider of healthcare resources to our school districts in Illinois, which count on Medicaid to help them take care of special needs students—counselors, psychologists, transportation, even feeding tubes for those who are severely disabled. It is a critical program as well for the disabled community, like Sam and young men and women who are victims of autism or Down syndrome who want to lead a full life but need health insurance. Medicaid is their health insurance.

One woman said to me in Champaign, IL, my 23-year-old son is autistic. He counts on Medicaid, and, Senator, if I don't have Medicaid, my only recourse is an institutional program that would cost us over \$300,000 a year. It is impossible for us to even consider that.

So those who would cut back on Medicaid spending in the name of flexibility and saving money or generating enough to pay for a tax cut for wealthy people would leave people just like those I have described in a terrible circumstance.

I haven't described the largest cost of Medicaid. The largest cost in Illinois and across our Nation is the Medicaid services and benefits provided to those who are older—mothers, grandmothers in nursing facilities and care facilities who count on Medicaid along with Medicare and Social Security for the basics in life.

I heard from Kevin. He is a worker from Urbana, IL, who is worried that the Senate Republican bill is going to increase his out-of-pocket expenses by thousands of dollars. He is worried because he fits into an age category which would see premiums go up dramatically in costs under the Republican bill. The Affordable Care Act, which we passed under President Obama, set limits on the increases in premium costs so no premium paid would be more than three times the cost of the lowest premium that is paid for health insurance in our country. Well, Republicans have changed that. In both the House and Senate, they have raised that to five times. So it means for people, particularly between the ages of 50 and 64, they are going to see a substantial increase in their premiums because of that Republican provision. People are following this closely enough to know that when premium costs go up for many of them, it becomes impossible to buy the coverage they need.

As I returned to Washington, I once again face the reality of what this Republican healthcare plan would mean. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget

Office told us the bill would cost 22 million Americans health insurance coverage—cutbacks in Medicaid as well as cutbacks in private insurance. Think of that. I don't know how the Republicans in our State can go home and explain why a million people in Illinois are about to lose their health insurance in the name of healthcare reform.

I can tell you the notion of repealing the Affordable Care Act may have had some surface political appeal until you realize you might be 1 of the 1 million people in my State who ends up with no health insurance when it is all over. It would cut Medicaid dramatically, as I have mentioned, and then keep cutting—a 35-percent cut over the next 20 years—with devastating impacts on hospitals, clinics, and many other facilities.

By 2020, average premiums in the individual market would increase by 76 percent under the Republican plan. Costs would skyrocket even higher for seniors, rural communities, and those with medical needs.

What happens to people with pre-existing conditions under the Republican repeal bill? One out of three Americans has a preexisting condition. In the old days, they couldn't buy insurance or, if they could, couldn't afford it because they had a history of cancer in their family, diabetes, heart disease. Well, this Republican plan would take away the protections of the Affordable Care Act. It would allow States to waive essential healthcare benefits, like maternity care, mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment. People in need of these services would be left to fend for themselves.

The Congressional Budget Office analyzed the Republican bill, and it said: "People who used services no longer included in the Essential Health Benefits would experience substantial increases in out-of-pocket spending on health care, or would choose to forgo the services. Moreover, the ACA's ban on annual and lifetime limits . . . would no longer apply."

With this scathing analysis from the Congressional Budget Office, what did the Republican leadership decide to do? Instead of addressing these challenges straight on, they retreated. They shut themselves off behind closed doors and tried to cut a deal within the 52 Republican Senate Members here to pass this measure, as bad as it is. There was not one hearing on this bill—on the Republican healthcare bill—no markups, no amendments, and no support from medical advocates in any part of our Nation. There was no input in the Senate from any Member outside the Republican caucus.

They want to call this bill right away, and it is understandable. The longer it sits out there and the longer people get to know it, the less they

support it. You know we still haven't seen the final language. Why? Because Republicans continue to work in secret on a bill that literally impacts one-sixth of the American people and every single person in our country.

This measure affects everybody. Even if you get your insurance through your employer or Medicare, this bill would make Medicare go insolvent sooner and allow employers to, once again, impose annual or lifetime limits on care under their health insurance plans.

Now, the latest we have heard is that the Republicans are meeting in secret, making some changes to this bill. They may be throwing some money at the opioid crisis facing America, but that will not make up for kicking 15 million people off of Medicaid. The amount of money they are talking about to deal with the opioid crisis is literally inadequate to deal with the seriousness of that issue or to provide the substance abuse treatment people currently receive from Medicaid who will be cut off under the Republican plan.

Cutting Medicaid, our best tool to fight the opioid epidemic, and offering a coupon for drug treatment is a cruel step backward. If it ends up buying a vote on the Republican side, shame on my colleagues for selling out so cheaply.

Republican Gov. John Kasich of Ohio is not fooled. He called this idea of a special opioid fund to win some votes on the Republican side "like spitting in the ocean." I called Governor Kasich this last week. He and I came to Washington together many years ago. I have known him, and I like him. We disagree on some political issues, but he is very forthright and frank. He has warned us that what is going to happen to Ohio is going to happen to the Nation, if the Republicans have their way with their healthcare bill.

We have also heard the Republicans are considering adding provisions that allow insurers to offer bare-bones plans. I have just heard some more about this today, and I believe the author of this idea is the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ.

Here is what he says: If your State offers a health insurance plan that complies with the requirements of the Affordable Care Act, then you may offer it to other consumers in the State insurance plans that do not. He says it gives consumers choice. Well, it sure does, but look at the choice it gives them because if he is aiming for lowering premium costs by offering health insurance plans that are junk plans, health insurance plans that are fake insurance, the net result is going to be people paying a lot more in copays and deductibles and a lot less coverage when they definitely need it.

There are a couple other things it will do. Because these younger healthier people will buy the cheaper plans believing they are invincible, it

will end up raising the cost of premiums for those who buy other insurance. The discrimination, in terms of premium costs, will be dramatic, and that, in and of itself, could be damaging to people all across the United States.

So Senator CRUZ believes that offering junk insurance plans and telling the consumers we are giving you a choice is going to answer the needs across America. It will not. It will raise premiums on everyone else. It will provide inadequate coverage for those who buy these plans, and sadly many of them are going to be facing deductibles and copays they just can't handle. That is no answer. It may be a political answer to get his vote, but it is certainly not a credible answer.

We have had this before the Affordable Care Act, and do you remember what it was like? People got sick and found out their insurance didn't cover what they needed. Women who were pregnant found out their plans didn't cover maternity or newborn care. People who were diagnosed with a mental health condition found out their insurance covered no treatment for mental illness. So what good is insurance if it doesn't care for the most basic and essential needs of Americans?

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, we changed it. We required that policies provide real insurance for real families. Do you know what happened, in addition to providing more care for people across America? The number of bankruptcies, personal bankruptcies, have been cut in half since the Affordable Care Act passed. Why? The No. 1 driver of personal bankruptcy and family bankruptcy in America was medical bills—medical bills that were beyond the payment of an ordinary person. There are fewer of those today because of the Affordable Care Act.

Senator CRUZ's plan for selling fake insurance or junk insurance plans that will not be there when you need them, I can just tell you it means more business for the bankruptcy court. It would banish those with preexisting conditions to the world of sky-high premiums, all in the name of Senator CRUZ's freedom of choice. Well, freedom isn't free when it comes to relegating so many Americans to such a precarious state when it comes to health insurance. No matter how much the Republican Senators tinker around the edges, they are dealing with a flawed, unfixable bill.

The American people oppose any bill that rips health insurance away from millions of individuals and families, they oppose any bill that causes nearly 1 million people nationwide to lose their jobs, and they are also opposed to a Republican health insurance plan that would cost coverage for half a million American veterans.

The American people oppose any bill that hurts those with preexisting con-

ditions. They oppose a bill that throws millions of people off Medicaid and slashes billions in Federal funding to hospitals, healthcare clinics, and schools.

The American people oppose any bill that is rejected by every major medical and patient group. The Republican bill is opposed by the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, nurses, pediatricians, AARP, heart, diabetes, and lung associations. How can you write a bill that draws that much opposition? They did it. They did it behind closed doors, and they don't want you to see what they are doing with it now.

Finally, the American people oppose any bill that takes away nearly a trillion dollars in healthcare in order to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and large corporations. Case in point: Of the 145 pages of the Senate repeal bill, 94 pages are devoted to slashing Medicaid and providing tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and pharmaceutical companies.

Last week, one conservative writer penned an article which said that it gives conservatism a bad name when we are giving tax breaks to the wealthiest people in order to cut and eliminate health insurance for the poorest people in America. That is exactly what this bill does.

I am glad the Senate Republicans have delayed their vote on this repeal, but many have not given up. In all of my townhall discussions, the plea from Illinois people has been clear: Improve the Affordable Care Act; don't repeal it.

So where do we go from here?

First, Republicans need to take repeal off the table. We need 3 Republicans out of the 53 to say this is the wrong way to go about it.

Second, President Trump must stop undermining the stability of the marketplaces with his uncertainty and sabotage.

Third, we need to work together on a bipartisan basis to strengthen our current system. We need to address the price of pharmaceutical drugs. The current bill and law does not. That is the biggest driver, according to Blue Cross in Illinois, of premium increases—the cost of pharmaceutical bills. We need to build competition through a Medicare-like public option available to everyone who chooses it across the United States.

Some Republicans, including Senator MCCONNELL, have said that the Republicans have to do this by themselves because the Democrats refuse to work with them. That is simply not true. We are here. We have been here all along, and we want to have a hearing. Bring in some experts. Let's just have a meeting. That would be a breakthrough.

Democrats have asked the Republicans to join us. Let's sit down together, informally, like grown-ups, and

address this issue in a responsible fashion. We are ready and willing to work on legislation to improve the individual market for the 6 percent of the people who purchase their insurance there. I fail to see how gutting Medicaid and throwing 22 million Americans off of health insurance in order to provide tax breaks for rich people does anything to help that 6 percent.

This is a critical moment when it comes to healthcare across America. It is unfortunate that we are now considering a bill that was revealed only 2 weeks ago, a bill that has never been subject to a hearing before any committee, a bill that has never been amended in an open process.

When it came to the Affordable Care Act, over 140 Republican amendments were adopted. The Republicans haven't offered us an opportunity to offer one amendment to their proposal—not one. It is a take-it-or-leave-it, closed-door deal. That is not the way the Senate was designed to work. It is not the way the American people want us to work. They expect us to work in a constructive fashion on a bipartisan basis to solve the problems facing our Nation. The biggest single problem is giving peace of mind to Americans and American families across the Nation that they have healthcare they can count on and afford.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I have joined my colleague in coming to the floor to talk about how we need to make progress on healthcare and make sure that we don't pull healthcare out from millions of Americans. I thank the Senator from Illinois for talking about his constituents. Like the Senator from Illinois, I was at home this past July recess talking to my constituents, and I heard many of them talk about their individual healthcare needs and their concerns about what is happening in Washington.

I met a young woman who told me about her daughter who was born prematurely and weighed less than 2 pounds. Her daughter required specialized, expensive treatment as a newborn. She was concerned that if we keep moving ahead with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, she and her husband would be overwhelmed with crushing hospital debt if, in fact, we hadn't covered preexisting conditions. She is one of millions of Americans who are scared that they are going to lose their health insurance under the proposal that is being talked about, that has been talked about for the last several weeks, and from what we can tell—because, obviously, there is a lot of secrecy—may still include details about reducing coverage for those who have access to care through Medicaid.

I have come to the floor tonight to talk about the latest idea because I

think one of the things that is clear—and probably why the Senate majority leader said that he wanted, basically, to cancel the first 2 weeks of the August recess—is that my colleagues don't want to go home and talk about the proposal that was brought before them. In fact, they are now trying to bring up a new proposal, thinking that, again, with a very limited time period, without floor discussion, without committee debate, without an amendment process, somehow our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will fall prey to the notion that there is a silver bullet, a magic solution. I have come to the floor knowing that an amendment or a discussion piece or the new behind-closed-doors discussion proposal being advanced by my colleagues from Texas and Utah is basically to allow junk insurance into the marketplace.

What do I mean by junk insurance? I mean a proposal that basically offers less than the essential benefits, such as hospitalization, prescription drug benefits, lab costs, and all of those things; that, basically, by offering a market where you can get junk insurance, you can say: Oh, well, you have to have one offering of insurance that does cover all the basics and essentials, but then you can have junk insurance.

I say "junk insurance" because this is the wrong idea for the marketplace. It is basically mixing good and bad and not having adequate risk spread across—so basically it means that you don't have to have compliant plans for the market. I know this firsthand because we had this in Washington. We had this same experiment in Washington in the 1990s, and people tried to do the exact same thing—basically, have a compliant plan, and then say that you have a bunch of less-than-adequate proposals for insurance in the market that really aren't giving individuals coverage. What happened? It drove up the cost of the compliant plans that covered most of healthcare and basically drove the insurers out of the market. That was the experience in Washington State. This same idea was tried, and it failed because basically it ran up the price, and insurers didn't stay around to offer options. They couldn't make the mandate of the required plan work because it basically took the risk out of the system.

The notion that somehow this new idea by my colleagues is going to be the silver bullet is, in my opinion, not an answer at all. People who would be the ones who could get that kind of coverage for a short period of time would then end up leaving the rest of the people without adequate coverage. As I said, what happens is, the costs then just go up, and then the market has to adjust. I would say that in our State—because a lot of people are talking about leaving the individual markets over the proposals that we are talking about today because they are

concerned about the costs and who is going to be covered—you would see a very rapid collapse of the individual market exacerbated by what my colleagues from Texas and Utah are proposing.

There are numerous nonpartisan health experts who seem to be saying the same thing. There is the American Academy of Actuaries, where one individual said:

People who are healthy now would tend to choose noncompliant plans with really basic benefits. People who want or need more comprehensive coverage could find it out of their reach, because it could become unaffordable.

Another individual from the American Enterprise Institute wrote that "the main effect of the Cruz-Lee amendment would be to shift costs from healthy consumers to less healthy consumers and households with lower incomes."

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, a Republican and former Director of the Congressional Budget Office called the amendment by my colleagues from Texas and Utah "a recipe for a meltdown."

Larry Levitt, senior vice president at the Kaiser Family Foundation, summed it up best when he called the amendment "a recipe for instability and discrimination."

So you can see that many people already understand the idea of junk insurance is not a market solution at all. It is not really even healthcare coverage. In its May 24 score of the House proposal, the CBO provided a definition of health insurance, saying that they would "broadly define health insurance coverage as consisting of a comprehensive major medical policy that, at a minimum, covers high-cost medical events and various services, including those provided by physicians and hospitals."

To me it seems pretty clear that the types of plans that could be sold under this proposal don't meet that definition.

What are essential benefits that we expect to be covered in a plan? Obviously, hospitalization, emergency services, ambulatory services, mental health, prescription drugs, rehabilitation, if needed, laboratory services, like lab tests, and we have moved toward some preventive, health, and wellness measures. Those are the essential benefits that are supposed to be in a plan, and I want my colleagues to know that this experiment was tried. It failed. It drove insurers out of the marketplace because it just made the plans that were covering essential benefits so costly by distorting—really tearing the market apart.

The second point about the proposal we are hearing about is that it is still a war on Medicaid. In my opinion there are cost-effective ways for us to continue access to healthcare. I have brought them up on the Senate floor. One would be looking at rebalancing

from nursing home care to community-based care or, as I have mentioned, a basic health plan that bundles up a population and serves them up to get a discount so that individuals would have as much clout as a large employer would have in the marketplace.

I hope that my colleagues will stop the focus on capping, cutting Medicare—because it would throw so many people off of the system—and focus on rebalancing people to the type of healthcare that will help us save costs, keep people in their homes, and give consumers the ability to compete cost effectively in the individual market.

These are the problems I still see with this proposal. To think, basically, that junk insurance will be the way for us to get a proposal and to see that Medicaid is still the target in a war on Medicaid, to me, is not the proposal to move forward on. I hope our colleagues will realize that both of these have severe faults and will sit down and talk about the proposals that will help us in establishing a more robust individual market.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### REMEMBERING R.J. CORMAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to remember the life of my dear friend, R.J. Corman, and to congratulate a business he started in Kentucky on its 30th anniversary. A man from humble beginnings, Rick started a company at the age of 18 with only a backhoe and a dump truck. With a keen business sense and a tireless work ethic, Rick built his company and earned a reputation for doing work better and faster than anyone else in the business. Today the R.J. Corman Railroad Group employs over 1,600 people and operates in 24 States.

Rick's life was tragically cut short when he passed away in August 2013 at the age of 58 after a long fight with multiple myeloma, a blood cancer. Although his company had to learn how to succeed without him, the signature red locomotives and white cross-rail fences still carry Rick's name and his legacy.

Those who knew Rick could agree that he worked hard, cherished honesty, and had an infectious laugh. In

2011, Fortune magazine published a profile on Rick and his business. It read, "In the way he operates—and faces the world—Rick Corman is truly larger than life."

Rick started his company making track repairs for major railroads in 1973. With vision and determination, Rick convinced people to take a chance on him, and he began to expand his company.

This year, one of his businesses, the R.J. Corman Railroad Co., is celebrating its 30th year of operation. It opened in 1987, when Federal deregulation allowed railroads to sell unwanted lines of track. Rick, seeing both a profitable venture and a way to provide an economic boost to rural areas, began purchasing short line railroads. Today the business operates 11 railroad lines and more than 900 miles of track.

When Hurricane Katrina devastated the gulf coast in 2005, Rick's emergency response operation immediately offered to help. Rick personally oversaw the repairing of railways damaged by the storm. Despite the heavy damage, Rick answered the call to help those in need.

Rick's business acumen was impressive, but even more extraordinary was his unstoppable spirit. When he was diagnosed with cancer in 2001, he fought far beyond the doctors' expectations. Rick continued to work, to enjoy life, and even to finish the Boston Marathon. He deeply cared for his employees and his community. When one of his employees lost his home to a fire, Rick sent the family a temporary trailer the next day. Over the course of his life, Rick and his company made numerous contributions to St. Joseph Hospital in Jessamine County. The hospital remembered Rick as the largest philanthropic supporter in its history.

Rick's compassion and love of life inspired so many friends, family, and employees. He may be gone, but his legacy will remain, as we celebrate the 30th year of the R.J. Corman Railroad Co. Rick believed in his employees, and he said, "It's really the people that make this company so different. It's not me; it's the people." Today I ask my colleagues to help me remember Rick for his kindness, his courage, and his undefeated spirit.

The Lexington Herald-Leader recently published an article about Rick's life and legacy. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lexington Herald-Leader, June 16, 2017]

R.J. CORMAN WAS "LARGER THAN LIFE:" HE'S GONE, BUT HIS BUSINESS KEEPS GROWING  
(By Tom Eblen)

One of the hardest things for a company to do is survive and grow after the death of a larger-than-life founder like Richard Jay Corman.

Carol Loomis, a legendary business journalist who interviewed America's most famous executives, wrote in a 2011 profile that Corman "just might be . . . the most unforgettable character I've ever met in my more than half-century at Fortune (magazine) . . . In the way he operates—and faces the world—Rick Corman is truly larger than life."

Corman, 58, died in August 2013 after a dozen years of fighting multiple myeloma, a blood cancer. But R.J. Corman Railroad Group, the Nicholasville company he started in 1973 with a backhoe and a dump truck, doesn't seem to have missed a beat.

"Rick built a heck of a company and a nationally known and recognized organization," said Ed Quinn, who worked seven years for Corman and returned to the company last year as president and CEO after the retirement of Craig King, who led the company after Corman's death and remains on the board. "That's what we trade on every day and that's why we continue to grow."

The company, owned by a trust controlled by Corman's sister and three of his five children, has continued growing and acquiring businesses over the past four years. It also continues to be a major benefactor to Central Kentucky charities.

Probate documents filed in November 2013 valued R.J. Corman Railroad Group at \$226.7 million. Since then, employment has grown from 1,100 to more than 1,600. Although the company doesn't release financials, executives say annual revenues now exceed \$350 million.

This year, the group's R.J. Corman Railroad Co. is celebrating its 30th year. It began with the purchase of two Kentucky short line railroads in 1987 as federal deregulation allowed major railroads to sell off lines they no longer wanted.

Since Corman's death, the company has acquired short line railroads in Texas and South Carolina, bringing its operations to 11 railroad lines with 904 miles of track in nine states. The company owns more than 100 locomotives and 475 rail cars, and last year they hauled more than 65,000 car loads of cargo.

Those railroads include the 148-mile Central Kentucky Line that runs through Lexington, where Corman's signature red locomotives and white cross-rail fences have become a landmark at the corner of West Main Street and Oliver Lewis Way. The company's first short line, in Bardstown, includes My Old Kentucky Home Dinner Train.

Next year, R.J. Corman Railroad Group will mark the 45th anniversary of its railroad services business, which Corman began by repairing and refurbishing track for major railroads. Those operations are based at shops on the company's 1,600-acre main campus in Jessamine County and at field locations in 23 states.

The company's best-known operations are its derailment and disaster recovery units, which can dispatch teams around-the-clock to handle some of the industry's biggest breakdowns and cleanup jobs. R.J. Corman's most famous job was helping clean up Gulf Coast rail infrastructure after Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Last year, the company logged 4,560 emergency responses, including major floods in the Midwest.

The railroad group also has other businesses that serve both its short line operations and all seven of the nation's "Class 1" railroads. Those include track construction and maintenance, equipment maintenance, materials management, signaling design and construction, and railroad employee training. The company also offers railcar loading



services for such major manufacturers as Toyota.

Railroads were the kings of American commerce from the Civil War until World War II, but declined after the Interstate highway system was built, leading to the rise of the long-haul trucking industry. But railroads have seen a resurgence as part of the world's multi-modal transportation network. Rail is still the most economical way to move many goods at least part of the distances they need to travel.

"While trucks and trains are competitive, there's also interconnection," said Noel Rush, the company's senior vice president for commercial development. "This is still a business you will see in 50 years."

And by reopening short lines that major railroads close, the company can provide an economic boost to small towns and rural areas with factories and warehouses that shut down when the railroad lines did, said Brian Miller, that division's president. He said the company is always looking for more short lines to buy.

"It has blossomed into a very good business for us," said April Colyer, Corman's daughter and the company's public relations director. "We're always trying to watch and adapt to the needs of customers in our industry."

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WATT GLOBAL MEDIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to recognize WATT Global Media, a leading provider of business information and marketing solutions for the agribusiness industry worldwide, headquartered in Rockford, IL. More than 100 years ago, on July 6, 1917, WATT Global Media was born.

WATT Global Media's history began in 1917, when J.W. Watt and Adon Yoder purchased "Poultry Tribune," a magazine published monthly for just 50 cents for an annual subscription. Before Watt and Yoder bought the magazine, its circulation was about 5,000. In a few short years, these young entrepreneurs grew the magazine's circulation by 400 percent. Under Watt's leadership, "Poultry Tribune" quickly became "America's Leading Poultry Farm Magazine" for poultry raisers, peaking in 1940 with a circulation of more than half a million readers.

During the mid-1920s, economic changes in the poultry industry led to the creation of the commercial hatchery industry, which led the staff at "Poultry Tribune" to create "Hatchery Tribune." In 1934, Watt added "Turkey World" to its growing list of publications. WATT Global Media, originally called the Poultry Tribune Company, changed its name in 1944 to Watt Publishing Company. In that same year, the company acquired Better Farming Methods, "The business magazine for leaders who train and advise farmers." As the evolving poultry industry grew, so did Watt Publishing Company.

In 1949, Leslie Watt—the second generation of family leadership—was named president of Watt Publishing Company and expanded the company

into international markets, acquiring "Industria Avicola," a Spanish language magazine targeting the Latin American poultry industry. In 1962, "Poultry International" was created to cater to the poultry and egg industries throughout Europe, Middle East, Africa, and Asia. In the 1980s, Leslie Watt took Watt Publishing Company to China by establishing "Poultry International China Edition" and became one of the first publishers from North America to make Chinese language business-to-business magazines in the People's Republic of China.

In the 1990s, under James W. Watt—the third generation of family leadership—the company expanded its portfolio to include pet food. In 1993, the Petfood Forum was created and grew into the world's largest annual event of its kind. Overnight, Watt became the global pet food market leader for business information—what an accomplishment.

Greg Watt—the fourth generation President and CEO—modernized the company by taking it into the 21st century, expanding across multiple media channels, including online and digital platforms, live events, and magazine channels. In recognition of its global audience, the Watt Publishing Company changed its name to WATT Global Media in 2014. Today, WATT Global Media serves 180,000 professionals in the pet food, poultry, pig, and animal feed industries from over 140 countries.

I will close with this: In 1907, J.W. Watt came to this country from the Orkney Islands, just north of Scotland. He came in search of the American Dream, and boy, did he find it. Despite WATT Global Media's growth and many achievements, its proudest accomplishment is that it has been family-owned for 100 years, and this family business isn't going anywhere. I want to thank J.W. Watt, Leslie Watt, James W. Watt, and Greg Watt—four generations from the Watts family—for their service to Rockford, Illinois, America, and throughout the world. I know the good people at WATT Global Media will continue its simple guiding mission: "to improve the health and well-being of people and animals across the globe."

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating WATT Global Media on 100 years of accomplishments, and I wish them all the best for another century of success.

#### ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notifica-

tion of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-25, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$34 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREG KAUSNER  
(For J.W. Rixey, Vice Admiral,  
USN, Director).

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-25

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: The Government of the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:  
Major Defense Equipment\* \$30 million.  
Other \$4 million.  
Total \$34 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case NE-B-WFV, implemented in June 2013, was below congressional notification threshold at \$26.3M (\$20M in MDE) and included one hundred and eighty (180) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles and twenty-four (24) M36E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM). The Netherlands has requested the case be amended to include an additional seventy (70) AGM-114R Hellfire II missiles. This amendment will push the current case above the MDE notification threshold and thus requires notification of the entire case.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Two hundred fifty (250) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles, Twenty-four (24) M36E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM).

Non-MDE includes:

Hellfire missile cutaway model, AGM-114R missile spare parts, a Launcher Test Station (LTS), LTS spares, two (2) maintenance support devices, integrated logistics support tools, M299 launcher software upgrade and testing, aircrew familiarization training, launcher test station training, unclassified publications, technical assistance, AN/AWM-101A software, CATM spare parts and related support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: NE-B-WFV.



(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 11, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

##### Government of the Netherlands—AGM-114R Hellfire Missiles

The Government of the Netherlands has requested the possible sale of an additional seventy (70) AGM-114R Hellfire II missiles to a previously implemented case for Hellfire missiles. The original FMS case, valued at \$26.3M, included one hundred and eighty (180) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles and twenty-four (24) M36E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM) with various support elements. Therefore, this case is for a total of two hundred fifty (250) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles, twenty-four (24) M36E8 CATMs, to include Hellfire missile cutaway model, AGM-114R missile spare parts, a Launcher Test Station (LTS), LTS spares, two (2) maintenance support devices, integrated logistics support tools, M299 launcher software upgrade and testing, aircrew familiarization training, launcher test station training, unclassified publications, technical assistance, AN/AWM-101A software, CATM spare parts and related support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is \$34 million.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of the Netherlands which has been, and continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the U.S. national interests to assist the Netherlands to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale will improve the Netherlands' capability to meet current and future threats and will be employed on the Netherlands' AH-64D Apache helicopters. The Netherlands will use this capability to strengthen its homeland defense, deter regional threats, and provide direct support to coalition operations. The Netherlands will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of these missiles will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel or contractor representatives to the Netherlands.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-25

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

##### Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. AGM-114R: The AGM-114R is used against heavy and light armored targets, thin skinned vehicles, urban structures, bunkers, caves and personnel. The missile is Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) based, with a variable delay fuse, improved safety and

reliability. The highest level for release of the AGM-114R is SECRET. Software and firmware documentation (e.g., Data Processing, Software Requirements, Source Code, Algorithms) are not authorized for disclosure. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale or by testing of the end item is up to and including SECRET. The highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is up to and including SECRET. Vulnerability data, countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified SECRET or CONFIDENTIAL. Detailed information to include discussions, reports and studies of system capabilities, vulnerabilities and limitations that leads to conclusions on specific tactics or other counter-countermeasures (CCM) are not authorized for disclosure. Reverse engineering could reveal SECRET information.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons systems effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Government of the Netherlands can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the Netherlands.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on June 29, 2017, the Agriculture Committee reported by voice vote the fourth authorization of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act, more commonly known as PRIA.

For nearly 20 years, PRIA has served as an example of bipartisanship, bringing together a wide range of stakeholders in support of a commonsense fee for service programs within the EPA's Office of Pesticides Programs.

PRIA provides certainty for registrants; much needed resources to the EPA to ensure regulatory examinations related to human health and environmental safety risks are done properly; and PRIA also provides vital funds for pesticide safety training and information to our Nation's farmworkers.

Unfortunately, after several years of carefully revising and finalizing an updated Worker Protection Standard, the EPA decided last month to delay key elements of worker protections, including the much needed revisions to the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule.

Without strong and timely farmworker protections, PRIA simply does not make sense for some stakeholders who are a part of the coalition. The funds from PRIA allocated to farmworker protection should be meaningful resources that complement strong, effective protections and should not be undermined by changes to EPA's Work-

er Protection Standard and the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule that would weaken farmworker protections.

Therefore, I strongly oppose any future efforts by the EPA to delay or amend the worker protection rules that the Agency finalized in November 2015 and January 2017, respectively, without undertaking a negotiated rulemaking, which must include all relevant stakeholders, to ensure that all voices are heard.

I hope the EPA will take a cue from our recent bipartisan and consensus-based committee action on PRIA and proceed in a similar fashion should they decide that any delays or adjustments to the Worker Protection Standards or the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule are necessary.

Should the Trump EPA dismiss the concerns of farmworkers and environmental advocates, I fear that last month's committee vote may unfortunately be the last bipartisan PRIA reauthorization that this panel is able to report out. I hope that is not the case, and I know other members of the committee share my concerns on the matter.

Once again, I want to thank Senator ROBERTS for his leadership. I am glad we were able to move forward in a bipartisan and consensus manner to reauthorize PRIA last month.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, for engaging in this important discussion.

I am proud to stand before my colleagues in the U.S. Senate to discuss some of the bipartisan work that we have accomplished through regular order at the Agriculture Committee specifically with regard to H.R. 1029, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2017, or PRIA 4.

PRIA, while technical in nature, is critically important with assisting both EPA in carrying out administrative functions and industry that relies upon timely, science-based pesticide registration decisions to get products on the market and in the hands of farmers, ranchers, and other consumers.

PRIA, historically, has received widespread support from a diverse coalition of stakeholders, including members of the pesticide registrant community—both agricultural and non-agricultural uses, labor, and environmental advocates, which has contributed to Congress's ability to pass reauthorizations swiftly and by unanimous consent. With the Widespread support of the PRIA coalition, as illustrated by a coalition letter addressed to our committee on June 29, 2017, which expresses support of the amendment to H.R. 1029 and urges swift action, this effort should be no different.

Our committee held a hearing earlier this year to review this issue in an

open and transparent manner. As we have heard time and time again, farmers and ranchers want regulatory certainty. EPA and registrants who rely on PRIA to get new products on the market and in the hands of farmers, ranchers, and other consumers want certainty.

My colleague raises an issue that has historically been outside the scope of the technical, fee-based registration process of PRIA. I certainly understand the concerns that have been raised by some groups with regard to certain actions EPA is considering with regard to the Worker Protection Standard and the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rules. My hope is that EPA and the relevant stakeholders can constructively discuss areas of concern related to these issues within the framework of our Federal regulatory process without jeopardizing PRIA.

Current authority for PRIA expires at the end of this fiscal year. With that deadline in mind, our recent committee action is timely and necessary to get PRIA updated.

Should PRIA's authority lapse, pesticide registration will not be available for a wide range of crops that rely on innovative and new solutions for pest protection, and a lapse will have a negative impact on the products requiring registration that are used to protect public health and ensure public safety.

It is important that we get PRIA across the finish line not only to provide certainty to the industry but to also provide new products to growers for crop protection and to consumers to protect public health, and the timely reauthorization provides resources to ensure safety education components are maintained.

I thank my colleague Senator STABENOW and other members of the Agriculture Committee for working with me on this issue together and in a bipartisan manner. I look forward to working with Senator STABENOW and the coalition in support of this legislation to get this bill across the Senate floor as quickly as possible and ultimately enacted into law.

that strives to be a liaison between the non-Hispanic and Hispanic communities. Rosemary began her career in government in 1992, working for Mayor Wellington Webb's administration. She served in several roles during her time with the mayor, such as deputy director of the mayor's Office of Arts, Culture & Film, Denver County clerk and recorder, and director of boards and commissions.

In 2003, she was elected to the Denver City Council. Later, her peers on the council elected her as president. In 2007, she began to work on the Election Assistance Commission. In this capacity, she worked to preserve the integrity of our national elections and increase access to our most fundamental right to vote. She chaired the commission in 2008.

In 2009, Rosemary became an invaluable part of my staff as State director and did a tremendous job representing our office and connecting with communities across Colorado. When I wasn't able to attend an event, I was always confident that Rosemary would convey our team's values and perspectives on any number of issues. I also counted on her advice whether it related to women's issues, immigration reform, or other issues of importance to the Latino community. Most recently, she was elected to the Denver School Board where she continues to serve Colorado's kids.

Due to her dedication to the people of Colorado, Rosemary has received several awards including the Mi Casa Resource Center's Volunteerism Award, the Anti-Defamation League's Passing the Torch Award, and the Denver Public Library's Cesar Chavez Hall of Fame Award.

I have been honored to work with my friend Rosemary for the past 8 years. Her intellect, creativity, and compassion should serve as an example for all those who serve. I wish her the best in her future endeavors, and I fully intend to count on her advice and perspectives for years to come.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO ROSEMARY E. RODRIGUEZ

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a dedicated community leader, civil servant, and dear friend, Rosemary E. Rodriguez. She most recently served as my State director and senior adviser. Throughout her life, Rosemary has displayed a genuine and consistent commitment to strengthening our State and our country.

Rosemary began her career as a legal assistant at two of Denver's most prominent law firms. Also, during the early stages of her career, Rosemary began her lifelong commitment to the Latino community as she helped form the Hispanic League, an organization

##### REMEMBERING TED SHANNON

• Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Ted Shannon, whose passing marks the end of an extraordinary life spent in service to country, community, and family. Ted committed his life to the pursuit of justice and equality. Ted and his late wife Dorothy were incredible pillars who had a great influence on me as I entered a life of public service.

Ted Shannon showed up. In service to his country, he became a civil affairs officer in July of 1941 during WW II, attached to the British 8th Army during the occupation of Italy. In his subsequent post, he served as executive offi-

cer for the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force in Paris.

He showed up as a leader in education, whether it was in his role as a Ford Foundation higher education adviser for five Middle Eastern countries in Lebanon—the nation of his ancestors—or as a highly regarded UW–Extension faculty member and dean for more than three decades.

Ted Shannon showed up. Along with Dorothy and fellow travelers from the New Deal era, Ted supported progressive causes at all levels of government for more than half a century. I cannot recall an event, large or small, for a progressive organization where I did not see Ted and Dorothy pitching in, providing leadership and encouragement no matter how challenging the cause.

He showed up as a beloved husband, father, grandfather, and friend. Ted met and married the former Dorothy Judge while at Yale pursuing his Ph.D. on the GI bill and shared his life with her until her passing in 2003. Ted was father to Tad, Sara, and Pam. Ted showed up as a hunting and fishing companion to son, Tad, and sage adviser on matters of food, music, languages, and world travel to Sara and Pam. He enjoyed outdoor adventures with his dear friend, Bill Threinen. Ted, Dorothy, Bill and Connie Threinen were friends and compatriots in advancing beloved ideals and forward-thinking causes for decades. A few years after Dorothy's passing, Ted married second wife, Kate Foster, of Eau Claire and continued his life of service for another 9 years.

Ted showed up. He was a doer. He walked the talk. Ted's multifaceted legacy is perhaps best illustrated by the words of Cuban poet Jose Marti: "Men of Action, above all those whose actions are guided by love, live forever."

The life of Ted Shannon serves as inspiration for anyone who seeks to create a world of peace, dignity, and opportunity for all. I miss him dearly.●

##### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF OSHKOSH CORPORATION

• Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 100th anniversary of a great Wisconsin company: Oshkosh Corporation.

Oshkosh Corporation began ten decades ago when cofounders William Besserdich and Bernard Mosling believed they had created something that would change transportation in America. Their new technology would improve vehicle steering and drive capacity, two factors that were essential for navigating unfinished roads. While the engineering was groundbreaking, they could not find a manufacturer who would purchase and build their designs.

Faced with possible failure, William and Bernard moved on to plan B: manufacturing and launching their own vehicle. On May 1, 1917, they founded the Wisconsin Duplex Auto Company that soon issued its four-wheel drive truck prototype, known as Old Betsy, using the duo's innovative technology. The company's rapid growth led them to move the production facility from Clintonville to Oshkosh, where it was renamed the Oshkosh Motor Truck Manufacturing Company.

Over the next 3 years, the Oshkosh Motor Truck Manufacturing Company grew exponentially as a defense supplier for the U.S. military. In 1945, the U.S. Army and U.S. Navy presented Oshkosh with the "E" award for excellence in wartime production. Throughout the 1940s, companies like Auto Body Works, Inc., and Kewaunee Shipbuilding and Engineering, which would later become part of the larger Oshkosh Corporation, made their marks on the military industry. The success of these companies built the foundation for Oshkosh Corporation's current success.

The escalation of the Cold War led to Oshkosh's first major defense contract. They produced 1,000 WT-2206 snow removal vehicles that allowed the Air Force to remove snow for bomber planes. Throughout the 1950s, the company continued to produce high-quality, technologically advanced trucks for various branches of the military. As our country transitioned out of a wartime economy, the company's focus shifted, resulting in the 1967 name change from Oshkosh Motor Truck Company to Oshkosh Truck Corporation.

Over the next several decades, Oshkosh continued to grow, as did its subsidiaries. Whether it was defense or construction, Oshkosh is known for its consistency, advanced technology, and efficient designs. In the area of defense, the Oshkosh name has become synonymous in the minds of U.S. servicemembers with quality, durability, and safety. From heavy-duty trucks, to the lifesaving MRAP—which was rapidly produced by skilled and patriotic Wisconsin workers in order to accelerate the safer vehicle's deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan—to the current production of the joint light tactical vehicle, Oshkosh boasts an unparalleled track record of delivering leading capability to our men and women in uniform. That is a record I have been honored to support throughout my time in Congress. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have worked to secure the funding required by the Armed Services to meet their need for tactical vehicles.

I have also been proud to represent Oshkosh in the Senate because the company has a steadfast commitment to its employees. Whether it was 1917

with two employees, 1972 with 500 employees, or present day with over 12,000 employees across the world, Oshkosh provides for its employees with scholarships, employee safety, and support. On the production floor or in the office, Oshkosh Corporation employees' remarkable dedication can be seen throughout the organization. I have been honored to meet many of these talented workers, including speaking with hundreds at a recent all-hands call at the Oshkosh Defense facility in Wisconsin.

Oshkosh's success has also lifted the fortunes of hundreds of Wisconsin companies throughout its various supply chains. Oshkosh is a true linchpin of my home State's manufacturing economy, and both its commercial and government programs support thousands of good-paying, skilled jobs. Just last year, I had the opportunity to partner with Oshkosh Defense and the Wisconsin Procurement Institute to strengthen this vibrant network by convening an event to build relationship's between Wisconsin suppliers and Federal agencies.

I would also like to commend the company's current leadership, including president and CEO Wilson Jones, and John Bryant, the president of Oshkosh's defense unit, both of whom I have had the pleasure of working with over the years. Similarly, I want to recognize the tremendous contributions made by their immediate predecessors, Charles Szews and John Urias, respectively. The steady hand provided by these leaders will ensure that the company is an integral part of Wisconsin's economy for another 100 years.

Now, 100 years after the creation of "Old Betsy," Oshkosh Corporation and its brands continue to lead the industry; yet the company has remained firmly committed to its strong ethics and employee-centric culture. For the last ten decades, Oshkosh Corporation has cemented its international reputation for innovation and excellence. I know Oshkosh leadership and frontline employees will continue to hold themselves to this high standard, as they continue to grow and contribute to our great Wisconsin economy. I am so pleased to add my voice in celebrating this monumental anniversary.●

#### RECOGNIZING CAMP BEAUREGARD

● Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I would like to acknowledge and honor Camp Beauregard on its 100th year of service. Named after famed Louisiana General Pierre Gustav Toutant Beauregard, Camp Beauregard is a U.S. Army installation operated by the Louisiana National Guard. For the past century, Camp Beauregard has hosted hundreds of thousands of soldiers training for combat missions all across the world and has served the State and local communities.

The site that eventually became Camp Beauregard was constructed in the late 1850s as a military academy. Following the Civil War, the school was relocated to Baton Rouge and renamed Louisiana State University. In the early 1900s, the site became the permanent camp for the Louisiana State National Guard's annual training exercises. The site officially became Camp Beauregard in 1917 as the United States entered World War I. Over 44,000 soldiers trained at Camp Beauregard before the end of the First World War, and hundreds of thousands of men trained at Camp Beauregard during the Second World War.

Camp Beauregard is currently the largest National Guard post in Louisiana and is essential to the Louisiana National Guard's efforts to serve the United States, Louisiana, and local communities. Not only does Camp Beauregard serve as a training ground for soldiers preparing for overseas combat operations, the camp also plays a vital role during major weather events and hosts competitions and family events. For 100 years, Camp Beauregard has served Louisianans and Americans alike.

I and my fellow Louisianans are proud of Camp Beauregard's accomplishments and the positive impact the training there has had on our State, our Nation, and across the world. I would like to thank those currently at Camp Beauregard as well as all those who have served our country there, and congratulate them for 100 years of service and patriotism.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL JAMES F. MARTIN, JR.

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. James F. Martin, Jr., USAF, will officially retire from Active Duty at the end of September. This month, Major General Martin's friends are gathering at the Pentagon to celebrate his career. In advance of that event, I wanted to say a few words about this exemplary military officer and adopted Alaskan who has devoted his entire 32 year career to the security of our Nation.

Major General Martin was born and raised in the State of Missouri. He completed his undergraduate work at Mississippi State University in accountancy and was commissioned as an Air Force officer through the ROTC Program. His initial assignment was Lowry Air Force Base, CO. Major General Martin pursued a traditional Air Force career serving in Texas, Panama, Italy, Hawaii, Ohio, and multiple stints in the Nation's Capital. In 1992, he was the Air Force Finance and Accounting Officer of the Year and has received numerous other awards and distinctions throughout his career.

Although Major General Martin served throughout the Air Force, it

was a fine day in 2001 when he arrived at Pacific Air Forces, PACAF, to serve as chief of the Operations and Maintenance Budget Branch. In 2006, Major General Martin, then Colonel Martin, took his first assignment in Alaska as commander of the 354th Mission Support Group, Eielson AFB. Major General Martin learned the hard way that, once bitten with the wonders of Alaska, you can never let it go. During that Alaska assignment, Major General Martin made friends around the State. Following his Eielson assignment, Major General Martin returned to PACAF Headquarters, first as director of financial management and comptroller and subsequently as chief of staff. He then began the first of three stints working for the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Financial Management and Comptroller.

In July 2013, Major General Martin was named Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget, his capstone experience and the role from which he will soon retire. As Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget, Major General Martin is responsible for planning and directing the formulation of the Air Force budget. This is a weighty and stressful responsibility in any year, but Major General Martin arrived his position just in time to deal with the 2013 government shutdown, as well as the overhanging threat of sequestration which continued to dog him for the remaining days of his Air Force career.

In spite of the many difficult challenges that faced his office, Major General Martin maintained the bearing of a calm and happy warrior; completely devoted to the cause of our airmen, airpower, and air dominance. The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget is responsible for the Air Force's relationship with members of the Defense and Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittees. Under his leadership, the appropriations liaison team was uniformly responsive and helpful to me and my staff. Major General Martin played a significant role in restoring congressional confidence in the Air Force as it emerged from several very difficult years in its relationships with Capitol Hill.

The Air Force's loss is Alaska's gain. Retirement will free up Major General Martin to spend more time in his beloved Alaska, and I understand that he plans to spend more than a few days in Unalakleet—Dutch Harbor, one of his favorite places. I hope to continue to rely upon General Martin in retirement for advice as I have many retired general officers whom I have come to know through their service in the State.

In Alaska, we take great pride that the path to a great Air Force career seems to run through our State. We have had more than our share of servicemembers who leveraged their time in Alaska to reach the highest levels of their profession. Major Gen-

eral Martin is among this select group, and his exemplary career sets an example for Alaska's airmen about where you might end up if you simply "Aim High."

On behalf of my Senate colleagues, I take this opportunity to thank Major General Martin for his service and wish him well in retirement.●

#### REMEMBERING MICHAEL GORDON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to the memory of a man who was a great friend of mine: Dr. Michael Gordon.

A professor at the University of Miami, Michael's love for medicine and people impacted the lives of so many, both inside the classroom and out. Michael first came to Florida in 1960 and eventually returned in 1966 to teach at the Miller School of Medicine at the University of Miami, a move that would keep him in the Sunshine State for the rest of his life. His tenacity and intelligence led to critical medical breakthroughs, but it didn't come easily.

Michael's first invention, "Harvey"—the cardiopulmonary patient simulator used across the globe—was initially viewed with contempt and suspicion amongst his contemporaries. But that did not discourage Michael. And thank God for that, because the once-ridiculed invention has since been used by many in the field of cardiology around the world. His relentlessness and ambition served as a testament to his character. He was a man with unfailing dedication to the well-being of others.

He also created UMedic, a system fostering research and learning in cardiology. Michael also devised training for first responders, which undoubtedly saved many lives over the years. He founded the Medical Training and Simulation Laboratory, which was eventually named the Michael S. Gordon Center for Research in Medical Education. The center focused on the mission of improving medical techniques and training paramedics and firefighters.

So many of us in the Miami-Dade community cherish his memory. While some in our community may never know his name, their loved ones may very well be saved by one of his innovations or the training he provided to first responders. Over the course of his life, Michael would bear many titles, including professor, mentor, innovator, doctor, inventor, friend, father, grandfather, and husband. To put it simply and quite literally; his friendship and passion touched many.

I am proud to have known such a tremendous human being and benefactor to the Miami community. My wife Jeanette and I will forever miss him and we join our friends at the University of Miami and his family in honoring his legacy.

May God bless him, his family, and those who continue his mission of saving lives and advancing medicine.●

#### RECOGNIZING THE ALCHEMIST BREWERY

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, my staff recently had the pleasure of visiting with Jen Kimmich of The Alchemist Brewery in Stowe, VT.

The Alchemist owners Jen and John Kimmich are model employers who have shown considerable dedication toward creating positive working conditions for their employees. Their workers receive excellent benefits and working conditions, including livable wages, paid sick days, vacation time, health insurance, wellness opportunities, paid family leave, and generous retirement benefits. The Alchemist not only produces an internationally award-winning product, but it has also fostered a workplace culture where people are put before profits.

Further, I would like to thank Jen for her statewide leadership championing workers' rights. She serves on the State Workforce Development Board helping to create opportunities for good jobs in Vermont. Through her volunteer work with Main Street Alliance, Jen has advocated for paid sick leave and paid family leave legislation.

I also commend the company for developing The Alchemist Foundation. The Foundation provides college scholarships and career pathway opportunities for area youth.

I am grateful for all that they do for their employees, their community, and the entire State of Vermont. Companies across the Nation should follow in The Alchemist's footsteps by supporting workers' rights and creating a positive workplace.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

#### PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER THAT AMENDS EXECUTIVE ORDER 13761 OF JANUARY 13, 2017—PM 12

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message

from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Consistent with subsection 401(b) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(b), and subsection 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") that amends Executive Order 13761 of January 13, 2017, by changing certain effective dates and revokes a reporting requirement in that order.

The order changes the date by which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, is to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan's progress in sustaining the positive actions taken by the Government of Sudan that gave rise to Executive Order 13761, from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017. The order also changes from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017, the effective date for the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the entirety of Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, provided that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, publishes on or before October 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to the order and has provided to the President the report described above.

The order revokes the requirement in Executive Order 13761 to provide an updated version of the report annually thereafter and, concurrent with those reports, to publish in the *Federal Register* a notice stating whether the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761.

The President issued Executive Orders 13067 and 13412, among other orders, to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan, including support for international terrorism; efforts to destabilize neighboring governments; and the prevalence of human rights violations.

In Executive Order 13761, the President determined that the situation that gave rise to the actions taken in Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412 related to the policies and actions of the Government of Sudan had been altered by Sudan's positive actions over the prior 6 months. Execu-

tive Order 13761 directed the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, and based on a consideration of relevant and credible information from available sources, including nongovernmental organizations, on or before July 12, 2017, to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan's progress in sustaining its positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761. Executive Order 13761 further provided that if the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, published on or before July 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan had sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761 and had provided to the President the report described above, the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and the revocation of Executive Order 13412 would become effective.

While the Government of Sudan has made some progress in areas identified in Executive Order 13761, I have decided that more time is needed for this review to establish that the Government of Sudan has demonstrated sufficient positive action across all of those areas.

For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to amend the effective date to October 12, 2017, to provide the report required by Executive Order 13761 and revoke sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412, provided that further action is taken by the Secretary of State, as set forth in Executive Order 13761, and to revoke the subsequent annual reporting requirement in Executive Order 13761.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 2017.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b)), the Minority Leader reappoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the National Council on the Arts: Ms. Chellie Pingree of Maine. The message further announced that pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2081, the Minority Leader reappoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission: Ms. MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 431(a)(3) of the Con-

solidated Appropriations Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-31), the Minority Leader appoints the following individuals to serve as Commissioners to the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission: Ms. Nicola Miner of San Francisco, California and Ms. Jennifer Siebel Newsom of San Francisco, California.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196), the Minority Leader appoints the following members to serve as Commissioners to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, from private life: Mr. Grant Hill of Orlando, Florida, Ms. Amy Gutmann of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Mr. Noah Griffin of San Francisco, California.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2040. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment" (Docket No. AMS-LPS-16-0071) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2041. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Fresh Pitahaya Fruit From Ecuador into the Continental United States" ((RIN0579-AE12) (Docket No. APHIS-2014-0095)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2042. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2043. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michelle D. Johnson, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2044. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Joseph W. Rixey, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2045. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas J. Trask, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2046. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of

two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2047. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commission Delegated Authority Provisions and Technical Amendments" (RIN3038-AE42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2048. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2049. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2050. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Bureau for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2051. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, Amtrak's fiscal year 2018 General and Legislative Annual Report; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2052. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry: Alternative Monitoring Method" (FRL No. 9964-14-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2053. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Correction to Incorporations by Reference" (FRL No. 9963-67-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2054. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Western Mojave Desert, Rate of Progress Demonstration" (FRL No. 9963-86-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2055. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Con-

trol District and the Town of Mammoth Lakes" (FRL No. 9955-67-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2056. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update" (FRL No. 9963-70-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2057. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Mendocino County Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits" (FRL No. 9960-08-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2058. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries Under CERCLA" (FRL No. 9958-47-OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2059. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; VT; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements" (FRL No. 9963-88-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2060. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Section 112(I) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Equivalency by Permit Provisions; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Plating and Polishing Operations" (FRL No. 9964-32-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2061. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Revised Format of 40 CFR Part 52 for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9955-06-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2062. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Reasonably Available Control Technology for US Watercraft, LLC" (FRL No. 9964-26-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2063. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Revised Format for Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9963-76-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2064. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; FL; Revisions to New Source Review, Definitions and Small Business Assistance Programs" (FRL No. 9964-35-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2065. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; FL; Hillsborough and Nassau Areas; SO<sub>2</sub> Attainment Demonstration" (FRL No. 9964-39-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2066. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval and Designation of Areas; KY; Redesignation of the Kentucky Portion of the Cincinnati-Hamilton 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment" (FRL No. 9964-41-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2067. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Permit Exemptions and Definitions" (FRL No. 9964-06-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2068. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Redesignation of the Collin County Area to Attainment the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9963-47-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2069. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program" (FRL No. 9963-41-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2070. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri's Air Quality



Implementation Plans; Reporting Emission Date, Emission Fees and Process Information" (FRL No. 9964-04-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2071. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fees for Water Infrastructure Project Applications under WIFIA" (RIN2040-AF64) (FRL No. 9964-19-OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2072. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; GA and SC: Changes to Ambient Air Standards and Definitions" (FRL No. 9964-09-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2073. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Encinitas-Solana Beach Shoreline Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, San Diego County, California, project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2074. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to the Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2075. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Canada and Saudi Arabia to support the design, development, modification, and integration of Enhanced Situational Awareness systems into armored vehicles in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-064); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2076. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services for the sale of one modified G550 aircraft to the government of Israel in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-106); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2077. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Israel for the manufacture of F-15 aircraft structural components in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2078. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the

United Kingdom for the manufacture of Joint Strike Fighter subassemblies, components, parts, and associated tooling of the aft fuselage and empennage in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-132); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2079. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and accessories abroad controlled under Category I of the United States Munitions List in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-138); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2080. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of various calibers of firearms ammunition to Saudi Arabia in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-003); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2081. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of M400 semi-automatic rifles and P320 semi-automatic pistols and accessories to Jordan in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-004); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2082. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Arab Emirates to support the maintenance, testing, support, field engineering services, logistics management assistance, training, repair, and calibration for three (3) sets of AN/TPS-78 Radar Systems, two (2) sets of TPS-70 Radar Systems, a command, control, and communications system known as the Emirates Air Defense Ground Environment (EADGE), and a low altitude surveillance system known as the Emirates Low Altitude Surveillance System (ELASS) in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-007); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2083. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of M400 5.56 mm rifles and associated parts and components to Jordan in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-011); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2084. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Japan for the sale and support of AAV7A1 RAMRS Amphibious Assault Vehicles in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-019); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2085. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including

technical data, and defense services to India to support the integration, assembly, and maintenance of M777A2 155mm Lightweight Howitzers in support of an existing Foreign Military Sales Contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-023); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2086. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of 5.56mm and 7.62mm carbines, associated training and parts, and accessories to Sweden in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-034); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2087. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of 5.56mm semi-automatic rifles, 9mm caliber rifles, 9mm pistols, silencers, and accessories to Indonesia in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-013); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2088. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the Republic of Korea for the manufacture, assembly, inspection, and testing of F404-GE-102 engines for the T-50, TA-50, and FA-50 aircraft series for end-use by various countries in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-044); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2089. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Australia, the United Kingdom and the United Arab Emirates to support the marketing, sale, and on-going support of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) and for future Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) requirements for the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-128); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2090. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of semi-automatic 9mm pistols with extra magazines to Thailand in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-024); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2091. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Germany to support the manufacture, integration, installation, operation, training, testing, maintenance, and repair of the TYTON line of laser rangefinder targeting devices and component modules (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-060); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2092. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the



certification of a proposed license for the export of semi-automatic 9mm pistols with extra magazines and ammunition to Thailand in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2093. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Taiwan for the MK41 Vertical Launching System in the amount of \$14,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-071); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2094. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Canada to support the manufacture of Precision Optical Subsystems, Optomechanical Major Assemblies, and Optical Components for the AIM-9X Sidewinder Missile in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-036); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2095. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2096. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0113—2017-0122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 696. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees (Rept. No. 115-127).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 829. A bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-128).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1099. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards (Rept. No. 115-129).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

\*Claire M. Grady, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

\*Henry Kerner, of California, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of five years.

By Mr. BURR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

\*David James Glawe, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1524. A bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1525. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to review and score TRIO applications with minor budgeting errors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1526. A bill to appropriate amounts to the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1527. A bill to appropriate amounts to the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1528. A bill to amend the market name of genetically altered salmon in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. KING):

S. 1529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility for the refundable credit for coverage under a qualified health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1530. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to voluntarily adopt advance directives guiding the medical care they receive; to the Committee on Finance.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. Kaine, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 217. A resolution welcoming Prime Minister Youssef Chahed of the Tunisian Republic on his first official visit to the United States, congratulating the people of the Tunisian Republic on their embrace of democracy after decades of dictatorship, and encouraging future reforms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 218. A resolution celebrating and reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Romania on the twentieth anniversary of its inception; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 200

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to prohibit the conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 372

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 372, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that merchandise arriving through the mail shall be subject to review by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and to require the provision of advance electronic information on shipments of mail to U.S. Customs and Border Protection and for other purposes.

S. 617

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 617, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 756, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Marine Debris Act to promote international action to reduce marine debris, and for other purposes.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

S. 845

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 845, a bill to protect sensitive community locations from harmful immigration enforcement action, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 910, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 985

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 985, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from revising the approved oil and gas leasing program for fiscal years 2017 through 2022.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1132

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1132, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the removal of the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices.

S. 1151

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a non-refundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1274

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to direct the President to establish an interagency mechanism to coordinate United States development programs and private sector investment activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1276

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to require the Attorney General to make a determination as to whether cannabidiol should be a controlled substance and listed in a schedule under the Controlled Substances Act and to expand research on the potential medical benefits of cannabidiol and other marijuana components.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1292, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to

monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes.

S. 1348

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1348, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to publicly justify unnecessary price increases.

S. 1403

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in national service positions to conserve, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1414

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1414, a bill to state the policy of the United States on the minimum number of available battle force ships.

S. 1462

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1462, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to improve cost sharing subsidies.

S. 1474

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1474, a bill to prohibit the use of fiscal year 2018 funds for the closure, consolidation, or elimination of certain offices of the Environmental Protection Agency.

S. 1520

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 21, a concurrent resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 154, a resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

S. RES. 214

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 214, a resolution designating June 19, 2017, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery legally came to an end in the United States.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1524. A bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Dignity for Incarcerated Women Act (Dignity Act), a critical criminal justice reform bill that would provide much needed reforms to address the unique needs women face in Federal prisons. This legislation helps shed light on the unique challenges women face behind bars, which seldom receive the attention they deserve in our criminal justice reform efforts. It is time we begin to remedy the barriers incarcerated women face, and that's what this bill would do. I thank Senators WARREN, DURBIN, and HARRIS for cosponsoring this bill, and I am proud to have their support.

America is truly exceptional when it comes to incarceration. The United States has 5 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the globe's prison population. Since 1980, our Federal population has grown by nearly 800 percent.

But let's look specifically at incarcerated women. Only 5 percent of the world's female population live in the United States, but nearly 30 percent of the world's incarcerated women are in our Nation—twice the percentage of China and four times as much as Russia. Since 1978, the number of women incarcerated in State and Federal pris-

ons in the United States has increased by 716 percent, twice the growth rate of men. America currently has 110,000 women behind bars, and women account for a larger proportion of the prison population than ever before in our Nation's history.

The numbers of women in our Federal prisons has seen substantial growth. Although women represent a small percentage of Federal prisoners, the proportion of women in the Federal system rose from 12.1 percent in fiscal year 2009 to 13.3 percent in fiscal year 2013. Based on the most recent Sentencing Commission data, 9,400 women were in Federal prisons as of fiscal year 2013. In 2013, more than two-thirds of women in Federal prison were behind bars due to nonviolent drug, fraud, or immigration crimes and over 70 percent of women in Federal prisons had little or no prior criminal history.

An urgent need exists to address the unique challenges women face while behind bars. Women are often primary caretaker parents, meaning their incarceration impacts children. Incarcerated women face the unconscionable choice of either calling home to talk to their children or using commissary funds to buy sanitary napkins. Women in prison are frequently victims of trauma. According to data from Vera Institute of Justice, women in jails face high-levels of trauma: 86 percent experienced sexual violence, 77 percent report partner violence, and 60 percent were survivors of caregiver violence. These troubling statistics deserve our attention.

Today, I'm proud to introduce the Dignity Act, a comprehensive bill that would begin to remedy the unique challenges faced by women behind bars. The bill would require the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to consider the location of children when placing an incarcerated parent in a Federal prison, which helps alleviate the great distances children and other loved ones often have to travel to visit incarcerated parents.

The bill would mandate the BOP create more generous and uniform visitation hours for primary caretaker parents to provide more easy access to loved ones while a woman is behind bars. We know family visitation is a critical part of a successful reentry strategy, so this commonsense provision would help maintain family contact when parents are behind bars. As a result, this provision makes it less likely that returning citizens commit crimes, which would enhance public safety.

The Dignity Act would ban solitary confinement and shackling of pregnant women in Federal prison. Studies confirm serious psychological and physical harm are likely to occur when these harsh practices are used on pregnant women. It is time we ban the use of solitary and shackling on pregnant

women and treat these women with the dignity and respect they deserve.

The bill would also require the BOP to provide parenting classes to primary caretaker parents, provide trauma-informed care to victims of trauma, and allow returning citizens to mentor incarcerated people. It would mandate the BOP train correctional officers in how to identify trauma victims in prison. This bill would help ensure people behind bars receive the critical programming they need to prepare for reentry into society.

The Dignity Act contains numerous other reforms. It would create an ombudsman at the Department of Justice to look into abuses associated with solitary confinement, prisoner transportation, strip searches, and other civil rights abuses. The bill would require the BOP to eliminate prison phone rates and mandate all prisons be equipped with video conferencing, which the bill ensures would be made available free of charge to incarcerated people. The legislation would require the BOP to make certain health products available for free, such as sanitary napkins, toothpaste, and ibuprofen.

Other reforms in the bill would preclude correctional officers of the opposite gender of the incarcerated individual from conducting strip searches or entering a restroom of the opposite gender. The bill has a common-sense exception for when an incarcerated woman's health is in danger and for other exigent circumstances. The bill would require the BOP to allow primary caretaker parents access to the Residential Drug Abuse Program, a critical drug treatment program, even if they fail to admit to having a substance abuse disorder prior to their incarceration. Finally, the Dignity Act would require the BOP to create a pilot program for overnight visits for incarcerated parents and children.

The legislation has broad support from organizations like the National Council for Incarcerated and Formerly Incarcerated Women and Girls, the ACLU, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

The Dignity Act would provide critical reforms to address challenges women behind bars face. Again, I thank Senators WARREN, DURBIN, and HARRIS for their leadership. I am proud to introduce this important criminal justice reform bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its speedy passage.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 217—WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER YOUSSEF CHAHED OF THE TUNISIAN REPUBLIC ON HIS FIRST OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES, CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE OF THE TUNISIAN REPUBLIC ON THEIR EMBRACE OF DEMOCRACY AFTER DECADES OF DICTATORSHIP, AND ENCOURAGING FUTURE REFORMS

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

## S. RES. 217

Whereas, on December 17, 2010, Mohammad Bouazizi, a young fruit vendor in Sidi Bouzid, set himself on fire to protest his unjust treatment by the regime of Tunisian President Zine al Abidine Ben Ali, and in his death inspired the “Jasmine Revolution” in the Tunisian Republic and popular revolutions across the Arab world of citizens demanding transparency, reform, and representation;

Whereas, on January 14, 2011, the peaceful mass protests of the Jasmine Revolution successfully brought to an end the authoritarian rule of President Ben Ali;

Whereas, in the aftermath of Ben Ali’s resignation, Tunisians initiated a peaceful, consensus-based, inclusive, and civilian-directed transition to democracy;

Whereas, on January 26, 2014, the Tunisian Republic adopted its first constitution drafted by a democratically elected governing body, formally ending a period of transitional governments;

Whereas the new constitution of the Tunisian Republic enshrines gender equality through enumerated rights and responsibilities, protects the rights of minorities, and specifically outlaws religiously motivated violence;

Whereas, on October 26, 2014, the Tunisian Republic held its first parliamentary elections under the new constitution, which the international community praised as free and fair;

Whereas, on December 31, 2014, after winning free and fair presidential elections, Beiji Caid Essebsi was inaugurated as the first freely elected President of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas, on October 9, 2015, the Norwegian Nobel Committee awarded the Tunisian National Dialogue Quartet, a coalition of four civil society organizations, the 2015 Nobel Peace Prize for the coalition’s work in building on the promise of the 2011 Jasmine Revolution and ensuring the transition of the Tunisian Republic into a democracy did not descend into violence;

Whereas President Essebsi, Prime Minister Chahed, and other political leaders of the Tunisian Republic have formed a national unity government to work in the national interest of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas the political evolution of the Tunisian Republic stands as a model for citizens of other states aspiring to establish the institutions of democracy after a history of autocratic rule;

Whereas, on March 18, 2015, a terrorist attack on the Bardo National Museum killed 21 people;

Whereas, on July 26, 2015, a terrorist attack on a beach in the town of Sousse left 38 people, including 30 British nationals, dead, and dealt a blow to tourism in the Tunisian Republic, an important industry upon which the economy of the Tunisian Republic depends;

Whereas a terrorist attack on November 24, 2015, on the Presidential Guard of the Tunisian Republic killed 12 people;

Whereas, in the aftermath of these attacks, citizens and leaders of the Tunisian Republic have reaffirmed their commitment to dialogue, pluralism, and democracy;

Whereas the Tunisian Republic continues to face serious threats to its security from violent extremist groups operating within the Tunisian Republic as well as in neighboring countries;

Whereas, in July 2015, the United States designated the Tunisian Republic as a major non-NATO ally;

Whereas the Government of the Tunisian Republic, as a member of the Global Coalition to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), is seeking to reduce the significant number of Tunisian citizens who become foreign fighters for ISIS;

Whereas the Tunisian Republic faces economic challenges, including high inflation and high unemployment, especially among young Tunisians;

Whereas Prime Minister Chahed has committed to combating corruption and facilitating necessary economic reforms for the prosperity of the people of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas the United States Government is committed to continuing a strong economic partnership with the Tunisian Republic as the Government of the Tunisian Republic undertakes reforms to transform its economy to meet the aspirations of all citizens of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas it is the interest of the United States, and consistent with the values of the United States, to support the aspirations of the people of the Tunisian Republic in developing a pluralist democracy and transparent, effective institutions;

Whereas the Governments and people of the United States and the Tunisian Republic have enjoyed friendly relations for more than 200 years;

Whereas, in accordance with the U.S.–Tunisia Strategic Partnership, both countries are dedicated to working together to promote economic development and business opportunities in the Tunisian Republic, education for the advancement of long-term development in the Tunisian Republic, and increased security cooperation to address common threats in the Tunisian Republic and across the region; and

Whereas the United States Government should provide a level of funding to strongly assist and reinforce the promising transition of the Tunisian Republic into a democratic, stable, and prosperous nation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes Prime Minister Chahed on his first official visit to the United States;

(2) commends the political leaders of the Tunisian Republic for their willingness to compromise and work together in the national interest and form a national unity government;

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the United States Government to the Tunisian Republic, including a commitment to pro-

vide appropriate levels of assistance, in support of the ongoing transition of the Tunisian Republic to an inclusive, prosperous, and secure democracy;

(4) condemns all acts of terrorism, and extends condolences to the families of victims of terrorism and to the people and Government of the Tunisian Republic.

(5) commends the people and Government of the Tunisian Republic for their resilience in the face of terrorist attacks and their enduring commitment to a free, democratic, and peaceful Tunisian Republic;

(6) encourages Prime Minister Chahed and the parliament of the Tunisian Republic to work together to accelerate economic reforms and anti-corruption measures;

(7) looks forward to the continued implementation of the 2014 constitution of the Tunisian Republic, including the new protections of civil liberties;

(8) urges the authorities of the Tunisian Republic to continue to make every effort to prevent the continued flow of Tunisian jihadist “foreign fighters” to Syria and Iraq;

(9) calls on the neighbors and partners of the Tunisian Republic to work in concert with the Government of the Tunisian Republic to counter terrorist threats, secure borders, and support the democratic transition of the Tunisian Republic;

(10) strongly urges the Government of the Tunisian Republic to cease support for all resolutions and other measures that discriminate against or otherwise target Israel in the United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and other United Nations organizations; and

(11) reaffirms the historic and continuing friendship between the people of the United States and the people of the Tunisian Republic.

SENATE RESOLUTION 218—CELEBRATING AND REAFFIRMING THE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ROMANIA ON THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS INCEPTION

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

## S. RES. 218

Whereas, in 1997, the Governments of the United States and Romania embarked upon a strategic partnership rooted in our mutual embrace of popular sovereignty, individual rights, free markets, and the rule of law, and our commitment to transatlantic security and prosperity;

Whereas the Government of Romania has striven to advance security and democratic principles in Southeast Europe, and has participated actively in building a Europe whole, free, and at peace;

Whereas the strategic partnership between the United States and Romania has helped forge durable economic and cultural bonds between our two countries;

Whereas the Government of Romania recently announced that it will raise defense spending to two percent of its gross domestic product (GDP) in 2017 in order to meet the minimum level of defense expenditures pledged at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit;

Whereas NATO’s first “Aegis Ashore” missile defense installation became operational on May 12, 2016, at Deveselu Base in Romania, representing a significant increase in

NATO's capacity to defend against ballistic missile threats outside the Euro-Atlantic zone;

Whereas the Romanian Armed Forces have supported NATO and United States operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theatres for over a decade, contributing more than 30,000 total combat and support personnel to those missions;

Whereas Romania maintains the fifth largest contingent in NATO's Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan, with over 600 troops helping to train, advise, and assist the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) and Afghan security institutions;

Whereas Romania is a member of the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS and has deployed military trainers to Iraq to train Iraqi Security Forces and provided humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq and Syria;

Whereas the people and Governments of the United States and Romania share a common interest in deepening our economic relationship through increased bilateral trade and investment and projecting economic stability and prosperity across Southeast Europe;

Whereas, in October 2017, Romania will host the tenth annual United States Commercial Service Trade Winds Forum and Trade Mission, helping United States companies explore new opportunities in Romania and across Southeast Europe;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Romania are working closely together to develop an ambitious bilateral economic, trade, and investment agenda, including through a record attendance this year by Romanian companies to the United States SelectUSA Summit;

Whereas the talent, energy, and creativity of the Romanian people have nurtured a vibrant society, embracing innovation and entrepreneurship, and inspiring new generations of young Romanian leaders in business, technology and advanced sciences;

Whereas the Government of Romania is setting a positive example through its continued efforts to defend the rule of law, to strengthen judicial independence, and to fight against corruption, notably through the work of Romania's National Anticorruption Directorate (DNA);

Whereas the rich heritage of many generations of Romanian-Americans have made indelible contributions to America's cultural tapestry; and

Whereas 2018 will mark the Centennial Anniversary of Romanian unification, a milestone to be lauded and celebrated: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates 20 years of close, strategic partnership between the United States and Romania and applauds Romania's significant contributions and commitment to transatlantic security and prosperity;

(2) commends the Government of Romania for its advancements in democratic governance, the rule of law, and a principled and inclusive society which provides opportunities for development and growth, and urges continued progress in these areas; and

(3) affirms the desire of the Senate to continue strengthening the strategic partnership between the United States and Romania and to inspire future generations of young leaders to cherish, preserve, and develop the friendship between our two nations.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 256. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 256.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XII, insert the following:

#### **Subtitle—Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2017**

##### **SEC. 12 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the "Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2017".

##### **SEC. 12 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) March 2017 marks the sixth year of the ongoing conflict in Syria.

(2) As of February 2017—

(A) more than 600,000 people are living under siege in Syria;

(B) approximately 6,300,000 people are displaced from their homes inside Syria; and

(C) approximately 4,900,000 Syrians have fled to neighboring countries as refugees.

(3) Since the conflict in Syria began, the United States has provided more than \$5,900,000,000 to meet humanitarian needs in Syria, making the United States the world's single largest donor by far to the Syrian humanitarian response.

(4) In response to growing concerns over systemic human rights violations in Syria, the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic (referred to in this section as "COI") was established on August 22, 2011. The purpose of COI is to "investigate all alleged violations of international human rights law since March 2011 in the Syrian Arab Republic, to establish the facts and circumstances that may amount to such violations and of the crimes perpetrated and, where possible, to identify those responsible with a view to ensuring that perpetrators of violations, including those that may constitute crimes against humanity, are held accountable".

(5) On December 21, 2016, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution to establish the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Those Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011.

(6) The 2016 United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Annual Report states that in Syria "[r]eports have emerged from all groups, including Muslims, Christians, Ismailis, and others, of gross human rights violations, including beheadings, rape, murder, torture of civilians and re-

ligious figures, and the destruction of mosques and churches."

(7) On February 7, 2017, Amnesty International reported that between 5,000 and 13,000 people were extrajudicially executed in the Saydnaya Military Prison between September 2011 and December 2015.

(8) In February 2017, COI released a report—

(A) stating that a joint United Nations-Syrian Arab Red Crescent convoy in Orum al-Kubra, Syria, was attacked by air on September 19, 2016;

(B) explaining that the attack killed at least 14 civilian aid workers, injured at least 15 others, and destroyed trucks, food, medicine, clothes, and other supplies; and

(C) concluding that "the attack was meticulously planned and ruthlessly carried out by the Syrian air force to purposefully hinder the delivery of humanitarian aid and target aid workers, constituting the war crimes of deliberately attacking humanitarian relief personnel, denial of humanitarian aid and targeting civilians."

(9) On October 21, 2016, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons-United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism transmitted its fourth report, which concluded that the Syrian Arab Armed Forces and the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) have both used chemical weapons against villages in Syria.

(10) On August 11, 2016, COI released a report stating that certain offenses, including deliberately attacking hospitals, executions without due process, and the massive and systematized nature of deaths in state-controlled detention facilities in Syria, constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity.

(11) Physicians for Human Rights reported that, between March 2011 and the end of December 2016, Syrian government and allied forces—

(A) had committed 412 attacks on medical facilities (including through the use of indiscriminate barrel bombs on at least 80 occasions); and

(B) had killed 735 medical personnel.

(12) The Department of State's 2016 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices—

(A) details President Bashar al-Assad's use of "indiscriminate and deadly force against civilians, conducting air and ground-based military assaults on cities, residential areas, and civilian infrastructure";

(B) explains that "these attacks included bombardment with improvised explosive devices, commonly referred to as 'barrel bombs' . . ."; and

(C) reports that "[t]he government [of Syria] continued the use of torture and rape, including of children".

(13) On March 17, 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry stated: "In my judgment, Daesh is responsible for genocide against groups in areas under its control, including Yezidis, Christians, and Shia Muslims. . . . The United States will strongly support efforts to collect, document, preserve, and analyze the evidence of atrocities, and we will do all we can to see that the perpetrators are held accountable."

(14) In February 2016, COI reported that—

(A) "crimes against humanity continue to be committed by [Syrian] Government forces and by ISIS";

(B) the Syrian government has "committed the crimes against humanity of extermination, murder, rape or other forms of sexual violence, torture, imprisonment, enforce disappearance and other inhuman acts"; and

(C) “[a]ccountability for these and other crimes must form part of any political solution”.

(15) Credible civil society organizations collecting evidence of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria report that at least 12 countries in western Europe and North America have requested assistance on investigating such crimes.

#### SEC. 12 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Congress—

(1) strongly condemns—

(A) the ongoing violence, use of chemical weapons, targeting of civilian populations with barrel, incendiary, and cluster bombs and SCUD missiles, and systematic gross human rights violations carried out by the Government of Syria and pro-government forces under the direction of President Bashar al-Assad; and

(B) all abuses committed by violent extremist groups and other combatants involved in the civil war in Syria;

(2) expresses its support for the people of Syria seeking democratic change;

(3) urges all parties to the conflict—

(A) to immediately halt indiscriminate attacks on civilians;

(B) to allow for the delivery of humanitarian and medical assistance; and

(C) to end sieges of civilian populations;

(4) calls on the President to support efforts in Syria, and on the part of the international community, to ensure accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide committed during the conflict; and

(5) supports the request in United Nations Security Council Resolutions 2139 (2014), 2165 (2014), and 2191 (2014) for the Secretary-General to regularly report to the Security Council on implementation on the resolutions, including of paragraph 2 of Resolution 2139, which “demands that all parties immediately put an end to all forms of violence [and] cease and desist from all violations of international humanitarian law and violations and abuses of human rights”.

#### SEC. 12 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **GENOCIDE.**—The term “genocide” means any offense described in section 1091(a) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) **HYBRID TRIBUNAL.**—The term “hybrid tribunal” means a temporary criminal tribunal that involves a combination of domestic and international lawyers, judges, and other professionals to prosecute individuals suspected of committing war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide.

(4) **TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE.**—The term “transitional justice” means the range of judicial, nonjudicial, formal, informal, retributive, and restorative measures employed by countries transitioning out of armed conflict or repressive regimes—

(A) to redress legacies of atrocities; and

(B) to promote long-term, sustainable peace.

(5) **WAR CRIME.**—The term “war crime” has the meaning given the term in section 2441(c) of title 18, United States Code.

#### SEC. 12 5. REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR WAR CRIMES, CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, AND GENOCIDE IN SYRIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall submit a report on war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and another such report not later than 180 days after the Secretary of State determines that the violence in Syria has ceased.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of alleged war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated during the civil war in Syria, including—

(A) incidents that may constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide committed by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad and all forces fighting on its behalf;

(B) incidents that may constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide committed by violent extremist groups, anti-government forces, and any other combatants in the conflict;

(C) any incidents that may violate the principle of medical neutrality and, if possible, the identification of the individual or individuals who engaged in or organized such incidents; and

(D) if possible, a description of the conventional and unconventional weapons used for such crimes and the origins of such weapons; and

(2) a description and assessment by the Department of State Office of Global Criminal Justice, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Justice, and other appropriate agencies of programs that the United States Government has undertaken to ensure accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated against the people of Syria by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad, violent extremist groups, and other combatants involved in the conflict, including programs—

(A) to train investigators within and outside of Syria on how to document, investigate, develop findings of, and identify and locate alleged perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide, including—

(i) the number of United States Government or contract personnel currently designated to work full-time on these issues; and

(ii) the identification of the authorities and appropriations being used to support such training efforts;

(B) to promote and prepare for a transitional justice process or processes for the perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria beginning in March 2011;

(C) to document, collect, preserve, and protect evidence of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria, including support for Syrian, foreign, and international nongovernmental organizations, and other entities, including the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011 and the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic; and

(D) to assess the influence of accountability measures on efforts to reach a negotiated settlement to the Syrian conflict during the reporting period.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) may be submitted in unclassified or classified form, but shall include a publicly available annex.

(d) **PROTECTION OF WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.**—The Secretary shall take due care to ensure that the identification of witnesses and physical evidence are not publicly disclosed in a manner that might place such persons at risk of harm or encourage the destruction of evidence by the Government of Syria, violent extremist groups, anti-government forces, or any other combatants or participants in the conflict.

#### SEC. 12 6. TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State (acting through appropriate officials and offices, which may include the Office of Global Criminal Justice), after consultation with the Department of Justice, the United States Agency for International Development, and other appropriate Federal agencies, shall—

(1) complete a study of the feasibility and desirability of potential transitional justice mechanisms for Syria, including a hybrid tribunal, to address war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated in Syria beginning in March 2011; and

(2) submit a detailed report of the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1), including recommendations on which transitional justice mechanisms the United States Government should support, why such mechanisms should be supported, and what type of support should be offered, to—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

#### SEC. 12 7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State (acting through appropriate officials and offices, which may include the Office of Global Criminal Justice), after consultation with the Department of Justice and other appropriate Federal agencies, is authorized to provide appropriate assistance to support entities that, with respect to war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad, all forces fighting on its behalf, and all non-state armed groups fighting in the country, including violent extremist groups in Syria beginning in March 2011—

(1) identify suspected perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(2) collect, document, and protect evidence of crimes and preserve the chain of custody for such evidence;

(3) conduct criminal investigations;

(4) build Syria's investigative and judicial capacities and support prosecutions in the domestic courts of Syria, provided that President Bashar al-Assad is no longer in power;

(5) support investigations by third-party states, as appropriate; or

(6) protect witnesses that may be helpful to prosecutions or other transitional justice mechanisms.

(b) **ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of State, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and the appropriate congressional committees, and taking into account the findings of the transitional justice study required under section 1206, is authorized to provide assistance to support the creation and operation of transitional justice mechanisms, including a potential hybrid tribunal, to prosecute individuals suspected of committing war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide in Syria beginning in March 2011.

(c) **BRIEFING.**—The Secretary of State shall provide detailed, biannual briefings to the appropriate congressional committees describing the assistance provided to entities described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 1208. STATE DEPARTMENT REWARDS FOR JUSTICE PROGRAM.**

Section 36(b)(10) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(b)(10)) is amended by inserting “(including war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide committed in Syria beginning in March 2011)” after “genocide”.

**SEC. 1209. INDEPENDENT INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC.**

The Secretary of State, acting through the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, should use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to advocate that the United Nations Human Rights Council, while the United States remains a member, annually extend the mandate of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic until the Commission has completed its investigation of all alleged violations of international human rights laws beginning in March 2011 in the Syrian Arab Republic.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to consider the nomination of: Mr. Richard V. Spencer to be Secretary of the Navy.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017 at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting.

**COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE**

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during

the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017 from 2:15 p.m.–2:30 p.m. in Room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed business meeting to consider the nomination of Mr. David Glawe to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis at the Department of Homeland Security.

**COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE**

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017 from 2:30 p.m.–4:00 p.m. in Room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

**COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing on legislation pending before the Committee.

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM**

The Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 11, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in Room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Concurrent Congressional and Criminal Investigations: Lessons from History.”

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Gloria Ramirez, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 2017**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Wednesday, July 12; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Nye nomination with all postcloture time being expired; finally, that if cloture is invoked on the Hagerty nomination, the time count as if cloture were invoked at 1 a.m., Wednesday, July 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators SANDERS, VAN HOLLEN, and BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

**HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION**

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today after a fourth field hearing in Connecticut. Every one of those field hearings has been packed. I spent time at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Hartford, as well as having visited others over the past year. I have spent time with numerous providers and at community health centers and heard firsthand from the people of Connecticut as to why the Republican health bill, which has been unveiled after having been concocted behind closed doors, would devastate the health and finances of Connecticut's families and their communities.

The bill that we expect to be disclosed later this week will almost certainly be defective in the same ways as the bills that we have seen. To call these proposals mean or heartless, as the President has, is a gross understatement. The bill, very simply put, would cost both dollars and lives, eroding not just our ability to save money by investing in a healthier future but causing death and despair when neither term is really necessary. This would be self-inflicted, but it is a wound that is preventable and avoidable.

I pledge to the people of Connecticut that I will fight as long and as hard as necessary to stop this grotesquely cruel and costly proposal.

It is not, in fact, a healthcare bill. It is a wealth care bill. It decimates Medicaid, saving, supposedly, close to \$1 billion so that those savings can be used for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. As Warren Buffett has said—and he is one of them—“I don't need it.” He would rather see it be used for better healthcare and coverage, and that is what the majority of Americans want. That is why this proposal is so deeply unpopular.

Now, after weeks of secrecy, followed by chaos, we are back to secrecy again, with Republicans retreating away from their constituents and going behind closed doors. Even over this past week, when we were back in our home States, they were crafting another bill. We have not seen it. We have not debated it. We cannot even say that we know anything about what is in it, and my Republican colleagues know little more than we do on this side of the aisle. We know for sure, despite the secrecy, that the devastating effect would be overwhelming on people across income strata, geographic boundaries, and cultural backgrounds.



I am here not to talk in abstractions. I am here to talk about real people in real life and to share the stories that I heard at these field hearings—people's stories that they have entrusted me to bring to you. Many of my colleagues have refused to hear these stories from their constituents because they would hear how repugnant and repulsive this bill is and how deeply angry the people of the country are. The people of Connecticut and the country are outraged.

The reason is people like Ariella Botts, and here she is. Ariella is 4 years old. She came to my field hearing last week with her mom, Rachel. Ariella, as her mom told me, has nemaline myopathy, which is a rare form of muscular dystrophy. Their family relies on Medicaid for her care. I want to tell you exactly what Rachel said about Ariella and their family, because her words are far more eloquent and powerful than mine.

Rachel said:

The fact of the matter is that my daughter's care would cost over \$20,000 a month out of pocket between her food, her medication, her care, and the breathing machines that keep her lungs clear. There is no average American family that can pay \$20,000 a month of medical costs. We do our part. We have two jobs a piece. We do everything we can do. This is the only thing we ask for help on.

Rachel went on to say:

Supporters of the Trumpcare bill want you to believe that costs are high because there is this nameless and faceless abuser of the system, but I have spent hours in the waiting rooms of Yale New Haven Hospital and Connecticut Children's Medical Center. I have spent hours in the neonatal intensive care units and the emergency rooms, and I can tell you that the people who are accessing care on my level—they're not abusers.

I am going to continue quoting Rachel. I cannot really speak with the same power and authenticity that she has, but we are not allowed to show videos here on the floor.

She continued:

We're mothers and fathers who know that there's more for our children to achieve. We're tax-paying, community-investing, voting, involved warriors for our families.

I asked Rachel what would happen to her family if Ariella did not have Medicaid, and Rachel said: "It would bankrupt us in less than a month."

I want to tell you what it is like to spend just a little bit of time with Ariella. She is the most vivacious, animated, beautiful girl, and you would not know anything about her condition but for this apparatus, which is there so she can lead a normal or a near-normal life and be the wonderful young lady that she is. I smile when I think of her at this hearing because she brought smiles to all of our faces. I understand the joy and pride that she brings to her family because she is one courageous, strong child, and we are proud of her.

Rachel and Ariella were not the only people I heard from whose lives have

been made not just better but, truly, whose lives have been made possible by Medicaid.

Jeff Pabon was also at a hearing that I held, and he told me about his family when he was growing up. As a single mother, his mom raised him and his four siblings. As a member of the working class, Jeff told me "she needed as much assistance from the system as the system could provide." Years later, as an adult, Jeff proudly served our country in the U.S. Navy during Operation Desert Storm. He now has a family of his own, including a son with autism. He spoke out at my hearing because, as he said, "I've fought for this country before."

What Jeff told me touches the core—the heart—of this debate, and I want to read it here on the Senate floor because he said it so powerfully:

The healthcare bill being crafted in secrecy by a minority of Republican Senators now threatens Medicaid protections and aims to provide tax breaks for the ultra wealthy, top 1 percent of America. I would like to see sensible, bipartisan legislation which serves the majority of Americans, like the other 99 percent. Let's repair the provisions of the Affordable Care Act that need reparation. We need to be moving forward, not backward.

Jeff is right, and so is Rachel. How absurd and reprehensible that costs will rise astronomically while Medicaid funding and the number of those with insurance coverage will go down, just so our Nation's richest can see billions of dollars in tax cuts—laughable, if it were not so deadly serious. "Deadly" is the word because this bill will cost lives. We rarely deal in life and death issues in this Chamber. This issue is one of them.

It will decimate the lives and livelihoods of so many and threaten not only Ariella but many like her of all ages—the senior who goes into a nursing home after exhausting her life savings and depends on Medicaid, the woman who goes to a Planned Parenthood clinic to be screened for cancer and finds that this pernicious disease has been detected because of that preventive step and the availability of healthcare at Planned Parenthood, the opioid addict who suffers from that disorder or disease—it is a disease, not a moral failing—and seeks recovery through the medicine that is made available by Medicaid. Forty-four percent of all of the medication for opioid addiction treatment comes from Medicaid in the State of Connecticut. All of them are at risk. It is not just their convenience or their comfort. Their lives are at risk.

I heard their stories, and I am haunted by them. I can hear their voices, and I can see their faces. I want my colleagues to do the same. I am ready to do what Jeff asked of me. I am ready to work with all of my colleagues—Democrat and Republican—to move us forward, not backward. Let's work to-

gether in a bipartisan way to fix the parts of our healthcare insurance system that need repair. Let's go forward, not backward.

I am eager for the call from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that offers solutions—not repeal but real solutions—as to what the American people need, want, and deserve.

First, we must bury the efforts to decimate Medicaid, to defund Planned Parenthood, and to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We have a chance right now to improve healthcare—a moment, an historic opportunity—and we must seize it. I feel that we are on the cusp of that dramatic and historic moment, and I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me be as clear as I can be. The so-called healthcare bill that passed in the House of Representatives several months ago, strongly supported by President Trump, is the most anti-working-class legislation that I have ever seen. The Senate bill, also supported by Mr. Trump, in some respects is even worse.

At a time when working families in Vermont and all across this country are working longer hours for low wages—many people in my own State are working two or three jobs just to bring in enough income to maintain a family—this legislation will cause devastating harm to millions of our families from one end of America to the other.

The American people are united. This weekend I was in West Virginia and Kentucky—so-called conservative States—but I tell you that what is true there, what is true in Vermont, and what is true all over this country is that the American people are standing up and saying loudly and clearly that we will not allow 22 million Americans to be thrown off of the health insurance they currently have in order to give over \$500 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest 2 percent, to the drug companies, to the insurance companies, and to other profitable corporations. We will not support a bill that takes from the most vulnerable people in our country—the children, the elderly, the disabled, the sick, and the poor—in order to make the very, very rich even richer. This is unconscionable, un-American, and the American people will not accept it.

Plainly stated, this so-called healthcare bill is really nothing more than a massive transfer of wealth from the working families of this country to the very rich. While this bill contains massive cuts to Medicaid; while seniors will pay far, far more in premiums; while Planned Parenthood will be

defunded, the 400 highest income taxpayers, most of whom are billionaires, will get about \$33 billion in tax cuts.

There is no State in this country—none, not the most conservative—that thinks that you throw 22 million people off of health insurance, including disabled children, in order to give \$33 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest 400 Americans. At a time when so many people in America are struggling, the very wealthy are already doing phenomenally well. They do not need more tax breaks.

Not only is this bill a disaster, but the secretive, backroom process by which it has been written is unprecedented and literally beyond belief. That is not just me speaking; I think a number of my Republican colleagues who disagree with me on everything make that point as well. This bill impacts one-sixth of our economy—over \$3 trillion—and by definition, dealing with healthcare, it impacts virtually every American. Yet the discussions and negotiations on this legislation have never been made public. In fact, I suspect they are going on right now—not here on the floor but behind closed doors.

Unbelievably, with legislation that would completely revamp our healthcare system, there have been no doctors, no nurses, no hospital administrators, no representatives of senior citizens, no experts on the opioid crisis—which is sweeping our country—who have testified in public about the impact this legislation will have in our country. How can one possibly dream of drafting a bill of such enormous magnitude without hearing one public comment from the most knowledgeable people in America with regard to healthcare?

How can you possibly go forward without one public hearing where Senators have the opportunity—Democrats, progressives, Independents—to ask questions? But that is precisely the process this legislation has gone through.

I fully understand there are a lot of people who will say: Well, big surprise, BERNIE SANDERS, a strong progressive, opposes this Republican bill. What else is new?

But I want you all to understand that it is not just BERNIE SANDERS or Democrats here who oppose this legislation; this legislation is opposed by virtually every major healthcare organization in the United States.

I am not quite sure how we can go forward with major legislation impacting one-sixth of the economy, opposed by every major healthcare organization in the country, and not have one hearing. I am not quite sure how that can be done, but that is precisely what the Republican leadership here is doing.

It is not just BERNIE SANDERS who opposes this legislation. It is the AARP, which is the largest senior

group in America. It is the American Medical Association. Hey, those are our doctors. When you get sick, you go to a doctor. Many of them are members of the American Medical Association. They say this bill is a disaster. It is not just doctors. It is nurses. It is hospital administrators. It is the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Psychiatric Association, the Federation of American Hospitals, the Catholic Health Association, the American Lung Association, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the March of Dimes, the National MS Society, and the American Nurses Association, among many other organizations that oppose this bill being written behind closed doors.

Several months ago, as I think everybody knows, with the strong support of President Trump, the House passed their disastrous healthcare bill. Now, we know what is in the House bill. The Senate bill probably is being worked on as we speak, so we don't know what is in that exactly, but let me tell my colleagues what the House bill does. At a time when 28 million Americans today—before the Republican bill—have no health insurance and millions more are underinsured, with high deductibles and copayments, this bill from the House will throw another 23 million Americans off of the health insurance they currently have.

Think about it. Gee, if we have 28 million Americans off of health insurance, what most Americans would say is: OK, how do we lower that number? In fact, the Affordable Care Act added another 20 million people to the ranks of the insured. This bill throws 23 million on top of the 28 million we currently have uninsured, almost doubling the uninsured in America to over 50 million people. Think about it. People have a hard time even beginning to believe that legislation that is being seriously debated would almost double the number of uninsured in America.

Everybody understands—there is no debate about this—that the Affordable Care Act is far, far from perfect. This is a point I have been making from the day the Affordable Care Act was passed. Premiums in my State of Vermont and around this country are too high, deductibles are too high, copayments are too high, and too many Americans remain uninsured or underinsured. But in each and every one of these legitimate concerns, the Republican legislation that has been brought forward and passed in the House would only make a bad situation much worse.

The Republicans say: Oh, the Affordable Care Act is a bad piece of legislation. It has problems. The Affordable Care Act does have problems. Their legislation exacerbates every single one of the problems that it has.

So our job today, and I think what the average American understands—

OK, we have problems. What are the problems? We have listened. Deductibles are too high. Copayments are too high. Premiums are too high. Prescription drug prices are way too high. OK. Let's discuss it. What is your idea? How do we deal with these problems? That is what the American people want. The American people want us to address the problems that are in the Affordable Care Act, not destroy it.

It seems to me clearly that our job right now—and the American people are rising up. They are not going to accept this Republican legislation. Together we are going to defeat it.

I wish to speak for a moment about what it means if this legislation were to pass. What are the implications of throwing 22 million people—that is the Senate bill—off of health insurance, and 23 million people in the House bill? Let me tell my colleagues. I want every American to think about this. Just think about it. Think about somebody today who has cancer and is maybe in chemotherapy or maybe in radiation, somebody who has heart disease, somebody who has diabetes or some other life-threatening disease. There are God knows how many people in this country right now who are sick. What happens if they lose their health insurance? A simple question. You have cancer, you are getting treatment today, and the Republican bill takes away your health insurance. What happens to you when you cannot afford to go to the doctor when you feel a lump in your breast or when you have problems with your heart? What happens to you if you have a heart attack or a stroke and need significant care, but you have no health insurance and you don't have the money to pay for the outrageously high cost of care?

Here is the horrible and unspeakable truth that has to be brought out into the open; that is, if this legislation were to pass, many thousands of our fellow Americans would die, and many more would suffer and become much sicker than they should. Now, I am not suggesting that there is anybody in this body who wants to see anybody die unnecessarily. Nobody does. But people have to take responsibility for their actions, and if you throw 23 million people off of health insurance, many of whom might have life-threatening illnesses, thousands of people will die.

Several weeks ago I was on a television program, and I said just that, and then right after that, I was criticized by Republicans and rightwing critics: Why did you say that? What a terrible thing. Why are you frightening the American people? "Some people will die"—that is not true.

Well, PolitiFact is a nonpartisan organization that checks out what public officials say, and they took a look at well over 10 different studies on the issue of mortality rates and lack of insurance coverage. That is what they

studied. They looked at more than 10 different studies looking at mortality rates and lack of healthcare coverage. What PolitiFact concluded is that the point that I made—that many thousands will die—is well supported. It is not BERNIE SANDERS. I am not coming up with some idea off the top of my head. This is what many, many medical and scientific studies have told us.

Obviously nobody can predict exactly how many people will die if 23 million people lose their health coverage, but what experts at the Harvard School of Public Health estimate is that if 23 million people are thrown off of health insurance, as the House bill does, up to 28,000 people could die each and every year—28,000 people. That is nine times more than the tragic loss of life we suffered on 9/11, and that would take place each and every year. In the wealthiest country in the history of the world, we must not allow that to happen.

This bill would impact the children, many of whom are covered by the CHIP program, covered by Medicaid. You tell me what happens to a kid who has a disability right now and whose family receives Medicaid. Some of those children may have Down syndrome. Some of those children may have cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, maybe autism. They may have mental health needs, such as depression or anxiety, or complications from premature birth. Today, Medicaid and CHIP cover 5 million—or 44 percent—of those kids, providing them with coverage so that they can live with dignity and security.

But it is not just the children who will be impacted, it is also the elderly. What every person in America should understand—and many do not—is that Medicaid now pays for over two-thirds of all nursing home care. So I ask my Republican friends: What happens when you slash Medicaid? Who will pay for somebody's mom or dad in a nursing home dealing with Alzheimer's disease? How many seniors in this nursing home will get thrown out on the street or be forced to live in their children's basement? Well, we don't know the answer to that. We haven't had any hearings. We haven't heard any people testify to that. But I think we will see a whole lot of families disrupted, having to make the choice about whether to take care of their parents or provide for their kid to go to college.

It is not just nursing home care. What happens if you are just an older worker. Maybe you are 60 years of age. Well, the likelihood is that if you are a 60-, 62-year-old worker, the cost of your premiums is going to soar. Again, this is not BERNIE SANDERS' view; it is what the AARP says.

This is a quote from the AARP from June 22:

This new Senate bill was crafted in secrecy behind closed doors without a single hearing or open debate—and it shows. The Senate bill would hit millions of Americans with

higher costs and result in less coverage for them.

AARP is adamantly opposed to the Age Tax, which will allow insurance companies to charge older Americans five times more for coverage than everyone else while reducing tax credits that help make insurance more affordable.

That is the AARP.

What about the opioid epidemic, which is hitting my State of Vermont hard and hitting States all over this country? Each and every day, more than 90 people in America die from an opioid overdose. Can you believe that? Ninety people die every single day. Nearly 4,000 people begin abusing prescription painkillers, and about 600 start using heroin. We have a major, major crisis in opioid addiction and heroin overdoses.

It turns out that if you cut Medicaid by \$800 billion, which is what the Republicans are talking about, our ability to address the opioid crisis will be severely curtailed. At a time when we should be expanding prevention efforts, expanding treatment efforts, the Republican bill will make it much harder for us to deal with the opioid crisis.

This legislation is not what the American people want. I understand that the Republican leader today suggested that Members of the Senate may have to stay here for a few more weeks in August, and I can understand that. If I were the Republican leader, I would not want my Senators to go home to hear what the American people have to say about this legislation.

The truth is, poll after poll shows overwhelming opposition to this disastrous legislation. According to the latest USA TODAY/Suffolk University Poll, just 12 percent of the American people support the Republican bill.

As a matter of fact, according to a recent report, this is the most unpopular piece of legislation in the last three decades. It is more unpopular than the \$700 billion bailout of Wall Street. That is pretty unpopular. The American people are catching on as to what is in this bill, and they do not want to see it.

Let me conclude by saying what is as obvious as can be. It is what the American people want. Are there problems with the Affordable Care Act? Absolutely. Premiums are too high, deductibles too high, copayments too high, prescription drug prices are off the charts.

Let's deal with it. What is the problem? Let's deal with it. Put it on the table, and let us address those problems. The American people want to improve the Affordable Care Act, not destroy it.

Let me now, speaking for myself only, say this. I hope very much there can be bipartisan efforts to improve the Affordable Care Act, but I happen to believe we have to go further than that. I intend to help lead that effort.

In my view, there is something profoundly wrong when the United States

of America is the only major country on Earth—the only one—that doesn't guarantee healthcare to all people as a right, while at the same time we spend far more per capita on healthcare. We spend far more per capita on prescription drugs, and our healthcare outcomes are not particularly good compared to many other countries.

I think the time is long overdue as to why we do not ask ourselves: How is it Canada can guarantee healthcare to all people, the UK can do it, Germany can do it, France can do, Scandinavia can do it? Every major country on Earth recognizes that healthcare must be a right, not a privilege.

I happen to agree with that. That is why I will—as soon as this debate is over and as soon as, hopefully, we defeat this disastrous Republican legislation—introduce a Medicare-for-all, single-payer bill, which will in fact guarantee healthcare to all of our people in a cost-effective way.

Let me conclude by saying that the current Republican bill in front of us is a moral outrage. There are very few people in America who think you should throw 22 million of our people off of health insurance in order to give huge tax breaks to billionaires. This is a moral outrage, and it must be defeated. I will do everything in my power to see that it is defeated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, like many of our colleagues during the Fourth of July break, I spent much of my time crisscrossing the State of Maryland. On the Fourth of July, I attended many parades. The very first parade of that day was in a part of Maryland outside of Baltimore City, called Dundalk, MD, where Donald Trump had done very well in the past election.

What I found during that parade was a lot of people there who were still supportive of President Trump but not one person at that parade who was in favor of TrumpCare or the Senate Republican so-called healthcare bill—not one.

I was listening to the Senator from Vermont about the most recent polling. The polling I had seen previously had shown 17 percent of the American people in favor of this, which was very low. I am not surprised to hear it is even lower now at 12 percent because my own personal experience in these places in Maryland that had been supportive of Donald Trump, and in many ways still are, were that they were not in favor of this healthcare bill. In many ways, they had felt betrayed by it.

After all, during the last campaign, Donald Trump said he wasn't going to cut Medicaid, and yet the bill before us has dramatic cuts to Medicaid. In fact, the Senate bill has even deeper cuts to

Medicaid over time than the House bill.

We all remember the House bill. President Trump had a great celebration in the Rose Garden in public, but behind closed doors he called it mean. Yet the Senate bill, when it comes to Medicaid cuts, will make them even deeper over a period of time, according to the report issued by the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, just as we all left town for the Fourth of July break.

It was an interesting experience to hear people, on the one hand, saying let's find ways to work together on many of the challenges we have in this country—and we should find ways to work together—but are strongly opposed to the healthcare bill that is before the Senate right now. The reason is, they are paying attention. They are concluding about this bill the same thing that the AMA, the American Medical Association, has concluded. In opposing this bill, America's doctors say it violates the No. 1 principle of medicine, which is: First, do no harm. That is the Hippocratic Oath. This Senate so-called healthcare violates that very simple proposition. At the very least, we want a healthcare system that doesn't do greater harm than what would otherwise be flawless. Yet we know, from this legislation, in looking at it, that it does do great harm to our healthcare system in the United States of America.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has looked at it and concluded that if you pass this legislation, 22 million fewer Americans will have access to affordable care than if you don't pass the bill. So it does harm compared to where we are today.

It is absolutely true that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. In fact, the healthcare exchanges specifically can be improved. We need more choices. We need more competition there. Make no mistake, the Senate Republican bill and the bill that passed the House don't improve the Affordable Care Act. They destroy those parts of it that are working and have been of great benefit to tens of millions of Americans.

The Congressional Budget Office also tells us that premiums will go up next year. The Congressional Budget Office also tells us that if you are a senior between the ages of 50 and 64, you are in for a walloping increase in your premiums, which of course is what the AARP calls the age tax and why they are on the warpath against this legislation—because it will be greatly damaging to those seniors who are in the individual market who are now going to have to pay huge increases in premiums. Those have been documented by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

I would remind my colleagues that the head of the Congressional Budget

Office was someone selected by the Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee and the Republican chairman of the House Budget Committee, and the CBO is our referee in this place.

If we all could make up our own facts, which in many cases the debates go in those directions anyway, it would be an even more unruly place. At least we have the CBO to provide that analysis. It is not just the CBO. This is masquerading as a healthcare bill.

I ask the question of my colleagues, Why is it that every single patient advocacy group that has weighed in on this bill has weighed in against this bill? These are not Democratic organizations or Republican organizations: the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Diabetes Association, the National Association on Mental Illness, National Breast Cancer Coalition, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, the Alzheimer's Association. These are our constituents.

They don't wake up every morning thinking about a Democratic plan or Republican plan or Independent plan. These are organizations dedicated to patient health. They are all against a bill that is parading as a healthcare bill.

How can that be the case, that every single advocacy group that has weighed in on this bill that has a healthcare mandate and is nonpartisan is against it?

I ask my Republican colleagues to go back to the drawing board. This is not a healthcare bill, not when every single patient advocacy group weighed in against it, not when nonpartisan analysis tells us that 22 million people will lose out, not when the American Medical Association says it violates this simple principle of, first, do not harm.

It is not just the doctors. It is the nurses. It is the hospitals. It is the National Rural Health Association. I spent a good amount of time in rural Maryland over the Fourth of July break. Rural hospitals are terrified of the consequences of this legislation, not just because of the harm that will befall their patients because their patients will be denied access to affordable care—but when they no longer have patients who are covered by insurance who come through their doors and there is an emergency so they provide that care anyway, then the hospital all of a sudden is not getting paid for the care it provides. They are deathly afraid they are going to have to scale back their operations and lay off people in a lot of these rural hospitals.

I really hope and believe this is a moment where the Senate can look at this situation and decide let's not go down this road because the American people are asking themselves why are we doing this. It is one of those cases

where I think people sort of lost track of why, other than the fact that, as many have said today, there had been this call to get rid of ObamaCare, to get rid of the Affordable Care Act but never a lot of thought as to what was going to replace it.

Now what we are learning is the proposals that would supposedly replace it will do harm. They will do a lot more harm than the place we are at today. Rather than do harm and hurt tens of millions of Americans, let's find a way to improve the current system. There are practical ideas for how we can improve the healthcare exchanges, the marketplaces within the Affordable Care Act. Many of us have put forward ideas, and I would be more than happy to explore with our colleagues ways we can improve upon those exchanges without doing harm.

When you look at this legislation and you realize it is not about healthcare, you have to ask yourself: What is it about other than simply saying we are going to fulfill this pledge of getting rid of the Affordable Care Act? At its core, there are two pillars to this bill. They are rotten pillars, but that is what they are. One is these very dramatic cuts to Medicaid, very dramatic. As I said, the Senate cuts even deeper over a longer period of time than the House bill. In the Senate bill, that cut is around \$770 billion, and then there are also cuts to tax credits that help more Americans afford healthcare. So if you cut Medicaid, you get rid of tax credits that make healthcare more affordable. On the other side of the ledger is this whopping tax cut—whopping tax cut that goes to some very powerful special interests and some very wealthy individuals. Many of us heard Warren Buffett a couple of weeks ago on TV saying: I don't need a \$670,000-a-year tax cut as part of a bill that is going to put the health of my fellow Americans at risk.

I think a lot of people are asking the question: If this is a healthcare bill, why is the core of it this huge cut to Medicaid and a huge tax break for the wealthiest Americans? And by the way, if you make \$1 million a year, you get a \$57,000-a-year, on average, tax break in this so-called healthcare bill.

So let's put aside a bill that is rotten to its core. I heard a lot of talk about trying to fix this. I would just warn my colleagues to make sure our constituents know that cosmetic changes aren't going to fix this. You can't put a little deodorant on this and make it come out smelling great. It is just not going to happen. But if people are genuinely interested in finding ways to improve the exchanges, I am all in. We certainly should work together to reduce the cost of prescription drugs, and there are lots of proposals out there to do it. The President at one time even talked about making that a priority, but that seems to have fallen away. We

all know there are ways we can smartly save money in our healthcare system by continuing to move away from a system that is based simply on the quantity of care and the volume of care and move toward one that rewards the value and quality of care. Let's do that.

The final thing I want to point out is that I was in Southern Maryland over the break, down in a place called St. Mary's County. I visited one of the substance abuse treatment centers called Beacon of Hope Recovery Center. These are people of great faith coming together to help people who are victims of the opioid epidemic, which has had a devastating impact on Maryland, as it has on so much of the rest of the country. We talked about some of the former patients who were there, people who are now actually part of the operation to help save the lives of other people who are racked with addiction. We met with these dedicated staff members, former patients, and with local law enforcement all around a table, recognizing that if we are really going to conquer the opioid epidemic, we need to provide treatment services. This recovery center was pleading with all of us—with me, asking me to plead with all of our colleagues to not cut Medicaid because they are going to be relying on continuing Medicaid funding in order to provide those treatment services.

I think people around the country are just beginning to learn that Medicaid has been helpful and will become even more helpful in the fight against the opioid epidemic; that it is helping our kids with disabilities and special education in our schools; that it helps low-income working families who may work for an employer who doesn't provide health insurance and who still pays so low that they are at an income level where they qualify for Medicaid. People are also learning that most of the money spent in Medicaid goes to individuals in nursing homes and people with long-term disabilities, people who need long-term care. That is where most of the money goes. And 2 out of 3 dollars spent on nursing home care in the United States are Medicaid dollars.

So we are all in this together. Those deep cuts to Medicaid are going to have a devastating impact, as will the other

changes that are going to make health insurance premiums go up for so many people, especially for seniors. And the provisions are going to harm those with preexisting conditions in various ways.

I will end with one of many stories that I have gotten, personal testimonies I received from constituents throughout the State of Maryland.

This one is from Sarah from Arnold, MD, who says:

Without the Affordable Care Act, my family would not have affordable, reliable health insurance. When my 3-year-old was 2 months old, he had emergency brain surgery for a benign cyst. Because of this, and even though he does not have any lingering effects or medical needs as a result of this surgery, we were denied coverage for him before the ACA.

That, of course, is because before the ACA, people could be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. At the age of 2 months, he had the cyst. He was forever marked as someone with a preexisting condition and therefore could not get affordable coverage.

They wrote:

We were denied coverage before the ACA. In 2014, my husband opened up his own family law practice. Because of this decision, we were on our own for health insurance.

So they bought into the exchange.

And we are now in our second year of excellent coverage thanks to the Affordable Care Act. Having a fixed monthly payment with the options and privileges equal to those who work for big companies has been immensely helpful. The Affordable Care Act has worked for me and my family.

Mr. President, my point is not that the Affordable Care Act is perfect. There are improvements that can be made. We should work together to make improvements, but let's not do something that violates what the doctors call the Hippocratic Oath. Let's not do something that does more harm in our system. Let's not do something that will result in 22 million fewer of our fellow Americans having access. Let's do something good together that actually builds on what we have, fixes what is broken, because we can make improvements in the Affordable Care Act, not by doing a U-turn and going backward but by looking forward.

Mr. President, I really hope that we will do that together.

Thank you.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:22 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 12, 2017, at 12 noon.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2004, VICE JEREMY C. STEIN, RESIGNED.

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN FOR SUPERVISION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RONALD L. BATORY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION, VICE SARAH ELIZABETH FEINBERG.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SUSAN COMBS, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE RHEA S. SUH, RESIGNED.

### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PAUL DABBAR, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE FRANKLIN M. ORR, JR.

MARK WESLEY MENEZES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF ENERGY, VICE KRISTINA M. JOHNSON, RESIGNED.

### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DENNIS SHEA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (GENEVA OFFICE), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE MICHAEL W. PUNKE.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARY KIRTLLEY WATERS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS), VICE JULIA FRIFIELD.

LEWIS M. EISENBERG, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SAN MARINO.

### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROBERT P. KADLEC, OF NEW YORK, TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, AND TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE NICOLE LURIE.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STEPHEN B. KING, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CZECH REPUBLIC.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 11, 2017

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COMER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 11, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES COMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### HONORING FRANKLIN HOBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Franklin Hobson for 60 years of service in the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department in Yadkin County.

Franklin was a young man of 21 when he became a charter member of the fire department in 1957. Since that time, he has been a dedicated leader in both the department and his community, including service as the Yadkin County fire marshal. Still active in the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department today, he will celebrate his 82nd birthday on September 27.

It is volunteers like Franklin Hobson who help our Nation thrive. Through the generous example he has set, Franklin inspires others to think about ways they can give to their local community.

I thank Franklin for all of the good that he does for his community and for being a great example for all of us.

RECOGNIZING FALL CREEK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 60th anniversary of

the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department in Yadkin County.

The first meeting of these dedicated citizens was held on June 13, 1957, at Fall Creek Elementary School as 12 local men worked to establish the fire department. Its charter calls for 60 members, and its membership ranks have remained nearly full for 60 years. A pillar of the community, members have been awarded North Carolina's Order of the Long Leaf Pine on three occasions.

Helping others is one of the most honorable activities anyone can engage in, and this kind of selfless dedication to one's community is critical to the well-being of our country.

I thank the members of the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department for the selflessness and bravery they demonstrate as firefighters. America needs more courageous individuals like them to give of their time and talents to keep our communities safe.

### FUNDING THE ENEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today I have the front page cover of Douglas Wissing's book, "Funding the Enemy: How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban." A few years ago, I had the pleasure of meeting with Douglas in my office here in D.C. to discuss his book.

One of the analyses of this book by the Publishers Weekly said: "'Funding the Enemy' is sober, sad, and important . . . it peels back the layers of American engagement in Afghanistan to reveal its rotten core: that United States dollars meant for that country's future instead fund the insurgency and support the Taliban. Paying for both sides of the war ensures America's ultimate defeat, and Wissing's book tells the story."

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of this book as we recently heard President Trump talk about how he would allow General Mattis to recommend troop level increases in Afghanistan. I am disappointed for many reasons. I am disappointed because Congress deserves a debate and a vote, and I am disappointed because we continue to lose American lives.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the administration of comments that President Trump made a few years ago regarding Afghanistan:

First, in August of 2011, he said that the United States was wasting lives and money in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In 2012, President Trump referred to Afghanistan as a "complete waste" and also declared it was "time to come home."

Then again the next year, he made many comments on the Twitter feed, first saying: "Do not allow our very stupid leaders to sign a deal that keeps us in Afghanistan through 2024—with all costs by USA."

He further tweeted: "Let's get out of Afghanistan. Our troops are being killed by the Afghanis we train and we waste billions there. Nonsense. Rebuild the USA."

That is what President Trump said, and I agree with President Trump.

Returning to the book, "Funding the Enemy" shows: "With the vague intention of winning hearts and minds in Afghanistan, the U.S. Government has mismanaged billions of development and logistics dollars, bolstered the drug trade, and dumped untold millions into Taliban hands."

President Trump and Douglas Wissing clearly agree. Afghanistan is a failed policy.

Mr. Speaker, that is why Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI and I have introduced H.R. 1666, asking for a debate on Afghanistan and a new AUMF. You can vote against the bill, but the discussion is still needed. We are joined by at least 13 of our colleagues in support, and I hope more Members in both parties will join us. All we are asking for is a debate.

Mr. Speaker, the week before the Fourth of July, I handed a letter to Speaker RYAN asking for a debate, which I include in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: First, let me commend you on your words regarding the need for Congress to find increased civility following the tragic shooting in Alexandria. Your words were very prophetic at this time in history.

Sir, respectfully, your recent response to my Afghanistan letter was very disappointing. At the time of my writing this, President Trump has decided to give troop level increase authority over to James Mattis. Now more than ever, it is time for a policy debate on the future in Afghanistan by the U.S. House of Representatives. The bill that I have introduced, H.R. 1666, would allow that debate.

Members of both parties are so frustrated by the 16 years we have spent in Afghanistan. Without further intervention by Congress, the loss of life and the waste of tax dollars in that country will continue. Sir, you have the authority as Speaker of the House to instruct the U.S. House committees to debate this conflict.

Let me close with a sentence from a recent email I received from the 31st Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Chuck Krulak: "[Afghanistan] is fragmented . . . tribal . . . controlled by war lords, economically a basket case, no real government outside of Kabul and that is questionable, a poorly organized and led Army (who will shoot at Americans as well as the 'enemy'), and no sense of what the country wants to be."

On behalf of all Americans who have died in Afghanistan, and the continued waste, fraud and abuse of money that persists, I respectfully ask how much longer will Congress do nothing? Please join in our effort to bring a debate to the House floor. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I said that if he doesn't read my letter, at least read the comments from the 31st Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, my friend and unofficial adviser, General Chuck Krulak. This is what I wanted PAUL RYAN to read, and I hope he did read it: "No one has ever conquered Afghanistan . . . and many have tried. We will join the list of nations that have tried and failed."

How prophetic is that, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue to go down this road and see this country spend and waste lives for absolutely nothing, known as Afghanistan?

#### GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, my staff and I finished our 34th townhall in the home of one of America's greatest citizens: my mentor and my hero, Bob Dole. At every location we go, most often, several people ask me about the \$20 trillion of deficit this country has and our debt, the \$600 billion of deficit we have every year. Americans work too hard and there are too many worthwhile functions of government for the Federal Government to irresponsibly spend taxpayer dollars.

From the time I started thinking about running for office, it has been a priority of mine to help create a fiscally responsible plan to reduce our annual deficits and national debt. Yet again, this year, 70 percent of our budget is mandatory spending—70 percent of our budget is mandatory spending—and therefore is spent before the annual appropriations discussions even begin. If we hope to eliminate the deficit, we must address mandatory spending programs and be willing to engage in tough conversations.

This administration and Congress have taken steps to limit bureaucracy

and rein in the size and scope of the Federal Government. In this spirit, we hope Congress stays true to this objective as we debate the upcoming budget in order to ensure that our limited taxpayer dollars are spent where they are most needed.

CLARK COUNTY, KANSAS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring my colleagues up to date on my last visit to Clark County, Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may remember that earlier this year wildfires consumed a vast sum of Clark County. The wildfires wrought havoc for many ranchers, farmers, families, and landowners in Clark County and across much of southwest Kansas, not to mention parts of Texas, Colorado, and Oklahoma. Besides the lives lost, including one in Kansas, thousands of livestock, 650,000 acres, and many family properties that had been passed down through generations burned in this disastrous blaze.

Through the perseverance of Kansans living in this region, a considerable amount of progress has been made since I visited right after the fires in March thanks to so many people throughout the country who donated hay as well as their personal services helping rebuild the hundreds of miles of fences that were burned down.

After visiting with the Giles family and the Grigsby family—both families impacted by the fires—their resilience, their strength, and their faith was made clear. These are the type of folks who are now working day in and day out to restore this section of the heartland.

I am delighted to see green rising in the pastures which was once scorched earth, burnt-to-the-ground grass. I am again reminded of the honor I have of working to represent some of the most hardworking Americans in the world: the Kansas agriculture, the Kansas farmers, and the Kansas ranchers.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the needs of the Nation, the world, and all of creation. Bless those who seek to honor You and serve each other and all Americans in this House through their public service. May the words and deeds of this place reflect an earnest desire for justice, and may men and women in government build on the tradition of equity and truth that represents the noblest heritage of our Nation.

These July days are busy, and the work to be done in the people's House is complicated—and very important. Bless all Members with a surfeit of energy, wisdom, patience, and firm resolve to do their best work for the benefit of all Americans.

May Your blessing, O God, be with us this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. NORTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### PRESIDENT TRUMP'S SUCCESSFUL G20 SUMMIT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump's success during his overseas trip to Poland and the G20 summit in Germany makes it clear that America is once again the clear leader of the free world.

In Poland, the President reaffirmed that Western nations will stand together against threats to our security and our way of life. His remarks focused on his strategy of peace through strength—increasing defense spending, confirming our commitment to NATO, and promoting American energy as an alternative to Russian sources in Eastern Europe.

During the G20, President Trump made it clear that, under his leadership, America remains committed to blocking the funding of terrorism and extremism, empowering women across



the world, affirming the right of nations to defend themselves, and pledging to end unfair trade. Additionally, working with other foreign leaders, he successfully negotiated a cease-fire in Syria.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Sadly, Canada has forgotten the 26 Canadians murdered on 9/11 by awarding millions of dollars to a confessed terrorist who killed U.S. Army Sergeant First Class Christopher Speer, putting American families and Canadian families at risk.

#### TRUMPCARE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, despite attempts at resuscitation, TrumpCare is close to impasse, charitably speaking. The Senate bill does so much harm to all concerned—to Americans who depend on Medicaid or Medicare or have a preexisting condition, and actually raises costs out of pocket with less coverage while kicking 22 million people, including 61,000 D.C. residents, off their healthcare plans altogether—that some may be tempted to cheer the coming demise of TrumpCare.

Defeat of TrumpCare may be better than repeal of the Affordable Care Act, but to leave it there is to show contempt for the American people.

Republicans argue that ObamaCare was flawed because it was the product of only one party. If so, Republicans should avoid the same mistake. The best way for Congress to spend the remaining weeks before recess is with Democrats and Republicans at the same table.

#### PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 392

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 392, a bill originally introduced by Representative Chaffetz of Utah, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### RECOGNIZING COLONEL JOE "SOLO" KUNKEL

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of

the United States Air Force, Colonel Joe "Solo" Kunkel. Solo has been selected for reassignment from Tyndall Air Force Base in the Second District of Florida, where he served as the vice commander of the 325th Fighter Wing.

He will continue his service at Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho as commander of the 366th Fighter Wing, the "Gunfighters."

Colonel Kunkel has been an exceptional leader at Tyndall, where he oversaw more than 4,000 people who train and support F-22 Raptor pilots and crews.

He has worked tirelessly to improve the lives of his officers, airmen, and their families. He improved mission performance, facilities, and family programs at Tyndall.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in extending congratulations and gratitude to Colonel Kunkel; his wife, Jenny; and their children, Madeline, Drew, Riley, and Brayden.

May God continue to bless our Nation with his kind of exemplary patriotism and service.

#### MAJORITY OF AMERICANS DO NOT TRUST THE MEDIA

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist poll found that a combined 68 percent of Americans said that they do not trust the media very much or not at all. The same poll also found that Americans trust President Trump more than the media.

It is no surprise that Americans do not trust the media. The media have stopped reporting and have started attacking. As The Federalist's David Harsanyi noted in a recent article, "News organizations have become obsessed with fighting the President rather than covering him."

A Harvard study recently found that 80 percent of the news coverage of President Trump in his first 100 days in office was negative, a new unfortunate record.

The media is so fixated on attacking the President that they rush to print unfounded stories using a single anonymous source.

Last month, three CNN employees resigned for their role in a botched Trump-Russia story. This debacle revealed the media's insatiable appetite to print any story—no matter how groundless—that is critical of the President.

The liberal media should stop fighting the President and start covering his Presidency in a fair and unbiased manner. Then they will regain the trust of the American people.

#### CONGRATULATING ERIN SMITH

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 17-year-old Erin Smith of Shawnee Mission West High School in Overland Park in my district at home in Kansas.

Erin recently won the International BioGENEius Challenge held in San Diego, California, earning \$7,500 for her research with the award from the Biotechnology Institute.

The International BioGENEius Challenge pushes high school students from across the world to find solutions to healthcare, sustainability, and environmental needs through biotechnology.

Erin's research and work focused on Parkinson's disease which affects about 7 to 10 million people worldwide and about 60,000 new patients in America each year. Erin coded a website that can record the facial expressions of subjects using special software which enabled her to discover early indicators of Parkinson's disease. She then built an algorithm that could be used as a diagnostic tool.

Mr. Speaker, Erin sounds like one of the world's foremost researchers, but she is only a rising senior at Shawnee Mission West. She is truly incredible.

I congratulate her and wish her the best in what is just the beginning of a long journey helping many people living with this dreaded disease.

#### HONORING VICE ADMIRAL DIEGO "DUKE" HERNANDEZ

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before the House today to recognize Vice Admiral Diego "Duke" Hernandez, a decorated war hero and patriot who passed away on Friday, July 7, at 83 years old.

Admiral Hernandez was born and raised in Puerto Rico, the son of two schoolteachers who became a three-star admiral and the highest ranking Hispanic officer in the United States Navy at the time. Throughout his distinguished 35-year career, he served as a commander to various naval forces earning the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Purple Heart. He exemplified the valor and commitment that his brothers in arms from Puerto Rico have demonstrated since the Great War.

On July 14, 1998, Admiral Hernandez testified before the Senate and highlighted Puerto Rican participation in our Nation's wars and the reality of their marginalization from the democracy they fought to defend and uphold.

He urged Congress to respond to the people of Puerto Rico so they can achieve political self-determination.

In his honor, I echo the same. Today, I ask the House to join me in expressing our profound gratitude to Admiral Hernandez and his contributions to the United States of America.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 11, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2017, at 10:00 a.m.:

Appointments:  
Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JULY 11, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 703(c) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (50 U.S.C.) 3161 note), I hereby appoint Mr. John F. Tierney of Massachusetts to the Public Interest Declassification Board.

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR) at 4 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### MEDICAL CONTROLLED SUB- STANCES TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1492) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1492

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. REGISTRATION FOR TRANSPORT OF CON- TROLLED SUBSTANCES TO STATES IN WHICH THE PRACTITIONER IS NOT REGISTERED UNDER THE CON- TROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADMINISTERING THE SUB- STANCES AT LOCATIONS OTHER THAN PRINCIPAL PLACES OF BUSINESS OR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.

Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(k) REGISTRATION FOR TRANSPORT OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES TO STATES IN WHICH THE PRACTITIONER IS NOT REGISTERED FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADMINISTERING THE SUBSTANCES AT LOCATIONS OTHER THAN PRINCIPAL PLACES OF BUSINESS OR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon application by a practitioner (other than a pharmacy) who is registered under subsection (f), the Attorney General shall issue a separate registration to the practitioner authorizing the practitioner—

"(A) to transport one or more controlled substances in schedule II, III, IV, or V from the practitioner's registered location in a State to one or more States in which the practitioner is not registered under subsection (f) for the purpose of the practitioner administering the substances at locations other than a principal place of business or professional practice; and

"(B) to so administer the substances.

"(2) REQUIREMENTS.—For a practitioner to be authorized to transport and administer controlled substances pursuant to a registration issued under paragraph (1), all of the following conditions must be satisfied:

"(A) The practitioner must be licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted by the State in which the controlled substances are administered to carry out such activity at the location where it occurs.

"(B) The practitioner must—

"(i) limit the time of transport and administering of any controlled substance pursuant to such registration to not more than 72 consecutive hours; and

"(ii) by the conclusion of such 72 hours, return any such controlled substance so transported but not administered to the registered location from which such substance was obtained.

"(C)(i) The practitioner must maintain records of the transporting and administering of any controlled substance pursuant to this subsection.

"(ii) Such records shall be maintained, in accordance with the requirements of section 307(b), at the practitioner's registered location from which the controlled substances were obtained and shall include—

"(I) the location where the controlled substance was administered; and

"(II) such other information as may be required by regulation of the Attorney General with respect to records for dispensers of controlled substances.

"(iii) Notwithstanding clause (ii), the exception in subsection 307(c)(1)(B) shall not apply to records required by this subparagraph.

"(3) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL OR REVOCATION.—The Attorney General may deny an application for registration under this subsection, or a renewal thereof, or revoke such registration, based on the criteria listed in section 304(a), except that the applicant shall not be required, as a condition of initially obtaining such registration, to present proof of State authorization to administer controlled substances.

"(4) AUTOMATIC TERMINATION.—A registration issued under this subsection shall automatically terminate if the practitioner no longer has an active registration under subsection (f) due to revocation, suspension, surrender, or other termination.

"(5) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'registered location' means, with respect to each registration issued to a practitioner under subsection (f), the address that appears on the certificate of registration."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), who is the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation.

I want to thank the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WALDEN from Hood River, Oregon, as well as the Health Subcommittee chairman, MICHAEL BURGESS from

Lewisville, Texas. I appreciate Dr. BURGESS for yielding me time on this bill that is mine, that I presented several years ago, Mr. Speaker, that we are finally getting a chance to support today.

I wish to express my full support for H.R. 1492, the Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017. This legislation represents commonsense reforms that will ensure certainty and regulatory clarity, while recognizing the needs of doctors, patients, and law enforcement alike. I hope Members on both sides recognize the need for not only this legislation, but will be in support.

Currently, physicians and other DEA-licensed medical practitioners are barred from transporting controlled substances from one practice setting to another. This is particularly strenuous on physicians who travel for their jobs. For example, team physicians at both the college and professional level have been particularly affected by the lack of clarity in the current law.

Physicians who travel with teams to away games carefully practiced transporting medicines—and they have done so for decades—in a manner that they believed to be in compliance with DEA regulations. Recently, however, there has been uncertainty surrounding this issue, as a number of teams have found themselves being challenged by the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Those physicians who had, for years, been in compliance, or felt like they were in compliance, were unable to provide players with proper medical care after many injuries while they were at an away game.

H.R. 1492 will allow physicians to obtain a separate mobile registration with the DEA for the ability to transport these very specific substances for medically relevant reasons directly related to the care of patients between practice settings. This registration allows for physician transport, up to 72 hours, while maintaining updated records of transport and the administration of these controlled substances. Such allowances would ensure that physicians whose practices are inherently dynamic have the necessary provisions to provide care to their patients regardless of the setting.

I would like to thank the Drug Enforcement Administration for working with me and my office for the last 5 years on this important issue. I would also like to thank Dr. Dan Cooper, who is the lead physician for the Dallas Cowboys. I would like to thank the gentleman who owns the Dallas Cowboys, Mr. Jerry Jones, for standing up on behalf of professional teams and their players to ensure that we work together for a commonsense answer. I want to thank the gentleman, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding me the time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1492, the Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017, authored by my good friend from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, Representative PETE SESSIONS.

Whether it is emergency medical service providers traveling to a disaster area to provide care or a team physician at an away game, certain medical practitioners often need to travel with and administer antiseizure or pain medications.

Although many of these are regulated under the Controlled Substances Act, current law does not specifically authorize the transportation or administration of such substances away from their registered location. Currently, the Controlled Substances Act does not specifically authorize the transportation and the administration of controlled substances away from the location registered with the Drug Enforcement Administration.

In order to ensure appropriate oversight of this practice, H.R. 1492 would establish a separate registration process for mobile practitioners who are already registered with the DEA and in good standing.

For a practitioner to transport and administer controlled substances pursuant to this new registration, he or she must be licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted by the State in which the substances are administered to carry out such activity at the location where it occurs.

In addition, the practitioner must limit the time of transport to not more than 72 consecutive hours and return any such substances not administered to their registered location from which they were obtained.

Further, the practitioner must maintain records of the transporting and administering, and DEA would maintain the authority to deny or revoke a registration.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2017.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN: I write with respect to H.R. 1492, the "Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 1492 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1492 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that

we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1492 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1492.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 1492, Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017. I appreciate your willingness to forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1492 at this time, the Judiciary Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that the Committee may address any remaining issues in its jurisdiction. I understand the Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and will support any such request.

I will include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during the Floor consideration of H.R. 1492.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,  
Chairman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1492, the Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act. This legislation will allow physicians, in agreement with the Drug Enforcement Agency, to transport and administer controlled substances to patients in another setting or disaster area.

Under current law, the Controlled Substances Act prohibits the transport and storage of controlled substances away from the site that is registered with the DEA. This makes it illegal for athletic team doctors to transport a small amount of critical medications that may be needed to treat athletes while on the road.

Athletics are awfully important in Texas, and I think it is by luck of the draw—specifically, football—that you have three Texans today who want to make sure that our teams can have their doctors treat them. For equal time for my colleague from Dallas, I am sure this law would also provide for the Houston Texans, not just for the Dallas Cowboys.

It also complicates care for patients in emergency disaster areas where a doctor may want to offer their services during a crisis.

This bill would allow a physician to transport controlled substances to another practice setting or to a Presidentially declared disaster area if the physician is registered to dispense controlled substances listed on schedules II, III, IV, or V, and they enter into a specific agreement with the DEA.

The agreement would require a physician to provide advance notification to the DEA of any transport, identify the controlled substances to be transported and the locations to and from, the intended dates of transport, and the anticipated travel time. The physician is also required to maintain records in their primary practice setting on the dispensing of transported substances, and the duration of the agreement is limited to 72 hours.

As the Nation grapples with the ongoing prescription drug abuse crisis, these safeguards are important to ensuring appropriate use, while allowing doctors to treat patients where they are.

I want to thank the sponsor, Representative PETE SESSIONS, and the committee for their work to advance this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1492, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to commend Chairman SESSIONS for working on this important legislation with the Energy and Commerce Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, and the Drug Enforcement Administration to ensure that we got it right. This is a good bill with appropriate safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1492, the "Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017."

This bill amends the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the CSA to administer these substances at locations other than principal places of professional practice.

H.R. 1492 provides necessary guidance to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to clarify the requirements of physicians whose jobs inherently require transporting controlled substances.

By requiring the registration of practitioners who transport and administer controlled substances across state lines, this bill also increases oversight to ensure physicians are appropriately administering controlled substances to their patients.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1492 addresses a crucial element in America's current opioid crisis regarding the mishandling of powerful prescrip-

tion drugs by licensed physicians which can result in problems with addiction or abuse for patients.

This issue is particularly relevant in the arena of sports medicine, where specialized physicians are often required to swiftly treat athlete injuries while on the road.

In high-pressure environments, physicians and trainers sometimes prioritize athletic performance over physical and mental health, a mentality which has been shown to leave the door open for long-term, potentially devastating consequences for the players.

Earlier this year, a group of more than 1,800 former professional football players filed a federal lawsuit against all 32 teams of the National Football League (NFL) for allowing teams to violate federal laws governing the transportation, distribution, and administration of prescription drugs.

The lawsuit revealed a slew of dangerous, illegal practices within the NFL and individual teams, including the excessive administration and use of powerful painkillers and anti-inflammatory drugs as well as the failure of league and team officials to acknowledge or comply with guidance from the DEA.

In 2012, for instance, the average NFL team prescribed nearly 5,777 doses of anti-inflammatory drugs and 2,213 doses of controlled medications to its players.

The staggering levels of opioid use in the NFL have led to a number of chronic health problems for many former players who continue to suffer from long-term organ and joint damage years or even decades after they have retired.

Even more troubling, a 2011 survey of 644 retired players found that 7 percent were still actively using opioid drugs in retirement—more than four times the rate of opioid use in the general population.

National sports leagues like the NFL are massive, multi-billion dollar industries that drive many local economies in the United States; last year, the average NFL team was worth \$2.3 billion and employed 3,739 people.

However, it is vital that we recognize the human cost of this highly profitable business.

With the immense economic and cultural value of America's sports teams and athletes in mind, the federal government should take all necessary measures to ensure that fans and players are able to enjoy their favorite past-times safely and fairly.

H.R. 1492 is a crucial step in improving the DEA's ability to protect prescription drug recipients who are vulnerable to misusing or abusing painkillers and other powerful medications.

Fixing our national opioid epidemic is a bipartisan cause, and I am confident that this legislation has the potential to effect powerful and positive change for large numbers of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1492.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1492.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTIDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 702) to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 702

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Section 102 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

"(4) accountability in the enforcement of Federal employee rights is furthered when Federal agencies take appropriate disciplinary action against Federal employees who have been found to have committed discriminatory or retaliatory acts;" and

(2) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(A) by striking "nor is accountability" and inserting "but accountability is not"; and

(B) by inserting "for what by law the agency is responsible" after "under this Act".

#### SEC. 3. NOTIFICATION OF VIOLATION.

Section 202 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) NOTIFICATION OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—

"(1) Not later than 30 days after a Federal agency takes final action or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issues an appellate decision involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation prohibited by a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), as applicable, the head of the agency subject to the finding shall provide notice for at least 1 year on the agency's Internet Web site in a clear and prominent location linked directly from the agency's Internet home page stating that a finding of discrimination or retaliation has been made.

"(2) The notification shall identify the date the finding was made, the date or dates on which the discriminatory or retaliatory act or acts occurred, and the law or laws violated by the discriminatory or retaliatory act or acts. The notification shall also advise Federal employees of the rights and protections available under the respective provisions of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a)."

#### SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ELECTRONIC FORMAT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(A) by inserting “Homeland Security and” before “Governmental Affairs”;

(B) by inserting “Oversight and” before “Government Reform”; and

(C) by inserting “(in an electronic format prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management)” after “an annual report”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1)(C) shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) TRANSITION PERIOD.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note), the report required under such section may be submitted in an electronic format, as prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the effective date in paragraph (2).

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—Section 203 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a Federal agency takes final action or a Federal agency receives an appellate decision issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation in violation of a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), as applicable, the employing Federal agency shall submit to the Commission a report stating whether disciplinary action has been initiated against a Federal employee as a result of the violation.”.

#### SEC. 5. DATA TO BE POSTED BY EMPLOYING FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 301(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for each such finding counted under subparagraph (A), the agency shall specify—

“(i) the date of the finding;

“(ii) the affected agency;

“(iii) the law violated; and

“(iv) whether a decision has been made regarding necessary disciplinary action as a result of the finding.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) Data regarding each class action complaint filed against the agency alleging discrimination or retaliation, including—

“(A) information regarding the date on which each complaint was filed;

“(B) a general summary of the allegations alleged in the complaint;

“(C) an estimate of the total number of plaintiffs joined in the complaint if known;

“(D) the current status of the complaint, including whether the class has been certified; and

“(E) the case numbers for the civil actions in which discrimination or retaliation has been found.”.

#### SEC. 6. DATA TO BE POSTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION.

Section 302(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Re-

taliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by striking “(10)” and inserting “(11)”.

#### SEC. 7. NOTIFICATION AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTIDISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding after section 206 the following:

##### “SEC. 207. COMPLAINT TRACKING.

“Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017, each Federal agency shall establish a system to track each complaint of discrimination arising under section 2302(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and adjudicated through the Equal Employment Opportunity process from inception to resolution of the complaint, including whether a decision has been made regarding necessary disciplinary action as the result of a finding of discrimination.”.

##### “SEC. 208. NOTATION IN PERSONNEL RECORD.

“If a Federal agency takes an adverse action covered under section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, against a Federal employee for an act of discrimination or retaliation prohibited by a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), the agency shall, after all appeals relating to such action have been exhausted, include a notation of the adverse action and the reason for the action in the employee’s personnel record.”.

(b) PROCESSING AND REFERRAL.—The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “TITLE IV—PROCESSING AND REFERRAL

##### “SEC. 401. PROCESSING AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINTS.

“Each Federal agency is responsible for the fair, impartial processing and resolution of complaints of employment discrimination and retaliation arising in the Federal administrative process and shall establish a model Equal Employment Opportunity Program that—

“(1) is not under the control, either structurally or practically, of a Human Capital or General Counsel office;

“(2) is devoid of internal conflicts of interest and ensures fairness and inclusiveness within the organization; and

“(3) ensures the efficient and fair resolution of complaints alleging discrimination or retaliation.”.

##### “SEC. 402. NO LIMITATION ON HUMAN CAPITAL OR GENERAL COUNSEL ADVICE.

“Nothing in this title shall prevent a Federal agency’s Human Capital or General Counsel office from providing advice or counsel to Federal agency personnel on the processing and resolution of a complaint, including providing legal representation to a Federal agency in any proceeding.”.

##### “SEC. 403. HEAD OF PROGRAM REPORTS TO HEAD OF AGENCY.

“The head of each Federal agency’s Equal Employment Opportunity Program shall report directly to the head of the agency.”.

##### “SEC. 404. REFERRALS OF FINDINGS OF DISCRIMINATION.

“(a) EEOC FINDINGS OF DISCRIMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issues an appellate decision involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation within a Federal agency, the Commission shall refer the matter to the Office of Special Counsel.

“(b) REFERRALS TO SPECIAL COUNSEL.—The Office of Special Counsel shall accept and review a referral from the Commission under subsection (a) for purposes of seeking disciplinary action under its authority against a Federal employee who commits an act of discrimination or retaliation.”.

“(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Office of Special Counsel shall notify the Commission in a case in which the Office of Special Counsel initiates disciplinary action.”.

“(d) SPECIAL COUNSEL APPROVAL.—A Federal agency may not take disciplinary action against a Federal employee for an alleged act of discrimination or retaliation referred by the Commission under this section except in accordance with the requirements of section 1214(f) of title 5, United States Code.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 206 the following:

“Sec. 207. Complaint tracking.

“Sec. 208. Notation in personnel record.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

##### “TITLE IV—PROCESSING AND REFERRAL

“Sec. 401. Processing and resolution of complaints.

“Sec. 402. No limitation on Human Capital or General Counsel advice.

“Sec. 403. Head of Program reports to head of agency.

“Sec. 404. Referrals of findings of discrimination.”.

#### SEC. 8. NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT LIMITATION.

Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13)—

(A) by inserting “or the Office of Special Counsel” after “Inspector General”;

(B) by striking “implement” and inserting “(A) implement”; and

(C) by striking the period that follows the quoted material and inserting “; or”; and

(2) by adding after subparagraph (A), as added by paragraph (1)(B), and preceding the flush left matter that follows paragraph (13), the following:

“(B) implement or enforce any nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement, if such policy, form, or agreement prohibits or restricts an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or an Office of the Inspector General any information that relates to any violation of any law, rule, or regulation, or mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial, and specific danger to public health or safety, or any other whistleblower protection.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Anti-discrimination Act of 2017, introduced by my colleague on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the ranking member, ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

I should note that Mr. CUMMINGS is unable to be with us here today for this important bill. He is recuperating from surgery, and we wish him a speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 702 amends the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, or the NO FEAR Act, to better identify and correct issues of discrimination throughout the Federal Government. Ranking Member CUMMINGS introduced H.R. 702 in response to problems identified in the Baltimore office of the Social Security Administration.

The bill requires Federal agencies to establish a system to track Equal Employment Opportunity complaints from beginning to end. This system must also track any disciplinary action that resulted from a finding of a discriminatory act.

□ 1615

The bill also requires both the disciplinary action and the reason for the action to be included in the employee's personnel record.

Mr. Speaker, this bill implements notification and reporting requirements for instances of discrimination within Federal agencies. Agencies must provide a notice on an internal website if the agency or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission finds that a discriminatory or retaliatory act has occurred.

The bill requires agencies to submit a report to the EEOC if such an act has occurred. The report must include any disciplinary action initiated against an employee for discrimination or retaliation against another employee.

Lastly, the bill bars agencies from using nondisclosure agreements to restrict Federal employees from reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, and Inspector General.

I thank Mr. CUMMINGS for his work on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017, as amended.

I also thank my good friend, Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, for his work on this measure and for his leadership and passion of our committee's ongoing efforts to ensure that Federal equal opportunity programs truly guarantee equal opportunity.

Most agencies are careful to ensure that their personnel policies protect employees' rights and that their EEO programs ensure that if discrimination does occur, employees can seek fair and timely redress.

Unfortunately, there have been instances in which agencies fail to meet the standards of a model EEO program. When that occurs, hardworking Federal employees are harmed.

For example, during the last Congress, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform conducted a number of hearings to examine how allegations of harassment and retaliation were handled at the National Park Service and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, including the Forest Service.

In the case of the Park Service, a former superintendent of the Grand Canyon, one of our premier parks, received a report in 2013 documenting multiple allegations of sexual harassment. But rather than determining whether further investigation was warranted or disciplinary action should be pursued, the superintendent attempted to bury the report.

A year later, more than a dozen current and former employees sent their allegations directly to the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary referred those allegations to the Inspector General. After an extensive investigation, the IG found "a long-term pattern of sexual harassment and a hostile work environment" at the Grand Canyon River District.

The Inspector General's Office also identified more than 20 other individuals who "reported experiencing or witnessing sexual harassment and hostile work environments," and the IG confirmed that previous reports of sexual harassment "were not properly investigated or reported."

As disturbing as these findings are, the Inspector General has also found instances of sexual harassment and retaliation at other parks, including iconic places like Yellowstone National Park and the Canaveral National Seashore.

While the Park Service has announced measures to address the serious shortcomings in its EEO programs, it is clear that deficiencies in these programs are longstanding and have hurt numerous employees.

Similar chronic problems have occurred at the Department of Agriculture. The EEO program there has now been the subject of two extraordinary letters sent by the Office of Special Counsel to the President of the United States.

In May 2015, the Special Counsel wrote to warn the President that USDA's civil rights program "has been seriously mismanaged, thereby compromising the civil rights of USDA employees."

Just last month, the Office of Special Counsel wrote again to the President,

finding that "while the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights has taken positive steps to improve its performance, based on the significant number of cases that are still subject to delays, OSC has determined that the agency response is unreasonable in part. USDA may need to devote more resources to the Office to ensure that cases are promptly processed and hold senior supervisors accountable for the mismanagement in this office."

Such findings are not to be tolerated, and they highlight why this bill, H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Anti-discrimination Act, is urgently needed.

This measure would require that the head of an agency's EEO program report directly to the head of the agency himself or herself. The measure would also require that an agency's EEO program be operated independently of its human resources or general counsel offices, ensuring that the EEO program is focused solely on protecting the civil rights of all employees and applicants.

H.R. 702 would strengthen the accountability mechanisms central to the effectiveness of the EEO process. For example, the bill would expand the notifications that agencies are required to provide when discrimination is indeed found to have occurred, and it would require agencies to track and report whether such findings resulted in any disciplinary action.

The bill would also prohibit agencies from attempting to gag employees by banning policies, forms, or agreements that seek to prohibit or restrict an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or an Office of the Inspector General any information that might relate to a violation of any law, rule, regulation, or waste, fraud, or abuse.

H.R. 702 is essentially identical to the bill we considered in the last Congress, which passed the House by a vote of 403-0. I urge Members to support the measure again.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I join with Ranking Member CUMMINGS in urging the Senate to move on this measure as expeditiously as possible, without the addition of extraneous and harmful amendments that might seek to curtail due process rights of Federal employees.

Any employee who engages in discriminatory or retaliatory behavior or who harasses another employee must be held accountable. The American public expects no less. Current personnel policies and practices are adequate to ensure that this can occur, and there is no need for any amendment to this bill that would undermine or weaken employees' due process rights.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS recently. He is doing great. He is full of fight and can't wait to get back here to Congress. We expect to see him shortly.



Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I wish Mr. CUMMINGS a speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017, as amended.

I thank all of the bill's co-sponsors, including Representatives NORTON, SENSENBRENNER and JACKSON LEE, for working with me on this measure and for their commitment to strengthening federal Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs.

I also thank Tanya Ward Jordan, Paulette Taylor, and all the members of the Coalition 4 Change (C4C) for their years of work on this measure and their perseverance.

H.R. 702 is essentially identical to H.R. 1557, which was considered in the last Congress. That legislation passed the House by a vote of 403–0. However, the bill did not pass the Senate before the end of the 114th Congress. I am hopeful that this year, we can finally get this measure over the finish line and to the President's desk for signature.

I authored H.R. 702 to make long-overdue reforms of federal EEO programs to ensure that they are better able to protect the rights of federal employees and applicants for federal employment.

Federal EEO programs exist to uphold the guarantee of equal opportunity that is the right of every citizen in this nation and to ensure that any barriers impeding fairness in personnel decisions are identified and eliminated.

While the vast majority of federal workplaces comply with current EEO requirements, some federal agencies still have not met the standards of a model EEO program set forth by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

For example, in 2014, the EEOC issued a report on the Social Security Administration (SSA) that made 12 findings regarding SSA's failure to maintain a model EEOC program, ensure efficient management of the complaint process, provide uniform training to ensure equal opportunities, and implement effective and efficient anti-harassment policies and procedures.

The EEOC made more than 60 recommendations for reform of that one program alone.

Last year, bi-partisan investigations conducted by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service found significant deficiencies in both agencies' EEO programs.

At both agencies, employees suffered when their complaints of discrimination were not handled in a fair and timely manner. Employees were also harmed by agencies' failure to safeguard complainants' personal information.

To help end these failings, my bill would require that EEO programs operate independently of an agency's human resources or general counsel offices—and that the head of the program reports directly to the head of an agency. This would ensure that effective implementation of the EEO program is prioritized

at the highest level of an agency—and that it operates with the sole purpose of ensuring equal opportunity for all employees.

H.R. 702 would also strengthen the accountability mechanisms that are central to the effectiveness of the EEO process.

Further, H.R. 702 would make clear that agencies cannot impose any nondisclosure agreement on federal employees to prohibit employees from disclosing fraud or illegal actions to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel (OSC), or an Inspector General.

According to the 2014 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, only 60 percent of federal employees agreed that they could, quote, “disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.”

The Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act would help ensure that federal employees can report discrimination without suffering retaliation—and that such reports will be thoroughly and fairly investigated and adjudicated in a timely manner.

Finally, as I close, I want to address some of the issues that arose during consideration of this measure in the Senate Homeland Security Committee last year.

I want to be crystal clear that I believe that supervisors who engage in discriminatory or retaliatory action must be held accountable.

However, this can be accomplished without curtailing any existing due process rights for federal employees and I will continue to oppose all efforts to roll back any due process right.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 702, and I hope that in this Congress, we can finally enact this measure into law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 702, the “Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017.”

I support this legislation because it ensures agencies effectively implement their Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs and that federal employees are never prevented from disclosing discriminatory or wasteful actions to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or Inspectors General.

Let me express my thanks to Ranking Member CUMMINGS for introducing this critical legislation that is essential to ensuring that our federal workplaces are free from discrimination, and that any barriers impeding fairness in personnel decisions are identified and eliminated.

This is not the first time we have addressed and offered legislation regarding workplace equality.

In 2002, the “No Fear Act” was first introduced in Congress and set the precedent for imposing additional duties upon Federal agency employers that are intended to reinvigorate their longstanding obligation to provide a work environment free of discrimination and retaliation.

On October 2, 2000, the House Science Committee held a hearing entitled “Intolerance at EPA—Harming People, Harming Science?”

Dr. Marsha Coleman-Adebayo, an EPA whistleblower, won a 600,000 dollar jury decision against EPA for race and sex discrimination under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

During that hearing, then-chairman of the Science Committee Congressman SENSENBRENNER illuminated the dangerous precedent

set by the EPA, stating, “While EPA has a clear policy on dealing with employees that discriminate, harass and retaliate against other EPA employees, no one apparently involved in the Coleman-Adebayo or Nolan cases have yet to be disciplined by EPA.”

Mr. Speaker, no employee should fear voicing their concerns in reference to a safer more work conducive environment.

According to the 2014 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, only 60 percent of federal employees agreed that they could quote, “disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.”

We must do better and ensure employees have confidence that they can report an act of discrimination without suffering retaliation.

Employees need to know that EEO reports will be thoroughly, fairly, and timely investigated and adjudicated.

H.R. 702 would require that EEO programs operate independently of an agency's human resources or general counsel offices.

This bill requires the head of the program report directly to the head of an agency and the act would prohibit the use of non-disclosure agreements that restrict an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or instance of waste, fraud or abuse.

We often look at individuals or groups who step forward as whistleblowers.

This term has been used with a negative connotation to describe insubordinate employees, but history has shown us that whistleblowers are often heroes that have shed light on employers' illegal practices and as a result made the workplace better for future employees.

Mark Felt, the FBI agent known as deep throat during the Watergate Scandal of the 1970s.

Frank Serpico, New York police officer who confronted his department for the rampant corruption the leadership let take place.

Jeffrey Wigand, a tobacco executive who admitted that tobacco companies knew they were putting addictive chemicals into their cigarettes.

And Sherron Watkins, an executive of the Enron corporation who was vital in exposing the financial lies and frauds of the company.

All these individuals stood up against well-established corporations and agencies even when others doubted their claims.

We must protect these types of acts in Federal offices and successfully implement the Equal Employment Opportunity Programs (EEO).

Mr. Speaker, in a sense every Member of Congress is a whistleblower for the people in that uncovering and correcting problems in the agencies that administer the laws is an essential part of our oversight responsibilities.

As a senior member of the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary, and as Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I understand the importance of safe and discrimination free workplaces.

By strengthening existing requirements to ensure federal EEO programs meet high standards, we are implementing the best practices available to combat workplace discrimination.



It is our duty as Members of Congress to be whistleblowers, bring attention to this pressing matter, and put a stop to injustices occurring in the workforce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 702, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MERLE HAGGARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1988) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1988

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. MERLE HAGGARD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, shall be known and designated as the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1988, which designates a post office in Bakersfield, California, as the Merle Haggard Post Office Building.

Merle Haggard once sang about being a "branded man out in the cold" because, having served time in prison, "no matter where I travel, the black mark follows me, I'm branded with a number on my name." He lamented

that: "If I live to be a hundred, guess I'll never clear my name."

Well, Merle didn't quite make it to 100, but it is safe to say that the people of Bakersfield will appreciate seeing the post office bear the name of Merle Haggard. Merle can hold his head up and be proud of who he was.

Now this will be a time for celebration, but remember: "We don't smoke marijuana in Muskogee; we don't take no trips on LSD." So in honor of the Okie from Muskogee, illicit substances will be prohibited at the Haggard Post Office. It will be okay to just stay there and drink, but keep in mind that tonight could be the night the bottle let's you down.

We would also appreciate if people refrain from burning draft cards on Main Street, and please don't let your "hair grow long and shaggy" at the Merle Haggard Post Office. Waving Old Glory down at the courthouse will, of course, be encouraged.

Now, Merle didn't always make it easy for people, particularly his mother. His mother did everything she could to raise him right, but Merle didn't listen. So, like others, he turned 21 in prison, doing life without parole, and that left only Merle to blame because "Mama tried, Mama tried."

Merle appreciated all our fighting men and women who fought and died to keep America free. Merle was right to ask if we can really count on being free if we have to depend on "some squirrely guy who claims he just" doesn't believe in fighting.

Merle was a patriot who loved this country. If you don't love it, then just leave it. But be warned: "When you are running down my country hoss, you are walking on the fighting side of me. . . ."

May God bless Merle Haggard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that was a hard act to follow. I was transported to the 1960s. I was always a fan of Merle Haggard, but not necessarily his political philosophy. I don't believe the proposition that if you disagree with the policies of your government, you have to leave the country. I actually believe the beauty of America is that you get to disagree, you get to respectfully dissent, and you still get to live here as a full-fledged American.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of this bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service in Bakersfield, California, as the Merle Haggard Post Office Building.

Merle was born in Bakersfield in 1937, and, as my friend from Florida said, took a circuitous route to becoming "the poet of the common man," as he was known.

As a teenager, he often found himself in reform school after committing petty crimes. By the age of 20, he was serving time, as Mr. DESANTIS said, in a California prison. It was that experience, however, that helped him turn his life around.

In prison, Merle Haggard rediscovered his love of music, and later put his talent to work on the Bakersfield club circuit. By singing about poverty, the struggles of the ordinary man and woman, and how music saved him during dark times, he captured the imagination and the attention of the entire country, and had 38 number one country hits.

In 1994, Merle was inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame. In 2010, he received a Kennedy Center Honors from President Barack Obama. After a long and fulfilling life, Merle died on his 79th birthday in April of last year.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize the incredible accomplishments to our culture that Merle Haggard represents to celebrate his country music and his ability to give a voice to working men and women everywhere who keep their "nose on the grindstone" and "work hard every day."

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1988, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am from California, but I happen to be from Bakersfield, California. I thank the gentleman for his creative use of the lyrics. Merle would be proud.

Mr. Speaker, when you take a look back at American history, you can see figures standing tall who spoke for the everyday working man. Following the long tradition of Whitman and Twain, Merle Haggard was a man who knew America instinctively because he lived an American life. It wasn't a life of the movies, but it was all the more compelling because it was all the more real. That is the reason they called him "The Poet of the Common Man."

Merle Haggard didn't have it easy. At the height of the Depression, his family searched for opportunity out West. Merle grew up with little means and lived with a past of mistakes and regrets.

So he sang. He sang in "Branded Man" of the stigma of prison, crooning "I held my head up high, determined I would rise above the shame."

He sang in "Working Man Blues" of the grind of doing his duty to his family, "working as long as my two hands are fit to use."

And he sang of his roots, not of power or wealth or status, but of pride in

being “an Okie from Muskogee,” a place of leather boots, football, and Old Glory.

He found success and, more importantly, redemption in the music he shared with his country.

Now, the Bakersfield Sound changed country music, and it is a testament to Merle Haggard’s talent that when you listen to his hits, from “Branded Man” to “Mama Tried,” to “Big City,” to “Working Man Blues,” or even to “Okie from Muskogee,” you not only hear the hardship and wisdom of a well-lived life, but you can hear the roots of so much of the music we still listen to today.

From a man who went from Bakersfield High School to San Quentin prison, to the Country Music Hall of Fame, a building doesn’t seem like much. But I hope that when people pass by the Merle Haggard Post Office Building in downtown Bakersfield, they will remember an icon of our community, an artist who never backed down, a man whose honesty above his own failings and willingness to pick himself back up inspired music that lifts our spirits and feeds our souls.

Merle Haggard’s name will live on in this building, but his spirit will live on in his music that calls us to do the best we can every day God gives us.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this side. I just want to echo the sentiments of Mr. MCCARTHY, the majority leader, in honoring a great artist who overcame enormous obstacles in his life to achieve great success and to make contributions to American culture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 954.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND TRANSFERRED TO ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 954) to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 954

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTION.

Public Law 101-479 (104 Stat. 1158) is amended—

(1) by striking section 2(d); and

(2) by adding the following new section at the end:

#### “SEC. 4. REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTION.

“(a) The approximately 1-acre portion of the land referred to in section 3 that is used for purposes of a child care center, as authorized by this Act, shall not be subject to the use restriction imposed in the deed referred to in section 3.

“(b) Upon enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall execute an instrument to carry out subsection (a).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 954, offered by our colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman BOB GOODLATTE of Virginia, would remove certain deed restrictions on an approximately 1-acre portion of a property previously transferred in Rockingham County, Virginia, under the terms of the National Park Service’s Federal Lands to Parks Program. The transferred land included a garage that had previously been used by the National Park Service.

Following the transfer, Rockingham County decided that the nonprofit Plains Area Daycare Center, which provides affordable childcare for nearly 100 children, would benefit from use of the garage.

In 1990, Congress passed a law allowing for a portion of the previously transferred land to be used for the childcare center. Although a portion of the transferred property is authorized for use as a daycare center, the center encounters hurdles in securing financing for improvements and repairs due to the terms of the original deed and the subsequent legislation.

H.R. 954 would remove certain deed restrictions from an approximately 1-acre portion of the property, while the other 2 acres would continue to be subject to the existing deed restrictions and revisionary clause. Removal of these deed restrictions will ensure that improvements and repairs can take place without further delay in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 954 removes the use restrictions on a 1-acre parcel of Federal land provided to Rockingham County, Virginia.

In 1989, Congress authorized Rockingham County to use a 3-acre parcel of Federal land for the purpose of establishing a childcare center under the condition that the land continues to be used for this purpose. If the county no longer needs the land for a childcare center, the land reverts back to ownership by the United States or the county has the option to purchase it at a fair market value.

The Federal Government has a long tradition of providing public land to State, county, and local governments. Fair use of Federal land and a fair return to the American taxpayer has yet to be at the forefront of these transactions.

Removing public-purpose requirements and use restrictions should only be done when it is deemed appropriate and necessary, and in this particular case, the sponsor of this bill has worked with the National Park Service to develop legislation that is both fair and transparent.

The land provided to Rockingham County includes a garage previously used by the National Park Service that the county has determined could benefit Plains Area Daycare Center. The Park Service no longer needs the garage, and removing the use restriction on one of the 3 acres will allow this childcare provider to access financial assistance in order to upgrade and rehabilitate the garage so that it is suitable to their needs.

This is a worthy goal, and I commend the gentleman from Virginia for this legislation, and that is why we support the adoption of H.R. 954.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me and for his work on this bill, as well as Chairman BISHOP’s work on this legislation and those on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 954. This bill simply removes 20-year-old deed use restrictions on 1 acre of land in Rockingham County, Virginia.

For over 25 years, a little over 3 acres of land and its associated buildings previously held by the Federal Government have been maintained by Rockingham County in the Plains Area Daycare Center in the Sixth District of Virginia.

In 1989, the Federal Government deeded these 3 acres of land, with restriction, to Rockingham County. However, even prior to this official declaration, Rockingham County had already been faithfully maintaining the property no longer utilized by the Federal Government.

The government transferred this land to Rockingham County in 1989 under the condition that this property was to be used for public purposes. The county then decided that the nonprofit Plains Area Daycare Center in Broadway, Virginia, which provides childcare on a sliding scale to many families who otherwise could not afford such a service, would benefit from the use of the old garage located on the property.

Therefore, in 1990, Congress enacted Public Law 101-479, which allowed the deed to be changed from public use to the particular use of the childcare center. Donations by the community, totaling \$75,000, turned the building into a nursery, daycare, and afterschool care facility.

Additionally, the establishment of the daycare center provided for the creation of a playground that the center supports and opens for public use. To be clear, the center and the playground are the sole reason this previously abandoned government land is being used by the community.

I have visited the Plains Area Daycare Center on many occasions, and I have seen the immeasurable investment this center is making in the community by providing high-quality childcare. Since opening in 1991, the center has always been at capacity and is the only facility of its kind in the community.

However, after 2 decades of consistent use, the facility is in desperate need of repairs. Unfortunately, because of the narrow way Public Law 101-479 was drafted and because of the terms of the deed, the daycare center has been unable to obtain a loan to complete much-needed renovations. To solve this problem, my legislation would remove the deed's use restrictions from the 1 acre of property on which the building resides.

While I would like to have seen the entire 3 acres released, this legislation is the result of a compromise that has been endorsed by the National Park Service and Rockingham County. By passing this legislation and allowing Rockingham County and, in turn, the Plains Area Daycare Center more authority over the land, we will ensure that more children and more of the community will be served.

Mr. Speaker, while my legislation today is simply a formality, it is of great importance to those being served by this daycare center in the community. For 25 years, the land has been deeded to Rockingham County, but with overbearing restrictions. Since it is clear the Federal Government no

longer has a vested interest in the land, it is time to lift those restrictions to allow the Plains Area Daycare Center to reach its full potential.

Twenty years ago, Congress made its intention clear that a daycare facility was to have use of the property, and I am pleased to lead the charge in fixing the law.

Again, I thank Chairman BISHOP and his committee for bringing this bill before the House. I also thank my legislative assistant, Angela Inglett, for her hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 954 to simply remove the deed restrictions on 1 acre of land so that the necessary upgrades may be made to the childcare center and so that this community investment may continue.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 954.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INTERAGENCY TRANSFER OF LAND ALONG GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1397) to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1397

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. INTERAGENCY TRANSFER OF LAND ALONG GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “George Washington Memorial Parkway—Claude Moore Farm Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 850\_130815, and dated February 2016.

(2) RESEARCH CENTER.—The term “Research Center” means the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center of the Federal Highway Administration.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TRANSFER.—

(1) TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION.—

(A) GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 0.342 acres of Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within the boundary of the George Washington

Memorial Parkway, as generally depicted as “B” on the Map, is transferred from the Secretary to the Secretary of Transportation.

(B) RESEARCH CENTER LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 0.479 acres of Federal land within the boundary of the Research Center land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Transportation adjacent to the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, as generally depicted as “A” on the Map, is transferred from the Secretary of Transportation to the Secretary.

(2) USE RESTRICTION.—The Secretary shall restrict the use of 0.139 acres of Federal land within the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway immediately adjacent to part of the perimeter fence of the Research Center, generally depicted as “C” on the Map, by prohibiting the storage, construction, or installation of any item that may interfere with the access of the Research Center to the restricted land for security and maintenance purposes.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT OR CONSIDERATION.—The transfers of administrative jurisdiction under this subsection shall not be subject to reimbursement or consideration.

(4) COMPLIANCE WITH AGREEMENT.—

(A) AGREEMENT.—The National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration shall comply with all terms and conditions of the agreement entered into by the parties on September 11, 2002, regarding the transfer of administrative jurisdiction, management, and maintenance of the land described in the agreement.

(B) ACCESS TO RESTRICTED LAND.—Subject to the terms of the agreement described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall allow the Research Center—

(i) to access the Federal land described in paragraph (1)(B) for purposes of transportation to and from the Research Center; and

(ii) to access the Federal land described in paragraphs (1)(B) and (2) for purposes of maintenance in accordance with National Park Service standards, including grass mowing, weed control, tree maintenance, fence maintenance, and maintenance of the visual appearance of the Federal land.

(c) MANAGEMENT OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—

(1) INTERIOR LAND.—The Federal land transferred to the Secretary under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall be—

(A) included in the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway; and

(B) administered by the Secretary as part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, subject to applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) TRANSPORTATION LAND.—The Federal land transferred to the Secretary of Transportation under subsection (b)(1)(A) shall be—

(A) included in the boundary of the Research Center land; and

(B) removed from the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

(3) RESTRICTED-USE LAND.—The Federal land that the Secretary has designated for restricted use under subsection (b)(2) shall be maintained by the Research Center.

(d) MAP ON FILE.—The Map shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1645

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1397, offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), would authorize a small land exchange between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Transportation.

Specifically, the bill transfers administrative jurisdiction over approximately a third of an acre of Federal land within the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway of the National Park Service to the Department of Transportation, and transfers from the Department of Transportation approximately a half an acre of Federal land within the boundary of the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center of the Federal Highway Administration.

The transfer centers on Colonial Farm Road, which provides public access to Claude Moore Colonial Farm and also serves as an entrance road to the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center and as a secondary entrance to the Central Intelligence Agency. The configuration of the property lines between the farm and the research center requires farm staff to travel across research center property to access their facilities.

The three Federal agencies have discussed concerns over crossing property lines, the need to have uninterrupted access to the properties, and the need to improve security near perimeter fencing of the research center. The agencies have identified properties suitable for exchange on their boundaries which will provide public access to the farm while providing the means to improve security outside the fencing of the research center and the Central Intelligence Agency. Though the immediate security concerns have previously been addressed through a temporary agreement, legislation is needed to codify the land exchange.

I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters to Chairman BILL SHUSTER of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the responses. We thank them for agreeing to help expedite consideration of this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 27, 2017, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered favorably reported without amendment H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding, as well as in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and for the extraordinary cooperation shown by you and your staff over matters of shared jurisdiction. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE,  
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land. As noted, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure received an additional referral on this legislation.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1397, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on this bill. However, as you noted, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Should a conference on the bill be necessary, I appreciate your agreement to support my request to have the Committee represented on the conference committee.

Thank you for your cooperation on this matter and for agreeing to place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the bill report and the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,  
Chairman.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1397 authorizes the National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration to comply with a longstanding agreement regarding two parcels of land near Claude Moore Colonial Farm in McLean, Virginia.

Specifically, the bill transfers a small parcel within the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Transportation. The bill also transfers a half acre within the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center from the Department of Transportation to the Department of the Interior.

Simply put, this bill permits a one-time land transfer that was agreed to 15 years ago. Ultimately, this will improve management efficiency and save taxpayer money.

The bill is noncontroversial and has been a longstanding legislative priority of the National Park Service. I commend the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) for her bipartisanship, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1397, which would authorize this Federal land exchange between the National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration.

As has been discussed, at issue is the jurisdiction of an access road adjacent to the Claude Moore Colonial Farm, a privately funded living history museum which is part of the National Park Service and in my district in McLean, Virginia.

Claude Moore Farm is a wonderful way to experience what life was like on a small family farm for the average family in the late 1700s, not the plantations that we often see preserved, but a very small, average family farm.

Claude Moore Farm is tucked in right next to the CIA, as has been mentioned, and the jurisdiction of this particular access road off of George Washington Memorial Parkway has not been clear and has resulted in confusion and unnecessary security concerns.

Over the years, general use of this access road has set off security alarms at Langley. And this confusion has not only been difficult for security personnel; it has also cost taxpayer resources.

On September 11, 2002, the National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration entered into an agreement under which the transfer of administrative jurisdiction, management, and maintenance of the lands in question were agreed upon. Since then, the two parties have been abiding by these rules.

What this agreement does now is make this permanent in a legislative fix. It is a commonsense, bipartisan bill. We worked on this with Senator WARNER also. Last year he was able to get it attached to the energy package, but that did not pass, so we now need this to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward, non-controversial bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1397.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### PASCUA YAQUI TRIBE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1404) to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1404

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term "District" means the Tucson Unified School District No. 1, a school district recognized as such under the laws of the State of Arizona.

(2) MAP.—The term "Map" means the map titled "Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act", dated March 14, 2016, and on file and available for public inspection in the local office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) RECREATION AND PUBLIC PURPOSES ACT.—The term "Recreation and Public Purposes Act" means the Act of June 14, 1926 (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

#### SEC. 3. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) PARCEL A.—Subject to subsection (b) and to valid existing rights, all right, title,

and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 39.65 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as "Parcel A" are declared to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date on which the District relinquishes all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the approximately 39.65 acres of land described in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 4. LANDS TO BE CONVEYED TO THE DISTRICT.

(a) PARCEL B.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and payment to the United States of the fair market value, the United States shall convey to the District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 13.24 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as "Parcel B".

(2) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the property to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition of the conveyance under this subsection, all costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the District.

(b) PARCEL C.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, not later than 1 year after the completion of the appraisal required by paragraph (3), the District submits to the Secretary an offer to acquire the Federal reversionary interest in all of the approximately 27.5 acres of land conveyed to the District under Recreation and Public Purposes Act and generally depicted on the map as "Parcel C", the Secretary shall convey to the District such reversionary interest in the lands covered by the offer. The Secretary shall complete the conveyance not later than 30 days after the date of the offer.

(2) SURVEY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the lands described in this subsection to determine the precise boundaries and acreage of the lands subject to the Federal reversionary interest.

(3) APPRAISAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the Federal reversionary interest in the lands identified by the survey required by paragraph (2). The appraisal shall be completed in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest under this subsection, the District shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the appraised value of the Federal interest, as determined under paragraph (3). The consideration shall be paid not later than 30 days after the date of the conveyance.

(5) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition of the conveyance under this subsection, all costs associated with the conveyance, including the cost of the survey required by paragraph (2) and the appraisal required by paragraph (3), shall be paid by the District.

#### SEC. 5. GAMING PROHIBITION.

The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities on lands taken into trust pursuant to this Act, either as a matter of claimed inherent authority, under the authority of any

Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), or under regulations promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

#### SEC. 6. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be no Federal reserved right to surface water or groundwater for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(b) STATE WATER RIGHTS.—The Tribe retains any right or claim to water under State law for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(c) FORFEITURE OR ABANDONMENT.—Any water rights that are appurtenant to land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act may not be forfeited or abandoned.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this Act affects or modifies any right of the Tribe or any obligation of the United States under Public Law 95-375.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1404, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member on the National Resources Committee.

H.R. 1404 would authorize a land exchange involving the Tribe, the Tucson Unified School District, and the Department of the Interior.

Under the bill, a 39.65-acre parcel of land currently held by the district shall be placed in trust for the benefit of the Tribe if the district relinquishes all right, title, and interest to it.

A 13.24-acre parcel of land shall be sold by the U.S. to the district at fair market value, and a Federal interest of 27.5 acres of land held by the district shall be cleared in exchange for the district paying the appraised value of the Federal interest. The Federal interest is a reversionary interest imposed on certain land patented to the district under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926.

All transfers under the bill are subject to valid existing rights. Gaming pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act would be prohibited on lands taken into trust under the bill.

This bill is substantively similar to the bill the House passed during the 114th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsor. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents the final part of a collaborative land agreement between the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, located in southern Arizona, and the Tucson Unified School District, TUSD.

H.R. 1404 will transfer a 40-acre parcel currently managed by TUSD under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act into a trust for the Tribe. Two additional parcels of land will be transferred to the TUSD, provided that the TUSD pays fair market value so that it may better plan for the future needs of the school district in the areas near the Tribe's reservation.

I want to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member and sponsor of the bill, not only for his leadership on the Natural Resources Committee, but for bringing this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1404, as was stated by my two colleagues, is a culmination of a longstanding land agreement between Tucson Unified School District and the Pascua Yaqui Tribe. In the 113th Congress, we finalized part of that agreement with the passage and signing of H.R. 507, which conveyed the two 10-acre parcels.

Both of my colleagues have stated the purpose of the legislation, the need for the legislation. The passage of this bill will complete the second part of that agreement, and both parties involved, as well as the surrounding communities, all see mutual benefit in this.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the bill is acted upon positively, that it passes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BISHOP for his cooperation in working with our staff to bring this to the floor today, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, briefly, the bill is identical to H.R. 2009, which passed in the 114th Congress by voice vote. That is why, as well as what we have heard today, I urge quick adoption of this legislation once again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1404.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN PROPERTY RELATED TO THE FORT SCOTT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1541) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1541

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION TO ACQUIRE LUNETTE BLAIR.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize establishment of the Fort Scott National Historic Site, Kansas, and for other purposes," approved October 19, 1978 (Public Law 95-484) is amended—

(1) in the first section—

(A) by inserting "only" after "donation"; and

(B) by striking "": *Provided*, that the buildings so acquired shall not include the structure known as "Lunette Blair"; and

(2) in section 2—

(A) by striking "When the site of" and inserting "(a) When the site of"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) The boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site established under subsection (a) is modified as generally depicted on the map referred to as 'Fort Scott National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Modification', numbered 471/80,057C, and dated February 2017.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1541, sponsored by the gentleman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), re-

moves the statutory prohibition preventing the Secretary of the Interior from acquiring a structure known as the Lunette Blair blockhouse and including the structure in the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site.

Congress initially deemed the Lunette Blair blockhouse anachronistic and excluded the structure from the boundaries of the Fort Scott National Historic Site. The National Park Service now wants to add the blockhouse to expand the interpretation of the site and to demonstrate its different roles throughout American history. The private citizens that currently maintain the blockhouse would like to donate the structure to the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support preservation of this unique piece of Kansas' heritage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1541 authorizes the National Park Service to expand the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas.

□ 1700

Fort Scott was designated as a National Historic Landmark back in 1964. Eight years later, in 1972, Congress established the site as a unit of the National Park Service "to commemorate the significant role played by Fort Scott in the opening of the West, as well as the Civil War and strife in the State of Kansas that preceded it."

The site is currently a modest 16 acres. The additions authorized by this bill will add approximately 3.8 acres to the park. The properties to be added include the only intact Civil War era building, Civil War entrenchments and fortifications, and home sites of the first African-American families who settled in the area after the war.

Preserving the story of freedom on the frontier is an important goal, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I note that the sponsor, Ms. JENKINS, was unable to be here to speak in support of her bill. She was unavoidably detained in her district due to a flight cancellation today. However, I have her statement in strong support of the measure. On her behalf, I urge adoption of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1541, legislation that would strike a prohibition in the Fort Scott National Historic Site's enabling law that prohibited the incorporation of the structure known as the Lunette Blair blockhouse into the site's formation.

Fortunately, the blockhouse still sits right across the street from the historic site, where, under the future care of the National Park



Service, it can remain on display in perpetuity without disrupting the grounds' antebellum view shed, successfully linking the site's frontier fort structures with the community's Civil War legacy.

Located in the historic town of Fort Scott, Kansas, the Fort Scott National Historic Site preserves the important story of the original frontier fort's role in nineteenth-century America. It serves as a physical snapshot of the pioneer days of westward migration of a young republic, from its initial construction 175 years ago, and portrays a figurative stepping-stone upon the prairie toward a transcontinental nation.

However, the story of the community of Fort Scott continues from that point on as the town grew around the shuttered fort of the same name. The community's history itself invokes the violent struggles of the era we all know as Bleeding Kansas and the conflicts of the Civil War.

After the U.S. Army demobilized Fort Scott in 1853 following the collapse of a permanent Indian frontier, private residents purchased the last of its property; the buildings of the old fort became the new town. Soon after, Americans of opposing sentiments, abolitionists, free-staters, and Border Ruffians alike, settled the area throughout the rest of the decade in turmoil. While the territory of Kansas ultimately became the free state of Kansas on January 29, 1861, violent conflict soon engulfed the entire nation.

During the Civil War, the Union Army militarized the town of Fort Scott to store Union supplies and to deter Confederate invasions into Southeast Kansas. The Union Army constructed many fortifications in the surrounding area, including four garrisoned blockhouses, or "lunettes," fortified structures with designated names, such as Fort Lincoln, Fort Insley, Fort Henning, and Fort Blair, in order to house soldiers and armaments while protecting the town's approach.

While these structures successfully deterred such attacks, the U.S. War Department considered these four blockhouses as surplus property after the Civil War and sold them at auction to private individuals. The structure called Fort Blair, known locally today as Lunette Blair is the sole remaining Civil War blockhouse standing today.

Mr. Speaker, it is only through the diligent stewardship of the citizens of Fort Scott, Kansas, and their dedication to preserve the community's heritage, that the Lunette Blair blockhouse still stands after all these years.

Members of the Fort Scott community support the donation of the blockhouse to the National Park Service and this proposal is in line with the sites' overall mission: to tell the encompassing story of Fort Scott's role in westward migration and to demonstrate the community's contribution in preserving our Union during the Civil War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1541.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1719) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1719

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act".*

##### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

*In this Act:*

(1) **HISTORIC SITE.**—The term "Historic Site" means the John Muir National Historic Site in Martinez, California, established by Public Law 88-547 (78 Stat. 753).

(2) **MAP.**—The term "map" means the map entitled "John Muir National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Expansion", numbered 426/127150, and dated November 2014.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

##### SEC. 3. JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) **ACQUISITION.**—The Secretary may acquire by donation the approximately 44 acres of land and any interests in the land that is identified on the map.

(b) **BOUNDARY.**—On the acquisition of the land authorized under subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the boundaries of the Historic Site to include the acquired land.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The land and any interests in land acquired under subsection (a) shall be administered as part of the National Historic Site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1719 would authorize the expansion of the John Muir National Historic Site by approximately 44 acres.

Located in the San Francisco Bay Area, in Martinez, California, this site preserves the 14-room Italianate Victorian mansion where John Muir lived, as well as a 325-acre tract of native oak woodlands and grasslands owned by the Muir family.

The additional proposed acreage in this bill is directly adjacent to the cur-

rent site and will allow for better public access to trails in the area. This acreage will be donated to the National Park Service and will not be acquired with any Federal dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1719 authorizes the National Park Service to expand the boundary of the John Muir National Historic Site and acquire 44 acres of land from the Muir Heritage Land Trust. The donation will expand the site and help carry on Muir's important legacy of conservation and environmental stewardship.

John Muir is one of our Nation's most respected and revered ecologists. His writings have inspired millions, and his activism and advocacy led to the establishment of some of our first and most iconic national parks.

From the moment he set foot in Yosemite Valley, John Muir was consumed with its natural wonder and beauty. He became Yosemite's most vocal champion, but he didn't spend his whole life there.

From 1890 until his death in 1914, Muir lived on a farm not far from San Francisco. It was from this corner of the bay area that Muir cofounded the Sierra Club and helped lay the groundwork for a century of conservation.

John Muir's tireless advocacy led to the creation of Yosemite and Sequoia National Parks, and his spirit and enduring legacy led to the protection of much more.

Passage of H.R. 1719 will contribute to John Muir's legacy and it will help to protect and conserve the place where he found solace and inspiration in his later years.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the bill's sponsor, Representative DESAULNIER from California, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1719, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act. This bipartisan legislation will expand the Martinez, California, historic site in my district that celebrates the life and legacy of John Muir.

Muir was a lifelong conservationist, a leading advocate of the National Park Service, and a cofounder of the Sierra Club. He worked to establish and protect national parks, including Yosemite, Sequoia, Grand Canyon, and Mount Rainier.



The John Muir National Historic Site, which includes the home where he lived, covers 330 acres of Contra Costa County where Muir championed the revolutionary idea that wild spaces should be set aside for all to enjoy.

This bill would make it possible for the National Park Service to accept a donation of 44 acres of land from the John Muir Land Trust, improving access to the park and its scenic trails, including those on Mount Wanda, named after Muir's eldest daughter.

The trail systems are accessible for hikers, bikers, and equestrians, including critical connections to the 550-mile Bay Area Ridge Trail and to nearby protected lands along the Franklin Ridge corridor.

As John Muir once said, "everybody needs beauty, as well as bread, places to play in . . . where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to body and soul alike."

Mr. Speaker, I thank my predecessor, Congressman George Miller, who championed this bill. I also thank the Natural Resources Committee chair, Chairman BISHOP; Ranking Member GRIJALVA; the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK from California; and subcommittee ranking member, Ms. HANABUSA for their leadership in bringing H.R. 1719 to the floor today.

I am grateful for the support of 21 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who cosponsored this legislation, and to Senator KAMALA HARRIS for leading the bill's counterpart in the U.S. Senate.

I also thank the John Muir Land Trust for its hard work and dedication preserving and protecting this valuable parkland and shoreline in Contra Costa County for future generations.

This legislation puts a fitting emphasis on the National Park Service's centennial celebrations, helping to preserve the trails and lands that surround the longtime home of the man known as the "father" of the U.S. National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan legislation, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1719, the "John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act," authorizing the Department of the Interior to acquire an additional 44 acres of land to expand the John Muir National Historic Site, which currently stretches across 330 acres in the East Bay of San Francisco and includes the home where legendary naturalist John Muir lived until he died in 1914.

The John Muir National Historic Site, established by Congress in 1964, is located in Martinez, California and honor one of the nation's

foremost conservationists, whom historians refer to as the "Father of the National Park Service."

The historic site preserves the 14-room Italianate Victorian mansion where the naturalist and writer John Muir lived, as well as a nearby 325 acre tract of native oak woodlands and grasslands historically owned by the Muir family.

H.R. 1719 authorizes the Department of the Interior to acquire by donation approximately 44 acres to expand the boundary of John Muir National Historic Site.

The acreage to be acquired is directly continuous with Mount Wanda and will allow for better public access to trails.

In the 114th Congress, H.R. 1289, a bill identical to H.R. 1719, passed the House by voice vote.

Additionally, a similar bill, H.R. 5699, was introduced in the 113th Congress by former Congressman George Miller, and passed the House by a vote of 361–39.

Companion legislation, S. 729, has been introduced in the Senate by Senator KAMALA HARRIS of California.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1719 is a fitting tribute to one of America's greatest citizen activists, the co-founder of the Sierra Club, and a central actor in the successful effort to establish Yosemite National Park.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 1719.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1719, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CLEAR CREEK NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1913) to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1913

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term "management plan" means the Plan for the Recreation Area prepared under section 4(c).

(2) **RECREATION AREA.**—The term "Recreation Area" means the Clear Creek National Recreation Area.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) **STATE.**—The term "State" means the State of California.

(5) **OFF HIGHWAY VEHICLE.**—The term "off highway vehicle" means any motorized vehicle designed for or capable of cross-country travel on or immediately over land, water, snow, or other natural terrain and not intended for use on public roads.

#### SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEAR CREEK NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To promote environmentally responsible off highway vehicle recreation, the area generally depicted as "Proposed Clear Creek National Recreation Area" on the map titled "Proposed Clear Creek National Recreation Area" and dated February 14, 2017, is established as the "Clear Creek National Recreation Area", to be managed by the Secretary.

(b) **OTHER PURPOSES.**—The Recreation Area shall also support other public recreational uses, such as hunting, hiking, and rock and gem collecting.

(c) **MAP ON FILE.**—Copies of the map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in—

(1) the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and

(2) the appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management in California.

#### SEC. 4. MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Area to further the purposes described in section 3(a), in accordance with—

(1) this Act;

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(3) any other applicable law.

(b) **USES.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize environmentally responsible off highway vehicle recreation and also facilitate hunting, hiking, gem collecting, and the use of motorized vehicles, mountain bikes, and horses in accordance with the management plan described in subsection (c);

(2) issue special recreation permits for motorized and non-motorized events; and

(3) reopen the Clear Creek Management Area to the uses described in this subsection as soon as practicable following the enactment of this Act and in accordance with the management guidelines outlined in this Act and other applicable law.

(c) **INTERIM MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Secretary shall use the 2006 Clear Creek Management Area Resource Management Plan Amendment and Route Designation Record of Decision as modified by this Act or the Secretary to incorporate natural resource protection information not available in 2006, as the basis of an interim management plan to govern off highway vehicle recreation within the Recreation Area pending the completion of the long-term management plan required in subsection (d).

(d) **PERMANENT MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall create a comprehensive management plan for the Clear Creek Recreation Area that—

(1) shall describe the appropriate uses and management of the Recreation Area in accordance with this Act;

(2) shall be prepared in consultation with—

(A) appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies (including San Benito, Monterey, and Fresno Counties);

(B) adjacent land owners;

(C) other stakeholders (including conservation and recreational organizations); and

(D) holders of any easements, rights-of-way, and other valid rights in the Recreation Area;

(3) shall include a hazards education program to inform people entering the Recreation Area of the asbestos related risks associated with various activities within the Recreation Area, including off-highway vehicle recreation;

(4) shall include a user fee program for motorized vehicle use within the Recreational Area and guidelines for the use of the funds collected for the management and improvement of the Recreation Area;

(5) shall designate as many previously used trails, roads, and other areas for off highway vehicle recreation as feasible in accordance with this in order to provide a substantially similar recreational experience, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as precluding the Secretary from closing any area, trail, or route from use for the purposes of public safety or resource protection;

(6) may incorporate any appropriate decisions, as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with this Act, that are contained in any management or activity plan for the area completed before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(7) may incorporate appropriate wildlife habitat management plans or other plans prepared for the land within or adjacent to the Recreation Area before the date of the enactment of this Act, in accordance with this Act;

(8) may use information developed under any studies of land within or adjacent to the Recreation Area carried out before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(9) may include cooperative agreements with State or local government agencies to manage all or a portion of the recreational activities within the Recreation Area in accordance with an approved management plan and the requirements of this Act.

(e) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land adjacent to the National Recreation Area by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Any land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(3) IMPROVED ACCESS.—The Secretary may acquire by purchase from willing sellers, donation, exchange, or easement, land, or interest in land to improve public safety in providing access to the Recreation Area.

(f) PRIVATE PROPERTY.—

(1) ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide landowners adequate access to inholdings within the Recreation Area.

(B) INHOLDINGS.—For access purposes, private land adjacent to the Recreation Area to which there is no other practicable access except through the Recreation Area shall be managed as an inholding.

(2) USE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.—Nothing in this Act affects the ownership, management, or other rights relating to any non-Federal land (including any interest in any non-Federal land).

(3) BUFFER ZONES.—Nothing in this Act creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Recreation Area.

(4) VALID RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act affects any easements, rights-of-way, and other valid rights in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) WATER RIGHT EXCLUSION.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) shall constitute or be construed to constitute either an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Recreation Area; or

(2) shall affect any water rights existing on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) HUNTING AND FISHING.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) limits hunting or fishing; or

(2) affects the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the State to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law (including regulations), including the regulation of hunting or fishing on public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(i) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—Except in cases in which motorized vehicles are needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles on public land in the Recreation Area shall be permitted only on roads, trails, and areas designated by the management plan for the use by motorized vehicles.

(j) GRAZING.—In the Recreation Area, the grazing of livestock in areas in which grazing is allowed as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be allowed to continue, consistent with—

(1) this Act;

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(3) any regulations promulgated by the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(k) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the Recreation Area is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patenting under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(l) FEES.—Amounts received by the Secretary under the fee structure required by subsection (d)(4) shall be—

(1) deposited in a special account in the Treasury of the United States; and

(2) made available until expended to the Secretary for use in the Recreation Area.

(m) RISK STANDARD.—The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (section 300 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations), published pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605), shall not apply to the Secretary's management of asbestos exposure risks faced by the public when recreating within the Clear Creek Recreation Area described in section 3(b).

#### SEC. 5. JOAQUIN ROCKS WILDERNESS.

In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 21,000 acres of Federal lands located in Fresno County and San Benito County, California, and generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed Joaquin Rocks Wilderness" and dated February 14, 2017, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System and shall be known as the "Joaquin Rocks Wilderness".

#### SEC. 6. RELEASE OF SAN BENITO MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), the San Benito Mountain wilderness study area has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) RELEASE.—The San Benito Mountain wilderness study area is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)).

#### SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION REGARDING FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1913, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), is a bipartisan bill that reopens public access and facilitates recreational activities in central California. The bill designates 63,000 acres as the Clear Creek National Recreation Area, 21,000 acres as the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness, and releases 1,500 acres of wilderness study area.

Once considered a world class off-highway vehicle, or OHV, recreation designation, the Clear Creek area has been closed to the public for nearly a decade due to concerns from the EPA about naturally occurring asbestos. However, after commissioning a study of the area, the State of California's Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division found a minimal health risk to OHV users from exposure to naturally occurring asbestos. Despite these findings and appeals from local communities and OHV users, the Bureau of Land Management has not reopened the area to the public or for OHV use.

This bill remedies the situation by reopening and redesignating the area as the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and including special provisions to prioritize and facilitate long-term, sustainable off-highway vehicle access and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1913 establishes the Clear Creek National Recreation

Area and the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness Area on land administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the central coast region of California. From hiking and hunting to off-highway vehicle use, those designations will improve and enhance access for a variety of recreational activities, while ensuring that ecologically sensitive and unique areas are managed in a way that supports their lasting and permanent protection.

In addition to the many ecological benefits they provide, including clean air and clean water, wilderness areas throughout the country play a large role in supporting the approximately \$646 billion per year outdoor recreation economy, so I am pleased that we are advancing this bill to add 21,000 acres of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

This bill has strong local support from San Benito County government officials and a number of off-highway vehicle and wilderness groups. These advocates understand that Clear Creek is important to the economy, and they have fond memories of the recreational opportunities when they were younger.

I have received numerous support comments from my constituents, the off-highway vehicle community, and other California residents about the importance of Clear Creek to their family and how the closure has impacted them. It is time to honor the desire of my constituents in California's 20th Congressional District and pass this bill once again.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of the bill.

SAN BENITO COUNTY,  
Hollister, CA, June 1, 2017.

Re Letter in Support of H.R. 1913.

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PANETTA: I would like to express my support of proposed legislation H.R. 1913. On at least three previous occasions, the San Benito County Board of Supervisors has formally expressed their support of this proposed measure in the form of H.R. 1776 as submitted by then-Congressman Sam Farr.

As background, the Serpentine Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) of the Clear Creek Management Area (CCMA) was closed in 2008 based on a study by the EPA which concluded that naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) posed a public health risk. However, in 2010, the Off Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation (OHMVR) Division of the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Commissioned an independent OHV-specific risk assessment of NOA exposure within the Serpentine ACEC of the CCMA.

This report, completed by the International Environmental Research Foundation (IERF), concluded that management and operation strategies could be employed to allow for off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation in the CCMA without exposing the public to higher than acceptable levels of NOA and without presenting a serious risk to human health. Specifically, the risk of OHV usage five days per year, for eight hours on

each of those days, was equated to being similar to the lifetime risk of smoking less than one cigarette one the same one year period, and the report noted that other recreational activities, such as swimming, hiking and snow skiing, are over 100 times more dangerous.

In light of this report which directly contradicts the conclusions of the EPA study and undermines the necessity of BLM actions taken since 2008 in reliance of that study, it would appear that closure of the ACEC is not scientifically warranted, and especially not during winter months when dust from OHV activity is greatly reduced.

Therefore, the County supports opening the area to OHV users once again and allowing the public access to this natural area which is easily accessible to the urban residents in the San Jose/San Francisco metropolitan areas. H.R. 1913, which would establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, is essential to enhancing public access to natural and scenic areas within our State.

The lack of evidence of a serious health risk is reinforced by the fact that there is the lack of any documented case of any person, whether recreational, visitor or governmental employee, injured by NOA within the ACEC despite the use of the area for decades. Therefore, the activities taken to close the area are especially troubling considering the effect of the closure on the public generally, as well as the local economy.

Access to recreational areas within San Benito County, including the CCMA, provides a necessary and substantial component to the local economy which has been drastically affected by the recent economic climate. The BLM's past decision to close the Clear Creek area has already seriously affected San Benito County's economic vitality. The County could understand such action if there was truly a serious health risk presented by use of the CCMA, but there is no generally accepted scientific evidence, especially during wetter winter months.

The Clear Creek Management Area was among the five most popular areas cited by California off-highway-vehicle (OHV) users in a 1990 study conducted by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Many of these users were residents of the San Jose and San Francisco Bay. In 2003 and 2004, there were an estimated 50,000 visitors to the CCMA, largely attributable to allowed OHV usage.

In conclusion, the Board of Supervisors supports the proposed legislation, as well as designation of the Clear Creek Management Area as a National Recreation Area, designation of OHV recreation as a "prescribed use" within the National Recreation Area, and providing that the management plan of the Clear Creek National Recreation Area, including OHV routes, open areas, number of permitted OHV events and other recreational activities should be as set forth in the 2005 Clear Creek Travel Management Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Respectfully,

JERRY MUENZER,  
Supervisor District 4,  
Board of Supervisors.

CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS PROJECT,  
Cottonwood, CA, April 20, 2017.

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PANETTA: We greatly appreciate your sponsorship of H.R. 1913, the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Con-

servation Act. The legislation will permanently protect 21,000 acres of BLM land in Fresno and San Benito counties by its inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The proposed Joaquin Rocks Wilderness follows the steep northern slope of Joaquin Ridge which climbs high above the floor of the western San Joaquin Valley.

Rising up over 4,000 feet from the valley floor, the striking Joaquin Rocks are the centerpiece of this remote area. These three scenic 250' tall monoliths are the eroded remnants of an ancient vaqueros sandstone formation.

The Joaquin Rocks are named for the legendary Joaquin Murieta, believed by some to be a heroic figure early California and an outlaw by others. The Joaquin Rocks are said to have provided a secluded hiding place for him and his band place during the 1850s. The area also shows archeological evidence of past Native American occupation.

The rugged area features deep canyons where oak woodlands cloak the numerous spur ridges that descend to the valley. Vegetation in the area includes, blue oak, California juniper, grey pine, chaparral, and native grasslands. Due to the cooler climate provided by its elevation, the area provides outstanding displays of native wildflowers well into summer.

The steep cliffs of the Joaquin Rocks—and the numerous other towering sandstone formations found throughout the area—are host to numerous falcons, hawks and owls. They could also provide potential nesting habitat for the California condor which has been reintroduced into the nearby Gavilan Range. One of the peaks of the Joaquin Rocks—La Centinela—hosts a vernal pool that supports fairy and tadpole shrimp.

The Joaquin Rocks proposed wilderness represents a unique opportunity to preserve one of central California's most outstanding natural landscapes and we sincerely appreciate Mr. Panetta's efforts to protect it for future generations.

Best Regards,

GORDON JOHNSON,  
Director.

APRIL 10, 2017.

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PANETTA: As representatives of national motorized recreation organizations we write in support of the "Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act" (H.R. 1913). This legislation would designate 75,000 acres of Federal land in San Benito and Fresno Counties in California as the Clear Creek National Recreation Area (NRA) and would ensure access for the responsible use of off-highway vehicles (OHVs) in the area into the future.

Clear Creek was closed in 2008 based on a questionable safety rationale related to exposure to asbestos. Subsequently the California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Commission commissioned an independent risk assessment study which concluded that management and operational strategies could be effectively employed in the area to allow OHV use without exposing the public to unacceptable risks. H.R. 1913 would guarantee that moving forward, the area will be managed in such a way as to provide for all sorts of legitimate and responsible recreation, while also providing for the safety of all of the area's visitors.

Our support for H.R. 1913 is possible because of the endorsement of the bill from a

broad array of local OHV organizations, businesses and enthusiasts. This local support is warranted not only because the legislation would reopen the popular OHV area, but because a diverse group of constituencies worked together on the bill.

We thank you for your statement upon introduction which makes it clear that you recognize the importance of multiple uses on public lands—"This bipartisan bill not only bolsters our area's conservation efforts, it also promotes recreation and tourism in our region. When this bill passes, locals and visitors will no longer be restricted from enjoying all that Clear Creek Management Area has to offer." We applaud this approach and hope that other Members of Congress will look to H.R. 1913 as a model for how to garner support for land use legislation.

Thank you for introducing this important bill. We look forward to working with you as it moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

Larry Smith, Executive Director, Americans for Responsible Recreational Access;

Nicole Nicholas Gilles, Executive Director, American Sand Association;

Don Amador, Western Representative, BlueRibbon Coalition, Inc.;

Duane Taylor, Director, Federal Affairs, Motorcycle Industry Council;

Russ Ehnes, Executive Director, National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council;

Tom Yager, Vice President, Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association;

Stuart D. Gosswein, Sr. Director, Federal Government Affairs, Specialty Equipment Market Association;

Kathy Van Kleeck, Senior Vice President, Government Relations, Specialty Vehicle Institute of America;

Steve Egbert, Vice President, United Four Wheel Drive Associations, Inc.

#### CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS

#### COALITION,

Anderson, CA, May 19, 2017.

Subject: Support for H.R. 1913, the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PANETTA: We are pleased to offer our support for H.R. 1913, the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act. We strongly support the designation of the proposed 21,000-acre Joaquin Rocks Wilderness and the protection of over 31 miles of streams as wild and scenic rivers. We believe that the bill strikes a reasonable balance between environmental protection, off-road vehicle recreation, public safety and other considerations in the Clear Creek-Joaquin Rocks area.

Joaquin Rocks is one of the dramatic scenic features in the region, with its three prominent pinnacles of rock standing like sentinels above the San Joaquin Valley. Its oak woodlands, grasslands and other plant communities provide important habitat for sensitive plant and wildlife species. Joaquin Rocks also has important historical values as, among other things, the former hideout of the notorious outlaw Joaquin Murrieta.

Thank you for introducing and working to advance the legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can assist you in this or any other public lands-related matter.

Sincerely,

RYAN HENSON,  
Senior Policy Director.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, and I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their leadership, their work, and assistance in getting this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives. I also thank Representatives DAVID VALADAO, JEFF DENHAM, and PAUL COOK, as well as my predecessor, Representative Sam Farr, and our staffs for their work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge quick adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for introducing this legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1913.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WESTERN OREGON TRIBAL FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1306) to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1306

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

#### TITLE I—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Land to be held in trust.

Sec. 103. Map and legal description.

Sec. 104. Administration.

Sec. 105. Land reclassification.

#### TITLE II—OREGON COASTAL LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 201. Definitions.

Sec. 202. Land to be held in trust.

Sec. 203. Map and legal description.

Sec. 204. Administration.

Sec. 205. Land reclassification.

#### TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT

Sec. 301. Amendments to Coquille Restoration Act.

#### TITLE I—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND CONVEYANCE

#### SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COUNCIL CREEK LAND.—The term "Council Creek land" means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance" and dated May 24, 2016.

(2) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

#### SEC. 102. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date on which the Secretary records the agreement entered into under section 104(d)(1).

#### SEC. 103. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

#### SEC. 104. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 102 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT.—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the Tribe that secures existing administrative access by the Secretary to the Council Creek land.

(2) RECIPROCAL RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On the date on which the agreement is entered into under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide to the Tribe all reciprocal right-of-way agreements to the

Council Creek land in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) **CONTINUED ACCESS.**—Beginning on the date on which the Council Creek land is taken into trust under section 102, the Tribe shall continue the access provided by the agreements referred to in subparagraph (A) in perpetuity.

(e) **LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Council Creek land is taken into trust under section 102, the Council Creek land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

#### SEC. 105. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under section 102.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located within the 18 western Oregon and California Railroad grant land counties (other than Klamath County, Oregon).

(c) **MAPS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **RECLASSIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

### TITLE II—OREGON COASTAL LAND CONVEYANCE

#### SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **CONFEDERATED TRIBES.**—The term “Confederated Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

(2) **OREGON COASTAL LAND.**—The term “Oregon Coastal land” means the approximately 14,742 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance” and dated July 11, 2016.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

#### SEC. 202. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey to establish

the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date on which the Secretary records the agreement entered into under section 204(d)(1).

#### SEC. 203. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

#### SEC. 204. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Confederated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 202.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 202 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) **FOREST MANAGEMENT.**—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Oregon Coastal land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) **AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the Confederated Tribes that secures existing administrative access by the Secretary to the Oregon Coastal land and that provides for—

(A) access for certain activities, including—

(i) forest management;

(ii) timber and rock haul;

(iii) road maintenance;

(iv) wildland fire protection and management;

(v) cadastral surveys;

(vi) wildlife, cultural, and other surveys; and

(vii) law enforcement activities;

(B) the management of the Oregon Coastal land that is acquired or developed under chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, consistent with section 200305(f)(3) of that title; and

(C) the terms of public vehicular transit across the Oregon Coastal land to and from the Hult Log Storage Reservoir located in T. 15 S., R. 7 W., as generally depicted on the map described in section 201(2), subject to the requirement that if the Bureau of Land Management discontinues maintenance of the public recreation site known as “Hult Reservoir”, the terms of any agreement in effect on that date that provides for public vehicular transit to and from the Hult Log Storage Reservoir shall be void.

(2) **RECIPROCAL RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—On the date on which the agreement is entered into under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide to the Confederated Tribes all reciprocal right-of-way agreements to the Oregon Coastal land in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) **CONTINUED ACCESS.**—Beginning on the date on which the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 202, the Confederated Tribes shall continue the access provided by the reciprocal right-of-way agreements referred to in subparagraph (A) in perpetuity.

(e) **LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 202, the Oregon Coastal land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

#### SEC. 205. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes under section 202.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located within the 18 western Oregon and California Railroad grant land counties (other than Klamath County, Oregon).

(c) **MAPS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **RECLASSIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

### TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT

#### SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT.

Section 5(d) of the Coquille Restoration Act (Public Law 101-42; 103 Stat. 92, 110 Stat. 3009-537) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) **MANAGEMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, shall manage the Coquille Forest in accordance with the laws pertaining to the management of Indian trust land.

“(B) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

“(i) **UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Unprocessed logs harvested from the Coquille Forest shall be subject to the same Federal statutory restrictions on export to foreign nations that apply to unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land.

“(ii) SALES OF TIMBER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all sales of timber from land subject to this subsection shall be advertised, offered, and awarded according to competitive bidding practices, with sales being awarded to the highest responsible bidder.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (9); and  
(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to acknowledge the gentlemen from Oregon, Mr. DEFazio and Mr. WALDEN, for their hard work on this important piece of legislation, which will benefit several Indian Tribes in the State of Oregon.

□ 1715

H.R. 1306 benefits three recognized Tribes in western Oregon by conveying publicly-owned forestlands to two of them, and to improve the management of forestlands currently held in trust for a third Tribe.

Various iterations of H.R. 1306 have been considered multiple times in previous Congresses, and nearly identical bills benefiting some or all of these Tribes were passed by the House in the 113th and 114th Congresses.

Title I of H.R. 1306 would place title to approximately 17,519 acres of public land in Oregon in trust for the benefit of the Cow Creek Umpqua Tribe. Lands to be held in trust under this section are depicted on a specific map, and the conveyance of the land in trust shall be subject to valid existing rights.

A substantial amount of the public land placed in trust for the Tribe is currently part of the Oregon and California railroad land grant, managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

Under title I, the Secretary is required to reclassify an equal acreage of public domain land located in the vicinity of the land given to the Tribe, as O&C land.

Land placed in trust by the Tribe under title I may not be used for gambling under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, and timber harvested from such land shall be subject to Federal law restricting the export of unprocessed logs.

Title II of the bill would provide that seven tracts of land currently managed by the Bureau of Land Management, totaling 14,742 acres, be held in trust for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

The parcels so transferred are located in western Oregon's Coos, Douglas, Benton, and Lane Counties, and include tracts such as the Coos Head, the Talbot Allotment, and the Umpqua Eden parcels, which are of particular cultural significance to the Tribes, as well as areas which are managed for timber production.

Title III would correct a situation with respect to the management of the Coquille Tribal Forest in Oregon. This forest has been regulated as part of the Northwest Forest Plan, which is inconsistent with the management of other tribally-managed forests in the United States. Under this title, the Coquille Tribe would manage its forest under the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act. This will improve the Tribe's ability to manage its timber resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1306 is a culmination of years of work to address the wrongs of the past. The termination era in Federal Indian policy is one of the darkest chapters in American history.

In Oregon, all but one of the Tribes lost their Federal recognition. Fortunately, the Federal Government eventually saw the error of their ways and restored the Tribes, but they were now left with nonexistent or inadequate land bases.

H.R. 1306, the Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act, will go a long way in helping reestablish, long-promised land bases for the Oregon Tribes, while also giving them the ability to effectively manage their land on their own terms.

I want to thank our colleagues from Oregon, Mr. DEFazio and Mr. WALDEN, for listening to the needs of the Oregon Tribal people and continuing to push this bipartisan legislation.

The previous version of this bill passed the House by voice vote last Congress, and I now urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, due to flight delays, I was unable to speak on the floor in support of my legislation.

The Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act is a bipartisan, no-cost, common sense bill that will go a long way to helping resolve some of the problems the Federal government and its haphazard policy shifts have created for three western Oregon tribes.

The bill provides fairness for the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and the Coquille Indian Tribe.

Provisions of this bill were passed by voice vote in both the 113th and 114th Congresses. I hope this Congress it can finally become law. The tribes have waited entirely too long to receive the fairness owed to them.

For over a hundred years federal policies have unfairly disadvantaged Indian tribes in Western Oregon. After signing many treaties with the Tribes, the United States removed them from their original homelands and put them on only two reservations—established to house potentially more than 60 tribal governments.

In 1954, Congress made things even worse. All tribes west of the Cascades lost federal recognition when the Western Oregon Termination Act became law.

Scholars called it The Termination Era, and it was terrible federal Indian policy. It was so bad, that it was formally rebuked by Congress less than 30 years later.

In the 1970's, Congress began the process of restoring the Western Oregon tribes to federal recognition and cleaning up the mess and injustice the United States had made.

In fact, I began my Congressional career as the original sponsor of the Coquille Restoration Act, now law, which restored one of Oregon's terminated tribes.

Yet even today, it remains difficult for these tribes to function as the sovereign nations they are and to govern themselves effectively.

Unlike many tribes, the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Tribe, as well as the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, are deprived of any land held in trust.

Unlike any other tribe in the United States, the Coquille Indian Tribe must function under a legal anomaly with regard to managing its forest.

The Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act makes good on decades-old promises to restore land bases for the Coos and Cow Creek Tribes, and it puts the Coquille Indian Tribe's forest management on equal footing with those of other Indian tribes nationwide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1306.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2156) to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.



The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2156

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

# SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Act”.

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 12, 1928, the Saint Francis Dam located in the northern portion of Los Angeles County, California, breached, resulting in a devastating flood that caused the death of approximately 425 individuals.

(2) The residents of Santa Clarita Valley, San Francisquito Canyon, Castaic Junction, Santa Clara River Valley, Piru, Fillmore, Bardsdale, Saticoy, and Santa Paula were directly impacted and suffered greatly from the worst flood in the history of the State of California.

(3) The disaster resulted in a tremendous loss of human life, property, and the livelihood of local residents, and was surpassed in the level of destruction in the 20th century only by the great San Francisco earthquake of 1906.

(4) The collapse of the dam may represent America’s worst civil engineering failure in the 20th century.

(5) The site of the disaster is subject to the theft of historic artifacts, graffiti, and other vandalism.

(6) It is right to pay homage to the citizens who were killed, injured, or dislocated due to the flood, and to educate the public about this important historical event.

(7) It is appropriate that the site of the Saint Francis Dam and surrounding areas be specially designated and protected to commemorate this tragic event.

## SEC. 3. SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MEMORIAL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary is authorized to establish a memorial at the Saint Francis Dam site in the County of Los Angeles, California, for the purpose of honoring the victims of the Saint Francis Dam disaster of March 12, 1928.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Memorial shall be—

(1) known as the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial; and

(2) managed by the Forest Service.

(c) **DONATIONS.**—The Secretary is authorized to accept, hold, administer, invest, and spend any gift, devise, or bequest of real or personal property made to the Secretary for purposes of developing, designing, constructing, and managing the Memorial.

## SEC. 4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MEMORIAL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress recommendations regarding—

(1) the planning, design, construction, and long-term management of the Memorial;

(2) the proposed boundaries of the Memorial;

(3) a visitor center and educational facilities at the Memorial; and

(4) ensuring public access to the Memorial.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In preparing the recommendations required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with—

(1) appropriate Federal agencies;

(2) State, tribal, and local governments, including the Santa Clarita City Council; and

(3) the public.

## SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established as a national monument in the State, cer-

tain National Forest System land administered by the Secretary in the County of Los Angeles comprising approximately 440 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument”, created on June 14, 2016, to be known as the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Monument is to conserve and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of the public the cultural, archaeological, historical, watershed, educational, and recreational resources and values of the Monument.

## SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY WITH RESPECT TO MONUMENT.

(a) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan for the Monument.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The management plan shall be developed in consultation with—

(A) appropriate Federal agencies;

(B) State, tribal, and local governments; and

(C) the public.

(3) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In developing and implementing the management plan, the Secretary shall, with respect to methods of protecting and providing access to the Monument, consider the recommendations of the Saint Francis Disaster National Memorial Foundation, the Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society, and the Community Hiking Club of Santa Clarita.

(b) **MANAGEMENT.**—The Secretary shall manage the Monument—

(1) in a manner that conserves and enhances the cultural and historic resources of the Monument; and

(2) in accordance with—

(A) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1606 et seq.) and the laws generally applicable to the National Forest System;

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable laws.

(c) **USES.**—

(1) **USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—The use of motorized vehicles within the Monument may be permitted only—

(A) on roads designated for use by motorized vehicles in the management plan required under subsection (a);

(B) for administrative purposes; or

(C) for emergency responses.

(2) **GRAZING.**—The Secretary shall permit grazing within the Monument, where established before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations and Executive orders); and

(B) consistent with the purpose described in section 5(b).

## SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION ON FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

## SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MEMORIAL.**—The term “Memorial” means the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial authorized under section 3(a).

(2) **MONUMENT.**—The term “Monument” means the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument established under section 5(a).

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of California.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Saint Francis Dam disaster is considered one of the worst civil engineering catastrophes in the 20th century.

H.R. 2156, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), my good friend, recognizes the incident’s devastation and subsequent impacts on the residents of northern Los Angeles County by establishing a national memorial and monument to preserve the area for future generations.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the memorial using donations from the community, working in consultation with the Santa Clarita City Council and the public. No taxpayer funds are authorized for the construction of the memorial.

The bill also authorizes the creation of a 440-acre monument that will encompass the Saint Francis Dam memorial. The boundaries of the monument were designated in consultation with the local community, and the bill includes provisions to ensure motorized access within the monument and continued grazing on any land where it is already permitted.

The memorial and the monument created by this legislation are a fitting tribute to the 400 people who lost their lives tragically and thousands more whose lives were forever changed by the Saint Francis Dam disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill introduced by Mr. KNIGHT, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In one of the worst civil engineering failures of the 20th century, the breach of the Saint Francis Dam, on March 12, 1928, tragically took the lives of over 400 Americans. To honor the memory of those who lost their lives on that fateful day, H.R. 2156 establishes a national memorial at the disaster site in California’s Santa Clarita Valley. The memorial will provide a permanent place of remembrance and a place for healing.

In addition to the memorial, H.R. 2156 establishes the Saint Francis Dam



National Monument on 440 acres of public land managed by the Forest Service. The national monument designation authorizes the U.S. Forest Service, in consultation with a range of stakeholders, to develop educational programs and improve the health of regional watersheds.

I want to thank Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, as well as Congressman KNIGHT, along with the Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society, for bringing the legacy of the Saint Francis Dam disaster to the attention of Congress. As we have all heard: "Those who cannot remember the past are doomed to repeat it."

This bill received strong support last Congress and was voted out of the House. This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the author of the legislation.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is something that is near and dear to my heart. This is something that has affected our community. It happened less than 20 miles from my house, almost 100 years ago, and today I rise in remembrance of the Saint Francis Dam and the bill I sponsored, which would establish a national memorial to honor those in this terrible tragedy.

The Saint Francis Dam failed on March 12, 1928, in the San Francisquito Canyon. Nearly 13 billion gallons of water crashed down upon the surrounding areas and, ultimately, traveled 54 miles down to the Pacific Ocean. The brute force of this floodwater claimed 437 lives, leaving in its wake unspeakable heartbreak and catastrophically impacted communities.

The Saint Francis Dam disaster was America's worst civil engineering failure of the 20th century. While the failure ultimately informed future dam construction and the development of new safety standards, these lessons were learned at a steep price. Many of the dams that were built after this were built because of the Saint Francis Dam issues, and they were built at a much different level.

This bill takes a small but significant step in memorializing the men, women, and children who lost their lives in this tragedy. Those individuals represent a solemn part of current-day Santa Clarita Valley's heritage, and I am humbled by this honor to commemorate their memory.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his support of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2156.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LYTTON RANCHERIA HOMELANDS ACT OF 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 597) to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 597

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lytton Rancheria Homelands Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Lytton Rancheria of California is a federally recognized Indian tribe that lost its homeland after it was unjustly and unlawfully terminated in 1958. The Tribe was restored to Federal recognition in 1991, but the conditions of its restoration have prevented it from regaining a homeland on its original lands.

(2) Congress needs to take action to reverse historic injustices that befell the Tribe and have prevented it from regaining a viable homeland for its people.

(3) Prior to European contact there were as many as 350,000 Indians living in what is now the State of California. By the turn of the 19th century, that number had been reduced to approximately 15,000 individuals, many of them homeless and living in scattered bands and communities.

(4) The Lytton Rancheria's original homeland was purchased by the United States in 1926 pursuant to congressional authority designed to remedy the unique tragedy that befell the Indians of California and provide them with reservations called Rancherias to be held in trust by the United States.

(5) After the Lytton Rancheria lands were purchased by the United States, the Tribe settled on the land and sustained itself for several decades by farming and ranching.

(6) By the mid-1950s, Federal Indian policy had shifted back towards a policy of terminating Indian tribes. In 1958, Congress enacted the Rancheria Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 619), which slated 41 Rancherias in California, including the Lytton Rancheria, for termination after certain conditions were met.

(7) On August 1, 1961, the Lytton Rancheria was terminated by the Federal Government. This termination was illegal because the conditions for termination under the Rancheria Act had never been met. After termination was implemented, the Tribe lost its lands and was left without any means of supporting itself.

(8) In 1987, the Tribe joined three other tribes in a lawsuit against the United States

challenging the illegal termination of their Rancherias. A Stipulated Judgment in the case, *Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria v. United States*, No. C-86-3660 (N.D.Cal. March 22, 1991), restored the Lytton Rancheria to its status as a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(9) The Stipulated Judgment agreed that the Lytton Rancheria would have the "individual and collective status and rights" which it had prior to its termination and expressly contemplated the acquisition of trust lands for the Lytton Rancheria.

(10) The Stipulated Judgment contains provisions, included at the request of the local county governments and neighboring landowners, that prohibit the Lytton Rancheria from exercising its full Federal rights on its original homeland in the Alexander Valley.

(11) In 2000, approximately 9.5 acres of land in San Pablo, California, was placed in trust status for the Lytton Rancheria for economic development purposes.

(12) The Tribe has since acquired, from willing sellers at fair market value, property in Sonoma County near the Tribe's historic Rancheria. This property, which the Tribe holds in fee status, is suitable for a new homeland for the Tribe.

(13) On a portion of the land to be taken into trust, which portion totals approximately 124.12 acres, the Tribe plans to build housing for its members and governmental and community facilities.

(14) A portion of the land to be taken into trust is being used for viticulture, and the Tribe intends to develop more of the lands to be taken into trust for viticulture. The Tribe's investment in the ongoing viticulture operation has reinvigorated the vineyards, which are producing high-quality wines. The Tribe is operating its vineyards on a sustainable basis and is working toward certification of sustainability.

(15) No gaming shall be conducted on the lands to be taken into trust by this Act.

(16) No gaming shall be conducted on any lands taken into trust on behalf of the Tribe in Sonoma County after the date of the enactment of this Act north of a line that runs in a cardinal east and west direction from the point where Highway Route 12 crosses Highway 101 as they are physically on the ground and used for transportation on January 1, 2016, and extending to the furthest extent of Sonoma County.

(17) Any agreement, now or in the future, regarding gaming restrictions between Sonoma County and the Tribe will be effective without further review by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(18) By directing that these lands be taken into trust, the United States will ensure that the Lytton Rancheria will finally have a permanently protected homeland on which they can once again live communally and plan for future generations. This action is necessary to fully restore the Tribe to the status it had before it was wrongfully terminated in 1961.

(19) The Tribe and County of Sonoma have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement in which the County agrees to the lands in the County being taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe in consideration for commitments made by the Tribe.

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purpose of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Sonoma County, California.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Lytton Rancheria of California.

**SEC. 4. LANDS TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The land owned by the Tribe and generally depicted on the map titled “Lytton Fee Owned Property to be Taken into Trust” and dated May 1, 2015, is hereby taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, subject to valid existing rights, contracts, and management agreements related to easements and rights-of-way.

(b) LANDS TO BE MADE PART OF THE RESERVATION.—Lands taken into trust under subsection (a) shall be part of the Tribe’s reservation and shall be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to property held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe.

**SEC. 5. GAMING.**

(a) LANDS TAKEN INTO TRUST UNDER THIS ACT.—Lands taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe under section 4 shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(b) OTHER LANDS TAKEN INTO TRUST.—

(1) TIME-LIMITED PROHIBITION.—Lands taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe in Sonoma County after the date of the enactment of this Act shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710 et seq.) until after March 15, 2037.

(2) PERMANENT PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), lands located north of a line that runs in a cardinal east and west direction and is defined by California State Highway Route 12 as it crosses through Sonoma County at Highway 101 as they are physically on the ground and used for transportation on January 1, 2016, and extending to the furthest extent of Sonoma County shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710 et seq.).

**SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAW.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Memorandum of Agreement entered into by the Tribe and the County concerning taking land in the County into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, which was approved by the County Board of Supervisors on March 10, 2015, and any addenda and supplement thereto, is not subject to review or approval of the Secretary in order to be effective, including review or approval under section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 597, sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), my colleague, would take into trust approximately 511 acres of land of noncontiguous fee land owned by the Lytton Rancheria. The land is adjacent to the

town of Windsor, in Sonoma County, California. Under the bill, gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act is prohibited on these lands.

In 2009, the Tribe applied to the Department of the Interior to place title to approximately 127 acres of lands acquired in this area in trust. The application is still pending with the Department of the Interior.

The Tribe has testified that it intends to use a portion of the lands for Tribal housing, while the rest would support a diverse range of economic development, including plans for a future resort and winery.

I want to thank the sponsor of the legislation for his hard work on this bill, and I urge adoption of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Along with dozens of other California Tribes, the Lytton Band of Pomo Indians had its relationship with the Federal Government terminated in 1958. That resulted in the loss of its Federal status and all of its Tribal lands.

The Tribe’s federally recognized status was eventually restored, but their reservation lands were not. As a result, with the exception of a small parcel of land that Congress provided for gaming in San Pablo, the Tribe has been left essentially landless and without a reservation since it was terminated.

This bill will take approximately 511 acres in Sonoma County into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria. By directing these lands into trust, the United States will ensure that the Lytton Rancheria will finally have a permanently protected homeland on which they can, once again, live communally and plan for future generations.

I commend Representative DENHAM, my neighbor to the east, for this bipartisan legislation, and I urge quick adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 597.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

**AFTER RECESS**

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

**MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT**

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1397, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1719, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

**INTERAGENCY TRANSFER OF LAND ALONG GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1397) to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—406

|            |                 |               |
|------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abraham    | Biggs           | Brown (MD)    |
| Adams      | Bilirakis       | Brownley (CA) |
| Aderholt   | Bishop (GA)     | Buchanan      |
| Aguilar    | Bishop (MI)     | Buck          |
| Allen      | Bishop (UT)     | Bucshon       |
| Amash      | Black           | Budd          |
| Amodei     | Blackburn       | Burgess       |
| Arrington  | Blum            | Bustos        |
| Babin      | Blumenauer      | Byrne         |
| Bacon      | Blunt Rochester | Calvert       |
| Banks (IN) | Bonamici        | Capuano       |
| Barletta   | Bost            | Carbajal      |
| Barr       | Boyle, Brendan  | Cárdenas      |
| Barragán   | F.              | Carson (IN)   |
| Barton     | Brady (PA)      | Carter (GA)   |
| Bass       | Brady (TX)      | Carter (TX)   |
| Beatty     | Brat            | Cartwright    |
| Bera       | Bridenstine     | Castor (FL)   |
| Bergman    | Brooks (AL)     | Castro (TX)   |
| Beyer      | Brooks (IN)     | Chabot        |

Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Emmer  
Engel  
Espallat  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallagher  
Gallo  
Garamendi  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Hanabusa

Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin

McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moonen  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Norman  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panteta  
Pascarella  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradner  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson

Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suzuki  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry

Tiberi  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

[State Seal Affixed]

# SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE JIMMY GOMEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect Gomez and the members of the California delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. GOMEZ appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 115th Congress.

# WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JIMMY GOMEZ TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Democratic delegation of California, I am so very pleased to welcome the newest member of the California delegation, Congressman JIMMY GOMEZ.

Congressman GOMEZ will represent the people of the 34th Congressional District.

Congressman GOMEZ was elected to the California State Assembly in 2012 and reelected in 2014, and most recently in 2016, with over 86 percent of the vote, to represent California's 51st assembly district.

In the assembly, Congressman GOMEZ was a national champion of paid family leave. Congressman GOMEZ authored and passed legislation, Assembly Bill 908, the Nation's most progressive expansion of paid family leave, that President Obama held as a model for Congress.

JIMMY also authored legislation to address public health, environmental justice, water conservation, and access to education.

We are all looking forward to Representative GOMEZ expanding and continuing his work in the United States Congress. I hope Members will all join me in welcoming him to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank everyone for the warm welcome.

## NOT VOTING—26

Butterfield  
Cleaver  
Collins (GA)  
Cummings  
Duncan (TN)  
Gaetz  
Garrett  
Gosar  
Grijalva

Gutiérrez  
Hoyer  
Hurd  
Johnson, Sam  
Larson (CT)  
Lieu, Ted  
Moore  
Napolitano  
Pearce

Perlmutter  
Raskin  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Smucker  
Titus

□ 1853

Mr. WENSTRUP changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 20, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Alex Padilla, California Secretary of State, indicating that, at the Special Election held on June 6, 2017, the Honorable Jimmy Gomez was duly elected Representative in Congress for the 34th Congressional District, State of California.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk.

Enclosure.

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, Alex Padilla, Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify that according to information concerning the statement of the results of the Special General Election held on the 6th day of June, 2017, on file in my office, Jimmy Gomez was elected to the office of United States Representative District 34.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the Great Seal of the State of California, at Sacramento, this 19th day of June, 2017.

ALEX PADILLA,  
Secretary of State.

I also want to thank Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for all the attention he has given me for the past several weeks. Thank you so much.

I am truly honored to be here and to be joined by my mother, Socorro; my brother, Gerry; my mother-in-law, Sally; and, of course, my amazing wife, Mary.

My approach to public policy, politics, and government is shaped by the experiences of my family and of my community. As the son of immigrants who believes in this country and everything it promises, I am a living embodiment of that promise. I have a profound commitment to protecting the rights of immigrants no matter where they are from and no matter what God they worship.

I am also a fighter for universal healthcare, because when I was 7 years old, I ended up in the hospital with pneumonia, and that 1-week stay in the hospital almost bankrupted my family.

I also believe that young people from working families should have access to debt-free education, because I know from my own personal experience that a high school degree is not always enough, and that is why a higher education can actually transform an individual's life.

I believe everyone deserves access to clean air and clean water and that climate change has exacerbated that challenge.

And lastly, I don't believe in the hype and the false divides that progressives can't be for working families and for families from all over America.

To the people of the 34th Congressional District, I know why they sent me to Congress. They want me to fight for our families, our State, and our values, and I will do that every single day, and I won't let them down.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from California, the whole number of the House is 434.

#### JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1719) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the

House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 15, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

#### YEAS—401

|                 |                 |                |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abraham         | Curbelo (FL)    | Hudson         |
| Adams           | Davidson        | Huffman        |
| Aderholt        | Davis (CA)      | Huizenga       |
| Agullar         | Davis, Danny    | Hultgren       |
| Allen           | Davis, Rodney   | Hunter         |
| Amodei          | DeFazio         | Issa           |
| Arrington       | DeGette         | Jackson Lee    |
| Bacon           | Delaney         | Jayapal        |
| Banks (IN)      | DeLauro         | Jeffries       |
| Barletta        | DelBene         | Jenkins (KS)   |
| Barr            | Demings         | Jenkins (WV)   |
| Barragán        | Denham          | Johnson (GA)   |
| Barton          | Dent            | Johnson (LA)   |
| Bass            | DeSantis        | Johnson (OH)   |
| Beatty          | DeSaulnier      | Johnson, E. B. |
| Bera            | DesJarlais      | Joyce (OH)     |
| Bergman         | Deutch          | Kaptur         |
| Beyer           | Diaz-Balart     | Katko          |
| Bilirakis       | Dingell         | Keating        |
| Bishop (GA)     | Doggett         | Kelly (IL)     |
| Bishop (MI)     | Donovan         | Kelly (MS)     |
| Bishop (UT)     | Doyle, Michael  | Kelly (PA)     |
| Black           | F.              | Kennedy        |
| Blackburn       | Duffy           | Khanna         |
| Blum            | Duncan (SC)     | Kihuen         |
| Blumenauer      | Dunn            | Kildee         |
| Blunt Rochester | Ellison         | Kilmer         |
| Bonamici        | Emmer           | Kind           |
| Bost            | Engel           | King (IA)      |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Eshoo           | King (NY)      |
| F.              | Españolat       | Kinzinger      |
| Brady (PA)      | Estes (KS)      | Knight         |
| Brady (TX)      | Esty (CT)       | Krishnamoorthi |
| Bridenstine     | Evans           | Kuster (NH)    |
| Brooks (AL)     | Farenthold      | Kustoff (TN)   |
| Brooks (IN)     | Faso            | Labrador       |
| Brown (MD)      | Ferguson        | LaHood         |
| Brownley (CA)   | Fitzpatrick     | LaMalfa        |
| Buchanan        | Fleischmann     | Lamborn        |
| Buck            | Flores          | Lance          |
| Bucshon         | Fortenberry     | Langevin       |
| Burgess         | Foster          | Larsen (WA)    |
| Bustos          | Fox             | Larson (CT)    |
| Byrne           | Frankel (FL)    | Latta          |
| Calvert         | Franks (AZ)     | Lawrence       |
| Capuano         | Frelinghuysen   | Lawson (FL)    |
| Carbajal        | Fudge           | Lee            |
| Cárdenas        | Gabbard         | Levin          |
| Carson (IN)     | Gaetz           | Lewis (GA)     |
| Carter (GA)     | Gallagher       | Lewis (MN)     |
| Carter (TX)     | Gallego         | Lipinski       |
| Cartwright      | Garamendi       | LoBiondo       |
| Castor (FL)     | Gianforte       | Loeb           |
| Castro (TX)     | Gibbs           | Loeb           |
| Chabot          | Gohmert         | Long           |
| Cheney          | Gomez           | Loudermilk     |
| Chu, Judy       | Gonzalez (TX)   | Love           |
| Cicilline       | Goodlatte       | Lowenthal      |
| Clark (MA)      | Gottheimer      | Lowe           |
| Clarke (NY)     | Gowdy           | Lucas          |
| Clay            | Granger         | Luetkemeyer    |
| Cleaver         | Graves (GA)     | Lujan Grisham, |
| Clyburn         | Graves (LA)     | M.             |
| Coffman         | Graves (MO)     | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Cohen           | Green, Al       | Lynch          |
| Cole            | Green, Gene     | MacArthur      |
| Collins (GA)    | Grijalva        | Maloney,       |
| Collins (NY)    | Grothman        | Carolyn B.     |
| Comer           | Guthrie         | Maloney, Sean  |
| Comstock        | Hanabusa        | Marchant       |
| Conaway         | Handel          | Marino         |
| Connolly        | Harper          | Marshall       |
| Conyers         | Hartzler        | Mast           |
| Cook            | Hastings        | Matsui         |
| Cooper          | Heck            | McCarthy       |
| Correa          | Hensarling      | McCauley       |
| Costa           | Herrera Beutler | McClintock     |
| Costello (PA)   | Hice, Jody B.   | McCollum       |
| Courtney        | Higgins (LA)    | McEachin       |
| Cramer          | Higgins (NY)    | McGovern       |
| Crawford        | Hill            | McHenry        |
| Crist           | Himes           | McKinley       |
| Crowley         | Holding         | McMorris       |
| Cuellar         | Hollingsworth   | Rodgers        |
| Culberson       | Hoyer           | McNerney       |

|             |                 |                |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| McSally     | Roe (TN)        | Stivers        |
| Meadows     | Rogers (AL)     | Suozi          |
| Meehan      | Rogers (KY)     | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Meeks       | Rokita          | Takano         |
| Meng        | Rooney, Francis | Taylor         |
| Messer      | Ros-Lehtinen    | Tenney         |
| Mitchell    | Rosen           | Thompson (CA)  |
| Moolenaar   | Roskam          | Thompson (MS)  |
| Moulton     | Ross            | Thompson (PA)  |
| Mullin      | Rothfus         | Thornberry     |
| Murphy (FL) | Roybal-Allard   | Tiberi         |
| Murphy (PA) | Royce (CA)      | Tipton         |
| Nadler      | Ruiz            | Tonko          |
| Neal        | Ruppersberger   | Torres         |
| Newhouse    | Rush            | Trott          |
| Noem        | Russell         | Tsongas        |
| Nolan       | Rutherford      | Turner         |
| Norcross    | Ryan (OH)       | Upton          |
| Norman      | Sánchez         | Valadao        |
| Nunes       | Sanford         | Vargas         |
| O'Halleran  | Sarbanes        | Veasey         |
| O'Rourke    | Schakowsky      | Vela           |
| Olson       | Schiff          | Velázquez      |
| Palazzo     | Schneider       | Visclosky      |
| Pallone     | Schrader        | Walberg        |
| Palmer      | Schweikert      | Walden         |
| Panetta     | Scott (VA)      | Walker         |
| Pascarella  | Scott, Austin   | Walorski       |
| Paulsen     | Scott, David    | Walters, Mimi  |
| Payne       | Sensenbrenner   | Walz           |
| Pelosi      | Serrano         | Wasserman      |
| Perry       | Sessions        | Schultz        |
| Peters      | Sewell (AL)     | Waters, Maxine |
| Peterson    | Shea-Porter     | Watson Coleman |
| Pingree     | Sherman         | Webster (FL)   |
| Pittenger   | Shimkus         | Welch          |
| Pocan       | Shuster         | Wenstrup       |
| Poe (TX)    | Simpson         | Westerman      |
| Poliquin    | Sinema          | Williams       |
| Polis       | Sires           | Wilson (FL)    |
| Posey       | Slaughter       | Wilson (SC)    |
| Price (NC)  | Smith (MO)      | Wittman        |
| Quigley     | Smith (NE)      | Womack         |
| Ratcliffe   | Smith (NJ)      | Woodall        |
| Reed        | Smith (TX)      | Yarmuth        |
| Reichert    | Smith (WA)      | Yoder          |
| Renacci     | Smucker         | Young (AK)     |
| Rice (NY)   | Soto            | Young (IA)     |
| Rice (SC)   | Speier          | Zeldin         |
| Richmond    | Stefanik        |                |
| Roby        | Stewart         |                |

#### NAYS—15

|       |          |             |
|-------|----------|-------------|
| Amash | Garrett  | Massie      |
| Babin | Griffith | Mooney (WV) |
| Biggs | Harris   | Rouzer      |
| Brat  | Jones    | Weber (TX)  |
| Budd  | Jordan   | Yoho        |

#### NOT VOTING—17

|             |              |                |
|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| Butterfield | Johnson, Sam | Raskin         |
| Cummings    | Lieu, Ted    | Rohrabacher    |
| Duncan (TN) | Moore        | Rooney, Thomas |
| Gosar       | Napolitano   | J.             |
| Gutiérrez   | Pearce       | Scalise        |
| Hurd        | Perlmutter   | Titus          |

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1910

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 345, and "yea" on rollcall No. 346.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I attended the funeral of a close family member and was unable to fly back to the Capitol in time for votes today. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 1397, To authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes, and "yea" on H.R. 1719, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE  
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR  
OF H.R. 622

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 622, a bill originally introduced by Representative Chaffetz of Utah, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON  
ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL  
REPORT ON H.R.  
2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
ACT FOR FISCAL  
YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 2810.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## VENEZUELA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 100 days, the Venezuelan people have been courageously protesting peacefully on the streets against the abusive regime of Nicolas Maduro.

Since June, more than 1,400 people have been injured, over 3,600 have been detained, and over 100 people have been killed by Maduro's thugs.

Just days ago, Maduro moved opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez to house arrest after more than 3 unjust years in prison. But this diversion tactic is not enough. All political prisoners must be released.

Maduro's fraudulent constituent assembly must be stopped. And more

names must be added to the sanctions list, especially those human rights abusers who are responsible for the violent actions against innocent civilians.

This will send a strong message that the United States stands with the people in their struggle for democracy and for justice for all Venezuelans.

UTILIZING UAS FOR INTERNATIONAL  
HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND DISASTER  
RELIEF

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, during the full committee markup of the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act, the House Armed Services Committee came together to produce a strong bipartisan bill that will ensure investment in and oversight of our military. We also recognized how valuable the Department is to international humanitarian assistance and disaster relief efforts as well.

During markup, I offered an amendment that will require the Department to assess the viability of unmanned aircraft systems in support of international humanitarian aid missions. Although it is well understood that the DOD has operated UAS platforms effectively for over a decade in offensive roles, I believe it is also important we recognize the capabilities of UAS platforms to increase the speed and quality of response forces providing disaster relief and medical assistance to those suffering around the world. Think of critical disaster efforts, whereby vital medicine and supplies are needed quickly. UAS could very well make all the difference between life and death.

I am pleased that this amendment was adopted during markup, and I thank my colleagues for their support of this endeavor.

## □ 1915

OFFICER DOWN: MIOSOTIS  
FAMILIA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as fireworks boomed in the sky above the Bronx, 48-year-old law officer Miosotis Familia sat in a mobile command unit. She was a good officer.

Known for her no-nonsense approach to law enforcement, she was friendly with the neighborhood, spoke Spanish, and was always quick with a smile and a wave. But suddenly, an evil outlaw appeared at her window and, with a heart fatally bent on mischief, pointed a .38-caliber revolver through the window and pulled the trigger, cold-bloodedly murdering Officer Familia.

She wore the uniform with the badge, the shield over her heart.

Officer Familia was one of 10 siblings from an immigrant family from the Dominican Republic, and she had three children of her own.

Our men and women in blue are being targeted, gunned down for simply wearing the uniform, gunned down by the scourge that prey on the police.

Congress should take action and protect those who serve our Nation every day, all day, on the streets of America. Senator CORNYN and I have introduced the Back the Blue Act of 2017, which increases the penalties for the soulless criminals who intentionally target the law enforcement community.

Peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the law and the lawless, between good and evil.

Taps has been played for the end of watch for Officer Familia. Her life may be gone, but her service and sacrifice are a reminder of those who give their lives to the thin blue line.

So back the blue, Mr. Speaker, back the blue.

And that is just the way it is.

THE INVESTIGATION MUST  
CONTINUE

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump, Jr., has documented that he, Jared Kushner, and former Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort met with a Russian lawyer with the understanding that she was a Russian Government agent and would provide damaging information on Hillary Clinton as part of Moscow's effort to help President Trump's campaign.

The attempt by these top advisers to solicit the support of a hostile foreign power to win the American Presidency is unprecedented in our history.

When an American political campaign is approached by a foreign source promising information on an opponent, they should contact the FBI. Unfortunately, the Trump campaign, instead, scheduled a meeting.

All those who participated in the Trump Tower meeting must testify under oath before Congress. Mr. Trump, Mr. Manafort, Mr. Kushner, Mr. Goldstone, and Ms. Veselnitskaya must disclose to Congress the nature and details of their conversations, including any sources in the Kremlin.

Special Counsel Mueller's investigation must continue, and so must ours.

CONGRATULATING MINNETONKA  
BOYS TENNIS CHAMPS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Minnetonka High School boys tennis team on their recent extraordinary State tournament victory. The Skippers won their second consecutive State title, led by Senior Adam Thompson and Junior Ben Wheaton.

The team worked hard to win, with a final score of 4-3. This close victory displayed their competitive skill, and the way the Skippers carried themselves after the victory epitomizes the virtue of sportsmanship and humility.

Mr. Speaker, with their strong determination and commitment to excellence, these student athletes exemplify the very best of their school and of our community. They excel both on the court and in the classroom.

I offer my congratulations to the players, the coaches, and the parents. Congratulations to the Minnetonka boys tennis team on their victory and becoming State champs.

#### THE PUBLIC TRUST HAS BEEN VIOLATED

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the son of Mr. Trump knew full well that he was accepting an invitation from a chain of individuals affiliated with the Kremlin: first, the liaison guy, the publicist, an operative of the Kremlin; the entertainer, the operative of the Kremlin; and then the attorney, who has affiliations through her family with the Kremlin. And then the idea was to receive information from a foreign, hostile nation about the opponent of his father.

With all of his outpouring of honesty now, the question has to be why was this meeting hidden, and it has to be whether we are on the brink of seeing a situation where those involved have acted against the interests of the United States of America.

Having just come back from a former Soviet bloc country, I know the distinction between the freedom in this Nation and the non-freedom that Putin believes in. So I think it is important, as I have said over and over again, that the House Judiciary Committee needs to open up its investigation, take oversight over issues that are relevant to the Constitution and, of course, those individuals who are holding the public trust.

The public trust has been violated, but I believe seriously that something more has been violated. There is Russian collusion: collusion in the election, skewing the idea of a fair election. This is what we are dealing with, and I am saddened by this situation.

The Judiciary Committee must investigate the skewing of the election toward one candidate over another.

#### RECOGNIZING PENN STATE UNIVERSITY CRITICAL LANGUAGE SCHOLARS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two Penn State University students who received critical language scholarships following their completion of the U.S. Department of State's Critical Language Scholarship Program in the summer of 2016.

The following students were two of the 564 total selected participants. A total of 5,700 students applied.

Janet Purdy, of State College, reached an intermediate level of Swahili while studying in Tanzania; and Erika Pugh, of Boalsburg, achieved an advanced level of Arabic while studying in Russia.

The Critical Language Scholarship Program is a crucial component of our Federal Government's goal to encourage Americans to master languages that are essential to our national security and economic prosperity. These students study abroad in rigorous summer institutes, learning these critical foreign languages, while engaging with citizens of the host countries to further their cultural educations.

We are proud of these two outstanding students from the Pennsylvania State University for their achievements. Congratulations, Janet and Erika.

#### RUSSIA'S ONGOING ASSAULT ON OUR DEMOCRACY CANNOT GO UNANSWERED

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Russia's ongoing assault on our democracy and democracies around the globe cannot go unanswered.

It has been a month since Russian sanctions passed the Senate 97-2, yet House Republican leaders continue to stall on bringing that worthy bill forward here. Why? Who or what are they protecting? Surely not liberty.

Putin's Russia targets journalists and political opponents for death. He shelters hackers that target democratic nations, including ours, and Russia hacks businesses to enrich Putin's cronies.

Russia's illegal invasion of sovereign nations, the latest being Ukraine, with over 10,000 dead and over 2 million displaced, reminds us of the evil brutality of Russia's kleptocratic rulers. Russia's damaging expansionism needs to be stopped.

Despite earlier denials, reports state that Donald Trump, Jr., Jared Kushner, and Trump campaign man-

ager Paul Manafort knowingly met with a Kremlin-aligned lawyer to secure damaging information about Hillary Clinton. This administration is not acting in the national interest, and the victim of their encounters is liberty herself.

Let House Republican leaders stop the delays and bring forward strong sanctions legislation on Russia. Let us defend liberty and our rule of law as a beacon of hope for people everywhere, even those living in the grim reality of Russia.

#### A VISIT TO ANIMAL ADVENTURE PARK

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a new friend I made last week as I was traveling through the 22nd Congressional District: April the Giraffe.

April is a resident of the Animal Adventure Park in Harpersville, New York; and many of you may already know April as the star of the Giraffe Cam which garnered worldwide attention this spring. The Giraffe Cam captured April giving birth to her baby calf, Tajiri. The live video was watched by more than 1 million viewers worldwide.

I am happy to report that April and I had a great meeting and that Tajiri is growing and doing very well in the Animal Adventure Park. I also had the unique opportunity to pose for a selfie with April from high atop a perch. She was much obliging, especially since I had some carrots to offer her.

Most importantly, during my visit to Animal Adventure Park, which is a beautiful preservation of wild animals from around the world, I learned that over the last 30 years the giraffe population numbers have declined by over 40 percent, and giraffes are now listed in the category of "vulnerable to extinction," an important reminder that we can all do more to preserve wildlife and to protect precious wild species such as April and her darling baby, Taj, that share the planet with us.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF MRS. MARTHA RIVERA CHAVIS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mrs. Martha Rivera Chavis, who passed away on July 6, 2017, at her home in Montclair, New Jersey.

After receiving her degree in French civilization at the Sorbonne University in Paris, France, Mrs. Rivera Chavis served as the French-to-Portuguese

translator for Angola's Ambassador to the United Nations. It was there she met Reverend Dr. Benjamin F. Chavis, Jr., a civil rights leader and president of the National Newspaper Publishers Association.

After marrying in 1988, Mrs. Rivera Chavis and her husband cared for nine Angolans, including six children with missing limbs, at their home in Montclair. Mrs. Rivera Chavis carried that empathy and compassion with her throughout life, including during her tenure as the head of the Women in NAACP committee, where she fought for justice, equality, and freedom for minority communities.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rivera Chavis will be greatly missed by all who knew her. I send my thoughts and prayers to her husband, Benjamin, and her children and loved ones.

#### PEOPLE ARE WORRIED ABOUT HEALTHCARE

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, last week, as I traveled throughout my district, I heard time and time and time again from people worried about one issue: healthcare. I heard stories like Diane's in Mundelein, who was able to get affordable coverage through ACA after losing her job of 30 years to outsourcing, and Claire's, from Vernon Hills, who was diagnosed with neurofibromatosis just a month before her 26th birthday. Yet, because of ACA, she has insurance today, despite her preexisting condition.

I was thrilled to learn that Claire recently got married, and is looking forward to pursuing her dreams: raising a family and living a long and productive life.

Mr. Speaker, across the country, there are millions of stories just like these. The ACA is far from perfect and it needs work. I heard that from my constituents as well.

I urge my colleagues here in Congress to listen to the people who share their stories with me and others and end this ill-considered repeal effort. Instead, let's get to work together to deliver quality, affordable healthcare for all Americans.

□ 1930

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES 399.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 399.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### EXECUTIVE ORDER AMENDING EXECUTIVE ORDER 13761—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-51)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Consistent with subsection 401(b) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(b), and subsection 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") that amends Executive Order 13761 of January 13, 2017, by changing certain effective dates and revokes a reporting requirement in that order.

The order changes the date by which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, is to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan's progress in sustaining the positive actions taken by the Government of Sudan that gave rise to Executive Order 13761, from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017. The order also changes from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017, the effective date for the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the entirety of Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, provided that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, publishes on or before October 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to the order and has provided to the President the report described above.

The order revokes the requirement in Executive Order 13761 to provide an updated version of the report annually thereafter and, concurrent with those reports, to publish in the *Federal Register* a notice stating whether the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761.

The President issued Executive Orders 13067 and 13412, among other orders, to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan, including support for international terrorism; efforts to destabilize neighboring governments; and the prevalence of human rights violations.

In Executive Order 13761, the President determined that the situation that gave rise to the actions taken in Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412 related to the policies and actions of the Government of Sudan had been altered by Sudan's positive actions over the prior 6 months. Executive Order 13761 directed the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, and based on a consideration of relevant and credible information from available sources, including nongovernmental organizations, on or before July 12, 2017, to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan's progress in sustaining its positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761. Executive Order 13761 further provided that if the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, published on or before July 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan had sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761 and had provided to the President the report described above, the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and the revocation of Executive Order 13412 would become effective.

While the Government of Sudan has made some progress in areas identified in Executive Order 13761, I have decided that more time is needed for this review to establish that the Government of Sudan has demonstrated sufficient positive action across all of those areas.

For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to amend the effective date to October 12, 2017, to provide the report required by Executive Order 13761 and revoke sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412, provided that further action is taken by the Secretary of State, as set forth in Executive Order 13761, and to revoke the subsequent annual reporting requirement in Executive Order 13761.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 2017.

#### THE TEST OF OUR PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to this hour, although I will probably take something less than that.



I want to bring to the attention of the House and, more beyond that, the citizens of the United States what is happening here with all this talk about the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. I want to spend some time on that issue. I want to review exactly what the Affordable Care Act has done for Americans and what the repeal would do to Americans. Those are really two different ways to look at this.

I want to start someplace else that has been a very special part of my thinking about government issues, about policies of all kinds, and it was something that Franklin Delano Roosevelt said during the height of the Depression as the American government and Mr. Roosevelt were talking about the various policies that were being discussed at the time. He laid out a test to which he would apply his judgment of a policy. It reads this way: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is rather we provide enough for those who have too little."

I see this as a profound and extremely important criteria upon which to judge many policies that come before us in bills, but it is also, I think, an extremely valuable way to judge the question of the Affordable Care Act: Has it added much to those who have little?

I will try to answer that in a few moments.

Similarly, in looking at the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. When we consider the repeal of the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—does it add to those who have much? Does it add to those who have little?

I will try to answer these questions in just a few moments.

So does the Affordable Care Act add much to those who have little?

The answer is: Categorically, it does. There is absolutely no doubt that the Affordable Care Act has helped those who have little. I will give a couple of examples. Just a couple.

One, a beauty salon operator in Sacramento, California, around the age of 30, married, wanting to have children but not able to do so because she had no insurance. A small-business operator, herself, maybe one part-time employee, unable to get insurance prior to the Affordable Care Act.

My wife visited her after the Affordable Care Act went into place, and she was able to purchase private insurance through the subsidized market, and she happily, excitedly told my wife: And now my husband and I, we are going to have a baby. At last I have the insurance. And I want you to tell your husband "thank you."

That thanks is not to me. It is to the men and women of the Congress in 2010, myself included, and the Senate, and

President Obama that signed the Affordable Care Act that set up a situation in which, through the California exchange, similar to other State exchanges, she was able to purchase insurance. Subsidized to be sure, but nonetheless, she was on her way to having a baby, or at least thinking about having a baby. I will come back to her in a few moments.

A second person, small family farmer in my district unable to have insurance throughout her entire adult life. In and out of hospitals for everything from an accident on the farm to some more serious things. Facing bankruptcy. The Affordable Care Act gave her the opportunity to have insurance, to stabilize her life, her healthcare, and, importantly, be able to avoid the financial disaster of a major medical bill that would have clearly bankrupted her and put her out on the street.

That is what the Affordable Care Act did to two constituents in my district. And that story is repeated over 20 million times around this Nation. More than 20 million Americans have been able to get health insurance as a result of Affordable Care Act. And 6.1 million young Americans have been able to stay on their parents' insurance policies, not thrown off at the age of 18, but able to stay on until the age of 25. And 27 percent of Americans who have preexisting conditions—27 percent of us have some sort of preexisting condition—no longer a bar to being able to get insurance.

I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I saw the forms that the insurance companies would require be filled out. Everything in their life from the moment of their birth—in fact, before their birth, they needed to disclose every single event. Did you have pneumonia? Did you have an illness of this or that? All the way down the line.

And if you answered "yes" to any one of those, you would probably not be able to get insurance. And 27 percent of the American public unable to buy insurance because of preexisting conditions, no longer the case in America today. It is gone. That is history.

This is my experience. Thousands of times I saw this. If a person went through that entire checklist and there was some inaccuracy in the way they answered those questions and they went to the hospital with a serious illness that was supposed to be covered, it was common for the insurance companies to go back and do medical underwriting after the event and deny the coverage. Common practice.

Something as mundane as: I did not have mumps when I was a child. Check, check, check. Oh, you had mumps? I am sorry, we are not going to pay for this operation.

Those days are gone. The Affordable Care Act did that.

In my own State of California, 3.7 million Californians are now insured

due to the Medicaid expansion program, which we call Medi-Cal in California. And 1.4 million people now have insurance through the exchange. The two examples I gave are but two of 1.4 million Californians that have insurance. So it works. And it is not just that. There are other things.

Seniors, the infamous doughnut hole in which, under Medicare part D, the first couple of thousand dollars of drug expenses would be covered. And then serious illnesses, you blow through that quickly, and then you faced the doughnut hole, and it was out of your pocket.

So you found seniors all across this country unable to afford the continuation of the drugs that kept them alive. It is gone—or will soon be gone. The Affordable Care Act collapses that doughnut hole so that in another 1½ years, 2 years from now it would be gone and the Medicare part D would provide the drugs that are necessary to keep seniors alive.

The repeal of the Affordable Care Act would end that and send those seniors back where they were before, facing the ominous doughnut hole. It goes on and on.

Medicaid expansion, 20 million Americans covered; 3.7 million in California. The drop in insurance rates. Due to the Affordable Care Act, the uninsured rate is now the lowest in history.

Consider this: 16 percent of Americans in 2010, before the Affordable Care Act, did not have insurance—16 percent of the 380 million of us.

□ 1945

Today, it is down to just about 8 percent—excuse me, that is in 2016. There has been continued improvements since then, 8 percent. That is where those 22 million Americans are.

So we have seen this over time. As a result of the Affordable Care Act, the uninsured in America have steadily decreased as the Affordable Care Act has taken hold.

Hospital-acquired infections significantly reduced. Under the Affordable Care Act, unnecessary hospital readmissions due to infections, have fallen for the first time on record, dropping 8 percent between 2010 and 2015. Why has this happened, you ask? Because in the Affordable Care Act, there was a serious financial penalty to hospitals when there was a readmission as a result of a hospital-acquired infection.

Is that important? It certainly is, for those who are not readmitted for infections.

The annual lifetime benefits, you have heard about this. You know somebody in your family, in your community, who had a limit on their insurance policy, \$100,000 a year, or maybe a lifetime exclusion or limit of \$200,000, or \$300,000, or some number. If you have a serious illness, you blow right up

through that barrier, and your coverage, it is on your account. Hospital coverage and expenses are no longer covered by the insurance policy.

That is gone. It is over. It doesn't exist any longer in the United States. So the end to annual and lifetime limits is a direct result of the Affordable Care Act.

Slower premium growth and a cap on out-of-pocket expenses. Due to the Affordable Care Act, all health policies now have a limit on out-of-pocket costs, which benefits all Americans.

Free preventative care. Have you talked to any seniors recently? If you are on Medicare, you have an annual free checkup. What does that mean? It means that your high blood pressure that you didn't know about, your onset for diabetes and other illnesses, you find out about it, deal with it, live longer, reduce the costs.

In part, that is the reason that we have now seen that the Medicare viability, the financial viability of Medicare has been extended by nearly a decade as a result of the Affordable Care Act and the kind of policies that were built in it—for example, free preventative care.

I have already talked about young adults being able to stay, and that is 2.3 million young adults.

Lives saved from reductions in hospital-acquired conditions. Eighty-seven thousand Americans are alive today because of better healthcare in the hospitals.

Public satisfaction. Eighty-two percent of the consumers in the marketplace plans or newly insured under Medicare due to the ACA, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, have expressed satisfaction with their coverages.

Tax credits. Seven in 10 consumers in the marketplace got coverage through their tax credits.

I already talked about preexisting conditions.

Mental health and maternity care. Family values, well, we hear that all the time here on the floor. Family values, this is a family value. This is a family value, yes. And the Affordable Care Act is a family value because maternity coverage is guaranteed. The most basic element of family, babies are now covered.

Maternity care is now guaranteed coverage under the Affordable Care Act. And from the moment that baby is born, through their life under the Affordable Care Act, they have a guaranteed coverage, regardless of any illness that they may have at birth.

I can give you story after story that I found when I was an insurance commissioner in California. The family had coverage. The family actually had maternity coverage. The baby is born with a serious defect of some sort. There was no coverage for that baby because of a preexisting condition from the

very moment of birth. That is not the case any longer in America as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

We can go on and on, and probably we ought to. We have heard a lot. I am just going to keep this up here to remind all of us about a test of what good public policy can and should be.

There has been a lot of talk now about the collapse of the insurance market. We have heard the President talk about the collapse of the insurance market. Any time he brings up the issue of the repeal of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, he always prefaces it or follows his comments with: The insurance market is imploding. It is collapsing.

We have heard that discussion here on the floor from the leaders of the majority party. The Affordable Care Act is collapsing. The insurance markets are collapsing. Oh, my, my. Interesting.

Let's see, this is the 10th of July. A report was issued by The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation—not a liberal organization, not a conservative organization, but one of the best-known research organizations on healthcare in America. The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation issued a report on July 10, 2017, by Cynthia Cox and Larry Levitt. I won't read it all to you, but I will read the discussion point.

Early results from 2017 suggest the individual market is stabilizing and insurers in this market are regaining profitability. Insurance financial results show no signs of a market collapse. Hello. Anybody listening?

Early results from 2017 suggest the individual market is stabilizing and insurers in this market are regaining profitability. Insurer financial results show no sign of market collapse.

First quarter premium and claims data from 2017. First quarter premium and claims data—this is from the insurance companies—from 2017 support the notion that 2017 premium increases were necessary as a one-time market correction to adjust for a sicker than expected risk pool.

Although individual market enrollees appear, on average, to be sicker than the market pre-ACA, data on hospitalization in this market suggests that the risk pool is stable, on average, and not getting progressively sicker, as of early 2017.

Some insurers have exited the market in recent years, but others have successfully expanded their footprints, as would be expected in a competitive market.

Now the caveats. While the market, on average, is stabilizing, there remain some areas of the country that are more fragile. In addition—and here is the important point for any policymaker in Washington, D.C., from the President to the rest of us. In addition, policy uncertainty has the potential to destabilize the individual market generally.

Mixed signals from the administration and Congress as to whether cost-sharing subsidies under the Affordable Care Act and cost-sharing reduction payments will continue, or whether the individual mandate will be enforced, have led some insurers to leave the market or request larger premium increases than they would otherwise.

Few parts of the country may now be at risk of having no insurers. If you don't mind, I would like to go back over that again. Mixed signals from the administration—hello, President

Trump and Congress. Hello, my colleagues—who have voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, mixed signals from the administration and Congress as to whether cost-sharing subsidy payments will continue, or whether the individual mandate will be enforced, have led some insurers to leave the market or request larger premium increases than they would otherwise.

So who is responsible for the collapse? Well, we can do some finger-pointing, but then I would be admonishing—Mr. Speaker, I should do some finger-pointing, but I am not going to do it right now.

I am going to go back here. “The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much.”

Okay. Let's look at the repeal. Let's judge the repeal based on that criteria. Maybe you don't believe Franklin Delano Roosevelt was correct, but maybe we ought to just see what we are talking about here.

The repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the legislation that passed this House, the tax provisions in the Affordable Care Act, it is somewhere north of a \$700 billion to \$800 billion reduction in taxes. That is a lot of tax reduction. That was in the legislation.

I have argued repeatedly here on the floor and other places that it is the largest single transfer of wealth from the poor and the middle class to the super wealthy. That argument is factual because, what are the benefits? Who wins in the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the poor, or the 22 million to 24 million people who will lose their insurance as a result of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act? That was in the House bill.

In the Senate bill, they are talking about similar numbers, 23 million, 24 million, 25 million people. That is a lot of Americans who are going to lose their insurance and are going to be personally, physically harmed as a result of the repeal.

So who benefits? The other side of this piece of legislation is one of the largest tax reductions ever—not for the poor, small for the middle class, but oh, my, for the wealthy, the top 1 percent of Americans—excuse me—the top one-tenth of 1 percent of Americans would have their taxes cut, on average, by \$197,490 per year. That is the top one-tenth of 1 percent.

How about the top 100 wealthy families in America, five of whom are in this administration, the super wealthy, what does it mean to them? \$4 million to \$6 million a year reduction, on average, in their taxes. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much.

Need I stand here on the floor for hours driving home the point that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act is more than a taking away of healthcare benefits in which, if we were to believe the Senate and the Senate bill were to become law, 18 million Americans next year would lose their health insurance, and then beyond, another 5 million Americans in the years ahead.

It is a test of our progress. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little. It is pretty easy, a pretty easy criteria when applied against the repeal. Are we providing anything for them? No, you are taking away their healthcare, their health insurance, and, undoubtedly, their health and their lives. It doesn't meet this test at all.

On the tax side, oh, my, the bottom 80 percent of taxpayers in this Nation would receive the awesome, extraordinary benefit of a reduction of \$160 a year in their taxes.

□ 2000

That is what our Republicans have offered us with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Eighty percent of American taxpayers would receive the awesome, extraordinary benefit of a \$160 annual reduction in their taxes, while the superwealthy, the top 100 families, a \$4 million to \$6 million annual reduction, and the top one-tenth of 1 percent of Americans—wealthy—would receive a \$197,490 reduction, on average.

Mr. Roosevelt, President Roosevelt, laid out a clear criteria.

So where are we? Where are we? We have the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation report yesterday. The insurance market is not collapsing, and where it is is the result of what this administration and Congress are doing. They are destabilizing the market. That is what is happening. That is why these insurers are leaving certain communities and certain States because they simply do not know what is going to happen.

Insurance companies have to plan now—actually, a month or two ago—for the insurance policy that they will be selling in the fall and in the early winter, October, November, December, for the next year, the 2018 year. And they do not know because of what this Congress is doing; they don't know how to price, and therefore market instability is the result.

There is more to it than that. Under the law today, the Federal Government is supposed to be providing money for the exchanges. That money has been withheld under this administration in numerous ways, actively and

proactively taking steps to undermine the insurance market so, presumably, they can say: "Oh, my, it is collapsing."

Well, if it is, it is the President's fault, and it is the fault of this Congress in passing such legislation.

Now, I hear a lot of talk, and it is correct, a lot of discussion about what we can do together. Let's not fight. Let's work together. Let's improve the Affordable Care Act. We ought to, and we can. There are many ways it can be done.

So what can we do?

Well, we could immediately end the efforts to destabilize the market. That would be a good start, wouldn't it? All that takes is an end to this effort to repeal and, rather, to do what the President asked us to do, and that is to work together as he drives forward policies that destabilize the market as he continually talks about repeal. But he also says, "Let's work together." I agree with him. Let's work together. I ask the President to please stop his efforts to destabilize the market.

So what can we do?

How about if we allow the Federal Government to negotiate the price of drugs? We can't do it now, but what if we did? Would that help stabilize the market? It would certainly help reduce the cost. That is not a bad idea. So idea one. Let's allow the Federal and State governments to negotiate the price of prescription drugs and allow individuals to buy certain medications in Canada, for example, which they cannot, now, legally do.

We might think about expanding programs that are proven to enhance quality and reduce costs, such as streamlining care coordination. Coordinate the care and medical services that an individual has, particularly for those with chronic conditions, where most of the healthcare dollars are spent. It has been proven.

There are programs out there, pilot programs, and some are more permanent, that allow for coordination of benefits—that is, services—for those who have chronic illnesses. Part of that is found in the current Affordable Care Act. It is being done. It needs to be expanded.

And we can dramatically improve the care and the health of individuals by coordinating their care, making sure, for example, that people with diabetes are able to get the drugs, get the treatment, work on their healthcare, work on the food they eat, and work on exercises, coordinate all of that. If you want to drive down the cost of healthcare, take the six chronic illnesses and coordinate the care. Keep people healthy. Keep them out of the hospital by being healthy. We can do that. We do, but not everywhere.

Allow States greater flexibility in administering the Medicaid program. Our Republican colleagues talk about

this. We should do it. I am in favor of it.

I know from my experience as insurance commissioner in California that there are many things that can be done by the States as they deal with the peculiar and individual circumstances of the citizens of their State in altering the Medicaid program so that it can meet the needs of the State. Let's do it, but not with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and stripping out of the program billions upon billions of dollars so there really is no money to do anything. That is flexibility in the Medicaid program.

We have a national health insurance exchange program. It is there, but it has been reined in. It has not been allowed to grow as it could by the actions of Congress. Since the Republicans took control of Congress, they have withheld, they have reined in, the national health insurance exchange program. This is in States that refused to establish their own exchanges. Individuals can then go to the national exchange. But they don't even know it is there because the advertising for the national exchange has been eliminated. So we can do that. It is pretty simple.

Hey, folks across America, you don't have a State exchange? You can come to the national exchange. You haven't heard about it? I am not surprised because there is no advertising. There is no knowledge available to individuals. It is a pretty simple thing we can do. As that exchange grows, we begin to spread the risk across a wider population.

In the early version of the Affordable Care Act here in the House of Representatives, we passed and I voted for what was known as the public option, a national public insurance option. The Senate removed it—mostly Republicans, but some Democrats didn't think that was a good idea. I thought it was a good idea in 2009 when the issue came before us because I saw an advantage in a national insurance program.

So there are five things that we can do right there, and there are many, many more.

When the repeal of the Affordable Care Act passed through this House on the floor, my Democratic colleagues offered 22 amendments to improve the Affordable Care Act, to improve ObamaCare. They were all rejected. So much for working together.

But let me make a baseline statement: Don't repeal the Affordable Care Act; improve the Affordable Care Act. If you are determined to repeal the Affordable Care Act, there is not much we can work with. That is why I took the time to talk about the Americans that are now covered, the seniors that now have drug coverages, the end of discrimination based upon preexisting conditions. That is why I talked about those things.

In a repeal—and the President called for a flat-out repeal—that is gone. It is

gone. If you want to do that, don't count on me. I won't be there. But if you want to take the Affordable Care Act and if you want to deal with the problems that we know are there, then let's work together.

I just laid out five things. There are 17 more that have been suggested by my Democratic colleagues. We can improve the well-being of Americans. We can help those people.

As for my wife's hairdresser, I don't know if she is going to get pregnant because she doesn't know if she is going to continue to have coverage. For that farmer, that woman who is running her own family farm, she doesn't know either. There are 23 million Americans who are in that position—23, and quite possibly more—who don't know if a year from now, 2 years from now, they will have health insurance.

So, President Roosevelt: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

#### HONORING MR. CLARENCE GOODEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the great community stewardship of Mr. Clarence Gooden, recently retired president of the CSX Railroad.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, I was newly elected sheriff of the city of Jacksonville, Florida, and my wife, Pat, and I were invited to a Christmas dinner hosted by Mr. Clarence Gooden and his wife, Corkie.

It was during my discussions surrounding my new position as sheriff that I shared with Clarence and his wife how drug dealers had taken over Mallison Park, which in years past was actually the crown jewel of parks in the city of Jacksonville. I explained to them how the park manager had been severely battered by drug dealers, and though we had made several arrests in the park, the dealers continued to return, and the children were being denied the use of this great park.

Mr. Speaker, I also shared with him a campaign promise that I had made to help at-risk youth through an expansion of an intervention program called the Police Athletic League into areas such as Mallison Park, which would offer at-risk youth sports programs, after-school tutoring, food, and personal hygiene, all provided by specialized officers trained in intervention.

Clarence asked me the cost of such an expansion, and I informed him it would be close to \$100,000 to refurbish

and move programs into Mallison Park. He immediately responded, Mr. Speaker, that he would raise those funds by April. I reminded him it was already the end of December, but he and Corkie assured me that they would meet an April deadline.

Incredibly, Clarence devised a plan for what became known as the CSX Charity Train Ride, which entailed a fundraiser that gave contributors an amazing train ride with dinner and entertainment. The event was a first-class success, and Clarence had raised all the funds necessary to refurbish Mallison Park and move the Police Athletic League into those new facilities. Their efforts led to an over 40 percent drop in violent crime within a 1-mile radius of Mallison Park.

Over the years, the CSX Charity Train Ride grew into one of the largest single charity events in northeast Florida, and it continued to add additional charity recipients every year.

Mr. Speaker, Clarence and Corkie, with the assistance of Mrs. Rosemary Thigpen, have raised, to date, over \$4 million for over 10 local charities. Last year alone, they raised over \$400,000 for charities, including Angelwood, the Police Athletic League, and the American Heart Association, just to name a few. Not only does he have a huge heart for the community, but he never lost his concern for others as he worked his way up throughout his career.

Mr. Speaker, Clarence actually began as a laborer at Seaboard Coastline Railroad before it became CSX, and he worked his way up the ranks to the president's office of a tier one railroad. He recently retired from CSX, and I know he will continue to have passion for others.

I appreciate his dedication to the citizens of northeast Florida. I am sure I echo the thoughts of all when I wish him and Corkie continued good health and happiness in both his retirement and all of their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing Mr. Gooden soon and presenting him with this coin as a token of the tremendous appreciation from all of those in the Fourth District whose lives Mr. Gooden, Mrs. Gooden, and CSX have touched.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

#### HEALTHCARE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to hear all the rhetoric about Republican efforts that a majority of Americans have wanted us

to take. Going back to even before ObamaCare was passed, the majority of Americans didn't want ObamaCare passed.

I have been amazed at some of the rhetoric from across the aisle, I think from the former Speaker, who said something about how open their process was.

Really?

Anyway, I know sometimes our memories aren't what they once were. That was not a terribly open process. I believe the Speaker back then said: We don't need any Republican vote and we don't want your input. Basically those were the words I recall.

People were promised over and over again by the President of the United States that if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. On at least one occasion he even said the word "period," there are no exceptions. If you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance.

So it was quite disappointing. Some of us knew this was a disastrous bill. I did read it. I didn't have to wait until Speaker PELOSI passed it to find out what was in it. I read it and I knew it was going to be a disaster.

Then, after it passed, we ultimately find out that they knew well in advance that if you liked your insurance, there was a very good chance you would not be able to keep your insurance, period. It wasn't true. All those, including the President, went around saying: If you like your insurance, you can keep it. According to statements after the fact by people involved, yes, they talked about it and they knew people were going to lose their insurance. They are going to lose their doctor, they are going to lose their healthcare provider, but we can't say those things and still pass this bill. We can't let that get out there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want people to remember how this disastrous legislation ever came about in the first place, and how, going against the will of the American people to pass the disastrous bill—around 2,500 pages is what my two volumes came to—but people knew it was going to do lot of damage to people's health and their lives. As we know, when you cannot get the healthcare you need or the lifesaving healthcare you have been getting, you no longer live.

It is amazing now, after ObamaCare passed 7 years, to find out things about the knowing design of ObamaCare. They knew that insurance companies, under ObamaCare, were given incentives not to have the best people to treat cancer, the best cancer healthcare providers, the best cancer lifesavers in the network.

They had incentives under ObamaCare to not include the best physicians and hospitals that will save the lives of people who have cancer; don't include the best healthcare providers that will help those save their

lives, or at least prolong the lives of those with AIDS; don't include in your insurance coverage the best healthcare providers for those with heart problems.

If you don't include the best healthcare providers for cancer, AIDS, heart problems, or whatever it is, then people who are going to cost you a lot of money will not likely choose your insurance.

It was all part of the design to implode healthcare in America, destroy the broken system we had so that people would eventually throw up their hands and say: Well, I didn't originally want healthcare, but surely anything will be better than what we have.

Apparently, from the beginning, the intention was to set it up to give Big Pharma, to give some insurance companies, basically, not only incentives, but mandates that would force their prices ever upward. As Big Pharma knew, they were going to make profits like they had never made in their history.

As I have told some of the Representatives before, when they signed onto ObamaCare, they basically signed your own death warrant. Yes, you will make tens, maybe hundreds of billions more than you have in the past, but eventually it will lead to your industry being controlled by the government in such a way that you will be like pharmaceutical companies in Third World countries where they are allowed to collect the costs of production and maybe a small percentage above that, which means there are no new lifesaving, life-enhancing drugs being produced in countries like that. Eventually, down the road, ObamaCare would destroy the incentives to create new lifesaving drugs and it would be the end of this incredible run of decades of the most incredible advances in medicine in the history of the world.

Some medical historians say that maybe 100 years or so ago, protocols around the time of World War I were the line of demarcation in our history. Somewhere around the early 20th century, early 1900s, there was a point where—before that point in time, if you went to a doctor, your odds were better of getting worse. If you go to a doctor seeking help for a healthcare problem, the odds were you would get worse. On the other side of that line, in the early 1900s, was a point that if you went to a doctor for healthcare help, your odds of getting well were better than of getting worse.

So it is pretty remarkable, if those historians are right, that for the thousands of years of recorded history, it is only the last 100 years where you had a chance of getting better if you sought medical help than of getting worse if you got medical help.

Look at what has happened since then. It is just incredible, especially since the 1950s. I would submit that the

Founders' vision in creating copyright and patent protection for intellectual creations and thought helped drive those developments in healthcare. It made a lot of people wealthy. But there is nothing like real incentive, more luxury, more freedom, more enjoyment because of the huge rewards of great intellectual creations. Healthcare had just become incredible.

I began to notice after I got to Congress that my friends across the aisle were completely skewing the massive difference between health insurance and healthcare. Health insurance was an even newer thing to most Americans. For healthcare—as we say, maybe the historians are right—it is around 100 years ago that, for the first time, you had a better chance of getting better than you had of getting worse after seeking a doctor's help. But wow, the advances, the progress that was made.

The more the government interferes and dictates who gets what, the more rationed care you get, the less advances in healthcare, the less incentives there are to create lifesaving, life-enhancing medications. When government is the most powerful player in healthcare, you will always end up with rationed healthcare.

Some point to the situation with the small child, Charlie Gard, in the U.K. They say that is what happens when you have bureaucrats deciding who gets to live and who has to die. But the more appropriate analysis, I think, is they are not actually deciding so much the ultimate conclusion of who gets to live and who has to die, but what they are really doing to get there is deciding, rationing, which lives, in the opinion of government bureaucrats, are more important or may be more helpful to the socialist movement, to the bureaucratic entrenchment than someone else.

If you are perceived by the government bureaucracy or the government bureaucrats, the D.C. bureaucrats as being a threat to more government—more powerful government, more control of the individual, if you are a threat to those things, then you can pretty well be assured that when your situation is analyzed by the bureaucrats, you are not going to be eligible for the lifesaving medications and you are not going to be eligible for the hip replacement because we looked at your age and you have had a nice life and it is time to give it up. We don't have enough for everybody to have everything we want, so we in Washington will decide who gets to live and who gets to die. Actually, we decide who gets what treatment.

In the case of Charlie Gard, it is not a lack of concern about life; it is just in the opinion of the bureaucrats, where it always goes with socialized medicine. We only have limited government resources, therefore, we have to be careful whom we help. In their opinion, Charlie Gard may not make it.

□ 2030

The way Americans, a majority of Americans, at least, used to feel was every life is worth trying to protect. Of course, along came *Roe v. Wade* and made clear only those lives are worthy of protecting if a mother wants to protect them.

We even had people in the previous administration that had voted, made the pronouncement through their actions and votes, statements, that even if a child is born alive after an attempted abortion, in the opinion of those individuals, like our former President, you still should be able to kill the child even if the child is born alive because the mother wanted the child aborted, so go ahead and kill the child.

I am grateful for all the stalwarts over the years, but I believe we have seen a change in that philosophy in the realization, like with the heartbeat bill, that says, in essence, if a child has a heartbeat, they are a living person and may not be aborted.

So it is an interesting time here in America, but it has now resulted in a lot of rhetoric that is really outrageous. You know, I have said for years here on this floor that, with all the allegations, statements, verbal wars that have gone on across the aisle, you know, we know that no one on the Democratic side wants to harm people, wants people hurt. We don't question their motives, and yet, as I am in my office hearing friends across the aisle—okay, I am using the term “friends” loosely—but hearing them use terms about how we want people to die. We have come to a sad place in our history.

This story, June 30, from FOX News, was reporting on statements made by some individuals. This quote said—this is from Massachusetts Senator ELIZABETH WARREN: “These Medicaid cuts are blood money. People will die. Let's be very clear: Senate Republicans are paying for tax cuts for the wealthy with American lives.”

Senator BERNIE SANDERS appeared on NBC's “Meet the Press” to predict thousands would die if a projected 23 million drop or lose their insurance. And Senator SANDERS accused Republicans of trading healthcare for tax breaks to the rich: “Is this what America is supposed to be about, taking away health insurance from kids with disabilities, from people with cancer in order to give tax breaks to the billionaires?”

“Let us be clear, and this is not trying to be overly dramatic: Thousands of people will die if the Republican healthcare bill becomes law.”

Well, you want to fact-check that, of course. If the Republicans' healthcare bill, whatever it says in the Senate, is passed, thousands of people will die. If the bill is not passed, thousands of people will die. So I guess we can't say it

is not true. People are going to die whether it passes or not, but the implication is that Republicans, through their efforts, are going to kill people.

What I would just like is an acknowledgment from our friends across the aisle, like Senator SANDERS, that there have been people since ObamaCare has passed who lost their insurance, lost their healthcare provider, didn't get the treatments they needed, their way of life was harmed; and there are bound to have been a lot of people who died sooner than they would have earlier if the President's words had not been hollow that, if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance, and if ObamaCare had not rewarded insurance companies for not including places like MD Anderson, treating for cancer, or good healthcare providers.

Obviously, if they have the best healthcare providers for cancer, for these other life-ending diseases, then people will use their insurance, drive up the cost; so it really created an incentive for insurance companies not to get the best end-of-life treaters in their network. To their credit, some have, but many haven't. So it has been amazing.

Here is other rhetoric. The former Senator, Hillary Clinton, said: "Forget death panels. If Republicans pass this bill, they're the death party."

I mean, maybe that is one of the reasons she didn't win. I mean, that is just an outrageous thing to say.

This article goes on to say: "Some Democrats traveled the country to ring the alarm. Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper came to Washington to lobby against the measure, which he said was immoral and would lead to 100,000 deaths by 2026."

Now, there is this liberal group, apparently, Center for American Progress, liberal think tank—I don't know what their tank is full of, but it is obviously more socialistic thinking. But according to this liberal group, the Center of American Progress, if 23 million fewer people have health insurance, then the coverage losses from the Senate bill would result in 27,700 additional deaths in 2026 and 217,000 over the decade.

Well, isn't that interesting. There is nothing that they can adequately point to as a factual basis. Any citing of CBO, whose margin of error on ObamaCare could have been anywhere from plus or minus 200 to 400 percent—CBO is not a source that should ever be cited with a straight face. They just shouldn't be.

I agree with my friend, Dr. Arthur Laffer, that when it comes to tax reform, we just need to forget CBO. They don't know "sic 'em" from "come here." They explain, yes, they create these models, so they don't really come up with a score. They create models that provide us the scores: garbage in, garbage out.

So it has just gotten to be a sad state of affairs because people are hurting across America. And I know there is apparently 25 percent in my district. I have heard them. I understand they want to keep ObamaCare. They want to move towards socialism. They like the government having so much control over their lives. Just go ahead and check them into an Orwellian center and let them enjoy Big Brother taking care of them.

But I do represent their best interests, and I think the 75 percent in my district are right about what will be best, that ObamaCare needs to be repealed. We need to get relationships back between a patient and a doctor without an insurance company or a government in between them—except for very rare occasions—as it once was. It used to be the government didn't have anything to say much at all about that other than having the FDA, things like that. But insurance companies came along, and they were only for catastrophic problems, so we still had complete control of our healthcare.

I do appreciate, greatly appreciate, House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI referencing the need to honor God. That means a lot to me. Her statement that to minister to the needs of God's creation is an act of worship, to ignore those needs is to dishonor the God who made us, but if the government is big and strong enough to say who gets healthcare and who doesn't, who gets treatment, who gets the lifesaving care and who doesn't, then that is to put government in the place of God, and nothing dishonors God more than to have any person or any entity that believes it is the substitute for God.

The United States Government is not a substitute for God. Without God's blessing, as our Founders repeatedly made clear, we wouldn't have even the freedom we have today.

Joseph Schmitz, on July 5, wrote a terrific article, and it is absolutely worth every Republican taking note of. I would encourage my friends across the aisle to take note of it, but I understand their positions. They cannot participate in the repeal of ObamaCare because they staked the majority—well, they staked future socialism on this bill.

Mr. Schmitz says: "In early 2016, Congress passed H.R. 3762, a law that would have repealed most of ObamaCare. On January 8, 2016, Obama vetoed that would-be ObamaCare Repeal Act.

"240 years earlier, Congress declared 'to a candid world' that, 'The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States.' Among other usurpations specified in the Declaration of Independence, 'He'—talking about the king—"has erected a mul-

titude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.'

"Our 1776 Declaration of Independence concluded, 'We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world'—that is not the government. That is appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world—"for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states; . . . and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.'

"In July 2017, Congress should likewise acknowledge the 'swarms of officers' harassing our good people under the guise of ObamaCare and reenact the 2016 ObamaCare Repeal Act.

"Note well below the revenue-raising nature of the ObamaCare repeal sections of H.R. 3762, keeping in mind that ObamaCare originated in 2009 as the 'Senate Health Care bill,' and the Constitution provides that, 'All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.'" That is Article I, section 7, clause 1.

□ 2045

And he goes on for quite some time to cite all the different sections in ObamaCare that actually make it a revenue-raising bill. Section 204 has the individual mandate mandating people have to pay money and buy something; section 205, an employer mandate mandating that they must pay a massive tax like the individual or pay for insurance, buy a product. For the first time in American history, citizens are required to buy a product, employers are ordered to buy a product. Section 206, Federal payments to the States; section 209, repeal of the tax on employee health insurance premiums and health plan benefits; section 210, repeal of the tax on over-the-counter medications.

I am sorry. These are the names of the sections in the House bill. Those were not in ObamaCare. These are the provisions in the House bill that would repeal all these taxes, as Chief Justice Roberts called them.

So these are all good sections, is what Joe Schmitz is pointing out, individual mandate, employer mandate, getting rid of those, Federal payments to States. It is just taking out a repeal of the employee tax. So there we go. It is eliminating so much of the taxes on individuals, repeal of the tax on over-the-counter medications.

This was the Democrats, without a single Republican vote, who passed this legislation, ObamaCare, the ACA. They

put a tax on over-the-counter medications, they put a tax on employee health insurance premiums and a tax on health plan benefits, and they put a tax on health savings accounts. They had already paid money on that that went in it, but anyway.

So the Republican bill that President Obama vetoed, it would repeal limitations on contributions to flexible spending accounts. You can put as much as you want in there. It would repeal the tax on prescription medication. ObamaCare actually put a tax on your precious prescription medications that are saving people's lives.

Anybody who would have the gall after voting for all these taxes put on the backs of poor people who can't even hardly afford their prescriptions as they are, and, yes, they have been skyrocketing under ObamaCare, and to say that Republicans are trying to harm people and dishonor God, for Heaven's sake, read your own bill.

They put a tax on medical devices. Senior citizens who had to have help moving or walking, you got to pay a tax on that, and we don't care if you can't afford the tax and you can't move around anymore. We are the government.

That was the ACA, ObamaCare, that put that tax in place, and another health insurance tax in the bill, and it eliminated the deduction for expenses allocatable to Medicare part D subsidies. It placed a tax called a chronic care tax, there was a Medicare tax increase, there was a tanning tax, there was a net investment tax, all kinds of taxes in ObamaCare. They hammered the American people.

We were promised—President Obama stood right there and promised no money would pay for abortions under his healthcare bill, under the healthcare bill they were going to pass. That is what he said. He said no people illegally in the United States were going to get their healthcare on the backs of people in America legally. Both of those were not true. It turns out Joe Wilson was prescient.

It is time to wake up. We were sent back into the majority because ObamaCare was passed, and we are going to be sent back in the minority, appropriately, if we don't repeal it.

President Trump has made clear in a recent tweet: Look, if you guys can't pass the replacement now, at least pass the repeal, then we can start moving together on a replacement.

Surely the Democrats will want to come and not be so obstructionist once their precious ObamaCare has been struck down; then maybe they will actually work with us to create a better system, but it is time to wake up, it is time to repeal ObamaCare.

Now, I want to touch on one other subject, Mr. Speaker, and that is involving all this mess, these allegations about Russia.

It was not Donald J. Trump nor any Republican who told the Russians—the Russian leaders, actually: I will have a lot more flexibility after the election.

That can only mean one thing: I am going to give away a lot more of America's strength, helping you out in Russia. As you are trying to get stronger, I am going to give away a lot more of our strength, maybe our edge over your military. I will have more ability to give that away after I am elected to a second term. Tell Vladimir.

It was not a Republican, certainly not anyone associated with Donald Trump, who went to Russia with a supposed reset button, couldn't get the translation right, but wanting to reset the relationship.

And for those who didn't follow history well back then, the reason there was a strain in the relationship between the United States and Russia was because George W. Bush as President of the United States stood on principle, and when the country of Russia, under Putin, attacked Georgia, President Bush, appropriately, was outraged, and he pushed for sanctions to let Russia know that the United States does not approve of Russia attacking sovereign countries.

So the message that President Obama and Hillary Clinton wanted to get across to Putin and the Russians was, with a wink and lots of pats and happy times: Look, George W. Bush as President, we think, overreacted when you attacked Georgia, you know. So we want to let you know we want a reset button, because under President Obama and me, Hillary Clinton, we are not going to overreact when you attack neighboring sovereign countries. We are okay with that, see, and we want things reset. We are not going to get upset like Bush did when you attacked a neighboring country.

That is the message that came across very loud and clear to Putin and those around him.

I would like to think I learned during my summer as an exchange student in the Soviet Union a little bit about the way a lot of Russians think. I get surprised when people say: It is so hard to read Putin. No, it is not. The man was part of the KGB. He wants the glory days of the old Soviet Union back even though they were built on a skeleton that could never maintain the weight that such a Socialist country was putting on that frame.

So then we find out here, this was back in January, January 11, 2017, an article in Politico of all places, surprise, surprise, by Kenneth P. Vogel and David Stern, it says: "Ukrainian government officials tried to help Hillary Clinton and undermine Trump by publicly questioning his fitness for office. They also disseminated documents implicating a top Trump aide in corruption and suggested they were investigating the matter, only to back

away after the election. And they helped Clinton's allies research damaging information on Trump and his advisers, a Politico investigation found.

"A Ukrainian-American operative who was consulting for the Democratic National Committee met with top officials in the Ukrainian Embassy in Washington in an effort to expose ties between Trump, top campaign aide Paul Manafort and Russia, according to people with direct knowledge of the situation."

This is Politico reporting on the collusion between Hillary Clinton, her campaign, and the country of Ukraine to stop and defeat Trump.

Now, where has the Politico reporting on this issue been since January? I appreciate them pointing this out back in January, but apparently at this point back in January, Politico had not yet gotten the word from their friends on the Democratic side of the aisle: hey, hey, kind of soft-pedal that stuff where we colluded with the Ukrainians to try to take Trump out, because we are going to make that a big allegation about Trump and the Russians, so kind of back off that. Let's take the spotlight off that one.

The article goes on: "The Ukrainian efforts had an impact in the race, helping to force Manafort's resignation and advancing the narrative that Trump's campaign was deeply connected to Ukraine's foe to the east, Russia. But they were far less concerted or centrally directed than Russia's alleged hacking and dissemination of Democratic emails."

"Russia's effort was personally directed by Russian President Vladimir Putin. . . ."

So they go on and try to do what they can to help, you know, salvage some respect for the Democrats here. There is little evidence of such a top-down effort by Ukraine, but the fact is Ukraine did collude with Hillary Clinton's campaign, and they were successful in helping the Trump campaign, Manafort had to be fired, and they are still trying to create clouds surrounding that. But anyway, how about that?

Well, it leads to one conclusion, and that is that it is part of the evidence that we have got to have an independent counsel, and I don't mean Robert Mueller. I am talking about an independent counsel, not one that is bosom buddies with Comey; and not one that can't stand Trump; and not one that is going to run out, not hire any Republicans for his staff who love Trump, but just hire people who can't stand him and wanted Hillary elected.

This is a guy who has been vindictive, who has worked closely with Comey in the past, and he is in no position whatsoever to judge anything about James Comey.

If you go back and look at what is required under 28 CFR 45.2, it provides



that a Department of Justice attorney should not participate in investigations that may involve entities or individuals with whom the attorney has a political or personal relationship.

Mueller and Comey are buddies. They have closely consulted on so many things.

□ 2100

For example, this story from June 7, 2017, by Josh Siegel, says:

“Former FBI Director Jim Comey ‘closely coordinated’ with Special Counsel Robert Mueller before his planned testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee about his interactions with President Trump.

“FOX News reported a source close to Comey said the former FBI Director consulted with Mueller about how to approach Thursday’s Senate Intelligence Committee hearing. The Department of Justice appointed Mueller special counsel to lead the investigation of Russia’s involvement in the 2016 election, and any possible collusion with the Trump campaign. Mueller and Comey were longtime colleagues at the Justice Department, and legal experts say it would not be unusual for a special counsel to be in contact with somebody who is a party to its investigation.”

Mueller and Comey were longtime colleagues at the Justice Department.

Well, anyway, there needs to be an independent counsel who will investigate the goings-on between Robert Mueller and James Comey with the recent revelations about Comey’s very apparent release of classified information.

Bob Mueller is not in a position to judge him. And a great piece of evidence that Robert Mueller is not fit to be the special counsel investigating this matter is the fact that he didn’t recuse himself because of his close relationship with Comey, and how Comey is a critical witness in what he accuses Trump of, which doesn’t seem to really be a crime.

But, based on Comey’s testimony before the Senate, it bears going back and looking at a normal FBI employment agreement that says: I will surrender upon demand by the FBI or upon my separation from the FBI all materials containing FBI information in my possession.

They also have a breach of contract case there because the FBI Director carried stuff with him, that he prepared on his government time with his government equipment, saved with his government equipment, and passed on, apparently, with his government equipment, that appears to have been classified, according to the new releases coming out now.

If you look at Comey’s conduct in the past, as this article from Mollie Hemingway on June 12, 2017, pointed out, he had pressured John Ashcroft to recuse

himself from the responsibility of investigating the supposed, the alleged, leak of Valerie Plame’s identity. It turns out the prosecutor knew on day one who it was—Richard Armitage—but he wasn’t honest enough to say: “We know. I don’t need to spend millions and millions of dollars of government tax dollars and waste thousands and thousands of hours investigating. We know the answer.”

No, no, no. This was Comey’s dear friend, Patrick Fitzgerald—not just a close personal friend, but godfather to one of his children—and Comey gave the role of special counsel into that leak on Valerie Plame’s identity. It was Comey who gave that to Patrick Fitzgerald, his close friend.

What a travesty that turned out to be. That was a fraud upon the American Government by Patrick Fitzgerald. He knew on day one the answer to his investigation, but he wanted a scalp, so he wasted a tremendous amount of time trying to get one. A 3-year investigation.

And what did he end up doing?

Fitzgerald ended up prosecuting “Scooter Libby for”—as she says—“wait for it, obstruction of justice. Comey was unconcerned about the jailing of journalists and never threatened to resign over this infringement on First Amendment freedoms.”

So, since Mueller did not have the moral sense to recuse himself when he was offered this special counsel job because of his close personal relationship with James Comey and who he has hired since then, it is very clear, the President is not going to be able to fire him, because there would be such screaming about the Saturday Night Massacre. Mueller knew that, and this is part of his vindictiveness. When it became clear from Comey’s testimony that there was no conclusion with Russia by President Trump, then he leaks out that: Oh, I am investigating the President for obstruction of justice.

Why would he do that?

Because by leaking out that he was now investigating the President—if the President fired him after he leaks out that he is investigating the President, then you would have the allegations of the Saturday Night Massacre and all this kind of stuff.

So the only way forward is the appointment by President Donald Trump of an independent counsel that is truly independent.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need someone who has been contributing to Hillary Clinton or to Barack Obama or to any major Democrat or to any major Republican. We need somebody that is going to be a fair arbiter in this pursuit of justice so that he can investigate Mueller fairly and impartially. And the relationship, whether Comey and Mueller consulted, as they did on so many things, like his Senate testimony, about some of the things—well,

like the leak that Comey testified to that appears, potentially, to have been a crime.

We need to know what Mueller knew. Obviously, Robert Mueller is not going to resign, so the President couldn’t very well fire him. But we have got to get to the bottom and find out what really happened so that justice is done.

The projecting by one group of people on the Republican Party conduct they engaged in and projecting it on the Republican Party as if it was they that did what this group did, it is time to have all this investigated. We are not going to get it with Mueller, a dear friend of Comey. It is time to have a true independent counsel.

The only one way we can do that appropriately is if President Trump finds somebody truly independent, truly not a political animal, who can investigate. And that is not Rosenstein, that is for sure, as well. Then we can get to the bottom and see that justice is done.

So here is our work. Let’s stay here and work until we get ObamaCare repealed, tax reform passed and signed into law, and let’s encourage the President to appoint independent counsel so that we can finally see justice in this case, where currently all we have is what one friend referred to as a big fraternity party among the Muellers and Comeys and their buddies in that fraternity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 23, GAINING RESPONSIBILITY ON WATER ACT OF 2017

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-212) on the resolution (H. Res. 431) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 23) to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

April 3, 2017:

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8

of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of the Interior relating to "Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska".

H.J. Res. 83. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness".

H.R. 1228. An Act to provide for the appointment of members of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to replace members whose terms expire during 2017, and for other purposes.

April 13, 2017:

H.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients.

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees.

April 18, 2017:

H.R. 353. An Act to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes.

April 28, 2017:

H.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes.

May 5, 2017:

H.R. 244. An Act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

May 8, 2017:

H.R. 534. An Act to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

May 16, 2017:

H.R. 274. An Act to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes.

May 17, 2017:

H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

June 6, 2017:

H.R. 366. An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

H.R. 375. An Act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

June 14, 2017:

H.R. 657. An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes.

June 30, 2017:

H.R. 1238. An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

## SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

April 3, 2017:

S.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services".

April 19, 2017:

S. 544. An Act to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to modify the termination date for the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Steve Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Michael Govan as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Roger W. Ferguson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

May 12, 2017:

S. 496. An Act to repeal the rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled "Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform".

June 2, 2017:

S. 419. An Act to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 583. An Act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

June 23, 2017:

S. 1094. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

June 27, 2017:

S. 1083. An Act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of tending to husband's health situation.

Mr. RASKIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 12, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

JIMMY GOMEZ, 34th District of California.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1899. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report for CY 2016, pursuant to Sec. 5.64 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1900. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report titled "Fiscal Year 2016 Purchases From Foreign Entities", pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 8305; Public Law 104-201, Sec. 827 (as amended by Public Law 111-350, Sec. 3); (124 Stat. 3833) and Public Law 114-113, Sec. 8028(b); (129 Stat. 2357); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1901. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a selected acquisition report for the Navy/Marine Corps and the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1902. A letter from the Board Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Report to the Congress on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions, pursuant

to 15 U.S.C. 1637 note; Public Law 100-583, Sec. 8; (102 Stat. 2969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1903. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Revisions to Freedom of Information Act Regulations (RIN: 3038-AE57) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1904. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Rosa's Law [Docket ID: ED-2017-OS-0051] (RIN: 1801-AA11) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1905. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Rosa's Law [Docket ID: ED-2017-OS-0051] (RIN: 1801-AA11) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1906. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Designation of Areas; KY; Redesignation of the Kentucky Portion of the Cincinnati-Hamilton 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0601; FRL-9964-41-Region 4] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1907. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Revised Format of 40 CFR Part 52 for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R02-OAR-2016-0060; FRL-9955-06-Region 2] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1908. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Reasonably Available Control Technology for US Watercraft, LLC [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0025; A-1-FRL-9964-26-Region 1] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1909. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Revised Format for Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0599; FRL-9963-76-Region 5] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1910. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; FL: Revisions to New Source Review, Definitions and Small Business Assistance Programs [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0166; FRL-9964-35-Region 4] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1911. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; FL: Hillsborough and Nassau Areas; SO2 Attainment Demonstration [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0624 and EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0623; FRL-9964-39-Region 4] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1912. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Section 112(l) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Equivalency by Permit Provisions; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Plating and Polishing Operations [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0209; FRL-9964-32-Region 4] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1913. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — the Incentive Auction Task Force and Media Bureau Adopt Filing Requirements for the Transition Progress Report Form By Stations that are Not Eligible for Reimbursement From the TV Broadcast Relocation Fund [MB Docket No.: 16-306] [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1914. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1915. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1916. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-73, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1917. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-70, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1918. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-69, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1919. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-130, pursuant to the reporting

requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1920. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), transmitting Amtrak's audited Consolidated Financial Statements for the years ended September 30, 2016 and 2015, with report of independent auditors; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1921. A letter from the Acting DAA for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fireworks Displays at Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary [Docket No.: 161216999-7516-02] (RIN: 0648-BG50) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1922. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act for the six months ending December 31, 2016, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; June 8, 1938, ch. 327, Sec. 11 (as amended by Public Law 104-65, Sec. 19); (109 Stat. 704); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1923. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Guidelines for the Streamlined Process of Applying for Recognition of Section of 501(c)(3) Status [TD 9819] (RIN: 1545-BM06) received July 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1924. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Cumulative List of Changes in Plan Qualification Requirements for Pre-Approved Defined Contribution Plans for 2017 [Notice 2017-37] received July 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1925. A letter from the Branch Chief, Border Security Regulations, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendments: Electronic Information for Cargo Exported from the United States [CBP Dec. 17-06] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

1926. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Privacy Office, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Privacy Office's Fiscal Year 2017 Semiannual Report to Congress as required by Sec. 803 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

1927. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting a Train and Equip Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 2810. A bill to authorize appropriation for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. Ordered to be printed. (Rept. 115-200, Pt. 2).

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 597. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 954. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1306. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1404. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona (Rept. 115-205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1397. A bill to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-206, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1541. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1719. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1913. A bill to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2156. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2868. A bill to protect National Flood Insurance Program policyholders from unreasonable premium rates and to require the Program to consider the unique characteristics of urban properties, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 431. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 23) to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-212). Referred to the House Calendar.

### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1397 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3175. A bill to establish privacy protections for customers of broadband Internet access service and other telecommunications services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. FASO):

H.R. 3176. A bill to prohibit the Federal Emergency Management Agency from recouping certain assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3177. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the requirement to provide nursing home care to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the delivery of home infusion therapy and dialysis and the application of the Stark rule under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways

and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 3179. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies, when issuing certain prudential regulations that are substantively more stringent than a corresponding international prudential standard to publish the rationale for doing so and a cost-benefit analysis of the difference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 3180. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3181. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to voluntarily adopt advance directives guiding the medical care they receive; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 3182. A bill to amend section 317A of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for screenings and referrals regarding lead poisoning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3183. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 3184. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 180 McCormick Road in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the "Captain Humayun Khan Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 3185. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to evaluate the organizational structure of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. TIP-TON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. STEFANKI):

H.R. 3186. A bill to establish an Every Kid Outdoors program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3187. A bill to advance United States interests in the freedom of navigation by enhancing congressional oversight of freedom of navigation operations conducted by the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H. Res. 432. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any general appropriations bill until a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted or the appropriate budgetary suballocations are made available; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H. Res. 433. A resolution disapproving of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Committee Inscription of Hebron as a Palestinian World Heritage Site in Danger; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H. Res. 434. A resolution condemning violence against religious minorities in the People's Republic of China and any actions that limit the free expression and practice of faith by these minorities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H. Res. 435. A resolution recognizing the millions of youth in this Nation benefitting from youth sports and the parents, volunteers, and local and national organizations that make youth sports in this country possible, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida):

H. Res. 436. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 29, 2017, as "Paralympic and Adaptive Sport Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

93. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9, urging Congress not to repeal the Patient

Protection and Affordable Care Act or its most important provisions; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3188. A bill for the relief of Christopher William Gard, Constance Rhoda Keely Yates, and Charles Matthew William Gard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Christopher William Gard, Constance Rhoda Keely Yates, and Charles Matthew William Gard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Christopher William Gard, Constance Rhoda Keely Yates, and Charles Matthew William Gard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3175.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 3176.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section, Clause 18

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3177.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

The Congress shall have Power to the United States Constitution which empowers Congress "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;"

And; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:  
The Congress shall have Power to the United States Constitution which empowers Congress "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:  
H.R. 3178.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 3179.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 3180.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, including those under Title 50, are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to enable the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in executing the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that "Congress shall have power . . . to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States"; ". . . to raise and support armies . . ."; to "make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water"; and "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3181.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3182.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3183.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3184.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 3185.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18  
The Congress shall have Power\*\*\* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 3186.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 3187.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3188.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4: "The Congress shall have Power To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization"

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3189

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4: "The Congress shall have Power To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization"

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 3190

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4: "The Congress shall have Power To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization"

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 25: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 36: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 48: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 93: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 95: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 154: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 187: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 203: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 205: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 206: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 224: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 227: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 233: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 350: Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 367: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 398: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FASO, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BRAT, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 449: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 468: Mr. POLIS and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 490: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 540: Ms. LEE and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 553: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 564: Mr. JONES and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 619: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 664: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 721: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 740: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 743: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 747: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. YODER, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 750: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 758: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 761: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 785: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 788: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 792: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 795: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 806: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 807: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 828: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 848: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 849: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. AMASH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 858: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 873: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 908: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 911: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 931: Mr. CORREA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 959: Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 982: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 986: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 997: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1017: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1046: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1054: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1057: Mr. CORREA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1059: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1090: Mr. ZELDIN and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1094: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1104: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1122: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1130: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1134: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1146: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1158: Mr. DENT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GIBBS, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1160: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1164: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1171: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1173: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1205: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1223: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1231: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1239: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1243: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1253: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1270: Mr. COHEN and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1291: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1316: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1318: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1322: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1359: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1399: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1406: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1409: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1457: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1491: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1519: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1537: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1552: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1553: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1554: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1563: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1626: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1639: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1645: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1651: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1661: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ISSA, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1676: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1685: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1686: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1698: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HURD, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1699: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1710: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1731: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1739: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1748: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1781: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1810: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1811: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1815: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1817: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1836: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1838: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1841: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1843: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1853: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1861: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1865: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1881: Mr. EMMER and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1911: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FASO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1928: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1937: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1953: Ms. MENG, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1963: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1974: Ms. NORTON and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1987: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2011: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2023: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2040: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 2069: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 2091: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2120: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2133: Mr. TROTT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2142: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2158: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2159: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2197: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2200: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2205: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2225: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 2259: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2287: Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2299: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2307: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2315: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2319: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2322: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 2340: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2345: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2417: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. JUDY

CHU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2422: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2428: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2431: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2435: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2445: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2451: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2475: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2478: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 2480: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 2482: Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2486: Mr. POCAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2501: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2505: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2519: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HECK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 2550: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2556: Ms. TITUS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2584: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2622: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2651: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2653: Mr. KEATING, Mr. CRIST, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2663: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 2664: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2666: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 2683: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 2687: Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2690: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 2706: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 2723: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2732: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2733: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2740: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2765: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2775: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2776: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2777: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2796: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2809: Mr. DUNN and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2826: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2841: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2845: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2856: Mr. BACON, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KATKO, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 2868: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2875: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2886: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAL-LONE, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2901: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 2902: Mr. HARPER, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2911: Mr. SOTO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 2915: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2918: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2926: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2932: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2933: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2938: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 2939: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 2942: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 2943: Mr. EVANS and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2957: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2961: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2967: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2989: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3000: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3006: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3032: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3036: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3038: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3040: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3048: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3079: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3086: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3097: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3100: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3101: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3107: Mr. LONG and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3108: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 3117: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 3163: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3164: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3171: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 33: Ms. SPEIER.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MARINO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.J. Res. 53: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Con. Res. 68: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H. Res. 15: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 30: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 43: Mr. GAETZ.

H. Res. 161: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KIND, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 206: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 220: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 252: Mr. ESTES of Kansas and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H. Res. 257: Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H. Res. 265: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 276: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 279: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Res. 282: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 307: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 320: Mr. KNIGHT.

H. Res. 336: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H. Res. 337: Ms. FUDGE.

H. Res. 345: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. ROSEN.

H. Res. 353: Mr. BEYER.

H. Res. 359: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 393: Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 400: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 401: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. KATKO.

H. Res. 407: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 423: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 426: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. ROSEN.

H. Res. 430: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

## CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

### OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

The provisions in H.R. 23 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

### OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 23 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Amendment No. 1 to be offered by Representative MAC THORNBERRY to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 399: Mr. STIVERS.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE FESTUS HIGH SCHOOL ROCKET CLUB ON THEIR FIRST PLACE WIN REPRESENTING THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL ROCK-ETRY CHALLENGE IN PARIS, FRANCE

## HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group of high school students from my district, the Festus High School Rocket Club on their first place win representing the United States in the International Rocketry Challenge in Paris.

Members of the team include Grace Basler, Ed Bohnert, Cydney Breier, Ryan Brown, Christopher Carden, Ashton Croft, Joel Marler, Rylie Martin, Jacob Rozner, and the club president Timothy Ruesche. They are coached by Devin Lorenz, a former member of the Festus Rocket Club himself.

In May of this year the Festus High School Rocketry Team participated in the annual Team America Rocketry Challenge's (TARC) Final fly-off in The Plains, Virginia. They were awarded first prize over 100 other teams from across the United States, which included a combined \$20,000 in scholarships and a trip to Paris, France to compete in the International Rocketry Competition. At the International Rocketry Challenge, Festus High School, representing the United States, bested competing teams from France, Great Britain, and Japan to take first place.

TARC is the aerospace and defense industry's flagship STEM program that is sponsored by the National Association of Rocketry, the Aerospace Industries Association, and numerous industry partners including Raytheon Company, Boeing Company and Thales USA. Raytheon Company has sponsored Team USA's attendance in the international competition for 12 years and running. In the age of technology, exposure to STEM education and opportunities is a national priority in order to ensure our workforce is equipped for the challenges of the 21st century. TARC has provided more than 65,000 middle school and high school students an opportunity to be engaged in hands-on experience that allows them to develop skills to assist them in future careers in STEM and aerospace.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Festus High School Rocket Club for their extraordinary accomplishment on behalf of the United States.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DEMARCK WIMBERLY'S TWENTY YEARS OF SERVICE TO HIS COUNTRY AND HIS HONORABLE RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES ARMY

## HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sergeant First Class Demarck Wimberly on his retirement from the United States Army after 20 years of faithful service to our country. An esteemed and respected member of the U.S. Army, Sergeant First Class Wimberly most recently served as a senior operations Non-commissioned officer and trainer for the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization. In this capacity, he was instrumental in the training and preparation of hundreds of personnel from across the Armed Forces as they prepared to deploy to some of the most dangerous places in the world.

SFC Wimberly's distinguished career began with the 4th Squadron 7th Cavalry Regiment, Camp Garry Owen South Korea. Sergeant First Class Demarck Wimberly's duty stations include, Fort Riley Kansas, Fort Hood Texas, Fort Richardson Alaska, Fort Bliss Texas, Fort Carson Colorado, Fort Campbell Kentucky, and finally the Pentagon where he was inducted into The Order of Saint Maurice. During these many duty stations, Sergeant First Class Demarck Wimberly deployed with 2nd Battalion 8th Infantry Regiment (4th Infantry Division) from Fort Hood Texas for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 where he received the Soldier's Medal for heroism, he also deployed with the 172nd Stryker Brigade in 2005 from Fort Richardson Alaska and to Djibouti Africa in 2013 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

SFC Wimberly's awards and decorations include the Soldier's Medal for heroism, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation medal (6th award), Joint Service Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal (5th Award) as well as numerous unit awards and service medals. Through his distinguished service, SFC Wimberly has also earned the Combat Infantryman Badge and Expert Infantryman badge. SFC Wimberly has also received the Order of Saint Maurice for his significant and long-lasting contributions to the infantry community.

As SFC Demarck Wimberly embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may recall, with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment, the outstanding contributions he has made to the United States Army. I would like to send him my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING UNITED STATES ARMY COLONEL THOMAS TICKNER

## HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the service of Colonel Thomas Tickner who is coming to the end of his assignment as the Chief of the Congressional Budget Liaison for the Secretary of the Army.

Tom is a native of Wayne, Pennsylvania. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering from Pennsylvania State University in 1990, his Masters of Civil Engineering Degree from University of Colorado at Boulder in 1999, and a Masters of Science in National Resource Strategy from the Eisenhower School, National Defense University in 2013.

Over the last year, Tom has made significant and lasting contributions while liaising with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to provide critical resources for Army Warfighters. Tom and his liaison team worked closely with every appropriation office in Congress; ensuring accountability to Congress and our Nation's taxpayers.

Through 26 years of active duty, Tom has served in a variety of tactical, operational, and strategic assignments. In 1989, Tom was commissioned a Distinguished Military Graduate through the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps. He began his military career in the 326th Engineer Battalion, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) followed by an assignment to the 84th Engineer Battalion (Combat Heavy), Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, where he held company command. Following graduate school he served in various assignments with the Sacramento District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from January 2000 to July 2002, to include a deployment to lead the Los Alamos Fire Recovery Office. From June 2003 to May 2005, Tom served as the Operations Officer and Executive Officer for the 52nd Engineer Battalion (Combat Heavy), Fort Carson, Colorado, where he deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. From June 2005 to June 2008 he served as an Engineer Branch Assignment Officer at the Army's Human Resources Command followed by command at the Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from June 2008 to July 2010. Tom worked as the Military Assistant for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) from July 2010 to July 2012. After graduating from the Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy, Tom commanded the Savannah District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from July 2013 to June 2015. Most recently, Tom returned from a one-year tour in Afghanistan serving as the Engineer Director for the Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as Colonel Tom Tickner moves on to a new assignment, he leaves behind a legacy of professionalism and friendship. I want to extend my thanks for his service and wish him and his family continued success in his future endeavors.

**JROTC TEAMS OF MARINER,  
RIVERDALE, AND GULF COAST**

**HON. FRANCIS ROONEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the JROTC teams of Mariner, Riverdale, and Gulf Coast high schools. These teams recently competed in the National All-Services JROTC Academic and Leadership Bowl Competition in Washington D.C. and all three placed in the top fifteen of 64 teams.

For over a century the JROTC program has instilled in students the value of teamwork, citizenship, and public service. This competition tests students in both academics and leadership. To get to the national competition, the three schools competed against a combined 2,600 teams.

It is humbling to see the young men and women of Collier and Lee Counties excel and show their knowledge and passion for civil service. I look forward to seeing what these young scholars will accomplish for our community and our country in the years to come.

**FRANK PIPER**

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of the late Walter Frank Piper, United States Army Private First Class, of Williamstown in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

Walter Piper, born April 6, 1930, was a proud resident of Williamstown and son of the late Charles and Alice Piper. Walter Piper graduated Glassboro High School in 1949.

Walter Piper enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1950, a year after graduating high school. He was a member of Headquarters Company, 3rd Battalion, 38th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Division. PFC Piper was taken prisoner of war during the Korean Conflict on February 13, 1951. PFC Piper died June 18, 1951 while being held prisoner of war.

PFC Piper's unidentified remains were recovered in 1990, returned to Hawaii on June 24, 1991, and positively identified April 18, 2017.

Walter Piper's name is inscribed on the Courts of the Missing at the Honolulu Memorial. Private First Class Piper has been posthumously awarded the following: Purple Heart with Oak Leaf cluster, Prisoner of War Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Korean Service Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge, United Nations Serv-

ice Medal, Republic of Korea War Service Medal and the Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citation.

On June 17, 2017, PFC Walter Piper will return home to Williamstown for the first time in 67 years, where he will finally be laid to rest with the full military honors he rightly deserves, at Gloucester County Veterans Memorial Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, PFC Walter Frank Piper is by all accounts an American hero who selflessly served his country and gave his life for his country. His service, sacrifice, and legacy must never be forgotten. I ask you to join me in honoring the memory of this great American and patriot.

**RECOGNIZING NORTHEAST GEORGIA'S  
SERVICE ACADEMY AP-  
POINTEES**

**HON. DOUG COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in recognition of northeast Georgia's 11 service academy appointees. These outstanding men and women are pursuing the honorable path of military service. At the U.S. service academies, these students will further their education and develop the skills needed to serve our country.

Those who are willing to lay their lives on the line do not make this decision impulsively. Instead, they make a conscious choice to put country before self, a choice that tests their strength and builds their commitment to service.

At a recent reception honoring these young leaders, I told them, "Don't look back. The challenges that lie ahead should not deter you from doing what you have set out to do."

"The challenges that you face will never outweigh the pride that you have in our country and the love that you have for your friends and neighbors."

I thank these men and women for their willingness to serve, and I will keep them in my prayers as they enter a new season at the United States military academies.

**HONORING MR. KEN CROWLEY**

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ken Crowley for his dedication to our community and service to those in need in Connecticut. In our state, Ken is well known both for his leadership in business and for his willingness to step up to help others.

Ken is a native of Waterbury, Connecticut, and learned the value of hard work at a young age after working on a local farm. He fell in love with driving and working with cars, and Ken eventually began working as a salesman in a dealership. Later, he rose up to run his

own dealership. Now, Ken is one of Connecticut's largest and most successful auto dealers, with 13 franchises employing hundreds of people. In addition, Ken has shown great commitment to the environment. He participated in the CT Green Bank Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy Program to outfit multiple car dealerships with clean energy improvements.

What's more, Ken has used his success and leveraged his business's influence to address important community needs in Connecticut. He worked with former Governor Jody Rell in 2002 to provide for military families during the holidays. Later, in 2008, Crowley Auto Group partnered with the Army Reserve's Employer Partnership Initiative to help veterans transition to the civilian workforce. Ken was also instrumental in the planning of Bristol Technical Education Center and donates vehicles to the school's auto-shop program. Two decades ago, Ken started the Crowley Automotive Golf Tournament to help raise funds for the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation and has raised over \$1 million over 20 years. In fact, Ford Motor Company recently honored Ken for his community spirit, one of only six dealers worldwide to receive this well-deserved recognition.

Mr. Speaker, Ken Crowley has been a business and community leader in Connecticut, and his work to support veterans and those in need has made our community stronger and more caring. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

**EDWARD FORTE**

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Honorable Edward Forte, former Mayor of the Borough of Haddon Heights, Camden County, in New Jersey's First Congressional District, on the occasion of his retirement as supervisor from Public Service Enterprise Group (PSE&G).

Mr. Forte is a long-time constituent and resident of Haddon Heights, where he distinguished himself with a commitment to public service as a member of Borough Council, Borough Council President, Mayor, Director of Public Safety for the Borough, a member of the Borough's Zoning Board, and volunteer firefighter and assistant fire chief for the Borough's fire department.

In 1980, Mr. Forte joined PSE&G, where he would ascend through the ranks to become distribution supervisor at the utility company.

During his employment at PSE&G and his simultaneous tenure as Mayor of the Borough of Haddon Heights, Mr. Forte would work to achieve an important personal milestone, earning his Bachelor of Science in Business Administration degree from Thomas Edison State College. Mr. Forte's determination both inspired those across South Jersey, and provided him with the educational tools to serve him in the execution of his professional and public service duties.

During his tenure as Mayor of Haddon Heights, Mr. Forte launched wellness initiatives, including the "Walk! Heights" campaign,

in which he walked through his Borough, engaging constituents and encouraged them to join him promoting healthy living and an active lifestyle. Mr. Forte's service also extended to the New Jersey Order Sons of Italy Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, Edward Forte is a model of community and public service, and an example for others who may wish to serve. I invite you to join me in thanking him for his many contributions to the community. And, I respectfully ask you to join me in congratulating Mr. Forte on the occasion of his retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAJOR  
JEFFERY A. SIERPIEN

**HON. DAVID A. TROTT**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to highlight the distinguished career of one of my constituents, United States Marine Corps Major Jeffery A. Sierpien.

Enlisting in the Marine Corps in 1997, Major Sierpien has been deployed seven times throughout his career, including multiple deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan.

He has been an unwavering defender of liberty, selflessly putting his life on the line time and time again so that we may have the privilege to enjoy the freedoms and liberties that make this country the greatest in the world.

Exemplifying the bravery and honor embodied by so many of our nation's servicemen and women, he has received numerous military decorations and awards, including two Iraq Campaign Medals and two Afghanistan Campaign Medals.

Now back in his home state of Michigan, retiring from a career that has moved him not only across the country, but around the globe, I thank him for his dedicated service and wish him the best of luck in everything he does next—from spending time with his beloved family, to teaching his children the art of hunting and fishing, to setting out on his next adventure.

COLONEL G. SCOTT TAYLOR RELINQUISHES COMMAND OF THE  
FORT IRWIN ARMY GARRISON

**HON. PAUL COOK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of U.S. Army Colonel G. Scott Taylor, who will relinquish command of the Fort Irwin Garrison on July 12, 2017. Colonel Taylor is leaving for his next duty assignment as the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3—Operations for the 8th Army in Camp Humphrey, South Korea.

I've had the pleasure of interacting with Colonel Taylor the past two years, during which time I saw the passion he possesses for his soldiers and his support for the vital training mission of Fort Irwin and the National

Training Center. Colonel Taylor was a driving force behind efforts to improve combat readiness and the quality of life for soldiers under his command. His work culminated in \$6.4 million in improvements to barracks on the installation, and his leadership resulted in the repair of essential base infrastructure that was severely damaged by flooding.

In addition to thanking Colonel Taylor for his service at Fort Irwin, I would also like to recognize his outstanding military career. Colonel Taylor is a decorated combat veteran with over 25 years of service, which includes three combat deployments. I wish Colonel Taylor and his family the best of luck as they embark on a new chapter at Camp Humphrey, but they will be sorely missed back home in the California desert.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNUAL  
FULTON COUNTY OFFICE FOR  
AGING SENIOR PICNIC

**HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 30th Annual Fulton County Office for Aging Senior Picnic.

Since its inception in 1987, the Fulton County Office for Aging Senior Picnic has brought our community together to celebrate our senior citizens. The Senior Picnic features food and entertainment for people of all ages, highlighting the Office's year-round work for Fulton County seniors. As with many of the Office's programs, the Senior Picnic depends on the dedication and tireless efforts of volunteers from our community.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank the Fulton County Office for Aging for its vital service to our seniors. The Office provides programs and information to help our seniors in key areas like healthcare, employment, and legal services. We are grateful to the Office for their continuing commitment to our elderly population, and wish them all the best on their 30th Annual Senior Picnic.

ED McBRIE

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of the late Ed McBride, a United States Navy World War II veteran who proudly served our nation aboard the USS *Martin* and the USS *Athene*.

After his service to our country, Mr. McBride became a self-employed contractor for 45 years and worked at the former New York Shipyard in Camden, New Jersey and Sun Shipyard in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mr. McBride's commitment to our nation and community continued long after his active duty service in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. McBride was also a life member of the Berlin, New Jersey Veterans of Foreign Wars

and a member of American Legion Post 311 in Atco, New Jersey.

Mr. McBride served his community for 22 years as a member of the Camden County Fire Police, was a life member of the Tansboro Fire Company, held the post of civil defense director for the Township of Winslow, and was past president and member of the Berlin, New Jersey Lions Club.

In addition to his volunteer endeavors, Ed McBride enjoyed a number of hobbies and activities including: cabinetry, camping, golfing and fishing.

Mr. Speaker, Ed McBride was an exemplary citizen with a devotion to public service, commitment, and hard work. I invite you to join me in honoring the memory of this great man.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL STEVEN J.  
OWENS

**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Colonel Steven J. Owens on his retirement from the United States Army after 30 years of service to our country. An esteemed and respected member of the Army Medical Service Corps, Colonel Owens most recently served as the Deputy Director for Reserve Affairs at the Office of the Surgeon General. In this capacity, he was instrumental in driving policy to improve the capability of the Army to recruit and retain high quality providers to care for our Nations Daughters and Sons. He also played an integral role in strengthening the relationship between Army National Guard and the Army Reserve medical communities.

Colonel Owens distinguished career began with the Virginia Army National Guard in 1987, and included time at Ft. Belvoir, VA; Camp Robinson, VA; Ft. Pickett, VA; Ft. A.P. Hill, VA; Joint Force Headquarters, VA; the National Guard Bureau; Fort Sam Houston, TX; and the Office of the Surgeon General. During this time, he deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. During his time in Iraq, he served as the I Corps MNCI and USFI liaison to the Iraqi Army Surgeon. In that role, he performed the medical portion of counter-insurgency training for hundreds of America's service members and advised the Iraqi Army Surgeon on methods to increase capabilities to provide care to the Iraqi Soldiers, and to improve recruitment and retention of providers in the Iraqi Army.

As Colonel Owens embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may recall, with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment, the outstanding contributions he has made to the Office of the Surgeon General, the Virginia Army National Guard and to the United States Army. I would like to send him my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors.

## HONORING DOROTHA WHITE

**HON. LUKE MESSER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor, Dorothea White, who passed away on Monday, July 3, 2017 in Henry County.

Mrs. White was born in New Lisbon, Ohio on December 27, 1916. After graduating from New Lisbon High School in 1934, she attended Dayton Conservatory of Music where she studied piano, organ, and accordion. She graced others with her talent for music by providing private piano lessons in New Castle, Indiana and played various instruments well into her nineties. In addition to her musical pursuits, Mrs. White helped run a successful dairy farm with her husband in New Castle and was very involved within the community and politics. She had a profound impact on countless Hoosiers, and her life should be an inspiration to all.

Mrs. White was a life member of the New Lisbon Christian Church and Henry County Historical Society, a founding member of the Henry County Saddle Club, a member of the Live & Learn Club, Indiana Jersey Cattle Club, the Brown Road Club, the Lenba Club of Henry County, the P.E.O.—Chapter AD, and the Altruistic Literary Club.

She served as the Council President on the Henry County Council and was a member of the Henry County GOP Club. Her years spent as a dedicated public servant will always be remembered and appreciated by the community.

Mrs. White was predeceased by her husband of 57 years, Robert; her parents; a brother, Delbert (Virginia) Hoover; and a sister, Betty Ann (Donald) Moore. She is survived by her sons, Stephen (Sharon) White and David (Susanne) White; her grandchildren Bradley (Deena) White, John (Susan) White, Amy (Jim) Byrum, and Christina (David) Whitesell; ten great-grandchildren; and four great-great-grandchildren to whom I give my deepest sympathies.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARCIA  
BOYLE**HON. DORIS O. MATSUI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the outstanding leadership of Marcia Boyle, a rare disease advocate who has dedicated the past four decades of her life to helping people impacted by primary immunodeficiency diseases. This mission was not a path Marcia would have chosen herself. Rather, this mission chose her, and she has responded with full vigor to improve life for not only her own son but for countless other people in the United States and world impacted by one of the more than 300 forms of primary immunodeficiency diseases, or PI.

Thankfully, as a result of Marcia's leadership, the world today is a much brighter place

for people with PI, though a number of changes remain to be addressed. Marcia first started to become a rare disease advocate when her son John became seriously ill in the late 1970s. John would later be diagnosed with a form of PI and had received the appropriate medical treatment, life-sustaining therapy he continues utilizing today.

Marcia recognized the deep need for people like John and their families and continued to make a difference for the entire community even though her child and family were taken care of. This led to Marcia's founding of the Immune Deficiency Foundation, an operation she ran out of her kitchen. For a dozen years Marcia worked as a full-time volunteer founder and leader of the organization before embarking on another career in leading development positions at Johns Hopkins Medicine.

Over the past several years, Marcia has significantly expanded the scope, staff and programming of the IDF to reach more persons in need. This includes working with the leading clinicians and scientists in the field to publish evidence-based guides for other clinicians, for parents and for patients. She had served on the board of the National Health Council and has been seen as a national and global leader of the patient advocacy or voluntary health community.

Mr. Speaker, I know many in the PI community are saddened by Marcia's retirement later this summer. To say Marcia has done the job well would be an understatement, and she may have a successor but certainly not a replacement. I'm pleased that Marcia will continue her service to IDF as a volunteer and member of the board of trustees, and am confident that she will continue to help lead this community for decades to come.

## CLARENCE B. JONES

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Clarence B. Jones, a towering civil rights figure and advocate for equality and justice. On June 6, 2017, family, friends and community members will gather for the renaming of the Palmyra High School Library and dedication of the newly created Dr. Clarence B. Jones Institute for Social Advocacy as a tribute to Dr. Jones.

Dr. Jones was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on January 8, 1931. He attended Palmyra High School in Palmyra, situated in New Jersey's First Congressional District, where he graduated valedictorian of his class in 1949. Dr. Jones' valedictorian speech, entitled "Tomorrow a Better World," called for breaking down racial barriers and marked the beginning of a life that would involve civil rights activism.

After high school, Dr. Jones attended Columbia University, served the United States military during the Korean Conflict, and graduated from Boston University's School of Law.

In 1960, after practicing law for a few years, Dr. Jones became the attorney and trusted advisor to iconic civil rights leader, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

In 1963, Dr. Jones played a vital role organizing and planning the historic March on Washington, D.C. alongside Dr. King. Dr. Jones also co-authored the "I Have a Dream" speech, regarded as the most notable civil rights address in U.S. history.

Dr. Jones broke racial barriers in corporate America, becoming the first African American partner at a Wall Street banking investment firm.

Dr. Clarence Jones is an honorable American, who has dedicated his life, voice, and actions to civil rights, and has inspired many to stand up for justice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in saluting Dr. Jones for his service to our nation, his devotion to the civil rights movement and for his ongoing fight for equality in our great nation.

## TRIBUTE TO CATHI MILLER

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Cathi Miller, a teacher at Central Academy in Des Moines, Iowa. Cathi was recently recognized by PBS as Iowa's 2017 PBS Digital Innovator.

Each year, PBS recognizes an educator from each state and U.S. territory who display a knack for innovation and "outside the box" thinking in their classroom. Cathi is an outstanding example of these principals. She has shown that when a teacher fully invests themselves in their students, the sky is the limit. Thanks to Cathi's exceptional work, students at Central Academy have the tools and skills to succeed, both in the classroom and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Cathi in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her today for receiving this esteemed recognition. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on receiving this award, and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

TRUMP'S VOTER FRAUD COMMISSION IS A FRAUD AND SHOULD  
BE DISBANDED NOW**HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, unable to cope with the brutal fact that he lost the popular vote to Hillary Clinton by 2.9 million votes, the largest vote deficit of any president in American history, Donald Trump tweeted that he would have won the popular vote but for "millions of people who voted illegally."

Instead of producing any credible evidence to support this claim, a hoax that has been repeatedly and decisively debunked by experts, the President doubled down and issued an Executive Order establishing the "Presidential

Advisory Commission on Election Integrity" (PACEI), appointing Kris Kobach, anti-immigration warrior and poster-child for voter fraud conspiratorialists everywhere, to lead the Commission.

It would be more accurate to characterize the PACEI as the "Presidential Advisory Commission on Vote Suppression." Voter suppression is real but the oft-repeated claim that American elections are rife with voter fraud is a myth.

According to a comprehensive 2014 study published in *The Washington Post*, out of more than a billion votes cast between 2000 and 2014, only 31 credible instances of impersonation fraud were found, and even this tiny number was likely inflated because the study's author counted not just voter fraud prosecutions or convictions but all credible claims. Numerous other reports have reached the same conclusion.

Any lingering doubt regarding the true purpose of the PACEI should be laid to rest by the request made by Commissioner Kobach on June 28, 2017 when he wrote each of the nation's state secretaries of state requesting that they provide the Commission with "the full first and last names of all registrants, middle names or initials if available, addresses, dates of birth, political party (if recorded in your state), last four digits of social security number if available, voter history (elections voted in) from 2006 onward, active/inactive status, cancelled status, information regarding any felony convictions, information regarding voter registration in another state, information regarding military status, and overseas citizen information."

The information requested by the Commission will not prevent voter fraud. It will violate rather than protect voter privacy.

And it will make it easier to craft legislation and devise campaign strategies intended to suppress the vote in urban clusters and among targeted demographic groups, particularly minority voters.

It is important that all voters, and the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas whom I am privileged to represent, be fully protected.

While supplying only public voter information may seem secure, the sad fact is that it is not. There is no publicly accessible database of voter registration information in any of the 50 states or the District of Columbia.

That is because information of this kind is protected from public disclosure under the settled principle of 'collective privacy' recognized by the Supreme Court in the landmark decision of *NAACP v. Alabama*, 377 U.S. 288, 84 S. Ct. 1302, 12 L. Ed. 2d 325 (1964), which held that compelled disclosure of affiliation with groups engaged in advocacy may constitute an impermissible chilling effect on the freedom of association guaranteed by the First Amendment, a holding that has been affirmed repeatedly.

Accordingly, neither Texas nor any state can, consistent with the U.S. Constitution, supply the voter information requested by the PACEI.

Indeed, if the information sought was as public in nature as PACEI contends, there simply would be no need for it to request the information from state governments.

Trump's voter suppression commission is a solution in search of a problem.

Contrary to what Trump and Kobach would have the public believe, American elections are not rife with widespread voter fraud. Studies have shown that it is more likely an American "will be struck by lightning than that he will impersonate another voter at the polls."

No, the major ill affecting our election system is not that too many people vote due to voter fraud, but that too many people are prevented from voting due to vote suppression schemes such as discriminatory photo identification requirements, curtailment of early voting, too few polling stations leading to long lines and excessive wait times, and purging of election rolls.

Even in the wholly unimaginable event that the commission created by Donald Trump and led by Kris Kobach could be trusted enough for states to cooperate by sharing their voter data, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that information would be kept secure and the privacy of voters protected.

Recent cyberattacks have made clear the vulnerability of large central databases to cyberattack. An information security breach at the Department of Veterans Affairs compromised sensitive personal data of 26.5 million persons and cost the VA between \$100 million to \$500 million to remediate; another occurring at the Office of Personnel Management impacted 22 million current and former federal employees, many of whom held sensitive security clearances; and the attack on Yahoo, the mother of all security breaches, resulted in 1.5 billion user accounts being compromised.

Because large centralized databases are targets of opportunities for criminals, terrorists, and foreign adversaries, it would be the height of recklessness for Texas or any state to provide the PACEI with personal information of millions of persons via unsecured email to be stored in undersecured databases on undersecured servers.

One of the biggest strengths of the American election system is its decentralized nature.

Aggregating all voter data into one centralized database with questionable security protections makes that data highly vulnerable to a cyberattack that could lead to the personal information of hundreds of millions of Americans being stolen and misused.

Voter privacy and the integrity of the secret ballot are integral to American democracy. Voter privacy rights should and must be protected.

This is especially true since we know for certain that adversaries like Russia are actively involved in cyberwarfare campaigns to undermine our democracy.

There is no denying that our election system is under assault, but not in the way Trump imagines.

Instead of wasting taxpayer money to fund an investigation into voter fraud, which is as mythical as a unicorn, American democracy would be better served by focusing on and correcting the real problem with our elections—voter suppression and external, illegal, and international interference in our national elections.

I am not opposed to employing reasonable, legitimate, and workable means to safeguard

the integrity of our electoral system and to protect the precious right to vote. But Trump's Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity is incapable of doing either and thus should be disbanded and dissolved immediately.

## RECOGNIZING THE UPPER PENINSULA CHAMPIONSHIP RODEO

**HON. JACK BERGMAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo upon the occasion of its 50th Anniversary. We Michiganders are so proud of the rodeo's half-century of world-class entertainment, turnkey production, and commitment to confronting domestic violence.

This tradition began in 1968 to showcase the rich agricultural production and culture of the Upper Peninsula. Originally established as the "Iron River Area Championship Rodeo," the name was changed to "Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo" when Michigan state Senator Joe Mack introduced a resolution proclaiming Iron River to be the "Rodeo Capital of the Upper Peninsula." To anyone who visits the wonderful city of Iron River, it is immediately clear that the bustling community takes great pride in hosting the only professional rodeo in Michigan.

Throughout its proud history, the Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo has featured some of the First District's greatest musicians, athletes, and citizens of the last half-century. The rodeo consistently brings folks from across Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula together to enjoy a weekend of community, culture, and competition. Moreover, each year, the economic benefits brought to Iron River cannot be understated as thousands of people travel to the region. The Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo is about more than just competition, it's a charitable event committed to bringing public awareness to the issue of domestic violence. By raising money for local organizations working to better our communities, the rodeo has set a positive example of what can be achieved when a social event becomes a force for good in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo for 50 years of entertainment and community service. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such a dynamic event and I look forward to enjoying the rodeo's continued success and dedication.

SEAN HAYS

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Senior Chief Petty Officer Sean Hays of the United States Coast Guard on the occasion of his retirement from active duty.

Senior Chief Petty Officer Hays was born and raised in Ocean City, New Jersey, and in 1997, enlisted in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Following the completion of his U.S. Coast Guard training, Sean Hays served the U.S. Coast Guard with distinction, earning promotions, honors and greater responsibilities. Sean Hays would serve as Petty Officer First Class/Second Class, in which his teams coordinated search and rescue missions, conducted narcotics detection, enforced immigration laws, managed fisheries, and enforced federal boating laws on waterways.

The U.S. Coast Guard would promote Sean Hays to the rank of Chief Petty Officer/Petty Officer First Class and ultimately, Senior Chief Petty Officer, the rank he'd earned before and until the time of his retirement.

In his role as Senior Chief Petty Officer, Sean Hays served as officer-in-charge and in command of U.S. Coast Guard Station Philadelphia, managing personnel and resources relative to maritime law enforcement for the Greater Philadelphia Port region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in thanking Senior Chief Petty Officer Sean Hays for decades of commitment to serving and protecting the United States of America and its interests, and in wishing him well in his retirement.

#### RECOGNIZING THE GENEROSITY OF NORTHEAST GEORGIA

##### HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the generosity of my friends and neighbors in northeast Georgia.

Fueled by a passion for service, northeast Georgians recently donated 15,000 pounds of food to the Georgia Mountain Food Bank. Everyday citizens made this incredible donation possible, and, in total, they donated a little more than \$25,000 to feed the homeless men and women in their community.

Their giving spirit reminds me of what I love most about my Georgia home: the people. For so many of my neighbors, kindness is second nature. They never hesitate to help each other out in a time of need.

We have a duty to be aware of the needs in our community and to respond with compassion. After all, as long as we're with friends and neighbors, giving back is really just sharing.

#### REMEMBERING THE HONORABLE BONNIE PANNELL

##### HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of my personal friend and former Sacramento City Councilwoman, Bonnie Pannell. Bonnie passed away on June 27th of this year at the

age of 68. I ask my colleagues to join me in tribute to Bonnie's truly remarkable life, which she dedicated to public service and activism within her community.

Bonnie served Sacramento as a member of its City Council for sixteen years, fighting tirelessly on behalf of the communities of Meadowview, Parkway, North Laguna Creek, and Jacinto Creek. I was honored to work alongside Bonnie in providing flood protection, efficient public transportation, and other essential services for our shared constituents. She was incredibly dedicated to the people she represented, and her partnership was invaluable on numerous initiatives, such as extending Sacramento Regional Transit's Light Rail to Cosumnes River College and opening the Valley Hi-North Laguna Library.

Bonnie was the model of what a true public servant should aspire to be. She knew and loved her constituents, she never lost sight of what was best for them, and she was constantly striving to provide her community with the best resources and opportunities available. The entire Sacramento community suffered a blow when Bonnie was diagnosed with primary progressive aphasia, which forced her to step down from office. I can think of no more fitting tribute to her than what the people of Sacramento did to mark Bonnie's retirement—naming a central and beloved community center in her district the Samuel and Bonnie Pannell Meadowview Community Center. This building, the people and families it serves, and the community in which it is located all remind us that we were honored to be in and experience the presence of Bonnie Pannell.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of the Honorable Bonnie Pannell. I will miss her professionally, and like so many in my beloved hometown of Sacramento, I will miss her personally.

#### INTRODUCTION OF A HOUSE RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING OF UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE INSCRIPTION OF HEBRON AS A PALESTINIAN WORLD HERITAGE SITE IN DANGER

##### HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a House Resolution disapproving of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO's) World Heritage Committee Inscription of the ancient city of Hebron as a Palestinian World Heritage Site in Danger. A UNESCO resolution inscribing Hebron was approved at the end of last week, and is the latest in a regrettable trend at the United Nations (UN). Truly, it seems as if every time I turn around the UN or one of its agencies is pursuing a radical anti-Israel agenda.

In recognizing Hebron as a Palestinian World Heritage Site, UNESCO has once again attempted to rewrite Jewish history out of world history. In the past year, the UN has adopted resolutions that have omitted Jewish identity from the Temple Mount, named for the

location of the Jewish Temple two thousand years ago, and also chastised Israel for planting 'fake Jewish graves' in the vicinity. This is ridiculous and bordering on anti-Semitism.

The resolution on Hebron is no different. At the center of Ancient Hebron lays the Cave of the Patriarchs, a shrine that is holy to Jews, Christians, and Muslims, and recognized as the burial place of the Patriarchs and Matriarchs of the Jewish people, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebecca, Jacob, and Leah. It is the second most holy site in Judaism, behind only the Dome of the Rock on the Temple Mount, where the ancient Jewish Temple stood more than two thousand years ago.

The Cave of the Patriarchs sits within a compound constructed by Herod, an ancient King of Judea during the Second Temple Period, when it served as a place for Jewish prayers at the grave sites of the Patriarchs and Matriarchs of Judaism. When the city of Hebron was conquered 700 years ago by the Mamluks, the compound was converted into a mosque and Jews were prohibited from entering. Thus was the case for nearly 700 years, until the city of Hebron was liberated by Israeli forces during the Six-Day War in 1967 and reestablished as a place where all religions could worship.

This history is important, Mr. Speaker, because UNESCO's World Heritage Committee does not appear to care about it. But I do. We do. All of us in this body understand the importance of world heritage. The UN does itself a great disservice when it allows these revisionist measures to move forward.

Even as wars and humanitarian disasters rage across the globe, the UN remains relentless in its anti-Israel agenda. I therefore felt it necessary to introduce this resolution today disapproving of UNESCO's inscription of Hebron and its Cave of the Patriarchs as a Palestinian World Heritage Site in Danger, and calling on this body to reject any anti-Israel measure that may follow. I ask that it be given immediate consideration.

#### WILLIAM "BILL" C. PACKER III

##### HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of William "Bill" C. Packer III who passed away April 16, 2017. He was a husband, father, community leader and dedicated public servant.

Raised in Brooklawn, New Jersey, Bill was the oldest of six children. He graduated from Gloucester City High School and continued his education at Camden County Vocational and Technical School in Industrial Chemistry, as well as Rutgers University where he studied Advanced Wastewater Treatment. He later earned numerous licenses for water and sewer system operations.

Bill's extensive career started in 1964, as the Superintendent of the Water and Sewer Department for the borough of Brooklawn. He moved to several boroughs in the surrounding areas including; City of Gloucester, Borough of Buena, Borough of National Park and the Borough of Wenonah. Bill also was an instructor

at Camden County Technical School and taught at Rutgers University.

Bill Packer is also an American hero, having served in the New Jersey National Guard from 1965 through 1967.

Bill would continue to serve his community in various positions—as Mayor of Westville from 1997 to 2006, as councilman from 2011 to 2014, as Assistant Fire Chief, Chairman of the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Westville Fire District, President of Region VI of the New Jersey Public Works Association, member of the Board of Trustees for the New Jersey Water Association, president and member of the Westville Lions Club, the Gloucester County Mayor's Association, and the Gloucester County College Board of Trustees.

Mr. Packer alongside his wife of fifty years raised a family of six children. He enjoyed playing the xylophone for the Broomall String Band, serving as umpire and coach for his children's baseball and soccer leagues. His ultimate joy was creating memories with his family.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. William "Bill" C. Packer exemplified exceptional dedication to public service and volunteerism. I ask you to join me in honoring the memory of this great American.

IN HONOR OF MR. PAUL  
VOERTMAN

**HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Paul Voertman, the former owner of the iconic Voertman's Bookstore on Fry Street in Denton, Texas. In addition to his business interests, Mr. Voertman also was a patron of the arts, a humanitarian, and a philanthropist.

Mr. Voertman grew up near the University of North Texas and attended the UNT Demonstration School from kindergarten through twelfth grade. He received his undergraduate degree in economics at the University of Texas at Austin. Upon graduation, he entered the U.S. Air Force. While on active duty in Germany, his father passed away and he returned to Denton to take over his father's general store. Over time, Voertman transformed the store into a well-known cultural landmark renowned for its high-quality wares, reasonable prices, and excellent customer service. Countless students at UNT and Texas Woman's University purchased their textbooks, spiral wear, and more at Voertman's.

Mr. Voertman generously contributed to the arts for more than 60 years and was one of UNT's most generous benefactors. In Denton, he sponsored prizes for Texas art organizations, commissioned locally-produced art works, and established juried art competitions at UNT and TWU, which still continue today. The Voertman-Ardoin Memorial Scholarship assists first-generation college students at UNT, and the Ardoin-Voertman Endowment Fund supports the College of Visual Arts and Design, the College of Music, and the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences.

Mr. Voertman also gave significant financial backing to TWU's Chancellor's Circle, scholar-

ships, and athletics. He was a patron of community organizations, including the Cumberland Presbyterian Children's Home, the Monsignor King Homeless Outreach Center, and the Denton Community Health Clinic.

I would like to express my sincere condolences to Mr. Voertman's family and friends. He will be remembered for his business acumen, cultural contributions, and selfless generosity to the Denton community

FRIENDSHIP MISSIONARY BAPTIST  
CHURCH 100TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. ANDRÉ CARSON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Friendship Missionary Baptist Church on 100 years of service and dedication to the Indianapolis community. As we celebrate its centennial on July 9, 2017, I extend my gratitude to Pastor Ronald Covington and First Lady Kim Covington for their leadership of this community.

Friendship Missionary Baptist Church first opened its doors on the west side of Indianapolis in 1917, under the leadership of Reverend B.T. Westbrook. Since then, Friendship Missionary Baptist Church has gone above and beyond to enrich our community through its youth programs and extensive charitable work, including the redevelopment of the Friendship Westside Center for Excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I would once again like to congratulate Friendship Missionary Baptist Church on their 100th anniversary. I am proud to know that organizations such as Friendship Missionary are flourishing and strengthening our community.

CONGRATULATING SING TAO  
NEWSPAPERS

**HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to congratulate Sing Tao Newspapers on 52 years of providing extraordinary news coverage from its New York branch office.

As one of the oldest and most widely read news sources in the Chinese community, Sing Tao Daily was first published in 1938. Providing in-depth reporting and updates from all corners of the world, Sing Tao Daily allows Chinese citizens living abroad to remain connected with global, national and local coverage. For a number of Chinese residents of my district in the Lower East Side of New York City, Sing Tao Daily serves as that connection.

Through engagement in local communities, the paper is always working to give back by supporting local arts and cultural events.

I congratulate Sing Tao Newspapers for a long history of publishing first-class news coverage. I wish all the staff and journalists many more successful years to come.

MAE KRIER

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a staunch supporter of U.S. efforts during the Second World War, Ms. Mae Krier of Levittown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, across the river from my Congressional District in Southern New Jersey.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, when American men were forced to leave their jobs for the battlefield, Mae Krier, who was 17 years old at the time, courageously left home herself, and joined other women to work in factories that supported the U.S. military during time of conflict.

Mae, her sister, and a friend worked at a Boeing plant in Seattle, where 17,000 B-17s and B-29s were built between 1942 and 1945.

Mae is quoted as saying about her service to the U.S., "Hitler thought American women were soft and that we could not produce because we were more concerned about shopping and keeping the house. We showed him what American women are really made of."

Since the 1980s, Mae Krier has stood as a symbol of women's strength and resolve, dispelling notions that strength and bravery are traits exclusive to men.

I ask you to join me in saluting and thanking Mae Krier for her contributions to our country during the Second World War and her selflessness to provide for our country in a time of need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BILL HUIZENGA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding a missed vote due to a meeting with a constituent. Had I been present for Roll Call vote No. 341, on H. Res. 3003 on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted Yea.

RECOGNIZING PAUL LARKIN'S  
90TH BIRTHDAY

**HON. DARIN LAHOOD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Paul Larkin as he celebrates his 90th birthday on July 4, 1927.

A native of Bloomington, Illinois, Paul enlisted in the Illinois National Guard following his graduation from Normal Community High School. He was then transferred to the U.S. Army, where he served as a Staff Sergeant in the U.S. Army Signal Corp. during the Korean War. Staff Sergeant Larkin, a bronze star recipient, separated from the service after the signing of the armistice in 1953. Upon his return home, Paul raised his four children alongside his wife, Helen, and managed the family's 160 acre farm.



Following his decorated military career, Paul continues to serve others by volunteering in the Normal, Illinois community. As a man of faith, he served on the Epiphany Catholic Church's first school board. He also is an active member of The Knights of Columbus. At age 90, Paul still resides on the family farm and enjoys spending time with his twelve grandchildren and twenty-two grandchildren.

Paul Larkin has dutifully served his nation and continues to proudly serve his family and community. I thank Paul for his service, and I hope he has a happy birthday.

HONORING TERESA REYNOSO DE GONZALEZ

**HON. J. LUIS CORREA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a special person in my district, Teresa Reynoso de Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez and her family have contributed enormously to our community through their efforts in founding and expanding the Northgate Gonzalez markets in California. This month, Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez celebrates her 90th birthday.

Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez was born in Jalostotitlan, Jalisco Mexico on July 2, 1927 and emigrated to the United States in 1976, where she has served as a loving figure and role model to our community as the co-owner of Northgate Market.

Her leadership of Northgate Market has allowed her family to serve the larger Latino population of Southern California, providing affordable and quality foods and services at over thirty locations and offering a taste of home for the many families that visit Northgate Market with Latino products, culture, and language.

Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez and her family's philanthropic efforts extend even further through the Gonzalez Reynoso Family Foundation, which supports neighborhood schools, sports teams, and other events. They have also been instrumental in uplifting the hard-working immigrant community and fostering invaluable memories, such as organizing Christmas gifts for children and hosting reunion meals for local families.

I want to thank Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez for the love she has offered so freely. Today, I join my district in recognizing the impact Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez has made on the lives she has touched, and wish her a very happy and blessed 90th birthday.

ALFRED C. ASHLEY III

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Fire Captain Alfred C. Ashley III on the occasion of his retirement from the Camden Fire Department in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

Captain Ashley was born and raised in Camden, New Jersey. In 1984, he graduated from Camden Catholic High School. In 1987, he joined the Camden Fire Department.

Following the completion of his training at the fire academy, he had many assignments. Arguably, his favorite assignment was Engine 7 on Kaighn Avenue in the City of Camden. After years of hard work and dedication, he earned the promotion of Fire Captain in April 2001.

Captain Ashley was also a vital part of the Camden Fire Officers Union—IAFF Local 2578. In 2009 he was elected Union President, during which he supported negotiations to fair contracts and maintaining workplace safety for members of the Camden Fire Officers Union.

Captain Ashley's last assignment before his retirement was Ladder Company 2-2 Platoon. After 29 years of service, Captain Ashley retired from the Camden Fire Department on December 31, 2016.

He has one daughter, Zakia, who is his pride and joy. He looks forward to spending more time with her, riding motorcycles and cooking for family and friends.

I ask you to join me in thanking Captain Alfred C. Ashley III for his service to the City of Camden's Fire Department and for his dedication to the people he helped each and every day at work and throughout his career.

IN HONOR OF MICHAEL "MATT" PATRICK RYAN

**HON. KEVIN BRADY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the life and faith of my friend and local Houston radio favorite, Michael "Matt" Patrick Ryan.

Convinced at a young age that he was called to a life in the radio industry, Matt Patrick began his career by spinning records at a small New York radio station. After hosting radio programs in New York, Indiana, and Ohio, his career finally brought him to the great state of Texas in 2011.

Matt quickly became a favorite among his listeners with his no-nonsense way of informing and entertaining his audiences. A well-known name in Houston, Matt anchored the morning news on KTRH and hosted the syndicated Matt Patrick Show every afternoon on KPRC. For his talents in the "theatre of the mind," Matt received national recognition as a two-time Radio and Television Broadcasters Hall of Fame inductee.

In addition to his nearly 40-year career in radio, Matt was often a contributor on Fox 26 Houston, where he discussed politics and debated current events with local activists and public officials.

Matt's straight talking attitude and strong conservative values guided him through his broadcasting career and defined him as an individual. Never shying away from fighting for his beliefs, Matt's passion and dedication to defending the constitution inspired countless listeners, known as Patrick's Patriots.

In September of 2015, Matt faced a new challenge: he was diagnosed with stage IV Melanoma. True to his no-nonsense nature, Matt decided to share his struggle with his listeners, and on July 5th, his six year anniversary at KTRH, he announced that he had exhausted all standard of treatment options.

Following his announcement, his co-workers and radio listeners from across Texas joined together in an outpouring of support that Matt called "breathtaking and humbling."

Constantly supported by his best friend and wife, Paula; his children, Lexa, Alanna, and Jake; his sisters, Maureen Shell and Colleen Ryan Neubauer; his parents, John and Marie Drummond; his father-in-law and mother-in-law, John and Cindy Parker; and his sister-in-law, Dawn Parker; Matt's unwavering moral compass and complete faith in God served as an example to his friends, his community, and his listeners.

It is my honor to join Matt's family, friends, and listeners to recognize his lifetime of service and his steadfast faith. On Sunday, July 9, Matt's battle with cancer ended. Matt's life was an inspiration to all who heard him, and he will be sorely missed.

CELEBRATING THE OPENING OF THE STORE AT REBUILDING TOGETHER SARATOGA COUNTY

**HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the opening of The Store at Rebuilding Together Saratoga County.

Founded in 2003 by the Larkin Family of Saratoga Springs, Rebuilding Together Saratoga County is an inspiring example of our community coming together to support its members in need. The organization works with low-income homeowners to provide necessary home repairs and safety updates at no cost to the homeowner. Due in large part to their dedicated team of local volunteers, Rebuilding Together Saratoga County continues to strengthen our community by ensuring that our citizens can live safely and independently in their homes.

The opening of The Store is an important development for Rebuilding Together Saratoga County. The revenue from its sales will directly contribute to the organization's projects and operations, allowing them to reach even more people in need.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank Rebuilding Together Saratoga County for their incredible service. We are grateful for their commitment to bringing our community together, and wish them all the best on the opening of The Store.

RECOGNIZING CARLY WINTERS

**HON. DOUG COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carly Winters, one of

my Hall County neighbors and a high school basketball player. Carly was recently selected for a spot on the USA Student Athlete World Games Tour, where she will be representing the U.S. as part of the women's basketball team.

Carly has played basketball as part of the East Hall Varsity team since she was a freshman. Last year, her team selected her to lead them as team captain.

We can all look up to Carly because she doesn't confine her diligence to the court. Instead, her diligence extends to her studies and relationships.

Carly is an honors student who routinely invests in others. People say that she is the type of person others want to see succeed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to highlight this young woman's achievement, and I look forward to seeing what more she will accomplish, both on the court and in her other endeavors.

---

JOSE BRACERO

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Army and New Jersey National Guard veteran, Mr. Jose Bracero of Camden in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

Mr. Bracero was born in Brooklyn, New York, and raised in Camden. In 1999 he graduated from Camden County Technical School. He then joined the U.S. Army in 2001 and was stationed at Fort Drum, 10th Mountain Division, assigned to 1/32 Infantry Regiment Unit.

Jose Bracero's assignments included a six month peace keeping mission in Kosovo from 2001 to 2002, and a one year deployment to Iraq from 2003 to 2004. After he was honorably discharged from the Army, Jose Bracero served four years in the New Jersey National Guard.

Even after his formal service to the United States military ended, Mr. Bracero's contributions to our country continue. In 2010, Jose Bracero started working on behalf work as an outreach coordinator with New Jersey's homeless veteran population as a mission to serve veterans continued in his case manager for Projects for Assistance in Transition. In 2012, Jose Bracero's Soldier On, a private non-profit organization committed to ending veteran homelessness.

Additionally, Mr. Bracero serves as a liaison to multiple non-profits, faith-based organizations, and local police departments to improve the quality of life for Southern New Jersey veterans with housing needs. He can often be found at train stations, airports, soup kitchens and shelters, working to connect veterans to housing opportunities.

Jose Bracero is an honorable American, having served our great nation in a time of war, and merits our collective appreciation.

I ask you to join me in saluting and thanking Jose Bracero for his service to our country and his ongoing commitment to our nation's veterans.

**HONORING NAVY REAR ADMIRAL  
VINCENT L. GRIFFITH IN CELEBRATION OF HIS RETIREMENT**

**HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Navy Rear Admiral Vincent L. Griffith, in commemoration of his retirement.

Admiral Griffith has a lifetime of leadership and commitment within the United States Navy. Prior to assuming his position as director of the Defense Logistics Agency Logistics Operations, he served as commander for the Naval Supply Systems Command Global Logistics Support. He has served several sea tours, including on a submarine, the USS *Stonewall Jackson*, and two aircraft carriers, the USS *Saratoga* and USS *John C. Stennis*. All of these assignments are only a small glimpse at a long career of dedicated service.

Admiral Griffith graduated with a bachelor's degree in business administration from Berry College in 1981. He was commissioned in 1982 through Officer Candidate School as an ensign in the Navy Supply Corps. He received a master of business administration degree from the George Washington University and completed Emory University's Goizueta Graduate School of Management's Advanced Executive Business Program and the Navy Corporate Business Course at University of Virginia, Darden School of Business. His personal awards include the Defense Superior Service Medal, three Legions of Merit, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, three Meritorious Service Medals, five Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals, the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, and the Expert Rifle and Pistol Medal.

I am honored to congratulate Admiral Griffith on his long and successful career. I thank him for the many lives that he has touched along the way. It is for these reasons that I join Admiral Griffith's family and friends in wishing him a blessed retirement and continued health and happiness in the years to come.

**IN RECOGNITION OF THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORLD'S OLDEST RODEO**

**HON. PAUL A. GOSAR**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 130th Anniversary of The World's Oldest Rodeo, Arizona's own Prescott Rodeo. On 4th of July weekend, cowboys and spectators gathered as they have every 4th of July weekend since 1888 to practice an art as old as raising cattle itself.

Few sports can compete with rodeo as a test of reflex, skill and practical ability. Tracing its origins to the Spanish vaquero, rodeo in America grew from an Arizona-based cowboy competition into a multimillion-dollar enterprise with hundreds of competitors. Participants har-

ness the spirit of ranchers in the American West, combining raw athleticism with instinctive knowledge and frontier toughness.

This incredible event draws nearly 27,000 people per year and allows Prescott Frontier Days, the event's organizer, to donate thousands of dollars per year to several highly-regarded charities. Their dedicated organization of committed volunteers is one of only sixteen ever to have been inducted into the Pro Rodeo Hall of Fame.

This storied event reflects so many of the values that make the American West, and the American spirit more broadly, unique and important. As we reflect on the 241st celebration of our nation's independence, I am proud to applaud the great Americans of the Prescott Rodeo and the tenacious character they embody.

---

**HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT  
JOHN J. DALY**

**HON. TOM RICE**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our nation's heroes, First Lieutenant John J. Daly. Lieutenant Daly was an All-American in the 82nd Airborne Division during World War II and commanded a parachute company in the 508th Parachute Infantry Regiment.

On June 6, 1944 Lieutenant Daly and his comrades landed behind enemy lines in Normandy, France, and secured multiple bridges of supply for the German beachfront embankment.

One month later on July 4, 1944, Lieutenant Daly gave his life attempting to take Hill 95 in Normandy. The sacrifice of Lieutenant Daly and so many others helped make our country what it is today. Because of their sacrifice, we are an independent nation that remains the strongest beacon of freedom, hope, and prosperity in the world.

We owe a great debt to these members of the Greatest Generation and honor their sacrifice, for without which life as we know it would not exist. May God bless the fallen soldiers, veterans, and those who currently serve, and May God bless the United States of America.

---

ALEX HORANZY

**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Army Veteran, Mr. Alex Horanzy of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, just across the Delaware River from my Congressional District in Southern New Jersey.

Mr. Horanzy was born April 22, 1922. He grew up with six other siblings in the Manayunk neighborhood of Philadelphia. On July 13, 1939, at age 17 and with his father's permission, he enlisted in the U.S. Army.

After completing basic training with the 66th Infantry Fort Meade, Maryland, Private Horanzy requested to be shipped overseas; he would be stationed in Oahu, Hawaii where he was assigned to the 19th Infantry at Schofield Barracks, later known as the 24th Infantry Division.

On the morning of December 7, 1941, Mr. Horanzy was jolted awake by the attack on Pearl Harbor. Mr. Horanzy not only survived the Pearl Harbor attack, but his unit courageously fought back and protected our nation in time of conflict. Mr. Horanzy is one of only 88 survivors of Pearl Harbor and the only survivor from the Greater Philadelphia region.

Mr. Horanzy's military service would take him to Australia for intensive training in jungle fighting, and to New Guinea, where he contracted malaria. Mr. Horanzy was honorably discharged from the U.S. military in 1945.

After his military service, Mr. Horanzy attended commercial art school, worked for the Department of the Army, passed his GED test, entered a 4-year apprenticeship for machinists and toolmakers, and worked his way up to a qualified assurance specialist for the Defense Department before his retirement.

He married and had three children.

Alex Horanzy is an honorable American, having served our great nation in a time of war, and merits our collective appreciation.

Alex Horanzy is the living embodiment of the Greatest Generation. I ask you to join me in saluting and thanking Alex Horanzy for his service to our country.

IN MEMORY OF CORPORAL FRANK SANDOVAL

**HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Corporal Frank Sandoval, a Korean War veteran who was laid to rest at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery in San Antonio today.

Corporal Sandoval was taken as a prisoner of war and died in a North Korean POW camp when he was just 20 years old. His family was notified that he was missing in 1951, and told of his death in 1953. Sadly, at the time, Corporal Sandoval's remains were misidentified and interred at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Hawaii.

Thankfully, through DNA analysis, the Department of Defense was recently able to correctly identify Corporal Sandoval's body, and he has returned home to San Antonio after more than 60 years.

That Corporal Sandoval will now permanently rest in San Antonio provides his family with long-awaited closure. His sons, Alex and Frank, who were just babies when their father left to serve the United States overseas, have finally had the opportunity to welcome him home. I join the San Antonio community in wishing the Sandoval family well and honoring the return of a patriot who made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HARTZELL PROPELLER

**HON. WARREN DAVIDSON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize and celebrate the 100th anniversary of Hartzell Propeller. Hartzell Propeller has been a tremendous leader in aviation engineering since its founding in 1917 and it represents the best of American innovation and entrepreneurship. Robert Hartzell founded the company when Orville Wright suggested he use his wood processing plant to manufacture propellers for him and his brother. Since then, the company has developed composite and aluminum propellers for the general aviation market that have broken numerous records and received many awards.

Hartzell Propeller has provided propellers in both world wars and successfully transitioned into the general aviation market because of its commitment to build the highest quality propellers. The phrase "Built on Honor" is placed on the company's propellers to reflect their dedication to this mission. Hartzell Propeller has had a profound impact on the history of American aviation and on its local community in Piqua, Ohio and it will continue to do so for years to come. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in celebrating the 100th anniversary of Hartzell Propeller.

RECOGNIZING CHARLEY PRIDE, WORLD RENOWN COUNTRY MUSICIAN

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2017*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize country

music singer, guitarist, performer, and business owner, Charley Pride. Mr. Pride was inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame in 2000 and is one of only three African Americans to have been inducted as a member of the Grand Ole Opry. His rise to stardom was an amazing feat given his humble beginnings and the obstacles he faced. Nonetheless, he developed a passion for music that could not be satiated. At the tender age of fourteen he purchased his first guitar, taught himself to play by listening to country music on the radio, and the rest is history.

Throughout his musical career, Charley Pride has accomplished what other artists can only dream of: 36 #1 singles, 12 gold albums, 52 top-10 country hits, millions of records sold worldwide, three Country Music Awards, one Grammy Award, and becoming the first major Black country music star.

A man of many talents, Pride also played for the Negro American League's Memphis Red Sox and the East Helena Smelterites before being signed by RCA Records in 1966. The sacrifices he made in order to craft masterpieces such as "Just Between You and Me", "The Snakes Crawl At Night", and "Kiss an Angel Good Mornin'" will forever pale in comparison to the sacrifice he made by putting his musical and professional baseball careers on hold to serve our country.

Despite his undeniable musical talents, Pride faced innumerable obstacles as he—a black man in a field predominantly occupied by whites—pursued a career as a country musician. Despite the heartaches and the challenges, Charley Pride has become one of the most successful artists in the history of country music. From being born in Sledge, Mississippi to a sharecropper, to becoming a special investor and a minority owner of the Texas Rangers, he has lived a life that his parents could not have fathomed. Times have changed, but the love of his three children and his wife, Rozene, have remained consistent.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call this man my constituent. I congratulate and thank him for his role as a trailblazer in music and an inspiration for so many. Mr. Speaker, the work and life of Charley Pride are worth placing these sentiments in the permanent RECORD of the United States Congress.